VERÖFFENTLICHUNGEN
DER SOCIETAS URALO-ALTAICA

Herausgegeben von
Annemarie v. Gabain und Wolfgang Veenker

Band 18

Documenta Barbarorum

Festschrift für Walther Heissig
zum 70. Geburtstag

1983
OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN
Documenta Barbarorum

Festschrift für Walther Heissig
zum 70. Geburtstag

Herausgegeben von
Klaus Sagaster und Michael Weiers

1983

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN
INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

KLAUS SAGASTER
Zu Waltler Heissigs zweiter Festschrift .......................... IX

MICHAEL WIEERS
Walter Heissig und die deutsche Mongolistik nach dem Kriege ........ XI

Bibliographie ............................................................. XVI

CHARLES R. BAWDEN (London)
Injanasi's Romantic Novels as a Literary Tour-De-Force .............. 1

LAJOS BÉSE (Budapest)
The Naming of Characters in Mongolian Folk-Tales .................. 11

ROLAND BIEMEIER (Bonn)
Zum Alter eines Lautwandels im Ladakhi ............................ 17

FRIEDRICH A. BISCHOFF (Hamburg)
A Tibetan Glossary of Mongol „Editorial“ Terms ................... 22

Д. ЦЭЭНСООЛОН (Улаанбаатар)
Монгол яруу найртгийн зарим нэр томъёны гарал ууслан асукдал 28

FRANCIS WOODMAN CLEAVES (Harvard University)
The Second Chapter of an Early Mongolian Version of the Hsiao Ching 39

TS. DAMDINSUREN (Ulan-Bator)
Corrections of Misprints and Errors in Tibetan Printings of Kanjur Made by Dandar Agramba .............................. 47

HELMUT EIMER UND PEMA TSERING (Bonn)
Sun zlog – Abwenden von Störungen .................................. 55

EMEL ESIN (Istanbul)
Descriptions of Turks and „Tatars“ (Mongols) of the Thirteenth Century, in Some Anatolian Sources .......................... 81
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autor/In</th>
<th>Titel</th>
<th>Seitenzahl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter A. Frank (Bonn)</td>
<td>Tamang-Legenden aus dem oberen Trisuli-Tal in Nepal</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Franke (München)</td>
<td>Nichtchinesische Ortsnamen im Quellgebiet des Huang-ho nach den Aufzeichnungen der Expedition unter Qubilai (1281)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgang Franke (Kuala Lumpur)</td>
<td>Notes on Some Ancient Chinese Mosques</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Gimm (Köln)</td>
<td>Verlorene mandjurische Übersetzungen chinesischer Romane</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hahn (Bonn)</td>
<td>Varañus Sarasatkaka – eine Analyse</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberte Hamayon (EPHE, Paris)</td>
<td>Derision lamaïque du chamanisme, derision pastorale de la chasse chez les Bouriates de Bargouzine</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirô Hattori (Yokohama)</td>
<td>Vowel Harmony or Consonant Harmony?</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans-Rainer Kämpfe (Bonn)</td>
<td>mGon po skyabs’ rGya nag chos ‘byun als Quelle des Çindamani-yin erikes</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>György Kara (Budapest)</td>
<td>Zur Liste der mongolischen Übersetzungen von Siregetti Güüşi</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudolf Kaschewsky (Bonn)</td>
<td>Ptolemaeus – und der kupferfarbene Berg Padmasambhavas</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans-Joachim Klimkeit (Bonn)</td>
<td>Das manchaische Königtum in Zentralasien</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>László Lőrincz (Budapest)</td>
<td>Natur- und Gebrauchsgenstände als übernatürliche Elemente in den Heldenliedern von Mansut Emegenov</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>С. Ю. Неклюдов (Москва)</td>
<td>Тюркские сюжеты о Гесере и их отношение к монгольским версиям</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfried Nolle (Peking)</td>
<td>Erinnerungen an W. A. Unkriq</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolaus Poppe (Seattle)</td>
<td>Zum Motiv der dankbaren Tiere in der mongolischen Volksdichtung</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor de Rachewiltz (Canberra)</td>
<td>Qan, Qa’an and the Seal of Güüüg</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh. Rashidonduk (Bonn)</td>
<td>Words of Wisdom and Words of Mockery – Remembered by an Old Mongol</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Б. Рифтин (Москва)</td>
<td>Незвестный сюжет восточномонгольского сказа</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Rinčindorj (Peking)</td>
<td>Baryu-yin toobi bolun oirad-un tooli-yin neitelig sinjí ba övermeče onča-li-y-un tuqai</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus Röhrborn (Giessen)</td>
<td>Gruppenflexion und Komposition im Türkischen</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andras Röna-Tas (Budapest)</td>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronika Ronge (Bonn)</td>
<td>Vorkehrungen zum Schutz von Kleinkindern in Tibet und in der Mongolei</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus Sagaster (Bonn)</td>
<td>Kesar, der islamische Antichrist</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Г. Д. Сахиеб †
Эрэ Горго Маргэн .......................... 349

