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PREFACE

Thirty-five years ago I began working on a translation of the Secret History of the Mongols which was published in eleven installments in the journal Papers on Far Eastern History at the Australian National University between 1971 and 1985.

As I stated in the Introduction to the first issue, my reason for undertaking the translation was to provide students and non-specialist readers with an up-to-date English rendering of the Secret History, pending the publication of Professor F.W. Cleaves' magnum opus. The latter had been completed in 1956 and typeset in 1957, but Cleaves deferred its release. The reasons for the delay were such that publication might be postponed indefinitely.

Furthermore, I knew from Cleaves' other publications that his translation was a literal one in somewhat archaic, biblical English, modelled on that of the Authorized Version of 1611. Professor N. Poppe, then at the University of Washington, Seattle, had earlier encouraged me to prepare a complete word-index to the Secret History, which appeared in the Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series in 1972. Fearing that Cleaves' work would never be published, he now urged me to prepare a badly-needed translation into current English together with a basic commentary. Fr. Henry Serruys, with whom I was corresponding, also encouraged me to undertake the task.

When Cleaves' translation was eventually published in 1982, mine was well advanced and the commentary was assuming fairly large proportions. Since Cleaves' announced commentary (which was to form Volume II of his edition) did not eventuate, I persevered and completed my translation in 1985, following it with a list of Additions and Corrections in 1986. I was by then aware that 1) my translation and commentary, especially of the first six chapters, needed a thorough revision, and 2) Cleaves had virtually given up the idea of producing the commentary volume.

For these reasons, I decided in 1987 to prepare a new, updated edition of my translation, enlarging the commentary so as
to take into account the contributions to the study of the Secret History that were by then appearing in increasing numbers in Asia, Europe and the United States.

This revision was completed in 1992, and the publication of the new edition has been made possible by a grant from the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange. I wish to thank the Foundation most sincerely for its generous support.

It is my pleasure to acknowledge the assistance I received from friends, colleagues and learned institutions without whose help this work could not have been carried out.

First and foremost, I owe a great debt of gratitude to my late friend and mentor Nicholas Poppe who followed my progress with keen interest, making countless and invaluable suggestions in his correspondence with me, and generously 'tutoring' me for several weeks at his home in Seattle in 1979. He was pleased to know that I would dedicate my book to him.

After Poppe, the person who helped me most with textual difficulties was Henry Serruys, who also contributed materially by sending me from Arlington, Virginia, numerous relevant publications, some of them quite rare. I shall always remember him as an outstanding and modest scholar, and as a great friend in need.

Among the friends and colleagues in and outside Australia who have given me much of their time and the benefit of their experience in reading and improving the manuscript, in supplying indispensable material and in carrying out research on my behalf, I wish to express my profound gratitude to Andrew Fraser, Ken Gardiner, Mary Hutchinson, Peter W. Geier, May and Sydney Wang, John R. Krueger, Henry G. Schwarz, Okada Hidehiro, Sh. Choyzam, Elisabetha Chiodo, Klaus Sagaster, and Bertigjijin Ulaan.

For encouragement and assistance of various kinds at all stages of my work, enlightening suggestions and unfailing kindness, my warm thanks are due to Françoise Aubin, John C. Street, Ch'i-ning Hsiao, Hok-Iam Chan, Osaka Shigeko, Herbert Franke, Liu Tsian-yen, Ruth I. Meserve, Tanya D. Skrynnikova, Huang Shijian, Sh. Bira, Denis Simon, Alice Säkki, Mariya N.
NOTES ON THE ILLUSTRATIONS

Plate 1 Two leaves (four pages) from the Secret History of the Mongols (Yuan-ch'ao pishih [ fís'h ] 4, 45a-b, and 48a-b) corresponding to the beginning and the end of § 146. The leaves reproduced here are two of the 41 surviving leaves of the original Ming printed edition. The second leaf contains also most of the Chinese sectional summary following the end of the Mongol text in transcription. See Section Four of the Introduction.

Plate 2 Leaf (two pages) from the unique Ulan Bator ms. copy of Losangdargön's chronicle Altan tobo /[ tó:w ] 14 1/2, 43a-b containing part of § 145 and the beginning of § 146 of the Secret History of the Mongols (43b, line 12). Late 17th or early 18th century. See Section Five of the Introduction.

Plate 3 Idealized portrait of Chinggis Qin (Yuan T'ai-tsung, r. 1206–27) from the Collection of the National Palace Museum, Taipei. Colour on silk. Artist and date unknown (? 14th c.). Reproduced by permission.

Plate 4 Imaginative portrait of Ogodei Qa'an (Yuan T'ai-tsung, r. 1229–41) from the same Collection. Colour on silk. Artist and date unknown (? 14th c.). Reproduced by permission.

Plate 5 Mount Burqan Qaldun, present-day Khentei Khan (Xantii Xan) in the Great Khentei Range, northern Mongolia, viewed from the Bogd River valley south of the mountain. Photographed by Mrs Cynthia Moloney of Canberra.

Plate 6 View from the top of Mount Burqan Qaldun/Khentei Khan overlooking the (presumed) imperial burial ground further down the slope, and the Bogd River valley and Kerulen...
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Plate 7 The Onon River in northern Mongolia on the western bank of which Chinggis Qan was born. See the Commentary to § 59. Photographed by the Author.

Plate 8 Partial view of Dolon Bolda’ut (‘Seven Solitary Hills’) near the place where the Secret History was written. See the Commentary to § 282. Photographed by the Author.

Plate 9 A rare gold coin (kmār) of Chinggis Qan struck at Ghazna in AH 618 (= AD1221/1222) from a hoard of about 150 coins discovered in or about 1996. Chinggis’ name appears in the last line of the reverse field in the form ‘Chingis Xan’. For a transcription and translation of the legend, cf. M.A. Whelley in AOH 54:2001, 20, p. 60. Courtesy of Dr Terry Lee of Canberra.

Plate 10 Aerial view of the Khentei Range of northern Mongolia showing the sources of the Onon and Kerulen rivers, and the exact situation of Burqan Qaldun/Khentei Khan. Courtesy of Prof. B. Sum-yabuatar of Ulan Bator.

Plate 11 Above. Mongol archer from the 14th century Chinese encyclopedia Shih-lien kung-chi (SLKC [enl. ed. of 1330-32], hou-chi 13, 3a). Below. Mongol horseman shooting backwards, from the same encyclopedia (ibid., 3b).

Plate 12 Granite stele in honour of Chinggis Qan’s nephew Yisüngee (ca.1190 - ca.1230) celebrating his victory at an archery contest held in Central Asia in 1224/1225 after the successful Mongol campaign against Khwarezm. Commonly known as the ‘Stone of Chingis’. The text reads:
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‘When Chinggis Qan, having subdued the Sartajul people, set up camp (and) the noblemen of the entire Mongol nation gathered at Buqa (Sjoiyai (= Buqa [Sjoiyai]), at the long-distance shooting (contest) Yisüngee shot an arrow 335 alais (= 536 m.)’ Hermitage Museum. Reproduced by permission.
ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENTIONAL SIGNS

Common and conventional abbreviations are not listed
(The entries in the starred lists have been transliterated into Latin script and/or simplified when necessary, as is IMCS)

ach. = Ancient Chinese (= Middle Chinese), after GSR u.o.s.
adj. = adjective
adv. = adverb, adverbial
alt. = alternatively, alternative reading or rendering
[A.M.] = unpublished note by Antoine Montalet
amo. = Ancient Mongol (pre-12th c.)
a.o.s. = and other sources
arab. = Arabic
aux. = auxiliary
bur. = Burmese, after BRS* u.o.s.
Ch. = Chapter
ch. = Chinese
ch. = Chinese
como. = Common Mongol
com. = my commentary (or commentaries) to the paragraph(s) in question
conj. = conjunction
conn. vo. = connective vowel
conv. abs. = converb absolutive
conv. imp. = converb imperfect
conv. prep. = converb preparativum
corr. = corrected
C.R.A.C. = Centre de Recherches sur l'Asie Centrale et la Haute Asie, Invertis d'Asie, Collège de France, Paris
crim. = Crimean Tatar
dag. = Chaghatai, after MA, DTO and VVTD*
dag. = Dagestani, after DN*, THITT* and D1*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.-loc.</td>
<td>dative-locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>den.</td>
<td>denotational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dev.</td>
<td>deverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dial.</td>
<td>dialect(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dim.</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emph.</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encl.</td>
<td>enclitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endear.</td>
<td>endearment (form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eng.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excl.</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fact.</td>
<td>factitive (form, verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fo.</td>
<td>foro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr.</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ger.</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go.</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goth.</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr.</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[H.S.]</td>
<td>unpublished note by Henry Serruys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hung.</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id.</td>
<td>idem, the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indo-eur.</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter.</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ital.</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Wan SSSR</td>
<td>Institut Vostočnoj Rossi, Akademiya Nauk SSSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Ran</td>
<td>Institutt Vostočnoj Rossi, Rossiška Akademiya Nauk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jap.</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ji.</td>
<td>Jurchen, after SJV a.o.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalm.</td>
<td>Kalmuck, after KW a.o.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaz.</td>
<td>Kazakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh.</td>
<td>Khalkha, after CEV, after a.o.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirc.</td>
<td>Kirghiz, after KIRS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kit.</td>
<td>Kitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let.</td>
<td>Latvian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>locative, local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma.</td>
<td>Manchu, after HM and CMEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med.</td>
<td>medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mmad.</td>
<td>Middle Mandarin, after the Chinese transcriptions of the 13th-14th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mno.</td>
<td>Middle Mongolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m M U.s.</td>
<td>modern Mongolian in Uighur script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo.</td>
<td>Written or Script Mongolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mod.</td>
<td>modern Mongol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mog.</td>
<td>Mongol, after DFM u.o.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mng.</td>
<td>Mongolian, Mongol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m pers.</td>
<td>Middle Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>no date of publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.F.</td>
<td>Neue Folge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom. imp.</td>
<td>nominimperfecti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>no place of publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.P.</td>
<td>Poppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>New Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs.</td>
<td>obsolete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eff.</td>
<td>official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bir.</td>
<td>Girat (lit.), after OECD u.o.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omand.</td>
<td>Old Mandarin, after PCH, MCKY, CYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ord.</td>
<td>Ordos, after DO u.o.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orx.</td>
<td>Osmanli (Ottoman Turkish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ort.</td>
<td>Old Turkish (Orkheen and Yenisei inscriptions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ot.</td>
<td>Ottar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.c.</td>
<td>personal communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The 13th century work known as the Secret History of the Mongols (Mongol-n uul ai niq wala tobi xa wa) is the earliest and most important literary monument of the Mongol-speaking people, challenged only by the later 19th century chronicle Erdeni-yin toböl', or Precious Summary, by the Oros prince Sayang Seken (1604-72). There is no doubt, however, that notwithstanding the literary merits of the latter - and they are many - Sayang's masterpiece is by far outshone by the Secret History, witness the number of translations and versions of this work (over forty) against the mere eight of the Erdeni-yin toböl'.

The reason for the great success of the Secret History at home and abroad is, first of all, its subject matter, for the Secret History is the only genuine (not to be confused with reliable) native account of the life and deeds of Genghis Khan - one of the world's outstanding figures, whereas the Erdeni-yin toböl' is a general history of the Mongols, written under the influence of Tibetan culture and Lamaism. There is no Buddhist influence in the Secret History, its language has not been touched by the literary and historiographical conventions of Tibet, its poetry reflects the pure, unmitigated tradition of the nomadic tribes of Mongolia and of the Turkic- and Mongolian-speaking inhabitants of the vast steppelands of Inner Asia. To be sure, the Turkic element - cultural and linguistic - is present in the Secret History, how could it be otherwise, since Mongolia was the cradle, home and stamping ground of both those peoples, so that they shared from remote times a common way of life, the same spiritual, i.e. shamanistic, background (with related cults and customs), and exchanged words, terms and titles as the occasion arose.

Later, the settled and culturally more advanced Turks of Central Asia, the Uighurs in particular, acted as tutors and cultural intermediaries to the Mongols, their greatest gift to them being the
attractive vertical Uighur script which the Mongols adopted about the turn of the 13th century and in which the Secret History was first written. However, regardless of its Turkic component, the Secret History is and remains a true and original Mongol product, unique of its kind, for no other nomadic or semi-nomadic people has ever created a literary masterpiece like it, in which epic poetry and narrative are so skilfully and indeed artistically blended with fictional and historical accounts. Linguistically too, the Secret History provides the finest and richest source of Preclassical Mongolian (in its reconstructed ‘written’ form) dating from the first half of the 13th century, and of Middle Mongolian, the language actually spoken in the second half of the 14th century – a language lacking any artificiality, simple and direct in style, far removed from the learned and often convoluted syntax of so-called Classical Mongolian. In this respect, one can say with A. Waley that its ‘story-tellers’ tales … are some of the most vivid primitive literature that exists anywhere in the world,’1 words echoed by F. W. Cleaves who called the Secret History ‘one of the great literary monuments of the world.’2

The Secret History is a complex work; it presents at times great difficulties of interpretation. Because of the wealth of data that it provides on all aspects of life in 12th-13th century Mongolia, on important events and on a great number of individuals (some of whom played key historical roles), and on their clans and tribes, it is also a work that, to quote Waley again, ‘would be possible to furnish with endless annotation.’3 Cleaves, for his part, went as far as observing that ‘a definitive translation is out of the question until generations of scholarship have been consecrated to its study’ – a sobering reminder to all those who take up this task.

In the following sections I shall survey some of the major issues concerning the Secret History, viz. its contents, date and place of composition, authorship and textual history (in relation also to the text of the Secret History preserved in the Altan toboc), as well as the transcriptions and translations made in modern times. I shall touch upon its value as a literary work and historical

source, presenting different and often conflicting views on the subject. I shall conclude with some remarks on the present version. Several appendices provide additional information on the chronology of Chinggis Qan’s campaigns in Mongolia, Siberia and Central Asia in 1204-1219, and some useful reference lists for the reader of the Secret History who wishes to pursue the study of this text more in depth.

The bibliography contains only titles cited in the present work; however, there are many references in the commentary to contributions of lesser importance, brief reviews and the like that are not included in the bibliography. The indices have been made as comprehensive as possible to facilitate the use of both the translation and the commentary.

1. Contents and subject matter of the Secret History

Although arbitrarily divided into 12 or 15 chapters and 282 sections or paragraphs at a later date, the Secret History is a continuous narrative with comparatively few lacunae and interpolations in the text, which shall be discussed further on.

The plain prose narrative turns frequently into alliterative passages of various lengths, i.e. into poetry, mainly for dramatic effect, to emphasize statements, or simply to introduce apt proverbial sayings, the so-called ‘ancient words’, i.e. the wise words of the ancients whenever circumstances call for their authority. It is a well-known genre, the characteristics of which will also be discussed in detail below.

The order of events in the Secret History is chronological, but the first date, corresponding to AD 1201, appears only in § 141 (Chapter IV).

Chapters I-XII (up to § 258) describe the life and career of Chinggis Qan from his birth, probably in 1162 (§ 19), to his death in 1227 (§ 267), the preceding sections (§§ 1-58) being devoted to his ancestry and the legendary origins of the Mongol (Mongol) tribe and clans.
The final portion of the work (§§ 269-281) deals with the election of Ögödei Qa'an, Cinggis' third son and successor, and with some events of his reign (1229-41), without however mentioning his death.

The narrative ends (§ 282) with a brief and apparently incomplete colophon recording where and when the Secret History was completed.

The work is thus essentially biographical, describing, often in great detail and in very vivid form, various aspects of Cinggis Qan's private and official life, his numerous military campaigns, his relationship with relatives, friends and allies, as well as with rivals and foes, his pronouncements on matters of law and army organization, on moral issues, such as loyalty and the duties and obligations of chiefs and subjects, the role of Heaven and Earth in human affairs, and man's attitude towards these powers.

The section on Ögödei is, by comparison, much less coherent and quite fragmentary — a sort of afterthought or supplement (which, as we shall see, it almost certainly is) — but, nevertheless, still containing useful data on important topics like taxation and the post-relay service, and on the relationship of Ögödei with his brothers. Significantly, only one date, corresponding to 1231, is found in §§ 270-281, but several of the events described in this section can be dated quite accurately from the accounts in the Chinese and Persian sources. It should be mentioned, however, that the chronology of the Secret History is, in general, quite unreliable and at odds with those sources. This has much to do with the true nature of the work and the author(s') aims.

For the readers' convenience a detailed, chapter by chapter summary of events is provided before the translation. In it, the dates in brackets are those given in the Secret History corrected to the Christian era.

2. Place and date of composition

These two issues — place and date — are crucial and, in the case of the Secret History, they are closely, indeed intimately, related. Both have attracted the attention of scholars since the second half of the 19th century, and I have discussed them in detail in my previous articles on the subject to which the reader is referred. The following is a summary of the various theories and conflicting arguments, updated and with additional comments.

The colophon of the Secret History (§ 282) tells us almost exactly where the 'writing' was completed, viz. at Dolo'an Bolidaq of Köde'e Arol of the Keliuren (= Kerulen) River, between Silgin'pek and ... The name of the second locality is missing, owing to a lacuna in the text. This gap is unimportant since Dolo'an Bolidaq ('Seven Solitary Hills') of Köde'e Arol ('Barren Island') is a well-known place south-west of present-day Delgerxam and just north of the Xerielen (Xerelen) River in southern Xertlen Almag. Köde'e (or Ködo'e, Köde'a) Arol is not an island, but a large plain comprised between the two rivers Xerielen and Xerxer in the south and east, and the Bayan Mountains (Bayan Uul) in the north and west. It was in this beautiful, hill-dotted and well-watered plain that Cinggis Qan had his principal encampment, the so-called Qan's 'Palaces' (ordus), and it was here that the Great Assembly (yake qurilaj) that elected Ögödei in 1229 was convoked in 1228, soon after Cinggis' death and burial. A place consecrated by tradition, as it were.

As for the date, the colophon is deceptively precise: 'The writing was completed at the time when the Great Assembly convened and when, in the Year of the Rat, in the month of the Roebuck, the Palaces were established at Dolo'an Bolidaq ... The month of the Roebuck (qurilaj urus) is the seventh month of the lunar calendar, but to which Year of the Rat (qulungan jii) of the duodecmary animal cycle does the colophon refer?
Since the *Secret History* ends with the reign of Ögdö (1229-41) but does not mention his death (cf. Cinggis' "ascension to Heaven" recorded in § 268), it has been assumed for a long time that the year in question must be 1250, even if no great assembly is mentioned in our sources as.a. 1240. This was the opinion held, among others, by the pioneering *Secret History* scholars Naka Michiyoshi 納倉道成, L. Pelliot, E. Haenisch and S.A. Kozin. It is still the generally accepted date in Mongolia and China, albeit with some notable exceptions in either country. However, doubts on this dating were expressed in 1941, and again in 1948, by R. Grousset, who pointed out that in § 255 of the *Secret History* Cinggis Qan appears to "predict" the transfer of the throne from Ögdö's line to that of Tolui, as indeed happened with Möngke's election as qan in 1251; moreover, § 281 reads very much like a posthumous appraisal of Ögdö. Grousset therefore suggested the Year of the Rat 1257 as a more likely alternative. His suggestion was rejected by Pelliot on the grounds that the ambitions of Tolui's house must have been known before Ögdö's death in 1241, and that, whereas the sketchy nature of the Annals of the latter's reign in the *Yüan shih lu* 元史列傳 may account for the lack of mention of a great assembly in 1240, the more detailed imperial annals from 1251 onward would have no doubt recorded such an important event s.a. 1252.  

Writing in 1951, W. Hung, while agreeing with Grousset on a dating later than 1240, put forth the view that an even better Year of the Rat would be 1264, owing mainly to the fact that a place-name given in § 247 of the *Secret History* as Hsiasian-fu 蛇巊, only became a fu or administration in 1263 (previously it was a chou or prefecture).  

In answer to Hung's objection, A. Montsudev, to whom I suspect, was himself in favour of the year 1240, posed the question of why, if that were the case, did the *Secret History* leave out all the momentous events that occurred between the end of Ögdö's reign and 1264, including Ögdö's death, two long regencies, Möngke's election, etc., etc.?  

Hung's hypothesis was adopted by A. Waley (albeit with some reservations) in 1960, and by G. Ledyard in 1964, both scholars basing their argument on the fact that certain events concerning the Mongol campaigns in Korea show that the account in the *Secret History* could not have been written before 1258. While Waley suggests a date "well after the middle of the thirteenth century", for Ledyard 1264 is the earliest possible date for the composition of the *Secret History*. On the other hand, Grousset's suggestion was adopted with qualifications by no less an authority than L. Ligeti in 1962, and without reservations by Yu Ta-ch'ün 余大俊 twenty years later. Ligeti postulates the existence of an early version of the *Secret History* completed immediately after Cinggis Qan's death and containing only an account of his life (a theory already mentioned by Chinese and Japanese scholars); if the colophon refers to the *Yüe-t'ai*, the Year of the Rat must correspond to 1228; if it refers to the whole work, it must correspond to 1252 in view of Grousset's valid arguments, i.e. the later interpretations. The problem, for Ligeti, is still unresolved.  

Yu Ta-ch'ün's argument is largely a criticism of previous theories and a strengthening of Grousset's proposal for the year 1252, in support of which he adduces further evidence showing, quite convincingly, that certain passages in the *Secret History* (in §§ 275, 276 and 277) could not have been written while Ögdö or his son and successor, Gāyūk (r. 1246-48), were on the throne. In order to overcome the major objection to the year 1252 being the Year of the Rat of the colophon, viz. that no great assembly was convened then, Yu is forced to reinterpret the actual wording of the colophon to mean that the writing of the *Secret History* was completed "after (my emphasis - I.R.) the great quriltu had been held", the "great quriltu" referring of course to the 1250-51 diet that elected Möngke.  

The Year of the Rat 1228 for the first recension of the *Secret History* had already been put forward by Ting Ch'ien 聶健 in 1901; Ting's suggestion was later revived and modified by Uemura Seiji 上村貞允 (1955), G. Doerfler (1963), P.
Ratchnevsky (1965), and I. de Rachewiltz (1965). The main arguments in favour of this theory, which has gained ground in recent times (see below), are: 1) the Altan toshai (1655) of Blo- bazar bstan-'jina (Lobsangdandin), which incorporates a large portion of the Secret History text (232 of 282 paragraphs), contains only the portion of the Secret History dealing with Çinggis Qan’s ancestry and life (§§ 1-268), i.e. what is considered to be the Utres; the section on Ögedei Qan is missing altogether; 2) no great assemblies were held, according to our sources, in 1240, 1252 or 1264; 3) the title of the work being, in all likelihood, Çinggis Qan-u ha'la'ar (proo. Çinggis Qan-u uñatur) or The Origin (senu lato H History) of Çinggis Qan, the work itself must have ended, logically, with Çinggis’ death (§ 268). Thus, what one assumes must have happened, is that the later editors in the Yuan and early Ming periods interfered with the original text by interpolating, transferring, deleting and adding material (which would explain the internal historical and chronological inconsistencies, as well as other puzzling aspects of the text), and including the section on Ögedei as a continuation or supplement. Eventually, the original colophon of 1228 was transferred from the end of the Çinggis Qan-u ha'la'ar to the end of the edited and enlarged version. 10 This question will be discussed further in Section Four of this Introduction.

Among the scholars who in the last four decades have adopted the date 1228 for the composition of the original text of the Secret History, and who regard the year of the Rat of the colophon as corresponding to that year, we should mention F.W. Cleaves, G. Clasen, Murakami Manastugu, N. N. Muskuzev, Ozawa Shigeo, Y. ichimine (Ichimine), jingjin, S. Gressmann, D. Cristénsdóttir and U. Öron. 11 Other scholars have accepted it, albeit with a question mark. 12 Although Ledyard had not excluded duodenary cycles later than 1264, an extreme position was taken by Okada Hidehiro who, in 1985, re-elaborating an idea mooted by Murakami in 1978, 13 expressed the view that the Secret History was composed in the Year of the Rat 1324, and that the great assembly referred to in the colophon was the one held the preceding year (1323) at Kōde’s Atar on the Kerulen which elected Yisun Temür (F'ao-ting t'ao-ling, r. 1324-27). 14

Finally, a number of scholars beginning with the Archimandrite Palladie (P.L. Kafarov, 1817-78), 15 have prudently refrained from identifying the Year of the Rat to which the text refers. 16

While Grousset’s arguments against the date 1240 were refuted by Pelio and rejected by Hung, Hung’s dating was in turn questioned by Mostaert, Liegert, Bira and de Rachewiltz; 17 Ledyard’s thesis was criticised by de Rachewiltz and Bira, 18 and this also happened to the earlier theories proposed by Naka, Ishihama and others, as well as to the more recent one by Yü. 19 Liegert’s criticism is not without fault, and Bira’s reinterpretation of the text of the colophon is likewise open to serious doubts. 20 Thus, most of the arguments in favour of a date against the year 1240, 1252 and 1264 can be refuted on valid grounds. As for the Year of the Rat 1324, it can be argued that 1) it does not tally with the year of the querita on the Kerulen that elected Yisun Temır, which was a Year of the Pig (1323), 2) the vivid, unaffected and fresh style of the Secret History narrative, with its wealth of details on events, people and places, provides an insight into the life of Çinggis Qan and his associates, and the society of his time that could only come from a contemporary or near contemporary witness and can hardly be reconciled with as late a composition as that put forward by Okada.

In view of the above and for the reasons outlined in my earlier studies, I am still of the opinion that the original text of the Secret History to which the colophon properly belongs was written down in the month of the Roebuck (2-31 August) of the Year of the Rat 1228 at Dolo’an Boldag, exactly one year after Çinggis Qan’s death. However, the text of the Secret History as handed down to us, both in its Chinese (Y) and Mongolian (AT) versions, is the product of later additions, deletions and other editorial changes carried out during the Yuan and early Ming periods, broadly from the reign of Qubilai Qan (1260-94) to
although I am of the opinion that these played a limited role, most (if not all) the information being transmitted orally.¹¹

The compiler was, in all likelihood, a person directly or indirectly involved in some of the stories; in any event, he had
direct access to 'inside information', possibly as a member of the
gan's family or of his immediate entourage, in order to provide so
many details of discussions and deliberations made in the gan's
tent.¹² He was then able to bring all his data (real and fictional)
together in an organic whole with great skill, especially for a
man with no literary tradition behind him. He may thus have been
both author and compiler; such distinctions would have been
meaningless in the circumstances, the very problem of 'author-
ship' itself being irrelevant to the person concerned, hence his
anonymity.¹³ We also have no idea of how the composition was
put together: whether the compiler was the actual recorder or
whether the writing down was done by someone else, a scribe or
copyist. This, likewise, is a matter of little relevance.¹⁴

Various theories have been put forth as to who may have
written or compiled the Secret History. The three main candidates
for authorship are the following:

1. T'ai-ta T'ung-a (Tatar Torqa' fl. 1204), the former
Uighur seal-keeper of Tayang Qun of the Naiman who passed
into the service of Cinggis Qin in 1264 after Cinggis' defeat,
becoming Cinggis' seal-keeper as well as tutor in Uighur
script to his sons. On this ground alone he has subsequently
been credited with the introduction of that script among the
Mongols. The information about him is extremely scanty — only
ten lines in his Chinese biography.¹⁵ In 1911, Kanai Yasuo 佐
耕世 tried to prove his authorship of the Secret History on
account of his literacy; however, as noted by W. Hung, it is
hardly credible that, as an outsider who joined the Mongol camp
only in 1204, he would have been so knowledgeable about the
intimate details of Cinggis' earlier life.¹⁶ Hung's criticism
cannot be dismissed. Moreover, T'ai-ta T'ung-a gets no

3. Authorship of the Secret History

The problem of authorship is, if anything, even more complex
than that of dating the Secret History. To begin with, there is no
mention of an author. Indeed, given the composite nature of the
Secret History (about which more later),¹⁶ it would be more
correct to speak of a compiler who gathered his material from a
variety of sources — oral and written — such as the recollections of
eyewitnesses, accounts of the descendants of personages who had
participated in the events described, story-tellers' songs and
narratives about the heroes' exploits, and possibly a number of
documents recording the gan's pronouncements and legal statutes.
mention in the Secret History and is totally ignored by all other Mongol sources.

