SOME REMARKS ON TÖREGENE'S EDICT OF 1240

Igor de Rachewiltz

The earliest epigraphical monuments of the Mongols present many historical and philological problems, several of which still await a solution.

Elsewhere I have dealt to some extent with various questions relating to the supposed earliest inscription in Uighur-Mongol script, namely the famous stele in honour of Yisüngge known as 'the Stone of Činggis-qan.'

In the present paper I propose to deal with a number of problems concerning the earliest Sino-Mongolian inscription discovered so far: the Edict of Töregene of 1240.

This bilingual inscription was discussed by Cleaves in 1961.² A transcription of the short Mongolian text of the inscription was published by Ligeti in 1963³ and, slightly revised, in 1972.⁴ As for the text itself (see p.38), a reproduction of the rubbing of the stele in the Shih-fang ta-tzu-wei Temple 十方大紫微宫 of Chi-yüan hsien 濟源縣 (Honan) was first published by Ts'ai Mei-piao 蔡美激励 in his book on the Yüan inscriptions in vernacular, which appeared in 1955.⁵

The Chinese Text of the Inscription

With regard to the Chinese text of the inscription, Cleaves (p.64) has rightly pointed out that its singular importance 'lies in the fact that it is an additional primary source for the story of the printing of the Taoist Canon at the beginning of the Yüan - a story of which only the most meagre details have been transmitted.' The inscription in question is, in fact, an edict (i-chíh 懿旨),⁶


5. Ts'ai Mei-piao, Yüan-tai pai-hua-peí chi-lu 元代白話碑葉錄 (Peking, 1955), Pl.II. Reproduced in Cleaves, Pl.I. See the important review of Ts'ai's work by Iriya Yoshitaka 入矢義高 in Tōhō-gakuhō 東方學報 26 (1956), 186-228. Cf. also W. Heissig in Ural-Altaiische Jahrbücher 27 (1955), 272. The character lu 路 in line 4 of the inscription has been inadvertently left out in the printed text on p.7 of Ts'ai's edition (no.6).

6. For this and other Chinese technical terms, including official titles, found in the text of the inscription, see Cleaves' notes (pp.65-68).
issued by Ögödei's wife, the Great Empress (yeke qadun[-qatun])
Töregene, 7 to the daruyäči and the leading civil officials (kuan-min
管民官) 8 of the P'ing-yang fu Circuit 平陽府路 (modern
Lin-fen hsien 臨汾縣 in Shansi) to the effect that: (1) Tu Feng
杜豐, leading civil official of Ch'in-chou 潑州 (Ch'in-hsien,
Shansi), be appointed commissioner-in-charge to oversee the cutting
of the printing blocks of the Tao-tsang-ching 道藏經 and the con-
struction of an edifice for this purpose in Ch'in-chou; (2) Tu Feng's
wife was to take over this task, should Tu Feng lack the time to
carry it out himself; and (3) no-one, regardless of whether it was the
personnel of the t'ou-hsia 9 administrations or any other officials,

7. On Töregene (? - shortly after 1246), see Cleaves, p.66, n.2; I.
de Rachewiltz in Papers on Far Eastern History (hereafter PFEH)

8. This is a general term for senior officials - prefects, magis-
trates and the like - of circuits, prefectures, etc. who were in
charge of the local administration. They were mostly Chinese.
The daruyäči were appointed over them as 'overseers,' i.e. in a
supervisory capacity, but also with executive functions. With a
few exceptions, they were all Mongols or Se-mu. See Hsiao Ch'i-
ch'ing, The Military Establishment of the Yuan Dynasty
the daruyäči, see also P.D. Buell, 'Tribe, Qan and Ulus in
Mongol China: Some Prolegomena to Yüan History,' (doctoral dis-
sertation, University of Washington, Seattle, 1977), pp.87-93;
Yao Ts'ung-wu 姚從吾 in Wen shih chih hsüeh-pao 文史哲學報
12 (1963), 1-20; Cha-ch'i Ssu-ch'in 札奇斯欽 (S. Jagchid),
ibid. 13 (1964), 293-441. A doctoral dissertation on regional
and local government in Yüan China, focussing on the role of the
daruyäči, is being completed at Princeton University by Mrs
Elizabeth Endicott-West.

9. On the t'ou-hsia (頭下 = 投下), the fiefs apportioned
in China to members of the Mongol ruling clan and the military
aristocracy, see Hsiao, op.cit., pp.132-33, n.69, and the
references cited therein, in particular the important contrib-
ution of P. Ratchnevsky 'Zum Ausdruck "t'ouhsia" in der
Mongolenzeit' in W. Heissig (ed.), Collectanea Mongolica.
Festschrift für Prof. Dr. Rintchen zum 60. Geburtstag (Wiesbahr,
should interfere with it. The edict ends with the formula, 'If one
contravenes [this order], he shall be punished for his transgression.
Respect this.' Ögedei's seal \(^{10}\) is apposed on the edict, which is
dated keng-tzu/III/17 (= 10 April 1240).

Now, we know that although Ögedei was still alive in 1240 (he
died on 11 December 1241), he was no longer actively involved in ad-
ministration; and that Töregene was then already managing the busi-
ness of government, assisted by her protégés - mostly Central and
Western Asian officials whom she had promoted to key positions in the
administration in the previous years. Senior ministers, like the
great Yeh-lū Ch'u-ts'ai 耶律楚材 (1189-1243), were either dis-
mmissed or ignored. \(^{11}\) This explains why our edict, even though
bearing the emperor's seal, actually proceeds from her and not from
Ögedei.

Töregene's status at the time is clearly defined in the edict,
where she is called yeh-k'o ho-tun 也可合敦 , i.e. yeke qadun
(= qutun) 'Great Empress,' this Mongol title in transcription being
immediately followed by its Chinese counterpart ta huang-hou 大皇后.
Töregene's titles as recorded in the edict are of particular interest,
as they help us to solve a hitherto puzzling question. In the

10. The legend of the seal is in Chinese and reads as follows:
皇帝之寶 'Seal of the August Emperor.' See Cleaves, p.68, n.28.
For the different legend of another seal of Ögedei in Chinese
(the one kept by his minister Čingai or Činggai), see A.
Mostaert and F.W. Cleaves in HJAS 15 (1952), 495, n.87.

