

PART TWO

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

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

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

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

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

[156]

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

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

It is true, even after noting some loss of interest in history by the Mongols, that one does not need to lapse into pessimistic exaggeration as some researchers have done (for example, entry 180, p. 371). It is appropriate to remember in this regard Vladimirtsov’s words “At the present time we can note that the Mongols during the

dark period of their history, i.e., during the time which elapsed from the fall of the Yüan dynasty to the period of renaissance in the second half of the 16th century, were able to preserve much of their cultural attainment. Thus we can affirm that the production of literature and writing among the Mongols was not interrupted, nor was the literary tradition of the Yüan dynasty period" (entry 145, p. 15; cf. also entries 186, pp. 137-139; 233, p. 14). By way of confirmation one may also cite a few concrete facts. Chinese sources, for instance, testify that the Mongols in the 15th and 16th centuries sent to the Ming court documents written in Mongolian, and that the Ming dynasty representatives sent their missives to the Mongolian princes and rulers in the same language (entries 184, pp. 139, 168, 177; 255, p. 218; 145, p. 15, note 3). Even among the Mongols who remained within the confines of China, measures were executed to maintain written traditions. According to data in the *Ming shih-lu* [Veritable Records of the Ming Dynasty], as early as 1390 a school was established in the border region of China, in which

[157]

Mongolian was taught (entry 225, p. 169). In Ming China in the sixth year of Hsüan-t'i (1431) there appeared a new edition of a four-language (Chinese/ Sanskrit/ Tibetan/ Mongolian) collection of Buddhist works, in which the second part of the collection contained a Chinese translation of the sutra, and a preface in Mongolian (entry 233, p. 14). However, one must acknowledge that the absence not only of historical works relating to the 15th-16th centuries, but as well of direct indications of sources verifying the existence of similar works during the time in question. This remains an indisputable fact. The attempt of Walther Heissig to prove the existence of some Mongolian historical works during the period under review on the basis of Tibetan sources must be considered unsuccessful (*ibid.*, pp. 14-15). The "Red Annals," mentioned by the Tibetan author Gos-lo-tsa-ba gZon nu dPal in his work, the *Blue Annals*, is not the Mongolian *Ulayan debter* as Heissig thinks, but a Tibetan composition written by Kun dGa' rDo-rje in 1346 and published in 1961 in Sikkim. It is not hard to be convinced of this after comparing the two Tibetan works. But more of this *infra*.

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

It is well-known that as a rule Mongolian chronicles are noted for being compilations. This is why it is possible to find in them a lot of material transferred from other sources without substantial change. These materials afford great interest not only for studying the historical process, but also for the development of historical

knowledge. As a striking example we may

[158]

point to Lubsangdanjin's *Altan Tobči*. This chronicle, although it does belong to the pen of a definite author, is not, as Father Mostaert correctly observed, an original work; it is a collection of texts which the author has borrowed from various sources (entry 73, p. xii), i.e., a recognizable compilation of data from the *Secret History*, the *Altan Tobči Anonymous* and others. The author is so faithful to the letter and spirit of his sources, that his work can serve as material to study the historical knowledge of the Mongols of those periods to which his sources relate. The same may also be said about other Mongolian chronicles of this time.

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

If such be the case, then in the works named by Vladimirtsov there may appear material enabling one to appraise the situation of Mongolian historical knowledge during the time in question in its general outline. Such materials actually exist. Among those in the first degree are sections of 17th century chronicles devoted to the period of the so-called minor khans and which reveal some characteristic features of the Mongolian historical outlook in the 15th century. But it is necessary to remember that after the fall of the empire historiographic activity of the Mongols, reverted to its beginnings, to those times when the links of Mongolia with the outside world were quite limited and were not distinguished by firmness and stability. As a result Mongolian historical views were basically defined by factors of social-economic

[159]

and political life. It is quite evident also that these views show no traces of Buddhist influence, although already at the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th centuries this influence had not only reestablished its position in Mongolian historiography, but had also become all but completely dominant within it.

The history of the "minor khans" was not subjected to a Buddhist reworking even by those chroniclers who were faithful to the Buddhist world-concept. This is apparently explained by the exclusive devotion of the authors to the spirit and letter of the sources, as we have already noted. The materials at our disposition testify that in the 15th-16th centuries the pre-imperial historiographic traditions came to be actively reestablished, at least those corresponding to the beliefs and style of life of Mongols at that time. The works of historians of the 17th century likewise show that

the authors displayed an interest not only in the early history of the country, not merely in a history of the Golden Clan, but also in contemporary issues. The rather good information about events of the more or less distant past of their country, the historians of the 17th century could only have inherited from their predecessors, the historians of the 14th and 15th centuries, from which it follows that the views of these historians could in no wise have seriously diverged from the views of their colleagues who had lived and created in the "dark period."

There is a greater basis to assume the opposite: that in the 17th century historians received from their predecessors information about such events which scarcely could be obtained from any other sources. Let us cite as an example information about the flight of Toyon Temür from China and his celebrated "lament."¹ The content of this "lament" compels one to doubt whether this text actually belongs to Toyon Temür, and even whether the text was contemporary to him. A "lament" of such content, it seems to us, would appear only after the death of a khan, and in no way later than the beginning of the 16th century. This "lament" does afford a certain interest in a historical sense. It is an epilogue of unique form, in which the khan's lips vividly express the disheartening aftermath of the existence of the empire of the Mongolian khans.

As to the historical knowledge of the Mongols in the 15th century, one may judge entirely from 17th century chronicles. The character of this material testifies that in the period of the country's

[160]

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

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

¹ The different versions of the "Lament of Toyon Temür" are found in many Mongolian chronicles; the oldest variant of it, as it seems to us, is preserved in the *Šira Tuquji* (cf. entry 70, pp. 55-56, p. 142).

and clearly expressed, but it is impossible to say of them that the Mongols were generally indifferent and uninvolved with events in their time. *Au contraire*, these works of the 17th-18th centuries give heavy emphasis to the histories of the internecine wars. This testifies to the fact that it was precisely that issue which disturbed the Mongols, and was for them one of the most urgent crises they faced. But keeping in view that the authors of historical works of that time frequently expressed their relationship to the events being described by them, and sometimes even wrote about them, sometimes contradicting each other, we must, when wishing to explain the real views of historical actors and the ideological stances of the historians, analyze the works of the latter with special exactitude.

In historical works of that time one not infrequently finds direct speech on the part of participants in the events, which imparts to the narration a special vividness and picturesqueness, and

[161]

lends an air of veracity to the events reported. For us too these are of particular interest, insofar as they permit judging the views of historical actors and their contemporaries.

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

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

One of the most important ideas in historical works of the period being described was a striving for references to history and ethical norms to justify claims to the khan's throne by representatives of the Golden Clan of Borjigids, who claimed exclusive rights, and decisively and categorically rebuffed

[162]

claims of all other pretenders, especially from amongst the Oirat aristocracy. This reveals rather clearly the Great-Power attitude of the Eastern Mongolian rulers.

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

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

1. Khān tāyizi Yūliktū (Mong. Khan Tayiji Biligtü);
2. Äyūshīrīdārā (Mong. Ayuśiridara);
3. Dūqūz Timūr (Mong. Toγus Temür);
4. Yisūdār (Mong. Yisudar)
5. Anka (Mong. Engke [Joriγtu]);
6. Alyak (Mong. Elbeg [Nigülesküi]);
7. Alji Timūr (Mong. Öljeγitü Temür).

[163]

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

1. Kun Timūr (Gün Temür);
2. Uruk Timūr (Uruk Temür);
3. Ilchi Timūr (Ilchi Temür);
4. Dāltāy (Dalbay, Delbeg);
5. Ūrdāy (Oyaradai);
6. Aldāy (Adai) (entry 240, p. 245).

It must be said that information about Mongolian genealogy in the works of Per-

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

This struggle took on a particularly fierce character in connection with the attempts of Toyon Temür and his closest successors to lay a foundation in Mongolia itself, where the descendants of Arig-Buqu, obviously, enjoyed great influence. There are grounds to assume that opposition on the part of representatives of the Arig-Buqu clan for a long time gave no opportunity to the khans from the Khubilai clan to return to the capital of the country, Qara Qorum, compelling them to be satisfied with the steppes in the eastern part of Mongolia. It is hard to imagine that the descendants of Arig-Buqu missed the opportunity of taking advantage of the difficult position of the old opponents of their ancestors—Khubilai's descendants. In this regard one fact conveyed by the Persian sources deserves attention: according to these sources, for 45 years from Togus Timur (died 1368) to Tayisung (ascended the throne in 1433), both belonged to the Khubilai clan. On the khan's throne of Mongolia there were at least

[164]

four representatives of the Arig-Buqu clan: Yesüder, Engke, Delbeg and Oyaradai and, perhaps, Gün Timür; two from the Ögedei clan: Kuei-li-ch'ih, Adai, and two from the family of Khubilai: Elbeg and Öljeitü Temür (entry 240, pp. 247-8). Characteristically, all these khans, descendants of the Khubilai clan (Toyus Temür, Elbeg, Öljeitü Temür, Tayisung), were slain by the Oirats, who had supported the descendants of Arig-Buqu.

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

Some scholars maintain that materials from Chinese sources on the genealogy of Mongolian khans of the 15th-16th centuries were likewise borrowed from Mongolian sources. Father Serruys contends (entry 279, p. 8) that the genealogical list of the descendants of Dayan Khan in the *Pei-lu feng-su* by Hsiao Ta-heng was rewritten in Chinese transcription from Mongolian genealogical notes, similar to the one which contains the genealogy of the Ordos princes and was reproduced by Sayang Sečen in his *Erdeni-yin tobči*. Hence, a detailed genealogical table, contained in a Chinese work about the history of Mongolia which was cited, can give a picture of the nature

of genealogical notes compiled in the period in question in the noble houses of Mongolia. We do not see any need to specially dwell on the data of this source, inasmuch as it has been studied by Father Serruys and published by him.

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

[165]

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

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

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

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

Natural under these conditions was an awakening Mongolian interest in the fate of their country, in its ideology,

[166]

religion, law and government. Indications of this revival showed up most forcefully in the spiritual sphere of life in society. The spread of Lamaism in Mongolia at the end of the 16th century meant inculcating the classic bases of Buddhism in its Lamaist variety into social life.

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

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

[167]

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

It is clear that the adoption of this new religion, which had ousted primitive shamanism, enabled the Mongols to acquire one of the most ancient cultures of the Orient. Vladimirtsov wrote: "The church of Tsong-kha-pa, and at the same time Tibet along with it, created for the Mongols a concentration not only of religious but of every kind of culture among them. In this respect not solely among those occupied with monastic life, there was disseminated a knowledge of Tibetan language and literature, Tibetan Buddhism brought to the Mongols its science, schools, views, attitudes and superstitions, transmitting what they themselves had borrowed from

India" (entry 142, p. 110).

Henceforth, Buddhism-Lamaism came to play a decisive role in the formulation and development of Mongolian culture. There appeared monasteries, and attached to the monasteries were schools, which acted as hotbeds of culture and centers for preparing cadres for the Lamaist church. In creating its own schools, the church in Mongolia was unable to avoid introducing some elements of the secular knowledge which it had inherited from early India. Having placed this knowledge at the service of its own interests, the church in Mongolia assumed the role as preserver of Indo-Tibetan antiquity amongst the Mongols.

The content of all the academic disciplines taught in the monastery schools and which were named the "five major" and the "five minor" sciences,² all save one, the study of Buddhism itself, consisted of elements of the secular education of ancient India. A significant phenomenon in the cultural life of the Mongols of that time was the rebirth of Mongolian script and literature, connected predominantly, especially at the outset, with translations of canonical literature. The facts testify that instruction of youth in the Mongolian national script occupied at that time an important place in the system of monastic education. In the colophon of a Mongolian translation of the work

[168]

Sitatapatra-dharani, for instance, it is communicated that among the pupils of Ayu-shi-gushi were several *kiya* (retainers), from whose midst arose Sečen-dayičin-kiya baysi, one of the two scribes who executed the well-known inscription on the cliffs by the Khalkha Čoytu Tayiji.