Alice Sárközi (Budapest)
Incense-Offering to the White Old Man .................. 357

Henry Sercuys C.I.C.M. †
A Note on Two Place Names in Mongolia ................. 370

Giovanni Stary (Venedig)
Drei mandschurische „Opferschriften“ Kaiser Ch’ien-lungs aus dem Jahre 1743 .................. 382

Edward Tryjarski (Warschau)
Vom Bāṅgā und von der Steinbaba zum Nišan ................ 390

Káthe U.-Kőhalmi und Géza Uray (Budapest)
Bemerkungen zu Ge-sar-Illustrationen .................. 398

Veronika Veit (Bonn)
Das Testament des Sečen Qan Šoloi (1577–1652) .......... 405

Michael Weiers (Bonn)
Der Mandschu-Khotsin Bund von 1626 .................. 412
QAN, QA'AN AND THE SEAL OF GÜYÜĞ

Two of the most important 'mots de civilisation' of Inner Asia are undoubtedly the titles qan and qa' an (qa yan), the origins of which are lost in the prehistory of the Altaic languages. These titles have been the subject of investigation by several distinguished scholars, such as K. Shiratori, B. Ya. Vladimirov, P. Pelliot, L. Hambis, F. W. Cleaves, L. Krader, H. F. Schurmann, L. Ligeti and G. Doerfer, to mention only the authors of some of the most important contributions. Valuable, however, as these contributions are, we still lack a comprehensive historical survey which takes into account all the available sources, including evidence from coins. The present tentative review is an attempt towards comprehensiveness with regard to the use of qan and qa'an by the Mongols in the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, fixing as terminus ad quem the collapse of the Mongol Yuan dynasty in A.D. 1368. Unfortunately, space limits make it impossible for me to dwell on the sources as I would wish, and my choice of references and illustrations is, therefore, confined to the essentials.

The turning point in our survey is the year 1229 in which Ögödei, the third son of Činggis-qan, was elected to succeed his father as supreme ruler of the Mongol world-empire. Accordingly, we shall divide the survey in two parts: (A) the use of qan and qa'an before 1229, and (B) the use of qan and qa'an after 1229.

A. Before 1229

1. Qa'an was not used as a title by the tribes of Mongolia or by Činggis-qan.

2. Qan was used as:
   a) the title borne by the elected leaders of important tribes or peoples (ulus), such as the Monggol, e.g. Qubul-qan, Qutula-qan, Ambaqai-qan; the

b) the title borne by the leaders of tribal confederations, including Činggis' pan-Mongolian nation, hence Činggis-qan, Januqa-qan;

c) the title employed by the Mongols and, presumably, other tribes of Mongolia, for the rulers of other countries and the leaders of important tribes or tribal confederations outside Mongolia, e.g. Altan-qan of the Kitat, Burqaan-qan of Qasun or Tang'ut, Arsalan-qan of the Qarlu'ut, Qan Melik of the Qangli;

d) a term (~ qa; pl. qat) designating the leader of a tribe or confederation, the ruler of a nation, and the powerful nature spirits in the Altaic shamanistic conception of the world. See the SH: tus qan, qa ergu-qan, qanuq-un qat, qajar usun-u ejet qat, etc.;

e) a term (~ qa) meaning 'qa' -ship', i.e. 'rulership, government', hence pertaining to the government, as in the expression qa bolqa- of SH §249 (where qa = 'government property'). This meaning seems to be an extension of 2(d).