11. See I. de Rachewiltz, 'Sino-Mongol Culture Contacts in the XIII
Century: A Study on Yeh-lū Ch'u-ts'ai,' (doctoral dissertation,
Australian National University, Canberra, 1960), pp.124-25; and
'Yeh-lū Ch'u-ts'ai (1189-1243): Buddhist Idealist and Confucian
Statesman,' in A.F. Wright and D. Twitchett (eds), Confucian
Personalities (Stanford, 1962), pp.207-08; N.C. Munkuev,
Kitaiskiy istoricheski o pervykh mongol'skich khanakh (Moscow, 1965),
p.84.
Chinese sources, notably the Yüan-shih 元史, 12 Töregene is referred to not only by her name (T'o-lieh-ko-na 脫列哥那), but also by the ethnic Nai-ma-chen 乃馬真 (Naimaxin, i.e. 'the Naiman' [fem.]), as well as by the appellation liu huang-hou 六皇后 'Sixth Empress.' The latter appellation has so far remained unexplained, since Töregene, as we know from both the Persian and the Chinese sources, was not the sixth, but the second wife of Ögödei, belonging to the emperor's principal ordo (his first wife was Boraqzin). 13 I have no doubt that the character liu 六 in the Yüan-shih is a scribal error for ta 大, going back to an earlier source, and that the original correct appellation was the same as that found in our edict, i.e. ta huang-hou 'Great Empress.' 14

The appointment of Tu Feng to supervise the cutting of the printing blocks of the Taoist Canon deserves comment.

Cleaves (p.66, n.13) says that he has not succeeded in identifying Tu Feng. This is clearly an oversight, as he is a fairly well-known figure in the early Yüan period and has a biography not only in the Yüan-shih, 15 but also in several other histories of the Yüan dynasty. 16 From these sources we learn the following facts about him.

14. Cf. PFCH 21 (March 1980), 33, n.198, where my remarks on the subject must now be revised. In May 1980, I discussed my new interpretation with Dr Chaoying Fang 范兆祥 of Englewood, N.J., and was gratified by his ready acceptance of it as quite plausible. That the error goes back to an earlier source is confirmed by Ch'en Ching's 陳庭 東淵 hsi1-pien 通鑑續編 (1362 ed.; pref ace of 1350) 22, 18a, where we also find the form liu huang-hou.
15. Yüan-shih 151, pp.3574-76.
His tsu was T'ang-ch'en 唐臣. He was born at P'ing-yao 平遥 near Fen-chou 汾州 (modern Fen-yang hsien 汾陽縣) in Shansi in 1190. He served under the Jurchen-Chin as a military officer, gaining distinction. When the Mongol army overran T'ai-yüan 太原 in 1218, Peng promptly changed sides and thus began a rapid and successful career under Činggis-qän's brother-in-law Alści-noyan and the Mongol general Alśar, capturing several important Chin strongholds in Shansi and Shantung. In 1235 he was made chief official (chang-kuan 長官) of Ch'in-chou 忻州, a post he held until his retirement in 1247. He died in 1256. 17 His office of chief official corresponds to the designation 'leading civil official' (kuan-min kuan) found in our inscription. 18

Therefore, in 1240, when Töregene's edict was issued, Tu Peng was the top official in Ch'in-chou. The printing of the Taoist Canon in Ch'in-chou, with which his name is associated, was an important event and, as we would expect, it is mentioned in several literary sources of the period. The relevant citations have been collected and critically discussed by Ch'en Yüan 陳垣, 19 Ch'en Kuo-fu 陳國

17. See Yüan-shih 151, p.3575; T'ū Chi 稲寄, Meng-wu-erh shih-chi 蒙兀兒史記 (1934 ed.; rep. Taipei, 1962) 56, 9b-10b. Tu Peng's shen-tao-pei 神道碑 composed by Li Ting 李鼎, which is found in the P'ing-yao hsien chih 平遙縣志 (chüan 11), is not available to me. However, it has been taken into account by the editors of the 1976 ed. of the Yüan-shih; see ibid., p.3587.

18. See Hsiao, p.192, n.246. T'ū Chi, op.cit., 56, 10a, makes Tu Peng a daruyači; however, T'ū's interpretation of chang-kuan as daruyači is not warranted in the present case. Chang-kuan and daruyači were not synonymous terms, even though the latter was often referred to as 'chief official' (chang-kuan) of a bureau. See Ratchnevsky, op.cit., p.33 et passim; Cleaves in HJAS 16 (1953), 250; and, especially, Paul Heng-chao Ch'en, Chinese Legal Tradition under the Mongols. The Code of 1291 as Reconstructed (Princeton, 1979), p.131, n.74.

20 And, to a lesser extent, by Yoshioka Yoshitoyo 吉岡義豊 21

From these sources the following facts emerge:

In 1234 Töregene donated a complete set of Taoist scriptures to Yin Chih-p'ing 尹志平 (1169-1251), the successor of Ch'iu Ch'ü-chi 丘處機 (1148-1227), alias Ch'ang-ch'ün 長春, as head of the Ch'üan-chen 靜真 Church in north China. In doing this, Töregene was following in the footsteps of Lady née Li 李氏, principal concubine of the Chin emperor Chang-tsung 章宗 (r.1189-1208), who in 1207 had presented a copy of the Canon to the T'ai-hsü Temple 太虛觀 in Ch'i-hsia 慈霞, Shantung, where Ch'ang-ch'ün was living at the time. 22

In the spring of 1235 Yin Chih-p'ing was in Ch'in-chou 沛州, where he performed religious services. A few months later, on 25 July, Yin and Li Chih-ch'ang 李志常 (1193-1256), Ch'ang-ch'ün's famous disciple and author of the Hsi-yu chi 西遊記, were ordered by Ögödei to build a Taoist temple at Qara-qorum and to staff it with selected priests. 23


22. In both instances, the scriptures donated were beyond doubt exemplars of the Chin Tao-tsang 金道藏, i.e. of the Taoist Canon printed under the Chin in 1190 in Yen-ching (Chung-tu 中都 ), also known as the (Ta Chin) Hsüan-tu pao-tsang (大金玄都寶藏). See Ch'en Kuo-fu, op.cit., pp.159-60. Cf. A. Waley (trans.), The Travels of an Alchemist. The Journey of the Taoist Ch'ang-ch'ün from China to the Hindukush at the Summons of Chingiz Khan, Recorded by His Disciple Li Chih-ch'ang (London, 1931), p.16; P. Pelliot, Les débuts de l'imprimerie en Chine (Paris, 1953), p.93.