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

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

² The five major sciences were grammar, logic, art, Buddhist teaching and medicine; the five minor sciences [were] astrology, poetics, the science of words, prosody, and mechanical arts (craftsmanship).

Heissig proved on the basis of Mongolian translations made prior to Ligdan which he had discovered, that the majority of Mongolian translations of the Buddhist canon made prior to Ligdan, at the time when the Mongolian *Kanjur* was compiled, had already been translated (entries 234, pp. 101-116; 237, pp. 71-87; 238).

The Mongolian chronicles *Bolor Erike* and *Altan Erike* inform us that a group of 35 translators under the direction of Gunga-Odser completed a translation of the *Kanjur* into Mongolian in one year, having begun it in 1628 and finishing it in 1629 (entries 232, p. 41; 234, pp. 101-102). It is perfectly obvious that such a short period of time to carry out this work is unthinkable, unless the translators had at their disposal ready-made translations of the greater part of the *Kanjur*. The work of translators under Ligdan Khan might well have come down to

[169]

matters of technical editing. Heissig presumes that 1,161 works in the *Kanjur*, not counting other religious books, were translated into Mongolian in the course of 50 years at the period ending the 16th and beginning the 17th century (entry 232, p. 101). This bears witness to a truly grandiose translational productivity, which reached its apogee under Ligdan Khan, when there was compiled a Mongolian *Kanjur* in 113 volumes, written “in gold and silver on blue and beryl paper”.

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

This important observation by the outstanding scholar and Mongolist long remained beyond the ken of researchers. Only recently did Heissig and Kasyanenko make the first serious attempts to research the St. Petersburg hand-written *Kanjur*.¹² On the basis of studying the colophons of the first five volumes, Heissig came to the conclusion that the version in question actually goes back to the time of Ligdan Khan and that the Peking xylographic edition of the *Kanjur* from 1718-1720 is just another edition with some minor linguistic and editorial changes of the Mongolian *Kanjur* which had been compiled by the editorial commission under Ligdan Khan in 1628-1629 (entry 238, p. 15). Kasyanenko made and published an excellent cata-

¹² Walther Heissig, “Some remarks on the question of the first translation of the Mongolian *Kandjur*,” in *Mongol sudlalyn ögüüllүүд, Essays on Mongol Studies* (Ulaanbaatar 1998), pp. 155-160 (The Bira 70th Anniversary Volume).

Z. K. Kasyanenko, *Katalog peterburgskogo rukopis'nogo “Gandzura” (Kanjur)*. St. Petersburg, 1993 (Pamyatniki pis'mennosti Vostoka).

logue of the manuscript *Kanjur* of St. Petersburg University. She pointed out that the manuscript *Kanjur* belonged to the first half of the 17th century.³

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

[170]

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

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

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

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

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

[171]

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

³ Z. K. Kasyanenko, *ibid.* p.8.

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

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

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

We succeeded in deciphering the Tibetan shorthand with the aid of Lama Luvsančültem (from the Gandan Monastery in Ulaanbaatar), who at our request rewrote the entire manuscript in ordinary Tibetan writing (*gzab-yig*).⁴ It then became clear that the manuscript contains many errors, both orthographic and other, which make it difficult, at times virtually impossible, to reconstruct the Mongolian original. Nonetheless the manuscript does give a definite impression of this document. It may be maintained that it represents a quite mediocre Tibetan translation of the *Law of Altan Khan* not preserved in an original. It is indubitably a unique monument of Mongolian law which survived (not the original but in a translation) from the time of Altan Khan.

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

[172]

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

The Word of Altan, King of the Dharma, rebirth of Aryabala, Supreme among Victors and Protector-God of all living creatures of the six kinds. There are none among sentients of the six kinds who would not be connected with one another through relationship. In this regard we cite an extract from the words of the Teacher, Buddha. "My teaching will be spread in the following fashion. It will spread from north to north." Thus, the northern country is Tibet, which is *Vajrasana*.⁵ It once was a dark territory. There was born the Dharmaraja Srong-btsan-gampo who once and for all put Tibetan subjects on the path of well-being through the two types of laws. To the north of Tibet is the country of Mongolia. The Dharmaraja, Altan the Bestower of Alms, who clearly indicated the path to well-being for all people who were in pitch-darkness, not distinguishing good deeds from sin, and bSod-rnams rgya-mtsho, the

⁴ This copy of the law and its English translation were recently published in the book: Sh. Bira, *Studies in the Mongolian History, Culture and Historiography: Selected Papers* (Tokyo, 1994), pp. 276-309.

⁵ *Vajrasana* is one of the fundamental Buddhist locations.

rebirth of the High Omniscient [Buddha], reborn as a teacher, have taken trouble for the sake of spreading doctrine to all the nine lands. . . . There exist two kinds of laws which have been disseminated throughout all states: the Law of Dharma, similar to a silken cord, is the indestructible Vajra⁶, and the Laws of the Ruler, similar to a golden yoke, omnipotent by its greatness. Of these, the laws of the ruler, which are great and small depending on to whom they are intended, are the following: to observe thoroughly these great and small laws by all leaders of the forty *hoshuuns* and five *ai-maks* of Mongolia. If one neither knows nor observes [the laws], then one cannot escape decisive punishments on the basis of the two types of laws, according to the prescriptions of the God of Death. To be known by all unambiguously!" (entry 256, pp. 268-269).⁷

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

[173]

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

⁶ *Vajra* – a symbol denoting the stronghold of power

⁷ The portion quoted reads as follows in Tibetan: . . . rgyal-ba thams čad kyi mthog tu dbang bskur ba rigs drug yongs kyi skyabs gnas nor bu padma gang la gang'dul gyi skur sprul pa althan čhos kyi rgyal po'i bka'/rigs drug 'di dag pha mar ma gyur pa med čin/de'i phyir ston ba yang dag pa'i bka' las kyang/nga yi bka' bstan gang la gang 'gyur nmams byang phyogs n'as byang phyogs su rgyas pa 'gyur ües pa rdo rje gdan de nid kyi byang ni bod yul mun pa'i gling/de la čhos kyi rgyal po srong btsan sgam po žes par sku sprul nas bod 'bangs nmams lugs gñis kyi lam las gtan gyi bde ba la 'khod pa de yin/bod yul rdo rje gdan de yi byang ni gnas di yin/de la kyang dge sdig gi blang dor mi šes pa'i mun ba'i smag rum du sems čan nmams la phan bde'i lam gsal bar ston par mdzad pa althan čhos kyi rgyal po sbyin bdag gi tshul dang/thams čad mkhyen pa mhog gi sprul sku bsod nams rgya mtsho bla mar sprul/gang la gang dul gyi phyogs bču kun tu bka' drin gyi khyab pa mdzad/sems čan thams čad phan bde yid brtan gyi bde ba la 'khod par mdzad pa sogs čung ig brjod pa de yin/da cha lugs gñis las/čhos khirms dar gyi mdud pa mi būig pa'i rdo rje/rgyal khirms gser gyi gñā'šing brjid čhen pos yangs pa'i rgyal khams kun thu khyab pa gñis las/rgyal khirms gyi gtan khirms čhe phra gang la gang 'gab di lthar bkod pa/khyod sog po sde rigs biži'i ču'i mgo byas mgo lnga sde rigs čhe phra thams čad blo yul du nges pa bgyis/gal srid ma nges pa dang nged khyad bsod kyi bya ba byas par gyur na gšin rje čhos kyi rgyal po'i bka' bzin lugs gñis kyi tsa ra drag po byed nges pa yin pas/kun gyi sems la nges gsal gdab pa bgyis.

Compare this with the following phrases from the "White History": Čhos khirms dar gyi mdud pa mi būig pa'i rdo-rje/rgyal khirms gser gyi gñā' üing brjid čhen pos yangs pa'i rgyal khams kun thu khyab pa gñis las...; Ünen nom-un jasaḡ gkib-ün janggiya metü aldarsi ügei, kündü qayan-u jasaḡ altan-u bayuly-a metü ebdersi ügei qoyar-yosun . . .

in question henceforth dominated all subsequent pre-revolutionary Mongolian historical writing.

For another early source permitting one to judge Buddhist influence on Mongolian historical-political thought in the period under survey, one may consider the *Golden Beam Sutra*, the *Altan gerel-tü* (Skt. *Suvarṇaprābhāsottama*). (For the complete Mongolian title, consult entry 13). Scholars have provisionally fixed the 3rd or 4th century as the time when this sutra first appeared. From data in the colophon it is apparent that the Mongolian translation was ordered by Altan Khan himself in 1579⁸ (entry 234, pp. 102-105).

The special interest of Altan Khan in the *Altan gerel-tü* sutra is not accidental. At that time he was vigorously working to reintroduce Lamaism from Tibet⁹ (entry 44, p. 254). The *Altan gerel-tü* sutra is thought to be a sermon preached by Buddha himself, intended just for doctrinal rulers, and for this reason it is still named the *Royal Book* (*Qayan-u sasdir*, in Tibetan *rgyal po'i bstan bčos*, in Sanskrit *rājaśāstra*). Chapter XII, titled "The Royal Shastra; the Vow of the Ruler Deva," presents the theoretical basis for divine right and the obligations of kings. It explains why the king is the "Son of Gods" (Skt. *Devaputra*), and indicates how he is supposed to rule the state.

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

⁹ It is necessary to add some new data concerning Altan Khan's special interest in the *Altan Gerel* (or *gerel-tü*) sutra. According to research by Čoyiji, Altan Khan some years before he met with the Third Dalai Lama, in a letter written in Wan Li 1, i.e. 1573-4, requested him to send him the sutra named "Altan Gerel", written in golden letters and in Tibetan translation. See Čoyiji, in the article mentioned in the preceding footnote, p. 14.

He becomes king who is born amidst the Gods [= *deva*] by the force of his earlier good deeds. Having received blessing from the Gods, he enters the maternal womb. There Gods protect him. Having been born into the world of people, he becomes a king of men. He is called a Son of Gods because Gods protect him. His main mission in the world is to be a just judge in determining the consequences of the actions of those who do good deeds, and those who commit sins and crimes. If the king forgets his mission and does not suitably punish those criminals and sinful people, then the number of such people in his state gradually increases and this in the final analysis serves as reason for his misfortune:

[174]

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁰ Cf. Sh. Bira, “The worship of Suvarṇaprābhasottama-sūtra in Mongolia,” in *Mongolia: Tryst with Change and Development*, edited by R. C. Sharma. Patiala: Vision and Venture, 1997, pp. 1-18.

There is an English translation of the sutra, *The Sutra of Golden Light: Being a Translation of the Suvarṇabhasottama-sūtra*, by R. E. Emmerick (London: Luzac, 1970).

More than that, he must render full measure of protection, respect and honor to all khuvaraks—followers of the *Altan gerel-tü*. Only when having so honorable a [175]

relationship to the sutra will the king enjoy all its blessings: his realm will be preserved by the four great protectors of the four corners of the world (Skt. *çaturmahārāja*, Tib. *rgyal chen sde bz̄i*, Mong. *dörben maqaranja*), his state will enter on a period of happiness, welfare, peace and tranquility, and the king will achieve the protection necessary for himself from those same gods, his life will be extended, and he will be reborn in each new generation as a Chakravartin-King¹¹ (entry 13, vol. 14, ff. 20-a/28-b). The sutra speaks clearly and in detail also about what penalty awaits the king if he is not obedient to the admonishments of the sutra (entry 13, vol. 14, ff. 32-b/36-a). In conclusion, Buddha himself advises the king always to respect this sutra, comparing it to a source of valuable things which satisfy the needs of kings in science, in a way similar to how cool water slakes thirst (entry 13, vol. 14, f. 36-b).