After the death of Činggis-qan in 1227, his sons inherited the vast Mongol empire and each of them became qan in his respective dominion (ulus). Since these dominions had been established before Činggis' death, the imperial princes were no doubt called qan already before 1227. In any event, the title of qan became unsuitable to designate the appointed successor to Činggis' throne also because this was a title traditionally associated with the leader of a tribe or tribal confederation. Mongol expansion and world rule called for the adoption of another, more exalted title. As the Mongol court was then largely under Uighur Turkish cultural influence, the title they adopted was the ancient Turkic title of qayran (= Middle Mongolian qa' an), first assumed by Ögödei when he was elected emperor in 1229.

B. After 1229

1. Qa'an was used as:
   a) the imperial title and personal epithet of Ögödei—the first ruler to use this title—who, as a result, was thereafter usually referred to simply as 'the Qa'an', i.e. 'the qa'an par excellence';

b) the title borne by all subsequent emperors of the Činggiside line, even when their authority as qa'an of the greater Mongol empire had become largely nominal, as was the case already under Qubilai (r. 1260–1294).
This title ceased to be used when the Mongols were overthrown and replaced by the Ming in 1368.\(^9\)
c) The title retrospectively conferred on Činggis-qan and his most illustrious ancestors, both direct and collateral (Qubul, Quruula, Ambakai and Yisügei). I think this retrospective conferment took place early in the reign of Qubilai, perhaps in 1266 or thereabouts, but this point requires further investigation;\(^10\)
d) the term for 'emperor', with reference to (b), as in the expression qayun-\(\text{-}\) jirly-\(\text{-}\) ijar 'by imperial edict';\(^11\)
e) a term (= qan) designating the ruler of a nation or people ('king, sovereign'), also used as a title, mainly in Buddhist texts, e.g. Asuki (= Asouya) qan.\(^12\)

2. Qan was used as:
   a) the title borne by the imperial princes, sons of Činggis, and their descendants, such as the khans of the Golden Horde and the Il-Khans of Persia. Thus: Toluqi-qan, Batu-qan, Huleqii-qan. The implication of this usage is that these rulers, although sovereign (qan) in their respective dominions (ulus), were still subject to the supreme authority of the qan/emperor;\(^13\)
b) a term (= A.2(d)) designating the ruler of a nation, and, specifically, the Mongol sovereign, this being the ruler of the Great Mongol Nation and the world, e.g. qan ergik- (SH § 269), yeke Mongyl ulus-un qan, dalai-yin qan (see below);
c) a term (= A.2(e)) meaning 'government'.\(^14\)

With regard to the expressions yeke Mongyl ulus-un qan and dalai-yin qan quoted above (b), some comments are necessary. In the SH § 280, Ögîdei is called dalai-yin qaban (read qan),\(^15\) rendered into Chinese as hai-nei huang-ti 'emperor of [all] within the seas[s]'. The same concept is expressed in lines 2–4 of the legend of the famous seal of Guügui: yeke Mongyl ulus-un dalai-in qan jirly 'Order of the ruler of the Great Mongol Nation and of [all within] the seas (= the whole world').\(^16\) My interpretation of these lines diverges from that of Pelliot ('du khan océanique du peuple des grands Mongols, l’ordre'),\(^17\) and of Mostaert and Cleaves ('Ordre du Dalai-in qan [m.a.m.: “Souverain (de ce qui est à l’intérieur) des mers]’ de l’empire des Grands Mongols').\(^18\) In the first place, I understand the words yeke Mongyl ulus as meaning 'the Great Mongol Nation' and not, as the above-mentioned authors do, 'the people of the Great Mongols' or 'the empire of the Great Mongols.' I base myself chiefly on the corresponding Turkish expression in the preamble of the letter of Guügui to Innocent IV on which the seal in question is affixed. In the preamble, as W.
Kotwicz noted long ago, the corresponding expression is kür uley ulus 'the whole Great Nation (= the Great [Mongol] Nation). The expression yeke Mongol ulus is to be compared to expressions like qamuy Mongol ulus 'the entire Mongol nation', ılon Mongol ulus 'the numerous Mongol people', etc. The expression Mongol ulus 'the Mongol nation (or people)', without the attribute yeke 'great', is of course well attested in the SH and other documents of the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries. Moreover, yeke ulus 'the Great Nation', i.e. the Mongol state or world-empire, is a well-known expression in later Mongolian political writings. While I do not for a moment wish to deny the existence of the expression yeke Mongol 'Great Mongols', amply documented by Mostaert and Cleaves, I do not share their view that in the present instance this expression constitutes 'une locution adjective déterminant ulus'. The interpretation of Mostaert and Cleaves should also be reviewed in the light of the recent comments by N.C. Munkuev and J.-Ph. Geley.