23. For the Chinese text of Ögödei's edict, see Ts'ai, op.cit., p.4, no.4; T'oung Pao (hereafter TP) 9 (1908), 307, no.XXI; for Ed. Chavannes' translation, see ibid., 308-09. See also the
In the ninth month of the same year (14 October-11 November 1235), Yin arrived in P'ing-yang 平陽, where he entrusted Sung Te-fang 宋德方 (H. Pi-yün 比雲; 1183-1247), another leading member of the Ch'üan-chen Church, with the task of preparing a new edition of the Taoist Canon. This was, of course, a long and arduous task in war-torn China, as it required collecting a large sum of money from government officials and private donors, gathering and collating the extant scriptures scattered in various temple libraries, preparing the new texts for printing, and engraving the printing blocks. The preliminary work was completed within two years. Engraving and printing went on at the Hsüan-tu Temple 玄都觀, in P'ing-yang from 1237 until completion of the Canon in 1244.

This edition of the Taoist scriptures, known as the Yüan Tao-tsang 元道藏 (to distinguish it from the Chin edition of 1190), comprised 'more than 7,800 ch'üan.'\textsuperscript{24} The original printing blocks were kept at first in the Hsüan-tu Temple; in 1247 they were transferred to the new Ch'un-yang Wan-shou Temple 純陽萬壽宮 in the Yung-lo Commandery 永樂鎮 at P'ing-yang. They were burnt in 1281 as part of the repression of Taoism carried out under Qubilai, in the course of which most of the Canon also unfortunately perished. What survived religious persecution was lost or destroyed during the disorders at the end of the dynasty.

The reprinting of the Taoist Canon undertaken by the Ch'üan-chen Church in the 1230s was largely prompted by political considerations. In the period in question, the rivalry between religious Taoism — represented in north China mainly by the syncretic Ch'üan-chen Church

\textsuperscript{24} Ch'en Kuo-fu, p.166; the 'liasses' of Pelliot, loc.cit., is an error for 'chapitres.'
and Ch'an Buddhism was at its fiercest. Mongol court patronage to this or that religious leader, with the granting of tax-exemptions and other privileges to their temples and followers, brought about abuses, bitter resentment, and endless charges and countercharges of prevarication and violence. In their propaganda the Taoists relied heavily on the authority of sacred texts, some of which were outright forgeries, to prove their doctrinal superiority. Until the reign of Möngke (1251-1259), they were able to check Buddhist opposition in the country chiefly on the strength of (1) the prerogatives conferred earlier by Činggis to Ch'ang-ch'un and his followers, and the subsequent favour enjoyed by the Taoists at the Mongol court under Ögödei; (2) the diffusion of religious tracts and the circulation of supernatural and miraculous stories. The reprinting of such an authoritative and impressive body of Taoist scriptures as the Canon would have naturally enhanced the prestige of the Taoist Church in the eyes of literate and illiterate alike, particularly since the Buddhists in the north were not then in a position to do the same with their own scriptures and were, therefore, at a disadvantage. In a short poem, written between 1233 and 1236 about a petition circulated in north China (probably by Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai himself) to find donors for the repair of the printing blocks of the Tripitaka, Ch'u-ts'ai wrote, 'For ten years now the world is filled with the dust of war. What a pity that half the gold-lettered texts [of the Tripitaka] have been turned to ashes! As we wish to analyse the finest points [of the

Buddhist doctrine], we have to bring out (= publish) the volumes of the sūtras. It is necessary [for that] to arouse [the people] in the world to donate their wealth according to their circumstances. This clearly shows that the Buddhists were not idle and that, at about the same time as the Taoists were reprinting their Canon, the Buddhists too were carrying out a campaign for the reprint of their scriptures. However, Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai's plea was not successful, perhaps because potential donors in the north got wind of the new edition of the scriptures that had just been undertaken in the south.

26. 'Pu Ta-tsang-ching pan shu' 補大藏經板疏, Chan-jan chu-shih wen-chi 漢然居士文集 (Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an ed.) 14, 8b. For the dating of the poem, see Wang Kuo-wei 王國維, 'Yeh-lü Wen-ch'eng kung nien-p'u' 謝陸文正公年譜 in Hai-ning Wang Ching-an hsien-sheng i-shu 海寧王靜安先生遺書 (Shanghai, 1940), ts'e 32, 20a.