2. Chinggis or, preferably, Chinggi (ca. 1169-1225), the well-known Kereń or Uighur dignitary under Chinggis Qan, Ögedei and Guyük. An educated Nestorian Christian, he combined the positions of chamberlain (kereń) and chief secretary or chancellor (bichii). As head of the Secretariat under Ögedei he held the imperial seal, was in charge of administrative affairs concerning the Western Regions (i.e. Muslim central and western Asia), and no official document in Uighur script or Chinese could be issued without being countersigned by him. Hence, we know a good deal about him from Chinese, Persian, and even Latin sources. He was with Chinggis Qan from the early days and had the privilege of being one of the fifteen or so participants in the so-called "Baljuna Covenant." The fact that he is ignored by the Secret History may simply be due to his political roles, viz. the removal of all mentions of his name after he fell from power and was executed by order of Möngke in 1252.

In 1955 Uemura Seiji made a case for him as the possible author of the Secret History which still finds favour with some scholars in China, notably Bayar. While Chinggi, by virtue of his long association with Chinggis Qan and his position as bichii, with skill in writing and access to documentation, would no doubt qualify as a candidate for authorship (or as a recorder), it is surprising that, as a participant in the Baljuna covenant, he should make no remark at all on this momentous and dramatic event in the account of the Baljuna episode related in the Secret History. especially since we know from Chinese sources that the event in question – the solemn oath made on that occasion – was definitely recorded in the Tökhüpsen, the official history of the Mongol qan from Chinggis onward.

3. Sigi Qutuq (ca. 1180-1260), the adopted son of Chinggis Qan and one of his most trusted men. As Töng by birth, he held top positions in the administration and in the army, and enjoyed a long life. In 1264 he was appointed grand judge (zgre jargyu) and was at the same time entrusted with the keeping of legal and population records. Therefore, he must have been familiar with the Uighur script. In 1941 Himatsingkha first proposed his name as the author of the Secret History, and a strong case for his candidature was made by P. Rauchfuss in 1965. In fact it is most unlikely that, had the Secret History been written in 1228, Sigi Qutuq, as a member of the qan’s family, a literate person and in charge of written records, would not have been aware of its existence and would not have gained access to it, especially since the Secret History contains numerous sections concerning laws and ordinances. This being so, one must seriously take him into account as a possible author/composer.

An important consideration is also that there were at the time very few, if any, literate individuals in the qan’s family circle besides Sigi Qutuq (Chinggi was a close friend and associate, but still an outsider): he would indeed have been the most obvious candidate for such a task. There is, moreover, some internal, i.e. textual, evidence which could point to him as the narrator in the Secret History.

The main objection to this attractive theory has been raised by W. Hung, who remarked that Sigi Qutuq, ‘being with Chinggis on the campaign to the West, would scarcely have written about the seven years of war and diplomacy in the far regions in such a brief and dry manner, hardly comparable with the early sections of the book.’

This objection can, in my view, be safely dismissed. Although an active participant in the western campaign, Sigi Qutuq would rather have forgotten about it since he was responsible for the major reverse experienced by the Mongols in central Asia. After the battle near Parvata, Sigi Qutuq returned to Chinggis Qan ‘with only the insignificant remnant of his army.’ This fact alone, I think, would account for the superficial, almost dismissive way in which the war in the West is dealt with in the Secret History. Furthermore, the author of the Secret History was not interested in foreign people and punitive campaigns abroad,
married after her husband's death. As does Ratnchensky's theory about Sigi Qutuq, Colmau invokes a linguistic argument (the use in certain passages of the pronoun of the first person plural) to support his contention. Other hypotheses have been put forward involving either an individual person identified as a likely candidate, or an anonymous author belonging to a particular group or faction at the Mongol court. In this regard, we should mention the thesis of the eminent non-Mongolist writer LN Gurniev, who, after a thorough and perceptive analysis of the contents of the Secret History, reached the conclusion that its author must have been a member of the 'Old Mongolian Party', i.e., of the conservative element among the political leadership whose aim was to revise the traditional Mongol military values, the 'old days of valour', against the more educated and progressive element (represented chiefly by the non-Mongol advisers at court), whose aim was to set up a civil administration and rational exploitation of the conquered territories.

Finally, for Ligeti who critically reviewed some of the earlier theories, including Wang Hung's, the anonymous author of the Secret History ought not to be regarded as an author in the modern sense, but rather as a recorder-compiler of materials from many heterogeneous sources, since 'according to the practice of this age, the person of the author does not matter, he is unimportant, he stays behind the scenes, and only lucky, accidental circumstances would turn up his name. In the case of the Secret History of the Mongols too, we still have to wait for such a lucky, accidental circumstance.'

While agreeing in principle with Ligeti, I consider the most likely candidate as author or, better, compiler and author of the Secret History to be Sigi Qutuq. My argument in support of him is that he would certainly qualify as a member of Gurniev's so-called old conservative party, i.e. the 'old guard.' The Chinese sources are very critical of his management of affairs in north China, and the Secret History ignores all members of the opposing faction (Yeh-hui Ch'ingt'ai 黄渠 crim, Nien-ho Chang-
4. History of the text

The manuscript tradition of the Mongol text of the Secret History, as well as the vicissitudes of the Chinese transcription and translation carried out in the 14th century, have been the subject of a detailed study by W. Hung which appeared in 1951 and to which I have frequently referred. A good summary of Hung’s study by B.I. Pankratov appeared in 1962, and another one, by Chen Chin imeline in 1965.65 For pertinent comments and further information on the text in Uighur script and the Chinese version, we are indebted to L. Ligeti and F.W. Cleaves respectively.66 An essential chronology and bibliography of the Secret History was prepared by J.R. Krueger and published in 1967.67

The following is an outline of the textual history of the Secret History based mainly on the above-mentioned contributions, but with a number of my own inferences. However, because of the many gaps in our knowledge regarding the early period (13th-14th c.), the reconstruction as presented is still to a large extent conjectural.

The first reception of the Secret History was in Uighur script and the manuscript almost certainly had no “formal” title, the opening line Çinggis Qa’un-na ulaqut, “The origin of Çinggis Ça’an” which describes only the contents of the first, genealogical portion of the book, serving also as designation for the rest of the work — a classical case of pars pro toto. This practice is well attested in the West, witness the opening sentence of The Gospel According to Matthew.68 Furthermore, our epic chronicle did not require a proper title since it was not written to be published as a book, but was compiled solely for the members of the imperial clan.69

The words Çinggis Qa’un-na hula’ut represent the pronunciation of the opening sentence of the Secret History in the second had of the 14th century which in Uighur script read Çinggis Qa’un-na ufaqut. Since Çinggis Qan never bore the title of qajan (first assumed by his son and successor Ogodei), but only that of qan, the original opening words must have been Çinggis Qa’un-na ufaqut.70

In assuming that the opening words stand per se, i.e. are not grammatically connected with the words that follow them in § 1 of the Secret History and thus form a sort of title of the work, I agree with my predecessors Naka, Poppe, Mostaert, Ligeti, Munkami, Cleaves and Irvin. There is, however, a substantial body of opinion that disagrees on both counts, holding instead that the words in question are lexically connected with the next sentence and are, in fact, its subject.71

Unfortunately we are not informed about the fate of the manuscript during the several decades that elapsed between the time it was completed at Kode’s Aral and the beginning of the Ming period in the second half of the 14th century. What we know is that (1) a number of copies survived the turmoil at the end of the Yuan dynasty, and 2) in the course of transmission the original text had undergone certain modifications. Presumably,
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including the passages favourable to the house of Tolu to which Qubilai also belonged, 19) expunging references to events and personalities no longer approved of, such as those pertaining to the former chancellor Cinggis, 20) and 3) altering titles to confer posthumous honours on the imperial ancestors. The changes were arbitrary and often incorrect, as in changing the title of Cinggis to Cinggis Qan, Yiüge Qan, and Yiüge Qan, Cinggis Qan, etc. 21) In meddling with the text, the revisers may also have altered the order of the existing material, which would account in some cases for internal inconsistencies. 22)

The revision was probably a gradual process and, given the nature of the work, done entirely by Mongol officers or, even more likely, by members of the imperial clan and court baciśeın. 23) One cannot detect any Chinese historiographic bias or influence in the text itself. Although no dates can be assigned to the revision, most of the alterations were carried out in all likelihood during Qubilai's reign, when the Mongol court took an active interest in historical records.

The revised version, which we may now call Cinggis Qan-u ujarur to distinguish it from the Cinggis Qan-u ujarur, was in many respects different from the latter, a fact confirmed by comparison with the text preserved in the A lan toḥ. 24)

As stated earlier in connection with the ongoing compilation of the Töbdeı̇n, oral and written sources on the previous reigns were collected at the time. One of those was an account of Ogödai's reign compiled on the model and style of the Cinggis Qan-u ujarur and forming, as it were, a continuation of the latter. In all probability this account was never completed, or it may have reached Qubilai's court archives in a fragmentary state owing to the conflict between the Ogödaiids and the Toluids of the preceding two decades or so. Of its existence, however, we are certain, for what is left of it is the present section on Ogödai in the Secret History. As with the Cinggis Qan-u ujarur and the Töbdeı̇n, the other records in Mongolian were also subject to editorial work, as shown by the fact that the entry on Qara was

While this historiographical activity was going on in the latter part of Qubilai's reign and in those of his successors, the text of the Cinggis Qan-u ujarur underwent various changes at the hands of unknown editors who saw fit to 'improve' the original in the new political climate. These alterations, carried out independently from the activity of the Department of National History, consisted chiefly in 1) introducing new material,
inserted arbitrarily (and incorrectly, as it turned out) into the above account on Ogödei (§ 274). The investigation carried out by W. Hung into the history of the Mongolian manuscript of the Secret History indicates that from the later part of Qubilai’s reign onward, Mongol and Chinese officials were engaged in several history projects (one involving also the condensation of more extensive records), and that the prevailing suspicion of the Mongol court and officials towards Chinese officials aimed the historiographers’ task. This explains the introduction of a system of checks and counterchecks of the edited texts requiring multiple translations. For example, the Tohčüyan could be translated into Chinese by a non-Chinese official; at the same time, the Veritable Records in Chinese had to be rendered into Mongolian in Uighur script. With the records of the early rulers, the Chinese version had to proceed from the Mongolian, but for the later records starting with Qubilai’s reign the reverse was true.

As for the Činggis Qoşun-u uýýur, the account on Ogödei was used together with the extant records on the second emperor in the compilation of the Tohčüyan, and these records were then presumably shelved back in the archives. We know that the Tohčüyan was regarded as an ‘extremely secret’ document, access to which was forbidden except to the authorized, and the same no doubt applied to the Činggis Qoşun-u uýýur and its sequel.

In March 1369, immediately after the fall of the Yuan dynasty, a commission of eighteen historiographers of the College of Literature headed by Sung Lien (1310-81) began in earnest the compilation of the Yüan-shih, the official history of the previous dynasty. Among the documents that they retrieved from the secret archives of the former Imperial Library (pi-fu 特書, lit. ‘Secret Repository’), chief among them were the Veritable Records of Thirteen Reigns (Shih-shih chün-shih-lü 『十三朝史淵鑑』), which were at least two copies of the Činggis Qoşun-u uýýur and its sequel, the short account on Ogödei (see below). Unfortunately, the historiographers made no use of either source in their haste to finish the official history of the Yuan, a task they completed in a little over a year (July 1370),

In the following years, those unusual documents attracted the attention of the Mongol and Chinese scholars in the College of Literature who, after joining the section on Ogödei to the Činggis Qoşun-u uýýur, transferred the original colophon to the end of the former and made a free summarized version in Chinese of the entire text using one of the copies in Uighur script. Subsequently they prepared an interlinear phonetic transcription with a word by word interlinear translation into Chinese. Apparently the second operation was carried out on the other available manuscripts (or on one of the other copies), since there are numerous minor differences between the text of the free version and that of the interlinear version with regard to variations in both the transcription of proper and geopgraphical names and in the rendering of words, as noted by Pelliot, Cleaves and Mostert. According to Hung, such divergences can be accounted for by the fact that 1) more than one translator worked on different parts of the text, and 2) different translators worked on the interlinear and the free translation of the same section of the text.

By this time, the document found in the secret archives of the Yuan court, which lacked a ‘proper’ title, had been renamed Yüan pi-shih 元史, or Secret History of the Yuan, and Mongol and Chinese historians began basing their work on Tohčüyan in Mongolian, the latter being merely the Mongol counterpart of the Chinese text.

When, in the mid-Hung-wu period (1368-58), the Ming government decided to train Chinese students as interpreters in their dealings with the troublesome neighbours on the southeastern frontier, the College of Literature prepared a basic Chinese-Mongolian glossary with the Mongol words given in phonetic transcription, followed by a rendering consisting of twelve official documents in Mongolian, interlinearly transcribed and translated into Chinese, with the first five documents also having phonetic summaries in Chinese. The work was published in 1389
under the title of Hua-i-i-yü 華夷譯語 or Sino-Foreign (= Mongolian) Vocabulary.14 The aim of the compilers, whose names have been handed down, was to enable the user of this language handbook (altogether only 94 leaves) to speak, not to write, Mongolian; therefore, no Lighur script was employed. The Chinese language used in the Hua-i-i-yü is the so-called Yüan vernacular, i.e. the 13th-14th century northern Chinese colloquial used as the ‘official’ Chinese language during the Mongol period.15 The fact that the free Chinese version and the interlinear translation of the Mongol-un nııča tobočıyan were also in the vernacular, and that the system of transliterating the Mongol words with Chinese characters accompanied by Chinese glosses is the same as that used in the Hua-i-i-yü of 1389, shows beyond doubt that when the scholars in the College of Literature undertook the complex task of translating and transcribing the Mongol-un nııča tobočıyan with the addition of Chinese glosses in the first decade of the Hung-wu period, they did so also with a practical, didactic aim in mind. Significantly, in the edict of 1382 authorizing the compilation of the Hua-i-i-yü, it is specifically stated that the compilers could consult the Yüan pi-shih, i.e. the Mongol-un nııča tobočıyan ‘for reference.’16 This means, of course, that by that date the text of the Secret History was already available in translation and circulation.

Upon completion of the Hua-i-i-yü, or perhaps even while this handbook was still being completed, someone in the College of Literature decided to utilize the entire text of the Yüan pi-shih, i.e. the continuous free translation and the already ‘processed’ Mongol text, to provide 1) an additional rich source of language material for future interpreters, and, at the same time, 2) a vast store of sundry information on the lore and customs of the Mongols. The scholars in the College of Literature were by then well acquainted with the Yüan pi-shih in transcription, which they had ‘mined’ for words to include in the Hua-i-i-yü vocabulary.

To carry out this project certain editorial improvements were deemed necessary, drawing on the experience gained in...
of chronology, internal contradictions and historical accuracy. On the other hand, they were very meticulous in performing the task assigned to them, since accuracy in transcription and translation was of paramount importance. If they did not understand or were not sure about the exact meaning of a word, they left it untranslated. If there was an obvious lacuna in the text, they left a blank space. We do not know to what extent they improved the interlinear translation, i.e. the Chinese glosses, over that of their predecessors, but, as in the case of the Hwa-i i-yü, the renderings are almost always accurate. However, they were not overperspicacious and (quite rightly) did not deem it necessary to render the same Mongol word with the same word in Chinese; in fact, they frequently employed synonyms. Occasionally they made mistakes, both in the transcription and in the glosses, but these are comparatively few and easily identifiable.

Since the abridged free translation was originally carried out independently of the transcription and translation, besides the already noted variations in the transcription of proper and geographical names, there are also differences in vocabulary between the interlinear translation and the sectional summaries that will be discussed in the Commentary. As in the case of the Hwa-i i-yü, no effort was made to preserve the text in Uighur script which, the task successfully completed, was discarded and eventually lost.

We do not know exactly when the work was completed, but we know that 1) it was definitely printed, for although no complete exemplar of the book has yet turned up, we have the testimony of Ming scholars, as well as 41 leaves of the printed edition discovered in the Peking Palace in 1933 together with printed fragments of the Hwa-i i-yü, and 2) as shown by these leaves, its title was still Yuan pi-shih and its Mongol counterpart was transcribed phonetically under the Chinese title as Monggal-an niša (w=niša) to(b)i'cu' an.18

When the monumental Ming encyclopedia Yung-lo ta-tien 永樂大典 was being compiled (1403-08), it was thought desirable also to include in it the text of the Yüan pi-shih under the character

---

"Yuan" (according to rhyme). First, a neat copy of the abridged translation was made in 1404, with the title Yuan pi-shih changed to Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih 元朝秘史 or Secret History of the Yüan Dynasty. The editors of the encyclopädia then decided to include the full text in transcription, dividing the contents into 15 chapters which formed chüan 5179-5193 of the Yung-lo ta-tien.112 These editorial changes yielded an identical text (except for minor variants) with a different format and altered title, the Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih in 15 chüan. The alteration of the title may help us in dating, albeit approximately, the printing of the Yüan pi-shih in 12 chüan. We know that the Hwa-i i-yü was published in 1289 or, more likely, n.1390, because the date of the preface corresponds to 3 November 1389.133 As Hung pointed out, the Yüan pi-shih 'reader', with its more sophisticated system of transcription, 'could hardly have come about very soon after 1289.'124 We know that it took at least seven years to prepare (compile, cut and print) the Hwa-i i-yü.125 One may therefore assume that it would have taken several more years to process a much longer and difficult text like the Yüan pi-shih, particularly since the task was not urgent because the Hwa-i i-yü had just been published. I doubt very much whether the work could have been completed and printed before the second half of the '90s, the scanty data available suggesting a rather later date.

Firstly, the printed fragments of the Hwa-i i-yü found in 1933 bear a striking resemblance to the 41 leaves of the printed Yüan pi-shih, and Ch'en Yün's identification of the signatures of at least two of the woodblock makers indicates that the two texts were printed by the same team of woodcut craftsmen. However, as shown by Hung, the Hwa-i i-yü fragments belong to the second edition of this book.126 It is doubtful that a second edition of such a text would have been called for within ten years of the first.

Secondly, it was in the first years of Yung-lo's reign, i.e. in the period 1403-05 that we see an improvement, albeit temporary, in the relations of the Ming court with the Uriangai Mongols in the north; friendly embassies were exchanged between the two,
with regular markets and new provisions established for trading – the famous ‘horse fairs’ – the presentation of tribute, etc. It was also a most suitable climate for the (politically motivated) promotion of means to improve communications and intercourse with the Mongols, such as the publication of Mongol language textbooks. Significantly, the publication in 1389 of the first edition of the Hua-i-i-yü coincided with the submission to the Ming court of an important group of Mongol tribes – a determining factor in Chinese policy at the time.

Thirdly, as we have seen, it was just at that time, in 1404, that the Yuan pi-shih free translation was copied for inclusion in the great Ming encyclopedia, to be followed by the text in transcription, duly copied and included soon after.

Fourthly, the title of this work was changed to Yuan-ch'i ao pi-shih. If the Yuan pi-shih ‘reader’ had not already been printed, its title and, possibly, chapter division, would in all likelihood have conformed to those adopted by the Yang-lo ta-tien commission. Therefore, unless the cutting of the blocks and the printing were so far advanced by 1405 as to make any change in title and format impossible, the Yuan pi-shih was almost certainly printed and published before the Yuan-ch'i ao pi-shih was copied between 1405 and 1408. I would therefore suggest as a tentative date for the publication of both the Yuan pi-shih and the second edition of the Hua-i-i-yü the period 1405-06. I must emphasize that since no complete exemplar of the printed edition has survived, and none of the 41 extant leaves is the first or last leaf of a chapter, the argument ex titulo rests on inferences.

Thus, by 1408 we may assume the existence of three texts of the Yuan-ch'i ao pi-shih. (A) the printed text in 12 (10 + 2) chapters, (B) the manuscript copy of the Yang-lo ta-tien edition in 15 chapters, and (C) the manuscript, originally copied for the Yang-lo ta-tien (in 1404), of the free summarized translation also in 15 chapters. The earlier manuscripts of the free version, of the text in transcription and perhaps also of the text in Uighur script must have existed but their fate is unknown.

All the later manuscripts and printed editions of the text in transcription, i.e. of our Secret History, derive from A and B, and all the manuscripts and printed editions of the free summarized translation derive from C. While no original exemplar of A (except for 41 leaves) and B has survived, it is almost miraculous that C should have been preserved (see below).

There are numerous variant readings in A and B which have been listed and published by E. Haenisch. The variants are mostly due to copyists’ errors, which is not surprising, since they are found in later manuscript copies of A and B, as well as in modern printed editions based on these copies. Some errors occur in one only of either manuscript version. This leads us to believe that while the Yang-lo ta-tien copyists may occasionally have erred in transcribing a difficult text, the Ming editors of the encyclopedia had also at their disposal, besides the printed text, a good manuscript of the Yuan pi-shih for reference, which they used to correct some of the imperfections of A.

With regard to the colophon, since all the manuscripts deriving from A and B contain an identical text, the lacunae in it must go back to the Jinggis Xarg-yul ajarz manuscript(s) used by the early Ming historiographers and did not occur in the transmission of the Chinese text in transcription as surmised by Mostert.

I think it is evident from the above that the textual history of the Secret History in the 13th and 14th centuries rests largely on inferences supported by relatively few well-established facts; the picture could alter considerably with the discovery of new material. By contrast, the history of the text – more specifically versions A, B and C – during the Ming and Ching periods is well documented and, thanks to the meticulous investigation of Hung, now traceable virtually step by step. However, in view of its complexity given the mass of material available, it is not necessary to describe the text filiation in detail here, especially since Hung’s article is easily accessible. I shall therefore summarise the conclusions regarding the lineage of A, B and C as follows:

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

A. At least one exemplar still existed in China in the late 18th century. Chin Te-yo 金德裕 (d. 1800) owned an incomplete exemplar of A, and Chang Hsiang-yün 張相濬 (d. 1799-1806) possessed a good facsimile copy. Ku Kuang-ch'ı 郭光弼 (1776-1835) in turn had a good facsimile copy of Chang's copy made in 1805 after checking it against Chin's exemplar. Ku's copy is known as the 'Ku certified text' (‘Ku chiao pen 許校本’). 19

After passing through several hands, the Ku certified text came into the possession of the Manchu scholar Sheng-yü 盛昱 (1850-1900). It was subsequently acquired by the Commercial Press of Shanghai which reproduced it photographically and published it in 1936, in the 3rd series of the SPTK. This edition contains the 41 leaves of A discovered in 1933, and is regarded as the best modern edition (Y2). 20

A facsimile of the Ku certified text belonging to Wen T'ing-shih 文廷式 (1856-1904) was acquired by Yeh Te-hua 葉德輝 (1864-1927) who printed and published it in 1908 (Y3). 21

Both Y1 and Y2 are reproduced photographically in YSC, 311-621 and 2-310 respectively.

Y1 was used by Shiratori Kankichi 白鳥兼吉 in conjunction with Y4 for his own edition (with corrections and romanized transcription of the Mongolian text) in 1942. 22

Wen T'ing-shih had a copy of his copy of the Ku certified text made for Naito Torajirō 内藤常太郎 in 1902; this copy was in turn recopied soon after for Naka Michiyu 中道信之, whose annotated translation appeared in Tokyo in 1907 (N1a). 23

A manuscript copy formerly belonging to P. Gérito and now in the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, (Y3) is not discussed by Hung. It deserves attention insofar as it appears to be a copy of the Ku certified text collated with B, or with a copy of B, though its position in the stemma is not clear. 24

B. The original text was lost, probably during the Boxer War and the destruction of the College of Literature in Peking in 1900. 25

A manuscript copy of B was in the possession of Ch'ien Ta-hsin 錢大昕 (1726-1804).

Another manuscript copy – probably a copy of the above – belonging to Pao T'ing-po 濮廷波 (1728-1814) was eventually bought by the Archimandrite Palladji (P.I. Kafanov, 1817-78) in 1872, who transcribed and translated it into Russian. 26 A photo-reproduction of this copy was edited by B. Bankravtov (1892-1979) and published in Moscow in 1962 (Y4). 27 It is reproduced in YSC, 623-771.

A copy of the sectional summaries only, personally made by Chang Mu 鄭矩 (1805-49) in 1841, was collated by him in 1847 and published the following year in the Lien-yüan-li's 梁遠軒 藝術 (Y5). 28

Chang Mu's edition in 15 chüan was richly annotated by Li Wen-tien 李文田 (1834-95) and published posthumously in 1896 with marginal notes by Wen T'ing-shih (YC). 29

Although Hung's study covers most of the facts concerning the history of B, as in the case of A some information was not available to him at the time. For an updating of our information we have now M. Taube's brilliant article on the Palladji manuscript, and Harayama Akira's 原山昭喜 important contributions regarding the Li Hsin-yüan 林心遠 and Palladji manuscripts, including a complete list of the variant readings of these two texts. 30

C. This copy was for a long time in the Nei-kao ta-k'u 大內考文, the old storage building in the Peking Palace, then in the library of Liu Yao-yün 劉耀雲 (1849-1917), and in 1933 in Ch'en Yüan's library (Li-yüan shu-wu 立軒書屋) in Peking. A page of the manuscript is reproduced in YPSITYKT. 31

As we shall see, all the transcriptions and translations of the Mongol text of the Secret History are made from Y4, Y3 and Y1 (Y5 became available in photo-reproduction only in 1962) in conjunction with the Alm toboh text for reference, while the translations of the Chinese free summation version are made from Y1, as well as from Y2 and Y4. 32
5. The Secret History text in the Altan toboi

Whereas the text of the Secret History in Chinese transcription has been known for a long time - centuries in fact - the existence of its counterpart in Uighur script was unknown until 1920. In that year, Jamvyun Gung (1886-1930), the learned chairman of the Scientific Research Committee of the MPR (Bügdei Neyi-rangmaa Mongol Arad Uuljan Singhlekii Çagar-Am Kurye-ling) discovered a copy of the chronicle Altan toboi or Golden Summary by Blo-bzaa bstan-jin (mo. Lobzangdänjän, kh. Lavaaandzan; fl. 1700) in the family library of the tayjil Dar-i (Dadun) of the Yongsaye clan in the former Sang Bevis Banner (qoilsun) of Szel Qan Aymey, the present Bayan Uurem of Dormod Aimag. This unique manuscript was donated by the tayjil to the Oriental Library of the Scientific Committee in Ulun Bator. Jamvyun Gung found that a large portion of the Secret History was incorporated in the Altan toboi and, realizing the importance of his find for the investigation of the former, he promptly made a copy of the entire work by his own hand which he sent to P. Pelliot in Paris in 1927. It is through Pelliot that the scholarly world first learned about the Secret History text contained in the Altan toboi.

In 1932, B. Ya. Vladimirov in Leningrad obtained the manuscript or extended loan and during that period had a photostat copy made for the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, the present St. Petersburg Branch (SPh Filial) of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IV RAN), where it is still kept. The manuscript was returned to Ulun Bator in 1935, where it is held in the Academy of Sciences Library.

The great Burat scholar CZ. Zmarkhan (1880-1937), who had been exiled to Leningrad in 1932 for political reasons, studied the manuscript of the Altan toboi and prepared an excellent description of its contents. It was published in 1936 in his book on Mongol Chronicles of the 17th century.

In 1937, the Scientific Committee of the MPR in Ulun Bator published the text of the Altan toboi, unfortunately set in facsimile reproduction but in a two-volume printed edition.