Secondly, I take the two expressions in the genitive case, i.e. yeke Mongol ulus-un and dalai-in, as both qualifying qan (gen.), but independently of each other ('of the ruler of the Great Mongol Nation and of the whole world'), whereas Mostaert and Cleaves understand 'du Dalai-in qan (m. à m.: "Souverain [de ce qui est à l'intérieur] des mers") de l'empire des Grands Mongols'. This use of the double genitive without the conjunction ba is fairly common in Middle and Preclassical Mongolian. Moreover, the expression yeke Mongol ulus-un qan 'ruler of the Great Mongol Nation' is well attested. It is found in the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362, where it occurs followed almost immediately by the expression delekei-yin ıjen 'lord of [all] the earth', which matches our dalai-in qan. The corresponding text of the preamble in Turkish presents also the same double genitive construction of the Mongol text of the seal and must be interpreted in the same way as the latter, i.e. 'ruler of the whole Great Nation (= the Great [Mongol] Nation) and of the whole world' (kür uley ulusun talanın yan).

With regard to the term dalai (= Tu. talai), I cannot accept P.D. Buell's interpretation of it as meaning here the qan's 'estate'. The special meaning of dalai as the 'imperial patrimony', which developed later in Central and Western Asia, is definitely excluded in my view because of the overwhelming evidence from Mongol, Persian and Chinese sources to the effect that in the expression dalai-in qan with which we are concerned, dalai can only mean 'all that is found in the land within the sea(s)', hence 'the whole world'. This is confirmed also by the corresponding imperial titles in the Persian sources discussed by V. Minorsky and on contemporary coins, such as pād-šāh-i jahān 'sovereign of the world' and xān-i ālam 'ruler of the world'. The
ruler in question, Güyüg, is designated in his coins with these titles, as well as with that of qa’an discussed earlier.34

From the above it appears, then, that a Mongol sovereign like Güyüg and Môngke bore the title of ‘emperor’ (qa’an) because he was the formally elected and consecrated successor of Činggis, hence the legitimate inheritor of the highest dignity in the empire which, since Ögedei, pertained to the qa’an. He was, at the same time, designated as ‘ruler of the Great Mongol Nation’ (yekhe Mongol elus-un qa’an) and ‘ruler of the world’ (dalai-yin qa’an), i.e. ruler of the Mongols (senzu lato) and of the world at large – the whole world belonging by divine right to the Great Mongol Nation.35 Thus, the term qa’an found in the legend of Güyüg’s seal is not the imperial title borne by Güyüg, which as we have seen was qa’an, but a term (see above, B 2[b]) occurring in, and an integral part of, the standard designations or appellations of all Mongol emperors. It follows, then, that from the point of view of the legend alone, the ‘seal of Güyüg’ could have been the one belonging to Ögedei or even to Činggis-qa’an, and doubts concerning the origin of this seal have, indeed, been expressed by Kotwicz, although on different grounds.36

The above covers, I think, the main points. I should mention, however, that as with almost all Mongol institutions and practices, there is also a certain inconsistency in the actual usage of the terms qa’an and qa’an. This is particularly evident in the ‘Phags-pa inscriptions, where ‘Jingis qa’an’ alternates with ‘Jingis qa’an’ (qa’an in Ligeti’s transcription).37 In the Sino-Mongolian inscriptions in Uighur-Mongol script studied by Cleave we observe the same phenomenon.38