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

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

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

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

¹¹ The Sanskrit word *Chakravartin*, in Russian translated as "turning the wheel [of the law]," i.e., "possessor of the symbol of power," in Mongolian is rendered as *kürdün ergigülegçi*, or *kürdün orçiyuluyçi*.

was not a lawful pretender to Mongolian khanship, and who was only a ruler (*ji-nong*) of the western part of the Eastern Tümen of Mongolia, could have been, from the Buddhist point of view, elevated to the rank of Great Mongolian Khan. The unnamed Mongolian translator, under influence of ideas conveyed by the sutra, ascribed all the qualities of a Devaputra-king to his own khan. From this moment the Buddhist religious-political concepts, so solidly laid out in the sutra under review, were called upon to form the basis of the historical-political views of the ruling class of Mongolia.

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

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

In the Mongolia of that time teaching about a powerful royal power had from the very outset not an abstract philosophical meaning, but a deeply practical one. Bearing the title *Chakravartin*, i.e., "Turner of the Wheel [of Doctrine]" in its Buddhist sense, a Mongolian khan was fully able to lay claim to the right to be an all-Mongolian khan. Despite the fact that in reality the concept of Chakravartin-kings [177]

was not fully realized in Mongolia, it played an important role in the formation of new historical-political ideas.

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

Qutuγtai Sečen Qung-Tayiji

The most outstanding historian of the first period after the consolidation of genealogical Buddhist historiography was Qutuγtai Sečen qung-tayiji. He may even be called the real founder of that type of historical writing in Mongolia. There is quite a bit of information about his life and work in the *Erdeni-yin tobči* chronicle, com-

piled by his great-grandson Sayang Sečen, as well as in Chinese sources, especially in the work *Wan-li wu-jun lu* [Military Records of the Wan-li Period] (entries 44, pp. 218-239; 279; 257, pp. 55-56).¹²

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

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

His great-grandson Sayang Sečen informs us that in the Red Mouse Year, at the age of 37, viz., in 1577, Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji, having met with his relative, Altan, advised him to invite the Dalai Lama from Tibet, to the end of accepting the new religion from him and by this to reestablish the rule of religion and state after the example of Khubilai Khan and Arya hPh'ags-pa lama (entry 44, p. 240). The advice of Qutuytai Sečen was accepted and Altan Khan invited the Third Dalai Lama, Sodnam-Jamtso (bSod-mams rgya-tsho), to his headquarters, where together with the most prominent members of the

[178]

Mongolian aristocracy he set up a splendid reception for the head of Lamaism. In a subsequent meeting (according to Sayang Sečen, the third, but according to the testimony of the Fifth Dalai Lama, the second) was headed by Qutuytai Sečen together

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

As regards the titles and name of the author, they are obviously misspelled. They may be corrected as follows: *sünglaba bariramba Sumadi Darma-girdi* (from Sanskrit Sumadhi Dharmakirti). The titles and the name of the author are written more correctly in the colophon of another book, the *Subud erike* [The Pearl Rosary], which is appended to Sonom's publication, p. 230. It is clear from the *Subud erike* colophon that Sumadi Darma-girdi was a learned lama and translator from the Ganjur Monastery in the Jasay qosiyun of the Yeke Juu čiyulyan of Ordos. As is further stated in the same colophon, he was a co-author of the *Subud erike*, jointly with Qončoyjab (p. 230).

with Dayan-noyon of the Tümeds; about three thousand persons took part in it. The sources bear witness that Quturytai Sečen appeared beside Altan Khan as a central figure in the official ceremony of acceptance of Lamaism by Mongolian ruling circles. According to Sayang Sečen's testimony, he made a brilliant speech in honor of the meeting of the Dalai Lama and Altan Khan at a vast gathering of some ten myriads of people (a figure probably exaggerated).

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

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

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

Beginning on such a fine and auspicious day, when the great stream moving with waves of blood transforms and converts into a transparent sea eddying with milk, when one proceeds on that white path of doctrine as set forth by the saints of yore [viz., Khubilai and hPhags-pa], this surely will be the benefice of our having relied on the Khan and Lama (entry 44, pp. 251-252; cf. Urga MS 76v15/77r07).¹³

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

[179]

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

¹³ The author and the translator have made a new translation into English strictly following the Mongolian original of this passage; see Sayang Sečen, *Erdeni-yin Tobci* (Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un Arad-un Keblel-ün Qoriy-a, 1981), pp. 441-442.

historical-religious ideas of Qutuytai Sečen. He was one of the first Mongolian historians to interpret the Buddhist doctrine of reincarnation as applying to the Mongolian khans as well. He called Godan the reincarnation of a bodhisattva, and Khubilai khan a Chakravartin. He likewise had a very clear idea about the basic stages of the history of Buddhism in Mongolia, which were later adopted by the majority of authors of historical works. As is evident from the above-quoted speech of Qutuytai Sečen, the first stage he linked to the time of Khubilai khan, and a new stage begins with Altan Khan, with the rebirth of religion and state in Mongolia.

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

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

In our opinion, it is not possible to pass judgment on the law in question solely from the text of Sayang Sečen, because he cites the latter incompletely and inaccurately. For this reason we have drawn

[180]

on another source, two decades earlier than Sayang Sečen's chronicle and interesting because it apparently used an original Tibetan version of the document in question which is still unknown to us. Comparing the texts in the two sources named, we discover significant divergence. It is hard, of course, to state which of these two versions corresponds more with the original. But it is beyond doubt that each complements the other.

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

*dörben jüil quvaraγ-tur ötele kümün kürbesü,
qariyabasu, tebčibesü čorji nar-un yamu ...*

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

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

*Bla ma dañg/dge 'dun kyi čha lugs čan la brdung bčog sogs bžag
pa byuñ na lag'jog mkhan kyi gzi ma thams čad gtor*

"If commoners subject lamas and those who are in orders to such physical

violence as assault and wounding and so on, then the offenders are to be quartered" (entry 23, fol. 95-b).

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

This law is further remarkable for the fact that it forbade some pagan practices, as for example to bury a wife along with the deceased, as well as his servants and domestic animals,

[181]

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

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

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

Altan Khan, as is known from Chinese and Mongolian sources, stubbornly but unsuccessfully strove to normalize commerce with China. The Chinese rulers in every way hindered development of commercial exchange with Mongolia, endeavoring to combine it with conditions degrading and unjust to the khans and princes. Taking into account the zeal which the Mongolian rulers had displayed toward the Lamaist religion, the authorities in China undertook attempts to draw its spread into their hands, arrogating to themselves the role of intermediary in the mutual relations

of Mongolia with Tibet by dispatching Tibetan monks with Buddhist sutras to Altan Khan from Peking. But this attempt enjoyed no success. Direct contacts between Tibet and Mongolia as a result of Altan Khan's discussions with the Dalai Lama became an actual fact.

[182]

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

One should particularly note Qutuytai Sečen's service in bringing about a rebirth of the Mongolian historiographic tradition to fit the new historic conditions. One may judge his historical views to a certain degree by the new edition of the *Čayan teūke* chronicle. The preface to the Ulaanbaatar copy says that Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji “sagaciously adopted [knowledge], extracted this history, the *Arban buyantu nom-un čayan teūke*, from the city of Sung-chou¹⁴ established previously by Khubilai Sečen Khan the Chakravartin, who compared it with the ancient copy belonging to the Uighurchin¹⁵ Biranashiri üijeng-guoshih, [and who] happily collated, com-

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

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

As early as 1958 Sh. Natsagdorj provisionally identified Uighurchin Biranashiri with the State Preceptor (Guo-shih) Biranashiri under Tüb-Temür (Jayayatu qayan – Sh. B.) (1329-1332), and expressed the opinion that this State Preceptor might have played an important role in editing the *Čayan teūke* in 1330. In the Russian edition of my book I expressed my doubt about Natsagdorj's opinion, but now I have to renounce my words, because new data corroborating Natsagdorj's supposition are available. He arrived at his opinion after discovering, in one copy of the *Čayan teūke* belonging to the Institute for Language and History in Kokeqota, the following notation: “Compiled in the first year of Ji-Sung (Dhi shün).” This corresponds to the year 1330 (cf. entry 120, p. 15). Qaraca, who wrote an interesting article on the authorship of the *Čayan teūke* in 1988, also supposed that Biranashiri üijeng

piled and brought out the revision" (entry 1, copy D). From the citation quoted it follows that it was precisely Qutuytai Sečen who discovered this historical-juridical monument of the 13th century and made his contribution to its creative employment in the spirit of its time by bringing into being a new edition of the *Čayan teūke*.

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

Thus, it seems to us that the following interpolations belong to the creation of Qutuytai Sečen to a greater or lesser degree: the introductory portion, where he gives a brief history of the Two Principles from the time they appeared; brief

[183]

information about the spread of Buddhism in India, Tibet and Mongolia; and brief information about the downfall of religion in Mongolia and the law about revival and support of Buddhism.

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

guo-shih (or üijeng-guo-shi) could have composed the *Čayan teūke* after having collected into a book the laws about the Two Principles, the religious and the secular, as established by Khubilai Khan. (See Qarača, "Čayan teūke-yin jokiyač-i-yin tuqai sübegčilel," *Öbör Mongyol-un neyigem-ün sinjilekü uqayan*, No. 3 (1995), pp. 37-43.

¹⁶ The text gives a Tibetan calque of the Sanskrit *Chakravarti*: *qural-un sutu boyda Cinggis qayan*. Here the word *qural* is a misspelling and we have to correct it to the Tibetan word *khör-lo*, corresponding to the Sanskrit *cakra* 'wheel'; we have the same word in another spot in the chronicle, as *qural-un ejen qayan*, which means the khan who has a *khör-lo*, or in Sanskrit, Chakravartin.

tion of the Sakya Lama Gunga-Nyangbo¹⁷ [Kun-dga' sñiñ-po] as a contemporary of Chinggis clearly indicates that we have an interpolation which could have taken place only during the new editing by Qutuytai Sečen. However great the authority of Chinggis Khan, in the 13th-14th centuries no one dared to make Chinggis a "king of doctrine," a founder of the Two Principles in Mongolia. At that time, it was evident to everyone that Chinggis had not been converted to Buddhism and had no links with the Sakya monastery. One has to think that the attempt to depict Chinggis Khan as founder of the Two Principles theory in Mongolia became possible only later, when the actual story of Chinggis had in time grown murky in the people's memory.

Qutuytai Sečen was the first historian who, for the sake of raising the prestige of the new religion, decided to combine the beginning of its penetration of Mongolia with the name of Chinggis Khan,

[184]

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

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

¹⁷ The name of Gunga-Nyangbo is given in the manuscript in Mongolian translation: *Sasgiy-a ba qamuy bayasqulang-un jirüken*.

low in their politics.

The next interpolation of Qutuytai Sečen is his exposition of the history of Buddhism in India, Tibet and Mongolia. Brief though the information he reports may be, we can see clearly in it the scheme of the historical

[185]

process, which later became a base common to all Mongolian historians. Expressing the growth of influence of Buddhist historiography, this scheme reproduces its chief principles. Thus, in setting forth the history of Mongolia, Qutuytai Sečen when editing the *Čayan teūke* writes that Buddhism was widespread among the Mongols in the years when the "three Chakravartin-kings" ruled, whom he obviously implies are Chinggis, Khubilai and Altan. If the third actually was Altan Khan, there is no doubt that this interpolation belongs to Qutuytai Sečen.

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

Having set this forth, he formulates the following laws:

"Respect the Three Jewels (Buddhism);"

"Disseminate the teaching of Buddha, like the sun;"

"Build a monastery which is the support of the body;"

"Write a book which is the support of the word [of Buddha];"

"Erect a stupa which is the support of the heart [thought];"

"Do not require those clad in yellow robes to bow before princes and khans;"

"Do not organize a hunt near monasteries;"

"Observe fasting;"

"Perform good deeds in memory of the deceased;"

"The highest of leaders is the Lama (the teacher), the highest of those who show is Buddha; the highest of paths to this world is the Doctrine [dharma]; the highest of friends of nirvana is the *quvaray*;"

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

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

Concerning legal questions touched on in Qutuytai Sečen's editing, one should direct attention to yet another issue. The laws of Qutuytai Sečen we have cited

[186]

carry a strong imprint of influence from the so-called laws of dharma, in particular the "Law Possessing Ten Virtues." Qutuytai Sečen obviously makes use here of the laws of the three Tibetan Chakravartin-kings. Naturally it is difficult to establish what these laws were exactly but in our view they may have some connection with

some that are in such works as the *Mani-gambum*, *Badma-ṣatang* (for them, see *infra*), and others. By way of example, we cite a law ascribed to one of the Tibetan Chakravartin-kings, Khri-srong bde-btsan. It is found in the *Badma-ṣatang*, chapter 64, where it is called "The Laws of Dharma by Khri-srong bde-btsan". It creates the impression that these laws can show the influence on the author of the new *Čayan teūke* edition, which begin with the words: "The core of holy religion is the Lama, the ruler of dharma; and the head of the state is the Khan, the possessor of earthly authority; the laws of the true dharma, similar to a sacred silken cord, are unabated, the laws of the mighty khan, like a golden yoke are invincible. And a brief exposition [*tobčiya*] of how to carry out both laws equally free of error is to be found in the "White History of Teaching about the Ten Virtues" (entry 1, no pagination).

