

## CHAPTER TWO MONGOLIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The most important events in Mongolian history of the 17th and first half of the 18th century were, as is well-known, connected with the struggle against the aggression of the Manchu conquerors, who slowly but steadfastly overcame the resistance of a disunited and fragmented Mongolia, subjecting to their power first the south of the country, and then its northern districts and finally, the western region.

However the revival of cultural life, including historiography, which had begun at the end of the 16th century continued for some time into the period of the Manchu conquest and after the establishment of the Manchu state. Convincing witness to this is given in the second half of the 17th century which was marked by the calling forth of a number of new historical works. This gives us the right to review the period from the second half of the 16th century to the end of the 17th century, as a stage in the development of Mongolian historical knowledge, requiring study of its particularities, and features unique to it.

Two circumstances contributed to the rise of Mongolian historiographic activity in the time under review: a rapid and unbroken strengthening in the position of Lamaism, which had awakened and strengthened Mongolian interest in the history of this religion and in the historical literature spawned by it; further growth of Mongolian interest in the historical past of their homeland, a new impetus for which was given by Manchu aggression and the fight against the

[226]

invaders, which lasted in all more than a century and a half. It is hard, when taking no account of these circumstances, to explain the fact that it was precisely in this period that Mongolian historians attempted to revive the old tradition of writing history, which may be termed the tradition of the *Secret History*. These attempts, as will be shown below, were crowned with full success, manifested in the creation of a number of major historical works.

The historical compositions of the 17th century prove that the rebirth of the *Secret History* traditions in the time being described embraced both oral history as well as the varieties of historical literature. Mongolian historiography, which was born in the 13th century, was preserved for a number of centuries and developed independent literary and oral traditions unique to it, the sources of which go back to the *Secret History*. The facts convince one that this monument despite all the perversities of fate had not been forgotten by the Mongolian people.

A corroboration of this we find in works of the 17th century, the authors of which made wide use of both oral and book versions of the first-born item of Mongolian historical literature. It is important in this regard to note that if the *Śira*

*tuyuji*, the *History by Asarayči* and the anonymous *Altan Tobči* were grounded for the most part on the oral tradition of the *Secret History*, then the *Altan Tobči* of Lubsangdanjin and the *Erdeni-yin tobči* of Sayang Sečen were mostly composed on the basis of the written tradition.

In this wise, Mongolian historical writing of the 17th century is characterized, in our view, by a strengthening of Buddhist influence on the one hand, and by a rebirth of traditions from early Mongolian historiography on the other.

### I. The *Altan Tobči* of Lubsangdanjin<sup>1</sup>

In the second half of the 17th century Mongolian historians created original works of a generalizing character, and at the same time began such types of historical literature as the chronicle. It is interesting to note that during the time under discussion the historiographic creativity of the Mongols, despite the expansion of Lamaism, developed not only along the lines of the ecclesiastical historical [227]

literature, as existed in Tibet, but also along the lines of the secular literature based on native Mongolian traditions of oral and written historiography. We have every reason to assert that the historians of this period were to a greater degree the successors of Qutuytai Sečen and the anonymous author of the *Altan Tobči*, than the initiators of Mongolian ecclesiastical historiography—Guoshi Čorji and Dondubtoyin.

The honor of creating the first such big Mongolian chronicle by rights belongs to Lubsangdanjin, author of an original work, "The *Šāstra*, called the Golden Summary, containing a brief history of the state governance, founded by the early

---

<sup>1</sup> The *Altan Tobči* by Lubsangdanjin went through several editions:

Lubsangdanjin, *Altan Tobči*, parts 1-2, Ulaanbaatar, 1937

*Altan Tobči: A Brief History of the Mongols*, with a critical introduction by the Reverend A. Mostaert, and an editor's foreword by Francis W. Cleaves. This edition is a photo-reproduction of the 1937 Ulaanbaatar printing (entry 73).

Čoyiji (editor), *Altan Tobči* (Kökeqota, 1984). This edition is based on Cleaves' publication (entry 322).

It was not until 1990 that the photofacsimile edition of the Ulaanbaatar manuscript discovered by Jamiyan-gun was first published, at the initiative of the author of these lines, viz., Lubsangdanjin, *Altan Tobči*, with an introduction by Sh. Bira (Ulaanbaatar, 1990) (entry 302).

A transcription of the same text of the *Altan Tobči* was made by Hans-Peter Vietze and GendengLubsang (Tokyo, 1992) (entry 325).

The *Altan Tobči* was partly translated into Chinese by Sechin Jagchid, and translated into Russian by N. P. Shastina:

Lubsan Danzan [Lubsangdanjin], *Altan Tobchi* (Moscow, 1973) (entry 71).

Sechin Jagchid, *Meng-ku Huang-chin shih I-chu* (Taipei, 1976) (entry 326).

kings.”<sup>2</sup> But Lubsangdanjin was not the only author of this work. He directed a group of authors who worked on the first Mongolian chronicle, as its colophon presents witness: “Thus, the monk Šašana-dhara, known as guoši Lubsangdanjin, expended effort to have the history of the origins of the remarkable, most holy khan-reborn ones written down on the basis of a host of chronicles, in order that the great people continue to read” (entry 41, p. 192).<sup>3</sup> From these words one may conclude that under the guidance of Lubsangdanjin several scribe-assistants might have been working; it may be they were his own disciples, who by his orders collected materials from various sources. It is no coincidence that the colophon uses the word *bičigülügsen* and not *bičigsen*. The verb of the causative form *bičigülügsen* means “to make someone write, or, to have something written down.”

Rather little is known about Lubsangdanjin’s biography. The *Altan Tobči* colophon informs us that he was a learned lama who held the title of guoši. He was also known under the name of Sumadhiśaśanadhara, which is a Sanskrit translation of his name, Lubsangdanjin (Tib. *bLo-bZang bsTan-hjin*)

Some scholars have tried to determine the identity of Lubsangdanjin and to fix, even if only approximately, the time of his life and activity. In Zhamtsarano’s opinion, he was a writer and translator who lived in the second half of the 17th century and the first half of the 18th century (entry 150, p. 80; Loewenthal, p. 56). Sh. Natsagdorj presumes that Lubsangdanjin is mentioned in passing in the *Erdeniyin erike* by Ishibaldan as *lha-zun* Lubsangdanjin from the Dashichoiling (Tib. *bKra šis čhos gliñ*) monastery in the hoshuun Dalad čiyulyana of Ikhe juu [228]

---

<sup>2</sup> Some scholars have not translated the full name of this chronicle quite correctly. Ts. Zhamtsarano gives this translation: “A work called the Golden Button, briefly narrating the laws and orders issued by the old kings” (cf. entry 150, p. 79; in the English translation by Loewenthal, p. 56: “The work, entitled *the Golden Button*, which relates briefly the laws and the administration established by the ancient emperors”). He translates the term *törü yosun* as “laws and orders.” As stated above, the two basic principles of the royal authority are the *yirtinčü-yin yosun* and the *nom-un yosun*. In *Lubsandanzan törü yosun* means *yirtinčü-yin yosun*, and not *nom-un yosun*. Hence by the words *törü yosun* one should understand “governmental laws and traditions” in the sense of “governmental administration.” The basic topic of the chronicle (cf. *infra*) is the history of the Mongolian state, and not the history of religion (*nom-un yosun*). We also encounter an inexact translation of the chronicle name by Father Mostaert: *Ouvrage nommé 'Bouton d'or' qui résume sommairement l'oeuvre des lois et règles établies par les anciens qan* (entry 73, p. x).

A recent translation of the book title which is close to ours was made by Hans-Peter Vietze, as “Golden Button (Summary) which Relates briefly the Deeds of Civil Governing established by ancient Emperors,” in Hans-Peter Vietze, “The Ulaanbaatar editions of the *Altan Tobči*,” *International Symposium on Mongolian Culture: Collection of Papers* (Taipei, 1992), p. 237 (entry 327).

<sup>3</sup> N. P. Shastina (cf. entry 71, p. 297) did not translate the colophon in question into Russian quite accurately.

of Inner Mongolia (entry 118, pp. 52-63). However this assumption merely rests on the identity of the names and is not reinforced by any other data. The author of the *Altan Tobči* is generally referred to in the sources with the title *guoši* (*güšri*), at the time when Ishibaldan extols Lubsangdanjin as a *lha-zun* (Tib. *lha-btsun*), i.e., a monk from an aristocratic family.<sup>4</sup>

Zhamtsarano informs us that to Lubsangdanjin belongs the *Description of the Holy Places of Wu-t'ai-shan*. He is right to consider that it was issued under the K'ang-hsi Emperor in 1721 (entry 150, p. 80, note 1; Loewenthal's translation, p. 56, note 1). Although Zhamtsarano did not give the full Mongolian name of the work in question, there is no doubt that he had in mind the *Uda-yin tabun ayulan-u orusil süsüg-ten-ü čikin-ü čimeg orusibai*, the "Guide to Wu-t'ai-shan, the so-called adornment to the ears of the faithful."<sup>5</sup> It is necessary, incidentally, to point out a mistake committed by Walther Heissig in determining the year this work was published according to the European system of reckoning years. Not having noticed a mis-writing in the colophon, where it mentions the sixth (*jirγuduxar*) year of K'ang-hsi, which in no way corresponds with the year registered as the White Iron-Ox year (*čaγaγčin eme temür üker jil*), Heissig fixed the publication of this work in 1667. Nonetheless it has to be written not as "the sixth" (*jirγuduxar*) but as "the sixtieth" (*jiraduxar*) year of K'ang-hsi, which is indeed the year of the White Iron-Ox, i.e., 1721. In this fashion, the date as given by Heissig (1667) (entry 87, p. 35), and supported by Father Mostaert (entry 73, p. 35), and N. P. Shastina (entry 71, p. 25) must be regarded as erroneous. Zhamtsarano is completely right when he connects the xylographic edition of it to 1721. Obviously, Zhamtsarano knew about the slip-up in the colophon, but for some reason did not mention it.

The correct determination of the date that the *Guide to Wu-t'ai-shan* was published has great significance for approximately determining the period of this author's creative activity.

Heissig, considering 1667 to be its date of publication, assumed that it was written in 1662. However, now it is explained that this work was written at the beginning of the 18th century, though no later than 1715, when the Khalkha Zaya Pandita, the teacher of Lubsangdanjin died. The nature of those lines in the colophon which are devoted to Zaya Pandita bears witness to this.

[229]

<sup>4</sup> Two Inner Mongolian scholars, C. Narasun and Ci. Načoydorji, are confident (although without giving any proof) that *lhazun* Lubsangdanjin, who, in their opinion, was also known as *erdeni pandita* Lubsangdanjin, was the author of the *Altan Tobči*. See *Ordos-un jayun merged-ün tobči* [A brief summary of one hundred sages from Ordos], [Dongsheng xian?] 1987, pp. 22-23.

<sup>5</sup> The xylograph was found in the personal library of Ts. Damdinsüren, who kindly furnished me the opportunity to get acquainted with it.

From these lines it is apparent that when the author wrote his work, his teacher was still alive.

The colophon of the *Guide to Wu-t'ai-shan* contains interesting information shedding some light on the identity of Lubsangdanjin. It says in it: "I, Sumadhiśaśanadhara, worshipping the dust from the feet of him who is famed as Zaya-Pandita quturytu by command of the omniscient Panchen and the Dalai Lama, wrote this work at the order of the wandering monk Ayvan-Lubsang" (entry 14, f. 1-72; cf. also entries 24, p. 4; 233, p. 52; 232, pp. 12-15). Concerning the authorship of the manuscript of the work itself, as one must judge from words of the author who in the xylographic edition says: "I, the gūsri [guōsī] Lubsangdanjin have briefly written [this work] on the basis of śāstras compiled by ancient sages at the order of all the lamas of the P'u-sa-t'ing monastery . . . who expressed the desire to publish on boards the work *Guide to Wu-t'ai-shan* as a mark of congratulation for long years of life to the emperor most high, the ruler of the world, the rebirth of Man-juśri" (entry 231, p. 5, note 1).

From these words it can be inferred that Sumadhiśaśanadhara, this same Lubsangdanjin, was a disciple of Zaya Pandita Quturytu and a contemporary of Ayvan-Lubsang. But who are they, this Zaya Pandita Quturytu and Ayvan-Lubsang? Heissig committed the error of taking Zaya Pandita Quturytu for the Oirat Zaya-Pandita Namkhajamtso, who as is well-known, was born in 1599 and died in 1662. Wishing to substantiate his opinion, Heissig connects the information of the *Brief History of Construction of such Monasteries as Čaylasi ügei Temple in Kökeqota* with the Oirat Zaya Pandita, who allegedly travelled to Kökeqota in the first year of K'ang-hsi (1662) and there founded the monastery of *Sayin-i erkilegči* (entry 233, p. 53). He thinks that Lubsangdanjin may have been a disciple of Zaya Pandita the Oirat right at the time of the visit by the latter to Kökeqota. This of course is incorrect. According to the biography of Zaya Pandita the Oirat, written by his disciple Ratnabhadra in 1690, Namqayaijamčö died in the Water-Tiger year (1662) on the way to Lhasa.

According to all the data, the colophon under discussion has in mind the Khalkha Zaya Pandita, Lubsangpringlei, whose years of life are 1642-1715. It is true, one might confuse the fact that the *Brief History of Construction* . . . says that in

[230]

the first year of the reign of K'ang-hsi, i.e., in 1662, Zaya Pandita Quturytu with his disciples (*šabi*), 163 families in all, travelled from the hoshuun of Jasaytu qayan and undertook a visit to the emperor, who authorized Zaya Pandita to settle with his disciples at any spot in the region of Kökeqota.

In accord with this decree Zaya Pandita built a monastery in the Jirgalantu mountains at the sources of the Kharagchin River. As is clear from the biography of Zaya Pandita Lubsangpringlei, compiled by his disciple Ganjurpa Mergen Nomunkhan (entry 133, pp. 9-10), his teacher would not have been able to travel to Kökeqota in 1662, because at that time he was studying in Tibet, and he was only 20 years old then. Lubsangpringlei only returned from Tibet to Khalkha Mongolia in

1679 and actually received from the Manchu Emperor the right to a residence in the Kökegota region, but this was in the Iron Sheep year, i.e., in 1691 (entry 10). It is hard to explain why in the source cited above the event mentioned is referred to 1662 (the first year of K'ang-hsi's reign).

In this manner one may consider it established that Lubsangdanjin was a disciple of the Khalkha Zaya Pandita Lubsangpringlei, and not of the Oirat one, Namqayijamčo.<sup>6</sup>

As for Ayvan-Lubsang, he, as Prof. Heissig informs us, was named in 1660 as head of all lamas at Wu-t'ai-shan by order of the emperor, in 1661 he wrote the preface to the Description of Wu-t'ai Shan, and in 1700 is mentioned in the title of a *čing siu ča si* (entry 233, p. 52, note 5). Ayvan-Lubsang was a lama of Chinese descent and enjoyed the trust of the Manchu emperors (entries 231, p. 4; 233, pp. 52-53).

What has been expounded above allows one to think that Lubsangdanjin lived and worked in the second half of the 17th century to the first half of the 18th century.

---

<sup>6</sup> Some new data recently discovered by S. Sečenbilig not only confirm our conclusion, but shed light on Lubsangdanjin, of whom until now we knew so little. These new data have been taken from the book titled *Ači sečelesi ügüi boγda blama nar-i sitüjü gүн narin ba ayuu yeke degedü nom sonusuγsan kiged öberün orčilang-dur yabuγsan yosun-i todorqay-a üjügülügen süsüg-ten-i nom-dur uduridduγči mör*. The manuscript of this book is kept in two copies in the Library of Inner Mongolia (Kökeqota). Thanks to the kindness of S. Sečenbilig I obtained a Xerox copy of the manuscript. See S. Sečenbilig, "Erten-ü qad-un ündüsülegen törü yosun-u jokiyal-i tobčilan quriyaysan Altan Tobči-yin surbulji jokiyayči jokiyaydaysan čay" [On the sources, authorship and date of the *Altan Tobči*], in *Öbör Mongγol-un neyigem-ün sinjilekü uqayan* (1996, No. 5). By the same author is his "Lubsangvangjil-un tobyiy ba silüg suryal" [On the *tobyiy* of Lubsangvanjil and his poetry], in *Mongγol burqan-u sasin-u uran jokiyal-un sudulul* ([Qayilar?]) *Öbör Mongγol-un Soyul-un Keblel-ün Qoriy-a*, 1998), pp. 208-218.

If there was no other learned disciple of the Khalkha Zaya Pandita, also named Lubsangdanjin (I believe it is difficult to suppose so), according to this new data, Lubsangdanjin was the closest disciple of Zaya Pandita, and very often accompanied him during his visits to such regions of Inner Mongolia, as, Utai, Doloyan nuur, etc. Lubsangdanjin was also known under the title *Tunumal umčid biligtü čorji*, or *Yeke mergen rasang (dačang) umčid*. He wrote several religious books: *Tegüs čoytu ündür ijayur-un maytayal*, *Niyuča neretü maytayal*, *Ülemji masi čayan sedkil neretü yirügel*, etc. He also participated in editing the *Kanjur* in 1717-1720. He was an influential religious figure. After Zaya Pandita's death in 1715, he played an important role in enthroning Zaya Pandita's reincarnation, and he was also a tutor of this young reincarnation. Together with Jebtsundamba and Jasag-lama from the Zaya Pandita monastery, he took part in the K'ang-hsi Emperor's funeral ceremony in Beijing in 1722. In 1723 he also came to Beijing to take the *sku-gdung* (remains) of Jebtsundamba, who died in Beijing. One can suppose that Lubsangdanjin was a Khalkha lama by origin.