In my opinion, the reason for this inconsistency is that, in the case of Činggis-qa’an, after he was retrospectively conferred the title qa’an, both forms existed side by side. In written language and the administration, the Mongols relied heavily on people of different countries, background and culture, and had no means of effectively and strictly enforcing uniformity of style and usage, since most of the Mongol officials lacked competence in such matters. This largely accounts for our own misunderstanding of their practices, as exemplified in the case of qa’an and qa’an. The inconsistent use of these two terms in the SH has been mainly responsible for past incorrect analyses, such as that by L. Krader. It is now well established that the text of the SH underwent editorial changes that were responsible, among other things, for the title of qa’an (as distinguished from the other meanings of the word) borne by members of the Mongol ruling clan being substituted with that of qa’an (~ qa-ban). However, lack of accuracy and consistency on the part of editors and copyists was responsible also for (1) cases where qa’an was retained where it should have been changed to qa’an,39 and (2) changing qa’an into qa’an in cases where the change was not warranted.40 Similar inconsistencies are also found in the Persian sources (where they may be attributable in some cases to copyists, in others to the sources used by the author), in Uighur documents of the Mongol period,41 and elsewhere. The misinterpretation of the role of the word qa’an in the legend of Güyüg’s seal has unfortunately further clouded the issue.

Another problem related to qa’an and qa’an which deserves full re-examination is the influence of Chinese, Turkish and Nestorian political and religious elements in early Mongol statecraft, but the problem is too complex to be discussed here.42

1 The linguistic relationship between these two terms is still a moot point and I shall not discuss it in the present paper. For an overview of the problem, see now G. Doerter, Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, III (Wiesbaden, 1967), no. 116 (pp. 176–179). Paul Pelliot was going to deal with this question in his note on Marco Polo’s ‘Kaan’, but he unfortunately never did. See his Notes on Marco Polo, I (Paris, 1959), p. 302. The reading qa’an which I use throughout the paper is the Middle Mongolian form of Old Turkish (> Precl. Mong. qa-ban). It corresponds to Persian qa’an/saqan.


3 The variant qa that we find in the Secret History of the Mongols (hereafter SH) deserves special study. For the text edition of the SH, see I. de Rachewiltz, Index to the Secret History of the Mongols (Bloomington, 1972), Part One.

4 See SH §§ 21, 57, 74, 112, 149, 244, 272. In § 244, qa’an is defined as the person whose function is ‘to hold the nation’ (ulus bars). With regard to ‘the lords and rulers of land and rivers’ (qpjar waan=a qes qa’an), cf. the later use of qar (Khaalkha qar) as an honorific term for mountains: Xenten-xan, Deiger-xan, Burin-xan, etc.

5 Jöji and Caadai (Cayatai), Činggis’ two eldest sons, are regularly called ‘Jöji-xan’ and ‘Cayatai-xan’ by Rashid al-Din. See Doerter, op. cit., p. 151. Cf. John of Pian ci Carpine’s ‘Tosuccan’ (= Jöji-qan), and his statement that ‘Tossuc (= Jöji) ... even Chan appelleme’; See A. Van den Wynaer, SinicaFranciscana, I (Quaracchi-Firenze, 1929), pp. 65, 58; P. Pelliot, Notes sur l’histoire de la Horde d’Or (Paris, 1949), p. 18. Cf. also Gregor of Akker’s statement ‘Cayatay,
who was surnamed Khan’ in his History of the Nation of the Archers, tr. by R. P. Blake and R. N. Frye, HJAS 12 (1949), 303.


7 See P. Pelliot, Notes on Marco Polo, I, p. 302, Bose in HJAS 19 (1956), 152.

8 Juwaini, and Rashid-al-Din following him, always refer to Guguy (r. 1226–1248) as Guguy-xan, i.e. Guguy-qan, not Guguy-qan’an, no doubt because the legitimacy of his rule was questioned when, with Mongke (r. 1251–1259), the imperial dignity passed from the line of Ögedei to that of Tolui. However, Pelliot, loc. cit., was mistaken when he stated that Qubilai was the first Mongol ruler to take the title of qa’an as a mere epithet. Like Ögedei, Guguy too bore the title of qa’an during his short reign, as attested by the legend on his coins (‘Guguy qa’an’). See M. Weiers, ‘Münzauszfriften auf Münzen mongolischen Il-khanen aus dem Iran, Part One’, The Canada-Mongolia Review 4, 1 (April 1978), 43. Weiers’ authority is E. Drouin’s article ‘Notice sur les monnaies mongoles faisant partie du recueil des documents de l’époque mongole publié par le prince Roland Bonaparte’, in Journal Asiatique, IX Sér., 7 (May–June 1896), pp. 480–544, p. 506. The coin in question is ‘un díhem frappé en Géorgie par Davith V, en l’annde 646’, i.e. in A.D. 1248. Coins issued during Guguy’s short reign are extremely rare, and I failed to find the one described by Drouin in the Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque nationale in October 1981. I wish to express here my thanks to Mme A. Negre, Chargée des monnaies orientales, for her kind assistance in my research at the B.N.). However, Guguy’s title of qa’an is confirmed by other documents in Latin in which Guguy is actually designated as caum (=


