

## 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 transferred 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 "supernatural" 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 initiated study and compilation of the history of the Mongols and their empire, attracting to this work both Mongolian

[76]

connoisseurs of antiquity as well as historians of China, Iran, Tibet and other countries.

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 teüke* [The White History] and the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* [Description of the Personal Campaigns of the Holy Martial (Emperor Chinggis)]

are extant.

### 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?<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup> To those copies of the *Čayan teūke* which are already known and investigated (copy A: the Leningrad; copy B, the Kōkeqota) 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 teūke* 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 Jaltsan) (1235-1280) in his small work *Šes-bya rab-gsal* [Elucidation of what is Knowable]<sup>2</sup> (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 teūke* 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.

[78]

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 teūke* there is an enumeration of eight countries of the so-called sixteen great countries of the Buddhist world.

Let us compare the data:

---

<sup>2</sup> It is called *Medegdekün-i sayidar todarayuluṣi* in Mongolian. The English translation is: *Prince Jin-gin's Textbook of Tibetan Buddhism, the Šes-bya rab-gsal [Jñeya-prakāśa]* by 'Phags-pa Blo-gros ryal-mtshan dpal-bzang-po of the Sa-skya. Translated and annotated by Constance Hoog (Leiden: Brill, 1983) (entry 318).

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**Čayan teūke*

1. rgya-gar
2. kha-cha
3. li'i yul
4. khu-sen
5. bal-yul
6. rgya-nag
7. jan-gi-yul
8. mi-nyag

1. enedkeg
2. kači-yin kasamir
3. li-yin sartayul
4. kowsan-u mongyol
5. singün-ü<sup>3</sup> bal
6. tūgön<sup>4</sup>-u nanggiyad
7. in-ge<sup>5</sup>-yin töbed
8. čayan ayula-yin solun-gyas

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 teūke* 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

<sup>3</sup> *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 Rashīd ad-Dīn, the word *Si-kin* was pronounced by the early Mongols as *Singgin*, which in our view corresponds to *singgin* in the *Čayan teūke* (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 teūke* writes *singün* (*singgin*)-ū *balbo*.

<sup>4</sup> *Tūgön* is written that way in Copy C; in Copy B this word is written as *Tūggön*. 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 *Tūnggön*, *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 Rashīd al-Dīn 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 teūke* says: *Tūgön-ū nanggiyad* / *tūngin-ū nanggiyad*.

<sup>5</sup> 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 hP'ags-pa lama (*jan-gi yul*). All these country names in the *Čayan teūke* 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 teūke* 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 An-nam with the Tonkin region), and Nepal (Tib. Balbo), and Singin (Si-kin).

Let us now shift to reviewing the basic data of the *Čayan teūke* which served as the original basis for the new edition brought into being by Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji. This section of the *Čayan teūke*, 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

[79]

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 teūke* 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 teūke* 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 teūke* 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 Nāg-dbañ kun-dga' bsod-nams grags-pa rgyal-mtshan.

[80]

There the following information is cited:

In the Fire-Hare year, when [hPhags-pa lama] was 33 years old [1267, Sh. B.], by decree 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 shape 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 people 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 teüke*. It is not hard to set up the Mongolian parallels to the 13 posts mentioned<sup>6</sup>.

Below we cite these parallels:

TIBETAN	MONGOLIAN	TRANSLATION
gsol	ayayači	cup-bearer
gzims	jiryayuluyči	valet
mčhod	takilči	temple-servant
mjal	oruyči [ekilegči]	a secretary conducting receptions
yig	bičigeči	scribe

<sup>6</sup> 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 T'o-pa tribe, preserved in Chinese transcription, a court title, denoted by the word *iang-t sien* (*yang-chen*). Bazin considers this word proto-Turkic and reconstructs it as *yanč in*, deriving it from Turkic *yan* (corner, side row) plus a suffix, *č in*, which means "the one who dwells in the ranks [of the emperor]." The *Yang-chen* was one of three court officials of the T'o-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 teüke*. 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.

mdzod	sang-un ejen	treasurer
thab	bayurči	courtier
'dren	jiluyuči	coachman
gdan	debisgerči	seat-pad attendant
skya (dreu)	luusači	mule-driver
rta	aduŋuči (aytači)	horseherder
mdzho (glaŋ)	ükerči	herdsman
khyi	noqayıči	dog-handler

[81]

In addition to the thirteen ranks mentioned above, the *Čayan teüke* 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-mtsan*, Mong. *orungya*),<sup>7</sup> 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 teüke* as *sikürči* (umbrella holder), *orungyači* (flag-bearer, Russ. khorunzhi 'cornet'), *büriyeči* (trumpeter), *biškegürči* (player of the *biškegür*), *üileči* (tailor), and others, were established to the degree permitted for expansion of staffs 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*, *yančin* and others (entry 210; entry 163). It is interesting that some of these posts are mentioned in the *Čayan teüke* as well.