Now we must turn to the dating of his chronicle. The exact date the *Altan Tobči* was written, despite all the efforts of scholars, has not yet been definitely established. Following Zhamtsarano, many scholars (Shastina, Puchkovskii, Perlee and others) placed this date at the beginning or second half of the 17th century (entries 150, p. 80; 71, p. 4; 186, p. 148; 123, p. 14).

Father Mostaert concluded that the chronicle was written between 1649 and 1736. His deduction is based on the following reasoning. Page 189 of vol. II of the new edition of the *Altan Tobči*

[231]

mentions six Ordos hoshuuns which were created in 1649. It is clear that the *Altan Tobči* could not have been written earlier than this year. The seventh Ordos hoshuun was created in the first year of Ch'ien-lung, i.e., in 1736. Since this hoshuun is not mentioned in the chronicle, the chronicle can have been written no later than 1736 (entry 73, p. x). Mostaert assumed that further search would permit setting the date for compilation of this chronicle more precisely. The time proposed by Mostaert (1649-1736) Heissig changed to 1651-1655 on the grounds that Lubsangdanjin, speaking of the descendants of Ligdan Khan, names his two grandsons (Burni and Lubsang-tayiji), the sons of Abunai-wang and the daughter of the Manchu emperor Abahai, who had married Abunai in 1645 (entries 231, pp. 7-9; 233, p. 53-55). The first of Abunai's sons, Burni, was born in 1651, and the second one, apparently quite a bit later. Considering these circumstances, one may conjecture that the chronicle was written some years after 1651. The *Altan Tobči* does not mention the uprising by Abunai, Burni and Lubsang against the Manchus in 1674, although this is spoken about in detail in many chronicles of the 18th century. Speaking of the genealogy of the Qaračin princes, Lubsangdanjin names the son of Jolbin, Büre, as the last representative. From the *History of the Mongolian Clan of the Borjigids* by Lomi, it is well-known that after Büre there were his sons, *ded jerge kya* Dalai and Lomi (the latter the author of the work cited). Lomi was born in 1675, and Dalai at least twenty years earlier, i.e., approximately in 1655. Thus, as the *Altan Tobči* does not mention the name of Dalai, this chronicle was, in Heissig's opinion, compiled earlier than 1655 (entries 231, pp. 3-8; 233, p. 55).

The proposals of Mostaert and Heissig, as we have seen, rest exclusively on analyzing internal data of the chronicle. But in view of the uncertainty about the identity of its author, this method suffers from a number of defects. Lubsangdanjin could not possibly have known those historical details which in the view of contemporary authors he should have known. And even if he had known some of them, he might for some reason not have written about them. Lubsangdanjin might, for instance, not have known about the creation of the seventh Ordos hoshuun in 1736, might somehow not have written in his chronicle about the tragic

[232]

fate of the descendants of Ligdan khan—Burni and Lubsang-tayiji—punished by the Manchus for disobedience. It is well-known that Burni was punished for participating in an uprising. As follows from extracts from Lubsangdanjin himself, the genealogy of the Qaračin princes was borrowed by him from some other history

(entry 41, p. 190), and in this source there might not have been any information about the last representatives of the Qaračın princes, in consequence of which it was not possible to discuss them in the *Altan Tobči*.

Proceeding from these considerations, we regard it as most likely that Lubsangdanjin wrote his work either at the very end of the 17th century, or at the beginning of the 18th.

The *Altan Tobči* was written on the basis of very valuable sources, which may be divided into two groups. To the first belong the sources of the 12th-13th centuries, and to the second, Buddhist and Tibetan sources. There is no necessity to linger in detail over an analysis of Lubsangdanjin's sources: this question has been exhaustively pursued by many researchers (entries 150, pp. 80-82, English translation, pp. 56-58; 233, pp. 199-202; 234; 57, pp. 18-22, pp. 60-73). But nonetheless a few things should be noticed.

The great merit of Lubsangdanjin and his assistants comes down to the fact that they were able, though under a foreign yoke and dominated by Lamaist ideology, to restore Mongolia's independent historiographic traditions, using in full degree sources of the 12th-13th centuries. As already noticed above, similar attempts had been undertaken earlier, even at the end of the 16th century, but then they were not able to withstand the onslaught of Buddhist-Tibetan literature gushing into Mongolia in connection with the expansion of Lamaism.

One may with certainty maintain that for its second birth the *Secret History* was obligated first of all to Lubsangdanjin and his helpers. Scholars have indisputably proven that of the 282 paragraphs of the *Secret History*, 233 are written into the *Altan Tobči*, in which connection only a few of them were subjected to insignificant abridgement or change.<sup>7</sup> Prior to Lubsangdanjin none of the Mongolian historians had made such full use of the *Secret History*.

In this particular case we cannot specially dwell on the thorny question of which version of the *Secret History* Lubsangdanjin used,  
[233]

that one which was preserved and came down to us in Chinese transcription, or a Mongolian original written in Uighur-Mongolian script which has not come down to us.

Scholars like Heissig, Sechin Jagchid and Hans-Peter Vietze hold the opinion that Lubsangdanjin must have used a Mongolian version of the *Secret History* in Uighur-Mongolian script.<sup>8</sup> After collating the relevant paragraphs of the *Altan Tobči*

<sup>7</sup> S. A. Kozin admitted that a section of paragraphs of the *Secret History* (from §177 to §208), in the copy of the *Altan Tobči* which has come down to us, were omitted by accident in recopying. If that is the case, then the percentage of paragraphs included from the *Secret History* becomes still higher (entry 57, p. 19).

<sup>8</sup> Liu Jingsuo also assumed that Lubsangdanjin had at his disposal a copy of the *Secret History of the Mongols* written in the old Mongolian Uighur script, because the text of the *Altan Tobči* reflects some orthographic peculiarities of the text of the *Secret History* as transcribed in: Liu Jingsuo, *Arban yurba-arban doloduyar jayun-u Mongγol-un teuke bičilge*

with those of the *Secret History*, Sechin Jagchid came to the conclusion that the *Altan Tobči* used not the Chinese transcription of the *Secret History*, but a Mongolian version written in Uighur-Mongolian script.<sup>9</sup> Vietze wrote, "Already without deeper statistical research it can be maintained for sure: The author of the *Altan Tobči* must have used a version of the *Secret History* in Uighur-Mongolian script which is proven not only by concordances, but even more by Blo bzan bstan' jin Guu Si's errors."<sup>10</sup>

Whatever may be true of the above surmises, it is more important for us that the *Secret History* is shown to have remained unforgotten in Mongolian historical writing, and that some centuries after its appearance, proved to be a most significant source for another great Mongolian historical work. We perceive in this fact the continuity of the national traditions of Mongolian historical writing.

It must be noted that the authors of the *Altan Tobči* used not just the single *Secret History* but other sources as well. Testimony to this is the presence in the *Altan Tobči* of certain data which are missing in the *Secret History*, but are found in other chronicles, in particular in the *Complete Collection of Histories* by Rashīd al-Dīn. Zhamtsarano showed this well when he analyzed the content and text of the *Altan Tobči*. For instance the chronicle introduces the rhythmical speech of a certain Kōdei-sečen, addressed to the ten sons of Ambagai and the seven sons of Qabul khan. On the basis of Rashīd al-Dīn's data, which unfortunately cite only part of this speech, Zhamtsarano considered it probable that "this sample of Mongolian oratory dating from the first half of the 12th century" (entry 150, p. 93; English translation p. 65) might well have preceded Lubsangdanjin in ancient "Mongolian scrolls and books." He wrote as well that

There exist many fragments from unknown sources; their contents are unified by an idea, namely, by the regulations of state government, i.e., by the *jasag* or "Yasa" of Činggis qan [Chinggis Khan]. This fact indicates that in Mongolia there existed more or less complete copies of several manuscripts of Činggis qan's famous "Yasa" which was nothing but a collection of his remarkable sayings; they bear the character of mandates and instructions. In it were also contained the observations of Činggis' companions and contemporaries, and of his close successors (especially of Čayadai), as we see from the *Činggis qayan-u čadig*. (entry 150, p. 120; English translation, p. 88).

---

[Mongolian Historiography in the 13th-17th centuries] (Kōkeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un Arad-un Keblel-ün Qoriy-a, 1979), pp. 222-223.

<sup>9</sup> Sechen Jagchid, *Meng-ku Huang-chin shih-i-chu* (Taipei, 1976), pp. 126-133. Cf. Čoyiji, *Introduction to the Altan Tobči*, p. 12.

<sup>10</sup> Hans-Peter Vietze, "The Ulan-Bator editions of the *Altan Tobči*," p. 238.

Zhamtsarano was correct to think that the main value of the *Altan Tobči* lay not so much in the Mongolian text of the *Secret History*, which we always could more or less restore from the Chinese phonetic rendering, as it did in

[234]

the fragments of Chinggis's instructions to khans and princes, taken from early Mongolian sources unknown to us (entry 150, p. 82; English translation, p. 58).

The *Altan Tobči* of Lubsangdanjin is, on the whole, a unique syncretism of Mongolian historiographic traditions proper with Buddhist ideology. Zhamtsarano was completely correct when he wrote:

The changes of the texts from the 12th and 13th centuries, as compared to those of the 17th century (even if only paraphrased), give an idea of the differences between the two periods and also between their speech formation and contents in reference to their vocabularies. The simplicity, bluntness, and genuine truthfulness of the narratives of the 12th and 13th centuries with their ancient wording, on the one hand, and on the other, a certain ornateness, garnished with Buddhist concepts and expressions of courtesy and reverence before superiors, and the legendary character of the narratives of the seventeenth century (entry 150, p. 82; English translation, p. 58)

Lubsangdanjin's work is divided into neither parts nor chapters. However, by the content and character of its materials it may be separated into two sections: the early history of the Mongols (up to the second half of the 16th century); and the history of the Mongols during the second half of the 16th and the first half of the 17th century. In the first part the author strives to review certain questions of early Mongolian history from the position of Buddhist historical-religious concepts. He begins the history of the Mongols not the way the anonymous authors of the *Secret History* did some four-five centuries prior to him. Setting forth the history of the origin of the Mongols and their khans, Lubsangdanjin is not satisfied with some early Mongolian historical traditions, [but] goes beyond these limits and ties them up with Indo-Tibetocentric concepts, according to which the history of the Mongols is an integral part of the history of the entire Buddhist world. For this reason he prefixes the history of the Mongols proper with a concise sketch (just four manuscript leaves) of the emergence of mankind and the origins of the Buddhist kings. Next the author tries to link "genetically" the origin of the Mongolian khans with the famed clan of Mahasammata, employing the Buddhist mythological traditions.

He writes that a thousand years after Buddha's nirvana the clan of Mahā-sammata crossed over to the Tibetans. Under King Sarpa, the son of Kushala, there was born a boy of unusual appearance. Having placed him in a copper box, they cast him into the Ganges.

[235]

On the border of Tibet and Nepal the box was pulled out of the water by an old Tibetan who opened it and discovered a fine lad. The Tibetans asked the boy where he came from. He pointed upwards. The Tibetans thinking that he had a destiny from Heaven decided to make him their king. Since the Tibetans had borne him on

their necks, they named him "the king on a throne of necks." He laid the beginning of the clan of the Tibetan kings, the kings of dharma, from whom in their turn arose the beginnings of the Mongolian khans. Lubsangdanjin writes that the progenitor of the Mongolian khans, Börte Chino was a younger son of the Tibetan king with the golden throne, Dalai Subin, belonging to the clan of the first Tibetan king, the king on a throne of necks. Börte Chino, having quarreled with his brothers, migrated to the northern land of Jad. There he married Goa-Maral and settled down in the Burqan Qaldun mountains. The race of the Mongols arose from them (entry 41, vol. 1, p. 6).

It must however be emphasized that a history of the Mongolian khans is at the center of Lubsangdanjin's attention. He hardly touches on the history of religion, having called his work *A Brief History Of State Rule, Founded by Ancient Kings* (*törü yosun-u teüke*).

The Mongolian historian executed a work quite up-to-date for its time, constituting a history of the Mongolian khans at a time when power in Mongolia had been usurped by foreign conquerors. And it is no accident that at the conclusion he writes his wish that "the great nation continue to read" his history.

Lubsangdanjin wanted to establish in the judgment of his Mongol contemporaries, that not only the early but also the sacred (from a Buddhist viewpoint) origin of the Mongolian khans was a reality, and to prove that these khans became famed not merely because of the past might of the Chinggisids, but by their sanctity and high birth; that the khans belonged to the famed race of Mahāsammata, founder of the kings of the Buddhist world. Mahāsammata, Chinggis, Khubilai, Dayan Khan and Ligdan were the key figures in the history of the Mongols, according to Lubsangdanjin. The history of the Manchu emperors, although they declared themselves the Boyda-Qayans of Mongolia, thus found no place in the *Altan Tobči*. Under Lubsangdanjin Mongolian history ends as it were with the liquidation of the Chahar khaganate of Ligdan Khan.

[236]

Lubsangdanjin gives a key place to the cult of Chinggis Khan. He asserts that the birth of Chinggis was foretold by Shakyamuni Buddha himself. According to this prediction, Chinggis was to appear 3250 years after Buddha's nirvana as a rebirth of Esrua tengri, to rule the world in the name of happiness and peace for people, who prior to this had languished under twelve bad rulers. So that the world should not be unaware, three years prior to the birth of Chinggis Khan, Sakya Gungya-nimbu (Tib. Kun-dga' sñin-po) proclaimed that the Boyda Chinggis Khan would be born, fated from Heaven, a revered Chintamani, and that he would govern everything in this world. This prediction was carved by two Chinese on the red cliff in the mountains of Burqan Qaldun (entry 41, vol. 2, pp. 27-28).

Resorting to the traditional Buddhist method, Lubsangdanjin excelled his predecessors, as we can see, in extolling Chinggis Khan, elevating him to the ranks of true Buddhist Chakravarti-kings, the advent of whom was allegedly foretold by the Buddha himself. There is no doubt that all this would have exerted influence on the minds of believers at that time, contributing to a consolidation of the cult of

Chinggis Khan in Mongolian historical writing. For just such a purpose Lubsangdanjin set up as anachronisms some facts to a degree bordering on a gross distortion of historical truth. Glaring examples of such anachronisms are the speeches which the author ascribes to the Nine Örlügs (marshals) of Chinggis Khan. These speeches stand out sharply by their Buddhist content and lexicon (entry 41, vol. 2, pp. 11-19). Bayurči, for instance, turns to Chinggis Khan with the following words:

Thou art Mount Sumeru, composed of divers jewels;  
 Thou art the Anabād Sea<sup>11</sup>, whither flow a host of rivers from various places;  
 Thou art the heavenly čintamani ringed about with stars by day and night;  
 Thou art the *sutu boyda* Ruler, son of omniscient Tengri.

Having learned the thirty-five sciences of a khan,  
 You peacefully ruled the great kingdom and religion,  
 And by mighty spirit did not fall before alien enemies,  
 You valued friendship and harmony among kith and kin (entry 41, p. 12).

All the remaining örlügs pronounce words of praise in honor of Chinggis Khan in approximately the same tone.

[237]

Still one should observe that Lubsangdanjin does not reduce his writing of history solely to Buddhist make-believe. In his case early Mongolian historiographic traditions clearly prevail over Buddhist dogma. In reproducing to a great degree data from the *Secret History*, Lubsangdanjin actually imparts all the basic ideas of the latter. Under the influence of his sources the author makes wide use of the method of citing direct speech, wise exhortations and teachings, ostensibly pronounced by famous historical personalities, with Chinggis Khan and his cohorts in the first rank. This also bestows a certain rhetorical-edifying character upon his *Altan Tobči*. Many of these "utterances" of Chinggis actually go back to early Mongolian *yosuns* (Mong. *yosun*, "custom") and *yasas* (Mong. *jasay* "law"), reported by Rashīd al-Dīn, Juvaynī and other historians. Lubsangdanjin himself notes that he "wrote in his book what was uttered and conveyed by the sages from the time of the *Sutu Boyda* Chinggis Khan, that it should become a law unto future generations" (entry 41, book 2, p. 68). This major goal he pursues through such extended citation of the "wise words" of his ancestors.

It is not hard to reveal as well the author's interest in political-ethical questions of history, in the historical experience of the past from the viewpoint of the tasks of

<sup>11</sup> *Anabād* (Skt. *Anavatavt*, Tib. *ma-dros-mtsho*) is the name of a mythical sea, often encountered in Buddhist literature. Sometimes it is called in Mongolian the *ese būlidūgsen dalai*, i.e., "the sea of which the waters never grow warm," and sometimes *mapam* (Skt. *mapham*) (same translation). In another place Lubsangdanjin says: *ese būlidūgsen dabulya yeke-tū mapam dalai minu ...* (entry 41, p. 14).

his time. Lubsangdanjin characteristically devotes attention first and foremost to such doctrines and utterances as are distinguished by their political and moralizing usefulness. It seems to us that he regarded as relevant to his time the political admonitions and testaments of the founder of the Mongolian state. This was at a time when the position of Mongolia, in Lubsangdanjin's opinion, was in direct opposition to what Chinggis Khan was saying in his admonitions to companions, sons and brothers. Lubsangdanjin called these admonitions "the nutriment of the state and the key of administration" (*ulus-un tejiyel törü-yin onisun*) (entry 41, vol. 2, p. 34).