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

Čhos khrims dar gyi mdud pa lta bur bsdams rgyal khrims gser gyi gñà śh̄n sbran lči dañ.

The Mongolian translation is the following:

nom-un jasay qib-un janggiy-a metü bekilen, qaṣan-u jasay küjügün-ü kündü altan boyulya-bar kündü-te daruylju (entry 2, f. 161-b).

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

[187]

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

Even in the special religious statutes in Qutuytai Sečen's text one can discover sections which differ to a greater or lesser degree from the corresponding texts of Buddhist laws. By way of example we cite a well-known Buddhist statute about the "Five non-intermediates" (or the "five immeasurable sins"). According to the *Mani-*

gambum, the “five non-intermediates” are: slaying one’s father; slaying one’s mother; spilling blood from the body of Buddha with malicious intent; slaying of arhats; slaying lamas, and *quvarays* (entry 18). In Qutuytai Sečen all this is formulated under the “four crimes:” killing the lama-teacher; spilling the blood from the body of Buddha with malicious intent; committing harm against father and mother; treachery to the state and its destruction (entry 1, copy D).

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

Guoshi Čorji

With the growth of a Buddhist educational system in Mongolia there began to appear historians coming from amongst the lamas, who were for their time rather educated persons. The most prominent of these was Manjushri Gushi Shiregetü Tsorjiwa [Tsorji] Shrishilasvaraba, also known as Pandita Gushi Tsorjiwa, from Kökeqota (for whom cf. entries 143, pp. 217-231; 234, pp. 231-232; 252, pp. 227-228). As to him personally, we know very

[188]

little.¹⁸ It is known only that his creative output extended from the end of the 16th to the beginning of the 17th centuries. To judge from the fact that he is not listed among the persons who edited the Mongolian *Kanjur* translation under Ligdan Khan one may assume that in 1628-1629 he was no longer among the living. As is evident from the colophon in the first volume, *Yum* (one of the *Kanjur* sections), other parties (Daiching-tayiji and Dorji-drag bandi)¹⁹ carried out editing the transla-

¹⁸ During the last few years, new material about Guoshi Čorji has become available. Čoyiji discovered two items containing new data which shed light on the religious and literary activity of Guoshi čorji:

1. *Köke-qota-yin yajar orun-u jaq-a kijayar ba širegetü gegen-ü tobči namtar, busu blama qutuytu kiked olan süm-e-yin neres-i temdeglegsen debter*. This book was composed in the third year of Būrintü jasaγči, or 1864.

2. *Erdeni tunumal neretü sudur* (Beijing, 1984). As we can see from the paper by Čoyiji, his materials not only provide us with new important data on Guoshi Čorji, but also confirm the reliability of materials already known, and our conclusions already made on the basis of those materials. See Čoyiji, *Siregetü Guoshi Čorji-yin tuqai nököbörilen ügülekü kedün jüil* [Some additional data on Shiregetü guoshi Čorji], in *Mongyol teüke sudulul* (1985), pp. 153-160.

¹⁹ Cf. the Mongolian colophon in the first volume, *Yum* (entries 251, pp. 168-169; 232, p. 11; 233, p. 34).

tion by Guoshi Čorji as early as 1620. If Guoshi Čorji had been alive at this time, then he no doubt would have been drawn to such a serious matter. Hence one may conclude that his activity was curtailed about the beginning of the 1620's.

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

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

[189]

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

Guoshi Čorji was best known as an outstanding translator and connoisseur of literature. To his pen belong translations of many Buddhist sutras (entry 143, p. 221-228). He was also a great historian of the period of the Mongolian Renaissance. As to his historical-philosophical and religious views, the best idea is given by his work *Čiqula kerelegči tegüs udq-a-tu neretü sasdir* [The Shastra Called the Essence of all that is Necessary]. Scholars, beginning with O. M. Kovalevskii, have been accus-

tomed to consider this work by Guoshi Čorji a translation or reworking of a work by hPhags-pa lama, the *Ses-bya rab-gsal* [What is to be Known] (entries 159 p. 13; 233, pp. 27-28). But this does not correspond to actuality. We are inclined to assert that the *Shashtra Called The Essence Of All That Is Necessary* is a completely independent production, of which it is not hard to be convinced on the most cursory comparison of both works. It is surely no accident that Guoshi Čorji does not even mention the work of hPhags-pa lama in his composition. The last part of this work remarks that Manjushri Gushi Shiregetü Tsorjiwa “translated, actually composing,” the work in question, “drawing into agreement shastras which like the rising sun illuminate the lovely holy words of former Bogdos [saints], by order

[190]

of Magada Bovadhi Sadov from the Kemčügüd clan and Gegen Biligtü Toin Shirab-sengege, for the purpose of spreading the religion of Shakyamuni in Mongolia” (entry 5, pp. 95-a/95-b). It must be remarked that the colophon of a handwritten copy belonging to us personally differs considerably from the colophon cited by Walther Heissig in his work (entry 233, p. 28, note 2).

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

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

The sole work which by its structure and content most resembles the *Sutra Called The Essence Of What Is Necessary*, is a work by the Tibetan author Lubčansanbaibal (*blo bcañ bzañ po'i dpañ*), which bears a name almost identical: *The Essence Of All That Is Necessary* (*ñer mkho mthoñ ba don yod*). But the date this work was written is not given in the colophon. In one spot, to be sure, it says that Buddhism has existed for 3504 years, from the time of Buddha's nirvana until the present Iron-

[191]

Swine Year (entry 5, fol. 53-b). Considering this evidence, as well as some other data, one may presume that Lubčansanbaibal worked on his composition in the

Iron-Swine Year of the 6th *rabjung*, i.e., in 1383. We have no direct proof which would permit one to assert that his work was used by Guoshi Čorji in the *Shastra Called The Essence Of All That Is Necessary*, but this similarity cannot fail to strike us.

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

The shastra opens with a traditional introduction (pp. 1-15), peculiar to all Buddhist historical literature, i.e., with a short description of the life of Buddha and a history of his teaching. It creates the impression that Guoshi Čorji was in this case interested more in the fate of Buddha's teaching than the description of the Buddha's life. He only briefly dwells on the high points of the life and activity of Buddha, mentioning that "our teacher Shakyamuni was born into the family of King Suddhodana" (entry 5, p. 2). The date of Buddha's nirvana is, as is well-known, a departure point in the chronology of Buddhist historical literature; on this foundation Guoshi Čorji gives different calculations of Buddha's age (100 years, 80 years). But at the same time he notes the impossibility of determining the actual age of Buddha, quoting in this respect the *Altan gereltü* sutra. In his opinion, under the death (nirvana) of Buddha one must assume a mere curtailment of his physical existence. Buddha submerged into nirvana to show living creatures the law of dharma. But as for the two manifestations of Buddha, spiritual as well as external beauty and grandeur, these are not subject to the laws of nirvana. Buddha in these manifestations is eternal. From this Guoshi Čorji, as indeed do other historian-Buddhists, [192]

concludes that after his nirvana Buddha lives in his own higher non-material spiritual hypostases, in particular in his doctrine. For this reason a basic object of history has to be the history of Buddha's doctrine.

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

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

The second section is the basic one in the Shastra (entry 5, ff. 15-a/73-b). For Guoshi Čorji history is inseparable from cosmology. For this reason the basic portion of his work is taken up with general religious-cosmological information, at

times utterly fantastic. Naturally, there is no need to discuss its characteristics, but it is immeasurably more interesting that in this section one may treat of history proper – the history of society, of peoples and states.

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

Starting from this concept of universality, Guoshi Čorji is first of all interested in how the external world was formed, i.e., the universe (*γadaγadu saba yirtinčü*) and the world of living beings (*dotuγadu amitan-u bayidal*). It must be stated that these problems were quite new to Mongolian historical writing at this time. Guoshi Čorji not only posed them but also tried to give answer to them, proceeding from the ancient Indian doctrine of naive materialism, which Buddhist cosmology partly inherited. It is interesting that Buddhism, which admitted the existence of the material world, worked out a well-developed

[193]

atomistic theory, not yielding to the ancient Greeks in the profundity of its rationalist surmises. Following Buddhist atomistics, Guoshi Čorji thinks that the material world consists of very tiny invisible particles: *baraman-u toγusun* (from Skt. *paramanu*), i.e., layers of dust or atoms, and gives a graded table of their differing units, under which each of the latter receives a designation, expanding into seven units from the minutest particles up to the very largest (entry 5, pp. 14-15).

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

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

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

Buddhist cosmology strove to depict in the *kalpas* the entire process of forma-

tion, development and destruction

[194]

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

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

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

Omitting further details of the history of the universe and of living creatures, the populating of areas of the three worlds, the *trailokya* (the upper is the abstract world; the lower is the material world; and between them is the intermediate world),

[195]

let us direct attention to how Guoshi Čorji presented the history of mankind. He located people in a third, lower world, called *samsara*. To this world belong not only all visible beings, but also the spirits: earthly, those of water and those of heaven.

The depiction of man and his origin in Guoshi Čorji is deeply religious. He adheres to Buddhist teaching, according to which people comprise the final link in the chain which unites higher creatures with lower ones: through soul they must elevate themselves to the upper abstract world, and through flesh, they are attached to the material *samsara*. Despite uninterrupted temptation, man acts freely, awaiting retribution for his deeds. For him the path is open to rebirth among people as well as in the higher or lower ranks of creatures. The law of karma inescapably guides all this.

The fruit of deeds is the inexorable judging of man. Of all the lower beings only man may attain the rank of Buddha. He, subject to the power of fate, according to its will, is rich or poor, clever or foolhardy, happy or ill-fated. As for the history of people, it is likewise subject to the over-all law of karma. By the force of this law a spiritual beginning, descending from the higher regions to the lower, acting on various creatures and being divided up among them, enlivens those living in the material world.

Like all Buddhist writers, Guoshi Čorji placed at the root of his history of how people appeared, a well-known Buddhist legend which reflects the primitive ideas of the ancient Hindus about the prehistoric period of human history. According to this legend, one *tengri* of the first *dhyāna* (Skt. *dhyāna*: the abode of a *tengri*) selected the abode of people for the location of his rebirth. His descendants gradually increased and finally filled seventeen kingdoms of visible, four regions of invisible and twenty regions in the world of desire. They made up the six types of beings, dispersed in the three worlds. At this time the men of Jambhudvipa (the world) multiplied through the resettlement of souls, lived an incalculable number of years, were nourished by a pure viand *samādhi* (*dhyāna*); they did not walk, but moved through the air with the aid of marvelous forces, emitting light from their own bodies. In those times some unrestrained beings

[196]

tasted the so-called essence of nectar which was white in color and tasty, like earthly honey. Others also acted after their example. Hence people were deprived of the ability to emit light from their bodies, and darkness set in. As a consequence of the deeds of all creatures, the sun and moon appeared in the heavens, and illumined the four continents of the world. After the disappearance of the primeval food—the viand *samādhi*—people were nourished on various products which appeared one after another according to their requirements. And finally there disappeared the last one which grew wild, millet (*salu*), since some foolhardy persons schemed to collect a sufficient quantity to be stored for the next day.

