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EDITORIAL REMARKS BY THE TRANSLATOR

TRANSCRIPTIONS

The author prefers a style of transcription closer to the customary Western forms as used for names, titles, authors, ranks, etc., as opposed to a “sound-alike” style; hence we write Lubsangdanjin, not Luvsandanzan; Šiřa tuuyiš, not Shara tuuji; Altan toboči, not Altan tobchi; and so on for many others. Similarly, the Mongyol-un niyuča tobočiyan is commonly called The Secret History in English.

TRANSLATIONS

When citing certain translations of works, it was natural for Dr. Bira to use sources in Russian known and accessible to his audience, e.g., Kozin’s translation of the Secret History; or Malov’s translation of the Old Turkic monuments. For Western readers, it will be far more useful to cite similar parallel translations available in English. In hope of making these references useful to both types of users, in some cases we give two citations, e.g., one to Kozin for Russian-oriented readers, and one to Cleaves or de Rachewiltz for English-oriented users.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The original edition had 301 bibliographical entries. Naturally, since 1972 many important new works have appeared, some of which are more suitable to be cited now. Hence, we have added new entries for items 292-335, for completeness’ sake. The original entries were organized by source language, as is customary in Russian books; but the additions are in no particular order, as the numbers were assigned as each new work was cited. However, there are not very many of them.

THE NEW EDITION

Dr. Bira had no intention to completely re-write his earlier book: that would be a very great task requiring much time. Our present goal was to revise, correct, update and supplement the first edition to bring it closer to the requirements of today. I first gave the author my basic translation into English; this he corrected, expanded, cut and revised.

Because there exist references to the first edition in works which quoted it, we thought it wise to include the page numbers of the original in brackets, as follows:

[165]
Translator’s Remarks

This may prove helpful to some users wishing to check a reference. These bracketed bold-face numbers are always leftmost on their own line, but not indented. Because of additions and removals made by the author, those original page numbers at times are out of sequence.

QUOTATIONS AND CONSISTENCY

Within an actual quotation, we must of course use the transcription of the original author, hence “Qubilai” for Khubilai, “Genghis” for Chinggis, and so on. Despite striving always to be consistent, e.g., Alan-Goa, Alan-Go’a, Alan-Qoa, and to quote accurately, we may have overlooked a few cases.
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AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION

The present volume represents the first part of an investigation the author intends to make of contemporary Mongolian historiography from its sources to the victory of the People's Revolution of 1921. Bearing in mind that to execute the entire work will inevitably demand a considerable amount of time, the author has decided to publish the present volume as the first part of the entire investigation.

From the time that Russian scholars began the study of Mongolian sources, about a century and a half has gone past (see Bibliography (entries 107, 51, 62 and 55). During this time, through the efforts of Mongolists of different countries much work has been performed in collecting, publishing and studying the monuments of Mongolian historical literature.

In the last half-century the interest of those investigating Mongolian historical works has particularly increased when chronicles were published in both serial editions as well as individually. In 1951, the *Scripta Mongolica* series published by the Harvard-Yenching Institute (USA) began. Its issues, published by photoreproduction, included such major manuscripts as the *Altan Tobči* [The Golden Summary] (entry 73) of Lubsangdanjin (from an original first published in the MPR in 1937), the *Erdeni-yin Tobči* [The Jeweled Summary] by Sayang Sečen, in three manuscript copies (entry 74), the *Bolor Erike* [The Crystal Chaplet] by Rashipuntsug and others (entry 75). These publications also contained valuable introductory articles written by well-known Mongolists. In particular, the introduction by Father A. Mostaert to the issuance of the *Erdeni-yin tobči* by Sayang Sečen presents independent research containing not only a brilliant textual analysis of the various copies of this chronicle, but also valuable historiographic observations.

Beginning in 1954 in Wiesbaden, Germany, there was published a monograph series under the general title of the *Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen*, which from 1959 on became known as the *Asiatische Forschungen*. In these series were published the following chronicles: the *Altan Tobči* by an anonymous author (entry 72), the *History of the Mongolian Borjigid Clan* (entry 88) the *Čaytan Teiše* (The White History of the Doctrine Possessing the Ten Virtues), *The History of Chinggis Khan* (or *The Feast of Youth*), *The Šira tuyuji* [The Great Yellow History] and an anonymous Chahar chronicle, the latter two chronicles published as supplements in the book by Walther Heissig (entry 233) and others.

Yet another series began in 1958 in Copenhagen, *Die Mongolischen Historischen Handschriften*, edited by Walther Heissig and appearing as one divi-
sion of the *Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Maioris*, founded by the Danish Orientalist K. Grønbech. This series published a number of chronicles, in particular the *Altan Kürdün* [The Golden Wheel] (see entry 86).

In 1960, the series *Monumenta Historica* was created in Mongolia, and warmly greeted by the learned world. In succeeding years this series published several volumes of the texts of a number of chronicles and historical documents (entry 39). Among the latest publications one should mention the photo-facsimile edition of the *Altan Tobči* text by Lubsangdanjin (entry 302).

It would be impossible not to mention likewise publications and investigations of Mongolian historical compositions carried out in different countries of the world, such as Russia, China, Germany, Japan, the USA, Hungary and others. A collated text of the *Śīra Tuṣāji* chronicle was edited by N. P. Shastina on the basis of three copies, with indication of variant readings, a translation into Russian (see entry 70 and notes). L. S. Puchkovskii published the chronicle by Gombojab, *Tangγa-yin urusqal* [The History of the Golden Clan of the Ruler Chinggis]. This composition, also titled *The Flowing of the Ganges* (entry 52), is accompanied by an index of names and ethnonyms. In 1970 P. B. Baldanzhapov's translation of the *Altan Tobči* came out in three parts: investigation, translation and commentaries; supplements (a facsimile of MS A; variant readings, bibliography, an index of names, ethnonyms and toponyms) (entry 47). A significant event likewise was a work by N. P. Shastina containing a translation of and commentary on one of the best chronicles of the 17th century, the *Altan Tobči* by Lubsangdanjin (entry 71).

In the Inner Mongolian region of China, publishing activities and studies of the monuments of Mongolian historical literature have made considerable progress since the mid 1970s. A series was set up, the *Mongγol tulyur biiγiγ-ūn čubural* [Mongolian Source Materials], in which historical works occupy a prominent place. The series was initially published by the Commission for Editing Mongolian Source Materials and later by a commission for publishing and editing old source materials for the national minority of the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region. Since that time, many sources of Mongolian historical writing have been made available to researchers, and most of the publications are accompanied by valuable introductions, and in most cases, contain thorough analyses and comments in the field of textual criticism and historiography. To mention only some of the chronicles which belong to the period of our research, I must name the three-volume work by Bayar on the *Secret History* (entry 303); the *Arban buyantu nom-un Čaγγan Teůke* [The White History], edited by Liu Jingsuo (entry 317); the edition of Lubsangdanjin's *Altan Tobči* by Čoyiji (entry 322); the *Erdeni-yin Tobči* of Sayang Sečen by C. Nasunbaljur, re-editing the Ulaanbaatar publication (entry 44); the *Asarγči neretti-yin teůke*, in a revised edition of Kh. Perlee's publication (entry 44); and others.

In the field of publishing and study of monuments of Mongolian historical literature, the Hungarian Mongologists are working successfully; an example of this
is the work of Louis Ligeti on the *Niyuca tobciyan* (the Secret History [of the Mongols]), a translation by him from Old Mongolian into Hungarian, and publication of the Mongolian text in a new transcription (entry 92).


The first really serious textual investigation dealing in a general way with Mongolian historical monuments was the well-known book of Ts. Zhamtsarano, *Mongolian Chronicles of the Seventeenth Century*, which essentially marked the beginning of their scientific analysis (entry 150; English translation entry 292).

The rich heritage of Mongolian historiographical creation is attracting ever-growing interest by the world scholarly community. However, this is primarily expressed in description and cataloguing, in the best instance in philological and textual investigations of published monuments. As for what is genuinely historiographic in their study, this began only recently, no earlier than the 1950's and 1960's.

In 1953 the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences published L. S. Puchkovskii’s article, “Mongolian feudal historiography of the 13th-17th centuries” (entry 186), the first really successful attempt at a historiographic survey of Mongolian historical literature. The author directed attention to the importance of studying Mongolian historical works from the methodological positions of contemporary historiography. In 1959 Kh. Perlee published a small book in Mongolia, *On the Question of pre-Revolutionary Mongolian Historiography* (entry 123), which contained a brief sketch of the history of Mongolian historical knowledge.

A fundamental study in the field of Mongolian historiography was Walther Heissig’s book, *Die Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Mongolen* (entry 233). In this work, especially in the first part, the main attention is directed at analyzing the content of the works studied, at establishing sources used by the chroniclers, and at clarifying the biographies of historians. As regards the second part, its scientific content is weaker than the first; it is limited to the introduction to publication of four Mongolian chronicles of the 19th century in facsimile, as appendices.

In 1960 the author of the present book wrote a small work in Russian, *Mongolian Historical Literature of the XVII-XIX centuries in Tibetan* (entry 133, English translation, 217). It draws attention to Tibetan-language historical literature about the Mongols, written by Mongols themselves. Another work of ours was an attempt at historiographic study of one of the greatest historic compositions—the so-called *Golden Book* by Damdin (entry 134). In 1966 we published
an article in the *Bulletin (Medee)* of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences devoted to the study of the Mongolian historiographic legacy (entry 112).

A contribution to the study of Mongolian historiography is I. Ya. Zlatkin's *Obzor istoriografii Mongolii* [A Sketch of Mongolian Historiography], published in the *Soviet Historical Encyclopaedia* (vol. IX). It reviews the basic stages of development of Mongolian historical knowledge from ancient times down to our days (entry 154, pp. 611-617).

In 1979, that is, one year after the first edition of our book in Russian, the Inner Mongolian scholar Liu Jingsuo published his book *Mongolian Historiography in the 13th to 17th centuries* (entry 305). This work presents an excellent summary of the contents of several important historical monuments of the Mongols, such as the *Mongol-un niyudca tobochiyan* [The Secret History of the Mongols], *the Altan qayan-u tuyuji* [The History of Altan Khan], the *Qad-un undusun quriyangui Altan Tobdi*, the *Altan Tobdi* by Lubsangdanjin, the *Sira tuyuji*, and the *Erdeni-yin Tobdi*. It should also be stated that during the last few years Inner Mongolian scholars have made good progress in studying and publishing interesting monuments of Mongolian historical literature. To give an example, I will mention the *History of Altan Khan*, which is known under several different Mongolian titles (*Erdeni tunumal nereti sudur; Erdeni toli nereti quriyangui cadig; Čakravard Altan qayan-u tuyuji*). This work was published for the first time by Jurunyga in 1984\(^1\) (entry 306). Up to this time this extremely interesting book had been inaccessible to researchers, although some scholars one way or another had mentioned it in their writings.

It is difficult to say exactly when and by whom the book was written, because there are no certain data in its colophon. Nevertheless, the first editor, Jurunyga, and other scholars have shown through analyzing the colophon that the book may have been written about 1607. As Jurunyga and Kesigtoyaqu have demonstrated, the original version of the book was written by Uran Tangyariy Tayun Kiya Saramai or Samani,\(^2\) and it was edited and enlarged by an anonymous author who preferred not to mention his own name in the colophon, but

---

\(^1\) Jurunyga, foreword to *Erdeni tunumal nereti sudur orosiba* (*Undusun-ü keblel-ün qoriya*, 1984), p. 3

\(^2\) Jurunyga (entry 306), pp. 4-5 of foreword; Kesigtoyaqu (entry 309), pp. 112-113.
wrote that he used the work of his predecessor.\(^3\) I have nothing to add to what my distinguished colleagues have written about the authorship of the book, except for one small detail. I must say that the author's name in the original, as distorted in the Mongolian sources, has not been corrected by any of those scholars. In reality, the correct way to spell the name Saramai or Saramani must be Śriman' or 'Śariman,' which originates from Sanskrit Śriman or Sariman, deriving from Sanskrit Śrīman, meaning glorious, one possessed of glory. This name is mostly known among the Mongols in its Tibetan equivalent, dPal-lDan (Mongolian Baldan).

Had this History of Altan Khan been available to me at that time, I could have included it in the paragraph about the origins of Buddhist religious historiography in Mongolia in the second half of the 16th century and the early 17th century (Part Two, Chapter One). Due to the shortness of time, what I can do at present is to refer my esteemed readers to these works of my predecessors, especially that of the just-mentioned scholars.

My general impression is that the book, alongside the works of Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji, Guosi Čorji and others, could serve as good testimony to the formation of a new kind of historical writing among the Mongols, as a result of the Mongols being converted to Lamaism. The History of Altan Khan obviously reflected the newly penetrating Buddhist ideology and aspirations; to be more concrete, it was composed on the basis of the so-called Two Principles, the power of religion and the power of the Khan. The first part of the book is devoted to political and military deeds, that is, to the secular deeds of the Khan, whereas the second part of the book contains his religious deeds. The history of the latter prevails over the former, occupying more than half of the book.

It is the second part of the book which reminds one more of the namtar genre of Buddhist literature, rather than the history of the Khan. It is obvious that the author did his best to exalt Altan Khan as a nom-un qayan or Dhārmarāja (King of the Law), or a Bodisadv Altan qayan (Altan Khan the bodhisattva), or Tengri-yin kūbegūn Altan qayan (Altan Khan the Devaputra), and so on. All these high-flown titles and ideas of the khan's power and religion may well have been borrowed from precepts of the Altan Gerel (the Suvarṇaprabhāsottama), which had been published, by decree of Altan Khan, in block-print form, in 1584\(^4\).

This practically exhausts a general view of works on the question of Mongolian historiography during the nearly 200 years that world Mongolian studies have existed. From this survey it emerges that the "virgin lands" of Mongolian historiography remain far from cultivated, which also obviously explains the erroneous assertions about Mongolian historiographic activity sometimes found in the literature. Thus, for example, the well-known book by J. W. Thompson, A History

\(^3\) Jurungya, Erdeni tunumal, p. 181.

of Historical Writing, says: “The Mongols themselves did not begin the narration of the great deeds of Jinghiz Khan, and his sons and grandsons, until long after the events. . . . The sole history of the Mongols written in the Mongol language which has survived is that of Sanang Setsen. . . . The original was discovered in Tibet in 1820 (?! Sh. B.). This book, supplemented by some information gleaned from Chinese annals, is the sum total of our knowledge of the history of the Mongols” (entry 283, p.354). The erroneous nature of such utterances is self-evident.

In the 1950s and 1960s, the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London undertook effectual measures to study the historiography of Asian peoples (India, Pakistan, Ceylon, China, Japan) and the Middle East, and issued a number of works under the general title Historical Writing on the Peoples of Asia. However, in this entire series no place was found for Mongolian historiography (if we do not count an article by Owen Lattimore, “The Social History of Mongol Nomadism,” which really does not have a direct connection to historiography (entry 248, pp. 328-343).

Thus one may boldly state that Mongolian historiography remains unknown to the world scholarly community, with the exception of a narrow circle of specialist-Mongolists. As early as 1960, speaking in debate on the paper by the English historian M. Butterfield in the section for methods and general problems at the XI International Congress of Historical Sciences in Stockholm, we observed that world historiography cannot limit itself solely to Western historiography; it must include within itself the rich historiography of the Orient, as well as Mongolian. And at the following XII International Congress of Historical Sciences (Vienna, 1965), one of the sessions of the section for methodology and contemporary history was devoted entirely to judgment of our report on the topic “Mongolian Historiography” (entry 215, pp. 49-56). The paper evoked great interest, as witness of which are the speeches of delegates and echoes in print (entry 216, pp. 577-586).

The author’s tasks in this book are quite vast, both in the sense of the chronological frame of the study, as well as in the scope of the material under study. An analysis of Mongolian historiography brings forth a host of new, rather complex and as yet little-studied problems, the burden for the solution of which is scarcely to be placed on the shoulders of a single person.

In studying Mongolian historiography, we proceed from the methodological principles of modern historiographic science, seeing in it an independent discipline, which studies the process of development of the historical knowledge of peoples. We have striven to investigate the history of Mongolian historical knowledge, the history of political, philosophical and religious ideas, the methods of historical research and the interpretation of sources in the works of Mongolian historians. Our task has concluded not merely in ascertaining this or
that phenomenon, but in explaining it, taking into account the concrete social-economic conditions of the nomadic society of the Mongols. We endeavored likewise to display the national individuality of Mongolian historiography, imparting those ideological-political trends which expressed the national aspirations and interests of the Mongols.

In our view, the history of Mongolian historiography may be divided into the following four basic periods:

1. Historical knowledge in ancient times and in the period of the Mongol Empire (to the end of the 14th century).
2. The post-Imperial period (15th-17th centuries).
3. The period of Manchu supremacy (18th century-early 20th century).
4. The rise and development of modern historiography (1920 to the 1990's).

The present work embraces merely the first two of these periods: from ancient times to the end of the 17th century.

The history of Mongolian historiography has its own specific peculiarities. It arose in a typical nomadic milieu, developing and enriching the centuries-old historiographic traditions of nomadic tribes and peoples, who had of yore settled the expansive steppes of Mongolia.

It is impossible to resolve the problem of sources of Mongolian historical knowledge by assuming a break from traditions inherited by them from the proto-Mongolian and Turkic-speaking inhabitants of Mongolia, inasmuch as it is proven that the advances in historical knowledge of nomadic peoples, equally as in other spheres of cultural life, did not vanish without a trace, but were transferred from one to the other, conditioning in the final account their rebirth and development of written history among the Mongols.

There are not a few common themes in the legends and traditional tales of Turkic and Mongolian peoples, in their views of their own origin from totemic ancestors, in their shamanic views of the external world and of history, of the Khans' power, and likewise in the means of stating historical events. The Cult of Köke tengri (Blue Heaven) held a central position in the historical-political views of both Turks and Mongols. A sizeable attainment of the nomadic peoples was working out the twelve-year animal-cycle chronology, which lay at the basis of their reckoning of historic time.

The historical-political concepts of the khagan's power among the early Mongols undoubtedly arose on the basis of traditions of many centuries, going back to the time of the Hsiung-nu. The system of state offices among the Mongols in the 13th century was essentially created on ancient models. It is interesting that these offices, fixed in Chinese script in the T'opa language, fully coincide with those we encounter in the Secret History and particularly in the Čayan tēuke (The White History).

The historical knowledge of nomadic peoples in the aggregate may be called "nomadic historiography." The tribes and peoples who inhabited Mongolia at
various times made their contribution to its creation. The appearance among the
Mongols in the 13th century of written history could be regarded as a most
mighty attainment and a garland of “nomadic historiography.” A graphic witness
to this is the first-born work of Mongolian historiography, the Secret History, a
singularity of which is its close link with Mongolian oral creation.

After the appearance of writing, Mongolian historiography developed under
complex conditions of wars of conquest and the formation of empire by the
Chinggisids (heirs of Chinggis). Despite the fact that during the rule of the Yuan
dynasty intensive work on establishing a written history was conducted, very few
historical works survive from those times. We have attempted to conduct an
analysis of this period of Mongolian historiography not only on the basis of the
few monuments which survived, but also through the medium of reconstructing
Mongolian historical knowledge with the aid of Chinese and Persian sources: the
Yuan shih (History of the Yuan [Dynasty]), the Tārikh-i-Jahāngushā or History
of the World Conqueror by Juvayni,

Jāmi‘at Tawārīkh, or Complete Collection of Histories, by Rashīd al-Dīn.

In the Empire period Mongolian historiography came into contact with three
developed historiographic traditions: the Buddhist, the Chinese and the Islamic,
but this circumstance did not exert any substantial influence on the further devel­
one of historical knowledge in Mongolia. With the fall of the Empire, Mong­
gol ties with Chinese and Iranian historiography were broken. In connection with
this, a number of valuable old Mongolian historiographic monuments taken by
Mongolian conquerors into foreign lands, or created there, always turned out to
get lost in a foreign ethnocultural milieu.

A new period in the development of Mongolian historiography began with
the fall of the Mongolian Yuan dynasty (1368). The country’s disintegration
which followed upon this and a spate of internecine wars are naturally likewise
reflected in the historiography; however the writing of history continued to occur
even in the “Dark Period” of Mongolian history, i.e., in the 15th-16th centuries.
We know that later Mongolian chronicles, especially of the 17th century, contain
no small amount of data borrowed from written sources of the 15th-16th centu­
ries; this bears witness to the uninterrupted continuity of Mongolian chronicle-
writing. Some Persian and Chinese sources of the 15th-16th centuries state that
the basic form of historiographic activity of the Mongols in the period of time
being examined was compiling genealogical lists in the families of tayijis (the
princely descendants, the Chinggisids).

From the second half of the 16th century there is a perceptible activization of
historiographic work: on the one hand, the Mongols drew into closer contact with
the Indo-Tibetan religious-historical school, and on the other, old Mongolian his­
torical-political traditions were revived and acquired further development. From
the end of the 16th and in the course of the 17th century there were being built up
and finally fused the bases of a new historiography, which was widely developed
in the 18th and 19th centuries, and which Prof. Walther. Heissig calls Familien-
Mongolian historiography, despite foreign domination, was not transformed into an appendage to Manchu-Chinese official historiography. On the contrary, it drew closer than ever before to another branch of Oriental historiography—the Buddhist.

Buddhism, like Christianity, created its own historiography in the countries where it became the dominant religion (Ceylon, Nepal, China, Tibet, Mongolia, Buriatia and others). For this reason we may speak about a Buddhist historiography common to those countries, one which, having arisen in ancient India, was further developed in a number of Asian countries.

The general features of Buddhist historiography are conditioned by a unity of world-view and a methodology of historical notions.

Presentations of history amongst the Buddhists were closely linked with their theological-philosophical doctrine about non-reality, and the brief span of worldly life. In their opinion, both historical activity and the historical process are as ephemeral as life itself. From this point of view, history as such would have no meaning if it did not serve the goals of the doctrine concerning ethics, about the ways of attaining Nirvana—the final goal of human life. In other words, history ought to become a proponent of Buddhist morality and a handmaiden of Buddhist theology. It should not be surprising that many utterances of the famed Aśoka about sovereigns observing the laws of *dharma* have an astounding similarity with the propositions of *dharma* (the doctrine of religion, the doctrine of the ruler's power), which far later were promulgated by the Tibetan rulers and the Mongolian khans.

The general nature of Buddhist historiography is likewise expressed in a unified scheme for writing history and in the cosmological concepts of the origin of the universe, biographies of the Buddha, of the ancient, mostly mythological, Indian kings and so on. In this regard the Ceylonese chronicle *Mahāvamsa* [The Great Chronicle], the Tibetan *Debter sngon-po* [The Blue Annals], and the Mongolian *Erdeni-yin tobči* scarcely differ from one another. As concerns history, they are obliged to direct it to its mythological origins amidst the kings of the Buddhist world of Mahāsammata. Thus the Buddhists tried to derive the genealogy of their kings from a single common origin, which appeared in the homeland of their faith, India.

Despite indisputable Buddhist influence, the historiographic creativity of the Mongols did not lead to a blind subservience to Buddhist historiography. The Lamaist variety of Buddhism, though it was widely disseminated in Mongolia, clashed there with local historiographic tradition which Buddhism was not able to reduce to naught, nor by the same token open a way to unlimited domination by church historiography, as took place in Tibet. Characteristically, under the conditions of Manchu rule,
Mongolian interest in their historical past not only did not drop off, but actually rose considerably, which may be regarded as a reaction to foreign intrusion. During this period there was reborn an old Mongolian historical tradition, which may be termed the tradition of the *Secret History*. It would be no exaggeration to state that it was precisely under the conditions imposed by the foreign yoke that written history again became an important factor in the national memory about the historical past of the country. It is no coincidence that Lubsangdanjin expresses his wish that “the great people continue to read” his history (entry 41, p. 192), and the anonymous author of the *Śīra tuyuji*, at the very beginning of his work proffers his famous utterance, “If the average man does not know his origin, that is like an ape, bewildered in the forest; if he knows not his tribe, that is like a dragon made of turquoise; if he reads not the writings relating the genealogy of his ancestors, that is like an abandoned child” (entry 70, p. 15 of the translation, p. 125 of the original).

At the root of the juncture of Buddhist and surviving Mongolian traditions in Mongolian historiography there lay new views. Attempts were made to periodize history in general and the history of Mongolia in particular, and the old Mongolian ideas about the Khan and his power were changed. Just at this time the historical-political concept of supreme power was devised, at the root of which lay on the one hand the old Mongolian tradition of the Khan’s power, and on the other, the Buddhist doctrine of the Law of Dharma. This concept reflected a tendency towards a close union of Throne and Altar. Let us cite two illustrations. At the end of the 16th century, Altan Khan, who had proclaimed Lamaism as the official religion, presented himself as the “King of the Dharma” and the Third Dalai Lama as the head of the religion. A second example, from the history of the Mongolian theocratic monarch of 1911-1919: the Bogdo Khan was proclaimed the “Bogdo Khan, exalted by many, holding united [the reins] guiding Religion and State.” Consequently the aristocratic-clerical elite, striving for a rebirth of Mongolian statehood in the form of an absolute Buddhist monarchy, was actually guided by the doctrine of the Two Principles.

In accord with the ideas of Buddhist historiography, the Mongolian historians strove to periodize world history into the three Buddhist monarchies (India, Tibet, Mongolia), in a fashion similar to the way the proponents of medieval Christian-feudal historiography devised a scheme to periodize world history by the four monarchies (Assyro-Babylonian, Medeo-Persian, Greco-Macedonian and Roman). In an attempt to link Mongolian history with the history of the Buddhist world, primarily with the homeland of Buddhism, India, the Mongolian chroniclers advanced a theory of the “migration” of the above-mentioned Two Principles, very reminiscent of the medieval European idea of the “transference” of empire. According to this theory, the first Buddhist monarchy founded by King Mahāsammata, did not perish, but continued to exist uninterruptedly, migrating from one country to another.
The Mongolian chronicle-writers advanced a more specific periodization for the history of Mongolia itself:

1. The first period was from ancient times to the fall of the Yuan dynasty in China, a time of growth for state and religion;
2. The second was the internecine struggle between the scions of the Golden Clan of the Chinggisids, a time of decline in state and religion;
3. The third, from the end of the 16th century, saw the re-birth of both State and Religion.

On the basis of this periodization of Mongolian history, a unified scheme for writing the history of Mongolia was established.

Mongolian historiography proceeded along a meandering path of ups and downs. But it kept unchanged its aristocratic-elitist character, its allegiance to the interests of the steppe aristocracy who were operating in feudal-like fashion, and to the interests of State and Church.

Mongolian historiography occupies a visible place in the history of Oriental historical writing. Regarding the need to study it, the Academician N. I. Konrad wrote, “In the countries of the Orient there existed not only a very rich historiography, but also a historiology, a science about history. Both the facts of history and the historical process were perceived as an aspect of fixed conceptions... It is impossible to accept such conceptions unreservedly, but it is necessary to understand what they mean, because they have also created such a relation to the actual historical process” (entry 160, p. 27).

The present book was written in 1972 (now thirty years ago), when it was not so easy for the author to have access to the publications and works of foreign scholars working on the same subject in various countries of the world, particularly in China and Japan. On the other hand, since that time Mongolian studies have advanced considerably, and had I time and opportunity, I could have re-written many more pages of my book.

When I found out that Professor Krueger of Indiana University was translating my book into English, and he kindly sent his manuscript to me to look through, I decided that the minimum I could do was to make those changes and additions which I found inevitable. This is something I unfortunately had no chance to do when my book was translated into Chinese and published in the Chinese People’s Republic in 1988, because I was not informed about this.

I would like to thank Professor J. Krueger, the eminent Mongolist, for his excellent translation of my book, and for his kindness in giving me the chance to revise my book, at least to some extent, after so many years had passed.
I would also like to thank Professors Edward Kaplan and Henry Schwarz, and Mr. Wayne Richter for their careful editorial work on the manuscript and for bringing it to the point where it was ready for publication.

Shagdaryn Bira
Ulaanbaatar
1995-1999
CHAPTER ONE

THE BIRTH OF MONGOLIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

I. Preconditions for the Appearance of Written History Among the Mongols

The Sources of Mongolian Historical Knowledge

There is no doubt that oral historical works developed independently among the nomadic peoples who inhabited the ancient territory of Mongolia. There is also no doubt that Mongolian historical knowledge was linked with oral traditions not only of the Mongols themselves, but of their predecessors who had dwelt in Mongolia and played an important role in its social-economic, political and cultural history. But we know very little about how, in what forms and in what way the transmission of cultural achievements took place, and how they were appropriated by the Mongols.

It is well-known that among the nomadic tribes and peoples of antiquity and of the early Mongolian middle-ages various types of legends, native traditions and tales were widely distributed, in one way or another reflecting the historical world-view of the nomads.

As Professor Owen Lattimore observed, the earliest known epic account of Modun current among the Hsiung-nu was recorded by Ssu-ma Ch’ien in his Shih-chi. Lattimore summarizes the story as follows:

Modun was placed as a hostage among the Yüeh-chih by his father, Tumen, who wished to get rid of him in favor of another heir. Tumen then suddenly attacked the Yüeh-chih, expecting that they would kill Modun, but Modun took one of the best Yüeh-chih horses and escaped back to the Hsiung-nu. Tumen received him as a hero and gave him command of ten thousand horsemen. Modun trained these followers to obey the signal of a “whistling arrow,” putting to death those who failed to draw on any target at which he had aimed such a signal ar-
row. After exercising them in this procedure, during a subsequent hunt he shot at his own favorite horse, and put to death those who did not follow the signal. He then tested them again, but more severely, loosing an arrow against one of his favorite wives, and again killed those who did not obey the signal. Again while hunting, he shot a “whistling arrow” at a fine horse of his father. All of his followers answered the signal. Judging them now sufficiently disciplined, Modun at last went hunting together with his father. During the hunt, he drew his bow against Tumen: His followers did the same, making them all guilty, and leaving Modun free to seize tribal power (entry 307, pp. 463-464).

There is another heroic account of the Hsiung-nu, also quoted by Lattimore:

There followed a war of tribal supremacy. The Tung-hu demanded of Modun a horse of the Hsiung-nu that had been famous in Tumen’s time. Against the advice of his lieutenants Modun surrendered the horse. Thinking he feared them, the Tung-hu then demanded from Modun one of his wives. Modun surrendered her, still against the word of his lieutenants. Finally, the Tung-hu claimed a stretch of land that lay between their borders and those of the Hsiung-nu. Modun consulted his advisers, who said that it did not matter whether he gave up the land or not. This time Modun was angered. Saying, “Land is the root of a nation; how can we cede it?” He put to death all those who had advised him to yield. Moreover, he followed this up by attacking the Tung-hu before he could be attacked (entry 307, p. 464).

Concerning these accounts, Lattimore rightly pointed out that “all of this recital is notably different from the chronicles of Chinese history, not only in detail, which is to be expected, but in style.” He goes on to say: “Though somewhat modified by translation and by the terse wording of Chinese literary composition, it echoes, I think, an original account current among the Hsiung-nu themselves in epic or saga-like form. Even as it stands, it is clearly more akin to such nomad [p. 465] history in legendary form as the older (pre-Chingghis) material in the Secret History of the Mongols than it is of the conventions of Chinese historical writing” (entry 307, pp. 464-465).

It is known, for instance, that the T’o-pa tribe had at its disposition a heritage of writing history which has left its traces in Chinese sources. The Mongolian historian G. Sukhbaatar is right when he asserts that the genealogy of the T’o-pa khagans, cited in the Wei-shu [History of (ruling) the Wei Dynasty] is quite reminiscent of the genealogy of the ancestors of Chinggis Khan in the Niyuca tobciyan [The Secret History], and related not to the Chinese but to the T’o-pa historical tradition (entry 126, p. 19; cf. also entry 219, pp.171-181).

As to the existence of historical traditionary tales among the T’o-pa, there is a legend about their re-settlement, briefly transmitted in the Wei-shu. According to this legend, Khan Hsüan T’ui-yin resettled in the south and acquired a great lake more than a thousand li in circumference. “The region was dark, cauldron-shaped
and swampy. . . . When Khan Hsien Lin sat on his throne, a saint said to him, ‘Since this remote and closed locality is not suitable for founding a capital, it will be necessary to remove further away.’ Then the Khan, being of advanced years, conveyed the throne to his son Tse-fen. He removed to the south and founded the Huns in an ancient locality” (entry 126, p. 133).

The legend in question is interesting because it has much in common with legends about origin and resettlement of other nomadic peoples of Central Asia. Let us point out for example a Turkic legend about the origins of the Turks. According to this account, the ancestors of the Turks dwelt at the edge of a great swamp, until they were exterminated by the neighboring tribe. Only a ten-year old boy remained alive, and he was saved from starvation by a female wolf, who became his wife. Hiding from enemies who finally even slew the lad, the last representative of the annihilated tribe, the wolf-dam fled to the mountains of northern Kao-ch’ang, where she bore seven sons, the father of whom was the lad she had saved. One of these sons received the name Ashina, this being the name of the tribe founded by him. His brothers founded their own clans.

Later on Ashina became the leader of a new tribe. The number of clans later expanded to several hundred. One of the heirs of Ashina, Asyan-shad, led the descendants of the she-wolf from the Kao-ch’ang mountains and settled them on the Altai (Ch’in-shan), where they became subjects of the Juan-juan, acquiring and working iron for them. Here they took the tribal name of “Turk,” which according to the legend, is connected with the local term for the Altai Mountains (entries 254, p. 40; 49, pp. 220-221; 158, pp. 103-4).

This legend in its turn reminds one of the old Mongolian legend about the origin of the clan to which the ancestors of Chinggis Khan belonged. It was stated by Rashīd al-Dīn in the form in which the Mongols related it to him. Let us cite it almost in its entirety:

Approximately two thousand years prior to the present [time], among a tribe called Mongol in ancient times, there occurred a clash with other Turkic tribes, ending in a conflict and war. There is a tale [conveyed from the words] of respected persons devoted to verity that other tribes defeated the Mongols and inflicted such a slaughter [amongst] them that no more than two men and two women remained [alive]. These two families, in fear of the enemy, fled to an inaccessible locality. Among these mountains were abundant grass and a steppe healthy [in climate]. The name of this place was Ergune-kun . . . and the names of those two persons were Nukuz and Kiyant. They and their descendants stayed long years in this place and multiplied. . . .

Among these mountains and forests this people multiplied and the area of ground occupied by them grew narrow and insufficient; then they conducted a council among themselves, as to what would be the best way and the path easiest of execution for them to emerge from this rough ravine and narrow mountain defile. And then they found [there] a place where formerly iron ore originated and where iron constantly melted. Having gathered everyone together, they readied much firewood and coal in the woods in entire cartloads, cut off the heads of sev-
enty bulls and horses; skinned the hides entirely from them and made [from them] blacksmiths' bellows. Then they placed in layers the firewood and coal at the foothills of this slope and so organized that spot that at one stroke with these seventy bellows they blew [fire under the firewood and coal] until that [mountainous] slope melted down. [As a result] from it they got an enormous [quantity] of iron and [along with it] also opened a passage. They all nomadized away and departed that narrow spot for the expanses of the steppe...

Inasmuch as Dobun-Bayan, the husband of Alan-Goa, came from the Kiyan clan, and Alan-Goa from the Kuralas tribe, the genealogy of Chinggis Khan, as set forth above, goes back to them. In consequence of this, [the people] have not forgotten that mountain, the melting of iron in the blacksmithing operation, and in the clan of Chinggis Khan there exists the custom and rule that on that night which is the beginning of the New Year, they prepare blacksmith's bellows, forges and coal. They make glow some iron, and having put it on the anvil, beat it with a hammer and stretch it out [into a strip] in gratitude [for their release]" (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, pp. 153-155).

The common nature of the basic topic lines of the legends cited above, their character and spirit of narration, evoke great interest. Unfortunately, the existing level of our knowledge makes it difficult to judge in what fashion the attainments of oral creation were conveyed from one tribe to another, finally reaching the Mongols. Undoubtedly, no small role is played here by such factors as identical life-style, a more or less common historical fate, and likewise the similar level of social-economic development. Under these conditions it would prove impossible for common features not to have developed, not only in the historiographic forms and content of the predecessors of the Mongols and the Mongols themselves, but also in the historical-political views and historiographic activity in general of the Mongols and their predecessors.

The direct basis and prerequisite for the rise of Mongolian written history is naturally the above oral tradition, which was engendered and developed amongst these Mongolian tribes. Its beginnings lie deep in the centuries before 1200, but it was fully put together at the beginning of the 13th century, and crowned the process of forming the Mongolian nationality and the creation of a unified Mongolian state.

It is the ancient historical traditions of the Mongols that Rashid al-Din communicates. Precisely this tradition, which evolved in the pre-script period, is the nourishing soil in which Mongolian historiography grew up. The Secret History bears eloquent witness to this.

As S. A. Kozin justly said, the greater introductory part of this monument is nothing other than the putting into writing of “the folkloric oral science of genealogy” (entry 57, p. 51).

Actually, the genealogical history of the ancestors of Chinggis Khan, beginning with Börte Chino, is reproduced in the Secret History in the form of tradi-
tional tales remaining as a national memory about the historical past. It is true that by the beginning of the 13th century many rather old tales, carefully preserved in popular memory, nonetheless became forgotten or were layered over by new ones which had arisen in connection with the stormy events of that epoch.

Sources bear witness to the fact that the historical traditions of the Mongols of the 13th century go back to the times of Dobun-Bayan and Alan-Goa, who in the opinion of Rashid al-Dīn (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 8) lived at the beginning of the Abbasid caliphate (750-1258) and in the Samanid epoch (819-999), i.e., towards the 8th or 9th century. It must be noted that in the initial part of Rashid al-Dīn’s work he sets forth the genealogy of Chinggis Khan’s forebears as does the Secret History, solely according to the old Mongolian traditionary tales.

The historical tradition lying at the base of the first written monuments is not marked by diversity of theme and is mainly centered about one and the same theme. This is explained by the fact that in the period when historiography arose among the Mongols, when the power of the khanāns began to grow, the old historical tradition substantially changed. Everything linked with the historic past of conquered tribes was subject to forgetting, and the traditionary tales of the victors, on the contrary, were not only preserved, but even became the predominant recollection of all the Mongols united under the might of a powerful khagan.

This is well seen from the example of Chinggis Khan and his kinsmen. Since the rise of Mongolian historiography coincided with the formation of the state with Chinggis Khan at the head, it preserved only the genealogical tales about the founding ancestors of this state. The tales connected with the history of other Mongolian clans and tribes were pushed into the background and then forgotten. They kept only those which bore on events in the history of the Borjigid clan that gave Chinggis Khan to the Mongols. This is why there have come to us so few examples of oral historical creative works of the Mongols from those distant times, when these works were not yet fixed in written form and were transmitted orally from generation to generation. Nonetheless a representation of ancient Mongolian historical tradition was preserved in the sources. As an example we cite the legend quoted above about the origins of the Mongols, which is the oldest of all the traditionary tales known to us. This legend enables one to surmise how the ancient Mongols imagined their origins and the history of the royal line. The date cited by Rashid al-Dīn for the beginning of Mongolian history is interesting. The legend he quotes speaks of events which took place 2,000 years before the author’s lifetime, i.e., about 1,000 B.C. It is quite possible that in it are preserved echoes of real events connected with the history of ancient Mongolian settlement.

A second traditionary tale, one about the origin of Chinggis Khan’s ancestors, dates to the beginning of the 13th century when oral reportage was still dominant, and forms the base of the written genealogical history of the Mongolian khanāns. Its great popularity and authoritativeness is shown by the fact that it also served as the main source for foreign historians of that era, who wrote the history of the
Mongols, commonly at the command of their rulers. The genealogical line of Chinggis Khan’s ancestors on the whole is presented identically in the *Secret History*, in the *Complete Collection of Histories* by Rashid al-Din, as well as in the *Hu-lan Deb-ther* (The Red Annals) by Kun-dGa’ rDo-rJe (= Gunga-Dorji), compiled in the Tshal Gung-thang monastery in Tibet (entries 90, 223). We shall return to this topic again below.

Judging by examples of popular oral creations of the early Mongols preserved in the sources, an epic genre, arisen in the depths of the popular mass mind, predominated. Oral creativity had richly developed the folk tales, legends, songs and poems linked with the lives and histories of these and other tribes and their brave leaders. Transmitted from generation to generation, these accounts were set forth in that oral-literary language, the existence of which in the pre-literate period was established by B. Vladimirtsov. One may find in written monuments not a few examples of this. Rashid al-Din, for instance, informs us:

Qutula Khan, of the six sons of Qabul Khan, became the ruler. . . . The Mongolian poets heaped up many verses in praise of him and described his bravery and valor. They say that his voice was so mighty that his shout sounded across seven hills and was like an echo resounding from another mountain, and that the hands of his arms are like

[24]
the paws of a bear; when he seized a man with both hands, no one was stronger or more powerful than he, and without [any] effort he would bend him in two like a wooden arrow, and break his back. Every meal he ate consisted of an [entire] big three-year old ram, and an enormous flagon of kumiss, and he was still not sated (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 42-42).

In the extract cited, despite the fact that it comes to us in a Persian translation, it is not hard to detect an epic style typical of the early Mongols, in the way they sing about the strength and agility of the steppe *bayaturs* (knights), who are the chief heroes of the Mongolian epic.

As the sources testify, “The Mongols in ancient times customarily transmitted [orally] most messages in a rhythmic and allegorical speech” *(ibid.,* vol. 1, book 2, p. 117). This means of communication was called by the “oral writers” of the Mongols *da’un bari ulhu* (lit. “to entrust to the voice”). Many messages, depending on their importance and the limited number of available literary forms, were memorized by the people. The “oral letter” also served to reproduce the historical past and to perpetuate the memory of outstanding personalities, famous particularly for their sharp-witted oratory and messages. For this reason one may say that such messages belong to a special genre of oral historiography created by the Mongols, that to a certain degree replaced written documents. It is no accident that the authors of such early sources as the *Secret History* or the *Complete Collection of Histories* regarded these as important historical documents, set forth in an oral form, and thus preserved for us many such messages. In demonstration of this we cite the message of Qadan-taishi to his opponent Toqtai:
Inform Toqtai that when two fighting rams clash with one another, they do not uncouple until one of them is wounded and beaten, and if they go at it anew [later], then they clash with their horns, until one of them is wounded, and your position is specifically this: Do you wish to take revenge for your father, or what are you able to do? At my left flank is [my] elder brother-bayatur named Qutula-kaan, from the land of Gurkutas, the abode of marvels; in comparison with the strength of his voice, the echo from those

high mountains seems weak; and the paws of a three-year old bear are weaker than the strength of his hands; from the swiftness of his assault, the water of three rivers begins to create waves; and from a wound [suffered] from his blow, the children of three mothers begin to cry. And at my left flank there is an in-law [quda] by the name of Arig-cine; when he goes hunting in dense woods, he seizes a gray wolf by the paw and smashes him to earth; he gnaws off the head and paws of a leopard, staves in the head of and fractures the neck of a tiger... In the center of my forces there is a [fellow] named Qadan-taishi; his hands never fail to hit the mark, and his feet never stumble, if he assaults a mountain or slope. When we three get together, we'll toss him [Toqtai] out of his lands and camp-grounds, and deprive him of his household staff and menials. Now, although [my] speech has been drawn out, nonetheless [I add the following]: they have dispatched you, lad­dies, as messengers because you are the most sharp-witted and renowned [per­sons] of the entire nation. You must not forget these words and repeat [them to those who sent you] (ibid., vol. 1, book 2, p. 39).

Many similar oral messages can be found in the Secret History. Such were exchanged by Chinggis Khan with Jamuqa, the Kereit Wang Khan, Dayan Khan of the Naiman, and others. From such messages one may form judgments about the interrelations of Mongolian tribes, about important events in their lives, etc. As example we may call on the message of Chinggis Khan to Wang Khan of the Kereits, as quoted in the Secret History and in the Complete Collection of Histories (see entries 57, §177; 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 127-129). It is correct that the sources transmit some details in different ways, but on the whole they are identi­cal. In this “oral letter,” Chinggis requests the leader of the Kereits to clarify the reason the latter has cancelled their union as sworn brothers (anda). The message contains valuable information about the internecine conflicts frequently placing Wang Khan in a critical position, from which he was extricated solely thanks to Chinggis’s father and Chinggis himself (entry 57, §169).

From what has been set forth it is evident that during their pre-literate period the Mongols had at their disposal a rich oral historiography and a well-developed oral literary language. This also served as the foundation on which the written history of the Mongols was put together and grew.

But written history in a nomadic world first arose not at the time of the Mongols, but long before their appearance on the world arena. The earliest traces of histo­riographic activity on Mongolian territory were laid down by the Turks and
Uighurs, whose written monuments permit one to judge more confidently about the continuity of historiographic tradition among the nomadic dwellers of Mongolia. One is convinced of this by analyzing the Turkic and Uighur runic inscriptions of the 7th and 8th centuries. Let us take, for instance, the Turkic inscriptions on the monuments dealing with Kül-tegin, Bilge Khan and Tonyuquq (entries 65; 192; 104; 66, pp. 40-49; 293; 69; 166).

As is well-known, the small and large inscriptions on the Kül-tegin monument were written by Yolig-tegin by order of and with the direct participation of Bilge-Khan. The inscriptions emphasize that everything written on them is the “heartfelt speech” of Bilge-khan, his genuine words, engraved at his order on “eternal stone” (entries 59, p. 33, 35; 166, p. 63).

In Klyashtornyj’s opinion these inscriptions represent on the one hand a fairly complex literary production, and on the other, an historical chronicle with a high degree of accuracy reporting events seeming to the author to be worthy of remembrance. The text is written in a clear and precise language, the palette of artistic modes is quite diverse, although sometimes the traditional nature of the style is expressed in stereotyped formulation and archetypical expressions (entry 158, pp. 63-64).

Both inscriptions on the Kül-tegin monument present no mere historical jottings about events in the life of the Turks, but actually offer a creative composition like a historical brochure, clearly and concisely revealing the historical-political views of the aristocratic upper class of the Turkic khanate headed by the Khan.

What is the content of these inscriptions like? In the smaller inscription, which may be read as a precursor to the large one, Bilge-Khan briefly speaks about the loftiness of the Turkic khaganate during his years of rule, about the distant campaigns undertaken for “the good of the Turkic people,” about the hard times when “the Turkic people . . . were completely exhausted and broken down under the rule of a khagan of the Tobgach [Chinese, i.e. an originally Mongolian speaking people whose rulers had become sinified] people”; “They [i.e., the Chinese people] give [us])

[27] gold, silver and silk in abundance. The words of the Chinese people have always been sweet and the materials of the Chinese people have always been soft. Deceiving by means of (their) sweet words and soft materials, the Chinese are said to cause the remote peoples to come close in this manner. After such a people have settled close to them, [the Chinese] are said to plan[t] their ill will there. [The Chinese] do not let the real wise men and real brave men make progress. [The Chinese] do not give shelter to anybody [from his immediate family] to the families of his clan and tribe. Having been taken in by their sweet words and soft materials, you Turkic people, were killed in great numbers” (entry 59, pp. 34-35; entry 294, pp. 261-2).

Still more historical data are given by the “Large Inscription” from the monument in honor of Kül-tegin, which contains a brief survey of the history of the
the Turks from ancient times to the rule of Bilge Khan, or more exactly, up to the rule of his son and successor:

When the blue sky above and the reddish-brown earth below were created, between the two human beings were created. Over the human beings my ancestors Bumin Kagan and Istâmi Kagan became rulers. After they had become rulers, they organized and ruled the state and institutions of the Turkic people.

They ruled [organizing] the Kök [Blue] Turks between the two [boundaries]. Then the younger brothers succeeded to the throne and the sons succeeded to the throne. . . . Since the lords and peoples were not in accord, and the Chinese people were wily and deceitful, since they were tricky and created a rift between younger and elder brothers, and caused the lords and peoples to slander one another, the Turkic people caused their state which they had established to go to ruin. Their sons worthy of becoming lords became slaves, and their daughters worthy of becoming ladies became servants to the Chinese people. . . . But the Turkic god above and the Turkic holy earth and water [spirits below] acted in the following way: in order that the Turkic people would not go to ruin and in order that it would be an (independent) nation again. . . . They held my father, Ilterii Kagan and my mother, Ilbilgâ Katun, at the top of heaven and raised them upwards. In severe conflicts

Ilterii restored the Turkic el [state]. After my uncle the kagan succeeded to the throne, he organized and nourished the Turkic people anew. He made the poor rich and the few numerous. Oh Turkic people, because of your unrudeness, you yourselves betrayed your wise kagan who had [always] nourished you, and you yourselves betrayed your good realm which was free and independent, and you [yourselves] caused discord. In order that the name and fame of the Turkic people would not perish, Heaven . . . enthroned me. I did not become ruler over a wealthy and prosperous people at all; [on the contrary] I became ruler over a poor and miserable people who were foodless on the inside and clothless on the outside. For the sake of the Turkic people, I did not sleep by night and I did not relax by day. I, with great armies, went on campaigns twelve times. I brought the people to life who were going to perish, and nourished them. I furnished the naked people with clothes and I made the poor people rich and the few people numerous (entry 59, pp. 36-43; entry 158, pp. 60-63; entry 294, pp. 265-268).

It further speaks of battles and campaigns in which the brother and collaborator of Bilge Khan, Kül-Tegin, took part, about his deeds and affairs, and about his death and burial, among other things.

The Tonyuquq inscription is an autobiographical panegyric written within the context of a broad background of tumultous events, in which the hero of the inscription himself was an active participant. It is noteworthy that the inscription contains not only description but an interpretation of historical events and their political evaluation. All this makes it a unique piece of historical literature of the early Turks.

The inscription, composed by order of Tonyuquq himself, informs us first and foremost that Tonyuquq received his education in China at a time when the
“Turkic people” were “in subjection to the Chinese state.” Furthermore, it lays out the history of the great rebellion of the Turks against China and the creation of the Second Eastern Turkic Khaganate. Many lines are devoted to describing military campaigns of the Turks against the Kirghiz, the Türgesh, and the Sogdians among others. In conclusion it unreservedly praises the personal exploits of Tonyuquq, without whom “in the land of Qapyan Kagan and of the Turkic Sir people, there would have been neither tribes, nor people, nor human beings at all” (entry 59, pp. 64-70; entry 294, p. 290).

From what has been said, it is evident that historical knowledge among the Turks was rather highly advanced. One must assume that the runic texts known at present to science are only part of the historical works created by the early Turks. It is no coincidence that new monuments of runic script are being found on the territory of Mongolia. At the present level of development of our knowledge, as we have already noted, it is hard to determine by exactly what means the historic achievements of the Turks were transmitted to the Mongols. It is scarcely likely that the Mongols had joined up with them, and then read the inscription, although the Kült-Teğin monument was well-known as early as the years in which Khubilai Khan ruled (1260-1294)(entry 141, p. 9). Far more likely, however, is it that the attainments mentioned came down to other nomadic tribes and peoples, including the Mongols, through oral transmission.

Be that as it may, it is beyond dispute that in the historiographic traditions of the early Turks and Mongols are displayed quite a few common traits, which are hard to explain solely by the ethnocultural proximity of their bearers or by the shamanist ideology common to them.

First and foremost there springs to mind the commonality in topic and theme of the traditions cited. Both the Turkic and Mongolian aristocrats were interested most of all in the history of the deeds and feats of their kagans. It may be said that their historiography arose largely from striving to magnify the kagans and to perpetuate knowledge of their actions. It is not remarkable that the common historical and political fate of Turks and Mongols gave rise to quite a few common historical themes. One of these is the problem of their relationship to China.

Above we observed how keenly the Turks took this topic up and how strongly they sound the notes of a unique anti-Chinese patriotism and independence. This topic was no less vital for the early Mongols. From the data which Rashid al-Din extracted from Mongolian sources, we learn about the strained relations between Mongols and Chinese as early as the pre-Chinggis period, when the Chinese Chin emperor nailed the Mongolian Khambaqai Khan “to a wooden donkey”, as he insulted and even intended to do away with the famed Qabul Khan, the third ancestor of Chinggis Khan (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, pp. 15-16, 42-43).

The common nature of Turkic and Mongolian historical knowledge is expressed most of all in the historical-political views of the qapyan as the highest being on earth, the fully empowered representative of the Blue Heaven (with the
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Turks: kök tänri; with the Mongols koke tengri). In our opinion, the Turkic expression Tänri jaratmiš Turk bilgä qayan or even Tänrida bolmiš Turk bilgä qayan (entry 59, pp. 16, 27) and the Mongolian De‘ere tenkeri-eče jaya‘atu törekken Bürte čino (entry 57, 1, p.79) are closely linked not only by sense, but in a lexico-semantic relationship. For this reason it seems more correct to us to translate this particular Turkic expression by the words “Bilge Khan, born by fate from Heaven”, the same way as we translate the Mongolian expression by the words “Börte čino, born by fate from Heaven.” The translation of the Turkic expression as “heaven-born” (“in Heaven” or “arisen from Heaven” (entry 59, p. 33), or “established by Heaven,” “favored by Heaven”) is inaccurate (entry 59, p. 20). If we translate either of the two Turkic expressions given above into Mongolian, then they become Tenkeri-eče jaya‘atu törekken Bilge qayan.

It is hard to say among which of the two Central Asian peoples, the Turks or the Mongols, that the title qayan first appeared. Some researchers consider that long before the Turks the Hsien-pi, one of the proto-Mongolian tribes, used this title (entries 281, pp.1-39; 282; 219, pp.171-2; 291, p. 429), and after the Turks, so did the Khitans, another Mongolian related people.

It is evident, from the inscriptions reviewed above, that the cult of the kagan was widely spread among the Turks, and to no less degree was it also developed among the Mongols under Chinggis-Khan. The Turkic kagan’s cult was inseparably linked with respect for the Blue Heaven. Heaven, among the Turks as indeed among the Mongols, is the creator of all beings, the ruler of all destinies on Earth. They are linked with Blue Heaven likewise through their ethonyms: the Turks have kök Türk Blue Turks, and the Mongols have koke mongyol Blue Mongols. Subject solely to the one Heaven is the kagan among both Turks and Mongols; Heaven bestows the state on the kagans (entry 59, p.39) and seats them on the throne. The good and bad deeds of the kagan are accomplished by the will and grace of Heaven. Attempts to explain this or that historical

[31] event as due to the intervention of Heaven may often be found, as we shall see below, even in the first historiographic monument of the Mongols, the Secret History.

The runic inscriptions bear witness to the fact that the Turks used the twelve-year animal cycle of chronology. They use two systems of chronology, one by years of the subject-hero’s life, and one by years of this the animal cycle. At the end of the large inscription on the Kül-tegin monument, it says, “Kül-tegin flew away [i.e., died] in the Year of the Sheep, on the seventeenth day . . . [the epitaph structure], the carved [figures?] and the stone with the inscription [in his honor] we dedicated in the Year of the Ape, in the seventh month, on the twenty-seventh

---

1 The question of the time and means of transmission of the animal-cycle chronology to the Turks is still not explained. It may be that they borrowed it from the Sogdians, insasmuch in old Uighur texts this system bears a Sogdian name, anxorwzn (entry 249, p. 19). About chronology in old Turkic monuments, see entry 227, pp. 191-203.
day. Kül-tegin died at the age of forty-seven" (entry 59, p. 43). But alongside this the basic events in the Turkic inscriptions are dated according to the years of the subject-hero’s life. This is best illustrated by the monument to Mogilian Khan (ibid., pp. 20-24).

As is well-known, the Uighurs, who were in their time one of the mostly highly cultured nations of Central Asia, exercised considerable influence on the Mongols, conveying to them their script, being their first teachers, giving them, along with the Khitans, cadres of state officials, etc. It is known that Chinggis Khan entrusted instruction of his children and those of the aristocracy to Uighur teachers. The Mongols became acquainted with Buddhism through the Uighurs. This is demonstrated by the fact that the numerous Buddhist terms among the Mongols are of Uighur origin. Uighur Buddhist monasteries were functioning at Qaraqorum under the first Mongolian khans.

It is difficult to say that such comprehensive cultural influence by the Uighurs did not affect Mongolian historiography. The sources reveal that Uighur historical knowledge was rather highly developed. Being one of the Turkic nationalities, they could readily inherit the Turkic historiographic tradition as well. The Uighurs, after the example of their predecessors, pursued the practice of fixing historical events in stone, even using, especially in the first cases, that self-same Turkic runic script. Thus for instance the monument to the Uighur kagan Moyunchur, who defeated the last Turkic kagan, Özmiş-tegin, in 745, was written in runic, not Uighur script (entry 59). This monument affords great interest [32] for studying the Uighur traditions of historical writing. On first comparison of it with the Turkic monuments reviewed above one can discover that the Uighurs in their turn were under strong influence from the Turkic historiographic tradition, despite the hostile relations of the Uighurs to the Turkic kagans.

In neither content nor form does the Uighur monument differ greatly from its Turkic prototypes. The basic historical-political ideology of the monument is the very same ideology of the manly kagan “born with a destiny from Heaven.” In it, as in the Turkic monuments, the chief attention is fixed on a description of the military campaigns of the Uighur kagan, whom almighty Blue Heaven always protected.

But the Uighur monument has some features which distinguish it from the Turkic ones. First of all it strikes one that it does not bear so focused a political-pamphlet style as do some of the Turkic models. The Moyunchur monument is a detailed, sometimes minute, record of the Uighur kagan’s campaigns. Here the author rarely allows himself any poetical or other digressions; he informs one, but does not sing; he establishes facts, but does not embellish them.

One of the particular oddities of this inscription is the elaborate nature of its chronology. The basic events, as distinguished from the Turkic inscriptions, are enumerated not according to the years of the hero’s life, but by years of the twelve-year animal cycle, indicating months, days and even whether it is daytime or night-time. The Uighurs, as we can see, along with the Turks, played an im-
important role in creating an historical chronology on the basis of the twelve-year cycle, an old system of annal-keeping of Central Asian nomadic peoples. We have every reason to suppose that it was from the Uighurs that this system went to the Mongols as early as the 13th century as a basis for chronological dating. When comparing the Turkic system of the twelve-year cycle with the one adopted in Mongolian historiography, it is obvious that they have much in common. It is clear from the Turkic and Mongolian monuments that in those times the Turks, Uighurs and Mongols did not differentiate years in this cycle by the signs and elements which became known to the Mongols later. It is noteworthy that the names of six of the twelve animals in the cycle have the same sounds among both the Turkic nationalities and the Mongols, namely,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkic</th>
<th>Mongolian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bars jil</td>
<td>bars jil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tabisyän jil</td>
<td>taulai jil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lü jil</td>
<td>luu jil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qon/qoyin jil</td>
<td>qonin jil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bičin jil</td>
<td>bičin jil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taqiyu jil</td>
<td>takiy-a jil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One should, however, note that the twelve-year system of chronology among the Mongols underwent two stages of development. In the first the Mongols used it exactly as did the Turks, but in the second, beginning in the 17th century, Mongolian historiography began to employ the Tibetan, and sometimes the Chinese, versions of the animal-cycle chronology.

The sources show that the Uighur runic inscriptions already discovered are not the only historiographic Uighur monuments on the territory of Mongolia. The Persian historian Juvayni, for instance, informs us that during a visit to Qaraqorum during the reign of Möngke Khan he saw amidst the ruins of the old Uighur capital, Qara-Balghasun, stones with inscriptions incised on them. Möngke Khan ordered one of these inscriptions to be read, but no one could decipher it. Then people from China were invited, who determined that the inscription was in Chinese characters, and they read it (entry 89, pp. 54-55). Juvayni cites in his book the content of this inscription, the stone original of which apparently has not come down to our times. There is some reason to assume that it was one of those Uighur inscriptions which were carved on stone in Chinese, Turkic and Sogdian scripts, similar to what had been done on the then sole monument preserved, discovered at the end of the 19th century (for translations of the Chinese text of this inscription, see entries 103, pp. 286-291; 114).

---

2 A considerable literature is devoted to the twelve-year animal cycle; we may mention particularly entries 223; 206; 151; and 260.
But the inscription which Juvayni mentions cannot be identified with the just-mentioned trilingual inscription. The one he saw, to judge from Juvayni’s exposition, contained a legend widespread in his time about the origin of the Uighur kagan’s clan of Buqu kagan; and the second, according to the Chinese text, which has been translated into German, contains information about the conversion of the Uighurs to Manicheism (see entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, p. 139; see likewise entry 267, p. 73; entry 222, p. 247). On the whole this inscription is sharply different in content from the Turkic and Uighur monuments known to us. It is possible that it was one of the first efforts of the Uighurs to record their oral historical traditions in writing.

The inscription says that Buqu tegin and his brothers were born from a great mound heated by the light which descended on it from the sky, and the mound was located between two trees which stood between two rivers, the Tughla (Tula) and the Selenga, which flowed together in a place called Qamlanchu. After these children grew up, they went to these trees as if to their parents and began to show respect to them. Then the trees, having received the gift of speech, predicted a great future for the children. Having learned of these marvels, the Uighur people decided to elect Buqu as their first kagan. It further relates that Buqu kagan brought under his power many nations of East and West (entry 89, pp. 55-59).

Juvayni emphasizes that the legend he cites is a “falsehood,” one of hundreds of oral tales similar to it, displaying the ignorance of the compilers and disseminators (entry 89, p. 60), and the fact that he mentions that among the Uighur princes was a “family [genealogical] tree, affixed to the wall of their houses” (entry 89, p. 61), bears witness to the existence of genealogical records among the Uighurs. However they have not come down to us.

It goes without saying that the meager materials at our disposal do not allow one to fully reveal the state of historical writing among the Turkic and Uighur peoples. But even the small amount known gives some basis to confirm that these peoples in the period of their flourishing had at their disposal their own original historiography written on stone, and representing a significant stage in the development of historical knowledge among the nomads, so that in early Mongolia there did exist a unique nomadic historiography, to the creation of which all tribes and nations who had settled the Mongolian soil at different times, made their contribution. But there can be no doubt that this question requires additional investigation.

The historiographic traditions of the predecessors that the Mongols inherited were raised by them to a new, higher level. They likewise knew practical ways to set down historic events on stones. But only a single monument of such type has come down to us. This is the so-called Stone of Chinggis erected in 1225 in honor of Yisüngke, the nephew of Chinggis Khan. A number of scholars worked on the decipherment and translation of this monument, including I. J.
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Schmidt, Dorji Banzarov, I. Klyukin and Kh. Perlee, but it would be more accurate to say that only the latter two scholars deciphered it more or less correctly (cf entries 157 and 124).

The inscription, the oldest specimen of Mongolian script known, states that Chinggis Khan, having returned from a campaign against the Sartaguls, set up a meeting of the princes, during which Yisungke shot from his bow a distance of 335 alda (or fathoms, the distance between outstretched arms). That is all. Naturally this single monument is insufficient to judge the degree to which the practical technique of recording events on stone was disseminated among the Mongols. It is only apparent that such a technique was not alien to them.

Historical-Cultural Prerequisites for Mongolian Written Historiography

The crucial moment in the development of Mongolian historical knowledge occurred in the process of forming a single Mongolian state that accomplished the unification of the separate tribes on the vast territory of Mongolia. This state was founded in 1206 by Chinggis Khan. It is commonly recognized that the creation of this state was a progressive event of enormous significance in the history of the Mongolian people. Within the confines of a single state there was executed the process of consolidating the Mongolian nationality, which tripped off significant upheavals in the development of the intellectual culture of the Mongols.

The greatest event of Mongol cultural history was the introduction at the beginning of the 13th century of the common-Mongolian script, based on Uighur writing. The young state needed literate and educated persons, who could bring into being a system to teach writing to the Mongols. People appeared who were able not only to serve in the state chancelleries but who could also produce literary work. The Mongolian court now held bitegčis, i.e., clerks or secretaries, who compiled state papers. This work was performed by Uighurs, Naimans, Chinese and emigrants from Central Asia working side by side with Mongols. Their chief duty was to produce decrees and other documents of the Mongolian khans in their respective languages, which in its turn enabled the spread of culture.

Considerable literary activity was created and developed on the basis of the new script. At the beginning of the 13th century there was carried out the first codification of Mongolian law, intended to serve the purpose of strengthening the Mongolian state. This first compilation of Mongolian law in writing was titled the Yeke jasa i.e. in Turkic, the Great Yasagh (see entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 135, 197, 234, 259, 263, 278; entries 68 and 185).

It may be assumed that in working out the Great Jasay, the first supreme judge of the Mongolian state, Shigi-qutuqu (approx. 1180-1262) played an active role. The Secret History writes: “And then Chinggis Khan [ordered], ‘Writing in a blue-[script] register all decisions about the distribution and about the judicial matters of the entire population, make it into a book (i.e., permanent re-
cord). Until the offspring of my offspring, let no one change any of the blue writing that Shigi-qutuqu, after deciding in accordance with me, shall make into a book with white paper. Anyone who changes it shall be guilty” (entry 293, PFEH 21, p. 27). Juvayni also gives an interesting report about the original establishment of the Great Jasay (entry 89, p. 25).

Consequently, in the 13th century there came together the fortunate circumstance of the appearance of Mongolian written history, on the basis of a long tradition of development of historical knowledge among the nomadic peoples in Mongolia, and of the oral historical creativity of those same Mongols.

II. THE SECRET HISTORY
The First Great Monument of Mongolian Historiography

The Question of Dating and Authorship of the Monument

As we have stated, the rise of Mongolian historiography was a significant phenomenon in the cultural history of the Mongolian state. The greatest and sole preserved monument of the 13th century is the Secret History (the Niyuča tobčiyan).3

The significance of this work as a monument of Mongolian historiography, and as a source for the history of the Mongols is extraordinarily great. An enormous literature in many languages has been devoted to its investigation, and the monument itself has been translated and published in Chinese, Japanese, Russian, German, French, English, Turkic, Bulgarian and Hungarian.

Despite the fact that leading Mongolists of the world have studied the Secret History for over a hundred years, this monument, as a historical phenomenon, is far from fully studied. Scholars have concerned themselves and continue to concern themselves with philological and textual analyses, which is merely the first, though an extremely necessary step towards its comprehensive unveiling. But in this field much still remains incomplete, and a host of old studies are in need of re-working. The basic difficulty in analyzing the Secret History lies in the fact that scholars do not have the original, but are using a text transcribed in Mongolian by means of Chinese characters. This transfer of the Mongolian text into a Chinese transcription was done many years after this monument was written.

---

3 This name for the monument was generally accepted until not long ago. However in recent years some researchers began to express doubts about the document having been originally called the Mongyol-un niyuča tobčiyan. Thus, Father A. Mostaert expressed the supposition that originally its name was the Cinggis qayan-u huja'ur. Father Mostaert translated this title into French as Origine de Cinggis-qayan (entry 258, pp. Ix-xiv).
down, i.e., as some researchers assume, between 1368 and 1418.\footnote{Prof. Bayar of Inner Mongolia adheres to another opinion. He supposes that the Chinese transcription could have been made earlier by Çayan, the famous translator and scholar of the Yuan period, whose biography is found in the Yuan-shih. See entry 303, p. 62.}

To reconstitute the Mongolian original, scholars have made various Latin-script transcriptions of the monument on the basis of the Chinese transcription, taking into account peculiarities of the spoken and written Mongolian language of the 13th and 14th centuries. It is well-known that the principles and system of transcribing the Mongolian text, as well as decoding archaic expressions and words are far from identical in the works of the different authors.

For this reason, when using the monument along with the Chinese transcription, it is necessary to utilize all works existing at present in which the Mongolian text is restored in modern scientific transcription.\footnote{Since the first edition of our book, there have been printed several important books containing reconstruction of the old Mongolian original and its rendering into modern Mongolian, as well as new translations into Japanese, English, French, German and other languages. In addition to the work of de Rachewiltz (entry 270), one must also mention the following works: 1. Bayar (entry 303). 2. Igor de Rachewiltz (entry 293). 3. Francis W. Cleaves, The Secret History of the Mongols, Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1982. (entry 315).}

When quoting the *Secret History*, the author has mainly employed the Russian translation of Kozin (entry 57), although other translations and comments by Pelliot, Mostaert, Haenisch and F. W. Cleaves were taken into account. For the use of Russian-based readers, we retain the Kozin citations, but now use the English translation from de Rachewiltz (entry 293), as later improved and modified by Dr. de Rachewiltz himself.

It is well-known that many researchers (as Palladius, Pelliot, Haenisch, Vladimirtsov and Damdinsuren) think that the Mouse Year, indicated in the colophon, is the year it was written (1240), inasmuch as exactly that year of the twelve-year cycle falls in that period \footnote{Eldengtei and Ardajab, *Mongyol-un niyuca tobčiya: seyireğüel, tayilburi*. (Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un Suryan Kümüjil-ün Qoriy-a, 1986).} of Ögedei Khan’s reign. The monument says nothing about the death of Ögedei in 1241, nor about other later events. One must moreover hold in mind that the Mouse Year is the final one in the sequence of events which the document conveys, and that this year is mentioned immediately after relating the chief events
of the last decade of Ögedei Khan, i.e., the 1230's, and prior to the Mouse Year only a single other date is cited, the Hare Year (1231). Of course the fact that the compilers of the Secret History, who indicated the Mouse Year as the date the monument was written, noted neither the sign of this year by the Chinese calendrical system nor by the Tibeto-Mongolian system, does create definite difficulties in establishing the precise date.

Likewise, the Yeke Quriltai (The Grand Assembly), which took place, according to the words of the author of the colophon, in the same year in which they concluded their work, is not mentioned in any source known to science. Taking all this into account, some scholars express doubt that the Secret History was actually written in 1240, and advance their own hypotheses on its dating.

In this respect one should say that the Mouse Year which interests us is not made more specific in the monument by indicating its cyclic sign or element, but then neither do any of the other dates cited by the compilers have these specifics. In any case, those events of which the dates are well-known, can be more or less confidently related to this or that year of the animal cycle mentioned in the monument, and the corresponding year of the modern chronology. Hence, we know that the first Fowl Year, mentioned in §141 of the Secret History, corresponds to 1201, and the Mouse Year mentioned in §269, refers to 1228 and 1240. Guided by this principle one can with no particular difficulty determine the Mouse Year mentioned in the colophon as the year the copy was made, inasmuch as this year belongs to the same sixty-year cycle relating to all other dates mentioned in the Secret History. As most scholars suppose, the book might have been composed between 1228 and 1240. In any case, as Cleaves pointed out, "the suggested dates of its composition now range from the years 1228 to 1264, and the grounds for later dating have become increasingly hypothetical."6

It is true that the sources do not mention a quriltai of 1240, a Mouse Year. But we cannot refute the possibility that Ögedei Khan called such a quriltai, as he did rather frequently during the years of his reign. Thus for instance, in the Horse Year (1234) and in the Sheep Year (1235) the Khan convoked two quriltai in succession; the latter one was specially devoted to the fact that all the sons, relatives and emirs were again to listen to the Jasay and the Decrees (entry 67, vol. 2, p. 35).

This does not exclude the possibility that a similar quriltai might have been convoked by Ögedei Khan in a Mouse Year, 1228 or 1240. The Khan might well have wanted all his relatives to listen to the history of "The Golden Clan," after which it would have been committed to writing so as to preserve this history in the minds of successive generations. It is important to notice in this connection that according to the colophon, this quriltai took place in the locality of Ködegegaral on the Kerülén River, i.e., right there where the famous quriltai which se-

---

lected Ögedei for the Khan’s throne was held.

In our view, the data of the colophon directly indicate that the Yeke quriltai had a close connection to recording the monument. It is fully possible that this quriltai, as a plenary session of the highest representatives of the “Golden Clan,” gave sanction to the first recording of a history of the Chinggisid House.

It seems to me that the European languages have an inexact interpretation of the colophon and the translations of it into European languages are not quite correct (entries 82, p. 148; 57, p. 199; 258, p. 392). The translations in question, differ among themselves, but commit a common error. If one believes them, it seems that the recording of the monument was produced either in the Mouse Year or during the Great Quriltai (Haenisch, Kozin), or during the time the Khan’s court was at Dolo’an boldag (Mostaert, de Rachewiltz), and the Great Quriltai is mentioned in the colophon solely as an event enabling one to fix the time the chronicle was compiled, but is not linked to its appearance. Moreover, Mostaert and de Rachewiltz connect the Mouse Year not directly to the time when the monument was set down in writing, but to the time when the Khan’s court was staying at Dolo’an-boldag (a locality of Kúdege-aral). Hence according to the translations of the scholars cited, the Yeke Quriltai and the Mouse Year have no direct relation to the record of the chronicle itself: Father Mostaert in particular observes that the Mongolian [40]  

ordos bawuju bükü-tür, and not to the last compound predicate of the whole sentence (bičijü dawusba).

A syntactic analysis of the Secret History colophon enables one to conclude that the whole of it is a typical Mongolian compound sentence, consisting of three parts:

1. Yeke qurilta quriju;
2. Kerülen-ü kőde’e aral-un Dolo’an boldaq-a šilginček qoyar ja’ura ordos bawuju bükü-tür;
3. bičijü dawusba (entry 57, §282, p. 199).

The first part can only refer to the final compound predicate, which is the predicate of the main clause. It is expressed by the subordinate gerund in -jü (modern Mongolian -z), which indicates the causal relationship with the action of the main clause (bičijü dawusba). As for the second part, it clarifies the place of action of the main clause. The phrase quluyana jil quran sara-da, although it stands immediately before the second part, does not relate to it in sense, but is an adverb of time of the main clause (bičijü dawusba).

Hence the colophon speaks of how, when and where the work of recording was performed: How? yeke qurilta quriju (lit. ‘the Grand Assembly having gathered’). When? quluyana jil quran sara-da (in the Doe Month of the Mouse Year.)
Where? Kerülen-ü köde 'e aral-un Dolo’an boldaq-a şilginček . . . qoyar ja’ura ordos bawuju büküü-tür (in Dolo’an-Boldaq at Ködege Island in the Kerülen River, (namely) between (the place named) and Şilginček, (where the court stayed), or literally, upon location of the court at Dolo’an-Boldaq).