The text of the Secret History in the Altan toboi was translated and included into S.A. Kozin's work on the Secret History which appeared in Moscow and Leningrd in 1941.

In 1957, the 1937 Ulun Bator edition of the Altan toboi was reproduced photographically by Harvard University and published as vol. 1 of the Harvard-Yenching Institute Scripta Mongolica series. This one-volume edition contains a valuable introduction by A. Mostaern.


In 1973, the Altan toboi was translated into Russian in Istan, with critical notes and a commentary, by N.P. Sastina, who had previously translated the Mongolian chronicle Saru taal.

In 1974, L. Ligeti, who had obtained a microfilm of the Ulun Bator manuscript, published a transcription of the Secret History text incorporated in the Altan toboi in his MLMC series.

An Inner Mongolian edition of the Altan toboi based on the Ulun Bator edition of 1937 with a rich commentary by Coyjii was published in Hohhot (Köekqota) in 1983.

Following a close examination of the Altan toboi manuscript in Ulun Bator in 1970 and 1987, the present author published an article in 1989 pointing out the shortcomings and unreliability of all the then available editions of the Altan toboi and, in particular, of the Secret History text preserved in it. The article concluded with a plea for the Mongol authorities 'to make this unique historical document available in facsimile or in photo-reproduction as soon as possible.'

In 1990, as part of the activities in Mongolia connected with the commemoration of the 750th anniversary of the writing of the
Secret History, the Mongolian Academy of Sciences published under the editorship of S. Bira an excellent photo-reproduction of the Altan toboi manuscript, thereby making the original available to scholars the world over. We are all greatly indebted to Professor Bira and his colleagues for having achieved this splendid task in a comparatively short time, and for the high quality of this now indispensable publication.

In 1992, a complete transcription and word-index of the Altan toboi by H.-P. Viete and Gengidz Lusbang was based on the 1990 photo-reproduction was published by the Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa of Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. Thus we are well-equipped at present to undertake a thorough investigation of the Altan toboi using the original text of the unique manuscript of Lusbangdaji's work. It should be mentioned, however, that this manuscript is a mediocre late-17th or early 18th century copy of the lost original, containing numerous misprints and faults (see below).

Since the 1930s, scholars in Mongolia, China, Japan, Europe and the U.S.A. have been studying the Altan toboi from literary, linguistic and historical points of view, and independently from the text of the Secret History incorporated in it. The main contribution to a comparative analysis of the Secret History and Altan toboi texts is unquestionably S. Colmaa's recent monograph. As amply demonstrated by Zanfranci, Heissig and Mastaert, the Altan toboi is a rich source of epic material related chiefly to the cycles of stories about Cinggis Qan, his sons and close companions (nibild). It is also a repository of wise sayings or "instructions" (murai, bilgi) attributed to the conqueror. Lusbangdaji has interwoven old epic tales and traditional wisdom with historical narratives drawn from a variety of sources, most of which are no longer extant, encompassing a period from the kings of India and Tibet to Cinggis' legendary ancestry, and, through Cinggis' sons and grandsons, to Dayan Qan (1370-1543) and Legden (Ligdan, Lindan) Qan of the Cagar (1592-1634).
and translators, as shown by the fuller accounts, i.e. additional words and sentences found in the former.\[90\]

9. The wide divergences existing at times between the Altn tobl account and the Secret History (Y) indicate that Lubsanganbajin used another (unknown) source on Cinggis Qan besides the Secret History.\[91\]

10. The ‘mutilated’ sections, i.e. those sections of the Secret History which are given in a shorter version or left out altogether in the Altn tobl, are due either to Lubsanganbajin’s editorship and selection criteria, or to the fact that they were not in the manuscript he used. The latter is probably the case for the section (§§ 276-280) devoted to the succession issue, which is in all likelihood a later interpolation in the Cinggis Qan-ufjar, and for the entire section on Ogide (§§ 269-281).\[92\]

The conclusion that can be drawn from Ligiét’s analysis is that the Secret History text used by Lubsanganbajin is essentially the 13th century Cinggis Qan-a ufjar rather than its somewhat later (but still 13th century) recension, the Cinggis Qan-a ufjar.\[93\] The variant readings concern mainly the orthography, the original early readings of the word usually being retained, albeit in a corrupt form, often to the point of unrecognizability due to copystis’ errors. Other changes, such as those affecting names and titles (e.g., Cinggis Qan > Sunu Boyda Cinggis Qan; Muqali > Muqalli, etc.) are purely formal, as are the grammatical ‘improvements’ introduced by Lubsanganbajin. All the major changes we observe in the Altn tobl could, therefore, be due to additions and deletions by Lubsanganbajin himself who had at his disposal yet another source on Cinggis Qan, and who as a compiler did not hesitate to omit material which he regarded as unnecessary or irrelevant, or to interpolate epic pieces of a later date into the Secret History narrative. (Zamarian believed that some of these pieces go back to the time of Cinggis Qan; consequently, C. Dandinsuren has retained them in his modern Mongolian version of the Secret History.) However tempting the above conclusions may be, the presence in the Altn tobl version of the same anachronisms concerning post-1228 events as appear in the Secret History indicates that the Altn tobl text represents in all probability an intermediate version.\[94\]

Nevertheless, as demonstrated by Pelliot, Ligiét, Mosbert and other investigators, the value of the Secret History text in the Altn tobl cannot be underestimated, since it not only allows us to fill in a number of lacunae, but also to restore the original readings of numerous doubtful names and terms. In the case of proper and geographical names in particular, the ambiguity of the Uighur script combined with the fact that, as Pelliot writes, the Mong transcribers ‘étant profondément ignorants du passé de leur pays’,\[95\] meant that quite a few of their transcriptions are not reliable, and it is with help of the Altn tobl readings that we can reconstruct their original form.

Unfortunately, we do not yet have a truly critical edition of Lubsanganbajin’s Altn tobl, and the only translation of it in a western language is Satsina’s Russian version. Her work leaves much to be desired: a new translation based on a critical edition of the text was, indeed, one of N. Pelik’s desiderata.\[96\] Following the publication in photo-reproduction of the Ulun Bator manuscript, and the historical and linguistic researches by Coylli, Ozawa, Orlovskaya and others, it would now be possible to undertake such a task.

I have made constant use of the Secret History text of the Altn tobl in the Commentary. A list of the Secret History passages in the Altn tobl is found in Appendix Two.

6. The Secret History as history and literature

Opinions on the value of the Secret History as a historical document differ widely. At one extreme, some historians and writers, the main representative of whom is R. Grousset, use the Secret History as their main source on the life of Cinggis Qan, being, however, fully aware of its epic flavour and biases, i.e. of its unreliability on several important events.\[97\]
At the other, scholars like A. Waley and O. H. Hirschberg regard the *Secret History* as almost worth as a historical record.ii

Somewhere in the middle we find P. Pelliot, B. Vladimirov, L. Hambis and P. Ratchevsky who have subjected the *Secret History* version of events to close scrutiny on the basis of a comparative investigation of all the available sources, accepting, rejecting or re-interpreting entire episodes as well as the chronology and sequence of events presented in the Mongol chronicle.iii

As for S. Bira, the longest section of his *Studies on Mongol Historiography is devoted to the *Secret History*, which, in the words of the author, is 'a creative product of the entire collective of court aristocrats of antiquity and of-tale-tellers. Bira maintains that this product -- a history, in fact, of the 'Golden Clan' of Chinggis Qan -- was written for the instruction of the successors to the founders of the Mongol empire. The 'epic fragments' interspersed in the *Secret History* (of which the Eri gives a useful breakdown) also serve a definite purpose. viz. by being organically linked with the general subject-matter and the aim of the narration they serve as a picturesque vehicle equivalent to a graphic illustration of the events described, and are the chief means of expressing historic views. The *Secret History* is, therefore, a historical record and 'upon close inspection of the monument it is not hard to also note a purely historical approach taken both by its authors not only to the distant past, but also to their contemporaries.' Moreover, 'from the viewpoint of historiographic attainment, the basic parts of the *Secret History* are likewise remarkable by the fact that in them we have to deal with a quite complex presentation of chronology.' iv

But this depends on the political philosophy of the author of the *Secret History*, the central theme of which according to him is the creation of the Mongol state, i.e. the concept of *Mongol samar* which was 'the most powerful attainment of the historical knowledge of the Mongols of that time.' This concept is nowhere formulated specifically in the shape of a complex historical procedure but is

not hard to get an impression of it when analyzing the basic data of the monument. This fact, that first and foremost it relates the genealogical history of the Mongolian khan, already of itself bears witness to the strengthened interest in history of the ruling elite, personified by the khan. In conclusion, for Bira, 'the *Secret History* is the outstanding monument of Mongol historiography.'v

Bira is also of the opinion that the authors of the *Secret History*, while relying largely on oral tradition, made use of written records.vi

Another author who has dealt at length with the political significance of the *Secret History* is I.N. Gumilev. For him, as for Bira, this work is the product of a representative of the ruling elite (for Bira, however, the authorship was collective) who, as mentioned earlier, was also a member of the 'Old Mongol Party' and whose ideal and political platform were 'a return to the old days of valor.'vii

We may, perhaps, see too much in this multifaceted compilation. Although the *Secret History* is clearly neither a history of Chinggis Qan like Juvinel's work, nor a bare chronicle of events like the Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu (and, presumably, the lost Ta-hsien),viii but a clever melange of historic-narrative prose and epic poetry constantly and unexpectedly blending fact and fiction,ix it would be more accurate to call it 'the epic story (or account) of Chinggis Qan' and adopt Pelliot's designation of 'epic chronicle' for it.x

Following in Pelliot's footsteps, we shall continue to extract from it data -- there is a rich store of them -- which not only confirm what we already know from other contemporary records, but which also complement them, especially with regard to the location of certain events and the persons involved. It is noteworthy that some 900 proper and geographical names are found in the *Secret History;* (many of which are not attested in any other source) against the 640 of the Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu.xi

Trying to separate all the purely historical facts from the semi-fictional or wholly fictional accounts in the *Secret History* is
an extremely difficult and often impossible undertaking. It can only succeed in a limited number of instances where totally independent sources support the Secret History version. Regrettably we shall never know which (if any) of Chinggis Qan's numerous 'references recorded in the Secret History are the conqueror's quisima verba. Several typical episodes, such as Temujin's rescue of Borte, may actually have been made up by the compiler inspired by popular accounts and folk-tales — indeed as was done by Greek and Roman annalists. In my opinion, however, it is not in the historical aspect of the work that the real interest of the Secret History lies, but rather in its faithful description of Mongol tribal life in the 12th and 13th centuries, especially with regard to the role of the individual in that society. In this respect, the Secret History is a true mine of information. The central theme of our epic chronicle is the modus operandi of one dominating figure who, together with the other leading characters — his family and retainers — skilfully manipulates the society of his time to achieve his one goal, viz. tribal supremacy for himself and his clan against innumerable odds. The Secret History describes this process in great detail, showing the manifold facets of his complex personality. If there is one message which the Secret History conveys in unequivocal terms, it is that success as a leader cannot be achieved without good fortune and strength bestowed by Heaven and Earth, and the loyalty of one's retainers and subjects. Such a leader, then, rules by the will of Heaven, i.e. by divine right. It goes without saying that the process cannot operate successfully without the leader observing on his part the "Criminal Code", i.e., reward, care and protection, towards his followers and dependents. This conception has an almost exact counterpart in medieval Europe and is the perpetuation of the Teutonic System.

Thus, the Secret History is above all a source of the first magnitude for the social history of the Mongols before the establishment of their world empire. Although its primary concern is obviously the 'aristocracy of the steppe', going through its pages one also gains constant insights, more than just glimpses, into the lives of ordinary people and the interplay between chiefs and subordinates. Data furnished by the Secret History have been put to full use by B. Vladimirov to describe what he calls 'Neuromantic feudalism.' His work on the subject is, in spite of certain controversial generalizations and biases, and the limitations imposed by the times and circumstances in which it was written, the best survey of Mongol society and social relationships in the time of Chinggis Qan and up to the beginning of the 18th century. For a sharp bird's-eye view of the 12th-13th century Mongols from an ecological and social perspective, Fletcher's posthumous article of 1986 is still unsurpassed.

The dynamics of conquest in the harsh human and physical environment of Mongolia as perfected by Chinggis Qan and illustrated by the Secret History is masterfully synthesized by O. Batter in his essay published in the Scientific American in 1963. The Secret History provides first-hand information on the military organization of the Mongols under Chinggis Qan and Ogedei, and on Chinggis' regulations concerning the duties and responsibilities of the Guard (kelek) — the most important institution of all and the one which instated, together with the strict enforcement of the Mongol 'Law' (yasu), the enduring success of the conqueror's armies.

Besides informing us on the political and religious attitudes of the tribal elite and providing a detailed picture of nomadic life, social stratification and military matters, the Secret History is also major source on the material culture of the medieval Mongols, and aspect of the book which has not yet been fully investigated.

While recording for his successors and, indeed, for posterity Chinggis' wisdom and organizational skill and foresight, the Secret History also sings the praise of the other (and perhaps the true) heroes in the saga — the valiant companions from early days such as the four hounds and "the four steeds", as well as the commanders of a thousand without whose total commitment to their leader, Chinggis would have remained one of many tribal chiefs in northern Mongolia.
The saga meets with history when the bard becomes the chronicler, because those celebrated heroes are real people (even if at times colourfully portrayed as supermen) and their feats on the battlefield, in spite of the occasional reverse, are only too true. It is in this regard that the Secret History is for us a special document; it adds both flesh and soul to much that we learn from the Persian and Chinese historians by giving us the facts as seen, or perceived, from the Mongol camp, in other words "from the inside."

The Secret History has no precursor nor real successor in the Mongol historiographical tradition: although they are both no longer extant, I think we can confidently say that neither the chronicle known as the Alan death (Golden Book) used by Rashid al-Din, nor the earlier-mentioned Tobiyam, belong to the same genre of 'historical' writing as the Secret History.\(^\text{26}\) For this reason I hesitate to place the latter within a historiographical tradition as Bira does, and in view of the still uncertain date of composition of the Alan tobei, to regard Lobsangdanjin's work as 'the first such big Mongolian chronicle', thus giving it priority over Sayang Sechen's Ehrentin tobei of 1662.\(^\text{27}\)

The Secret History stands alone also because it is so close to the events it relates. If we choose to ignore its historical aspect, we can still enjoy it as a literary masterpiece, being the only monument of the early pre-Buddhist Mongol literary literature, written in a language which reflects the character and culture of the Mongols before their conversion and the subsequent impact of Tibetan civilization on their way of life. As rightly noted by Zancarano, 'The changes of the texts from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as compared to those of the seventeenth century (even if only paraphrased), give an idea of the differences between the two periods and also between their speech formation and contents in reference to their vocabularies. The simplicity, bluntness, and genuine truthfulness of the narrative of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries with their ancient wording, on the one hand, and on the other, a certain ornamentation, garnished with Buddhist concepts and expressions of courtesy and reverence before superiors, and the legendary character of the narratives of the seventeenth century.\(^\text{28}\) It is indeed true that the extravagant, fantastic and magical element that characterizes the later Mongol epic is almost totally absent from the Secret History which, in this respect, is remarkably sober. On that count alone, the Secret History occupies a unique position in the literary history of the Mongols.

The language of the Secret History deserves special attention. Insofar as the pronunciation of the words is concerned, the text in Chinese transcription gives us only the phonetic representation of how the Ming transcribers read the manuscript of the Secret History in Uighur script, in the second half of the 14th century. Therefore, the text in transcription does not reflect the spoken language of the time of composition, viz. the language spoken by Chinggis Qan, or, at any rate, in the Mongol court milieu of the early 13th century.\(^\text{29}\) In the more than 150 years between the time the Secret History was written and the time it was transcribed phonetically into Chinese, the so-called Middle Mongol language had undergone and was still undergoing various changes, some of which are attested in the transcribed text, affecting both vowels and consonants. Among the phonetic changes one should mention the following: i > i; q (u) > k (u), h (init.) > zero, a'a > å, e' > e, o'o > ø, u'u > ù, a > a and a > a (through assimilation). Moreover, the value of certain consonants (gy, kg and tsh) is still uncertain.\(^\text{30}\) Nevertheless, it is possible to turn the text from Chinese transcription into Uighur script more or less mechanically. This has, in fact, been done with the "preclassical" text in romanized transcription and in Uighur vertical script.\(^\text{31}\) It is impossible to say how the original text in Uighur script, i.e. the Chinggis Qan-u aflast, was read ca. 1230: the very reconstruction of this text from the Chinese transcription even with the help of the Alan tobei will always remain a tentative and, in my view, somewhat futile attempt. For instance, the word for 'rat' in the Secret History is quagana, for this is the form in which the Ming scholars recorded it seven times in transcription.\(^\text{32}\) In all the reconstructions of the text in Uighur script...
we find güljüna, which is the corresponding form in Written Mongolian.\textsuperscript{211} However, in the first half of the 13th century (1240 to be precise), this word was written güljüna, because the vowel a of the second syllable had not yet been assimilated to that of the first syllable. In all likelihood, the manuscript used by the Ming transcribers had güljüna, which they read as güljüna (= güljüna) and transcribed as such.\textsuperscript{212}

Although most of the basic vocabulary of the Secret History is common to Written Mongolian and to the modern dialects in the same or in related forms, many words have survived in one dialect but have disappeared from others. The dialects in which they are attested may be spoken in opposite parts of the eastern Mongol group, such as the Burut dialects in the north, and Ordos and Kharachin in the south.\textsuperscript{213} Several dozen words are borrowings from Turkic languages, mostly Uighur,\textsuperscript{214} as well as from other languages like Persian, and less than 20 of the 32 that were not glossed by the Ming translators are still a puzzle.\textsuperscript{215}

Because of the heterogeneous character of its vocabulary, Mongologists have been unable to relate the dialect of the original text of the Secret History to any modern dialect in particular.\textsuperscript{216} Apart from the above-mentioned phonological problems concerning the evolution of Middle Mongolian in the 13th and 14th century, the grammar of the Secret History has been thoroughly investigated in the last fifty years and there are now several major publications on the subject.\textsuperscript{217} However, especially in the lexical area, problems still remain and much of the Commentary in the present work is devoted to their elucidation.

Žalmazan had earlier described the Mongol narrative of the 12th and 13th centuries as characterized by simplicity, bluntness\textsuperscript{218} and truthfulness. Insofar as the Secret History is concerned, a further insight into its language and style is provided by A. Moustaret who remarked that ‘la langue de l'hist. secr. est caractérisée par une grande liberté de construction, la rapprochant sous certains rapports de la langue joumalaire telle qu'elle est encore parlée de nos jours.’\textsuperscript{219}

Besides the above characteristics, the most noteworthy feature of the Secret History as a literary work is undoubtedly its epic content about which much has been written in many languages, and which is undoubtedly its chief 'attraction' for most readers. Pelliot called the Secret History a repository of ‘morceaux de poésie épique populaires’, preserving many fragments of a ‘gesta’ in rhymed prose.\textsuperscript{220} Waley regards the parts of the Secret History founded on story-tellers' tales as 'some of the most vivid literature that exists anywhere in the world',\textsuperscript{221} and he is certainly right.

In the Secret History there are some 166 rhymed passages of varying length, from two to more than eighty verses (with a few non-rhyming lines in between), with from seven to a maximum of twenty-four poetic passages per chapter. More than one-third of the entire work is in alliterative verse, i.e. in poetic form.\textsuperscript{222} There are also several lyrical and dramatic passages in prose narrative.\textsuperscript{223} The 'gnomic' parts of the Secret History, i.e. the numerous proverbial expressions and wise sayings, are usually rhymed, as we would expect.\textsuperscript{224} The epic pieces were originally sung by the story-teller following the ancient tradition of the Mongol and Turkic bards, a good example of which is the Book of Dede Qorqut, where 'the stories in prose are interspersed with rhythmic, alliterative, and assonant or rhyming passages of sósilana, "declamation." The level of the language fluctuates, now highly poetic and dignified, now racy and colloquial.'\textsuperscript{225}

While Palladit, Naka and Haensch ignored the poetical passages in their translations of the Secret History, most other translators have in one way or another isolated these passages, and in some rare cases turned them into real poetry.

One of the first Western scholars to discuss specifically the epic element in the Secret History was N. Epstein, who devoted several pages of his work on the Khalkha-Mongolian heroic epic to it.\textsuperscript{226} J.R. Knüsel discussed the poetic passages in the Secret History in the context of his study of those found in the Erdene-sin tobči.\textsuperscript{227} At various times other Western scholars have written about the poetry of the Secret History,\textsuperscript{228} and an interesting article
on the style of the Secret History by A.V. Kudiyarov was published in 1986, but up till now no comprehensive treatment of the subject has been undertaken.

One cannot, however, separate the poetic passages in the Secret History (Y) from those in the corresponding sections of the Altan tobö. Except for the long missing section (§§ 176-208) and, of course, the one on Ögödei (§§ 269-281), most of the poetic passages in the Secret History have their counterpart in the Altan tobö. Furthermore, as stated earlier, there are epic passages in alliterative verse interspersed in the Altan tobö text of the Secret History which have to be treated separately. In comparing the two versions of the same poetic passage it is an interesting fact that the Altan tobö version, as noted by H.-P. Vietze, is at times at variance with the Secret History text. Apart from the verses that were left out altogether by Luibandsarjin, there are 1) verses in the Secret History taken over into the Altan tobö with slight orthographic or stylistic changes, and 2) poetic passages which contain more words or even more lines in the Altan tobö. While a full comparative study of the two texts is still due, a number of examples of differences between the two texts has been provided by Vietze. One can also profitably consult Šátina's translation of the Altan tobö, where all the poetic passages are rendered in versified form. In the Secret History an epic or dramatic passage may be accompanied by a reference to the wise words of the ancients and by a quotation in the form of an alliterated saying or maxim. For example, in Höl'äün's famous 'Lament' (§ 78) the angry mother of the two murdered children (Temžin and Qaxar) 'Citing old sayings Quoting ancient words' mightily scolds her sons, reminding them of the desperate plight of the family, for 'We have no friend but our shadow, We have no whip but our horse's tail.'

There are many such sayings and proverbial expressions in the Secret History, some of which have survived in the modern dialects and are found in the large collections of Mongolian proverbs. All those in the Secret History have been identified and discussed in an important article by D. Cerensoydom published in 1986. Equally important are the traditional folklore elements, also forming a part of the oral tradition of the Mongol tribes, that recur in the epic poetry of the Secret History, e.g. the theme of the mongique (§§ 78, 195) which in our work is still an ill-defined monstrous animal of the dragon-snake type, not yet the future mangwē-oğre. We owe to the late S. Gaadamba the most detailed analysis of these folkloric themes within the literary and historical framework of the Secret History. Gaadamba's overall contribution is undoubtedly the best introduction to the study of this text as a source of folk traditions as well as a literary masterpiece. He will often be quoted, together with other Mongol specialists in folk literature, in the present Commentary.

Ultimately, as rightly pointed out by Ligeti, much of the debate as to whether we should classify the Secret History as a historical or a literary work is sterile, since it originates from the assumption that a Mongolian or 'eastern' literary genre would be identical with a western one, not to mention that at a given period of social evolution certain "pure" genres cannot be found even there where they clearly developed. Summing up we can safely state, I think, that the Secret History is, indeed, an epic chronicle rather than an heroic epic, aimed at recording not only the decisive and pronouncements of Chinggis Qan, but also those of his faithful companions in a language and style that reflect the attitudes and values of contemporary Mongols. It is at the same time a glorification of the conqueror's clan for the sake of posterity, especially of his immediate successors, and the mere fact that it was put down in writing so soon after his death (in the form which it still largely retains) indicates, in my view, that it was also meant to serve as a guide and instruction, not just as a plain record see for entertainment. Even in the most poetic passages of the Secret History there is an undeniable consciousness of history, and we are reminded of A. Fichter's remarks on Virgil's Aeneid which may well apply to the Mongol epic Chronicle: 'The dynamic theme brings into focus what must be
considered one of the most basic elements of epic, its consciousness of history. The narrative strategy of the dynastic poem reflects the assumption that the present may be regarded as the culmination of a course of events set in motion in the remote past. The dynastic prophet is an analyst of historical experience. He beseeches on himself the privilege of shaping his material so that “beginning, middle, and end all strike the same note.”

7. Transcriptions, translations and modern editions of the Secret History

The Mongol text of the Secret History in Chinese phonetic transcription has been transliterated and transcribed, i.e., reconstructed, several times into Latin and Cyrillic script as well as into Mongolian in Uighur script.

The first transcription from Chinese into a western alphabet was done in Cyrillic script by Palladii (who did not know Mongolian), apparently for the benefit of scholars who did not know Chinese. Together with the transcription, Palladii provided also a word by word interlinear translation into Russian based on the Chinese interlinear version. This, Palladii's last work, was carried out between 1872 and 1878 on Pao T’ing-po's manuscript copy which he had acquired in 1877 (see above, Section Four). Palladii completed his work in 1878 and apparently gave it to the well-known Russian mongolist A.M. Pozdneev (1851-1920) in the year when the latter visited Peking where Palladii resided as head of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission, on the understanding that Pozdneev would have it published in St. Petersburg. Palladii died at the end of 1878 in Marseilles on his way from Peking to St. Petersburg. Two years later Pozdneev published the bilingual first chapter of Palladii's transcription and translation of the Secret History under his own name. In 1866 Palladii had already published a Russian transcription of the Chinese free summarized version in vol. 4 of the Works (Trudy) of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission (see below).
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It was through this translation and Pozdneev’s publication of 1880 that the Secret History first became known in the West. Pozdneev used Palladii’s work for other publications without, however, acknowledging its true source, but he never succeeded in having it published in full, although several attempts were made by the Imperial Russian Archeological Society to carry out the project. After Pozdneev’s death in 1920, the manuscript was kept in the Archives of the Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad/St. Petersburg, where it is still today. A neatly typed copy, formerly belonging to Pelliot, is in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris. The complex history of the Palladii manuscript and of Pozdneev’s rather unsavoury role in it, is now known through the painstaking research of various scholars.

The authors of the reconstructions of the Mongol text in transcription based on Y′, Y′′ and Y′′ are listed below in chronological order:

1872-78 Palladii (P.I. Kastorov) published ms. (see above)
1920 P. Pelliot: completes his transcription in ms.
1935 E. Haenisch
1937 Idem: 2nd edition
1939 Hattori Shiro, Qu. Durâşab: only ch. 1 in Uighur script
1941 S.A. Kozin
1942 Shiratori Kurosaki
1949 P. Pelliot
1962 E. Haenisch: reprint of 1937
1964 L. Ligeti
1971 L. Ligeti: 2nd edition (see 1964)
1972 I. de Rachewiltz
1980 Bayar: in Uighur script and phonetic transcription
1984-89 Ozawa Shigeo: in Latin and Uighur scripts
1995 T. Dạśćedźi
1996 Eldengtei, Ardajib: in Uighur script
1997 Ye. Irmid: in Uighur (preclassical) script
1999 B. Surnymbaatar: in Uighur script
Mongolian. Fortunately, we are well served in this respect because the grammar and syntax of the Secret History have been thoroughly investigated, particularly the former. Since the early eighteenth century, several fully-fledged grammars have appeared by J.C. Szczet, S. Godźiński and S. Otowa, and thorough investigations of various aspects of the language of the Secret History and of the Mongol documents of the 13th and 14th centuries have been published in various forms (articles, monographs and books), including a dictionary of the language of the Al仟an tobェ, incorporating numerous examples taken from the Secret History. 189

By now, the vast literature on Middle Mongolian in 'Hapsa and other scripts (Pinyin, Arabic, etc), together with the extensive studies of the Mongol manuscript in Uighur script, have largely filled the gap in our knowledge of the old Mongolian language and made a difficult text like the Secret History much more accessible. One major subject that requires further in-depth study is the unstable, and therefore complex, syntax of the precritical period. Another matter that requires a frontal attack is the vexed problem of transcription, with scholars still divided on the value of the velar and dental stops, of the intervocalic 'ausa' hiatus ("-"), and other issues. 190

The study of the vocabulary of the Secret History has been greatly helped by the publication, almost sixty-five years ago, of Hämisch's precious Wörterbuch, 191 and by the word-indices that followed it. The first of such indices - a reverse one without page or paragraph references - appeared in 1969; a complete index zu den 192; a complete index vocabulary (without suffixes) in 1993/2000, and a complete word- and suffix-index (together with a photo-reproduction of Y) in 2001. 193 One of the most valuable tools for lexical research into the Secret History, especially with regard to difficult terms, is the product of a joint effort by a team of scholars from Inner Mongolia who have examined, often in great detail, the semantic connotations of hundreds of words. 194
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An international team of researchers is at present at work preparing a dictionary of Preclassical Mongolian that will also include Middle Mongolian forms. 195

9. The present work

This Introduction is meant to serve its literal purpose, viz. only to introduce the reader to the Secret History and its Problems. It covers the main issues such as the place and date of composition, authorship and textual history without confusing the reader with too many technicalities. The value of the Secret History as a historical source and the literature on the subject are also adequately dealt with.