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

<sup>7</sup> *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 Choiji Odser (found in Turfan) we find: *delgegsen orungyatu serege-tü ded dooradu yar-tur bariŋsan*. But in much later Mongolian sources we do not encounter this word; instead they write *dovačaba*, originating from Skt. *dhvaja*. If the *Čayan teüke* translates the name of hP'ags-pa lama, *blo gros rgyal-tshan*, as *čoytu sayin oyun-u orungya*, then Sayang Sečen has *madi dovačaba*. Many scholars consider that the Russian word *khorguv* is connected with Mongolian *orungya* < *horungya*.

*yančigs*, 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 *bayurči*,

[82]

*čerbi*, *aytači*, *gorči*, the myriarchs, chiliarchs and centurions, were alike everywhere. The *Čayan teūke* speaks about 99 posts and about the existence of special books (the *Sira teūke* "Yellow Book" and the *Ulačan teūke* "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 *Čayan teūke*. 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,"<sup>8</sup> 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 *Čayan teūke*. 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 *Čayan teūke* 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 *Čayan teūke*. 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.

[83]

The question involuntarily arises: where did the anonymous author of the *Čayan teūke* 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

<sup>8</sup> 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 *Čayan teūke*. 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 Yüan 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 čhos*), and you through godly [religious] law (*lha čhos*), 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 question<sup>9</sup> as to what vows he would have to give to receive the *abhiṣeka* from the lama, hPhags-pa lama [84]

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.

<sup>9</sup> 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<sup>10</sup> (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<sup>11</sup> (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 Yüan Empire. And it is these principles, in our view, that lie at the root of the *Čaγan teüke* 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

[85]

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

<sup>10</sup> 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).

<sup>11</sup> 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 jiyuqu bičig*) in the journal *Neyigem-ün sinjileküi uqayan* [Social Sciences] 6 (1990), pp. 47-53 (entry 319).

The two documents were taken from the Peking block print of 1765, titled *Getülgečei dededü blama sasin-u ejen lčang skiy-a lalida bčar-a-yin ggen-ü erteke töröl-ün üyi-yin domoy egerel küsel-i qangγayči čindamani*. This book contains an extensive biography of hPhags-pa lama, taken from the *Sa-skya gduñ rabs* (entry 30). This biography of hPhags-pa was also recently published by Čoyiji, *ayba lama-yin tuyuji* (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."<sup>12</sup> 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, *daruyačis* [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

[86]

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.

<sup>12</sup> This proposition is cited in the *Čayan teūke* as well. Obviously it was well-known to Mongols in the period of the Yüan 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 Möngke who dwelt in Qara Qorum. In support of this assumption is the fact that twice in the message the names of Möngke 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 Möngke Khan, and in the second, that hPhags-pa lama wished "sturdy health and long life to Möngke 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 Möngke 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

[87]

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 *Kāvyaadarśa* [The Mirror of Poetry] by Dandin and the *Chandoratna-kara* [Prosody, the So-called Place Where Jewels Arise] by Ratnakaraśanti, 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-Temür, 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-Temür of the Pal-chengSer-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*,<sup>13</sup> "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

---

<sup>13</sup> *Dandaka*: a metrical class, the verses of which may run from  $4 \times 27$  to  $4 \times 999$  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, Matrçeta, 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 *Čayan teüke*. hPhags-pa lama formulated its principal ideology with the greatest exactitude in the "Instructions

[88]

to Prince Jibeg-Temür,"<sup>14</sup> 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*<sup>15</sup> 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.

[entry 27, *Pa.* f.12a/158a-13b/159b]

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

<sup>14</sup> Jibeg-Temür 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.