If we think that the first clause relates to the main clause (yeke qurilta quriju . . . bitijii dawusba), then it becomes clear that we are dealing with an active subject (yeke qurilta) of the main clause. In other words, the Grand Assembly is the subject in relation to the predicate bitijjuan dawusba. The sentence yeke qurilta quriju . . . bitijją dawusba belongs with sentences in modern Mongolian of the type: ix xural xuraldaj, undsen xuul’ batlav (The Great Hural having met, it approved the Constitution).

In short, we consider a correct translation of the colophon to be: “Having finished the record as a result of (by reason of) the convocation of the Grand Assembly, in the month of the Doe [the seventh month] [41] of the Mouse Year, upon location of the court at Dolo’an-Boldaq at Ködege Island in the Kerülen River, namely between (there) and Şilginček.”

The accuracy of this translation of our colophon is in principle most important for clarifying the question of authorship of the work. If I make no error in understanding the text of the colophon, the indication is that the recording of the monument was finished not at that time, but as a result of convoking the Grand Assembly (or indeed at the Grand Assembly) and this gives us a basis to conclude that the Mongolian Grand Assembly played a role in the appearance of the Secret History. Above I remarked that as it is logically the subject of the main clause, this in my view points right to the Grand Assembly’s direct involvement in the appearance of the monument.

It is quite possible that the history of the “Golden Clan” of the Chinggisids had long been transmitted from mouth to mouth, and finally was fixed in writing and approved by actual representatives of this very clan at their Grand Assembly. It might be that during these extended sessions some preservers of the past, relatives and close companions of Chinggis Khan, some from memory, some helped by court records, laid forth the most important events in the history of the Chinggis clan, which were written down right there by the bitegčis, the scribes.7 Assist-

---

7 Prof. Bayar, in the interesting introduction to his three-volume book on the Secret History (entry 303), has given considerable data from Chinese sources on the learned bitegčis (scribe-secretaries) who served at the court of Chinggis Khan and Ögedei Khan. He is of the opinion that the Secret History must have been written by the most learned bitegčis, namely, Jingyai (Cingyai –Sh. B.) Čingsang from Kereyid aimak, Gereyidke, the head of the bitegčis and Sečskür from Qorlos aimak who served Chinggis Khan as a chief of one thousand (chiliarch) and a bitegči (entry 303, pp. 30-35, 50-51). Chingyai is written in several different ways, as Čingqai or as Čingqai, in Chinese as Chen-hai or Ch’eng-hai. He was born about 1169 and died about 1252. As Paul D. Buell writes, he was “a trusted associate and principal advisor of Chinggis and then chief minister to that qan and his successors Ögödei and Guýûk, his service to the Mongols spanning nearly
ing them were popular tale-tellers, the bearers of early Mongolian oral poetry, and active participants in every ceremonial occasion of that time, including the Grand Assemblies. That is why, as it seems to us, the colophon gives in first place its mention of the Assembly, as it were emphasizing its involvement in the appearance of the monument to all who were in attendance at it. The possibility must also be noted that the entire copy went through a detailed literary editing by a person able to employ the pen. Bearing witness to this is the elaboration in theme and composition, polishing the language and style, the logical sequence of narration and the ideological orientation.

The efforts of some researchers (Haenisch, Poucha and others) to establish the individual authorship of the monument can scarcely ever expect to be crowned with success. The Secret History above all else is a creative product of an entire collective of court aristocrats of antiquity and of tale-tellers.

[42]

It was first reduced to writing with the active participation of actual representatives of the “Golden Clan” headed by the Khan. At the Grand Assembly they talked it over, and then approved this written variant of the history of the founders of the Mongolian state.

At the dawn of Mongolian historiography, under conditions of that time, such a composition could not have arisen merely at the creative initiative of some chronicler. The appearance of such a work was in the first place conditioned by the practical interests of Golden Clan representatives after the death of Chinggis Khan. If the Great Jasay was the maker of the highest law, guaranteeing the reliability of the political bases of Chinggis Khan’s empire, then the Secret History, in the ideas of its creators, ought to have served as a history of the life and deeds of founders of the Empire, intended to instruct their successors. And the need to create such a history, one must imagine, was particularly great during the years of Ögedei’s rule as Khan. As everyone knows he strove to be faithful to the tenets of his father.


Insofar as Prof. Bayar’s opinion is concerned, I have to say that although it is difficult to categorically ascribe the authorship of the Secret History to any particular person or persons, it is possible that the first written history of the Mongols was the final result of creative efforts by the learned bitegčis who, inter alia, practiced recording the deeds of their Khans at their courts.

A new, very original hypothesis concerning the date and authorship of the Secret History was recently proposed by Prof. Shigeo Ozawa whose life-long study of the monument has been crowned with excellent results for the last several decades. See entry 332. While completing the preparation of this book for publication I had the chance to read the latest book of Sh. Ozawa in its Mongolian translation.

8 I am pleased that our supposition in this respect put forward in early 1970s is being supported by the latest investigation of Prof. Sh. Ozawa (entry 332, p. 122).
Speaking about the date the *Secret History* was written, it is impossible not to touch on the opinions of some researchers who dispute the traditional dating and advance other hypotheses. René Grousset, the first to express doubts about the accuracy of the traditional dating, connected the Mouse Year with 1252 and did this by the following steps. First, one of the speeches of Chinggis Khan (entry 57, §255, pp. 185-6) sounds as if he foresaw the transfer of the throne from the line of Ögedei to the line of Tolui and then into the line of Möngke, who became Khan in 1251; second, the final paragraph of the work (entry 57, §282, pp. 198-199) is rather reminiscent of a posthumous evaluation of Ögedei’s attainments, although the words quoted are ascribed to the Khan himself (entry 229, pp. 230, 303; entry 228, p. 27; entry 230, pp. 1-2).

It may be stated that Pelliot and de Rachewiltz have proven the groundlessness of Grousset’s opinion (entry 261; 269, pp. 187-8, 196-7). Pelliot in particular noted that the claim of Tolui’s line to the throne must have been known even before the death of Ögedei, and in that portion of the *Yuan-shih* where it speaks of the most important events occurring after 1251 there is not a word about the Grand Assembly of 1252, and finally, that the absence of any mention in the *Yuan-shih* of the Grand Assembly of 1240 must be [43] a consequence of the generally fragmentary nature of the chapter devoted to Ögedei Khan. At the present time Pelliot’s opinion has essentially been confirmed by de Rachewiltz who, guided by the Persian and Chinese sources, considers it established that Tolui’s claim to the Khan’s throne made its appearance as early as the Great Assembly of 1227-1229 (entry 269, pp. 196-7).

In the light of these data it becomes evident that §255 of the *Secret History* cannot serve as proof of Grousset’s hypothesis.

One may add to what has been said that we do not quite understand the ideas of investigators concerning the pro-Tolui orientation (§254, 255 etc.). L. Ligeti, for instance, maintains that these and other paragraphs where it speaks of succession to the throne were added later to justify the rise of the Tolui clan. Ligeti’s deductions are these: this part of the monument stands outside the general context, it is impossible to find this in the corresponding parts of Rashīd al-Dīn’s work, and it is absent from Lubsangdanjin’s *Altan Tobe*. De Rachewiltz likewise adheres to Ligeti’s view (entry 269, p. 197, note 48).

It is hard to conclude from §§254-255 that they reflect any pro-Tolui orientation. On the contrary, the basic thrust of this text leads toward justifying Chinggis Khan’s designation of Ögedei as successor to the throne. They clearly state that Tolui, as well as the other sons of Chinggis, were in agreement with their father’s selection, and expressed a readiness to serve Ögedei. If there is talk of events inserted later in these paragraphs, they clearly relate to the post-Chinggis period, and not to the post-Ögedei one. It is quite possible that these texts “through the words” of Chinggis Khan and his sons advocate the position of Ögedei’s adherents, and not that of the representatives of Tolui’s clan.

William Hung, Gary Ledyard and Igor de Rachewiltz have dwelt in greater
detail on the question of dating the monument. In the opinion of the first two au-
thors, the Mouse Year indicated in the colophon corresponds to 1264 or even 
later (to 1276 or 1288). Their basic arguments center on the fact that in the Mon-
golian text as transcribed into Chinese characters, there is a geographical name 
(Chin. Hsüan-te-fu, Mong. Söndiwu, cf. §247) which did not exist prior to 1250, 
but turned up 
only after 1263, and that in another paragraph there is a report about events hav-
ing taken place in the 1250’s (entry 241, pp. 487-492, entry 250, pp. 1-10). These 
views encountered sharp rejection on the part of Father Mostaert and Igor de 
Rachewiltz, and some other researchers. 

Father Mostaert, when he expressed his doubts about the question of dating 
proposed by William Hung, wrote that readers would like to know Hung’s opin-
ion on the reasons why the author of the monument maintains complete silence 
about such important events as the death of Ögedei, the rule of following Khans, 
completing the conquest of Persia, renewing the war with the Sung dynasty, the 
ascention of Khubilai to the throne, and so on, which took place during the 24 
years from the death of Ögedei until 1264 (entries 258 and 269, note 254). 
The factual data cited by de Rachewiltz place in doubt Hung’s main proof, 
which is based on the presence of the place-name Hsüan-te-fu in §247. De 
Rachewiltz maintains that this term existed as early as the beginning of the 
1230’s, although it was not given official status until later. This name is found in 
reports by P’eng Ta-ya in his book Hei-t’a shih-lüeh. De Rachewiltz considers it 
possible that this place-name existed even in 1228 (entry 269, p. 196). 

Hung’s attempt to link the date of writing he proposes (1264) with the date of 
the colophon likewise cannot be considered convincing. The indication in the 
colophon that the Grand Assembly was called in a place named Dolo’an-boldag 
on the Kerulen River puts Hung in a difficult position. If the monument was 
compiled during the Yuan dynasty, when the capital was located in Dai-du, when 
Khubilai broke the ties to his ancestral lands of yore, convoking a quriltai solely 
in China, then why does the monument talk about a quriltai taking place whilst 
the Khan’s court was staying on the Kerulen River? But if we admit that the 
quirtai took place in 1264 in Mongolia, then how can one explain this event so 
unusual for the time of Khubilai? 

So as to get out of this difficult spot, Hung expresses a supposition that a 
Grand Assembly, taking place in the seventh month (25 July to 22 August) of 
1264 was not set down in the Yuan-shih. However, this does not exclude the pos-
sibility that such a meeting of princes of the blood could have occurred. Between 
March 27 and September 22, Khubilai 

was presumably in Shang-du. But this does not mean that he could not have gone 
on a hunt, or have presided over an unrecorded meeting. It is possible there was 
another assembly in which Arig-Buqu and his adherents took part. And at this 
meeting, which took place at Köde’e aral on the Kerulen River, it may be that
they decided Arig-Buqu ought to acknowledge his defeat before Khubilai. If there was in reality such a Grand Assembly under the chairmanship of Arig Buqu, Hung concludes, then we can scarcely expect that it was recorded in the Yüan-shih, as Khubilai would have wished to consign to oblivion everything connected with discord in his clan.

Now Hung asks his readers to imagine, during this hypothetical meeting in the cool August evenings on the banks of the Kerülen River, that some sort of aged teller of tales is recounting his stories to the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of Chinggis Khan. That, in Hung's opinion, is how the famed Secret History arose (entry 241, pp. 491-492).

It is hard to agree with Hung's deductions. It is impossible to presuppose that Arig-Buqu would have convoked a Grand Assembly on the Kerülen in order to decide the issue of his capitulation before Khubilai, and that it was precisely during this time that the Secret History was compiled. There is no information about this convocation either in the Chinese sources or in Rashid al-Din's book, where the struggle between Arig-Buqu and Khubilai for the Khan's throne is described quite in detail (entry 67, vol. 2, pp. 156-168).

Rashid al-Din gives information about two quriltais held in 1260. One was called by Arig-Buqu in the locality of Yailag-Altai, and the other by Khubilai in the Chinese city of K'ai-p'ing-fu (K'ai-feng), and at both quriltais the two brothers proclaimed themselves Khan at the same time. Thus did the struggle for the throne begin between them. Rashid al-Din cites interesting details about a hearing organized by Khubilai concerning the defeated Arig-Buqu and his partisans (entry 67, pp. 165-168). But he says not a word about the quriltai which Hung has in mind. It is hard to verify that any eighty-eight year-old story-teller, who was, according to data in the Yüan-shih, one of those who supplied materials to the Chinese court historian Wang-O, would have been able to create such a marvelous historical-literary monument imbued with "the aroma of the steppe," depicting accurately and in detail the life and customs of the early Mongols.

The arguments of Gary Ledyard in favor of the new views of dating the Secret History likewise cannot be considered convincing. In his opinion, the report in §274 about the campaign of Yisüder-qorči into Korea following Jalairtai-qorči refers to those events, which according to the Koryơ-sa [The History of Korea], took place in 1254-1258. Accordingly, the first Mouse Year after 1258 can only be 1264, which Ledyard therefore considers to be the earliest possible date for composition of the Secret History (entry 250, pp.9-10).

Connecting the campaigns mentioned in the Mongolian source with the events which took place under Ögedei (1229-1241), Ledyard regards as anachronistic. There is no doubt that the Koryơ-sa, an accurate court chronicle of the Korean princes, is a most authoritative source on the history of Korea in the period of the Mongol conquests. But the question arises, would it not be possible that a still earlier activity of the two Mongolian military leaders who interest us might be
attested solely in the Secret History, and have escaped the attention of those who executed the court records of the Korean prince?

From data in the Yuan-shih we know that Jalairtai served all the Mongolian khans from Chinggis to Möngke. It would be hard to establish that all the historical events spoken of in §274 of the Secret History actually took place in the years of Ögedei’s reign and that only the information about campaigns to Korea refers to a much later period, to the period of Möngke Khan’s reign, but is incorporated into this paragraph as a supplement, so to speak, like a back number of a periodical.

If it is correct that information about the campaigns to Korea was incorporated into the Secret History as a kind of supplement, then why do other greater events of Mongolian history from the reigns of Güyük and Möngke find no echo in it? In reply to this question, Ledyard expresses a view which essentially leads to the idea that in illuminating the history of Mongolian-Korean relations there are similar anachronisms, not only in the Secret History but also in the Yuan-shih and Rashid al-Din’s Complete Collection of Histories. This affirmation, however, no one [47] can verify. If the campaigns of Jalairtai to Korea in the Secret History, which supposedly took place in 1258, were in point of fact erroneously connected with 1234, then the authors of the Yuan-shih and the Complete Collection of Histories behaved differently: they connected the arrival of the Korean hostage Wang Chun in Mongolia to 1258, when in reality this event refers to 1241. To explain errors in dating events in Mongolian-Korean relations in three completely different sources, Ledyard supposes that a source common to all lies at the basis of this text, a chronicle unknown to us, compiled about 1258 and recounting events using the twelve-year cyclical chronology. This chronicle might specifically speak of the deeds of Yisüder under the Horse Year (1258) and about the arrival of Wang Chun from Korea to Mongolia, also in that year. And then, apparently after 1258, the events mentioned might have been moved back for two twelve-year cycles, to the years of Ögedei’s reign.

Such an error might occur, in Ledyard’s opinion, as a result of someone confusing pages of the chronicle or, having discovered an evident error in dating the arrival of Wang Chun in Mongolia, and deciding to correct it, redated this event to another Horse Year, to 1234. Such an operation might also have been carried out on the date of dispatching Yisüder to Korea. The compilers of the Secret History, not having grasped the essence of the matter, uncritically transferred this date, 1234, into their chronicle, as a result of which the events connected with Yisüder and Jalairtai were presented to the readers as allegedly having taken place in 1234, during the reign of Ögedei Khan, and not 24 years later, as they had in reality (entry 250, pp. 10-16).

What can one say about these ideas of Ledyard?

First of all, it is hard to prove that a person who knew and remembered the date of Wang Chun’s arrival in Mongolia could have confused it with the date of
Yisüder and Jalairtai’s campaign to Korea, although such a person, in the opinion of Ledyard himself, was an eyewitness to the campaign indicated. Under such conditions the “accidental” transfer of events from the Möngke Khan era to the reign of Ögedei seems quite doubtful. Secondly, it remains unexplained what hindered the compilers of the Secret History from including in their chronicle a host of other events from the 1240’s and 1250’s which were far more important in their significance and consequences. It must likewise be stated that it is scarcely possible to establish a date for the monument on the basis of a single fact of some sort, even if this fact is in itself related to the period which Ledyard has in mind.

Ledyard, one-sidedly accepting as true the data of the Koryo-sa, and on this basis advancing a new date of birth for the Secret History, strange though it be, did not consider it necessary to take into account the information provided by the colophon that is no less important for dating the monument than that single fact which the aforementioned author places at the heart of his hypothesis.

In this regard, finally, it must be stated that the question undertaken by Ledyard, dating the campaigns of Yisüder and Jalairtai to Korea, cannot be regarded as definitely resolved. It demands further research by drawing on both Korean and Chinese, Mongolian and other sources able to shed light on the matter in question.

Ledyard writes that the authors of the Secret History thought to limit their chronicle solely to the history of the first two Khans. But he does not clarify exactly why that should have been the intent of the authors of the Secret History. The absence in the document of any mention of the death of Ögedei, Ledyard attempts to explain as a traditional taboo of the Mongols. But the question arises, for how long might such a taboo have remained in effect, when the monument itself, according to Ledyard, was written in 1264 or even later? One should keep in mind that the representatives of the Tolui clan hardly observed any so strict a tradition of taboo in respect of Ögedei.

A compromise solution to this thorny question about dating the monument has recently been advanced by Igor de Rachewiltz who devoted an entire article to this question (entry 269).

History and Historical Views in the Secret History

It has already been demonstrated by many scholars that the Secret History is a most valuable source for the early history of the Mongols. It would be no exaggeration to state that at present there is no serious scholarly work which in one way or another has not employed the data of this work. Suffice it to recall such classic works as Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion by W. W. Bartol’d, or Le Régime Social des Mongols by Vladimirtsov, and others. We have therefore no particular need to speak about
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the Secret History as a source of Mongolian history.

Another question is of greater interest to us: how did the Mongols in those distant times interpret historical events, and what was their relation to history as a whole?

Before entering on any analysis of the historical views of our monument, let us review the methods of the authors and their means of knowing history. It is necessary to consider that this work arose when history had not yet fully detached itself from the native oral tradition; it was still quite closely bound up with legend and traditionary tales, which imparted to it a kind of more or less free narration, where the living fantasy of the artistic story-teller was at times valued more highly than the accuracy of the chronicler. Under these conditions it is no wonder that Mongols at the beginning of the second millennium regarded history as a type of artistic creativity. They were in that respect no exception to the other nations of antiquity and in particular those of the Middle Ages.

In antiquity, as everyone knows, the Muse of History adorned the suite of Apollo, god of the arts (entry 127, pp. 67-68; from the Loeb edition of Aristotle’s Poetics, §§8.9.2, p. 35):

The difference between a historian and a poet is not that one writes in prose and the other in verse. Indeed the writing of Herodotus could be put into verse and yet would still be a kind of history, whether written in metre or not. The real difference is this, that one tells what happened, and the other, what might happen.

In the same sense, the Secret History does not become a better example of Mongolian historical composition because it contains within it many fragmentary verses, epic passages reflecting peculiarities of Mongolian literary creativity of that time, and in the latter the historian, as has already been brilliantly proven by many prominent scholars, finds abundant factual material about events actually having taken place in Mongolian history.

Similar ideas about history among the majority [50]
of peoples of antiquity and the Middle Ages is explained in particular by the specifics of historical knowledge. As is well-known, history in contrast to other branches of knowledge, fulfills a dual task: side by side with generalizing and discovering regularity in the development of society, it renews, possibly more sharply and clearly, the portrait of an individual epoch and the concrete description of events, for which at an earlier stage of development of historical knowledge the second task played the fundamental role. So it was with all peoples, so it was with the Mongols.

In those times the artistic knowledge of history occupied the most important place. The anonymous authors of the Secret History mastered well the method of reproducing an historical image in artistic form through direct emotion-evoking action on the reader. This method of knowing history finds expression in the wide use of different kinds of Mongolian literary creativity both oral and in book form selected with the aim of re-establishing the historic past. As Kozin reck-
oned, the *Secret History* includes 122 instances of verses (entry 57, p. 33). If we compare this figure with the total number of paragraphs (282) into which the whole work is provisionally broken down, then every two paragraphs contain one set of verses. Each one of the twelve major divisions (or chapters) is a complex epic fragment, composed half in verse, half in alliteration.

Among these verses one finds epic fragments (§139, 149, 170, 186-197, 199 etc.), letters of emissaries in speeches (§105, 106, 108, 265, 266), paeanas (*magtaals*, hymns of praise) (§74, 75, 146, 208-214), precepts or *surgaals* (§78, 126, 174, 276, 279), rites (§96, 102, 164), satires (§111, 179, 265), weddings (§64), nomadic topics (§118), speeches with oaths and vows (§123, 127, 147), elegies: the words of Jamuqa prior to his death, the words of Tolui before his death (§201, 272), lamentations (§203), a hymn to the guards (§230), the respectful words of the crown-prince to the ruler (§245, 254), minor verses, as proverbs, sayings and gnomic utterances (entry 57, pp. 34-35). There is no doubt that all these literary fragments, in their abundance, the diversity of themes and genres and other special features make the *Secret History* a most fascinating literary monument. In this regard it is particularly important for the fragments indicated to be organically linked with the general subject-matter and the aim of the narration; they serve as a picturesque verbal equivalent to a graphic illustration of the events described, and are the chief means of expressing historic views.

Together with this, it was precisely those artistic means, skillfully used in the *Secret History*, which made possible such a sharp reproduction of the unforgettable image of Mongolian steppe life and furnished very rich material to evaluate the different phases of this life. When the *Secret History* speaks about the dark thoughts of shaman Teb-Tengri, urging Chinggis Khan to fix on his brother Qasar for the purpose of sowing discord within the clan of the great Khan, we see here an affirmation of a possible historic fact linked to the history of the struggle between the shaman and the khan. When the monument begins to describe details of this occurrence, we encounter an exceptionally bright and dramatic picture of one of the episodes in the life of the Chinggisid clan. This episode, even if it never took place in actuality, so excellently reproduces in an artistic-emotional sense the general spirit and atmosphere of the time, that its presence in the text of the monument alongside the indisputable facts is not superfluous, but rather aids readers to taking a better grasp of the true sense of the narration (entries 57, 244-245, pp. 176-177; 270, Index, §244).

Upon close inspection of the monument it is not hard to also note a purely historical approach taken both by its authors not only to the distant past, but also to their contemporaries. Even the general structure of the composition speaks of this.

In our view, it is more correct to divide the *Secret History* in the matter of its
composition into three component parts:

1. The genealogy of the ancestors of Chinggis Khan (§1-68);
2. The history of Chinggis Khan (§69-268);
3. The history of Ögedei Khan (§269-282).

The first part speaks of how the authors of the monument first of all are interested in the question of the sources of Mongolian history. And on the very first pages they indicate that this history begins with the legendary Borte Chino (the Gray Wolf). Having raised the question of the genealogy of the Mongolian Khans, the authors in this very first part illuminate the questions of the genealogical predecessors of Chinggis Khan, the origins of the Mongolian clans, the style of life of the predecessors (hunting, nomadism, mutual raids etc.), and cite some instructive examples from the history of individual clans and tribes. All of this is expounded solely from memory, on the basis of preserved historical traditions. Naturally, in such expositions there is much which is non-historic and legendary. Nonetheless the content of the first part as a whole reflects a real historical image.

In striving to derive the genealogy of the khan ruling at the given moment from possibly more distant ancestors, and to ground the khanate’s extraordinary origins among the Mongols of that epoch, they worked out the concept of uninterrupted succession within the genealogical line of the khan. Thus, the genealogical history of Chinggis Khan was derived from the legendary Börte Chino, actually a totemistic progenitor of the Chinggisid clan. When portraying this genealogical line, there is a long chain stretching uninterruptedly from the far past down to the time described in the monument. The stories about the forebears of Chinggis Khan are conducted strictly on the principle of: from the father, the leader of the clan, to the son and successor. As a result there is an orderly genealogical history of representatives of the ruling clan, underlying the base of all Mongolian historical writing. In this history, side by side with the legendary and semi-legendary names, there are many genuine historical figures, successful leaders of the tribe and tribal unions. The closer to the time the monument was compiled, the more reliable is the information it conveys. The reality of such historical personages as Bodonchar, Qadu, Tumbiqai-seçen, Ambagai, Qabul-qagan, Qutula-qagan, Bartan-bagatur, Yesügei bagatur, and others, is beyond doubt. Working out an unbroken genealogy of the Mongolian khans on the basis of the concept of their historical sequence must be regarded as one of the attainments of the Secret History. Its substantial flaw is the absence of an exact chronology, though the idea of a temporal sequence was not strange to the compilers. Popular memory did not prove to be in a position to preserve more or less correct dates of events from the distant past under conditions of fast-moving and even stormy times.

---

9 As is well-known, some researchers consider that the Secret History consists of two basic parts (entry 57, p. 35; entry 102, p.8).
Proceeding to other materials of the first part of the monument it should be noted that the genealogical predecessors of Chinggis Khan are not turned out as a bare list of names, but are supplemented by information about ethnic ties and the type of life-style of clan collective groups, accounts of outstanding figures and so on. These supplements no doubt reflect the developing process of unifying the scattered Mongolian clan and tribal domains and their merger into a single over-all Mongolian state, for which one had to be able to promote the idea of a historically conditioned ethnic unity of all clans and tribes.

Thus we know that the clans of Bükünüd, Belgünüd, Qatagi, Salji'ud, and Borjigin are blood-relatives, because they derive their origins from the five sons of Dobun-Mergen and Alan-Goa (entry 57, §42, p. 83). The need to know the origins of separate tribes and clans, as well as the degree of relationship, was dictated, it is likely, by the need to arrange marriages, and other interests such as struggles with common enemies, the election of chiefs, etc. Here history is entwined with the realities of life and culture of the Mongols of that time.

The first part of the monument contains quite a few historical events, enabling us to judge what most interested the Mongols about their historical past. Let us cite for instance a story about the early life of Alan-Goa and her clan:

As for that band of people, the matter stood thus. The daughter of Barqudad Mergen, lord of the Köl barqujin Lowland, was a girl called Barqujin Qo’a, and she had been given in marriage to Qorilartai Mergen, a chief of the Qori Tumat. At Arib-usun, in the land of the Qori Tumat, that girl, named Alan Qo’a, was born to Barqujin Qo’a, wife of Qorilartai-mergen.

As in their land, the Qori Tumat had imposed bans on one another’s sable, squirrel and wild game hunting grounds, and mutual relations were bad as a result, Qorilartai Mergen separated from the Qori Tumat and took the clan name Qorilar. Saying that the land of Burqan Qaldun was good, and that it was suitable for game hunting, he was now moving into the territory of the Uriangqai Burqan Bosqaqsan and Sînci Bayan, lords of Burqan Qaldun.

This is how Dobun-mergen asked there and then for Alan Qo’a, daughter of Qorilartai Mergen born at Arib Usun, and how he took her as his wife (entry 57, §§8-9, pp. 79-80; entry 293, PFEH 4, p. 119, §§8-9 as later revised).

Attention is paid likewise in the portion reviewed to specially speak of those leaders who fell at the hands of internal and external enemies, about their instructions to descendants, striving at the same time, as it seems to us, to evoke in the reader sympathy for the heroes of the narrative, and antipathy for their enemies. Thus, for instance, the text relates that Ambaqai Khan accompanied his daughter, whom he had given in marriage, to the Tatars:

As he was taking his daughter to them in person, Ambaqai Qa’an was captured by Tatar Jüyin men. When they were on their way to deliver him to the Al-
tan-qa’an of the Kitat, Ambaqai qa’an contrived to send a message using as messenger Balaqaci, a man of the Besüt. He said to him, “Speak to Qutula, the middle one of the seven sons of Qabul qa’an, and of my ten sons speak to Qada’an Taiśi.” And he sent saying, “When you become qa’an of all and lord of the people, learn from my example and beware of taking your daughter in person to her betrothed.

I have been seized by the Tatars.
Until the nails of your five fingers
Are ground down,
Until your ten fingers are worn away,
Strive to revenge me!"

(entries 57, §254, pp. 182-183; 293, PFEH 4, §53, pp. 126-127 as later revised)

This tragic demise of one of the Mongolian khans actually took place. The laconic reports of the Secret History are confirmed by the more detailed data of the Complete Collection of Histories by Rashid al-Dīn (entry 67, vol. 2, book 2, pp. 22-24). As though explaining what is written in the Secret History, the Collection speaks about how

the [Tatars], having made use of a fortunate circumstance, seized Qambakai-qan [Ambagai]. . . and the origin (uruq) of the latter derives from the tribesmen of Qabul-qa’an.

In consequence of this, the Tatars knew that the Chinese emperor had been offended by Qabul-qa’an, because the latter had slain his emissaries and comrades (nökör), and that [the emperor] had evil thoughts against Qabul-qa’an and the Mongols, all of whom were his relatives and were as one with him. That hatred towards them [deeply] penetrated the heart of the emperor. The Tatars were subordinate and subject to him. They sent Qambakai-qa’an to him. Likewise they themselves had towards Qambakai-qa’an an ancient enmity and hostility, for which reason they decided on such an impudence and adamant action. The Chinese emperor ordered Qambakai-qa’an to be nailed with iron nails to the “wooden donkey”. . . After this Qutula-qa’an was dispatched with a force of Mongols to war with the Chinese emperor, and pillaged his country (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, pp. 104-105).

The historical views of the Mongols of that time show up with special clarity in the second and third parts

of the Secret History. Here the monument takes on the character of a written history. Related just to these parts are the words of Kozin about the basic portion of the chronicle “having a tendency to be an annual list of events, . . . including them in an artificial chronological framework, despite the fact that this latter portion takes up an entire forty years of the life of the chronicler and of the chief heroes of his account, Chinggis and Jamuqa” (entry 57, p. 35).

The second part begins to look like a real history, now that it is put in writing for the first time. It enables one to judge what considerable changes the oral historical creations of the Mongols underwent. The story of this or that person is converted here into a real biography; what is epic and legendary goes into the
background, yielding to more believable data, although the epic style still retains its alluring force to Mongolian ears. In this portion of the Secret History one may discern not only a real biography of the main hero, but also to a certain degree the status of Mongolian society at that time.

From the viewpoint of historiographic attainment, the basic parts of the Secret History are likewise remarkable by the fact that in them we have to deal with a quite complex presentation of chronology.

Although there are no dates here at all, the temporal sequence of events is maintained considerably better than in the foregoing part of the monument. At the outset it sets forth the events of the childhood years of Chinggis Khan, and then of his youth and maturity. Moreover, it sometimes indicates Temüjin’s age at the moment of this or that event. For instance, “When Temüjin was nine years old, Joči Qasar was seven, Qaçı’un Elći was five, and Temüge očigin was three, and Temülnün was still in the cradle” (entries 57, 60-61, p. 86; 293, PFEH 4, §60, p. 129, as later revised). And similarly, “When Temüjin was nine years old, Yisügei Ba’atür set out to go to the Ołqunu’ut people, relatives of Mother Hō’elün,” (entries 57, ibid.; 293, PFEH 4, §60, p. 129, as later revised).

Further on, beginning with paragraph 141, the Secret History definitely takes on the character of a chronicle. It gives exact dates, expressed in the twelve-year animal cycle. Below we present as an example the chronology for events mentioned in the last two portions of the monument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Paragraphs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fowl</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>§141-152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>§153-165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swine</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>§166-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>§193-197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>§198-201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>§202-238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>§239-246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>§247-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>§251-256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>§257-263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowl</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>§264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>§266-268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>§269-271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>§272-281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>§282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data cited above it is clear that in the Secret History the most important events in Mongolian history, beginning from 1201, are set forth in strict chronological order. In §202, for instance, the Tiger-Year is indicated as the date of founding of the Mongolian State. Under the heading of 1207 in §239 it communicates the struggle between Chinggis-Khan and Teb-Tengri, which ended in the defeat of the celebrated shaman; in §247-250 the events of 1211 are set forth.
The basic portions of the *Secret History* are devoted to events which were a reality at that time. As testimony to this fact, the entrance of the Mongols into the historical arena attracted increased interest in fixing events of the time. Together with this, it heightened the need for representatives of the ruling class to immortalize their deeds, to enlarge themselves and their relatives in the eyes of contemporaries and descendants. With such aims they fell back on the services of chroniclers, or more correctly, *bitegčis*, who henceforth had to occupy themselves first and foremost with contemporary affairs, the history of the functioning khans.

These new duties set before the chroniclers made the writing of history a more active and concrete form of knowledge, than the old oral historical tradition, which was a collection of legends and traditional tales about events of the past. As an historical monument, the *Secret History* is remarkable for the fact that in it one can still trace things back even at this juncture. If its first portion, operating with traditional tales, could evoke a national memory about the more remote historical past, then its other parts, devoted to contemporary affairs, could firmly base themselves on genuine historical facts.

These facts brought about a change in the traditional tales, which also meant establishing history as a branch of knowledge. A new view of the role and significance of facts is expressed in the *Secret History*. The question naturally arises, what about the sources from which these facts were drawn? In our view they can be taken from two possible sources. Some data, especially for the first period of the life of Chinggis Khan, are for the greater part based on oral eyewitness accounts of contemporaries closely acquainted with Chinggis, probably his relatives. And these data, in view of their nearness in time to the events described, and the good knowledge of the situation by these informants, substantially differ from earlier oral traditionary tales by the degree of their reliability. Keeping this in mind one may assume that on the whole there can be no doubt among researchers about events of the childhood and youth of Temǔjin.

Another source for the *Secret History* consists of documentary materials from the headquarters of Chinggis-Khan and Ögedei. On an attentive reading it is not hard to notice that the monument makes use of orders and decrees of the Khans, reports from emissaries, court memos, official papers and the like. Recognizing written documents as an important type of historical source had a significant effect on the future development of Mongolian historical knowledge. The use of sources of written history took a turn for the better. It follows from this, indeed before all else, that it ties together the growth of reliability in the information communicated with the appearance of a chronology in the basic portions of the monument. In places one encounters extracts from orders and decrees of Chinggis-Khan (e.g., about the appointment of the 95 chiliarchs, with an exact enumeration of their names and indication of their origins, about the creation of the *kesig*-guard corps, its rules and duties), and likewise from the decrees of Ögedei
about the privileges and obligations of the Khan’s Guard, about the institution of the  
\textit{urton}-service, and so on (entry 57, §202, 204, 278, 279, 280).

A detailed history of the unified Mongolian state’s creation, clarification in a  
condensed form of the campaigns of Chinggis

Khan and Ögedei against the countries of Central and Inner Asia, as well as in  
Southern Rus, a rather exact listing of geographical names, all serve as additional  
proof that the basic sections of the chronicle could not have been written by a  
single oral witness, but were for the most part based on written and documentary  
data.

Let us try to analyze just which historical questions are elucidated in the  
chronicle and how they are explained. Let us select from these questions the fol­

towing ones: Temüjin’s struggle to unify the Mongols into a single state and his  
election to the throne of all the Mongols; the structure of the Mongolian state;  
external campaigns of Chinggis, and finally, the history of Ögedei.

Such an analysis will make it possible to get better acquainted with the his­
torical views of the chronicle compilers. A skillful selection of data displaying  
the activity of the main hero, is already indication by itself of a new approach by  
the authors to historical narration, their understanding of the significance of his­
torical events and facts, and the expediency of including them in the chronicle.

It is precisely this new idea of history, it seems to us, which guided the au­
thors and enabled them to state the most important events in the life not only of  
Chinggis Khan and his clan, but also of Mongolian society as a whole. Strictly  
speaking, the struggle of the young Temüjin to establish the rights of the Borjigid  
clan was in an objective sense also a struggle to establish the powerful authority  
of the khan, enabling him to unite all the Mongolian tribes into one state.

Thus the \textit{Secret History} is devoted to one of the main and most current prob­
lems of the history of the early 13th century, the history of creating the Mongolian  
state.

The concept of Mongolian statehood, one of the most important historical  
ideas of this monument, is the most powerful attainment of the historical knowl­
dge of the Mongols of that time. True, this conceptual basis of the \textit{Secret His­
tory} is nowhere formulated specifically in the shape of a complex historical pro­
cedure but it is not hard to get an impression of it when analyzing the basic data  
of the monument. This fact, that first and foremost it relates the genealogical his­
tory of the Mongolian khans, already of itself bears witness to the strengthened  
interest in history of the ruling  

\footnotesize{[59]}  
elite, personified by the khans. In those times the supreme power could be  
thought of solely as the khan’s power. The state and the khan were synonymous  
in the minds of people in those days. For this reason the history of creating the  
state is presented in the monument as a history of establishing an all-Mongolian  
khan power through unification of the different Mongolian tribes and nations un­
der the guiding Borjigid clan.
Chapter One: The Birth of Mongolian Historiography

The history of the struggle to create a state is presented truthfully and realistically. The young and energetic Temüjin begins to subject one Mongolian fief after another to himself, now by armed might, now through diplomatic means. This fight was hard, at times bloody, and required immense effort and sacrifice. Two opposing forces arose: one, headed by Temüjin, came forward to unite all the Mongols, and the other, representing the interests of the conservative circles of the clan and tribal aristocracy, struggled to retain the old order.

The childhood and youth of the future Mongolian Khan is described with great artistic expressiveness: the reader is, as it were, prepared for stories about the imminent forceful actions of Chinggis in establishing his paternal ulus and in unification of all the Mongolian fiefs. It was they, the Tatars, who poisoned his father, Yesugei-bagatur, and left Ho’elün-eke with five children in an impoverished situation. It was they, the Taich’uts, who nomadized away from the widow of Yesugei-bagatur, having abandoned her to the mercy of fate, and then kidnapped Temüjin while he was yet a juvenile and held him against his will until a fortunate circumstance enabled him to flee. And finally, young Temüjin, who had lived through all kinds of hardships and difficulties, ambitious, harboring an implacable hatred for his enemies, became Chinggis-Khan, and achieved his goals in a harsh and blood-filled clash with the opponents of the unified state.

The basic intent of Chinggis-Khan, if we are to believe the Secret History, was to “direct the state of many tongues onto the path of truth” and to bring it “under his reins alone” (entries 57, §224, p. 168; 270, Index, p. 128). Dominant in the Secret History is the idea that a unified Mongolian state was a guaranty “of general welfare”, in which the period of “strife among all the people” would be ended. The idea of peace and harmony among the Mongolian tribal groups was becoming a real possibility and an important goal for many at that time. It found expression in the mood and expectations of the Mongolian national masses, who had endured not only the hardships of steppe life, but also the endless internecine wars during the period of disassociation.

In our view, the positive reaction of those who supported the unificatory activity of Chinggis-Khan is quite clearly reflected in the message To’oril Khan of the Kereit sent to his anda, Chinggis-Khan:

To make my son Temüjin qan is indeed right. How can the Mongols live without a qan? In future
Do not break this, your agreement,
Do not dissolve your bond,
Do not tear off your collar!
(entries 57, §126, p. 111; 293, PFEH 5, p. 166, §126, as revised.)

The difficult position of Mongolia in the pre-State period is described in the following fashion:

The starry sky was turning upon itself,
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The many people were in turmoil...
They did not lie on their coverlets *to rest*,
But attacked each other.
(entries 57, §254, pp.183-84; 293, PFEH 30, p. 90, §254 as revised)

From the quotation cited it is evident that the monument gives an evaluation of the contemporary situation in contrast with the past, and this evaluation quite agrees with the objective course of social development in Mongolia toward unity.

In conclusion, everything that is said about the victorious struggle of Chinggis Khan for the throne of all the Mongols, the *Secret History* describes in the tragic end of the major rival of Chinggis, his one-time anda, Jamuqa. It explains that in the fight against Chinggis, Jamuqa suffered a complete defeat, was abandoned by his people and given to Chinggis by five of his cohorts. This led to his former *anda*, Jamuqa, publicly acknowledging his guilt and in noble fashion asking Chinggis to execute him promptly. Jamuqa’s words, pronounced before his execution and addressed to Chinggis, sound like the concluding notes of confession of a man convinced of the senselessness of opposing everything which came out against the single-state authority of an all-Mongolian khan (entry 57, §201, p. 158).

One should observe the great attention which the *Secret History* devotes to the history of creation and construction of the single Mongolian state. As if of a very great event, it speaks about founding the state in the Tiger-Year (1206) at the Grand Assembly (§202):

And so, when the people of the felt-walled tents had been brought to allegiance, in the Year of the Tiger (1206), they all gathered at the source of the *Onan River*. They hoisted the white standard with nine tails and there they gave Chinggis qa’an the title of qa’an. . . . Having thus set in order the Mongolian people, Chinggis qa’an said, “To those who sided with me when I was establishing *our nation*, I will express my appreciation and, having formed units of one thousand men, I shall appoint them leaders of a thousand” (entry 293, PFEH 18, p. 25, §202 as later revised).

Then it enumerates by name all 95 noyons whom Chinggis Khan named chil-iarchs.

Further, he [i.e., Chinggis Qa’an] entrusted *Siigi-Qutuqu with the power* of judgement over all, and said to him “Of the entire people
Chastising the robber,
Checking the liar,
execute those who deserve death, punish those who deserve punishment”
(entries 57, §203, pp. 113-114; 293, PFEH 18, p. 27, §203).

The materials about Chinggis’s formation of a personal guard-corps are interesting (§226-230); as Vladimirtsov pointed out, this was a direct result of the earlier
bands of nökör and detachments of bodyguards of the tribal khans. The Guard of Chinggis Khan was a military organization of the khan, which was converted into a powerful military institution.

It is curious that through the mouth of Chinggis’s wife, in a casual way, it seems to us, she expresses in the monument a certain disquietude about the fate of the Mongolian state in connection with the preparations for Chinggis Khan’s campaign to distant Turkestan:

The qa’an has thought of
Establishing order over his many people,
Climbing high passes,
Crossing wide rivers
And waging a long campaign.
But living beings born to this world are not eternal: When your body, like a great old tree,
Will fall down,
To whom will you bequeath your people
Which is like tangled hemp?
When your body, like the stone base of a pillar,
Will collapse,
To whom will you bequeath your people
Which is like a flock of birds?

Of your four heroic sons whom you have begotten, which one will you designate as your successor? I have given you this advice on what, thinking about it, we the sons, younger brothers, the many common people and my bad self understood to be an important question. Your order (= word) shall decide!” (entries 57, §254, p. 301; 293, PFEH 30, p. 88-89, § 254, as later revised).

It is noteworthy that the Secret History speaks in detail about the sharp discussion which took place among the sons of Chinggis as to whom their father ought to name as successor to the throne. This question concerned all the sons of Chinggis. And only the Khan could decide this question. He compelled his sons to come to an agreement and approve the designation of Ögedei as successor to the throne.

This dramatic scene, so clearly sketched in §254, anticipated future clashes among the descendants of Chinggis Khan. The Secret History, alongside the story of creating the Mongolian state, likewise deals with the matter of its future, when the founder of that state would be no more.

The history of campaigns by Chinggis Khan and Ögedei Khan, briefly sketched in the Secret History, bears witness to how the ruling class of the Mongols maintained an interest in expanding its sphere of influence. The data in the monument likewise say that Mongolian historiography at the moment of its birth had at its disposal sufficiently reliable geographical information about many countries of Inner and Central Asia, and partly of Europe. At the present time, for
the most part, the modern correspondences of place names found in the *Secret History* have been established, and their etymological meaning has been clarified in quite a few cases.

Let us cite some examples (following Igor de Rachewiltz, *Index to the Secret History of the Mongols*, (entry 270):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitad or Jürčid</th>
<th>Northern China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solangyas</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangyud</td>
<td>Minyaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu-jou</td>
<td>Fu-chou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čabčival</td>
<td>Chū-yung-kuan, Chinese fortress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śira dektür</td>
<td>Lung-hu-t’ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungdu</td>
<td>Chung-tu (Peking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunčan</td>
<td>Tung-ching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungčang</td>
<td>Tung-ch’ang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarta’ul</td>
<td>Turkestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buqar</td>
<td>Bukhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semisgab/Semisgen</td>
<td>Samarkand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ürünggeči</td>
<td>Urgench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isebur</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aru-lru</td>
<td>Iru-Herat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maru</td>
<td>Merv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baqat</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>Hindustan, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin-müren</td>
<td>Indus (river)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejil</td>
<td>Volga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erdes</td>
<td>Irtysh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayag Yaik</td>
<td>Ural river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanglin / Ganglin</td>
<td>Name of a Turkic people in the basin of the Syr-Darya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibčat</td>
<td>Kipchak, Polovetsians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orus(ut)</td>
<td>Russians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majarat</td>
<td>Magyars, Hungarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serkesüt</td>
<td>Cirkassians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolar</td>
<td>Bulgarians and others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have already observed above that the history of external campaigns takes up relatively little space in the *Secret History*. The first to notice this was Kozin, in whose words the chronicle “has little interest in Chinggis Khan’s undertakings of conquest beyond the borders of Mongolian countries and peoples,” and speaks of them “dryly, inconsistently and without the least enthusiasm” (entry 57, pp. 52-53). The monument merely registers the basic military events. There the reader will find no sharply defined episodes nor epic digressions such as are so richly wrought in the sections devoted to internal history. Such a chronicle ought,
one would think, to express thoughts to some degree justifying or glorifying the military plans and actions of Chinggis Khan. But these are not there either. Perhaps this can be explained by the fact that the *Secret History* was intended above all else to be a family history of the “Golden Clan.”

Speaking of factual data touching on the history of military battles, one should emphasize their historical reliability. It is easy to be convinced of this by comparing them with what is said in other sources, in the works of Juvayni, Rashīd al-Dīn and others (entry 57, §270, §274, pp. 191-196, 268-270).

The concluding paragraphs of the *Secret History* (§§269-282) are devoted to relating the rule of Ögedei as khan (1228-1241). These differ considerably from the preceding ones both in manner of exposition as well as in style. Everything artistic and epic fully yields place to what is actual and historic. The *Secret History* clearly observes a general tendency which is in common to this particular monument: the closer the events are to the time of compilation, the more distinct does the history as such begin to dominate other forms of literary creation.

The exposition of the khanship of Ögedei is a condensed tale about the most important events with no frills. It creates the impression that when the monument was written these happenings were well-known to everyone; they had taken place under the eyes of contemporaries and for this reason the author considered it permissible to restrict himself to the shortest possible elaboration. One feels that Ögedei Khan is striving to observe the traditional Mongolian respect of a son for his father: the chief matter in the *Secret History* ought to be the history of the famed father, and as for what concerns the son, his history should be an illustration of devotion to the memory and precepts of his father. Whatever the son may have done, all served to fulfill these precepts, culminating in the name of his “grand deeds.” In one of his decrees Ögedei Khan says:

We shall not cause suffering to the nation that Our father Činggis qa’an established with so much toil. We shall make the people rejoice, causing them to rest Their feet upon the ground, Their hands upon the soil.

Sitting now on the throne made ready by Our father the qa’an, so that people do not suffer (entries 57, 279, p. 197; 293, 279, PFEH 31, p. 38, as later revised).

In another place he says, “I have sat on the throne made ready by my father Činggis qa’an. Will people not say of me, By what merit has he sat on it. If Elder Brother Ča’adai agrees, since our father the qahan has left matters with the Altan Qan of the Kitat people unfinished, I shall now move against the Kitat people” (entries 57, 271, p. 192; 293, 271, PFEH 31, pp. 27-28, as later revised).

Characteristically, at the conclusion of the *Secret History* the lips of Ögedei Khan sum up as it were everything spoken of in the pages of the chronicle: “After my father the qa’an, I have indeed added four good deeds to his, and four deeds of mine were surely faults.” Further, as everyone knows, the Khan briefly
enumerated his four "good deeds," and his four "faults" (entries 57, §281, pp.198-199; 293, PFEH 31, p. 43, 281).

Ögedei Khan's speeches may bewilder the reader. Can it be that the ruling Khan personally "repented" his errors? This is quite possible if one considers the following circumstance. The Secret History was written under the son, Ögedei, primarily as a history of Chinggis Khan's reign. Being the initiator of this document, Ögedei could at any suitable moment emphasize his insignificance as an individual before the presence of his father; he could "give an account of himself" as adhering to the spirit of the latter in all his deeds. This completely matches the shamanic tradition.

It is well-known that in ancient times, when worshipping the ongon (idol), the shaman, having rendered due respect to the deceased, always spoke about himself, about his worthy affairs and transgressions, as if he were giving an account of himself before the spirit of his predecessor. One may assume that this purely shamanic tradition also stipulated the unique ending of the chronicle. Faced with such a detailed exposition of the history of his predecessor, Ögedei Khan could but briefly and in a "spirit of self-criticism" appraise his actions against the background of this history.

History and Political Ideas in the Secret History

It is characteristic of the Secret History not only to register, but also to interpret historical events, thus expressing definite ideas and aspirations of its own time. In this respect, it is the most complete historical work that ever appeared among nomadic peoples.

It is obvious that the philosophy of history in the book is purely shamanistic. Its main political ideas have been formulated from the viewpoint of shamanism, the indigenous faith of the Mongol nomads. If one deals with the book thoroughly, one can discover, once in a while, sophisticated ideas concerning not only history, but the theory of statehood in Mongolia. For instance, the Secret History recorded the earliest known speculation on the subject of the origin and nature of political authority in Mongolia, and this theory strongly reminds us of the divine origin of the state theory among other peoples of antiquity. As is well-known, the Hindus, the Chinese, the Christians and others all subscribed to the view that the origin of political authority has a divine sanction. The divine origin of the royal power of Chinggis Khan is attested differently in two places of the book. First, in the very beginning of the book, it states that Borte činno, the forebear of Chinggis Khan's clan, was "born with his destiny ordained by Heaven Above" (entry 293, PFEH 4, §1, p. 118).

All this shows that the origin of the khan's power for the Chinggisids was initially sanctioned by Heaven or Tengri which, according to shamanism, is the highest being governing the world and directing the affairs of men. Dr. Igor de Rachewiltz has pointed out the possibility of influence from the traditional Chi-
nese doctrine of the mandate of Heaven (t’ien ming) on the Mongolian concept of Heaven evidenced in the Secret History. In principle sharing this view, I nevertheless have to note the following. As I have written elsewhere, the worship of Heaven was originally characteristic of shamanism; it could not have been borrowed from anywhere else. But the very idea of sanctioning the power of the sole khan in Mongolia by means of a more sophisticated theory might have, in the final phase of its evolution, been inspired by the more developed political doctrine of its nearest neighbor.

Thus, when the Mongols began to record the history of the great founder of the Mongol Empire, the old totem-origin theory of a clan leader might have been re-interpreted in the light of the Heavenly Mandate doctrine of the Chinese, the closeness of which to the Mongolian worship of Heaven could easily be understood (Börte čino, the “wolf,” was “born with his destiny ordained by Heaven above”).

Second, in some lines after the first paragraphs of this book, one can find another story about the divine origin of khanship in Mongolia:

Dobun Mergen asked there and then for Alan Qo’a, daughter of Qorilartai Mergen . . . born at Ariq Usun and . . . she bore him two sons called Bügünütei and Belgünütei. . . . Before long, Dobun Mergen died. After his death, Alan Qo’a, although she had no husband, bore three sons who were named Buqu Qatagi, Buqatu Salji and Bodončar Mungqaq. [21]

Bügünütei and Bügünütei, the two sons born earlier to Dobun Mergen, said to each other, behind the back of their mother Alan Qo’a, “Although this mother of ours is without brothers-in-law and male relatives, without a husband she has borne these three sons. In the house there is only the man of the Ma’aliq Baya’ut. Surely these three sons are his.” Their mother Alan Qo’a knew what they had been saying to each other behind her back. . . .” [22]

Then their mother Alan Qo’a said, “You, my sons Bügünütei and Bügünütei, are suspicious of me and said to each other, ‘These three sons that she has borne, of whom, of what clan, are they the sons?’ And it is right for you to be suspicious. Every night, a resplendent yellow man entered by the light of the smoke-hole or the doortop of the tent, he rubbed my belly and his radiance penetrated my womb. When he departed, he crept out on a moonbeam or a ray of sun in the guise of a yellow dog (Emphasis added, Sh.B.).

How can you speak so rashly?
When one understands that, the sign is clear:
They are the sons of Heaven.
How can you speak, comparing them
To ordinary black-headed men?
When they become the rulers of all,
Then the common people will understand!"
(entries 57, pp. 80-81; 293, §§1, 9, 17-22, pp. 118-119, as later revised)

The same story was retold in a somewhat different variant by the Persian historian Rashid al-Din. It runs as follows:

They [the Mongols, Sh. B.] assert that the responsibility [for this lies] on the narrator, that Alan-Goa some little time after this, when her husband was gone, was sleeping once at home. And there through the [same] opening of the tent came a beam of light that plunged into her womb... After some time she perceived that she was pregnant. When the time came to be delivered of this pregnancy, her brothers and the kinfolk of her husband gathered and said: "How is it possible that a woman without a husband has surreptitiously conducted herself with a man and become pregnant?!" Alan-Goa in reply said [to them]: "Inasmuch as I have borne a child without a husband, a circumstance might exist [in reality] in which your presupposition was appropriate and the suspicion you harbor was seemingly correct. But there is no doubt that 'in truth, some suspicions are a sin.' How could I conduct [such a] mis-step, so worthy of scorn, one which would serve as a cause for shame? Any suspicion which you nurture respecting me is false! These sons which I bore belong to a special class [of beings]. When they grow up and become lords and khans of the entire people, they will be defined and explained for you and other subject tribes, how my circumstances came to be!" Three sons appeared on earth from Alan-Goa... The name of the youngest [son] was Bodonchar-kaan, the clan [nasab] of Chinggis Khan goes back to him (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 12-13).

As is evident from the texts cited above, the basic content of the story of Alan-Go’a is alike in all, and focuses on the same topic, that is, the genealogy of Chinggis Khan goes back to a supernatural origin, this time to light. This topic deserves special attention. In one place in his work, Rashid al-Din made a very interesting remark, with regard to the fact that those who originated from the three sons whom Alan-Go’a bore from light were called nirun, that is “womb”, and that this was a hint at the existence of immaculate wombs, since these children were conceived from light (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, p. 272).

It is obvious that the legend of Alan-Go’a’s immaculate conception from light was another attempt of the Mongols to show the divine nature of their supreme political authority. This theory, which could be called the “light origin theory of the Khan’s power,” was a more advanced political notion, compared with that of the totem origin of the Mongol khanship, with Börte čino, the wolf, being an ancestor of the Chinggisids.

In my previous works I tried to argue that the initiative of the authors of the
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Chapter One: The Birth of Mongolian Historiography

Secret History to attribute the origin of the Chinggisids to the miraculous action of light could have been the result of Zoroastrian-Manichaean influence upon early Mongolian historical thought. This might have occurred through the Uighurs, whose theory of the khan’s origin from light was ultimately inspired by the Manichaean cult of light (as is well-known, Manichaeism was once dominant among the Uighurs).

Generally speaking, the Secret History is ideologically more predetermined, insofar as it deals with the deeds of Chinggis Khan. It contains rather developed ideas of the historical necessity for a united statehood, under the rule of a single khan of the Chinggisids. Rulership by a sole khan was a symbol and guarantee of Mongol nationhood.

The Secret History says: “How can you Mongols live without a qan?” (entry 293, PFEH 5, p. 166, §126). The words of Tayan-qan of the Naiman, the powerful rival of Chinggis Khan, speak eloquently of the same idea: “I am told that yonder east are a few Mongols. Do they now want to be rulers themselves? Even if there are two shining lights, the sun and moon are indeed there. Yet how can there be two rulers on earth. Let us go and bring here those few Mongols!” (entry 293, PFEH 18, pp. 46-47, §189).

The Secret History reflects the idea that the khan’s sovereignty is indivisible and incontestable. The book bears witness to how Chinggis Khan demonstrated the power of the khan over that of Teb-Tengri, the supreme shaman.

What is more, the Secret History bears witness not only to the fact that the interests of the shamanist ideologists and of Chinggis Khan coincided, but also about instances when these interests diverged sufficiently that Chinggis had to ruthlessly repress the shamans, taking no heed of their authority nor of the will of Eternal Heaven. We recall the tragic case of the shaman Teb-Tengri (Kököû), the elder son of Möngliq, stepfather of Chinggis. Teb-Tengri was famed as a great shaman who consorted with spirits, rose to Heaven and had powerful protector-spirits. He enjoyed considerable confidence from Chinggis-Khan himself. But Teb-Tengri, making use of his position, eventually began to contend for supreme power in the Empire and openly encroached on the prerogatives of Chinggis Khan. Having squabbled with Qasar, the brother of Chinggis, Teb Tengri presented himself before the Khan and declared to him:

The decree of Eternal Heaven concerning the ruler has been foretold by heavenly signs as follows: once they [i.e., the signs] said that Temüjin will hold the nation, once that Qasar will. If you don’t strike at Qasar by surprise, there is no knowing what will happen! (entries 57, §244, p. 176; 293, PFEH 26, p. 48, §244).

That was a clear attempt to provoke a conflict between Chinggis and his
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brother (same entry). But Teb-Tengri did not stop at this. He actively prepared for the realization of his ambitious plans. The shaman’s position quickly strengthened, and around him there gathered numerous adherents from the aristocracy and the simple folk.

“After that, the ‘people of the nine tongues’ gathered under Teb Tenggeri,” says the Secret History in §245. And once Teb-Tengri was so bold as to offend the younger brother of Chinggis, Otchigin, who tearfully told the Khan of what had come to pass (entries 57, §245, p. 177; 293, PFEH 26, p. 50, §245).

Then Chinggis Khan’s wife, Börte-ujin, declared to the Khan: “What are these Qongqotan doing? They recently ganged up and beat Qasar. And now, why do they make this Otchigin kneel down behind them? What kind of behavior is this?”

When your body, like a great old tree
Will fall down,
Whom will they let govern your people? . . .
How can people covertly injure your younger brothers like this . . . (entries 57, p.178; 293, PFEH 26, p.51, §245, as later revised).

Having finally understood what a grave danger threatened him from Teb-Tengri, Chinggis Khan was able to employ the shaman’s own weapon, the ideology of shamanism, against him. So as to justify this step, organizing the slaying of the shaman, and to give advance notice of his intentions to the people, Chinggis declared: “Because Teb Tenggeri laid hands on my younger brothers and spread baseless slanders among them in order to sow discord, he was no longer loved by Heaven, and his life, together with his body, has been taken away” (entries 57, §246, pp. 178-179; 293, PFEH 26, p. 53, §246).

By this declaration Chinggis wanted to show that the power of the khan was superior to everyone and everything, that he might punish anyone who thought to rise up against him or against his kinsmen, that Heaven was protecting him as khan even more than the shaman himself—the living embodiment of the will of Heaven. The Secret History, as we see, reveals a real displacement of traditional Mongolian views. Before, when the positions of shamanism were strong and immovable, the inviolability of shamans and magi, who usually stood at the head of their clans, was generally accepted and was an indisputable law, but after the Mongol state was established, they forfeited their superior status and were compelled to subject themselves to the will of the all-powerful khan.

Some other principles of shamanism likewise underwent change. Thus, Blue Heaven in these new circumstances was invoked to protect not only the shaman, but the khan as well, and even more. In our view, the conflict between Chinggis and Teb-Tengri reflects the latter, concluding stage of a conflict between adherents of the new khan power, and the representatives of the old shamanist tradition.

Chinggis’s reference to the will of Heaven, which had sanctioned the slaying
of Teb-Tengri, was merely a cunning cover-up of the true reason for why he had moved so harshly against the noted shaman:

Činggis qa’an then railed at Father Monglik saying, “By not restraining your sons’ nature, you and your sons began thinking that you were equal to me, and you have paid for this with Teb Tenggeri’s life. If I had known that you had such a nature, you would have been dealt with like Jamuqa, Altan, Qučar and others” (entry 57, §246, p. 179; entry 293, PFEH 26, p.53, §246 as revised).

He added more graciously “Had you restrained your ambitious nature, who among Father Monglik’s offspring would have considered himself equal to me?” After he had destroyed Teb Tenggeri, the proud air of the Qongqotan was much reduced (entry 293, loc.cit.). An analysis of the Secret History convinces one that its author used shamanism not in defense of persisting local interests, but to affirm autocratic khan power in the person of Chinggis.

An interesting detail here deserves notice, one showing that the chronicle strives to justify the selection of Chinggis and not Jamuqa for the khan’s throne. Qorci, who had in consequence become one of the closest cohorts of Chinggis Khan, said to him:

A heavenly sign appeared before my very eyes, revealing the future to me. There came a fallow cow. She circled Jamuqa and struck his tent-cart with her horns; then she butted him too, breaking one of her two horns... Then a hornless and fallow ox lifted up the great shaft under the tent, harnessed it on to himself and... as he proceeded following Temújin on the wide road, he kept bellowing:

Together Heaven and Earth have agreed:
Temújin shall be lord of the people!” and
I am drawing near carrying the people and
Bringing it to him.

These heavenly signs appeared before my eyes (entries 57, 121, p. 107; 293, PFEH 5, p. 162, §121, as later revised).

The Secret History is witness to the fact that Chinggis Khan, being a shamanist and remaining as such throughout his entire life, firmly believed in the intervention of Eternal Heaven to determine his destiny, and he strove in every way to have a similar representation affirmed throughout all his empire.”“By the strength of Eternal Heaven, my strength and power have now been increased by Heaven and Earth and I have brought the whole people to allegiance, causing them to come under my sole rule, so now choose men to serve on roster as day-guards . . .” (entries 57, §224, p.168; 293, PFEH 23, p.120, §224). In another place he repeats this thought: “. . . since I enjoyed the protection of Eternal Heaven, I subdued the Kereyit people and, indeed, gained the high throne” (entry
Another political idea is no less clearly expressed in this monument—the loyalty of subjects (arats) and nokors (cohorts) to their noyons (lords) and khans, an idea brought forth to affirm and strengthen relations of hierarchical subordination in society. Many places in the monument speak of this in connection with the most diverse events, and it is set forth, as a rule, from the mouth of Chinggis Khan himself. Let us cite some examples. At the time the Tayichi’ut were destroyed, Old Man Shirgū’tetu of the Nichugut-Ba’arin and his sons captured the Taichi’ut prince Tarqutai-kiriltuq, and were about to convey him to Chinggis. But one of the sons of Old Man Shirgū’tetu, Naya’a, said:

If we arrive holding this Tarqutai captive, Çinggis qa’an will say of us that we came having laid hands on our rightful master. Çinggis qa’an will say of us: “How trustworthy a people are those who come having laid hands on their rightful master? ... People who lay hands on their rightful master must be cut down!” ... It would be better if we freed Tarqutai and sent him away from here, and only ourselves went to Chinggis-qahan to say, “We have come to offer our strength. We had seized Tarqutai and were coming here, but we could not make away with our rightful master.... So we freed him ... and we have come respectfully to offer our strength to you.” Let us say this! (entry 57, §149, p. 121; entry 293, PFEH 13, p. 43, §149 as later revised).

The kinsmen did as Naya’a proposed. And Chinggis Khan said to them when he met them: “If you had come, having laid hands ... 

on your rightful master, you and your offspring would have been cut down. Your thought that you could not make away with your rightful master is right” (entries 57, §149, p. 121; 293, PFEH 13, pp.43-44, §149, as later revised). In another place it talks about Kököčü, who had betrayed his master, so as to go over to Chinggis’s side. Chinggis Khan declared: “As for the equerry Kököčü himself, who comes here having in this manner abandoned his rightful master, who would now trust such a man and take him for a companion?” (entries 57, §188, pp.141-142; 293, PFEH 13, pp. 45-46, §188, as later revised).

Finally, there is a story about how five companions of Jamuqa seized him and dragged him to Chinggis. “When Jamuqa was brought here by his companions,” he told someone to say to his sworn brother the khan:

Black crows have gone so far
As to catch a ‘qarambai’ duck,
Black skins [=commoners] and slaves have gone so far
As to lay hands on their lord.
Qa’an, my sworn friend,
How can you be mistaken? (entries 57, §200, p. 154; 293, PFEH 21, p.21, §200, as revised).

To this Chinggis Khan replied: “How could we let men live who have raised
their hands against their rightful master. To whom can such men be companions? Exterminate to the offspring of their offspring these people who have raised their hands against their rightful master!” (entries 57, §200, p. 155; 293, PFEH 21, p. 21, §200). And right there, before Jamuqa’s eyes, he slew the arats who had encroached on him, and for Jamuqa himself, handed over by his subjects, Chinggis even wished to be merciful, but Jamuqa declined to be pardoned.

The Secret History is the Outstanding Monument of Mongolian Historiography

Researchers have characterized the Secret History in various ways. I. N. Berezin called it “a Mongolo-Chinese chronicle” (entry 48, p. 1). W. W. Bartol’d, regarding such a definition as unrewarding, related the monument to the “works of a bogatyr epic” (entry 132, pp. 90-91). He maintained that the Secret History “distinguished itself from every other chronicle by the fact that the narrative does not go by years, and the chronology of events is very indefinite and confused” (entry 132, pp. 90-91). It is not possible in this respect not to observe that the great Orientalist clearly underrated the significance of the Secret History as a source for Mongolian history.

Vladimirtsov gave the most correct statement of the character of this monument:

Actually, the Yüan-ch’ao pi-shih [i.e., the Secret History—Sh. B.] forms a special source of data about Chinggis Khan, based on the oral traditions closest to his times, and imbued with epic motifs. Nonetheless, the work cannot be regarded as a genuine epic and be related to it as to one which is exclusively epic in nature. The Secret History reveals itself to be a chain of epic stories, re-worked with a purpose—the goal of making it be the cherished traditional tale of the House of Chinggis Khan, its history. . . . On the basis of the epic Secret History one may form judgments about the life of the Mongolian aristocracy in the same way as in India and use the Odyssey to learn about the life of the ancient Greek basileus. But the Secret History is far more prosaic than the poems of Homer, and approaches more closely the “epic chronicle” type, although this is because, despite the assertion of Bartol’d, narration in the Yüan-ch’ao pi-shih (Secret History) does go on according to years, beginning with 1201, which has been observed by Palladius. The Secret History tells the story of the clan from which Chinggis Khan sprang, and sketches widely and freely a picture of steppe life, furnishing abundant material to form judgments about various aspects of Mongolian life in the 12th-13th centuries. The Secret History for this reason may be characterized not as a “production of the bogatyr epic,” but as a history-chronicle, transmitted in epic style, and pervaded with “the aroma of the steppe” (entry 145, pp. 6-8).

Professor Francis W. Cleaves, who made the first full English translation, pointed out that “The Secret History of the Mongols is not only the capital
monument of thirteen-century Mongolian literature, but it is one of the great literary monuments of the world.”

The Secret History is unconditionally an original historical creation of the Mongols which not only illumines the basic events of their early history, but also expresses the most important historical-political ideas of the Mongols at the turning point of their history.

The Secret History, along with its peculiarities, is clearly different from the typical annual chronicle of Mediaeval Europe, and from the Oriental annals, the Chinese and Tibetan in particular. This monument bears witness to the fact that from the moment it arose, Mongolian historical writing bore an independent national character, which had arisen and developed in a typical nomadic milieu. The Secret History is the only historical work of its kind created by the nomadic peoples of Central Asia. With its birth the historical knowledge of Mongolian nomadic peoples acquired a definitive formulation of written history, and reached the apogee of its development. Universal acknowledgment of this book as a great monument of Mongolian literature and history has been noted by UNESCO, in its resolution adopted in connection with the 750th anniversary of the Secret History, which the international community commemorated in 1990.\footnote{Sh. Bira, Nuuts Tovdoo bol Mongolyn tüüx ba bičgiin soyolyn aguu ikh dursgal mön [The Secret History of the Mongols as a Great Monument of Mongolian History and Writing], a report read at the general session of the International Conference dedicated to the 750th anniversary of the Secret History, held in Ulaanbaatar in 1990, and appearing later in the Bulletin of the IAMS, 1990, No. 2(6), pp. 7-19 (entry 316).}

CHAPTER TWO
MONGOLIAN HISTORICAL WRITING
IN THE EMPIRE PERIOD
(13th-14th CENTURIES)

I. Historiographic Activity of the Mongols
     in the Yüan Dynasty

As a result of expansionist wars, which continued for some decades, Chinggis
Khan and his successors succeeded in creating an enormous empire, extraordinarily
diverse both in the ethnic make-up of its conquered nations, as well as in the level of
its culture.

The unique historical-cultural conditions which had been created during the
process of forming and developing of the empire could not but be reflected in the
content and character of the Mongolian historiography of that time. One of its most
important and defining factors was the fact that historiographic activity was trans­
ferred from Mongolia itself to other countries, chiefly to China and Iran, where the
maturing Mongolian historical writing entered into close relationships with the local
highly-developed historiographic traditions. These connections had to accommodate
a guiding historiographic direction, one intended to substantiate not only a “super­
natural” origin for the Mongolian khans, but also justify their “right” to world rule.
Tibetan, Chinese and Persian historians and chroniclers must have made use of
Mongolian historical works of this period. Mongolian rulers early on grasped well
the practical utility of history-writing and for this reason strove in every way to
make it serve their interests. It was no accident that the Mongolian khans often initi­
at ed study and compilation of the history of the Mongols and their empire, attracting
to this work both Mongolian
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connoisseurs of antiquity as well as historians of China, Iran, Tibet and other coun­
tries.

During the Yüan dynasty intensive work was done to compile the history of the
Mongolian khans. True it is that very few of the actual Mongolian works of that
time have come down to us. We know of them chiefly through references in the
Chinese sources. Of the Mongolian historical works of that era that have come
down to us only the Čayan teiike [The White History] and the Sheng-wu ch’in-cheng
lu [Description of the Personal Campaigns of the Holy Martial (Emperor Chinggis)]
An Analysis of the Basic Content of the Čayan teūke and the Time of its Compilation

The full Mongolian name of this work is the Arban buyantu nom-un Čayan teūke, [The White History of the Ten Meritorious Deeds]. The majority of researchers provisionally assign its compilation to the years when Khubilai Khan ruled, i.e., in the second half of the 13th century (entries 150, pp. 70-73; 186, p. 154; 119; 123, p. 12; 215, pp. 50-51). This supposition is based for the most part on information from the chronicle itself, as well as on data provided by Sayang Sečen, according to whom the Čayan teūke was compiled by Khubilai Khan. Other proofs confirming its dating are not cited. That is why some authors express doubt of so early an origin for the monument. They never quite go into an analysis of its content, so carried away are they with a search for proofs of a later dating (entries 271; 233, p. 26).

The question arises as to whether anything substantive has been preserved from the original text from the times of Khubilai in the later copies of the Čayan teūke, or whether that version which has come down to us as edited by Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji is actually a new work having nothing in common with the original?1

The Čayan teūke may provisionally be divided into two parts: the original framework as set up by Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji with no substantive changes; and the later supplements and changes introduced into the text by Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji (the second part will be analyzed in detail infra).

Belonging to the first part are: the traditional organizational scheme of the three Buddhist monarchies of India, Tibet and Mongolia; data about secular and spiritual ranks and offices; the basic Buddhist [77] concepts of the chronicle, especially the concept of the Two Principles of the khan’s power. A brief historical narrative reflecting the influence of the three Buddhist monarchies beyond all doubt contains much written by Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji himself. However, this outline itself, which in all likelihood lay at the root of the

---

1 To those copies of the Čayan teūke which are already known and investigated (copy A: the Leningrad; copy B, the Kõkeqota) may be added a copy kept in the library of the Gandan monastery in Ulaanbaatar. In our opinion, of these four copies the most interesting and old-fashioned ones are the Ulaanbaatar one which Sh. Natsagdorj denoted as Copy C, and the Gandan one, which we call Copy D. They are similar to each other and evidently are two independent copies of that version of the Čayan teūke which has come to us in an edition of the second half of the 16th century.

Prof. Liu Jingsuo published Arban buyantu nom-un Čayan teūke in 1981 (entry 317). The editor used eight different manuscripts of the book. I also have to mention the German translation (entry 301) by Prof. Klaus Sagaster, which had not yet been published when I was preparing the Russian edition of my work.
original Čayan teike text, is retained unchanged and fully preserved in the 16th-century edition.

The scheme of the three Buddhist monarchies, so enduring a part of Mongolian historical writing, must first have been worked out in just that intellectual atmosphere which prevailed under the mightiest khan of the Mongolian Empire, the first to proclaim Buddhism to be the state religion. One might assume that the foundation of this scheme was established by State Preceptor hPhags-pa lama Blos-gros rgyal-mtshan (Lodoi Jalsan) (1235-1280) in his small work Šes-bya rab-gsal [Elucidation of what is Knowable]² (entry 29, vol. pa, ff. 1-35) written, as the colophon says, in the Earth-Tiger year, i.e.,, in 1278, at the request of the Mongol Gung tayiji, elder son of Khubilai, Chingim, whom his father had designated as his successor (huang-t'ai-tzu).

hPhags-pa lama’s work contains a schematic outline of history in terms of the three Buddhist monarchies of India, Tibet and Mongolia. He first elevates the Mongolian khans to the rank of “Revolver of the Wheel [of doctrine],” the Chakravarti, on a level with the early Indian and Tibetan kings. After surveying the inanimate and animate worlds from the viewpoint of Buddhist cosmology, hPhags-pa lama briefly sets forth the history of the rulers and of Buddhism in India, Tibet and Mongolia. He begins the history of Mongolia with Chinggis Khan, whom he considers a Chakravarti khan, born in Mongolia “as a result of the maturing fruits of earlier favorable deeds 3,250 years after the Buddha’s nirvana” (entry 29, f. 19b). He declares Khubilai to be Grand Khan, guiding the state in accord with the teaching of Buddha.