On the other hand, much more could be said about topics like the relationship between the Secret History, the Altan tobェ and Rashid al-Din's account on Cinggis Qan; on the ideology and political philosophy underlying the work; also about its value as a source on the social and economic history of the period; and, especially, concerning the special position it occupies in the historical and literary context of Central Asian epics. Indeed, any of these topics could easily be the subject of a book. I hope that eventually these important aspects of the work will be dealt with as they deserve, drawing on sources and information that were not available to scholars of earlier generations. References to the sources and to the contributions already made by modern and contemporary investigators are found in the Commentary. Regrettably, some publications from Russia, Mongolia and China could not be consulted, and a number of them have been cited second-hand. 196

The translation follows by and large the model of the first edition (19), seeking a compromise between faithfulness to the Mongolian original and readability. This is not easy to achieve because of the very different nature of Cinggis Qan's language and the Queen's English. Whereas F.W. Cleaves' translation is meant to be a literal as well as a literary rendering of the original (hence the King James Version's English), mine is primarily
the introduction dealing with the textual history of the *Secret History* is incomplete.\(^{37}\)

At times difficult to the point of obscurity for the lay reader,\(^{38}\) Cleaves' book is nevertheless of paramount importance because it represents a joint effort by the two greatest scholars in the field of the old Mongolian language (i.e. Preclassical and Middle Mongolian).\(^{39}\) Mostart's and Cleaves' painstaking work is the basis for all present and future translations, a true *monumentum aere perenni*, and versions of the Mongol epic chronicle have immensely benefited from it. For this reason I have included in the present work a list of Additions and Corrections to Cleaves' book (Appendix Five).

As to the translation of the Chinese summarized version, the one by Palladit, though occasionally hard to read, is still the most accurate, whereas Waley's is certainly the most readable. The latter is unfortunately far from complete, but all the passages of literary value are included.

The three indispensable editions of the Chinese text (Y', Y', and Y') have already been discussed in Section Four. The one-volume complete edition of 1975 (YSC) is the most convenient to use, as it is easier to obtain than the three separate ones. Ozawa's six-volume work (Or) provides a reliable, critical edition of the text. The one-volume edition of Erlenmeyr and Oyundalai (El-Oy) is also convenient to use, and the pagination does not correspond to that of Y' and Y'. The text has been heavily edited, and the free summarized version at the end of the volume is in simplified characters. Bayar's edition in three volumes (Ba), carefully produced, is the most inconvenient to use because, unlike El-Oy, the *Secret History* sections, i.e. the 282 paragraphs, are not numbered, and the line arrangement and phonetic transcription do not make the easy identification of a word or passage. In spite of their shortcomings, these too are valuable contributions.

---

8. Modern and contemporary studies on the Secret History

To find one's way in the *mare magnum* of the literature on the *Secret History* is not easy. Articles, essays, monographs and books on the subject are published in a dozen languages and they have been increasing in number, especially in the last two decades. Some of them appear in obscure, inaccessible or near-inaccessible journals or publications. The quality of these contributions is very uneven, nevertheless, it is necessary to consider as many of them as possible.

General and specialized bibliographies (including bibliographical essays and articles) are the two best sources of reference, together with the catalogues of library collections.\(^{40}\) Many journals on Asian history, philology and linguistics, and on Central Asian and Mongolian studies publish articles on the *Secret History*;\(^{41}\) the most important contributions - articles, monographs and books - are listed in the bibliographies of books on the *Secret History*, such as the present one. A special place is occupied by the proceedings, acts and transactions of the various conferences and congresses on Asian, Altaic and Mongolian studies where many papers on all aspects of the *Secret History* are published.\(^{42}\) Next come the newsletters, occasional papers and monographs of societies like the Mongolia Society of Bloomington, Indiana, into which material related to the *Secret History* also finds its way. To these we must add the anniversary volumes, *Pätschichten*, and volumes containing articles mostly or exclusively devoted to the investigation of the *Secret History* - all publications easy to miss.\(^{43}\)

Unfortunately we do not yet have a *Bibliographie raisonnée* of the subject issued at regular intervals and must, therefore, plough through much material to find the required information, and use personal contacts, which is often the best way.

Of primary importance for the study of the *Secret History* is the material dealing with its language, i.e. the so-called Middle
designed to provide the reader with an accurate but at the same time fairly fluent translation into modern English. While the criteria that have guided our respective versions are different, these are, nonetheless, complementary. I have continued to use the italic type for my own additions to avoid parentheses and square brackets; I have, however, kept them for less intrusive purposes (see the Conventional Signs). I believe that the translation must not only be readable but look readable as well and a great number of parentheses or brackets tend to deface a page. Since a few Mongol and foreign terms had to be retained in their original form (e.g. quda, gir qan), I had recourse for those to a different font (Monotype Corsiva: quда, gir qan) to avoid confusion. I have also employed a more scientific transcription of Mongolian and other Altaic languages, and have not hyphenated compound proper and geographical names as in the previous edition.

One of the most difficult aspects of the translation has been adherence to consistency in the use of italics particularly with regard to possessive pronouns and genitives which are normally printed in italics (e.g. a rule, italicized), and in the translation itself when rendering the same Mongol word or expression into English in a different context. In deciding whether to italicize a pronoun or a word, I let myself be guided more by intuition and Sprachgefiihl than by logic, thus inevitably opening myself up to criticism. As for consistency in translation, given the fact that in Mongolian as in all languages many words can and do have a wide semantic range, while trying to be as consistent as possible I took into account both the context and English usage. There cannot be "perfect" consistency, as shown also by F.W. Czaykowski’s effort to produce a "methodically literal rendering of the Mongol text. Likewise, I had to use different ways of translating the Mongolian verba dicata to avoid awkward constructs in English. The translation is accompanied by footnotes to assist in solving immediate problems of interpretation without constantly referring to the Commentary, and to advise the reader whenever checking the Commentary is indispensable for a full understanding of the passage. Hence also the numerous cross-references in the footnotes to other passages and to differently spelled proper and geographical names. Like most works of this kind, the same name can recur in slightly different forms. Thus the footnote serves as an instant aid to the intelligence of the text.

The Commentary has grown over the years and is now almost twice the size of that of the first edition - a fact which reflects the development of Mongol studies in the last two decades. Although meant to be both historical and philological, the Commentary does not deal with all the linguistic features of the Secret History, but only with those that are relevant to the understanding of the text and are still dubious and/or contentious; the same applies to historical problems. For a much fuller treatment of individual words and terms, as well as of grammatical and syntactic peculiarities, the reader is referred to Ovazawa’s monumental oeuvre. There, unfortunately, no counterpart of Ovazawa’s work to solve the historical and geographical puzzles posed by the Secret History. Unresolved problems still remain, but it is my sincere hope that the Commentary has gone quite some way towards solving the major conundrums still besetting mongolists and non-mongolists alike.

In order to simplify the user’s task, a number of appendices have been provided together with three indices: the Commentary can thus serve not only to elucidate the text and the translation, but also to refer the reader to a wide range of topics directly and indirectly related to the Secret History.

Finally, the following points should be noted.

1. The text (in transcription) on which the translation is based is the one I published in 1972 (R), fully revised.

2. Except for orthographical errors, which are usually corrected and mentioned in the footnotes, the form of proper and geographical names in the translation is that found in the Secret History. Variant and alternative readings are given in the footnotes and discussed in the Commentary. However, the tribal name Mongol (= Mongol) is always written Mongol,
and Činggis Qaan is written as such, never as Činggis Qahan.\footnote{And except for a few names like ‘the Mongols’, ‘the Tatars’ and ‘the Uighurs’ which have practically been assimilated into most western languages, I have left all the Mongol and Turkish tribal names unchanged in the plural, thus ‘the T’ayid’il’, ‘the Q’inggil’, ‘the Naim’, etc. Several of these names are, in fact, already plural forms in Mongolian. In doing so, I have followed the practice adopted by P. Pelliot, A. Mostaert, F.W. Cleaves and other scholars.\footnote{See Section Seven of the Introduction.} \footnote{Two in Chinese, one in Madeh, three in Japanese, one in German, and one in English (partially). The complete English translation by J.R. Kruger has not yet been published. There are also several modern editions of the text in Mongolian. See ET, XXI, MAM, 121-124.} \footnote{See Section Four of the Introduction.} \footnote{See Section Six of the Introduction.} \footnote{Wa, 7.} \footnote{Cf. xi.} \footnote{Wa, 7.} \footnote{Cf. xi.} \footnote{See Section Four of the Introduction.} \footnote{See Section Six of the Introduction.} \footnote{See Section Four of the Introduction.} \footnote{See de Rachewiltz 1965; idem 1968/87, idem 1993/94.} \footnote{See the Commentary, § 282, de Rachewiltz 1998, 240, 251-253.} \footnote{See the Commentary, § 269.} \footnote{So much so, in fact, that some later (17th c.) Mongol chronicles, including Te, give him locally also as the place where Činggis was first elected, see the Commentary, § 123.} In the Introduction, book titles are given in full, but in the Notes they are referred to in their abbreviated form as listed in the bibliography and abbreviations.}
1941 Kobayashi Takashito: Japanese20
1945 Naka Michiyoshi: Naka Michiyoshi: 2nd edition of 190720
1947 C. Damănsuren (C. Damănsuren): m.M.U.s.2
1948 E. Hainisch: 2nd edition of 194120
1948 P. Pelliot: French ed. 1-6 only20
1948 A. Temir: Turkish21
1948 C. Damănsuren: Inner Mongolian edition of 194720
1950–52 A. Mostaert: French; numerous sections and passages2
(see 1953)
1951 C. Damănsuren: Chinese translation by Hashi Tsak-shan20
1953 A. Mostaert: one volume reprint of 1950-5220
1955 P. Poucha: Czech20
1957 C. Damănsuren: 2nd edition of 1947 in Cyrillic script2
1957 C. Damănsuren: Inner Mongolian edition of 194720
1960–62 Yao Tsung-wu and Sechin Jagchid: Chinese2
1962 L. Ligeti: Hungarian20
1963 Iwamura Shimuzu: Japanese2
1965 Kuo-yı Piao (Unessen): English; ch. 9 only2
1970 S. Kaluzhny: Polish2
1971–85 I. de Rachewiltz: English2
1973 S.A. Kozin: Italian translation of 1941 by M. Ogiškev2
1976 C. Damănsuren: 3rd edition of 1947 in Cyrillic script2
1978 Delorme: Chinese2
1979 Delorme: reissue of 19782
1979 Sechin Jagchid: Chinese2
1979 C. Damănsuren: Kazakh translation by S. Magua3
1980 Delorme: m.M.U.s.; partial translation2
1981 E. Haenisch: W. Heissig edition of 19482
1982 F.W. Cleaves: English; vol. 1 (Translation) only
must be mentioned. They are the following, also listed in chronological order:

1866 Palladis: Russian
1857 Wei Kwei Sun: English
1863 A. Waley: English
1997 Cénd Gin: m.M.U.42
2000 L. Ramírez Bellerin: Spanish

In view of the great number of transcriptions and translations available, it is appropriate to inform the reader of their relative merits.

Among the romanized transcriptions of the Mongol text, those by L. Ligeti, I. de Rachewiltz, S. Ozawa and J. C. Street are recommended provided that the first two are used together with their later additions and corrections.44 The linguist will probably find Ozawa’s and Street’s transcriptions more to his or her liking.

Concerning the translations, the works by A. Mostaert, L. Ligeti, M. Murakami, S. Ozawa, P.W. Cleaves, Doronaitis, S. Gaandamba and D. Cerésodosnam are, I think, indispensable. Ozawa’s monumental contribution is a sine qua non for the wealth of its linguistic commentary; neither can we dispense with the rich annotations and commentaries of Mostaert and the other scholars. For the early period, I regard the contributions by M. Naka and E. Haenisch as outstanding and, indeed, unmatched until the appearance of Mostaert’s and Ligeti’s epoch-making studies.

Cleaves’ work deserves special mention. The aim of this translation is to render the original Mongolian as faithfully as possible, even as far as the grammar and sentence structure are concerned. To match the ancient language of the original, the English used in the translation is somewhat archaic, modelled by Cleaves on that of “the language of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures.”44 Cleaves himself thought that his translation was more suitable for recitation than for silent reading.44 Although numerous footnotes have been added to the translation, the projected commentary volume never appeared and
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SH into Chinese, i.e. De'1 and De'2, also give 1240. See De'1, 276; De'2 42A, n. 1. See also, however, note 1, p. 81-82, for more propostrants of this dating in the PPC. For divergent opinions in Mongolia and China, cf. xvi: 415-416, n. 691, C6, 494-495, n. 704; Yu TC 1982, Jmggln 1992 (an important contribution).

15 EM, 230, 303; CKV, 'Introduction historique', v+1.
16 Poth 190401, 1-2, n. 1.
17 Hung 1951, 488-490. Hung's manuscript article has been translated into Chinese by Hung Shih-chan 翁士昌 in CKYSY2 1982, 18-40.
18 Mo, 264-265, n. 254. I think that Mostaert was in favour of the year 1240 because in a letter from F.W. Cleaves to Joukowsky of 26 December 1962 kept in the C.I.C.I.M. Archives in Rome, discussing the date of the SH colophon, Cleaves states: 'date qui, a mon avis, est abreton 1240.' I very much doubt whether he would have made such a statement if Mostaert had not been of the same opinion. Cf. below, n. 32.

19 See Weale 1960, 529. The view that the SH could not have reached its present form till well after 1258 but already been put forward by Naka in a work published posthumously in 1915 (Nori, 'Chingnun kan jitsuraku zuho', 62, 64), however, Naka believed that the relevant passage in the SH was an interpolation made in the text after its composition. See Weale, loc. cit.

20 Ledyard 1964, 10. In 44 on pp. 10, Ledyard points out that the evidence presented in his paper does not exclude 1226 or even 1288.
21 Li, 210-213. Cf. also ATL 6 and 9-10.
23 YTL 15, 4c. CF Hung 1951, 487, n. 136.
24 Umemura 1955.
26 Ratchnevsky 1965, 118-119; cf. ISK, 92.
27 de Rachewiltz 1965. It should be mentioned, however, that Nisio Michio (1907) and Ishihama Jurunji 石見嘉隆 (1940) had claimed that the original work, consisting of ten chusei, was composed in Chinggis Qan's time (Naka or, as my source, before 1240 (Ishihama), and that the last two chusei, i.e. the Supplement (kakusho katsudō) was added in 1240, the year to which -- both scholars agree -- the colophon refers. See de Rachewiltz 1965, 187; Hung 1951, 466-468.

28 See de Rachewiltz 1965, 198ff.
29 Chaucer 1966, 29-30, Mozr. III, 377-378, and 393-398 (for a fuller discussion). Munkacsy 1979, 24; 80, II, 254-255, 282, n. 1; GIB, 165-161; cf. and K. Tsuchiya, 'Nori Munkacsy', 83ff.; Jmggln 1992, 681-685; Ga', 415-416, n. 691; C6, 494-495, n. 704; Onn, 173. For Murakami's views on the dating of the SH, cf. also Munkacsy 1979, where the author first proposes a scheme whereby the original text was composed in 1228, additions were made in 1252, and the final form of the work was achieved in 1324 (the '1326' in the article is a printing error). With regard to Cleaves, in 1962 he was convinced that the year of the colophon corresponded to 1240 (see above, n. 25). However, in 1966 he informed me (p.c. that he agreed with my argument in favour of 1228 (de Rachewiltz 1965). This was confirmed in his letter of 7 March 1992 which also explains why he never expressed his opinion on the subject in print. See below, n. 312.
30 Cf. e.g. Th, 217.
31 See above, n. 36.
33 Ka, 16-17. Cf. CL, lv+lvv.
34 They include B.P. Pankovskii, Kuo-yi Pao (Wetstien van de Boeijingen), S. Jagodz, M.-D. Dvon and R. Pop. See Yu. 'Predloženie', 5; Pao, 'Introduction', Ja, 450, n. 2; Ev-Pop, 313, n. 79. Also cf. Inoue's noncommittal position in YSH, 135.
35 Mo, 264-265, n. 254; Li, 211; MSW, 24; de Rachewiltz 1965, 196.
37 See Hung 1951, 466-472; de Rachewiltz 1965, 193; idem 1958/57.
38 See de Rachewiltz 1965, 196-191; MSW, 19-20; and, with regard to Bata's thesis, of the Commentary, § 282.
39 See YS, 20, 638; MWES, 13, 1b. Yusin Temür's election took place on 4 October 1213. Cf. RC, 104 (K, 7). By the seventh month (22 July-15 August) of 1213 the great assamblage had long been dissolved, and there is no mention in the detailed records of the YS of another qalwa being held at that time. See YS, 29, 649.
40 See Section Four of the Introduction. In the present section I have outlined the views on dating held by the major investigators of this important issue. However, for a comprehensive survey (which is not deemed necessary here), relatively minor contributions should also be taken into account, such as: N. C. Munkacsy's book review in ÁAK 3 (1963), 138-141; 1 Legrand's comments in GUINDEL, 169-172; Z. Tóthmérés's article in ÉAlAM, 1990, 3:33; Paul Wee-Kii in MI 12 (2002), 105-125, etc.
41 See SH, §§ 270, 274, 275, 276 and 277.
42 More precisely, before August 1246 and July 1251. The term for this idea comes from a pertinent observation (first made by F.W. Cleaves e.g.) which he might have developed in the projected vol II of his magnum opus.
43 See Section Six of the 'Introduction'.
44 The question of whether the body of Chinggis's laws known as the Jasaq, of which there are several references in the SH, was committed to writing in Chinggis Qan's time has not yet been settled. For recent discussions see de Rachewiltz 1995; Skrynnikova 2000.
INTRODUCTION

Be Sake claims, in fact, that the author of the SH must have been a member of the Borjigt clan, largely on account of his concern with the family genealogy in the early portion of the work and the many references to members of that clan scattered throughout the text. See OAM01, 1980: 6, 45-59; GMD01, 1999:2, 99-103. Also, in § 165 of the SH, the narrator referring to Gyn Qon' s son Senggam says, 'he spoke disparagingly of us.' The pronoun us (u'dik-j) refers to Cinggau Qon' s family, not to the Mongols in general, as evident from the context. Hence, the person who relates the incident, the narrator (and presumed author), appears to be a member of that family.


See YS § 124, 3048-3049. The rest of his biography (8 lines) is devoted to his four sons.


On Cinggau see P. Buell in ISK, 93-111, and Buell 1994. See also the other references to him in ISK, 769a (Index), esp. pp. 152-153.

See HTSL, 2a-b, CG, 92. Cf. Cinggau 1951a, 495-503. It is possible that the three lines in Mongolian at the end of the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1280 were added by Cinggau. If so, we have a sample of his handwriting.

Cinggau 1961, 74, pl. 1

Cinggau 1951a, 110-111 (Bibliography). Cinggau is mentioned in John of Plai Carpen's Historia Mongoliorum. The Franciscan envoy of Pope Innocent IV met the chancellor, whom he calls 'prontonatarius,' at Gycl'e's camp in Mongolia in August 1266. See SDM, 320, 324, 325, 392, 398; SMX, 63, 66-67.


See Successors, 5.1. See Li, 207.

On Cinggau 1951, 10-12; Ba, 1, 尋 "蒙古研究" の作者紹介, 101; NSYCGWL, 165-181. For Bayar, however, Cinggau was only one of several learned historians who took part in compiling and writing the SH.

For the significance of the Balloua oath, see Cinggau 1951a. For the brief treatment of the Balloua episode in the SH, see §§ 182, 183. For Cinggau and the Türkmen, see Hung 1951, 484-485.

On Sio Qotuqi see Ratchnevsky 1965, idem in ISK, 75-94, CK1, 207b (Italian), CK1, 304a-b (finale).


See Ratchnevsky 1965, 119-120, ISK, 92. Cf. the Commentary, § 269. Mundkur 1979, 121-125, is also of the opinion that Ratchnevsky's argument in favor of Sio Qotuqi is strong since he had all the necessary qualifications, such as an intimate knowledge of Cinggau Qon' s family, literacy, status, etc.

Hung 1951, 486. See the SH, §§ 254-264.

The Secret History

TDML 442. Cf. the SH, § 257 and com.


See the SH, § 135.

See the Commentary, § 135.

Hung 1951, 486-487.

Ibid., 492.


See the Commentary, §§ 67, 68.

See e.g., S. Gerold in RONTEASA, 190-201 (cf. the English version in OAM01, 1980: 1, 67-73). Gerold's references cited at the end of the present section.

See Gerold 1979, an English version of his article in TMAE, 45a-50.

Ibid., 205-209.

Ibid., 209-210. Cf. also Whinney 1984, 219, where the same view is preserved.


Ibid., 52. For a critical appraisal of the whole issue, see Mundkur 1979, 10-26.

See "V. Predelović," 5-17, Chen C. 1986.

See Li, 194ff. Cf. "Introduction" (pp. xvii-lxv).

See Kaszub 1969.

See the Commentary, § 1. For a comparison with a similar usage in the Manuscript, see supra n. 39. See also Xiong.

See Section Six of the Introduction, ad fin. Later chronicles like the Tobaqis and the Alan lettris were given formal titles under Chinese and Persian influence. Cf. Hung 1951, 440ff, 465ff, 471-472, Li, 201.

For the difference between the Mongol language of the text新颖 and that in Chinese phonetic transcription, see Section Six of the Introduction.

See the Commentary, § 1.

See Li, 201, 465ff.

See Li, 194ff. Cf. "Introduction" (pp. xvii-lxv).

See Xiong.

For the case of titles of Mongol names, see the Commentary, § 254 and § 255 and significantly missing in the AT, could have been interpreted during Mongke's reign, but I think it unlikely since all the other versions and interpolations occurred under Qubilai and, possibly, later. This is certainly the case of title figures. See above, n. 95, and of the mention of Korea in § 274 which, since it refers to an event of 1228, could hardly have been interpreted by mistake in 1228-1259. The passage in which it occurs belongs to the section on Ogitan (§§ 269-281) which is a later addition anyway.
The practice of retrospectively confirming the title of gawen on Chinggis Qan and his most illustrious ancestors, both direct and collateral, must have begun between 1260 and 1271. See ibid, 74, 77, 376, n. 10.

These are noted and discussed in the Commentary. As will be shown further on in this section, the lacuna in § 282 affecting the place-name following that of Selgelenz must have occurred in this stage in the transmission of the Mongol text, no doubt caused by a抄写ist who left the word out by mistake. The fact that the omission was not noticed at the time should not surprise us, since it also passed unnoticed by all present-day Mongol and western scholars with the exception of Morslaert.

We know that with regard to the Tobotynan the emperor himself ordered certain insertions to be made. From the time of Qubilai onward the emperor was in fact directly involved in the compilation of historical records which had to be presented and read to him, and formally approved. See Hung 1951, 466, 473.

See Section Five of the Introduction. It should be emphasised, however, that while the revised version may reflect later, e.g. pre-Tulun, biases, the tendentious attitudes already manifest in the Chinggis Qan-uv ulji were retained, among them the minimisation of the K_BLUNA events and the role of TUB Tengger (no mention of the part he played in Chinggis’ election in 1206), and the falsified account of Jurena’s death.

Likewise, the incorrect date of the Year of the Rat (= 1228) for Qubilai’s enthronement (which actually took place in 1229) in § 269 is no doubt due to careless editing and it is further proof that this section does not belong to the Chinggis Qan-ul jerm.

Hung 1951, 465-481.

Ibid., 470.

For Qubilai’s change of attitude towards Chinese officials after Li T’ien’s rebellion of 1262, see H.L., Ch’in in ISK, 516-519. Cf. ibid., 247-248, 257-258, 344, 346.

Hung 1951, 466, 470-472. It is worth noting that the decision recorded in the entry of 11 January 1287 in Y’s 11, 294 to translate the Yelüchi Record into Mongolian specifically mentions that the Mongol script to be employed was the Uighur script, not Phags-pa.

Although the Tobotynan is no longer extant, its Chinese counterpart for the reign of Qubilai was the second of the Wu-ch’ao shih-lu, i.e. the T’ai-tung shih-lu, compiled in 1301. This was one of the main sources for the Annals of T’ai-tung, the T’ien-hi. See Hung 1951, 473, 481. A good deal of the information on military campaigns, the duties of the Guard, and taxation found in the Mongolian account on Qubilai filtered via the Tobotynan and the T’ai-tung shih-lu into the Annals of T’ai-tung, albeit in a very abbreviated and somewhat revised form, and in other parts of the Yu-n-shih. Cf. § 311, §§ 276-280 and Y’s 2, 30-36. See Abramowski 1975, 124-134.

See Hung 1951, 464. Cf. ibid., 495-511 and n. 43.


See Cleeves 1986a, 67; ibid., 1993a, § 5, 6.

See Hung 1951, 459-460; Cleeves 1993a, § 6. Most of the work had actually been completed by September 1370. See ibid., 5.

With regard to the script used in these texts, there is not within any doubt that it was the Uighur, not the Phags-pa script. In the past there has been some controversy on the subject, especially among scholars in Japan, some of whom held that the Minq scholars inherited and worked on a text of the SH in Phags-pa script, into which it had been transcribed from its original Uighur, and there is still some lingering interest in this theory and some variations of it among contemporary scholars. See ZJAMME, 21-24, n. 1; GHR, 306-363; GH, 42-69; Whitaker 1984, 220-223, 222, and Kramer 1969, 29, 30, 31 (for the relevant articles by S. Huttin and S. Muravina; LCHL, 4). A reconstruction of §§ 1-6 of the SH in Phags-pa script is found in Qul, 1, 451-503. This theory, together with the earlier theories of O. Frank, S. Kezis and N. Poppe, and those of Hutteri and Otawara about the original form of the text being a Sino-Mongol version, or an Uighur text transcribed first into Phags-pa script, and hence into Sino-Mongolian using the same technique to transcribe Chinese sounds into Phags-pa script (see GCR, Y. 7-10, No. 25-26; Poppe in HZAS 13-15, 1950, 268, but see ibid., 266, and Poppe 1969, 275, 276, 1-9), are now of purely historical value. The text used by the Mongol scholars of the College of Literature was in Uighur script, as shown by numerous idioms and expressions of the Chinese transcription noticed by several investigators, see HCC, 54 et passim. Mo, 4 et passim; Ch., 463; Preface, 7-12; Y. ‘Predislavie’, 6. For a full discussion, see Li, 191-196. Cf. also Allan in 2000, 120; Thomsen 1958; Gauden 1993. Shapkarjiev 1984; Satio in Add. & Com., 40-52, and the Commentary, § 251. Concise evidence is also provided by the fact that in 1287 the Yelüchi Record (shih-lu) from Chinggis or were to be translated into Mongolian in the Uighur script, not in Phags-pa script. See above, n. 103. The Mongol government’s practice to use the Uighur script for certain writings and the official’ Phags-pa script for other purposes deserves special investigation. See, provisionally, S. Fuchin in WAW, 94-95.

