

The Expression Dur-a Qocarulcaju in the Letter of Oljeitu to Philippe le Bel

Francis Woodman Cleaves

Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Vol. 11, No. 3/4. (Dec., 1948), pp. 441-455.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0073-0548%28194812%2911%3A3%2F4%3C441%3ATEDQIT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-3

Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies is currently published by Harvard-Yenching Institute.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/hyi.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org
Fri Sep 7 03:40:55 2007

THE EXPRESSION *DUR-A QOČARULČAǰU* IN THE LETTER OF ÖLǰEITÜ TO PHILIPPE LE BEL

FRANCIS WOODMAN CLEAVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

[On 24 July 1948 I read this article in an abridged form at the *XXI^e Congrès International des Orientalistes* in Paris under the title "A propos de l'expression *dur-a qočarulčaǰu* dans la lettre d'Öljeitü à Philippe le Bel."—F. W. C.]

On 6 September 1822 the French Orientalist, Jean Pierre ABEL-RÉMUSAT, read in Paris his famous *mémoire* entitled "Relations diplomatiques des Princes chrétiens avec les Rois de Perse de la race de Tchinggis, depuis Houlagou, jusqu'au règne d'Abousaïd," in which he described the two letters of the Mongol rulers of Iran to Philippe le Bel of France—that of Arγun of 1289 and that of Öljeitü of 1305—which he had discovered in the "archives du roi de France." This was the second of his "Mémoires sur les relations politiques des Princes chrétiens, et particulièrement des Rois de France, avec les Empereurs mongols." Subsequently the *mémoire* was published in *Histoire et Mémoires de l'Institut Royal de France, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 2^e Série, 7 (Paris, 1824). 335-438. RÉMUSAT also published with the *mémoire* a "copie figurée" (lithographic reproduction) of each of the letters—that of Arγun consisting of three *planches* and that of Öljeitü of four.

In the same year (1824) Isaac Jacob SCHMIDT published in St. Petersburg his *Philologisch-kritische Zugabe zu den von Herrn Abel-Rémusat bekannt gemachten, in den Königlich-französischen Archiven befindlichen, zwei mongolischen Original-Briefen der Könige von Persien Argun und Öldshäitu an Philipp den Schönen.*

That was one hundred and twenty-four years ago. Since that time the letters have been studied by several scholars whose

researches have greatly advanced our understanding of them, but there has not yet been published an entirely satisfactory translation of either.

The translation of the letters has been singularly difficult for want of documents containing analogous phraseology. Consequently, some scholars have resorted to forced interpretations in the case of certain obscure passages. There is, however, a major work of early Mongolian literature which only a few Mongolists have utilized—*Mongγol-un niuča* [= *ni'uča*] *to*[*b*]*ča'an* or the *Secret History of the Mongols*.[1] In this article I propose to demonstrate the usefulness of this work in the study of these letters.

In lines 20 and 21 of the letter of Ölǰeitü there is a sentence which has been variously rendered because in line 21 there occur two words which have been difficult to interpret. These two words constitute an expression of which the first word has been read both *dur-a* and *dor-a* and the second, *qočarulčaǰu*, has been taken both transitively and intransitively.

On page 437 of his *mémoire* RÉMUSAT published the Italian translation which is written on the back of the letter of Ölǰeitü. It is a contemporary translation of which the content differs in several respects from that of the original. The passage of the letter containing the sentence in question is rendered in this translation as follows: " Per paraula che parlaseno male persone, noi sangue d'Ianchischano gia xlv anni abiamo auto nimista insieme e guerra."

In his own translation, or rather paraphrase, of the letter RÉMUSAT wrote on page 391: " A la ligne vingtième, Œldjaïtou raconte ' que les intrigues et les mauvais rapports de gens malintentionnés avoient jeté le mésintelligence entre les princes '."

Although both the Italian translation and RÉMUSAT's paraphrase render in a general way the sense of the original, neither can be considered adequately to account for the expression which is the subject of this article.

On page 14 of his *Philologisch-kritische Zugabe* SCHMIDT transcribed the text with an interlinear translation as follows:

[1] See note 4 below.

bida achanar dägöner . .
wir ältere und jüngere Brüder

maghô charatsussun taschija . . . ügäs jär dura .
schlechter {Leute . . . / Unterthanen} {unterschlagende / verläumderische} Worte durch {den Wil- / die Nei-

. . chotsarultsadshu bölägäi;
len / gung verloren hatten;

On page 18 his smooth version runs: "Durch aufhetzende Worte schlechter Leute leben wir ältere und jüngere Brüder in gegenseitiger Abneigung." [2]

From his interlinear translation it is clear that SCHMIDT took the word "dura" as the object of the verb "chotsarultsadshu," but we shall see that such a construction is inadmissible.