The date for the beginning of this practice is uncertain, but it must be placed between 1260 and 1271, as the title qa’an is not used for Cügis in Juwaini, but it occurs already in Grigor of Aknir’s History of the Nations of the Archers. See F. W. Cleaves in HJAS 12 (1949), 418–419. Thereafter, the title appears in Sino-Mongolian inscriptions in Uighur-Mongol script, in the ‘Phags-pa inscriptions – albeit irregularly (see below) – in the SH (see also below), and in the later Mongol sources, such as the seventeenth century chronicles and inscriptions. Rashid-al-Din, like Juwaini, uses xan as throughout for Cügis, but both xan and qa’an for his ancestors. A comparison of all the MSS of his work is, however, necessary, to throw light on the peculiarity of his usage of qa’an. See, provisionally, Doerfer, op. cit., pp. 152–153. Since posthumous titles were conferred on Cügis’ father Yüsüge (or Yüsüg), in 1266, it is possible that the extension of the title qa’an to Cügis originated about that time. See Pelliot et Hambis, op. cit., p. 2.

11 See F. W. Cleaves in HJAS 17 (1954), 53 [4–1663 a7], 85.

29 See F. W. Cleaves in HJAS 12 (1949), 62(3) and 83(3). Cf. also ibid. 14 (1951), 66b, and 15 (1952), 78a. Cf. also the expression talayiun ejen alain qaran in the Phags-pa text of the Chii-yung kuan inscriptions, rendered by Pelliot as ‘master of the ocean, Emperor of the Nation’ (Notes on Marco Polo, I, p. 301; cf. Les Mongols et la Papauté, p. 121, n. 3). Cf. also the Mongolian and papal texts of the Chii-yung kuan inscriptions, rendered by Pelliot as ‘master of the ocean, Emperor of the Nation’ (Notes on Marco Polo, I, p. 301; cf. Les Mongols et la Papauté, p. 121, n. 3).

30 For the text and transcription of the preamble of the present work, Pelliot’s rendering (ibid., pp. 16, 22) ‘Nous le khan océanique du grand peuple tout entier’ is not correct. Equally faulty, therefore, are those citations or translations of the preamble by authors (like G. Soranzo, A. Van den Wyngaert, F. Risch, E. Voegelin, N. P. Sartina, B. Spuler, J. A. Boyle, J. J. Saunders, etc.) who followed Pelliot’s interpretation. A notable exception is Doerfler (op. cit., no. 1672, p. 634), who rendered it as follows: ‘Chän des machtvollen großen (Mongolen)-Staates und des Weltkreises’. Cf. also his remark (loc. cit.) that ‘das ist in etwa eine Übersetzung des mo. Siegels.’

31 Buell’s translation of the words yoke Mongol ala-un dalai-un qan is ‘qan of the dalai of the Great Mongol Patrimony’. See his Tribe, Qan and Ulus in Early Mongol China: Some Prolegomena to Yuan History, Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1977 (Univ. Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, 1981), p. 250, n. 129. This is untenable also on the ground that in such a rendering both dalai and ala are taken as meaning the qan’s ‘patrimony’ or ‘estate’; see ibid., p. 36, where yoke dalai is rendered as ‘great estate’. Therefore, according to Buell’s translation, the actual meaning of the above-mentioned sentence would be ‘qan of the estate of the Great Mongol Patrimony’.


33 In Iranica. Twenty Articles, University of Tehran, Vol. 775 (1964), p. 65.
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Addenda


To note 34: For additional references to coins minted under Ögedei and Güyig containing the title qan, see ibid., pp. 155–156, 158, 165–166; E. A. Pahomov, Money Graze (Tbilisi, 1970), p. 128.