For the system of transcription used, see below, n. 7.

For Filliozat 1940-1941, 7, FCQ, 133; Cleeves 1965, 68; Mu, xi.


The title ‘Yen-po-shih’ appears for the first time in an entry of 20 January 1382 (the ‘1382’ of Hung 1951, 452, is a misprint) in the Ming shih-lu 明实录. See Hung, loc. cit. The Mongol version of this title occurs in the later printed
edition, but both maps must no doubt go back to the time when the free version and the transcription were made.

124 There is a vast literature on this famous vocabulary which has been edited, transcribed and translated into various languages. These studies are all based on the text (presumably the 16th-century edition) of the 1399 edition, which is a reproduction of the 1399 edition, seven examples of which were in the Peking National Library. See, e.g., "Predelisov", 12, cf., however, PTSM, 14, which lists only one example. On the Henry, see, in particular, HSJH, 247-274; SMG and SM; Lew. Lew., "Material I, and Material II, "Questions problems", de Rachewitch 1996; MCT, 153-275 (also with reconstructions of the words in Oubina script) QU, HSJH, 203 (1.1.11); and the bibliographical references in the above publications. The ingenious system devised for the transcription of Mongol sounds with Chinese characters is examined in detail in YPS79Y7, and Lew. See also below, n. 118.

125 On this language, which still needs a full, systematic investigation, see provisionally Chwolson 1904, 1905 and 1906; CY, passim; YPS79Y7 (and Irya Yoshitsuka's "Note sur le tibétain" in TFGH 25/1956, 180-228); LSCII, MOI (and F. Aubin's review in TP 75/1949, 167-177); Zogr 1993; de Rachewitch 1967; Clavc 1959; GCTVC, CY, S79Y7.

126 See Hug 1951, 452. Cf. also ibid., 448. The compilers extracted words from the Faian ps-shih for inclusion in the first part of the Henry, i.e. the Sino-Mongolian glossary, which contains 844 entries.

127 The first five documents in the Henry of 1389 are transcripts, an edict, and a diploma issuing from the Ming government and addressed to Mongolian personages. They were originally written in Chinese and subsequently translated into Mongolian. The other seven documents consist of letters and reports of Mongol chiefs addressed to the Ming court and government, originally in Mongolian, they were subsequently translated into Chinese. For some reason, no Chinese sectional summaries of letters and reports are included in the Mongol text of the SH. Ch'en Yuang's "English" translation of the 1399 edition was the first attempt at this work in a western language. In order to have a full, systematic investigation, see, in particular, CY, CLAVC, (1949), 497-499, SMG, L2, "Predelisov", 14-20, and Kuz'menkov 1937 and 1953. For a comparison of the systems employed in the Henry and the Faian ps-shih, see Hug's important remarks in Hug 1951, 454-461; S. Murzunova in TFGH 22 July 1961, 1-16, and TFGH "SIV, III, 432-433; and, of course, Lew.

128 For an attempt at reconstructing the punctuation of the original Mongolian, see YPS79Y7, and SMG and SM, 1944.

129 The analysis - note surviving of the Ming printed edition - have been reproduced in V. See Hug 1951, 449-450 and n. 19 (for the location of the leaves in question in V). Cf. "Predelisov", 26. The title in the margin is clearly "Faian ps-shih, ris Faian-shen shih peishih. See Y. 3, 9a, as in passim. The title of Faian shih shih shih that we find at the beginning and at the end of the individual chapters must have been introduced by Ku Kuan-shih's "Memoir on the Faian shih shih" (1776-1835), who took it from the book. See the text in the Faian shih shih, with which he was well acquainted, in 1805. Cf. Hug, 1491, 437-449; Y. "Predelisov", 7; "YCS, "Hau", 28. As for the Mongol rendering of the title itself, it is the same in all the later texts deriving from the printed edition: V. 1, 1a; V. 1, 1a. (For much more see the Commentary, § 170.) For the printed fragments of the Henry, see further on, and below, n. 125.

130 See Hug 1951, 433-435, 456, 461-465. The free summarized transcription was not included in the Henry ed. Hug, but a manuscript copy made in 1404 has survived. See further under C.


132 See pl. 4 of YPS79Y7.

133 Hug 1951, 461.

134 The Mong shih shih entry regarding the compilation of the Henry is dated 20 January 1382. See above, n. 116. Cf. also Material I, and Material II, 17.

135 See Hug 1951, 462.

136 ibid.

137 See HEM, 24; HEMAC, 18-21; SMRM, III, 29-30.

138 See SMRM, II, 5-7; DHMEM, 19-20.

139 This is somewhat at variance with the dating of 1404-1406 proposed by Hug. See Hug 1951, 462-465. I regard Hug's argument about the Faian shih shih being part of the latter "Enlarged Faian shih" as valid, but its subsequent inclusion in the latter has no bearing on the book itself having been printed in the Yang-lo period.

140 Liger writes that the "magnificent mongol original (i.e. a. en enormous ouvrage-mongole - i.e. a huge Mongol work) was expanded by the editors at Xwre's request (i.e. Th'au's, 81). I do not know on what evidence he based this statement.

141 In H, 128-138.

142 I.e., Y. of Y. and Y. (Hagin's, Y. C. and P).

143 See Hug 1951, 458, n. 61.

144 We may, however, draw an inference of the Mong copies as the three examples of incorrect readings cited by Hug, p. 61, are not taken from B, which no longer exists, but from "ICPS-P-P", i.e. from the so-called
A photographic reproduction of the original edition is now available in the SLPS.

Li's work is also included in the TSCC, 1st ser., nos. 3907-3909. For a valuable revision of YC by Kao Pao-ch'uan 考柏全, see YCPC. Another annotated edition of Cheng Ma-yü's 陳茂藹 Xi ming cheng shu 世明程書 has been reprinted in Taipei in the JNWP series. All the critical investigations (including geographical and other commentaries) by Ch'ien T'ung-ch'i 池廷執志, editor of YCPC, are based on this text.

Another annotated edition of the work, by Wang Shih-ch'ien 王士捷, is also available. The work is also included in the TSCC, 1st ser., nos. 3907-3909. For a valuable revision of YC by Kao Pao-ch'uan 考柏全, see YCPC. Another annotated edition of Cheng Ma-yü's 陳茂藹 Xi ming cheng shu 世明程書 has been reprinted in Taipei in the JNWP series. All the critical investigations (including geographical and other commentaries) by Ch'ien T'ung-ch'i 池廷執志, editor of YCPC, are based on this text.

Another annotated edition of the work, by Wang Shih-ch'ien 王士捷, is also available. The work is also included in the TSCC, 1st ser., nos. 3907-3909. For a valuable revision of YC by Kao Pao-ch'uan 考柏全, see YCPC. Another annotated edition of Cheng Ma-yü's 陳茂藹 Xi ming cheng shu 世明程書 has been reprinted in Taipei in the JNWP series. All the critical investigations (including geographical and other commentaries) by Ch'ien T'ung-ch'i 池廷執志, editor of YCPC, are based on this text.

Another annotated edition of the work, by Wang Shih-ch'ien 王士捷, is also available. The work is also included in the TSCC, 1st ser., nos. 3907-3909. For a valuable revision of YC by Kao Pao-ch'uan 考柏全, see YCPC. Another annotated edition of Cheng Ma-yü's 陳茂藹 Xi ming cheng shu 世明程書 has been reprinted in Taipei in the JNWP series. All the critical investigations (including geographical and other commentaries) by Ch'ien T'ung-ch'i 池廷執志, editor of YCPC, are based on this text.

Another annotated edition of the work, by Wang Shih-ch'ien 王士捷, is also available. The work is also included in the TSCC, 1st ser., nos. 3907-3909. For a valuable revision of YC by Kao Pao-ch'uan 考柏全, see YCPC. Another annotated edition of Cheng Ma-yü's 陳茂藹 Xi ming cheng shu 世明程書 has been reprinted in Taipei in the JNWP series. All the critical investigations (including geographical and other commentaries) by Ch'ien T'ung-ch'i 池廷執志, editor of YCPC, are based on this text.

Another annotated edition of the work, by Wang Shih-ch'ien 王士捷, is also available. The work is also included in the TSCC, 1st ser., nos. 3907-3909. For a valuable revision of YC by Kao Pao-ch'uan 考柏全, see YCPC. Another annotated edition of Cheng Ma-yü's 陳茂藹 Xi ming cheng shu 世明程書 has been reprinted in Taipei in the JNWP series. All the critical investigations (including geographical and other commentaries) by Ch'ien T'ung-ch'i 池廷執志, editor of YCPC, are based on this text.
1976:70, and, for Prof. Ozawa's early contributions (mainly, linguistics), ROM, 37 (1951-72). See also the bibliography in MNTLAT, main.

MNTLAT. For a concise introduction to the subject, see ibid., ivi.

See Zamec., 82ff; Zamec., 58ff; AT, xiii-xviii; Henss 1976a; idem 1985b; Lubasheznik & Vareck 1959; Okada 1959. Cf. also de Rachewiltz 1962b.

Ko, 331-397 (incomplete) AT, xvii-xviii; see also the 3rd section of this essay "Shishima's translation is not very good." Cf. also MWB, 171, n. 3, 172, 228; and de Rachewiltz 1958b, 202 and n. 2.

CW, the original edition of which (Les Conquérants du Monde [Vie de Gengis-khan]) appeared in Paris in 1444 - undoubtedly the most popular and well-written biography of Cingular Qin in any language - is largely, in fact almost entirely, based on the SH. For many of such biographies (by M. Prawdin, R. Fox, R.P. Lister, M. Hoang, etc.), however, careful points out throughout his work that the account as presented is "the revival of the Mongol bard", "the 'Gest' of so and so", "this quaint little drama the Mongol bard has staged for us", etc. etc. See CW, 8, 15, in passim, and his revealing remarks in the Introduction to the text, 321-324.

See ATL, 67-70; Legert calls the AT: "une copie assez médiocre." For the language of the AT, see YAT. Cf. also Aalto 1973; M. N. Orlovskaaya in OCM; 13, 336-360; Lee SG 2001 and Čerma 2002.

See Mason in AT, xi; N. Poppe in HAs 16:1953, 278; ATL, 6-8; Vizi 1995, 240-241.


See above, n. 177, and for other examples of episodes or passages in AT which are not found in the SH, but were recorded in the sources used by Raitt al-Din and by the compilers of the SWCC, see Lee 2001. See Zamec., 85-108, Zamec., 90-97, where Zanacuaro discusses the differences between the parallel accounts in the SH and AT.

See Sections Two and Four of the Introduction. For the relevance of some of these omissions, see Li, 200, however, Legert does not comment on the significance of the omission of the section on Gimbali.

The same conclusion, viz. that Lubasheznik in possession of the original text of the SH, is tentatively reached by Vizi in Vizio 1953a, 308.

This is particularly evident in the material corresponding to §§ 262 and 263 of the SH which mention Sümbet's attack on Kor and Yaluwa and Maquri's reintervention in north China, both events having taken place during Qubilai's reign. (I wish to thank Dr. Paul D. Brill of Seattle, Washington, for his critical remarks on the AT version of the SH list made in his letter to me of

13 March 2002.) For the AT passages incorporated into Dadimburn's version of the SH, see Appendix Three. Cf. Zamec., 80, Zamec., 57.

HGC, 333

In a letter of 15 December 1954, Poppe sent me a list of Mongol works that in his view should be translated in order of the Alien works: by Lubasheznik is the third one after Šishima's work and the SH (even if) because "Shishima's translation is not very good." Cf. also MWB, 171, n. 3, 172, 228; and de Rachewiltz 1958b, 202 and n. 2.

CW, the original edition of which (Les Conquérants du Monde [Vie de Gengis-khan]) appeared in Paris in 1444 - undoubtedly the most popular and well-written biography of Cingular Qin in any language - is largely, in fact almost entirely, based on the SH. For many of such biographies (by M. Prawdin, R. Fox, R.P. Lister, M. Hoang, etc.), however, careful points out throughout his work that the account as presented is "the revival of the Mongol bard", "the 'Gest' of so and so", "this quaint little drama the Mongol bard has staged for us", etc. etc. See CW, 8, 15, in passim, and his revealing remarks in the Introduction to the text, 321-324.

WA, 7-8; Okada 1960; idem 1972; idem 1959; CHL, 17-19 (see Section Two of the Introduction). See especially, HGC, 3 and up. GKV, GKC, and K. Among the more popular works on Cingular Qin, one which deserves credit for its attempt to be more selective in its use of sources is GKG, still valuable today.

Vizi 1995a, 472-475-476.

Yet such is the case of the long passage on Kuditi's Senid's address in AT, 11b-12a, which refers to the election of Abbaqan Qin (SH, § 52) which see Zamec., 93-96, Zamec., 65-68. For other examples of episodes or passages in AT which are not found in the SH, but were recorded in the sources used by Raitt al-Din and by the compilers of the SWCC, see Lee 2001. See Zamec., 85-108, Zamec., 90-97, where Zanacuaro discusses the differences between the parallel accounts in the SH and AT.


Sec. 9. The meaning of the SH is essentially in accordance with the view expressed by S. Nacagdor (S. Naluydor) in his preface to Daı ı. In this book is displayed an admirable, harmonious and beautiful summary of the facts that the 15th century Mongols, according to the laws of history - struggled for the sake of establishing a centralized Mongol state. This work is not only so much a primary source of Mongol history, but also a model of Mongol literature." See Dir. 3.

Ibid. 57. I think that Bira is undoubtably right. For C.J. Halperin, however, the SH 'drew exclusively (my emphasis - I.R.) from oral sources' (Halperin 2000, 2). See Dir. 9. See Section Four of the Introduction. See GKG, 212; Le discours de Gengis-khan dans le § 213 de l'Historie secrete, qui de ses parties alternées, est tres bien, comme tant d'autres (my emphasis - I.R.).t is a mere excerpt of literature invented of tuous pieces.

Although in the Pe, 1-2 (written ca. 1920), Poppe refers to the SH as a 'chronique', in his contribution to the entry 'Mongoli' in El, XXIII (1934),
analysis of the portrayal of Cinggis Qun in the SH and in the later chronicles influenced by Tibetan Buddhism, see Sasanka 1977; LM, 344-348.

66. Cf. Legrand’s statement in ATL, 9-10, that “la prononciation fixée par les transcriptions ne vaut que pour le dialecte mongol des transcriptions de la fin du XIVe siècle. Les anciennes transcriptions chinoises du mongol prouvent jusqu’à l’énorme que le système phonétique mongol des transcriptions était différent, bien qu’on ne prononce pas, de celui du mongol du XIIIe siècle, parce dans l’entourage des grands khans.”

67. Cf. also de Rachewiltz 2007, 59-70, for the remaining differences in the system of the SH, see the relevant sections in IMCS and UGM; see also the comparable statement concerning the system of the HII which are also valid for the SH, but see N. Popp’s review in AJIS 71:1951, 187-192, and especially, “Quelques problèmes” of which de Rachewiltz 1999b, 107-108, n. 54, Morphologically, we notice also the grammatical disappearances of the feminine verbal forms. See Li, 195-196. For the Mongol language at the time of Cinggis Qun, cf. CH, 701.

68. See Ko, 399-519 (roman); Shi (roman) 1: Ba: El-Ar; Or: ZVI, Su.

69. See R, 300a.

70. See, e.g., the paragraph (282) which the works cited above n. 211.

71. See Cleses 1961, 69, 73, n. 7.

72. Cf. also § 129, where the Mong transcribers wrote ‘Oman’ twice for the ‘Oman’ in Legrand’s transcript. Therefore, Popp’s statement in Pr, 3, that ‘un des grands etudes sans soude étudier la langue mongole de l’histoire secréte des Mongols au moyen de la transcription chinoise. Le manque de précision dans l’attestation mongole de l’histoire secréte des Mongols’ is clearly valid only if by ‘languange mongole de l’histoire secréte des Mongols’ Popp means only the Mongol dialect spoken by the Mong transcribers.

73. See TH (on its Mongolian version JTV), which is the best analysis of the SH vocabulary so far.

74. Popp 1953 lists merely 39 Turkic loan-words in the SH ‘papua-script material and the HII; however, there are many more borrowings from Turkish languages in the SH than previously estimated. See TH and the Commentary.

75. See de Rachewiltz 1997.

76. In IAL, 21, Popp states that ‘Eastern Middle Mongolian is well represented by the language of the text in the so-called “papua-script” material’ of this manuscript, and various Sino-Mongolian glossaries of the XIV century’, in Popp 1975b we read: ‘The language of the SH is Mo. [script Mongol (Wiesen Mongol)] – I.R.] but in phonetic transcription which strongly influences the colloquial language of that time, i.e. MBB [Middle Mongol – I.R.], and in GWM (1974 ed.), 2, he simply states that the SH was ‘written in 1240 in a Mongol script and later
translated with Chinese characters" in a letter to me dated 15 December 2001, Prof. M.N. Ovšěrný has confirmed that "the language of the SH cannot be related to any modern dialect." Cf. also FSTYTIM and Kazimierczuk 1993a.

218 See Section Eight of the Introduction.

219 Žáml, 82, uses the term 'present' which means 'presence, readiness', by which he no doubt means an unmarked directness of speech in contrast to the literal literary style of the 17th century.

220 Mar 33. See also B J, 134.

221 Pe, 3, and El, Xliii, 665a (see above, n. 198). Cf. also his statement in NIHOK, 25, n. 2; 'hhistória secreta abonde en domes lendragés souven contradictorias.'

222 Wa, 7.

223 The number of poetic passages increases of course if the non-alliterated lines are regarded as actual bounders, rather than a sort of 'caesura', between passages. There is also no agreement among translators about a number of lines which are regarded by some as being alliterative. The figures given here are, therefore, somewhat subjective and interpretative but, by and large, correct, I think. For a convenient listing of all the passages, see MNTUK, 362-428.

224 Among them: Temújin, with Bo-qa's help, receives the eight-light-ray greetings (§ 90-93); Temújin's flight from the Merkid, when Börte was left without a horse (§§ 98-102); Börte's rescue from the Merkid camp (§ 110); Qorgil Şira's attempt on the life of five-year old Tutul (§ 214). Father Mongkil's picking up the hat of his son Tęb Tengger when the latter was about to be killed.

225 Cf. P. Poucha in 31M 1969, 27-42. It should be noted that some of the proverbial sayings in the SH are not alliterated but have a rhymed style as, e.g., § 277; omor aš'at qan akāsal, and as a result were not recognized as such by Ligitzi. See L, 215. Cf. Cs. 218. See also the end of § 126, where Toör Qan's invitation to Temújin is expressed in the same manner.


227 In W. Heising's re-edition of Ho, the poetic passages have been isolated and versified. In Pe and Mo, they have been marked by writing the alliterative syllables in bold type. In Li, they have been turned into good Hungarian poetry by the professional pen of Gitta Köves. In his version (SHM), P. Kahó rendered the entire SH into poetry. Regrettably, Waley did not turn a single passage into English verse.

228 KMGEO, 1:11; FEBI, 9-14, and Poppo 1934, 429ff.

229 See PEPÍ, 9ff, 229b (Index).


232 See Section Five of the Introduction, and above, nn. 186 and 187.
translated with Chines characters." In a letter to me dated 15 December 2001, Prof. M.N. Orlovskaya has confirmed that "the language of the SH cannot be related to any modern dialect." Cf. also FSTYTM and Rozemiskov 1993a.

See Section Eight of the Introduction.

[Rem: 1. 82.] the term "t mortar" which means "coarseness, redness," by which no doubt means an unadorned directness of speech in contrast to the litera literary style of the 17th century.

Mo, 33. See also id. 134

Pe, 3, and EL XXIII, 66a (see above, n. 183). Cf. also his statement in NHHZ, 25, n. 2: "I'histoire secrète abonde en données légendaires sauvant contradictoires."

Wa, 7.

The number of poetic passages increases of course if the non-alliterating lines are regarded as actual boundaries, rather than a sort of "causaus," between passages. There is also no agreement among translators about a number of lines which are regarded by some as being alliterating. The figures given here are, therefore, somewhat subjective and interpretative but, by and large, correct, I think. For a convenient listing of the passages, see MNTHK, 362-428.

Among them: Temjilin, with Bo oru's help, receives the eight-light-bay goldings ([7]; 90-97): Temjilin's flight from the Merkin, when Buiré was left without a horse ([7]; 98-102); Buiré's rescue from the Merkin camp ([7]; 110): Qargil Siirta's attempt on the life of five-year-old Tolu ([7]; 214). Father Minglek's picking up the hat of his son Togtengt when the latter was about to be killed.

Cf. P. Froshus in SM 6:1969, 24-32. It should be noted that some of the proverbial sayings in the SH are not alliterated but have a final rhyme as e.g., s 277: olon arla bai (qan also bai), and as a result were not recognized as such by Ligeti. See L7, 251. CF. 218. See also the end of § 126, where Tooril Qan's instruction to Temjilin is expressed in the same manner.

BDU, "Introduction", 14.

In W. Hessing's re-edition of the Ha, the poetic passages have been isolated and translated, as Pe and Mo, they have been marked by writing the alliterative syllables in bold type. In Li, they have been turned into good Hungarian prose by the professional pen of Géza Képes. In his version (SHD), P. Kahn rendered the entire SH into prose. Regrettably, Waley did not turn a single passage into English verse.


See PPET, 9ff, 229ff (Index).


See Kudinarov 1986. Cf. also the earlier contribution by L.D. Sargsyan (Sagsyan 1973).

See Section Five of the Introduction, and above, nn. 186 and 187.

THE SECRET HISTORY


See also Sarks' remarks on the AT: version in SMUC, 8-9.

Sina at MUCD. They are discussed in the Commentary.

See Ceresasenoom 1588. Cf. also Jagch 1978, which several of these maxims and aphorisms from both the Shi and the AT are cited.

See the Bibliography under Gadiamba, as well as the translators MNTZ, e.g. pp. 234-255) and MAZER (with D. Ceresasenoom, and Gadiamba's rich commentary in 1). On the subject of folklore contacts of the Mongols and other nomadic peoples, cf. also Birn 1990a.


Munkvart 1979, 13. On the topic of instruction and entertainment in the SH, see Kahn 1996. We must not overlook the fact that for the Mongols in the early 13th century, as for the early Turks, writing - a new and unfamiliar medium - was used for very definite purposes confining almost exclusively to state and administrative experts. To compose such a long text as the Cengiz Qan's story would have been a major undertaking and nothing less than a reason d'etat would have supposed it and made it possible.

Fischer 1982, 165. Cf. Alan Qo's prophetical words at the beginning of the SH (s. 211): "When one understands that, the sign is clear: They are the sons of Heaven ... When they become the rulers of all, then the common people will understand!"

See B. Parkhurt in his "Predislovie" to s, 14-15.

It is not clear whether Parkhurt obtained the ms. of Palladii's transcription and translation (two pages of which are reproduced in 7 between p. 10, and 11) in 1878 in Pirjol with the "Palladius ms." (see above, n. 148), or whether he received it early in 1880, after Palladii's death. See Parkhurt, op. cit., 15; Yakovleva 1993, 9.

See IPCLM, 29-30.

In the lithographic form, with the title Trascrisia palagradskago tekstov. "Vzor"-arx i H., St. Petersburg, n.d., 161 pages. Vol. 1-9 contain the transcription and Russian interpretation translation; pp. 61-98, the reconstructed Mongol text in Uighur script; and pp. 91-112, 26 notes to the text, which on p. 90 ends in the middle of VII (in R, line 211) of the SH. The first page is reproduced in Aiol 1913, 13, and p. 61 is reproduced on p. 14. A copy of this extremely rare work was given by B. Vladimirov to Pellea in 1924. It is in the "Fund mongolii" of the Section des manuscrits orientaux of the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris (call number Mongol 160). A copy of this lithographic is found in the Ulam Bostan State Library (call number S4 499 Nbm. P. 471). See Mandjuk 1975, 147-148. In 1958 I also checked the copy held in the library of the former LFO (now SPB: Filial IV). The lithographic has no date of
The SECRET HISTORY

The introduction provided here is a brief overview of the historical context and the primary events discussed in the SECRET HISTORY. It also mentions the significance of the work in the field of literature and its influence on later works.

The SECRET HISTORY was written in the 6th century by an anonymous Chinese author, and it is an important historical text that provides a detailed account of the events leading up to the fall of the Han dynasty and the rise of the Sui dynasty. The text is a valuable source of information about the political, social, and cultural history of China during this period.

The introduction notes that the text is known for its vivid descriptions of the events it covers, and it highlights the importance of understanding the context in which these events took place. The text is also noted for its influence on later works of literature and history, and it is considered a significant contribution to the study of Chinese literature and history.
to complete his "Introduction." As for the commentary which was to form the main portion of the second volume, Cleaves wrote to me on 29 August 1984: "It is possible that I shall put together what I have in the way of a commentary, on The Secret History of the Mongols, but, with the passage of time, so many articles and translations have appeared in so many languages that it would absorb most of my time to try to deal with all of them. In any case, your own commentary would fill a pressing need." On 27 January 1992 he wrote: "I have virtually decided not to try to complete the second volume of my translation of the Secret History... There is much material to deal with... I have dozens of folders with references to much that has been published—that it would take me more years than I have to spare. I only wish that I had included all of the "Introduction" in Volume I. If the Harvard University Press does a third edition (the first edition is that, unpublished of 1957—F.R.), I shall make a few alterations." In a letter of 17 March 1992, Cleaves wrote: "As for my own Volume II of The Secret History, I concluded, when you told me that you were bringing out a second edition of your own, that it would be better for me to put the time that I have left into such articles as that of which I enclose an offprint, "The Postscript to the Table of Contents of the Faww Xihn." The Preface for Cleaves' decision to publish Volume I is given in his letter of 18 December 1990: "I wish to thank you for your most interesting article on the words wiku'ura ina in The Secret History of the Mongols which is, indeed, most convincing. I was deeply touched by the reference you made to my own translation of the text. You must have observed that not one of the several reviews was favourable, no one of which took the slightest note of the countless problems with which I dealt in the text as a whole, but only deplored the fact that I elected to use a somewhat archaic English as the vehicle of translation precisely because language of the text itself is archaic. By translating into contemporary English you have produced a version which is far more palatable than mine. The one by Kalan, who knows no Mongolian, ... is, in opinion of some, far more readable than mine, but you know as well as I that, for the most part, it paraphrases what I have. It was because he was able to publish his that Joe Fletcher insisted that I publish mine as it was without attaching ado. The Harvard-Yenching Institute had the publisher of Kalan's put his on hold until mine appeared." The flies to which Cleaves refers in his letter of 27 January 1992 are now kept at Girard in New Hampshire. See Wright 1988, 328-29. I should add that in August 1960, at Harvard University, Cleaves told me that one other reason for the delay in the publication of his translation was the strong criticism of some of his colleagues at Harvard, who objected to the language and style of the translation. For reviews of his translation, cf. C.R. Hawtins in TLS of 24 June 1983, 669; W. Harris in HASS 44:1984, 107- 1990; J.K. Kuegler in JAS 45:1984, 514-515.
INTRODUCTION

See Ke[1]. An interesting and useful volume. Besides the photoreproduction of Ke[1], pp. 217-391), it also contains an emended transcription of Ke[1] in modern print with paragraph divisions (pp. 1-298), and a remanufactured transcription of the same (pp. 395-536).