<sup>15</sup> *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 *ankuša*."<sup>16</sup>

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  
[89]

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

<sup>16</sup> *Ankuša* (Skt.): 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

[90]

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 *Čayan teūke* 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 *Čayan teūke* into a higher governmental law of the Mongolian state.

[91]

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 teūke*, 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

[92]

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 teūke* 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 Manjuśri, personifying knowledge and wisdom. Beginning with the *Čayan teūke*, 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 teūke* helps to clear up the spiritual atmosphere in which the *Čayan teūke* appeared, and to understand its basic ideas, as well as to make the date of its composition more precise.

What has been said permits one to conclude that Mongolian tradition, within which the *Čayan teūke* 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 teūke*. 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.<sup>17</sup>

[93]

### The Basic Historical-Political Ideas of the *Čayan teūke*

The *Čayan teūke*, 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 Yüan Empire. As an historical monument the *Čayan teūke* 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 teūke* 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 teūke* it is clearly evident how much Mongolian historical writing had fallen under the influence of Buddhism, having affixed to it a specifically Buddhist world-view. 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 Tümed at the end of the 16th century and the Khalkha Boyda Jibjundamba in 1911 tried to bring back to life the basic premises of

<sup>17</sup> During recent years, scholars have discussed in a lively manner the possible date and authorship of the *Čayan teūke*. 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 teūke-yin jokiyayčiyin tuqai sübegčilel" [On the authorship of the *Čayan teūke*], *Öbör Mongğol-un neyigem-ün shinjilekü uqayan* (1985 no. 3), pp. 37-43.

Another scholar, Mongğoljin Li Bouving, supposes that the *Čayan teūke* could have been written by Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji in the period between 1540 and 1586. His article is "Čayan teūke-yi ken kedüi-tü jokiyaysan tuqai," [Regarding who composed the *Čayan teūke* and when], *Öbör Mongğol-un neyigem-ün shinjilekü uqayan*, (1995) no. 5), pp. 22-28.

this philosophy. One may say that the influence of the *Čayan teūke* 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 teūke*.

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

[94]

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 teūke*, destined to be the official history of the Yüan 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 teūke*, the history of Jambhudvipa, 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 Jambhudvipa," 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 teūke*, having specially dwelt on the history of Buddhist monarchy in the Srong-btsan gam-po period in Tibet, brings the history of Jambhudvipa 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 teūke* especially stands out in the history of India, Tibet and Mongolia.

The universal-historical ideology of the *Čayan teūke* 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

[95]

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 teūke* 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 teūke* 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 teūke* 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 teūke*:

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."<sup>18</sup>

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 teūke* 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

[96]

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 teūke* says: "He who can compel the four great rivers of Abhiṣeka to flow in the name of the khan, the Master of the state, is called a Guṣri, 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.

<sup>18</sup> 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.

[97]

In the *Čayan teüke* spiritual and secular power are presented in the form of the "four great powers,"<sup>19</sup> 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.

<sup>19</sup> *Nom-un törü tarni sudur kiged yirtinčü-yin törü engke kilbar*. The Mongolian word *kilbar* literally means "the metal tip of an arrow" (*sumny 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*.

The *Čayan teūke* 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 Yüan dynasty demonstrates that a number of the most important provisions of the *Čayan teūke* 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 teūke* 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*<sup>20</sup>, by the three *qonjins*,

[98]

the four *tayijis*, the six *čerbis*, the seven *jayisangs*, the ten *örlügs* and so on. Beside those named in the *Čayan teūke* 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,<sup>21</sup>
2. the doctrine of the tantra is frightening power,<sup>22</sup>

---

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

<sup>21</sup> Mong. *amuṡulang-un törü*. In this present instance Mongolian *amuṡulang* corresponds to Tibetan *ši*, 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.

<sup>22</sup> 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<sup>23</sup>;
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 *baɣatur* 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

[99]

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;

---

guardians of religion, whereas the teaching of the sutra affirms the peaceful reincarnation of deities.

<sup>23</sup> Copy D has the word *joriɣ*, and copy C writes this word differently: *jiruɣ*, 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 teūke* 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 *bayatur* 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 teūke* 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 teūke* 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<sup>24</sup> to bring sacrifices to the four guests<sup>25</sup>; 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 teūke* 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

[100]

chiefly on Indo-Tibetan Buddhist traditions.