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

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

Guoshi Čorji adheres to the traditional scheme of three Buddhist monarchies, firmly asserted in Mongolian historical writing from the time of the *Čayan teüke*. After the history of the early Indian kings, he goes over to the history of doctrine, and of the rulers of Tibet and Mongolia.

Guoshi Čorji regards the history of Mongolia as an inseparable part of the history of the Buddhist world. After hPhags-pa lama he is one of the first amongst Mongolian historians who makes an attempt to figure out the date of Chinggis Khan's birth according to Buddhist time-reckoning. He writes that Chinggis Khan was born 3,253 years after the nirvana of Buddha as a result of his accumulation of good deeds during all his prior rebirths (entry 5, fol. 69-b/70-a). This date also serves Guoshi Čorji to mark the onset of Mongolian history. It is characteristic that unlike [197]

some much later authors he does not link the beginning of Buddhism with the name of Chinggis Khan. He merely compares Chinggis with a Chakravartin king. In his opinion, the policy of the Two Principles of power takes its beginning from the time of Ögedei Khan (entry 5, fol. 70-a). As for Khubilai Khan, under him Buddhism merely experienced its further spread in the Mongolian empire. As was stated above, Guoshi Čorji brings the history of the Mongolian khans right down to his own time. Having finished an exposition of Mongolian history, he observes that after Toyon Temür lost power as Khan in China, religion went into decline and thus the names of subsequent khans are not imprinted in documents (entry 5, fol. 70-b). It must be stated that history plays a subordinate role in Guoshi Čorji's work, his chief attention being devoted to popularizing the basic tenets of Buddhism. It is no accident that the third part of his work is, as the author himself says, an abbreviated translation of "everything needful" in the teaching of Buddhism (entry 5, fol. 93-a/93-b). He here also acquaints readers with all the elementary/basic Buddhist ethical-moral standards which every believing Buddhist should know.

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

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

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

[198]

Tibetologists hold differing opinions as to which variety of literary creation one should assign the *Manigambum* and other apocryphal works similar to it: to historical literature or to works of *belles-lettres*. Some scholars have regarded these works as valuable monuments of Tibetan historical literature. Andrei I. Vostrikov was not in agreement with this; he thought that as historical sources they had no value and could not be related to historical works, although many of them possess consider-

able literary merit (entry 146, pp. 25, 45). In our view, Vostrikov is only partly right. Actually, Tibetan apocryphal works contain very few reliable data; religious-legendary and didactic material predominate in them. They cannot be related to that time to which they are often erroneously assigned. By their content these works represent a compilation of works of much later authors, who had striven to imbue their compositions with the authority of works by famed figures in Tibetan antiquity.

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

[199]

historiographers. In the eyes of church sources, an apocryphal work was the most suitable type of historical work, destined to glorify early figures of religion and dharmarajas.

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

What has been said helps one to understand why of all the Tibetan historical works one of the first to be translated into Mongolian was the *Manigambum*. From

the colophon which accompanies Guoshi Čorji's translation, it is evident that in full agreement with Tibetan tradition he actually regarded this composition as the fruit of King Srong-btsan-gambo himself²⁰. He apparently believed that the historiographic activity of this king, the founder of state and religion in Tibet, held for the rulers of Mongolia an especially

[200]

important significance as they set forth on the path of increased patronage of Lamaism in their dominions and in the country as a whole. Guoshi Čorji writes straightforwardly that he translated the *Manigambum* especially to advance the cause of disseminating religion in Mongolia (entry 116, p. 293), and as the *bičin*-year (Earth-Ape year) indicated in the colophon as the date of translation, corresponds to 1584, one concludes that he also finished his work immediately after Altan Khan and the other Mongolian rulers adopted Lamaism.

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

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

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

Speaking of the history of Tibet, Guoshi Čorji firmly adheres to early Buddhist historical traditions, according to which the Tibetans at the behest of Aryabala originated from apes in the shape of ascetic-*toyins* and *rakshisas*

[201]

in the shape of young women. Respecting the origin of the Tibetan kings he, following all those Tibetan traditions, asserts that the first king of Tibet, Nya-khri-btsam-

²⁰ Cf. Guoshi Čorji's colophon in the hand-written Mongolian translation of the *Manigambum* in the Mongolian stacks of the National Library in Ulaanbaatar. This colophon has been published in Ts. Damdinsüren's reader (entry 18, pp. 288-295).

po, belonged to the Sakya clan of early Indian kings. Furthermore, Guoshi Čorji briefly dwells on the history of king Srong-btsan-gam-po whom, as we stated earlier, he considers the author of the *Manigambum*, exalts him in every way, calling him a great Chakravartin king who illumined the profound darkness by the holy words of dharma.

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

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

[202]

Guoshi Čorji gives an analogous overall scheme for Mongolian history in the colophon of his translation of another Buddhist composition: the *Śatasahasrika-prajñā-paramita* (in Mongolian the *Bilig-ün činadu kijaγar-a kürügen jayun mingγan toγa-tu*) (entry 9) in twelve volumes²¹. There the author likewise extolled Chinggis Khan

²¹ *Supra* it was stated that the translation of this work was later included in the Mongolian *Kanjur*, the editors of which were so faithful to the translation of their famous predecessor that they even left his colophon with no changes at all, merely adding some information about their own editorial work and about Guoshi Čorji himself. In our view, closest of all to that original variant of Guoshi Čorji's colophon is the one in the incomplete hand-written *Kanjur* (pp. 393-396), which does not indicate the translator's name nor the dates of translation. But the main part of this colophon agrees with the first part of the colophon from the xylograph edition of the *Kanjur*, which we link by its content to the output of Guoshi Čorji. Guoshi Čorji himself for some reason did not mention anything in the colophon about himself nor about the translator, but the editors of his translation of the *Kanjur* spoke quite definitely about this.

as a reincarnation of Qormuzda in the great northern country (Mongolia), who had disseminated the holy religion everywhere, having subjugated all the wild-mannered creatures to his mighty power. A weakening of the position of religion under the "impious khans" Guoshi Čorji compared to the darkness of night. But Altan Khan, who reawakened religion in Mongolia, he calls a dharmaraja. It is quite evident from Guoshi Čorji's work that he was devoted body and soul to the Buddhist religion, and with faith and truth served the khan's power, rendering support to its expansion. For this reason all his colophons are replete with every kind of praise for Buddhist teaching.

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

[202]

Sakya Dondub

The translator, Sakya Dondub, played an important role in popularizing Tibetan religious-historical literature in the initial period of Lamaism's spread among the Mongols. There is little information preserved about him. According to some data he himself communicated he was a Tibetan by birth from the Sakya monastery, but grew up in Mongolia, in the Ordos. He studied many languages, including Mongolian. He was a contemporary of the noted Bošoytu-jinong of the Ordos (1565-1624) and quickly became renowned as a translator. He translated into Mongolian two very important Tibetan historical

[203]

compositions: *Genealogy Of The Kings, Called The Clear Mirror* (in Tib. *Rgyal rabs čhos 'byuñ gsal ba'i me loñ*) (entry 35)²² and the *Badma-yaḍang* (Mong. *Badma-yaṭang sudur*); its complete Mongolian name is the *Badma sambu-a baysi-yin delgerenggüi jokiyaṣan törül-ün cadiṣ*) (entry 2). Bearing in mind that in the colophon of the *Clear Mirror* Sakya Dondub calls Bošoytu jinong and his wife Jünggin-qatun the ones who commissioned the translation of this work, listing all

²² This work has several different names. Henceforth we shall call it *The Clear Mirror*. In Mongolian the translator calls it: *Čidayči-yin šasin sayitur delgeregsen yosun-i, činar buyan-tan qoyar törü-yi yabuyluṣan inu, čing ünen-iyer uqayulqui gegën toli, čindamani metü ene čadiṣ-un tujuji*.

his titles (*Bošoytu nom-un kürdün orčiyluyçi čakravard jinon sečen, bodisung töröl-tü jüנגgin qatun*), which Maidari qutuytu conferred on them in 1614, it is possible to assume that the translation in question was completed by him no earlier than 1614 and no later than 1624, the year Bošoytu jinong died (entry 233, p. 34).

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

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

[204]

of factual data cited by Sodnom-Jaltsan (entries 58, p. 9; 91, pp. vii-x).

To Kuznetsov's reasons must be added some information from the biography of Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan in the *[Holy] Genealogy [of the Deacons] of the Sakya monastery* (entry 19, fol. 161-a/180-a) (as to this work, cf. entry 134, pp. 67, 74). By the way, for some reason up to now none of the researchers have employed this most valuable biography of Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan as they should in studying his work.²³ Moreover it is clear from it that the author of the *Clear Mirror* was one of the most learned lamas among the Sakya deacons, which in this sense can place him on a level with the famed Gunga-Jaltsan. The biography states that Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan was a King of Doctrine, having no equal among the sages in the majority of lands of Jambhudvipa: India, Nepal, Kashmir, Gu-ge, the three regions of Tibet (Na, Ri, Kor), China, Mongolia and others (entry 19, fol. 172-a).

²³ As the author of the *[Holy] Genealogy [of the Deacons] of the Sakya Monastery* writes, he composed the biography of Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan on the basis of primary sources, including biographies (*namtars*) compiled by his close associates, Jantsub-zemo, Jantsub-Jaltsan and Baldan Chültem.

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

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

[205]

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

Rather detailed information about the initiator of the Mongolian translation of the *Clear Mirror* can be found in the chronicle of Sayang Sečen. We know from it that Bošoytu jinong was one of the greatest political figures of Mongolia in the second half of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century. He, along with Altan Khan, Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji and other figures, earnestly striving to strengthen the khan's power in Mongolia with the aid of the new religion, took active part in all possible measures to disseminate Buddhism on the Mongolian steppes. For services rendered he received in 1578 from the Third Dalai Lama the title of Chakravard sečen jinong (entry 44, p. 254; Urga MS 77v14), and from Maidari Qutuytu in 1614 the title of *Altan kürdün ergigülegči Čakravard sečen jinong qayan* (entry 44, p. 287; Urga MS 86v02), which means Wise jinong-Chakravartin-king Who Turns the Golden Wheel. Bošoytu jinong found himself on friendly terms with Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji. His father Buyan Bayatur qung-tayiji was a companion of Qutuytai Sečen who had elevated him to the rank of *jinong*, when he was at most 13 years of age (in 1576) (entry 44, p. 240; Urga MS 74r11). From that time on Bošoytu Jinong

was the closest companion of the famed qung-tayiji. It is remarkable that he, like Qutuytai Sečen, displayed interest in history, although he undertook no historical work himself. However, Bošoytu Jinong was involved in historiographic activity on the Mongols of his time, having organized a translation of the *Clear Mirror* (the date of the Mongolian translation is not indicated in the colophon).

Bošoytu Jinong's choice was quite successful, inasmuch as the *Clear Mirror* by Sakya Sodnom-Jaltsan is

[206]

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

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

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

Sakya Dondub translated the *Badma-yadang*, a Tibetan historical work, at the command of a certain well-known Mongolian figure, Erdeni Mamys-qulači bayatur tayiji²⁴. To judge from the fact that in the colophon the client, Mamys-qulači, bears the rank which he received from Maidari-qutrytu in the Blue Tiger Year (1614) (entry 44, p. 287), and that Dondub, who mentions in the colophon the appearance of the fourth reincarnation of the Dalai Lama in the clan of a Mongolian khan, does not report his death in the Red Dragon Year (1616), one may with full trust in its likelihood

²⁴ This is stated in the colophon of the Mongolian translation of the *Badma-yadang* (entries 2, fol. 292-b; cf. 232, pp. 31-32; 233, pp. 40-44).

[207]

presume that the translator executed his work between 1614 and 1616.