The second, the Secret History of the Mongols, The Life and Times of Chagatai Khan (Current Research, Volume, Series), this version is different from the 1990 edition only notably more the language is concerned (an improvement in the earlier edition due to Prof. Gregor Benton's editing), but also in another important respect, viz. previous paratextual matter has now become an integral part of the text and, in spite of the new square brackets, there is no longer any certainty as to what is in the translation and what is O'Connor's commentary. Cf., for example, §. 1 (p. 190 ed. 1): His origins were from his ancestors being Börte Chino (whose name means "wolf"). His wife Qau- naur (a means "a beautiful doe"), and § 1 (2007 ed. 37): He was descended from Börte Chino, whose name means "grayish-white wolf," and Qau-naur, the wolf's spouse, whose name means "beautiful doe." The words "whose name means "grayish-white wolf" and "whose name means beautiful doe" are not in the original Mongol text, they are O'Connor's interpolations which should be either in parentheses/brackets, or in a footnote, or in the commentary. Because of this ambiguity, the 2001 edition (which Ke[1] also calls a "restatement from my 1990 translation", ibid., 17) cannot be used for reference purposes in the same way the 1990 translation, which is, therefore, the only one I generally refer to in my Commentary.

See Qo. This, the most recent Chinese translation by a non-Mongol, is in simplified characters and for the general reader. The free transcribed version of the SH is found on pp. 526-620.

Some slight or unworthy publications have been left out. In preparing both lists (reconstructions of the Mongol text and translations of the same), I have also consulted various contributions, in particular those by N.S. Yakobson and M. Tuba, the former, n. 30. Two other translations of the SH are in preparation: one into Swedish by Staffan Rosén with the assistance of B. Suna yahsat (p.e. of Dr. J.R. Krämer of 28 Jan. 2002), and the other into Spanish by Ivar Sande (p.e. of Dr. P.D. Boell of 29 March 2002). No doubt more are in the making.

See Pa. The transcriptions of proper and geographical names are completely unreliable and 278 is missing.

See Pa. Waley's translation is partial and selective. In the 'Preface' (ibid., 7), he writes: "Of the Secret History I have translated only the parts founded on story-stories' tales." 

See C, and above, n. 275.

THE SIEK HISTORY

See Rabic. This translation has extensive annotations, but the author is not a mongol.

See I. de Rachewiltz, in AM 18/1973, 229-235; KCL 157-158; and Appendix Six of the present work.

See above, n. 312; MCL, 237.

In his letter of 22 March 1980, Chaves wrote: As you must have observed from reading the reviews of my translation, the language which I used seems to the specialist, if not difficult to read. I am not certain, nonetheless, that I would do anything differently; even if I were to do it all over again. As you know, people do not now read aloud, as they were wont to do in years gone by. If my translation were read aloud with the proper cadences, it would, I think, change a read to two. I have read passages aloud to audiences who appeared to enjoy it. 

See above, n. 312.

Cf. e.g. p. 11, §. 53: 22, §. 53: 46, §. 111: 194, §. 257: 82, §. 153 and 190, §. 254 (which is incomprehensible without n. 39. By using square brackets as Chaves does, I would turn the sentence in question into the following: I have given you [this], ask on, why. This, I think, about it, we - the young, younger brothers, the common people and I [my] old self - understand to be an important question." Cf. MCL, 182.

See C. I. de Rachewiltz, in AM 19/1973, 103-104 and n. 43.

See IEEC. 141-144, IS. 512a-b; BM. 166-168; Lafait 1907, 210-211.

SLL, xim. 45-47; Harnisch 1946; Popp 1950b, 66-66; Emauli 1950; Krüger 1966; GIKR, 122 et passim; Popp 1970a, 135-137; Furiyama 1978; YISHK, 379-385; MNST, B. Szejn in Mongolica 1 (1990), 283-290; D. Tommelen, L. Manfand, ibid., 294-304; MNST, 544-587; Yakobson 1993; Tuba 1993; Condina 1993, Böhm 1993; Isard 1994; Bazarov 1995; ISMAR; and the numerous references in the International Bibliography on "Mongol Studies" (Im Mongolica 8 (297), 197-197, and "World Mongol Studies" in IAMH, 1992, 2, 9, 10). As for the bibliographies, see, e.g., MAM, 182-195; CMCM, 1479-1480. The above list is by no means exhaustive, especially with regard to the Chinese and Japanese bibliographies on Mongol and Mongol studies which include publications on the SH (see below, n. 351). I have limited myself to the essential ones.

From AA to ZDMG, and several of them (like EJSU, CKSYYCT, CKSYC). AA and other Japanese periodicals include - occasionally or regularly - bibliographical surveys of publications on Mongol/Van studies. See, e.g., Yamada 1973 and Minakami 1974.

Of special relevance are those of the ICM (International Congress of Mongolians), Ulan Bator (OM/EDM), of the PIA (Permanent International Atlantic Conference), and of the IAMH (International Association for Mongol Studies, BAZM), but many other conferences and symposia on Mongol studies
and on the SH in particular have been held in Europe, Mongolia, China, Japan and Korea, and in most cases are being published among the important ones, the A. Mairakt Symposium held at Leuven, Belgium, in August 1993, the proceedings of which were published in 1999 (JAMEM).

See, e.g., S.SA: SOOL, FDMN: SA, MS, NB, MNT, I, Mongolia 1/22, 1990; MNT, MO 1993; TIM. This is particularly the case with the numerous Festschriften published in Japan in which so many articles on the SH have appeared over the years. Several of these (for the period 1900-50) are listed in BOM, 5-7 (1896).


See LTHM, I: C/SMK and G/MBKZ. I leave aside L. Hambo's GLME which is a "hybrid" work so far as the language treated is partly that of the SH.

See M. Walz' masterly work UGFM, D. Tönniesgo's MXT(U), N. Orlovskaya's YM7. G. Doerfer's unpublished doctoral dissertation on the syntax of the SH (Doerfer 1954), and his important article on the subject, Doerfer 1955; the numerous articles and essays by Ozawa in the appendices of OZ, his C/SMK (entirely devoted to the language of the SH), as well as his other publications and those of mongolists from P. Asio to H.P. Vieitez listed in the Bibliography and referred to in the Commentary of the present work. Further contributions are listed under individual authors in the "International Bibliography on Mongolian Studies" (see above, n. 350).

See YAT.

Thus, the word for "true" in the SH and the Middle Mongolian material may be correctly "transcribed" maqar, but can equally be "interpreted" as manad, the regular form in Written Mongolian. The 'maqar' reading is adopted, among others, by P. Pelliot, N. Peng, L. Ligeiri, A. Mostert (in his early works), G. Kara and I. Rachewitch, while the 'manad' reading is advocated by A. Mostert (in his later publications), F.W. Cleaves, S. Ozawa, and D. Tönniesgo. The same gliding is transcribed as such by Cleaves and Ozawa, but as Gligik by Pelliot and Ligeiri. For -v and -s, cf. manadly 'bed' (Pelliot, Ligeiri, D. Tönniesgo) and ma-ni (Mostert, Cleaves, Ozawa and Rachewitch).

See the Commentary, § 1. Likewise, should one transcribe bua 'is', not 'are' (Pelliot), Ozawa, Ligeiri, or bua (Mostert, de Rachewitch)? See de Rachewitch in AFF 18/1973, 232; St., I, 2, n. 3. These, and related issues, require urgent attention in the part of mongolists and sino-mongolists. Cf. above, n. 210.

See HFW. Cf. Cleaves 1949a, 459.

See RWMNT: R. G/MBKZ, 281-570 (Ozawa already had published his index-vocabulary by sections in OZ, 1970) and G/MBKZ, 351-490 (proper and geographical names), and KCL. R can still be used taking into account the Additions and Corrections listed in Appendix Six which supersede those published in the MSN 1/Dec 1945, 9-13. We also owe to Vieitez and Giedion Lhaban a complete word-index to the AT (AT) which appeared in 1992.

See TH and its Mongolische version JYT. The Chinese edition has been reprinted in Hohhot in 1997.

The team consists of D. Cerniosnov from Ulan Bator. G. Kara from Budapest and I. de Rachewitch from Canberra.

They are married [u.w.]. I regret that my ignorance of the Korean language has prevented me from having access to, and reading full use of, the numerous contributions of our Korean colleagues.

Thus, unlike Cleaves, I have sometimes reformed the Mongol demonstrative pronouns *-bui* and *-rav* that with the English definite article *the*; and I have regularly transliterated the numerals *gur-* 'two' and *qur-* 'three' following two or three numerals in succession with the conjunction 'and' and 'also', for the sake of English style. I have occasionally avoided repeating the same word several times and have paraphrased the original. In all these instances, however, I have given the literal translation in a footnote and/or in the Commentary. Nevertheless, for those who wish to follow the Mongolian text word by word, Cleaves' translation is still available.

Mongol words in the Commentary are, of course, written in italic type except when quoting passages from the translation, in which case the font employed is the same as that of the Translation.

The transcription used in the present work follows the standard system of transcription of N. Poppe for Middle, Peculiar and Written Mongolian, which is followed by most mongolists, with occasional slight modifications. It is a somewhat improved version of the simplified system I used in R (where ę and ě are written e and i; and ď is written a). In R, composed names are hyphenated, following Pe and Li. Long vowels are noted only when they result from vowel contractions through the disappearance of an intervocalic consonant. See UGFM, 23. For Written Mongolian, please note that the suffixes which are not attached to the word they modify are also separately (by hyphens) in the transcription. However, word-endings, including part of suffixes (such as the -u of -raa), which are normally written separately according to orthographic rules, are not noted in the transcription from the word they belong to. In doing so, I have followed the system found in DO, III, 769-809: Index des mots du mongol écrit et du mongol ancien.

In many cases, even if the possessive pronoun in Mongolian, it is clearly implied from the context. Cf. Cl. 172, § 238 [13]: 'my daughter...my fifth son'. In both instances, 'my' is not actually expressed in the original. However, in some cases the ambiguity of the text is such that it requires the italic type (or brackets) in the translation.
In the case of Nōgait’s outstanding contribution, not all the information contained in Mo has been incorporated in the Commentary. For this reason (and because of the inadequacy of the Index des passages de l’Histoire secrète des Mongols cités et traduits in Mo, 266-267), the reader is referred to Appendix Four which contains a complete paragraph-page reference list to Mo.

2 See Appendix Six; and above, n. 366.

21 There is no form ‘gualin’ in Mongolian, only ‘gulain’ (qulain).

22 See, e.g., HCG, Mo, Cl, and Latimore 1963b.
SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS

(Figures in parentheses refer to the paragraphs of the Secret History in which an episode is related or first mentioned; figures in brackets are dates converted to the present era)

Chapter One: Genealogical account. The Mongol clans. Temüjin’s birth and betrothal.

The mythical ancestors, the blue-grey wolf and fallow doe, settle on Mount Burqan Qaladun after crossing the Tenggis (? Lake Baikal). From them originate all the Mongol (Mongol) clans (1). The story of Alan Qu’a and her five sons (17). The exploits of Bodončar Mungqaq (24). Growth of the Mongol clans and explanation of their names based on folk etymology (40). Qubul and Ambanqai become the chiefs (qan) of the Mongol clans (52). Capture of Ambanqai by the Tatars allied to the Jurchen (Khitai) of north China (53). Qubul’s grandson Yisüxie Ba’atúr captures Hô’elín of the Olqanu’ut, the young bride of the Merkit Yeke Çildü (54). Qubul’s son Qutula succeeds Ambanqai as qan and fights the Tatars without success (57). Yisüxie fights and defeats the Tatars, taking their chief Temüjin Üge prisoner. At that time Yisüxie’s first son from Hô’elín is born near a hill (Deli’un Boldaq) by the Oron (= Oron) River and is given the name Temüjin (59). Three more sons and one daughter (Qasar, Qaq’un, Temüge and Temülin) are born to Yisüxie (60). When Temüjin was nine (= eight) years old, his father takes him to the Olqanu’ut people to find a bride for him. Temüjin is betrothed to Bêrte, the ten (= nine) years old daughter of Dei Sećen, and is left with his future in-laws (61). On his way home Yisüxie meets some Tatars who recognize him and poison him (67). Before dying, back at his camp three days later, Yisüxie instructs Mônglik, the son of his faithful retainer Čanaq of the Qongqottat, to bring back Temüjin (68).
Chapter Two: Temüjin’s boyhood and youth.

Temüjin returns home with Father Möngö (69). After Yesugei’s death, his Taşüü’t kinsmen (from Ambaqua’s line) desert the widow, taking all Yesugei’s subjects with them. Mother Hö’elün and her children — her own five and two from another wife of Yesugei — are thus left to fend for themselves (70). Hö’elün brings up her children. Their precarious life on the bank of the Onon (74). Temüjin and Qasar have a squabble with their step-brothers Bekter and Belgüti; they kill Bekter in cold blood (77). Hö’elün’s ‘lament’ over their ghastly deed (78). The Taşüü’t led by Taqrut Kirtitiu suddenly reappear and kidnap Temüjin, but he outsmarts them and escapes with the help of a subject of the Taşüü’t, Sonqan Shira of the Suludus, and his family (79). Thieves steal right night of the nine geldings belonging to Hö’elün when she and her children are camped at Koko Na’ur, a lake south of Bürqan Qaldun. Temüjin retrieves them with the help of Bo’orcu, a brave youth of the Arulat tribe (90). Temüjin marries Bo’tu and brings her home (94). He sends his step-brother Belgüti to Bo’orcu with the invitation to join him as a companion (nokor), which Bo’orcu accepts (95). Temüjin, Qasar and Belgüti go to To’orl Qan of the Kerčet tribe, later known as Öng Qan (see Chapter Four), with a gift of a black sable coat which was Bo’tu’s wedding present. To’orl had formerly been Yesugei’s sworn friend (anda). He promises Temüjin to help him to the subjects who had deserted him (96). Jarš’udai of the Uriangai gives his son Jelme to Temüjin to serve as his attendant (97). Soon after, when Temüjin and his family were camping near the source of the Kerčet River, the Three Merkit, i.e. Toqto’a, Dayër Juaun and Qa’atai Darmala, attack them and capture Bo’tu (whom they give to Yeke Ched’s younger brother Cülger Böyük) and Belgüti’s mother (Sütiği or Sütiği) in revenge for Yesugei’s earlier abduction of Hö’elün (98). Temüjin escapes and hides in the forest on Bürqan Qaldun. The Merkit abandon the search for him. Temüjin worships the mountain that has saved his life (c.02).

Chapter Three: Börte’s proposal and election of Temüjin.

Temüjin turns to To’orl Qan for assistance in rescuing Bo’tu. To’orl entails the help of Temüjin’s cousin Jumqala of the Jadaran (104). Together they fall upon the Merkit encamped on the Selenge (= Selenga) River. The Merkit are defeated and Börte is rescued (107). The Merkit allies and Cülger Böyük escape (111). Belgium’s mother disappears and the Merkit remnants are exterminated (112). Temüjin thanks both To’orl Qan and Jumqala. Mother Hö’elün adopts Kúču, a little boy found in the Merkit camp (114). Temüjin and Jumqala renew their oath of amity and, but after eighteen months of close friendship — and because of Börte’s intervention — they break up (116). Temüjin passes the Taşüü’t camp at night. The Taşüü’t move away and join Jumqala, leaving behind a boy, Köükči of the Besüt, who is also adopted by Hö’elün (119). Many clans led by their chiefs come and join Temüjin (120). One of them, Qorlül of the Ba’tarim, predicts a brilliant future for Temüjin (121). Temüjin is elected qan by Altan, Qurşür and Saça Beki, the three senior clan members (from Qabul’s line), who thereby renounce their legitimate claims to leadership in his favour. They give him the appellation of Cinggis Qa’an (read Cinggis Qan, ‘Fierce Ruler’) (123). Cinggis Qan appoints several officers and puts Bo’orcu and Jelme in charge of them, thus setting up a rudimentary civil and military administration (124). He informs both To’orl Qan and Jumqala of his election as qan. To’orl Qan notifies his approval (125).

Chapter Four: Rivalry between clans and election of Jumqala.

Jumqala, informed of Cinggis Qan’s election as qan, accepts it (127). Soon after, Jumqala’s younger brother Taqul steals some horses from Joli Darmala of the Jalaq (who were Cinggis’ subjects); he is killed by Joli Darmala who retrieves the horses (128). The enraged Jumqala with his Jadaran and
allied tribesmen—thirteen 'camps' (ğür-i'êr) amounting to 30,000 men altogether—attacks Çinggis, whose forces (comprising also 30,000 men) are defeated at Dalan Baljut, near the sources of the Sengür (= Tseske iter) River. Jamiqû has the princes of the Čîns (allied to Çinggis) boijed alive (129). However, other clans joined Çinggis' camp (130). A big feast held on the banks of the Onon turns into a fight between Çinggis' men and his Jürk êmmen (also of Qubul's line) when Bûri Bokô, a cousin of Çinggis, injures Belgüte (131). Çinggis and To'o'rl Qos join forces with the Jürken of north China and fight the Tatars who are defeated (132). Çinggis Qan is rewarded by the Jürken with the title jasgi qurî ('Commander of Hundreds'), and To'o'rl with that of ong (= ch. wang 'King' or 'Prince'), hence his new designation as Onq Qan (134). Mother Hû'elîn adopts the infant Sîghîken Qutuqua found abandoned in the Tatars' camp (135). The Jürken raid Çinggis' base camp (a'arsa) at Lake Harité and are in turn attacked by Çinggis who kills their two chiefs (who are also his cousins) Saça and Taîo (136). Güün's U'a of the Jalazy gives his two sons Muqali and Buqa to Çinggis Qan. Hû'elîn adopts Boroqul (Boro'ul), a little boy found in the Jürken camp (137). She counts her adopted sons reared in her bent: Kûlî (Goçqû), Kôkûcî, Sîghîken Qutuqua and Boroqul (138). The origin of the Jürken is explained (139). Çinggis arranges the killing of Bûri Bokô by Belgüte at a wrestling match, thus eliminating another possible contender for leadership (140). Fearful of Çinggis' growing power, a number of clans ally themselves with tribes, such as the Naiman, Merkit and Oyrat, as well as the Tâyîl'ût, that are hostile to him. They hold a meeting at Aqûlı Bulaq, near the confluence of the Argun and Gan rivers, and elect Jamiqû as gür-ûn ('Universal Ruler'), thus forming a rival coalition against Çinggis Qans and Onq Qan (1201) (141). The joint forces of Çinggis Qan and Onq Qan move to meet those of Jamiqû and his allies. Jamiqû's vanguard is spotted by Çinggis' vanguard at Mount Çiçirqua, near Lake Bukir (142). The encounter takes place at Köyîlen,

where the enemy's twin magic fails disastrously (?). The enemy leaders disperse; Onq Qan pursues Jamiqû while Çinggis engages the Tâyîl'ût on the Onon (144). Çinggis is seriously wounded in the neck and his life is saved by Jelmé (145). Sûçqun Sûr of the Sûdus and Jirgâqâdî of the Tâyîl'ût voluntarily submit to Çinggis. Jirgâqâdî is renamed Jebe (146).

Chapter Five: More fights with the Tâyîl'ût, the Tatars and the Naiman.

Çinggis crushes the Tâyîl'ût but their chief Tarqatâ Kiirîtluq escapes (148). Historical portrait of Onq Qan. Onq Qan's younger brother Jâqqa Gambio submits with other Kungûts clans (150). Onq Qan, attacked by the Naiman, is forced to flee to Central Asia. He is rescued by Çinggis Qan. They spend the winter together at Qiba Qaya (151). Jâqqa Gambio plots against Onq Qan, but his supporters are arrested and humiliated by the latter. Jâqqa Gambio flees to the Naiman (152). Çinggis attacks the Tatars and defeats them at Dalen Némûrûs near the Qaba River (1202). Àlâqû, Qeçit and Dârstâ are punished for unlawfully seizing booty (153). The Tatar male population is massacred. Belgüte is punished for leaking the plan of the massacre (154). Çinggis marries Yisûqên and Yissû, the two daughters of the Tatar chief Yelîç Cerên (155). Yisû's former husband, who had escaped, is found and put to death (156). Onq Qan, who in the meantime had attacked the Merkit, defeats them but does not share the booty with Çinggis (157). Çinggis and Onq Qan jointly attack the Naiman and defeat their chief Buyûqûn Qan at Lake Kißî Bât (158). At Jamiqû's instigation Onq Qan deserts Çinggis. A group of Naiman pursues Onq Qan and in a battle his son Sengqîm is defeated (159). Onq Qan asks Çinggis for help and Sengqîm is rescued by the 'four steeds' (dürken kalîqût) Bocorla, Muqali, Boroqul and Çakûn (163). In gratitude Onq Qan formally adopts Çinggis as a son (164). Marriages to cement the friendship between the two families are thwarted by
Senggilm and the relationship between them turns sour as a result (165). With Ong Qan’s acquiescence, Jamiuq and Senggilm, together with Atan and Qücär, hatch a plot to ambush Činggis, but he feels them thanks to timely advice from Father Muńglik (166). Senggilm decides to attack Činggis in a surprise attack. The two herdsman Bodii and Kiśilii fight for the plan and, travelling by night, forearm Činggis (169).

Chapter Six: Ong Qan and Jamiuq at war with Činggis Qan. Činggis escapes at night with his men pursued by Ong Qan and Jamiuq. Ong Qan prepares the attack, but Jamiuq secretly informs Činggis of Ong Qan’s plan and withdraws his troops (170). A great battle takes place at Qulaqaljis Elet, south of the Qalpa River. Both the Kerejyt and the Mongols suffer considerable losses. Senggilm is wounded, so are Öqyldar and Öqyldar on Činggis’s side (171). Činggis Qan moves to Dulan Närmbest and along the Qalpa River, counting his losses. Öqyldar dies of his wounds (175). The Onggirat submit voluntarily. Činggis encamps with his 2,600 men at the Tüngge Stream from where he sends a message to Ong Qan reminding him of their former relationship and of what both Yürük and himself have done for him. On receiving it Ong Qan swears to be loyal and faithful to him (176). Činggis also sends messages to Jamiuq, Aluc, Qüçar, Toorril of the Söge’en and Senggilm, at the same time requesting an exchange of rōvji. Činggis resiles beligerently (179). Činggis encamps at Lake Bajana, south of the Qalpa River, where he is joined by his younger brother Qoşa who has escaped from Ong Qan’s camp. A hostile exchange of envoys takes place between Ong Qan and Činggis Qan, prompting the latter to attack the Kerejyt by surprise (182). The Kerejyt are utterly defeated at Jër Qobēşi Pas, but Ong Qan and Senggilm manage to escape (185).

Chapter Seven: Conflict with the Naiman. Distribution of the Kerejyt people among the Mongols (186). Death of Ong Qan and Senggilm (188). Täyqg Qan of the Naiman shows hostility towards the Mongols and decides to attack them (189). Činggis Qan is forewarned by Ala Qun Digit Quri of the Önggii who refuses to ally himself with Ong Qan (190). Činggis prepares for a confrontation with the Naiman by reorganizing his army and the Guard (191). He moves to the Sa’ari Steppe along the Kerulen River (1204). The Mongols, whose horses are in poor condition and who are inferior in number, devise a clever stratagem to deceive the enemy (193). Täyqg Qan is frightened by Jamiuq’s description of Činggis Qan’s army leaders. Jamiuq abandons him and again forewarns Činggis Qan (193). The Naiman are crushed at Naqji Qan. Täyqg Qan dies. Jamiuq’s allies submit to Činggis. Täyqg’s mother Gürbési is taken as wife by Činggis (196). The Merkit led by Töqto’a and his sons are defeated in the Sa’ari Steppe (1204). Qulan Qutan, the daughter of the Merkit chief Dayir L’unun, undergoes a virginity test before being taken by Činggis as his wife (197).

Chapter Eight: Jamiuq’s death and Činggis Qan’s re-election. Part of the Merkit population rebels against the Mongols. Töqto’a and his sons join forces with Täyqg Qan’s son Gücülük and the Naiman remnants. They are defeated by Činggis Qan at the Buquruma source of the Erdi (= Jirgish) River. Töqto’a is killed and the alliance falls apart. A further rebellion by the Merkit is also quashed (198). Činggis sends Sūbë’esi Ra’atir in pursuit of Töqto’a’s sons [1205] (199). Jamiuq is handed over to Činggis by his few companions, who are immediately executed for their treachery. Dramatic dialogue between Jamiuq and Činggis Qan. According to his wishes, Jamiuq is killed without shedding blood and is given a proper burial (200). Činggis is elected supreme leader at a great assembly at the sources of the Onur River [1206]. Hoisting of the white standard with nine tails (tug). Činggis is
voluntarily. He and the Onggis ruler are duly rewarded. Cinggis praises Jochi for his successful campaign (239). The Qor Urga murder Boroqul and take Qorchi and Qudaqan Beki prisoners. Dürbei Doqul has a punitive expedition, defeats the Urga and recaptures Qorchi and Qudaqan Beki (240). Cinggis Qan apportions the conquered people among the members of his family (242). Cinggis’ brother Qasar is beaten and humiliated by Kököchii Tenggegeri and the other six sons of Father Mönigt. Tenggegeri slanders Qasar. Cinggis believes him and seizes Qasar for questioning. A dramatic family scene in which Qasar is freed, and Cinggis renounces, by Mother Hulun (242). Tenggegeri, with the support of the Qoqogot and other clans, challenges Cinggis authority by humiliating Cinggis’ younger brother Temüge Ochig, who complains to Cinggis, rousing Börte’s anger and indignation. Tenggegeri, urged by Cinggis to settle the matter, challenges Tenggegeri to a wrestling match. Tenggegeri is treacherously killed by three strong men outside the tent. A dangerous situation develops, but Cinggis prevails (244). Tenggegeri’s body is placed in a test, but after three days it mysteriously disappears. Cinggis explains the disappearance as due to Heaven’s anger at Tenggegeri’s actions, severely rebukes Father Mönigt for having allowed them, and quickly moves camp. Decline in power of the Qoqogot (246).

Chapter Eleven: Campaigns in North China and Central Asia.
Cinggis Qan sets forth against the Jurchen Chin state of north China (212). The Mongols seize several outposts and reach the central capital Jundu (Peking). The Jurchen ruler submits and pays a heavy tribute. Cinggis withdraws his army (247). The Mongols then attack the Tangut Hsi Hoing kingdom (Qafar) to the west. Their king also submits and pays tribute. Cinggis returns to his camp in the Sauari Steppes (249). The Jurchens hamper the Mongol envoy to the Chin court. Cinggis launches his second campaign against Chin (1214). The Chin ruler leaves the capital. The Mongols capture and

Chapter Ten: Further military campaigns abroad and removal of Tiber Tenggeri.
Cinggis praises his guards and issues further regulations concerning their duties and privileges (230). Qubilai Noyan is sent on a campaign to subjugate the Quilq tribes whose ruler Abul Qan voluntarily submits to Cinggis and is given the latter’s daughter in marriage (235). Togto’a’s son and the Merkit remnants are finally destroyed by Sübe’ee. Jebe deals with Gidulik and the Naiman remnants in the same way (236). The idar of the Uighur xians is given Cinggis daughter A Ilgtun in marriage (238). Cinggis sends Jochi to subjugate the People of the Forest (hui-jin irgen) and the tribes of the north-west (212). Qudaqan Beki of the Oyrat submits
loot Jungdu. The Jurchens submit again and the Chin ruler's son with a hundred companions is sent to Ćinggis as hostage Ćinggis withdraws his troops. Qasar seizes the Chin's northern capital Beijing (present-day Ta-t'ing). Ćinggis returns to his main base camp in Mongolia (251). Ćinggis goes to war against the 'Sarta'ul people', i.e. the Khwarizmian empire, following the murder of his envoy at Otrar. Before he leaves, Ŭisyū Qutan questions him about the succession. After some squabbling between Ćinggis' sons, the choice falls on Ōgodei (254). Ćinggis requests the military participation of the Tangut (Hsi Hsia) in the campaign, but they refuse (256). The campaign begins (257). In the course of the campaign, Ŭisyū Qutan, Tokugar and Ŝiquis Qutu are sent as vanguards. The Mongols gain a great victory over Jalalīdn Soltan and Qan Melīk (Jalal al-Dīn and Amlīn al-Mulk) after an initial defeat suffered by Ŝiquis Qutu. They occupy many towns, including Semisgab (Samarkand), Būqar (Būkhara) and Khwarizm's capital Oringenqti (Urgentq Urganqti). Ćinggis sends Čornsqaq to conquer Bhaqtat (Baghdad), ruled by the Qalībī Soltan, i.e. the 'Sultan Calīh' (257). Campaign of Dōrbe Dōqşt against the peoples between Baghdad and India (261). Ŝūbe'et's great campaign in the West (262). After the defeat of the Sarta'ul, Ćinggis appoints resident commissioners (darugqin) in charge of the conquered towns. He puts two Muslims of Khwarizmian stock, Yalawāqī (Mīhī-md Yalawāqī) and his son Masqut (Mas'īd Hīq), in charge of the administration of the Central Asian towns and, later, of Kītāt, i.e. the former Chin territories in north China (273). After seven years of warfare, Ćinggis Čan returns with much booty to his ārdas in the Black Forest of the Tūla River [1223] (264).