Chinggis instructs his associates to concern themselves first and foremost with the state created by him with such effort, not thinking about their own egos, for them always to be "the stakes of his nation and the tether for the numerous people" (entry 41, vol. 2, p. 29).

[238]

Chinggis Khan himself can serve as an example of devotion to the interests of the state, when, according to Lubsangdanjin, he utters the following aphorism:

When my fathom-high body<sup>12</sup> takes a brief respite,  
How might not my kingdom weaken;  
When my entire body takes a rest,  
How might not my whole kingdom be ruined.  
Let my fathom-high body grow fatigued,  
Lest my state not weaken;  
Let my whole body be troubled,  
Lest my whole kingdom not be ruined. (entry 41, vol. 2, pp. 59-60)

From the author of the *Altan Tobči* we learn the basic mottoes of Chinggis Khan in the period of military campaigns. Chinggis Khan said to his four sons:

Hold the path to the passes of high mountains,  
Cross wide rivers wading,  
Be not afraid that it is far, if you go, you will reach,

---

<sup>12</sup> Here my understanding and translation differ greatly from those of most of my colleagues. It is true that in the text of the *Altan Tobči* this phrase is written as *altan bey-e* "golden body." Cf. the version of *Jamiyan gung* published in 1990, Luvsangdanzan, *Altan Tobči*, with an introduction by Sh. Bira (Ulaanbaatar, 1990), p. 106-a. Cf. further Čoyiji's edition, *Altan Tobči* (Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un Arad-un Keblel-ün Qoriy-a (1984), p. 427. N. P. Shastina translated it as *zlotaya osoba* (Russian translation of the *Altan Tobči*, p. 211). But judging by the meaning of the phrase, a native speaker of Mongolian can easily find it a mis-spelling for *alda bey-e*. *Alda* is the Mongolian traditional unit of measurement, indicating the distance between the tips of the middle fingers of the outstretched arms of a man. *Alda* could provisionally be translated as "fathom" (1.6 m). Chinggis Khan, who here puts the deeds of state above all else, cannot compare his own body with the golden body. He can modestly speak of his body only as a fathom-high or alda-high body.

Be not afraid that it is hard; if you undertake, you will overcome;  
 The teeth for eating meat are in the mouth;  
 The teeth for eating people are in the thoughts,  
 Strong in body, one conquers units;  
 Strong in soul, one conquers a multitude." (entry 41, vol. 2, pp. 27-28)

Here is one more speech of Chinggis Khan, addressed to his sons:

Henceforth you will pass through high mountains,  
 Cross over wide rivers,  
 Execute distant campaigns,  
 Stretching your legs in the stirrups  
 So forcefully that their straps will stretch and their flaps will tear apart.  
 You will rule a host of lands,  
 Having conquered the body, conquer the mind,  
 If the spirit is overcome,  
 The body will not depart anywhere. (entry 41, vol. 2, p. 46)

There is reason to think that these lines actually go back to the times of Chinggis Khan and his successors; according to another source, written in square script and preserved in an album under the name of *Najm'al 'Ajāib*, which was discovered in one of the departments of the Istanbul University Museum, a number of lines of

[239]

the citations quoted by us (see the extracts above and below) are likewise in the Decree of Khubilai Khan. It is interesting to compare the lines from the two quite different sources:

*Altan Tobči*

Olan ulus-i barisu  
 Beye inu quriyatala  
 Sedkil-i inu quriyaytun  
 Sedkil-i quriyabasu  
 Beye inu qamiy-a oduqu  
 (entry 41, II, p. 46)

*Najm'al- 'Ajāib*

ta 'uru ut minu mona  
 qoyina ulus irgen-i quriyabasu  
 gesü beyeyi anu quriyatala setgili anu  
 quriyabasu setgili anu quryača beyas  
 anu q'a 'e'ütqun ...  
 (entry 93, p. 123)

In the extract cited, Lubsangdanjin, a connoisseur of the Mongolian country, has very adroitly characterized the unique psychology of the nomad-conqueror by his own words. Of the moralizing admonitions we cite the following:

It is good for the commoner under a good khan.  
 Happy the khagan for whom his state is in order.  
 Happy the commoner whose khan is good,  
 Happy the woman whose husband is good,  
 Happy all those who have peace and accord. . .

It is not for a woman to understand her husband in life,  
She will understand him after his death;

If the khan behaves like a commoner,  
He is deprived of his kingdom;  
If a commoner behaves like a khagan  
He is deprived of his dark head (entry 41, vol. 2, p.32).

The extraordinary endeavor of Lubsangdanjin to raise the authority of historical figures of the past led him at times, as we have already remarked, into falsification of historical truth. He ascribes for example to contemporaries of Chinggis Khan Buddhist ideas which were contemporaneous to Lubsangdanjin himself, and they sharply stand out in the mass of really ancient fragments. Let us cite such an instance. When speaking about the "royal rules of state government," Goa-Sečen compares the mercy of the khan with the sun, and his magnanimity with a lake: the sun with its rays warms all persons on earth alike, the good and the evil, the quick and the dead. Thus the khan ought to display equal mercy to all. Similarly to the way a lake drinks in all the waters into itself, both the clean and the dirty, the khan ought magnanimously to take in all words: truthful, lying, complimentary and unpleasant (entry 41, p. 35).

[240]

As we see it, Lubsangdanjin delivered up prescriptions of Buddhist teachings about the norms of conduct for kings as utterances of a contemporary of Chinggis Khan.

Part of his work Lubsangdanjin devoted to the history of the Mongols in the post-Empire period, up to the beginning of the 17th century, restricting himself in general to reproducing oral traditions connected for the most part with the political history of the country. One must give him his due: with the aid of these traditionary tales he was able to restore an overall picture of that epoch when the country was living through the dissolution and internecine wars of the country.

In an analysis of historiography of the second part of Lubsangdanjin's work one can draw forth his thought that governing by representatives of the Golden Clan of the Chinggisids, in the persons of the so-called minor khans, with some individual exceptions, was not interrupted right down to Ligdan Khan inclusive. Lubsangdanjin writes with pathos about those khans who undertook real measures to restore the unity of Mongolian lands and for the rebirth of the Buddhist religion in Mongolia. He views the historical merit of Altan Khan as "the rebirth of the religion which had been broken off and the reestablishment of the ruined state, as well as in unifying the "five colored and the four foreign" [peoples--Sh. B.] (entry 41, p. 185).

Lubsangdanjin speaks very sparingly about Ligdan Khan, saying nothing about his merit in the struggle to strengthen the Chahar khanate, nor about his fight against the Manchus. In the *Altan Tobči* he does not even report that the rule of this khan ended, although he mentions his sons and grandsons. In return, Lubsangdanjin specially notices the services of Ligdan Khan in the expansion of the Buddhist religion, his cooperation in translating the "holy words" into Mongolian. The author of the *Altan Tobči* endows Ligdan Khan with all kinds of splendid titles, already

well-known from the colophons of the Mongolian *Kanjur*: *Sutu Činggis tai-ming sečen, jüg-üd teyin bögöd jilayučei taisung tngri-yin tngri delekei dakin-u qurmusta altan kürdün-i orčiyluysan nom-un qayan* (entry 41, p. 192).

In a brief conclusion Lubsangdanjin sums up what has been said on the pages of the *Altan Tobči*. The characteristic peculiarity of this conclusion is that in it too the author links history with contemporaneity. With great interest he traces down the genealogy of the Mongolian nobility

[241]

right up to his days, on the basis of historical information establishing the origin of ruling princes contemporary with him.

In this respect, the study of the historical past became in the final analysis dictated to Lubsangdanjin by the practical needs of his time. In elucidating the events contemporary with him he displayed selectivity. This even creates the impression that Lubsangdanjin was not interested in the history of the conquest of Mongolian lands by the Manchus. And only in one place does he mention the annexation of Qaračin to Manchuria on the basis of a treaty, reinforced by traditional sacrifices (entry 41, p. 192).

Lubsangdanjin and his cohorts played an important role in reestablishing the succession of Mongolian historiographic traditions under the difficult circumstances of foreign domination.

[241]

## II. The *Šira Tujuji* (The Yellow History)

The *Šira Tujuji* exists in four copies under different names. Three of these, kept in libraries of the former Soviet Union, have already been written about by investigators (entries 150, pp. 60-78, English. translation, pp. 43-55; 70 pp. 9-12). The fourth copy, belonging to the National Library of Mongolia in Ulaanbaatar, was published in 1959 as a supplement to Heissig's book *Die Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Mongolen*. In our view this copy, called the *Činggis qayan-u teüke* [The History of Chinggis Khan]<sup>13</sup>, is considerably older. For this reason we place this copy at the foundation of our analysis, drawing on the others, of course, in necessary cases. In the Ulaanbaatar copy there are no late inter-

<sup>13</sup> The title page of the Ulaanbaatar copy bears the name *Činggis qayan-u teüke Dalai blam-a-yin nomlaysan jalayus-un qurim kemekü qad noyad-un teüke ene bolai* [The History of Chinggis Khan]. This is a history of khans and princes also called the *Feast of Youth*, Composed by the Dalai Lama. As it seems to us, the name of the copy in question should be only the first sentence, i.e., *Činggis qayan-u teüke*. As for the second sentence, it is an inaccurate explanation, made by the owner of the copy or a copyist, who having seen the initial phrase in the text of the work, where it gives a citation from a book by the Fifth Dalai Lama, *The Feast of Youth*, decided to make such an explanation, quite unsuccessfully, of course. The *Šira Tujuji* was translated into Russian by Shastina (entry 70).

polations and additions, which abound in Copy A (the Radlov copy), kept in the stacks of the Institute of Oriental Studies attached to the Russian Academy of Sciences, and lying at the base of the collated text made by Shastina for publication and translation into Russian. The text of the Ulaanbaatar copy ends at page 176 of Manuscript A, where it sets out the genealogy of Yabuyan-Mergen of the Qoyids.

In our view, the Ulaanbaatar copy preserves better than the others the character of an original version of

[242]

the work in question, which it may be. At first it was called *The History of Chinggis Khan*. Manuscripts A, B and C bear witness to the fact that various parties introduced interpolations and additions to the original text, and called this work different things: *Erten-ü qad-un ündüsün-ü yeke Šira tuyuji*, or even *Erten-ü mongγol-un qad-un ündüsün-ü yeke Šira tuyuji*.

Zhamtsarano was right when in the following he characterized the *Šira Tuyuji* on the basis of these copies as follows: "Judging generally by the style of writing of the text, one is led to surmise that the chronicle was compiled gradually; it has the character of a collection" (entries 150, p. 67, in the English translation, pp. 47-48; cf. 70, p. 9).

Copy A contains several extensive insertions between the lines, written in small letters with a very sharp instrument and in a handwriting different from the basic text. Our collation has shown that these insertions were copied literally from the *History* by Asarayči (cf. entries 70, pp. 19, 26-28, 32-33, 36-45, 53-56; 39, pp. 8, 18-20, 34-42, 45-47). As for this work, see below. From what has been said, it follows that the interpolations were made later than when the basic text of the *Šira Tuyuji* was written, and after the time when the *History* by Asarayči was finished in 1677.

The author of the *Šira Tuyuji* is unknown. Some scholars assume that the Khalkha tayiji Toba, a name found on the cover of Copy A, was not only the owner but also the author of the basic text (entries 150, p. 61, English translation, p. 44; 70, p. 9).

Recently Perlee undertook another attempt to establish the authorship of the *Šira Tuyuji* (entry 125, pp. 139-140). According to his supposition, the young son of Ilden degüregči, Šambadar Čoytu Aqai, mentioned in copy C as Öber-yin Čoytu aqai (reading according to the rules of old Mongolian script as Öber-yen Čoytu Aqai<sup>14</sup>) is the author of the work in question. It is interesting that Šambadar Čoytu Aqai was the younger brother of Asarayči (Jamba), the author of the *History* by Asarayči, which is known by his name. He, like his elder brother, was by birth from the nomadic area of Ongiin-gol near the Orkhon River. It is characteristic that copy

<sup>14</sup> It is interesting that in the Ulaanbaatar copy Čoytu Aqai is mentioned with no explanation: Öber-yin or Öber-yen. Cf. Suppl. III in Heissig's book (entry 233, p. 107).

A of the *Śira Tuγuji* was found in exactly these surroundings at the Orkhon River. No less interesting is the fact that copy A, as we already remarked, contains insertions from the *History* by Asarayči. Hence Šambadar Čoytu Aqai may be considered as having participated in the writing

[243]

of the *Śira Tuγuji* only to the extent that he was able to make some interpolations into the basic text. But that is not reason enough for us to consider him an author of this work.

The text does not indicate the time the *Śira Tuγuji* was compiled. It may be, however, assumed that the basic text was written at the beginning of the second half of the 17th century. Heissig connects the time of appearance of the *Śira Tuγuji* to the period between 1651 and 1662 (entry 233, p. 84), having in mind that the text mentions the grandson of Ligdan Khan, Lubsang, who was born after 1651, and that the text of the *Śira Tuγuji* was employed by Sayang Sečen in writing his history in 1662 (entry 233, pp. 83-84). The latest additions to the *Śira Tuγuji* were made at the end of the 17th or beginning of the 18th century, inasmuch as they mention the names of Galdan Bošoytu (1671-1697), Čebeng-rabdan (1697-1727) and the Jebtsun Damba qutrytu (1635-1723).

The author does not mention in the text any sources which he used. However, collating the *Śira Tuγuji* with works well-known to us, it is not hard to determine these sources. Zhamtsarano proved from concrete examples that the *Secret History* was used in the *Śira Tuγuji*, but he also noted with full justification that the *Śira Tuγuji* author did not copy this source, but conveyed its content in abbreviated form (entries 150, pp. 65-66, English translation, p. 47; 186, p. 147).

Another Mongolian source of the *Śira Tuγuji* is the work we have already mentioned, the *Altan Tobči Anonymous*. Zhamtsarano established a number of places (for instance, a description of the death of Chinggis Khan, etc.) which are extracts from the *Altan Tobči* (entry 150, pp. 66-67, English translation, pp. 46-47).

Even less studied are the Tibetan sources of the *Śira Tuγuji*. The text contains references to two Tibetan works: *Dalai blama-yin nomlaysan jalaγus-un qurim kemekü teūken* (The History called the *Feast of Youth*, Preached by the Dalai Lama), and the *Köke debter* (The Blue Annals). The first named of these works must be understood to be the well-known Tibetan chronicle compiled in 1643 by the Fifth Dalai Lama, Ņag-dbañ blo-bśaŋ rgya-mtsho (1617-1682) (entries 134, pp. 74-75; 286, p. 145), the historical views of which had a noticeable influence on the author of the *Śira Tuγuji*. The latter begins his work with a well-known argument about the need to study history,

[244]

taken by the Fifth Dalai Lama from a genealogical book, which speaks of the origins of the Tibetan clan of Lan. At the very beginning of the *Śira Tuγuji* we read: "In a history called the *Feast of Youth*, written by the Dalai Lama, it is said: If an ordinary person does not know his origins, then he is like an ape, bewildered in the forest; if he does not know his own clan, then he is like a dragon made from

turquoise; if he does not know writings narrating the genealogy of his ancestors, then he is like an abandoned child" (entry 70, p. 15)<sup>15</sup>. This utterance consequently became a kind of epigraph for many Mongolian historians. It is cited by Jamba in his chronicle, the *Asaraγči neretü-yin teüke* (The History written by Asaraγči (entry 39), in the *Erdeni-yin erike* by Galdan tusalayči (entry 40), in the *Mingyan kegesütü* (entry 86) and others.

In the additions written between the lines of the *Śira Tuγuji* there are references to the *Köke debter* by which one must not understand the Mongolian work, the *Köke sudur*, as some investigators assumed (entry 70, p. 175, note 20), but a well-known Tibetan chronicle, the *Deb-ther shon-po* (The Blue Annals, Mong. *Köke debter*) written by Gos-lo-tsa-ba gžon-nu dpal (1392-1481); this chronicle was translated into English by my late professor, George Roerich (entry 105). Our opinion is confirmed by a brief citation, introduced into the *Śira Tuγuji* from the chronicle in question, *Köke debter-tür eng terigün tngri-yin köbegün börte činu-a* (entry 70, p. 19): "The *Köke debter* says that the first was Börte Chino, the son of Heaven." This phrase we regard as a Mongolian translation from the Tibetan *Blue Annals*: *dañ por gnam gyi bu sbor tha che* (entry 37, f. 26-a). It is necessary to say to this too that the author of the *Blue Annals* in his turn borrowed information about Börte Čino from the work we mentioned, the *Red Annals* by Kun-dga' rdo-rje where we find exactly the same phrase (entry 90, p. 14a). It is worthy of attention as well that in the late additions to the *Śira Tuγuji* the progenitor of the Mongolian khans, whom in antiquity the Mongols called "Born with a Destiny from Heaven," is converted into the "Son of Heaven" (Skt. Devaputra).

The *Śira Tuγuji* offers special interest for us inasmuch as this work appeared in Khalkha, in all probability, prior to the establishment of Manchu rule. In favor of this supposition is the fact that

[245]

every participant in this work was to one degree or another from Khalkha by birth; the owner of copy C was the Khalkha prince Kürüski (entry 150, p. 61, English translation, p. 44), the Ulaanbaatar copy was found in Khalkha Mongolia (in the Baishingu monastery); special attention is devoted in this work to the genealogical history of the Khalkha princes, descendants of Geresenje (entries 70, p. 7; 233, p. 85).