I. A. KLYUKIN in his article, "Письмо Улдзэйту иль-хана к Филиппу Красивому, Эдуарду I-му и прочим крестоносцам" ("Lettre d'Ouldzeitou il-chan à Philippe le Bel, Edouard I et aux autres croisés") in Труды Государственного Дальневосточного Университета. Серия VI, 2. (*Mémoires de l'Université d'Etat à l'Extrême-Orient*. Série VI, 2) (Vladivostok, 1926). 1-26, gives an interlinear translation on page 17 which runs as follows: "[20] Мы старшие и младшие коварных подданных лживыми наветами добрые [21] отношения друг к другу порвали было. [We elder and younger brothers almost destroyed our good relations with one another through the mendacious calumnies of cunning subjects.]"

On page 18 he writes: "Перевод Шмидта в этой части письма близок к монгольскому тексту и почти верен. [The translation of SCHMIDT in this part of the letter is close to the Mongolian text and almost correct.]"

In his smooth translation on page 24 he renders the text as

[2] The English translation of this text on page 574 of Henry H. HOWORTH's *History of the Mongols from the 9th to the 19th Century, Part III, The Mongols of Persia* (London, 1888) is from the French translation on page 588 of C. d'OHSSON's *Histoire des Mongols, depuis Tchinguiz-khan jusqu'à Timour Bey ou Tamerlan* (Le Haye et Amsterdam, 1835), *Tome Quatrième*, which, in turn, is from this German translation by SCHMIDT.

follows: " Мы старейшие и младшие (ханы) благодаря наветам коварных из подданных наше миролюбие нарушили, . . . [We elder and younger (khans) on account of (lit., ' thanks to ') the calumnies of the cunning among the subjects disrupted our peaceableness, . . .] "

Władysław Kotwicz gave a new translation of the letter of Öljeitü in his article, " Les Mongols, promoteurs de l'idée de paix universelle au début du XIII[e] siècle," in *La Pologne au VII[e] Congrès International des Sciences Historiques* 1 (Varsovie, 1933). 199-204. His translation was based on new philological research in the domain of Altaic studies, but was published without any critical apparatus, because, as he explained (page 201), " Les résultats de ces recherches seront présentés ailleurs; ici je ne veux donner qu'une nouvelle traduction, qui dans plus d'un passage, diffère de la traduction surannée de Schmidt." [3]

On page 202 of the article we find the following translation of our passage: " Nous, frères aînés et cadets, par suite des paroles perverses de sujets méchants, nous étions frappés d'un tort."

In his article, " En marge des lettres des il-khans de Perse retrouvées par Abel-Rémusat," in *Collectanea Orientalia* 4 (*Lwów*, 1933). 1-48, Kotwicz presented his new transcription and translation of the letter. On page 31 the passage in question is transcribed as follows:

" 20. *bida axanar degüner mayun xaračus-un tašij-a üges-ijer,*
21. *dor-a xočarułčažu bülegej* "

On page 34 it is translated: " / 20-21 / ' Nous, frères ainés [*sic*] et cadets, par suite des paroles perverses de sujets méchants, nous étions frappés d'un tort '."

In his " Commentaires " Kotwicz wrote (page 41):

" 42. *Dor-a xočarułčažu* / 21 /. Schmidt et M. Klukine ont lu le premier mot: *dur-a*, ' désir, volonté ', traduisant la proposition

[3] Kotwicz did his translation " en prenant pour base une nouvelle reproduction, infiniment plus précise, de la lettre " which, as he stated in note 8, was the reproduction published by Prince Roland Bonaparte in *Documents de l'époque mongole* (Paris, 1895), Pl. XIV.

citée par: ' ils ont perdu envers soi la bonne volonté, ils ont rompu leurs bons rapports '. Ce qui s'oppose avant tout à cette interprétation, c'est que nous n'avons pas ici un verbe réciproque mais un verbe comitatif, verbes qui se détachent distinctement dans les lettres des il-khans; ensuite, ce verbe n'a pas un sens transitif, mais neutre: ' demeurer en arrière, derrière les autres '. C'est pourquoi je proposerais une autre leçon: *dor-a*, ' en bas '. Il est vrai qu'en langue littéraire, ce mot se trouve sous la forme *dour-a* / *doγura* /, orthographe qui figure sur la stèle d'Erdeni-dzou; mais, comme en langue Kalmouke nous avons le corrélatif *dor-o*, avec un *o* bref, l'on peut admettre que la langue mongole possédait aussi deux formes différentes: l'une avec un *do-* bref, l'autre long. Le sens de la phrase serait que tous les frères demeuraient dans une situation pire que les autres, ce qui ferait antithèse à la phrase: *deger-e bołxu*, ' être en haut, être meilleur '."

Kotwicz was, indeed, right in saying that the verb *qočar-* is not transitive, but intransitive—" to remain behind." That was a new contribution on his part. However, as we shall see, his reading *dor-a* cannot be retained.

In his article, "Вопросу о дешифрировании дипломатических документов монгольских иль-ханов" ("Déchiffrement des documents diplomatiques des il-khans de Mongolie") in Известия Академии Наук СССР. 1935 (*Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS*), Отделение общественных наук (*Classe des sciences sociales*) 645-655, S. A. Kozin reproduced Kotwicz's transcription of the letter of Öljeitü on page 647 and gave a Russian translation of Kotwicz's French translation on pages 647-648. Then on page 650 he wrote:

В дальнейшем совершенно верно, на мой взгляд, дана интерпретация выражению « dora χočarułčaju (строка 21) bülegei » в смысле антитезы такому выражению, как, напр., « degere bołχu » — « être en haut, être meilleur ».

[" Farther on perfectly correctly, in my opinion, is given the interpretation to the expression ' *dora χočarułčaju* [*sic*] (line 21) *bülegei* ' in the sense of an antithesis to such an expression, as, for example, ' *degere bołχu* '—' être en haut, être meilleur '."]

On page 651 of his article KOZIN resumes his discussion of *dora χočarułčaǰu*, which continues to page 653 as follows:

Возвращаясь затем к вопросу о передаче выражения « dor-a χočarulčaǰu » (строка 23) посредством « nous étions frappé d'un tort », необходимо отметить, что, являясь по существу правильной, такая передача все же по необходимости далека от точности. Дело в том, что и здесь мы, повидимому, имеем дело с одним из своеобразных, присущих языку кочевого народа способов выражения пространственно-временных отношений, как, например, общеизвестные « сзади » ~ « к северу »; « спереди » ~ « с юга »; « позади » ~ « в будущем » и т. д.

« Dora χočarułčaǰu » буквально значит « в н и з у отстали » вместо нашего « позади отстали ». Очевидно в языковом сознании кочевого народа « отстать » ассоциируется более с рядом « низ-верх », чем « спереди-сзади »; отставать как бы предполагается « внизу », под горой, а не на ровном месте. Тем более, что с понятиями « сзади », « спереди » связаны вышеуказанные иные ориентировочные представления.

[652] Однако трудность адэкватной передачи этого непереводимого на европейские языки выражения мало озабочивала бы, если бы не следующая в дальнейшем своего рода антитеза его — « degere ömerin bayiya! », которая включена в дважды повторяемый основной тезис документа.

Итак, « dora χočarułčaǰu bülüge », т. е. « внизу отстали » или в переносном смысле « в низкое, низменное впали », « долу вращались » — противополагается выражению « degere ömerin bayiya! », т. е. « высокое, возвышенное будем защищать ».

Замечательно, что антитеза в выражениях doora χočaraχu и degere ömerikü восходит и к самой этимологии этих двух глаголов, совершенно параллельной по методу словообразования χočoraχu, как и вышепоказанное degere ömörikü < ömüne и irekü — « заступиться », есть синтактический комплекс, так же составленный из. χoyiši и irekü > χočraχu, « поздно прийти », « опоздниться », « опоздать », « отстать ». Так что и в данном случае нет возвратной частицы r a, а налицо лишь radix глагола ire-. Антитеза: « в н и з у были » — « в е р х н е е оборонять будем ».

При этом стоящее в тексте « χočarułčaǰu bülegei », быть может,

обладает одновременно двумя залогообразующими частицами: побудительной — γul ~ uuł и совместной — łca. При наличии же здесь одной только частицы совместного залога правильнее было бы написать χočŏrałčaǰu. В таком случае χočarułčaǰu надо бы понимать как χočoraγułčaǰu, т. е. « мы все вместе допустили отстать внизу ».

Как бы то ни было, выражение это употреблено в документе не в прямом его значении, а в переносном: составитель документа хотел констатировать общеизвестный факт имевшего место в Монгольской империи культурного застоя, отсталости из-за продолжительных взаимных распрей правителей отдельных областей.

Знаменательным представляется факт, что и в настоящее время строители новолитературного монгольского языка при передаче термина « культурная осталость » пользуются тем же самым глаголом χočoraχu в одной из его именных форм. Напр., « kocorsonoo nokozi » ~ « ликвидируя свою культурную отсталость », χoǰimdaǰu χočoroγdaγsan yabudal-i uruγši debšigülkü' — idem.[1]

[1] См. Н. Н. Поппе. Учебник монгольского языка, 1932, стр. 86. Журн. Neyigem ǰirum-un ǰam, №. 1-2, стр. 115.

Наконец, следуя традиции грамматик А. Бобровникова и В. Л. Котвича, я предпочитаю при передаче второй повествовательной формы, для выражения свойственного ей оттенка мысли, присоединять что-нибудь вроде [653] нашего « как известно », « заведомо », « бывало ». Этот метод, по моим наблюдениям, в громадном большинстве случаев оправдывает себя при передаче текстов не только ранней эпохи монгольского письменного языка, но и позднейших.

[" Returning again to the question about the rendering of the expression ' *dor-a χočarułčaǰu* ' (line 23) by means of ' nous étions frappé [*sic*] d'un tort,' we must remark that, although being right in substance, such a rendering, however, is necessarily far from precision. As a matter of fact, here, too, we apparently have to do with one of the ways, peculiar to and inherent in the language of a nomadic people, of expression of space-time relations, as, for example, the generally known ' behind ' ~ ' to the north '; ' in front ' ~ ' from the south '; ' behind ' ~ ' in the future,' etc.

" ' *Dora χočarułčaǰu* ' literally means ' they lagged below ' instead of our ' позади отстали ' [' they lagged behind ']. Obviously in the language consciousness of a nomadic people ' to lag behind ' is associated more with the series ' bottom-top ' than ' in front-behind '; to lag behind is as if one is supposed to be ' below,' at the foot of a mountain, but not on a level place. The more so because the above-indicated other notions of orientation are bound with the concepts of ' behind,' ' in front.'

" [652] However, the difficulty of an adequate rendering of this expression, untranslatable into European languages, would be of little trouble, if there were not its antithesis of a certain sort following farther on—' *degere ömerin bayiya*! ', which is inserted into the twice repeated basic thesis of the document.

" Thus, ' *dora χočarułčaǰu bülüge* [*sic*],' i. e., ' they lagged below ' or in a figurative sense ' they fell into a low, deep hollow,' ' they returned down '—is the opposite of the expression ' *degere ömerin bayiya*! ', i. e., ' we shall defend the high, the elevated.'

" It is remarkable that the antithesis in the expressions *doora χočaraχu* and *degere ömerikü* goes back to the very etymology of these two verbs, [an etymology] perfectly parallel in the way of word formation[.] *χočoraχu*, just as the above-demonstrated *degere ömörikü* < *ömüne* and *irekü*—' to take the part of,' is a syntactic complex, also composed of *χoyiši* and *irekü* > *χočraχu*, ' to arrive late,' ' to be tardy,' ' to be late,' ' to lag behind.' So that in the given case there is no reflexive particle *ra*, but only the *radix* of the verb *ire-* is present. The antithesis: ' they were below ' —' we shall defend the upper.'

" With this the ' *χočarulčaǰu bülegei* ' standing in the text, perhaps, possesses simultaneously two voice-forming particles: causative *γul* ~ *uuł* and the comitative *-łca* [*sic*]. With the presence here of only one particle of the comitative voice it would be more correct to write *χočŏrałčaǰu* [*sic*]. In such a case *χočarulčaǰu* would have to be understood as *χočoraγulčaǰu*, i. e., ' we all together let lag below.'

" However that may be, this expression is used in the document not in its direct meaning, but in a figurative one: the writer of the document wished to establish the universally known fact of

the cultural stagnation which had taken place in the Mongolian empire, of the backwardness resulting from the long-continued reciprocal feuds of the rulers of the separate territories.

" It strikes us as a significant fact that even at the present time the creators of the new-literary Mongolian language in the rendering of the term ' культурная осталость [*sic*] ' use the same verb *χočoraχu* in one of its nominal forms. For example, ' *kocorsonoo nokozi* ' ~ ' liquidating one's cultural backwardness,' *χoǰimdaǰu χočoroγdaγsan yabudal-i uruγši debšigülkü*—idem.[1]

[1] See N. N. Poppe, Учебник монгольского языка [*Textbook of the Mongolian Language*], 1932, page 86. The journ[al] *Neyigem ǰirum-un ǰam, No.* 1-2, p. 115.

" Finally, following the traditions of the grammarians A. Bobrovnikov and W. L. Kotwicz, I prefer in the rendering of the second narrative form, for the expression of the shade of thought peculiar to it, to add something in the manner [653] of our ' как известно ' [' as is known '], ' заведомо ' [' as one knows '], ' бывало ' [' as happened ']. This method, according to my observations, in a prodigious majority of cases, is justified in the rendering of texts not only of the early period of the Mongolian written language, but also of the later ones."]

Then on page 653 he rendered the passage in question as follows: " Мы, старшие и младшие братья, как ведомо, впадали в низменное (пребывали внизу, культурно отставали) из-за лукавых речей дурных холопов. [We, elder and younger brothers, as is known, have fallen into the low (have remained below, have lagged behind culturally) on account of the sly words of bad serfs.] "

On page 10 of his article, " Quelques mots encore sur les lettres des il-khans de Perse retrouvées par Abel-Rémusat," in *Collectanea Orientalia* 10 (Wilno, 1936). 1-22, Kotwicz expressed himself in the following terms with reference to Kozin's exposition of an antithesis:

" Ainsi, il entend le mot *degere*, non dans sa signification habituelle de postposition: ' sur, dessus, à la surface de ', mais dans le sens plus rare de: ' haut, supérieur ', conférant à cet adjectif même le sens encore plus rare de substantif: ' chose supérieure '. Ce mot servirait d'antithèse à *dor-a* (ligne 21): ' nous

nous trouvions en bas . . . nous défendrons une chose supérieure'. Mais l'antithèse serait incomplète: dans le premier cas, il y aurait un adverbe et, dans le second, un substantif; j'irai jusqu'à dire que même l'opposition logique ne me paraît qu'accidentelle. Si l'il-khan avait eu l'idée d'une antithèse, il l'aurait exprimée avec plus de clarté, usant, dans le second cas, d'un tour de phrase concret, comme dans le premier; et, plus que probablement, il ne se fût pas servi d'une idée détachée, telle que l'attribue M. Kozin au mot *degere*. Les Mongols évitent ces idées abstraites dans leur vie journalière, et nous n'en trouvons guère non plus dans les documents de leur passé."

And on page 13 he added:

"15. L'expression *dora xočarułčažu* se rapporte, selon moi, non à la stagnation de la culture, mais à la faiblesse politique, à l'amoindrissement de puissance, car c'était là ce qui devait alors inquiéter les Mongols plus que tout."

KOTWICZ was again right in denying the existence of such an antithesis in the letter of Öljeitü, but the arguments employed by both KOTWICZ and KOZIN in their respective attempts to interpret the text are easily refuted, when it is recognized that they are based on an inadmissible reading.

In summary, we have seen two solutions: that of SCHMIDT, followed by KLYUKIN, and that of KOTWICZ, followed by KOZIN. Yet neither of these solutions can be accepted in its entirety. The analogous phraseology which serves to establish the correct reading is found in the passage of the *Secret History of the Mongols* (*Mongγol-un niuča* [= *ni'uča*] *to*[*b*]*ča'an*)[4] in which it is told how Činggis *qahan* requested Ča'ur *beki*, younger sister of Nilqa Senggüm of the Kereyid, for his son Jöči and proposed

[4] *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* 元朝秘史 + *Hsü chi* 續集 [*Supplement*] (1908) (hereinafter referred to as *YCPS*). Cf. also Erich HAENISCH, *Manghol un Niuca Tobca'an* (*Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi*). *Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen* (Leipzig, 1937) (hereinafter referred to as [Text]) and S. A. KOZIN, Сокровенное сказание. Монгольская хроника 1240 г. под названием *Mongγol-un niγuča tobčiyan*. Юань чао би ши. Монгольский обыденный изборник [*Secret History. Mongolian Chronicle of the Year 1240 Under the Title Mongγol-un niγuča tobčiyan. Yuan' čao bi ši. Mongolian Daily Selection*] 1 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1941) (hereinafter referred to as [Text] or

giving Qoǰin *beki* to Tusaγa, son of Nilqa Senggüm. There we read: [5]

. . . *tende Senggüm ö'er-iyen yekeǰilen* [39a] *sedkiǰü ügülerün. bidanu uruγ andur odu'asu ala'un-a bayiǰu e'enegče qoyimar qaraγu aǰu'u. anu uruγ bidan-tur ire'esü. qoyimar-a sa'uǰu ala'un-a qaran aǰu'u ke'en ö'er-iyen yekeǰilen sedkiǰü. bidani doramǰilan ügüleǰü. Ča'ur beki-yi ülü ögün* [39b] *ese ta'alaǰu'ui. tere üge-tür Činggis qahan dotora'an Ongqan Nilqa Senggüm qoyar-tur dura qočorču'u.* [40a] *teyin dura qočoruγsan-i J̌amuγa uqaǰu γaqai ǰil qabur J̌amuγa Altan Qučar Qardakidai Ebügeǰin Noyakin Süge'etei To'oril Qači'un beki tede bolun. niken eyeten bolǰu ne(ü)'üǰü* [= *ne'üǰü*] *odču* . . .

". . . Then, Senggüm [6] [39a] spoke, imagining himself to be someone great. Saying, 'If a kinswoman [7] of ours should go to them [8] she would stand at the door and would look only at the back [9] [of the tent]; if a kinswoman [10] of theirs should come to us, she would sit at the back [of the tent] and look in the direction of

[Translation]). Cf. also Erich HAENISCH, *Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen* [= *Das Mongolische Weltreich. Quellen und Forschungen* 1] (Leipzig, 1941) (hereinafter referred to as [Translation]).

[5] *YCPS* 5.38b6-39b2; HAENISCH [Text] 41 §165; [Translation] 59-60 §165; KOZIN [Text] 445 §165; [Translation] 127 §165. This episode is the subject of a chapter entitled "Nos filles sont des dames, et les leurs des servantes!" on pp. 149-151 of René GROUSSET's *Le Conquérant du Monde* (*Vie de Gengis-khan*) (Paris, 1944).

[6] For the reconstruction of the name of Nilqa Senggüm cf. Paul PELLIOT, *JA* 15 (1920). 176, note 2; *TP* 27 (1930). 22-24.

[7] The text has *uluγ*, as indicated by HAENISCH in the "Anmerkungen" to his edition of the text of the *Secret History* (113 §165, note 2, where we have *uluh* in his system). A small 舌 has disappeared from the lefthand side of 魯.

[8] *andur* is the *dat.-loc.* in *-dur* of *an-*, the stem in the oblique cases of the pronoun **a*, of which only the form *anu* ("*eorum*") still exists.

[9] In the later language *qoyimar* alternates with *qoyimor*. The word *qoyimar* is a derivative formed by means of a suffix *-mar* on a base **qoyi-* of which the meaning is "back." For the suffix *-mar/-mer* cf. page 103 §16 of the article, "Die Nominalstammbildungssuffixe im Mongolischen," by N. POPPE in *Keleti Szemle* 20 (1923-1927). 89-126. Cf. also the Ordos "χóõmūr le fond de la tente en face de la porte (place [356] du maître du logis et des hôtes qu'on veut spécialement honorer); au fond de la tente en face de la porte." (A. MOSTAERT, *Dictionnaire ordos* 1.355b-356a). The "*ḫoyimarr*" in HAENISCH's text is a misprint for "*ḫoyimar*," which appears correctly immediately below ("ḫoyimar a sa'uju . . .").

[10] See note 7 above.

the door,'[11] imagining himself to be someone great, he spoke of us in humiliating terms[12] and, without giving [us] Ča'ur[13] *beki*, [39b] he did not welcome with joy [our proposition]. At those words Činggis *qahan*[14] inwardly (lit., 'in his interior') lost his affection[15] for both Ongqan and Nilqa Senggüm.

"[40a] Jamuγa perceived that he had thus lost his affection. In the spring of the pig year [1203] Jamuγa, Altan, and Qučar [as well as] Süge'etei, To'oril, and Qači'un *beki* of the Qardakid, Ebügeǰin, and Noyakin[16] [respectively]—all those (lit., 'becoming

[11] By this Senggüm means that, if his younger sister Ča'ur *beki* were to marry Jöči, she would be treated as a servant who sits just inside the door facing the place of honor at the back of the tent; but that, if Qoǰin *beki* were to marry his son Tusaγa, she would be treated as a lady who sits in the place of honor at the back of the tent facing the door.

[12] The transcription *doromǰilan* in Kozin's edition of the text (445 §165) is an error for *doramǰilan*.

[13] Presumably the name *Ča'ur* is the same word as *ča'ur* "military campaign" which is found in the expression *urtu ča'ur ča'uran* "campaigning a long campaign" in the *Secret History* (*YCPS Sup.* 1.20b3). Cf. also Haenisch [Text] 87 §254; Kozin [Text] 500 §254. Cf. also Ordos "*tš'ūr* dans *tš'irik tš'ūr* soldats, armée. [*Hist. secr.* Suppl. I, f. 20v. (Haenisch, 254) *ča'ur* expédition militaire]." (A. Mostaert, *Dictionnaire ordos* 2.719a).

[14] Here, as elsewhere in the *Secret History*, with some exceptions, the word *qaγan* is written *qa han* (= *qahan*). The transcription with 罕 (*han*) without a small 中 on the upper lefthand side is probably a manner of marking the hiatus which certainly existed in this word, as is clear, for example, from the transcription *qa a nu* (= *qa'an-u*) in *YCPS* 4.40b2.

[15] As for the words *Činggis qahan . . . dura qočorču'u*, the subject of *qočorču'u* is *dura*. Literally translated *dura qočorču'u* means "the heart (i. e., affection) remained behind." However, *Činggis qahan* is the logical subject of *dura qočorču'u*. Literally we may translate *Činggis qahan . . . dura qočorču'u* as "[As for] Činggis *qahan*, the heart (i. e., affection) remained behind." The meaning is, of course, that Činggis *qahan* lost his affection. The Chinese transcription of *dura* by the characters 都剌 *du-ra* (= *dura*) and both the interlinear and smooth Chinese translations of *dura* by 心 (*hsin*) "heart" leave not the slightest doubt as to either the reading or the meaning of *dura* in the expression *dura qočor-*.

[16] The text has 那不勤 *No bu kin* (= *Nobukin*), an obvious error for 那牙勤 *No ya kin* (= *Noyakin*), as is clear from 那牙勤 *No ya kin* (= *Noyakin*) in 1.27b1 and 那牙乞納察 *No ya ki na ča* (= *Noyakin-ača*) in 3.35b4. Haenisch has "*nobukin*" in this passage of his text, but "*noyakin*" on page 5 §46 and "*noyakin aca*" on page 24 §120. On page 180b of his *Wörterbuch*, in the "Namenliste zu Mangḫol un Niuca Tobca'an," Haenisch corrected the reading "*nobukin*" by inserting the entry "Nobukin 1. Noyakin." *Sub verbo* "Noyakin" he has "S 46, 120, 166." On page 60 §166 of his translation he has "Noyakin." Kozin on page 445 §166 of his

those ') —became of one mind,[17] arose,[18] and departed . . ."

In this passage we have seen the words *dura qočor-* used twice, once as *dura qočorču'u*, where the suffix *-ču'u* designates the *praesens perfecti* of the verb *qočor-* " to remain behind," and once as *dura qočoruγsan*, where the suffix *-γsan* designates the *nomen perfecti* and is attached to the verb *qočor-* with the intervening union vowel (*-u-*).

Under the entry *ḥocorhu*, which is a misprint for *ḥocorḥu* in his system, Erich HAENISCH registers on page 64 of his *Wörterbuch* the expression " *dura—cu'u*, d. Zuneigung liess nach 165." However, *sub verbo dura* on page 39 he has " ~ *ḥocorḥu*, d. Liebe aufgeben, verlieren 165."

On page 60 §165 of his translation HAENISCH rendered the words *tere üge-tür Činggis qahan dotora'an Ongqan Nilqa Senggüm qoyar-tur dura qočorču'u* as " Auf diese Reden hin liess Cinggis ḥan in seinem Herzen mit der Liebe zu Ongḥan und Nilḥa-Sanggum etwas nach." Again on page 60 §166 he rendered the words *teyin dura qočoruγsan-i J̌amuγa uqaǰu* as " Dass diese Liebe nachgelassen hatte, merkte Jamuḥa, . . ."

KOZIN on page 127 § 165 of his translation renders the first text as: " Во время этих переговоров Чингис-хан внутренно охладел и к Ван-хану и к Нилха-Сангуму. [At the time of these negotiations Čingis-khan cooled internally both toward Van-khan and toward Nilkha-Sangum.] " Again, on page 127 § 166 he renders the second text as: "Об этом охлаждении Чингис-хана проведал Чжамуха, . . . [Čžamukha came to know about this cooling of Čingis-khan, . . .]."

In the interlinear Chinese translation (*YCPS* 5.39b2) the words *dura qočorču'u* are rendered 心落後了有來 " the affection (lit., ' heart ') fell behind." In the smooth, abridged version (*YCPS* 5.39b8) the whole text is rendered 以此成吉思心落後了 " With this, [as for] Činggis, [his] affection (lit., ' heart ') fell behind."

text has " *Nöbükin*," but " *Noyakin* " on page 403 §46 and " *Noyakin-ača* " on page 426 §120.

[17] For 額耶由 in *YCPS* 5.40a3 we must read 額耶田 (*eyeten*) as indicated by HAENISCH in his " Anmerkungen " (113 §166, note 1).

[18] The transcription *nögügüǰü* in KOZIN's edition of the text (445 § 165) would appear to be a misprint for what he transcribes as *nöügüǰü* on page 440 §151.

Again, in the interlinear translation (*YCPS* 5.40a1) the words *dura qočoruγsan* are rendered 心落後了的 "the fact that the affection (lit., 'heart') had fallen behind."

In the smooth, abridged version (*YCPS* 5.41b4) the whole text is rendered 那成吉思心落後的意思被札木忽覺了, which literally translated means: "The fact that, [as for] Činggis, the affection (lit., 'heart') had fallen behind,[19] was perceived by J̌amuγa." In a smooth translation we may render this: "The fact that Činggis had lost his affection was perceived by J̌amuγa."

Thus we see that *dura qočorču'u* and *dura qočoruγsan* in the *Secret History* confirm the reading *dura chotsarultsadshu* in line 21 of the letter of Öljeitü, proposed for other reasons by Schmidt in 1824 and followed by Klyukin in 1926, but fail to confirm the reading *dor-a xočarułčažu* proposed by Kotwicz in 1933 and followed by Kozin in 1935.

The form *qočarulčaǰu* in the letter of Öljeitü is a *converbum imperfecti* in *-ǰu* of the *comitativus* or *cooperativus* in *-lča* of *qočar-*[20] "to remain behind." The word *dur-a* is the subject and not the object of this verb. Hence, *dur-a qočarulčaǰu* means literally "the affection remaining behind on both sides." However, *bida aqanar degüner* is the subject of the whole expression *dur-a qočarulča-* just as *Činggis qahan* is the subject of *dura qočorču'u* in the passage of the *Secret History* cited above. Thus, very

[19] I have not encountered the expression 心落後了 in any other Chinese text. It has every appearance of being a literal translation of the Mongolian *dura qočor-*. On page 83 of his Старинное монгольское сказаніе о Чингисханѣ ["Ancient Mongolian Account About Čingiskhan"] [= Труды членовъ россійской духовной миссіи въ Пекинѣ (*Works of the Members of the Russian Religious Mission in Peking*), Tome IV, S(aint)-Petersburg, 1866] the Archimandrite Palladij translated the first text in the smooth version (*YCPS* 5.39b8) as: "Сердце Чингиса оттого охладѣло [the heart of Čingis, therefore, cooled]." In note 279 on page 204 he remarked: "Ло хоу ляо: собственно, отстало назади [*Lo khou lyao*: properly, to lag behind]." On page 83 he translated the second text (*YCPS* 5.41b4) as: "Объ этомъ охлажденіи сердца Чингиса провѣдалъ Чжамуха [Čžamukha came to know about this cooling of the heart of Čingis]."

[20] Side by side with the form *qočor-* of the *Secret History* we have also the form *qočar-* in the old Mongolian language. Cf., e. g., N. N. Poppe, Монгольский словарь Мукаддимат ал-Адаб [*Mongolian Dictionary of Mukaddimat al-Adab*] III (Moscow-Leningrad, 1939). 493, column 2. Such alternations are common in the old language. Cf., e. g., *oro* ~ *ora* "place," *oro-* ~ *ora-* "to enter," etc.

literally, *bida aqanar degüner . . . dur-a qočarulčaǰu* means " We, elder brothers and younger brothers, . . . the affection remaining behind on both sides." In a smooth translation we must change the construction, however, to conform to the requirements of our own language. Thus we may render the whole complex as " We, elder brothers and younger brothers, . . . losing on both sides the sentiments of affection [which we had for one another]."

Hence, it is clear that we must transcribe this sentence of the letter of Ölǰeitü as follows:

[20] *bida aqanar degüner mayun qaračus-un tasiy-a üges-iyer.*
[21] *dur-a qočarulčaǰu bölegei* [21]

and we must translate it:

[20] We, elder brothers and younger brothers, through (lit., " by ") the calumnious words of malicious commoners
[21] had lost on both sides the sentiments of affection [which we had for one another].

[21] The verb *bölegei* of this text was cited as *bülegei* by A. MOSTAERT in note 1 on page 152 of his article, " A propos de quelques portraits d'empereurs mongols," in *AM* 4 (1927). 147-156. The reading *bülegei* with *ü* instead of *ö* represents, in effect, the only pronunciation of this form of the verb *bö-* attested in the *Secret History*.