Chapter Twelve: Ćinggis' last campaign and death, and Ōgodei's reforms and "confession."

Činggis Čan leads a punitive expedition against the Tangut kingdom of Hsi Hsia [1226]. On the way south he falls from his ārdas and becomes ill. The Hsi Hsia ruler and his minister
Further regulations regarding the management of post stations (279). Gödel's eight-point self-criticism: four good deeds accomplished against four 'faults' committed during his reign (281). The colophon recording the place and date [? 1228], when the writing of the work was completed (282).

### The Secret History of the Mongols (Yuan Chao Pi-shih)

**Chapter and Paragraph Concordance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12-ch'üan text (Y¹, Y²)</th>
<th>15-ch'üan text (Y²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-68</td>
<td>69-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-103</td>
<td>97-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104-126</td>
<td>119-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-147</td>
<td>141-153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148-169</td>
<td>154-169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-185</td>
<td>170-185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186-197</td>
<td>186-197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198-208</td>
<td>198-207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209-229</td>
<td>208-224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-246</td>
<td>225-238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247-264</td>
<td>239-246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265-282</td>
<td>247-264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>265-276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>277-282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS

CHAPTER ONE

The origins of Chinggis Qa’an.
At the beginning there was a blue-grey wolf, born with his destiny ordained by Heaven Above. His wife was a fallow doe. They came crossing the Tenggis. After they had settled at the source of the Onon River on Mount Burqan Qaldun. Bataqishan was born to them.

The son of Bataqishan was Tamaa; the son of Tamaa, Qorich Mergen; the son of Qorich Mergen, A’ujam Boro’ul; the son of A’ujam Boro’ul, Sali Qaq’a’u; the son of Sali Qaq’a’u, Yeke Nidun; the son of Yeke Nidun, Sem Sochi; the son of Sem Sochi, Qur’tu.

The son of Qur’tu, Borjigitai Mergen, had as wife Mongqoljin Qo’a. The son of Borjigitai Mergen, Toroqolin Bayan, had a wife named Boroqolin Qo’a, a young lad named Boroldai Saybalbi, and two fine geldings, Dayir and Boro. Toroqolin had two sons, Du’a Soqor and Dobun Mergen.

Du’a Soqor had a single eye in the middle of his forehead; with it he could see for a distance of three stages.

One day Du’a Soqor went up Burqan Qaldun with his younger brother Dobun Mergen. Du’a Soqor looked out

1 See the Commentary.
2 Lit., ‘the Sea’ or (fig.) ‘a large body of water’ such as a great lake, possibly the Baikal.
3 i.e., a young manservant.
4 i.e., ‘Dusky’ and ‘Grey.’
5 A ‘maga’ (or ‘urt’) is the distance between two nomadic camps.
This is how Dobun Mergen asked there and then for Alan Qo'a, daughter of Qoriglart Mergen of the Qori Tumat born at Aiq Usun, and how he took her as his wife.

After Alan Qo'a had come to Dobun Mergen, she bore him two sons who were named Bügünüte and Belgünüte.

Du'a Soqor, his elder brother, had four sons. Before long, the elder brother Du'a Soqor died. After Du'a Soqor's death his four sons no longer regarded their uncle Dobun Mergen as a member of the family but, looking down on him, they left him and moved away. They took the clan name Dörben and became the Dörben tribe.

After that, one day Dobun Mergen went out hunting on the Toqoçai Heights. In the forest he met a man of the Uriangai tribe who had killed a three-year-old deer and was roasting its ribs and entrails. Dobun Mergen said, 'Friend, share the quarry!' 'I will give it to you,' said the man, and kept the main portion of the animal which has the lungs, and the skin, he gave all the meat of the three-year-old deer to Dobun Mergen.

Dobun Mergen went on, carrying the three-year-old deer on the back of his horse. On the way he met a poor man on foot who was leading his son by the hand. Dobun Mergen asked him, 'To which clan do you belong?' The man said, 'I am a man of the Ma'aliq Bayat, and I am in desperate straits. Give me some of the meat of that animal and I will give you this child of mine.' At these words Dobun Mergen cut off one thigh of the three-year-old deer and gave it to him, and he took the child to be a servant in his house.

Before long, Dobun Mergen died. After his death, Alan Qo'a, although she had no husband, bore three sons who

---

1. Lit., 'when he looked.'
2. I.e., downstream.
3. I.e., a cart covered with black felt.
4. I.e., 'Clear Water' (River or Spring).
5. I.e., mainly deer, antelopes and wild goats.
6. Translation uncertain. 'Burqan Bosqagan' may actually be a designation (lit., 'Who has erected his Burqan [i.e., monument]') of Sinči Bayan, and 'lords' (qic) is, honorific plural. See the Commentary.
7. Or 'Halls.'
8. Lit., 'Friend, the roast.'
9. I.e., the head, trachea, lungs and heart.
were named Buqa Qatagi, Buqatu Salji and Bodončar Munugqat.\footnote{1}

Bielginiutie and Gbginiutie, the two sons born earlier to Dobun Mergen, said to each other, behind the back of their mother Alan \textit{Qo'a}, "Although his mother of ours is without brothers-in-law and male relations, and without a husband, she has borne these three sons. In the house there is only the man of the Ma'aq Mahya'ut. Surely these three sons are his." Their mother Alan \textit{Qo'a} knew what they had been saying to each other behind her back.\footnote{2}

One day in spring, while she was cooking some dried lamb, she had her five sons Bielginiutie, Gbginiutie, Buqatu Qatagi, Buqatu Salji and Bodončar Munugqat sit in a row. She gave an arrow-shaft to each of them and said, "Break it!" One by one they immediately broke the single arrow-shafts and threw them away. Then she tied five arrow-shafts into a bundle and gave it to them saying, "Break it!" The five sons each took the five bound arrow-shafts in turn, but they were unable to break them.\footnote{3}

Then their mother Alan \textit{Qo'a} said, "You, my sons Bielginiutie and Gbginiutie, are suspicious of me and said to each other, "These three sons that she has borne, of whom, of what clan are they the sons?" And it is right for you to be suspicious. Every night, a resplendent yellow man entered by the light of the smoke-hole or the door top of the tent, he rubbed my belly and his radiance penetrated my womb. When he departed, he crept out on a moonbeam or a ray of sun in the guise of a yellow dog. How can you speak so rashly?" When one understands that, the sign is clear: They are the sons of Heaven. How can you speak, comparing them

\textit{To ordinary black-headed men.}\footnote{4} When they become the rulers of all, Then the common people will understand!\footnote{5}

Further, Alan \textit{Qo'a} addressed those words of admonition to her five sons: You, my five sons, were born of one womb. If, like the five arrow-shafts just now, each of you keeps to himself, then, like those single arrow-shafts, anybody will easily break you. If, like the bound arrow-shafts, you remain together and of one mind, how can anyone deal with you so easily?\footnote{6} Some time went by and their mother Alan \textit{Qo'a} died.\footnote{7}

After the death of their mother Alan \textit{Qo'a}, the five brothers divided the livestock among themselves. Bielginiutie, Gbginiutie, Buqatu Qatagi and Buqatu Salji all took their share to Bodončar no share was given, for they said that he was a fool and a half-wit, and they did not regard him as one of the family.\footnote{8}

Bodončar, seeing that he was no longer counted as one of the family, said, "Why should I stay here?" He got on a white horse with a black sere back and a mangy tail. "If I die, I die, if I live, I live!" he said and left riding fast downstream along the Onan River. He went on and when he reached Bajun Aral\footnote{9} he built a grass hut and made his home there.\footnote{10}

While he was living there, he once saw a grey female hawk eating a black grouse that it had caught. He made a snare with the hair of his white horse with the black sere back and mangy tail, caught the hawk and reared it. When he had nothing to eat, he stalked the wild game which

\footnote{1}{i.e., ‘Bodončar the Fool (or Simpleton).’}
\footnote{2}{Lit., ‘behind the back of their mother.’}
\footnote{3}{Lit., ‘with a black step along the backbone, mid-back saddle-sores, and a hairless tail.’}
\footnote{4}{Or: ‘If he dies, I will die; if he lives, I will live!’}
\footnote{5}{Areal means ‘island’ as well as ‘peninsula.’ See the Commentary.}
\footnote{6}{Lit., ‘a grass hut.’}
wolves had penned in on the cliffs. He shot and killed the game, and fed on it together with the hawk; they also gathered up and ate the food left over by the wolves. And so, feeding his own guلن and his hawk, he got through that year.

When spring came and the ducks began to arrive, he starved his hawk and let it loose. The ducks and wild geese which the hawk had caught he placed all about, so that every tree stump reeked with their stench. Every dead tree with their foul smell.

From the northern side of Mount Daybeh, a band of people on the move came following the course of the Tunggelik Stream. After he had loosed his hawk in the daytime, Bodončar used to go to those people and drink kumis with them: at night he returned to his grass hut to sleep.

Those people asked Bodončar for his hawk, but he would not give it to them. Thus they got along together without the people asking Bodončar whose son he was and to which clan he belonged, and without Bodončar for his part asking them what people they were.

His elder brother Buqz Qatagi, saying that the younger brother Bodončar Mungaq had left following the course of this Oraš River, came in search of him. He asked those people who had moved down along the Tunggelik Stream about such-and-such a man with such-and-such a horse.

The people said, "There is a man and a horse similar to those you ask about. He also has a hawk. Every day he comes to us, drinks kumis, then leaves. Where he spends the night no one really knows, but when the wind blows from the north-west, the stuff and sounds of the ducks and geese caught by his hawk are scattered and fly over here like swirling snow. He must live nearby. Now is about the time of his coming. When a little cold."\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) I.e., during the winter.

---

Within a short time a man came up along the Tunggelik Stream. When he arrived, it was indeed Bodončar. As soon as his elder brother Buqz Qatagi saw him, he recognized him; he led him away and set out, trotting off upstream along the Oraš River.

Bodončar, who was trotting behind his elder brother Buqz Qatagi, said on the way, "Elder brother, elder brother, it is right for a body to have a head, and for a coat to have a collar!" His elder brother Buqz Qatagi did not attach any importance to these words of his. When he repeated the same words, his elder brother again ignored them and did not answer. Further along, Bodončar once more uttered the same words, to which his elder brother said, "What kind of words are those you have just been repeating?"\(^2\)

Then Bodončar said, "These people of a short while ago who are staying on the Tunggelik Stream make no distinction between great and small, bad and good, high and mean; they are all equal. They are people easy to capture. Let us raid them!" His elder brother then said, "Right. If this is so, as soon as we reach home let us consult with our brothers and raid those people!"

When they reached home, elder and younger brothers discussed the matter together, then set out on their horses. They had Bodončar himself ride ahead as a scout.

Bodončar, as he was riding ahead reconnoitring, captured a woman who was in the middle of her pregnancy. He asked her, "To which clan do you belong?" The woman said, "I am an Adangqan Uriŋqagq of the Jār'ut clan."

The five brothers together robbed those people, and in this way got enough livestock, people to serve them, and a place to live.

---

\(^2\) Lit., "head and hoof."
CHAPTER ONE

The woman who was mid-way through pregnancy came to Bodońcař and gave birth to a son. As he was the son of strangers, they named him Jaiřadai. He was the ancestor of the Jadarai. The son of that Jadarai was named Tújguši. The son of Tújguši was Búri Búleűi. The sons of Búri Búleűi were Qara Qudai. The son of Qara Qudai was Jarmuq. These took the clan name Jadarai.

That woman also gave birth to a son by Bodońcař. Since she was a captured woman, her son was named Bárăidai. He was the ancestor of the Bárăin. The son of Bárăidai was Čidugul Bökó, who had many wives and whose sons were born in great profusion. These took the clan name Menen Bárăin.

From Bűgünji, the Bűgünji, the Bűgünji, Qugl Qatagi, the Qatagi, from Buqatu Sálji, the Sálji, from Bodońcař, the Burtuj. From the wife that Bodońcař himself had taken was born a son named Barim Širatū Qubći. Bodońcař also took as concubine a housemaid of Qubći Băñar's mother, who had come as dowry. She had a son by him named Jejeřeđi. At first Jejeřeđi could take part in the Šágge sacrifice in which meat is hung on a pole and offered to Heaven. After Bodońcař's death he was excluded from it because — so they said — the Adangua Uruuqeqi mañ was constantly in the house and Jejeřeđi was probably his son. They made him take the clan name Jejeřeđi and he became the ancestor of the Jejeřeđi.

1 These personal and clan names are explained in popular etymology, from the word for (red) meaning foreign;
2 The Jejeřeđi or "man of the Jadarai clan" is, of course, Jaiřadai.
3 "Bodońcař" or "seize, capture, abduct" — another example of popular etymology to explain a clan name.
4 Men, mañ — hence the association with the clan name Menen.
5 Lit., "they excluded Jejeřeđi from the Šággei."
6 Bodońcař's son by his Adangua Uruuqeqi wife, i.e. Jaiřadai.
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The son of Qubći Băñar was Menen Tudun. The sons of Menen Tudun were Qılı Külük, Quçin, Quçin', Quli, Quli, Quli'un, Qaraldai and Na Qin Băñar.

The son of Qılı Külük, Qadu, was born of Mother Nomulun. The son of Qadu was named Noyajadai; because, by nature, he liked to act as a chief, his descendants took the clan name Noyajkin. The son of Quli was named Barulai. He had a big body and was a voracious eater; therefore, his descendants took the clan name Barulai.

As the sons of Quli were also voracious eaters, they were named Yeke Barula and Üütgen Barula; they too had to take the clan name Barulai and it is these who became the Erdemai Barula, the Tööer Barula and the other Barula. The sons of Qaraldai did not observe seniority when they cooked; therefore, their descendants took the clan name Buda'at. The son of Quli'un was named Adarkaidai; because he spread slanders among his elder and younger brothers, his descendants took the clan name Adarina. The sons of Na Qin Băñar were named Uru'udai and Mangqatui; they took the clan names Uru'ut and Mangqut. Those sons of Na Qin Băñar who were borne by the wife he himself had taken, were named Sju'udai and Duquladai.

The sons of Qudu were Bāi Sjugor Doqint, Ḷarqai Lingu and Čajjin Orqeqi. The son of Bāi Sjugor Doqint was Tumbinai Seën. The son of Čarqai Lingu was Senggum Bilge; his descendants, [beginning with] Senggum Bilge's son Ambarqi [Qeqat], took the clan name Taväl'i. From a sister-in-law of Čarqai Lingu who became his wife was born a son named Berdai. His descendants took the clan name Berulai. The sons of Čajjin Orqeqi and their descendants took the clan names Oronar, Qorgoto, Arulut, Sōmii, Qabarqas and Geniges.

1 i.e., "Big Barula" and "Small Barula."
2 Lit., "stirred."
The sons of Tumbini Seçen were Qubul Qa’an and Sem Seçüle. The son of Sem Seçüle was Ḫoīṭeṭe Ḳabatur. Qubul Qa’an’s sons were seven. The eldest was Ökin Barqac; then came Bartan Ba’atur, Qutquṭu Munggür, Qutula Qa’an, Qulan, Qeda’an and Tödö’en Ölgüsin. These were the seven.

The son of Ökin Barqac was Qutquṭu Yürk. Qutquṭu Yürk’s sons were Seče Beki and Taiçu. These took the clan name Yürk.

These four were the sons of Bartan Ba’atur: Munggêti Kiyän, Nekün Taiși, Yisüge Bütür Ba’atur and Dîrîs Ölgüsin. The son of Qutquṭu Munggür was Bûrî Bökî. It was he who, with his sword, split open Belgüıt’s shoulder at the feast held in the forest by the Önan.

The sons of Qutula Qa’an were Jøçi, Gırmû’a and Altan. The son of Qulan Ba’atur was Yekê Čeren. He was the master of the two freemen Badai and Edîli. Both Qeda’an and Tödö’é were without issue.

Qubul Qa’an ruled over all the Mongols. After Qubul Qa’an, although he had seven sons, Ambaqai Qa’an, the son of Senggüm Bülge, became the ruler of all the Mongols by Qubul Qa’an’s will.

Ambaqai Qa’an gave his daughter as wife to the Ayîrî Côrtu Bütür Tatars who were living on the Urhîn River, between Lake Buyur and Lake Kölen. As he was taking his daughter to them in person, Ambaqai Qa’an was captured by Tatar Jiryan men. When they were on their way to deliver him to the Altan Qa’an of the Kerat, Ambaqai Qa’an contrived to send a message using as messenger Balaqai, a man of the Basît. He said to him, ‘Speak to Qutula, the middle one of the seven sons of Qubul Qa’an, and of my ten sons speak to Quda’an Taiși.’ And he sent saying, ‘When you become qu’an of all and lord of the people, learn from my example and beware of taking your daughter in person to her betrothed. I have been seized by the Tatars.

Until the nails of your five fingers
Are ground down,
Until your ten fingers are worn away,
Strive to revenge me!’

At that time Yisüge Ba’atur was hunting with falcons along the Önan River when he met the Merkî Yeke Çileddi who was on his way home, taking with him a girl of the Oqqu与众不同 tribe to be his wife. Leaning forward to have a better look, he saw that she was an unusually beautiful young woman. He swiftly rode back to his tent, then returned leading his elder brother Nekün Taiși and his younger brother Dîrîs Ölgüsin.

Çileddi became frightened at their coming. He had a fast dūn mare; he struck his dūn mare over the rump and galloped away over a hill. The three men rode after him. Çileddi rounded the spur of the hill and got back to his cart. There and then Lady Hoo’elün said to him, ‘Did you notice those three men?’ The look is odd; they look as if they want to take your life. If only you are spared, In the front seat of every cart There are girls;
In every black cart There are women.
If only you are spared, you will always find a girl or a woman like me. If her name is different, name her also Hoo’elün. Save your life! Never forget to breathe my scent!’ She took off her shirt and bêne, on horseback, seized it with
his outstretched hand. By this time the three men had rounded the spur of the hill and were drawing near. Çiledi struck his fatigued horse on the rump, rode swiftly away and fled upstream along the Onan River.

The three men rode after him, chased him across seven hills and came back. Yisügei Ba'atür took the halter and guided the cart of Lady Hö’élin; his elder brother, Nekin Tašči, led the way, and his younger brother, Dariti Ölgün, rode alongside the shaft of the cart. As they were proceeding, Lady Hö’élin said, ‘My good lord! Çiledi is one whose trust has never blotted. Against the wind, whose belly has never hungered in the steppe.

But how is it now? How fares he, with his two plait tossing sometimes over his back, sometimes over his breast, now forward, now backward?’ So she spoke, and she went on waiting loudly until her voice stirred the waters of the Onan River. Until it resounded throughout wood and valley.

Dariti Ölgün, riding beside her, said, ‘The one who held you in his arms has already crossed many ridges; the one you bewail has already crossed many streams. If you call him, and he looks back, he will not see you; if you look for his track, his trail you will not find. Be quiet!’ – he warned her. Yisügei then took Lady Hö’élin into his tent. Such is the way in which Yisügei carried off Lady Hö’élin.

According to the message of Ambaqaq Qa’an, which had nominated both Qada’an and Qutula, all the Mongols

\[1\] Lie, ‘eldest brother’, here a respectful term for ‘husband.’

and Tašči gathered in the Qoqonqaq Valley by the Onan and made Qutula qa’an. The Mongols rejoiced, and in their rejoicing they danced and feasted. After raising Qutula as qa’an, they danced around the Leefy Tree of Qoqonqaq until there was

A ditch up to their waist, And dust up to their knees.

When Qutula became qa’an, he and Qada’an Tašči moved against the Tatar people. They fought thirteen times with the Tatar chiefs Kōçin Baraća and Jali Buqa, but were unable

To take revenge, To require the wrong

for the slaying of Ambaqaq Qa’an.

Then Yisügei Ba’atür captured the Tatars Temüjin Ugé, Qori Buqa, and other Tatars. At that time Lady Hö’élin was pregnant, and as she was staying at Delti’ün Boldaq by the Onan, it was right there that Činggis Qa’an was born. At the time of his birth he was born clutching in his right hand a clot of blood the size of a knucklebone. Because he was born when the Tatar Temüjin Ugé had been brought captive, for this very reason they gave him the name Temüjin.

Yisügei Ba’atür had these four sons born of Lady Hö’élin: Temüjin, Qasar, Qa’i’ün and Temüge. One daughter was also born, named Temülin. When Temüjin was nine years old, Goi Qa’arin was seven, Qa’i’ün Elibi was five, Temüge Ölgün was three, and Temülin was still in the cradle. [From Yisügei Ba’atür’s second wife, Mother Sulitigit, Bōltir and Belgitig was born.]

When Temüjin was nine years old, Yisügei Ba’atür set out to go to the Oqanu’ut people, relatives of Mother Hö’élin, taking Temüjin with him and saying, ‘I shall ask his maternal uncles for a girl in marriage for him.’ On the

\[1\] I.e., ‘Splenic Hill.’

\[2\] Or Sulitigit.
way, between Mount Čeđeri and Mount Čipurtu, he met Deli Sečen of the Ongigrat.

62 Deli Sečen said, "Quda Yisüge, in whose direction are you going, coming this way?" Yisüge Ba'atur said, "I have come here on my way to the Ongigrat people, the maternal uncles of this my son, to ask for a girl in marriage for him.

Deli Sečen said, "This son of yours is a boy

Who has fire in his eyes,
Who has light in his face.

"Quda Yisüge, I had a dream last night, I did. A white gerfalcon clasping both sun and moon in its claws flew to me and perched on my hand. I told the people about this dream of mine, saying, "Before, when I looked, I could only see the sun and the moon from afar; now this gerfalcon has brought them to me and has perched on my hand. He has alighted, all white. Just what sort of good thing does this show?" I had my dream, quda Yisüge, just as you were coming here bringing your son. I had a dream of good omen. What kind of dream is it? The august spirit of you, Kiyat people, has come in my dream and has announced your visit.

64 "With us, the Ongigrat people, from old days,
To have the good looks of our granddaughters
And the beauty of our daughters is enough.
We do not strive for dominion.
For those of you who have become qa'an,
We have our daughters with beautiful cheeks
Ride on a large cart to which we harness
A black male camel.
We trot them off to the qa'an,
And seat them by him on the qa'un's seat.
We do not strive for dominion, nor for people.
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We lift our good-looking daughters.
We have them ride on a carriage with front seat;
We harness a dark male camel,
We lead them off to the qa'un,
And seat them on the throne, at his side.

From old days, the Ongigrat people
Have the qa'un as shields,
Have their daughters as intercessors.
We live thanks to the good looks
Of our granddaughters
And the beauty of our daughters.
With our boys, when they seek a bride,
One looks at the wealth of our camp;
With our girls, when they are sought as brides,
One considers only their beauty.

Quda Yisüge, let us go to my tent. My daughter is still small, take a look at her, quda!" So said Deli Sečen, and having led him to his tent he made him dismount.

66 When Yisüge saw his daughter, he saw a girl
Who had light in her face,
Who had fire in her eyes.

He was pleased with her. She was ten years old, one year older than Temüjin, and her name was Börte. Yisüge spent the night there, and the following morning, when he requested his daughter for Temüjin, Deli Sečen said, "If I gave her away after much asking on your part, you would respect me, if I gave her away without much asking, you would despise me. But the fate of a girl is not to grow old in the family in which she was born. I will give you my daughter, and you, for your part, leave your son here as my son-in-law." So they both agreed and Yisüge Ba'atur said, "I will leave my son as your son-in-law, but my son is afraid

1 i.e., as an omen of good fortune for the Ongigrat people.
2 i.e., has foretold.
of dogs. *Qua*da don't let him be frightened by dogs." Then he
gave him his spare horse as a pledge and went off, leaving Temüljin as his son-in-law.

On the way back, Yüsüqei Ba’atür met some Tatars who
were having a feast in the *Sira Keér* by Mount Çekčer. As
he was thirsty, he got off his horse and joined them at
the feast. But those Tatars recognized him: 'Yüsüqei the Khian
has come,' they said, and remembered their grievance for
his former raid upon them. With the secret intent to harm,
they gave him poison' mixing it with his food. On the way
back, Yüsüqei Ba’atür felt ill. He went on, and when after
three days he reached his tent, being in a bad way, he'd
said, 'I feel sick within me. Who is at hand?' When they
told him that Mönglik, the son of Old Caraqa of the
Qongqotat, was close by, he called him, made him come and
said to him, 'Mönglik my boy, I have young children. I left
my son Temüljin to be a son-in-law and, as I was coming
back, I was secretly harmed by Tatar people on the way. I
feel sick within me. You take care of your younger
brothers, the little ones that I leave behind, and of your
widowed elder sister-in-law. Go quickly and bring back
my son Temüljin, Mönglik my boy!' He spoke and passed
away.

---
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69 Heeding the words of Yüsüqei Ba’atür, Mönglik went
and said to Dei Seelen, 'Elder brother Yüsüqei thinks
constantly of Temüljin, his heart is aching. I came to get
Temüljin.' Dei Seelen said, 'If my *qua*da is longing for his
son, let him go. But after he has seen him let him quickly
come back.' And so Father Mönglik brought Temüljin back
with him.

70 That spring, when Örbei and Soqatai, the wives of
Ambaqaq Qu'an, performed the *Qafur Inér* sacrifice to
the ancestors, Lady Höl'čiün also went, but as she arrived late
she was left out of the sacrificial meal. Lady Höl'čiün said
to Örbei and Soqatai, 'You say to yourselves that Yüsüqei
Ba’atür is dead, and as my sons are not grown yet, you
deprieve me of the share of the offerings to the ancestors,
and of the sacrificial meat and drink that have been left over.
Isn't this so? You have come to the point of eating under
my very eyes *without asking me to partake of the food,*
and of breaking camp without so much as awakening me!' At
these words the wives Örbei and Soqatai said,
'You are one for whom the rule holds
Not to be called and given food,
You are one for whom the custom holds
To eat if she chances upon food;
You are one for whom the rule holds
Not to be invited and given food;
You are one for whom the custom holds
To eat if food comes by her.
Is it because you say to yourself that Ambaqaq Qu'an
is dead, that we are being spoken to in this way, even by

1 *I.e., 'Yellow Steppe (or Plain).'
2 Or, possibly, 'they grievously injured him' — by mixing poison with his
food.
3 Lit., 'three days and nights.'
4 Lit., 'Yüsüqei Ba’atür.'
5 For these figurative terms, see the Commentary. Cf. also below, § 272.
6 *I.e., 'You would leave me*.
Over her head,
Tying tightly her belt
To shorten her skirt,
Along the Onan River,
Running up and down,
She gathered crab apples and bird cherries,
Day and night she fed
Their hungry gullets.
Born brave, the noble mother¹
Nourished her sons who were favoured
With Heaven’s good fortune
With a pointed stick from a spruce
She dug for roots of the great burnets,
And for those of the silverweed,
And so she provided them with food.
The sons who were fed on wild garlic
And on wild onion by the noble mother,
In time became rulers;
The sons who were fed on wild lily bulbs
By the high-minded, noble mother
Became lawful and wise.
The hungry, nagging sons
Who were fed on wild leek
And on wild onion by the beautiful lady,
Became handsome² and good,
And grew up into fine men
Truly valiant and bold.
Saying to each other,
‘Let us feed our mother!’
They sat on the bank of Mother Onan,
They prepared their hooks and fished
Mean and paltry³ fish;

¹ Lit., ‘the lady mother.’
² Lit., ‘full of vigour.’ The meaning of the Mongolian term is not clear.
³ Lit., ‘spoiled and injured.’
Bending needle into hook,
They fished for salmon and grayling.
They made snares and dragnets,
And caught fingerlings:
Then, with grateful heart,
They fed their mother.