The appearance of a historical work such as the *Śira Tuγuji* in Khalkha Mongolia bears witness to the fact that the process of rebirth of Mongolian historical traditions encompassed Khalkha as well in the period being described. The most important principles of compiling such a type of chronicle were identical in both Southern Mongolia and Khalkha. The *Śira Tuγuji* by structure and content

<sup>15</sup> For this citation in the original, cf. the Fifth Dalai Lama (entry 22, p. 157). In translating this quotation we have compared the Mongolian translation with the Tibetan original and have not found any particular divergence in the sense of the two.

differs but little from the chronicles surveyed above, such as the *Altan Tobči Anonymous* and the *Altan Tobči* by Lubsangdanjin. Here, apparently, the decisive influence of the Southern Mongolian historians is visible, in particular that of the anonymous author of the *Altan Tobči*, one of the *Śira Tuγuji*'s sources.

The *Śira Tuγuji* is written using the traditional chronological scheme of the Buddhist three stages of monarchy. But in distinction from other historical works its text is prefaced with a preamble containing a brief history not only of the origin of mankind, but also of the formation of the "external world." The introductory part was written on the basis of Buddhist cosmological concepts, about which we spoke when analyzing the work of Guoshi Čorji, *The Essence of all That is Necessary*. There is no need to dwell on the attempt of the author of the *Śira Tuγuji* to base the kinship of the Mongolian khans with the Indian and Tibetan kings, inasmuch as this effort in no wise differs from that employed by the other works reviewed above by us.

Of considerable interest to us in the basic part of the work is a history of the Mongols from ancient times to the days near when it was written. One portion of the basic text, devoted to a history of Chinggis Khan and his successors, is distinguished by its extreme brevity. In some places of the text there are interpolated (in another's handwriting) detailed stories from the *Secret History* (entry 70, pp. 26-28, 32-33), from the *Altan Tobči Anonymous* (entry 70, pp. 36-42) and from other sources. This confirms our opinion that the Khalkha historians

[246]

displayed no less interest in the historical past of their ancestors than their brethren in Southern Mongolia. In this connection it is impossible not to notice that the compilers of the *Śira Tuγuji* depended exclusively on a few sources, and being restricted to citing extracts from works of predecessors even when speaking of the most important issues in the history of Mongolia, and when their predecessors had treated them in differing ways. The absence of any critical relationship to the sources on the part of the *Śira Tuγuji* compilers testifies to this. Hence, for example, apropos of Chinggis Khan's campaign to the Tangut (Minyak) country, and concerning his death, three different extracts are cited: the first, drawn from an unknown source, is contained in the basic part; the second and third, written between the lines, are borrowed from the *Secret History* and the *Altan Tobči Anonymous* (entries 70, pp. 32-33, 36-42; 57, §§265-267; 73, pp. 57-60).

When speaking of the first part of the work, it is necessary to indicate one peculiarity, that the compilers, like their predecessors, strove to reconsider some questions of Mongolian history in the light of the Buddhist religion, even when faced with outright falsification of historical truth. They may well have been the first ones after Qutuytai Sečen to have taken on themselves the labor of disclosing connections, allegedly having existed between Chinggis Khan and the Sakya Lama Anandahirdi,<sup>16</sup> i.e., Kun-dga' sñiñ-po. In the basic text there is yet another curious

<sup>16</sup> Anandahirdi (Skt. *Ānandahrdaya*) is the Sanskrit equivalent of the Tibetan *Kun-dga' sñiñ-po*. In the Mongolian text this name is incorrectly written as *Ananda gerbai*. This name

bit of legendary information: after the campaign against Tibet Chinggis betook himself to India; on the way, at the Čadagrik Pass,<sup>17</sup> there came running up to him a wild one-horned creature called a *serü*, and having thrice knelt before the Khan to worship him, Chinggis stated: "The place Očirtu (from Skt. Vajrasana or Bodhigaya, Tib. rdo-rje-gdan Sh. B.) is in India; they say it is the birthplace of Buddha Shakyamuni." At this the wild beast, not knowing speech, bowed. "If one proceeds [thither], what will take place? It is likely, this is my Heavenly Father speaking, [he] said and turned back" (entry 70, pp. 24-25, p. 129). There is no doubt that this tale is a late reworking of an old legend, which was specifically recorded on a well-known stele, erected "on the road of Spirit" (Shen-tao pei) at the end of the 13th century in honor of Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai, the Khitan adviser of Chinggis and Ögedei (entry 174, p. 71). However, it is difficult to say from which [247]

source this legend was taken by the compilers of the *Šira Tuγuji*. To judge from the character of the reworking, and as well from some Tibetan terms contained within it, one might think that it was borrowed from Tibetan sources, inasmuch as the original version of the legend underwent a strong change reflecting the spirit of Buddhism.

The Buddhist influence on the *Šira Tuγuji* also found expression in a number of other places which tell about Mongolo-Tibetan religious relations under the successors of Chinggis Khan: Ögedei, Godan, Khubilai and others. Most marked of all is how the compilers strove to link the history of the first Mongolian khans with the history of the dissemination of the well-known Two Principles of government, i.e., of state and religion. In all of this it must be considered that the compilers of the *Šira Tuγuji* do cite some new facts on the history of Mongolo-Tibetan relations. The trustworthiness of this data, borrowed from a Tibetan historical work, the [*Holy*] *Genealogy [of the Deacons] of Sakya Monastery*, compiled in 1630 (entry 134, pp. 67-68) evoked no doubts.

The history of the post-Yüan khans in the *Šira Tuγuji* has been related most briefly. It is laid out in greater detail only when dealing with the sons of Dayan Khan, where the main stress is laid on the history of the rulers of Khalkha Mongolia, i.e., the sons of Geresenje. As Shastina writes, the genealogy of the princes, which is so well worked out in the *Šira Tuγuji* has one peculiarity which distinguishes it from other historical works by Mongolian authors; it gives

---

has not been restored in the Russian translation of the *Šira Tuγuji*. There is written Ananda Kherbei (cf. entry 70, p. 24, p. 129). As to the anachronism of the idea about ties between Chinggis and Kun-dga' sñin-po, this was already discussed above.

<sup>17</sup> The Mongolian text gives an incorrect writing of the Tibetan word Chakri (*lčags-ri*), which may possibly be a Tibetan translation of the name of the defile in the Baisun mountains which the Mongols called *temür qayalya* (The Iron Gates), and the Chinese *T'ieh-men* (entries 67, vol. 1, book 2, pp. 217-218, note 2; 174, p. 101, note 7).

information about the female line, which is generally omitted by other authors (entry 70, p. 7). Such information about wives and daughters of the Khalkha warlords is of great significance in establishing links between different groups of Mongols scattered in various corners of Mongolia in the 16th-17th centuries. In this way we see a clearly expressed pro-Khalkha orientation in the *Śira Tuṇju*. But all this does not mean that the *Śira Tuṇju* is a typical local Khalkha-Mongolian chronicle. It also expresses interest in the history of all Mongolia, as witnessed by the presence of special sections devoted to peoples inhabiting the appanages of Jochi and Chagatay, brothers of Chinggis Khan, and to the six Mongolian and [248]

four Oirat tümens, bestowed as appanages on the sons of Dayan Khan in various parts of Mongolia.

Of special interest to us are the descriptive characteristics of each of the six tümens, composed in verses. In these, in our view, one of the basic historical-political ideas of the entire work is clearly expressed to show the significance of each part of Mongolia for the general fate of the country. Thus in agreement with the descriptions mentioned, the Chahar tümen is the "blade of a hacking sword, the crest of a helmet," and the Khalkha tümen is the "defender of those who have returned home," the "support of one's own life," and the Ordos tümen is the "wing of a swift falcon, preserving the mountain-like white yurt of the proud Ruler, born with skill in his thumb, with a vast heart in his bosom" (entry 70, p. 97, p. 159).

The interest of the Khalkha author of the *Śira Tuṇju* in the history of other regions of Mongolia is also revealed in an appraisal of the activity of Ligdan Khan, who is spoken of with great sympathy, in emphasizing his service to the Mongolian state and religion:

Ligdan qutrytu, called the Sutu Chinggis Tai-ming Sečen, vanquisher of all lands, the grand Chakravarti, Tai Tai-tsung, tengri of all tengris, Qormuzda of all the Universe, rotating the golden wheel, master of Doctrine, a surpassing exemplar who has actuated the two governances (entry 70, p. 75, p. 150).

Here Ligdan Khan emerges with all his splendid titles which, as shown above, the Mongolian translators of the *Kanjur* awarded him. It is characteristic that the compiler of the basic text of the *Śira Tuṇju* similarly to the *Kanjur* translators, ascribes the merit of spreading religion into Mongolia precisely to Ligdan Khan, and not to Altan Khan, whom he merely mentions. The *Śira Tuṇju* clearly conveys the idea of justifying Ligdan Khan, because he applied forceful measures to unite all Southern Mongolia under his authority: "Inasmuch as among rulers and subjects events contradicting interests of the state have grown frequent, Ligdan Khan, having exhausted peaceful means, united in forceful fashion the great uluses of the Six Tümens" (entry 70, p. 76). Under "events contradicting interests of the state" must be understood the endless frays of rulers of Southern Mongolia which were particularly aggravated in the period when Manchu aggression was strong, as [249]

were the uprisings of some aimags of the three western түmens against Ligdan Khan in 1632.

Actually, Ligdan Khan led a stubborn fight against the aimag rulers, who had not desired to subject themselves to his central authority and had striven for separatism and were even ready to go over to the Manchu side. This struggle concluded, as is well-known, with the crushing of the Chahar khanate and the subjection of all Southern Mongolia to the Manchus. But nothing is said in the *Śira Tuγuji* about this *finale* of Ligdan Khan's anti-Manchu battle. It merely informs one that after unification of the Six Түmens Ligdan Khan resettled in the west and in the locality of Śira Tala died at the age of 43. As is evident, the author of the *Śira Tuγuji* at this point is deliberately laconic; he continues to speak of Ligdan Khan as if nothing in particular had ever happened to him. It creates the impression that he preferred to remain silent about the tragic events which took place then in Southern Mongolia.

In conclusion, we cite the statement of Vladimirtsov about the *Śira Tuγuji*:

This history is a product of a more or less free steppe creativity. It is written for and in favor of the Mongolian steppe aristocracy, not yet having had time to be converted into a Manchu hereditary bureaucracy, it answers Manchu requirements and interests. Though one can observe a certain interest in Buddhism in it, it more strongly expresses interest in epic and native traditional tales. And there is absolutely no sort of Manchurophile attitude in it, although it does acknowledge the Manchu Emperor as the creator of the *Pax Mandjurica* (entry 143, p. 1272).

[249]

### III. The *Erdeni-Yin Tobči* of Sayang Sečen

Sayang Sečen is rightly regarded as the greatest figure in Mongolian historiography. Zhamtsarano called him "one of the best representatives of the aristocratic intelligentsia of the seventeenth century, a participant in and witness to the intertribal wars, of the religious innovations, and of the downfall of the Mongolian national monarchy of Ligdan qan of Chahar" (entries 150, p.38-a; 292, English translation, p. 29).

Sayang Sečen was born in a Blue-Dragon Year, the 32nd year of the reign of the Wan-li Emperor, i.e., in 1604, in the hoshuun called Üüsin near the plain of Yeke-

[250]

Siber in the southwestern part of the Ordos (entry 107, p. 264; Urga MS 81r28; 91v12). He came from a hereditary aristocratic family belonging to the Golden Clan of the Chinggisids. His clan derived its origins from Dayan Khan (1464-1543), a descendant of Chinggis Khan in the fifteenth generation, one of the first of those who undertook to establish the unity of all Mongolian soil. Sayang Sečen is known best of all as the great-grandson of Quturytai Sečen qung-tayiji, about whom we spoke above. His grandfather Öljei-ildüči darqan bayatur sečen qung tayiji (1556-1589) and father Batu darqan bayatur sečen qung tayiji (1580- ?) were likewise mighty political figures in the Ordos. It is hardly amazing that under the conditions

of that time the political career of Sayang Sečen began quite early. At the age of ten he assumed the title of *sečen qung tayiji*, i.e., the same title that his predecessors bore, beginning with Qutuytai Sečen. The reason for such a distinction was that Sayang Sečen was “a descendant of persons who had established the rule of religion among the six nations” (entry 44, p. 287 ; Urga MS 86v11-13).

At the age of sixteen he was raised to a high state rank and assumed an active role in managing the state as a very close companion of Bošoytu Jinong of the Ordos (1565-1624). The influence of Sayang Sečen among the Ordos nobility expanded further under the successor to Bošoytu Jinong, Rinčen Elči Dayiching. During a solemn ceremony in 1627 Sayang Sečen declared the award of the title of khan to Rinčen. However, after 1627 there began a very trying period in the life of Sayang Sečen and his kinsmen, one which ended in 1634 with the collapse of the Chahar khanate of Ligdan Khan, who fell under the blows of the Manchu aggressors. Under these circumstances Sayang Sečen's activity became self-contradictory. At one time both he and Jinong Rinčen recognized the suzerainty of Ligdan as khan. As the author himself writes, “they [Sayang Sečen and Rinčen Jinong--Sh. B.] together entered the *bag*-detachment of Ligdan-qutuytu and jointly served with Ligdan in one hoshuun” (entry 44, p. 304 ; Urga MS 91r28). However there quickly broke out an internecine conflict between Ligdan Khan and the aimags which had risen against him. Ligdan Khan, who was faced with ever increasing Manchu aggression, dealt sternly with his disobedient vassals. Having invaded the Ordos in 1632, Ligdan deprived Rinčen of his rank as jinong and seized the “relics” of Chinggis Khan.

[251]

As Sayang Sečen writes, at that time when in this way “the great State began to be destroyed” (entry 44, p. 304 ; Urga MS 91r30) he himself, Sayang Sečen, went on campaign so as to meet and conclude peace with “the Chahar *sayid* [= officials--Sh. B.]” who had gone into the field, and who, in all probability, were remnants of the forces of Ligdan who had attacked the west.” Sayang Sečen succeeded in establishing friendship with 300 Chahar subjects. Later, in the Dog Year [1634], he decided to return to his homeland. On the way, Sayang Sečen ran into his old jinong, Rinčen, and proposed to him that they should return to the Ordos together, having announced that he was returning after establishing friendship with the Chahars (entry 44, p. 305; Urga MS 91v7).

When Sayang Sečen and Rinčen returned to the place Yeke-Šiber in the Ordos in that same year, 1634, a grand ceremony took place at which Rinčen was anew awarded the rank of jinong, and on Sayang Sečen were bestowed splendid titles for his services to the jinong (entry 44, pp. 305-306 ; Urga MS 91r30/92r1; entry 74, pp. 21-22). In all probability, the Ordos ruler as well as Sayang Sečen were for some time occupied with reconstructing their *ulus* which had suffered mightily from the conflicts. In the Ordos, Sayang Sečen writes in conclusion, “peace and calm again reigned” (entry 44, p. 306; Urga MS 92r5). With these words he finishes the exposition of the history of his country and the account of himself.

Thus, after the fall of the Chahar khanate in 1634, Sayang Sečen strove to create peace and friendship among the quarreling groupings in Southern Mongolia, and to strengthen his ulus in the north. It is remarkable that at just the critical moment when Ligdan Khan had lost the conflict, Sayang Sečen did not go over to the side of the Manchu victors, as did the aimag rulers of Southern Mongolia. On the contrary, having reconciled with the Chahars, he returned to his homeland, taking his former jinong along with him.

Researchers have already stated the most likely suppositions about the negative relationship of Sayang Sečen to the Manchu conquerors (entries 74, pp. 23-29; 233, pp. 96-97; 112, p. 11). As Father Mostaert writes, because of the fact that Sayang Sečen tells us nothing about his activity after 1634, although he was only over 30 by then, one might conclude that he held no official position under the Manchus (entry 74, p. 25). In all likelihood, Sayang Sečen belonged to that group of representatives [252]

of the tribal Mongolian aristocracy, who under the new regime were deprived of the gracious favor of the Manchu emperor. It is hard, of course, to suppose that such a person as Sayang Sečen who was not only a descendant of a tayiji, but also an active political figure, would have displayed indifference at Mongolia's loss of independence, nor could easily be consoled at the loss of those privileges he enjoyed as the closest cohort of the jinong and a powerful Mongol ruler. Very characteristic is the fact that right up to recent times among the kinsmen of Sayang Sečen there survived a legend, which Father Mostaert recorded on the spot and published in 1934 (entry 257, pp. 67-71). This legend states that Sayang Sečen, who very boldly and proudly rejected the numerous proposals of the Manchu emperor to accept subjection, was barbarically executed and his body dismembered. As Father Mostaert reports, in the Ordos region up until recently they lovingly preserved the tomb of Sayang Sečen and annually on the 29th of the 12th lunar month, at the locality of Üüsin, conducted a ceremony in honor of the spirit of their noted forebear (entry 74, p. 67). When and under what circumstances Sayang Sečen died is not known.

The *Erdeni-yin Tobči* of Sayang Sečen is a great monument of Mongolian historiography at the end of the 17th century. The author himself reports exactly on when he wrote his work (entries 44, p. 324; Urga MS 97r12-15; 150, p. 24):

In this wise, [the work] begun [on the day] *modun gray*<sup>18</sup> *ilayūsan odun*<sup>19</sup>, *edür* which is the eleventh day of the month Udirabalguni [Skt. *uttaraphalguni*, which corresponds to the second Mongolian month—Sh. B.] of the current year,<sup>20</sup> *naiman*

<sup>18</sup> *modun gray*: the planet Jupiter.