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

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

Behind these admonitions, in our view, stand anonymous authors with their entirely earthly and practical interests. Through the lips of their heroes they set forth their own views on some important world problems of their time, held in strict conformity with the interests of the Buddhist religion and church. This was the most effective method employed by Tibetan religious writers to influence the minds of readers. This or that exhortation or admonition sounded more forceful when it was set forth

[208]

from the mouth of Padmasambhava, and not in the name of the little-known author. To attain their main aim the real authors sacrificed their own names, but in return their works earned lasting fame as the allegedly true creations of religious figures and enjoyed wide renown among the believing masses. For us the legacies of Padmasambhava in the *Badma-yadang* afford particular interest since they display some of the Tibetan religious ethical-juridical views, along with the law of Khri-srong-bde-btsan which had considerable influence on Mongolian historical-political thought.

An example quite characteristic in this sense is the admonition of Padmasambhava to the Tibetan kings, ministers and the so-called commoners. Padmasambhava's lips set forth the basic content of one of the two principles of power, about which we have spoken *supra*—the principle of secular power.

In accord with these admonitions, the Tibetan kings in governmental affairs were

to adhere to the following rules:

- not to behave like common folk;
- not to be unyielding in matters requiring tolerance;
- to have considerate officials under them and to direct them to attain their goals;
- not to fall under the sway of the soft speech of associates who are able to inflict harm on the state;
- to be able to listen to stern words without displaying anger; not to be overly generous in bestowing kindnesses and in awards to officials and subjects, but strictly consider what they merit;
- to be cautious that mediocre and mercenary officials do not destroy the state, because if this occurs, then it brings about loss of the khan's power;
- to maintain the Three Jewels at the apex of regard, and so forth.

Padmasambhava ordered the Tibetan officials

- to be true to their king in body, word and heart,
- to display caution,
- to act as the king ordered,
- to concern themselves with the welfare of the whole state;
- to pursue a policy of dharma;
- to look to the future and follow the past;
- to think things over well and then not regret what was done. He who behaves in accord with dharma and respects the Three Jewels is a servant of the doctrine; he who is wise, encourages agreement and unfailingly investigates good and bad things, is a sagacious councillor;
- he who can fearlessly and with artful means suppress enemies, is

[209]

a *bayatur*-official. Whether royal authority is good or bad, depends on the activity of the official; one needs to strengthen a great state, displaying perspicacity, and other applications of Buddhist morality.

From what has been stated it is clear what a necessary book the *Badma-ṣadang* was for the ruling circles of Mongolia, who had just embarked on propagation of a new faith. As to what the immediate reaction of Mongolian ruling circles was to their first acquaintance with the *Badma-ṣadang*, there is an extensive colophon written by Dondub himself which speaks to this; it both illustrates his historical judgments and the new historical views of the Mongols of that time. That is why the colophon is such an important source for judging the ideology of Mongolian society at the beginning of the 17th century. From the initial lines of prayer in the colophon it is clear that its author nourished an unshakeable faith in the almighty force of Buddhist teaching, which the Grand Teacher Padmasambhava expounded amongst the "innumerable creatures" who had turned to the Buddhist faith. For Dondub, Padmasambhava was a higher holy being, fulfilling the desires of people of all times and all lands of the world.

Dondub says that he wants to relate how "the precious religion" came to Mongolia. But he begins the story with a brief exposition of the history of the appearance and expansion of Buddhism in India and Tibet, essentially summing up everything

which is said about this subject in the work itself. He treats the religion of Shakyamuni like a world religion. Buddha Shakyamuni was born when the age of sentience had only one hundred years left; and it was he who placed the whole world on the true path by means of the two forms of dharma: sutras and dharanis. The onset of Buddhist expansion among the Mongols Dondub attributes to the time of Khubilai Setsen Khan and hPhags-pa lama. From that time over the course of more than ten generations, according to his words, this religion flourished in Mongolia. But under Hulayu Khan, the learned translator Choidji Odser, who had brought into being the translation of a book on the prajnaparamita, sutra and dharani, was invited as a mentor. The translator ascertains with regret that Toyon Temür unworthily lost his royal power, having abandoned it to Chinese hands. From this time on religion fell into decline, and the Mongols over the course of many generations led a sinful

[210]

life. And only Altan Khan from the Borjigid clan, the grandson of Batu-möngke, Dayan Khan, restored the holy religion and the state, invited the Dalai Lama to Mongolia and regularized relations with China. The Dalai Lama who was this khan's object of worship not only "illuminated the dark region of Mongolia by the light of holy teaching", but he himself after his death was reborn into the clan of a Mongolian khan.

To conclude, Dondub desired all people at all times to act in accord with the Precious Doctrine (Buddhism) and thereby ultimately to attain the status of a Buddha, so that there would be timely precipitation and grain would grow according to people's needs, and there would be no illnesses, so that the Mongolian state might peacefully flourish.

The *Altan Tobči* Anonymous

The *Altan Tobči Anonymous* is something of an oddity among the historical works of the period under review; its full title is *Qad-un ündüsün-ü quriyangyui altan tobči neretü sudur* [A Brief Genealogy Of The Khans, Called The *Altan Tobči* or The Golden Summary] (entry 11).²⁵

To establish the exact date when this work was written is difficult, but one may consider acceptable the dating proposed by some scholars on the basis of studying the text. In their opinion, the basic text of the *Altan Tobči Anonymous* can be established no earlier than 1604, since in all copies the propounding of events concludes by mentioning the ascension of Ligdan to the throne in the Dragon Year (1604). The composition says nothing about the religious merits of Ligdan Khan, nor about the downfall of his khanate. Louis Ligeti and L. S. Puchkovskii, bearing in mind that

²⁵ As to the various copies of this work, cf. entries 150, pp. 53-59; and 188, pp. 19-24. The *Altan Tobči* has long drawn the attention of scholars. It was first translated into Russian by Galsang Gomboyev (entry 51). It has also been translated into Japanese and English.

the text of the monument mentions the name of the Ming Emperor T'ien-ch'i (1621-1627) expressed the opinion that the *Altan Tobč'i* was written no earlier than the 1720s (entries 253, pp. 57-61; 188, p. 19). Charles Bawden regards the list of Ming emperors included in the monument text as an interpolation which upsets the normal course of exposition (entry 72, p. 156, note 12). Bawden, a translator of the *Altan Tobč'i*, dates the time the basic text of the work appeared back to the period of Ligdan's rule, i.e., to the period between 1604 and 1634 (entry 72, p. 13). It must be remembered that when dating this work, we have to keep in mind only the basic text.

[211]

Scholars have already uncovered several interpolations which clearly upset the normal course of exposition. The very latest of these is a report about Ligdan Khan's grandson, Burni, born in 1651 (entries 72, p. 14; 233, pp. 75-76).

Heissig, in support of the dating advanced by Bawden, at the same time considered that the *Altan Tobč'i Anonymous* was a shortened version of Lubsangdanjin's *Altan Tobč'i*, compiled, as Bawden thinks, about 1655²⁶ (entry 233, p. 75).

The *Altan Tobč'i Anonymous* is an original work of Mongolian historical writing written during the period in question. Its appearance testifies to the fact that after the acceptance of Lamaism Mongolian historiographic activity did not come down to a mere imitation of Buddhist historical literature, or more exactly, of Tibetan ecclesiastical historiography. It must be remembered that Lamaism upon its penetration into Mongolia clashed with a very complex Mongolian historiographic tradition. This circumstance served as a barrier on the road to the unrestricted dominance of ecclesiastical historiography in Mongolia. The formation of Mongolian ecclesiastical historiography is connected to a much later period, to the 18th-19th centuries, but even then the Mongolian historiographic tradition did not fully and unreservedly yield its place to a new type of historical literature.

A remarkable phenomenon in the history of development of Mongolian historical knowledge in the time being described is the fact that Mongolian interest in their own history not only did not wane, but on the contrary to a certain degree even grew. The *Altan Tobč'i* in particular speaks about this. Although it overtly displays a Buddhist world-view (more will be said about that *infra*), it is to a far greater degree a collection of the most varied information about the history of the Mongols with the addition of tales about some historical events dealing with the years when the anonymous author of this work was alive.

For an historiographic analysis it would be most suitable to divide the *Altan Tobč'i* text into two parts, although the work itself is neither divided into chapters

²⁶ Bayar, in his interesting paper published in 1985, on the basis of analyzing the text of the *Altan Tobč'i* by way of collating it with the text of Lubsangdanjin's *Altan Tobč'i*, arrived at the conclusion that the anonymous *Altan Tobč'i* was composed between 1675 and 1725, and that it is an abbreviated version of Lubsangdanjin's book. See Bayar, *Altan Tobč'i kiji-y-a jokiyaγday-san bui?* [When was the brief *Altan Tobč'i* written?], in *Öbör Mongγol-un baγsi-yin yeke surγayuli-yin sedkül*, 1985, no. 1, pp. 7-15.

nor parts. The first part includes within it a history of the Mongols from earliest times to the fall of the Yüan empire, and the second,

[212]

a history of the post-Yüan period down to the ascension of Ligdan to the throne as khan. The most characteristic peculiarity of the first part is the fact that it is written on the basis of ancient Mongolian traditional tales, legends and all kinds of stories, the majority of which go back to the 13th century, i.e., to the time when the *Secret History* appeared. Those tales and traditional stories which go back to the 13th century include

1. The genealogy of the ancestors of Chinggis Khan from Börte Chino to Dowa Soqor and Dobun-Mergen (pp. 4-7);
2. Alan-goa's marriage to Dobun-Mergen (p. 7);
3. The dispute among the five sons of Alan-Goa (p. 8);
4. Bodonchar and his descendants down to Yisügei (pp. 9-10);
5. How Yisügei took Hö'elün to wife (p. 11);
6. The birth of Temüjin and the death of Yisügei (pp. 12-13);
7. The slaying of Begter (pp. 14-15);
8. Temüjin's capture by the Taichi'ud and his flight with the help of Sorgon Shira (pp. 15-18);
9. The return of his horses from the Taichi'ud with the help of Bogorchu (pp. 18-19);
10. The meeting of Temüjin and Börte (pp. 19-21);
11. The flight of Qasar and the order of Chinggis Khan (pp. 21-23);
12. The quarrel with the Taichi'ud, at which time Belgütei received a wound (pp. 23-24);
13. The decamping of Oran Chingküi and the pursuit of him by Chinggis and Qasar (p. 26);
14. Chinggis Khan's campaign against the Jürchen (p. 27);
15. Chinggis Khan's campaign against the Koreans (pp. 27-32);
16. Argasun quurči (pp. 32-34);
17. Chinggis Khan's campaign against Sidurgu Khan and the death of Chinggis (pp. 34-49). [These page numbers refer to Bawden's work (entry 72), pp. 35-61]

The first nine events of those enumerated here are strongly reminiscent in their content of corresponding passages in the *Secret History*. It is of course impossible to say that they completely agree in their texts with the *Secret History*, and for this reason Bawden definitely asserts that the author of the *Altan tobči Anonymous* did not use the *Secret History* (entry 72, p. 16). Bawden explains the cases of agreement of content in both works by the fact that both of them are based on one and the same early Mongolian tradition (*ibid.*). But it seems to us that the link of the *Altan Tobči* with the first-born child of Mongolian historiography is rather closer. It is solely a question of whether this link is direct or indirect, and whether it was executed at first-hand or through the medium of oral retelling of the *Secret History's* contents.

The fact that the content of the latter

[213]

to a greater or lesser degree is reflected in Mongolian chronicles of the 17th-18th centuries bears witness to the fact that this work was preserved by the Mongols not only in written form, but also orally, in the popular memory, in the repertoire of the tellers of tales. On the strength of this it appears quite possible that the *Altan Tobči Anonymous* was compiled on the basis of various sources, including the oral traditions of the *Secret History*. As distinct from the *Altan Tobči Anonymous*, the work by the same name of Lubsangdanjin as we shall see *infra*, is based on the written version.

In the *Altan Tobči* not all the data referring to early Mongolian history remind one of the *Secret History*. Of the seventeen events going back to the 13th century mentioned above, items 10 through 17 actually differ substantially from the *Secret History* paragraphs which correspond to them, or are quite absent in the latter. Much of that which is related in these passages noted from the *Altan Tobči* permit one rather clearly to imagine how early traditionary tales and legends were transmitted from one generation to another, growing by layers and even acquiring a new vocabulary. As an example we cite the speech about Chinggis Khan just before his death, the speech by Külüketei bagatur, addressed to the ailing Chinggis Khan, and also his address to the deceased Chinggis, when the cart with his body was mired in the mud (entry 72, pp. 43-48, 141-145). In these speeches and addresses one may already encounter Buddhist expressions and concepts.