27. The famous Chi-sha 補砂 edition, begun in 1231 at Su-ch'ou and completed under the Mongols in 1332. On it, see K. Ch'en in HJAS 14 (1951), 213-14; J.W. de Jong, Buddha's Word in China, the 28th G.E. Morrison Lecture in Ethnology (Australian National University, Canberra, 1967), pp.17, 25-26, n.57. K.T. Wu's claim in HJAS 13 (1950), 516 (cf. K. Ch'en, 214), that Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai indicated 'that a Chinese version of the Tripitaka was made in Yen-ch'ing (i.e., Peking) is due to a misunderstanding of a somewhat ambiguous statement by Yeh Kung-ch'o 葉恭绰 in his article 'Li-tai Tsang-ching k'ao-lüeh' 僧塔藏經考略 in Chang Chü-sheng hsien-sheng ch'i-shih sheng-jih chi-nien lun-wen-chi 張菊生先生七十生誕紀念論文集, Hu Shih胡適 a.o. (eds) (Shanghai, 1937), p.39. The references to Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai's works to which Yeh alludes are found in Chan-jan chu-shih wen-chi 8, 28a-30a and in the above-mentioned poem (ibid. 14, 8b); however, it is nowhere stated that the Tripitaka was printed in Yen-ch'ing under Ögödei or in Ch'u-ts'ai's lifetime. According to Chiang Wei-hsin 蔣維心 (quoted by Wu, op. cit., 457), the blocks repaired or replaced under Ögödei were those of the Chao-ch'eng 趙城 Tripitaka of the Chin (printed between 1148 and 1173). These blocks were transferred, early in the Yüan period, to the Hung-fa Temple 弘法寺 in Peking, so that the Hung-fa edition of the Tripitaka of the Yüan was
Evidence of the favours enjoyed by the Taoists at the Mongol court in Qara-qorum and, particularly, in the empress' milieu, are the gifts and edicts mentioned earlier. That they also had local support in China is shown by the fact that they were able to obtain the funds and resources needed for this major undertaking in a comparatively short time.²⁸ P'ing-yang in Shansi was, of course, an obvious choice, as it was a place famous since the first half of the twelfth century not only as an official publishing centre, but also as a centre for private printing.²⁹ Moreover, as we shall see, it was just then being re-established as a leading centre for printing by the Mongol government.

Our edict shows, however, that in 1240, when the printing of the Taoist Canon was halfway through, there must have been considerable opposition to this enterprise. The edict, as we have seen, empowers the leading Chinese official in the P'ing-yang administration personally to supervise the Taoists' printing activity and warns the t'ou-hsia personnel and any other officials not to interfere with the work (不以是何頭下官員人等無得搖擾). Now, we know that Tu Feng was not one of the persons directly associated with the printing project;³⁰ his participation in supervising the printing of

---

28. Our sources mention how Hu T'ien-lu 胡天祿, a powerful official in P'ing-yang, contributed one thousand liang of silver to start the project. See Ch'en Kuo-fu, p.161.

29. See Wu, 454ff.

30. Tu Feng is not mentioned in any of the sources dealing with the printing of the Canon. On the other hand, these record the names of laymen (like Hu T'ien-lu) and Ch'uan-ch'en priests (like Ch'in Chih-an 秦志安 and Li Chih-ch'uan 李志全) who, to a greater or lesser degree and in various capacities, took part in the project. See Ch'en Yüan, op.cit., pp.24-28.
the Canon was, therefore, an ad hoc measure designed, in my view, to police the printing activity and protect the Taoists from interference on the part of 'other officials.' Who were these officials?

From the Yuan-shih we know that in 1236 tammači troops were assigned to important centres in north China, including P'ing-yang. These troops were the private armies of the t'ou-hsia, and the districts of north China apportioned to the t'ou-hsia leaders were, therefore, under the military control of the t'ou-hsia administrations. The Yuan-shih also informs us about the identity of the t'ou-hsia leader at P'ing-yang. He was the above-mentioned Alčar, who has a biography in the same work. His fief in P'ing-yang comprised 648 households altogether (= c.3240 individuals). It is, however, doubtful whether he was still alive in 1240, for he seems to have died soon after his enfeoffment, leaving two sons about whose role in P'ing-yang at the time I can find no references in the sources available to me.

Besides the t'ou-hsia personnel stationed in P'ing-yang, there was also in P'ing-yang, Hsüan-te (Hsüan-hua hsien, Chahar) and other circuits the Myriarch's Administration (wan-hu fu) of Liu Ni, alias Hei-ma (1200-1262), son and successor of the famous general Liu Po-lin (1148-1221).

33. Yuan-shih 123, p.3023.
34. Ibid., 122, pp.3006-08.
35. See ibid., 122, p.3007; cf. Rachnevsky, pp.174-75, 184, n.16; Hsiao, pp.96, 182, n.138. Alčar is also briefly mentioned in the Hei-Ta shih-i Shih (Hai-ning Wang Ching-an hsien-sheng i-shu ed.), ts'e 37, 23a.
Interference from officials of these regional military administra-
tions, particularly in matters concerning the exaction of goods and
labour, was frequent in this period; Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai's efforts
were, in fact, largely directed towards the curbing of abuses by re-
moving the civil administration (chiefly tax-collection) from the
control of the military. 37

A further potential source of trouble for the Taoists in P'ing-
yang were government officials actually connected with the printing
activity. We must not forget that the printing and publishing of the
Taoist Canon at its inception (1235-36) coincided with the establish-
ment of a central government printing office in this very city. This
office - also a brainchild of Ch'u-ts'ai - was set up in July-August
1236 under the name of ching-chi-so 经籍所 or Bureau of Literature,
its main function being the editing and publishing of books under of-
official sponsorship. 38 It was, therefore, chiefly thanks to Ch'u-
ts'ai that P'ing-yang came to the fore again as one of the leading
printing centres in north China, and it is perhaps not without sig-
nificance that the first edition of his literary works had been pub-
lished in P'ing-yang only three years before. 39 The Bureau of