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

<sup>24</sup> The four unlimited virtues: love (*byams-pa*), compassion (*sñiñ-rje*), bliss (*dga'-pa*), and indifference to happiness and sorrow (*btañ-sñoms*).

<sup>25</sup> 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 mčhog srid šu'i mgron*]. 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 political 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 assumed 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*<sup>26</sup> to be a Chinese translation 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 mention 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<sup>27</sup>, 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 scholars 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*

---

<sup>26</sup> 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).

<sup>27</sup> 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 Rashīd al-Dīn 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'üan-shu* presumed that the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* was compiled under Khubilai Khan after his chief court history writer Wang O 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.

[102]

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'in-cheng lu* in connection with the historiographic activity of the Mongols during the period of the Yüan 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 Ögedei, 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 Yüan 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

[103]

previous historians had striven in the first instance to show the aristocratic origin of each khan, then this sequence was reversed under the Yüan 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 Yüan [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 Yüan 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 Rashīd al-Dīn, and the *Secret History*. Many places in the *Sheng-wu ch'in-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

[104]

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 Yüan 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 Rashīd al-Dīn. 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

[105]

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 Yüan 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),

[106]

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 [Ögedei] 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-tsung [Möngke]; 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 Güyük and Ögedei (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, Öljeitü, 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 O-le-che (Öljei) to supervise work on this history. And in a year the

chronicle of Khubilai was presented for Imperial review. Under the year 1304 the *Yüan-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 *Yüan-shih* one can conclude that the chronicles of all other Yüan khans were also compiled by the efforts of this department. In all, in the years that the Yüan dynasty existed

[107]

thirteen *shih-lu*, i.e. "veritable histories of a reign," were written, which later formed the basis of the *Yüan-shih*. In addition, according to data in the *Yüan-shih*, the department conducted a compilation of biographies of Yüan 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 *chüan*.

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 T'ien-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 *T'ang hui-yao* [Collection of the Most Important Regulations of the T'ang (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 *Chün-shih* [The deeds of the rulers], were compiled under Mongolian administration [*meng-ku chü*]. 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 *Yüan-shih*, being an official dynastic history of the Mongolian khans in China was, as is well-known, compiled in a very short period at

[108]

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 *chüan* (booklets) of the *Yüan-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 *Yüan-shih* is a compilation

of numerous chronicles, different historical records and other sources relating to the period of Yüan 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 Yüan dynasty under the *shih-lu* genre. Another very important source for the *Yüan-shih* was the *Ching-shih ta-tien* (entries 224, pp. 25-34; 278, pp. ix-xiv). Such portions of the *Yüan-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 *Yüan-shih* is a historical work not only of Ming times, but also of the Yüan dynasty.

By its structure and nature, the *Yüan-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 *Yüan-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 *Yüan-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

[109]

historical writing, the Mongolian historical tradition nonetheless revealed itself under the Yüan 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 *Yüan-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 *Tobčiyān*,<sup>28</sup> which is mentioned in five different places of the *Yüan-shih*. In all probability the *Tobčiyān* included within it the history of only the first four great khans (Chinggis, Ögedei, Güyük and Möngke). As William Hung correctly supposes, the term *tobčiyān* 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 Chün (1840-1893) expressed the interesting idea that "... the *Tobčiyān*, although it was a carefully preserved Imperial book, must have existed in du-

<sup>28</sup> Francis W. Cleaves has established that the Mongolian word *tobčiyān* is first attested in Uighur script in the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362, in *HJAS*, 12 (1949); cf. William Hung (entry 241, pp. 440-441, footnote 16).

plicates intended for princes of the blood who stood at the head of the vassal states" (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 *Tobčiyān*, 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 *Hu-lan 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-śri 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 Rashīd al-Dīn (entry 214, pp. 72-3). The author of the *Red Annals* quotes from it twice in his own chronicle

[110]

(entry 90, part 1, pp. 11b-12b). It is very interesting that Kun dGa' rDo-rje named his work in Mongolian the *Hu-lan deb-ther*<sup>29</sup> from the Middle Mongolian *Hulan debter*. It is fully possible that Kun dGa' rDo-rje, being by birth from the family of rulers of the Tshal region, had been in service with the Mongolian khans, and called his chronicle *The Red Book*, following the Mongolian tradition (possibly at the advice of Jambhala-Tu-śri mGon) of giving books, especially historical works, the name of a color (blue, red, white, yellow) or of a precious metal such as gold, which was considered the most valuable and pure of all precious substances. At that time too there were such well-known works as the *Čayan Teūke* [The White History], the *Köke debter* [the Blue Book], the *Altan debter* [the Golden Book], and so on.