<sup>19</sup> *ilayūsan odun*: name of a constellation.

<sup>20</sup> *urūyusan oyтары-yin jil*: to be translated in the sense of "the current year." In the opinion of Father Mostaert, Sayang Sečen used such an expression because for him years

*čayan-u egüsgegči*<sup>21</sup> [March 30th, 1662], which is the fifty-ninth year [counting] from [the year] *yisün ulayan kilingtū*<sup>22</sup> [1604] when [I] was born, and finished [on the day] *yadasun gray bus odun*<sup>23</sup> *edür*, which is the first day of the new [moon], i.e., the month of *Burvašad* [Skt. *purvasadha*, corresponding to the sixth Mongolian month, and by the European calendar to the 15th of July--Sh. B.] (entry 74, pp. 47-51).

Over the course of many years, Sayang Sečen's work enjoyed great popularity among the Mongols. It was widely distributed in manuscript form throughout the country, and was one of the books most read by scholars literate in Mongolian. It is worthwhile mentioning that at the request of the Manchu

[253]

emperor, the *chiang-chün* of Uliyasutai, the Khalkha prince Čenggünjab, "handed over for his high review" the book by Sayang Sečen (entry 64, pp. 159-160, note 6). Not long after, the *Erdeni-yin tobči* was translated into Manchu (entry 64), and then from Manchu into Chinese (as to the Chinese translation, see entries 208, pp. 85-86; 239, pp. 195-198; 74, pp. 36-37).

The great fame which Sayang Sečen's work acquired in the West is due to the appearance of a German translation by Isaac Schmidt (1829), accompanied by the Mongolian text (entries 107; 83, 74, 85).

The *Erdeni-yin tobči* is in many respects the most finished work of its time about the history of Mongolia. In a compositional sense it clearly expresses and contains a host of new undertakings. After brief introductory remarks about the content of his work the author begins the main portion: a history of the world and of Mongolia, set forth in several large divisions (the history of the origin and formation of the universe, the appearance of the first living beings and of people on the earth, the history of the Indian and Tibetan kings, the history of Mongolia, and so on). The work concludes with a colophon.

---

were enumerated in correspondence with the movement of such heavenly bodies, as the sun, moon and stars.

<sup>21</sup> The year of *naiman čayan-u egüsgegči* or, as the Mongols otherwise call it, the year *buyan egüsgegči*, is, as Father Mostaert established, a calque of the Sanskrit name Śubhaktṛ (Tib: *dge-byed*). In this case it is the 36th year in the sixty-year cycle of the Indo-Tibetan system of chronology. This year in Sayang Sečen corresponds to 1662.

<sup>22</sup> As Father Mostaert determined, *yisün ulayan kilingtū* is also a calque of a Sanskrit name of the year Krodhin (Tibetan *khro-mo*), which in this case corresponds to the 38th year of the tenth Tibetan sixty-year cycle, encompassing the period from 1567 to 1624. Consequently, this year in Sayang Sečen corresponds to 1604. Cf. entry 74, p. 49.

<sup>23</sup> *bus odun*: name of a constellation.

It is remarkable that Sayang Sečen introduced into Mongolian historical writing the practice of enumerating the sources used, at the end of his work. He himself names the following seven sources:

1. *Tegünčilen üjegseger udqa-tu čiqula kereglegči* [The *sūtra* called The Meaningful and Important Necessity].<sup>24</sup>
2. *Tayiqamsiy-a üjegdeküi sečeg-ün čomorliḡ neretü Šastir* [The *śastra* called The Flower Bouquet Marvelous to Behold].<sup>25</sup>
3. *Ulaḡan debter* [The Red Annals].<sup>26</sup>
4. *Šarba qutuy-tu-yin jokiyaḡsan qad-un ündüsün-ü tuḡuḡi* [The Story of the Origin of the Khans, compiled by Sharba Quturytu].<sup>27</sup>
5. *Erdem-ten-ü sedkil-i geyigülküi sečeglig kemekü kitad-un šastir*<sup>28</sup> [The Chinese *śastra* called The Flower Garden Illuminating the Mind of Savants]
6. *Erkin [erkim] degedü čakrawar-un qayan-u bayiyuluḡsan nom-un čayan teüke* [The White History of the Law, [254]

<sup>24</sup> This is the work by Guoši Čorji reviewed above, the *Čiqula kereglegči tegüs udqa-tu neretü sasdar*.

<sup>25</sup> We still know nothing about this work. At the beginning of his work, Sayang Sečen, when speaking of the Indian rulers, mentions this composition along with other sources. He reports that the *śastra* was compiled by the sage Aksapāda. Cf. entry 44, p. 15, Urga MS 4v23; cf. entry 233, pp. 100-101.

<sup>26</sup> This implies the previously mentioned Tibetan historical work, the *deb-ther dmar-po* (or *hu-lan deb-ther*), compiled in 1346 by Kun-dga' rdo-rje. At the beginning of his work Sayang Sečen reports that the *Red Annals* were written by *Yeke mergen-e bütügšen sangga siri bada* (Skt. *Samghasribhadra*). I have already remarked in one of my works that the author of the *Red Annals* is not called by his own name but by his respectful title (in Mongolian and in Sanskrit). If we reconstruct it in Tibetan, it will be: *Mkha-grub čhen-po dge-'dun dpal bžan-po*. Cf. Sh. Bira, "Some remarks on the Hu-lan Deb-ther of Kun-dga' rdo-rje" (entry 214, pp. 74-75; cf. entry 233, pp. 101-102).

<sup>27</sup> The work referred to has not come down to us. Scholars think that its author, Sharaba-quturytu, is that same Sharaba-quturytu or Sakya Panchen Sharaba Ananda Shri bhadra, who was a personal preceptor of Ligdan Khan. As is well-known, he took an active role in editing the Mongolian *Kanjur* in 1628-1629. To judge from the title, one may presume that the *History of the Origin of the Khans* was written by Sharaba-quturytu with the aim of establishing the genealogical claims of Ligdan Khan to the throne of all the Mongols. This work could have been written by the author, as Walther Heissig correctly assumes, in the period between 1617 and 1629, when Sharaba-quturytu was in the service of Ligdan Khan (entry 233, pp. 48-50).

<sup>28</sup> Scholars have not yet been able to establish which Chinese work Sayang Sečen had in mind.

composed by the Supreme Sublime Chakravarti Khan].<sup>29</sup>

7. *Erten-ü mongγol-un ündüsün-ü yeke Šira tuyuji* [The Great Yellow History of the Origin of Former Mongolian Khans]. We spoke of this work earlier *supra* (Urga MS 96v30/97r1-9).

Sayang Sečen did not identify every source he used, but only the basic works he employed. In the text one may discover ones other than those named, as well as unnamed sources, which the author used in writing these or other divisions. Of the sources which he names one may list the following:

1. The *Kālačakra-sūtra* (*čay-un kürden-ü toyačan-u toyalal*).

2. The *Suvarṇaprabhās-asūtra* (*degedü Altan gerel*).

3. The *Sayin-u toyan-u sudur*, written by Sakya-Pandita Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan (1182-1252) on the basis of the *Kālačakra* of Panchen Shagjashri (Bančen Segjasiri < Pan-čen Sākyašri).

4. *Qayučin sudur* [The Ancient Book], compiled by Qirdi dovačava (from Tibetan *grags-pa rgyal-mtshan*) on the basis of the sutra: *Burqan kkir ügei neretü Okin-e vavangirid üjügülügsen uduriyulsunu sudur* (the *Vimalakīrtini desa nama mahāyānasūtra*).

5. *Burqan-u üres (?) boluysan maytaγal-un tayilburi kemeküi sudur*<sup>30</sup>, compiled by Bilig-ün quyay kemekü baysi (Tib. *Šes-rab go-čha* < Prajñavarman), and others.

All these sources are Buddhist religious works. They had a strong influence on the world view of Sayang Sečen as a historian.

As regards sources not named by Sayang Sečen, some scholars presume that his data about the visit to Mongolia by the Third Dalai Lama he borrowed from the well-known and often mentioned here biography of the Third Dalai Lama, compiled by the Fifth Dalai Lama in 1643 (entry 233, pp. 108-109). However this seems most unlikely. On comparing the corresponding passages in both works one is easily convinced that the data in them are far from identical, and even at times are contradictory. Let us cite some examples.

According to Sayang Sečen, the idea of inviting the Dalai Lama to Mongolia was advanced to Altan Khan by Qutuytai Sečen qung-tayiji in 1576 (a Red Mouse Year) (entry 44, p. 240; Urga MS 74r27-30). But we find something quite different in the work by the Fifth Dalai Lama. He informs us that in the Iron Ram Year (1571) Altan Khan accepted faith in the dharma. After Asen-lama, who had journeyed to visit him, had made him acquainted with the biography of the Dalai

<sup>29</sup> It is referring to the previously discussed *Čayan teüke*, edited by the great-grandfather of Sayang Sečen, Qutuytai Sečen.

<sup>30</sup> In all probability, he is speaking of the well-known work *Lha las phul du byuñ ba'i bstod pa'i grel pa*, written by Sherabgocha (Tib. *Ses-rab go-cha*) from which Tibetan authors extracted data about the origins of the Tibetans. Kun-dga' rdo-rje and gZon-nu dpal specifically cite this work (entry 90, p. 156).

[255]

Lama, the khan decided to extend an invitation to the latter (entry 23, f. 88-b). According to Sayang Sečen, Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji of the Ordos and Dayan-noyon of the Tümed were at the head of a third meeting, set up in honor of the Third Dalai Lama on the road he was following to the encampment of Altan Khan (entry 44, p. 243; Urga MS 75r11-13). The Fifth Dalai Lama, however, writes that they were at the head of a second, but not a third meeting (entry 23, f. 94). It must be said that the narrative of the Fifth Dalai Lama about the official adoption of Lamaism by the Mongols is fuller than this episode is in Sayang Sečen's work. One encounters curious details which are not in Sayang Sečen. For instance, the Fifth Dalai Lama reports that the Third Dalai Lama committed the main *ongyon*, a shamanist idol, to the flames as a kind of offering to Gombo (Tib. mGon-po), a four-headed deity. All the Mongols, he writes, followed this example, and committed to the flames their own ongyons (entry 23, f. 96-b).

On the other hand, Sayang Sečen has much information which is not in the work on the Third Dalai Lama. Hence one may conclude that Sayang Sečen did not make use of the biography of the Third Dalai Lama compiled by the Fifth Dalai Lama. One has to think that at his disposal lay other materials, perhaps a family archive of his, set up by his great-grandfather Qutuytai Sečen. He might also have used oral communications from his kinsmen. To judge from the character and content of the information he conveys, it is not hard to establish that those portions devoted to the history of the "minor khans" are written on the basis of purely Mongolian traditional tales, epic stories and some notes preserved in the families of nobles. It is in just those parts of his work that Sayang Sečen offer his most valuable material for reconstructing Mongolian historiographic traditions and views during the so-called dark period (15th-16th centuries). When writing the colophon of his work, Sayang Sečen made wide use of, as he notes himself, "of sutras and shastras" among which first and foremost must be understood to include the *Subhasita* of Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan.

When proceeding to analyze the basic portion of his work, it must be noticed first of all how Sayang Sečen understands a history of Mongolia. In our view, he clearly formulated this in his conclusion:

Being unable to relate [this] fully, I am summarizing at some length:

[256]

[information about] that former worldly material-universe [and]

The various descendant living-beings relying on it

On behalf of living-beings from India's Khan *Acclaimed by Many* down to now

To the present-day time of strife

[About] the birth of *boydas* and powerful Khans pacifying the earth

The birth of meritorious *bodhisattvas* leading living-beings,

[And about] all having been made joyful by the religion of Buddha and government

by *boydas* (entry 295, p. 107; Urga MS 96v, 16-24).

It is clear that Sayang Sečen wrote his history in full accord with a general scheme, worked out, as we have already seen, by his great-grandfather Qutuytai Sečen and other predecessors: a history of Mongolia is a history of the "Two Principles," the union of religion and the khan's power. But under this scheme Sayang Sečen places such a solid historical base that his work in places goes far beyond these limits. One may also add that his work was essentially the first attempt at a full-scale exposition of the overall history of Mongolia from oldest times to the second half of the 17th century.

What are these basic issues which Sayang Sečen illumines? At the very beginning of his work he writes:

[I shall relate]

How the steadfast support, the outer earth-vessel, was established;

How the supporting inner descendants and sentients were formed;

How the *bodhisattvas* who broadly lead sentients were born;

How the three nations of ancient India, Tibet and Mongolia

Have spread out since ancient times (entry 296: unpublished MS; Urga MS 1v5-11; entry 297; PP-ET A-1. pp. 35-36).

One's attention is drawn by the author's attempt to link the history of the Mongols with a universal historical process, bravely demolishing the old historiographic tradition according to which the history of the Mongols began only with the forebears of Chinggis Khan. It is true that this attempt by Sayang Sečen, as with attempts by his predecessors, was entirely founded on Buddhist historical-cosmological theory, as set forth in the *Abhidharmakośa* mentioned above, but nonetheless he did display some independence in the matter. Sayang Sečen is primarily interested in a naive naturalistic concept of Buddhist cosmology. For him the most important thing of all is to reveal the historical process revealing the origin of the material world and of living beings, humanity. In distinction to some of his predecessors (for instance, Guoši Čorji) he has no interest in a fantastic description of the make-up of the universe, nor in the characteristics of every possible animate creature which inhabits the various realms of the universe. Proceeding from the organic unity

[257]

of the material world and the world of animate creatures, Sayang Sečen concisely describes the formation of the universe. At the base of this process lie three substances: air, water, earth. Space (*qoyusun ayar*) serves as the place where the formation of the world takes place, and there, from the powerful movement of air from the ten directions, is first formed the unshakeably firm sphere of the element "air" (*kei-yin mandal*), after which, thanks to heat imparted through the movement of the air, a great cloud arose from which came a mighty rain, which gave rise to the sphere of the element "water" (*usun-u mandal*) in the shape of a vast ocean. Over the surface of the water was formed a *paramanu*-dust, similar to the skim on milk. From the heaping up of the dust—of its most minute particles—there was formed the

sphere of the element "earth" (*siroi mandal*)—the "Golden Universe" (*altan delekei*) (entry 44, p. 8 ; Urga MS 1v17-30/ 2r1-3).

Proceeding to the history of animate beings, the author restricts himself to a short narration of the history of the appearance of humanity on earth. In Sayang Sečen's opinion, people did not originally split off from the world of living substances. Then, he writes, there was no such name as "man", but there was only one general name: "living-beings" (*amitan*). At first people held the status of reincarnated-*tengris*, and were distinguished both by physical and moral perfection. They lived incalculably many years, not walking the earth but flying through the sky, nourished not by earthly foods, but by a pure viand, *samadhi*. This was the "time of complete perfection" in the Buddhist cosmology, corresponding to the "Golden Age" of antiquity amidst Greek and Chinese thinkers.

According to the degree of degradation of their moral qualities men were distanced from their original status and descended, at last remove, to the position of earthly creatures with all the flaws they possess. This process was broken down into five periods. Sayang Sečen strictly adheres to the thesis of Buddhist cosmology that the origin of feelings for property among people served as a basic reason for the change in their way of life. The first trial people made of earthly food, was the so-called fat of the land (*yajar-un tosun*). This brought about their transformation into earthly creatures. And the person who kept food for the next day, produced the impetus for the disappearance of the abundance of ready-to-eat

[258]

food, a grain which grew wild (*salu tuturay-a*) and the appearance of property. It was necessary for people to work the earth themselves to gain their bread.

Quarrels and strife among people began over land as well as from unequal distribution of food. Thievery arose, as did slaying and other vices. All this, in turn, led to the fact that people had agreed among themselves to divide up their land portions equally and to select a ruler able to maintain order in society. In this way the first ruler arose, called "Elevated by the Multitude" (Mong. *olan-a ergügdegsen*, Skt. *Mahāsammata*). This king, in the opinion of Sayang Sečen, was also the progenitor of all the kings of the earth, in the first place in India, Tibet and Mongolia.

In comparison with his predecessors Sayang Sečen "set the groundwork" in a more circumstantial way for the well-known scheme of the three Buddhist monarchies. It is just in this work of his that the scheme attains its ultimate expression. Sayang Sečen strove to prove not only the spiritual kinship but also the genealogical unity of the kings of the three lands (India, Tibet and Mongolia), and regarded it as necessary to preface the history of Mongolia with a brief survey of the history of kings and religion of India and Tibet. His point of departure used the concept of the Tibetan historian-Buddhists about the origins of the Tibetans from the Indians, and their kings from the race of *Mahāsammata*. Unaware of the falsehood in this concept, worked out by Tibetan authors who had striven to link the destiny of Tibet with its being the homeland of Buddhism, Sayang Sečen upheld this thesis, and cited as its foundation those legends that were widely disseminated

among the Tibetan authors. Alluding to the work of Śes-rab go-čha, Sayang Sečen writes that the youngest of the five sons of Pandu (Pandu, Tib. *skya-sen*, Mong. *itegel arsalan*), Rupati, having suffered defeat in a battle with the forces of an enemy, fled to the slopes of the snowy mountains and became the progenitor of the Tibetans (entry 44, pp. 21-22 ; Urga MS 7r29-30/ 7v1). This same legend is also quoted by the Tibetan historians Kun-dga' rdo-rje and Gos-lo-tsa-va gZhon-nu dpal.