When comparing this survey of the history of Buddhism and the kings of India, Tibet and Mongolia in the Čayan teike with the brief accounts which are in the Elucidation of what is Knowable by hPhags-pa lama, it is difficult to find any textual agreement in them. The first is undoubtedly an independent work.

But there is present an undoubted similarity in topic and composition; the history of the kings and of Buddhism is written according to the same scheme. Curiously enough, there is one spot where the data of both works agree. Both in the Elucidation of what is Knowable and in the Čayan teike there is an enumeration of eight countries of the so-called sixteen great countries of the Buddhist world.

Let us compare the data:


The book was also translated into Chinese by one of hPhags-pa’s pupils named Sarpa or Shara-pa (1259-1314) with the title Chang-so-chih-lun, and included in the Chinese Tripitaka.
### Elucidation of what is Knowable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. rgya-gar</th>
<th>1. enedkeg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. kha-cha</td>
<td>2. kači-yin kasamir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. li'i yul</td>
<td>3. li-yin sartayul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. khu-sen</td>
<td>4. kowsan-u mongyol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. bal-yul</td>
<td>5. singün-ú³ bal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. rgya-nag</td>
<td>6. tūgōn⁴-u nanggiyad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. jan-gi-yul</td>
<td>7. in-ge⁵-yin töbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. mi-nyag</td>
<td>8. čayan ayal-a-yin solun-ğyas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data cited above bear witness to the fact that of the eight countries enumerated in both works, seven agree completely. But instead of the Mi-nyag (the land of the Tanguts) of hP'ags-pa lama, in the Čayan teiike the place is called Korea. It is hard to explain the replacement of the Tangut country by Korea, but perhaps it is because of the hostile relations between the Mongolian rulers and the Tanguts, who had in their time offered resistance to Mongolian invasions, as well as the cautious policy of Khubilai Khan with respect to Korea, since it was important to him as a

3 **Singün** is written in Copy B as singgin, which shows, as we assume, a more accurate transcription of the Chinese Si-kin (hsi-ching), “Western Capital.” As can be seen from the data of Rashid ad-Din, the word Si-kin was pronounced by the early Mongols as Singgin, which in our view corresponds to singgin in the Čayan teiike (cf. entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 165). It is possible that Mongolian rulers in the 13th century connected Balbo (Nepal) to Western China with the capital Hsi-ching (Si-kin). This could explain why the Čayan teiike writes singün (singgin)-ú balbo.

4 **Tūgōn** is written that way in Copy C, in Copy B this word is written as Tūggōn. It seems to us that in both cases this word is incorrectly presented. Judging from the sense, one may presume that it was originally written as Tūnggōn, Tūnggin, which corresponds to Chinese Tun-kin (or Tung-ching), which means “Eastern Capital”. From the same word comes the name of the Tonkin or Tunkin region, in North Vietnam. The word Tun-kin (Tung-ching) was presented by Rashid al-Din in the way in which it was pronounced by the Mongols in the 13th century. Obviously, in the 13th century the Mongols, continuing a Chinese tradition, also connected Tonkin (Tun-kin) to China (Nanggiyad), together with the other regions of North Vietnam. For this reason, the Čayan teiike says: Tūgōn-ú nanggiyad / tūngin-ú nanggiyad.

5 Copy C writes ingge, but Copy B engge. This is a mis-writing. Obviously this word corresponds to Tibetan jan or jan-gi, by which one must understand the early kingdom of Zhang (jan), which existed in North-Eastern Tibet. This is confirmed by a Tibetan parallel in hPhags-pa lama (jan-gi yul). All these country names in the Čayan teiike were either left without comment or explained incorrectly in various works. See Sagaster’s edition and translation (entry 301), p. 83, 110; and Liu-Jingsuo (entry 317, pp. 113-114).
staging area for the attack he contemplated on Japan. Some countries in the Čayan teuke bear their old-fashioned names, known to the Mongols from the time of their wars of conquest: Tibet is called Zhang, southern China is "the Tonkin Nankiyad" (by which, obviously, one must understand not only South China, but also old Annam with the Tonkin region), and Nepal (Tib. Balbo), and Singin (Si-kin).

Let us now shift to reviewing the basic data of the Čayan teuke which served as the original basis for the new edition brought into being by Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji. This section of the Čayan teuke, which contains an extensive list of governmental and court ranks of the clergy and the secular bureaucracy, a concise sketch of their duties, as well as the most important
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doctrines about religion and the khan's power, may relate to the times of the Mongolian Empire. It is no accident that Zhamtsarano considered "the most interesting pages in this document for the historians and jurists concerned with Mongolia, are those in which the court and state officials are enumerated, beginning from the highest after the emperor, down to the lowest, the leaders of a group of ten" (entry 150, p. 72; and in the English translation by Loewenthal, entry 292, p. 52).

In this monument, as we have already remarked, the famed Two Principles, the union of secular and ecclesiastical authority, are first stipulated clearly and concisely. In the Čayan teuke these principles are preceded by the text of an order, ascribed to Khubilai Khan. But reading this text, it is not hard to be convinced that the order is prefaced by an introduction, the editing of which, as Heissig (entry 233, p. 24) has correctly observed, is undoubtedly related to a much later time, although a document of the 13th century undoubtedly lies at the basis of this new edition. Obviously, Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji introduced corrections into the original edition in the introductory part of the order by Khubilai, "modernizing" this decree according to the spirit of its time. To do this it was necessary to ascribe the merit of introducing the Two Principles into Mongolia to Chinggis Khan, despite the direct indications of the true sources.

But the provisions of the Two Principles, as reflected in the spiritual and worldly ranks, and the functions of the persons holding offices in the church and state, remained basically unchanged. Apparently Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji considered these provisions so unassailable that he decided to leave them as previously written, seeing in them forms for new law-giving. He treated the Čayan teuke as [he did] the admonitions of the khans to their descendants.

The provision on instituting posts at the court for the three highest lamas of the empire may serve as a convincing proof of the information about ranks in the Čayan teuke going back to the time of Khubilai Khan. In the monument all these posts are enumerated. At the court of the highest lama, the Master of Doctrine, 25 posts were established; at the court of the middle lama, there were 13, and at that of the junior one, five. As to the question of under what circumstances these posts were first introduced at the court of the highest lama, a clear answer is given in: "[The Sacred] genealogy [of the Deacons] of the Sakya monastery" which was written in 1630 by the Sakya pandita Ṇag-dbaṅ kun-dga' bsod-nams grags-pa rgyal-mtshan.
There the following information is cited:

In the Fire-Hare year, when [hPhags-pa lama] was 33 years old [1267, Sh. B.], by de­
cree of the holder of the golden p'ai-tzu, who had transmitted the invitation of the
Great Khan, [he] arrived at Court. At that time he instituted a staff of thirteen posts. . .
And then Chomdanraldi said:""The doctrine of Buddha has been obscured by clouds
infringing precepts. The prosperity of [the] people has fallen into the hands of a
worldly ruler. In a sinful time the holder of virtues has assumed the sh^ of a ruler.
Know ye: a holy man who excludes these three is not [a holy man]."" In reply to these
untrue words the Master of the Doctrine [hPhags-pa lama, Sh. B.] said: ""The Victor
himself taught that the doctrine has its ascent and its descent. The prosperity of peo­
dle depends on their own deeds [karma]. You are assuming the guise of him whom
you are turning [to religion]. Know ye: a sage, who excludes these three, is not one [a
sage] ["]. At the present time there have arisen many different customs, established at
the wish of these and other people. But everything which is here briefly introduced, is
taken from the basic original sources (entry 19, f. 103).

These data bear witness to the fact that the staff of 13 posts was first instituted in
1267 by hPhags-pa at his court. It is interesting that these posts basically agree with
those mentioned in the Čayan teuke. It is not hard to set up the Mongolian parallels
to the 13 posts mentioned⁶.

Below we cite these parallels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIBETAN</th>
<th>MONGOLIAN</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gsol</td>
<td>ayayači</td>
<td>cup-bearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gzims</td>
<td>jiryayuluči</td>
<td>valet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mchod</td>
<td>takilči</td>
<td>temple-servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mjal</td>
<td>orruči [ekilegči]</td>
<td>a secretary conducting receptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yig</td>
<td>bičigeči</td>
<td>scribe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁶ The Mongolian parallel of the Tibetan word las tshan (a post) is yamu. In Kowalewski's
dictionary this word is translated as "a post and its functions." There it gives the Tibetan
parallel of this word as las-ka. But las-ka is a word of rather late origin, and its older form is
las-tshan. Mongolian yamu is likewise an old form; in much later times it is converted to
yambu. However this word in its original form is encountered in sources of the 17th century
(cf. entry 44, pp. 114, 131). Louis Bazin discovered among words of the ancient To-pa tribe,
preserved in Chinese transcription, a court title, denoted by the word iang-tsen (yang-chen).
Bazin considers this word proto-Turkic and reconstructs it as yančin, deriving it from Turkic
yan (corner, side row) plus a suffix, čin, which means "the one who dwells in the ranks [of
the emperor]". The Yang-chen was one of three court officers of the To-pa (entry 210, p.
305). The Japanese scholar Shiratori identified this same word yan (chen) with Mongolian
yamu, which is found in Kowalewski's dictionary, where however there is no citation of the
Čayan teuke. In this fashion, the word yamu goes back to T'o-pa times. It is fully possible
that this ancient word, similarly to some others, was long preserved among the Turco-
Mongolian tribes of Central Asia, transmitted from generation to generation, and in the
process acquiring different shades of meaning.
In addition to the thirteen ranks mentioned above, the Čayan teuke enumerates another twelve posts. The fact that the latter also existed in the time of Khubilai and hPhags-pa lama is evident from the data of that same “[Holy] Genealogy [of the Deacons] of the Sakya Monastery,” which reports the lavish gifts of Khubilai to hPhags-pa lama and the magnificent meetings which were arranged on the occasion of his numerous arrivals at Court. Speaking of the gifts, this source names a cloak adorned with gold and pearls, outer garments, a jeweled hat and other attire, a golden umbrella, the banner of doctrine (Tib. rgyal-mtshan, Mong. orungya),7 musical instruments, horses, camels, mules and other animals (entry 30, f. 97a, 128a).

From this one may conclude that such posts mentioned in the Čayan teuke as sikürči (umbrella holder), orungyači (flag-bearer, Russ. khorunzhi ‘comet’), büriyeči (trumpeter), biškegürči (player of the biškegür), üileči (tailor), and others, were established to the degree permitted for expansion of staff of the personal court of the State Preceptor of the Empire, where the number of posts initially did not exceed 13, and later reached 25.

The posts indicated at the courts of high lamas were introduced using as their model the early Mongolian khans’ headquarters, which existed long prior to Chinggis Khan. It is well-known that even in T’o-pa times there were at the headquarters of rulers such persons holding posts as the sečen, üijeng, qorči, kelemürči, örtegečin, bayurči, yamčin and others (entry 210; entry 163). It is interesting that some of these posts are mentioned in the Čayan teuke as well.

The sources testify to the fact that the number of posts attached to the court tended to expand. Hence, for instance, Rashid al-Dīn informs us that at the courts of the Il-Khans there were persons holding such posts as the emir-myriarchs, chiliarchs, centurions, bayurči, čerbis, quščiys, barsčins, aytacis, qorčis, egüdečis,

7 orungya “the banner,” in all likelihood a word of Uighur origin. As Poppe observed, it is witnessed in Uighur sources (entry 268, p. 303). In a hymn dedicated to Mahakala and written by the noted Chojii Odser (found in Turfan) we find: delgegsen orungyaṭu serege-tu ded dooradu yar-tur barıṣan. But in much later Mongolian sources we do not encounter this word; instead they write dovacaba, originating from Skt. dhvaja. If the Čayan teuke translates the name of hPags-pa lama, blos rgyal-tshan, as čoyt u sayin oyun-u orungya, then Sayang Sečen has madi dovacaba. Many scholars consider that the Russian word khorguv’ is connected with Mongolian orungya < horungya.
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yandigs, muleteers, camel-drovers, falconers, huntsmen and others. In this fashion one may consider it as established that the presence of numerous posts at the courts of the Mongolian khans in various parts of the Empire was a widely dispersed phenomenon. Various sources indicate that the posts introduced into China and Persia were not identical. This is of course explained by the fact of local peculiarities and customs. However such age-old Mongolian posts as the bayurći, ğerbi, ğaşacı, görçi, the myriarchs, chiliarchs and centurions, were alike everywhere.

The ğayan teiike speaks about 99 posts and about the existence of special books (the Sira teiike "Yellow Book" and the Ulayan teiike "Red Book") which contained the standards for each post.

One may refer as well to the data about Buddhist holidays in the original version of the ğayan teiike. These holidays were apparently first set up by Khubilai Khan after the model of the early Indo-Tibetan tradition and were established on the days of the most important dates in the life of Buddha. The legitimization of these holidays by Khubilai played an important role in integrating Buddhist traditions into the Mongolian way of life. There has been preserved an interesting document which leads one to the idea that hPhags-pa lama himself might have introduced these holidays. We have in view the brief remark in "Specifications of the Four Great Times of Buddha,"8 where the author establishes precise dates for the four most important landmarks in the life of Buddha (his birth, nirvana, his two-fold demonstration of miraculous powers: once to a small degree, and once to a large degree). It must be remarked that the dates which hPhags-pa lama cites do not correspond to those we have in the ğayan teiike. It is possible that this can be explained by the fact that in the Mongolian monument they are expressed in terms of season and climate, in honor of the four seasons of the year. Among the Buddhists, dates of such type often differed, in consequence of which holidays were held as a rule at different times.

As for the feasts in honor of the four seasons of the year that the ğayan teiike speaks of, these had long ago existed among the Mongols, and had been part of Mongolian tradition since time immemorial, linked not only to the cult of Chinggis Khan, but also with the major events of the nomadic animal-breeding year (the beginning and end of the milking season, etc.).

As was stated above, the concept of the Two Principles of state rule deals with the original basic portion of the ğayan teiike. One may say without exaggeration that the whole chronicle is built upon the idea of these Two Principles, and that its original edition was devoted to working these out, in all probability.

The question involuntarily arises: where did the anonymous author of the ğayan teiike get this concept from? It may, of course, be assumed that it was borrowed by him from Buddhist treatises. But this would be too general, and it is hard to have a

---

8 This work is contained in Volume Pa of the collection of works mentioned above (entry 19, f. 476/298b-480/299a).
demonstration of its truth. Searches for an answer to the question raised compel us to turn again to the works of hPhags-pa lama. True it is that some scholars (in particular cf. entry 150, p. 78) have already expressed the thought that hPhags-pa lama was involved with compiling the Čaryā teuke. W. Heissig, relying on G. Tucci, proposed that the concept of the Two Principles is founded on a work by hPhags-pa lama, “Precepts for the Khan” (entry 233, p. 24).

There are important sources which bear witness to the fact that a requirement for theoretical foundation and practical realization of the concept of the Two Principles arose long before the formation of the Yuan empire, but found its expanded use only under Khubilai. In particular, Tibetan sources say that Godan Khan supported this concept in his policy for Tibet. In dispatches to ecclesiastical and secular persons written by Sakya-pandita Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan after meeting the Mongolian deputy in 1246, the following words of Godan are cited: “If I support [the world] through secular law (mi 6hos), and you through godly [religious] law (lha 6hos), then will not the teaching of Shakya Muni be disseminated beyond the borders of the external ocean? . . . Preach the doctrine with a tranquil mind, and I promise everything which you will need. Your welfare depends on me, and mine on Heaven” (entries 19, f. 214-b/217a; 286, pp. 10-12).

After Godan, Khubilai, who took up Buddhism, also grappled with this question of which authority, the spiritual or the secular, ought to head the state and which of the two representatives of power, the ruler of doctrine or the ruler of people, ought to stand at the head of the state? In one place in the “[Holy] Genealogy [of the Deacons] of the Sakya Monastery” there is an interesting story about the first meeting between hPhags-pa lama and Khubilai during the Water-Ox year (1253) in Shang-tu, and about the discussion between them. To the Khan's question9 as to what vows he would have to give to receive the abhiṣeka from the lama, hPhags-pa lama replied: “The lama [the Teacher] ought to sit at the head of the row, and you ought to pray to him in person, and heed what the lama says, not departing from the lama’s opinion.” The Khan said that was not suitable. Then the wife of Khubilai said by way of reconciliation: “When accepting the teachings, when there are few people, let the lama sit in the middle, and during the times of assembly of members of the Khan's clan, sons-in-law, noyons and subjects, to avoid disobedience, let the Khan sit in the middle. Let him act in affairs of Tibet according to what the lama blesses. Let the Khan issue no orders without having declared them to the lama. But in other affairs, large and small, by the might of his great mercy, so as not to show pressure on the state during pronouncements, let him not conform to the lama's words and opinions” (entry 19, f. 89b/90a). Khubilai and hPhags-pa lama accepted this proposition, and Khubilai received consecration from his Tibetan mentor. In this wise was Khubilai's acceptance of Buddhism officially formulated.

9 At this time Khubilai was deputy Mongolian Khan in China. However, in the Tibetan sources he is customarily called the Khan.
From data in the “[Holy] Genealogy [of the Deacons] of the Sakya Monastery,” it is clear that at the time of these unique diplomatic negotiations between hPhags-pa lama and Khubilai they not only executed a treaty about the vassalage of Tibet to the Mongolian Empire, but also decided the question about relations between the head of the church and the Khan. The results of these negotiations were stated in two documents: in a decree by Khubilai, which is called the “Pearl Document,” compiled in Shang-tu on the first of the middle month of summer in the Mouse-year\(^{10}\) (1252), and in a message of hP'ags-pa lama to the Tibetan lamas, called the “Tibetan Document,” written on the ninth of the middle summer month of the Wood-Tiger year\(^{11}\) (1254).

Both documents afford us great interest by the fact that they have worked out and stated the basic principles of Khubilai's policy towards the Buddhist religion, which he later officially proclaimed to be the State Religion of the Yuan Empire. And it is these principles, in our view, that lie at the root of the Čāryā teūke in which they received a fuller development.

What does this “Pearl Document” speak about? The language and style of the document permit us to conclude that it was compiled in Mongolian and only later translated into Tibetan, possibly by hPhags-pa lama himself, “by the might of Eternal Heaven and the protection of great power this our Khan decree,” it says, and

for the information of the numerous lamas and laymen. Although it is necessary to act in accord with the Law of Chinggis Khan, which embodies all the best qualities of this world, having reflected duly in favor of [what the lama] deigned [to say] about the necessity to base ourselves henceforth on the Law of Doctrine, and having perceived that the path of Buddha Shakya Muni is the true one, and having accepted the

\(^{10}\) In the first edition of my book in Russian, I miscalculated the date, but I had previously given it correctly in my work *O Zolotoi knige Sh. Damdina* (entry 134, p. 73).

\(^{11}\) Both documents are reproduced in full in *[The Holy] Genealogy [of the Deacons] of the Sakya Monastery* (entry 19, f. 94a/98b). Although I have studied these documents since the end of the 1950s, it was not known then that Mongolian translations of these documents existed. In 1990 Prof. Čoyiji first published the old Mongolian translation of the documents, under the title "Two diplomas of Khubilai Khan" (*Qubilai qayan-u qoyar jiyuq bičig*) in the journal *Neyigem-ūn sinjilekū uqayan* [Social Sciences] 6 (1990), pp. 47-53 (entry 319).

The two documents were taken from the Peking block print of 1765, titled *Getülgegči degedü blama sasin-u ejen lčang sky-a lalida bčar-a-yin ggen-ü eteki törūl-ün uyı-yıın domoy egerel küsel-i qangnyxī čindamani*. This book contains an extensive biography of hPhags-pa lama, taken from the *Sa-skya gduh rabs* (entry 30). This biography of hPhags-pa was also recently published by Čoyiji, *qyba lama-yin tuyqiy* (entry 320).

There is an excellent study and translation of Sa-skya documents into German by Dieter Schuh, *Erlasse und Sendschreiben mongolischer Herrscher für tibetische Geistliche* (entry 321).
consecration of acarya from hPhags-pa, we have awarded him the rank of gušri. He is named head of the entire confraternity of clerics. In view of this, the acarya himself ought to conduct himself with proper respect for the teaching of Buddha, i.e., in matters of religion in general, to be the head of the clergy, to be in charge through precept, listening and contemplation of doctrine. And the clergy ought not to infringe the instructions of the acarya. ... If you, the community of clergy, will not act in accord with doctrine by precept, listening and contemplation, then what do deeds end in according to the teaching of Buddha? Verily Buddha himself taught: "My doctrine is similar to the king of beasts, the lion. If nothing damages him within his body, then nothing can destroy him from without."12 I, having stood on the great path, acting in accord with our law, have well understood the law of dharma, and I am displaying impartial respect and esteem [for religion]. In this fashion, to those clergy who act in accord with the law, there will come no harm from any military commanders, soldiers, deputies in cities, daruyadis [leaders] and the holders [bearers] of golden p'ai-tzus.

Three obligations are not imposed on them: military service, taxes and urton duty. Not behaving contrary to the doctrine of Shakya Muni about the path, worship Heaven and pray for me. Upon infringement a decree about supporting order has been issued. Holders of golden p'ai-tzus are not to stay at monasteries nor the dwellings of clergy. There is to be no supply of rations. Nor in any case is the party in charge to deprive temples of land, water or water-mills, etc. ... [The decree] is written according to our chronology on the first day of the middle month of summer in the Mouse-Year [1264] at Shang-du. This decree was compiled on behalf of others jointly with hPhags-pa lama, sagacious friend, who is a vessel of the dharma in the teaching of Buddha, which furnishes [benevolence] at once [here and] beyond the borders of the sea of this world. For this paradise let all beings without exception dwell

in the precious world of bodhisattvas, [let] gloom disappear from reason, blessing through benefactors as a result of the most perfected actions (entry 19, f. 94-a/95-a).

From the decree it becomes clear that as a supplement to the primitive Mongolian laws from the times of Chinggis Khan, it was necessary for the rulers of the Mongolian Empire to resort to the aid of Buddhism, to the so-called law of the doctrine, hoping thereby to strengthen their dominance both over the Mongols and conquered nations. There is reason to assume that this decree is the same early Mongolian document which lay at the base of the Two Principles of the Mongolian khan's state politics. This is revealed likewise by the fact that the two "sides engaged in negotiations" and drew a clear distinction between religious and secular governmental matters. The head of the religion ought thenceforth to concern himself solely with spiritual activity, not interfering with secular affairs, and the Khan in return promised him full prosperity and freedom of action in the religious sphere. Thus was concluded the union between Throne and Altar in the Mongolian Empire.

12 This proposition is cited in the Čayan teúke as well. Obviously it was well-known to Mongols in the period of the Yuan Empire.
There is no need to specially analyze the document compiled by hPhags-pa lama, since it on the whole repeats the content of Khubilai's order. Let us merely observe one important circumstance. The negotiations between the Tibetan lama and Khubilai did not take place, apparently, without the knowledge of the great Khan Mongke who dwelt in Qara Qorum. In support of this assumption is the fact that twice in the message the names of Mongke and Khubilai are mentioned side by side.

In the first case it says that Khubilai issued a decree under the protection of Chinggis Khan and Mongke Khan, and in the second, that hPhags-pa lama wished "sturdy health and long life to Mongke Khan, ruler of the people, and to Khubilai and their sons and wives" (entry 19, f. 98-a). In this fashion one has to admit as quite probable that Mongke Khan himself was involved in determining the policy of rulers of the Empire with respect to the Buddhist religion and Tibet.

There are also other sources in which one can find a theoretical basis and explanation of the Two Principles mentioned. First and foremost are numerous epistolary works, written at various times by hPhags-pa lama in the name of Khubilai, his sons and relatives, which bear on these Two Principles.

Of the letters, congratulations and hymns of praise composed by hPhags-pa lama on the basis of poetical theory and the rules of versification, expounded in the Kāvyādarśā [The Mirror of Poetry] by Dandin and the Chandoratana-kara [Prosody, the So-called Place Where Jewels Arise] by Ratnakarāṇanti, whose zealous popularizers were hPhags-pa lama and Sakya-Pandita Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan. One should particularly select: "Instructions to the Khan", "Instructions to Prince Jibeg-Temur, the So-called Precious Chaplet," "The Ornament of Prosody, Illuminating Creation of the Writings of the Buddha," "How to Show Sincerely an Example of Creating a Valuable Book," "An Example of the Creation by Jibeg-Temur of the Pal-chen-gSer-od" sutras and others, verses of praise, written on the occasion of the construction of a stupa by the Khan and his sons, the so-called metrical dandaka,13 "Praise to Those who are Worthy of It," verses of praise dedicated to the genealogy of the Tibetan kings, blessings in verses to Khubilai Khan, his sons and wife, pronounced in the Wood-Hare year and in other years. All these works are contained in entry 19, Pa. The main ideas of these works explain the existence of the Two Principles of the khan's power and substantiate the holy nature of the authority of the Mongolian khans.

A study of the works of hPhags-pa lama enables one to conclude that the concept of the Two Principles of governmental rule was first worked out by this lama alone and at the insistence of Khubilai Khan. hPhags-pa, naturally, based himself on Buddhist ethico-moral doctrine, as well as on ancient Indian and Tibetan tradition. It is

---

13 Dandaka: a metrical class, the verses of which may run from 4 × 27 to 4 × 999 syllables. hPhags-pa called his work that because he wrote it in accord with the rules of ancient Indian metrics (chando).
not hard to notice in the works named above influence from the epistolary traditions of the early Indian Buddhist sages, such as Nagarjuna, Matrćeta, Chandragomin and others. In all his works directed at the Mongolian rulers, hPhags-pa lama conveys one major thought: governmental power must rest on a skilful blend of secular power with its spiritual origins, with religion. In this respect there is displayed a full ideological kinship of hPhags-pa lama’s works with the Mongolian monument, the Čañan teūke. hPhags-pa lama formulated its principal ideology with the greatest exactitude in the “Instructions to Prince Jibeg-Temūr,” written in the Fire-Tiger year (1266). He wrote:

You, the ruler of riches and glory,
Why this material gift to You?
Similarly to how moonlight shines on the kumuda in winter
Do I wish to impart to You the gift of my doctrine.
He who possesses this wealth
Is not joined to the present doctrine.
But it, like victuals mixed with poison,
Brings only unhappiness and sorrow.
But if he who possesses doctrine,
Is deprived of worldly fame,
That is similar to a jewel in a husk,
It will be of no use to others.
He who is the possessor of both these riches
He brings merit to himself and to others,
Similarly to a jewel which has been cleaned up,
Serving as adornment to this one and that one,
That is why you heed
That which I say,
So as to show the fruits of that which
You rule by the Two Principles.

Further, the author briefly sets forth the basic content of both principles. The first he terms the secular, understanding by this the rules of conduct which great rulers must observe in matters of governance. hPhags-pa lama, as State Preceptor of the Empire, sets forth what is in his opinion the best method “of peaceful construction” of this state on the “immovable” ethico-moral principles of Buddhism. In all his letters and advice he steadfastly calls on the khans to rule the empire “in accord with

---

14 Jibeg-Temūr was the son of Godan, a Mongolian deputy in Lanchou, who initiated a close connection with the Sakya monastery. hPhags-pa lama dedicated a number of his works to him and to Chingim-tayiji, the elder son of Khubilai, in whom he saw future rulers.

15 Kumuda (Skt.): a water-lily which, the Indians supposed, opened by the light of the moon.
Buddhist doctrine" (ibid., vol. Pa, f. 13-a/159-b), as the sole correct teaching able to multiply his power and fame. He counsels them not to resort to violence, because "this is no way to increase the khan's power." He maintains that only "by peace do you obtain peace," that "fire must be extinguished with water, and not by fire," that "if you find a proper method, then you will convert the opponent to a friend, similarly to how an enraged elephant can be turned into a clever helpmate, having pacified him by the ankuṣa. 16

A king should be compassionate, liberal and just with respect to his subjects, hPhags-pa continues. He should concern himself with the government in the same way

as a father does with his own son; he should be just and liberal in rewarding worthy ones with posts and ranks; to encourage one who is worthy of it, and to defend one who is weak and poor; to give preference to the senior one among office holders, to the honorable one among advisors, to the true teaching, to knowledge, but not to wealth, to one who is learned; among nobles [they should give preference] to the poor man among the weak; to the sick one among poor folk; to the obedient one among wives; to the successor among sons; to one who is true among relatives; to him who brings benefit among friends; to a submissive one among slaves; to him who answers good with good (entry 24, Pa, f. 14b/160b; 15b/161b; 13a/159a).

Being concerned with the correct side of a matter, the State Preceptor proposes to eradicate such crimes as slander, rape, thievery, malevolence, but to do this by peaceful means, not by punishing people. He is wise, he writes, "who washes grime from his garment, not he who burns up his garment with its grime; a king ought personally to set a good example, and avoid harsh words, because only with tender words do you get things; for others to praise you, do not be addicted to strong drink, because restraining yourself from it, you keep your senses and health." Such, in the opinion of hPhags-pa lama, is the content of the first of the two chief principles of the khan's power.

The content of the second principle is revealed with the greatest exactitude in hPhags-pa's work, "Instructions to the Khan" (entry 28) and in commentaries to it, which the author calls "Explanation of the instructions to the khan, the so-called adornment of the all-clear doctrine," as well as in his work already mentioned, "Instructions to Prince Jibeg-Temür." The basic text of the "Instructions to the khan" takes up five folios (entry 28, Pa, 1a/147a-5a/151a), and the commentary on it, 37 folios (entry 28, Pa, f. 1a/394a-37a/430a). As it states in the colophon, hPhags-pa wrote this commentary in the Wood-Swine year (1275), four years after compiling the basic text, at the incessant insistence of Khubilai Khan himself, whom hPhags-pa calls "the king of the doctrine, maintaining the spiritual power of the All-Mighty Buddha, master of true knowledge."

hPhags-pa's second principle leads to a clarification of Buddhist doctrine about

16 Ankuṣa (Skr.): a staff with a hook on the end which is used by the elephant mahout.
enlightenment (nirvana) (entry 27, vol. Pa, fol. 22-b/168-b). He insistently recommends
for the Mongolian khan to stay on the holy path of a great bodhisattva, and by this to
reach the higher Buddhist wisdom needed for successful governance of the vast Empire. hPhags-pa proceeds from the basic idea that “there are countless beings inhabiting this world, which in its turn is limitless, similarly to the heavens, having no beginning nor end" (entry 27, Pa, f. 17a/163a). These beings are in an eternal cycle of suffering by force of the karma appropriate to each of them. For this reason each one who is concerned with earthly creatures, in particular the Great Khan, and having at his disposal innumerable subjects, ought truly to strive to deliver them from their incredible sufferings and at the same time place them on the true path of a bodhisattva.

With the aid of the well-known theory of the “Void,” hPhags-pa lama strove to inculcate in the Mongolian khan the idea that it was not proper to be extremely diverted by worldly matters in the name of wealth and glory, but that it was necessary to think first and foremost about perfecting one’s own spiritual peace, i.e., about attaining the grand enlightenment, nirvana.

hPhags-pa lama paid particularly great attention to Buddhist ethico-moral teachings on the actions of people and their consequences. He writes about this in almost all his works. Moreover, by order of Chingim-tayiji in the Earth-Horse year (1258) hPhags-pa wrote a special composition, “The Clear Mirror, reflecting deeds and consequences” (entry 27, f. 9b/155b-12a/158a).

For hPhags-pa lama the doctrine of the ten virtues and the ten sins occupies a central position in his interpretation of the spiritual principle of royal power. In hPhags-pa’s opinion, the khan ought always to remember the rule: these the actions, those the results. It is necessary to recognize that the teaching about good and bad deeds had a substantial influence on the historico-legal thought of the Mongols. It is well-known that the Čayán teúke bears as its full title “The White History of the Ten Virtues.” But in 1586, as we shall see below, Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji, at the time when the Third Dalai Lama and Altan Khan of the Tümed met, composed on the model of Khubilai Khan’s law a new law of doctrine “About the ten virtues,” striving to transform the basic idea of the Čayán teúke into a higher governmental law of the Mongolian state.

One should especially single out hPhags-pa lama's teaching about esteem for the lama teacher. He writes that worship of the teacher is even more necessary than worship of Buddha himself, since “Buddha brings favor only indirectly, whereas the teacher brings favor directly” (entry 29, Pa, f. 11a/404a-13a/406a). For this reason hPhags-pa lama proposes that the Mongolian khan “nurture the true faith in the teacher, taking into account his particular service in protection” (entry 29, f. 11a/404a-13b/406a). He compares the believer with a sick person, and the quvaray with the physician-healer, the doctrine with medicine, and the teacher with the one who directly conveys the medicine to the sick person (entry 29, f. 13b/406b). For
this reason he recommends that the Mongolian khan display every sort of respect to an ecclesiastical person and always "to maintain him in his head and in the lotus of his heart," "to pray until the end of his life in the name of attaining nirvana" (entry 29, f. 18a/411a). The effort of hPhags-pa lama at propaganda for the cult of the "Teacher" becomes comprehensible if we take into account the mutual needs of the spiritual head and the secular khagan under Khubilai. Apparently, hPhags-pa lama's teaching about the Teacher served as the theoretical basis for one of the main ideas of the Čayan teiže, the idea of the ruler of religious doctrine, the State Preceptor, embodying the spiritual basis of the khan's power.

But how do things stand with the khan himself? The State Preceptor of the Mongolian Empire, according to hPhags-pa lama's teaching, serves his patron, grounding himself in the concept of the divine origin of the khan's power on the basis of the Buddhist teaching about the bodhisattva, explaining to the khan the Buddhist teaching about the path to attain bodhisattva status, adding that his Alms-Giver, i.e., the khan, in fact possesses all the qualities of a bodhisattva, devoting to him numerous congratulations and hymns of praise, in which he said that he sincerely prays for his khan to become a great bodhisattva, the ruler of people. All these congratulations and hymns are important to understand the loyal relationship of the spiritual head of Tibet to the Mongolian khan, and as well to understand the Buddhist ideas worked out by him to magnify the might of the Mongolian rulers (entry 19, Pa, f. 2a/389-28b/409b).

Especially interesting are hPhags-pa lama's congratulations [921 dedicated to Khubilai, written in the Fire-Dragon year (1259) (entry 19, f. 3a/390). Well before Khubilai became the Great Khan, the author of the congratulations actually had already declared him a grand bodhisattva in the shape of a khan, and even then turned to Khubilai with that same respectful tone in which the Buddhist authorities customarily address bodhisattvas. At the outset of the work mentioned, the author blesses Khubilai Khan with the three so-called supports of the bodhisattva: in body, in word and thought: the body is the image of Buddha or a bodhisattva; the word is the teaching of Buddha; and the thought is the appearance of Buddha or the bodhisattva in the shape of a saint, identifying in this way the Mongolian khan with a bodhisattva, this high earthly ideal of Buddhists. In our view, that was exactly when the basis was first laid on which the anonymous author of the Čayan teiže was able to declare the Mongolian khans to be reincarnations of appropriate bodhisattvas: Chinggis Khan was a reincarnation of the bodhisattva Vajrapani, personifying might and power, and Khubilai Khan was a re-birth of Manjušri, personifying knowledge and wisdom. Beginning with the Čayan teiže, the Buddhist concept of the bodhisattva firmly penetrated Mongolian historical writing, and the historian-Buddhists employed this to exalt their khans. One must seek its sources in the ideas of hPhags-pa lama.

An analysis of the ideological content of the Čayan teiže helps to clear up the spiritual atmosphere in which the Čayan teiže appeared, and to understand its basic ideas, as well as to make the date of its composition more precise.
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What has been said permits one to conclude that Mongolian tradition, within which the Čayan teike appeared during the reign years of Khubilai khan, has not lost its historical basis. An analysis of the chief ideas of this monument after contrasting it with the basic ideas of hPhags-pa lama's works gives one the foundation for surmising that hPhags-pa lama had, if not a direct, then an oblique and certainly substantial influence on working out the ideological concepts of the Čayan teike. Its original text, lying at the base of the latest edition by Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji, may have been compiled no earlier than 1260, when Khubilai took his seat upon the throne, and no later than 1280, the year hPhags-pa lama died.¹⁷

The Basic Historical-Political Ideas of the Čayan teike

The Čayan teike, although it is not strictly an historical work, is still the only source which has come down to us from which one can judge the historical-political views of the Mongols during the period of the Yuan Empire. As an historical monument the Čayan teike is interesting primarily because it presents a philosophy of history, one lying at the base of the official Mongolian historiography of the 13th century. This was the crucial moment in the development of Mongolian historical knowledge, evoked by new circumstances, substantially differing from the one under whose conditions the first historiographic monument, the Secret History, had been created.

The Čayan teike arose in the Empire period, formed by a new generation of Mongol rulers. This made inevitable a review of the old views and the formation of a new world-view, a new view of history, state and society. From the example of the Čayan teike it is clearly evident how much Mongolian historical writing had fallen under the influence of Buddhism, having affixed to it a specifically Buddhist worldview. This volume of small size was adjudged to be a model and basic guide for all subsequent Mongolian historical writing extending over several hundred years. In it we find the bases of the world-view of the medieval Mongol historians and the governmental philosophy of the Mongolian ruling class. Following the example of Khubilai Khan, Altan Khan of the Tumed at the end of the 16th century and the Khalkha Boyda Jibjundamba in 1911 tried to bring back to life the basic premises of

¹⁷ During recent years, scholars have discussed in a lively manner the possible date and authorship of the Čayan teike. The Inner Mongolian scholar Qarača, for instance, supposes that the book could have been composed in the first year of Dhi shun (1330) by Biranashiri Üijüng guosi on the basis of Khubilai Khan's law of the Two Principles. His article is "Čayan teike-yin jokiyayciyin tuqai süбегчел" [On the authorship of the Čayan teike], Obör Mongyol-un neyigem-ün shinjilekū uqayan (1985 no. 3), pp. 37-43.

Another scholar, Mongyoljin Li Bouving, supposes that the Čayan teike could have been written by Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji in the period between 1540 and 1586. His article is "Čayan teike-yi ken kedüü-tü jokiyaycan tuqai," [Regarding who composed the Čayan teike and when], Obör Mongyol-un neyigem-ün shinjilekū uqayan, (1995) no. 5), pp. 22-28.
this philosophy. One may say that the influence of the Čayan teře on the pre-revolutionary historical writing of the Mongols was no less than the influence of St. Augustine's work, *The City of God*, on all European historiography of the early Middle Ages. As will be demonstrated below, in works of leading Mongolian historians right up to the beginning of the 20th century one may very often encounter views which literally or in somewhat modified form are reproducing the ideas of the Čayan teře.

Buddhism, which had long since gone beyond the borders of its original homeland and was disseminated in many countries of the Orient, strove to unite all mankind on a religious foundation just as did at different times the proponents of other world religions, in particular Christianity and Islam. Precisely this facet of Buddhism attracted the attention of Mongolian conquerors, who had striven to create a universal Chinggisid empire. It is not surprising that under such a historical circumstance there could arise similar global ideas among both proponents of Buddhism and the Mongolian khans. Thus these ideas also arise on the pages of the Čayan teře, destined to be the official history of the Yuan Empire and not ascribed to Khubilai Khan merely by chance.

In this work we see the first attempt of Mongolian historians to ground the idea of the unity of mankind in the idea of universal history, uniting the history of all states whenever they existed. In the Čayan teře, the history of Jambhuvipa, i.e., the physical world, takes its beginning during the reign of Mahāsammata, the progenitor of the rulers of all countries, including Mongolia. This first mythical king, Mahāsammata, is a reincarnation of the bodhisattva Arya Samantabhadra, who first created in the land of Magadha a state founded on the Two Principles of power.

Further on in time, analogous systems of rule would take shape in the “Sixteen Great States of Jambhuvipa,” spreading from one country to another. This system specially flourished in India during the years of rule by Suddhodana and his son Arthasiddhi (the Buddha). The anonymous author of the Čayan teře, having specially dwelt on the history of Buddhist monarchy in the Srong-btsan gam-po period in Tibet, brings the history of Jambhuvipa down to the empire of Khubilai Khan, whom he proclaims as a grand Chakravarti, having re-established in his state a traditional rule, based on the Two Principles. In an unending chain the continuity of the Two Principles system of power in the Čayan teře especially stands out in the history of India, Tibet and Mongolia.

The universal-historical ideology of the Čayan teře bears a primitive religious character and has nothing in common with a scientific presentation about the historical process in the development of mankind. Considering, however, that in its time this ideology was taken up by various peoples as truth, though they demanded no proof, and that at that time it was undoubtedly new and to a certain degree a positive influence in the history of Mongolian historical thought, it deserves the serious attention of researchers. It aided the expansion of the historical horizon of people, inspired them with the idea of unity and the mutual linkage of historical
destinies of peoples of the world. This idea was seized by subsequent generations of Mongol historians, in whose works it received its furthest development. But of this we shall speak infra.

Another important historiographic idea of the Čayan teüke connected with the governmental policy of the Mongolian khans is the problem of the relationship between state and church. As stated above, this problem was resolved in a practical sense as early as the first years of Khubilai's rule, when the link of worldly power with the Buddhist church of Tibet was established. In the Čayan teüke the idea of uniting secular and clerical power acquired further development and a theoretical basis in the shape of the unity of the ecclesiastical and secular principles justifying the khan's power. It would, however, be an error to see in this unity an equality of the stated principles, which would mean recognizing an equality of secular and church power. Attentive familiarity with the content of the Čayan teüke convinces one that the unity in question presupposes a distinct differentiation of the functions and prerogatives of spiritual and royal power. According to the Čayan teüke:

At the root of the holy religion lies the lama, the Master of doctrine, and as head of the state, the Khan, holder of earthly power; the laws of the true doctrine, similarly to a sacred silken cord, are unable to be weakened; the laws of the mighty khan, similarly to a golden yoke, are invincible. And as a short exposition of how to execute both laws free of error is the “White History of the Doctrine of Ten Virtues.”

Commenting on these words, Zhamtsarano wrote: “Here is to be seen an interesting attempt on the part of Qubilai to establish his world empire and to expound the administrative principles of the state by creating a union between church and state, between the spiritual and secular powers” (entries 150, p. 72; 292, p. 51).

Despite the high authority of Buddhism and the Buddhist church, despite the still higher activism of hPhags-pa lama, the problem of mutual relationships between the secular and spiritual power was decided in the Čayan teüke in favor of the primacy of the khan's power over the Buddhist church. The author acknowledges that the khan, and not the state preceptor, plays the preponderant role in the empire. In the opinion of the Mongolian khans, the Buddhist church ought to serve their interests, their state, i.e., the secular power. If the Mongolian khan provided high and full powers to the head of the Buddhist church and conferred a high ecclesiastical rank on him, then this had as a major goal the blessing of the khan's power by the authority of Buddhism. As to the basic function of the spiritual head, the Čayan teüke says: “He who can compel the four great rivers of Abhiśeka to flow in the name of the khan, the Master of the state, is called a Gušri, the Master of Doctrine” (entry 1, copy C). Thus was the chief purpose of the State Preceptor clearly defined, and his activity was bounded by the framework of church affairs.

---

18 This text, in a somewhat different edition, exists in a copy in Leningrad, concerning which Zhamtsarano wrote in his time (cf. entries 150, pp. 71-73; 292, pp. 50-52).
The Buddhist church was to play a role subsidiary to royal power.

In its treatment of the problem of the relationship between the secular and spiritual power, Mongolian historiography of the 13th century substantially differs from medieval European historiography, in which, particularly at the stage of early feudalism, the primacy of the church over secular power was asserted. The two different approaches to this problem in medieval Mongolian and European historiography, consecrated to two world religions, to two church systems, which had striven with identical zeal for dominance in governing nations, are explained in the first instance by the unusual relationship between state and church in Asia and Europe. If in Europe at the time of St. Augustine and later, the secular state organization just barely survived collapse, and the Christian church was on an upsurge, then in Mongolia at the time of the Empire things were different. Here the secular royal power around the time of the Čayan teüke was still rather strong; it turned to Buddhism not as to an all-powerful protector, but as to an aide and ally. Whatever high authority the Buddhist church enjoyed within the ruling class of the empire, it could not pretend to prevail over the power of the secular, all the more so as Tibet, the country from which Buddhism came to the Mongols, stood in vassal-like dependence on the Mongolian khans. What has been said above sheds light on the character of the dialogue cited between Khubilai and hPhags-pa lama, and which explains that the Buddhist church cannot lay claim to a dominating role in the Empire.

In the Čayan teüke spiritual and secular power are presented in the form of the “four great powers,” the spiritual power, which should be founded on the teachings of sutras and tantra, and the secular, which realizes on the one hand a peaceful and on the other a forceful function. The peaceful function is allotted to the khan, and the forceful one to his ministers. Virtually central in the Čayan teüke is the ideology which recognized establishing a need for the eternal existence of the Buddhist church and the secular state, of the Teacher and the Khan: “If there is no spiritual power, then creatures will fall into hell, and if there is no royal power, then the state is ruined. Supporting oneself on the Teacher, you will find the road to bodhisattvahood, and relying on the holy Khan, you will obtain peace in the state” (ibid.). In this thesis there is clearly formulated the khanship-clerical ideology, justifying and substantiating a need for the power of the ruling class over the subject masses. It somehow subsequently also became for all pre-modern Mongolian historiography a major methodological principle, according to which the history of a country was in the final accounting reduced to the history of the Buddhist religion and the great khans.

19 Nom-un törü tarni sudur kiged yirtinčü-yin törü engke kilbar. The Mongolian word kilbar literally means “the metal tip of an arrow” (sunny gilber), and in a transferred sense as it is used in the Čayan teüke, “force, forcible”. In another place in the Čayan teüke it is replaced by the word dayičin (törü), which in much later historical chronicles normally substitutes for the old term kilbar.
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The Čayan teïke is scarcely the sole source testifying to the attempts of the Mongolian rulers to create on the basis of Buddhism a governmental organization appropriate to their national interests, in contrast to their Chinese advisors, who strove to build a Mongolian state after Chinese models. But the history of the Yuan dynasty demonstrates that a number of the most important provisions of the Čayan teïke found no application in the practical activity of Mongolian administration, by virtue of which the Chinese models of power assumed dominance at the end of the existence of this dynasty.

Not going into details of a theoretical nature, the anonymous author of the Čayan teïke is more interested than anything else in the character of activity of high church and state posts which embody the Two Principles of the khan's power. The spiritual principle is exemplified by high religious officials, and the secular, by the khan, the ruler of the state, by the three gušri, by the three qonjins, the four tayijis, the six čerbis, the seven jayisangs, the ten örlügs and so on. Beside those named in the Čayan teïke many other governmental and court posts are mentioned, to enumerate which there is no need. But in brief one should dwell on the ideas lying at the root of the functions of major governmental officials, and explain that they represented the so-called “three great deeds,” the “four great powers,” the “six great examples” and the “seven great previsions.”

The “three great deeds,” which the three qonjins are in charge of, are acknowledged:

1. salvation in the two worlds, i.e., a deed, assuring a higher peace;
2. preservation of the people, i.e., a deed showing high bliss;
3. defense of the state, i.e., a deed which is the highest of all deeds.

The four great powers, as noted above, consisted of:

1. the doctrine of the sutra is peaceful power,
2. the doctrine of the tantra is frightening power.

---

20 This is evidently an error. It should be kung. The title of kung was first introduced by Ögedei khan (cf. entry 280, p. 137).

21 Mong. amuyulang-un törü. In this present instance Mongolian amuyulang corresponds to Tibetan šï, which means “peaceful, tranquil.” The teaching of the sutra gives instruction in the usual, peaceful path to enlightenment, to Nirvana. This road requires considerably more time than the path of Tantra.

22 Mongolian jiya törü. Here jiya by its sense corresponds to Tibetan khro’ drags, which means “frightening, angry, fierce.” According to Tantric teaching, the path to Nirvana is short, but it requires a maximum of energy and effort on the basis of physical and spiritual practice of yoga. Tantrism recognizes the fiercest and most frightening activity of deities, the
3. the worldly power, which the khan puts into practice;
4. forceful power, which the officials' practice.

These "four great powers" are put into practice by the four tayijis.
The "six great examples" are these:

1. astrology, which shows the creation of the world;
2. instructions, which have created a treasure house of the precepts of Buddha;
3. ceremonies and rules, which show the organization of power (of the state);
4. laws, expressing volition\(^{23}\);
5. defense, which shows the organization of forces;
6. enrichment, i.e., the creation of finances.

The six čerbis are in charge of these six great examples.

The "seven great previsions" (bin) are:

1. prevision of a great thinker who knows the past;
2. prevision of a great prophet who knows the future;
3. prevision of a special sage who knows secret things;
4. prevision of one who knows current situations;
5. prevision of a marvelous sage who can divine the thought of someone else before he utters it;
6. prevision of the bayatur who is getting ready for deeds of campaigns and battles;
7. prevision of one who masters the five sciences.

These seven previsions are in the charge of the seven jayisangs.

1. It is curious that the seven types of prevision mentioned remind one of those six which are commonly encountered in Buddhist compositions, and these are:
2. prevision of miraculous actions, permitting one to know events of the past and future life;
3. prevision which arises thanks to divine hearing;
4. prevision which can discover the thoughts of another;
5. prevision which is able to know the past;

---

\(^{23}\) Copy D has the word jory, and copy C writes this word differently: jiruy, which means "picture, sketch". In our opinion the writing in copy D is the correct one.
5. prevision of death and birth;
6. prevision which is able to quell suffering.

As we see, the author of the Čayan teüke adheres basically to the common Buddhist understanding of previsions, but somewhat diverges from the generally accepted treatment of them, including in his list the prevision of a baŋatur getting ready for deeds of hunt and battle.

It affords interest, in our view, that there are a number of Buddhist prescriptions touching on moral-legal ideas. The Čayan teüke cites traditional Buddhist formulas having as their goal the preservation of the interests of religion and state. We find analogous ideas in the khan’s decrees, addressed to Tibetan ecclesiastical persons, in particular in Khubilai’s order already mentioned above, “The Pearl Document.” The Čayan teüke says that all lamas, from highest to lowest, must observe the spiritual laws, strictly follow the teachings of the sutra and tantra, absolutely observe all their prescriptions in the name of enlightenment. To these ends it is prescribed to hold Buddha in one’s heart; to preserve all living creatures as one would one’s own son; to observe holy vows; to devote oneself unceasingly to the four deeds; to sincerely study the writings of Buddha; to sincerely strive toward the four unlimited virtues\(^\text{24}\) to bring sacrifices to the four guests\(^\text{25}\); to worship the Three Jewels; to observe the vows of Tantra; not to think that friends are many; to learn from one’s enemy, even if there is but one; to behave alike to rich and poor; to annihilate the two defilements (moral and intellectual); to enlarge the two accumulations (of knowledge and moral attainments); to restrain oneself from the ten sins; to strive for the ten virtues; to eradicate the five types of poison; and so on.

From the data cited it is apparent that the Čayan teüke in some respects actually is a helmsman’s guide for Mongolian khans, intended, as it says in the Mongolian sources, to inculcate the laws of the ten virtues. In this book the two basic principles of royal power find a legal embodiment in a unique governmental organization, founded chiefly on Indo-Tibetan Buddhist traditions.

The Čayan teüke is an important historiographic monument, giving witness to new trends in the development of historical knowledge of the Mongols. The Bud-

\(^{\text{24}}\) The four unlimited virtues: love (byams-pa), compassion (sñih-rje), bliss (dga’-pa), and indifference to happiness and sorrow (btan-shoms).

\(^{\text{25}}\) Here “the four guests” must be understood as the four objects of offering. The “guests” are these: the jewels or the saints who are the object (guest) of offering in this world [dkon mchog sríd šu’i mgon]. Under “jewels” one must understand the Buddha, the dharma, the sangha and the guru (the teacher-lama); the group of frightening deities, the heavenly gods, are the defenders of the faith, to whom one must bring sacrifices; the group of living creatures: the gods, demons, people, animals, spirits, inhabitants of hell, demons and evil spirits, to whom it is necessary to bring offerings, so as to pacify them.
dhist concept of the Two Principles is not only a firm part of subsequent Mongolian
historiography, but it became the basis of state doctrine, by the help of which the
ruling class of Mongolia strove up until 1921 to maintain and strengthen their politi-
cal power. It is no accident that the head of the Mongolian theocratic monarchy, the
Boyda Gegen, considered himself the Ruler of the state and the religion, having as-
sumed the title of “Elevated by Many,” which is a translation to Mongolian of the
Sanskrit title of Mahāsammata, the title of the first mythical king of the Buddhist
world.

The *Sheng-wu ch‘in-cheng lu*: A Mongolian Historical Work

Many scholars consider the *Sheng-wu ch‘in-cheng lu*\(^26\) to be a Chinese transla-
tion of a Mongolian chronicle (entries 100, pp. xi-xiii; 241, pp. 479-481; 174, p.
163). Indeed, even on first reading it is evident that this work by its manner and
style of exposition, by language and approach to history is a Mongolian work,
transposed into Chinese. The language in which it is written differs sharply from the
classical Chinese literary language and is, as N. Ts. Munkuyev has correctly noted,
“a unique Chinese-Mongolian jargon” (entry 174, p. 171). It is appropriate to men-
tion as well that anyone who undertakes a translation of the *Sheng-wu ch‘in-cheng
lu* into Mongolian, ought first of all to think less about translating from the Chinese
than about reconstructing the Mongolian original, using in this connection the Secret
History, the *Complete Collection of Histories* and other sources.

As regards the translation executed by Danda\(^27\), it unfortunately does not answer
these needs and requires an attentive editing, after which it could become a genuine
reconstruction of a vanished Mongolian chronicle.

[101]
Only then will readers have, it seems, a second Secret History.

At present it is difficult to establish which Mongolian original lay at the base of
the translation, and equally, how to date it. For these reasons the opinions of schol-
ars are divided (cf. entries 241, pp. 469-471; 174, pp. 163-164). Some of them
(Hung Chün, Naka Michiyo and others) proposed that the *Sheng-wu ch‘in-cheng lu*

\(^{26}\) This work has been translated into Russian by Palladius Kafarov (entry 56, vol. 1). It
was partly translated into French (entry 100, vol. 1). There is as well a Mongolian translation
made by the historian Danda; it is kept in the Mongolian National Library in Ulaanbaatar
(entry 15).

\(^{27}\) Danda’s translation is basically literal, which has its merits as well as its demerits. The
translation renders exactly all the uniqueness and all the nuances of the language of the work,
but its literal nature makes it difficult to understand the sense of the book. The translator even
left uncorrected many Mongolian titles and names that are distorted in the Chinese text. A
start on the scientific reconstruction of the genuine Mongolian titles and names was made by
Paul Pelliot and Louis Hambis.
was a translation of the *Secret History* and connected its appearance to the 14th century. Louis Hambis in his brief introduction to the French translation from Chinese expressed his opinion that the common source both for the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* as well as for the *Complete Collection of Histories* of Rashid al-Din might have been the *Altan debter*, because information which both communicate basically coincides (as to the *Altan Debter*, see infra). He concedes that the Chinese translation of a vanished Mongolian chronicle was made in the second half of the 13th century (entry 100, pp. xiii-xxv). William Hung thinks that the Mongolian original of the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* goes back to a number of sources of various times, and that this work made an attempt to gather up in a unified way information from the early history of the Mongols, and was undertaken by command of Khubilai Khan. This collection, in Hung's opinion, included in it the original Mongolian version of the *Secret History*, the text of which in many other ways agrees with the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu*, and also many other Mongolian materials, the data of which are not reflected in the *Secret History* (entry 241, p. 479-a). William Hung connects the appearance of the work under discussion to approximately the last six years of the rule of Khubilai Khan, i.e., to 1288-1294 (entry 241, p. 478).

Comparing and contrasting everything that is known about the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu*, we incline to the view that its appearance may actually be connected with the khanship of Khubilai. The compilers of the *Ssu-k'u ch'uan-shu* presumed that the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* was compiled under Khubilai Khan after his chief court history writer Wang 0 in the fourth year of Chung Tung (1263) turned to Khubilai with a proposal to assemble all the historical material about the *t'ai-tzu* [Chinggis] and transfer it to the Historiographic Bureau (entries 17, p. 5; 15, p. 1; 100, p. 1).

However opinions of scholars may differ about the Mongolian original of the work in question and the time of its compilation.

One thing is beyond doubt: by origin it is Mongolian, and for this reason must be regarded as a Mongolian historiographic monument. It is even possible that its Mongolian original was written considerably earlier than the translation into Chinese. Its basic portion in all likelihood was devoted to the pre-Empire period, as is also the case with the *Secret History*. But we regard the *Sheng-wu ch'ing-chen lu* in connection with the historiographic activity of the Mongols during the period of the Yuan dynasty not only because its Chinese translation was made during just that period, but also because we have reason to presume that the translators introduced some changes into the Mongolian original.

The *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* consists of two basic parts: a history of the rise of Chinggis Khan through uniting the Mongolian tribes under his sole rule, and a history of the external campaigns of Chinggis and Ogedei, chiefly the conquest of China. It is quite understandable that elucidating these questions suited more than anything else the urgent needs of the Mongolian rulers in China.

The first part, i.e., the history of Chinggis Khan, is of particularly great interest for studying the Mongolian historiographical tradition in close contact with the Chinese historical school. The anonymous compiler of the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu*,
although remaining by and large true to the Mongolian original, brings everything before us in the role of an innovator, one who has introduced some new elements into Mongolian historiography.

As is well-known, in 1266 Khubilai Khan, in accord with Chinese tradition, conferred on his great predecessor the dynastic title _Sheng-wu t'ai-tzu_, “The Martial Emperor, the Grand Ancestor.” By this he wished to emphasize the historical continuity of his dynasty in China with the “Grand Ancestor,” founder of the Mongolian empire, by dint of whom a history of the Yuan dynasty in China ought to be a history of the Mongolian khans, and to begin with Chinggis Khan, thus having put an end to the traditional official history of the Chinese emperors.

From the text of the monument being considered one may conclude that the customary version of the beginning for Mongolian historical writing underwent a certain change. If previous historians had striven in the first instance to show the aristocratic origin of each khan, then this sequence was reversed under the Yuan dynasty. Now the main task was to write a history of Chinggis Khan himself as the ancestor of the emperors of this dynasty. This is why the anonymous author of the _Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu_ began his exposition of history with the birth of Chinggis, merely mentioning his father Yesügei as _sheng-yüan liu-tsu_, “Most August Emperor of the Yuan [Dynasty], Splendid Ancestor.” In the work under review, in distinction to past times, we almost never find elements of poetical creation, aside from some clichés. The _Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu_ is strictly historical and prosaic. It is the concrete result of a creative re-working of early Mongolian historical traditions under new conditions. A more developed Chinese historical tradition is reflected in it. Chinggis Khan is no longer a hero in the old Mongolian sense, “born by destiny of High Heaven,” but a concrete historical personality, elevated to the official Chinese title of _sheng-wu t'ai-tzu_. It is very possible that they have used in part notes made at campaign headquarters of the Mongolian emperor for the history of the conquest of China.

However, it is necessary to say that the history of Chinggis Khan, worked out by the Mongols as early as the pre-Empire period, by and large served as a base for historical works created under the Yuan dynasty. Convincing testimony to this is the first part of the work under review. By its thematic canvas and content it greatly reminds one of corresponding sections in the _Secret History_. There can be no doubt that this part of the _Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu_ is a product of Mongolian creativity. Attentive comparison and contrast of both monuments permits the scholar to establish striking similarity and at times even a full identity of the data in the _Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu_, the _Complete Collection of Histories_ by Rashid al-Din, and the _Secret History_. Many places in the _Sheng-wu ch'ing-cheng lu_ echo corresponding information in the _Yüan shih_ about the life and deeds of Chinggis and Ögedei.

The historical literature of the time being described bears witness that in the empire years a decisive role was played by the historical tradition of the Mongols themselves, despite the diffi-
culties connected with the great distances separating one part of the empire from another. During the period when the Yuan dynasty reigned, especially at the outset, the western and eastern part of the empire could with no great difficulty maintain links with each other when compiling a history of the Mongolian khans, exchanging written sources and opinions about their problems which were of interest. We have no direct proof that things were exactly like that, but we have reason to think so, because otherwise it is impossible to explain the similarity and the direct agreement of factual data in the works, which appeared in different parts of the empire rather removed from each other. To explain the points of agreement only by the common nature of the sources used, it being unknown in what manner they turned up at the disposition of chroniclers and authors, is rather implausible.

Of definite interest for us is the chronology of events described in the monument. The *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* was, indubitably, a step forward in its claim for trustworthiness in Mongolian historiography. In this work one may discern two groups of dates: those connected with events which took place before the elevation of Temüjin to the khan's throne, and the historic dates of military campaigns of Chinggis and Ögedei against China.

The first group, mostly corresponding to the dating in the Complete Collection of Histories and the *Yüan-shih*, we must regard as convincing attestation of the principles of chronologization in historiography.

One should note that by the nature of the events illuminated, the very earliest date in the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* might be the Dragon Year (1186) (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 110), which we succeeded in establishing thanks to the exact data of Rashid al-Din. But in the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* this year is for some reason not indicated, but in return it does mention the season exactly as being in the fall.

This explains why the events of Mongolian history described in the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* begin earlier (1186) than in the *Secret History* (1201).

Dates connected with the second group serve as a basic pivot for the events set forth, and are distinguished by their fullness and accuracy. In this connection it must be stated that a strict chronological principle, unique to the traditional Chinese historiographic school, showed a serious positive influence on Mongolian historical writing during the Yuan dynasty years.

II. Reconstruction of the Historical Knowledge of the Mongols According to the Chinese and Persian sources

**Historiographic Activity at the Court of the Mongolian Khans in China:**

*The Yüan-Shih As A Source For The History Of Mongolian Historical Writing*

In February of 1264, Khubilai Khan promulgated a decree about the establishment of a Department of Dynastic History, which after the death of any khan, was to compile a chronicle of his reign on the basis of official documents. The compilation
of chronicles was conducted under the strict supervision of the khan, who nominated specialists to compile an orderly chronicle and actively participated in the work process itself. Each such chronicle, upon its conclusion, was subjected to imperial confirmation by the khan and only after this did it go into effect. The *Yüan-shih* even describes a special rite for presentation to the khan upon confirmation of finished chronicles. In many sections of the *Yüan-shih* one encounters information about work on such chronicle-writing, in which regard some of the chronicles were even subjected to a series of repeated editings. The sources testify that at the beginning of Yüan dynasty rule, chronicles were compiled either only in Mongolian, or in Mongolian and Chinese, in which case the Chinese versions were as a rule translations from Mongolian originals. It happened, however, that Chinese annals were also translated into Mongolian. Additionally, at times, according to the degree of Chinese influence on the Yüan dynasty, history was written chiefly in Chinese, and authors of chronicles, to judge from their names mentioned in the *Yüan-shih*, were exclusively Chinese in service to the Mongolian rulers.

Let us cite some information from the *Yüan-shih* which relates how chronicles were compiled under the Yüan dynasty. In the 23rd year of the rule of Shih-tzu (Khubilai),

[i.e., the 8th of March 1286], Sa-li-man (Sarman?) reported that the Department of Dynastic History was occupied with re-working the chronicle of Tai-tzu (Chinggis Khan) and the following reigns. He requested authority to transpose this manuscript into Uighur letters to prepare it for presentation and reading, and then subject it to a final editing. His report was approved by the khan. And in two years, in 1288, Ssu-t’u, Sarman and others presented the chronicle for Imperial review. Having gotten acquainted with it, Khubilai Khan said: “The history of Tai-tsung [Ogedei] has been corrected; the history of Jui-tsung [Tolui] needs somewhat to be corrected; as for Ting-tsung [Güyük], you really have had insufficient time; hence you are not in a position to recollect the deeds of Hsien-tsimg [Mongke]; thus it will be necessary to become informed about this from knowledgeable persons” (entry 17, book 15; cf. entries 183, pp. 182-3; 241, p. 473).

William Hung thinks that these chronicles were the first draft versions written in Mongolian, at which stage some parts of them were subjected to serious correction. On August 2nd and December 25th of 1290 the chronicles of Guyug and Ogedei (entries 17, book 16, f. 7, 11; 241, pp. 473-4; 183, p. 188) were presented for Imperial review. It is not known whether these chronicles were ones definitively edited or were preliminary outlines; it is likewise not known what stage the Chinggis Khan chronicle had reached by that time. The source, to be sure, says that around 1300 work was completed on chronicles of the first five khans in Mongolian and Chinese (entries 17, book 21, f. 10-11; 183, p. 191). These were the so-called Veritable Histories of the Five Reigns [*Wu-ch’ao shih-lu*]. After the death of Khubilai, his successor, Öljeytü, who ascended the throne in 1294, issued a decree in the name of the Department of Dynastic History about compiling a chronicle of Shih-tzu (Khubilai) and ordered Ö-le-che (Öljei) to supervise work on this history. And in a year the
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chronicle of Khubilai was presented for Imperial review. Under the year 1304 the Yuan-shih says that Sa-li-man (Sarman?) presented some entries in Chinese script from chronicles of Shih-tzu's reign (entry 17, book 21). From an analysis of the Yuan-shih one can conclude that the chronicles of all other Yuan khans were also compiled by the efforts of this department. In all, in the years that the Yuan dynasty existed thirteen shih-lu, i.e. "veritable histories of a reign," were written, which later formed the basis of the Yuan-shih. In addition, according to data in the Yuan-shih, the department conducted a compilation of biographies of Yuan empresses and the life-stories of officials in service in accord with the old Chinese historical tradition.

As to the extent of historiographic activity of the Mongolian dynasty in Chinese, there is also the fact that under it was assembled as enormous a compilation as the Ching-shih ta-tien [The Great Law of Ruling the World], consisting of 894 chiūan.

As is well-known, this work is not completely preserved. Some parts of it were included in the Yung-lo ta-tien [The Grand Encyclopedia], compiled under the Yung-lo emperor of the Ming dynasty (1403-1425) (entry 224, pp. 25-26). The Imperial decree about compiling the Ching-shih ta-tien was issued in winter of the second year of rule of Tien-li (1329-1330), and the compilation was presented to the throne in finished form on the first day of the fifth moon of the second year of the reign of Chih-shun (June 6th, 1331) (entries 224, pp. 25-29; 278, pp. ix-x, 173). As stated in the preface, the compilers were ordered to gather official documents and write a work on the model of the Tang hui-yao [Collection of the Most Important Regulations of the Tang (Dynasty)] and the Sung hui-yao [Collection of the Most Important Regulations of the Sung (Dynasty)]. It is interesting that in creating the Ching-shih ta-tien Mongols took part alongside Chinese scholars. It is known from the preface that the first four books, united under the title of Chūn-shih [The deeds of the rulers], were compiled under Mongolian administration [meng-ku chu]. On the basis of this information, scholars make the assumption that the first four books were compiled from Mongolian sources to which non-Mongolian officials were not admitted (such as the Secret History and the Altan Debter) (entries 278, p. x; 174, p. 174).

Unfortunately, of the numerous chronicles and translated works of those times very few have survived and come down to us. We may only judge about these from some Chinese works written on the basis of Mongolian sources. The Yuan-shih, being an official dynastic history of the Mongolian khans in China was, as is well-known, compiled in a very short period at the very beginning of Ming dynasty rule. Sixteen authors set to work on March 9th, 1369 and on September 19th of the same year 159 chūan (booklets) of the Yuan-shih were already written. The accomplishment of so grandiose a project in so short a time was possible only because the compilers had ready-made material at their disposal.

One may maintain with complete confidence that the Yuan-shih is a compilation
of numerous chronicles, different historical records and other sources relating to the period of Yuan dynasty rule. It is well-known, for instance, that basic sources of the pen-chi section [basic annals] were the chronicles of Mongolian khans compiled under the Yuan dynasty under the shih-lu genre. Another very important source for the Yuan-shih was the Ching-shih ta-tien (entries 224, pp. 25-34; 278, pp. ix-xiv). Such portions of the Yuan-shih as the chih [sketches], the piao [genealogy] and the Shih-huo chih ["Description of the Exchequer; lit. food and money;" political economy] were written on the basis of the Ching-shih ta-tien.

Keeping all this in mind, one may regard it as established that in terms of its sources the Yuan-shih is a historical work not only of Ming times, but also of the Yuan dynasty.

By its structure and nature, the Yuan-shih undoubtedly is a typical Chinese dynastic history. Its basic parts are the pen-chi (books 1-47), the chih (books 48-105), the piao (books 106-113), and the lieh-chuan [biographies] (books 114-210). But its single-minded purpose and unique origin render this work different from ordinary dynastic histories. The Yuan-shih is a unique monument of Chinese historical writing, reflecting a blend of two different historical traditions: the Mongolian and the Chinese. There are not a few Mongolian elements in it. They find their expression first and foremost in the old Mongolian historical tradition from which the Yuan-shih by its nature likewise springs. That Mongolian tradition is reflected in frequent use of non-Chinese turns of phrase, including Mongolian terms and words and Mongolian geographical names.

Despite the strong influence of Chinese official historical writing, the Mongolian historical tradition nonetheless revealed itself under the Yuan dynasty. It is evident from the sources that at the time when work began on compiling the history of the Mongolian khans, the compilers already had finished Mongolian chronicles. For this reason Khubilai Khan first took steps to assemble and systematize historical materials preserved from earlier times. Information from the Yuan-shih furnishes a basis to assume that these materials had been systematically arranged in a large collection of historical notes under the general title of the Tobčiyan,28 which is mentioned in five different places of the Yuan-shih. In all probability the Tobčiyan included within it the history of only the first four great khans (Chinggis, Ögedei, Güyük and Möngke). As William Hung correctly supposes, the term tobčiyan was used at that time in the sense of "series," having in mind, historical compilations in Mongolian dedicated to the deeds of the khans, beginning with Chinggis (entry 241, p. 465).

Even Hung Chun (1840-1893) expressed the interesting idea that "... the Tobčiyan, although it was a carefully preserved Imperial book, must have existed in du-

---

28 Francis W. Cleaves has established that the Mongolian word tobčiyan is first attested in Uighur script in the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362, in HIAS, 12 (1949); cf. William Hung (entry 241, pp. 440-441, footnote 16).
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... (quoted from entry 241, p. 469). The opinion of Hung Chün is based on the fact that data in two different works extant in China and in Iran (the Sheng-wu ch'ing-cheng lu and the Complete Collection of Histories) agree to the extent that they compel one to think that they originate from one common Mongolian source.

As to the wide dispersal of the Mongolian source called the Tobdiyan, as well as the influence of Mongolian historical traditions on the historiographic activity of conquered countries, there is the evidence of the well-known Tibetan chronicle Hulan deb-ther [Red Annals], written in 1346 by Tshal-pa Kun dGa’ rDo-rje (entry 90, part 1, p. 14b) (for data on the history of Mongolia in the Red Annals see entry 214, pp. 70-80). From this chronicle it is evident that a certain Jambhala Tu-šri mGon rendered great assistance to its author. We presume that the latter was a Mongol who during the creation of the Red Annals of Kun dGa’ rDo-rje played no less great a role than Pulad-chingsang did under Rashid al-Dīn (entry 214, pp. 72-3). The author of the Red Annals quotes from it twice in his own chronicle... (entry 90, part 1, pp. 11b-12b). It is very interesting that Kun dGa’ rDo-rje named his work in Mongolian the Hulan deb-ther... (entry 214, pp. 72-73). This work in all probability was a history of the Mongolian khans. In enumerating the descendants of Chinggis Khan, Kun dGa’ rDo-rje writes: “All this is re-written from the Yeke thob-čan by the degree of its importance” (entry 90, l4b). Comparing the data transmitted by Kun dGa’ rDo-rje from the Yeke tobčyan with the corresponding passages in the Secret History and the Complete Collection of Histories by Rashid al-Dīn, we come to the conclusion that these three works essentially agree, although written at different times and in different countries far from one another (entry 214, pp. 76-77). This fact also reinforces our opinion that in the period of the Mongolian Empire a general Mongolian source or different versions of one was widely disseminated, and one or more than one such work must lie...
at the base of these works, which were used to compile histories of the Mongolian khans in different parts of the Empire. And such a source, in all probability, is the Tobčīyan, which in Tibet was called the Yeke tobčīyan, and in Persia, must have been like the Altan debter.

Both the Chinese and the Persian sources are alike in that the history of the Golden Clan was always kept a secret. As to the Altan debter, we shall speak infra. As for the Tobčīyan, this source likewise belongs among the secret documents. On the 30th of May

[111] 1331, members of the K'uei-chang-ko Department, working on the Ching-shih tat-ten, asked for the books of the Tobčīyan chronicle to be given to them from the Department of Dynastic History, so as to note the events which had taken place under Tai-tzu (Chinggis) and subsequent khans. However, this request was refused on the grounds that the Tobčīyan by law was restricted and access to it was prohibited (entries 17, book 35, f. 14; 183, vol. 1, pp. 219-220; 241, pp. 450-451, note 43). It must be assumed, however, that this chronicle, no matter how secret it may have been, nonetheless could not have lasted long under lock and key. In time one or another part of it would become the property of historians residing all over the empire's territory. As is well-known, Rashīd al-Dīn had access to the Altan Debter and to other historical documents kept in the Il-Khans' treasury. Even in Tibet they used the Yeke tobčīyan. As for China, there the Tobčīyan not only became one of the basic sources for the history of Chinggis and his successors, but was also translated into Chinese by the well-known scholar Chagan in 1312-1320 and published under the title of Sheng-wu k'ai t'ien-tzu (entry 17, book 137). Many researchers consider that the Tobčīyan also served as a source for the compilers of the Yūan-shih. If the matter was really that way, then it could only relate to the history of the first four khans, who in the form set forth in the Yūan-shih, did not take on the form of the customary shih-lu, the first of which was the history of Khubilai.

The chronicle of the first four khans in the Yūan-shih is of special importance for getting acquainted with the Mongolian historical tradition proper, still preserved in the initial period of Yüan dynasty rule. Let us therefore linger in somewhat greater detail on this portion of the Yūan-shih, in particular on the history of Chinggis Khan's ancestors, so strongly reminiscent of the pages in the Secret History, the Complete Collection of Histories, the Sheng-wu ch'ing-chen-lu and other works. It is true that it does not enumerate all the ancestors of Chinggis Khan after Börte Chino, as is done in the Secret History and by Rashīd al-Dīn. There is thus room to think that the compilers of the Yūan-shih deliberately shortened this part. At the very beginning they merely observe casually that "Chinggis Khan was of the Kiyad clan" (entry 17, book 1). According to Mongolian tradition

[112] the first leader of the Kiyad clan was Börte-Chino. The semi-legendary data about Bodonchar in the Yūan-shih is identical in places with what the Secret History contains (entries 17, book 1; 42, §170). In the history of Chinggis Khan's ancestors set forth by the compilers of the Yūan-shih there is information which substantially dif-
fers from other sources. In this respect the story about the history of Bodonchar's descendants is characteristic. However, taking everything reported in the *Secret History*, the *Complete Collection of Histories* and the *Yüan-shih*, it is easy to be convinced that these reports mutually supplement and make each other more precise. Let us cite an example: neither the *Yüan-shih* nor the *Complete Collection of Histories* gives the names of the sons of Tudun, the grandson of Bodonchar, and their number according to the first source, was seven, and by the second source, nine. Rashīd al-Dīn writes that their names were not ascertained (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 19). But from the *Secret History* we learn the names of Tudun's seven sons [Mennen Tudun] (entries 57, §45, p. 83; 293, PFEH 4, p. 125), although this source does not cite these details of their biographies, which are contained in the *Yüan-shih* and the *Complete Collection of Histories*, where they agree more or less, which speaks to their apparent common source. Rashīd al-Dīn used this common source more thoroughly and in greater detail than did the *Yüan-shih* compilers (entries 17, book 1; 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 18-19; 50, pp. 3-5).

A striking feature of the Chinggis Khan story in the *Yüan-shih* is the fact that the chronology in the part of the chronicle mentioned is based on the same principles employed in the first Mongolian historical work. Obviously it had not yet been touched by the influence of the Chinese historical tradition so firmly observed in the remaining sections of the work.

The basic dates of events in the internal life of the country in the *Yüan-shih* agree almost identically with those which are cited in the *Secret History*. The sources agree even in such a detail as that one of the first dates mentioned in the *Yüan-shih* and the *Secret History* is a Dog Year (1202) (entries 17, book 1; 57, §153, p. 123; cf. 50, p. 21). It is evident that this year is a starting point for Mongolian historical chronology, and for this reason, everything connected with this year is most accurately attested to in the sources. The data cited under the Dog Year are basically identical in all the sources known to us.

[113]

It was in the Dog Year that Chinggis Khan undertook a campaign against the Tatars and promulgated a decree about military booty (entries 17, book 1; 57, §153, p. 123; 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 10). The sources speak alike about how Altan, Quchar and Daritai, who violated this decree, were punished by Chinggis Khan. Moreover, the *Yüan-shih* and the *Secret History* basically agree both in the description of events in the political life of Mongolia as well as on the dates of these events. However, the *Yüan-shih* differs from the *Secret History* in that it devotes considerably greater detail to Chinggis's campaign against China. In this instance the *Yüan-shih* compilers must have used Chinese sources which contained fuller and more exact data than the Mongolian sources.

The information about Ögedei Khan in the *Yüan-shih* is more reliable than the history of his father. But it lacks the vividness which the historical tradition of the Mongolian history of Chinggis Khan offers. It contains, for instance, interesting details about the *quriltai* in the vicinity of Dalan-dava, which considerably supplements and clarifies Rashīd al-Dīn's story about this event (entry 67, vol. 2, p. 35).
Rashîd al-Dîn only briefly mentions convoking the *quriltai* at Dalan-dava in 1234-1235, and he says nothing about its decisions. But from the *Yüan-shih* we learn that at this *quriltai* Ögedei Khan promulgated a new law which established firm order in the Empire. This law is cited in full in the Chinese translation (entries 17, book 2; 50, pp. 250-251).

Chronicles of the rule of Güyük and Möngke are presented in the *Yüan-shih* most modestly in comparison with the chronicles of the other khans, especially those of the Yüan period. This, apparently, is explained by the fact that the history of the khans mentioned was not compiled. Because of the brevity of their reigns; they enjoyed no special authority and no tales were put together about them, nor were detailed accounts about their famed predecessors compiled then.

As for chronicles of the Yüan khans (Khubilai and others), they were written on the basis of the court diaries, the introduction of which only became a practice from the time of Khubilai Khan. This portion of the basic section of the *Yüan-shih* is almost entirely the work of the Chinese official historiographers who were in service to the Mongolian khans.

[114]

There are not a few similar examples in the history of Chinese historiography. Foreign conquerors of China invariably fell back on the services of the Chinese historiographic tradition for the purpose of immortalizing their rule. This was the case with the Khitans of antiquity and under the Ch’ing dynasty in recent times. If the role of Chinese chroniclers of the Yüan dynasty epoch in writing the history of the khans is shown to be a decisive one, which found its expression in their use of Chinese court historiography, then when compiling genealogical tables of Golden Clan representatives or biographies of cohorts of the Mongolian khans, particularly of the pre-Yüan period, in no way could they have managed without the Mongolian material which had come down to them, obviously both written and oral in form. This confers on the corresponding sections of the monument great significance as witnesses to the historical knowledge of the Mongols of that time. It is true that these sections on the whole are modeled on those parts of dynastic chronicles, which are usually called the *piao* [tables], and the *lieh-chuan* [biographies].

The third part of the *Yüan-shih*, the *piao*, consists of eight books containing genealogical tables of the khan’s family names and the families of the nobility. Let us take as an example Book 107 (entries 76 and 77). It turns out to be a series of genealogical tables of the Chinggisids of all branches, who ruled sectors granted them by the Yüan khans. As Louis Hambis justifiably remarks in his preface to his translation of the indicated part of the *Yüan-shih*, these tables are incomplete; they do not have many names mentioned in the text of the *Yüan-shih*; and moreover one encounters many inaccuracies in them, for which not only the Ming compilers but also the Yüan sources which these compilers used are responsible (entry 76, p. 9).

In the preface to the basic text of Book 107 of the *Yüan-shih* the authors remark on the difficulties which they encountered in compiling genealogical tables, since the genealogy of the Yüan khans was always preserved in strictest secrecy, in a golden trunk in a stone vault. The historians were allowed to compile only general
genealogical tables which in no wise could give a full representation of the true state of affairs (entry 17, book 107). The *Yüan-shih* genealogical tables were compiled in 1369 during the final editing of the chronicle. However one must keep in mind that the tables were based on materials of the Yüan period and in them, of course, the characteristic features of the genealogical history of that time were reflected. The genealogy of the Chinggisids in the *Yüan-shih* must be regarded as a concrete result of the fusion of Mongolian and Chinese historical traditions, in which genealogies occupied one of the most important places to an equal degree.

From data in the *Yüan-shih* it is clearly evident that the compilers and editors strove to embrace as far as possible all branches without exception of the genealogical tree of the Chinggisids within not only the Yüan Empire but the entire Mongolian Empire. This undoubtedly expresses the basic trend of works on the genealogical history of the Mongolian khans in the Yüan period, which of course was dictated by practical requirements, chief among which was the effort to prove the blood kinship of all members of the Chinggis clan when in point of fact no unity of empire existed any longer. Such a tendency, which we see infra in connection with an analysis of the Persian sources, was characteristic also of the work on genealogy of the Chinggisids in Iran. Speaking in general terms, we do not find in the basic genealogical works of the Mongolian empire, whether East or West, differences of principle, despite the fact that they were the result of influence of different historical schools—the Chinese and the Muslim. The Mongolian historical tradition apparently was a unifying link here, defined by the policy of the conquerors. Even in those cases when the genealogy of Chinggis Khan's ancestors is cited, Book 107 of the *Yüan-shih* and the corresponding passages in the *Complete Collection of Histories* by Rashid al-Din basically agree. This gives one grounds to think that the sources mentioned, as Hambis correctly notes, were based on a common tradition in that time when the genealogy of Chinggis Khan's ancestors in the *Secret History* had come to represent a different tradition (entry 77, pp. 1-2).

It must be noted that the eastern and western branchings of the genealogies of the Chinggis clan are far from identically complete and correct as represented in the *Yüan-shih*. Actually, the tables relating to the eastern branch of the Chinggisids, are distinguished by a certain fullness and accuracy, but those tables which contain information about the genealogies of members of the western branch have errors in abundance. Hambis, who has studied the genealogical tables in the *Yüan-shih* in detail, after careful comparison of them with the corresponding data in the Muslim sources, has revealed many errors, in particular in the genealogies of Joči, Čayadai and others. He correctly observes that the genealogy of the Joči clan is presented in the *Yüan-shih* in a distorted form (entry 77, p. 3). But this genealogy is well represented in the Muslim sources, the compilers of which had greater access to resources than their eastern colleagues.

The fourth part of the *Yüan-shih*, consisting of biographies of the khan's relatives, important officials and military leaders and noble women, gives us supple-
mentary material to judge the nature and level of Mongolian historical knowledge in that era. An analysis of the numerous books (114-210) of that part of the Yiān-shih, especially of those devoted to biographies of Mongols, testifies to the fact that when they were written the compilers did not have to manage without Mongolian materials and biographical knowledge of their Mongol subjects. In the biographical portions of the Yiān-shih, exactly as in the "Basic Annals," these two traditions, the Mongolian and the Chinese, are mingled. Biographies of those persons who lived prior to the beginning of the Yiān dynasty are founded on Mongolian traditions proper; as regards biographies of figures of the Yiān period, they are by nature scarcely distinguished from the Chinese lieh-chuan. As it seems to us, the data of the Yiān-shih bear witness to the development of a biographical offshoot in Mongolian historical creativity. We know that even the authors of the Secret History were interested in data about individual personalities who were cohorts of Chinggis Khan. Further, Mongolian interest in these or other historical figures ought to have increased to the extent that the political institutions, particularly those connected with the transmission of rights and privileges to the succession, were inculcated and affirmed.

Under the Yiān dynasty such important measures were introduced as compiling biographies of all people of the empire who had been honored, beginning from the rule of Chinggis Khan.
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To get acquainted with Mongolian tradition, particularly great interest is afforded by the biographies of Tolui (Book 115), Belgütei, Joči (Book 117), Dai-Sečen (Book 118), Muqula, Baurči (Book 119), Čayn, Čingqai (Book 120), Sübetei (Book 121) and others. These biographies differ noticeably from the others, especially from biographies of Yiān figures. There is no doubt that they were basically written from Mongolian sources and oral tales of the Mongols. We find in them quite a few bits of narrative held in common with corresponding passages in the Secret History and in other sources. For instance, data about the cause of Tolui's death, about the wounding of Belgütei, about his advice to Chinggis Khan not to stir up a fray, and Chinggis's words of praise in an address to Belgütei and Qasar, among others, are quite similar to the information in the Secret History and the Complete Collection of Histories. This can only be explained by the common nature of their sources.

The Tārīkh-i jahan-gusā of Juwaynī as a Source for the History of Mongolian Historical Knowledge

As a result of the conquest of Iran by Hulagu Khan (1256-1265), the state of the Hulaguids, or in other words, the Il-Khans, was created in the 1350s.

The Mongolian rulers, finding themselves in a country with an old culture and rich historical traditions, tried in every way to show their right to power in Iran by quoting history, conceding nothing in this respect to their confrères in China. The Il-Khans could employ for their purposes a highly-developed Muslim historiographic
tradition, and at their disposal for this task were no small number of Mongolian chronicles and official documents; eyewitnesses and participants in many stormy events from the times of Chinggis Khan and his first successors were still alive. All this enabled the creation of outstanding works by Persian authors, such as the *History of the Conqueror of the World* by Juvaynī and the *Complete Collection of Histories* by Rashīd al-Dīn.

These works belong, of course, to Iranian national historiography. But there is no doubt that they are directly related to Mongolian historiography as well, inasmuch as they were written not only at the orders of Mongol rulers, but also with the active participation of Mongols and on the basis of Mongolian sources, a considerable part of which, alas, have not come down to us.

The facts which lie at the base of these works and were extracted from Mongolian sources, have for this reason the same great importance for study of Mongolian historical knowledge and views as for the investigation of Mongolian history proper. We have the possibility to reconstruct to a certain degree Mongolian historical knowledge through some Persian sources from the times of Mongolian rulership in Iran.

The first great work on the history of Mongolian conquests was compiled by ʿAlī-Malik Juvaynī (1226-1283), who was in service to the first Mongolian rulers in Iran: Hulagu-Khan, Argun and Abaqa Khan. He was the closest associate of and personal secretary to Hulagu-Khan. Juvaynī's work is called the *Tārīkh-i jāhan-gushā* [History of the Conqueror of the World] (entry 89). In Juvaynī's words, he began to write this work in Qara Qorum during 1252-1253 at the insistence of "his faithful friends and pure-hearted brethren," who proposed to him on his visit to the great Khan Mongke to compile a history "to perpetuate the excellent deeds and to immortalize the glorious actions of the Lord of the Age" (entry 89, book 1, p. 5). By his "faithful friends" we are obviously to understand the Mongols who were near to Mongke Khan, who had prompted the Persian historian into the idea of writing such a history. In one spot Juvaynī writes that this was a "definite command," at "the behest of dear ones," whom he "could not refuse and held it necessary to carry out" (entry 89, p. 10). In this fashion, one may think, they did not simply propose or recommend him to write a history of the Mongolian khan, but ordered him to do it.

Yet it is clear that such an order would be given solely by the Khan personally or through persons close to him. Juvaynī says that he visited Qara Qorum, accompanying Argun, deputy khan in Iran, who had traveled to Möngke Khan's court on business matters and had remained in the capital of the Empire more than a year (from May 1252 to September 1253). Argun and the persons accompanying him were well received by Möngke Khan, who had ascended the khan's throne a year before their arrival. Each member of Argun's retinue had his service role. As regards Juvaynī, his particular responsibility, obviously, was to compile the histories of the Mongolian conquerors. As to the significance which the Mongols gave to this matter, one may judge
from the fact that Juvaynī “was presented by Mongke with a yarligh and a paiza confirming his father in the office of sahib-divan” (entry 67, vol. 1, p. xx, vol. 2, p. 519). It is not known when Juvaynī finished his work. John Boyle presumes that this occurred in 1260; it is known, however, that even having been named ruler of Baghdad, Juvaynī still continued his historical work (entry 89, p. xxv).

There is no need to dwell in detail on Juvaynī’s work, which has been well studied by scholars (entries 132, pp. 87-89; 53, pp. 7-11; 89, vol. 1, pp. xv-xxxv). It is of interest to us only to the degree to which it enables us to judge Mongolian historical knowledge of that time. V. V. Bartol’d indicated that “Juvaynī's vast superiority over Rashīd al-Dīn and Wassāf lies in the fact that he lived at a time when the Mongol empire was still a unity, and that he visited Turkestan, Uighuria, and Mongolia in person. In his narrative he endeavoured, so far as his sources allowed, to relate the history of the whole empire” (entries 132, p. 88; 299, p. 40-41). “Juvaynī,” Bartol’d wrote, “had already made use of oral narratives of the Mongols, and possibly also some written ones; some of his expressions openly indicate a Mongol source” (ibid).

The translator of Juvaynī, John Boyle, repeats this thought: “Most of his [Juvaynī’s: Sh. B.] information regarding the Turks and Mongols must have been gathered at the courts of the Mongol princes and in the course of his journeys thither” (entry 89, vol. 1, p. xxvii). Juvaynī himself writes of this: “Nevertheless, as I have several times visited Transoxiana and Turkestan to the confines of Machin [South China: Sh. B.] and farthest China . . . and have observed certain circumstances and have heard from certain creditable and trustworthy persons of bygone events” (entry 89, vol. 1, pp. 9-10). Actually, one can encounter in Juvaynī not a few historical facts which may have been borrowed from Mongolian sources. Boyle expressed the quite enticing proposal that Juvaynī possibly got some of his information from the Secret History with the aid of those “reliable Mongols,” whom he mentions in his book. To justify his explanation Boyle provides the following facts: the information of Juvaynī concerning the downfall of the shaman Teb-Tengri, but nothing is said of this by Rashīd al-Dīn. Juvaynī’s account is quite similar to the Secret History’s narrative; Juvaynī’s tale about Chinggis Khan and the durability of a bundle of arrows reminds one of the same story in the Secret History, although in the latter it is cited in connection with the story of Alan-Goa; Juvaynī, completely agreeing with the Secret History, speaks about Tarbai (Darbai) as an emissary of the Uighur ruler Idiqut to Chinggis Khan, and not in reverse (from Chinggis Khan to Idiqut), as Rashīd al-Dīn writes. In Boyle’s opinion, the date of Ögedei’s accession to the throne coincides with the date in the Secret History (spring, 1228), whereas Rashīd al-Dīn connects this event with 1229 (entry 220, pp. 134-136).

It is necessary to stipulate, however, that not all Boyle’s suppositions prove convincing. The similarity between some data in Juvaynī’s work and the Secret History might also be explained by commonality of their sources, considering that Juvaynī began to write his work some four decades after the Secret History. Under these conditions, it is impossible to exclude the possibility that Juvaynī got from Mongols
information which agreed with the data of the Mongolian chronicle. The question also arises: if Juvaynī really used the *Secret History*, then why did he not include in his work such important historical information as the genealogical history of Chinggis Khan, his struggle to unite the Mongolian tribes, the creation of a Mongolian state, and so on, restricting himself solely to secondary data? Reading the appropriate pages of Juvaynī’s book creates the impression that he himself felt the inadequacy of the information furnished him on early Mongolian history, and replaced it with general phrases and quotations from fragmentary oral information from Mongols. If he had really had assistants who knew the *Secret History*, he might easily have filled that gap.

When considering the influence of Mongolian sources on Juvaynī’s work, one must consider the author’s unique approach to them. He was not a compiler who merely reproduced the information in the sources. If one compares him with Rashīd al-Dīn, then the text of Juvaynī has fewer facts, but more judgments. It has many panegyrical digressions, rhetorical figures, and more citations from the Koran and other Muslim works. More than anything, he strove to re-work his material, admitting sometimes only isolated extracts from sources, but not indicating exact contexts. All of this makes it difficult to reconstruct Mongolian historical knowledge from Juvaynī’s book though it may at least aid in presenting some idea of how Islamic ideology was used in writing histories in the interests of the Mongolian khans, as well as what historical information obtained from those Mongols was used by our author.

Juvaynī’s work testifies to the fact that his aim included justifying the conquests of Muslim countries from the position of Islam itself using canons of the Muslim religion, and at the same time to render service to the Mongolian rulers in the matter of subjugation of Juvaynī’s compatriots and co-religionists to the might of conquerors. He exalts the Mongolian khans exactly the way his predecessors did vis-a-vis the Muslim rulers. He even depicts the khans as mighty defenders and protectors of Islam. In one place in his book he even awards Möngke Khan the purely Muslim title of *ghazi* (conqueror of infidels) and characterizes him as “the Supreme monarch, the Lord of all mankind, the Khan of all Khans” (entry 89, vol. 2, p. 557).

In order for the proofs he cites to sound more convincing, he resorts to analogies. Referring to a certain Muslim dogma, according to which people ought to be subject to punishment in accord with their sins, Juvaynī compares the Mongolian conquests with those punishments, which according to the Koran were imposed in the past by Allah on people for disobedience to God. In Juvaynī’s opinion, the Mongolian conquerors were the true fulfillers of the will of almighty Allah, who drew them from the “slumber of neglect” and imparted to them all visible signs of power for the sake of punishing Muslims “by the might of the sword” (entry 89, vol. 1, pp. 16-19). Juvaynī finds in Chinggis Khan and his deeds, directed at the merciless defeat of the Muslim countries, a genuine confirmation of the prophecies of almighty Allah, who, as he writes, once said: “Those are my horsemen; through them shall I avenge me on those that rebelled against me.” The author thinks that “nor is there the shadow
of a doubt
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but that these words are a reference to the horsemen of Chingiz Khan and to his people” (entry 89, vol. 1, p. 24). In this fashion, according to Juvaynî, it turns out that the military campaigns of Chinggis Khan against his [=Juvaynî’s] co-religionists/dissenters was a “godly punishment” for their unfaithful actions and that as a result, in that tragic fate which befell the Muslim nations in the period of Mongolian conquests, the guilty parties were not the initiators of aggression, but its victims.

Juvaynî ascribes to the Mongolian khans a special service to Islam, in that their conquests enlarged the limits of its expansion into those countries to which the “True Faith” had earlier not penetrated (entry 89, vol. 1, p.13). There is no doubt that such an affirmation by a Muslim author was produced solely in the interests of the conquerors; Islam in the western part of the Mongolian empire was made use of with exactly the same aims as Buddhism in its eastern regions. Juvaynî the Muslim and hP'ags-pa the Buddhist in fact played one and the same role as apologists for the politics of the Mongolian khans.

Of what sort are those materials in Juvaynî’s work which enable us to judge them as reflecting Mongolian historical knowledge? In the first place, this is information about the history of the Mongols themselves. As for the history of the Central Asian conquests, it was written about chiefly by Persian historians and from the personal observations of the author. Thus the material which interests us consists predominantly of the chapters devoted to the history of Chinggis, Ögedei, Güyük and Mongke. These chapters are written with such knowledge of the matter, they are at times so detailed and concrete that they themselves serve as proof of the author's direct use of Mongolian oral and written sources. Many quotations from speeches and orders of Mongolian khans cited by Juvaynî are impressive in their complete trustworthiness, convincing the reader that they were not invented by the author. One is easily convinced of this after analyzing their content and contrasting them with the corresponding data in other sources.

In Juvaynî's work the history of the Mongolian khans actually displaces the history of the Muslim rulers, which was quite unusual for Muslim historians. In this regard the history is basically laid out along
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the very same lines by which the Mongols themselves set forth the history of their own khans. Juvaynî, who began his work with the unification of the Mongolian tribes by Chinggis Khan, described at great length the history of his wars of conquest, after which he goes over to the history of the successors of Chinggis and their conquests. The difference consists solely in the fact that Juvaynî lays basic stress on the history of the external campaigns of the Mongolian khans, whereas the Secret History chiefly speaks about the internal events in the life of the Mongols and only fleetingly describes the campaigns of Chinggis and Ögedei. But the general outline—internal history plus history of the campaigns of conquest—remains unchanged. It merely assumed a more expanded view under the Persian author.

The author was first and foremost interested in the history of Chinggis Khan, the
founder of the empire. Juvaynî, like the authors of the *Secret History*, begins from the general premise, according to which prior to Chinggis Khan the Mongols "had no chief or ruler. Each tribe or two tribes lived separately; they were not united with one another, and there was constant fighting and hostility between them." (entry 89, vol. 1, p. 21). We may properly regard this idea of Juvaynî's as an expression of the view prevailing among the Mongols of that time about the role of Chinggis Khan in their history. But Juvaynî, when appraising the Mongolian khan, goes further than the *Secret History*, maintaining that Chinggis Khan not only united the Mongols but also, fulfilling the will of Allah, created a world empire. And he spares no effort to extol this empire (entry 89, vol. 1, p. 22).

It may well be that the most interesting chapter of those devoted to Chinggis Khan is the second, in which he speaks of the *yasay* [the laws] of the latter. Judging from the content of this chapter, it is hard to conclude that the author had any direct access to the famed codex of laws, *The Great Yasa*ay. At the root of his information apparently lie oral reports gotten from Mongols. Juvaynî writes that the Great Yasa was proclaimed by Chinggis Khan after his ascent to the throne, that it was written in Uighur script on a scroll, called "The Great Book of Yasas" [Laws] and kept in the "treasury of the chief princes." He further states that every time a new khan ascended the throne, or

a great army was mobilized, or the princes assembled and began to consult together concerning affairs of state and the administration thereof, they produced these rolls and modeled their actions thereon (entry 89, vol. 1, p. 25).

Juvaynî is very brief in depicting events connected with the struggle of Chinggis to unite the Mongolian tribes. However, he does have some curious information about Chinggis's struggle with Wang Khan of the Kereits. He says that at first there was friendship between them, and Wang Khan, admiring Chinggis's bravery and energy, did everything in his power to help the latter. But after Chinggis attained complete power, the sons, brothers and all the retainers of Wang Khan, harboring envy of Chinggis, began to stretch a net of perfidy and treachery about him. Even Wang Khan himself began to grow suspicious of Chinggis Khan and to nurture enmity towards him. Being in no position to move openly against Chinggis, Wang decided to finish him off by trickery. He thought of carrying out an unexpected night attack on the khan and his retinue and began to prepare the realization of his plan. But Kišlik and Bada, in service to Wang Khan, simultaneously warned Chinggis about the danger threatening him. Chinggis Khan at once transferred his place of residence. It is interesting that exactly the same narrative is in the *Secret History* and the *Complete Collection of Histories* of Rashîd al-Dîn (entries 57, §167-170, pp. 128-131; 293, PFEH 13, pp. 57-58; 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 122-124).

But Juvaynî's further account substantially diverges from the testimony of the other sources. In this regard one must remember Juvaynî's important observation that the data about this differ as to whether Wang Khan's adherents returned after an unsuccessful attack on the quarters abandoned by Chinggis Khan or whether they gave chase to him. In our view, this observation casts some light on the character of
the sources used by Juvaynl. It is understandable that he had contradictory information about the course of the battle between Chinggis and Wang Khan. This enables one to draw the conclusion that the peripetia of this struggle were insufficiently known to contemporaries, and that information about these things was conveyed in far from identical form, with different versions accumulating. According to Juvaynl's narrative, Wang Khan, who fell on the camp of Chinggis, but found there only empty yurts, set out in pursuit of him, having troops at his disposal considerably exceeding Chinggis's forces. A fierce battle took place on the Baljuna river, and Chinggis Khan emerged the victor. According to Juvaynl this event took place in 599 A.H. (1202-1203). The names of all commoners and nobles involved are specially listed, and all those mentioned received awards for their participation in the battle. Bada and Kišlik were given the rank of dargan. Some other battles between Chinggis and Wang Khan followed, the latter was routed and beaten, and his wife and daughter fell into the hands of the victor.

Juvaynl has very little on how Chinggis defeated other tribes. He merely notes that when the affairs of Chinggis Khan were flowering and the star of his fate was at its height, he dispatched his emissaries to other tribes, and they subjected themselves to his might. But Juvaynl has one interesting item concerning the famed shaman Teb-Tengri. He writes that at that time when Chinggis had set up his power over the Mongolian tribes, there was one man who went about naked in heavy frost in desert and mountainous places, and when he returned, said: "God has spoken with me, and has said:

I have given all the face of the earth to Temüjin and his children and named him Chingiz-Khan. . . . They [the Mongols: Sh. B.] called this person Teb-Tengri, and whatever he said Chingiz-Khan used implicitly to follow. Thus he too grew strong; and many followers having gathered around him, there arose in him a desire for sovereignty.

One day in the course of a banquet, he engaged in altercation with one of the princes; and that prince, in the midst of the assembly, threw him so heavily upon the ground that he never rose again (entry 89, vol. 1, p. 39).

As is well-known, the same thing, but in greater detail, is related in the *Secret History* (entries 57, §244, p. 176; 293, PFEH 26, pp. 47-48). Juvaynl himself writes that his information about Teb-Tengri he received from "trustworthy Mongols" (entry 89, vol. 1, p. 39), who must be understood to be members of the Golden Clan or the retinue of the Khan, who knew the family secrets of the House of Chinggis. Otherwise the Persian author would not have found out the secret of the killing of the famous shaman. It is also possible that these "trustworthy Mongols" were acquainted with the text of the *Secret History* or with some other copy of a history of the Chinggis clan.

This is also the sole but quite impressive conclusion which, as already stated above, John Boyle drew in favor of his supposition about the possibility that Juvaynl used
some data from the *Secret History*.

The first volume of Juvaynl's work, where he speaks about the sons of Chinggis Khan, contains some valuable folklore data, which is of great interest for understanding peculiar features of Mongolian historical knowledge of that time. Juvaynl cites, for instance, one traditionary tale, very reminiscent of an episode found in the *Secret History* (entries 89, vol. 1, p. 41; 57, §19-22, pp. 80-81; 293, PFEH 4, pp. 120-121). The difference consists merely in the fact that in Juvaynl the admonition about the need for unity and peace within the Golden Clan is ascribed not to Alan-Goa, a mythical progenitor of the Mongols, but to Chinggis Khan himself. The legend quoted in Juvaynl’s rendition states that after uniting all the tribes of Mongolia under his power, Chinggis Khan divided them among his sons, brothers and other members of his clan. Side by side with this he exerted great effort to strengthen unity among them, as well as mutual trust and support. In this spirit he instructed them with the aid of parables. On one occasion, he gathered the members of his clan and showed them, taking an arrow from his quiver, how easily he broke it in two; then he took two arrows and likewise broke them; he added arrow on arrow until he was not able to break them in any way. Then, turning to his sons, Chinggis said, “So it is with you also. A frail arrow, when it is multiplied and supported by its fellows, cannot be broken even by mighty warriors, who in impotence withdraw their hands therefrom. As long, therefore, as you brothers support one another and render stout assistance one to another, though your enemies be men of great strength and might, yet shall they not gain the victory over you” (entry 89, vol. 1, p. 41). Juvaynl further writes that once Chinggis Khan told a tale to his sons about a many-headed snake, crushed by disagreement among its heads, and about another snake which escaped danger thanks to the fact that it had only one head and a thin tail. Such parables, adds Juvaynl, were numerous among the Mongols, and all of them by their content served the purpose of strengthening the unity of the empire divided among members of the Golden Clan; the sense of these parables guided the Mongols during the empire period too, especially under Môngke Khan (entry 89, vol. 1, 42-43).

Hence we learn from Juvaynl that the idea of the need for unity, which first arose in the course of unification of the Mongolian tribes, was later on invoked to serve the task of strengthening the world empire of the Mongolian war lords. And the more the borders of the empire expanded, the more powerful became the striving of its separate parts for independence, and the more sharply became observed the need for overcoming disagreement among members of the Golden Clan and their unification under the aegis of a great khan. Let us note, however, that this idea, no matter whose decree ordered it, had no chance under conditions of that time to become a reality, and to stave off disagreements and violence amongst the Chinggisids.

Skipping the chapters devoted to the campaigns of conquest of Chinggis Khan as of no interest for our topic, we proceed to Juvaynl’s exposition of the history of Chinggis’s successors: Ögedei, Güyüg and Môngke. Whereas in the *Secret History* the history of Ögedei is presented in a very condensed and schematic fashion, in
Juvaynî's book it is treated in some detail (entry 89, vol. 1, pp. 178-239). It is well-known that during Chinggis Khan's lifetime the question of succession to the throne was one of the most acute among his kinsmen. Naturally, for this reason this succession topic became significant as one of the most important in the historical literature of that time. It is treated in detail in the Secret History, and Juvaynî writes about it as well. In this regard, the information communicated by the latter, although diverging in details from the Secret History, is basically close to the Mongolian chronicle. The Persian author, in essence, expresses the same appraisal of Ōgedei Khan's rule as do the Mongolian authors. To judge from the sense and style of exposition, the details of how Chinggis Khan designated Ōgedei as his successor on the throne, are obviously one of the versions widely disseminated at that time (entry 89, vol. 1, pp. 180-183). Comparing Juvaynî's data with the reports in the Secret History and the Complete Collection of Histories, it is not hard to establish that they are common to all.

All sources are in agreement about the fact that Chinggis Khan designated Ōgedei as his successor on the throne

in the presence of all his sons and ordered them not to break his covenants. The sources express in different ways Chinggis's apprehension only in connection with the danger of a struggle over the succession to the throne which might arise after his death. The Secret History, as noted above, has given a clear picture of the skirmish between Jodi and Čayadai, presaging a future struggle for the throne. But Juvaynî says that Chinggis Khan persuaded his sons: "For if all my sons each wish to become Khan, and be the ruler, and not be subservient to one another, will it not be like the fable of the snake with one head and the snake with many heads?" Having designated Ōgedei as his successor, Chinggis Khan ordered his sons to confirm in writing that they were in full agreement with their father's decision and would not oppose it (entry 89, vol. 1, pp. 181-183).

According to the Secret History, all of Chinggis's sons who had participated in this ceremony, swore to their father that they agreed with his decision. Both in Juvaynî and in the Secret History, Ōgedei was elevated to the throne in accord with Chinggis Khan's testament. But the sources do diverge in minor ways touching on these or other specific facts. Let us cite some of these. In Juvaynî, Chinggis Khan's meeting with his sons took place when he grew ill from "an incurable disease arising from the insalubrity of the climate" during his campaign against the land of the Tanguts. However according to the Secret History this meeting took place considerably earlier, even before the campaign to Turkestan. The sources also differ in enumerating the sons of Chinggis—the participants in the meeting (entries 89, vol. 1, pp. 180-181; 57, §255, p. 186; 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 232).

The great quriltai at which Ōgedei was elevated to the khan's throne, is described by Juvaynî in such lively fashion that the author possibly made use of information from those very Mongols who may have been direct participants and eyewitnesses of this event, whom he may have met during the time he was staying in Qara Qorum (cf. entry 89, vol. 1, pp. 185-189).

As for details of Ōgedei's rule, extensively cited by Juvaynî with the aim of
showing the nobility and generosity of this khan, they are for the most part based on court gossip and talk. There is no need to dwell on them.

Juvayni's information about Ögedei's external campaigns is interesting because it contains some geographical names cited in exactly the same form as they were employed in those times by the Mongols, for example: Solongai (Solonqas), Tangut (Tangyut), Qara møren [Yellow River], Etil (Adil/Ejil) [Volga], etc. Likewise expressions such as "The kite that takes refuge in a thicket from the talons of the falcon is safe from its fury" (entry 89, vol. 1, p. 242), directly points to Mongolian sources which the author used.30

The chapters devoted to Güyük and Möngke testify to the fact that the Persian chronicler, moving in the circles of persons intimate with the rulers, had many chances to penetrate the secrets of court life of the Mongolian khans. Particularly interesting in this connection is Juvayni's story about the illegal acts of Ögedei's wife, Töregene qatun, who immediately after the death of her husband seized power in the Empire (entry 89, vol. 1, pp. 239-248)31. This leads us to the thought that the Persian historian was well-informed by his Mongolian "friends" about the ignoble acts of this woman. It is fully possible that with the transfer of power from the Ögedei clan to the Tolui clan in the person of Möngke Khan that secrets of the House of Ögedei became matters of public knowledge, thanks to which Juvayni too was able to secure such information which never would have become known to him if a representative of the Tolui clan, rivals to those of Ögedei, had not come to power.

The history of the khanship of Möngke is in our view the best part of Juvayni's book. If, while writing the history of the first khans it was hard for the author to manage without the assistance of local sources, then when working on this part of the manuscript, he could completely rely on his own observations, as well as on tales of direct participants in the historic events of those years: Argun, Hulagu and others. However, after an attentive reading one can also discover material undoubt­edly based on Mongolian sources. There is reason to assume that Juvayni during his sojourn in Qara Qorum learned a lot from rumors connected with the recent fierce battle for the throne that had concluded not long before. And right in the capital of the empire, located among Mongols, Juvayni could clear up details of how Güyük's wife Ogul-Gaimish, worked against

30 This is what V. V. Bart'old wrote, who cited this proverb and reminded us of another, in the Secret History: "When a sparrow hawk chases a sparrow into a bush, even the bush protects him" (entries 293, §85, PFEH 4, P. 141; 258, p. 313).

31 The information which Juvayni furnishes was borrowed in toto by Rashid al-Dīn (cf. entry 67, vol. 2, pp. 114-118).
mum and Nagu, sons of Giiyug, directed against Mongke, and about the big court trial at which harsh verdicts for all participants in this plot were rendered (entry 89, vol. 2, p. 574-592). From the sources one may conclude that the conspiracy, organized by adherents of the Ögedei clan against Mongke during the time when the latter was being elevated to the throne, was one of the political topics discussed in lively fashion in the higher circles of the Mongolian aristocracy. It is interesting that Rubroek, who likewise visited Mongolia under Mongke Khan, writes approximately the same thing about the plot as Juvaynī does (entry 54, p. 135-136; cf. entry 89, vol. 2, pp. 574-579); Juvaynī's information was later borrowed by Rashid al-Dīn (entry 67, vol. 2, pp. 133-135).

There can be no doubt that Rubroek's information, to an extent equal to Juvaynī's data, is based on Mongolian sources, particularly on oral information received from the Mongols themselves. The similarity of data provided by different authors can only be explained by the common nature of the sources they used.

In his history of Mongke Khan's rule Juvaynī expresses his views on the new chief of empire, who had just sustained a victory over members of the Ögedei and Giiyug clans. Although Juvaynī often quotes the authority of Chinggis Khan, he quite fails to consider that Chinggis specifically promised the khan's throne to Ögedei and not to the Tolui clan. More than that, he strives in every way to prove the illegality of the actions of the Giiyug clan members who were focussed on holding power over the empire in their hands. The author is clearly on the side of the victor. But on the other hand he shares the concern of adherents of the new khan in connection with the fact that the fight for the throne never grew as acute as under Mongke khan. It is no accident that Juvaynī returns three times in his book to the fact that Chinggis Khan admonished his sons of the need to maintain unity (entry 89, vol. 1, pp. 41-42).

In this fashion, in the absence of Mongolian monuments proper of that time, Juvaynī's book can to a certain degree aid us in reconstructing Mongolian historical-political views, which substantially shifted with the transfer of the khan's throne from the Ögedei clan to the Tolui clan. Had Juvaynī been a Mongolian historian on the spot, a descendant of ruling ranks, he would have expressed the same views and cited these same data on the history of Mongke's rule as khan, particularly in those cases when discussing the new khan's fight against his opponents.

[131]

The Jāmi'at-tawārīkh of Rashīd al-Dīn32 and Mongolian Historical Knowledge

One of the important sources for the study of Mongolian historical knowledge in the period of empire is the Complete Collection of Histories (the Jāmi'at-tawārīkh) by Rashīd al-Dīn (1247-1318)—a noteworthy monument of Persian historiography,

32 We have used Rashīd al-Dīn's work chiefly from the Russian translation (see entry 67).
created in 1300-1311. There is no need to write a great deal about this, as it has been well studied by specialists. We therefore merely touch on those aspects of it which relate to the history of Mongolian historical writing.

It is well-known that the initiative to compile a work on the history of the Mongols and other peoples of the world was taken by the Mongolian khans in Iran, Ghazan Khan and Öljteitü. Rashîd al-Dîn wrote that Ghazan Khan gave him the order to compile a history of the Mongols (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, pp. 68-69).

But Ghazan Khan did not live to see the full realization of his idea. The essential part of the Complete Collection of Histories is devoted to the history of Turco-Mongolian tribes and nationalities and was only finished by Rashîd al-Dîn in 1307, under Öljteitü khan. After becoming acquainted with this portion of his work, the successor of Ghazan Khan ordered it preserved by giving the name of his brother to the title of the work; that is why the first part of the Complete Collection of Histories was called “The History of Ghazan” (tarih-i Gazani). Moreover, Öljteitü Khan gave Rashîd al-Dîn an additional commission: to compile a universal history (entry 67, pp. 47-48).

The idea of compiling a universal history must be considered in connection with the policy which the Mongolian ruling class conducted with the goal of subjecting all the peoples of the world to their might. As noted above, the Mongolian khans, who attached great practical importance to history, strove to put it at the service of their own interests. With the formation of the Mongolian empire they presented new requirements to the science of history, namely, for the purpose of establishing Mongolian dominance over other peoples, to unite to
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Mongolian history proper the histories of already conquered nations, as well as of peoples not yet conquered and not yet included in the makeup of the empire; in this connection Mongolian history ought to be established in the center of world history. As a result of these new conditions Muslim traditional historiography underwent substantial changes.

The history of non-Islamic peoples, in particular the Mongols, occupied first place in the historical works of this period, displacing the histories of other peoples to the background. In agreement with this new task the scheme of construction of the Jâmi’at-tawârikh is divided into two parts: the first was devoted to the history of the Mongols and the states formed by them, and the second was a universal history, i.e., a history of the Muslim states prior to the Mongolian conquest, as well as histories of the non-Muslim peoples and states: China, the ancient Hebrews, the Franks, the Popes of Rome, India and the like. The history of peoples conquered by the Mongols occupied a clearly designated secondary place; it was subordinate to the main topic—the Mongolian khans.

Specialists in the field of Oriental studies have noted with complete justification that the Complete Collection of Histories is a unique phenomenon in both mediaeval and Persian historical literature, sharply distinguished from all prior Islamic historical productions by the fact that for the first time an attempt is being made to write a genuinely universal history which incorporates the history of all nations then
known—from the “Franks” to the far west to the Chinese to the far east (entry 178).

Prior to the appearance of this work neither Islamic nor Christian historiography had produced anything similar. Acknowledging the accomplishment of Rashid al-Din in such an innovative approach to history, it is necessary nonetheless to consider that the idea of compiling a universal history belongs to Öljeitii Khan, who desired to have for the needs of his rule a history of all the countries both subject to and not subject to the Mongols. It was difficult to expect from a Muslim author so decisive a departure from centuries of the established tradition of Islamic historiography, had he not been guided by the new political conditions that the Mongolian ruling circles presented to historians.
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It should also be borne in mind that the Complete Collection of Histories is not the work of Rashid al-Din alone. His first investigator and translator, Quatremère, in a biographical sketch on Rashid al-Din prefaced to the French translation of the History of Hulagu-Khan from the Complete Collection of Histories, wrote that such a work ought to have occupied the entire life of a historian, if he were capable of the labor, and in which so many sources in different languages were employed, it could not have been written by one person. He maintained that the history of such countries as China, Mongolia and others must have been compiled by persons from those countries, and Rashid al-Din must have brought into order materials presented by these persons and collated the materials into his book. In this manner his work is in reality the fruit of the activity of a whole group of people (entry 101, pp. xxvii-xxviii).

V. V. Bartol’d in his turn wrote:

Rashid al-Din consciously strove to set forth the historical traditionary tales just as the representatives of the peoples in question had conveyed them, not adding anything by himself and not inserting evaluations of the trustworthiness of individual items. His work thus was not a scientific-historical production in the modern sense, but as a collation of materials holding an absolutely exclusive place in world literature. Neither then nor since has there been such an attempt to collect in one book the tales of universal history, with the participation of all educated peoples of the Ancient World (entry 131, p. 861).

The Russian scholar I. Petrushevskii, who wrote an introduction to the Russian translation of the Complete Collection of Histories, also observed: "Naturally the compilation of such a grandiose and comprehensive work was not within the power of a single person, all the more so when compiling the histories of non-Muslim countries and nations Rashid al-Din desired to be founded on their own sources, and some of those were not available in Arabic or Persian translations. Rashid al-Din needed collaborators—connoisseurs of history of different lands and peoples. . . Thus, the Jami‘at-tawārīkh is the product of an entire collective who worked under the supervision of Rashid al-Din who also in this connection was an innovator—as similar collective works prior to this were previously unknown in Iran" (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, pp. 25-26). We have every reason to maintain that the history
of the Mongols in the Complete Collection of Histories likewise is not the work of Rashid al-Din alone. Reading this history, it is impossible to imagine that a work written by a Muslim historian is before us. If one frees this part of the work from the literary adornments and versified digressions of the Persian author, which had the purpose of praising Allah, or explaining this or that "strange event" in the lives of Mongols, one gets a typical Mongolian history, merely relocated into Persian forms.

In the Complete Collection of Histories it is easy to discover a characteristic early Mongolian style of historical narration, including whole Mongolian expressions and turns of phrase, to say nothing of numerous Mongolian words and terms. The language of Rashid al-Din is not at all typical for a Persian historian of that time; he is simple, laconic and devoid of the florid or pretentious manner so characteristic of the majority of Persian authors, who, as Petrushevskii writes, strove for a refined language of rhythmic prose, overworked metaphors, hyperbole and other literary figures of speech, chronograms, riddles in the form of verse and various literary technical stunts, and pushed an exposition of historical events and facts into the background (entry 67, p. 23). This peculiarity of Rashid al-Din's language, as well as the peculiarity of all his works on Mongolian history, is impossible to explain solely by influence of Mongolian primary sources.

Reading and re-reading this history one involuntarily confronts questions such as: isn't this a simple translation into Persian of some Mongolian original, incorporated into this collection of chronicles about peoples of the world? If it is, then what kind of a Mongolian original was it? When and by whom could it have been written? We find an answer to these questions in A. Z. V. Togan, who informs us that in the Persian and Arabic manuscripts of Rashid al-Din's work, the Favā'id-i sultāniyya [Conversations with Öljeytu Khan], is a statement that the Complete Collection of Histories together with some other works of Rashid al-Din were originally written in Mongolian. Further, Togan writes:

On the ground of the study of Turkic and Mongolian words with non-Persian suffixes and the non-Persian short style of the chapters containing the history and apotheoses of Chingiz Khān, Ögedei Khān and Gūyūk Khān, we can safely assume that the first draft of Jāmi'al-tavārfīx was originally not written in Persian. These chapters apparently go back to a Mongolian version, most probably compiled by Pulad Jinkşank and other Mongol genealogists. In my opinion, Rashīd-al-dīn incorporated that first Mongolian version in a larger Persian version of Jāmi'al-tavārfīx in a literal translation with his own remarks. It was afterwards abbreviated here and there, but, on the other hand, supplemented with the commentaries of Rashīd-al-dīn himself, with verses in both Arabic and Persian. Consequently that monumental history became a multi-lingual affair, which was edited in Persian, Arabic and perhaps also in Mongolian and East-Turkic (entry 285, p. 64).

Not dwelling on all the conclusions of Togan (cf. entry 285, pp. 64-71), we merely consider some of them. Togan expresses a view according to which the
so-called “Mongolian Book” (Kitāb-i mugūlī) mentioned by Rashīd al-Dīn as one of his sources (ibid., pp. 68-70) was the Mongolian original of the Complete Collection of Histories, written by Pulad-čingsang and other Mongolian chroniclers in Tabriz (ibid., pp. 66-68). Rashīd al-Dīn also translated this book into Persian, accompanying the translation with notes and verses. In Togan's opinion, the “Mongolian Book” was compiled on the basis of the Mongolian chronicle, the Altan debter, which Pulad čingsang and his colleagues supplemented with new data on Mongolian history, in particular on the descendants of Chinggis Khan in Iran, in the uluses of Jochi and Chagatai (entry 285, p. 67). Togan finds traces of the aforementioned “Mongolian Book” in the Mongolian names and parallels of proper names in Uighur script, contained in the manuscript of the Shu'b-i panjgāne (in the Topkapi Saray Museum), and likewise in proper names in Uighur script in the Tashkent manuscript of the Complete Collection of Histories (entry 285, p. 71). Moreover, in Togan's opinion, the “Mongolian Book” is quite fully preserved, specifically in the just mentioned Shu'b-i panjgāne. He also writes that miniatures in some manuscripts of the Complete Collection of Histories were made by Mongolian experts under Rashīd ad-Dīn’s supervision. According to Togan's data, the Mongolian vizier employed 20 families of Mongolian and Turkic craftsmen, artists and other artisans (entry 285, p. 71).

It must be said that Togan's proposition that Pulad-čingsang and other chroniclers compiled the “Mongolian Book” has a rather solid base under it. The facts testify that the grand emir Pulad-čingsang was not only a high governmental participant in the Hulagu'īd state, but was also knowledgeable about the Mongolian past and knew all kinds of traditionary tales. All scholars acknowledge that the role of Pulad-čingsang in writing the Mongolian history in the Complete Collection of Histories was considerable. Their opinions diverge only on the issue of exactly what form of aid Pulad rendered to Rashīd al-Dīn. One of the latter's assistants, Shems ad-din Kashani, said that Pulad-čingsang and Rashīd al-Dīn worked together systematically, day in day out, in the manner of master and pupil, and what’s more, the happy emir would relate the stories, and the learned vizier would transcribe from his words (entry 218, pp. 94-95).

There is another opinion, according to which Pulad-čingsang and his colleagues originally wrote the Mongolian history in Mongolian, and Rashīd al-Dīn translated it into Persian. Ghazan Khan himself, the khan who initiated the entire enterprise, could hardly have stayed on the sidelines of this work, he also being an outstanding connoisseur of the Mongolian past and yielding in this sense only to Pulad-čingsang. It is not possible to doubt that he helped Rashīd al-Dīn one way or another. Thus there is every reason to affirm that the contribution of these same Mongols in creating the first part of Rashīd al-Dīn’s work was quite significant.

It seems appropriate to say here a few words about Pulad-čingsang as a Mongolian historian. It is well-known that he was by birth from the Durban tribe and moved in aristocratic circles. His father Yuraki was a court-official (bayūrdī) for
Chinggis Khan, serving in the headquarters of Chinggis's senior wife, Börte-fujin, and was commander of a hundred in Chinggis Khan's bodyguard (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, p. 187). His son Pulad-ningsang held a high position as minister (ningsang) under Khubilai Khan, who later sent him as plenipotentiary representative to Iran, where Pulad arrived in 1286. He enjoyed great respect at the Il-Khans' court, holding the post of grand emir and commanding troops of Iran and Turan. Pulad died in 712 A.H. (i.e., 1312-1313 A.D.) in Arran (entry 101, p. 77, note 95).

The Complete Collection of Histories, besides everything else, affords great interest for us also because it permits us to make judgments to a certain degree about the early Mongolian sources which have not come down to us. As is well-known, the compilers of this work had free access to the secret archives of the Mongolian khans in Iran. Rashîd al-Dîn himself writes:

In early times some of the great figures of the century and the learned parties of the epoch brought [us] . . . [contradictory data] on the circumstances of the conquest of the universe, the subjugation of fortresses and the dominion of Chinggis Khan and his noted clan, and likewise about the beliefs of the Mongolian crown princes and emirs. . . . However century after century trustworthy history [of the Turks and Mongols] was written in Mongolian and Mongolian script, but was not gathered and translated in sequence, in the shape of uncoordinated sections [it was preserved] in the treasuries [of the khans]. From being read by outsiders and [even by their own] good people it was hidden and secret . . . until at the present time when the Shah-in-shah crowns and the throne of Iran . . . were made happy by the blessed presence of the Lord of Islam, Sultan Mahmud Ghazan Khan . . . who [assented] to issue [his] most glorious decree, that the servant of the Il-khan state . . . the compiler of this work . . . Rashîd, a physician of Hamadan . . . was to gather and translate all chronicles about Mongolian origins and the genealogies of all the Turkic tribes who were kinsmen to the Mongols, and diversified tales and narratives about them . . . into a [proper] sequence, setting [everything] forth in irreproachable expression, and introducing those charming damsels of wisdom and thought, begotten by histories and trusty memories [of the people], up to this time hidden under cover of secrecy, into an open arena [where they might be presented] in [all] their glory of [their] revelation, and that which has been shortened or not set forth in detail in these notes, let it be brought up for corresponding correction by learned men and sages of Chinese, Indian, Uighur, Kipchak and other nations, and by [their] aristocratic people, because these [representatives] of all classes of various peoples stand unswervingly in the service of his greatness, especially with the grand emir who commands the forces of Iran and Turan, the leader of states of the world,

Pulad-ningsang. May his greatness be prolonged! In all the parts of the inhabited world he has none equal to himself [in being informed] about the various types of arts, in knowledge about the origins of Turkic tribes and their history, especially [the history] of the Mongols (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, pp. 67-68).

Among the many sources he employed, Rashîd al-Dîn mentions several times
only one chronicle under the name of the *Altan daftar* (the *Altan debter*, the “Golden Book”) (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, p. 180; book 2, pp. 8, 16, 21, 266). Considering that this source, in the words of Rashíd al-Dīn, “was always kept in the treasury of the khans by the great emirs” (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, p. 180), it apparently was the greatest authority on the family history of the Golden Clan.

John Boyle thinks that the *Altan debter* contained material exclusively linked with the origins and genealogy of the Mongols and the Turks, who resembled them, and that it in this fashion represents a prototype of Part One (volume 1) of the *Complete Collection of Histories* (entry 221, p. 3).

To judge from those portions of his book where Rashíd al-Dīn quotes from the *Altan debter*, one may acquire a somewhat more concrete idea about this Mongolian chronicle which has not come down to us. First of all, it is clear that the *Altan debter* contained a history of the ancestors of Chinggis khan, based on early Mongolian historical tradition, according to which the clan of Chinggis Khan goes back to Dobun-bayan and Alan-goa. It is interesting that on the basis of data from the *Altan debter* and other sources, Rashíd al-Dīn determined the approximate date when Dobun-bayan and Alan-goa lived. He writes:

> Although there is no definite date, it will be around four hundred years [back to this clan’s origins, i.e., to the clan of Chinggis Khan, Sh. B.], because from the content of portions of the chronicle which was in the [khan’s] treasury, and from tales of old men grown wise through experience, the following is known: they [Dobun-bayan and Alan-goa, Sh. B.] were [ruling] in the first period of the Abbasid Khalifate and in the epoch of the Samanids up to [our] time (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 8).

In this fashion Rashíd al-Dīn connects the epoch of Dobun-bayan and Alan-goa to the 8th-9th centuries, and one may consider his date for the life of the founder of the Golden Clan as quite probable. As we see, both in the *Altan debter* and in the *Secret History*, the
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Mongolian chroniclers were able to track the origin and genealogy of the Chinggis Khan clan back to approximately the 8th century.

To judge from the fact that when Rashíd al-Dīn expounded the history of the Taijiud tribe anew, several places in the *Altan debter* were cited, one may presume that the chronicle in question contained the most reliable information about this tribe. He writes:

> In some copies of the Mongols’ chronicles they relate the following: The Taijiud tribe arose from the second son of Dutum-Men’en, Nāčin by name and branched off. In the “Golden Scroll”, which was always kept in the khans’ treasury by the grand emirs, one reads [it being] clearly and certainly written that the Taijids came from Charaqaqi-lingum, son of Qaidu-khan. Nowhere does it mention [their] origin from Nāčin. It merely mentions that he fled from the Jilair [tribe] of his brother’s relative Qaidu and [that] together with him they went and settled down on the Onon River. In light of that, apparently, this story [from the cited] text is more justified. Since the Taijiud tribes were numerous, it is possible that the children of Nāčin were confused
with them and received this name. In all likelihood, it [was] this way, otherwise his children and clan would be mentioned somewhere (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 180).

It is clear that Rashid al-Dîn gave preference to the Altan Debert in selecting historical data on Taijiud history. In another place he again emphasizes that the traditional tale as expounded in the source mentioned “is closer to reality and is more reliable” (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 21). Rashid al-Dîn is also right when confirming this. Let us take, for example, the just-cited information from the Altan Debert about the Taijiud clan origins in Charaqai-Lingum and contrast it with data from the Secret History where we read: “Qaidu’s three sons were Bai-shingqor-doqshin [Rashid al-Dîn has Baison-kur; Sh. B.], Charaqai-lingqu [Charake-lingum: Sh. B.] and Chaujin-örtegei [Jaučin: Sh. B.]. The sons of Charaqai-lingqu [Senggûm-bilge, Ambqaqi, etc.] formed the Tayichi’ut clan” (entries 57, §47, p. 83; 293, PFEH 4, p. 125). The agreement in evidence between these two sources is impossible to be considered coincidental; the most reliable historical tradition of the early Mongols is recorded in them.

It is possible that the Altan Debert, reproduced in several copies, was preserved not only at the court of the Il-Khans in Tabriz but also at the court of the Yuan khans in cheng Khanbaliq, where there was also a prime source for historical works compiled and published in the eastern regions of the empire. It is no accident thus that the frequent agreements of data in the Complete Collection of Histories, the Sheng-wu ch’in- lu and the Secret History, is by some scholars explained by the commonality of their sources (entries 241, pp. 472-481; 100, pp. xiii-xv). Louis Hambis, for instance, presumes that the Altan Debert was a major general source both for Rashid ad-Dîn's Complete Collection of Histories as well as for the Sheng-wu ch’in-cheng lu (entry 100, p. 15).

Speaking about the Mongolian sources of the Complete Collection of Histories, it is impossible not to devote attention to the question of to what degree and with what accuracy their evidence is rendered in Rashid al-Dîn's work. Rashid al-Dîn himself gives the best answer of all to this question. In the introduction to the first volume of his work he expresses the interesting thoughts which he had on getting acquainted with these sources, so completely different from his customary Islamic ones. He writes that in the presence of different sources on the history of this or that nation, the historian must collect and take down all their stories and all the information about them kept in their books, as well as that conveyed orally, observing the greatest accuracy possible, because the historian must respect “everything which every nation retains in its oral traditionary tales and stories” (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, p. 50). If the historian arbitrarily changes the content of the sources, then his work is unqualifiedly incorrect (loc. cit.). As to how Rashid al-Dîn himself approached the sources he used, his following words speak clearly: “When this humble [author] received the commission to compile this book, the Complete Collection of Histories, then he laid forth [in it] with no change at all, no alteration or liberties, everything
which he found written in the well-known books of each nation from that which existed among them of popular oral transmission, from [all] that which their authoritative scholars and sages had expounded according to their views" (loc. cit.).

One may conclude from all that has been stated that Rashid al-Din's major task was not only to write an independent historical investigation, but also to compile a handbook of chronicle tales, guided by primary sources. This assignment, as well as the orientation of his work, is precisely expressed in the title, the Complete Collection of Histories. His work is so true to the letter and spirit of the sources that even then, when it seemed to the disciplined mind of the Persian scholar that this or that early Mongolian traditionary tale was dubious, even contradicting the truth, he was not so bold as to ignore or disparage it.

Since the Mongolian sources in the Complete Collection of Histories did not undergo basic changes, Rashid al-Din's work is an excellent source for us to reconstruct Mongolian historical knowledge. There is reason to assume that the Complete Collection of Histories praised Öljeytü Khan precisely because of its adherence to early Mongolian historical traditions.

One might say that the Complete Collection of Histories is the most valuable collation of historical knowledge accumulated by the Mongols in the course of centuries. From this it is evident that in the Empire period the Mongols actually possessed a rather developed system of historical knowledge, recorded in Uighur script in various copies, chronicles and annals, kept as a routine matter by the Mongolian khans in various parts of the Empire. What indeed was the content of this knowledge and how was it used in the period of Mongolian history which we are reviewing? To answer this question, let us turn to our source and conduct an analysis of it.

Considerable attention is devoted in the Complete Collection of Histories, as we have already stated, to the early history of the Turks and Mongols. This portion of the work is entirely based on ancient Mongolian historical traditions. Let us note that the data of the Complete Collection of Histories serves as supplemental witness to the close affinity and even common nature of Turkic and Mongolian historical traditions. With the development of the Mongolian Empire and consequent reinforcing the might of the ruling circles of the Mongols in different parts of the Empire, interest naturally arose in the origins of tribes, leaders, khans and princes.

There fused together different types of legends and traditionary tales which had as their goal to prove that the tribes indicated and their aristocracy came from common ancestors. In this way there was created one of the most ancient varieties of Mongolian historical creativity—the genealogy of tribal leaders and khans. Thenceforth, concentration of power in the hands of a single-state all-Mongolian khan, a quantity of genealogical histories already in existence took the place of a history of a single ruling clan; the history of this clan indeed became a kind of general history of all the tribes and clans, and took on the shape of a history of the khan common to all Mongols.

Thus, as was stated above, there arose the history of the Golden Clan of the
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Chinggisids. A much fuller reflection of this history we find in the Complete Collection of Histories, which cites brief genealogies of almost all the well-known Mongolian tribes and clans, defining the degree of their kinship according to a genealogical principle based on the concept of descent from a common ancestor. But in the Complete Collection of Histories all the clan and tribal histories are cited not for glorifying their own ancestors, but to disclose the common theme—the history of the Golden Clan. To these ends the chief attention of the author is riveted on the Chinggis Khan period, at a time when still earlier history was inadequately illumined.

In the Empire period, when the rule of the Golden Clan was the general law in Mongolia and beyond its borders, this question attained exceptionally great importance: the matter of which tribe had a truly Mongolian origin, and to what degree and whether this consisted in kinship, and what degree of kinship, with the Golden Clan. It is important to note that this question had not merely scholastic meaning but a deeply practical one as a means of perpetuating power in the hands of the Chinggisids.

From the Complete Collection of Histories it is evident that the historical tradition of that time had not divided the Mongolian tribes into Darlekins and Niruns by accident. In the words of the author of the Complete Collection of Histories, “by the term Darlekin Mongols we have in mind the Mongols in general, and by the term Nirun Mongols, we mean those who descend from the chaste loins of Alan-go” (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, p. 152). Rashid al-Dīn definitely says that at the root of this division lay oral historical tradition (ibid., p. 153). He cites the story in which the origin of the Darlekin Mongols, as noted above, goes back to descendants of the legendary progenitors Nukuz and Kiyan, and from these latter the tribe of the Kiyad to which Dobun-bayan belonged, takes its origin,
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as does the tribe of the Qurulas, which had given Dobun-bayan his wife in the person of the celebrated Alan-go.

The origin of the Nirun tribe is likewise founded on an ancient legend, which Rashid al-Dīn did not dare to disparage, because already at that time it had become official history, a part of the narrative describing the extraordinary origin of the Golden Clan. “These are tribes,” we read in the Complete Collection of Histories, “Mongolian tribes which have come from the revived clan of Alan-go, because Alan-go was of the Quralas tribe, and the Quralas tribe is a branch of the Darlekin Mongols. Alan-go, who had no husband, was impregnated by [a beam of] light, and three sons of hers turned up on earth, and those who arise from the clan and descent of these three sons are called nirun, i.e., “loins.” This is an allusion to chaste loins, because they were conceived by light. Tribes which arose from the clan of Alan-go and these three sons are of three kinds: the first are those who come from Alan-go’s clan unto the sixth generation, Qabul Khan. They are all called nirun for the reason mentioned above. Exactly the same is true for the brothers of Qabul Khan. His children and their descendants are jointly called “the Nirun tribe” (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, p. 172).

Besides the Darlekins and Niruns in the Complete Collection of Histories another
group of nomadic tribes is singled out, called "Turkic" by Rashid al-Din and are linked by him according to features not of ethnic affiliation, but of their way of life and social features. These tribes in their turn are divided into two groups: to the one belong the Turks, whom those surrounding them call "Mongols," and to the second those whose language is close to Mongolian, but who did not keep up any ties of relationship with the Mongols. Tribes of the first group each had of old their particular designation, special leaders and emirs, and from each of them there arose new clans and tribes. The tribes of the second group likewise in the past had each their own lord and leader, but they, as already stated, did not enter into ties of relationship with the Mongols.

The division by the author of the Complete Collection of Histories of the Turkic tribes into two basic groups reflects, in our view, the struggle of individual clans and tribes of Mongolia for dominance, for rule over the country, and for power in the state which had been put together. Viewing this struggle from the position of the victor-clan, i.e., the Golden Clan, Rashid-al-Din likewise divides its participants into a group of close kinsmen and a group of alien ones, sometimes even tribes and clans of different races, although the overwhelming majority were ethnically all close one to the other and related. The long battle for hegemony concluded, as is well-known, with the complete victory of the Niruns and the tribes which derived their origin from them.

To the state which the victors created there were joined both voluntarily and by compulsion the remaining tribes who, having lost their independence, gradually also forfeited their former ethnonyms, and finally assumed the name of their conquerors, the name of "Mongol." Hence the ethonym Mongol became the native name not only of the clans and tribes ethnically related to the Golden Clan but also of many others, including Turkic-speaking peoples (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, p. 77).

In making the division of the Mongols into two groups, the Darlekins and the Niruns, they were observing, in our opinion, two ideas characteristic of Mongolian historical views in the 13th and 14th centuries. One of these was to ground the origin of leading Mongolian clans and tribes in one common root, and serving here was the legend already mentioned by us about the origin of the Darlekin Mongols from the progenitors Nukuz and Kiyan. In the period when the Mongols were being united into a single state and in the time of the Empire this idea had a very topical significance. Chinggis Khan and his successors strove in every way to assure the rule of just their own clan. As for the second idea, this had as its intention to provide a foundation for the rise of that clan from the ranks of which Chinggis Khan came; and the wide-spread legend about Alan-goa served to gain this end.

The second book of the first volume of the Complete Collection of Histories convincingly testifies to the fact that in the empire period Mongolian history was essentially reduced to the history of the Golden Clan of Chinggis Khan. Let us dwell on the Complete Collection of Histories. This genealogy is interesting because of what substantially distinguishes it from the one given in the Secret History. For instance, whereas in the Complete Collection of Histories Dobun-Bayan, Alan-goa's husband,
husband, is located on the family tree right after Qali-Qarču, in the *Secret History*, between Dobun-Mergen (Dobun-Bayan) and Qarču (Qali-Qarču), there are an additional two names, viz., Borjigidai-Mergen and Torogoljin-bayan. In other words, according to the *Complete Collection of Histories*, Dobun-Bayan is the son of Qali-Qarču, but according to the *Secret History*, he is the great-grandson of the latter (entries 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 9-10; 57, §3-4, p. 79; 293, PFEH 4, pp. 118). Attention is also drawn by the fact that in the *Complete Collection of Histories* there are none of those interesting details about the father and grandfather of Dobun-Bayan, which are in the second-named source. There is a considerable divergence to be noted in both chronicles also in the details connected with the descendants of Alan-goa, in particular about Bodonchar, to whom the clan of Chinggis Khan properly goes back. In the *Complete Collection of Histories* there are none of those details about the life of Bodonchar which are formed in §§23-44 of the *Secret History*; it merely says laconically that "Bodonchar, the third son of Alan-goa, was in his time the representative and master of many Mongolian tribes. He was extremely respected and brave" (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 16).

The sources give the names of Bodonchar's son in different ways: according to the *Complete Collection of Histories*, Bodonchar had two sons, Buka and Buktai; and according to the *Secret History*, he had three sons: Jaradai, Ba'aridai and Barin-Siretū-Qabiči, or Qabiči ba'atur. Both sources diverge on details of the biography of Dutum-Menen, a descendant of Bodonchar. The *Secret History* says Menen-Tudun (Dutum-Menen) is the son of Qabiči-Ba'atur, a son of Bodonchar, but the *Complete Collection of Histories* says he was the son of Buktai, a son of Bodonchar. According to the *Secret History*, Dutum-Menen had seven sons, given by name (entries 57, § 45, p. 83; cf. 293, PFEH 4, p. 125), but in the *Complete Collection of Histories* he has nine sons, of whom eight were killed (their names are not given), and the sole one remaining alive was Qaidu-khan, to whom the clan of Chinggis Khan goes back (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 19). It is interesting that according to the *Secret History*, Qaidu-qan is not the son of Dutum-Menen, but his grandson, i.e., the son of Qaci-Kūlūg, who in his turn, was the elder son of Dutum-Menen. The *Complete Collection of Histories* cites interesting information about the wife of Dutum-Menen, one Munulun, as well as about the Jalair tribe, but these facts are not in the *Secret History*.

After the data about Qaidu-qan in the sources, there are no serious discrepancies in the exposition of Chinggis Khan's ancestors, but in return the information in the *Complete Collection of Histories* is vastly fuller than in the *Secret History*. This speaks to the fact that Rashid al-Dīn and his assistants had at their disposal more detailed materials on the history of the closest ancestors of Chinggis Khan; these materials likewise were incorporated with no substantial changes into the *Complete Collection of Histories*. In this source, for instance, there are exceptionally interesting data about Qabul-qan, Qutul-qan and others (entry 67,
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vol. 1, book 1, pp. 35-38), entirely borrowed from tales and traditionary tales of an historical-epic nature, which are in places mentioned in that same source.

From all that has been said, it is evident that Rashid al-Dīn and his Mongolian colleagues, being unaware of the Secret History, used some other version of the genealogical history of Chinggis Khan, which was differentiated from the Mongolian chronicle not only in details but also by a far greater fullness of biographical data about Chinggis’s ancestors. Judging from the fact that this part of the Complete Collection of Histories frequently cites the Altan debter, it is possible to suppose that the genealogy of the early Mongols was borrowed by Rashid al-Dīn from just this chronicle. In this event we must admit that the genealogy shown in the Altan debter was vastly fuller than that in the Secret History.

Particularly great attention is paid to the history of Chinggis Khan himself in the Complete Collection of Histories. This portion has the advantage of differing from the others by being based on written Mongolian sources. Rashid al-Dīn himself observed that the basic part of the Chinggis Khan history was written in accord with what “is quoted in Mongolian annals and chronicles by years” (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 73). In another spot he states: “Since prior to the 41st year [of his life] part of his life consisted of childhood years, and part took place under agitated conditions of life and the chroniclers do not know enough of the events of that [time], they have written the chronicle of these forty-one years briefly, and they relate [also] in detail year by year only the last period of his life, we shall write [this portion] relying on the same means [of exposition]” (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, p. 74).

Hence it is clear that the history of Chinggis Khan in the Complete Collection of Histories is wholly based on Mongolian sources. In addition, the testimony of Rashid al-Dīn gives us valuable data to judge the condition of Mongolian historical knowledge in the 13th-14th centuries. From these words one may conclude that genuine annal-writing took shape in Mongolia after Chinggis Khan had established autocratic power, and that prior to this, history among the Mongols was predominantly oral.

Thus, the birth of written history in the shape of chronicles was the most direct form connected with strengthening the power of the pan-Mongolian khan, i.e., on the creation of a single Mongolian state. And in the period of the Empire nothing remained for historians other than to base themselves on the already attained level of development of historical knowledge. All the initial divisions of the Complete Collection of Histories which we have reviewed, as in the Secret History, contain no fixed chronological dates, and the exposition of early Mongolian history in these divisions is based predominantly on oral history materials. Beginning with the Chinggis Khan period, in the Complete Collection of Histories, as in the Secret History chronicle, a trustworthy chronology appears. In this regard, and this is very important, it is completely based on the ancient Turco-Mongolian system of counting years according to the twelve-year animal cycle. Even the names of the years are given in Mongolian, beginning with the Khulugune year, that is the Mouse Year, with which the twelve-year cycle begins, and ending with the Kaka year (modern
yaqai “pig”), the final year of the cycle. As for the Islamic system of counting years, it played a secondary role.

All events connected with the history of Chinggis Khan are grouped according to the years of the twelve-year cycle: from the Kaka year (1152-1153) to the following Kaka year (1164-1165); from the beginning of the Khulugune year (1167-1168) to the end of the Bars [Tiger] year (1194); from the end of the Toloi year [Hare: 1195] to the beginning of the Kaka year (1203), and so on. Events in the life of Chinggis after he attained 41 years of age are cited in Rashid al-Dīn’s work year by year. This is actually an orderly chronology, entirely based on the Mongolian system of reckoning years (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 249-259).

In the period of the Mongolian Empire, the realm of application of calculating years according to the twelve-year animal cycle considerably expanded. It penetrated far to the west. As I. V. Zakharova observes, the twelve-year cycle became the governmental system of calculating years within the bounds of the Mongolian state (entry 151, p. 33). It is interesting [148] that the system mentioned continued to exist among Central Asian peoples for a considerable time after the collapse of Mongolian rule. For instance in the 15th-16th centuries, the historians Sharaf ad-Dīn (died 1446), Mir-khond (born about 1433) and his son Khondemir (born about 1475) continued to employ it (entry 223, vol. 7, p. 60).

The presence in the texts of completely or almost completely identical information in the Complete Collection of Histories and the Secret History raises no doubts. They permit one to establish with no great effort the Mongolian source of many facts cited in Rashid al-Dīn’s work, especially about reports by emissaries, khans’ decrees, epic relations[?] and so on. Agreement in word and topic of this sort in the data in both works is more than likely explained by the common nature of their sources and the persistence of historical tradition. The Secret History and the Altan debter [The Golden History] which arose under identical historical conditions, on the basis of a common historical tradition and which were dedicated to one and the same topic, could not but have a great deal in common.

Finally, the compilers of the Complete Collection of Histories, having abundant material at their disposition that contained all the information which the Mongols had accumulated up to then, were able to create a thoroughgoing and quite comprehensive narration. From this it can be seen that the Mongols of the 13th-14th centuries were masters of a sufficiently full history of their country, which was reduced to two main topics—the history of Chinggis khan’s struggle to unite the Mongolian clans and uluses under his power, and the history of his wars of conquest and those of his successors.

The histories of these wars of conquest in the Complete Collection of Histories occupy enormously more space than in the Secret History. This is understandable. The compilers of the former had at their disposal infinitely greater wealth of materials, in the first instance from Muslim sources. We do not enumerate these sources as they are commonly known. It is however necessary to note that when the Complete
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*Collection of Histories* expounds on the history of Chinggis Khan’s wars of conquest and those of his successors; it reveals the effect on it of Mongolian geographic and ethnographic knowledge of that epoch. The greater part of the ethnonyms and toponyms are given in this work in Mongolian
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with Mongolian sound-values: Jurje (Jurcid), Nangyas (China, Chinese), Kara-Kitai, Kara-Jan, Tangut (country and people), Kaščan, Si-gin (see this chapter, note 3), Tun-kin (see this chapter, note 4), Urgench (Gurganc - Khwarezm), Chamčiyal (Ča-bčiyal, Chinese *Chü-yung-kuan*), Shara-Muren (the Yellow River in China), Sindh (the River Indus) and so on.

We have already spoken *supra* about how Mongolian exposition of history was often accompanied by various admonitions and exhortations, as well as by decrees ascribed to Chinggis Khan and written in prescribed form of language, often in rhymed verses. The *Complete Collection of Histories* is no exception in this regard. In the third and last section of the book there are cited numerous Mongolian parables, sayings and *biligs* (admonishments) (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 259-266); there can be no doubt that they were taken from Mongolian originals which, unfortunately, have not survived.

From Rashid al-Dīn's data it is evident that Chinggis Khan, striving to establish firm order in his domains, not only employed old customs and laws, but also created new ones, directed towards enforcing the khan's power over Mongols in general. In this regard the legal terminology used in Rashid al-Dīn's work is of interest when he clearly cites the differences between such concepts as *yūsūn* (custom), *biligs* and *yāsā* (laws). There is reason to think that on the basis of these legal concepts which reflected the juridical creativity of the Mongols, there arose the distinguished Mongolian codes of laws, the *Great Yasa*. It is difficult to explain why Rashid al-Dīn nowhere mentions this codex. However, considering the fact that numerous Mongolian practices and laws are cited in his work one may assume that the codex was known to him and used to some degree.

The third part of the *Complete Collection of Histories* contains information about events which became known to the author “separately and in no order from all sorts of persons and from various books” (entry 67, vol. 2, book 2, p. 259). These testify that side by side with the history of the Golden Clan of Chinggis Khan the compilers of the *Complete Collection of Histories* had at their disposal materials about the organization of the Mongolian army and biographies of military figures (entry 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 266-281). Employing the Mongolian terms, Rashid al-Dīn divides the Mongolian army into three parts: *gol* (the center), *barungar* (the right flank or wing) and *jungar* (the left flank or wing). In this part too he lists the names of commanders of myriads, thousands and hundreds, as well as their biographies.
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The second volume of the *Complete Collection of Histories* includes a rather detailed and reliable history of the four sons of Chinggis Khan (Ögedei, Jöchi, Čayadai, Tolui) and their children. Attention is focused on the histories of these sons and the grandchildren of Chinggis who assumed the khan's throne—Ögedei, Güyük, Möngke and Kubilai. The contents of the second volume bear witness to the fact that thanks to the extent of the spread of writing and under the influence of other countries, the compilation of historical records became a widely practiced phenomenon in the empire. The successors of Chinggis Khan, for completely understandable reasons, displayed keen interest in the actions of their noted predecessor (entry 67, vol. 2, p. 101).

The history of each khan was written according to a unified scheme and consisted of three parts: the genealogy, the history of the khan's rule, *biligs* and sayings of the khan. Such a scheme far better answered the historical notions of the Mongols than did the Muslim historiographic traditions.

The genealogies in Rashid al-Dīn's work are of great interest for us. There is no doubt that such detailed genealogies could not have been created save with the participation of Golden Clan members. One may assume that as early as under the sons of Chinggis Khan the assembling of genealogical tables came into Mongolian historical practice in connection with the intensification of the struggle among the descendants of Chinggis for rights and privileges, determined in the first place by the degree of kinship with the Golden Clan founder. We are inclined to think that the tradition of compiling genealogies which later received the name *ger-iün üye-yin bičimel* (genealogical records) goes directly back to the sons of Chinggis Khan. It is even more likely that the genealogical tables found in the second volume of the *Complete Collection of Histories* are Persian versions of Mongolian originals; so much do they remind one of the later genealogical tables of Mongolian tayijis.

Pride of place by the descendants of Chinggis Khan is held in the volume by their history of rule as khan. On examination of the history of Ögedei Khan this principle is already observed, as in the history of Chinggis Khan in the first volume: events are set forth in strict chronological order according to the periods of the twelve-year cycle (*ibid.,* pp. 20-43). It must be acknowledged that to evince the sources which Rashid al-Dīn employed in writing the history of Chinggis Khan's descendants is rather hard, inasmuch as in the whole second volume as opposed to the first there is a complete absence of citation from source. However, bearing in mind the content, character and linguistic-stylistic oddities of the information conveyed, it is possible to distinguish what belongs to Mongolian sources and Mongolian historiographic traditions, from

---

33 When creating the original Russian edition of this book, I was not able to use the excellent English translation of this volume made by John Andrew Boyle, as it was published in 1977, viz., John Andrew Boyle, *The Successors of Genghis Khan, translated from the Persian of Rashid al-Dīn* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977).
the Muslim sources and traditions.

Being guided by what has been said, we arrive at the conclusion that the description of Ögedei's ascent to the throne, the detailed information about his campaigns against China and other countries, were drawn from Mongolian historical records, and information about the death of Tolui-noyon, strongly reminiscent of analogous data in the Secret History, is undoubtedly based on Mongolian historical tradition, on surviving oral tales (entry 67, vol. 2, p. 24). Rashīd al-Dīn made wide use of Juvaynī's work. The third part, which contains a narrative about the personal qualities and cohorts of Ögedei Khan, is almost entirely based on Juvaynī's materials (cf. entry 67, vol. 2, pp. 48-64 and 89; vol. 1, pp. 201-236).

The chapters devoted to Joči, Čayadai and Tolui-noyon bear witness to the fact that the Mongols had at their disposal considerable data on the history of Chinggis Khan's sons who became rulers of different uluses. In such wise, the history of the Golden Clan branched out into a history of the four sons of Chinggis Khan. Materials from this part were likewise based on Mongolian sources. In places Rashīd al-Dīn himself indicates that these data were taken by him from oral communications "from persons of reliable veracity" (entry 67, vol. 2, p. 78).

After the history of Chinggis Khan's sons the author expounds the history of Guyūg, Môngke, Khubilai and Timur (Öljetii khan). The most valuable information relates to the history of these last three khans. On analyzing their history, especially that of Môngke khan, it is not hard to note that the corresponding portion of the book was written by Rashīd al-Dīn under the evident influence of the views dominant at that time among the upper-class Mongolian lords,
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which had been determined in the first instance by the tensions of a battle for the throne among the descendants of Chinggis Khan. Rashīd al-Dīn, like Juva[y]nī, expressing the official viewpoint of the Mongolian rulers, saw it as his duty to ground the legality of deeds by members of Tolui's clan, who sustained victory in the struggle for ascension to the throne against the clan of Ögedei khan (entry 67, vol. 1, pp. 133-139).

The histories of Khubilai and Timur are of the greatest interest for our topic. They convincingly show that people in Iran knew the history of the Yuan Empire well, thanks to the vigorous cultural and scientific exchanges between the two main parts of the Empire during the reign of Khubilai Khan.

The history of Khubilai Khan was written according to the same scheme as the histories of the other khans, but it is noticeable that it is divided up both according to the nature of the information communicated and as to the manner of exposition. Whereas in the preceding chapters, especially those which were devoted to the history of Mongolian campaigns in the West, one can detect the influence of Muslim historical literature. In these chapters there is no doubt that there is a clearly expressed Mongolo-Chinese style of historical narration, which had grown traditional at the Chinese court of the Mongolian Khans.

It is well known that when writing the history of the Mongolian khans in China Pulad-ëingsang played a large role. Rashīd al-Dīn himself spoke of him as a man
“who has precise information on the condition of that state” (entry 67, vol. 2, p. 173). In the portion of the Complete Collection of Histories being discussed, along with the history of the khans themselves, special heed is devoted to the lives and actions of the ministers and other companions of the khans, to historical-geographic information about China, and to the governmental-administrative structure of the Yüan Empire. It is evident that all these data were extracted by Rashid al-Din not from Muslim sources, but from Mongolian and Chinese ones. The history of the first two Yüan khans in the second volume is distinguished by the reliability of its information and by the orderly nature of the exposition. By way of an example one may point out the description of the internecine struggle between Khubilai and his brother, Arig-Buqu, for the khan’s throne. Rashid al-Din would not have been able, naturally, to shed light on the course of this struggle in such detail and so reliably, had he not had first-class sources at his disposal.

By way of summing up, we are anew convinced that the historical information communicated by the Persian historian, is more reliable and detailed than the events described in works nearer to his time, irrespective of what part of the empire they originated from—in Persia or in the Mongolian empire to the east far from its center. Rashid al-Din’s work is not completely uniform, either as regards its content or its style of narration. It presents a clear-cut example of a unique synthesis of differing historiographic traditions of its time. There is reason to see in it a monument of Persian historiography from the epoch of Mongolian rule in Iran, unique through its syncretism and embracing in it the most varied elements, which had never earlier been contiguous—Muslim, Mongolian and Chinese. If Mongolian sources and traditions predominate in the first two volumes of this work, then in the third, dedicated to the history of the Hulagaid state, the traditions are exclusively of Muslim origin. Even the Mongolian year-reckoning, which the author observed so strictly in the first two volumes, has been withdrawn from it in the third volume and the events are rendered on the basis of the Muslim system of chronology. Considering that in this last volume there are almost no data which could assist us in reconstructing Mongolian historical knowledge, if we do not count the brief genealogies prefacing the history expounded for each of the Il-Khans, not in essence differing from those already reviewed by us, we see no need to continue an analysis of the Complete Collection of Histories. The third volume testifies further about one important aspect of

34 With regard to the sources for writing this part of Rashid al-Din’s work, John Boyle writes the following in his translator’s introduction to The Successors of Genghis Khan, pp. 11-12: “The great khan’s representative, Bolod Chingsang, whom Rashid had consulted on the early history of the Mongols, seems to have been his chief authority on contemporary China. The accounts of Qubilai’s campaigns are plainly based on Mongolian rather than Chinese sources. They lack the topographical and chronological precision of the Yüan shih and contain many obviously legendary or folkloristic elements. They are valuable nonetheless as illustrative of the Mongol point of view and add considerable detail and color to the somewhat laconic narrative of the Chinese chronicles.”
the links between Mongolian and Muslim historiographic traditions of that era: Mongolian historiography, although it appeared to enjoy official status, must have finally yielded to the prevailing position of a mature local historical school, and this process accelerated as the degree of assimilation of the Mongolian conquerors into a Muslim cultural-ethnic milieu also accelerated.

We have in this fashion determined that Mongolian historiographic [154] activity during the time concerned proceeded under the specific conditions during the existence of the world empire. Though having forcibly united the most diverse peoples; this activity did not develop in the same way in Mongolia itself, but only more or less far from its borders. Under these conditions Mongolian historiographic traditions were in closest contact with the three great historical schools: the Buddhist, the Chinese and the Muslim. As a result of this convergence there appeared a number of original historical works which related to Mongolian historiography proper as sources, containing sufficient material for us to gain hints about Mongolian historical knowledge of those times. Of the three historical traditions we have named, only one, the Buddhist, sank deep roots in Mongolia, and was appropriated, continued and developed by the Mongols. How this took place will be related infra.

Although in the Empire period rather intensive historiographic work did continue, it exercised no substantial influence on the further course of development of historical knowledge in Mongolia. With the fall of the Empire, as noted above, Mongolian contacts with Chinese and Iranian historiography were broken; in China and Iran national historiographic traditions again gained the upper hand, and historical works created at the courts of Mongolian rulers in China and Iran were lost to the Mongols. The basic stuff of the most valuable early Mongolian historical monuments, carried by the Mongolian war lords into alien lands, remained buried there in secret storehouses and with very rare exception were lost forever to the local cultural milieu.

After the fall of the Empire, the existence of which was so costly for Mongolia and the Mongolian nation, historical knowledge in the country temporarily fell into decline. Much effort was required for future historiographic tradition in Mongolia to arise and spread, but this indeed took place under other historical conditions.
PART TWO

MONGOLIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY
IN THE POST-IMPERIAL PERIOD
(15th–17th CENTURIES)

CHAPTER ONE
MONGOLIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY
FROM THE 15TH TO THE FIRST HALF OF THE 17TH CENTURY

I. Historiographic Traditions of the Mongols in the 15th Century

Mongolia, still not recovered from the ruinous consequences of the long years of
wars of conquest, entered onto a lengthy period of political disintegration and of
internecine wars, which were prolonged until the end of the 16th century. This con­siderably worsened the already difficult position of the country, which in the empire
period had become a half-forgotten region.

Having returned to their native steppes after expulsion from China, the Mongols
seemed isolated from the external world, having forfeited all links with their kins­
men, who became scattered across Eurasia in the period of military expansionism.

Commerce with the settled population of a number of countries, including China,
at first was quite curtailed, and this placed the Mongolian economy in a very diffi­
cult position. Conditions were likewise unfavorable for serious literary activity, al­
though literacy and corresponding traditions were not totally forgotten. At this time,
Boris Vladimirtsov wrote, "the old 'tales' were neglected beneath the sounds of
bogatyry byliny, the Buddhist sutras were forgotten beneath the rumble of the sha­
man's drum, old manuscripts vanished during a time of incessant raids and bloody
internecine wars, and monuments of Mongolian culture and monuments of literary
creation irretrievably perished." (entry 142, p. 97).

Such a situation could not fail to be reflected in the historiographic activity of the
Mongols. It can be no accident that up to this time there has not been found a single
whole historical work created in Mongolia during the "dark period"—from the end of
the 14th to the end of the 16th centuries.

It is true, even after noting some loss of interest in history by the Mongols, that
one does not need to lapse into pessimistic exaggeration as some researchers have
done (for example, entry 180, p. 371). It is appropriate to remember in this regard
Vladimirtsov's words "At the present time we can note that the Mongols during the
dark period of their history, i.e., during the time which elapsed from the fall of the Yuan dynasty to the period of renascence in the second half of the 16th century, were able to preserve much of their cultural attainment. Thus we can affirm that the production of literature and writing among the Mongols was not interrupted, nor was the literary tradition of the Yuan dynasty period” (entry 145, p. 15; cf. also entries 186, pp. 137-139; 233, p. 14). By way of confirmation one may also cite a few concrete facts. Chinese sources, for instance, testify that the Mongols in the 15th and 16th centuries sent to the Ming court documents written in Mongolian, and that the Ming dynasty representatives sent their missives to the Mongolian princes and rulers in the same language (entries 184, pp. 139, 168, 177; 255, p. 218; 145, p. 15, note 3). Even among the Mongols who remained within the confines of China, measures were executed to maintain written traditions. According to data in the Ming shih-lu [Veritable Records of the Ming Dynasty], as early as 1390 a school was established in the border region of China, in which Mongolian was taught (entry 225, p. 169). In Ming China in the sixth year of Hsüan-t’i (1431) there appeared a new edition of a four-language (Chinese/ Sanskrit/ Tibetan/ Mongolian) collection of Buddhist works, in which the second part of the collection contained a Chinese translation of the sutra, and a preface in Mongolian (entry 233, p. 14). However, one must acknowledge that the absence not only of historical works relating to the 15th-16th centuries, but as well of direct indications of sources verifying the existence of similar works during the time in question. This remains an indisputable fact. The attempt of Walther Heissig to prove the existence of some Mongolian historical works during the period under review on the basis of Tibetan sources must be considered unsuccessful (ibid., pp. 14-15). The “Red Annals,” mentioned by the Tibetan author Gos-lo-tsa-ba gZon nu dPal in his work, the Blue Annals, is not the Mongolian Ulayan debter as Heissig thinks, but a Tibetan composition written by Kun dGa’ rDo-ije in 1346 and published in 1961 in Sikkim. It is not hard to be convinced of this after comparing the two Tibetan works. But more of this infra.

As for the Mongolian Ulayan debter, to judge from Zhamtsarano’s data, it did not appear in the 15th century, but considerably earlier, possibly even under Chinggis Khan or soon after his death. Heissig’s opinion that a Mongolian source mentioned in the Tibetan work The Clear Mirror of the History of the Kings during the period which we are surveying, can likewise not be free of dispute; the year which Heissig proposes as a date for the compilation of this work, 1508, cannot be accepted unequivocally. It must be acknowledged that there are no data in the Tibetan sources which confirm the presupposition according to which the historiographic creativity of the Mongols in the “dark period” was not curtailed. In the case in question, it is better to turn to other sources, first of all to the Mongolian.

It is well-known that as a rule Mongolian chronicles are noted for being compilations. This is why it is possible to find in them a lot of material transferred from other sources without substantial change. These materials afford great interest not only for studying the historical process, but also for the development of historical
knowledge. As a striking example we may point to Lubsangdanjin’s *Altan Tobdi*. This chronicle, although it does belong to the pen of a definite author, is not, as Father Mostaert correctly observed, an original work; it is a collection of texts which the author has borrowed from various sources (entry 73, p. xii), i.e., a recognizable compilation of data from the *Secret History*, the *Altan Tobdi Anonymous* and others. The author is so faithful to the letter and spirit of his sources, that his work can serve as material to study the historical knowledge of the Mongols of those periods to which his sources relate. The same may also be said about other Mongolian chronicles of this time.

Mongolian chronicles of the 17th century set forth the history of the so-called minor khans of Mongolia in considerable detail. But what were those sources from which the authors extracted material? It is scarcely probable that the chroniclers were able to recreate the actual course of history of the 15th-16th centuries solely on the basis of tales, traditional tales and legends. It would be more correct to presume that there were some sort of written sources available to the chroniclers, which they used as the basis of chronicles. In this connection one must pay heed to Vladimirtsov’s opinion: “Sayang Sečen and the authors of the Altan Tobdi and ‘Radloff’s History’ [= the Šira Tûnjî: Sh. B.] undoubtedly used not only oral narrations of an epic character; at their disposal also were written monuments, which in the bulk of instances have not come down to us” (entry 145, p. 16).

If such be the case, then in the works named by Vladimirtsov there may appear material enabling one to appraise the situation of Mongolian historical knowledge during the time in question in its general outline. Such materials actually exist. Among those in the first degree are sections of 17th century chronicles devoted to the period of the so-called minor khans and which reveal some characteristic features of the Mongolian historical outlook in the 15th century. But it is necessary to remember that after the fall of the empire historiographic activity of the Mongols, reverted to its beginnings, to those times when the links of Mongolia with the outside world were quite limited and were not distinguished by firmness and stability. As a result Mongolian historical views were basically defined by factors of social-economic and political life. It is quite evident also that these views show no traces of Buddhist influence, although already at the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th centuries this influence had not only reestablished its position in Mongolian historiography, but had also become all but completely dominant within it.

The history of the “minor khans” was not subjected to a Buddhist reworking even by those chroniclers who were faithful to the Buddhist world-concept. This is apparently explained by the exclusive devotion of the authors to the spirit and letter of the sources, as we have already noted. The materials at our disposition testify that in the 15th-16th centuries the pre-imperial historiographic traditions came to be actively reestablished, at least those corresponding to the beliefs and style of life of Mongols at that time. The works of historians of the 17th century likewise show that
the authors displayed an interest not only in the early history of the country, not merely in a history of the Golden Clan, but also in contemporary issues. The rather good information about events of the more or less distant past of their country, the historians of the 17th century could only have inherited from their predecessors, the historians of the 14th and 15th centuries, from which it follows that the views of these historians could in no wise have seriously diverged from the views of their colleagues who had lived and created in the "dark period."

There is a greater basis to assume the opposite: that in the 17th century historians received from their predecessors information about such events which scarcely could be obtained from any other sources. Let us cite as an example information about the flight of Toyon Temür from China and his celebrated "lament." The content of this "lament" compels one to doubt whether this text actually belongs to Toyon Temür, and even whether the text was contemporary to him. A "lament" of such content, it seems to us, would appear only after the death of a khan, and in no way later than the beginning of the 16th century. This "lament" does afford a certain interest in a historical sense. It is an epilogue of unique form, in which the khan's lips vividly express the disheartening aftermath of the existence of the empire of the Mongolian khans.

As to the historical knowledge of the Mongols in the 15th century, one may judge entirely from 17th century chronicles. The character of this material testifies that in the period of the country's disintegration no noticeable qualitative changes occurred in the creativity of historians. History in both the pre-Imperial and the Imperial period was created for the most part through the mouths of narrators in the shape of traditionary tales, legends, epic tales, and only later were they written down. One should be clear about the epic character of the materials analyzed by us in chronicles of the 17th century. These sources had earlier mingled with literary elements. In historical works of this epoch artistic efforts continued to play an important role. But chief among these was history, the exposition of genuine historical events, the activity of khans and princes. The historical nature of chronicles and annals of the period being described is expressed by the fact that they strictly observe a chronological principle of narration according to the years of reign of khans, beginning with the first successor of Toyon Temür and finishing with Ligdan Khan; the years of birth and rule of each of them is noted, although rather often, it must be said, these years show up in quite different ways. A major deficiency of these works is, however, the absence of dating of events being described, which lowers their historical value in comparison with the Secret History.

It is, of course, difficult, on the basis of the material which we have, to speak about the historical views of the Mongols of this period as being fully articulated

---

1 The different versions of the "Lament of Toyon Temür" are found in many Mongolian chronicles; the oldest variant of it, as it seems to us, is preserved in the Šira Tuyuji (cf. entry 70, pp. 55-56, p. 142).
and clearly expressed, but it is impossible to say of them that the Mongols were generally indifferent and uninvolved with events in their time. *Au contraire*, these works of the 17th-18th centuries give heavy emphasis to the histories of the inter-necine wars. This testifies to the fact that it was precisely that issue which disturbed the Mongols, and was for them one of the most urgent crises they faced. But keeping in view that the authors of historical works of that time frequently expressed their relationship to the events being described by them, and sometimes even wrote about them, sometimes contradicting each other, we must, when wishing to explain the real views of historical actors and the ideological stances of the historians, analyze the works of the latter with special exactitude.

In historical works of that time one not infrequently finds direct speech on the part of participants in the events, which imparts to the narration a special vividness and picturesqueness, and lends an air of veracity to the events reported. For us too these are of particular interest, insofar as they permit judging the views of historical actors and their contemporaries.

Let us cite an example. Expounding the history of wars between the Eastern and Western Mongols (the Oirats), most historical chronicles point to their origin from an incident connected with Elbeg Khan, the first of the “minor khans,” who at the instigation of his retainer, Quqai Daiyu of the Oirats, slew his own son (according to other accounts, his blood brother) with the aim of taking to wife the wife of the slain man, the beauty Öljeitü yoa-bigici (entries 70, pp. 58-59, 142-3; 72, pp. 69-70, 157). This action by the khan is sharply judged by the victim’s wife, who with indignation says to the khan, “Do Heaven and Earth consort together? Do the lofty Qans behold their daughters-in-law? Has your son [i.e., of Elbeg Khan; Sh. B.] Diigureng Temiir Qung Tayiji died? Has the Qayan become a black dog?” (entry 72, p. 69, p. 157). The unknown *Šira Tuuyiji* author explains the khan's action by saying that “suddenly a Shimnus, an evil spirit, entered his heart” (entry 70, p. 59). This event also served here, as the authors affirm, as cause of all the subsequent events: the khan himself was slain, power in his country fell into the hands of the Oirats, and lengthy wars began between Mongols and Oirats, which gave rise to a very nasty period of feuds and disintegration in Mongolia.

It must be observed that our sources clearly and definitely express a negative reaction to everything which weakened the central power of the khan, destroying unity in the country, and which aided the rise of conflicts and wars with representatives of the local aristocracy. At the same time they display sympathy and compassion for those khans and princes who strove to overcome the disunity of Mongolia, and strove to reestablish its unity and strengthen the central power, so that peace and the order necessary for it would be established.

One of the most important ideas in historical works of the period being described was a striving for references to history and ethical norms to justify claims to the khan’s throne by representatives of the Golden Clan of Borjigids, who claimed exclusive rights, and decisively and categorically rebuffed
claims of all other pretenders, especially from amongst the Oirat aristocracy. This reveals rather clearly the Great-Power attitude of the Eastern Mongolian rulers.

A basic form of Mongolian historiographic activity in the 15th-16th centuries was compiling genealogical histories of the noblest families. These genealogies were subsequently a major source for authors of the 17th century who wrote the genealogical history of the Mongolian khans and tayijis of the 15th-16th centuries. The genealogies referred to were also used by Chinese and Persian historians. Of particular interest to us are the works of Persian authors, inasmuch as at the time they were written they were very close to the compilers of genealogies of khans and princes in Mongolia, which enables us to judge the character and content of these works. Surprisingly, the earliest data about the genealogy of the first successors of Tuyon Temür we find in the Persian historians of the 15th-16th centuries.

Honda Minobu has particularly studied the genealogy of the post-Yüan Mongolian khans from the data in Persian historical literature created at the court of Tamerlane and his successors. He writes that one may approach the works of the Persian authors with confidence, considering that they used quite reliable sources (entry 240, pp. 232-233). Contrasting the data of the Persian historians with the indications in Mongolian sources convinces one that the Mongolian genealogical records of the 15th-16th centuries are rather precisely reflected in the works of Timurid historians. First among these was Nizám al-dín Shāmī, who wrote in 1401-1404 by direct order of Tamerlane his well-known work *Zafar-nāma*, in which he enumerates, along with the famous predecessors of Tuyon Temür, seven of his successors in the following order:

1. Khan tayizi Yüliktü (Mong. Khan Tayiji Biligti);  
2. Ayūshīrūdārā (Mong. Ayusuirdara);  
3. Düqüz Timūr (Mong. Tuyus Temür);  
4. Yisūdār (Mong. Yisudar)  
5. Anka (Mong. Engke [Jorjytu]);  
6. Alyak (Mong. Elbeg [Nigulesküi]);  
7. Alji Timūr (Mong. Öljeiyıtū Temür).

The Mongolian khans, successors of Tuyon Temür, are also enumerated by another Timurid historian of the 15th-16th centuries, Sharaf ad-dīn Alī Yazdī (Khwan-damīr). Let us observe that Khondemir (died in 1535-36) in his *Habīb al-siyar*, lists not seven but thirteen khans in Mongolia in the 15th-16th centuries, supplementing the list of Nizám al-dīn Shāmī with the following names:

1. Kun Timūr (Gün Temür);  
2. Uruk Timūr (Uruk Temür);  
3. Ilchī Timūr (Ilchī Temür);  
4. Dältäy (Dalbay, Delbeg);  
5. Ürdäy (Oyaradai);  

It must be said that information about Mongolian genealogy in the works of Per-
sian historians has a host of important merits, although likewise having some deficiencies, distortions and inaccuracies. Among the undoubted merits must be included the information that the internecine war in Mongolia which began after the fall of the Yuan empire took place at first not only between Eastern Mongolia and the Oirats, as is frequently written in Mongolian chronicles of the 17th century, but also between two branches of the Golden Clan, the descendants of Khubilai Khan on the one hand, and the descendants of Arig-Buqu on the other. In this fashion, the old enmity between these two groups of Chinggisids, which had quieted down after the defeat of Arig-Buqu, turned up with new force after the descendants of Khubilai Khan were driven from China.

This struggle took on a particularly fierce character in connection with the attempts of Toyon Temür and his closest successors to lay a foundation in Mongolia itself, where the descendants of Arig-Buqu, obviously, enjoyed great influence. There are grounds to assume that opposition on the part of representatives of the Arig-Buqu clan for a long time gave no opportunity to the khans from the Khubilai clan to return to the capital of the country, Qara Qorum, compelling them to be satisfied with the steppes in the eastern part of Mongolia. It is hard to imagine that the descendants of Arig-Buqu missed the opportunity of taking advantage of the difficult position of the old opponents of their ancestors—Khubilai’s descendants. In this regard one fact conveyed by the Persian sources deserves attention: according to these sources, for 45 years from Togus Timur (died 1368) to Tayisung (ascended the throne in 1433), both belonged to the Khubilai clan. On the khan’s throne of Mongolia there were at least four representatives of the Arig-Buqu clan: Yesüder, Engke, Delbeg and Oyaradai and, perhaps, Gün Timür; two from the Ögedei clan: Kuei-li-ch‘ih, Adai, and two from the family of Khubilai: Elbeg and Öljëiti Temür (entry 240, pp. 247-8). Characteristically, all these khans, descendants of the Khubilai clan (Toyus Temür, Elbeg, Öljëiti Temür, Tayisung), were slain by the Oirats, who had supported the descendants of Arig-Buqu.

As we can see, the Persian sources contain valuable information that is in neither the Chinese nor the Mongolian historical works. This information the Persian historians could only have secured from Mongolian sources which, however, did not come down to us and remain unknown to science. Such sources did not have to be written ones. They might have been oral, in some way having been transported from Mongolia to Iran.

Some scholars maintain that materials from Chinese sources on the genealogy of Mongolian khans of the 15th-16th centuries were likewise borrowed from Mongolian sources. Father Serruys contends (entry 279, p. 8) that the genealogical list of the descendants of Dayan Khan in the Pei-lü fêng-su by Hsiao Ta-heng was rewritten in Chinese transcription from Mongolian genealogical notes, similar to the one which contains the genealogy of the Ordos princes and was reproduced by Sayang Sečen in his Erdeni-yin tobči. Hence, a detailed genealogical table, contained in a Chinese work about the history of Mongolia which was cited, can give a picture of the nature
of genealogical notes compiled in the period in question in the noble houses of Mongolia. We do not see any need to specially dwell on the data of this source, inasmuch as it has been studied by Father Senuys and published by him.

With the sharp decline in prestige of the khans and the increase in independence of individual local lords, it was inevitable that the history of the khans, which personified the history of the country, the people, the state and the empire, would lose its earlier significance. The history of the khans gradually was reduced to genealogical lists of princes who drew their origins from the Borjigids. By testimony of the sources, the genealogies of the Mongolian princes in the course of time were converted into bare lists of names. Such lists have no particular historical value.

II. The Birth of a Genealogical and Church Historiography
(Second Half of the 16th Century to the Beginning of the 17th Century)

The Historical-Cultural Situation in Mongolia and the Revival of Mongolian Historical Writing

During the second half of the 16th century there appeared some signs of growth in the political and cultural activities of Mongolian society. This increase is viewed by a number of scholars as “the Mongolian revival” (entries 144, pp. 23-25; 145, p. 15, in the French translation, p. 18; 150, pp. 9-10, English translation, pp. 5-6; 233, p. 11). But when speaking of a “revival,” they scarcely imagine that Mongolia during the time in question was undergoing anything similar to the Renaissance epoch in medieval Europe. In our opinion, they merely wish to note some new trends, which had not existed in the preceding 150 to 200 years, when the country was in a decline of its economy, culture and other areas of social life. At the root of the fact that scholars have called this a “revival,” there lies a taking notice of efforts to unite the Mongolian lands, on the one hand, and for the spread of Buddhism-Lamaism on the other.

As is well-known, at the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th century the extended internecine battle of the Mongolian rulers was crowned by the victory of Golden Clan members. In the years when such influential khans as Batumöngke Dayan Khan, Tūmen-Jasaytu Khan, and Ligdan Khan reigned, active attempts were undertaken to surmount the disintegration of the country, to reestablish its unity and affirm a solid centralized power for a khan who was a descendant of Chinggis Khan. The cessation of internecine conflicts and the strengthening of central power had favorable effects on the economic position of Mongolia as well, because to no small degree it enabled opening barter markets with China.

Natural under these conditions was an awakening Mongolian interest in the fate of their country, in its ideology,
Indications of this revival showed up most forcefully in the spiritual sphere of life in society. The spread of Lamaism in Mongolia at the end of the 16th century meant inculcating the classic bases of Buddhism in its Lamaist variety into social life.

As is well-known, the Buddhist tradition in Mongolia was not completely interrupted by the fall of the empire. Contacts with Buddhist centers in Tibet were supported by certain Mongolian rulers even after the empire perished, especially in regions adjacent to Tibet and China. Moreover there is evidence that acquaintance with Lamaism took place considerably prior to its official acceptance and its adoption as the single religion of all Mongols. It is indisputable and commonly recognized that never earlier had Buddhism in Mongolia had such meaning for the whole nation as it took on with uncommon speed after its adoption by Altan Khan. This is how one can explain the unanimous opinion of the Mongolian chroniclers that the rule of Altan Khan in South Mongolia and of Abatai Khan in Khalkha was the pivotal point in the spread of Lamaism throughout all Mongolia, as a result of which shamanism, which had for many centuries if not indeed millennia occupied the dominant position in the spiritual life of the Mongols, quickly faded into the background.

There is no doubt that the spread of the new religion in Mongolia was accompanied by notable events in the realm of culture. Buddhism was closely bound up with the ideology and culture of ancient India, which had given rise to and nurtured it. Every place to which it was disseminated became a conduit not only of early Indian religious traditions but also of Indian cultural values. The spread of Buddhism in its Tibetan form had to bring to life elements of Indo-Tibetan antiquity along the Mongolian steppes as well. Buddhism came to Mongolia in the shape of an active cultural force, bearing with it "a higher culture and a splendid cult; its adherents were ready to become both reciter-scribes (baysī) and physicians (emōi) and portenders (jayayadi), i.e., were able in full measure to furnish everything which the earlier lamas and shamans had, but in addition, surpassed them in many ways:

on the one hand they bore cultural skills, they spoke against bloody sacrificial offerings and barbaric customs, they contributed to the development of writing, and on the other, they created "miracles," they appeased the former evil geniuses (ongyud), they introduced rites and processions earlier unseen, they conferred every possible kind of initiation, they said that the noyans were rulers owing to good deeds in prior rebirths (entry 145, p. 184; in the French translation, pp. 237-238).

It is clear that the adoption of this new religion, which had ousted primitive shamanism, enabled the Mongols to acquire one of the most ancient cultures of the Orient. Vladimirtsov wrote: "The church of Tsong-kha-pa, and at the same time Tibet along with it, created for the Mongols a concentration not only of religious but of every kind of culture among them. In this respect not solely among those occupied with monastic life, there was disseminated a knowledge of Tibetan language and literature, Tibetan Buddhism brought to the Mongols its science, schools, views, attitudes and superstitions, transmitting what they themselves had borrowed from
Henceforth, Buddhism-Lamaism came to play a decisive role in the formulation and development of Mongolian culture. There appeared monasteries, and attached to the monasteries were schools, which acted as hotbeds of culture and centers for preparing cadres for the Lamaist church. In creating its own schools, the church in Mongolia was unable to avoid introducing some elements of the secular knowledge which it had inherited from early India. Having placed this knowledge at the service of its own interests, the church in Mongolia assumed the role as preserver of Indo-Tibetan antiquity amongst the Mongols.

The content of all the academic disciplines taught in the monastery schools and which were named the “five major” and the “five minor” sciences, all save one, the study of Buddhism itself, consisted of elements of the secular education of ancient India. A significant phenomenon in the cultural life of the Mongols of that time was the rebirth of Mongolian script and literature, connected predominantly, especially at the outset, with translations of canonical literature. The facts testify that instruction of youth in the Mongolian national script occupied at that time an important place in the system of monastic education. In the colophon of a Mongolian translation of the work \[168\] Sitatapatra-dharani, for instance, it is communicated that among the pupils of Ayushi-gushi were several kiya (retainers), from whose midst arose Sečen-dayičin-kiya baysi, one of the two scribes who executed the well-known inscription on the cliffs by the Khalkha Čoytu Tayiji.

In the spread of literacy the so-called home schools (gerin suryaul) played a considerable role. The Chinese traveller, Hsiao Ta-heng, who visited South Mongolia during the time in question, gives information about them (entry 45, p.8; cf. translation, entry 108, p. 141). There is some information regarding how the Mongols put their children under the tutorship of a baysi to learn reading and writing. He says that private schools together with the monastery ones played an important role in preparing the first members of the clerical intelligentsia, from whom outstanding figures of Buddhism emerged as well as translators, connoisseurs of literature, history, law and language. They are the ones who executed a complete translation of the Kanjur from Tibetan into Mongolian; indeed, they laid the foundation of Mongolian genealogical-clerical historical writing.

It has now been established that the Kanjur’s translation into Mongolian began long before Ligdan Khan’s reign, but was completed under him. There is reason to assume that individual parts of the Kanjur had been translated as early as the Yuan dynasty, and were used by translators under Ligdan. True, we do not yet know exactly how many of these parts there are, nor the nature of their reworking by translators and editors during Ligdan's time. Following Vladimirtsov (entry 143, p. 222),

---

2 The five major sciences were grammar, logic, art, Buddhist teaching and medicine; the five minor sciences [were] astrology, poetics, the science of words, prosody, and mechanical arts (craftsmanship).
Heissig proved on the basis of Mongolian translations made prior to Ligdan which he had discovered, that the majority of Mongolian translations of the Buddhist canon made prior to Ligdan, at the time when the Mongolian Kanjur was compiled, had already been translated (entries 234, pp. 101-116; 237, pp. 71-87; 238).

The Mongolian chronicles Bolor Erike and Altan Erike inform us that a group of 35 translators under the direction of Gunga-Odser completed a translation of the Kanjur into Mongolian in one year, having begun it in 1628 and finishing it in 1629 (entries 232, p. 41; 234, pp. 101-102). It is perfectly obvious that such a short period of time to carry out this work is unthinkable, unless the translators had at their disposal ready-made translations of the greater part of the Kanjur. The work of translators under Ligdan Khan might well have come down to matters of technical editing. Heissig presumes that 1,161 works in the Kanjur, not counting other religious books, were translated into Mongolian in the course of 50 years at the period ending the 16th and beginning the 17th century (entry 232, p. 101). This bears witness to a truly grandiose translational productivity, which reached its apogee under Ligdan Khan, when there was compiled a Mongolian Kanjur in 113 volumes, written “in gold and silver on blue and beryl paper”.

When studying the history of the Kanjur’s translation into Mongolian, especially when attempting to get acquainted with the nature of the original versions of this translation, great interest is afforded by hand-written Mongolian texts of the Kanjur which are preserved in the library of St. Petersburg University and in the National Library in Ulaanbaatar. Vladimirtsov observed that “hand-written Mongolian Kanjurs or manuscripts were written in the middle of the first half of the 17th century, when as everyone knows, the Mongolian Kanjur or manuscripts going back to the above-mentioned also arose” (entry 144, p. 38). He further informs us that “in the library of Leningrad University there is a copy of a hand-written Mongolian Kanjur; it is known there are additional copies which belong to the Mongolian Learned Committee and to some Buddhist monasteries of Buriatia and Mongolia” (ibid.).

This important observation by the outstanding scholar and Mongolist long remained beyond the ken of researchers. Only recently did Heissig and Kasyanenko make the first serious attempts to research the St. Petersburg hand-written Kanjur. On the basis of studying the colophons of the first five volumes, Heissig came to the conclusion that the version in question actually goes back to the time of Ligdan Khan and that the Peking xylographic edition of the Kanjur from 1718-1720 is just another edition with some minor linguistic and editorial changes of the Mongolian Kanjur which had been compiled by the editorial commission under Ligdan Khan in 1628-1629 (entry 238, p. 15). Kasyanenko made and published an excellent cata-

---


logue of the manuscript Kanjur of St. Petersburg University. She pointed out that the manuscript Kanjur belonged to the first half of the 17th century.

As regards the hand-written Kanjur belonging to the National Library of Mongolia, it is far from complete. It has no more than some 50 volumes. Preliminary acquaintance with these tomes makes it possible to conclude that the Kanjur in question both

by its structure and by the content of the colophons substantially differs from the xylographic Kanjur. Only after a minute comparative study of the Leningrad and Ulaanbaatar Kanjurs will it be possible to discover whether they are two copies of one and the same original, or actually different versions of a hand-written Kanjur going back to the time of Ligdan Khan. However there is no doubt that the Ulaanbaatar manuscript Kanjur is not a copy from a xylographic edition; it is linked to the original version of the Mongolian Kanjur. For this reason infra we shall draw attention to those colophons in the Kanjur which were written by the Mongolian translators and in which there is information affording interest to those seeking to understand Mongolian history in the period being examined.

The end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th centuries was characterized by a considerable growth of Mongolian interest both in literary occupations and the phenomenon of an enormous literature in Mongolian, predominantly it is true, in translation. It is quite understandable that the general rise of political and cultural life in the country at that time could not but evoke a growth of interest likewise in the historical past of Mongolia.

Beginning to Establish a Genealogical and Buddhist Church Historiography: The First Historians

The recovery of Mongolian historiographic work at the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th centuries rested on a unique renascence, on the one hand of early Mongolian historic-political traditions, and on the other of much closer contacts with the Indo-Tibetan religious-historical school.

At first the historians reworked their historiographic heritage in the spirit of the new religious and political ideas which had accompanied the translation of the basic historical-religious works of Buddhism into Mongolian. Among the numerous translators, many broadly educated for their time, were not a few outstanding connoisseurs both of Mongolian antiquity and Buddhist literature. It was just these people who began to lay the foundations of a new genealogical Buddhistic historiography in Mongolia. Some of them translated Buddhist canonical treatises,

which enabled formation of new Mongolian historical outlooks, and others not only translated sutras, but accompanied the translations with specialized colophons in which they subjected to review some important aspects of their country’s history

from the perspective of a new Weltanschauung. There also were translators who became authors of the first independent historical works written in the spirit of Buddhist religious-historical literature.

Not a single one of any finished historical work that might be confidently related to the years Altan Khan ruled, has come down to us. However, sources were preserved which enable one to judge the drastic changes which occurred in Mongolian historical thinking upon the rise of the new religion. The earliest known source of this type is a document, known as the Law of Altan Khan, preserved only in a Tibetan translation and written in a Tibetan shorthand difficult to read (gšar-yig). This manuscript was discovered by R. O. Meisezahl in the Liverpool Museum and then published by him in the journal Zentralasiatische Studien (entry 256).

Unfortunately the publication indicated contains no information about either the law or the manuscript.

We succeeded in deciphering the Tibetan shorthand with the aid of Lama Luvsandultem (from the Gandan Monastery in Ulaanbaatar), who at our request rewrote the entire manuscript in ordinary Tibetan writing (gzab-yig). It then became clear that the manuscript contains many errors, both orthographic and other, which make it difficult, at times virtually impossible, to reconstruct the Mongolian original. Nonetheless the manuscript does give a definite impression of this document. It may be maintained that it represents a quite mediocre Tibetan translation of the Law of Altan Khan not preserved in an original. It is indubitably a unique monument of Mongolian law which survived (not the original but in a translation) from the time of Altan Khan.

But its value does not lie in that alone. It also contains valuable information that to a certain degree sheds light on Mongolian historical outlooks of this epoch.

In the opening part, which is a brief historical introduction, it says:

The Word of Altan, King of the Dharma, rebirth of Aryabala, Supreme among Victors and Protector-God of all living creatures of the six kinds. There are none among sentient of the six kinds who would not be connected with one another through relationship. In this regard we cite an extract from the words of the Teacher, Buddha. “My teaching will be spread in the following fashion. It will spread from north to north.” Thus, the northern country is Tibet, which is Vajrasana. It once was a dark territory. There was born the Dharmaraja Srong-btsan-gampo who once and for all put Tibetan subjects on the path of well-being through the two types of laws. To the north of Tibet is the country of Mongolia. The Dharmaraja, Altan the Bestower of Alms, who clearly indicated the path to well-being for all people who were in pitch-darkness, not distinguishing good deeds from sin, and bSod-rnams rgya-mtsho, the

---


5 Vajrasana is one of the fundamental Buddhist locations.
rebirth of the High Omniscient [Buddha], reborn as a teacher, have taken trouble for the sake of spreading doctrine to all the nine lands. . . . There exist two kinds of laws which have been disseminated throughout all states: the Law of Dharma, similar to a silken cord, is the indestructible Vajra, and the Laws of the Ruler, similar to a golden yoke, omnipotent by its greatness. Of these, the laws of the ruler, which are great and small depending on to whom they are intended, are the following: to observe thoroughly these great and small laws by all leaders of the forty hoshuuns and five aimaks of Mongolia. If one neither knows nor observes [the laws], then one cannot escape decisive punishments on the basis of the two types of laws, according to the prescriptions of the God of Death. To be known by all unambiguously!” (entry 256, pp. 268-269).

From the quotation cited it is clear that the Buddhist conception of history, which arose as is known first under the Yuan dynasty, was reborn with renewed vigor under Altan Khan, who himself was advanced to the rank of Dharma-raja. The basic topic of history again becomes the history of Buddhism, a history of its spread from India into Tibet and Mongolia. Most interesting of all, however, is that we encounter here the already well-known concept of “the two principles of power,” which is formulated in almost these exact same words,

which we reviewed earlier in the White History. As we shall see below, the concept

6 Vajra – a symbol denoting the stronghold of power

7 The portion quoted reads as follows in Tibetan: . . . rgyal-ba thams čad kyi mthog tu dbang bskur ba rigs drug yongs kyi skyabs gnas nor bu padma gang la gang’dul gyi skur sprul pa althan čhos kyi rgyal po ‘i bka’/rigs drug ‘di dag pha ma gyur pa med čin/de’i phyir ston ba yang dag pa ‘i bka’ las kyang/nga yi bka’ bstan gang la gang ‘gyur mams byang phyogs n’as byang phyogs su rgyas pa ‘gyur ües pa rdo rje gdan de ŋid kyi byang ni bod yul mun pa’i gling/de la čhos kyi rgyal po srong btsan sgam po žes par sku sprul nas bod ‘bangs rnam sugs gnis kyi lam las gtan gyi bde ba la ‘khod pa de yin/bod yul rdo rje gdan de y i byang ni gnas di yin/de la kyang dge sdig gi blang dor mi šes pa’i mun ba’i smag rum du sems čan mams la phan bde’i lam gsal bar ston par mdzad pa althan čhos kyi rgyal po sbyin bdag gi tshul dang/thams čad mkhyen pa mhog gi sprul sku bsod nams rgya mtsho bla mar sprul/gang la gang dul gyi phyogs b’cu kun tu bka’ drin gyi khyab pa mdzad/sems čan thams čad phan bde yid brtan gyi bde ba la ‘khod par mdzad pa sogs čung ig brjod pa de yin/da cha lugs gnis las/chos khrims dar gyi mdud pa mi büig pa’i rdo rje/rgyal khrims gser gyi gnā’śing brjod čhen pos yangs pa’i rgyal kham s kun thu khyab pa gnis las/rgyal khrims gyi gtn khrims čhe phra gang la gang ‘gab di lthan bkod pa/khyod sog po sde rigs bzi’i ‘ču’i mgo byas mgo lnga sde rigs čhe phra thams čad blo yul du nges pa bsig/gal srid ma nges pa dang nged khyad bsod kyi bya ba byas par gyur na gsin rje čhos kyi rgyal po ‘i bka’ bzin lugs gnis kyi tsa ra drag po byed nges pa yin pas/kun gyi sems la nges gsal gdab pa bsigis. Compare this with the following phrases from the “White History”: Čhos khrims dar gyi mdud pa mi büig pa’i rdo-rje/rgyal khrims gser gyi gnā’ tuing brjod čhen pos yangs pa’i rgyal kham s kun thu khyab pa gnis las...; Ūnen nom-ün jasa gkib-ün janggiya metü aldersi ügei, kündü qayan-ú jasa al-tan-u baryły-a metü ebdersi ügei qoyar-yosun...
in question henceforth dominated all subsequent pre-revolutionary Mongolian historical writing.

For another early source permitting one to judge Buddhist influence on Mongolian historical-political thought in the period under survey, one may consider the *Golden Beam Sutra*, the *Altan gerel-tu* (Skt. *Suvannaprābhāsottama*). (For the complete Mongolian title, consult entry 13). Scholars have provisionally fixed the 3rd or 4th century as the time when this sutra first appeared. From data in the colophon it is apparent that the Mongolian translation was ordered by Altan Khan himself in 1579\(^8\) (entry 234, pp. 102-105).

The special interest of Altan Khan in the *Altan gerel-tu* sutra is not accidental. At that time he was vigorously working to reintroduce Lamaism from Tibet\(^9\) (entry 44, p. 254). The *Altan gerel-tu* sutra is thought to be a sermon preached by Buddha himself, intended just for doctrinal rulers, and for this reason it is still named the *Royal Book* (*Qajan-u sasdir*, in Tibetan *rgyal po'i bstan bcos*, in Sanskrit *rājàśastra*). Chapter XII, titled “The Royal Shastra; the Vow of the Ruler Deva,” presents the theoretical basis for divine right and the obligations of kings. It explains why the king is the “Son of Gods” (Skt. *Devaputra*), and indicates how he is supposed to rule the state.

\(^8\) I am not quite sure that the *Altan gerel-tu* was newly translated at the time of Altan Khan. In addition to Heissig, Čoyiji in Inner Mongolia asserts that this sutra was translated into Mongolian in 1577, referring to the same colophon of the Copenhagen manuscript of the *Altan gerel-tu* (Čoyiji, *Gudayar dalai blama-luya ayuljaqu-yin urdaqi Altan qayan ba Tübedün burqan-u sasin* [Altan Khan and Tibetan Buddhism Prior to Meeting the Third Dalai Lama], in *Mongol sudulul-un medegelel*, No. 3 (1996), p. 20). The colophon of the Copenhagen manuscript does not actually speak of the translation of the sutra, but rather about its being published by the block-printing (xylographic) method. Scholars have understood and interpreted the lengthy colophon of the Copenhagen manuscript in different ways. The expressions *tamaya čowołyaju* or *qabtasun-dur ariyun-a čowołyaju* . . . are to be understood as meaning “to write down” or “written on tablets,” being wrongly transcribed as *tamaya čuylayaju* or *qabtasun-dur ariyun-a čuylayaju* (see *Catalogue of Mongol Books, Manuscripts and Xyloglyphs*, by W. Heissig, assisted by Charles Bawden, Copenhagen 1971, pp. 204-205). As I have observed elsewhere, these old Mongolian expressions should be understood as “had engraved signs” or “had engraved signs on wooden blocks” in order to print from these woodblocks. As far as I understand, the colophon of the Copenhagen manuscript of the *Altan gerel-tu* sutra gives us three important bits of data: first, the whole text of the sutra was engraved on wooden blocks (tablets) in the *ding ulayan Үker Jil*, or the Red Cow Year (1577). Second, the sutra was printed in the Yellow Sheep Year (*uu qonin jil*, 1583), and third, the printed sutra was sanctified by way of blessings from the Mongolian Sayin Erdem-tii ardjar in the Ape Year (1584). Thus, Altan Khan by his order played an active role in popularizing the *Altan gerel-tu* sutra among the Mongols.

\(^9\) It is necessary to add some new data concerning Altan Khan's special interest in the *Altan Gerel* (or *gerel-tu*) sutra. According to research by Čoyiji, Altan Khan some years before he met with the Third Dalai Lama, in a letter written in Wan Li 1, i.e. 1573-4, requested him to send him the sutra named "Altan Gerel", written in golden letters and in Tibetan translation. See Čoyiji, in the article mentioned in the preceding footnote, p. 14.
He becomes king who is born amidst the Gods [= deva] by the force of his earlier good deeds. Having received blessing from the Gods, he enters the maternal womb. There Gods protect him. Having been born into the world of people, he becomes a king of men. He is called a Son of Gods because Gods protect him. His main mission in the world is to be a just judge in determining the consequences of the actions of those who do good deeds, and those who commit sins and crimes. If the king forgets his mission and does not suitably punish those criminals and sinful people, then the number of such people in his state gradually increases and this in the final analysis serves as reason for his misfortune:

[174]
complete disorder begins, there are killings, violence, pillage, ravage, starvation, misery, drought, hunger and all possible kinds of bad things. All this then evokes the wrath of the Gods who finally deny such a king their protection. Through this his kingdom undergoes collapse, similar to a lotus pool where a great elephant came on a rampage (entry 13, vol. 14, ff.49-b/53-b).

Such are the consequences for the dharmaraja of violation. For this reason the sutra insistently recommends the king to steadfastly pursue the dharma, to support the state and to preserve the people solely with the aid of the dharma, never acting contrary to dharma and not forgetting to punish and pacify those who execute crimes and sins. Only then will the king achieve protection by the gods and be able to assure fortune and happiness for all in his state (entry 13, vol. 14, ff. 49-b/53-b).10

The Altan gerel-tü sutra is further remarkable for the fact that it is one of the earliest Buddhist sutras to deal with the most important earthly problems—family, society and state. In distinction to the early Hindu ideals of rule, which spurred kings toward conquest and territorial encroachment, it advocates peace and harmony among kings. The sutra says that when "all the world’s kings are merciful and compassionate, there will be no hostilities and frays arising among them and they will be content with their own dominions, they will possess all possible royal power, obtained by accumulating merit from previous actions, and will be reborn into the blessed land of the Gods, in the shape of a Devaputra, and the country will be flourishing, populous, earth will be fertile, and there will be timely rain and all sorts of other favorable things" (cf. entry 13, vol. 14, fol. 276).

These points in the sutra, of course, could not but sound timely to Mongols of that day, who for extended periods of time suffered from internecine violence among the rulers of Mongolia.

Further on, the sutra speaks in detail about the favor the king will enjoy if he follows its prescripts. Any king who wishes to pursue the true path of the dharma, must not only study this Royal Shastra but steadily strive to fulfill all its requirements.


More than that, he must render full measure of protection, respect and honor to all khuvairaks—followers of the Altan gerel-tü. Only when having so honorable a relationship to the sutra will the king enjoy all its blessings: his realm will be preserved by the four great protectors of the four corners of the world (Skt. caturmahā-rāja, Tib. rgyal chen sde bzi, Mong. dörtben magaranja), his state will enter on a period of happiness, welfare, peace and tranquility, and the king will achieve the protection necessary for himself from those same gods, his life will be extended, and he will be reborn in each new generation as a Chakravartin-King\(^{11}\) (entry 13, vol. 14, ff. 20-a/28-b). The sutra speaks clearly and in detail also about what penalty awaits the king if he is not obedient to the admonishments of the sutra (entry 13, vol. 14, ff. 32-b/36-a). In conclusion, Buddha himself advises the king always to respect this sutra, comparing it to a source of valuable things which satisfy the needs of kings in science, in a way similar to how cool water slakes thirst (entry 13, vol. 14, f. 36-b).

It is not hard to imagine what impression this sutra must have produced on the minds of Mongols of that day, in the first place, naturally, on the khan himself and the members of those layers of the Mongolian aristocracy who were actively interested in strengthening the khan's central power, both in its authority and autocratic powers. In this regard the colophon which the unnamed translator provided for his translation is of great interest. It says:

He who was born in the 25th generation into the clan of Chinggis khan has become famed as Altan Khan the Devout. He is a rebirth of the Chakravartin. This is why one must always take concern for the interests of the whole world, adorning one's self with knowledge: and not managing in passing, like an Esrua [approximate meaning Ruler; Sh. B.], Altan Khan most correctly of all has understood the policy of the Buddha's dharma. [He indeed] invited the bodhisattva Dalai Lama and founded the Buddhist religion [in Mongolia] (cited according to entry 234, pp. 102-103).

Further on, it states where and whom Altan Khan ordered to produce the Mongolian Altan gerel-tü as a book “with the purpose of sustaining the khuvairaks and of rendering use to living creatures” (loc.cit., p. 103). It is true that Altan Khan does not bear the title of Devaputra in the colophon, but is called a Dharmarāja, in Mongolian Nom-un Altan qayan, which is of equivalent meaning to the former, because in Buddhist terms a true Dharmarāja should possess all the qualities of a Devaputra.\(^{176}\)

It is clear from the colophon that the translator considered Altan Khan not only a worthy member of the Chinggis clan, but also a reincarnation of a Chakravartin, who refounded the Buddhist faith in Mongolia. Thus, Altan Khan, who in reality

\(^{11}\) The Sanskrit word Chakravartin, in Russian translated as “turning the wheel [of the law],” i.e., “possessor of the symbol of power,” in Mongolian is rendered as kürdüń ergigalegći, or kürdüń orčiyulyći.
was not a lawful pretender to Mongolian khanship, and who was only a ruler (ji-nong) of the western part of the Eastern Tümen of Mongolia, could have been, from the Buddhist point of view, elevated to the rank of Great Mongolian Khan. The unnamed Mongolian translator, under influence of ideas conveyed by the sutra, ascribed all the qualities of a Devaputra-king to his own khan. From this moment the Buddhist religious-political concepts, so solidly laid out in the sutra under review, were called upon to form the basis of the historical-political views of the ruling class of Mongolia.

The proposition from the Buddhist teaching about the king’s power was the basis for the Chakravartin-kings enjoying the greatest popularity in Mongolia, and encouraged their efforts directed at strengthening the khan’s power in the country. Let us dwell briefly on this situation. The idea of Chakravartin-kings, as is well known, is of rather old provenance: it is encountered as early as the Brahmanic literature, and with the appearance of Buddhism acquired still more significant importance in the political and historical thought of the early Indians. Tales about Chakravartin-kings became a basic theme in the historical-literary works of early Indian authors.

Major space was devoted to doctrine concerning Chakravartins in basic canonical Buddhist sutras too. From these sutras the ones best known to the Mongols were those, like the Altan gerel-tü (Skt. Svapnaprabhasottama sūtra), which we have already inspected, the Qutuytu bodhisatuvanar-un yabudal-un arya-yin visai-dur teyin böged qubilyan-i üjegülügsen neretti, the Qutuytu aui yeked Çenggegseen neretti, and a few others. It was from these sutras that the Mongols learned about the Buddhist teaching on the power of kings, about Chakravartin-kings, the so-called law of the ten virtues, ways of punishing sinners, and so on. Naturally, this aspect of Buddhist doctrine more than anything else attracted the attention of members of the Mongolian ruling class.

In the Mongolia of that time teaching about a powerful royal power had from the very outset not an abstract philosophical meaning, but a deeply practical one. Bearing the title Chakravartin, i.e., “Turner of the Wheel [of Doctrine]” in its Buddhist sense, a Mongolian khan was fully able to lay claim to the right to be an all-Mongolian khan. Despite the fact that in reality the concept of Chakravartin-kings was not fully realized in Mongolia, it played an important role in the formation of new historical-political ideas.

It is no accident that the Mongols and Mongolian historians during the period being reviewed were most of all interested in the basic issues of the history of state and religion.

Qutuytu Sečen Qung-Tayiji

The most outstanding historian of the first period after the consolidation of genealogical Buddhist historiography was Qutuytu Sečen qung-tayiji. He may even be called the real founder of that type of historical writing in Mongolia. There is quite a bit of information about his life and work in the Erdeni-yin tobči chronicle, com-
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piled by his great-grandson Sayang Sečen, as well as in Chinese sources, especially in the work *Wan-li wu-jun lu* [Military Records of the Wan-li Period] (entries 44, pp. 218-239; 279; 257, pp. 55-56).  

Qutuytai Sečen was a descendant of Chinggis khan in the nineteenth generation. His great-great-grandfather was the notable Batumongke Dayan-khan (1464-1543). Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji (1540-1586) was born in the Ordos, in the family of hereditary *jinongs* of the three right *tümens*. Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji played a mighty role in the political life not only of the Ordos, but of all Mongolia in the 16th century.

Qutuytai Sečen is best known in history as a close associate of Altan Khan, his first cousin once removed, together with whom he stubbornly strove to establish the predominance of the Tümed ruler in Mongolia, using not only force of arms, but also the authority of a new religion, Lamaism, common to all Mongols. As Mongolian and Tibetan sources testify, Qutuytai Sečen took an active part in accepting and expanding this religion in Southern Mongolia.

His great-grandson Sayang Sečen informs us that in the Red Mouse Year, at the age of 37, viz., in 1577, Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji, having met with his relative, Altan, advised him to invite the Dalai Lama from Tibet, to the end of accepting the new religion from him and by this to reestablish the rule of religion and state after the example of Khubilai Khan and Arya hPhags-pa lama (entry 44, p. 240). The advice of Qutuytai Sečen was accepted and Altan Khan invited the Third Dalai Lama, Sodnam-Jamtso (bSod-nams rgya-tsho), to his headquarters, where together with the most prominent members of the [178] Mongolian aristocracy he set up a splendid reception for the head of Lamaism. In a subsequent meeting (according to Sayang Sečen, the third, but according to the testimony of the Fifth Dalai Lama, the second) was headed by Qutuytai Sečen together

---

12 In addition to our sources, new materials on Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji have recently become available. These materials are of great interest for studying the historical role of one of the greatest representatives of the "Mongolian Renaissance" of the late 16th century. In 1995 Sonom in Inner Mongolia published interesting material on Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji (*Gegen toli, Ordus-un tuqaï temdeglel*, Sonom, editor and commentator, Beijing 1995). As its colophon states, the book was compiled by "Tayin Sōnglayib-a barayiramba aydi daram-a qardi, having used as his main sources old histories, including the history (cadiq = biography) of the learned lama, the Fifth Dalai Lama, and others ...".

As regards the titles and name of the author, they are obviously misspelled. They may be corrected as follows: sīnglaba bariramba Sumadi Dārma-girdi (from Sanskrit Sumadhi Dharmakirti). The titles and the name of the author are written more correctly in the colophon of another book, the *Subud erike* [The Pearl Rosary], which is appended to Sonom's publication, p. 230. It is clear from the *Subud erike* colophon that Sumadi Dārmagirdi was a learned lama and translator from the Ganjur Monastery in the Jasay qosiyun of the Yeke Juu čiγulγan of Ordos. As is further stated in the same colophon, he was a co-author of the *Subud erike*, jointly with Qončojjab (p. 230).
with Dayan-noyon of the Tümeds; about three thousand persons took part in it. The sources bear witness that Qutuytai Sečen appeared beside Altan Khan as a central figure in the official ceremony of acceptance of Lamaism by Mongolian ruling circles. According to Sayang Sečen’s testimony, he made a brilliant speech in honor of the meeting of the Dalai Lama and Altan Khan at a vast gathering of some ten myriads of people (a figure probably exaggerated).

This speech is of great interest for understanding the historical-political outlook of Qutuytai Sečen. We quote it in full:

Now, owing to encountering of a good benediction of yore, the Lama, Seat of Worship and the Khan, Lord of Alms, dwell like the sun and moon which have risen as one in the blue heavens. Sutu Boyda Chinggis Khan [the Fortunate Holy Chinggis Khan], who, being given the command by the ancient powerful khan Qormusta [Hormuzda], subjected to his might [the peoples] of the Five Colors and the Four Foreigns, [namely] Kūden qayan, the reincarnation of a bodhisattva, and Khubilai Sečen qayan, the Revolver of the Wheel, and Saskya Pandita who has attained the subjects of knowledge [or learning], and hPhags-pa lama, the Lord of faithful doctrine and the Faith of Sentients, [= each two] being respectively at the head of the doctrine [-believing] princes of Mongolia, and the siddhi [possessing] lamas of Saskya, have now, in this time, met, and have made excessively delighted all sentient-beings through the Two Realms [= the secular and the religious].

After this, since Uqayantu Sečen qayan to the present, the Faith and the Realm have been somewhat disarrayed, when we acted, we have practiced sin and wickedness, and when we ate, we made use of flesh and blood in our food. Now the sainted lama, Shakyamuni of today’s time of strife, [i.e., Sodnam-Jamtso], and the great and mighty Khan, Qormusta [Hormuzda] of these lands [i.e., Altan Khan] have met.”

Beginning on such a fine and auspicious day, when the great stream moving with waves of blood transforms and converts into a transparent sea eddying with milk, when one proceeds on that white path of doctrine as set forth by the saints of yore [viz., Khubilai and hPhags-pa], this surely will be the benefice of our having relied on the Khan and Lama (entry 44, pp. 251-252; cf Urga MS 76v15/77r07).

From this speech, as well as from that advice which Qutuytai Sečen gave to Altan Khan on the occasion of inviting

the Dalai Lama, it is evident that he evaluated the meeting of the Khan with the Dalai Lama as reestablishing after a lengthy interruption the renowned policy of the Two Principles, which went back to the time of Khubilai Khan. He attached extremely great significance to the acceptance of Lamaism by the khan, which he considered the most important way to strengthen the khan’s power and to establish peace and tranquility in the country. In this regard it is impossible not to see some

13 The author and the translator have made a new translation into English strictly following the Mongolian original of this passage; see Sayang Sečen, Erdeni-yin Tobci (Kökeqota: Õbôr Mongyol-un Arad-un Kebel-lün Qoriy-a, 1981), pp. 441-442.
historical-religious ideas of Qutuytai Sečen. He was one of the first Mongolian historians to interpret the Buddhist doctrine of reincarnation as applying to the Mongolian khans as well. He called Godan the reincarnation of a bodhisattva, and Khubilai khan a Chakravartin. He likewise had a very clear idea about the basic stages of the history of Buddhism in Mongolia, which were later adopted by the majority of authors of historical works. As is evident from the above-quoted speech of Qutuytai Sečen, the first stage he linked to the time of Khubilai khan, and a new stage begins with Altan Khan, with the rebirth of religion and state in Mongolia.

To understand the political world-view of Qutuytai Sečen there is one more document of great importance. We have in mind a law compiled by Qutuytai Sečen on the basis of “old examples of sutras,” belonging to the times of the “three Tibetan Chakravartin-kings and the Mongolian Khan, Khubilai Sečen” (entry 44, pp. 253-254; cf. also entry 113, pp. 14-21), confirmed “by all secular and clerical parties, khans and subjects headed by the Omniscient Bogdo and Altan Khan,” who had assembled at the ceremony to adopt the new religion.

This law, called the “Law of the Teaching [dharma] which possesses the Ten Virtues,” comes to us in that shape in which it was recorded in two authoritative sources: in Sayang Sečen’s chronicle and in the biography of Sodnam-Jamtso, the Third Dalai Lama, compiled in 1646 by the Fifth Dalai Lama on the basis of biographies written much earlier by the Third Dalai Lama, as well as on oral tales of his contemporaries (entry 23; cf. also entry 134, p. 75).

In our opinion, it is not possible to pass judgment on the law in question solely from the text of Sayang Sečen, because he cites the latter incompletely and inaccurately. For this reason we have drawn on another source, two decades earlier than Sayang Sečen’s chronicle and interesting because it apparently used an original Tibetan version of the document in question which is still unknown to us. Comparing the texts in the two sources named, we discover significant divergence. It is hard, of course, to state which of these two versions corresponds more with the original. But it is beyond doubt that each complements the other.

Hence, in all copies of Sayang Sečen’s work there is an important omission in one of the sections of this law which may be filled only by comparison with the Tibetan version. Sayang Sečen says:

\[
\text{dörben jüül guvaray-tur ötele kümün kürbestü, qariyabasu, tebčibesi čorji nar-un yamu...}
\]

“If commoners subject monks of the four classes to assault, injury or loss of life, then his privileges of čorji ...”

(Entries 44, p. 253; 74, copy A, p. 216; copy B, p. 197; copy C, p. 211; Urga MS, 77r20-22). Evidently the phrase is unfinished. But the Tibetan version of this reads:

\[
\text{Bla ma dāŋ/dge ’dun kyi cha lugs čan la brdung bdog sogs bzag pa byun na lagjog mkhan kyi ĝzi ma thams čad gtor}
\]

“If commoners subject lamas and those who are in orders to such physical
violence as assault and wounding and so on, then the offenders are to be quartered” (entry 23, fol. 95-b).

Using both sources, it is possible to set up a reliable collated text of this important law, legally formulated and confirmed by the adoption of the new religion in Mongolia. From the text it is evident that Qutugtai Sečen was expressing the interests of that portion of Mongolian ruling circles who strove to enforce their rule through the Lamaist religion, basing themselves on the autocratic power of the all-Mongolian khan. The law which he had worked out had as its main purpose to consolidate the position of Lamaism in Mongolia as the official and dominant religion, as well as eradicate shamanism from Mongolian social consciousness. Though nurtured by remnants of the clan-tribal structure, shamanism was losing the ability under new conditions to serve the interests of the Mongolian rulers.

This law is further remarkable for the fact that it forbade some pagan practices, as for example to bury a wife along with the deceased, as well as his servants and domestic animals, threatening offenders with punishment by death and confiscation of possessions (entries 23, fol. 95-b; 44, p. 252; Urga MS 76v). The law likewise declared an implacable fight against shamanism: all ôngyons (idols) were subject to burning, and any who protested this, to severe punishment. It was forbidden to make sacrifices of livestock; those who violated this prohibition had fines imposed, at ten times the quantity of animals brought to sacrifice (entry 23, fol. 95-b); they abolished as well animal sacrifice in honor of ôngyons, which had hitherto been practiced three times a month; in exchange they prescribed observing a fast on those days, to worship Lamaist deities and to present them the three white offerings, i.e., ones of milk origin.

A special feature of the law equated higher lamas with the corresponding ranks for secular parties of the Mongolian aristocracy. The designation of čorji, for instance, corresponded to qung-tayiji, and the rabjamba and gabji to the tayijis, and gelongs to qonjin-tayijis and javisangs (entry 44, p. 253; Urga MS 77r21-24). The Tibetan version of the law likewise has a special provision which forbade mutual armed conflicts between Mongolian lords and flights into the borders with China and Tibet (entry 23, fol. 95-b).

As for the special activity which Qutugtai Sečen undertook in restoring the policy of the Two Principles, one cannot but direct attention to one important circumstance, which had great international import at that time.

Altan Khan, as is known from Chinese and Mongolian sources, stubbornly but unsuccessfully strove to normalize commerce with China. The Chinese rulers in every way hindered development of commercial exchange with Mongolia, endeavoring to combine it with conditions degrading and unjust to the khans and princes. Taking into account the zeal which the Mongolian rulers had displayed toward the Lamaist religion, the authorities in China undertook attempts to draw its spread into their hands, arrogating to themselves the role of intermediary in the mutual relations.
of Mongolia with Tibet by dispatching Tibetan monks with Buddhist sutras to Altan Khan from Peking. But this attempt enjoyed no success. Direct contacts between Tibet and Mongolia as a result of Altan Khan’s discussions with the Dalai Lama became an actual fact.

Qutuytai Sečen may be considered a representative of the Mongolian aristocracy, enlightened for his time, playing a visible role in the political and cultural life of Mongolia of that time. He is famed among Mongols as “a wise man, knowing the past by its traces, and the future by its omens” (entry 44, p. 218; Urga MS 67r16-18). Father Mostaert observes, having lived long in Ordos and having studied this region well, that Qutuytai Sečen enjoyed wide popularity in his homeland, where in his memory an annual religious service dedicated to the “eternal spirit” of their famed countryman, is held (entry 257, pp. 57-58).

One should particularly note Qutuytai Sečen’s service in bringing about a rebirth of the Mongolian historiographic tradition to fit the new historic conditions. One may judge his historical views to a certain degree by the new edition of the Čaryn teike chronicle. The preface to the Ulaanbaatar copy says that Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayijii “sagaciously adopted [knowledge], extracted this history, the Arban buyantu nom-un Ĉaryn teike, from the city of Sung-chou established previously by Khubi-lai Sečen Khan the Chakravartin, who compared it with the ancient copy belonging to the Uighurchin Biranashiri üijeng-guoshih, [and who] happily collated, com-

14 Liu Jingsuo, the editor of the Čaryn teike, ascertained that Sung-chou (Sünggii) is located on the territory of present-day JUU-Uda ayimay, not far from the western side of Ulayanqada, in the southern part of the pine forest. (See Liu Jingsuo, editor and commentator, Arban buyantu nom-un Čaryn teike (Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un Arad-un Keblel-ün Qorol-a, 1981), p. 109.

15 The word Uighurchin (uiyurčin) was translated by Zhamtsarano as “Uighur.” Hence according to Zhamtsarano, Branashri was an Uighur by nationality. It seems to me that Heissig was right to correct Zhamtsarano. He writes, proceeding from data provided by Father Mostaert, that among the six Ordos otogs there were some obogs (clans) which bore the name “Uighurchin.” According to Heissig, Branashri was by birth from one of these Uighurchin obogs. He thinks it more likely there was a copy of the Čaryn teike in the 16th century belonging to a member of one of the Ordos obogs, than to a foreign-speaking Uighur (cf. entry 233, p. 18).

As early as 1958 Sh. Natsagdorj provisionally identified Uighurchin Biranashiri with the State Preceptor (Guo-shiih) Biranashiri under Tüb-Temür (Jayayatu qayan – Sh. B.) (1329-1332), and expressed the opinion that this State Preceptor might have played an important role in editing the Čaryn teike in 1330. In the Russian edition of my book I expressed my doubt about Natsagdorj’s opinion, but now I have to renounce my words, because new data corroborating Natsagdorj’s supposition are available. He arrived at his opinion after discovering, in one copy of the Čaryn teike belonging to the Institute for Language and History in Kokeqota, the following notation: “Compiled in the first year of Ji-Sung (Dhi shün).” This corresponds to the year 1330 (cf. entry 120, p. 15). Qaraca, who wrote an interesting article on the authorship of the Čaryn teike in 1988, also supposed that Biranashiri üijeng
piled and brought out the revision” (entry 1, copy D). From the citation quoted it follows that it was precisely Qutuytai Sečen who discovered this historical-juridical monument of the 13th century and made his contribution to its creative employment in the spirit of its time by bringing into being a new edition of the Čayan teiike.

We have spoken in detail about this monument in its original edition supra. Now our task is to review and analyze the additions and changes introduced to the old text by Qutuytai Sečen. It is not possible to say that this was an easy task. It is rather difficult to draw a fine line between what was in the original version and what belongs to the pen of Qutuytai Sečen. But something can be done.

Thus, it seems to us that the following interpolations belong to the creation of Qutuytai Sečen to a greater or lesser degree: the introductory portion, where he gives a brief history of the Two Principles from the time they appeared; brief information about the spread of Buddhism in India, Tibet and Mongolia; and brief information about the downfall of religion in Mongolia and the law about revival and support of Buddhism.

From the introductory portion it is clear that our historian was interested most of all in the historiographic tradition which had been put together during the reign of Khubilai. Naturally, it is for that reason that when aiding the rebirth of Buddhism in its Lamaist form in Mongolia, he was able to reestablish a Buddhist tradition in Mongolian historical writing as well. But in striving to strengthen the khan's power over all parts of Mongolia, he purposely turned to the epoch of the early Mongolian khans. As a result, at the root of his historical-political views there lies an old but refurbished concept of the union of Altar and Throne. Whereas hPhags-pa lama had first of all attached importance to the theoretical groundings of the Two Principles, Qutuytai Sečen concentrated his attention on their historical groundings. He attributes the origin of these principles to times of deep antiquity, to the mythical progenitor of all kings, Mahāsammatā, who had ruled, as it says in the chronicle “in the time when people lived incalculably many years.” Beginning from that time, the Two Principles were transferred from one country to another, until they arrived in Mongolia under Chinggis Khan and Khubilai. The assertion that Chinggis Khan is a Chakravartin16, who had set up the Two Principles in Mongolia, and as well men-

---

16 The text gives a Tibetan calque of the Sanskrit Chakravarti: qural-un sutu boyda Cinggis qayan. Here the word qural is a misspelling and we have to correct it to the Tibetan word khor-lo, corresponding to the Sanskrit caḷra 'wheel'; we have the same word in another spot in the chronicle, as qural-un ejen qayan, which means the khan who has a khor-lo, or in Sanskrit, Chakravartin.
tion of the Sakya Lama Gunga-Nyangbo\textsuperscript{17} [Kun-dga' sñiि-po] as a contemporary of Chinggis clearly indicates that we have an interpolation which could have taken place only during the new editing by Qutuytai Sečen. However great the authority of Chinggis Khan, in the 13th-14th centuries no one dared to make Chinggis a "king of doctrine," a founder of the Two Principles in Mongolia. At that time, it was evident to everyone that Chinggis had not been converted to Buddhism and had no links with the Sakya monastery. One has to think that the attempt to depict Chinggis Khan as founder of the Two Principles theory in Mongolia became possible only later, when the actual story of Chinggis had in time grown murky in the people's memory.

Qutuytai Sečen was the first historian who, for the sake of raising the prestige of the new religion, decided to combine the beginning of its penetration of Mongolia with the name of Chinggis Khan, although he presumably knew that Chinggis had no such connection with it. Moreover, he makes Gunga-Nyangbo a contemporary of Chinggis Khan, despite the fact that the former lived in 1098-1156 and the latter was born, according to the \textit{Yüan-shih} in 1162, and according to Persian historians, in 1155. It is hard to think that Qutuytai Sečen, knowledgeable about the past, did not know this. Even some later historians (Sumba-Khambo Ishibaljir, and Darmadala) wrote that Chinggis Khan and Gunga-Nyangbo lived at different times (cf. entry 134, pp. 33-34). Qutuytai Sečen's devotion to religion won out over historical truth. He even resorts to deliberate falsification, having ascribed to Khubilai Khan the declaration that the Two Principles, first established in history by Mahāsammatā, were adopted and established by Chinggis Khan in the state he created. As will be demonstrated \textit{infra}, the attempt to depict Chinggis in the role of founder of the Two Principles theory and as "king of doctrine" in Mongolia found quite a few adherents among Mongolian historians at the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th centuries. It is perfectly obvious that such falsifications had to serve the same goal—to raise the prestige of the Lamaist church and to strengthen the authority of the khan's power.

There is reason to assume that the idea of the Two Principles of authority, in the shape that it was formulated under Khubilai Khan, was subjected to substantial revision when Qutuytai Sečen edited the Čayn teũke. Whereas in the first edition this idea played the role of a general law of development in countries of the Buddhist world, Qutuytai Sečen reduced its significance merely to a matter of 'transfer of the two principles' from one country to another, and Mahāsammatā, whom the Buddhists regarded as progenitor of all kings of the universe, he considered merely the founder of the history mentioned above. As we see, the chief and practically the only goal of Qutuytai Sečen was by citations from history and the authority of the church to establish those principles that Altan Khan and his successors ought to fol-

---

\textsuperscript{17} The name of Gunga-Nyangbo is given in the manuscript in Mongolian translation: \textit{Sasgiy-a ba qamur bayasqulang-un jirũken.}
low in their politics.

The next interpolation of Qutuytai Sečen is his exposition of the history of Buddhism in India, Tibet, and Mongolia. Brief though the information he reports may be, we can see clearly in it the scheme of the historical
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process, which later became a base common to all Mongolian historians. Expressing the growth of influence of Buddhist historiography, this scheme reproduces its chief principles. Thus, in setting forth the history of Mongolia, Qutuytai Sečen when editing the Čayn teůke writes that Buddhism was widespread among the Mongols in the years when the “three Chakravartin-kings” ruled, whom he obviously implies are Chinggis, Khubilai and Altan. If the third actually was Altan Khan, there is no doubt that this interpolation belongs to Qutuytai Sečen.

He is also the author of the third interpolation, which describes the decline of Buddhism in post-Yüan Mongolia and its subsequent rebirth. He calls the period of decline in Buddhist influence “dark” and opposes it to the years of rule by Altan Khan, which were marked by the rebirth of religion. In his words, in the “dark period,” “people ceased to observe the doctrine and devoted themselves solely to worldly matters”, “people ceased to act according to righteous words, preferring to follow false, untrue words,” “they did not behave according to the Two Principles, but merely followed customary law” (entry 1, copy D).

Having set this forth, he formulates the following laws:

“Respect the Three Jewels (Buddhism),”
“Disseminate the teaching of Buddha, like the sun;”
“Build a monastery which is the support of the body;”
“Write a book which is the support of the word [of Buddha];”
“Erect a stupa which is the support of the heart [thought];”
“Do not require those clad in yellow robes to bow before princes and khans;”
“Do not organize a hunt near monasteries;”
“Observe fasting;”
“Perform good deeds in memory of the deceased;”
“The highest of leaders is the Lama (the teacher), the highest of those who show is Buddha; the highest of paths to this world is the Doctrine [dharma]; the highest of friends of nirvana is the quvaray;”

“Hold the vows of a lama like the apple of your eye, the commands of the khan like your own soul, and the orders of your parents like life itself” (ibid.).

As we can see, these laws are reminiscent in their content of that law of Qutuytai Sečen we spoke of earlier.

Concerning legal questions touched on in Qutuytai Sečen’s editing, one should direct attention to yet another issue. The laws of Qutuytai Sečen we have cited
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carry a strong imprint of influence from the so-called laws of dharma, in particular the “Law Possessing Ten Virtues.” Qutuytai Sečen obviously makes use here of the laws of the three Tibetan Chakravartin-kings. Naturally it is difficult to establish what these laws were exactly but in our view they may have some connection with
some that are in such works as the *Mani-gambum, Badma-yatang* (for them, see *infra*), and others. By way of example, we cite a law ascribed to one of the Tibetan Chakravartin-kings, Khri-srong bde-btsan. It is found in the *Badma-yatang*, chapter 64, where it is called “The Laws of Dharma by Khri-srong bde-btsan”. It creates the impression that these laws can show the influence on the author of the new *Čayan teiike* edition, which begin with the words: “The core of holy religion is the Lama, the ruler of dharma; and the head of the state is the Khan, the possessor of earthly authority; the laws of the true dharma, similar to a sacred silken cord, are unabated, the laws of the mighty khan, like a golden yoke are invincible. And a brief exposition [*tobčiya*] of how to carry out both laws equally free of error is to be found in the “White History of Teaching about the Ten Virtues” (entry 1, no pagination).

In the introductory part of the “Law of Dharma of Khri-srong bde-btsan” we read: “The laws of the dharma, similar to a silken cord, are various, and the laws of the King, similar to a golden yoke, are weighty”. This phrase in Tibetan goes like this:

\[
\text{Chos khrims dar gyi mdud pa lta bur bsrams rgyal khrims gser gyi gñā śīn sbran lèi dañ .}
\]

The Mongolian translation is the following:

\[
\text{nom-un jasay qib-un janggigiy-a metü bekilen, qayän-u jasay kājjugün-ü kündü altan boyula-bar kündü-te daruylju} \ (\text{entry 2, f. 161-b}).
\]

Further on in the text Khri-srong bde-btsan sets forth the basic positions of the law of dharma and the law of the King. From their content it is evident that the laws of dharma are regarded as the spiritual sustenance of the people, and for this reason are compared with the “softness of a silken cord,” just as the laws of the King are regarded chiefly as means of punishment for those who break the dharma laws, and for this reason are compared with the “weight of a golden yoke.” “If one does not keep the laws of dharma [in order], then the laws of the King which are intended for punishment will be applied” say the lips of King Khri-srong bde-btsan (entry 2, fol. 162-b).

Comparing the legal statutes by Qutuytai Sečen in the *Čayan teiike* with the corresponding sections in the “Law of Dharma of Khri-srong bde-btsan,” we readily discover similarity both in content and in the form of exposition. The chief likeness lies in the fact that both texts relate to the so-called laws of ten virtues, in other words, to the laws of dharma. This of course does not mean that Qutuytai Sečen simply copied his laws from Tibetan or other Buddhist models. It may confidently be asserted that he creatively applied them to the conditions of his country. The most striking thing about this is that the laws noted above bear witness that they were directed against shamanism in Mongolia.

Even in the special religious statutes in Qutuytai Sečen’s text one can discover sections which differ to a greater or lesser degree from the corresponding texts of Buddhist laws. By way of example we cite a well-known Buddhist statute about the “Five non-intermediates” (or the “five immeasurable sins”). According to the *Mani-
gambum, the “five non-intermediates” are: slaying one's father; slaying one's mother; spilling blood from the body of Buddha with malicious intent; slaying of arhats; slaying lamas, and quvarays (entry 18). In Qutuytai Sečen all this is formulated under the “four crimes:” killing the lama-teacher; spilling the blood from the body of Buddha with malicious intent; committing harm against father and mother; treachery to the state and its destruction (entry 1, copy D).

In Qutuytai Sečen, history-writing is completely subordinated to his religious-political views. Thereby one can explain the great space he devotes to legal problems, and to editing the laws of dharma in a manner applicable to Mongolian conditions. Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji, indubitably, was one of the greatest ideologists of the renascent genealogical-religious historiography, which long exerted a strong influence on the development of historical thought in Mongolia.

Guoshi Čorji

With the growth of a Buddhist educational system in Mongolia there began to appear historians coming from amongst the lamas, who were for their time rather educated persons. The most prominent of these was Manjushri Gushi Shiregetū Tsorjiwa [Tsorji] Shrishilasvaraba, also known as Pandita Gushi Tsorjiwa, from Kökeqota (for whom cf. entries 143, pp. 217-231; 234, pp. 231-232; 252, pp. 227-228). As to him personally, we know very little.** It is known only that his creative output extended from the end of the 16th to the beginning of the 17th centuries. To judge from the fact that he is not listed among the persons who edited the Mongolian Kanjur translation under Ligdan Khan one may assume that in 1628-1629 he was no longer among the living. As is evident from the colophon in the first volume, Yum (one of the Kanjur sections), other parties (Daiching-tayiji and Dorji-drag bandi)¹⁹ carried out editing the transla-

** During the last few years, new material about Guoshi Čorji has become available. Čoyiji discovered two items containing new data which shed light on the religious and literary activity of Guoshi čorji:
1. Köke-qota-yin yejar orun-u jaq-a qijayar ba širegetū gegen-ü tobči namtar, busu blama qutuytu kiged olan süm-e-yin neres-i temdeglegsen debter. This book was composed in the third year of Bürintii jasayći, or 1864.
2. Erdeni tunumal neretü sudur (Beijing, 1984). As we can see from the paper by Čoyiji, his materials not only provide us with new important data on Guoshi Čorji, but also confirm the reliability of materials already known, and our conclusions already made on the basis of those materials. See Čoyiji, Širegetü Guoshi Čorji-yin tuqai nököbörilen ügulekü kedün jüil [Some additional data on Shiregetü guoshi Čorji], in Mongyol teûke sudulul (1985), pp. 153-160.

¹⁹ Cf. the Mongolian colophon in the first volume, Yum (entries 251, pp. 168-169; 232, p. 11; 233, p. 34).
tion by Guoshi Čorji as early as 1620. If Guoshi Čorji had been alive at this time, then he no doubt would have been drawn to such a serious matter. Hence one may conclude that his activity was curtailed about the beginning of the 1620's.

Of the Guoshi Čorji translations known to us, the earliest goes back to 1587 (cf. entries 234, pp. 110-111; 236, pp. 169-172; 233, p. 33), and the latest, to 1618 (entries 143, pp. 220-222; 232). Guoshi Čorji was reputed to be a pupil of the Third Dalai Lama; in 1579 he was among those who accompanied the Dalai Lama and with whom he remained in Altan Khan's domain. His creative output mostly was written in Kökeqota. But the number and extent of his works were quite broad. There is a mention of him as an author in the Tibetan inscription from Čayan-Baishing in Khalkha Mongolia, which is tied to the name of Čoytu Tayiji. By order of Čoytu Tayiji and his mother Chin-taiqu-qatun in 1618 he translated into Mongolian the biography of the celebrated Tibetan poet Milaraspa, as a result of which after this translation there traveled to him special representatives of Čoytu Tayiji in the persons of Kündülen Quluči čingsang, Erdeni nomči Sandin and Joriytu kiya (entries 16, fol. 233-235; 143, pp. 220-221). This speaks to the fact that Guoshi Čorji was quite a well-known figure on the scale of Mongolia as a whole.

According to a number of versions of a history of Erdeni Dzuu, Guoshi Čorji traveled as a representative of the Third Dalai Lama to Khalkha too, where he actively participated in the spread of Lamaism during the years when Abatai Khan governed. "As a result of these and other deeds at the khan's command he proclaimed his title-name to be gahju (Tib. bkah-bdü) in the Indian, Tibetan and Mongolian languages: širegetū bandita (pandita) güsi čorji (chos-rje) ["throne sage, state preceptor, ruler of faith"], and gave him a seat as the very first lama [upad-ja]" (entry 143, p. 219).

Vladimirtsov noted this report perhaps blurred together sobriquets and titles and for this reason one should deal with it cautiously until the discovery of a more solid source on the history of the Erdeni Dzuu monastery (entry 143, p. 219). However it seems to us that one may believe the report cited. The Golden Book of Sh. Damdin testifies that Guoshi Čorji (he is called Shiregetū Guoshi Čorji there) actually traveled to Erdeni Dzuu, that the Third Dalai Lama replied to the invitation of Abatai-Sain Khan, that he was not able to visit Khalkha-Mongolia himself, but designated Shiregetū Guoshi Čorji, his representative, with whom Abatai-Sain Khan also returned from Kökeqota (entry 38, ff. 76-b/77-a). In some versions of the Erdeni Dzuu history say that the monastery was constructed under the leadership of Manjushri-darqan, which in our view may well mean Guoshi Čorji, also well-known as stated above under the name of Manjushri Guoshi Čorji.

Guoshi Čorji was best known as an outstanding translator and connoisseur of literature. To his pen belong translations of many Buddhist sutras (entry 143, p. 221-228). He was also a great historian of the period of the Mongolian Renaissance. As to his historical-philosophical and religious views, the best idea is given by his work Čiqua kerelegči tegūs udq-a-tu neretū sasdir [The Shastra Called the Essence of all that is Necessary]. Scholars, beginning with O. M. Kovalevskii, have been accus-
tomed to consider this work by Guoshi Čorji a translation or reworking of a work by hPhags-pa lama, the Šes-byā rab-gsal [What is to be Known] (entries 159 p. 13; 233, pp. 27-28). But this does not correspond to actuality. We are inclined to assert that the Shastra Called The Essence Of All That Is Necessary is a completely independent production, of which it is not hard to be convinced on the most cursory comparison of both works. It is surely no accident that Guoshi Čorji does not even mention the work of hPhags-pa lama in his composition. The last part of this work remarks that Manjushri Gushi Shiregetii Tsojirwa “translated, actually composing,” the work in question, “drawing into agreement shastras which like the rising sun illuminate the lovely holy words of former Bogdos [saints], by order of Magada Bovadhi Sadov from the Kemčügüd clan and Gegen Biligü Toin Shirab-sengge, for the purpose of spreading the religion of Shakyamuni in Mongolia” (entry 5, pp. 95-a/95-b). It must be remarked that the colophon of a handwritten copy belonging to us personally differs considerably from the colophon cited by Walther Heissig in his work (entry 233, p. 28, note 2).

One must confess that What is to be Known by hPhags-pa lama is one of the shastra used by Guoshi Čorji in his work, in which there are actually some places which agree with the hPhags-pa text or are close to it. But such places are few. Even the cosmological information provided by Guoshi Čorji, which at first glance may seem taken from hPhags-pa-lama, is presented in a different way than he does. It is extracted, as the author himself repeatedly reminds one, from a basic Buddhist cosmological work, the Abhidharmakośa. As for the historical parts, devoted to India, Tibet and Mongolia, Guoshi Čorji wrote them on the basis of other sources, which for some reason he did not find necessary to mention. The history of the Mongolian kings in his work differs from the one which is in hPhags-pa's work and is actually brought down to the of the author's lifetime (entry 5).

In its structure Guoshi Čorji's work is not at all similar to hPhags-pa lama's composition. As everyone knows, the latter consists of five divisions: the non-organic world; the organic world; the path to enlightenment; the fruit of deeds; and the unmanifested elements of existence. Guoshi Čorji's work can be divided into three sections: a description of Buddha's life and the history of his teaching; cosmological-historical data; and the most important things necessary to know in Buddhist teaching (Čiqula udgas).

The sole work which by its structure and content most resembles the Sutra Called The Essence Of What Is Necessary, is a work by the Tibetan author Lubčansanbaibal (blo bcañ bzāñ po'i dpal), which bears a name almost identical: The Essence Of All That Is Necessary (ñer mkho mthoñ ba don yod). But the date this work was written is not given in the colophon. In one spot, to be sure, it says that Buddhism has existed for 3504 years, from the time of Buddha's nirvana until the present Iron-Swine Year (entry 5, fol. 53-b). Considering this evidence, as well as some other data, one may presume that Lubčansanbaibal worked on his composition in the
Iron-Swine Year of the 6th *rabjung*, i.e., in 1383. We have no direct proof which would permit one to assert that his work was used by Guoshi Čorji in the *Shastra Called The Essence Of All That Is Necessary*, but this similarity cannot fail to strike us.

Guoshi Čorji's composition is of particularly great interest as it seems to be almost the only completed historiographic monument of the first years of the spread of Lamaism in Mongolia. Heissig justifiably dates its appearance to some time between 1587 and 1620. Guoshi Čorji's work marks the beginning of a new type of Mongolian historiography clerical-Buddhist in character and content. The author emerges as a historian-Buddhist interested in everything new which existed in Buddhist literature on the history of the universe, religion and living creatures.

The shastra opens with a traditional introduction (pp. 1-15), peculiar to all Buddhist historical literature, i.e., with a short description of the life of Buddha and a history of his teaching. It creates the impression that Guoshi Čorji was in this case interested more in the fate of Buddha's teaching than the description of the Buddha's life. He only briefly dwells on the high points of the life and activity of Buddha, mentioning that "our teacher Shakyamuni was born into the family of King Suddhodana" (entry 5, p. 2). The date of Buddha's nirvana is, as is well-known, a departure point in the chronology of Buddhist historical literature; on this foundation Guoshi Čorji gives different calculations of Buddha's age (100 years, 80 years). But at the same time he notes the impossibility of determining the actual age of Buddha, quoting in this respect the *Altan gereltü* sutra. In his opinion, under the death (nirvana) of Buddha one must assume a mere curtailment of his physical existence. Buddha submerged into nirvana to show living creatures the law of dharma. But as for the two manifestations of Buddha, spiritual as well as external beauty and grandeur, these are not subject to the laws of nirvana. Buddha in these manifestations is eternal. From this Guoshi Čorji, as indeed do other historian-Buddhists, concludes that after his nirvana Buddha lives in his own higher non-material spiritual hypostases, in particular in his doctrine. For this reason a basic object of history has to be the history of Buddha's doctrine.

Proceeding to the history of Buddhism, Guoshi Čorji describes in great detail the history of forming this doctrine by codifying the words of Buddha at the three Buddhist councils which played an important role in validating Buddhism as a religion. Supporting the Mahayana tradition, Guoshi Čorji writes that the first council took place a year after Buddha's nirvana under the patronage of King Ajasitum; the second one, 110 years after the nirvana, under the dharma-raja Asoka; and the third, 300 years after the nirvana during the reign of King Kanishka.

Guoshi Čorji briefly describes how Buddhist teaching branched out into various schools and caps the section with a short explanation of the general structure of Buddhist doctrine.

The second section is the basic one in the Shastra (entry 5, ff. 15-a/73-b). For Guoshi Čorji history is inseparable from cosmology. For this reason the basic portion of his work is taken up with general religious-cosmological information, at
times utterly fantastic. Naturally, there is no need to discuss its characteristics, but it is immeasurably more interesting that in this section one may treat of history proper—the history of society, of peoples and states.

Under the influence of Buddhist cosmology Guoshi Čorji's concept of writing history comes down to the fact that history is not just the history of mankind, but the history of the universe, and the history of a particular country, in this case of Mongolia, is merely a part of world-wide history in its Buddhist sense.

Starting from this concept of universality, Guoshi Čorji is first of all interested in how the external world was formed, i.e., the universe (yadayadu saba yirinči) and the world of living beings (dotuyadu amitan-u bayidal). It must be stated that these problems were quite new to Mongolian historical writing at this time. Guoshi Čorji not only posed them but also tried to give answer to them, proceeding from the ancient Indian doctrine of naive materialism, which Buddhist cosmology partly inherited. It is interesting that Buddhism, which admitted the existence of the material world, worked out a well-developed
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atomistic theory, not yielding to the ancient Greeks in the profundity of its rationalist surmises. Following Buddhist atomistics, Guoshi Čorji thinks that the material world consists of very tiny invisible particles: baraman-u toyusun (from Skt. paramanu), i.e., layers of dust or atoms, and gives a graded table of their differing units, under which each of the latter receives a designation, expanding into seven units from the minutest particles up to the very largest (entry 5, pp. 14-15).

Relying on the concepts of the Abhidharmakośa, Guoshi Čorji asserts that the primeval elements of world-creation are the four so-called mahabhutas (Skt. mahābhuta, Mong. maqabud), i.e., the four major elements: earth, water, fire and air.

Under influence of the early Indian naive-materialist and dialectic traditions, Buddhist cosmology does not acknowledge a Supreme Being who created all things visible and invisible, does not consider the universe and world of living beings to exist once and forever as givens, but on the contrary asserts that they were created in the process of a lengthy evolution by the force of the immutable law of karma. Among the numerous religious-fantastic ideas in the system of Buddhist cosmology, in pursuit of our goal we must specially emphasize this evolutionary concept which has a direct bearing on history. This concept of evolution is basic to a more or less historical approach to cosmological questions, which through this concept of evolution gives rise to cosmology and history.

Buddhism, striving to penetrate into the mystery of the history of changes in the universe, advanced a complex cosmic concept of time, according to which the general understanding of time is divided into kalpas, which are cosmic cycles eternally repeating one after another, and consisting of a certain number of years. The basic kalpas are four: formation, population, destruction and void. Each of these kalpas consists of twenty minor, so-called intermediate kalpas. And the four above-named basic kalpas together comprise one so-called Grand Kalpa. In this fashion, a grand kalpa embraces 80 intermediate ones.

Buddhist cosmology strove to depict in the kalpas the entire process of forma-
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tion, development and destruction

of the universe from its beginning to its annihilation. According to this theory, a
given process is repeated unendingly, and on the termination of one grand kalpa all
develops anew, but in the reverse order. It is not known how many times the world
has undergone destruction and how many times it was renewed, the endless revolu­tion
arises in a universal process of destruction and renewal. The basic concept of
Buddhist cosmology, in essence, reflects a naive-dialectic ideology that there was
neither a beginning nor will there be an end of the world. The history of mankind,
which is merely a small part of the history of the universe is also subject to the law
of unending change of the universe.

It is remarkable that for the Mongols the evolutionary bent of Buddhist cosmol­
ogy received a rather distinct historical interpretation, making it in the majority of
instances an inalienable introductory part of every Mongolian historical composi­tion.
But this did not take place right away. Guoshi Čorji took only the first steps.

Following the Abhidharmakosa, Guoshi Čorji gives a brief history of the origin
of the universe and a detailed description of its structure and only after this proceeds
to expounding the history of mankind. Here is how this looks on the pages of the
Shastra Called The Essence Of All That is Necessary: Initially there was a void
(qoyosun), then from the void there appeared an air mass (ki-yin mandal) the size of
1,600,000 leagues, of incalculable size, a mass of indestructibly thick bluish color.
This was the element of air, from the movement of which there arose a cloud called
the “golden heart.” From the cloud poured forth a protracted rain which gave rise to
the sea below to a depth of 1,120,000 leagues, and a width of 1,203,000 leagues and
in circumference 3,610,350 leagues. From the fact that this air made the water
shake, on its surface was established an indestructibly heavy golden universe, simi­
lar to how the scum is formed on milk. The thickness of the universe is 320,000
leagues. The air mass is the foundation of the universe, and water and earth are the
foundation of the various parts of the earth.

Omitting further details of the history of the universe and of living creatures, the
populating of areas of the three worlds, the trailokyā (the upper is the abstract
world; the lower is the material world; and between them is the intermediate world),
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let us direct attention to how Guoshi Čorji presented the history of mankind. He
located people in a third, lower world, called samsara. To this world belong not
only all visible beings, but also the spirits: earthly, those of water and those of
heaven.

The depiction of man and his origin in Guoshi Čorji is deeply religious. He ad­
heres to Buddhist teaching, according to which people comprise the final link in the
chain which unites higher creatures with lower ones: through soul they must elevate
themselves to the upper abstract world, and through flesh, they are attached to the
material samsara. Despite uninterrupted temptation, man acts freely, awaiting retri­
bution for his deeds. For him the path is open to rebirth among people as well as in
the higher or lower ranks of creatures. The law of karma inescapably guides all this.
The fruit of deeds is the inexorable judging of man. Of all the lower beings only man may attain the rank of Buddha. He, subject to the power of fate, according to its will, is rich or poor, clever or foolhardy, happy or ill-fated. As for the history of people, it is likewise subject to the over-all law of karma. By the force of this law a spiritual beginning, descending from the higher regions to the lower, acting on various creatures and being divided up among them, enlivens those living in the material world.

Like all Buddhist writers, Guoshi Čorji placed at the root of his history of how people appeared, a well-known Buddhist legend which reflects the primitive ideas of the ancient Hindus about the prehistoric period of human history. According to this legend, one tengri of the first dhyāna (Skt. dhyāna: the abode of a tengri) selected the abode of people for the location of his rebirth. His descendants gradually increased and finally filled seventeen kingdoms of visible, four regions of invisible and twenty regions in the world of desire. They made up the six types of beings, dispersed in the three worlds. At this time the men of Jambhudvipa (the world) multiplied through the resettlement of souls, lived an incalculable number of years, were nourished by a pure viand samadhi (dhyāna); they did not walk, but moved through the air with the aid of marvelous forces, emitting light from their own bodies. In those times some unrestrained beings tasted the so-called essence of nectar which was white in color and tasty, like earthly honey. Others also acted after their example. Hence people were deprived of the ability to emit light from their bodies, and darkness set in. As a consequence of the deeds of all creatures, the sun and moon appeared in the heavens, and illumined the four continents of the world. After the disappearance of the primeval food—the viand samadhi—people were nourished on various products which appeared one after another according to their requirements. And finally there disappeared the last one which grew wild, millet (salu), since some foolhardy persons schemed to collect a sufficient quantity to be stored for the next day.

Thus the era of agriculture arose. Along with this there began mutual strife and dispute between people over the division of grain. Then, having palavered among themselves, people selected one handsome righteous man as their ruler. He was called the King “Elevated by Many” (Mong. olun-a örgüüdegensen qayan, Skt. Mahāsammata), since he had been elevated to the calling of khan by all the people (entry 5, fol. 65-a/67-b). From him, like all Buddhist authors, Guoshi Čorji derives all the legendary and semi-legendary kings of India down to King Suddhodana, the father of Shakayamuni Buddha.

Such is Guoshi Čorji’s highly schematic outline of Buddhist doctrine about the origin of human society. It is obvious that this teaching may be considered one of the most ancient Oriental versions of the contract theory of the state.

Guoshi Čorji adheres to the traditional scheme of three Buddhist monarchies, firmly asserted in Mongolian historical writing from the time of the Čayăn teüke. After the history of the early Indian kings, he goes over to the history of doctrine, and of the rulers of Tibet and Mongolia.
Guoshi Čorji regards the history of Mongolia as an inseparable part of the history of the Buddhist world. After hPhags-pa lama he is one of the first amongst Mongolian historians who makes an attempt to figure out the date of Chinggis khan's birth according to Buddhist time-reckoning. He writes that Chinggis Khan was born 3,253 years after the nirvana of Buddha as a result of his accumulation of good deeds during all his prior rebirths (entry 5, fol. 69-b/70-a). This date also serves Guoshi Čorji to mark the onset of Mongolian history. It is characteristic that unlike some much later authors he does not link the beginning of Buddhism with the name of Chinggis khan. He merely compares Chinggis with a Chakravartin king. In his opinion, the policy of the Two Principles of power takes its beginning from the time of Ögedei Khan (entry 5, fol. 70-a). As for Khubilai khan, under him Buddhism merely experienced its further spread in the Mongolian empire. As was stated above, Guoshi Čorji brings the history of the Mongolian khans right down to his own time. Having finished an exposition of Mongolian history, he observes that after Toyon Temür lost power as khan in China, religion went into decline and thus the names of subsequent khans are not imprinted in documents (entry 5, fol. 70-b). It must be stated that history plays a subordinate role in Guoshi Čorji's work, his chief attention being devoted to popularizing the basic tenets of Buddhism. It is no accident that the third part of his work is, as the author himself says, an abbreviated translation of "everything needful" in the teaching of Buddhism (entry 5, fol.93-a/93-b). He here also acquaints readers with all the elementary/basic Buddhist ethical-moral standards which every believing Buddhist should know.

Hence, Guoshi Čorji's Shastra Called The Essence Of All That is Necessary includes not only a history of Buddhism but the basic tenets of this religion, in which history here is far from totally set off from the mass of religious dogma. It even still remains in a rudimentary state.

Influencing the historical views of Guoshi Čorji were not only Buddhist historical-cosmological literature but also hagiographic works by Tibetan authors. Bearing witness to this are his translations into Mongolian of the well-known Tibetan work, the Manigumbum, and two namtars (lives): of Molon Toin and of Milasrasba.

The Ma-ni bka'-bum (Manigumbum) (entry 18) belongs to that category of apocryphal works occupying a special place in Tibetan Buddhist historical literature. The Manigumbum is claimed as the creation of the famed Tibetan king Srong-btsan-gampo. It contains a life of Srong-btsan-gampo, as well as his decrees and commandments. However, in reality the work in question was written no earlier than the 15th century (entries 272, p. 327; 146, p.45).

Tibetologists hold differing opinions as to which variety of literary creation one should assign the Manigumbum and other apocryphal works similar to it: to historical literature or to works of belles-lettres. Some scholars have regarded these works as valuable monuments of Tibetan historical literature. Andrei I. Vostrikov was not in agreement with this; he thought that as historical sources they had no value and could not be related to historical works, although many of them possess consider-
able literary merit (entry 146, pp. 25, 45). In our view, Vostrikov is only partly right. Actually, Tibetan apocryphal works contain very few reliable data; religious-legendary and didactic material predominate in them. They cannot be related to that time to which they are often erroneously assigned. By their content these works represent a compilation of works of much later authors, who had striven to imbue their compositions with the authority of works by famed figures in Tibetan antiquity.

However, what has been said gives us no basis to exclude this category of work by Tibetan authors from literature of a historical nature. Of course it would be incorrect to approach historical works of the more or less distant past from the position of our days and to judge the “historicity” of this or that work, applying contemporary criteria to them. A modern scholar must, in our view, make it clear first of all what the Tibetans themselves considered history and historical works. An answer to this question is given by sources which leave no room to doubt that Tibetan historians, as a rule, were convinced of the reliability of apocryphal compositions and used them widely in works on the ancient history of Tibet. It follows from this that we must regard apocrypha as unique monuments of Tibetan historical writing, as one of the varieties of hagiographic literature which appeared at that stage of development of historical knowledge when hagiography, under the influence of the Buddhist religion, became a favored occupation of devout [199] historiographers. In the eyes of church sources, an apocryphal work was the most suitable type of historical work, destined to glorify early figures of religion and dharma-rajahs.

Many Tibetan apocrypha by their content, character and aims were in point of fact historical. Apocryphal works among the Tibetans are called *der-choi* (secret books, or books from treasure). They are called that because they are alleged to be very ancient documents, taken from vaults, and usually ascribed to the pen of authoritative historical figures. As to why they were for long periods hidden from people in the vaults in which they were found, is usually related in their contents, when at times whole chapters are devoted to a tale about vaults often hidden in various spots. Sometimes the “secret books” even have a decidedly mysterious and ancient appearance on the outside. Rarely does one find in them material actually borrowed from ancient sources which ought obviously to remove all doubt as to their authenticity. On the whole Tibetan apocrypha are done in the style of ancient documents. It must be noted that similar activity by Tibetan authors is vastly reminiscent of the very widespread practice of medieval European chroniclers who also fabricated documents. Under the constraints of pervasive dominance by religious dogmas, in the absence of creative and critical thinking among believers, the anonymous authors of “secret books” undoubtedly attained their goal of inculcating faith in the genuineness of their works. It is true that sooner or later, there came a time when critical faculties appeared, and then doubts were uttered about the truthfulness of tales about the origins of these secret books.

What has been said helps one to understand why of all the Tibetan historical works one of the first to be translated into Mongolian was the *Manigambum*. From
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The colophon which accompanies Guoshi Čorji's translation, it is evident that in full agreement with Tibetan tradition he actually regarded this composition as the fruit of King Srong-btsan-gambo himself. He apparently believed that the historiographic activity of this king, the founder of state and religion in Tibet, held for the rulers of Mongolia an especially important significance as they set forth on the path of increased patronage of Lamaism in their dominions and in the country as a whole. Guoshi Čorji writes straightforwardly that he translated the Manigambum especially to advance the cause of disseminating religion in Mongolia (entry 116, p. 293), and as the bičin-year (Earth-Ape year) indicated in the colophon as the date of translation, corresponds to 1584, one concludes that he also finished his work immediately after Altan Khan and the other Mongolian rulers adopted Lamaism.

The Manigambum is interesting to us for two reasons. First, there is reason to assume that the third division of this work might be one of the primary sources of Guoshi Čorji when he wrote the third part of the Čiqla kereglegči. Second, the Mongolian translation of the Manigambum has an extensive colophon written by Guoshi Čorji himself. This colophon, despite its versified form, is a historical composition by which one may determine the author's historical views.

As is well-known, the third and final division of the Manigambum is called "The Section For Personal Exhortations," i.e., Srong-btsan-gampo's exhortations. In actuality it presents a popular exposition of Buddhist ethical-moral standards, gathered together from assorted sutras. It is astounding that the third section of the Shastra Called The Essence Of All That is Necessary contains quite a few places which remind us of corresponding portions from the third section of the Manigambum translation by Guoshi Čorji. Such for example are the sections about the two kinds of accumulation (qoyar čiyul yan, Tib. tshogs gūn), about the four forms in which Buddha exists (burqan-u dörben bey-e, Tib. sku bzi), the five deadly sins, and so forth.

As for the colophon which Guoshi Čorji wrote, in it the author tries to ground a commonality of history for Tibet and Mongolia based on their common religion. For this reason he propounds the history of Mongolia in the closest connection with the history of that country whence Lamaism came to the Mongols.

Speaking of the history of Tibet, Guoshi Čorji firmly adheres to early Buddhist historical traditions, according to which the Tibetans at the behest of Aryabala originated from apes in the shape of ascetic-toyins and rakshisas in the shape of young women. Respecting the origin of the Tibetan kings he, following all those Tibetan traditions, asserts that the first king of Tibet, Nya-khri-btsam-

---

20 Cf. Guoshi Čorji's colophon in the hand-written Mongolian translation of the Manigambum in the Mongolian stacks of the National Library in Ulaanbaatar. This colophon has been published in Ts. Damdinsüren's reader (entry 18, pp. 288-295).
po, belonged to the Sakya clan of early Indian kings. Furthermore, Guoshi Čorji briefly dwells on the history of king Srong-btsan-gam-po whom, as we stated earlier, he considers the author of the Manigambum, exalts him in every way, calling him a great Chakravartin king who illuminated the profound darkness by the holy words of dharma.

Proceeding to the history of Mongolia, Guoshi Čorji emphasizes the historical continuity of the religion which the Mongols received from Tibet. He begins the history of Mongolian khans from Chinggis Khan. It is striking that this author comes forth not only as a true defender of the new religion, but also as a mighty ideologue upholding the authority of the Mongolian khans. Extolling Chinggis Khan in every way, despite the historical facts, he ascribes to him the merit of founder of the Two Principles policy. He writes that Chinggis Khan was a rebirth of Qormuzda, the king of all the Tengris (gods, devi), that Chinggis Khan, having subjected haughty enemies to his power, founded the Two Principles policy. The Buddhist religion, according to his words, began to flourish under the subsequent kings of the Chinggis clan. However it fell into decline under kings who departed from the true faith. Such a situation continued until those times when pious kings arose, who labored in the interest of expanding religion in Mongolia. At this point, the author particularly emphasizes the merit of Altan khan and Boșoytu jinong, who organized the invitation of the Dalai lama to Mongolia.

In the colophon, Guoshi Čorji essentially gave a concise outline history of Mongolia closely bound with the history of the homeland of Lamaism. It must especially be emphasized that in him we find one of the early attempts of clerical historians to designate the chief landmarks of Mongolian history, which later lay at the root of all Mongolian historical writing. These high points, as already noted, correspond to the three chief periods of the history of Buddhism in Mongolia—the period of its initial dissemination under the great khan; the period of its decline after the destruction of the Yuan dynasty; and its period of rebirth under Altan khan.

Guoshi Čorji gives an analogous overall scheme for Mongolian history in the colophon of his translation of another Buddhist composition: the Śatasahasrika-prajñā-paramita (in Mongolian the Bilig-ün činadu kijayar-a kürügsen jayun mingyan toya-tu) (entry 9) in twelve volumes. There the author likewise extolled Chinggis Khan

21 Supra it was stated that the translation of this work was later included in the Mongolian Kanjur, the editors of which were so faithful to the translation of their famous predecessor that they even left his colophon with no changes at all, merely adding some information about their own editorial work and about Guoshi Čorji himself. In our view, closest of all to that original variant of Guoshi Čorji's colophon is the one in the incomplete hand-written Kanjur (pp. 393-396), which does not indicate the translator's name nor the dates of translation. But the main part of this colophon agrees with the first part of the colophon from the xylograph edition of the Kanjur, which we link by its content to the output of Guoshi Čorji. Guoshi Čorji himself for some reason did not mention anything in the colophon about himself nor about the translator, but the editors of his translation of the Kanjur spoke quite definitely about this.
as a reincarnation of Qormuzda in the great northern country (Mongolia), who had disseminated the holy religion everywhere, having subjugated all the wild-mannered creatures to his mighty power. A weakening of the position of religion under the “impious khans” Guoshi Čorji compared to the darkness of night. But Altan Khan, who reawakened religion in Mongolia, he calls a dharmaraja. It is quite evident from Guoshi Čorji’s work that he was devoted body and soul to the Buddhist religion, and with faith and truth served the khan’s power, rendering support to its expansion. For this reason all his colophons are replete with every kind of praise for Buddhist teaching.

Guoshi Čorji, as a figure of religion, naturally could not fail to be interested in Tibetan hagiographic literature, which occupies as everyone knows a considerable part of Tibetan historical writing. The saints’ lives of Molon Toin and Milaraspa which Guoshi Čorji translated belong to the category of those namtars (saints’ lives) which of all similar types of Tibetan literature are the ones of the very least interest. What is more, they do not have colophons which might have been of interest to us. These saints’ lives are replete with all kinds of legends and didactic precepts. In the very first period when Lamaism was being spread in Mongolia these kinds of hagiographic works were the most numerous of all, evidently in response to the needs of the new faith for propaganda amongst the broad national masses.

[202]
Sakya Dondub

The translator, Sakya Dondub, played an important role in popularizing Tibetan religious-historical literature in the initial period of Lamaism’s spread among the Mongols. There is little information preserved about him. According to some data he himself communicated he was a Tibetan by birth from the Sakya monastery, but grew up in Mongolia, in the Ordos. He studied many languages, including Mongolian. He was a contemporary of the noted Bošoytu-jinong of the Ordos (1565-1624) and quickly became renowned as a translator. He translated into Mongolian two very important Tibetan historical compositions: *Genealogy Of The Kings, Called The Clear Mirror* (in Tib. Rgyal rabs chos byun gsal ba’i me loñ) (entry 35)\(^2\) and the *Badma-yadang* (Mong. Badma-yatang sudur); its complete Mongolian name is the *Badma sambu-a baysi-yin delgerenggui jokiyas-an törül-un cadiɣ* (entry 2). Bearing in mind that in the colophon of the *Clear Mirror* Sakya Dondub calls Bošoytu jinong and his wife Jünggin-qatun the ones who commissioned the translation of this work, listing all

---

\(^2\) This work has several different names. Henceforth we shall call it *The Clear Mirror*. In Mongolian the translator calls it: Čidayチ-yin șasin sayitur delgeregen șosun-i, șinar buyan-țan qoyar törür-yi yaberapaşan inu, čing ünen-iyor uqaşulqui geğen toli, čindamani mete șene čiday-un türünü.
his titles (Bošoytu nom-un kārdān orčiyuluŋči čakravard jinon sečen, bodisung töröl-tū jünggiŋ gatun), which Maidari qutuytu conferred on them in 1614, it is possible to assume that the translation in question was completed by him no earlier than 1614 and no later than 1624, the year Bošoytu jinong died (entry 233, p. 34).

It must be noted that, although the Clear Mirror has been studied by scholars for some 150 years, the question of its authorship and the date it was written are still not fully solved (entries 245, pp. 180, 194; 212, p. 207; 286, vol. 1, p. 141; 287, p. 79; 273, p. 671; 277, p. 481; 91, pp. vi-x). The major difficulty lies in the fact that the Earth-Dragon year (1328) mentioned in the colophon as the time when the Clear Mirror was compiled in no wise agrees with what the author says about events of much later times, for instance about the transfer of power in China from the Mongolian khan Toyon Temür to the emperor of the Ming Dynasty in 1368. In addition, when expounding the history of the Mongolian khans, the author quotes a Tibetan work (the Red Annals, Ulan debter, Mong. Hu-lan deb-ther, Tib. Deb ther mar po), compiled by Situ Gebailodoi Gunga-dorji (dGe-ba'i bLo-gros Kun-dga' rdo-ije) no earlier than 1346 (the Fire-Dog Year) (entry 35, fol. 12-b).

In our view, of the more recent research, the most convincing is that of the Russian Tibetologist B. I. Kuznetsov, who thinks that there are no grounds to deny authorship to Sakya Sodnom Jaltsan (bSod-nams rgyal-mtshan) (1312-1375). As for what concerns the Earth-Dragon year (1328) referred to in the colophon, that in his opinion is the result of an error or a miscopying committed by the author himself or by a copyist of the manuscript. In actuality this composition was completed in 1368 or shortly afterward. Kuznetsov came to this conclusion not only because the name of Sodnom-Jaltsan is in the colophon of that work, but also on the basis of analyzing a number of factual data cited by Sodnom-Jaltsan (entries 58, p. 9; 91, pp. vii-x).

To Kuznetsov’s reasons must be added some information from the biography of Sakya Sodnom Jaltsan in the [Holy] Genealogy [of the Deacons] of the Sakya monastery (entry 19, fol. 161-a/180-a) (as to this work, cf. entry 134, pp. 67, 74). By the way, for some reason up to now none of the researchers have employed this most valuable biography of Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan as they should in studying his work. Moreover it is clear from it that the author of the Clear Mirror was one of the most learned lamas among the Sakya deacons, which in this sense can place him on a level with the famed Gunga-Jaltsan. The biography states that Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan was a King of Doctrine, having no equal among the sages in the majority of lands of Jambhuvipa: India, Nepal, Kashmir, Gu-ge, the three regions of Tibet (Na, Ri, Kor), China, Mongolia and others (entry 19, fol. 172-a).

23 As the author of the [Holy] Genealogy [of the Deacons] of the Sakya Monastery writes, he composed the biography of Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan on the basis of primary sources, including biographies (namtars) compiled by his close associates, Jantsub-zemo, Jantsub-Jaltsan and Baldan Chütem.
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It is noteworthy that Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan, under various pretexts, thrice declined an invitation of the Mongolian court to remain in Peking, "being freed from the threats of those holding a golden p'ai-tzu [emissaries of a Mongolian khan—Sh. B.] through the mercy of the goddess Odser-chanma" (entry 19, fol. 167-b), from which one may conclude that he did not cherish much sympathy for the Mongolian khan, and for that time this was undoubtedly a very bold step. The mention of a History of Buddhism among the numerous works of Sodnom-Jaltsan serves as confirmation of the fact that the Clear Mirror was actually written by him (entry 19, fol. 172-b). Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan borrowed his data on the history of Mongolia from the above-mentioned Red Annals of Gunga-Dorji. As to the close relations between Sodnom-Jaltsan and Gunga-Dorji one may speculate on the fact that in the biography of the former his correspondence with Tshalpa Gunga-Dorji is reported (entry 19, fol. 173-b). The discovery of this correspondence might elucidate a host of questions connected with the activity of Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan as a historian.

Comparing the beginning chapters of the works of both authors creates the impression that the Red Annals of Gunga-Dorji exercised a notable influence on the structure, or more exactly, on the introductory portion of Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan's work.

In the work of both authors the history of religion in Tibet is written from a wide stock of histories from countries contiguous to Tibet: India, China, the Tangut lands and Mongolia. It is no accident that Sakya Dondub, by birth from Sakya in the Ordos, was interested in the work of his famed countryman. Nor is it coincidental that Boṣoytu jinong and his wife Jinggiin qatun, "sincerely desiring to cooperate in expanding the religion of Buddha," (from the colophon of the Mongolian translation of the Clear Mirror manuscript, fol. 177; quoted according to entry 233, p. 34) in their region had selected for translation specifically this work by the Sakya lama Sodnom-Jaltsan, with whose famed ancestors the Mongolian khans were in such close relationship.

Rather detailed information about the initiator of the Mongolian translation of the Clear Mirror can be found in the chronicle of Sayang Sečen. We know from it that Boṣoytu jinong was one of the greatest political figures of Mongolia in the second half of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century. He, along with Altan Khan, Quturyai Sečen qung-tayiji and other figures, earnestly striving to strengthen the khan's power in Mongolia with the aid of the new religion, took active part in all possible measures to disseminate Buddhism on the Mongolian steppes. For services rendered he received in 1578 from the Third Dalai Lama the title of Chakravard sečen jinong (entry 44, p. 254; Urga MS 77v14), and from Maidari Quturytu in 1614 the title of Altan kürdün ergigüleği Čakravard sečen jinong qayan (entry 44, p. 287; Urga MS 86v02), which means Wise jinong-Chakravartin-king Who Turns the Golden Wheel. Boṣoytu jinong found himself on friendly terms with Quturyai Sečen qung-tayiji. His father Buyan Bayatur qung-tayiji was a companion of Quturyai Sečen who had elevated him to the rank of jinong, when he was at most 13 years of age (in 1576) (entry 44, p. 240; Urga MS 74r11). From that time on Boṣoytu Jinong
was the closest companion of the famed qung-taiji. It is remarkable that he, like Qutuytai Sečen, displayed interest in history, although he undertook no historical work himself. However, Bošoqtyu Jinong was involved in historiographic activity on the Mongols of his time, having organized a translation of the *Clear Mirror* (the date of the Mongolian translation is not indicated in the colophon).

Bošoqtyu Jinong’s choice was quite successful, inasmuch as the *Clear Mirror* by Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan is one of the best of the Tibetan historical works. It has the advantage of being different not only from the Tibetan hagiographical works, but also from many historical works by Tibetan authors of the period in question. The thematic topics of this work are vast. It incorporates not only a history of Buddhism, but also a history of royal genealogies. Moreover, this work embraces the history of a host of countries: India, Tibet, China, the Tangut country, and Mongolia. Thanks to all this the *Clear Mirror* can in no way be classified as embodying the traditional scheme of the three monarchies, to which the Mongols had been drawn ever since the times of hPhags-pa lama.

Beyond doubt, the *Clear Mirror*, having been translated into Mongolian, could not but assist the expansion of Mongolian historical knowledge. There is no need to analyze it in detail, but we would like to observe that the history of the Mongolian khans in the *Clear Mirror* has one significant peculiarity. Being the final echo of the Mongolian historiographic traditions of the empire period, it has conveyed some of these down to us. The history of the Mongolian khans in the *Clear Mirror* begins, following early Mongolian tradition, with the distant legendary ancestors of the Chinggisid clan, i.e., from Börte chino and his descendants (entry 19, fol. 11-b). Sodnom-Jaltsan thinks that prior to Chinggis khan in China, in the Tangut country and in Mongolia, the Buddhist religion had yet to be disseminated.

The date of Chinggis’s entry into the historical arena he places at 3250 years after Buddha’s nirvana. He brings the history of the Mongolian khans, as we noted above, down to their overthrow in China under Toyon Temür. Though his history of the Mongols is also given in a very compressed fashion, it obviously played an important role in acquainting the Mongols with their early historical traditions.

Sakya Dondub translated the *Badma-yadang*, a Tibetan historical work, at the command of a certain well-known Mongolian figure, Erdeni Manyus-qulači bayatur tajiji. To judge from the fact that in the colophon the client, Manyus-qulači, bears the rank which he received from Maidari-qutuyt in the Blue Tiger Year (1614) (entry 44, p. 287), and that Dondub, who mentions in the colophon the appearance of the fourth reincarnation of the Dalai Lama in the clan of a Mongolian khan, does not report his death in the Red Dragon Year (1616), one may with full trust in its likelihood

---

24 This is stated in the colophon of the Mongolian translation of the *Badma-yadang* (entries 2, fol. 292-b; cf. 232, pp. 31-32; 233, pp. 40-44).
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presume that the translator executed his work between 1614 and 1616.

The special interest in the Badma-yadang by the Mongolian prince mentioned supra is not accidental. This work, distinctive for its accessible and entertaining manner of exposition, was intended to serve as a way to popularize Buddhism in Mongolia. Although according to Tibetan tradition, the Badma-yadang is thought to have been written in antiquity as a life of the celebrated Padmasambhava, withdrawn like all the “secret books” from vaults, in reality it is a much later compilation put together by anonymous authors on the basis of the rich legendary and semi-legendary reports, and sometimes real historical information accumulated by the Tibetans in the course of many generations.

The hagiographic aspect of historical-literary creativity was used most adroitly as propaganda of the Buddhist faith for the wide popular masses of Tibet. The work in question not only contained a description of Padmasambhava's life, replete with miracles intended for the most pious believers, but also gave splendid examples of how the Dharmaraja and the Preceptor should labor for the weal of religion and state. The work cites the legacy of Padmasambhava, whom the Tibetans all but put on a level with Buddha himself. In these legacies addressed to the Tibetan kings, officials, quvarags, commoners and others, Padmasambhava explains how to be guided by the requirements of sacred doctrine. Naturally, Padmasambhava would hardly have written such admonitions, and much less likely could they have been preserved and come down to us in such complete form. But it is impossible in this regard to negate the older genuine base on which they were able to arise.

Behind these admonitions, in our view, stand anonymous authors with their entirely earthly and practical interests. Through the lips of their heroes they set forth their own views on some important world problems of their time, held in strict conformity with the interests of the Buddhist religion and church. This was the most effective method employed by Tibetan religious writers to influence the minds of readers. This or that exhortation or admonition sounded more forceful when it was set forth
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from the mouth of Padmasambhava, and not in the name of the little-known author. To attain their main aim the real authors sacrificed their own names, but in return their works earned lasting fame as the allegedly true creations of religious figures and enjoyed wide renown among the believing masses. For us the legacies of Padmasambhava in the Badma-yadang afford particular interest since they display some of the Tibetan religious ethical-juridical views, along with the law of Khri-srong-bde-btsan which had considerable influence on Mongolian historical-political thought.

An example quite characteristic in this sense is the admonition of Padmasambhava to the Tibetan kings, ministers and the so-called commoners. Padmasambhava's lips set forth the basic content of one of the two principles of power, about which we have spoken supra—the principle of secular power.

In accord with these admonitions, the Tibetan kings in governmental affairs were
to adhere to the following rules:
not to behave like common folk;
not to be unyielding in matters requiring tolerance;
to have considerate officials under them and to direct them to attain their goals;
not to fall under the sway of the soft speech of associates who are able to inflict
harm on the state;
to be able to listen to stern words without displaying anger; not to be overly
generous in bestowing kindesses and in awards to officials and subjects, but
strictly consider what they merit;
to be cautious that mediocre and mercenary officials do not destroy the state,
because if this occurs, then it brings about loss of the khan’s power;
to maintain the Three Jewels at the apex of regard, and so forth.

Padmasambhava ordered the Tibetan officials
to be true to their king in body, word and heart,
to display caution,
to act as the king ordered,
to concern themselves with the welfare of the whole state;
to pursue a policy of dharma;
to look to the future and follow the past;
to think things over well and then not regret what was done. He who behaves in
accord with dharma and respects the Three Jewels is a servant of the doctrine;
he who is wise, encourages agreement and unfailingly investigates good and
bad things, is a sagacious councillor;
he who can fearlessly and with artful means suppress enemies, is
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a bayatur-official. Whether royal authority is good or bad, depends on the activ­
ity of the official; one needs to strengthen a great state, displaying perspicacity, and
other applications of Buddhist morality.

From what has been stated it is clear what a necessary book the Badma-yadang
was for the ruling circles of Mongolia, who had just embarked on propagation of a
new faith. As to what the immediate reaction of Mongolian ruling circles was to
their first acquaintance with the Badma-yadang, there is an extensive colophon writ­
ten by Dondub himself which speaks to this; it both illustrates his historical judg­
ments and the new historical views of the Mongols of that time. That is why the
colophon is such an important source for judging the ideology of Mongolian society
at the beginning of the 17th century. From the initial lines of prayer in the colophon
it is clear that its author nourished an unshakeable faith in the almighty force of
Buddhist teaching, which the Grand Teacher Padmasambhava expounded amongst
the “innumerable creatures” who had turned to the Buddhist faith. For Dondub,
Padmasambhava was a higher holy being, fulfilling the desires of people of all times
and all lands of the world.

Dondub says that he wants to relate how “the precious religion” came to Mon­
golia. But he begins the story with a brief exposition of the history of the appearance
and expansion of Buddhism in India and Tibet, essentially summing up everything
which is said about this subject in the work itself. He treats the religion of Shakyamuni like a world religion. Buddha Shakyamuni was born when the age of sentience had only one hundred years left; and it was he who placed the whole world on the true path by means of the two forms of dharma: sutras and dharmas. The onset of Buddhist expansion among the Mongols Dondub attributes to the time of Khubilai Setsen Khan and hPhags-pa lama. From that time over the course of more than ten generations, according to his words, this religion flourished in Mongolia. But under Hulayu Khan, the learned translator Choidji Odser, who had brought into being the translation of a book on the prajn^aramita, sutra and dharani, was invited as a mentor. The translator ascertains with regret that Toyon Temür unworthily lost his royal power, having abandoned it to Chinese hands. From this time on religion fell into decline, and the Mongols over the course of many generations led a sinful life. And only Altan Khan from the Borjigid clan, the grandson of Batu-möngke, Dayan Khan, restored the holy religion and the state, invited the Dalai Lama to Mongolia and regularized relations with China. The Dalai Lama who was this khan’s object of worship not only “illumined the dark region of Mongolia by the light of holy teaching”, but he himself after his death was reborn into the clan of a Mongolian khan.

To conclude, Dondub desired all people at all times to act in accord with the Precious Doctrine (Buddhism) and thereby ultimately to attain the status of a Buddha, so that there would be timely precipitation and grain would grow according to people’s needs, and there would be no illnesses, so that the Mongolian state might peacefully flourish.

The Altan Tobči Anonymous

The Altan Tobči Anonymous is something of an oddity among the historical works of the period under review; its full title is *Qad-un ındüsün-ü quriyangwyni altan tobcı nereti sudur* [A Brief Genealogy Of The Khans, Called The Altan Tobči or The Golden Summary] (entry 11).

To establish the exact date when this work was written is difficult, but one may consider acceptable the dating proposed by some scholars on the basis of studying the text. In their opinion, the basic text of the Altan Tobči Anonymous can be established no earlier than 1604, since in all copies the propounding of events concludes by mentioning the ascension of Ligdan to the throne in the Dragon Year (1604). The composition says nothing about the religious merits of Ligdan Khan, nor about the downfall of his khanate. Louis Ligeti and L. S. Puchkovskii, bearing in mind that

As to the various copies of this work, cf. entries 150, pp. 53-59; and 188, pp. 19-24. The Altan Tobči has long drawn the attention of scholars. It was first translated into Russian by Galsang Gomboyev (entry 51). It has also been translated into Japanese and English.
the text of the monument mentions the name of the Ming Emperor T'ien-ch'i (1621-1627) expressed the opinion that the *Altan Tobči* was written no earlier than the 1720s (entries 253, pp. 57-61; 188, p. 19). Charles Bawden regards the list of Ming emperors included in the monument text as an interpolation which upsets the normal course of exposition (entry 72, p. 156, note 12). Bawden, a translator of the *Altan Tobči*, dates the time the basic text of the work appeared back to the period of Ligdan's rule, i.e., to the period between 1604 and 1634 (entry 72, p. 13). It must be remembered that when dating this work, we have to keep in mind only the basic text.

Scholars have already uncovered several interpolations which clearly upset the normal course of exposition. The very latest of these is a report about Ligdan Khan's grandson, Bumi, born in 1651 (entries 72, p. 14; 233, pp. 75-76).

Heissig, in support of the dating advanced by Bawden, at the same time considered that the *Altan Tobči Anonymous* was a shortened version of Lubsangdanjin's *Altan Tobči*, compiled, as Bawden thinks, about 165526 (entry 233, p. 75).

The *Altan Tobči Anonymous* is an original work of Mongolian historical writing written during the period in question. Its appearance testifies to the fact that after the acceptance of Lamaism Mongolian historiographic activity did not come down to a mere imitation of Buddhist historical literature, or more exactly, of Tibetan ecclesiastical historiography. It must be remembered that Lamaism upon its penetration into Mongolia clashed with a very complex Mongolian historiographic tradition. This circumstance served as a barrier on the road to the unrestricted dominance of ecclesiastical historiography in Mongolia. The formation of Mongolian ecclesiastical historiography is connected to a much later period, to the 18th-19th centuries, but even then the Mongolian historiographic tradition did not fully and unreservedly yield its place to a new type of historical literature.

A remarkable phenomenon in the history of development of Mongolian historical knowledge in the time being described is the fact that Mongolian interest in their own history not only did not wane, but on the contrary to a certain degree even grew. The *Altan Tobči* in particular speaks about this. Although it overtly displays a Buddhist world-view (more will be said about that *infra*), it is to a far greater degree a collection of the most varied information about the history of the Mongols with the addition of tales about some historical events dealing with the years when the anonymous author of this work was alive.

For an historiographic analysis it would be most suitable to divide the *Altan Tobči* text into two parts, although the work itself is neither divided into chapters

---

26 Bayar, in his interesting paper published in 1985, on the basis of analyzing the text of the *Altan Tobči* by way of collating it with the text of Lubsangdanjin's *Altan Tobči*, arrived at the conclusion that the anonymous *Altan Tobči* was composed between 1675 and 1725, and that it is an abbreviated version of Lubsangdanjin's book. See Bayar, *Altan Tobči kijiy-a jokiyaydayasan bui?* [When was the brief *Altan Tobči* written?], in Öhör Mongol-un baysi-yin yeke suryağuli-yin sedkal, 1985, no. 1, pp. 7-15.
nor parts. The first part includes within it a history of the Mongols from earliest times to the fall of the Yüan empire, and the second,

a history of the post-Yüan period down to the ascension of Ligdan to the throne as khan. The most characteristic peculiarity of the first part is the fact that it is written on the basis of ancient Mongolian traditionary tales, legends and all kinds of stories, the majority of which go back to the 13th century, i.e., to the time when the Secret History appeared. Those tales and traditional stories which go back to the 13th century include

1. The genealogy of the ancestors of Chinggis Khan from Börte Chino to Dowa Soqor and Dobun-Mergen (pp. 4-7);
2. Alan-goa's marriage to Dobun-Mergen (p. 7);
3. The dispute among the five sons of Alan-Goa (p. 8);
4. Bodonchar and his descendants down to Yisügei (pp. 9-10);
5. How Yisügei took Hö'elün to wife (p. 11);
6. The birth of Temüjin and the death of Yisügei (pp. 12-13);
7. The slaying of Begter (pp. 14-15);
8. Temüjin's capture by the Taichi'ud and his flight with the help of Sorgon Shira (pp. 15-18);
9. The return of his horses from the Taichi'ud with the help of Bogorchu (pp. 18-19);
10. The meeting of Temüjin and Börte (pp. 19-21);
11. The flight of Qasar and the order of Chinggis Khan (pp. 21-23);
12. The quarrel with the Taichi'ud, at which time Belgütei received a wound (pp. 23-24);
13. The decamping of Oran Chingküi and the pursuit of him by Chinggis and Qasar (p. 26);
14. Chinggis Khan's campaign against the Jürchen (p. 27);
15. Chinggis Khan's campaign against the Koreans (pp. 27-32);
16. Argasun quurći (pp. 32-34);
17. Chinggis Khan's campaign against Sidurgu Khan and the death of Chinggis (pp. 34-49). [These page numbers refer to Bawden's work (entry 72), pp. 35-61]

The first nine events of those enumerated here are strongly reminiscent in their content of corresponding passages in the Secret History. It is of course impossible to say that they completely agree in their texts with the Secret History, and for this reason Bawden definitely asserts that the author of the Altan tobći Anonymous did not use the Secret History (entry 72, p. 16). Bawden explains the cases of agreement of content in both works by the fact that both of them are based on one and the same early Mongolian tradition (ibid.). But it seems to us that the link of the Altan Tobći with the first-born child of Mongolian historiography is rather closer. It is solely a question of whether this link is direct or indirect, and whether it was executed at first-hand or through the medium of oral retelling of the Secret History's contents.
The fact that the content of the latter

to a greater or lesser degree is reflected in Mongolian chronicles of the 17th-18th
centuries bears witness to the fact that this work was preserved by the Mongols not
only in written form, but also orally, in the popular memory, in the repertoire of the
tellers of tales. On the strength of this it appears quite possible that the *Altan Tobči
Anonymous* was compiled on the basis of various sources, including the oral tradit­
ions of the *Secret History*. As distinct from the *Altan Tobči Anonymous*, the work
by the same name of Lubsangdanjin as we shall see *infra*, is based on the written
version.

In the *Altan Tobči* not all the data referring to early Mongolian history remind
one of the *Secret History*. Of the seventeen events going back to the 13th century
mentioned above, items 10 through 17 actually differ substantially from the *Secret
History* paragraphs which correspond to them, or are quite absent in the latter. Much
of that which is related in these passages noted from the *Altan Tobči* permit one
rather clearly to imagine how early traditionary tales and legends were transmitted
from one generation to another, growing by layers and even acquiring a new voca­
bulary. As an example we cite the speech about Chinggis Khan just before his
death, the speech by Külüke tiei bagatur, addressed to the ailing Chinggis Khan, and
also his address to the deceased Chinggis, when the cart with his body was mired in
the mud (entry 72, pp. 43-48, 141-145). In these speeches and addresses one may
already encounter Buddhist expressions and concepts.

The second part of the *Altan Tobči* text testifies that the Mongols not only care­
fully guarded the ancient traditions, but even created new traditional tales and leg­
ends, infused with old examples, and even simply imitating them. Similar creativity
continued in later times as well. This portion of the work, like the first, also embod­
ies traces of traditionary tales, and only some of its passages deliver any more or
less up-to-date and reliable historical facts.

From what has been said it follows that Mongolian historical literature at the end
of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century, as before, was not able to draw a
strict distinction between the data of legends and genuine history; history at that
time was still not liberated from the methods of literary-folkloric creativity.

The *Altan Tobči* cites some improbable narrative information about persons,
whose existence in history is beyond doubt. At the same time the actual historical
events are expounded in such a way that their factual accuracy seems sacrificed to
the imagination of the storyteller, overflowing with vivid formal details, characteris­
tic of oral creativity. Thus, when describing Toyon-taishi of the Oirats occupying
the khan’s throne, an event which actually took place in history, the author of the
chronicle informs us that Toyon-taishi, having insulted the spirit of Chinggis Khan,
was slain by an arrow from Chinggis’s quiver, kept in the Eight Yurts (entry 41).

Likewise, it is common historical knowledge that the Ming emperor Ying-tsung
in the *Altan Tobči* erroneously called Jingtai (Chingtai) was captured by the Oirat
Esen Tayiji. The author of the *Altan Tobči* also communicates this fact, but he ex-
pounds it within the spirit of a fantastic tale, according to which it proved impossible to cut the body of the emperor with a sword. The sword with which they were to use to slay him allegedly shattered into pieces; when the emperor was bound and cast into water, his body did not sink, but floated on the surface.

Convinced that it was impossible to kill the emperor, the Mongols decided to hold him in captivity. However, his stay among the Mongols drew a host of disasters down on them: famine, illnesses, loss of cattle and so on. During this period the captured emperor wrote a note and secreted it in the wool of a sheep which the Mongols sold to the Chinese. The Chinese having learned the fate of their emperor, said to the Mongols: “They say that you are compelling our king to work for you. This is not good for you. Release him to us!” The Mongols returned the emperor, receiving in return great riches from the Chinese (entry 41, pp. 89-90).

Many pages of the Altan Tobči vividly recreate the overall picture and spirit of its time, a time when Mongolia suffered from disintegration and internecine strife. Among these events may be mentioned:

1. The tales of Elbeg Khan who killed his own son, so as to marry his daughter-in-law (pp. 63-65);
2. The one about Adai Khan’s campaign against the Oirats, during which time a duel took place between Sigisütei-bayatur-wang of the Mongols and Gürülinči-bayatur of the Oirats (pp. 66-67);
3. The one about the fight of Taisun Khan with the Oirats;
4. The treachery of Agbarchin-jinong and his going over to the Oirat side (pp. 71-75, 77-78);
5. The one about Toyon-Tayiji of the Oirats and his claims to the throne (p. 85);
6. The one about Esen-Tayiji and his campaign against China, which culminated in a defeat of the Chinese army and in taking the emperor prisoner (pp. 86-90);
7. and the story of Muguligai-wang (pp. 91-92), and so on.

The main subjects of these tales are the unending strife between separate groups of Mongolian khans, tayijis and jinongs, as well as the struggle between the eastern and western parts of Mongolia. In these, as we see, are expressed the most important events of Mongolian history in the period of internecine wars. The chief historical-political idea which permeates the tales mentioned is the striving to justify the members of the Golden Clan, the direct descendants of Chinggis khan, who had fought to keep the royal throne in their hands against the claims of the separatist lords.

The portion of the Altan Tobči under review strictly observes the chronological principle of narration. At the base of this chronology lies the traditional Mongolian system of calculating years according to the twelve-year animal cycle. Guided by this, the author cites, although with errors, the complete chronology of rule of all the Mongolian khans in the 15th and 16th centuries. The influence of the Tibeto-Chinese system of the sixty-year animal cycle had not yet been adopted; this took place somewhat later. Almost all the persons figuring in this part of the Altan Tobči are actual historical figures. In this regard it is especially interesting that the geneal-
ogy of the Mongolian khans is grounded on the data of the genealogical records of the khans and tayijis.

The historicity of the events set forth in the portion of the *Altan Tobdī* being reviewed is notably reinforced when the narrative draws nigh to the years when the author lived. By way of example one may point to the biographical data on Batumongke Dayan Khan, Bodī-Alag, Daraisun Khan, as well as Altan Khan, Tūmenjasaytu Khan, Buyan Seèen Khan and Ligdan Khan. The author displays special interest in Altan Khan, dwelling in this connection on the tradition of his predecessors. In the *Altan Tobdī* there is no glimmer of the cult of Ligdan Khan, so characteristic of much later chronicles.

Here the author speaks of Altan Khan as a ruler who restored the early tradition of governing the state and the religion of Mongolia. According to the *Altan Tobdī*, Altan Khan completed his campaigns against the Oirats with the aim of revenging himself for Elbeg Khan, Adai Khan, Taisun Khan, as well as for Aybarji-jinong, who was victim of a plot (entry 41, p. 123). Further on it reports that Altan Khan executed an attack on China, destroying fortresses and towns, which compelled the Ming emperor out of fright to lay tribute before him and to award him the title of *Shun-i wang* (entry 41, entry 124). The story then goes on to narrate genuine events concerning Mongol-Chinese historical relations during 1550-1571. We shall return to this topic infra.

The anonymous author of the *Altan Tobdī* sees a particular service to history in Altan Khan’s disseminating Lamaism within Mongolia. According to the anonymous author, Altan Khan invited the Dalai Lama Sodnam Jamtso from Tibet, and other visible religious figures “with the goal of restoring the by-gone state management and religion curtailed under Toyon Temür Khan” (entry 41, p. 21). He compares the actions of this khan with the activity of Khubilai Khan.

The *Altan Tobdī* is a product of its epoch and bears a distinct image of Buddhist influence. This shows up most strikingly of all at the onset of the author’s narrative. Adhering to the well-known scheme of the three Buddhist monarchies, he prefaces the beginning of his history with a genealogy of early Indian and Tibetan kings, beginning with Mahāsammata, and then, with the aid of Buddhist myth, links the origins of Tibetan kings with the clan of Mahāsammata, and derives the Mongolian khans from the Tibetan kings. Thanks to this, the genealogical line of the Mongolian khans is taken back to the clan of Mahāsammata through the intermediation of the kings of the homeland of Lamaism. The work also makes use of the religious myth that Börte Chino, the legendary progenitor of the Mongolian khans, was the younger son of the Tibetan king Dalai-Subin Altan Sandalitu Khan who, having quarreled with his brothers, set out across the “sea,” and arrived in Mongolia where he married Goa-Maral, thereby beginning the Mongolian clan (entry 41, p. 4). Having in this way finished the prehistory of Mongolia, the author proceeds to a genealogy of the ancestors of Chinggis Khan, describing them in agreement with the early Mongolian historical tradition (entry 41, pp. 4-5).
Let us give one more example. The author of the Altan Tobči, when setting forth the events of the 12th-13th centuries, resorted to the aid of Buddhism to explain them. He wrote that Chinggis Khan was born with a fate predestined from Heaven on High (Tengri), 3250 years after the nirvana of Buddha and at the prophecy of the latter; he was to suppress the twelve evil khans who had brought suffering to living creatures. Having received tribute and duty from the People of the Five Colors and the Four Foreign Lands, from the people of the 361 tribes and the 720 languages of Jambhuvipa, and proffering them peace and tranquility, he became famed as the Chakravartin-king (entry 41, p. 21). It is clear that this is an effort of the Altan Tobči's author to found a Chinggis Khan cult in the eyes of believers from the position of a new religion. His pen converts Chinggis Khan, "born with a fate preordained from Heaven," into a typical Buddhist king of the doctrine.

The Altan Tobči is an original historical composition serving as a unique kind of footbridge linking early Mongolian historical traditions with the subsequent history of Mongolian historiography. The Altan Tobči is the earliest secular Mongolian chronicle which has come down to us if we do not include the Čayán teüke.

Historical-Political Ideas in the Mongolian Kanjur Colophons

It has already been stated above that the translation of the Kanjur into Mongolian, begun as early as the Yüan empire, was completed under Ligdan Khan, and that this translation lay at the base of the woodblock Kanjur edition of 1718-1720. We also mentioned the incomplete hand-written Kanjur kept in the National Library in Ulaanbaatar. In both instances we are interested solely in the colophons written by the Mongolian translators of this work. Some of the colophons contain valuable historical information permitting one to judge the historical-political views of the Mongols in the years when Ligdan Khan ruled.

Keeping in mind the xylographic edition of the Kanjur, one must point to one of its important peculiarities. Although it was brought into existence under the Manchu Emperor Hsüan Yeh (K'ang-hsi), who had striven to promote himself amongst the Mongols as a defender of their faith, the initial Mongolian translation, made under Ligdan Khan, actually did not undergo any special changes. The Mongolian editors of the xylographic edition remained faithful to the translations of their predecessors. Even in the preface to the Mongolian edition, the authorship of which is ascribed to that same Hsüan Yeh, they not only mention the Mongolian translation, executed under Ligdan Khan (entry 251, p. 333), but also say that the woodblock edition in question was executed on the basis of an old translation, checked against the text of the Tibetan original at the time when it was definitively edited (entry 251, p. 337). Thus does it explain that it fell to the Manchu Emperor, despite his hostile attitude to the memory of Ligdan, to share with him the merit of publishing the Kanjur. As for the hand-written Kanjur, it contains colophons which on the whole are missing from the
printed edition or actually differ from the latter.

Let us cite a few examples. In the printed Kanjur, the sutra called *Qutuytu bilig-tün ĉinadu kārīgisen nayiman mingyatu* (Skt. *Ārya-aṣṭāsahasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*) is only furnished with a brief colophon by the Tibetan translators (ibid., pp. 183, 184, 766), whereas in the hand-written copy there is an interesting Mongolian colophon from which we learn that this sutra was translated by Altan-Gerel-ubashi at the order of Danjin-qung-tayiji and his spouse Čayan Dara-qatun (entry 9, section yum, vol. kha, fol. 108-109). The Mongolian translation of the sutra called *Qutuytu jayun tūyiletū* (Skt. *Karṇaśataka*) contains a colophon in the hand-written Kanjur (entry 9, section elde, vol. ha, fol. 149-150), which differs from the colophon in the printed one (entry 251, No. 1102). It is clear from the text of the former colophon that the sutra in question was translated by that same Altan-gerel-ubashi, whereas the colophon of the printed Kanjur contains quite different information. The Mongolian translations of certain sutras in the hand-written Kanjur are provided with colophons which do not exist in the corresponding sections of the printed Kanjur (entry 251, No. 839; entry 9, section *Olan sudur* vol. da, fol. 145-b, section elde, vol. sa, fol. 152-a/153-b).

One could multiply the number of such instances, but those cited will suffice to prove the
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significance and the immense value of the colophons of the hand-written Kanjur, which supplement the information contained in the printed text. It is quite beyond doubt that the hand-written Kanjur to a considerable degree has preserved old colophons from the time of Ligdan Khan. In this respect a study of the colophons of the Leningrad hand-written Kanjur would have great scientific interest. Heissig, who studied only five volumes from the dulwa section, found five Mongolian colophons which were not in the printed Kanjur.

The Mongolian colophons of both the printed and the hand-written Kanjurs, may fully be regarded as historical material preserved from the times of Ligdan Khan. It is characteristic that nowhere in these colophons is there mentioned the Manchu Emperor, the instigator of the xylographic edition. This creates the impression that in this case the Mongolian editors of the edition, undertaken at the initiative of Hsüan Yeh, were more objective than those who worked on executing the Mongolian Kanjur translation under Ligdan Khan. Verily, Ligdan Khan’s translators, as already observed supra, took no little effort to alter the colophons of some translations dating to the time of Altan Khan, to extol their patron and themselves.

What kind of historical-political ideas are expressed in the colophons? First of all the Ligdan Khan translators, as well as their predecessors of the Altan Khan period, were by tradition interested exclusively in matters of the history of religion and of the Mongolian state. The difference lies merely in the fact that in this case as opposed to the past, the chief historical figure, who is spoken of with such reverence in almost all the colophons, is Ligdan Qutuytu Khan.

Let us take as an example the colophon of the Mongolian translation of the sutra called *Čoytu yeke mudr-a-yin dusul neretū yeke yogini-yin dandaris-nu qa yan-u*
Having reached its heyday in the Indian state, the religion of the Almighty Shakya-muni Buddha was likewise disseminated in our Mongolian state in ancient times. However in the course of time the holy religion considerably weakened. At that time when the chief thing in the religion which had been disseminated came to be an object of worship, there appeared Ligdan Qutuytu Tai-yian-Sechen khan, ruler of men, who possessed a holy wisdom and very profound knowledge, belonging to the ranks of Chakravartins, a reincarnation of the Almighty and Omniscient Tengri, satisfying all needs, who expanded religion by the might of his own true faith, a leader who vanquished by his might the alien enemies, who supported the state by the force of his magnanimity. [He], having encountered Sharaba-qutuytu, similar to Sun and Moon, born as the great-great-grandson of Sakya, so as to make no error in his relations, contemplating Maha-Yoga, so as to make no error in the ubidas [wonders], supported the Vajradhara [Holder of the Vajra], so as to make no error in the root of Doctrine, executed the dissemination of the most sacred religion like the sun, led all the state on the path of Vajrayana, bringing happiness through his policy of peace and tranquility. For the sake of oppressing opponents by his might and for further expansion of the holy religion, having carefully considered with his profound wisdom, [he] ordered the Kanjur translated (cited according to entry 251, pp. 4-5).

Further on the colophon says that the sutra was translated by a person by the name of Køke-od-zer. This is an obvious miscopying. Instead of køke it should be the name kun-dga'(Mong. Gunga), a famous translator, the main editor of the Mongolian translation of the Kanjur, Kun-dga' Od-zer. This makes it clear that the colophon in question belongs to the pen of the chief editor. The content of the colophon permits one to judge the historical-political views of Kun-dga' Od-zer—one of the most prominent translators of Ligdan Khan's time—for whom the concepts of religion and khan's power were inseparable.

The author was convinced that a close collaboration with the khan, the representative of earthly power, the representative of spiritual power, assured the flourishing of both religion and state in Mongolia. Kun-dga' Od-zer briefly sets forth the traditional outline of the history of religion in the three countries: India, Tibet and Mongolia, but in this scheme the main place is devoted to contemporaneity, i.e., to the history of Ligdan Khan. The credit for the rebirth of religion in Mongolia Gunga-Odser (Kun-dga' Od-zer) assigns to Ligdan Khan alone, not devoting a single word to Altan Khan. The pen of the translator presents Ligdan as a typical Buddhist dharmarāja. In his exposition, Buddhism totally serves the interests of the Mongolian khan.

It is remarkable that almost all the Kanjur translators who wrote special colophons for their translations, considered it their duty specially to mention the historical merits of Ligdan Khan towards religion and the Mongolian state.

In the Buddhist understanding a Chakravartin-king ought to be not only a great
defender of religion but also an all-powerful ruler of people, an up-to-date embodiment of the power and might of the Supreme Deva (Tengri, Qormuzda) on earth. For this reason it turned out that glorifying Ligdan as defender of religion and the chief initiator of the Kanjur translation, also obliged the Mongolian translators to extol him also as the decisive antagonist of the Manchus, an energetic fighter for restoration of the all-Mongolian khan’s throne. Under the conditions of Manchu rule in Mongolia this naturally sounded a strange dissonance, but no less strange was the fact that the Mongolian editors of the Kanjur under Hsüan Yeh did not regard it as necessary to remove this “irrationality,” and left the old colophons unchanged, thus keeping all their splendid titles for Ligdan Khan.

One may consider an unconditional merit of the Mongolian Kanjur editors and translators to be the fact that the name of Ligdan Khan, an active fighter for Mongolian independence, not only remained unforgotten but on the contrary was immortalized in a Buddhist monument, the Kanjur. For this reason it is quite natural that the more the Kanjur, translated into Mongolian, was disseminated throughout all Mongolia, the higher the Mongol-Buddhists regarded the memory of the chief instigator of its Mongolian translation, “the great Mongolian khan, the second Chinggis-bogdo, Ligdan Qutuytu Chakravartin.” Extending over a more than two-century period of Manchu domination in Mongolia, Ligdan Khan remained in the consciousness of the Mongolian people not merely as a defender of religion, but also to some degree as a symbol of the once extant independent Mongolian state.

Of what sort were the titles and ranks awarded Ligdan Khan by the Mongolian translators of the Kanjur in their colophons? The most wide-spread of the multitude which existed were: “Kümän-i erketü delekei-dekini-i qormusda [222] Ruler of people, Qormuzda27 of the whole world,” Degedu nom-un mergen çakra­vad-un qutuytu Çinggis tay-un qayan “Qutuytu Chinggis tay-un qayan, wise Chakravartin of the holy religion”, Temüjin Çinggis qayan-u yeke orun-dur sayuysan tngri boyda çakravarti Lindan qutuytu tayiming Çinggis qayan “Tengri-bogdo Chakravartin, Tai-ming Chinggis khan Ligdan, the qutuytu seated on the great throne of Temüjin-Chinggis khan,” and so forth.

The life and activity of Ligdan Khan was a major historical topic in Mongolian colophons of the Kanjur. This theme could have received a more detailed treatment in Mongolian historiography and at the same time serve as impetus for further development of Mongolian historical writing, if the Manchu conquerors had not annihilated the Chahar Khanate, as a result of which Mongolian historical writing lost its basic theme—the history of the khans.

Hence, the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century mark a turning

27 Scholars think that the word Qormuzda is the Persian Ormuzd ’Heaven’. As Dorji Banzarov noted, the Buddhists, in translating Sanskrit books into Mongolian, called the God of Heaven Indra, chief of the 33 heavenly dwellers, Qormuzda in Mongolian (entry 130, pp. 59-60).
point in the history of Mongolian historical literature. Buddhism becomes an integral part of the ideology dominant in Mongolian historical writing. So began the genealogical-Buddhist stage in the history of Mongolian historiography.

A center of Mongolian literary and historiographic activity in this period was Southern Mongolia, which is also the place from which Lamaism began to expand onto the Mongolian steppes. As for Khalkha Mongolia and Western Mongolia, during the time under review they lagged behind Southern Mongolia. Although Abatai sain Khan accepted Lamaism at almost the same time as did Altan Khan, the new religion in Khalkha Mongolia at first did not expand as successfully as in Southern Mongolia. During the first period of Lamaist expansion among the Mongols no notable feats in literary activity of the Khalkhas and Oirats took place, which is explained, along with other reasons, as due to the absence of a sufficient number of educated folk, translators and literary figures. This is why Čoytu Tayiji and his mother, with their decrees about translating Buddhist sutras, had to turn to the celebrated translator from Kökeqota, Guoshi Čorji.

From those times very little data has come down to us, by
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which one could judge the position of Khalkha-Mongolian historical knowledge. Only one small inscription on rock from Čayan Baišing (White House) of Čoytu Tayiji has been preserved (entry 182, vol. 1, pp. 468-469; English translation entry 300, pp. 308-312). At present it is the solitary Khalkha-Mongolian historical monument from the beginning of the 17th century. The inscription contains, alongside data about the progress in constructing Buddhist temples, interesting information about the genealogy of the Khalkha-Mongolian khans and tayijis. It testifies as well to the fact that at the beginning of the 17th century Buddhism had already begun to show its influence on Khalkha-Mongolian historical knowledge. We cite this inscription in toto according to Pozdneyev's translation [and cited here according to the edition and translation by John Krueger, entry 300, pp. 310-311]:

> When from the most august Chinggis-khan, who,  
> By virtue of his acquiring a vast number of supreme virtues  
> In the course of an unnumbered multitude of periods,  
> Manifested his majestic and wondrous existence in the boundless Mongolian land

And became Khan of the inhabitants of the ten countries, thirty-one exalted generations of khans had passed, [when there appeared] Dayan-khan “furthering the development with solicitude.” Of the two sons of that most absolute beauty, his spouse Jimiskhen-khatun, the younger, Jalair-kung-tayiji, became the ruler of the ten thousand Khalkhas in Khangai Khan Nutuk. From him came seven sons, and the youngest of two was Úidzang-tayiji. From him six sons were begotten: Vachir-khan, Daichin, Yelden, Tsöökhor, Khoshuuchi, and Bodisun. From their midst, as the sun and the moon, the Khan and Tsöökhor, became especially useful to the faith and the world. During the good time of their furtherance of prosperity, that noble and good lady Mati-taikhal, the spouse of Khoshuuchi-tayiji, and Čoktu-tayiji, mother and son, concerned for the good of countless animate beings, from the fifteenth day of the
“cuckoo” month in the Iron-Cow year [1601], undertook the building of six temples on the western side of Tansuk-tala [the valley] of the river Tuula on a dry crest on the southern side of the mountain Khaldudun jirükhen, beginning with the temple of sed-kisi ùgei čindamani [jewel of unimaginable value], and after the passage of seventeen years, they completed them in the first summer, “cuckoo” month, in the Fire-Serpent year (1617)” (entry 182, pp. 469-472; entry 300, English translation, pp. 310-311).

Translation activity underwent a big surge among the Oirats in the 1640s, when the noted Zaya Pandita Namkhaijamtsö (1599-1662) and his disciples undertook active work on translation of Buddhist sutras into Mongolian. It is well-known that they translated from Tibetan into Mongolian more than two-hundred different sutras. Of these only a small number have come down to the present. During the last few years the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the MPR has discovered more than forty translations by Zaya Pandita and his disciples, made from Tibetan into Oirat (entry 117, p. 19). Among these were translations of a host of major historical works, such as the Manigambum²⁸, the Ćıqula keregtů [The Most Important Thing], the biographies of Milaraspa, Tsong-kha-pa, the Dalai Lama Gendun-Jamtso, the Gegen toli, the History of Buddhism by Bu-sTon-rinpoche²⁹, and others. We thus see that among the Oirats, as among the southern Mongols, at the same time as Lamaism was expanding, intensive work was going on to translate into their native language Tibetan historical literature, which as early as the second half of the 17th century was rather widely dispersed throughout Mongolia.

It follows, however, to remark, that Zaya Pandita, in the colophons to the translations which he completed and were written by himself, in contrast to the South Mongolian translators, does not express himself on the substance of these or other problems of Mongolian history and of the current position of the country, and does not share his own suppositions about them with the reader. His interests, evidently, were limited to the task of acquainting the Mongols with Tibetan historical literature devoted to the history of Buddhism-Lamaism—the new religion of all the Mongols.

²⁸ We reviewed supra the Manigambum translation executed by Gushi Tsooji. Zaya Pandita translated the same work in 1644. It was this translation which had wide-spread use among the Mongols. It was republished several times by the wood block (xylographic) method (in 1712, 1717, 1735).

²⁹ This work by Bu-sTon-rinpoche (1290-1364) was written in 1322 and enjoys great authority in Tibetan and Mongolian historiography (cf. entry 146, pp. 91-92).
CHAPTER TWO
MONGOLIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY
OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The most important events in Mongolian history of the 17th and first half of the 18th century were, as is well-known, connected with the struggle against the aggression of the Manchu conquerors, who slowly but steadfastly overcame the resistance of a disunited and fragmented Mongolia, subjecting to their power first the south of the country, and then its northern districts and finally, the western region.

However the revival of cultural life, including historiography, which had begun at the end of the 16th century continued for some time into the period of the Manchu conquest and after the establishment of the Manchu state. Convincing witness to this is given in the second half of the 17th century which was marked by the calling forth of a number of new historical works. This gives us the right to review the period from the second half of the 16th century to the end of the 17th century, as a stage in the development of Mongolian historical knowledge, requiring study of its particularities, and features unique to it.

Two circumstances contributed to the rise of Mongolian historiographic activity in the time under review: a rapid and unbroken strengthening in the position of Lamaism, which had awakened and strengthened Mongolian interest in the history of this religion and in the historical literature spawned by it; further growth of Mongolian interest in the historical past of their homeland, a new impetus for which was given by Manchu aggression and the fight against the invaders, which lasted in all more than a century and a half. It is hard, when taking no account of these circumstances, to explain the fact that it was precisely in this period that Mongolian historians attempted to revive the old tradition of writing history, which may be termed the tradition of the Secret History. These attempts, as will be shown below, were crowned with full success, manifested in the creation of a number of major historical works.

The historical compositions of the 17th century prove that the rebirth of the Secret History traditions in the time being described embraced both oral history as well as the varieties of historical literature. Mongolian historiography, which was born in the 13th century, was preserved for a number of centuries and developed independent literary and oral traditions unique to it, the sources of which go back to the Secret History. The facts convince one that this monument despite all the perversities of fate had not been forgotten by the Mongolian people.

A corroboration of this we find in works of the 17th century, the authors of which made wide use of both oral and book versions of the first-born item of Mongolian historical literature. It is important in this regard to note that if the Šīra
tuyujı, the History by Asarayči and the anonymous Altan Tobči were grounded for the most part on the oral tradition of the Secret History, then the Altan Tobči of Lubsangdanjin and the Erdeni-yin tobči of Sayang Sečen were mostly composed on the basis of the written tradition.

In this wise, Mongolian historical writing of the 17th century is characterized, in our view, by a strengthening of Buddhist influence on the one hand, and by a rebirth of traditions from early Mongolian historiography on the other.

I. The Altan Tobči of Lubsangdanjin

In the second half of the 17th century Mongolian historians created original works of a generalizing character, and at the same time began such types of historical literature as the chronicle. It is interesting to note that during the time under discussion the historiographic creativity of the Mongols, despite the expansion of Lamaism, developed not only along the lines of the ecclesiastical historical literature, as existed in Tibet, but also along the lines of the secular literature based on native Mongolian traditions of oral and written historiography. We have every reason to assert that the historians of this period were to a greater degree the successors of Qutuytai Sečen and the anonymous author of the Altan Tobči, than the initiators of Mongolian ecclesiastical historiography—Guoshi Čorji and Dondubtojın.

The honor of creating the first such big Mongolian chronicle by rights belongs to Lubsangdanjin, author of an original work, "The Śāstra, called the Golden Summary, containing a brief history of the state governance, founded by the early

---

1 The Altan Tobči by Lubsangdanjin went through several editions:
Lubsangdanjin, Altan Tobči, parts 1-2, Ulaanbaatar, 1937
Altan Tobči: A Brief History of the Mongols, with a critical introduction by the Reverend A. Mostaert, and an editor’s foreword by Francis W. Cleaves. This edition is a photo-reproduction of the 1937 Ulaanbaatar printing (entry 73).
Čoyiji (editor), Altan Tobči (Kökeqota, 1984). This edition is based on Cleaves’ publication (entry 322).
It was not until 1990 that the photofacsimile edition of the Ulaanbaatar manuscript discovered by Jamiyan-gun was first published, at the initiative of the author of these lines, viz., Lubsangdanjin, Altan Tobči, with an introduction by Sh. Bira (Ulaanbaatar, 1990) (entry 302).
A transcription of the same text of the Altan Tobči was made by Hans-Peter Vietze and Gendeng Lubsang (Tokyo, 1992) (entry 325).
The Altan Tobči was partly translated into Chinese by Sechin Jagchid, and translated into Russian by N. P. Shastina:
Lubsan Danzan [Lubsangdanjin], Altan Tobchi (Moscow, 1973) (entry 71).
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kings.” But Lubsangdanjin was not the only author of this work. He directed a group of authors who worked on the first Mongolian chronicle, as its colophon presents witness: “Thus, the monk Šašana-dhara, known as guoši Lubsangdanjin, expended effort to have the history of the origins of the remarkable, most holy khan-reborn ones written down on the basis of a host of chronicles, in order that the great people continue to read” (entry 41, p. 192). From these words one may conclude that under the guidance of Lubsangdanjin several scribe-assistants might have been working; it may be they were his own disciples, who by his orders collected materials from various sources. It is no coincidence that the colophon uses the word bičigülügsen and not bičegsen. The verb of the causative form bičigülügsen means “to make someone write, or, to have something written down.”

Rather little is known about Lubsangdanjin’s biography. The Altan Tobči colophon informs us that he was a learned lama who held the title of guoši. He was also known under the name of Sumadhiśāsanadhara, which is a Sanskrit translation of his name, Lubsangdanjin (Tib. bLo-bZang bsTan-hjin).

Some scholars have tried to determine the identity of Lubsangdanjin and to fix, even if only approximately, the time of his life and activity. In Zhamtsarano’s opinion, he was a writer and translator who lived in the second half of the 17th century and the first half of the 18th century (entry 150, p. 80; Loewenthal, p. 56). Sh. Natsagdorj presumes that Lubsangdanjin is mentioned in passing in the Erdeniyin erike by Ishibaldan as lha-zun Lubsangdanjin from the Dashichoiling (Tib. bKra' sis čhos glin) monastery in the hoshuun Dalad čiyul'ana of Ikhe juu
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---

2 Some scholars have not translated the full name of this chronicle quite correctly. Ts. Zhamtsarano gives this translation: “A work called the Golden Button, briefly narrating the laws and orders issued by the old kings” (cf. entry 150, p. 79; in the English translation by Loewenthal, p. 56: “The work, entitled the Golden Button, which relates briefly the laws and the administration established by the ancient emperors”). He translates the term törü yosun as “laws and orders.” As stated above, the two basic principles of the royal authority are the yirtindii-yin yosun and the nom-un yosun. In Luvsandanzan törü yosun means yirtindii-yin yosun, and not nom-un yosun. Hence by the words törü yosun one should understand “governmental laws and traditions” in the sense of “governmental administration.” The basic topic of the chronicle (cf. infra) is the history of the Mongolian state, and not the history of religion (nom-un yosun). We also encounter an inexact translation of the chronicle name by Father Mostaert: Ouvrage nommé ‘Bouton d’or’ qui résume sommairement l’oeuvre des lois et règles établies par les anciens qan (entry 73, p. x).

A recent translation of the book title which is close to ours was made by Hans-Peter Vietze, as “Golden Button (Summary) which Relates briefly the Deeds of Civil Governing established by ancient Emperors,” in Hans-Peter Vietze, “The Ulaanbaatar editions of the Altan Tobči,” International Symposium on Mongolian Culture: Collection of Papers (Taipei, 1992), p. 237 (entry 327).

3 N. P. Shastina (cf. entry 71, p. 297) did not translate the colophon in question into Russian quite accurately.
of Inner Mongolia (entry 118, pp. 52-63). However this assumption merely rests on the identity of the names and is not reinforced by any other data. The author of the Altan Tobđi is generally referred to in the sources with the title guoši (gûšir), at the time when Ishibaldan extols Lubsangdanjin as a lha-zun (Tib. lha-btsun), i.e., a monk from an aristocratic family.⁴

Zhamtsarano informs us that to Lubsangdanjin belongs the Description of the Holy Places of Wu-t’ai-shan. He is right to consider that it was issued under the K’ang-hsi Emperor in 1721 (entry 150, p. 80, note 1; Loewenthal's translation, p. 56, note 1). Although Zhamtsarano did not give the full Mongolian name of the work in question, there is no doubt that he had in mind the Uda-yin tabun ayulan-u orusil süsğ-ten-u čikin-u čimeg orusibai, the “Guide to Wu-t’ai-shan, the so-called adornment to the ears of the faithful.”⁵ It is necessary, incidentally, to point out a mistake committed by Walther Heissig in determining the year this work was published according to the European system of reckoning years. Not having noticed a mis-writing in the colophon, where it mentions the sixth (jir̃duỹar) year of K’ang-hsi, which in no way corresponds with the year registered as the White Iron-Ox year (čaγaγγin eme temür üker jil), Heissig fixed the publication of this work in 1667. Nonetheless it has to be written not as “the sixth” (jir̃duỹar) but as “the sixtieth” (jir̃duỹar) year of K’ang-hsi, which is indeed the year of the White Iron-Ox, i.e., 1721. In this fashion, the date as given by Heissig (1667) (entry 87, p. 35), and supported by Father Mostaert (entry 73, p. 35), and N. P. Shastina (entry 71, p. 25) must be regarded as erroneous. Zhamtsarano is completely right when he connects the xylographic edition of it to 1721. Obviously, Zhamtsarano knew about the slip-up in the colophon, but for some reason did not mention it.

The correct determination of the date that the Guide to Wu-t’ai-shan was published has great significance for approximately determining the period of this author’s creative activity.

Heissig, considering 1667 to be its date of publication, assumed that it was written in 1662. However, now it is explained that this work was written at the beginning of the 18th century, though no later than 1715, when the Khalkha Zaya Pandita, the teacher of Lubsangdanjin died. The nature of those lines in the colophon which are devoted to Zaya Pandita bears witness to this.
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---

⁴ Two Inner Mongolian scholars, C. Narasun and Ci. Naγ̃oydorji, are confident (although without giving any proof) that lha-zun Lubsangdanjin, who, in their opinion, was also known as erdeni pandita Lubsangdanjin, was the author of the Altan Tobđi. See Ordos-un jayun merged-un tobđi [A brief summary of one hundred sages from Ordos], [Dongsheng xian? ]1987, pp. 22-23.

⁵ The xylograph was found in the personal library of Ts. Damdinsiiren, who kindly furnished me the opportunity to get acquainted with it.
From these lines it is apparent that when the author wrote his work, his teacher was still alive.

The colophon of the Guide to Wu-t'ai-shan contains interesting information shedding some light on the identity of Lubsangdanjin. It says in it: “I, Sumadhiśaśanadhara, worshipping the dust from the feet of him who is famed as Zaya-Pandita Quturytu by command of the omniscient Panchen and the Dalai Lama, wrote this work at the order of the wandering monk Ayvan-Lubsang” (entry 14, f. 1-72; cf. also entries 24, p. 4; 233, p. 52; 232, pp. 12-15). Concerning the authorship of the manuscript of the work itself, as one must judge from words of the author who in the xylographic edition says: “I, the guśri [guoṣi] Lubsangdanjin have briefly written [this work] on the basis of śāstras compiled by ancient sages at the order of all the lamas of the Pu-sa-t'ing monastery ... who expressed the desire to publish on boards the work Guide to Wu-t'ai-shan as a mark of congratulation for long years of life to the emperor most high, the ruler of the world, the rebirth of Manjuśri”(entry 231, p. 5, note 1).

From these words it can be inferred that Sumadhiśaśanadhara, this same Lubsangdanjin, was a disciple of Zaya Pandita Quturytu and a contemporary of Ayvan-Lubsang. But who are they, this Zaya Pandita Quturytu and Ayvan-Lubsang? Heissig committed the error of taking Zaya Pandita Quturytu for the Oirat Zaya-Pandita Namkhaijamtsö, who as is well-known, was born in 1599 and died in 1662. Wishing to substantiate his opinion, Heissig connects the information of the Brief History of Construction of such Monasteries as Čaylasi ügeber Temple in Kökeqota with the Oirat Zaya Pandita, who allegedly travelled to Kökeqota in the first year of K'ang-hsi (1662) and there founded the monastery of Sayin-i erkilegči (entry 233, p. 53). He thinks that Lubsangdanjin may have been a disciple of Zaya Pandita the Oirat right at the time of the visit by the latter to Kökeqota. This of course is incorrect. According to the biography of Zaya Pandita the Oirat, written by his disciple Ratnabhadra in 1690, Namqayaijamčö died in the Water-Tiger year (1662) on the way to Lhasa.

According to all the data, the colophon under discussion has in mind the Khalkha Zaya Pandita, Lubsangpringlei, whose years of life are 1642-1715. It is true, one might confuse the fact that the Brief History of Construction ... says that in the first year of the reign of K'ang-hsi, i.e., in 1662, Zaya Pandita Quturytu with his disciples (šabi), 163 families in all, travelled from the hoshuun of Jasaytu qayan and undertook a visit to the emperor, who authorized Zaya Pandita to settle with his disciples at any spot in the region of Kökeqota.

In accord with this decree Zaya Pandita built a monastery in the Jirgalangtu mountains at the sources of the Kharagchin River. As is clear from the biography of Zaya Pandita Lubsangpringlei, compiled by his disciple Ganjurpa Mergen Nomunkhan (entry 133, pp. 9-10), his teacher would not have been able to travel to Kökeqota in 1662, because at that time he was studying in Tibet, and he was only 20 years old then. Lubsangpringlei only returned from Tibet to Khalkha Mongolia in
1679 and actually received from the Manchu Emperor the right to a residence in the Kökegota region, but this was in the Iron Sheep year, i.e., in 1691 (entry 10). It is hard to explain why in the source cited above the event mentioned is referred to 1662 (the first year of K’ang-hsi’s reign).

In this manner one may consider it established that Lubsangdanjin was a disciple of the Khalkha Zaya Pandita Lubsangpringlei, and not of the Oirat one, Namqayijamčo.6

As for Ayvan-Lubsang, he, as Prof. Heissig informs us, was named in 1660 as head of all lamas at Wu-t’ai-shan by order of the emperor, in 1661 he wrote the preface to the Description of Wu-t’ai Shan, and in 1700 is mentioned in the title of a čing siu ča si (entry 233, p. 52, note 5). Ayvan-Lubsang was a lama of Chinese descent and enjoyed the trust of the Manchu emperors (entries 231, p. 4; 233, pp. 52-53).

What has been expounded above allows one to think that Lubsangdanjin lived and worked in the second half of the 17th century to the first half of the 18th century.

6 Some new data recently discovered by S. Sečenbilig not only confirm our conclusion, but shed light on Lubsangdanjin, of whom until now we knew so little. These new data have been taken from the book titled Ači sečellesi ügii boyda blama nar-i sitūjū gün narin ba ayuu yeke degedū nom sonusuyşa kiged überün orčilang-dur yabуysan yosun-i todorqay-a uñğagulüşen sủşig-ten-i nom-dur uduriddüşçi mör. The manuscript of this book is kept in two copies in the Library of Inner Mongolia (Kökegota). Thanks to the kindness of S. Sečenbilig I obtained a Xerox copy of the manuscript. See S. Sečenbilig, “Erten-ü qad-ün ündüstülegen törlü yosun-u jokiyal-i tobcilan quiriyaşsan Altan Tobći-yin surbulji jokiyayçı jokiyaydayasun čay” [On the sources, authorship and date of the Altan Tobći], in Öbør Mongyol-un neyigem-ün sinjilekũ uqayyn (1996, No. 5). By the same author is his “Lubsangvangjil-un tobyiy ba siliğ suryal” [On the tobyiy of Lubsangvanjil and his poetry], in Mongyol burqan-u sasin-u uran jokiyal-un sudulul ([Qayılar?)] Öbør Mongyol-un Soyul-un Kebiel-ün Qoruy-a, 1998), pp. 208-218.

If there was no other learned disciple of the Khalkha Zaya Pandita, also named Lubsangdanjin (I believe it is difficult to suppose so), according to this new data, Lubsangdanjin was the closest disciple of Zaya Pandita, and very often accompanied him during his visits to such regions of Inner Mongolia, as, Utai, Doloyan nuur, etc. Lubsangdanjin was also known under the title Tunumal umčid biligtu čorji, or Yeke mergen rasang (dačang) umčid. He wrote several religious books: Teguş čoju ündür ijayur-un mayayal, Nýncä neretü mayayal, Ülemji masi čayen sedkil neretü virügel, etc. He also participated in editing the Kanjur in 1717-1720. He was an influential religious figure. After Zaya Pandita’s death in 1715, he played an important role in enthroning Zaya Pandita’s reincarnation, and he was also a tutor of this young reincarnation. Together with Jeb-tsundamba and Jasag-latna from the Zaya Pandita monastery, he took part in the K‘ang-hsi Emperor’s funeral ceremony in Beijing in 1722. In 1723 he also came to Beijing to take the sku-gdung (remains) of Jebtsundamba, who died in Beijing. One can suppose that Lubsangdanjin was a Khalkha lama by origin.
Chapter Two: Second Half of the 17th Century

Now we must turn to the dating of his chronicle. The exact date the *Altan Tobći* was written, despite all the efforts of scholars, has not yet been definitely established. Following Zhamsarano, many scholars (Shastina, Puchkovskii, Perlee and others) placed this date at the beginning or second half of the 17th century (entries 150, p. 80; 71, p. 4; 186, p. 148; 123, p. 14).

Father Mostaert concluded that the chronicle was written between 1649 and 1736. His deduction is based on the following reasoning. Page 189 of vol. II of the new edition of the *Altan Tobći*

mentions six Ordos hoshuuns which were created in 1649. It is clear that the *Altan Tobći* could not have been written earlier than this year. The seventh Ordos hoshun was created in the first year of Ch’ien-lung, i.e., in 1736. Since this hoshun is not mentioned in the chronicle, the chronicle can have been written no later than 1736 (entry 73, p. x). Mostaert assumed that further search would permit setting the date for compilation of this chronicle more precisely. The time proposed by Mostaert (1649-1736) Heissig changed to 1651-1655 on the grounds that Lubsangdanjin, speaking of the descendants of Ligdan Khan, names his two grandsons (Burni and Lubsang-tayiji), the sons of Abunai-wang and the daughter of the Manchu emperor Abahai, who had married Abunai in 1645 (entries 231, pp. 7-9; 233, p. 53-55). The first of Abunai’s sons, Burni, was born in 1651, and the second one, apparently quite a bit later. Considering these circumstances, one may conjecture that the chronicle was written some years after 1651. The *Altan Tobći* does not mention the uprising by Abunai, Burni and Lubsang against the Manchus in 1674, although this is spoken about in detail in many chronicles of the 18th century. Speaking of the genealogy of the Qaračin princes, Lubsangdanjin names the son of Jolbin, Būre, as the last representative. From the *History of the Mongolian Clan of the Borjigids* by Lomi, it is well-known that after Būre there were his sons, *ded jerge kya* Dalai and Lomi (the latter the author of the work cited). Lomi was born in 1675, and Dalai at least twenty years earlier, i.e., approximately in 1655. Thus, as the *Altan Tobći* does not mention the name of Dalai, this chronicle was, in Heissig’s opinion, compiled earlier than 1655 (entries 231, pp. 3-8; 233, p. 55).

The proposals of Mostaert and Heissig, as we have seen, rest exclusively on analyzing internal data of the chronicle. But in view of the uncertainty about the identity of its author, this method suffers from a number of defects. Lubsangdanjin could not possibly have known those historical details which in the view of contemporary authors he should have known. And even if he had known some of them, he might for some reason not have written about them. Lubsangdanjin might, for instance, not have known about the creation of the seventh Ordos hoshun in 1736, might somehow not have written in his chronicle about the tragic

fate of the descendants of Ligdan khan—Burni and Lubsang-tayiji—punished by the Manchus for disobedience. It is well-known that Burni was punished for participating in an uprising. As follows from extracts from Lubsangdanjin himself, the genealogy of the Qaračin princes was borrowed by him from some other history
and in this source there might not have been any information about the last representatives of the Qaračin princes, in consequence of which it was not possible to discuss them in the Altan Tobči.

Proceeding from these considerations, we regard it as most likely that Lubsangdanjin wrote his work either at the very end of the 17th century, or at the beginning of the 18th.

The Altan Tobči was written on the basis of very valuable sources, which may be divided into two groups. To the first belong the sources of the 12th-13th centuries, and to the second, Buddhist and Tibetan sources. There is no necessity to linger in detail over an analysis of Lubsangdanjin's sources: this question has been exhaustively pursued by many researchers (entries 150, pp. 80-82, English translation, pp. 56-58; 233, pp. 199-202; 234; 57, pp. 18-22, pp. 60-73). But nonetheless a few things should be noticed.

The great merit of Lubsangdanjin and his assistants comes down to the fact that they were able, though under a foreign yoke and dominated by Lamaist ideology, to restore Mongolia's independent historiographic traditions, using in full degree sources of the 12th-13th centuries. As already noticed above, similar attempts had been undertaken earlier, even at the end of the 16th century, but then they were not able to withstand the onslaught of Buddhist-Tibetan literature gushing into Mongolia in connection with the expansion of Lamaism.

One may with certainty maintain that for its second birth the Secret History was obligated fitk of all to Lubsangdanjin and his helpers. Scholars have indisputably proven that of the 282 paragraphs of the Secret History, 233 are written into the Altan Tobči, in which connection only a few of them were subjected to insignificant abridgement or change.7 Prior to Lubsangdanjin none of the Mongolian historians had made such full use of the Secret History.

In this particular case we cannot specially dwell on the thorny question of which version of the Secret History Lubsangdanjin used, that one which was preserved and came down to us in Chinese transcription, or a Mongolian original written in Uighur-Mongolian script which has not come down to us.

Scholars like Heissig, Sechin Jagchid and Hans-Peter Vietze hold the opinion that Lubsangdanjin must have used a Mongolian version of the Secret History in Uighur-Mongolian script.8 After collating the relevant paragraphs of the Altan Tobči

---

7 S. A. Kozin admitted that a section of paragraphs of the Secret History (from §177 to §208), in the copy of the Altan Tobči which has come down to us, were omitted by accident in recopying. If that is the case, then the percentage of paragraphs included from the Secret History becomes still higher (entry 57, p. 19).

8 Liu Jingsuo also assumed that Lubsangdanjin had at his disposal a copy of the Secret History of the Mongols written in the old Mongolian Uighur script, because the text of the Altan Tobči reflects some orthographic peculiarities of the text of the Secret History as transcribed in: Liu Jingsuo, Arban yurba-arban doloduyar jayun-u Mongjol-un teũke bičilge
with those of the *Secret History*, Sechin Jagchid came to the conclusion that the *Altan Tobči* used not the Chinese transcription of the *Secret History*, but a Mongolian version written in Uighur-Mongolian script. 9 Vietze wrote, “Already without deeper statistical research it can be maintained for sure: The author of the *Altan Tobči* must have used a version of the *Secret History* in Uighur-Mongolian script which is proven not only by concordances, but even more by *Blo bzan bstan’ jin Guu Si’S’S* errors.” 10

Whatever may be true of the above surmises, it is more important for us that the *Secret History* is shown to have remained unforgotten in Mongolian historical writing, and that some centuries after its appearance, proved to be a most significant source for another great Mongolian historical work. We perceive in this fact the continuity of the national traditions of Mongolian historical writing.

It must be noted that the authors of the *Altan Tobči* used not just the single *Secret History* but other sources as well. Testimony to this is the presence in the *Altan Tobči* of certain data which are missing in the *Secret History*, but are found in other chronicles, in particular in the *Complete Collection of Histories* by Rashīd al-Dīn. Zhamtsarano showed this well when he analyzed the content and text of the *Altan Tobči*. For instance the chronicle introduces the rhythmical speech of a certain Kodedi-sečen, addressed to the ten sons of Ambagai and the seven sons of Qabul khan. On the basis of Rashid al-Dīn’s data, which unfortunately cite only part of this speech, Zhamtsarano considered it probable that “this sample of Mongolian oratory dating from the first half of the 12th century” (entry 150, p. 93; English translation p. 65) might well have preceded Lubsangdajin in ancient “Mongolian scrolls and books.” He wrote as well that

There exist many fragments from unknown sources; their contents are unified by an idea, namely, by the regulations of state government, i.e., by the *jasaq* or "Yasa" of Činggis qan [Chinggis Khan]. This fact indicates that in Mongolia there existed more or less complete copies of several manuscripts of Činggis qan's famous "Yasa" which was nothing but a collection of his remarkable sayings; they bear the character of mandates and instructions. In it were also contained the observations of Činggis' companions and contemporaries, and of his close successors (especially of Čaydai), as we see from the Činggis qayan-u ċadig. (entry 150, p. 120; English translation, p. 88).

---


Zhamtsarano was correct to think that the main value of the *Altan Tobči* lay not so much in the Mongolian text of the *Secret History*, which we always could more or less restore from the Chinese phonetic rendering, as it did in the fragments of Chinggis’s instructions to khans and princes, taken from early Mongolian sources unknown to us (entry 150, p. 82; English translation, p. 58).

The *Altan Tobči* of Lubsangdanjin is, on the whole, a unique syncretism of Mongolian historiographic traditions proper with Buddhist ideology. Zhamtsarano was completely correct when he wrote:

The changes of the texts from the 12th and 13th centuries, as compared to those of the 17th century (even if only paraphrased), give an idea of the differences between the two periods and also between their speech formation and contents in reference to their vocabularies. The simplicity, bluntness, and genuine truthfulness of the narratives of the 12th and 13th centuries with their ancient wording, on the one hand, and on the other, a certain ornateness, garnished with Buddhist concepts and expressions of courtesy and reverence before superiors, and the legendary character of the narratives of the seventeenth century (entry 150, p. 82; English translation, p. 58)

Lubsangdanjin’s work is divided into neither parts nor chapters. However, by the content and character of its materials it may be separated into two sections: the early history of the Mongols (up to the second half of the 16th century); and the history of the Mongols during the second half of the 16th and the first half of the 17th century. In the first part the author strives to review certain questions of early Mongolian history from the position of Buddhist historical-religious concepts. He begins the history of the Mongols not the way the anonymous authors of the *Secret History* did some four-five centuries prior to him. Setting forth the history of the origin of the Mongols and their khans, Lubsangdanjin is not satisfied with some early Mongolian historical traditions, [but] goes beyond these limits and ties them up with Indo-Tibetocentric concepts, according to which the history of the Mongols is an integral part of the history of the entire Buddhist world. For this reason he prefixes the history of the Mongols proper with a concise sketch (just four manuscript leaves) of the emergence of mankind and the origins of the Buddhist kings. Next the author tries to link “genetically” the origin of the Mongolian khans with the famed clan of Mahasammata, employing the Buddhist mythological traditions.

He writes that a thousand years after Buddha’s nirvana the clan of Mahāsammata crossed over to the Tibetans. Under King Sarpa, the son of Kushala, there was born a boy of unusual appearance. Having placed him in a copper box, they cast him into the Ganges.

On the border of Tibet and Nepal the box was pulled out of the water by an old Tibetan who opened it and discovered a fine lad. The Tibetans asked the boy where he came from. He pointed upwards. The Tibetans thinking that he had a destiny from Heaven decided to make him their king. Since the Tibetans had borne him on
their necks, they named him “the king on a throne of necks.” He laid the beginning of the clan of the Tibetan kings, the kings of dharma, from whom in their turn arose the beginnings of the Mongolian khans. Lubsangdanjin writes that the progenitor of the Mongolian khans, Börte Chino was a younger son of the Tibetan king with the golden throne, Dalai Subin, belonging to the clan of the first Tibetan king, the king on a throne of necks. Börte Chino, having quarreled with his brothers, migrated to the northern land of Jad. There he married Goa-Maral and settled down in the Burqan Qaldun mountains. The race of the Mongols arose from them (entry 41, vol. 1, p. 6).

It must however be emphasized that a history of the Mongolian khans is at the center of Lubsangdanjin’s attention. He hardly touches on the history of religion, having called his work *A Brief History Of State Rule, Founded by Ancient Kings* (*töriyosun-u teńke*).

The Mongolian historian executed a work quite up-to-date for its time, constituting a history of the Mongolian khans at a time when power in Mongolia had been usurped by foreign conquerors. And it is no accident that at the conclusion he writes his wish that “the great nation continue to read” his history.

Lubsangdanjin wanted to establish in the judgment of his Mongol contemporaries, that not only the early but also the sacred (from a Buddhist viewpoint) origin of the Mongolian khans was a reality, and to prove that these khans became famed not merely because of the past might of the Chinggisids, but by their sanctity and high birth; that the khans belonged to the famed race of Mahāsammata, founder of the kings of the Buddhist world. Mahāsammata, Chinggis, Khubilai, Dayan Khan and Ligdan were the key figures in the history of the Mongols, according to Lubsangdanjin. The history of the Manchu emperors, although they declared themselves the Boyda-Qayans of Mongolia, thus found no place in the *Altan Tobći*. Under Lubsangdanjin Mongolian history ends as it were with the liquidation of the Chahar khaganate of Ligdan Khan.

Lubsangdanjin gives a key place to the cult of Chinggis Khan. He asserts that the birth of Chinggis was foretold by Shakyamuni Buddha himself. According to this prediction, Chinggis was to appear 3250 years after Buddha’s nirvana as a rebirth of Esrua tengri, to rule the world in the name of happiness and peace for people, who prior to this had languished under twelve bad rulers. So that the world should not be unaware, three years prior to the birth of Chinggis Khan, Sakya Gungya-nimbu (Tib. Kun-dga’ sñin-po) proclaimed that the Boyda Chinggis Khan would be born, fated from Heaven, a revered Chintamani, and that he would govern everything in this world. This prediction was carved by two Chinese on the red cliff in the mountains of Burqan Qaldun (entry 41, vol. 2, pp. 27-28).

Resorting to the traditional Buddhist method, Lubsangdanjin excelled his predecessors, as we can see, in extolling Chinggis Khan, elevating him to the ranks of true Buddhist Chakravarti-kings, the advent of whom was allegedly foretold by the Buddha himself. There is no doubt that all this would have exerted influence on the minds of believers at that time, contributing to a consolidation of the cult of
Chinggis Khan in Mongolian historical writing. For just such a purpose Lubsang-danjin set up as anachronisms some facts to a degree bordering on a gross distortion of historical truth. Glaring examples of such anachronisms are the speeches which the author ascribes to the Nine Örlügs (marshals) of Chinggis Khan. These speeches stand out sharply by their Buddhist content and lexicon (entry 41, vol. 2, pp. 11-19). Bayurći, for instance, turns to Chinggis Khan with the following words:

Thou art Mount Sumeru, composed of divers jewels;
Thou art the Anabad Sea\(^\text{11}\), whither flow a host of rivers from various places;
Thou art the heavenly čintamani ringed about with stars by day and night;
Thou art the sutu boyda Ruler, son of omniscient Tengri.

Having learned the thirty-five sciences of a khan,
You peacefully ruled the great kingdom and religion,
And by mighty spirit did not fall before alien enemies,
You valued friendship and harmony among kith and kin (entry 41, p. 12).

All the remaining örlügs pronounce words of praise in honor of Chinggis Khan in approximately the same tone.

[237]

Still one should observe that Lubsangdanjin does not reduce his writing of history solely to Buddhist make-believe. In his case early Mongolian historiographic traditions clearly prevail over Buddhist dogma. In reproducing to a great degree data from the Secret History, Lubsangdanjin actually imparts all the basic ideas of the latter. Under the influence of his sources the author makes wide use of the method of citing direct speech, wise exhortations and teachings, ostensibly pronounced by famous historical personalities, with Chinggis Khan and his cohorts in the first rank. This also bestows a certain rhetorical-edifying character upon his Altan Tobći. Many of these “utterances” of Chinggis actually go back to early Mongolian yosuns (Mong. yosun, “custom") and yasas (Mong. jasay “law”), reported by Rashid al-Din, Juvayni and other historians. Lubsangdanjin himself notes that he “wrote in his book what was uttered and conveyed by the sages from the time of the Sütu Boyda Chinggis Khan, that it should become a law unto future generations” (entry 41, book 2, p. 68). This major goal he pursues through such extended citation of the “wise words” of his ancestors.

It is not hard to reveal as well the author’s interest in political-ethical questions of history, in the historical experience of the past from the viewpoint of the tasks of

\(^{11}\) Anabad (Skt. Anavatavr, Tib. ma-dros-mtsho) is the name of a mythical sea, often encountered in Buddhist literature. Sometimes it is called in Mongolian the ese bülidügsen dalai, i.e., “the sea of which the waters never grow warm,” and sometimes mapam (Skt. mapham) (same translation). In another place Lubsangdanjin says: ese bülidügsen dabulya yeke-tü mapam dalai minu ... (entry 41, p. 14).
his time. Lubsangdanjin characteristically devotes attention first and foremost to such doctrines and utterances as are distinguished by their political and moralizing usefulness. It seems to us that he regarded as relevant to his time the political admonitions and testaments of the founder of the Mongolian state. This was at a time when the position of Mongolia, in Lubsangdanjin’s opinion, was in direct opposition to what Chinggis Khan was saying in his admonitions to companions, sons and brothers. Lubsangdanjin called these admonitions “the nutriment of the state and the key of administration” (*ulus-un tejiyl törü-yin onisun*) (entry 41, vol. 2, p. 34).

Chinggis instructs his associates to concern themselves first and foremost with the state created by him with such effort, not thinking about their own egos, for them always to be “the stakes of his nation and the tether for the numerous people” (entry 41, vol. 2, p. 29).

Chinggis Khan himself can serve as an example of devotion to the interests of the state, when, according to Lubsangdanjin, he utters the following aphorism:

When my fathom-high body\(^{12}\) takes a brief respite,
How might not my kingdom weaken;
When my entire body takes a rest,
How might not my whole kingdom be ruined.
Let my fathom-high body grow fatigued,
Lest my state not weaken;
Let my whole body be troubled,
Lest my whole kingdom not be ruined. (entry 41, vol. 2, pp. 59-60)

From the author of the *Altn Tobdi* we learn the basic mottoes of Chinggis Khan in the period of military campaigns. Chinggis Khan said to his four sons:

Hold the path to the passes of high mountains,
Cross wide rivers wading,
Be not afraid that it is far; if you go, you will reach,

\(^{12}\) Here my understanding and translation differ greatly from those of most of my colleagues. It is true that in the text of the *Altn Tobdi* this phrase is written as *altn bey-e* “golden body.” Cf. the version of *Jamiyan gun* published in 1990, Luvsangdanzan, *Altn Tobdi*, with an introduction by Sh. Bira (Ulaanbaatar, 1990), p. 106-a. Cf. further Čojiji's edition, *Altn Tobdi* (Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un Arad-un Keblel-un Qoriy-a (1984), p. 427. N. P. Shastina translated it as *zolotaya osoba* (Russian translation of *Altn Tobdi*, p. 211). But judging by the meaning of the phrase, a native speaker of Mongolian can easily find it a mis-spelling for *alda bey-e*. Alda is the Mongolian traditional unit of measurement, indicating the distance between the tips of the middle fingers of the outstretched arms of a man. Alda could provisionally be translated as “fathom” (1.6 m). Chinggis Khan, who here puts the deeds of state above all else, cannot compare his own body with the golden body. He can modestly speak of his body only as a fathom-high or alda-high body.
Be not afraid that it is hard; if you undertake, you will overcome; 
The teeth for eating meat are in the mouth;  
The teeth for eating people are in the thoughts, 
Strong in body, one conquers units;  
Strong in soul, one conquers a multitude." (entry 41, vol. 2, pp. 27-28)

Here is one more speech of Chinggis Khan, addressed to his sons:

Henceforth you will pass through high mountains, 
Cross over wide rivers, 
Execute distant campaigns, 
Stretching your legs in the stirrups 
So forcefully that their straps will stretch and their flaps will tear apart. 
You will rule a host of lands, 
Having conquered the body, conquer the mind, 
If the spirit is overcome, 
The body will not depart anywhere. (entry 41, vol. 2, p. 46)

There is reason to think that these lines actually go back to the times of 
Chinggis Khan and his successors; according to another source, written in square 
script and preserved in an album under the name of *Najm'al 'Ajāib*, which was 
discovered in one of the departments of the Istanbul University Museum, a number 
of lines of 
[239]
the citations quoted by us (see the extracts above and below) are likewise in the 
Decree of Khubilai Khan. It is interesting to compare the lines from the two quite 
different sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altan Tobči</th>
<th>Najm'al- 'Ajāib</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olan ulus-i barisu</td>
<td>ta 'uru ut minu mona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beye inu quriyatala</td>
<td>qoyina ulus irgen-i quriyabasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedkil-i inu quriyaytun</td>
<td>gesü beveyi anu quriyatala setgili anu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedkil-i quriyabasu</td>
<td>quriyabasu setgili anu quryaça beyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beye inu qamiy-a oduqu</td>
<td>anu q'a e'tütqun ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(entry 41, II, p. 46)</td>
<td>(entry 93, p. 123)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the extract cited, Lubsangdanjin, a connoisseur of the Mongolian country, 
has very adroitly characterized the unique psychology of the nomad-conqueror by 
his own words. Of the moralizing admonitions we cite the following:

It is good for the commoner under a good khan. 
Happy the khagan for whom his state is in order. 
Happy the commoner whose khan is good, 
Happy the woman whose husband is good, 
Happy all those who have peace and accord. . .
It is not for a woman to understand her husband in life,
She will understand him after his death;

If the khan behaves like a commoner,
He is deprived of his kingdom;
If a commoner behaves like a khagan
He is deprived of his dark head (entry 41, vol. 2, p.32).

The extraordinary endeavor of Lubsangdanjin to raise the authority of historical figures of the past led him at times, as we have already remarked, into falsification of historical truth. He ascribes for example to contemporaries of Chinggis Khan Buddhist ideas which were contemporaneous to Lubsangdanjin himself, and they sharply stand out in the mass of really ancient fragments. Let us cite such an instance. When speaking about the “royal rules of state government,” Goa-Sečen compares the mercy of the khan with the sun, and his magnanimity with a lake: the sun with its rays warms all persons on earth alike, the good and the evil, the quick and the dead. Thus the khan ought to display equal mercy to all. Similarly to the way a lake drinks in all the waters into itself, both the clean and the dirty, the khan ought magnanimously to take in all words: truthful, lying, complimentary and unpleasant (entry 41, p. 35).

As we see it, Lubsangdanjin delivered up prescriptions of Buddhist teachings about the norms of conduct for kings as utterances of a contemporary of Chinggis Khan.

Part of his work Lubsangdanjin devoted to the history of the Mongols in the post-Empire period, up to the beginning of the 17th century, restricting himself in general to reproducing oral traditions connected for the most part with the political history of the country. One must give him his due: with the aid of these traditionary tales he was able to restore an overall picture of that epoch when the country was living through the dissolution and internecine wars of the country.

In an analysis of historiography of the second part of Lubsangdanjin's work one can draw forth his thought that governing by representatives of the Golden Clan of the Chinggisids, in the persons of the so-called minor khans, with some individual exceptions, was not interrupted right down to Ligdan Khan inclusive. Lubsangdanjin writes with pathos about those khans who undertook real measures to restore the unity of Mongolian lands and for the rebirth of the Buddhist religion in Mongolia. He views the historical merit of Altan Khan as "the rebirth of the religion which had been broken off and the reestablishment of the ruined state, as well as in unifying the "five colored and the four foreign" [peoples--Sh. B.] (entry 41, p. 185).

Lubsangdanjin speaks very sparingly about Ligdan Khan, saying nothing about his merit in the struggle to strengthen the Chahar khanate, nor about his fight against the Manchus. In the Altan Tobči he does not even report that the rule of this khan ended, although he mentions his sons and grandsons. In return, Lubsangdanjin specially notices the services of Ligdan Khan in the expansion of the Buddhist religion, his cooperation in translating the "holy words" into Mongolian. The author of the Altan Tobči endows Ligdan Khan with all kinds of splendid titles, already
well-known from the colophons of the Mongolian *Kanjur: Sutu Činggis tai-ming sečen, jüg-ūd teyin bögöd jilaŋyči taisung tngri-yin tngri delekei dakin-u qurmusta altan kürdön-i ortiŋulyśan nom-un qajan* (entry 41, p. 192).

In a brief conclusion Lubsangdanjin sums up what has been said on the pages of the *Altan Tobđi*. The characteristic peculiarity of this conclusion is that in it too the author links history with contemporaneity. With great interest he traces down the genealogy of the Mongolian nobility right up to his days, on the basis of historical information establishing the origin of ruling princes contemporary with him.

In this respect, the study of the historical past became in the final analysis dictated to Lubsangdanjin by the practical needs of his time. In elucidating the events contemporary with him he displayed selectivity. This even creates the impression that Lubsangdanjin was not interested in the history of the conquest of Mongolian lands by the Manchus. And only in one place does he mention the annexation of Qaračin to Manchuria on the basis of a treaty, reinforced by traditional sacrifices (entry 41, p. 192).

Lubsangdanjin and his cohorts played an important role in reestablishing the succession of Mongolian historiographic traditions under the difficult circumstances of foreign domination.

II. The *Śira Tuŋyji* (The Yellow History)

The *Śira Tuŋyji* exists in four copies under different names. Three of these, kept in libraries of the former Soviet Union, have already been written about by investigators (entries 150, pp. 60-78, English translation, pp. 43-55; 70 pp. 9-12). The fourth copy, belonging to the National Library of Mongolia in Ulaanbaatar, was published in 1959 as a supplement to Heissig's book *Die Familien- und Kirchen-geschichtsschreibung der Mongolen*. In our view this copy, called the *Činggis qayan-u teüke* [The History of Chinggis Khan]¹⁴, is considerably older. For this reason we place this copy at the foundation of our analysis, drawing on the others, of course, in necessary cases. In the Ulaanbaatar copy there are no late inter-

---

¹⁴ The title page of the Ulaanbaatar copy bears the name *Činggis qayan-u teüke Dalai blam-a-yin nomlayśan jalayus-un qurim kemekő qad noyad-un teüke ene bolai* [The History of Chinggis Khan]. This is a history of khans and princes also called the *Feast of Youth, Composed by the Dalai Lama*. As it seems to us, the name of the copy in question should be only the first sentence, i.e., *Činggis qayan-u teüke*. As for the second sentence, it is an inaccurate explanation, made by the owner of the copy or a copyist, who having seen the initial phrase in the text of the work, where it gives a citation from a book by the Fifth Dalai Lama, *The Feast of Youth*, decided to make such an explanation, quite unsuccessfully, of course. The *Śira Tuŋyji* was translated into Russian by Shastina (entry 70).
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polations and additions, which abound in Copy A (the Radlov copy), kept in the stacks of the Institute of Oriental Studies attached to the Russian Academy of Sciences, and lying at the base of the collated text made by Shastina for publication and translation into Russian. The text of the Ulaanbaatar copy ends at page 176 of Manuscript A, where it sets out the genealogy of Yaburan-Mergen of the Qoyids.

In our view, the Ulaanbaatar copy preserves better than the others the character of an original version of the work in question, which it may be. At first it was called *The History of Chinggis Khan*. Manuscripts A, B and C bear witness to the fact that various parties introduced interpolations and additions to the original text, and called this work different things: *Erten-ü qad-un ündüsün-ü yeke Şira tuyuji*, or even *Erten-ü mongol-un qad-un ündüsün-ü yeke Şira tuyuji*.

Zhamtsarano was right when in the following he characterized the Şira Tuyuji on the basis of these copies as follows: "Judging generally by the style of writing of the text, one is led to surmise that the chronicle was compiled gradually; it has the character of a collection" (entries 150, p. 67, in the English translation, pp. 47-48; cf. 70, p. 9).

Copy A contains several extensive insertions between the lines, written in small letters with a very sharp instrument and in a handwriting different from the basic text. Our collation has shown that these insertions were copied literally from the *History* by Asarayci (cf. entries 70, pp. 19, 26-28, 32-33, 36-45, 53-56; 39, pp. 8, 18-20, 34-42, 45-47). As for this work, see below. From what has been said, it follows that the interpolations were made later than when the basic text of the Şira Tuyuji was written, and after the time when the *History* by Asarayci was finished in 1677.

The author of the Şira Tuyuji is unknown. Some scholars assume that the Khalkha tayiji Toba, a name found on the cover of Copy A, was not only the owner but also the author of the basic text (entries 150, p. 61, English translation, p.44; 70, p. 9).

Recently Perlee undertook another attempt to establish the authorship of the Şira Tuyuji (entry 125, pp. 139-140). According to his supposition, the young son of Ilden degüregçi, Şambadar Čoytu Aqai, mentioned in copy C as Ober-yin Čoytu aqai (reading according to the rules of old Mongolian script as Ober-yen Čoytu Aqai) is the author of the work in question. It is interesting that Şambadar Čoytu Aqai was the younger brother of Asarayci (Jamba), the author of the *History* by Asarayci, which is known by his name. He, like his elder brother, was by birth from the nomadic area of Ongiin-gol near the Orkhon River. It is characteristic that copy

14 It is interesting that in the Ulaanbaatar copy Čoytu Aqai is mentioned with no explanation: Ober-yin or Ober-yen. Cf. Suppl. III in Heissig's book (entry 233, p. 107).
A of the Šira Tuyuji was found in exactly these surroundings at the Orkhon River. No less interesting is the fact that copy A, as we already remarked, contains insertions from the History by Asarayči. Hence Šambadar Čoytu Aqai may be considered as having participated in the writing of the Šira Tuyuji only to the extent that he was able to make some interpolations into the basic text. But that is not reason enough for us to consider him an author of this work.

The text does not indicate the time the Šira Tuyuji was compiled. It may be, however, assumed that the basic text was written at the beginning of the second half of the 17th century. Heissig connects the time of appearance of the Šira Tuyuji to the period between 1651 and 1662 (entry 233, p. 84), having in mind that the text mentions the grandson of Ligdan Khan, Lubsang, who was born after 1651, and that the text of the Šira Tuyuji was employed by Sayang Sečen in writing his history in 1662 (entry 233, pp. 83-84). The latest additions to the Šira Tuyuji were made at the end of the 17th or beginning of the 18th century, inasmuch as they mention the names of Galdan Bošoytu (1671-1697), Čebeng-rabdan (1697-1727) and the Jebtsun Damba qutuytu (1635-1723).

The author does not mention in the text any sources which he used. However, collating the Šira Tuyuji with works well-known to us, it is not hard to determine these sources. Zhamtsarano proved from concrete examples that the Secret History was used in the Šira Tuyuji, but he also noted with full justification that the Šira Tuyuji author did not copy this source, but conveyed its content in abbreviated form (entries 150, pp. 65-66, English translation, p. 47; 186, p. 147).

Another Mongolian source of the Šira Tuyuji is the work we have already mentioned, the Alton Tobdi Anonymous. Zhamtsarano established a number of places (for instance, a description of the death of Chinggis Khan, etc.) which are extracts from the Alton Tobdi (entry 150, pp. 66-67, English translation, pp. 46-47).

Even less studied are the Tibetan sources of the Šira Tuyuji. The text contains references to two Tibetan works: Dalai blama-yin nomłaysan jalaysus-un quirim kemekü teiken (The History called the Feast of Youth, Preached by the Dalai Lama), and the Köke debter (The Blue Annals). The first named of these works must be understood to be the well-known Tibetan chronicle compiled in 1643 by the Fifth Dalai Lama, Nag-dbaṅ blo-bsaṅ rgya-mtsho (1617-1682) (entries 134, pp. 74-75; 286, p. 145), the historical views of which had a noticeable influence on the author of the Šira Tuyuji. The latter begins his work with a well-known argument about the need to study history,

taken by the Fifth Dalai Lama from a genealogical book, which speaks of the origins of the Tibetan clan of Lan. At the very beginning of the Šira Tuyuji we read: "In a history called the Feast of Youth, written by the Dalai Lama, it is said: If an ordinary person does not know his origins, then he is like an ape, bewildered in the forest; if he does not know his own clan, then he is like a dragon made from
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turquoise; if he does not know writings narrating the genealogy of his ancestors, then he is like an abandoned child” (entry 70, p. 15)\(^\text{15}\). This utterance consequently became a kind of epigraph for many Mongolian historians. It is cited by Jamba in his chronicle, the *Asarayči neretü-yin teüke* (The History written by Asarayči (entry 39), in the *Erdeni-yin erike* by Galdan tusalayči (entry 40), in the *Mingjan kegesiitu* (entry 86) and others.

In the additions written between the lines of the Šira *Tuñuji* there are references to the *Köke debter* by which one must not understand the Mongolian work, the *Köke sudur*, as some investigators assumed (entry 70, p. 175, note 20), but a well-known Tibetan chronicle, the *Deb-ther shon-po* (The Blue Annals, Mong. *Köke debter*) written by Gos-lo-tsa-ba 不断地-nu dpal (1392-1481); this chronicle was translated into English by my late professor, George Roerich (entry 105). Our opinion is confirmed by a brief citation, introduced into the Šira *Tuñuji* from the chronicle in question, *Köke debter-tür eng terigün tngri-yin köbegün börte čimu-a* (entry 70, p. 19): “The *Köke debter* says that the first was Börte Chino, the son of Heaven.” This phrase we regard as a Mongolian translation from the Tibetan *Blue Annals: dañ por gnăm gyi bu sbor tha čhe* (entry 37, f. 26-a). It is necessary to say to this too that the author of the *Blue Annals* in his turn borrowed information about Börte Čino from the work we mentioned, the *Red Annals* by Kun-dga' rdo-rje where we find exactly the same phrase (entry 90, p. 14a). It is worthy of attention as well that in the late additions to the Šira *Tuñuji* the progenitor of the Mongolian khans, whom in antiquity the Mongols called “Born with a Destiny from Heaven,” is converted into the “Son of Heaven” (Skt. Devaputra).

The Šira *Tuñuji* offers special interest for us inasmuch as this work appeared in Khalkha, in all probability, prior to the establishment of Manchu rule. In favor of this supposition is the fact that every participant in this work was to one degree or another from Khalkha by birth; the owner of copy C was the Khalkha prince Kūrūski (entry 150, p. 61, English translation, p. 44), the Ulaanbaatar copy was found in Khalkha Mongolia (in the Baishingtu monastery); special attention is devoted in this work to the genealogical history of the Khalkha princes, descendants of Geresenje (entries 70, p. 7; 233, p. 85).

The appearance of a historical work such as the Šira *Tuñuji* in Khalkha Mongolia bears witness to the fact that the process of rebirth of Mongolian historical traditions encompassed Khalkha as well in the period being described. The most important principles of compiling such a type of chronicle were identical in both Southern Mongolia and Khalkha. The Šira *Tuñuji* by structure and content

\(^{15}\) For this citation in the original, cf. the Fifth Dalai Lama (entry 22, p. 157). In translating this quotation we have compared the Mongolian translation with the Tibetan original and have not found any particular divergence in the sense of the two.
differs but little from the chronicles surveyed above, such as the *Altan Tobđi Anonymous* and the *Altan Tobđi* by Lubsangdanjin. Here, apparently, the decisive influence of the Southern Mongolian historians is visible, in particular that of the anonymous author of the *Altan Tobđi*, one of the *Sīra Tuṇḍī’s* sources.

The *Sīra Tuṇḍī* is written using the traditional chronological scheme of the Buddhist three stages of monarchy. But in distinction from other historical works its text is prefaced with a preamble containing a brief history not only of the origin of mankind, but also of the formation of the “external world.” The introductory part was written on the basis of Buddhist cosmological concepts, about which we spoke when analyzing the work of Guoshi Čorji, *The Essence of all That is Necessary*. There is no need to dwell on the attempt of the author of the *Sīra Tuṇḍī* to base the kinship of the Mongolian khans with the Indian and Tibetan kings, inasmuch as this effort in no wise differs from that employed by the other works reviewed above by us.

Of considerable interest to us in the basic part of the work is a history of the Mongols from ancient times to the days near when it was written. One portion of the basic text, devoted to a history of Chinggis Khan and his successors, is distinguished by its extreme brevity. In some places of the text there are interpolated (in another’s handwriting) detailed stories from the *Secret History* (entry 70, pp. 26-28, 32-33), from the *Altan Tobđi Anonymous* (entry 70, pp. 36-42) and from other sources. This confirms our opinion that the Khalkha historians displayed no less interest in the historical past of their ancestors than their brethren in Southern Mongolia. In this connection it is impossible not to notice that the compilers of the *Sīra Tuṇḍī* depended exclusively on a few sources, and being restricted to citing extracts from works of predecessors even when speaking of the most important issues in the history of Mongolia, and when their predecessors had treated them in differing ways. The absence of any critical relationship to the sources on the part of the *Sīra Tuṇḍī* compilers testifies to this. Hence, for example, apropos of Chinggis Khan’s campaign to the Tangut (Minyak) country, and concerning his death, three different extracts are cited: the first, drawn from an unknown source, is contained in the basic part; the second and third, written between the lines, are borrowed from the *Secret History* and the *Altan Tobđi Anonymous* (entries 70, pp. 32-33, 36-42; 57, §§265-267; 73, pp. 57-60).

When speaking of the first part of the work, it is necessary to indicate one peculiarity, that the compilers, like their predecessors, strove to reconsider some questions of Mongolian history in the light of the Buddhist religion, even when faced with outright falsification of historical truth. They may well have been the first ones after Qutuytai Sečen to have taken on themselves the labor of disclosing connections, allegedly having existed between Chinggis Khan and the Sakya Lama Anandahirdi, i.e., Kun-dga’ sniṅ-po. In the basic text there is yet another curious

---

16 Anandahirdi (Skt. Ānandahrdaya) is the Sanskrit equivalent of the Tibetan Kun-dga’ sniṅ-po. In the Mongolian text this name is incorrectly written as Ananda gerbai. This name
Chapter Two: Second Half of the 17th Century

bit of legendary information: after the campaign against Tibet Chinggis betook himself to India; on the way, at the Čadagrik Pass,\(^{17}\) there came running up to him a wild one-horned creature called a serū, and having thrice knelt before the Khan to worship him, Chinggis stated: “The place Očirtu (from Skt. Vajrasana or Bodhigaya, Tib. rdo-rje-gdan Sh. B.) is in India; they say it is the birthplace of Buddha Shakyamuni.” At this the wild beast, not knowing speech, bowed. “If one proceeds [thither], what will take place? It is likely, this is my Heavenly Father speaking, [he] said and turned back” (entry 70, pp. 24-25, p. 129). There is no doubt that this tale is a late reworking of an old legend, which was specifically recorded on a well-known stele, erected “on the road of Spirit” (Shen-tao pei) at the end of the 13th century in honor of Yeh-lū Ch’u-ts’ai, the Khitan adviser of Chinggis and Ögedei (entry 174, p. 71). However, it is difficult to say from which source this legend was taken by the compilers of the Šira Tuyuji. To judge from the character of the reworking, and as well from some Tibetan terms contained within it, one might think that it was borrowed from Tibetan sources, inasmuch as the original version of the legend underwent a strong change reflecting the spirit of Buddhism.

The Buddhist influence on the Šira Tuyuji also found expression in a number of other places which tell about Mongolo-Tibetan religious relations under the successors of Chinggis Khan: Ögedei, Godan, Kubilai and others. Most marked of all is how the compilers strove to link the history of the first Mongolian khans with the history of the dissemination of the well-known Two Principles of government, i.e., of state and religion. In all of this it must be considered that the compilers of the Šira Tuyuji do cite some new facts on the history of Mongolo-Tibetan relations. The trustworhiness of this data, borrowed from a Tibetan historical work, the [Holy] Genealogy [of the Deacons] of Sakya Monastery, compiled in 1630 (entry 134, pp. 67-68) evoked no doubts.

The history of the post-Yuan khans in the Šira Tuyuji has been related most briefly. It is laid out in greater detail only when dealing with the sons of Dayan Khan, where the main stress is laid on the history of the rulers of Khalkha Mongolia, i.e., the sons of Geresenje. As Shastina writes, the genealogy of the princes, which is so well worked out in the Šira Tuyuji has one peculiarity which distinguishes it from other historical works by Mongolian authors; it gives

\(^{17}\) The Mongolian text gives an incorrect writing of the Tibetan word Chakri (lčags-ri), which may possibly be a Tibetan translation of the name of the defile in the Baisun mountains which the Mongols called temür qayalha (The Iron Gates), and the Chinese T’iehmen (entries 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 217-218, note 2; 174, p. 101, note 7).
information about the female line, which is generally omitted by other authors (entry 70, p. 7). Such information about wives and daughters of the Khalkha warlords is of great significance in establishing links between different groups of Mongols scattered in various corners of Mongolia in the 16th-17th centuries. In this way we see a clearly expressed pro-Khalkha orientation in the Sira Tuγuji. But all this does not mean that the Sira Tuγuji is a typical local Khalkha-Mongolian chronicle. It also expresses interest in the history of all Mongolia, as witnessed by the presence of special sections devoted to peoples inhabiting the appanages of Jochi and Chagatay, brothers of Chinggis Khan, and to the six Mongolian and four Oirat tumens, bestowed as appanages on the sons of Dayan Khan in various parts of Mongolia.

Of special interest to us are the descriptive characteristics of each of the six tumens, composed in verses. In these, in our view, one of the basic historical-political ideas of the entire work is clearly expressed to show the significance of each part of Mongolia for the general fate of the country. Thus in agreement with the descriptions mentioned, the Chahar tumen is the “blade of a hacking sword, the crest of a helmet,” and the Khalkha tumen is the “defender of those who have returned home,” the “support of one’s own life,” and the Ordos tumen is the “wing of a swift falcon, preserving the mountain-like white yurt of the proud Ruler, born with skill in his thumb, with a vast heart in his bosom” (entry 70, p. 97, p. 159).

The interest of the Khalkha author of the Sira Tuγuji in the history of other regions of Mongolia is also revealed in an appraisal of the activity of Ligdan Khan, who is spoken of with great sympathy, in emphasizing his service to the Mongolian state and religion:

Ligdan quturγu, called the Sutu Chinggis Tai-ming Sečen, vanquisher of all lands, the grand Chakravarti, Tai Tai-tsung, tengri of all tengris, Qormuzda of all the Universe, rotating the golden wheel, master of Doctrine, a surpassing exemplar who has actuated the two governances (entry 70, p. 75, p. 150).

Here Ligdan Khan emerges with all his splendid titles which, as shown above, the Mongolian translators of the Kanjur awarded him. It is characteristic that the compiler of the basic text of the Sira Tuγuji similarly to the Kanjur translators, ascribes the merit of spreading religion into Mongolia precisely to Ligdan Khan, and not to Altan Khan, whom he merely mentions. The Sira Tuγuji clearly conveys the idea of justifying Ligdan Khan, because he applied forceful measures to unite all Southern Mongolia under his authority: “Inasmuch as among rulers and subjects events contradicting interests of the state have grown frequent, Ligdan Khan, having exhausted peaceful means, united in forceful fashion the great uluses of the Six Tumens” (entry 70, p. 76). Under “events contradicting interests of the state” must be understood the endless frays of rulers of Southern Mongolia which were particularly aggravated in the period when Manchu aggression was strong, as
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were the uprisings of some aimags of the three western tümens against Ligdan Khan in 1632.

Actually, Ligdan Khan led a stubborn fight against the aimag rulers, who had not desired to subject themselves to his central authority and had striven for separatism and were even ready to go over to the Manchu side. This struggle concluded, as is well-known, with the crushing of the Chahar khanate and the subjection of all Southern Mongolia to the Manchus. But nothing is said in the Šira Ṭuṇuji about this finale of Ligdan Khan’s anti-Manchu battle. It merely informs one that after unification of the Six Tümens Ligdan Khan resettled in the west and in the locality of Šira Tala died at the age of 43. As is evident, the author of the Šira Ṭuṇuji at this point is deliberately laconic; he continues to speak of Ligdan Khan as if nothing in particular had ever happened to him. It creates the impression that he preferred to remain silent about the tragic events which took place then in Southern Mongolia.

In conclusion, we cite the statement of Vladimirtsov about the Šira Ṭuṇuji:

This history is a product of a more or less free steppe creativity. It is written for and in favor of the Mongolian steppe aristocracy, not yet having had time to be converted into a Manchu hereditary bureaucracy, it answers Manchu requirements and interests. Though one can observe a certain interest in Buddhism in it, it more strongly expresses interest in epic and native traditionary tales. And there is absolutely no sort of Manchuophile attitude in it, although it does acknowledge the Manchu Emperor as the creator of the Pax Mandjurica (entry 143, p. 1272).

[249]

III. The Erdeni-Yin Tobči of Sayang Sečen

Sayang Sečen is rightly regarded as the greatest figure in Mongolian historiography. Zhamtsaraano called him “one of the best representatives of the aristocratic intelligentsia of the seventeenth century, a participant in and witness to the intertribal wars, of the religious innovations, and of the downfall of the Mongolian national monarchy of Ligdan qan of Chahar” (entries 150, p.38-a; 292, English translation, p. 29).

Sayang Sečen was born in a Blue-Dragon Year, the 32nd year of the reign of the Wan-li Emperor, i.e., in 1604, in the hoshuun called Üüsın near the plain of Yeke-Šiber in the southwestern part of the Ordos (entry 107, p. 264; Urga MS 81r28; 91v12). He came from a hereditary aristocratic family belonging to the Golden Clan of the Chinggisids. His clan derived its origins from Dayan Khan (1464-1543), a descendant of Chinggis Khan in the fifteenth generation, one of the first of those who undertook to establish the unity of all Mongolian soil. Sayang Sečen is known best of all as the great-grandson of Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji, about whom we spoke above. His grandfather Öljei-ildüči darqan bayatur sečen qung tayiji (1556-1589) and father Batu darqan bayatur sečen qung tayiji (1580-?) were likewise mighty political figures in the Ordos. It is hardly amazing that under the conditions
of that time the political career of Sayang Sečen began quite early. At the age of ten he assumed the title of sečen qung tayiji, i.e., the same title that his predecessors bore, beginning with Qutuytai Sečen. The reason for such a distinction was that Sayang Sečen was "a descendant of persons who had established the rule of religion among the six nations" (entry 44, p. 287; Urga MS 86v11-13).

At the age of sixteen he was raised to a high state rank and assumed an active role in managing the state as a very close companion of Bošoγtu Jinong of the Ordos (1565-1624). The influence of Sayang Sečen among the Ordos nobility expanded further under the successor to Bošoγtu Jinong, Rinčen Elči Dayiching. During a solemn ceremony in 1627 Sayang Sečen declared the award of the title of khan to Rinčen. However, after 1627 there began a very trying period in the life of Sayang Sečen and his kinsmen, one which ended in 1634 with the collapse of the Chahar khanate of Ligdan Khan, who fell under the blows of the Manchu aggressors. Under these circumstances Sayang Sečen's activity became self-contradictory. At one time both he and Jinong Rinčen recognized the suzerainty of Ligdan as khan. As the author himself writes, "they [Sayang Sečen and Rinčen Jinong--Sh. B.] together entered the bag-detachment of Ligdan-qutuytu and jointly served with Ligdan in one hoshuun" (entry 44, p. 304; Urga MS 91r28). However there quickly broke out an internecine conflict between Ligdan Khan and the aimags which had risen against him. Ligdan Khan, who was faced with ever increasing Manchu aggression, dealt sternly with his disobedient vassals. Having invaded the Ordos in 1632, Ligdan deprived Rinčen of his rank as jinong and seized the "relics" of Chinggis Khan.

As Sayang Sečen writes, at that time when in this way "the great State began to be destroyed" (entry 44, p. 304; Urga MS 91r30) he himself, Sayang Sečen, went on campaign so as to meet and conclude peace with "the Chahar sayid [= officials--Sh. B.]" who had gone into the field, and who, in all probability, were remnants of the forces of Ligdan who had attacked the west." Sayang Sečen succeeded in establishing friendship with 300 Chahar subjects. Later, in the Dog Year [1634], he decided to return to his homeland. On the way, Sayang Sečen ran into his old jinong, Rinčen, and proposed to him that they should return to the Ordos together, having announced that he was returning after establishing friendship with the Chahars (entry 44, p. 305; Urga MS 91v7).

When Sayang Sečen and Rinčen returned to the place Yeke-Šiber in the Ordos in that same year, 1634, a grand ceremony took place at which Rinčen was anew awarded the rank of jinong, and on Sayang Sečen were bestowed splendid titles for his services to the jinong (entry 44, pp. 305-306; Urga MS 91r30/92r1; entry 74, pp. 21-22). In all probability, the Ordos ruler as well as Sayang Sečen were for some time occupied with reconstructing their ulus which had suffered mightily from the conflicts. In the Ordos, Sayang Sečen writes in conclusion, "peace and calm again reigned" (entry 44, p. 306; Urga MS 92r5). With these words he finishes the exposition of the history of his country and the account of himself.
Thus, after the fall of the Chahar khanate in 1634, Sayang Sečen strove to create peace and friendship among the quarreling groupings in Southern Mongolia, and to strengthen his ulus in the north. It is remarkable that at just the critical moment when Ligdan Khan had lost the conflict, Sayang Sečen did not go over to the side of the Manchu victors, as did the aimag rulers of Southern Mongolia. On the contrary, having reconciled with the Chahars, he returned to his homeland, taking his former jinong along with him.

Researchers have already stated the most likely suppositions about the negative relationship of Sayang Sečen to the Manchu conquerors (entries 74, pp. 23-29; 233, pp. 96-97; 112, p. 11). As Father Mostaert writes, because of the fact that Sayang Sečen tells us nothing about his activity after 1634, although he was only over 30 by then, one might conclude that he held no official position under the Manchus (entry 74, p. 25). In all likelihood, Sayang Sečen belonged to that group of representatives of the tribal Mongolian aristocracy, who under the new regime were deprived of the gracious favor of the Manchu emperor. It is hard, of course, to suppose that such a person as Sayang Sečen who was not only a descendant of a tayiji, but also an active political figure, would have displayed indifference at Mongolia's loss of independence, nor could easily be consoled at the loss of those privileges he enjoyed as the closest cohort of the jinong and a powerful Mongol ruler. Very characteristic is the fact that right up to recent times among the kinsmen of Sayang Sečen there survived a legend, which Father Mostaert recorded on the spot and published in 1934 (entry 257, pp. 67-71). This legend states that Sayang Sečen, who very boldly and proudly rejected the numerous proposals of the Manchu emperor to accept subjection, was barbarically executed and his body dismembered. As Father Mostaert reports, in the Ordos region up until recently they lovingly preserved the tomb of Sayang Sečen and annually on the 29th of the 12th lunar month, at the locality of Üüsín, conducted a ceremony in honor of the spirit of their noted forebear (entry 74, p. 67). When and under what circumstances Sayang Sečen died is not known.

The Erdeni-yin Tobći of Sayang Sečen is a great monument of Mongolian historiography at the end of the 17th century. The author himself reports exactly on when he wrote his work (entries 44, p. 324; Urga MS 97r12-15; 150, p. 24):

In this wise, [the work] begun [on the day] modun gray¹⁸ ilüyor-yin odun¹⁹, edür which is the eleventh day of the month Udirabalguni [Skt. uttaraphalguni, which corresponds to the second Mongolian month—Sh. B.] of the current year,²⁰ naiman

¹⁸ modun gray: the planet Jupiter.

¹⁹ iliyor-yin odun: name of a constellation.

²⁰ urany-yin jil: to be translated in the sense of “the current year.” In the opinion of Father Mostaert, Sayang Sečen used such an expression because for him years
čayn-u egūsgegčī²¹ [March 30th, 1662], which is the fifty-ninth year [counting] from [the year] yiśīn ulayn kilingtū²² [1604] when [I] was born, and finished [on the day] ỵadasun gray bus odun²³ edür, which is the first day of the new [moon], i.e., the month of Burvāsad [Skt. āvrasadhā, corresponding to the sixth Mongolian month, and by the European calendar to the 15th of July—Sh. B.] (entry 74, pp. 47-51).

Over the course of many years, Saγang Sečen’s work enjoyed great popularity among the Mongols. It was widely distributed in manuscript form throughout the country, and was one of the books most read by scholars literate in Mongolian. It is worthwhile mentioning that at the request of the Manchu emperor, the chiang-chūn of Uliyasutai, the Khalkha prince Cenggūnjab, “handed over for his high review” the book by Sayang Sečen (entry 64, pp. 159-160, note 6). Not long after, the Erdeni-yin tobči was translated into Manchu (entry 64), and then from Manchu into Chinese (as to the Chinese translation, see entries 208, pp. 85-86; 239, pp. 195-198; 74, pp. 36-37).

The great fame which Saγang Sečen's work acquired in the West is due to the appearance of a German translation by Isaac Schmidt (1829), accompanied by the Mongolian text (entries 107; 83, 74, 85).

The Erdeni-yin tobči is in many respects the most finished work of its time about the history of Mongolia. In a compositional sense it clearly expresses and contains a host of new undertakings. After brief introductory remarks about the content of his work the author begins the main portion: a history of the world and of Mongolia, set forth in several large divisions (the history of the origin and formation of the universe, the appearance of the first living beings and of people on the earth, the history of the Indian and Tibetan kings, the history of Mongolia, and so on). The work concludes with a colophon.

were enumerated in correspondence with the movement of such heavenly bodies, as the sun, moon and stars.

²¹ The year of naiman čayn-u egūsgegčī or, as the Mongols otherwise call it, the year buyan egūsgegčī, is, as Father Mostaert established, a calque of the Sanskrit name Śubhakrt (Tib: dge-byed). In this case it is the 36th year in the sixty-year cycle of the Indo-Tibetan system of chronology. This year in Sayang Sečen corresponds to 1662.

²² As Father Mostaert determined, yiśīn ulayn kilingtū is also a calque of a Sanskrit name of the year Krodhin (Tibetan khro-mo), which in this case corresponds to the 38th year of the tenth Tibetan sixty-year cycle, encompassing the period from 1567 to 1624. Consequently, this year in Sayang Sečen corresponds to 1604. Cf. entry 74, p. 49.

²³ bus odun: name of a constellation.
It is remarkable that Sayang Sečen introduced into Mongolian historical writing the practice of enumerating the sources used, at the end of his work. He himself names the following seven sources:

1. **Tegünčilen üjegsenger udqa-tu čiqula kereglegči** [The sūtra called The Meaningful and Important Necessity].
2. **Taiyqamsiy-a üjegdekkii sečeg-ün čomorliy neregű Şastir** [The shastra called The Flower Bouquet Marvelous to Behold].
3. **Ulaţan debter** [The Red Annals].
4. **Şarba qutuy-tu-yin jokiyaysan qad-un ündüsün-ü tuyuji** [The Story of the Origin of the Khans, compiled by Sharba Qutuytu].
5. **Erdem-ten-ü sedkil-i geyigülkii sečeglig kemekü kitad-un şastir** [The Chinese shastra called The Flower Garden Illuminating the Mind of Savants].

---

24 This is the work by Guoši Čorji reviewed above, the Čiqula kereglegči tegüs udqa-tu neregű sasdar.

25 We still know nothing about this work. At the beginning of his work, Sayang Sečen, when speaking of the Indian rulers, mentions this composition along with other sources. He reports that the šastra was compiled by the sage Aksapāda. Cf. entry 44, p. 15, Urga MS 4v23; cf. entry 233, pp. 100-101.

26 This implies the previously mentioned Tibetan historical work, the deb-ther dmarg-po (or hu-lan deb-ther), compiled in 1346 by Kun-dga’ rdo-rje. At the beginning of his work Sayang Sečen reports that the Red Annals were written by Yeke mergen-e bütügsen sangga siri bada (Skt. Samghasribhadra). I have already remarked in one of my works that the author of the Red Annals is not called by his own name but by his respectful title (in Mongolian and in Sanskrit). If we reconstruct it in Tibetan, it will be: Mḵha-grub chen-podge-d‘un dpal bzhin-po. Cf. Sh. Bira, “Some remarks on the Hu-lan Deb-ther of Kun-dga’ rdo-rje” (entry 214, pp. 74-75; cf. entry 233, pp. 101-102).

27 The work referred to has not come down to us. Scholars think that its author, Sharaba-qutuytu, is that same Sharaba-qutuytu or Sakya Panchen Sharaba Shri bhadra, who was a personal preceptor of Ligdan Khan. As is well-known, he took an active role in editing the Mongolian Kanjur in 1628-1629. To judge from the title, one may presume that the History of the Origin of the Khans was written by Sharaba-qutuytu with the aim of establishing the genealogical claims of Ligdan Khan to the throne of all the Mongols. This work could have been written by the author, as Walther Heissig correctly assumes, in the period between 1617 and 1629, when Sharaba-qutuytu was in the service of Ligdan Khan (entry 233, pp. 48-50).

28 Scholars have not yet been able to establish which Chinese work Sayang Sečen had in mind.
composed by the Supreme Sublime Chakravarti Khan].

7. Erten-ü mongol-un ündüüsün-ü yeke Şira tüyüji [The Great Yellow History of the Origin of Former Mongolian Khans]. We spoke of this work earlier supra (Urga MS 96v30/97rl-9).

Sayang Sečen did not identify every source he used, but only the basic works he employed. In the text one may discover ones other than those named, as well as unnamed sources, which the author used in writing these or other divisions. Of the sources which he names one may list the following:

1. The Kālačakra-sūtra (čay-un kārden-ü toyač-an-u toyalal).
2. The Suvarnaprabhās-asūtra (degēdu Altan gerel).
3. The Sayin-u toyān-u sudur, written by Sakya-Pandita Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan (1182-1252) on the basis of the Kālačakra of Panchen Shagjashri (Bančen Sēgjasiiri < Pan-čen Sākyaśri).
4. Qayučin sudur [The Ancient Book], compiled by Qirdi dovačava (from Tibetan grags-pa rgyal-mtshan) on the basis of the sutra: Burqan khr Ugei neretU Okin-e vavangirid újügülügsen uduriyulsunu sudur (the Vimalakirtini desa nama mahāyānasūtra).
5. Burqan-u üres (?) boluysan mayta-yal-un tayilburi kemekü sudur, compiled by Bilig-ün quyay kemekü bayısı (Tib. Ses-rab go-čha < Prajñāvarman), and others.

All these sources are Buddhist religious works. They had a strong influence on the world view of Sayang Sečen as a historian.

As regards sources not named by Sayang Sečen, some scholars presume that his data about the visit to Mongolia by the Third Dalai Lama he borrowed from the well-known and often mentioned here biography of the Third Dalai Lama, compiled by the Fifth Dalai Lama in 1643 (entry 233, pp. 108-109). However this seems most unlikely. On comparing the corresponding passages in both works one is easily convinced that the data in them are far from identical, and even at times are contradictory. Let us cite some examples.

According to Sayang Sečen, the idea of inviting the Dalai Lama to Mongolia was advanced to Altan Khan by Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji in 1576 (a Red Mouse Year) (entry 44, p. 240; Urga MS 74r27-30). But we find something quite different in the work by the Fifth Dalai Lama. He informs us that in the Iron Ram Year (1571) Altan Khan accepted faith in the dharma. After Asen-lama, who had journeyed to visit him, had made him acquainted with the biography of the Dalai

---

29 It is referring to the previously discussed Ćayan teuke, edited by the great-grandfather of Sayang Sečen, Qutuytai Sečen.

30 In all probability, he is speaking of the well-known work Lha las phul du byuñ ba'i bstod pa'i grel pa, written by Sherabgocha (Tib. Ses-rab go-cha) from which Tibetan authors extracted data about the origins of the Tibetans. Kun-dga' rdo-rje and gZon-nu dpal specifically cite this work (entry 90, p. 156).
Lama, the khan decided to extend an invitation to the latter (entry 23, f. 88-b). According to Sayang Sečén, Qutuytai Sečén qung tayiji of the Ordos and Dayan- 
noyony of the Tümed were at the head of a third meeting, set up in honor of the Third 
Dalai Lama on the road he was following to the encampment of Altan Khan (entry 
44, p. 243; Urga MS 75r11-13). The Fifth Dalai Lama, however, writes that they 
were at the head of a second, but not a third meeting (entry 23, f. 94). It must be said 
that the narrative of the Fifth Dalai Lama about the official adoption of Lamaism by 
the Mongols is fuller than this episode is in Sayang Sečén’s work. One encounters 
curious details which are not in Sayang Sečén. For instance, the Fifth Dalai Lama 
reports that the Third Dalai Lama committed the main ongyön, a shamanist idol, to 
the flames as a kind of offering to Gombo (Tib. mGon-po), a four-headed deity. All 
the Mongols, he writes, followed this example, and committed to the flames their 
own ongyons (entry 23, f. 96-b).

On the other hand, Sayang Sečén has much information which is not in the 
work on the Third Dalai Lama. Hence one may conclude that Sayang Sečén did not 
make use of the biography of the Third Dalai Lama compiled by the Fifth Dalai 
Lama. One has to think that at his disposal lay other materials, perhaps a family 
archive of his, set up by his great-grandfather Qutuytai Sečén. He might also have 
used oral communications from his kinsmen. To judge from the character and 
content of the information he conveys, it is not hard to establish that those portions 
devoted to the history of the “minor khans” are written on the basis of purely 
Mongolian traditional tales, epic stories and some notes preserved in the families of 
nobles. It is in just those parts of his work that Sayang Sečén offer his most valuable 
material for reconstructing Mongolian historiographic traditions and views during 
the so-called dark period (15th-16th centuries). When writing the colophon of his 
work, Sayang Sečén made wide use of, as he notes himself, “of sutras and shastras” 
among which first and foremost must be understood to include the Subhasita of 
Kun-dga’-rgyal-mtshan.

When proceeding to analyze the basic portion of his work, it must be noticed 
first of all how Sayang Sečén understands a history of Mongolia. In our view, he 
clearly formulated this in his conclusion:

Being unable to relate [this] fully, I am summarizing at some length:

[256] 
[information about] that former worldly material-universe [and] 
The various descendant living-beings relying on it 
On behalf of living-beings from India’s Khan Acclaimed by Many down to now 
To the present-day time of strife 
[About] the birth of boγelas and powerful Khans pacifying the earth 
The birth of meritorious bodhisattvas leading living-beings, 
[And about] all having been made joyful by the religion of Buddha and government 
by boγelas (entry 295, p. 107; Urga MS 96v, 16-24).
It is clear that Sayang Sečen wrote his history in full accord with a general scheme, worked out, as we have already seen, by his great-grandfather Quturytai Sečen and other predecessors: a history of Mongolia is a history of the "Two Principles," the union of religion and the khan's power. But under this scheme Sayang Sečen places such a solid historical base that his work in places goes far beyond these limits. One may also add that his work was essentially the first attempt at a full-scale exposition of the overall history of Mongolia from oldest times to the second half of the 17th century.

What are these basic issues which Sayang Sečen illumines? At the very beginning of his work he writes:

[I shall relate]
How the steadfast support, the outer earth-vessel, was established;
How the supporting inner descendants and sentient were formed;
How the bodhisattvas who broadly lead sentient were born;
How the three nations of ancient India, Tibet and Mongolia
Have spread out since ancient times (entry 296: unpublished MS; Urga MS 1v5-11; entry 297; PP-ET A-1. pp. 35-36).

One's attention is drawn by the author's attempt to link the history of the Mongols with a universal historical process, bravely demolishing the old historiographic tradition according to which the history of the Mongols began only with the forebears of Chinggis Khan. It is true that this attempt by Sayang Sečen, as with attempts by his predecessors, was entirely founded on Buddhist historical-cosmological theory, as set forth in the Abhidharmakośa mentioned above, but nonetheless he did display some independence in the matter. Sayang Sečen is primarily interested in a naive naturalistic concept of Buddhist cosmology. For him the most important thing of all is to reveal the historical process revealing the origin of the material world and of living beings, humanity. In distinction to some of his predecessors (for instance, Guoši Corji) he has no interest in a fantastic description of the make-up of the universe, nor in the characteristics of every possible animate creature which inhabits the various realms of the universe. Proceeding from the organic unity

of the material world and the world of animate creatures, Sayang Sečen concisely describes the formation of the universe. At the base of this process lie three substances: air, water, earth. Space (qoynsun ajar) serves as the place where the formation of the world takes place, and there, from the powerful movement of air from the ten directions, is first formed the unshakeably firm sphere of the element "air" (kei-yin mandal), after which, thanks to heat imparted through the movement of the air, a great cloud arose from which came a mighty rain, which gave rise to the sphere of the element "water" (usun-u mandal) in the shape of a vast ocean. Over the surface of the water was formed a paramamu-dust, similar to the skim on milk. From the heaping up of the dust—of its most minute particles—there was formed the
sphere of the element “earth” (siroi mandal)—the “Golden Universe” (altan delekei) (entry 44, p. 8; Urga MS lv17-30/ 2rl-3).

Proceeding to the history of animate beings, the author restricts himself to a short narration of the history of the appearance of humanity on earth. In Sayang Sečen’s opinion, people did not originally split off from the world of living substances. Then, he writes, there was no such name as "man", but there was only one general name: “living-beings” (amitan). At first people held the status of reincarnated-tengris, and were distinguished both by physical and moral perfection. They lived incalculably many years, not walking the earth but flying through the sky, nourished not by earthly foods, but by a pure viand, samadhi. This was the “time of complete perfection” in the Buddhist cosmology, corresponding to the “Golden Age” of antiquity amidst Greek and Chinese thinkers.

According to the degree of degradation of their moral qualities men were distanced from their original status and descended, at last remove, to the position of earthly creatures with all the flaws they possess. This process was broken down into five periods. Sayang Sečen strictly adheres to the thesis of Buddhist cosmology that the origin of feelings for property among people served as a basic reason for the change in their way of life. The first trial people made of earthly food, was the so-called fat of the land (najar-un tosun). This brought about their transformation into earthly creatures. And fire person who kept food for the next day, produced the impetus for the disappearance of the abundance of ready-to eat food, a grain which grew wild (salu tuturay-a) and the appearance of property. It was necessary for people to work the earth themselves to gain their bread.

Quarrels and strife among people began over land as well as from unequal distribution of food. Thievery arose, as did slaying and other vices. All this, in turn, led to the fact that people had agreed among themselves to divide up their land portions equally and to select a ruler able to maintain order in society. In this way the first ruler arose, called “Elevated by the Multitude” (Mong. olan-a ergüdgesen, Skt. Mahāsammata). This king, in the opinion of Sayang Sečen, was also the progenitor of all the kings of the earth, in the first place in India, Tibet and Mongolia.

In comparison with his predecessors Sayang Sečen “set the groundwork” in a more circumstantial way for the well-known scheme of the three Buddhist monarchies. It is just in this work of his that the scheme attains its ultimate expression. Sayang Sečen strove to prove not only the spiritual kinship but also the genealogical unity of the kings of the three lands (India, Tibet and Mongolia), and regarded it as necessary to preface the history of Mongolia with a brief survey of the history of kings and religion of India and Tibet. His point of departure used the concept of the Tibetan historian-Buddhists about the origins of the Tibetans from the Indians, and their kings from the race of Mahāsammata. Unaware of the falsehood in this concept, worked out by Tibetan authors who had striven to link the destiny of Tibet with its being the homeland of Buddhism, Sayang Sečen upheld this thesis, and cited as its foundation those legends that were widely disseminated.
among the Tibetan authors. Alluding to the work of Šes-rab go-čha, Sayang Sečen writes that the youngest of the five sons of Pandu (Pandu, Tib. skya-sen, Mong. itegel arsalan), Rupati, having suffered defeat in a battle with the forces of an enemy, fled to the slopes of the snowy mountains and became the progenitor of the Tibetans (entry 44, pp. 21-22; Urga MS 7r29-30/ 7v1). This same legend is also quoted by the Tibetan historians Kun-dga' rdo-ije and Gos-lo-tsa-va gZon-nu dpal.

Sayang Sečen likewise quotes the legend of the origin of the first Tibetan king. To King UryuyuluySi, ruler of the Badasal people, was born a son with turquoise hair, with teeth of white conch, with fingers and toes on his hands and feet like those of a goose, with eyes resembling those of a bird, shutting from the bottom up. When they showed him to the interpreters of signs, these shamans stated: "This son will be bad for his father, he must be slain." But no swords were able to dispatch him. For this reason they placed the youngster in a copper case and cast him into the Ganges River. A former, living near the city of Vaishali, drew him from the river. The boy grew up with the farmer's family. Having learned about his past from those who brought him up, he betook himself in an eastward direction, to the Snowy Land. There local inhabitants elected him king after he related to them his origin from the golden clan of the ancient Indian king, Mahāsammata (cf. entry 44, pp. 22-24; Urga MS 7r/8r). Thus there arose the first king of Tibet, Kujugun Sandalitu (Mong. kujügon sandalitu qaγan, Tib. gya khri btsan po), progenitor of the Tibetan kings.

Following this pattern, the Mongolian Buddhist-historians in their turn concocted a legend about the origin of the Mongol khans from the Tibetan kings, and through them from Mahāsammata. This legend, which in its various shadings achieved widespread distribution in Mongolian historical literature beginning with the 17th century, emerges in Sayang Sečen as follows. The Tibetan king, Dalai-Subin Aru Altan Shiregetu, who was the seventh king after Kujugun Sandalitu, was slain by his vizier Long-nam, who had seized the throne. The three sons of the king, Boroču, Śibayuči and Borte-Čino, fled from the latter. Börte Čino did not settle down in the Konbo district (Tib. rkon-po), but redirected himself across the Sea (Tengis), took himself a wife and reached the mountains of Burqan qaldun in the environs of Lake Baikal. There he met up with the Bida people. When they

---

31 As Sumba-Khambo Ishibaljir observed, the Mongols erroneously called this king Srip khri "Gser khri", then translating the latter into Mongolian as Altan sirengetü (cf. entry 36, p. 301).

32 This is how Sayang Sečen translates Tib. ša-khri into Mongolian.

33 This is the Mongolian translation of Tibetan bya-khri.

34 Bida is the Mongolian distortion of a Chinese name bei-ta (Northern Tatars) which the Chinese used to denote all the Mongols in ancient times.
asked him who he was, Börte Čino told about his origin from the clan of the ancient Indian king Mahāsammata and the Tibetan king. When they learned this, the Bida people took counsel and decided to elect him their noyon-ruler (entry 44, pp. 71-72; Urga MS 24/4).

The legend cited above represents a blend of two quite different traditional tales having the common historical purpose of establishing a blood link between the Mongolian khans and the Tibetan kings. One of these, a well-known Mongolian tale, reads: “The ancestor of Chinggis Khan was Börte Čino, born by the will of High Heaven. His spouse was Goā-Maral. They appeared, having crossed the Tengis [the Inner Sea]. They nomadized at the sources of the Onon River, at Burqan Qaldun” (entry 57, §1, p. 79).

The other story is of purely Tibetan origin and is widely known in Tibetan historical literature. Its content may be briefly summarized as follows: King Dri Gundzanbo (grī khrū nbtṣam po), son of the last king of the “Seven Kings who rule the Heavenly Thrones” (Tib. gnam-la khri baṅ), was slain by his vizier Lonam (Lo-maṅ, blo-maṅ). His three sons, by name Dja-dri (bya-khrī), Sha-dri (Sa-khrī) and Nya-dri (Na-khrī), fled to a place called Konpo (kōṅ-po, rkoṅ-po). Later, Djadri ascended the throne and became known under the name of Pude-Gunjal (spu-lde guṅ-rgyal). Sha-dri and Nya-dri became the rulers of Konpo and Nyanpo (nāṅ-po) respectively (cf. entry 90, f. 15-b/16-a).

In the Tibetan version of this tale, as we see, there is no hint that the youngest of the three fleeing sons of King Dri Gimdzanbo might become khan of the Mongols. But for Sayang Sečen, as for the other Mongol historians, it was sufficient to have the slightest mention of the flight of the youngest son of Dri Gundzanbo to another locality, so as to identify him with the Mongolian Börte Čino, who had appeared, as stated in Mongolian traditional tales, in Mongolia together with his spouse Goa-Maral, “having crossed the Tengis.” As to how all this was accepted by the Mongolian authors, even Sumba-Khambo Ishibaljir wrote about this. Quoting this very tale, the latter noted that Nya-dri in Mongolian is called Bor-ta-se-ba (bor-ta-se-ba), who later came to be called Börte Čino (Borta čhe-no) by the Mongols (entry 36, f. 300-b/301-a).

It is clear that Sayang Sečen played no small role in reworking the well-known concept of the so-called “genetic” kinship of the kings of India, Tibet and Mongolia. This concept is devoid of any historical foundation; it is totally based on legends, which arose as a result of reworking old Tibetan and Mongolian traditionary tales in a Buddhist religious spirit. Nevertheless one should note that Sayang Sečen, striving to establish this concept, did not restrict himself to just a few legends, but strove to strengthen it historically with reliable data from the early history of India and Tibet. He discusses, for instance, not just the legendary kings, but also such patrons of Buddhism as...
Asoka (*yasalang ügei nom-un qa'ya*), Kaniska (*kanige, genika*), Sron-btsan-gampo, Dri-sron-de-tsan and others. The brief survey of the history of Buddhism in early India and Tibet in Sayang Sečen is unconditionally directly connected with the history of that religion in Mongolia. For the Mongolian reader, it naturally was not devoid of interest to know where and when the Buddhist religion in general had arisen. It is noticeable that the author already has a historical-logical approach to the subject to be studied, as a result of which Sayang Sečen considerably expanded the topics of study in Mongolian historiography.

Having established in this way, as it seemed to him, the genetic continuity between the Mongolian khans and the Indo-Tibetan kings, Sayang Sečen goes over to the main division of his work—the history of the Mongols—in which he distinguishes three principal periods: first an early era of the rise of the Mongols; second, the era of creation of the Mongolian state and empire; and third, the post-Yuan—a period of the loss of the khan's power and of internecine struggle in Mongolia and the modern (to the author), a time of attempts to reestablish the unity of Mongolian lands and of threats to Mongolian political independence posed by the Manchus.

The early period of Mongolian history the author describes solely by those historical reports and tales which since the time of the *Secret History* were the basis of Mongolian historical knowledge. It is understandable therefore that some events which Sayang Sečen narrates in connection with the genealogy of the Golden Clan, and the life and activity of Chinggis Khan, are very similar to corresponding paragraphs of the *Secret History*. Also, as a new undertaking, Sayang Sečen, as part of his account of the history of Mongolian conquests, devoted a paragraph to a short survey of the history of China, beginning with its first rulers down to its conquest by Chinggis Khan (entry 44, pp. 100-106; Urga MS 33r/35r). His principal attention here is devoted to the history of Chinese emperors and the Buddhist religion in China. It is characteristic that Sayang Sečen regarded China as one of the Buddhist countries, establishing India as the homeland of Buddhism thereby providing the same spiritual kinship for China to India common to all Buddhists. It is difficult to determine the sources used by the author in his description of the history of China. However, some of his data is very close to that which we find in the *Red Annals* of Kun-dga' rdo-rje. True, the information in the latter is less detailed than what Sayang Sečen has. This is witnessed by the fact that our author used other sources as well, in the first place Chinese ones, but exactly which ones is still unknown.

Considerable space in Sayang Sečen is allotted to the history of the Yuan dynasty, which ruled China. The author observes two tendencies.

The first is that he strives to maintain a strict chronological sequence, indicating in each instance the year of birth and of rule of all khans of this dynasty, basically as do the *Śīra tuyűji*, and to somewhat less an extent, the *Altan Tobči* of Lubsangdanjin. The second is that he strives to survey the history of the Yuan dynasty as a history of the famed "Two Principles", the union of the khan's power
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and the Buddhist church. In this matter the Buddhist world view of the author shows up quite clearly. According to Sayang Sečen, from the time Buddhism spread among the Mongols, the history of religion became the most important component of Mongolian history. The author devotes particular attention to the advent of Khubilai Khan, whom he considers a Chakravarti, who makes revolve the thousand golden wheels and who guides the world through the law of dharma—the doctrine of the ten virtues. Sayang Sečen borrowed his basic facts about this period from Tibetan sources. Thus, for instance, everything he says about the acceptance of Buddhism on the part of Khubilai Khan when the latter met hPhags-pa Lama, is greatly reminiscent of what is written about this in the [Holy] Genealogy [of the Deacons] of the Sakya Monastery.

In Sayang Sečen's opinion, all the khans of the Yuan dynasty, with the exception of the last one, Toyon Temūr, correctly pursued the policy of the Two Principles, following the example of Qubilai sečen. The author furnishes each of these khans with a personal preceptor who personifies spiritual power in the empire. At the same time Sayang Sečen portrays the Mongolian khans of the Yuan dynasty as typical patrons of Buddhism. He endeavors in his own way to explain the reasons for the overthrow of the Yuan dynasty in China. Striving to lay all the responsibility for the Mongol conquerors being driven out of China on Toyon Temūr, Sayang Sečen selects the factual data in such a way that the latter looks like the chief guilty party in the downfall of the empire. Toyon Temūr, Sayang Sečen thinks, committed a fatal mistake by excessively trusting his Chinese official Chou Ko from the Chou clan, and ignoring the warnings of his Mongolian retainers. The author maintains that it was precisely this Chinese official who was later shown to be the chief organizer of a plot against the Mongolian khan.

It is also interesting that Sayang Sečen also speaks of the inevitable end of the Mongolian empire's existence. True, he does not base this opinion on sober judgments of a historian, but solely on a typical Buddhist prophecy allegedly uttered by hPhags-pa Lama when he met Khubilai Khan. "No one can stave off his karma [destiny], if the time is ripe," declared preceptor Ananda Madi in reply to the khan's request to aid him in saving the empire from the danger threatening it. At that very critical moment the angry khan drove out his preceptor, sending him back to his homeland. Nonetheless in the opinion of the author, Toyon Temūr undermined the basic policy of the Two Principles, which inescapably had to lead to lamentable consequences. In conclusion Sayang Sečen compels Toyon Temūr, who has lost the khan's throne in China, to be remorseful about his actions. He cites the lament of the deposed khan, which substantially differs from the versions given in the Śīra turya and the Altan Tobči of Lubsangdanjin (entries 44, pp. 156-158; Urga MS 49v/50r; 70, pp. 55-56; 41, vol. 2, pp. 123-124). This so-called lament of Toyon Temūr, as was stated above, was widely disseminated among the Mongols in the 15th-16th centuries, and served 17th century historians as a basis for appraisal of the actions of the last khan of the Yuan dynasty.
Sayang Sečen made a valuable contribution to the study of Mongolian history of the post-Yuan period. As Vladimirtsov observed, Sayang Sečen devotes his best pages to the 15th and 16th centuries, and as a ruling prince belonging to the Chinggisids, was able to hear many things from his kinsmen, the preservers of the old traditional tales of the Golden Clan (entry 145, p. 16). The data he cites are far richer and more detailed than those in the Šira tsoyji or the Altan Tobči of Lubsangdanjin. Sayang Sečen was able to reproduce a vivid picture of Mongolian political life in the period of the country’s break-up into internecine conflicts. He got this entirely thanks to those historical-literary traditions which were preserved down to his time from the 15th-16th centuries. In this context, the historian was more like an artist-restorer who was recreating an original down to minor details. He held strictly to the historic-epic style of traditional Mongolian historiographic creativity, and expressed his full agreement with the basic political and historical ideas of his predecessor-historians, whose works were his sources.

Of great interest for us is the light Sayang Sečen sheds on matters of genealogy and chronology in Mongolian history of the post-Yuan period. Of all the historians of the 17th century, only Sayang Sečen, it seems, is able to give the fullest and most trustworthy genealogy of the Mongolian tayijis of the 15th-16th centuries, those belonging to the leading branch of the Golden Clan Chinggisids. When reading the appropriate pages, it is not hard to be convinced that the author had at the basis of this genealogy those genealogical notes which were on hand in the families of the Mongolian tayijis. For Sayang Sečen genealogy is not a stark recital of names. He accompanies it with many details from the lives of the khans and powerful political figures. The author persistently strives to indicate dates of lives and rule for all khans, as well as activities of other historical personages, and not seldom without error. This would be an attainment for any historian. It is precisely this circumstance which bestows the style of a chronicle on his work.

In this part of his work there are reflections of those new historical-political ideas which arose then in connection with the stormy events in the political life of Mongolia. In the 16th century the major event riveting the attention of all the Mongols was the violent struggle between the eastern and western regions of the country, as well as the internecine uprisings among the eastern Mongolian rulers. For this reason it is quite comprehensible that Sayang Sečen brings together almost the entire post-Yuan history of Mongolia to narrate this struggle. He is especially interested in details which permit one to determine the reasons for and character and outcome of these endless conflicts. He thinks that the internecine struggles arose not only from the Oirat claims to the khan’s throne, but also from the chronic discord among representatives of the Golden Clan of the Chinggisids. In Sayang Sečen’s opinion, the irrational and stupid acts of some khans and their retainers often served as the cause of disaster for all Mongolia. The most graphic one of all, the author indicates through the example
of Elbeg Khan and Aybarsi jinong. In accord with historical tradition, he maintains that Elbeg Khan was actually the first khan who by his wild deeds lay the foundation for the internecine conflicts. Sayang Sečen, appraising the shameful actions of the khan, quotes these words of the Oirat ruler Ugeji Qasaqa:

This khan having established his realm unjustly, has [now] slain his younger brother, Qaryučuy qung tayiji, and has taken to wife his sister-in-law, Qong yoa bayiji; he administers the government improperly. My minister Quuqai was betrayed and slain by the bayiji-princess. To his own shame, though I the prince am living, he has let my subject Batula rule The Four. (entry 44, p. 163; Urga MS 51v17-23).

In the final accounting Elbeg Khan became victim of his own deeds, and the eastern Mongols soon fell under the power of the Oirat rulers, Toyon and Esen.

The reason for the defeat of the Mongolian Tayisun Khan in battle with the Oirats, Sayang Sečen ascribes to the treachery of Aybarsi jinong. The latter was the younger brother of Tayisun Khan, but at the crucial moment yielded to the promises of the Oirats; he betrayed his brother and went over to the other side. Sayang Sečen does not conceal his disapproval of Aybarsi jinong’s actions. It is true that he expresses this obliquely, citing in a number of places the very words of Aybarsi or the statements of the Oirats. Prior to the treachery of Aybarsi his son Qaryučuy, anticipating his father, said that it would be bad for the latter if he broke the link between the clan and the khan. And when Aybarsi at the insistence of the Oirats decided to become khan, having yielded his title as jinong to Esen of the Oirats, Qaryučuy said to his father:

Sun and Moon are in the High Blue [Heaven];
Khan and Jinong [are] on the Lower Crust [Earth].
There are tayishis and čingsangs amidst the descendants of the Sutai [the Fortunate Lady];
How can one give one's name to others?
(entries 44, p.181; Urga MS 56v23-26; 297, p. 212)

[266]

These words aptly express the opinion predominant at this time amidst the Mongolian aristocracy about defining the degrees of nobility in representatives of the upper class. In Mongolia during the post-Yüan period the jinong was second only to the khan and thus had to be by birth from among the closest relatives of the khan. He was the co-ruler with the khan and led the right tiimen. Another branch of the Chinggisid family tree was the so-called kürgens (sons-in-law), Golden Clan relatives on the maternal side. The fact of the matter is that all the tayijis (crown relatives on the maternal side. The fact of the matter is that all the tayijis (crown

35 jinong (Chin. qin-wang) is a ruling prince. In the Yüan period this title was borne by the heir to the throne, who commonly resided in Kharakhorum.
princes) were regarded as relatives, as members of the same clan and "bone" (*kiiyan yasutu, Borjigin oboytu*), and thus in no instance could they marry girls from their own clan. The Mongolian tayijis and khans bestowed their daughters on members of other aristocratic clans, appointing tayijis and jaisangs from the houses of those same nobles, with whom they had long been linked by exchange of brides (entry 145, p. 144). From what has been said, it is clear that the decision of Aybarji jinong represented a scandalous violation of legitimized traditions. For this reason the rebukes of his son are quite understandable. But Aybarji jinong insisted on going his own way and made a deal with the Oirats. To top this off, Sayang Sečen makes the Oirats say this about Aybarji:

This Jinong of ours
Is really no jinong at all!
He is a colossal ass! (entries 44, p. 180; 306; 297, p. 120; Urga MS 56r29-30).

and informs us that Aybarji jinong met an evil fate--killed by those same Oirats to whose side he had fled.

In his capacity as a ruling prince and a scion of the Chinggis clan, Sayang Sečen persistently promotes the idea, according to which the holder of Mongolian power, ruler of all the Mongols, can only be a pure-blooded descendant of Chinggis Khan, above all else a descendant of Qubilai, founder of the Yuan empire. Proceeding by this rule, he relates all khans of the post-Yuan period to descendants of the noted khans of the Yuan dynasty, passing over in silence the fact that during the post-Yuan period not once were any representatives of Arig-Buqa’s clan seated on the Mongolian throne; when speaking about the seizure of power by the Oirat lords, Sayang Sečen does not conceal his own negative attitude toward them. Characteristic is the statement he cites about Töyon tayishi, a pretender to the khan's throne. Töyon, as is well-known, was the emperor's son-in-law. He was the son of Samur-gungji,
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and married to the daughter of Elbeg Khan. Then Sayang Sečen puts in Töyon tayishi’s mouth a phrase that might well have been grounded in this fancy: “Thereupon Töyon tayishi . . . three times circled the stockade of the ruler's palace, slashing as he brushed past, and said, ‘You may well be the White House of the *Suu* [i.e., Chinggis], but I Töyon am a descendant of the *Sutai* [i.e., his mother belonged to the Imperial clan]’” (Urga MS 53-v 15-18). The aristocratic folk and the Forty [Mongols] and Four [Oirats] who had observed this said among themselves:

This sainted lord is not a ruler of the Mongols alone; but is a son of Khan Qormusta who has brought under sway
The Ones of Five Colors and the Four Foreign Ones . . . (Urga MS 53v 20-22; entries
306; 297, pp. 209-210)
Your words and your demeanor are extremely mean. It would be (more) seemly to bow to the grace of the sainted Lord, and to beg for your life. (Urga MS 53v24-26)

In reply Toyon tayishi said: ‘From whom shall I ask my life save than from myself? . . . Let me assume the rank of Khan after the practice of the former Mongolian khans (entry 44, p. 169; Urga MS 53v26-29).

However, when bowing to the spirit of Chinggis, an invisible spike penetrated Toyon tayishi, and everyone saw that an arrow in Chinggis Khan’s quiver, which was in the tent, was covered with blood; all the people in the 44 tumens said that the Ruler had not pardoned Toyon. Before his death, Toyon called to his son Esen and said to him:

The Fortunate man [i.e., Chinggis] has manifested his male power [i.e., his machismo];
The Fortunate Woman [i.e., Toyon’s mother, of imperial descent] was unable to defend me;
Whilst putting my trust in the Fortunate Mother,
I have thus been manhandled by the Saintly Lord."
(entry 44; Urga MS 54r11-13; 297).

Sayang Sečen is a proponent of strong power for the khans in Mongolia. This view is most evident from the facts of the life and activity of Batumôngke (later Dayan Khan) and Altan Khan, whom he cites.

As an historian, Sayang Sečen was able to capture the basic historical slant of the period being described. As is well-known, at the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th centuries, the internecine wars in Mongolia concluded with victory for the Chinggisids. And this victory of the descendants of the Golden Clan was first accomplished under Batumôngke/Dayan Khan, who according to Sayang Sečen, was born in the Ape-Year (1466), ascended the throne in the Tiger-Year (1470) and died at the age of eighty (European style, 79) in the Hare-Year (1543). In summing up the deeds of Batumôngke, the historian emphasized that this khan assured all Mongolia
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“peace and happiness, having united the state [ulus] of the Six Tümens” (entry 44, p. 215; Urga MS 66r25).

Of especially great interest to us are those pages devoted to Altan Khan (1507-1581). Here Sayang Sečen displays himself as an historian most of all. The factual data he cites in this case are vastly more historical and reliable. The chronology of the main events in the life and actions of Altan Khan and his cohorts are particularly precise. Much of his data are confirmed by other sources, including the Chinese (cf.

36 As to the matter of the dates of the life and rule of Batumôngke, the sources differ. Cf. entry 279, pp. 13-14.
the biography of Altan Khan in the *Wan-li wu-jun lu*, ch. 7-8) (entry 279, p. 80) and the Tibetan (entry 23, f. 90-95). The best pages of the section under discussion are devoted to a history of the acceptance of Lamaism by Altan Khan. The author’s information about the life and activity of Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji is particularly trustworthy. It is fully understandable that the author displays a heightened interest in the actions of his noted great-grandfather, emphasizing his merit as an historical figure in every way.

In Sayang Sečen’s treatment, the history of Altan Khan is sharply distinguished by its ideological orientation. His Buddhist religious views come out more strongly than elsewhere. He sees the chief merit of Altan Khan as not only his reestablishment of the Mongolian state, but also as the chief figure in the rebirth of the Buddhist religion in Mongolia. The author glorifies this khan in every way as the grand defender of Buddhism. It is apparent that Buddhist religious literature had a powerful influence on Sayang Sečen, both in the exposition and appraisal of historical events. Side by side with reliable historical facts the author cites quite a few religious legends and traditional tales, which serve his goal of popularizing the Buddhist religion. But he does not restrict the history of Altan Khan solely to his religious activity. He is interested to no less degree in earthly matters dealt with by the khan, his military campaigns against the Oirats, Tibet and China, his measures taken to strengthen the khan’s power, and so on. Here for instance is what Sayang Sečen writes about the military campaigns of Altan Khan:

Thereupon Altan Khan, in the sim-Mouse year [1552], at the age of forty-seven, set out against the Four Oirats and upon Kúnggei [or: Kúngkü] Jabqan, slew Mani mingyatu, prince of the Eight Thousand Qoyid. His wife, Lady Jigekeen, and his two sons, Toqoi and [269]
Bökegütei, and the entire nation, were taken into submission. Thus having conquered the Four Oirats, he put them under his rule. After this he campaigned for nineteen years against the Chinese who had taken the city [Peking], and destroyed and harassed their lands and people. The Chinese people were greatly affrighted and dispatched emissaries [saying]:

“We will grant to Altan Khan [desiring peace] the title of *Sun-i wang* [Prince Following Righteousness] and a golden seal.”

Altan Khan at the age of sixty-five in the sin-Sheep year [1571] established a great realm [in company] with the Dayi-ming Lünching Khan of China and he opened immeasurably vast treasure gates (entries 44, p. 228; Urga MS 70r17-30/70v1; 297, pp. 178-179).

The information given by Sayang Sečen is of great interest from two points of view: first, with great exactness, though briefly, he is able to state genuine historical facts; second, and this is very important, he expresses quite interesting and original speculations on the character of Mongolian-Chinese relations.

It is well-known from Chinese sources that Altan Khan for a very long time, twenty years (1550-1570), was actually striving to establish good-neighborly relations with China, to establish the possibility of peaceful commercial exchange of the products of Mongolian herding for Chinese agricultural goods and artisiany. But his efforts met strong opposition on the part of the Ming Dynasty, which saw no need to undertake such relations with the Mongols until circumstances compelled them to that step. At the beginning of the 1570s Altan Khan went to such lengths that it was hard for the Ming authorities not to deal with him. His frequent forays deep into China inflicted perceptible damage on the treasury and the population. Finally, in 1571 the Ming court, at the insistence of its functionaries, decided to conclude the peace with Altan Khan that was spoken of in the preceding citation. As Father Serruys informs us, on the basis of Chinese sources, on April 21st, 1571 the Chinese emperor awarded Altan Khan the title of *un-i wang* and dispatched rich gifts to him. On the 13th of June of the same year a grand ceremony was held at the conclusion of peace between Altan Khan and the Chinese emperor. Altan Khan attended it with his own retainers, he rendered an oath of friendship and a commitment not to assault the Chinese borders. For their part, the Ming Court [270] agreed to what Altan Khan had long been striving for, namely, to establish political and economic relations favorable for the Mongols, as well as to open border trade with Mongolia (entries 280, pp. 72-73; 108, pp. 1-63). This confirms the reliability of Sayang Sečen’s data.

It is well-known that Chinese official historiography of the Ming period persistently advanced the idea of the vassal dependency of Mongolia on China. Such an idea is founded on the traditional Chinese theory according to which all the so-called barbarians, i.e., the peoples living on the outskirts of the Chinese state, were vassals of the Chinese emperor. The Ming dynasty tried to apply this theory to the Mongols. It stubbornly did not wish to establish any sort of relationship with other countries, unless these relationships were founded, albeit sometimes only formally, on tributary obligations on the part of the “barbarians.” In other words, all countries that wished to conduct relations with China had to proffer tribute, even if only in a symbolic sense, to the Chinese emperor, so that there would be, in the view of the Chinese rulers, acknowledgment of their obligation to recognize Chinese suzerainty. Thus there arose and developed the “tribute-bearing” system in the relations of China with foreign states, including Mongolia. The economic basis of this theory was the Nature-based character of the Chinese agricultural economy and the weak development of the social division of labor, by virtue of which China was little interested in trade with other countries and nations, with the exception of trade in objects of luxury produced in those countries, and horses for the army, which China frequently needed.
But in Sayang Sečen we find another viewpoint on the nature of Mongolian-Chinese relations. He maintains that Mongolia in the post-Yüan period, including under Altan Khan, supported quite independent and equitable relations with Ming China. He offers no hint that Mongolia ever acknowledged vassal dependency on the Ming Dynasty. On the contrary, he strives in every way to emphasize the significance of military campaigns by Altan Khan, who coerced the Chinese emperor into normalizing relations with the Mongols, and into legitimizing non-state trade between China and Mongolia. It must be said that this viewpoint of Sayang Sečen is not an original one, but it does correspond to historical truth.

To understand Sayang Sečen’s historical-political views, the final sections of his work, devoted to contemporary issues of that time, afford considerable interest. It is true the author is always frank, and clearly expresses his opinion on the cause of these or other events. But nonetheless it is not hard to note that the closer he approaches to the events of his own time, the more distinct is his subjective, at times even preconceived approach to them. He displays much care in choice of factual data and his preconceived approach casts light on some important events of Mongolian history during the period of the Manchu conquest.

First of all attention is drawn to the fact that he actually terminates his exposition of the history of Mongolia with the events of 1634, even though his book was written in 1662, almost thirty years later.

The period from 1627 to 1634, he handles in routinized and brief fashion, merely communicating those facts which, apparently, were on his mind, at the time, putting aside much else which he considered unnecessary to narrate in a history of his country. What were the facts he chose to be silent about? He fails to write about the treachery of the Ordos princes to Ligdan Khan, about their shift over to the side of the aimags who rose against the latter, about the victory of these aimags over the Chahar forces (1627), about Ligdan’s invasion of the Ordos territory in 1632 and his depriving Rinchen of his title as jinong, about the details of the fall of Ligdan’s khanate or about the transfer of his domains under Manchu rule. All this creates the impression that Sayang Sečen deliberately avoided writing about events unfavorable to Ligdan Khan, such as the battles with the aimags of Southern Mongolia and their subjection to the Manchus. As Father Mostaert writes,

"Il me semble difficile de résister à l'impression que Sayang-sečen avait gardé un reste de sympathie pour le souverain qu'ensemble avec Erinčen il avait un moment servi dans sa jeunesse, et que c'était avec regret qu'il avait vu disparaître l'homme qui, en face de la menace mandchoue, avait tenté en vain de rétablir l'unité mongole (entry 74, p. 26)."

It is appropriate to mention as well that the appraisal of Ligdan Khan's actions given by Sayang Sečen is somewhat contradicting the evaluation made by the
anonymous author of the *Śīra tuyuji*. Sayang Sečen writes: "Meanwhile, it drew nigh unto the time of the Five Hundred Evils and there arose many deeds and actions, on the part of the government" (Urga MS 68r27-30/68v1). Ligdan Khan proved not to be in a position to establish "peaceful policy" *(tayibing törü-ber: Urga MS 68v1)* to maintain under his own power the six tümens and fell back on a "policy of violence" to unite the great state. And here he declares that Ligdan's policy was not quite correct, and aided the fall of the khanate. To illustrate his opinion the author cites an old expression: "If the khan gets angry, then he destroys his state; but if an elephant gets angry, he destroys his enclosure" (Urga MS 68v3-4; entry 297, p. 186).

The dissatisfaction of our author with the excessive "policy of violence" is obviously based on the well-known fact that this khan actually harshly fell out with those who betrayed him and went over to the enemy side. Against them he organized punitive expeditions. In 1632 the khan invaded the Ordos, the homeland of Sayang Sečen, where he mercilessly punished everyone who had gone over to the side of the aimags that had risen against him, deprived Rinčen, a friend of Sayang Sečen, of his jinong title, captured the relics of Chinggis Khan, and so on. As for the events connected with the Manchu conquest of the Southern Mongolian lands, which Sayang Sečen doubtlessly knew full well about, there he is deliberately laconic, silent and casually mentioning the demise of Ligdan Khan, the transition of the power of the Mongolian khan to the hands of the Manchu Emperor Abahai after the wife of Ligdan Khan, Sudai taiqu, and her son Erke qongqor were subdued by him. As for everything else connected with the Manchu conquest of Mongolia, Sayang Sečen is stubbornly silent.

He ends his work with an account of the really energetic activity directed at restoring to Rinčen the title and duties of Jinong of the Ordos after the internecine war with Ligdan Khan. It is impossible not to note that Sayang Sečen writes about this with enthusiasm, dwelling on the ceremony of Rinčen’s second proclamation as jinong and ruler of Ordos, enumerating in detail all the honorary ranks and privileges which he himself was awarded for his own services (entry 44, pp. 304-306; Urga MS 91r-92r). This narrative is capped with his mention of the fact that peace and happiness again as in former times reigned in the Ordos, (entry 44, p. 306; Urga MS 92r5), though he says not a word about what had recently gone on in the Ordos, i.e., the recognition by Rinčen in 1635 of Manchu dominion, or on how the Manchus organized six banners in the Ordos in 1648.

At the very end of his work Sayang Sečen gives a very brief survey of the history of the first Manchu emperors. We may regard this as a *sui generis* tribute of the time. But this survey stands in isolation, it is not organically linked with the basic part of the work. Still, this section is free from the panegyric tone that was characteristic of some much later Mongol historians devoted to the overlordship of the Manchu Ch'ing dynasty.
In the historiographic sense, the extended colophon by Sayang Sečen affords much of interest. In it we find some philosophical reflections of the author about the problems of history and life. He sets forth his understanding of the historical experience not only in the form of religious morality, but in a general form of rules of worldly wisdom. He cites the following seven rules:

1. The beneficent joy of occupying oneself with salvation;
2. The evil sorrow of the distressing (rebirth) cycle;
3. The increase and decrease of the material world;
4. The good virtues of the original sublime people;
5. The mixed (i.e., good and evil) deeds of such persons [as are] of mediocre [attainment];
6. The evil faults of common folk, clinging to the material world;
7. Together with the uses of a broad [= magnanimous] person (Urga MS 97r27/97v2; entry 295).

The first two sections include general judgments about the ultimate goal of human existence and about the six categories of suffering on account of sins. The author maintains that the higher happiness of man must be acquired not in this world, but solely in the land of Akanistra, upon attaining Nirvana. The only correct path to this is belief in the Three Jewels, the dharma, the Buddha and the samgha (the clergy). The source of these sufferings is sin, owing to which man experiences unbelievable torment and suffering. Although the author does not state it directly, it is not hard to guess that history for him provides the best [274] illustration of this general regularity of the Cycle of Existence.

The remaining sections, in which the author passes judgment on life and history in more concrete fashion, are of considerable interest. Here for instance is the third section which speaks about the increase and decrease of the material world. In Sayang Sečen’s opinion, history is an eternal process of alternating rise and fall, happiness and suffering in human life. The following thoughts draw one’s attention:

Making to naught and consuming all one’s remaining riches,
Obviously, when requesting of others, nothing at all is given [one];
The greatly elevated ones, falling from their own rule,
Become slaves or ordinary men and are used as servants.

And then the all-perfect ones of great happiness,
Suffer decline and endure many and varied afflictions;

The entire colophon is written in boldly complex allegorical verses, affording not only historical but literary interest. The verses of this work, as the author himself writes, are in 316 lines, comprising 79 strophes: yučin arban-u degere dörbe dörben baday (thirty times ten + four times four = 316 lines, doluyan arban yurban yurban šilüg (seven times ten + three times three = 79 šlokas or strophes).
Stalwart youths, endowed with heroic strength,
Are captured by the might of the enemy and suffer
(entries 44, pp. 330-331; 295, p.115).

These arguments lead one to the thought: did not the author, himself a ruling prince, have in mind the current fate of the descendants of the famed Golden Clan, who wound up falling under the power of foreign rulers? No less worthy of attention are the arguments of Sayang Sečen about people and their deeds, cited in the remaining sections of the colophon. Thus in the concluding seventh section he writes about those men’s deeds that are most worthy of approval, obviously meaning by this the role of the people in history and their responsibility to society. It is true that all this is presented in a veiled form, in a preceptoral-moralizing tone and in the spirit of Buddhist doctrine. The author divides people into three categories according to their moral qualities: outstanding people (manglai arad); mediocre people (dulitu arad); and dissolute people (tangqai arad). In his opinion, history is also an arena for the actions of these three categories of people. Here is one of the basic deductions which Sayang Sečen makes from an analysis of history. Belonging to the category of the most outstanding people, in his opinion, are: the lama-teacher, who is the highest of all the boydas; virtuous boyda-khans, not regretting either life for the sake of attaining the status of a true Buddha, or the body for the use of others; functionaries do not come to a stop before that which immortalizes their deeds similarly to their superiors’

which they have set down in stone; fearless military leader-heroes; sharpshooters from a bow; sages (stanzas 25-28; entry 295. pp. 117-119).

To the lower classes of people belong: disciples, respecting the lama-teacher while in his sight, but behind his back speaking of his vices; children, revealing family secrets; subjects (arats) responding with ingratitude to the magnanimity of khans and high persons, and so on.

Here in all clarity is displayed that moral criterion which guides the author in classifying people. This criterion is totally determined by the world view of a hereditary prince (tayiji) by birth from the Mongolian aristocracy, a historian-Buddhist. However at certain points one notes echoes of something personal in the judgments of the author: the mood of a man who has forfeited his former high position under a new political regime in Mongolia. It is no accident that he quite often makes judgments about noble sages, striving obviously to prove that it is impossible to disregard them even when temporary failures overcome them. He writes:

Very wise sages and savants [are like] jewels and gold;
Veritable heroic men [are like] select steeds;
If they are in one's own land, [they are] ornaments there;
If they go to one's own side, it is a spot to be venerated.

However much extraordinary sages and savants may weaken,
Nonetheless knowledge and intellect increase all the more;
The marvelously exquisite golden jewel
Increases all its own colour burning in the fire.

Even though famed nobles are discouraged at times,
Other knowledge deserving to be learned emerges;
However much one may cover the flower called Suiman [jasmine]
A novel and fine odor is universally smelt.

However much one oppresses select intellectual nobles,
Their loyal virtue emerges at once;
If one take and turn upside-down a lighted lamp,
Its burning fire goes blazing upward


The last section of the colophon expresses the general mood of the historian-Buddhist; musing on history and the perversities of fate, he seeks consolation in religious contemplation, apparently finding in this more satisfaction than in speculations of a curious mind.

Thus, the work by Sayang Sečen, the greatest Mongolian historian of the 17th century, by its significance in the history of historical knowledge among the Mongols may be compared, perhaps, only with the Secret History.

[276]
IV. The Asarayči neretā-yin teūke (The History by Asarayči)

In the period under survey persons were occupied with writing chronicles not just in the southern parts of Mongolia, but also in Khalkha. Eloquent witness is borne to this by the Sira tuyuji which we reviewed supra as well as a chronicle compiled by the Khalkha historian Asarayči.

The Asarayči neretā-yin teūke was first published by the Mongolian scholar Kh. Perlee in 1960 (entry 39), in a duplicated edition from a manuscript preserved in the stacks of the National Library of Mongolia, and was called A History of Mongolia, Beginning with Chinggis Khan up to Uqayantu Toşun Temūr. On the basis of internal evidence, Perlee established the real title of the manuscript, the authorship, date and place where it was written (entries 39, pp. 1-5; cf. 203, pp. 139-191; 233, pp. viii-x). Asarayči’s chronicle was created in the environs of Ongi in the Khangai Mountains (the central part of the former Sayin Noyan aimag, i.e., the northern part

39 A few verses have been borrowed by the author from the Subhasita of Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan.

40 Kh. Perlee’s edition was reedited and commented on by Bayana and published in 1984 by the Undüsüten-ën Keblel-ën Qoriy-a of Peking, in its series Mongyol tulyur bičig-ün čubural.
of the present Övörkhengai aimag). Proceeding from the Reddish-Snake Year mentioned in the colophon, as well as from data in the text, Perlee determined the date of composition of the chronicle to be 1677. The author calls himself Jamba in one place, but in the colophon his name appears as Asarayči (Tib. hJam-pa).

Some data from the biography of Jamba may be found in the text of the chronicle itself (entry 39, p. 83), as well as in the Sira tuyuji (entry 70, p. 88), and the 69th book of the Iledkel šastir, the genealogical history of the wangs and gungs of Inner Mongolia and Khotan (entry 8, f. 13-18), a well-known handbook of service records of Mongolian, Oirat and Turkic princes. According to this data, Jamba (written as Shamba), or Asarayči, originated from the Nuqimuqu clan, the third son of Geresenje Tumenkin, who bore the title Kündilen čögekür Sayin noyan, who was elevated to khan rank along with three other Khalkha rulers. The second of thirteen sons of Tumenkin, Dandzin-lama, was Asarayči’s grandfather. Dandzin-lama adhered to a pro-Manchu orientation, he frequently sent emissaries to the Shun-chih Emperor and in reply received messengers, letters and gifts. When eight jasay-rulers were confirmed in Khalkha, then

Asarayči adhered to his grandfather’s political orientation. The Manchu Emperor Hsüan-yeh awarded him honorary titles, at first Itegemjitū eyetei erke dačin, and later Jasay čin-wang. From data in the sources it is clear that Asarayči belonged to those Khalkha lords who, on the eve of the conquest of Khalkha-Mongolia by the Manchus, were already in a fully pro-Manchu mood. He not only maintained active links with Hsüan-yeh, but helped him in every way in his struggle with the Oirat, Galdan. In 1691, Asarayči’s (Jamba’s) detachment, jointly with detachments of other lords, led a reconnaissance against Galdan. In 1695 these same detachments led the advance against the Oirats in the western part of Khalkha; Asarayči personally participated in the operation and organized his headquarters in the locality of Küren-belčir. And in 1696 he and his detachment participated as part of Manchu forces against Galdan in the locality of Jayun-modun. For this service of his, as well as for sacrificing his horses, livestock, and provisions to the employ of the Manchu forces, Asarayči received the title of chin-wang. Besides the Manchu title he also bore the title of Sayin-noyan, although the latter was not allotted to him by an official document of the Manchu emperor. Asarayči died in 1707 (entries 70, p. 88; 39, pp. 2-3; 203, p. 191).

In this wise, the author of the chronicle under review comes before us as a representative of the ruling summit of Khalkha, which until the conquest of this part
of Mongolia by the Manchus, was openly collaborating with the foreigners in the struggle against their western brothers, the Oirat lords.

However, it must be emphasized that Asarayči's historical work, despite the author's political position, belongs to those Mongolian chronicles which are free from a pro-Manchu stratum. It is difficult, of course, to clarify why the political activity of the author did not influence the ideological content of his work. Perhaps this can be explained by the fact that the Mongolian tradition of historical writing which has come down to us was in his time still so strong that the force of this tradition revealed itself involuntarily. The work represents more a traditional compilation than an original book. One must also take into account that this work appeared prior to the establishment of Manchu dominance in Khalkha.

Proceeding to an analysis of this work, one must note that in form and content it differs little from other Mongolian chronicles of the 17th century. It is not divided into chapters or paragraphs. Only by the sense can one determine the separate parts and divisions of which the chronicle consists. In a compositional sense the History by Asarayči may tentatively be divided into four parts: the introduction; the early history of the Mongols, chiefly the history of Chinggis Khan; the history of the Mongols from the fall of the Empire to the middle of the 17th century; and the postface.

It is characteristic that the introductory portion of the work is very similar to that part of the Šíra tuyuji chronicle. Like the author of the Šíra tuyuji, Asarayči begins his narration with citations known to us about the use of knowledge of ancestral history, drawn from the chronicle of the Fifth Dalai Lama, the Feast of Youth (entry 4). The author expresses his desire that those who do not know history will read his work, and that following generations will continue to write history. Might the query arise: for what reason did the author concern himself with history? What motives might arouse a Khalkha prince of such actively pro-Manchu beliefs, to take on the work of a historian? It seems to us that Asarayči had the goal not only of enlightening uninformed folk, but of demonstrating the high-born nature of his ancestors in the eyes of those with whom he wished to deal in his own mercenary interest so as to get wider privileges from his Manchu protectors. He was interested not solely in history as such, as he was in the genealogy of the Mongolian tayijis, in the first rank among the Khalkhas.

The first part of the chronicle comprises a basic history of Chinggis Khan in which the author supports the well-known system of three monarchies. But in Asarayči one can also notice a somewhat different approach to the traditional beginnings of Mongolian chronicles. He is uncommonly brief when he writes about the Indian and Tibetan kings. As for what deals with cosmological data, the stories about the appearance of inanimate and animate worlds with which Mongolian chroniclers customarily began the history of their own country, there is almost none of this in Asarayči. What is more, he is dubious about
the correctness of the idea according to which Börte Čino is the progenitor of the Mongolian khans. Setting forth the legendary information about Börte Čino, Asarayči notices that "the origin of the Mongolian princes from the so-called Börte Čino, it seems, is still not explained by investigation" (entry 39, p. 9). And at the end of this short exposition of the legend of how Börte Čino belonged to the clan of the Tibetan king Dalai-Subin Altan Sandalitu, our author most significantly uses the word gekti, "they say" (entry 39, p. 8).

Asarayči begins the genealogy of the Mongolian khans with Bodončar as the most likely progenitor of the Borjigids. He cites information about Bodončar not only from Mongolian sources, but from Tibetan as well, at the same time affording readers the possibility of comparing different sets of data about the progenitor of the Golden Clan. This creates a definite impression that the author did not ascribe particular significance to the theory about the blood relationship of the Mongolian khans with the early Indian and Tibetan rulers that had commonly been accepted in Mongolian historical writing at this time.

From the ancestors of Chinggis Khan Asarayči quickly makes a transition to the history of Chinggis himself, whose life he considers in all likelihood to be the most important part of his work. He devotes relatively many pages to the history of Chinggis. In this regard the History by Asarayči differs considerably from the &ira tuyuji. However, from the way he sets forth the history of Chinggis in his work, it is hard to conclude with no reservations, as do Kh. Perlee and following him some other researchers (entries 39, p.3; 233, p. vii; 203, p. 192), that the author used the Secret History.

A comparative analysis reveals an interesting phenomenon: according to our calculations, approximately 90 of the 282 paragraphs of the Secret History find reflection in the same or another form in the Asarayčineretü-yin teüke. First and foremost one observes the similarity of content of the basic facts in both works. Asarayči almost never has those parts which are not in the Secret History. However, the nature of the lack of convergence in content of the two works and the varied readings of similar topics are such that it is difficult to speak of any sort of direct borrowing. If indeed Asarayči made direct use of the Secret History, then he scarcely would have permitted himself such liberties with respect to his basic source. It is not hard to note that the history of Chinggis in Asarayči, in comparison with that set forth in the Secret History itself, bears a sketchy and fragmentary character. It is merely a brief retelling of basic paragraphs from the Secret History. Many interesting details are omitted and there is none of the vividness which is characteristic of the first Mongolian historical work. The corresponding spots in both compositions differ sharply both in stylistic and linguistic aspects. The archaic words are replaced by newer ones. Many poetical passages which are abundant in the Secret History are not included in Asarayči's work, and those few which are preserved in it, appear differently edited to one degree or another. All this convinces us that Asarayči used only the oral tradition of the Secret History, of which we
spoke earlier. Or, it is possible that Asarayči could have borrowed the relevant passages from Mongolian chronicles like the *Altan Tobči*, both the one of Lubsangdanjin and the *Altan Tobči Anonymous*. Only in this sense can one speak of some links of the work under review with the first-born work of Mongolian historiography.

By collating some passages from the *Asarayči neretu-yin teüke* with those of the *Secret History*, even where the information provided by the two works is very similar, one can easily discover a host of variant readings and a lack of convergence (for instance, in the former, entry 39, pp. 9-10, and in the latter, entry 42, §§ 54-56).

At the end of the Chinggis story, Asarayči cites some legendary information about the campaign into the Tangut country, and about the death and transportation of Chinggis's body to Mongolia. This information, especially the versified fragments, is very close to those which are in other chronicles of the 17th century, such as the anonymous *Altan Tobči*, the *Altan Tobči* by Lubsangdanjin, and the *Erdeni-yin Tobči* by Sayang Sečen. And yet it is hard to concede that they were taken by the author from the chronicles named. After contrasting the texts, we have discovered much lack of convergence and variant readings and even differences in lexicon and expression. It remains to speculate that Asarayči used one and the same traditional tale about the death of Chinggis Khan which arose in a much later time in a land far from Mongolia, and was widely disseminated there in the period when the chronicles mentioned appeared.

As to the history of the successors of Chinggis Khan, Asarayči does not inform us of anything new in comparison with the chronicles we have reviewed. He cites essentially those same facts which are of a semi-historic, semi-legendary nature. It is interesting that Asarayči, following the two *Altan Tobči* authors, cites a well-known legend, according to which the Yung-lo Emperor, one of the first emperors of the Chinese Ming dynasty, was the son of Toyon Temūr by the wife who had remained in China during the time when the former fled from Daidu (entry 39, p. 48). As a result the Mongolian chroniclers held a false opinion, as though after the fall of the Yūan dynasty in China there still remained a dynasty founded by the son of the last Mongolian khan in China. This agreed very much with the mood of the top layer of the Mongolian rulers, who had no desire to be reconciled to the loss of their former power and past privileges. Strictly adhering to the concept according to which all the Mongolian khans, beginning with Chinggis, pursued the policy of the Two Principles, Asarayči at times falsifies the historical facts. It is hard to say whether he does this intentionally or under the influence of traditional legends. Thus, for instance, despite the facts, he considers Gunga-Nyanpo a retainer of Chinggis, although, as was earlier indicated, they lived at different times. In a similarly inaccurate way he ascribes to Ögedei Khan the merit of inviting Sakya-pandita Kun-dga’ rgyal-mtshan, when in actuality, we have direct indications about this from the Tibetan sources, known to a number of Mongolian authors, that the person who
Chapter Two: Second Half of the 17th Century

initiated entering into a union of the “Alms-Giver” and the “Preceptor” was not Ögedei, but Godan.

Asarayči devotes considerable attention to the post-empire period of Mongolian history. It must be noted that from the fullness and value of the information conveyed, this portion of his work in many ways surpasses the basic text of the Šīra tūyūji and yields place solely to the work of Sayang Sečen. Being by birth from Khalkha, Asarayči devotes special sections of his history to this part of Mongolia, and this expanded the customary boundaries of topic-matter for historical research for that time. This, perhaps, is the main merit of Asarayči as a historian. In truth, he actually reduces the history of Khalkha Mongolia to genealogical data about the Khalkha tayijis. By their content these segments devoted to Khalkha are poorer than those in which he illuminates the history of the southern part of Mongolia. Asarayči’s information about how the progenitor of the rulers of the seven Khalkha hoshuns, Jalayir qung tayiji Geresenje, became the ruler of Khalkha Mongolia (entry 39, p. 72), does have some historical interest. But in terms of its completeness this information yields place to that contained in the later supplements to the Šīra tūyūji (entry 70, pp. 107-109). Asarayči also reports some new data about the beginnings of the spread of Lamaism in Khalkha Mongolia (entry 39, pp. 78-79) that shed additional light on the history of the acceptance of Lamaism in Khalkha under Abatai Khan simultaneously with Southern Mongolia, and [284] on the close religious and secular ties between these two basic parts of Mongolia at the end of the 16th century.

The genealogy of the Khalkha tayijis in Asarayči’s exposition is remarkable for the fact that it contains abundant material about the clan relationships of the Khalkha ruling princes from the 16th century right down to the time of the author himself. We do not have anything like this in any of the chronicles of the period we have surveyed. Their value lies in the fact that Asarayči cites from them dates of birth and death for the tayijis he mentions. Thus, for instance, he communicates the date of birth for all the sons of Jalayir qung tayiji Geresenje; from him we learn that the elder son of the latter, Ashigai-darqan qung tayiji, was born in the White-Tiger Year (1530); Noyontai qadan-baγatur in the White-Hare Year (1531); Unuqu iiijeng noyan in the Blue-Horse Year (1534); Amin Dorqal noyan in the Red-Ape Year (1536) (entry 39, p. 92), and so on.

In terms of its composition, the postface, with which the author concludes his work, offers limited interest. In it he gives brief summings-up, communicates the date the book was written and proffers good wishes to the Golden Clan. Asarayči states the following brief conclusions: Chinggis Khan united “all the Five Nations of Color;” Kubilai Khan converted the “forty tūmens” to the true faith, the dharma, “the khan, named the Intelligent One (uqayantu), although he was no master of intelligence,” was deprived of rule and demolished religion in China, but Abatai sayin qayan expanded the Two Principles in Khalkha. It is not hard to understand exactly which problems of history interested Asarayči, the Buddhist-historian born among the tayijis of Khalkha Mongolia, most of all.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>Akademiya nauk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOH</td>
<td>Acta Orientalia Hungaricae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCUP</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Catholic University of Peking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNMAU</td>
<td>Büög Nairamdakh Mongol Ard Uls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAJ</td>
<td>Central Asiatic Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIMN</td>
<td>Filologiya i istoriya mongol’skikh narodov : pamyati akademika Boris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJAS</td>
<td>Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAMS</td>
<td>International Association of Mongol Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAN</td>
<td>Izvestiya akademii nauk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is.M.E.O.</td>
<td>Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAS</td>
<td>Journal of Asian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRASB</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSINA</td>
<td>Kraitkie soobshcheniya Instituta narodov Azii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCD</td>
<td>Mongolian Collection Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Monumenta historica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLM</td>
<td>National Library of Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFEH</td>
<td>Papers on Far Eastern History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Rocznik Orientalistyczny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShUA</td>
<td>Shinzhlékh Ukhaan Akademi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIÈ</td>
<td>Sovetskaya istoricheskaya entsiklopediya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skt.</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOÊ</td>
<td>Sbornik trudov Orkhonskoi ekspeditsii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUST</td>
<td>Suomalais-ugrilaisen Seuran toimituksia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.</td>
<td>Tom’, Tomus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBKNII</td>
<td>Trudy Buryatskogo kompleksnogo nauchno-issledovatel’skogo instituta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TChRDM</td>
<td>Trudy chlenov Rossiiskoi dukhovnoi missii v Pekine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVOIAO</td>
<td>Trudy Vostochnago otdeleniya Imperatorskago arkheologicheskago obschestva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVORAO</td>
<td>Trudy Vostochnago otdeleniya Rossiiskago arkheologicheskago obschestva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCD</td>
<td>Tibetan Collection Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIIAÊ</td>
<td>Trudy Instituta istorii, arkheologii i etnografii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTKO IRGO</td>
<td>Trudy Troitsko-Kyakhtinskago otdeleniya Imp. Rossiiskago geograficheskago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obschestva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAJ</td>
<td>Ural-Altaiische Jahrbücher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UJ</td>
<td>Ungarische Jahrbücher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UZIVAN</td>
<td>Uchenye zapiski Instituta vostokovedeniya Akademii nauk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>Vestnik akademii nauk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZVORAO</td>
<td>Zapiski Vostochnago otdeleniya Rossiiskago arkheologicheskago obschestva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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