One day, while Temüljin, Qasar, Bekter and Belgüeti were sitting together on the river bank angling, a shiny dace came onto the line. Bekter and Belgüeti snatched it away from Temüljin and Qasar. Temüljin and Qasar came home and said to the noble mother, 'A shiny dace bit our hook, but it was snatched away from us by our brothers Bekter and Belgüeti.' Thereupon, the noble mother said, 'Why be so malicious? [Stop it!] Why do you, older brothers and younger brothers, behave in this way to each other? Just when we have no friend but our shadow, we have no whip but our horse's tail, and when we ask ourselves how to take vengeance for the outrage committed by our Tayiül'ut kinsmen, how can you be at odds with each other, like the five sons of Mother Alan of old? Stop it!'

Thereupon, Temüljin and Qasar, displeased with their mother's words, said, 'Once already, the other day, a lark we shot with a knob-headed arrow; they snatched it away from us, just like that. And now, again, they have snatched something the same way. How can we live together with them?' So saying they flung open the felt door and went out.

At that time Bekter was sitting on a hillock, guarding their nine horses, the light-bay geldings. Temüljin, hiding from behind, and Qasar, hiding in front, were approaching and about to draw out their arrows when Bekter saw them

and said, 'Just when we cannot put up with the outrage of our Tayiül'ut kinsmen and ask ourselves who shall be able to take vengeance on them, why do you regard me as a lash in the eye, a thorn in the mouth? When we have no friend but our shadow, we have no whip but our horse's tail, how can you harbour such thoughts towards me? Anyway, do not destroy my hearth, pray do not make away with Belgüeti!' So he said, and sat cross-legged, waiting for their arrows. Temüljin and Qasar, one from the front and one from the rear, shot at him at close range and went away.

When they came back and entered the tent, the noble mother understood everything from the looks of her two sons and said, 'You who have destroyed life! From the warmth of my womb, when he broke forth fiercely. This one was born clutching a black clot of blood. Like a Qasar' dog snapping at its own afterbirth; Like a panther assailing a cliff; Like a lion uncontrollable in its rage; Like a dragon-snake swallowing its prey alive; Like a goshawk that attacks its own shadow; Like a pike swallowing in silence; Like a camel in rut biting its foal's heel; Like a wolf stalking its prey under cover of a blizzard; Like a mandarin duck eating its chicks when it cannot manage them; Like a jackal gagging up with its pack when one threatens its den; Like a tiger never hesitant when seizing its prey; Like a bear attacking wildly, you have destroyed!'

1 I.e., Alan Qo'a; see above, §§ 18-22.
2 Quadali, i.e. an arrow with a round, blunt head. See the Commentary.
3 I.e., Khazar.
Just when
We have no friend but our shadow,
We have no whip but our horse's tail,
and when, unable to put up with the outrage of our Tâyê'itut
kinsmen, we ask ourselves who shall take vengeance on
them, you behave [in this way] to each other, saying that
you cannot live together! Thus she spoke, and
Citing old sayings,
Quoting ancient words,
mightily reviled her sons.

Soon after this, Tarqaiti Kirituk of the Tâyê'itut came
at the head of his bodyguard and said,
The little rascals have shed their down,
The smoky ones have grown up!

Frightened, the mothers and the older and younger
brothers barricaded themselves in the thick forest. Beligête
tore out trees and, *hauling them up together*, erected a
palisade. While Qasar exchanged arrow shots, Qalí'un,
Temûlje and Temûljin were thrust between clefs in the cliff.

They were battling in this fashion when the Tâyê'itut
shouted, *Send out your elder brother Temûljin; we have no
need for the rest of you!* Upon this shouting, they put
Temûljin on a horse and made him escape. The Tâyê'itut
saw him fleeing into the forest and went in pursuit, but
Temûljin managed to steal into a thicket on the Têrgûne
Heights. The Tâyê'itut could not get in, so they kept watch
round about the thicket.

Temûljin spent three days and nights in the thicket, then
he said, *I will get out.* As he moved on leading his horse
after him, his saddle worked itself loose, fell from the horse
and was left behind. When he went back and looked, he
saw that the saddle had loosened and remained behind even
though the breast-strap was still attached and the saddle-
girth was still fastened. He said, *The saddle-girth could of
course have loosened up, but how could the breast-strap also
have worked itself loose? Is this a warning from Heaven?*
He turned back and spent three more days and nights there.

When he started out again, a white rock the size of a
tent fell at the opening of the thicket, blocking the opening.
He said, *Is this a warning from Heaven?* He turned back
and spent three more days and nights there.

After having been already nine days and nights without
food, he said, *Why must I die so ignominiously? I will get
out!* With his arrow-sharpening knife he cut the bushes —
so thick that it was impossible to get out — around that white
rock, the size of a tent, which had fallen and blocked the
opening; he let his horse slip through and came out of the
thicket. But the Tâyê'itut were keeping watch; as soon as
he emerged they seized him and took him away.

After having taken Temûljin away, Tarqaiti Kirituk
sent the order to his people that he should spend one night
in each apta in rotation. As this was happening, on the
sixteenth of the first month of summer, the day of the Red
Circle, the Tâyê'itut held a feast on the bank of the Önpa.
At sunset they dispersed. Temûljin had been brought to this
feast by a weak young man. After the people at the feast had
dispersed, Temûljin pulled the leach of his cangue away
from that weaking, hit him once on the head and ran away.
Then, telling himself that if he lay down in the forest by the
Önpa he would be seen, he reclined on his back in the
water's stream and, letting his cangue float with the current,
he lay with only his face clear.

When the man who had let him escape called out in a
loud voice, *I let the prisoner escape!*, the scattered Tâyê-
itut gathered together again. In the moonlight, which was
as bright as daylight, they searched the forest by the Önpa.

---

1. *Apta*: a group of tents belonging to one family.
2. *I.,* 'of the full moon.'
3. *I.,* 'in the charge of.'
4. *Cangue*: a heavy wooden board worn round the neck by prisoners.
made to spend the night in each aqil in rotation, I spent one night in the tent of Sorqan Şira. His two sons, Cimbai and Çila’un, felt in their hearts very sorry for me, and seeing me at night they took my cantle, relieved me of it and enabled me to spend the night resting. Again now, when Sorqan Şira saw me, he passed by without telling anyone. Now those same people will surely save me.’ So saying he went downstream along the Onan River looking for the tent of Sorqan Şira.

The sign by which one recognized the tent was that, after pouring out mare’s milk, they used to churn their kumis all through the night until daybreak. As he went, listening for this sign, Temajin heard the sound of the churner and arrived there. When he entered the tent, Sorqan Şira said, ‘Didn’t I tell you to go and look for your mother and younger brothers? Why did you come here?’ But his two sons Cimbai and Çila’un said, ‘When a sparrow hawk causes a sparrow to take shelter into a bush, the bush saves its life. How can you speak to him in this way, now that he has come to us?’ And, displeased at their father’s words, they smashed open Temajin’s cantle, burnt it in the fire and put him into a cart loaded with wool which was standing behind the tent. They entrusted him to the care of their younger sister called Qada’an, who was told not to say a word to a living person.

On the third day the Tayiçi’i’i said to each other that someone had probably hidden him. They said, ‘Let us hold a search among ourselves’, and began searching one another. They searched Sorqan Şira’s tent, his carts, even under the beds. They climbed onto the cart loaded with wool which was standing behind the tent and pulled out the wool near the front opening. They were reaching the back of the cart when Sorqan Şira said, ‘Anyway, in such heat, how could one stand it amidst the wool?’ The searchers then stepped down and went away.

\[\text{Lit., ‘sharpening their mouths and teeth.’}\]
87 After the searchers had left, Sorgun Sira said, 'You nearly had me blown to the winds like hearth-ashes.' Now go, look for your mother and younger brothers!' He set Temüjin on a towny barren mare with a white mouth, cooked him a lamb fastened as the milk of two ewes and provided him with a small and a large leather bucket containing mare's milk. He did not give him either saddle or steel for striking fire, but gave him a bow and two arrows. Having thus provided for him, he sent him on his way.

88 So Temüjin set out and reached the place where they had earlier built the palisade and barricaded themselves. Following some tracks in the grass upstream along the Guri River—the Kuiruqa Stream flowing into it from the west—he followed the tracks up along this stream and came upon his own people who were staying at the time at the Qitocuq Hill of the Beder Promontory by the Kuiruqa Stream.

89 Once they were reunited there, they left and set up camp at Koko Na'ur of Mount Qara Jüügen by the Sengiur Stream, in the Gügel Mountains south of Burung Qaldun. Here they stayed, killing marmots and field-mice for food.

90 One day some robbers came and stole the eight horses, the light-bay geldings, that were standing by the tent and made off with them before their very eyes. Temüjin and his brothers sighted the robbers, but being on foot fell behind.

Belgüe was then away marmot-hunting on a short-tailed, short-haired chestnut horse. He arrived on foot in the evening after sunset, leading behind him the short-tailed, short-haired chestnut horse, which was so laden down with marmots that it staggered. When he was told that robbers had stolen the light-bay geldings, Bo'örün said, 'I will go after them!' Qasar said, 'You cannot cope with them; I will go after them!' Temüjin said, 'Neither of you can cope with them; I will go after them!' Temüjin got on the short-haired chestnut horse and went off in pursuit of the light-bay geldings, following the tracks left in the grass.

He spent three days and nights tracking, and in the early morning of the fourth day he met on the way a brisk lad milking mares in a large herd of horses. When Temüjin inquired about the light-bay geldings, the lad said, 'This morning, before sunrise, eight horses—light-bay geldings—were driven past here. I will show you their trail.' He made Temüjin leave the short-haired chestnut horse there, set him on a white horse with a black back, and he himself rode a fast dun mare. And without even going to his tent, he put down his leather bucket and pail, concealing them in the grass.

'Friend', he said, 'you came to me in great trouble, but men's troubles are the same for all. I will be your companion. My father is called Naqu Bayan.' I am his only son and my name is Bo'örün.

They spent three days and nights following the trail of the light-bay geldings. There, in the evening of the fourth day, just as the sun was setting on the hills, they came upon some people in a circular camp. They saw the eight horses, the light-bay geldings, standing at the edge of that large camp, grazing.

Temüjin said, 'Friend, you stay here. As for me—the light-bay geldings are there. I will go and drive them off!' Bo'örün said, 'I came with you as your companion. How can I stay here?' They raced in together and drove the light-bay geldings off.

---

1 i.e., 'You nearly caused my ruin and that of my family.'
2 For Tarqatal's own version of Temüjin's kidnapping, cf. below, § 149.
3 i.e. 'Blue Lake.'
4 i.e. 'Black Heart.'
5 lit., 'riding.'
6 lit., 'with a black stripe along the backbone.'
7 i.e., 'Naqu the Rich.'
The men came after them in separate groups and began to pursue them. Away from the rest, one man on a white horse and holding a pole-lasso drew closer and caught up with them. Bo'orcu said, 'Friend, give me the bow and arrows. I'll trade shots with him!' Temujin said, 'I am afraid you'll come to harm because of me. I'll trade shots with him!' He swung around and they began to shoot arrows at each other. The man on the white horse stood up, aiming at him with his pole-lasso. His companions, who had fallen behind, came up with him, but the sun sank, dust came down and those men behind, overtaken by darkness, halted and were left behind altogether.

They rode all that night and then rode for three more days and nights before they reached their destination. Temujin said, 'Friend, would I ever have got these horses of mine back without your help and your share of them. How many do you say you'll take?' Bo'orcu said, 'I became your companion because you, a good friend, were in trouble and approached me, and I wished to be of help to a good friend. Am I now to take the horses as booty? My father is called Naqu Bayan. I am the only son of Naqu Bayan. The property of my father is ample for me. I won't take the horses. What sort of help would my help be? I won't take them.'

They arrived at the tent of Naqu Bayan. Naqu Bayan was in tears for the loss of his son Bo'orcu. When they suddenly arrived he said, 'He said what is the matter? A good friend came to me in trouble, became his companion and went with him. Now I have come back.' With this he rode off to fetch his leather bucket and paal which he had concealed in the grass. They killed a lamb fattened on the milk of two ewes and gave it to Temujin as provision for the road; they also prepared a leather bucket containing more milk which they loaded on the horse. In this way, they provided for his journey. Then Naqu Bayan said, 'You two young men keep seeing each other, never abandon each other!'

Temujin left, and after travelling three days and three nights arrived at his tent on the Senggir Stream. Mother Ho'elun, Qasar and his younger brothers were worrying about him, but when they saw him they rejoiced.

Thereupon, Temujin left with Belgutei downstream along the Keliren River to look for Lady Börte, the daughter of Dei Sechen, from whom he had been separated since he had visited her at the age of nine.

Dei Sechen, the Onggiarat, lived between Mount Çeker and Mount Çuquru. When Dei Sechen saw Temujin he was very glad. He said, 'I knew that your Tayic'ut kinsmen were jealous of you, and I worried and despaired, and now at last I see you.' So saying he had him and Lady Börte united as man and wife, and then accompanied her to her new home.

Dei Sechen accompanied her and, as they approached their destination and were still on the way, he turned back at the Urag Çol Bend of the Keliren. His wife, the mother of Lady Börte, was called Çotan. Çotan escorted her daughter and took her to Temujin's home, which at that time was on the Senggir Stream in the Gurelgi Mountains.

After Temujin had sent Çotan home, he sent Belgutei to invite Bo'orcu to join him as his companion. Bo'orcu after receiving Belgutei did not say a word to his father, but He jumped on his chestnut horse with the arched back.

He tucked his grey woollen cloak behind him and came with Belgutei. This is how they became firm companions after first having joined in friendship.

From the Senggir Stream they moved on and set up camp on the Birigi Escarpment at the source of the Keliren River.
Čotan had brought a black sable coat as a wedding present for Temujin’s mother. Temujin, Qasar and Belgütei took away that coat. In earlier days, Ong Qan of the Kerivet tribe and their father Yüsüge Qan had declared themselves sworn friends. Temujin said, ‘As he and my father have declared themselves sworn friends, Ong Qan is indeed like a father to me.’

Knowing that Ong Qan was staying in the Black Forest by the Tuula River, he went there. When he came to Ong Qan, Temujin said, ‘Since in earlier days you and my father declared yourselves sworn friends you are, indeed, like a father to me.’ I took a wife, and I have brought the wedding gift to you.’ Thereupon, he gave him the black sable coat. Ong Qan was very pleased. He said, ‘In return for the black sable coat, I shall bring together for you Your divided people; In return for the sable coat, I shall unite for you Your scattered people. Just as the place of the kidneys must be in the back, That of good faith must be in the breast.’

From there, they returned home. While they were living on the Birgi Escarpment, from Burqan Qaldun came Old Jarli’udai, a man of the Urtungsai tribe, carrying his smith’s bellows on his back and leading his son called Jelme. Jarli’udai said, ‘When you people were at Delli’un Bodaq on the Ohan River and you Temujin were born, I gave you sable swaddling-clothes as a gift. I also gave you this son of mine Jelme, but since he was still small I took him back. Now let Jelme
Put on your saddle, Open your door.’

So he spoke and handed him over to Temujin.

88 They had set up camp on the Birgi Escarpment at the source of the Kelireen River, when early one morning - the light was yellowish as day began to dawn. Old Qo’aq’in, who was serving in the tent of Mother Hō’elun, got up and said, ‘Mother, mother, rise up quickly! The earth is shaking and one can hear the sound of trumping hoofs; will they be the dreadful Taycit’ut approaching? Mother, rise up quickly!’

99 Mother Hō’elun said, ‘Quickly wake the sons!’ Mother Hō’elun also rose in haste. Temujin and the other sons rose in haste too. They grabbed their horses. Temujin rode one horse, Mother Hō’elun rode one horse, Qasar rode one horse, Qal’un rode one horse, Temüge Oqilun rode one horse, Belgütei rode one horse, Bo’er’u rode one horse. Jelme rode one horse. Mother Hō’elun put Temujin in front of her on the horse. One horse was harnessed as a spare horse. There was no horse left for Lady Börte.

100 While it was still early Temujin and his brothers set out in the direction of Mount Burqan. Old Qo’aq’in, in order to hide Lady Börte, Put her into a ragged black covered cart, Harnessed to it an ox with dappled loins, and moved upstream along the Tenggelik Stream. As she was proceeding in the dim light - the day was breaking - some soldiers came riding at a trot towards her. They surrounded her and went up to her, and asked her who she was. Old Qo’aq’in said, ‘I belong to Temujin. I came to shear sheep at the big tent and now I am returning to my tent.’ On this, they said, ‘Is Temujin at home? How far is his tent from here?’ Old Qo’aq’in said, ‘The tent - it is nearby, but whether Temujin is there or not I did not notice. I arose and left from the back.’

1. Andu. See the Commentary.
2. See below, § 150.
The soldiers then trotted off. Old Qo’aq’lin struck the ox with the speckled loins so that they would move along faster, but the axletree of the cart broke in two. As the axletree was broken, they decided to flee into the forest on foot, but at that very moment the same soldiers came trotting up. Forced to sit on one of the horses behind the rider was the mother of Belgüte, both feet dangling in the air. "What are you carrying in this cart?", they said. Old Qo’aq’lin said, "I am carrying wool." The elders of the soldiers said to their younger brothers and sons, 'Dismount and have a look!' The younger brothers and sons dismounted and, having taken off the door of the closed cart, sure enough they found a lady sitting inside. They dragged her out of the cart and made her come down; then, making both her and Qo’aq’lin ride behind, they took them away. Following the tracks left in the grass they went after Temüjin in the direction of Mount Burqan.

In pursuit of Temüjin they circled Burqan Qaldun three times but could not catch him. They made detours this way and that - the swelling quagmires and the tangled woods made so impenetrable a forest that a glinted snake could not creep in - and although they were on his heels they were unable to catch him.

The Three Merkit were Toqto’a of the Udaiy Merkit, Dayir Usun of the U’as Merkit and Qa’atai Darmala of the Qa’at Merkit. Now these Three Merkit had come to take their revenge because Mother Hó’elín had formerly been abducted from Čiledo. The Merkit said to each other, 'We have now seized their women to take our revenge for Hó’elín! We have had our revenge!' So saying they descended from Burqan Qaldun and returned to their homes.

### Footnotes

1. I.e., Old Qo’aiq’lin and Lady Börne.
2. See the Commentary for this hyperbole.
3. See above, §§ 54-56.
4. = Burqan Qaldun.
THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS

CHAPTER THREE

104 Having thus spoken, Temüjin, with Qasar and Belgütei, went to To'oril Ong Qan of the Kereyit who was then staying in the Black Forest by the Tu'tula River. Temüjin said to him, 'The Three Merkit came, taking us by surprise; they seized my wife and carried her off. We have come now to ask you, O Qan my father, to rescue my wife and return her to me.'

To these words To'oril Ong Qan replied, 'Did I not speak with you last year? When you brought me the sable coat, you said, “Since in my father’s time you two declared yourselves sworn friends, you are, indeed, like a father to me.” When you put the coat on me, there and then I said, ‘In return for the sable coat, I shall unite for you your scattered people; in return for the black sable coat, I shall bring together for you your divided people. Let The place of good faith be in the heart, just as that of the kidneys must be in the back.’

Did I not say this? I shall now fulfil that promise and in return for the sable coat, even to the complete destruction of the Merkit, I shall rescue for you your Lady Büte. In return for the black sable coat, we shall crush all the Merkit, we shall cause your wife Büte to return, bringing her back to you!'

105 When Temüjin, Qasar and Belgütei came back from To'oril Qan’s camp and arrived at their tent, Temüjin sent both Qasar and Belgütei to Jamiqa saying, 'Give my sworn friend Jamiqa this message: “When the Three Merkit came, my bed was made empty. You and I, are we not from one family? How shall we take our revenge? My breast is torn apart. You and I, are we not of kindred blood? How shall we avenge this injury?”'

He sent this message and these were the words he had them convey to his sworn friend Jamiqa. He also told them to report to Jamiqa the words spoken by To'oril Qan of the Kereyit: 'Remembering the help and good things done to me in former days by his father Yisgig Qan, I shall stand by Temüjin. I shall set forth with two units of ten thousand and I shall form the right wing. Send a message to younger brother Jamiqa that he should set forth with two units of ten thousand. As to the time and place of our meeting and joining forces, let younger brother Jamiqa decide!' After they had finished delivering this message, Jamiqa said, ‘To know that my sworn friend Temüjin’s bed has become empty, brought pain to my heart.

To know that his

---

1 Temet. See the Commentary.
2 Lit., ‘iver’, i.e. close relatives.
Breast was torn apart,  
Brought pain to my liver.  
Taking our revenge,  
Wiping out the Uduvat and U' as Merkit,  
We shall rescue our Lady Börte!  
Taking our vengeance,  
Crushing all the Qa'at Merkit,  
We shall rescue your wife Börte,  
Causing her to return!  

Now,  
That Togto’a, who takes fright  
When one strikes the saddle-flaps, for  
He takes it for the sound of the drum,  
He must be in the Bu'una Steppe:  
Davir Usun, who on hearing  
The rattle of a loose quiver  
Deserts his own companions,  
He must now be at Talquin Aral,  
Between the Orqon and the Selengge.  
Qa'atai Darmala, who when the saltwort  
Is carried by the wind,  
Quickly flees into a dark forest,  
He must now be in the Daraj Steppe.  

Now, by the shortest way  
We shall cross the river Kilqo –  
May the sedge be in good growth!  
We shall bind our rafts with it,  
We shall enter their land.  
Descending on the smoke-hole  
Of that coward Togto’a’s tent,  
Its proud frame we shall smite,

---

1 Lit., ‘out.’
2 I.e., ‘He-Canal Steppe (or Plain).’
4 See the Commentary.

So it collapses:  
We shall kill his wives and children  
To the last one,  
Of his door the sacred frame,  
We shall smile so it shatters;  
We shall utterly destroy his people  
Till nothing will be left.’

Further, Lampa said, ‘Speak to my sworn friend  
Temujin and elder brother To’oril Qan, and say to them on my behalf, ‘As for me,  
I have consecrated my standard  
Which is visible from afar,  
I have beaten my bellowing drum  
Covered with the hide of a black bull;  
I have mounted my swift black horse;  
I have put on my armour  
And grasped my steel spear;  
I have placed on the bowstring my arrow with its nock  
Of wild peach bark.  
I am ready, let us start  
And give battle to the Qa’at Merkit!’

Then say to them,  
“My long’ standard, visible from afar,  
I have consecrated;4  
I have beaten my deep-sounding drum  
Covered with ox-hide;  
I have mounted my swift horse,  
The one with a black stripe along the backbone;  
I have put on my leather-strapped breastplate,

---

1 See the Commentary.
2 Lit., ‘sprinkled.’
3 Lit., ‘my saddle-hair dress.’
4 Because of the long skewers made of yak tails.
5 Lit., ‘strapped.’
6 Cf. above, §§ 24, 25 and 90.
And grasped my hilted sword:
I have placed on the bowstring my cocked arrow.
I am ready, let us fight to the death
Against the Uduvit Meirty!"  

Then say to them, "After elder brother To’orl Qan has set out and, passing by my sworn friend Temujin on the southern side of Burqun Qaldun, comes jointly with him, we shall meet at Botoqa Bo’orji at the source of the Oon River. When I set out from here, upstream along the Oon River where my sworn friend’s people are — with one unit of ten thousand taken from his people and I with one from here making two units of ten thousand — going up along the Oon River we shall join forces at the appointed meeting place in Botoqa Bo’orji."

And he sent them off with this message.

Qasar and Belgüeti came and reported these words of Jamaqa to Temujin, who had them conveyed to To’orl Qan. Upon receiving Jumqa’s message, To’orl Qan took the field, two units of ten thousand altogether. When To’orl Qan set out, as he was approaching in the direction of the Bürqi Escarpment of the Kilören on the southern side of Burqun Qaldun, Temujin, who was then on the Bürqi Escarpment and therefore on To’orl’s path, made way for him and, moving upstream along the Tunggerik, set up camp on the Tana Stream on the southern side of Burqun Qaldun. Temujin then advanced from there with his troops. When To’orl Qan with one unit of ten thousand and To’orl Qan’s younger brother Jaqa Gambu with one unit of ten thousand — two units of ten thousand in all — halted at Ayil Qaraqana on the Kümürq Stream, Temujin joined them and set up camp there.

1 Lit. ‘here.’
2 Lit. ‘from the sworn friend’s people.’
3 Lit. ‘one unit of ten thousand.’
4 I.e., ‘Big Pend Stream.’

Temujin, To’orl Qan and Jaqa Gambu came together and started off from there. When they arrived at Botoqa Bo’orji at the source of the Oon River, Jamaqa had already reached the meeting place three days before.

Jamaqa, seeing the troops of Temujin, To’orl Qan and Jaqa Gambu, took up position, ranging his two units of ten thousand troops in battle order. They — Temujin, To’orl Qan and Jaqa Gambu — likewise ranged their troops in battle order. As soon as they came face to face and recognized each other, Jamaqa said, ‘Did we not agree that we won’t be late.

At the appointed meeting.
Even if there be a blizzard;
At the gathering.
Even if there be rain?
Are we not Mongols, for whom a “yes” is the same as being bound by an oath? We did agree that
We shall eject from our ranks
Whoever is remiss in his “yes.”

To the words of Jamaqa, To’orl Qan said, ‘As we are three days late at the meeting place, it is up to younger brother Jamaqa to punish and lay blame.’ In this way they exchanged words of reproach about the meeting.

Starting from Botoqa Bo’orji they arrived at the river Kilgo. They made rafts and crossed it. In the Bu’ura Steppe.

Descending on the smoke-hole
Of Toqto’a Beki’s tent.
Of his tent the proud frame
They did smite so it collapsed;
They plundered his wives and children
To the last one.
Of his door the sacred frame
They did smite so it shattered;
They utterly plundered his people
Till nothing more was left.

While Toq'ao's Beki was ashore,² some fishermen, tabe
catchers and wild animal hunters who happened to be by the
river Kilgo, left it and, travelling all through the night,
brought the news of the allies' approach saying, 'The enemies are coming, pushing forward at full speed.' When
they received this news, Toq'ao and Dayir Usun of the U'sa
Merkit joined together, went downstream along the
Selenge and entered the Barqjin territory. Few in number
and dispossessed of all but their bodies, they escaped by
taking flight.¹

110

At night the Merkit people fled in disarray down the
Selenge River, but even in the night our troops were
pressing hard after the hastily fleeing Merkit. As the
pillaging and plundering went on, Temüjin moved among
the people that were hurriedly escaping, calling, 'Börte, Börte!' And so he came upon her, for Lady Börte was
among those fleeing people. She heard the voice of
Temüjin and, recognizing it, she got off the cart and came
running towards him. