

Review: [untitled]
Author(s): Herbert Schurmann
Reviewed work(s): Steuergerechtsame/der chinesischen Kloster/unter der Mongolenherrschaft/ by Erich Haenisch
Source: *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 1/2, (Jun., 1951), pp. 291-306
Published by: Harvard-Yenching Institute
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2718305
Accessed: 20/08/2008 10:46

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. 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/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=hyi.

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.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org

REVIEWS

Erich HAENISCH, *Steuergerechtsame/der chinesischen Klöster/ unter der Mongolenherrschaft/ Eine kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung/mit Beigabe dreier noch unveröffentlichter Phagspa-Inschriften* [= *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig Philologisch-historische Klasse, 92 Band,* 1940, 2. Heft.] Leipzig: S. HIRZEL, 1940. Pp. 74 + 4 plates.

The publication of CHAVANNES' "Inscriptions et pièces de chancellerie chinoise de l'époque mongole,"[1] introduced to Mongolists and Sinologists the question of the special privileges accorded religious sects by the Mongols in the various countries under their rule. These special privileges, such as freedom from taxation (*Steuergerechtsame*) and exemption from levies and requisitions, were contained in imperial edicts regarding the temples and monasteries in question. Many of these edicts, cut on stelae in Chinese and Mongolian, have been preserved intact. Professor HAENISCH has endeavored to bring together much of the material already available, as well as new material, and to present a full picture of the relations between the Mongolian régime in China and the various religious sects, in the matter of economic privileges.

HAENISCH begins with a short summary of the economic status of religious sects in China from the T'ang to the Ch'ing (pp. 5-8). He points out that although the official histories categorically deny that religious institutions received special privileges during the Ming dynasty, the existence of a Mongolian letter in the *Hua-i i-yü* 華夷譯語, containing the customary phrases granting tax exemptions, indicates that such privileges must have been granted in individual cases (p. 7).

HAENISCH then gives a short survey of his most important sources, which, of course, include the *Yüan shih* 元史 and the

[1] *TP* 5 (1904).357-447; 9 (1908).297-428.

Hsü Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao 續文獻通考 (pp. 8-10). Among the sources, he mentions the *Ching-shih ta-tien* 經世大典,[2] but neglects to note that, except for a few fragments, it has been entirely lost to us. Next he discusses the *Yüan tien-chang* 元典章 and the *T'ung-chih t'iao-ko* 通制條格, two voluminous compilations of edicts of this period, of inestimable importance in the study of the economic and social history of the Yüan.[3] With the exception of Paul RATCHNEVSKY in 1937 [4] and Herbert FRANKE in 1949,[5] no Western Sinologist or Mongolist has as yet dealt extensively with these two great compilations. HAENISCH does both Mongolists and Sinologists a great service by extracting and translating some of the extremely important and interesting material found in these works.

Lastly he treats of the many individual privileges contained in the inscriptions. Thus HAENISCH has placed at our disposal the following three principal types of sources:

(1) Official histories (compiled after the downfall of the Yüan)
(2) Edicts promulgating laws of general application (contemporary)
(3) Individual privileges granted in special edicts preserved on stone (contemporary)

Next HAENISCH briefly summarizes the tax system during the early years of Mongolian rule (pp. 11-12).

Section B (pp. 12-45), called "Privilegien," contains translations of "Grundverfügungen in der offiziellen Geschichtsschrei-

[2] Cf. Paul PELLIOT, *TP* 25 (1928).98-99; 30 (1932).104. Also Paul RATCHNEVSKY, *Un code des Yuan* (Paris, 1937), pp. xx-xxii.

[3] HAENISCH says, in reference to the *TCTK*, "Sie ist . . . in Photokopie der Handschrift eines gewissen Moh-koh 墨格 aus dem Anfang der Ming-zeit, i. J. 1908 herausgegeben . . ." "Moh-koh" does not refer to a person, but to the manuscript; it means very literally "black-lined." Moreover, the *TCTK* was first published in 1930 photolithographically by the Pei-p'ing National Library (Kuo-li Pei-p'ing t'u-shu-kuan) from a manuscript preserved in the library of the old Manchu *nei-kô* 內閣. For a discussion of this publication cf. ABE Takao 安部健夫, *Tōhō Gakuhō* (Kyōto) No. 1 (March, 1931).249.

[4] RATCHNEVSKY, *op. cit.*; RATCHNEVSKY, as PELLIOT indicates in his "Préface" (p. iv), was not able to make use of the *TCTK*.

[5] *Geld und Wirtschaft unter der Mongolenherrschaft* (Leipzig, 1949).

bung" (pp. 12-23) and "Sonderverfügungen in den Akten (YT und TT)" (pp. 23-43). HAENISCH does not state explicitly that these sections consist of "Übersetzungen"; nevertheless our criterion of criticism must be the degree of precision and faithfulness with which the original text is rendered. Section B. I. (pp. 12-23) contains material from the official histories—material which, although still posing many problems, is already known to Western Sinologists. In this review, I should like to deal *in extenso* with some of the new material extracted from the *YTC* and the *TCTK* which HAENISCH presents for the first time.

Unfortunately HAENISCH has, in many cases, extracted portions of these edicts from their original contexts, often without so indicating. In some cases the remainder of the edict deals with matters pertaining to population groups other than the priests and monks mentioned in HAENISCH's extracts. In other cases the remainder deals with the economic status of the religious groups in question. In both cases the reader, unless he himself investigates the matter in detail, is quite unaware of the over-all context and spirit of the edict in question. The first edict (p. 23: "1263") is extracted from a long edict in the *TCTK* (2.2a2-19b3; also *YTC* 17.2a-12a), issued in 1271, which details the tax obligations of the many classes of the population. HAENISCH's extract is taken from item no. 17 (15b5-16a4), entitled "Confucianists"; it begins on 16a2.

HAENISCH's second edict (p. 25: "1264") covers *YTC* 24.1a-1b and includes in essence the entire edict. The same edict with some variations appears in *TCTK* 29.9a2-9b6. HAENISCH translates the term *ch'ai-yi* 差役 (*YTC* 24.1a5; *TCTK* 29.9a5) as "Abgaben und Leistungen." The term should be translated as *Leistungen*. This is made quite clear by the usage of the term in *YTC*, Supplement, "*Hu-pu*" 36a, where it designates a collection of edicts dealing with the rendering of service. It is questionable whether the term *Han-êrh* 漢兒 (1b1-9b3) should be translated as "Chinesen."[6] A preferable translation would be *Nordchinesen*

[6] For an excellent article on the subject cf. CH'ÊN Yin-k'o 陳寅恪, *Yüan-tai Han-jên i-ming k'ao* 元代漢人譯名考, in *Kuo-hsüeh lun-ts'ung* 國學論叢 2.1 (August, 1929).1-6.

or *Einwohner von Nordchina* which would include the Ch'i-tan, the Ju-chên and the Korean as well as the Chinese inhabitants of the areas once ruled by the Chin. Here *Ho-hsi* 河西 is not a place name modifying *Han-êrh*, but a designation of the Tanguts, i. e., the Hsi-Hsia, who lived west of the bend of the Yellow River.[7] In the passage preceding this one there exists a significant discrepancy between the *YTC* and the *TCTK*, which HAENISCH does not mention. The former has the phrase 據該納丁稅; the latter has | 不 | | | |. HAENISCH translated, "Aber sie zahlen keine Kopfsteuer." In this case CH'ÊN Yüan 陳垣 says nothing in his lists of corrections about this passage. This discrepancy is followed by another, which HAENISCH again fails to note (*YTC* 24.1b3; *TCTK* 29.9b4-5). A sentence which may be translated as "Mongolian and North-Chinese postal workers and soldiers are to pay only one-half [the land tax]; if the warehouses are remote, they are [entirely] exempted" is missing in the *TCTK*. The last sentence of HAENISCH's translation is a much abbreviated version of the original text.[8]

The third edict (p. 24: "1271") is item 15 in the long edict of 1271 in the *TCTK* discussed above. HAENISCH's remark, "Die Oberverwaltungsbehörde setzt unter Berufung auf zwei frühere Verordnungen von 1235 und 1252 eine grosse Liste für Steuerregistrierung und Steuerpflichten der einzelnen Bevölkerungsklassen auf, in 27 Paragraphen . . .," should really be affixed to the first edict he translates; it is not a translation, but merely a terse *Zusammenfassung* of the passage explaining the edict (*TCTK* 2.2a-2b). I do not believe that HAENISCH's rendering of

[7] That the term *Ho-hsi* was used in an ethnic sense referring to the Tanguts, during the Yüan, is demonstrated decisively in a passage from the travelogue of the Taoist monk Ch'ang-ch'un: 田園不能自主,須附漢人及契丹河西等, "they [the Uïγurs] could not manage the fields and gardens themselves; they had to depend on North Chinese, Ch'i-tan and Ho-hsi, etc." (*Ch'ang-ch'un chên-jên hsi-yu-chi chiao-chu* 長春眞人西遊記校注, *ts'ê* 32 in *Wang Chung-k'o kung i-shu* 王忠慤公遺書, 1.32b14-15). This passage was first translated by Arthur WALEY in *Travels of an Alchemist*, p. 93. In the *Secret History* the term *Qašin*, clearly referring to the Tanguts, occurs repeatedly; cf. Erich HAENISCH, *Manghol un niuca tobca'an* (Leipzig, 1935), pp. 150, 177, 249, 250. For a further discussion of the term cf. WANG Ching-ju 王靜如, *Hsi-hsia yen-chiu* 西夏研究 1 (Pei-p'ing, 1932) .87-88.

[8] For a complete translation of this edict, cf. RATCHNEVSKY, *op. cit.*, pp. 208-210.

the term *shih-ch'an* 事產 as "Erwerbsberuf" is correct. *Ch'an* 產 most likely refers to *ch'an-yeh* 產業 "property," a very common term in *YTC* and *TCTK*. *Shih* probably means "occupation," "Beruf." Thus HAENISCH's translation probably should read, ". . . und weder Erwerbsberuf noch Eigentum haben." [9]

HAENISCH's fourth edict (p. 24: "1287") includes the entire edict (*YTC* 33.8a2-8b10). Unlike most in the *YTC* and the *TCTK*, this is a special edict of privilege, and, in wording, resembles the inscriptions quite closely. HAENISCH's translation of the common phrase *ch'in-tz'ŭ* 欽此 as "besonderer Wille" (p. 25) is quite wrong. The correct translation can be found in COUVREUR: "on doit respecter cet ordre ou cet édit." [10]

The fifth edict (p. 25 "1289") covers *TCTK* 29.8a9-9a1, and includes the entire edict except for a few phrases (8b4-8b7).

I shall not go into the rest of the edicts, save for one. These few examples, I hope, will suffice to warn the casual reader that HAENISCH's version of these edicts cannot be accepted as integral, complete, or conclusive. As a final comment on HAENISCH's method of extracting portions from their contexts, I should like to give a translation of the edict of which HAENISCH presents parts on p. 38 ("1318") (*YTC* Supplement, "Hu-pu," 36a1-11). First the edict as HAENISCH renders it:

> 1318 Aus einem Antrag der Zentralregierungsbehörde über die Steuerpflichten: Die Mönchs- und Taoistenklöster sollen im Süden von (dem Ende) der früheren Sung an, im Kerngebiet und in Yün-nan vom 1. Jahre Yüan-chen an als Termin, für Grundstücke ständigen Wohnsitzes und Altbesitz sowie Schenkungen der Kaiser von Steuern befreit sein . . . Die Mönche und Taoisten sollen für die später erworbenen Grundstücke für welche das Vermögensaufsichtsamt die Bebauung zu besorgen hatte, insgesamt entsprechend der Produktion gleichermassen Steuern zahlen mit der übrigen Bevölkerung wie Militär, Postleuten, Handwerkern, Ärzten, Konfuzianern, Fabrikarbeitern (爐戶), Korntransportschiffern, aller Rassen gleichviel welcher Familienlisten. Auf diesen Antrag erging ein zustimmendes Edikt mit dem besonderen Kaiserlichen Willensvermerk. YT Suppl. II 36r.

I have rendered this same edict in the following manner:

[9] On the Derwishes (Darvīš) mentioned in this edict cf. Paul PELLIOT, *TP* 38 (1948).139, note 107. The term occurs as a proper name in the form *Derbis* in the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362; cf. F. W. CLEAVES, *HJAS* 12 (1949).89.

[10] *Troisième édition suivant l'ordre alphabétique* . . . (Ho Kien Fou), p. 398c.

Rendering of Service [11]

[Miscellaneous Prestations [12] by Households of Various Categories]

The second year of Chih-chih [1322-1323]: Copy of a memorial of the *chung-shu-shêng* [13] of the first day of the eleventh moon of the fifth year of Yen-yu [23 November 1318] which was authorized [by the Emperor] and is as follows: "Hereafter in accordance with imperial edicts which have been repeatedly issued, as for 'hiring by contract,' [14] 'purchase by contract,' [15] [acting as] village or cantonal heads,[16] miscellaneous prestations and services to which the people are subject, besides (i. e., in addition to) soldiers in distant regions and postal workers between Ta-tu and Shang-tu who supply their own rations,[17] various [Buddhist] temples and [Taoist] monasteries which have held property in the South since before the fall of the Sung, and in the *fu-li*,[18] and Yün-nan as of the first year of *Yüan-chên* [1295-1296], together with lands granted [to them] by the Emperor, are exempt [from these services]. Furthermore, [we] note that all soldiers who are serving in distant regions, and who, wherever they have their home registers, have real estate which supports soldiers, have already been exempted there (i. e., in their home towns). These officers and soldiers together with [Buddhist] priests and [Taoist] monks who continue to purchase lands of the people which are subject to obligations, and surplus lands on which the *ts'ai-fu tsung-kuan-fu* [19] was to have received (= ? has failed to receive) tenants, together with others such as soldiers, postal workers, laymen, artisans, doctors, [Confucianist] scholars, salt workers,[20]

---

[11] *Ch'ai-i* 差役. HAENISCH translates incorrectly as "Steuerpflichten." The entire section (36a-38b) deals with the rendering of service, not the payment of taxes.

[12] *Tsa-fan* 雜泛. Cf. RATCHNEVSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 241, note 2, where RATCHNEVSKY translates a very similar edict from the *YTC*.

[13] The central administrative office under the Mongols. Cf. RATCHNEVSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 117 ff.

[14] *Hô-ku* 和雇. Cf. RATCHNEVSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 229, note 1.

[15] *Hô-mai* 和買. Cf. Lien-sheng YANG, "Buddhist Monasteries and Four Money-raising Institutions in Chinese History," *HJAS* 13 (1950).178, note 15; cf. also RATCHNEVSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 229, note 2.

[16] *Li-chêng* 里正; *chu-shou* 主首. Cf. RATCHNEVSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 63, note 9.

[17] *Shou-ssŭ* 首思. This is a Mongolian word, the colloquial form of *šigüsün*, meaning "rations." Cf. KOWALEWSKI, *Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français* (Kazan, 1844-1849), Vol. 2, pp. 1513a-b. For an excellent discussion of this word cf. Paul PELLIOT, "Notes sur le "Turkestan" de M. W. Barthold," *TP* 27 (1930).37-38, note 3: cf. also Władysław KOTWICZ, "Contribution aux études altaïques," *Collectanea Orientalia* 1 (Wilno, 1932).30-34.

[18] *Fu-li* 腹裏. This term designated the central region under the direct administrative control of the *chung-shu-shêng*. Cf. *Yüan shih* (*Pai-na-pên*).58.3a1 ff. Cf. also RATCHNEVSKY, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-126.

[19] *Ts'ai-fu tsung-kuan-fu* 財賦總管府. I am not sure of the meaning of this phrase or the function of this office. See RATCHNEVSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 246, note 1. HAENISCH does not justify his translation "Vermögensaufsichtsamt."

[20] It is regrettable that HAENISCH did not look into CH'ÊN Yüan's "Verbesserungs-

grain shippers and all the various tribes,[21] no matter what family category it may be, all are to be subject to obligations alike on the basis of their property. What shall we do about it?" Upon [receipt of this] memorial, there was received an imperial edict saying, "So be it! Respect this!"

Because the author treats only of those parts of the edicts which deal explicitly with religious groups, it is difficult for readers to see how the institutional pattern of such privileges fitted into the whole social and economic structure. This is one criticism which may be raised regarding HAENISCH's method of procedure. Secondly, in a work which deals primarily with economic questions, it is imperative that those terms dealing with taxes, levies, fiscal bureaus, etc., be translated and annotated as adequately as possible so that those who pick up the threads may be able to build with assurance on the foundations already laid. However, HAENISCH's method of procedure necessitates a thoroughgoing revision and restudy of the material he has presented, before scholars can take this material as a *point de départ* for further work.

I should like to deal with a few more specific points in HAENISCH's translations. The edict translated on p. 28 ("1295": *YTC* 24.12b-13b) was already translated by RATCHNEVSKY (*op. cit.*, pp. 211-212). HAENISCH's translation of the phrase *ti-liang shang-shui so-pan ch'ien-wu* 地糧商稅所辦錢物 (*YTC* 24.12b10-11) as, ". . . in Sachen der Behandlung von Bodensteuer und Umsatzsteuer . . .," is neither correct nor very meaningful. *Pan* here has the meaning "obtain," "procure" (cf. COUVREUR, 3e éd., p. 646b). The passage should be translated, "as for the money and goods which are obtained as land and commercial taxes."[22]

liste" (p. 8) wherein *lu-hu* 爐戶 is corrected to *tsao-hu* 竈戶, i.e., "salt-workers." Cf. *Tz'ŭ yüan, wu*, 234c. Furthermore it is difficult to conceive of the existence of "Fabriken" in fourteenth-century China.

[21] *Chu-t'ou-hsia* 諸投下. In the third 'Phags-pa inscription translated by HAENISCH, this term is given as the equivalent of *ayima'ud*, i.e., "the tribes" (p. 61).

[22] Note RATCHNEVSKY's translation: ". . . En ce qui concerne l'argent et les objets fixes pour le paiement de l'impôt sur la terre et de l'impôt sur le commerce . . ." It should be noted that the term *ch'ien-wu* 錢物 is used once, in HAENISCH's second inscription (p. 60), as an equivalent for the Mongolian *ya'ud k'ed*, i.e., "things, objects." Cf. F. W. CLEAVES, "The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1335 in Memory of Chang Ying-jui," *HJAS* 13 (June, 1950).116, note 107.

The two names which HAENISCH gives in transcription as "Ma-śi-sze-ki-sze" and "Ai-se" (p. 30; "1295") are well-known names of the period. HAENISCH's reconstruction of the former as "Masisgis" (p. 30, note 3) is incorrect. Moreover he transcribes one character wrongly as "ki": it should be *k'i* (= *ch'i*). CH'ÊN Yüan 陳垣 feels that this man whose name is written as *Ma-hsi-ssŭ-ch'i-ssŭ* is probably identical with the Mar Sargis prominently mentioned in the inscription written by LIANG Hsiang 梁相 in commemoration of the Ta-hsing-kuo Christian monastery at Chên-chiang-fu.[23] *Ai-hsieh* is ultimately derived from the Syriac *Išu'*,[24] i. e., "Jesus"; the name was current during the Yüan period.[25] It is interesting to note that in the edict of 1304 (pp. 33-34) the name of the Emperor Möngke (1251-1259)[26] is mentioned in the list of emperors who had previously issued edicts on the subject in question. In most edicts the names of Güyüg and Möngke are not included. For a note on the term *Chu-hu* (= Jews) (p. 38) see Rudolf LÖWENTHAL, "Nomenclature of Jews in China," *MS* 12 (1947).111-114.

In Part III (pp. 39-43) HAENISCH presents a summary of the contents of the inscriptions which CHAVANNES translated, and makes a number of corrections in his translations. Being both a Mongolist and a Sinologist, HAENISCH is in a position to control the bilingual texts.

[23] CH'ÊN Yüan does not hesitate to declare that *ssŭ* 思 must be an error for *li* 里, thus giving us the name as Ma-hsi-li-ch'i-ssŭ (cf. *Yüan yeh-li-k'ô-wên k'ao* 元也里可溫考, Vol. 73 in the *Tung-fang wên-k'u* 東方文庫, p. 73). This name could then be reconstructed as **Mar Sirkis*. CH'ÊN Yüan identifies this man with the well-known Mar Sargis of the Christian monastery at Chên-chiang-fu. The name *Mar Sargis* occurs repeatedly in the edicts dealing with Christians but mostly in the form, *Ma-hsieh-li-chi-ssŭ*. The Syriac form of the name is clearly *Sargis*; cf. BROCKELMANN, *Syrische Grammatik* (Berlin, 1912), p. 198. Nevertheless the form **Sirkis* is indicated by the occurrence of the name as *Marsarchis* in the *Marco Polo*; cf. *Marco Polo il Milione*, Luigi F. BENEDETTO (Firenze, 1928).141, §CL. For further information on Mar Sargis cf. A. C. MOULE, *Christians in China* (London, 1930), pp. 145-157. For a reference to this edict, cf. p. 233, also note 33.

[24] BROCKELMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

[25] Cf. *Ai-hsieh, His Biography*, an unpublished doctoral dissertation by WÊNG Tu-*chien* 翁獨健 (Harvard, 1938).

[26] HAENISCH reads the name of this emperor variously as "Monggo" (pp. 34, 35) and "Mungge" (p. 73).

Section C (pp. 43-52) contains first (pp. 43-45) a *Zusammenfassung* of the information presented above. This section should be supplemented by RATCHNEVSKY's discussion of the economic status of religious groups. HAENISCH has not given much attention to the many government edicts issued against tax evasion practised by citizens entering orders under false pretenses. RATCHNEVSKY, more interested in the legalistic aspects of the matter, discusses them in detail.[27]

HAENISCH, in his general discussion (pp. 45-52), excellently summarizes the whole question of privileges for religious groups in the following phrases (p. 47): "Sie [die Klöster—H. S.] gingen aufs Ganze: Befreiung ihres Guts und ihrer Betriebe von jedweder Abgabe überhaupt nach der Formel . . . 'Sie sollen keine Abgaben irgendwelcher Art leisten!' Um diese absolute Steuerfreiheit, die zu den kaiserlichen Grund- und Sonderverfügungen in klarem Widerspruch steht, haben die Klöster ihren Kampf geführt." HAENISCH thus provides an interesting explanation for the fact that the general edicts (*YTC* and *TCTK*) usually restrict privileges and exemptions, whereas the particular edicts grant greater freedom than that provided for in the general edicts. According to HAENISCH, the religious groups and institutions were engaged in a constant battle with the local authorities. A general edict might specify that land and commercial taxes were to be collected, but then a particular monastery or temple might go over the heads of the local authorities, appeal directly to the crown, and gain for itself an edict of exemption. HAENISCH also feels he has uncovered evidence that some monks mutilated the texts of edicts on the stelae in their own favor. In one bilingual inscription, two characters meaning "with the exception of" seem to have been scratched from a passage dealing with payment of land and commercial taxes, thus making the monks totally tax-exempt (pp. 49-50). The Mongolian text, which probably was unintelligible to them, clearly specifies that they were to pay the land and commercial taxes. This discrepancy between the Mongolian and Chinese texts was noted by N. N. POPPE, but he provided no

[27] Cf. RATCHNEVSKY, *op. cit.*, pp. lxvii-lxxxvi.

explanation for it.[28] HAENISCH's explanation seems to me to be correct.

Lastly (pp. 53-73) HAENISCH presents us with translations and studies of three 'Phags-pa inscriptions heretofore unpublished. The rubbings which were made from stelae located near the Taoist temple Ch'ung-yang-kung 重陽宮 in the market town of Tsu-an-chên 祖奄鎮 in Chou-chih-hsien 盩厔縣 in Shensi Province were up till the publication of HAENISCH's work (1940) preserved in the Berliner Museum für Völkerkunde. HAENISCH mentions (p. 53) that Marian LEWICKI had just recently published and translated all known Mongolian 'Phags-pa inscriptions.[29] HAENISCH did not know that at the time POPPE, in Russia, was preparing for publication his collections of 'Phags-pa inscriptions in Mongolian.[30] POPPE himself became aware of HAENISCH's publication just shortly before his own book was to appear. He states that the last known 'Phags-pa inscription in Mongolian relates to the year 1351, but in a footnote adds that one of HAENISCH's inscriptions (no. 2, p. 59-60; transl. p. 63-64) relates to the year 1351, and another (no. 3, 60-61, 65-66) presumably to the year 1352.[31] POPPE published thirteen inscriptions, mentioning the fact that these thirteen did not exhaust the extant 'Phags-pa material, nor even that portion of it known to him personally.[32] In addition to the thirteen inscriptions published by POPPE and the three published by HAENISCH, we have now the edict of Hai-shan published posthumously for PELLIOT [33] and the Ch'êng-tu inscription published by HAN Ju-lin 韓儒林.[34]

[28] N. N. POPPE, Квадратная Писменность (*Square Writing*) published by Академия Наук СССР, Институт Востоковедения (Academy of Sciences U. S. S. R., Institute of Orientology) (Moscow, Leningrad, 1941) p. 109.

[29] Marian LEWICKI, "Les inscriptions mongoles inédites et écriture carrée," *Collectanea Orientalia* 12 (Wilno, 1937).1-72.

[30] N. N. POPPE, *op. cit.*

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 15 and note 2.

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 55-57. He did not translate the inscription presented on plate 25 of CHAVANNES' inscriptions, *TP* 9 (1908).428-429, because of the poor quality of the photographic reproduction. Furthermore there remain the many 'Phags-pa inscriptions in Chinese.

[33] Paul PELLIOT, "Un rescrit mongol en écriture 'Phags-pa," in *Tibetan Scrolls* published by Giuseppe TUCCI, pp. 621-624.

[34] *Studia Serica*, 2 (September, 1941).136-149.

In concluding this review I should like to take up a few specific points in connection with HAENISCH's rendering of these three inscriptions.

In his first inscription, HAENISCH's translation of the term "cölge cölges" (*č'eol-ge č'eol-ges*, in POPPE's transcription), glossed by the term *chu-lu* 諸路, as "die verschiedenen Provinzen" is wrong (p. 58, line 20-21; p. 67, note 20/21). The *lu* were administrative subdivisions of the "provinces," which in turn were the large regional areas administered by the *hsing-chung-shu-shêng* 行中書省.[35] POPPE, in the glossary at the end of his book, translates the term correctly as *okrug*, i. e., "district" (p. 152).

The term "tsaṅ tamḥa" (*c'aŋ t'am-qa*) (line 24), meaning land and commercial taxes respectively, appears over and over again in both the 'Phags-pa inscriptions and the ordinances in *YTC* and *TCTK*, in their Chinese equivalents, *ti-shui* and *shang-shui* respectively. *T'am-qa* also existed in Persia as a commercial tax. According to Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī, the pre-Mongolian commercial tax was called *māl-i ṭamγā* مال طمغا, i. e., "*ṭamγā* levy"; under the Mongols it was known as *tamγā* تمغا.[36] We note, therefore, that although the orthography is different, the use of this term in the sense of commercial tax seems to have antedated the Mongolian period. Thus HAENISCH's speculation that *t'am-qa* (which means "seal" in Turkish and Mongolian) may have had some relationship to Chinese grain storehouses ("vielleicht von dem gestempelten Ausweis über den Umsatz der mit der Einzahlung [der Handelssteuer] einzureichen war?") is probably groundless. The commercial tax, of course, is an old Chinese institution, but *t'am-qa* (= *tamγa*, in the *Uïγur* script) may have its roots in the West.

HAENISCH inserts the word "Betten" in his translation of the series of terms in line 26 (p. 63), line 27 (p. 64) and lines 22-23

[35] Cf. PELLIOT, "Notes sur le "Turkestan" de M. W. Barthold," *TP* 27 (1930). 18-21. Cf. also *Yüan shih* (*Pai-na-pên*) 58.3a1-3. In the central adminstrative region alone there were 29 *lu*.

[36] M. MINOVI and V. MINORSKY, "Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī on Finance," *BSOS* 10 (1940). 755-790. Cf. especially p. 773, and p. 781 (b).

(p. 65), in all three inscriptions. There is no corresponding term for "beds" in the Mongolian text. In all three inscriptions we note in the Mongolian text the terms *dėṃ k'ebid*, in each case glossed by the Chinese terms *tien-shê p'u-hsi* 店舍鋪席. *Dėm* obviously is a transcription of the word *tien* which in that period still retained the final *m*. From its equivalent *tien-shê* we may conclude that *dėm* means "inn," *Herberge*.[37] Nevertheless, it is not clear whether this means "inn" in the Western sense, or an establishment somehow associated with commerce. The word *tien* in modern Chinese and *-ten* or *mise* in Japanese means "store." Consequently *k'ebid* and *p'u-hsi* must mean the same thing. In the *Hua-i i-yü* (I.9a) *kebid* is glossed as *p'u-mien* 鋪面, literally, "front of a shop," "stall."[38] POPPE translates the term as *lavki*, i. e., "shops," "stalls."[39] Word for word, *p'u-hsi* means "to spread out a mat" or "a mat [on which wares are] spread out." This word possibly referred to the setting up of a stall or to the stall itself. The translation of these two terms probably should be "inns" and "stalls," pending further investigation of the nature of these "inns" and "stalls."

The word *könörge* (line 27), "Weinhefe," has undergone an interesting metathesis in some of the dialects. In Kalmuck we have "*körŋgə* . . . Saat . . . Hefe."[40] In the KOWALEWSKI we have *körüngge*: "levain, ferment . . ."[41] So also in Ordos[42] and Khalkha.[43] However, in Monguor we have the form *k'uonorguo*: "levure, ferment, levain."[44] It would be most interesting if further examples of such striking similarities occurring only be-

[37] In the first inscription (p. 63) HAENISCH neglects to insert *Herberge* as he has done in the rest. This must be a *lapsus*. On *tien-shê*, cf. PALLADIĬ, Полный Китайско-русскій Словарь (*Complete Chinese-Russian Dictionary*) (Peking, 1909), Vol. 1, p. 327c.

[38] PALLADIĬ, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 726c.

[39] POPPE, *op. cit.*, p. 118, notes 44, 45.

[40] RAMSTEDT, *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*, p. 240b.

[41] KOWALEWSKI, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 2640a.

[42] Antoine MOSTAERT, *Dictionnaire ordos*, p. 431a.

[43] A. R. RINČINE, Краткий Монгольский-русский Словарь [*Concise Mongolian-Russian Dictionary*], (Moscow, 1947), p. 276.

[44] A. de SMEDT and A. MOSTAERT, *Le dialecte monguor parlé par les Mongols du Kansou occidental, III^e partie, Dictionnaire monguor-français* (Pei-p'ing, 1933), p. 213.

tween Monguor and the language of the 'Phags-pa script could be found.

The term " alba ḥubcir i " (= *al-ba qub-č'i-ri*) (line 27), generally glossed as *ch'ai-fa* 差發, raises interesting problems.[45] *Ch'ai-fa* is a pre-Mongolian term appearing as early as the Chin.[46] It is used in the *Hei-ta shih-lüeh*, written in 1237, to describe Mongolian levies.[47] In *YTC* (25.1a-3b) there is an entire section dealing with *ch'ai-fa*. From the contents of the edicts, *ch'ai-fa* refers to taxes and levies other than the land and commercial taxes, which are treated separately (*YTC* 22, 24).[48] HAENISCH translates both terms (i. e., the Chinese and Mongolian) as " die allegemeinen Lasten: Dienste und Steuern " (p. 69, note 27). This translation seems to be too general; however, I am not sure what the exact translation should be.

The term *qubč'iri* has had an interesting institutional evolution. In the *Secret History* it apparently had the general meaning of " levy."[49] Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī (died 1274) included the term *qopčur* (actually written *qabǰūr* قبجور) under the category of poll taxes.[50] POPPE states:

> In the work of Rašid ed-Din and in other Moslem historians the term *qubčur* designated a special levy on livestock. According to BEREZIN, *qubčur* was introduced by Mönke Qan and was collected in the amount of one head per hundred. Later *qubčur* was collected in money in the amount of 70 gold coins per ten individuals . . . V. V. BARTOL'D reports that " kopčur " designated pasturages and a levy on grazing herds in the amount of one percent. Initially

---

[45] Cf. PELLIOT, *TP* 37 (1944).154-164, on *qubčiri*. Also POPPE, *op. cit.*, p. 108, note 10.

[46] *Chin shih* (*Pai-na-pên*).47.15a.2.

[47] *Hei-ta shih-lüeh chien-chêng* 黑韃事略箋證, in *Wang Chung-k'ô kung i-shu*, *op. cit.*, 11a6-13a13.

[48] In the *Yüan shih* there is a section entitled *k'ô-ch'ai* 科差 which corresponds to the *ch'ai-fa* section in the *YTC*. The first sentence (*YS*. 93.11b10-12) reads, " As for the designations for *k'ô-ch'ai*, there are two: (a) *ssŭ-liao* 絲料 and (b) *pao-yin* 包銀. [According to] this method taxation takes place on the basis of family status." The edicts in the *YTC* in the corresponding section also deal with the *pao-yin* tax, which is a kind of household tax, originally payable in silver, but during most of the Yüan actually collected in paper money. Cf. *YS*. 93.13a9.

[49] Glossed as *k'ô-lien* 科斂 which PELLIOT translates as " redevance par catégorie," " redevance spécifique," with reservations. Cf. *TP* 37 (1944).164, note 1. HAENISCH translates it as " Abgabe, Steuer " (*Wörterbuch*, p. 69).

[50] MINOVI and MINORSKY, *op. cit.* 776, 783, note e.

it was collected primarily from nomads. On the other hand, V. V. BARTOL'D, with reference to Juwayni, confirms that "kopčur" during the time of Mönke designated a head tax, collected in money from a conquered population.[51]

BARTOL'D himself states:

In the *yarlīγ* of 1304 on taxation all taxes collected on a usual basis, in non-privileged areas, are divided into three categories: (1) *kopčur* and taxes (*postuplenia*) from inhabitants of towns, paid twice a year; (2) *kopčur* and taxes from steppe-dwellers, paid once a year, namely at the beginning of the year; (3) *tamga*, the amount of which was specially fixed for each area, where such taxes were collected, and was posted on billboards to be affixed to the gates of said place. From this text [i. e., of Abū Sa'īd Bahādur Khan—H. S.] it can be concluded that by "kopčur" were understood all direct taxes, collected from agriculturalists as well as nomads, in differentiation from "tamga" or indirect taxes, collected from the cities.[52]

M. MINOVI and V. MINORSKY state:

In general use *qopchur* was applied to various casual imposts levied on the spot chiefly to defray the expenses of messengers and officials (*ilchi*).[53]

In the *Hua-i i-yü* (II.A.12a.3) we have the phrase of exemption, *aliba alba qubčirin ülü abun bu qudqulatu'ai*, literally, "not taking any *alba qubčirin* from them, let one not disturb them," or more freely, "let one not disturb them by taking any *alba qubčirin* from them." Here *alba qubčirin* is glossed as *ch'ai-fa k'ô-lien* (see above, and note 49). Thus it becomes quite clear that the complications concerning these tax institutions are far greater than one might suspect from HAENISCH's brief note on the subject.

In line 29 the Chinese term *kô-chih-êrh t'ou-hsia* 各枝兒投下 is rendered simply as *ayima'ud*, i. e., as HAENISCH puts it, "die Unterworfenen der verschiedenen Stämme" (p. 70, note 29). This is an excellent example of the value of bilingual inscriptions. With regard to this question, ABE Takao 安部健夫 states, "Thus it can be decided that *tokyā* 投下,頭下, and *tokyān* 投項,頭項 designated various kinds of aggregate groups having special rights,

[51] POPPE, *op. cit.*, p. 109 (in Russian).

[52] V. BARTOL'D, Персидская Надпись на Стѣнѣ Анійской Мечети Мануче [*A Persian Inscription on the Wall of the Manuče Mosque at Ani*] (St. Petersburg, 1911), pp. 32-33. This *yarlīγ* of 1304 mentioned by BARTOL'D is contained in the *Rašīd al-Dīn*; cf. BARTOL'D, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-2.

[53] MINOVI and MINORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 784.

established as a reward for distinction in military affairs, or [in turn designated] those who received [such rewards]." [54] During the later Yüan, however, according to ABE, the term *t'ou-hsia* tended to become confused with the term *aimaγ*, and eventually was replaced by the latter altogether. ABE's contention is further proved by the passage in question.

In lines 19-20 (pp. 60-61) we find the interesting phrase, " ḥan u tsaṅ 'amu bu cidḥutuhayi " (= *qa-nu c'aŋ a-mu bu č'id-qu-t'u-qayi*), which has as its Chinese equivalent a phrase which may be clearly translated as, " do not store up government grain " (p. 65; p. 72, notes 19, 20). Here *qan* seems to have the meaning " government " to judge by the Chinese translation. That *qan* does not refer to the emperor is evident from the fact that the reigning emperors were called *qaγan* and not *qan*. The question of the meaning and etymology of this word bears further investigation.

These few points by no means exhaust the interesting questions and problems in these three inscriptions. As a whole it is to be regretted that HAENISCH has not annotated his translations more fully, by bringing together much of the available material on the subject. The Mongols extended their privileges not only to religious groups in China, but to sects throughout their empire. In Naṣīr al-Dīn we read:

> . . . Even now, . . . (it)[4] is not collected from five categories of people: (a) from the *tarkhāns* raised to that state by the king, such as (Muslim) sages and (Christian) clergy . . .
>
> [4] I. e., the poll tax, gradually comprised under qopchur . . .[55]

Similar edicts granting tax exemptions were granted metropolitans of the Russian Orthodox Church by the rulers of the

[54] ABE Takao, " Gendai " Tō-ka " no Gogen-kō " 元代「投下」の語源考 (" De l'étymologie du mot " T'ou Hsia " . . . employé à la période de Yuan . . .") in *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 東洋史研究 3 (1938).16.

[55] MINOVI and MINORSKY, *op. cit.* 776, §16; *Aknūn ham ba-hukm-i yāsaq az panj kas namīgīrand, avval az mardum-i ṭarkhan kih pādišāh išān-ra ṭarkhan kardah bāšad čūn dānišmand[ān] va arkāūn* 9 p. 763 §16). Note the un-Persian and typically Mongolian usage of the words for " Nestorian " and " Muslim " clergy.

" Golden Horde." [56] In most of these edicts the phraseology is not too different from the language of the edicts issued by Mongols elsewhere in the empire. Again we see that, however much the Mongols identified themselves with the various cultures of China, Persia, Central Asia, etc., there remained a number of characteristics common to all the parts of that vast empire. HAENISCH has performed a very valuable service by giving us this extremely interesting volume on Mongolian religious policy in China. Nevertheless, it must be re-examined carefully before scholars interested in the social and economic history of the Mongols can utilize it.

Herbert SCHURMANN

Ilza VEITH, *Huang Ti Nei Ching Su Wen, the Yellow Emperor's Classic of Internal Medicine*, Chapters 1-34 translated from the Chinese with an Introductory Study, Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Company, 1949. Pp. xix + 253.

In this handsome volume an extended translation from one of the classical Chinese works on medicine is for the first time made available. Mrs. VEITH has here translated the first thirty-four sections, about one-third of the *Nei ching*. In addition she has translated the prefaces by WANG Ping and LIN I, as well as the notice in the *Ssŭ-k'u Catalog*. A long (58 page) introduction discusses the text, its age and authorship, and supplies an analysis of the contents and key concepts of the *Nei ching*. Mrs. VEITH's purpose has been to make this Chinese medical classic available to the Occidental medical historian; she states (Preface, p. xii) " It should be realized, therefore, that the translation . . . represents the approach of a medical historian rather than that of a Chinese philologist. It is hoped that this preliminary study will serve as a starting point for further work on the text, with more attention to its many linguistic problems." Such a purpose is certainly commendable in its modesty, and Mrs. VEITH deserves praise for her courage in tackling so formidable a book at all.

[56] M. D. PRISELKOV, Ханскіе Ярлыкы Русскимъ Митрополитамъ (*Yarliks of the Khans to Russian Metropolitans*) (Petrograd, 1916), pp. 27-28, 38.