The second part of the *Altan Tobči* text testifies that the Mongols not only carefully guarded the ancient traditions, but even created new traditional tales and legends, infused with old examples, and even simply imitating them. Similar creativity continued in later times as well. This portion of the work, like the first, also embodies traces of traditionary tales, and only some of its passages deliver any more or less up-to-date and reliable historical facts.

From what has been said it follows that Mongolian historical literature at the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century, as before, was not able to draw a strict distinction between the data of legends and genuine history; history at that time was still not liberated from the methods of literary-folkloric creativity.

[214]

The *Altan Tobči* cites some improbable narrative information about persons, whose existence in history is beyond doubt. At the same time the actual historical events are expounded in such a way that their factual accuracy seems sacrificed to the imagination of the storyteller, overflowing with vivid formal details, characteristic of oral creativity. Thus, when describing Toyon-taishi of the Oirats occupying the khan's throne, an event which actually took place in history, the author of the chronicle informs us that Toyon-taishi, having insulted the spirit of Chinggis Khan, was slain by an arrow from Chinggis's quiver, kept in the Eight Yurts (entry 41).

Likewise, it is common historical knowledge that the Ming emperor Ying-tsung in the *Altan Tobči* erroneously called Jingtai (Chingtai) was captured by the Oirat Esen Tayiji. The author of the *Altan Tobči* also communicates this fact, but he ex-

pounds it within the spirit of a fantastic tale, according to which it proved impossible to cut the body of the emperor with a sword. The sword with which they were to use to slay him allegedly shattered into pieces; when the emperor was bound and cast into water, his body did not sink, but floated on the surface.

Convinced that it was impossible to kill the emperor, the Mongols decided to hold him in captivity. However, his stay among the Mongols drew a host of disasters down on them: famine, illnesses, loss of cattle and so on. During this period the captured emperor wrote a note and secreted it in the wool of a sheep which the Mongols sold to the Chinese. The Chinese having learned the fate of their emperor, said to the Mongols: "They say that you are compelling our king to work for you. This is not good for you. Release him to us!" The Mongols returned the emperor, receiving in return great riches from the Chinese (entry 41, pp. 89-90).

Many pages of the *Altan Tobči* vividly recreate the overall picture and spirit of its time, a time when Mongolia suffered from disintegration and internecine strife. Among these events may be mentioned:

1. The tales of Elbeg Khan who killed his own son, so as to marry his daughter-in-law (pp. 63-65);

2. The one about Adai Khan's campaign against the Oirats, during which time a duel took place between Sigüsütei-bayatur-wang of the Mongols and Güyilinči-bayatur of the Oirats (pp. 66-67);

3. The one about the fight of Taisun Khan with the Oirats;

4. The treachery of Agbarchin-jinong and his going over to the Oirat side (pp. 71-75, 77-78);

[215]

5. The one about Toyon-Tayiji of the Oirats and his claims to the throne (p. 85);

6. The one about Esen-Tayiji and his campaign against China, which culminated in a defeat of the Chinese army and in taking the emperor prisoner (pp. 86-90);

7. and the story of Muguligai-wang (pp. 91-92), and so on.

The main subjects of these tales are the unending strife between separate groups of Mongolian khans, tayijis and jinongs, as well as the struggle between the eastern and western parts of Mongolia. In these, as we see, are expressed the most important events of Mongolian history in the period of internecine wars. The chief historical-political idea which permeates the tales mentioned is the striving to justify the members of the Golden Clan, the direct descendants of Chinggis khan, who had fought to keep the royal throne in their hands against the claims of the separatist lords.

The portion of the *Altan Tobči* under review strictly observes the chronological principle of narration. At the base of this chronology lies the traditional Mongolian system of calculating years according to the twelve-year animal cycle. Guided by this, the author cites, although with errors, the complete chronology of rule of all the Mongolian khans in the 15th and 16th centuries. The influence of the Tibeto-Chinese system of the sixty-year animal cycle had not yet been adopted; this took place somewhat later. Almost all the persons figuring in this part of the *Altan Tobči* are actual historical figures. In this regard it is especially interesting that the geneal-

ogy of the Mongolian khans is grounded on the data of the genealogical records of the khans and tayijis.

The historicity of the events set forth in the portion of the *Altan Tobči* being reviewed is notably reinforced when the narrative draws nigh to the years when the author lived. By way of example one may point to the biographical data on Batumöngke Dayan Khan, Bodi-Alag, Daraisun Khan, as well as Altan Khan, Tümen-jasaytu Khan, Buyan Sečen Khan and Ligdan Khan. The author displays special interest in Altan Khan, dwelling in this connection on the tradition of his predecessors. In the *Altan Tobči* there is no glimmer of the cult of Ligdan Khan, so characteristic of much later chronicles.

[216]

Here the author speaks of Altan Khan as a ruler who restored the early tradition of governing the state and the religion of Mongolia. According to the *Altan Tobči*, Altan Khan completed his campaigns against the Oirats with the aim of revenging himself for Elbeg Khan, Adai Khan, Taisun Khan, as well as for Aybarji-jinong, who was victim of a plot (entry 41, p. 123). Further on it reports that Altan Khan executed an attack on China, destroying fortresses and towns, which compelled the Ming emperor out of fright to lay tribute before him and to award him the title of *Shun-i wang* (entry 41, entry 124). The story then goes on to narrate genuine events concerning Mongol-Chinese historical relations during 1550-1571. We shall return to this topic *infra*.

The anonymous author of the *Altan Tobči* sees a particular service to history in Altan Khan's disseminating Lamaism within Mongolia. According to the anonymous author, Altan Khan invited the Dalai Lama Sodnam Jamtso from Tibet, and other visible religious figures "with the goal of restoring the by-gone state management and religion curtailed under Toyon Temür Khan" (entry 41, p. 21). He compares the actions of this khan with the activity of Khubilai Khan.

The *Altan Tobči* is a product of its epoch and bears a distinct image of Buddhist influence. This shows up most strikingly of all at the onset of the author's narrative. Adhering to the well-known scheme of the three Buddhist monarchies, he prefaces the beginning of his history with a genealogy of early Indian and Tibetan kings, beginning with Mahāsammata, and then, with the aid of Buddhist myth, links the origins of Tibetan kings with the clan of Mahāsammata, and derives the Mongolian khans from the Tibetan kings. Thanks to this, the genealogical line of the Mongolian khans is taken back to the clan of Mahāsammata through the intermediation of the kings of the homeland of Lamaism. The work also makes use of the religious myth that Börte Chino, the legendary progenitor of the Mongolian khans, was the younger son of the Tibetan king Dalai-Subin Altan Sandalitu Khan who, having quarreled with his brothers, set out across the "sea," and arrived in Mongolia where he married Goa-Maral, thereby beginning the Mongolian clan (entry 41, p. 4). Having in this way finished the prehistory of Mongolia, the author proceeds

[217]

to a genealogy of the ancestors of Chinggis Khan, describing them in agreement with the early Mongolian historical tradition (entry 41, pp. 4-5).

Let us give one more example. The author of the *Altan Tobči*, when setting forth the events of the 12th-13th centuries, resorted to the aid of Buddhism to explain them. He wrote that Chinggis Khan was born with a fate predestined from Heaven on High (*Tengri*), 3250 years after the nirvana of Buddha and at the prophecy of the latter; he was to suppress the twelve evil khans who had brought suffering to living creatures. Having received tribute and duty from the People of the Five Colors and the Four Foreign Lands, from the people of the 361 tribes and the 720 languages of Jambhudvipa, and proffering them peace and tranquility, he became famed as the Chakravartin-king (entry 41, p. 21). It is clear that this is an effort of the *Altan Tobči*'s author to found a Chinggis Khan cult in the eyes of believers from the position of a new religion. His pen converts Chinggis Khan, "born with a fate preordained from Heaven," into a typical Buddhist king of the doctrine.

The *Altan Tobči* is an original historical composition serving as a unique kind of footbridge linking early Mongolian historical traditions with the subsequent history of Mongolian historiography. The *Altan Tobči* is the earliest secular Mongolian chronicle which has come down to us if we do not include the *Čayan teüke*.

Historical-Political Ideas in the Mongolian *Kanjur* Colophons

It has already been stated above that the translation of the *Kanjur* into Mongolian, begun as early as the Yüan empire, was completed under Ligdan Khan, and that this translation lay at the base of the woodblock *Kanjur* edition of 1718-1720. We also mentioned the incomplete hand-written *Kanjur* kept in the National Library in Ulaanbaatar. In both instances we are interested solely in the colophons written by the Mongolian translators of this work. Some of the colophons contain valuable historical information permitting one to judge the historical-political views of the Mongols in the years when Ligdan Khan ruled.

Keeping in mind the xylographic edition of the *Kanjur*, one must point to one of its important peculiarities. Although it was brought into existence under the Manchu Emperor

[218]

Hsüan Yeh (K'ang-hsi), who had striven to promote himself amongst the Mongols as a defender of their faith, the initial Mongolian translation, made under Ligdan Khan, actually did not undergo any special changes. The Mongolian editors of the xylographic edition remained faithful to the translations of their predecessors. Even in the preface to the Mongolian edition, the authorship of which is ascribed to that same Hsüan Yeh, they not only mention the Mongolian translation, executed under Ligdan Khan (entry 251, p. 333), but also say that the woodblock edition in question was executed on the basis of an old translation, checked against the text of the Tibetan original at the time when it was definitively edited (entry 251, p. 337). Thus does it explain that it fell to the Manchu Emperor, despite his hostile attitude to the memory of Ligdan, to share with him the merit of publishing the *Kanjur*. As for the hand-written *Kanjur*, it contains colophons which on the whole are missing from the

printed edition or actually differ from the latter.

Let us cite a few examples. In the printed *Kanjur*, the sutra called *Qutuγtu bilig-ün činadu kürügšen nayiman mingγatu* (Skt. *Ārya-aṣṭāśahasrikā-prajñapāramitā*) is only furnished with a brief colophon by the Tibetan translators (*ibid.*, pp. 183, 184, 766), whereas in the hand-written copy there is an interesting Mongolian colophon from which we learn that this sutra was translated by Altan-Gerel-ubashi at the order of Danjin-qung-tayiji and his spouse Čayan Dara-qatun (entry 9, section *yum*, vol. *kha*, fol. 108-109). The Mongolian translation of the sutra called *Qutuγtu jayun üyiletü* (Skt. *Karmaśataka*) contains a colophon in the hand-written *Kanjur* (entry 9, section *eldeb*, vol. *ha*, fol. 149-150), which differs from the colophon in the printed one (entry 251, No. 1102). It is clear from the text of the former colophon that the sutra in question was translated by that same Altan-gerel-ubashi, whereas the colophon of the printed *Kanjur* contains quite different information. The Mongolian translations of certain sutras in the hand-written *Kanjur* are provided with colophons which do not exist in the corresponding sections of the printed *Kanjur* (entry 251, No. 839; entry 9, section *Olan sudur*, vol. *da*, fol. 145-b, section *eldeb*, vol. *sa*, fol. 152-a/153-b).

One could multiply the number of such instances, but those cited will suffice to prove the

[219]

significance and the immense value of the colophons of the hand-written *Kanjur*, which supplement the information contained in the printed text. It is quite beyond doubt that the hand-written *Kanjur* to a considerable degree has preserved old colophons from the time of Ligdan Khan. In this respect a study of the colophons of the Leningrad hand-written *Kanjur* would have great scientific interest. Heissig, who studied only five volumes from the *dulwa* section, found five Mongolian colophons which were not in the printed *Kanjur*.