The chronicle of Kun dGa' rDo-rje is interesting because it speaks directly about its author using a Mongolian composition, the *Yeke thob-čan* [Tib. *yeke tobčān*, colloq. Mong.], which we have reconstructed as Mongolian *yeke tobčiyān* (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, 14b). Comparing the data transmitted by Kun dGa' rDo-rje from the *Yeke tobčiyān* with the corresponding passages in the *Secret History* and the *Complete Collection of Histories* by Rashīd 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

<sup>29</sup> It is interesting that in the Tibetan transcription of the word the initial *h* is preserved. This had existed in Mongolian in the middle period of its development (cf. the words *hodun*, *haran*).

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 *Tobčiyān*, which in Tibet was called the *Yeke tobčiyān*, 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 *Tobčiyān*, 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 ta-tien*, asked for the books of the *Tobčiyān* chronicle to be given to them from the Department of Dynastic History, so as to note the events which had taken place under T'ai-tzu (Chinggis) and subsequent khans. However, this request was refused on the grounds that the *Tobčiyān* 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 tobčiyān*. As for China, there the *Tobčiyān* 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 *Tobčiyān* also served as a source for the compilers of the *Yüan-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 *Yüan-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 *Yüan-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 *Yüan-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 *Yüan-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 *Yüan-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 *Yüan-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).

Rashīd al-Dīn 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 Güyüg 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 [115]

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 Rashīd al-Dīn 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

[116]

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 *Yüan-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 *Yüan-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 Yüan dynasty are founded on Mongolian traditions proper; as regards biographies of figures of the Yüan period, they are by nature scarcely distinguished from the Chinese *lieh-chuan*. As it seems to us, the data of the *Yüan-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 Yüan 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.

[117]

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), Muqulai, Baurči (Book 119), Čayan, Čingqai (Book 120), Sübetei (Book 121) and others. These biographies differ noticeably from the others, especially from biographies of Yüan 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 jahān-gusā* of Juvaynī 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.

[118]

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 'Atā-Mālik Juvaynī (1226-1283), who was in service to the first Mongolian rulers in Iran: Hulagu-Khan, Argun and Abaqai Khan. He was the closest associate of and personal secretary to Hulagu-Khan. Juvaynī's work is called the *Tārīkh-i jahān-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 Möngke 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 Möngke 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

[119]

from the fact that Juvaynī “was presented by Möngke 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-xxv). 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 [120]

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 Idikut to Chinggis Khan, and not in reverse (from Chinggis Khan to Idikut), 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 panegyric digressions, rhetorical figures, and more citations

[121]

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

[122]

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 Juvaynī, it turns out that the military campaigns of Chinggis Khan against his [=Juvaynī'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.

Juvaynī 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. Juvaynī 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 Juvaynī'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, Güyüg and Möngke. 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 Juvaynī are impressive for 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 Juvaynī'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

[123]

the very same lines by which the Mongols themselves set forth the history of their own khans. Juvaynī, 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 Juvaynī 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. Juvaynī, 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 Juvaynī’s as an expression of the view prevailing among the Mongols of that time about the role of Chinggis Khan in their history. But Juvaynī, 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 exalt 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 Yasay*. At the root of his information apparently lie oral reports gotten from Mongols. Juvaynī writes that the Great *Jasay* 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

[124]

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).

Juvaynī 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 Rashīd al-Dīn (entries 57, §167-170, pp. 128-131; 293, PFEH 13, pp. 57-58; 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 122-124).

But Juvaynī’s further account substantially diverges from the testimony of the other sources. In this regard one must remember Juvaynī’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 Juvaynī. 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 Juvaynī's narrative, Wang Khan, who fell on the camp

[125]

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 Juvaynī 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.

Juvaynī 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 Juvaynī 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). Juvaynī 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.

[126]

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 Juvaynī used

some data from the *Secret History*.