Sayang Sečen likewise quotes the legend of the origin of the first Tibetan king. To King *Urγuγuluγi*, ruler of the Badasal people, was born a son with turquoise hair, with teeth of white conch, with fingers and toes on his hands and feet like those of a goose, with eyes

[259]

resembling those of a bird, shutting from the bottom up. When they showed him to the interpreters of signs, these shamans stated: "This son will be bad for his father, he must be slain." But no swords were able to dispatch him. For this reason they placed the youngster in a copper case and cast him into the Ganges River. A farmer, living near the city of Vaishali, drew him from the river. The boy grew up with the farmer's family. Having learned about his past from those who brought him up, he betook himself in an eastward direction, to the Snowy Land. There local inhabitants elected him king after he related to them his origin from the golden clan of the ancient Indian king, Mahāsammata (cf. entry 44, pp. 22-24 ; Urga MS 7r/8r). Thus there arose the first king of Tibet, Kujugun Sandalitu (Mong. *kūjūgūn sandalitu qayan*, Tib. *gha khri btsan po*), progenitor of the Tibetan kings.

Following this pattern, the Mongolian Buddhist-historians in their turn concocted a legend about the origin of the Mongol khans from the Tibetan kings, and through them from Mahāsammata. This legend, which in its various shadings achieved widespread distribution in Mongolian historical literature beginning with the 17th century, emerges in Sayang Sečen as follows. The Tibetan king, Dalai-Subin Aru Altan Shiregetu<sup>31</sup>, who was the seventh king after Kujugun Sandalitu, was slain by his vizier Long-nam, who had seized the throne. The three sons of the king, Boroču<sup>32</sup>, Šibayuči<sup>33</sup> and Börte-Čino, fled from the latter. Börte Čino did not settle down in the Konbo district (Tib. *rkoḥ-po*), but redirected himself across the Sea (Tengis), took himself a wife and reached the mountains of Burqan qaldun in the environs of Lake Baikal. There he met up with the Bida people.<sup>34</sup> When they

<sup>31</sup> As Sumba-Khambo Ishibaljir observed, the Mongols erroneously called this king Srip khri "Gser khri", then translating the latter into Mongolian as *Altan siregetü* (cf. entry 36, p. 301).

<sup>32</sup> This is how Sayang Sečen translates Tib. *śa-khri* into Mongolian.

<sup>33</sup> This is the Mongolian translation of Tibetan *bya-khri*.

<sup>34</sup> *Bida* is the Mongolian distortion of a Chinese name *bei-ta* (Northern Tatars) which the Chinese used to denote all the Mongols in ancient times.

asked him who he was, Börte Čino told about his origin from the clan of the ancient Indian king Mahāsammata and the Tibetan king. When they learned this, the Bida people took counsel and decided to elect him their noyon-ruler (entry 44, pp. 71-72 ; Urga MS 24r/v).

The legend cited above represents a blend of two quite different traditional tales having the common historical purpose of establishing a blood link between the Mongolian khans and the Tibetan kings. One of these, a well-known Mongolian tale, reads: "The ancestor of Chinggis Khan was Börte Čino, born by the will of High Heaven. His spouse was Goa-Maral. They appeared, having crossed the Tengis [the Inner

[260]

Sea]. They nomadized at the sources of the Onon River, at Burqan Qaldun" (entry 57, §1, p. 79).

The other story is of purely Tibetan origin and is widely known in Tibetan historical literature. Its content may be briefly summarized as follows: King Dri Gundzanbo (*gri khuñ btsam po*), son of the last king of the "Seven Kings who rule the Heavenly Thrones" (Tib. *gnam-la khri bdun*), was slain by his vizier Lonam (*Lo-nam, blo-nam*). His three sons, by name Dja-dri (*bya-khri*), Sha-dri (*Ša-khri*) and Nya-dri (*Ňa-khri*), fled to a place called Konpo (*koñ-po, rkoñ-po*). Later, Dja-dri ascended the throne and became known under the name of Pude-Gunjäl (*spu-lde guñ-rgyal*). Sha-dri and Nya-dri became the rulers of Konpo and Nyanpo (*nan-po*) respectively (cf. entry 90, f. 15-b/16-a).

In the Tibetan version of this tale, as we see, there is no hint that the youngest of the three fleeing sons of King Dri Gundzanbo might become khan of the Mongols. But for Sayang Sečen, as for the other Mongol historians, it was sufficient to have the slightest mention of the flight of the youngest son of Dri Gundzanbo to another locality, so as to identify him with the Mongolian Börte Čino, who had appeared, as stated in Mongolian traditional tales, in Mongolia together with his spouse Goa-Maral, "having crossed the Tengis." As to how all this was accepted by the Mongolian authors, even Sumba-Khambo Ishibaljir wrote about this. Quoting this very tale, the latter noted that Nya-dri in Mongolian is called Bor-ta-se-ba (*bor-ta-ze-ba*), who later came to be called Börte Čino (*Borta čhe-no*) by the Mongols (entry 36, f. 300-b/301-a).

It is clear that Sayang Sečen played no small role in reworking the well-known concept of the so-called "genetic" kinship of the kings of India, Tibet and Mongolia. This concept is devoid of any historical foundation; it is totally based on legends, which arose as a result of reworking old Tibetan and Mongolian traditionary tales in a Buddhist religious spirit. Nevertheless one should note that Sayang Sečen, striving to establish this concept, did not restrict himself to just a few legends, but strove to strengthen it historically with reliable data from the early history of India and Tibet. He discusses, for instance, not just the legendary kings, but also such patrons of Buddhism as

[261]

Aśoka (*γasalang ügei nom-un qaγan*), Kaniśka (*kanige, genika*), Sron-btsan-gampo, Dri-sron-de-tsan and others. The brief survey of the history of Buddhism in early India and Tibet in Sayang Sečen is unconditionally directly connected with the history of that religion in Mongolia. For the Mongolian reader, it naturally was not devoid of interest to know where and when the Buddhist religion in general had arisen. It is noticeable that the author already has a historical-logical approach to the subject to be studied, as a result of which Sayang Sečen considerably expanded the topics of study in Mongolian historiography.

Having established in this way, as it seemed to him, the genetic continuity between the Mongolian khans and the Indo-Tibetan kings, Sayang Sečen goes over to the main division of his work—the history of the Mongols—in which he distinguishes three principal periods: first an early era of the rise of the Mongols; second, the era of creation of the Mongolian state and empire; and third, the post-Yüan—a period of the loss of the khan's power and of internecine struggle in Mongolia and the modern (to the author), a time of attempts to reestablish the unity of Mongolian lands and of threats to Mongolian political independence posed by the Manchus.

The early period of Mongolian history the author describes solely by those historical reports and tales which since the time of the *Secret History* were the basis of Mongolian historical knowledge. It is understandable therefore that some events which Sayang Sečen narrates in connection with the genealogy of the Golden Clan, and the life and activity of Chinggis Khan, are very similar to corresponding paragraphs of the *Secret History*. Also, as a new undertaking, Sayang Sečen, as part of his account of the history of Mongolian conquests, devoted a paragraph to a short survey of the history of China, beginning with its first rulers down to its conquest by Chinggis Khan (entry 44, pp. 100-106; Urga MS 33r/35r). His principal attention here is devoted to the history of Chinese emperors and the Buddhist religion in China. It is characteristic that Sayang Sečen regarded China as one of the Buddhist countries, establishing India as the homeland of Buddhism thereby providing the same spiritual kinship for China to India common to all Buddhists. It is difficult to determine the sources used by the author in his description of the history of China. However, some of his data is very close to that which we find

[262]

in the *Red Annals* of Kun-dga' rdo-rje. True, the information in the latter is less detailed than what Sayang Sečen has. This is witnessed by the fact that our author used other sources as well, in the first place Chinese ones, but exactly which ones is still unknown.

Considerable space in Sayang Sečen is allotted to the history of the Yüan dynasty, which ruled China. The author observes two tendencies.

The first is that he strives to maintain a strict chronological sequence, indicating in each instance the year of birth and of rule of all khans of this dynasty, basically as do the *Śira tuyuji*, and to somewhat less an extent, the *Altan Tobči* of Lubsangdanjin. The second is that he strives to survey the history of the Yüan dynasty as a history of the famed "Two Principles", the union of the khan's power

and the Buddhist church. In this matter the Buddhist world view of the author shows up quite clearly. According to Sayang Sečen, from the time Buddhism spread among the Mongols, the history of religion became the most important component of Mongolian history. The author devotes particular attention to the advent of Khubilai Khan, whom he considers a Chakravarti, who makes revolve the thousand golden wheels and who guides the world through the law of *dharma*—the doctrine of the ten virtues. Sayang Sečen borrowed his basic facts about this period from Tibetan sources. Thus, for instance, everything he says about the acceptance of Buddhism on the part of Khubilai Khan when the latter met hPhags-pa Lama, is greatly reminiscent of what is written about this in the *[Holy] Genealogy [of the Deacons] of the Sakya Monastery*.

In Sayang Sečen's opinion, all the khans of the Yüan dynasty, with the exception of the last one, Toyon Temür, correctly pursued the policy of the Two Principles, following the example of Qubilai sečen. The author furnishes each of these khans with a personal preceptor who personifies spiritual power in the empire. At the same time Sayang Sečen portrays the Mongolian khans of the Yüan dynasty as typical patrons of Buddhism. He endeavors in his own way to explain the reasons for the overthrow of the Yüan dynasty in China. Striving to lay all the responsibility for the Mongol conquerors being driven out of China on Toyon Temür, Sayang Sečen selects the factual data in such a way that the latter looks like the chief [263]

guilty party in the downfall of the empire. Toyon Temür, Sayang Sečen thinks, committed a fatal mistake by excessively trusting his Chinese official Chou Ko from the Chou clan, and ignoring the warnings of his Mongolian retainers. The author maintains that it was precisely this Chinese official who was later shown to be the chief organizer of a plot against the Mongolian khan.

It is also interesting that Sayang Sečen also speaks of the inevitable end of the Mongolian empire's existence. True, he does not base this opinion on sober judgments of a historian, but solely on a typical Buddhist prophecy allegedly uttered by hPhags-pa Lama when he met Khubilai Khan. "No one can stave off his *karma* [destiny], if the time is ripe," declared preceptor Ananda Madi in reply to the khan's request to aid him in saving the empire from the danger threatening it. At that very critical moment the angry khan drove out his preceptor, sending him back to his homeland. Nonetheless in the opinion of the author, Toyan Temür undermined the basic policy of the Two Principles, which inescapably had to lead to lamentable consequences. In conclusion Sayang Sečen compels Toyan Temür, who has lost the khan's throne in China, to be remorseful about his actions. He cites the lament of the deposed khan, which substantially differs from the versions given in the *Śira tuyuji* and the *Altan Tobči* of Lubsangdanjin (entries 44, pp. 156-158; Urga MS 49v/50r; 70, pp. 55-56; 41, vol. 2, pp. 123-124). This so-called lament of Toyan Temür, as was stated above, was widely disseminated among the Mongols in the 15th-16th centuries, and served 17th century historians as a basis for appraisal of the actions of the last khan of the Yüan dynasty.

Sayang Sečen made a valuable contribution to the study of Mongolian history of the post-Yüan period. As Vladimirtsov observed, Sayang Sečen devotes his best pages to the 15th and 16th centuries, and as a ruling prince belonging to the Chinggisids, was able to hear many things from his kinsmen, the preservers of the old traditional tales of the Golden Clan (entry 145, p. 16). The data he cites are far richer and more detailed than those in the *Šira tuyuji* or the *Altan Tobči* of Lubsangdanjin. Sayang Sečen

[264]

was able to reproduce a vivid picture of Mongolian political life in the period of the country's break-up into internecine conflicts. He got this entirely thanks to those historical-literary traditions which were preserved down to his time from the 15th-16th centuries. In this context, the historian was more like an artist-restorer who was recreating an original down to minor details. He held strictly to the historic-epic style of traditional Mongolian historiographic creativity, and expressed his full agreement with the basic political and historical ideas of his predecessor-historians, whose works were his sources.

Of great interest for us is the light Sayang Sečen sheds on matters of genealogy and chronology in Mongolian history of the post-Yüan period. Of all the historians of the 17th century, only Sayang Sečen, it seems, is able to give the fullest and most trustworthy genealogy of the Mongolian tayijis of the 15th-16th centuries, those belonging to the leading branch of the Golden Clan Chinggisids. When reading the appropriate pages, it is not hard to be convinced that the author had at the basis of this genealogy those genealogical notes which were on hand in the families of the Mongolian tayijis. For Sayang Sečen genealogy is not a stark recital of names. He accompanies it with many details from the lives of the khans and powerful political figures. The author persistently strives to indicate dates of lives and rule for all khans, as well as activities of other historical personages, and not seldom without error. This would be an attainment for any historian. It is precisely this circumstance which bestows the style of a chronicle on his work.

In this part of his work there are reflections of those new historical-political ideas which arose then in connection with the stormy events in the political life of Mongolia. In the 16th century the major event riveting the attention of all the Mongols was the violent struggle between the eastern and western regions of the country, as well as the internecine uprisings among the eastern Mongolian rulers.

For this reason it is quite comprehensible that Sayang Sečen brings together almost the entire post-Yüan history of Mongolia to narrate this struggle. He is especially interested in details which permit

[265]

one to determine the reasons for and character and outcome of these endless conflicts. He thinks that the internecine struggles arose not only from the Oirat claims to the khan's throne, but also from the chronic discord among representatives of the Golden Clan of the Chinggisids. In Sayang Sečen's opinion, the irrational and stupid acts of some khans and their retainers often served as the cause of disaster for all Mongolia. The most graphic one of all, the author indicates through the example

of Elbeg Khan and Aybarji jinong. In accord with historical tradition, he maintains that Elbeg Khan was actually the first khan who by his wild deeds lay the foundation for the internecine conflicts. Sayang Sečen, appraising the shameful actions of the khan, quotes these words of the Oirat ruler Ugeji Qasaqa:

This khan having established his realm unjustly, has [now] slain his younger brother, Qaryučuy qung tayiji, and has taken to wife his sister-in-law, Qong γoa bayiji; he administers the government improperly. My minister Quuqai was betrayed and slain by the bayiji-princess. To his own shame, though I the prince am living, he has let my subject Batula rule The Four. (entry 44, p. 163; Urga MS 51v17-23).

In the final accounting Elbeg Khan became victim of his own deeds, and the eastern Mongols soon fell under the power of the Oirat rulers, Toyon and Esen.

The reason for the defeat of the Mongolian Tayisun Khan in battle with the Oirats, Sayang Sečen ascribes to the treachery of Aybarji jinong. The latter was the younger brother of Tayisun Khan, but at the crucial moment yielded to the promises of the Oirats; he betrayed his brother and went over to the other side. Sayang Sečen does not conceal his disapproval of Aybarji jinong's actions. It is true that he expresses this obliquely, citing in a number of places the very words of Aybarji or the statements of the Oirats. Prior to the treachery of Aybarji his son Qaryučuy, anticipating his father, said that it would be bad for the latter if he broke the link between the clan and the khan. And when Aybarji at the insistence of the Oirats decided to become khan, having yielded his title as jinong to Esen of the Oirats, Qaryučuy said to his father:

Sun and Moon are in the High Blue [Heaven];  
Khan and Jinong [are] on the Lower Crust [Earth].  
There are tayishis and čingsangs amidst the descendants of the *Sutai*  
[the Fortunate Lady];  
How can one give one's name to others?  
(entries 44, p.181; Urga MS 56v23-26; 297, p. 212)

[266]

These words aptly express the opinion predominant at this time amidst the Mongolian aristocracy about defining the degrees of nobility in representatives of the upper class. In Mongolia during the post-Yüan period the *jinong*<sup>35</sup> was second only to the khan and thus had to be by birth from among the closest relatives of the khan. He was the co-ruler with the khan and led the right *tümen*. Another branch of the Chinggisid family tree was the so-called *kürgens* (sons-in-law), Golden Clan relatives on the maternal side. The fact of the matter is that all the *tayijis* (crown

<sup>35</sup> *jinong* (Chin. *qin-wang*) is a ruling prince. In the Yüan period this title was borne by the heir to the throne, who commonly resided in Kharakhorum.

princes) were regarded as relatives, as members of the same clan and "bone" (*kiyad yasutu*, *Borjigin oboytu*), and thus in no instance could they marry girls from their own clan. The Mongolian tayijis and khans bestowed their daughters on members of other aristocratic clans, appointing tayijis and jaisangs from the houses of those same nobles, with whom they had long been linked by exchange of brides (entry 145, p. 144). From what has been said, it is clear that the decision of Aybarji jinong represented a scandalous violation of legitimized traditions. For this reason the rebukes of his son are quite understandable. But Aybarji jinong insisted on going his own way and made a deal with the Oirats. To top this off, Sayang Sečen makes the Oirats say this about Aybarji:

This Jinong of ours  
Is really no jinong at all!

He is a colossal ass! (entries 44, p. 180; 306; 297, p. 120; Urga MS 56r29-30).

and informs us that Aybarji jinong met an evil fate—killed by those same Oirats to whose side he had fled.