The Mongolian colophons of both the printed and the hand-written *Kanjurs*, may fully be regarded as historical material preserved from the times of Ligdan Khan. It is characteristic that nowhere in these colophons is there mentioned the Manchu Emperor, the instigator of the xylographic edition. This creates the impression that in this case the Mongolian editors of the edition, undertaken at the initiative of Hsüan Yeh, were more objective than those who worked on executing the Mongolian *Kanjur* translation under Ligdan Khan. Verily, Ligdan Khan's translators, as already observed *supra*, took no little effort to alter the colophons of some translations dating to the time of Altan Khan, to extol their patron and themselves.

What kind of historical-political ideas are expressed in the colophons? First of all the Ligdan Khan translators, as well as their predecessors of the Altan Khan period, were by tradition interested exclusively in matters of the history of religion and of the Mongolian state. The difference lies merely in the fact that in this case as opposed to the past, the chief historical figure, who is spoken of with such reverence in almost all the colophons, is Ligdan Qutuγtu Khan.

Let us take as an example the colophon of the Mongolian translation of the sutra called *Čoytu yeke mudr-a-yin dusul neretü yeke yogini-yin dandaris-nu qayan-u*

auṃ-a ejen (Skt. *rimahāmudrātilākam-nāma-mahāyoginītantrarājātipati*). It says:

Having reached its heyday in the Indian state, the religion of the Almighty Shakyamuni Buddha was likewise disseminated in our Mongolian state in ancient times. However in the course of time the holy religion considerably weakened. At that time when the chief thing in the religion which had been disseminated

[220]

came to be an object of worship, there appeared Ligdan Qutuytu Tai-yüan-Sečen khan, ruler of men, who possessed a holy wisdom and very profound knowledge, belonging to the ranks of Chakravartins, a reincarnation of the Almighty and Omniscient Tengri, satisfying all needs, who expanded religion by the might of his own true faith, a leader who vanquished by his might the alien enemies, who supported the state by the force of his magnanimity. [He], having encountered Sharaba-qutuytu, similar to Sun and Moon, born as the great-great-grandson of Sakya, so as to make no error in his relations, contemplating Maha-Yoga, so as to make no error in the *ubidas* [wonders], supported the Vajradhara [Holder of the Vajra], so as to make no error in the root of Doctrine, executed the dissemination of the most sacred religion like the sun, led all the state on the path of Vajrayāna, bringing happiness through his policy of peace and tranquility. For the sake of oppressing opponents by his might and for further expansion of the holy religion, having carefully considered with his profound wisdom, [he] ordered the *Kanjur* translated (cited according to entry 251, pp. 4-5).

Further on the colophon says that the sutra was translated by a person by the name of Kōke-od-zer. This is an obvious miscopying. Instead of *kōke* it should be the name *kun-dga'* (Mong. *Gunga*), a famous translator, the main editor of the Mongolian translation of the *Kanjur*, Kun-dga' Od-zer. This makes it clear that the colophon in question belongs to the pen of the chief editor. The content of the colophon permits one to judge the historical-political views of Kun-dga' Od-zer—one of the most prominent translators of Ligdan Khan's time—for whom the concepts of religion and khan's power were inseparable.

The author was convinced that a close collaboration with the khan, the representative of earthly power, the representative of spiritual power, assured the flourishing of both religion and state in Mongolia. Kun-dga' Od-zer briefly sets forth the traditional outline of the history of religion in the three countries: India, Tibet and Mongolia, but in this scheme the main place is devoted to contemporaneity, i.e., to the history of Ligdan Khan. The credit for the rebirth of religion in Mongolia Gunga-Odser (*Kun-dga' Od-zer*) assigns to Ligdan Khan alone, not devoting a single word to Altan Khan. The pen of the translator presents Ligdan as a typical Buddhist

[221]

dharmarāja. In his exposition, Buddhism totally serves the interests of the Mongolian khan.

It is remarkable that almost all the *Kanjur* translators who wrote special colophons for their translations, considered it their duty specially to mention the historical merits of Ligdan Khan towards religion and the Mongolian state.

In the Buddhist understanding a Chakravartin-king ought to be not only a great

defender of religion but also an all-powerful ruler of people, an up-to-date embodiment of the power and might of the Supreme Deva (Tengri, Qormuzda) on earth. For this reason it turned out that glorifying Ligdan as defender of religion and the chief initiator of the *Kanjur* translation, also obliged the Mongolian translators to extol him also as the decisive antagonist of the Manchus, an energetic fighter for restoration of the all-Mongolian khan's throne. Under the conditions of Manchu rule in Mongolia this naturally sounded a strange dissonance, but no less strange was the fact that the Mongolian editors of the *Kanjur* under Hsüan Yeh did not regard it as necessary to remove this "irrationality," and left the old colophons unchanged, thus keeping all their splendid titles for Ligdan Khan.

One may consider an unconditional merit of the Mongolian *Kanjur* editors and translators to be the fact that the name of Ligdan Khan, an active fighter for Mongolian independence, not only remained unforgotten but on the contrary was immortalized in a Buddhist monument, the *Kanjur*. For this reason it is quite natural that the more the *Kanjur*, translated into Mongolian, was disseminated throughout all Mongolia, the higher the Mongol-Buddhists regarded the memory of the chief instigator of its Mongolian translation, "the great Mongolian khan, the second Chinggis-bogdo, Ligdan Qutuytu Chakravartin." Extending over a more than two-century period of Manchu domination in Mongolia, Ligdan Khan remained in the consciousness of the Mongolian people not merely as a defender of religion, but also to some degree as a symbol of the once extant independent Mongolian state.

Of what sort were the titles and ranks awarded Ligdan Khan by the Mongolian translators of the *Kanjur* in their colophons? The most wide-spread of the multitude which existed were: "*Kümün-ü erketü delekei-dekini-ü qormusda* [222]

Ruler of people, Qormuzda²⁷ of the whole world," *Degedü nom-un mergen čakravad-un qutuytu Činggis tay-un qayan* "Qutuytu Chinggis tay-un qayan, wise Chakravartin of the holy religion", *Temüjin Činggis qayan-u yeke orun-dur sayuysan tngri boyda čakravarti Lindan qutuytu tayiming Činggis qayan* "Tengri-bogdo Chakravartin, Tai-ming Chinggis khan Ligdan, the qutuytu seated on the great throne of Temüjin-Chinggis khan," and so forth.

The life and activity of Ligdan Khan was a major historical topic in Mongolian colophons of the *Kanjur*. This theme could have received a more detailed treatment in Mongolian historiography and at the same time serve as impetus for further development of Mongolian historical writing, if the Manchu conquerors had not annihilated the Chahar Khanate, as a result of which Mongolian historical writing lost its basic theme—the history of the khans.

Hence, the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century mark a turning

²⁷ Scholars think that the word *Qormuzda* is the Persian *Ormuzd* 'Heaven'. As Dorji Banzarov noted, the Buddhists, in translating Sanskrit books into Mongolian, called the God of Heaven Indra, chief of the 33 heavenly dwellers, *Qormuzda* in Mongolian (entry 130, pp. 59-60).

point in the history of Mongolian historical literature. Buddhism becomes an integral part of the ideology dominant in Mongolian historical writing. So began the genealogical-Buddhist stage in the history of Mongolian historiography.

A center of Mongolian literary and historiographic activity in this period was Southern Mongolia, which is also the place from which Lamaism began to expand onto the Mongolian steppes. As for Khalkha Mongolia and Western Mongolia, during the time under review they lagged behind Southern Mongolia. Although Abatai sain Khan accepted Lamaism at almost the same time as did Altan Khan, the new religion in Khalkha Mongolia at first did not expand as successfully as in Southern Mongolia. During the first period of Lamaist expansion among the Mongols no notable feats in literary activity of the Khalkhas and Oirats took place, which is explained, along with other reasons, as due to the absence of a sufficient number of educated folk, translators and literary figures. This is why Čoytu Tayiji and his mother, with their decrees about translating Buddhist sutras, had to turn to the celebrated translator from Kōkeqota, Guoshi Čorji.

From those times very little data has come down to us, by

[223]

which one could judge the position of Khalkha-Mongolian historical knowledge. Only one small inscription on rock from Čayan Baišing (White House) of Čoytu Tayiji has been preserved (entry 182, vol. 1, pp. 468-469; English translation entry 300, pp. 308-312). At present it is the solitary Khalkha-Mongolian historical monument from the beginning of the 17th century. The inscription contains, alongside data about the progress in constructing Buddhist temples, interesting information about the genealogy of the Khalkha-Mongolian khans and tayijis. It testifies as well to the fact that at the beginning of the 17th century Buddhism had already begun to show its influence on Khalkha-Mongolian historical knowledge. We cite this inscription *in toto* according to Pozdneyev's translation [and cited here according to the edition and translation by John Krueger, entry 300, pp. 310-311]:

When from the most august Chinggis-khan, who,
By virtue of his acquiring a vast number of supreme virtues
In the course of an unnumbered multitude of periods,
Manifested his majestic and wondrous existence in the
boundless Mongolian land

And became Khan of the inhabitants of the ten countries, thirty-one exalted generations of khans had passed, [when there appeared] Dayan-khan "furthering the development with solicitude." Of the two sons of that most absolute beauty, his spouse Jimiskhen-khatun, the younger, Jalair-kung-tayiji, became the ruler of the ten thousand Khalkhas in Khangai Khan Nutuk. From him came seven sons, and the youngest of two was Uidzang-tayiji. From him six sons were begotten: Vachir-khan, Daichin, Yelden, Tsöökhör, Khoshuuchi, and Bodisun. From their midst, as the sun and the moon, the Khan and Tsöökhör, became especially useful to the faith and the world. During the good time of their furtherance of prosperity, that noble and good lady Mati-taikhal, the spouse of Khoshuuchi-tayiji, and Čoktu-tayiji, mother and son, concerned for the good of countless animate beings, from the fifteenth day of the

"cuckoo" month in the Iron-Cow year [1601], undertook the building of six temples on the western side of Tansuk-tala [the valley] of the river Tuula on a dry crest on the southern side of the mountain Khaldudun jirükhen, beginning with the temple of *sed-kiši ügei čindamani* [jewel of unimaginable value], and after the passage of seventeen years, they completed them in the first summer, "cuckoo" month, in the Fire-Serpent year (1617)" (entry 182, pp. 469-472; entry 300, English translation, pp. 310-311).

Translation activity underwent a big surge among the Oirats in the 1640s, when the noted

[224]

Zaya Pandita Namkhaijamtsö (1599-1662) and his disciples undertook active work on translation of Buddhist sutras into Mongolian. It is well-known that they translated from Tibetan into Mongolian more than two-hundred different sutras. Of these only a small number have come down to the present. During the last few years the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the MPR has discovered more than forty translations by Zaya Pandita and his disciples, made from Tibetan into Oirat (entry 117, p. 19). Among these were translations of a host of major historical works, such as the *Manigambum*²⁸, the *Čiqula keregtü* [*The Most Important Thing*], the biographies of Milaraspa, Tsong-kha-pa, the Dalai Lama Gendun-Jamtso, the *Gegen toli*, the *History of Buddhism* by Bu-sTon-rinpoche²⁹, and others. We thus see that among the Oirats, as among the southern Mongols, at the same time as Lamaism was expanding, intensive work was going on to translate into their native language Tibetan historical literature, which as early as the second half of the 17th century was rather widely dispersed throughout Mongolia.

It follows, however, to remark, that Zaya Pandita, in the colophons to the translations which he completed and were written by himself, in contrast to the South Mongolian translators, does not express himself on the substance of these or other problems of Mongolian history and of the current position of the country, and does not share his own suppositions about them with the reader. His interests, evidently, were limited to the task of acquainting the Mongols with Tibetan historical literature devoted to the history of Buddhism-Lamaism—the new religion of all the Mongols.

²⁸ We reviewed *supra* the *Manigambum* translation executed by Gushi Tsorji. Zaya Pandita translated the same work in 1644. It was this translation which had wide-spread use among the Mongols. It was republished several times by the wood block (xylographic) method (in 1712, 1717, 1735).

²⁹ This work by Bu-sTon-rinpoche (1290-1364) was written in 1322 and enjoys great authority in Tibetan and Mongolian historiography (cf. entry 146, pp. 91-92).