The first volume of Juvaynī'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. Juvaynī 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 Juvaynī 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 Juvaynī'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). Juvaynī 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 Juvaynī, were numerous among the Mongols, and all of them by their content served the purpose of strengthening the unity of the empire

[127]

divided among members of the Golden Clan; the sense of these parables guided the Mongols during the empire period too, especially under Möngke Khan (entry 89, vol. 1, 42-43).

Hence we learn from Juvaynī 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.

Skiping the chapters devoted to the campaigns of conquest of Chinggis Khan as of no interest for our topic, we proceed to Juvaynī's exposition of the history of Chinggis's successors: Ögedei, Güyüg and Möngke. Whereas in the *Secret History* the history of Ögedei is presented in a very condensed and schematic fashion, in

Juvaynī'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 Juvaynī 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 Ögedei Khan's rule as do the Mongolian authors. To judge from the sense and style of exposition, the details of how Chinggis Khan designated Ögedei 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 Juvaynī'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 Ögedei as his successor on the throne

[128]

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 Joči and Čayadai, presaging a future struggle for the throne. But Juvaynī 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 Ögedei 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 Juvaynī and in the *Secret History*, Ögedei 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 Juvaynī, 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 Ögedei was elevated to the khan's throne, is described by Juvaynī in such lively fashion that the author possibly made use of information from those very Mongols who may have been direct participants and eye-witnesses 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 Ögedei's rule, extensively cited by Juvaynī 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.

Juvaynī's information about Ögedei's external campaigns

[129]

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 mören* [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.<sup>30</sup>

The chapters devoted to Güyüg 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 Juvaynī'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)<sup>31</sup>. 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 Juvaynī 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 Juvaynī'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 Juvaynī 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, Juvaynī could clear up details of how Güyüg's wife Ogul-Gaimish, worked against

[130]

the selection of Möngke Khan in every way possible, stubbornly insisting on the right of the Ögedei clan to the throne, and also about the failed conspiracy by Sire-

<sup>30</sup> 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).

<sup>31</sup> The information which Juvaynī furnishes was borrowed *in toto* by Rashīd al-Dīn (cf. entry 67, vol. 2, pp. 114-118).

mun and Nagu, sons of Güyüg, directed against Möngke, 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 Möngke 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 Rusbroeck, who likewise visited Mongolia under Möngke 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 Rashīd al-Dīn (entry 67, vol. 2, pp. 133-135).

There can be no doubt that Rusbroeck'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 Möngke 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 Güyüg 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 Güyüg 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 Möngke 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 Möngke'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-Dīn<sup>32</sup> 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,

<sup>32</sup> 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 Öljeitü. Rashīd al-Dīn 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 Rashīd al-Dīn in 1307, under Öljeitü 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" (*tarikh-i Gazani*). Moreover, Öljeitü Khan gave Rashīd al-Dīn 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

[132]

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 *Jāmi'at-tawārīkh* 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 Rashīd al-Dīn in such an innovative approach to history, it is necessary nonetheless to consider that the idea of compiling a universal history belongs to Öljeitü 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.

[133]

It should also be borne in mind that the *Complete Collection of Histories* is not the work of Rashīd al-Dīn alone. His first investigator and translator, Quatremère, in a biographical sketch on Rashīd al-Dīn 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 Rashīd al-Dīn 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:

Rashīd al-Dīn consciously strove to set forth the historical traditional 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 Rashīd al-Dīn desired to be founded on their own sources, and some of those were not available in Arabic or Persian translations. Rashīd al-Dīn needed collaborators—connoisseurs of history of different lands and peoples. . . . Thus, the *Jāmi'at-tawārīkh* is the product of an entire collective who worked under the supervision of Rashīd al-Dīn 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

[134]

of the Mongols in the *Complete Collection of Histories* likewise is not the work of Rashīd al-Dīn 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 Rashīd al-Dīn 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 Rashīd al-Dīn'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 Rashīd al-Dīn's work, the *Favā'id-i sultānīya* [Conversations with Öljeitü Khan], is a statement that the *Complete Collection of Histories* together with some other works of Rashīd al-Dīn 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 Güyük Khān,

[135]

we can safely assume that the first draft of Jāmi' al-tavārīx was originally not written in Persian. These chapters apparently go back to a Mongolian version, most probably compiled by Pulad Jinksank and other Mongol genealogists. In my opinion, Rashīd-al-dīn incorporated that first Mongolian version in a larger Persian version of Jāmi'al-tavārīx 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