37. See de Rachewiltz, 'Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai,' 201ff; Munkuev, pp.73-74.
38. See Yuan-shih 2, p.34; 146, p.3459; Munkuev, pp.76-77, 192. Cf.
Th.F. Carter, The Invention of Printing in China and Its Spread
Westward, 2nd ed. rev. by L.C. Goodrich (New York, 1955), p.100,
n.33. The Bureau of Literature in P'ing-yang was active until
1266, when it was transferred to the new capital Chung-tu (Peking). The following year it was renamed hung-wen-yuan 文院
or Department for the Development of Literature, and in
1273 it was absorbed into the newly established pi-shu-chien 秘書監 or Board of Imperial Archives. See Yuan-shih 6, pp.
112, 114; 147, p.2296; Hsü Wen-hsien t'ung-k'ao 續文献通考
39. This is the 9-chüan edition, edited by Tsung Chung-heng 宗仲亨
and prefaced by Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai's Buddhist teacher Wan-sung
萬松, Wang Lin 王麟, Meng P'an-lin 孟攀籬 and Li Wei
Literature in P'ing-yang, like its counterpart in Yen-ching, was staffed with former Chin scholar-officials. Ch'u-ts'ai's relationship with members of the P'ing-yang intelligentsia and officialdom was, therefore, quite close - a fact confirmed by the poems he wrote to them that have survived. Now, Ch'u-ts'ai was strongly opposed to the Ch'üan-chen Church and its followers, partly on doctrinal grounds, but mostly because of their ruthless methods in gaining increasing power and prestige in China, and at the Mongol court, at the expense of the Buddhists. One of the main criticisms he levelled at the Taoists was their appropriation of Buddhist temples and destruction of Buddhist images, and their abuse of privileges conferred on them by the Mongol court (see above). His Hsi-yu lu (Record of a Journey to the West), in spite of its title, is not a travelogue so much as a forceful diatribe against Ch'ang-ch'un and his disciples. Another important document containing detailed allegations concerning the latter's unorthodox practices is the famous Pien-wei lu (Record of the Confutation of Falseness) by the Ch'än monk Hsiang-mai Xiang-i (fl.1265). In this work, P'ing-yang is listed among the cities that suffered at the hands of the Taoists. By piecing

李徽. Li Wei's preface, dated 2 December 1233, is reproduced at the end of Chan-juan ch'ü-shih wen-ch'i. See also the Ts'ung-shu chi-ch'eng 蒐書集成 ed. (no.2053) of the wen-ch'i, in which all the prefaces have been brought together. Cf. the Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu tsung-mu t'i-yao 四庫全書總目提要 (Commercial Press ed.; rep. Taipei, 1971), p.3465; Wang Kuo-wei, 'Yeh-1h...,' yü-chi 餘記, 5a.


41. See, e.g., Chan-juan ch'ü-shih wen-ch'i 1, 1b-4a, 13b; 2, 3a, 14a; 6, 10b. Cf. Wang Kuo-wei, op.cit., 18b-21a, s.a. ping-shen (= 1236).

42. See de Rachewiltz, 'Hsi-yu lu,' 2ff., 29ff., 78-80, nn.190-96.

43. Pien-wei lu 辨偽錄 (Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新修大藏經 ed., v.52, no.2116) 3, 767c, lines 3-4. On the Pien-wei lu,
all these facts together, one need hardly speculate on the existence in P'ing-yang at the time of the printing of the Canon of a number of officials - some of them attached to the important government printing office - who belonged to Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai's faction and who were consequently hostile to the Taoists. They could not have failed, in my view, to become further incensed by the Taoists' abusive practices and by their proselitising and printing activity in loco. Active opposition to the Taoists and their work would not have been surprising in the circumstances.

This, in brief, is the background against which the printing of the Taoist Canon was carried out. The promulgation of our edict in 1240 appears then in a new light, even though most of the details are still missing.

The Mongolian Text of the Inscription

Turning now to the Mongolian text of the 1240 edict, the following are Cleaves' transcription and translation of the three lines in Uighur-Mongol script:

[1] ene minu üge busi bolgay-san kümün
[2] yeke ..?.. alday-situ boltuyai[.] ene
[3] bıčig qulayana ğil

[1] The person who shall have contravened this my word,
[2] let him be held greatly ..?.. punishable. This
[3] Writ. The year of the rat. 44

A glance at the inscription confirms that the first word of the Mongol text is, indeed, ene, written, following the traditional

---

see Éd. Chavannes and P. Pelliot in Journal asiatique (1913), n.[2], 128, n.1; de Rachewiltz, op.cit., p.12, n.12.

44. Cleaves, p.69.
Uighur orthography, as *ane* (*ane*). Cleaves' doubts on the correct reading of this word are, therefore, unwarranted and the word is correctly transcribed as *ane* by Ligeti. As for *minu* 'my,' instead of the usual *manu* 'Our,' the explanation, in my view, is that the decree (lit., 'word[s]') was issued by Töregene, not by Ögödei; thus, the pluralis majestatis is, in this case, not strictly required.

The real difficulty concerns the second word of the second line, immediately following *yeke*. Cleaves writes: 'As it stands, the word would appear to be *nenge* or *nenke*, *ange* or *anke*, or possibly *nege* or *neke*. Together with *yeke* it would appear to form a "mot-couple," but, as none of the suggested readings yields anything which is recognizable either independently or in conjunction with *yeke*, it is futile to speculate as to what the word itself or the "mot-couple," if it be such, might signify. For this reason I have preferred to leave the word untranscribed and untranslated.'

In his more recent transcription of the Mongol text, Ligeti reads the word in question as *'eregü* [?],* which would be perfectly acceptable in this context, *eregü* meaning 'offence, crime entailing punishment,' hence also 'punishment.' The loop of the -*gü* is

45. For other examples of this orthography, see A. Temir, *Kirşehir Emiri Çaça Oğlu Nur el-Din'in 1272 tarihli Arapça-Moğolca vakfiyesi* (Ankara, 1959), pp.159-61, lines 8, 12, 14, 18, 60: *ane*;


46. Cleaves, p.69, n.2, suggests as possible alternatives *eyin* 'thus' and -*gine*, the latter being the second half of the name *Töregine-Toregene.*