In his capacity as a ruling prince and a scion of the Chinggis clan, Sayang Sečen persistently promotes the idea, according to which the holder of Mongolian power, ruler of all the Mongols, can only be a pure-blooded descendant of Chinggis Khan, above all else a descendant of Qubilai, founder of the Yüan empire. Proceeding by this rule, he relates all khans of the post-Yüan period to descendants of the noted khans of the Yüan dynasty, passing over in silence the fact that during the post-Yüan period not once were any representatives of Arig-Buqa's clan seated on the Mongolian throne; when speaking about the seizure of power by the Oirat lords, Sayang Sečen does not conceal his own negative attitude toward them. Characteristic is the statement he cites about Toyon tayishi, a pretender to the khan's throne. Toyon, as is well-known, was the emperor's son-in-law. He was the son of Samur-gungji,

[267]

and married to the daughter of Elbeg Khan. Then Sayang Sečen puts in Toyon tayishi's mouth a phrase that might well have been grounded in this fancy: "Thereupon Toyon tayishi . . . three times circled the stockade of the ruler's palace, slashing as he brushed past, and said, 'You may well be the White House of the *Sutu* [i.e., Chinggis], but I Toyon am a descendant of the *Sutai* [i.e., his mother belonged to the Imperial clan]'" (Urga MS 53-v 15-18). The aristocratic folk and the Forty [Mongols] and Four [Oirats] who had observed this said among themselves:

This sainted lord is not a ruler of the Mongols alone; but is a son of Khan Qormusta who has brought under sway

The Ones of Five Colors and the Four Foreign Ones . . . (Urga MS 53v 20-22; entries 306; 297, pp. 209-210)

Your words and your demeanor are extremely mean. It would be (more) seemly to bow to the grace of the sainted Lord, and to beg for your life. (Urga MS 53v24-26)  
 In reply Toyon tayishi said: 'From whom shall I ask my life save than from myself? . . . Let me assume the rank of Khan after the practice of the former Mongolian khans (entry 44, p. 169; Urga MS 53v26-29).

However, when bowing to the spirit of Chinggis, an invisible spike penetrated Toyon tayishi, and everyone saw that an arrow in Chinggis Khan's quiver, which was in the tent, was covered with blood; all the people in the 44 *tümens* said that the Ruler had not pardoned Toyon. Before his death, Toyon called to his son Esen and said to him:

The Fortunate man [i.e., Chinggis] has manifested his male power [i.e., his machismo];  
 The Fortunate Woman [i.e., Toyon's mother, of imperial descent] was unable to defend me;  
 Whilst putting my trust in the Fortunate Mother,  
 I have thus been manhandled by the Saintly Lord."  
 (entry 44; Urga MS 54r11-13; 297).

Sayang Sečen is a proponent of strong power for the khans in Mongolia. This view is most evident from the facts of the life and activity of Batumöngke (later Dayan Khan) and Altan Khan, whom he cites.

As an historian, Sayang Sečen was able to capture the basic historical slant of the period being described. As is well-known, at the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th centuries, the internecine wars in Mongolia concluded with victory for the Chinggisids. And this victory of the descendants of the Golden Clan was first accomplished under Batumöngke/Dayan Khan, who according to Sayang Sečen, was born in the Ape-Year (1466), ascended the throne in the Tiger-Year (1470) and died at the age of eighty (European style, 79) in the Hare-Year (1543)<sup>36</sup>. In summing up the deeds of Batumöngke, the historian emphasized that this khan assured all Mongolia

[268]

"peace and happiness, having united the state [*ulus*] of the Six *Tümens*" (entry 44, p. 215; Urga MS 66r25).

Of especially great interest to us are those pages devoted to Altan Khan (1507-1581). Here Sayang Sečen displays himself as an historian most of all. The factual data he cites in this case are vastly more historical and reliable. The chronology of the main events in the life and actions of Altan Khan and his cohorts are particularly precise. Much of his data are confirmed by other sources, including the Chinese (cf.

<sup>36</sup> As to the matter of the dates of the life and rule of Batumöngke, the sources differ. Cf. entry 279, pp. 13-14.

the biography of Altan Khan in the *Wan-li wu-jun lu*, ch. 7-8) (entry 279, p. 80) and the Tibetan (entry 23, f. 90-95). The best pages of the section under discussion are devoted to a history of the acceptance of Lamaism by Altan Khan. The author's information about the life and activity of Qutuytai Sečen qung tayiji is particularly trustworthy. It is fully understandable that the author displays a heightened interest in the actions of his noted great-grandfather, emphasizing his merit as an historical figure in every way.

In Sayang Sečen's treatment, the history of Altan Khan is sharply distinguished by its ideological orientation. His Buddhist religious views come out more strongly than elsewhere. He sees the chief merit of Altan Khan as not only his reestablishment of the Mongolian state, but also as the chief figure in the rebirth of the Buddhist religion in Mongolia. The author glorifies this khan in every way as the grand defender of Buddhism. It is apparent that Buddhist religious literature had a powerful influence on Sayang Sečen, both in the exposition and appraisal of historical events. Side by side with reliable historical facts the author cites quite a few religious legends and traditional tales, which serve his goal of popularizing the Buddhist religion. But he does not restrict the history of Altan Khan solely to his religious activity. He is interested to no less degree in earthly matters dealt with by the khan, his military campaigns against the Oirats, Tibet and China, his measures taken to strengthen the khan's power, and so on. Here for instance is what Sayang Sečen writes about the military campaigns of Altan Khan:

Thereupon Altan Khan, in the *sim*-Mouse year [1552], at the age of forty-seven, set out against the Four Oirats and upon Künggei [or: Küngküi] Jabqan, slew Mani mingyatu, prince of the Eight Thousand Qoyid. His wife, Lady Jigeken, and his two sons, Toqoi and

[269]

Bökegütei, and the entire nation, were taken into submission. Thus having conquered the Four Oirats, he put them under his rule.<sup>37</sup> After this he campaigned for nineteen years against the Chinese who had taken the city [Peking], and destroyed and harassed their lands and people. The Chinese people were greatly affrighted and dispatched emissaries [saying]:

"We will grant to Altan Khan [desiring peace] the title of *Šun-i wang* [Prince Following Righteousness] and a golden seal."

Altan Khan at the age of sixty-five in the *sin*-Sheep year [1571] established a great realm [in company] with the Dayi-ming Lünching Khan of China and he opened immeasurably vast treasure gates (entries 44, p. 228; Urga MS 70r17-30/70v1; 297, pp. 178-179).

<sup>37</sup> The author considers it necessary to correct the translation of this sentence, which runs in the Mongolian as: *tere metü qonin* [another spelling, *qumin*, is correct—Sh. B.] *abuysan dörben oyirad-i toyin-dur-iyen oruylju abuysad* . . . "*Qumin abuysan*" means "conquered." Sayang Sečen, *Erdeni-yin tobči* (Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un Arad-un Keblel-un Qoriy-a, 1981), p. 399.

The information given by Sayang Sečen is of great interest from two points of view: first, with great exactness, though briefly, he is able to state genuine historical facts; second, and this is very important, he expresses quite interesting and original speculations on the character of Mongolian-Chinese relations.

It is well-known from Chinese sources that Altan Khan for a very long time, twenty years (1550-1570), was actually striving to establish good-neighborly relations with China, to establish the possibility of peaceful commercial exchange of the products of Mongolian herding for Chinese agricultural goods and artisanry. But his efforts met strong opposition on the part of the Ming Dynasty, which saw no need to undertake such relations with the Mongols until circumstances compelled them to that step. At the beginning of the 1570s Altan Khan went to such lengths that it was hard for the Ming authorities not to deal with him. His frequent forays deep into China inflicted perceptible damage on the treasury and the population. Finally, in 1571 the Ming court, at the insistence of its functionaries, decided to conclude the peace with Altan Khan that was spoken of in the preceding citation. As Father Serruys informs us, on the basis of Chinese sources, on April 21st, 1571 the Chinese emperor awarded Altan Khan the title of *Šun-i wang* and dispatched rich gifts to him. On the 13th of June of the same year a grand ceremony was held at the conclusion of peace between Altan Khan and the Chinese emperor. Altan Khan attended it with his own retainers, he rendered an oath of friendship and a commitment not to assault the Chinese borders. For their part, the Ming Court [270]

agreed to what Altan Khan had long been striving for, namely, to establish political and economic relations favorable for the Mongols, as well as to open border trade with Mongolia (entries 280, pp. 72-73; 108, pp. 1-63). This confirms the reliability of Sayang Sečen's data.

It is well-known that Chinese official historiography of the Ming period persistently advanced the idea of the vassal dependency of Mongolia on China. Such an idea is founded on the traditional Chinese theory according to which all the so-called barbarians, i.e., the peoples living on the outskirts of the Chinese state, were vassals of the Chinese emperor. The Ming dynasty tried to apply this theory to the Mongols. It stubbornly did not wish to establish any sort of relationship with other countries, unless these relationships were founded, albeit sometimes only formally, on tributary obligations on the part of the "barbarians." In other words, all countries that wished to conduct relations with China had to proffer tribute, even if only in a symbolic sense, to the Chinese emperor, so that there would be, in the view of the Chinese rulers, acknowledgment of their obligation to recognize Chinese suzerainty. Thus there arose and developed the "tribute-bearing" system in the relations of China with foreign states, including Mongolia. The economic basis of this theory was the Nature-based character of the Chinese agricultural economy and the weak development of the social division of labor, by virtue of which China was little interested in trade with other countries and nations, with the exception of trade in objects of luxury produced in those countries, and horses for the army, which China frequently needed.

But in Sayang Sečen we find another viewpoint on the nature of Mongolian-Chinese relations. He maintains that Mongolia in the post-Yüan period, including under Altan Khan, supported quite independent and equitable relations with Ming China. He offers no hint that Mongolia ever acknowledged vassal dependency on the Ming Dynasty. On the contrary, he strives in every way to emphasize the significance of military campaigns by Altan Khan, who coerced the Chinese emperor into normalizing relations with the

[271]

Mongols, and into legitimizing non-state trade between China and Mongolia. It must be said that this viewpoint of Sayang Sečen is not an original one, but it does correspond to historical truth.

To understand Sayang Sečen's historical-political views, the final sections of his work, devoted to contemporary issues of that time, afford considerable interest. It is true the author is always frank, and clearly expresses his opinion on the cause of these or other events. But nonetheless it is not hard to note that the closer he approaches to the events of his own time, the more distinct is his subjective, at times even preconceived approach to them. He displays much care in choice of factual data and his preconceived approach casts light on some important events of Mongolian history during the period of the Manchu conquest.

First of all attention is drawn to the fact that he actually terminates his exposition of the history of Mongolia with the events of 1634, even though his book was written in 1662, almost thirty years later.

The period from 1627 to 1634, he handles in routinized and brief fashion, merely communicating those facts which, apparently, were on his mind, at the time, putting aside much else which he considered unnecessary to narrate in a history of his country. What were the facts he chose to be silent about? He fails to write about the treachery of the Ordos princes to Ligdan Khan, about their shift over to the side of the aimags who rose against the latter, about the victory of these aimags over the Chahar forces (1627), about Ligdan's invasion of the Ordos territory in 1632 and his depriving Rinchin of his title as jinong, about the details of the fall of Ligdan's khanate or about the transfer of his domains under Manchu rule. All this creates the impression that Sayang Sečen deliberately avoided writing about events unfavorable to Ligdan Khan, such as the battles with the aimags of Southern Mongolia and their subjection to the Manchus. As Father Mostaert writes,

*Il me semble difficile de résister à l'impression que Sayang-sečen avait gardé un reste de sympathie pour le souverain qu'ensemble avec Erinčen il avait un moment servi dans sa jeunesse, et que c'était avec regret qu'il avait vu disparaître l'homme qui, en face de la menace mandchoue, avait tenté en vain de rétablir l'unité mongole (entry 74, p. 26).*

[272]

It is appropriate to mention as well that the appraisal of Ligdan Khan's actions given by Sayang Sečen is somewhat contradicting the evaluation made by the

anonymous author of the *Šira tujuji*. Sayang Sečen writes: “Meanwhile, it drew nigh unto the time of the Five Hundred Evils and there arose many deeds and actions, on the part of the government” (Urga MS 68r27-30/68v1). Ligdan Khan proved not to be in a position to establish “peaceful policy” (*tayibing törü-ber*; Urga MS 68v1) to maintain under his own power the six tümens and fell back on a “policy of violence” to unite the great state. And here he declares that Ligdan’s policy was not quite correct, and aided the fall of the khanate. To illustrate his opinion the author cites an old expression: “If the khan gets angry, then he destroys his state; but if an elephant gets angry, he destroys his enclosure” (Urga MS 68v3-4; entry 297, p. 186).

The dissatisfaction of our author with the excessive “policy of violence” is obviously based on the well-known fact that this khan actually harshly fell out with those who betrayed him and went over to the enemy side. Against them he organized punitive expeditions. In 1632 the khan invaded the Ordos, the homeland of Sayang Sečen, where he mercilessly punished everyone who had gone over to the side of the aimags that had risen against him, deprived Rinčen, a friend of Sayang Sečen, of his jinong title, captured the relics of Chinggis Khan, and so on. As for the events connected with the Manchu conquest of the Southern Mongolian lands, which Sayang Sečen doubtlessly knew full well about, there he is deliberately laconic, silent and casually mentioning the demise of Ligdan Khan, the transition of the power of the Mongolian khan to the hands of the Manchu Emperor Abahai after the wife of Ligdan Khan, Sudai taiqu, and her son Erke qongqor were subdued by him. As for everything else connected with the Manchu conquest of Mongolia, Sayang Sečen is stubbornly silent.

He ends his work with an account of the really energetic activity directed at restoring to Rinčen the title and duties of Jinong of the Ordos after the internecine war with Ligdan Khan. It is impossible not to note that Sayang Sečen writes about this with enthusiasm, dwelling on the ceremony of Rinčen’s second proclamation as jinong and ruler of Ordos, enumerating in detail

[273]

all the honorary ranks and privileges which he himself was awarded for his own services (entry 44, pp. 304-306; Urga MS 91r-92r). This narrative is capped with his mention of the fact that peace and happiness again as in former times reigned in the Ordos, (entry 44, p. 306; Urga MS 92r5), though he says not a word about what had recently gone on in the Ordos, i.e., the recognition by Rinčen in 1635 of Manchu dominion, or on how the Manchus organized six banners in the Ordos in 1648.

At the very end of his work Sayang Sečen gives a very brief survey of the history of the first Manchu emperors. We may regard this as a *sui generis* tribute of the time. But this survey stands in isolation, it is not organically linked with the basic part of the work. Still, this section is free from the panegyric tone that was characteristic of some much later Mongol historians devoted to the overlordship of the Manchu Ch’ing dynasty.

In the historiographic sense, the extended colophon by Sayang Sečen affords much of interest.<sup>38</sup> In it we find some philosophical reflections of the author about the problems of history and life. He sets forth his understanding of the historical experience not only in the form of religious morality, but in a general form of rules of worldly wisdom. He cites the following seven rules:

1. The beneficent joy of occupying oneself with salvation;
2. The evil sorrow of the distressing (rebirth) cycle;
3. The increase and decrease of the material world;
4. The good virtues of the original sublime people;
5. The mixed [i.e., good and evil] deeds of such persons [as are] of mediocre [attainment];
6. The evil faults of common folk, clinging to the material world;
7. Together with the uses of a broad [= magnanimous] person (Urga MS 97r27/97v2; entry 295).

The first two sections include general judgments about the ultimate goal of human existence and about the six categories of suffering on account of sins. The author maintains that the higher happiness of man must be acquired not in this world, but solely in the land of Akanistha, upon attaining Nirvana. The only correct path to this is belief in the Three Jewels, the *dharma*, the Buddha and the *samgha* (the clergy). The source of these sufferings is sin, owing to which man experiences unbelievable torment and suffering. Although the author does not state it directly, it is not hard to guess that history for him provides the best

[274]

illustration of this general regularity of the Cycle of Existence.

The remaining sections, in which the author passes judgment on life and history in more concrete fashion, are of considerable interest. Here for instance is the third section which speaks about the increase and decrease of the material world. In Sayang Sečen's opinion, history is an eternal process of alternating rise and fall, happiness and suffering in human life. The following thoughts draw one's attention:

Making to naught and consuming all one's remaining riches,  
Obviously, when requesting of others, nothing at all is given [one];  
The greatly elevated ones, falling from their own rule,  
Become slaves or ordinary men and are used as servants.

And then the all-perfect ones of great happiness,  
Suffer decline and endure many and varied afflictions;

---

<sup>38</sup> The entire colophon is written in boldly complex allegorical verses, affording not only historical but literary interest. The verses of this work, as the author himself writes, are in 316 lines, comprising 79 strophes: *γučin arban-u degere dörbe dörben baday* (thirty times ten + four times four = 316 lines, *doluγan arban γurban γurban šilüg* (seven times ten + three times three = 79 ślokaś or strophes).

Stalwart youths, endowed with heroic strength,  
Are captured by the might of the enemy and suffer  
(entries 44, pp. 330-331; 295, p.115).