[136]

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'id 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 (*bayurči*) 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-čingsang held a high position as minister (*čingsang*) 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

[137]

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. Rashīd al-Dīn 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 treasures [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 . . . Rashīd, 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,

[138]

Pulad-čingsang. 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, Rashīd al-Dīn 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 Rashīd 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 Rashīd 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-goā. It is interesting that on the basis of data from the *Altan debter* and other sources, Rashīd al-Dīn determined the approximate date when Dobun-bayan and Alan-goā 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-goā, 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 Rashīd al-Dīn connects the epoch of Dobun-bayan and Alan-goā 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

[139]

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 Rashīd 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-Menen, Načīn 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 Taijiuds came from Charaqai-lingum, son of Qaidu-khan. Nowhere does it mention [their] origin from Načīn. It merely mentions that he fled from the Jalair [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 Načīn 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 Rashīd al-Dīn gave preference to the *Altan Debter* 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). Rashīd al-Dīn is also right when confirming this. Let us take, for example, the just-cited information from the *Altan debter* 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-dogshin [Rashīd al-Dīn has Baison-kur: Sh. B.], Charaqai-lingqu [Charake-lingum: Sh. B.] and Chaujin-örtegei [Jaučin: Sh. B.]. The sons of Charaqai-lingqu [Senggüm-bilge, Ambaqai, 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 debter*, reproduced in several copies, was preserved not only at the court

[140]

of the Il-Khans in Tabriz but also at the court of the Yüan 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 Debter* was a major general source both for Rashīd al-Dīn'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 Rashīd al-Dīn's work. Rashīd al-Dīn 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 Rashīd al-Dīn 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 Rashīd al-Dīn's major task was not only to write an independent historical investigation, but also

[141]

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, Rashīd al-Dīn'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 Öljeitü 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

[142]

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

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 illuminated.

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-goa” (entry 67, vol. 1, book 1, p. 152). Rashīd 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,

[143]

as does the tribe of the Qurulas, which had given Dobun-bayan his wife in the person of the celebrated Alan-goa.

The origin of the Nirun tribe is likewise founded on an ancient legend, which Rashīd 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-goa, because Alan-goa was of the Qurulas tribe, and the Qurulas tribe is a branch of the Darlekin Mongols. Alan-goa, 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-goa and these three sons are of three kinds: the first are those who come from Alan-goa’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 Rashīd al-Dīn 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 [belong] 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, Rashīd-

[144]

al-Dīn 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 ethnonym *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-goā 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-goā'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

[145]

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 found 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-Siretü-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-qan, 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 Qači-Külüg, 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

[146]

the *Secret History*. This speaks to the fact that Rashīd 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,

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 Rashīd 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 Rashīd 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. Rashīd 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 Rashīd al-Dīn gives us valuable data to judge the condition

[147]

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 Rashīd 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-Din (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 Rashīd 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*

*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

[149]

with Mongolian sound-values: Jurje (Jurčid), 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 (Čabčiyal, Chinese *Chü-yung-kuan*), Shara-Müren (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 Rashīd ad-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 Rashīd 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 Rashīd 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, Rashīd al-Dīn divides the Mongolian army into three parts: *gol* (the center), *barungar*

[150]

(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.

The second volume<sup>33</sup> of the *Complete Collection of Histories* includes a rather detailed and reliable history of the four sons of Chinggis Khan (Ögedei, Joči, 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, Güyüg, Möngke and Khubilai. 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 Rashīd 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-ün 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,

[151]

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 Rashīd 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

---

<sup>33</sup> 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 Rashīd 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-nyon, 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-nyon 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 Güyüg, Möngke, Khubilai and Timur (Öljeitü khan). The most valuable information relates to the history of these last three khans. On analyzing their history, especially that of Möngke 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,

[152]

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 Juvaynī, 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 Yüan 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-čingsang 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 Rashīd al-Dīn not from Muslim sources, but from Mongolian and Chinese ones.<sup>34</sup> 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. Rashīd al-Dīn would not have been able, naturally, to shed light on the course

[153]

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.

Rashīd al-Dīn'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

---

<sup>34</sup> With regard to the sources for writing this part of Rashīd al-Dīn'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 Rashīd 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.