49. Ligeti 72, p.19.

50. *Eregü*-eregü (*= mo. eregû, eregûû*) is a well known term and one frequently occurring in the orders and proclamations issued by
broken, but this could of course be the result of carelessness in tracing or inscribing the word, or it might be due to subsequent damage to the stone. Unfortunately, the word ends with a conspicuous ductus, which virtually precludes the possibility of the last syllable being -gū. Nor can it be read as -gün (i.e. eregün instead of eregū)\(^51\) since the ductus is clearly unbroken. Furthermore, the number of 'teeth' before the kāph is three, whereas four would be needed for ere. For all these reasons, I think that we must regretfully exclude eregū. As it is written, the last syllable can only be read -ke or -ge, and the only plausible reading of the word is erke. This is, in fact, the reading tentatively proposed by Ligeti in his earlier transcription of the text,\(^52\) a reading which he subsequently rejected. I had, independently, read the word also as erke, and I am still of the opinion that this is the correct reading.\(^53\) Together with yeke it forms the expression yeke erke, lit., 'great (= supreme)

the Mongol authorities in the 13th and 14th centuries. In the Secret History of the Mongols it occurs in the following sentences taken from Činggis-qan's ordinances: yisün aldal alda'asu ere'ū-čīr bu orotuqai 'he shall not incur punishment if he commits [up to] nine crimes' (§211); yisün aldal-tur ere'ū-čīr bu orotuqai 'they shall not incur punishment for [up to] nine crimes' (§219). The denominal verb ere'ūle- 'to punish' occurs six times in the Secret History (§§224, 228, 257, 278[3 times]), always in the context of decrees and ordinances issuing from the emperor. See I. de Rachewiltz, Index to the Secret History of the Mongols (Bloomington, 1972), p.224b; E. Haenisch, Wörterbuch zu Manghöl un niuca tobc'an (Leipzig, 1939; rep. Wiesbaden, 1962), p.45.

51. In the Mukaddimät al-Adab we find the form with and without the -n stem. See N.N. Poppe, Mongol'skiï slovar' Mukaddimät al-Adab (Moscow-Leningrad, 1938; rep. by Gregg Int. Publ., 1971), p.470a.

52. Ligeti 63, p.17.

53. See Asia Major (hereafter AM) 18 (1973), 232, where I criticised Ligeti's rejection of the earlier reading, without however discussing the problem.
power,' which I presume refers to Heaven rather than to the qayan or the Mongol state. We may compare the words 
busi bolųąy-san kūμūn 
yeke erke alday-situ boltųyai of our inscription with the following 
words from the Mongolian document of 1272 published by A. Temir: 
busi bolųąbasu mengų (= mąŋke) tngri-ečе aldaltu boltųyai 'if they con-
travene, they shall be held punishable by Everlasting Heaven.'
In the former sentence, the words yeke erke seem to correspond to mengų 
tngri of the latter, erke being normally used in the literature of 
the period with reference to Heaven. The fact that erke is not 
followed by any case suffix is due to the extremely succinct style of 
the text, which has led Cleaves to state that the document is actu-
ally incomplete (a point to which I shall return later). The ex-
pression yeke erke is, nevertheless, very unusual in the present con-
text, but so is the rest of the document, including the word immedi-
ately following erke. With regard to this word, Cleaves' reading 
alday-situ is based on a personal communication from the late Fr. A. 
Mostaert. Mostaert wrote: 'Je lis le mot qui suit alday-situ, que 
j'explique comme étant un adjectif en -tu formé sur aldaysi, qui 
serait synonyme de aldal ["faute, offense; infraction" - I.R.].
Aldaysitu boltųyai serait donc l'équivalent de alldaltai boltųyai [m. 
à m. "qu'il soit tenu pour punissable" ou "qu'il soit possible de" - 
I.R.]. Aldasi est un mot attesté. Si alday situ est correctement lu,
il faut en conclure qu'à côté de alda- ["perdre, faire une faute, être coupable de, être punissable" - I.R.] ce verbe a eu une forme alday-. Pour cette dernière particularité, l'on ne peut dire a priori que alday- soit impossible, parce que, p. ex. Hist. secr. ilay- "vaincre" existe à côté de Hist. secr. et mo. ila- idem. 57

The term aldayi 'fault, offence, transgression' (a deverbal noun in -si from alda-) is, indeed, one occurring frequently in the Chinese texts of the Yuan period. In these texts, several excerpts of which are given in translation by Cleaves, the word in question is transcribed as an-ta-hsi 按答奚 (~按答奚 ~ 按打奚). 58


58. Cleaves, pp.70-72, n.5. Cf. also P. Ratchnevsky, Un Code des Yuan, II (Paris, 1972), p.87 and n.3. However, Ratchnevsky's statement (n.3) that an-ta-hsi 'rend en principe un mo. andagi ou aldayi' is not quite correct and calls for comment. Concerning the transcriptions an-ta-hsi 按打奚 ~ 按答奚 ~ 按答奚, Cleaves (p.73, n.5) remarked as follows: 'As observed by the Reverend Antoine Mostaert in a letter dated 12 December 1961, the use of the character 畜 (hsi) in these transcriptions is difficult to explain: "Le problème est: Comment le caractère 畜, qui à cette époque se prononçait Xi, peut-il servir à rendre la syllabe mongole źi? Autrement dit comment le mot 按打奚 peut-il correspondre à un mot mongol aldaysi ou aldayi? Je ne puis pas résoudre ce problème.

Autre problème. Si le caractère 畜 peut transcrire źi dans le mot aldaysi-aldayi, pourquoi rend-il la syllabe ki dans le nom 李蘭奚 à lire Boralki (Inscr. de 1335, 1.38)?"'

I should like to propose the following tentative solution to this two-fold problem. The Ancient Chinese reading of the character 畜 was yiæï. See B. Karlgren, Grammata Serica Recensa (rep. Stockholm, 1972), p.232, no.876d; cf. Shen Chien-shih 沈兼士 (ed.), Kuang-yün sheng-hsi 廣韻聲音 (Peking, 1945; rep. Kyoto, 1969), p.918a. According to Karlgren, the initial γ was a 'fricative dorso-vélopalatale, orale, sonore.' See Études sur la Phonologie Chinoise, Archives d'Études Orientales (Leide et Stockholm, 1915-24), p.290. (For E.G. Pulleyblank, on the other hand, this initial was a laryngal ῆ. See 'The Consonantal System of Old Chinese,' AM 9 [1962], 66,
Cleaves is of the opinion that this transcription may represent an original *alda[y]si* on the strength of Mostaert's reconstruction.