These arguments lead one to the thought: did not the author, himself a ruling prince, have in mind the current fate of the descendants of the famed Golden Clan, who wound up falling under the power of foreign rulers? No less worthy of attention are the arguments of Sayang Sečen about people and their deeds, cited in the remaining sections of the colophon. Thus in the concluding seventh section he writes about those men's deeds that are most worthy of approval, obviously meaning by this the role of the people in history and their responsibility to society. It is true that all this is presented in a veiled form, in a preceptoral-moralizing tone and in the spirit of Buddhist doctrine. The author divides people into three categories according to their moral qualities: outstanding people (*manglai arad*); mediocre people (*dulitu arad*); and dissolute people (*tangqai arad*). In his opinion, history is also an arena for the actions of these three categories of people. Here is one of the basic deductions which Sayang Sečen makes from an analysis of history. Belonging to the category of the most outstanding people, in his opinion, are: the lama-teacher, who is the highest of all the boydas; virtuous boyda-khans, not regretting either life for the sake of attaining the status of a true Buddha, or the body for the use of others; functionaries do not come to a stop before that which immortalizes their deeds similarly to their superiors'

[275]

which they have set down in stone; fearless military leader-heroes; sharpshooters from a bow; sages (stanzas 25-28; entry 295. pp. 117-119).

To the lower classes of people belong: disciples, respecting the lama-teacher while in his sight, but behind his back speaking of his vices; children, revealing family secrets; subjects (arats) responding with ingratitude to the magnanimity of khans and high persons, and so on.

Here in all clarity is displayed that moral criterion which guides the author in classifying people. This criterion is totally determined by the world view of a hereditary prince (*tayiji*) by birth from the Mongolian aristocracy, a historian-Buddhist. However at certain points one notes echoes of something personal in the judgments of the author: the mood of a man who has forfeited his former high position under a new political regime in Mongolia. It is no accident that he quite often makes judgments about noble sages, striving obviously to prove that it is impossible to disregard them even when temporary failures overcome them. He writes:

Very wise sages and savants [are like] jewels and gold;  
Veritable heroic men [are like] select steeds;  
If they are in one's own land, [they are] ornaments there;  
If they go to one's own side, it is a spot to be venerated.

However much extraordinary sages and savants may weaken,

Nonetheless knowledge and intellect increase all the more;  
The marvelously exquisite golden jewel  
Increases all its own colour burning in the fire.

Even though famed nobles are discouraged at times,  
Other knowledge deserving to be learned emerges;  
However much one may cover the flower called *Suiman* [jasmine]  
A novel and fine odor is universally smelt.

However much one oppresses select intellectual nobles,  
Their loyal virtue emerges at once;  
If one take and turn upside-down a lighted lamp,  
Its burning fire goes blazing upward<sup>39</sup>  
(entries 44, pp. 332-333; 295, p. 119, stanzas 29-32).

The last section of the colophon expresses the general mood of the historian-Buddhist; musing on history and the perversities of fate, he seeks consolation in religious contemplation, apparently finding in this more satisfaction than in speculations of a curious mind.

Thus, the work by Sayang Sečen, the greatest Mongolian historian of the 17th century, by its significance in the history of historical knowledge among the Mongols may be compared, perhaps, only with the *Secret History*.

#### [276]

#### IV. The *Asarayči neretü-yin teüke* (The History by Asarayči)

In the period under survey persons were occupied with writing chronicles not just in the southern parts of Mongolia, but also in Khalkha. Eloquent witness is borne to this by the *Śira tuṇji* which we reviewed *supra* as well as a chronicle compiled by the Khalkha historian Asarayči.

The *Asarayči neretü-yin teüke* was first published by the Mongolian scholar Kh. Perlee in 1960 (entry 39), in a duplicated edition from a manuscript preserved in the stacks of the National Library of Mongolia, and was called *A History of Mongolia, Beginning with Chinggis Khan up to Uqayantu Toyon Temür*.<sup>40</sup> On the basis of internal evidence, Perlee established the real title of the manuscript, the authorship, date and place where it was written (entries 39, pp. 1-5; cf. 203, pp. 139-191; 233, pp. viii-x). Asarayči's chronicle was created in the environs of Ongi in the Khangai Mountains (the central part of the former Sayin Noyan aimag, i.e., the northern part

<sup>39</sup> A few verses have been borrowed by the author from the *Subhasita* of Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan.

<sup>40</sup> Kh. Perlee's edition was reedited and commented on by Bayana and published in 1984 by the Ündüsüten-ü Keblel-ün Qoriy-a of Peking, in its series *Mongyol tulγur bičig-ün čubural*.

of the present Övörkhengai aimag). Proceeding from the Reddish-Snake Year mentioned in the colophon, as well as from data in the text, Perlee determined the date of composition of the chronicle to be 1677. The author calls himself Jamba in one place, but in the colophon his name appears as Asarayči (Tib. hJam-pa).

Some data from the biography of Jamba may be found in the text of the chronicle itself (entry 39, p. 83), as well as in the *Śira tuγuji* (entry 70, p. 88), and the 69th book of the *Iledkel śastir*, the genealogical history of the wangs and güngs of Inner Mongolia and Khotan (entry 8, f. 13-18), a well-known handbook of service records of Mongolian, Oirat and Turkic princes. According to this data, Jamba (written as Shamba), or Asarayči, originated from the Nuqunuqu clan, the third son of Geresenje Tümenkin, who bore the title *Kündülen čögekür Sayin noyan*, who was elevated to khan rank along with three other Khalkha rulers. The second of thirteen sons of Tümenkin, Dandzin-lama, was Asarayči's grandfather. Dandzin-lama adhered to a pro-Manchu orientation, he frequently sent emissaries to the Shun-chih Emperor and in reply received messengers, letters and gifts. When eight *jasay*-rulers were confirmed in Khalkha, then

[277]

Dandzin-lama was one of them. His nomadic territory was located on the Ongi River at a place called Khoyorkhgi. He had four sons, the eldest of whom, Tasgib, bore the title of Ilden Dürgegči, and was the father of Asarayči. Tasgib died the same time as his father in 1667. It is not known when Asarayči was born. The sources give witness that he succeeded his grandfather Dandzin-lama, and received the title of *jasay* in 1667.

Asarayči adhered to his grandfather's political orientation. The Manchu Emperor Hsüan-yeh awarded him honorary titles, at first *Itegemjitü eyetei erke daičin*, and later *Jasay čin-wang*. From data in the sources it is clear that Asarayči belonged to those Khalkha lords who, on the eve of the conquest of Khalkha-Mongolia by the Manchus, were already in a fully pro-Manchu mood. He not only maintained active links with Hsüan-yeh, but helped him in every way in his struggle with the Oirat, Galdan. In 1691, Asarayči's (Jamba's) detachment, jointly with detachments of other lords, led a reconnaissance against Galdan. In 1695 these same detachments led the advance against the Oirats in the western part of Khalkha; Asarayči personally participated in the operation and organized his headquarters in the locality of Küren-belčir. And in 1696 he and his detachment participated as part of Manchu forces against Galdan in the locality of Jayun-modun. For this service of his, as well as for sacrificing his horses, livestock, and provisions to the employ of the Manchu forces, Asarayči received the title of *chin-wang*. Besides the Manchu title he also bore the title of Sayin-noyan, although the latter was not allotted to him by an official document of the Manchu emperor. Asarayči died in 1707 (entries 70, p. 88; 39, pp. 2-3; 203, p. 191).

In this wise, the author of the chronicle under review comes before us as a representative of the ruling summit of Khalkha, which until the conquest of this part

of Mongolia by the Manchus, was openly collaborating with the foreigners in the struggle against their western brothers, the Oirat lords.

However, it must be emphasized that Asarayči's historical work, despite the author's political position, belongs to those Mongolian chronicles which are free from a pro-Manchu stratum. It is difficult, of

[278]

course, to clarify why the political activity of the author did not influence the ideological content of his work. Perhaps this can be explained by the fact that the Mongolian tradition of historical writing which has come down to us was in his time still so strong that the force of this tradition revealed itself involuntarily. The work represents more a traditional compilation than an original book. One must also take into account that this work appeared prior to the establishment of Manchu dominance in Khalkha.

Proceeding to an analysis of this work, one must note that in form and content it differs little from other Mongolian chronicles of the 17th century. It is not divided into chapters or paragraphs. Only by the sense can one determine the separate parts and divisions of which the chronicle consists. In a compositional sense the *History by Asarayči* may tentatively be divided into four parts: the introduction; the early history of the Mongols, chiefly the history of Chinggis Khan; the history of the Mongols from the fall of the Empire to the middle of the 17th century; and the postface.

It is characteristic that the introductory portion of the work is very similar to that part of the *Šira tujuji* chronicle. Like the author of the *Šira tujuji*, Asarayči begins his narration with citations known to us about the use of knowledge of ancestral history, drawn from the chronicle of the Fifth Dalai Lama, the *Feast of Youth* (entry 4). The author expresses his desire that those who do not know history will read his work, and that following generations will continue to write history. Might the query arise: for what reason did the author concern himself with history? What motives might arouse a Khalkha prince of such actively pro-Manchu beliefs, to take on the work of a historian? It seems to us that Asarayči had the goal not only of enlightening uninformed folk, but of demonstrating the high-born nature of his ancestors in the eyes of those with whom he wished to deal in his own mercenary interest so as to get wider privileges from his Manchu protectors. He was interested not solely in history as such, as he was in the genealogy of the Mongolian tayijis, in the first rank among the Khalkhas.

The first part of the chronicle comprises a basic history of Chinggis Khan in which the author supports the well-known system of three monarchies. But in Asarayči one can also notice a somewhat different approach to the traditional beginnings of Mongolian chronicles. He is uncommonly brief

[279]

when he writes about the Indian and Tibetan kings. As for what deals with cosmological data, the stories about the appearance of inanimate and animate worlds with which Mongolian chroniclers customarily began the history of their own country, there is almost none of this in Asarayči. What is more, he is dubious about

the correctness of the idea according to which Börte Čino is the progenitor of the Mongolian khans. Setting forth the legendary information about Börte Čino, Asarayči notices that "the origin of the Mongolian princes from the so-called Börte Čino, it seems, is still not explained by investigation" (entry 39, p. 9). And at the end of this short exposition of the legend of how Börte Čino belonged to the clan of the Tibetan king Dalai-Subin Altan Sandalitu, our author most significantly uses the word *gekü*, "they say" (entry 39, p. 8).

Asarayči begins the genealogy of the Mongolian khans with Bodončar as the most likely progenitor of the Borjigids. He cites information about Bodončar not only from Mongolian sources, but from Tibetan as well, at the same time affording readers the possibility of comparing different sets of data about the progenitor of the Golden Clan. This creates a definite impression that the author did not ascribe particular significance to the theory about the blood relationship of the Mongolian khans with the early Indian and Tibetan rulers that had commonly been accepted in Mongolian historical writing at this time.

From the ancestors of Chinggis Khan Asarayči quickly makes a transition to the history of Chinggis himself, whose life he considers in all likelihood to be the most important part of his work. He devotes relatively many pages to the history of Chinggis. In this regard the *History by Asarayči* differs considerably from the *Šira tuyuji*. However, from the way he sets forth the history of Chinggis in his work, it is hard to conclude with no reservations, as do Kh. Perlee and following him some other researchers (entries 39, p.3; 233, p. vii; 203, p. 192), that the author used the *Secret History*.

A comparative analysis reveals an interesting phenomenon: according to our calculations, approximately 90 of the 282 paragraphs of the *Secret History* find reflection in the same or another form in the *Asarayčineretü-yin teüke*. First and foremost one observes the similarity of content of the basic facts in both works. Asarayči almost never has those parts which are not in the *Secret History*.

[280]

However, the nature of the lack of convergence in content of the two works and the varied readings of similar topics are such that it is difficult to speak of any sort of direct borrowing. If indeed Asarayči made direct use of the *Secret History*, then he scarcely would have permitted himself such liberties with respect to his basic source. It is not hard to note that the history of Chinggis in *Asarayči*, in comparison with that set forth in the *Secret History* itself, bears a sketchy and fragmentary character. It is merely a brief retelling of basic paragraphs from the *Secret History*. Many interesting details are omitted and there is none of the vividness which is characteristic of the first Mongolian historical work. The corresponding spots in both compositions differ sharply both in stylistic and linguistic aspects. The archaic words are replaced by newer ones. Many poetical passages which are abundant in the *Secret History* are not included in Asarayči's work, and those few which are preserved in it, appear differently edited to one degree or another. All this convinces us that Asarayči used only the oral tradition of the *Secret History*, of which we

spoke earlier. Or, it is possible that Asarayči could have borrowed the relevant passages from Mongolian chronicles like the *Altan Tobči*, both the one of Lubsangdanjin and the *Altan Tobči Anonymous*. Only in this sense can one speak of some links of the work under review with the first-born work of Mongolian historiography.

By collating some passages from the *Asarayči neretü-yin teüke* with those of the *Secret History*, even where the information provided by the two works is very similar, one can easily discover a host of variant readings and a lack of convergence (for instance, in the former, entry 39, pp. 9-10, and in the latter, entry 42, §§ 54-56).

[282]

At the end of the Chinggis story, Asarayči cites some legendary information about the campaign into the Tangut country, and about the death and transportation of Chinggis's body to Mongolia. This information, especially the versified fragments, is very close to those which are in other chronicles of the 17th century, such as the anonymous *Altan Tobči*, the *Altan Tobči* by Lubsangdanjin, and the *Erdeni-yin Tobči* by Sayang Sečen. And yet it is hard to concede that they were taken by the author from the chronicles named. After contrasting the texts, we have discovered much lack of convergence and variant readings and even differences in lexicon and expression. It remains to speculate that Asarayči used one and the same traditional tale about the death of Chinggis Khan which arose in a much later time in a land far from Mongolia, and was widely disseminated there in the period when the chronicles mentioned appeared.

As to the history of the successors of Chinggis Khan, Asarayči does not inform us of anything new in comparison with the chronicles we have reviewed. He cites essentially those same facts which are of a semi-historic, semi-legendary nature. It is interesting that Asarayči, following the two *Altan Tobči* authors, cites a well-known legend, according to which the Yung-lo Emperor, one of the first emperors of the Chinese Ming dynasty, was the son of Toyon Temür by the wife who had remained in China during the time when the former fled from Daidu (entry 39, p. 48). As a result the Mongolian chroniclers held a false opinion, as though after the fall of the Yüan dynasty in China there still remained a dynasty founded by the son of the last

[283]

Mongolian khan in China. This agreed very much with the mood of the top layer of the Mongolian rulers, who had no desire to be reconciled to the loss of their former power and past privileges. Strictly adhering to the concept according to which all the Mongolian khans, beginning with Chinggis, pursued the policy of the Two Principles, Asarayči at times falsifies the historical facts. It is hard to say whether he does this intentionally or under the influence of traditional legends. Thus, for instance, despite the facts, he considers Gunga-Nyanpo a retainer of Chinggis, although, as was earlier indicated, they lived at different times. In a similarly inaccurate way he ascribes to Ögedei Khan the merit of inviting Sakya-pandita Kundga' rgyal-mtshan, when in actuality, we have direct indications about this from the Tibetan sources, known to a number of Mongolian authors, that the person who

initiated entering into a union of the “Alms-Giver” and the “Preceptor” was not Ögedei, but Godan.

Asarayči devotes considerable attention to the post-empire period of Mongolian history. It must be noted that from the fullness and value of the information conveyed, this portion of his work in many ways surpasses the basic text of the *Śīra tuyuji* and yields place solely to the work of Sayang Sečen. Being by birth from Khalkha, Asarayči devotes special sections of his history to this part of Mongolia, and this expanded the customary boundaries of topic-matter for historical research for that time. This, perhaps, is the main merit of Asarayči as a historian. In truth, he actually reduces the history of Khalkha Mongolia to genealogical data about the Khalkha tayijis. By their content these segments devoted to Khalkha are poorer than those in which he illuminates the history of the southern part of Mongolia. Asarayči's information about how the progenitor of the rulers of the seven Khalkha hoshuns, Jalayir qung tayiji Geresenje, became the ruler of Khalkha Mongolia (entry 39, p. 72), does have some historical interest. But in terms of its completeness this information yields place to that contained in the later supplements to the *Śīra tuyuji* (entry 70, pp. 107-109). Asarayči also reports some new data about the beginnings of the spread of Lamaism in Khalkha Mongolia (entry 39, pp. 78-79) that shed additional light on the history of the acceptance of Lamaism in Khalkha under Abatai Khan simultaneously with Southern Mongolia, and [284] on the close religious and secular ties between these two basic parts of Mongolia at the end of the 16th century.

The genealogy of the Khalkha tayijis in Asarayči's exposition is remarkable for the fact that it contains abundant material about the clan relationships of the Khalkha ruling princes from the 16th century right down to the time of the author himself. We do not have anything like this in any of the chronicles of the period we have surveyed. Their value lies in the fact that Asarayči cites from them dates of birth and death for the tayijis he mentions. Thus, for instance, he communicates the date of birth for all the sons of Jalayir qung tayiji Geresenje; from him we learn that the elder son of the latter, Ashigai-darqan qung tayiji, was born in the White-Tiger Year (1530); Noyontai qadan-bayatur in the White-Hare Year (1531); Unuqu üijeng noyan in the Blue-Horse Year (1534); Amin Dorqal noyan in the Red-Ape Year (1536) (entry 39, p. 92), and so on.

In terms of its composition, the postface, with which the author concludes his work, offers limited interest. In it he gives brief summings-up, communicates the date the book was written and proffers good wishes to the Golden Clan. Asarayči states the following brief conclusions: Chinggis Khan united “all the Five Nations of Color;” Khubilai Khan converted the “forty tümens” to the true faith, the dharma, “the khan, named the Intelligent One (*uqayantu*), although he was no master of intelligence,” was deprived of rule and demolished religion in China, but Abatai sayin qayan expanded the Two Principles in Khalkha. It is not hard to understand exactly which problems of history interested Asarayči, the Buddhist-historian born among the tayijis of Khalkha Mongolia, most of all.