n.2.) In the Chinese dialects this ancient initial fricative has developed into the following phonemes (in Karlsgren's transcription): h, s, s (= s), f, k, or zero. See Études, pp.373-74; cf. also ibid., p.110 (to transcribe the palatal fricative, Karlsgren uses s in Études, but s in Grammata Serica Recensa; to avoid confusion I shall only use the latter transcription). Thus, we have *ši* (= hs in the Wade-Giles system) in Pekinese and the Modern Mandarin dialects, *hai* in Cantonese, *hi* in Hakka and Swatow, *hie* in Fukienese, etc. See Études, p.744. Now, the intermediate stage between Ancient Chinese γ(+i) and Modern Mandarin $\gamma$(+i) was Ancient Mandarin $\chi$(+i). See A. Dragunov, 'The hPhags-pa Script and Ancient Mandarin,' Izvestiya Akad. Nauk SSSR (1930), no.9, 635. A similar phenomenon can also be observed in some Mongolian dialects, e.g., in Alar-Buriat, where we find *q* and *k(+i)>X-Ś*. See N. Poppe, *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies* (Helsinki, 1955), p.132. Although the passage γ>Ś is already attested in north China in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, both Xī and Śi are found in the Yüan sources, the former reflecting the Ancient Mandarin stage, and the latter the newly evolved Middle Mandarin stage of the language. While the transcription 按苔(答,打) tà = aldasi and the Chung-yüan yin-yūn 中原音韻 of 1324 guarantee the reading Śi, the Meng-ku tzu-yūn 蒙古字韻 of 1308 and the transcription 學術史 = Boralki of the Sino-Mongolian inscriptions of 1335, the Yüan-shih and other Yüan sources still reflect the earlier pronunciation Xī. Cf. H.M. Stimson, *The Jongyuan in Yunn: A Guide to Old Mandarin Pronunciation* (New Haven, 1966), p.62, no.0375a; for the Meng-ku tzu-yūn, see Lo Ch'ang-p'ai 羅常培 and Ts'ai Mei-piao 蔡美彪, *Pa-ssu-pa tzu yü Yüan-tai Han-yu* 八思巴字與元代漢語 (Peking, 1959), p.106b (= A, 23b); M. Nakano, *A Phonological Study in the Phags-pa Script and the Meng-ku Tzu-yūn* (Canberra, 1971), p.112, no.202. Cf. L. Ligeti, 'Le Po kia sing en écriture 'phags-pa,' AOHung. 6 (1956), 15, 41, no.63. Both the Meng-ku tzu-yūn and the Pai-chia-hsing in 'Phags-pa script (2b6) transcribe เถ as hēi (= Ligeti's hǐ), hence Dragunov's Ancient Mandarin Xī quoted by Mostaert. See Dragunov, op.cit., p.784, no.163. As pointed out by Ligeti, (op. cit., p.37 and AOHung. 1 [1950], 155ff.), the Meng-ku tzu-yūn system reflects Ancient Mandarin, not Middle Mandarin. For Boralki (-Boralki), see P.W. Cleaves in *HJAS* 13 (1950), 56, n.205 (on p.101 this name is written 'Boralgi'); cf. P. Pelliot
aldaysitu. I doubt whether this interpretation is correct. If we assume that an-ta-hsi represents alda[y]si we would expect, in view of the frequent use of this word in the Mongol period, to find some instances of the use of the verb alday- on which the noun aldaysi is built. This, however, is not the case: the only attested form of this very common verb is alda-. Moreover, aldaysi is not attested.

---

et L. Hambis, Histoire des Campagnes de Gengis Khan. Cheng-wou ts'in-tcheng lou, I (Paris, 1951), p.121, where Pelliot reads buralgi (< buralγi) instead of buralki on the basis of the Persian transcriptions. However, k-g is very common in the thirteenth-fourteenth century transcriptions of foreign names and terms. With regard to Boralki, it should be noted that in this back vocalic word the syllable ki<qi(qI). In the first half of the fourteenth century ki still alternated with qi and they were, in effect, interchangeable. Cf., e.g., the Bodistv-a Şari-a avatar-un tayilbur of 1312, where we find the suffix -dam--daki. See Cleaves in HJAS 17 (1954), 59a. For -ki--qi in the 'Phags-pa inscriptions, see Ligeti in AOHung. 16 (1963), 148. On this well-known phenomenon, which originates from the breaking of *i in Middle Mongolian, see Poppe, Introduction, pp.132-34, 137-39. Cf. also Ligeti in AOHung. 16 (1963), 147-51. The transcription $ (Xi) of Mongolian ki shows, therefore, that the actual sound value of k in this syllable was probably q, since as a rule the Chinese texts of the Yüan render Mongolian q with a velar fricative, whereas Mongolian k is rendered with the corresponding Chinese stop (k'). See M. Lewicki, La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIVe siècle. Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389 (Wrocław, 1949), pp.81-85; Ligeti in AOHung. 1 (1950), 156ff. In conclusion, an-ta-hsi can render in principle either aldasi or aldaki-aldagi; however, only aldasi is eligible because this is the only form which is morphologically possible. Ratchnevsky's andagi (or andaki) is also excluded on the same ground; as for andasi, although possible in view of alda--anda-- (cf. Kowalewski, p.12b), one can virtually exclude it because the only form of this verb that is attested in Middle Mongolian and Preclassical texts is alda-. On the term aldasi see also N.C. Munkuev in Akademiya Nauk SSSR Institut Vostokovedeniya, Sed'maya Naučnaya Konferenciya "Obščestvo i Gosudarstvo v Kitae," Tezisy i doklady, I (Moscow, 1976), pp.172, 176-77, n.15.

59. On the meaning and usage of alda--, see N.Ts. Munküev in AOHung. 31 (1977), 210-15, n.h. Cf. however, de Rachewiltz in
in any other Preclassical text, nor in the later literary language, nor in the modern dialects, whereas aldasi is a well known term and one used in the literary language as well as in the dialects to this day. Thus, while provisionally accepting Mostaert's ingenious explanation of the term aldaysitu, I regard this word as an extremely rare form, almost certainly a hapax legomenon, and take an-ta-hsi to be the regular transcription of aldasi.

Ligeti, judging by his transcription of the text, regards aldysitu as two separate words, i.e. aldav situy. Such an interpretation is grammatically unsatisfactory (what is the meaning of aldav and in what relationship is this word with yeke eregtu or yeke erke?), and certainly less convincing than the one proposed by Mostaert.

Aldaysitu (= aldasitu) is, then, synonymous with aldaltu or aldaltai which, in combination with bol-, means 'to be held punishable,' i.e. 'to be held guilty of an offence and thus liable to punishment.' My tentative transcription and decipherment of the Mongol text of the inscription are as follows: [1] ane minu òge busi

---

60. See the lexicographical references in Cleaves, p.70, n.5. As to Cleaves' statement regarding the word aldas listed in Kowalewski, p.88b, and translated as 'une petite faute, défaut,' that this word is more than probably a misprint for aldasi (a word not registered by Kowalewski), I should point out that this is not so. Aldas is merely a variant of aldasi, no doubt reflecting a dialect pronunciation, which has found its way into the written language. See Ya. Celel, Mongol xelni tovč tañlbar tol' (Ulan-Bator, 1966), p.31a; Mongol kitad toli (Huhehot, 1976), p.51a. Cf. F.D. Lessing, a.o., Mongolian-English Dictionary (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960), p.31a: aldas 'mistake, slip, omission, fault.'


bolγay-san khümün [2] yeke erke alday-situ boltuyai ̄ne [3] bičig qulayana ̄jil 'The person who shall have contravened this my word (= order) shall be held punishable [by] the supreme power (i.e. by Everlasting Heaven). This Writ, [I have written it in] the Year of the Rat (= 1240).'

With regard to the peculiar phraseology of this text, Cleaves has suggested that it is only the terminal formula of a longer original document (bičig) in Mongolian, and an incomplete one at that. He also claims that the three lines in Mongolian were cut, 'presumably, to lend a greater air of authority to the Chinese text of the Edict.'64 While agreeing with the last statement, I am not so certain that the Mongol text of the edict is the incomplete terminal formula of a longer original. I would venture to say that this extremely terse text, phrased in what today we would call 'telegraphic style,' may well be a particular type of formula conferring authority on a document issued by the court in Chinese (for promulgation in north China) in the early phase of Mongol rule. We know that at least one other edict of the same kind, dating from 1235 - hence contemporaneous with ours - bore a short text (now unfortunately lost) in Uighur-Mongol script following the main text in Chinese.65 The existence of such brief 'validations' in Mongolian on documents issued by the Chinese chancellery during Ögödei's reign is well known.66 This may explain why only the essential words are written

63. Cleaves, pp.63-64, 73, nn.6 and 7.
64. ibid., p.63.
65. This is Ögödei's edict of 25 July 1235 mentioned earlier (see above, n.23). Chavannes' statement (TP 9 [1908], 309, n.1) that the text in 'hui-hui tzu 回回字' in this edict must have been in 'Phags-pa script is, of course, incorrect. By hui-hui tzu are meant here Uighur letters. See Pelliot in TP 28 (1932), 418.
66. From Hsü T'ing's 徐 順 account of 1235/6 in the Hei-Ta shih-lüeh, 8b. See Cleaves in HJAS 14 (1951), 502-03, 507ff.
down, so conveying the misleading impression that the Mongol text is incomplete. Judging by the language, however, I personally feel that whoever composed the three lines was a person with an imperfect knowledge of Mongolian, hence possibly a non-Mongol, but this is somewhat speculative.

One last point: As Cleaves has already noted, the stele with the Mongol and Chinese texts of the 1240 edict is found at the Shih-fang ta-tzu-wei kung (see above), a temple in Honan (100 li NW of Chi-yüan hsien) far removed from P'ing-yang, to the authorities of which circuit the edict was originally directed. This being so, 'the reasons for which they were cut on stone at that temple is a matter of speculation.'67 To answer this question one cannot do better, I think, than quote Ed. Chavannes. Commenting on the localities in north China where some of the stelae with inscriptions concerning the Ch'üan-chen Church are found, the great French savant wrote: 'Il est intéressant de découvrir ces textes dans deux régions aussi distantes l'une de l'autre que Teng-fong hien [登封縣, Honan - I.R.] et Wei-hien [衛縣, Shantung - I.R.]; selon toute vraisemblance on pourra les signaler ailleurs encore, car ils devaient être reproduits dans nombre de temples taoïstes de l'empire; il est évident, en effet, qu'en les gravant sur pierre les taoïstes se proposaient un but politique qui était d'agir sur l'esprit du public en lui montrant de quelle faveur ils avaient joui sous les deux premiers empereurs mongols; ces inscriptions étaient pour eux une arme dont ils se servaient dans leur lutte contre les Bouddhistes.'68

Chavannes' assumption that copies of the same inscriptions would be discovered in various Taoist temples has proved correct. The

67. Cleaves, p.64. See ibid., n.6, for the exact location of the Shih-fang ta-tzu-wei Temple.

68. TP 9 (1908), 299.
inscription of the Yü-ch'ing Temple 玉清宮 of Wei-hsien in Shan-tung to which he refers in the above passage is the edict of 25 July 1235\textsuperscript{69} which I mentioned earlier. The text of the same edict published by Ts'ai Mei-piao is, however, the one engraved on a stele found in the Ch'ung-yang Wan-shou Temple 重陽萬壽宮 in Chou-chih hsien 墊屋縣, Shensi.\textsuperscript{70} It is to be hoped that another copy of the 1240 edict will also turn up in China one day, and that it will then be possible to dispel all doubts concerning the Mongolian text of the inscription.

\textsuperscript{69} See \textit{ibid.}, pp.308-09, no.XXI.

\textsuperscript{70} Ts'ai, p.4, no.4. The text of Činggis-qan's edict of 1223 published by Chavannes on the basis of the inscription found at the Yü-ch'ing Temple in Shantung (TP 4 [1904], 368-70, no.1) was also published by Ts'ai, p.1, no.1, on the basis of the inscription in the Ch'ung-yang Wan-shou Temple in Shensi. Cf. Iriya, \textit{op.cit.}, 195.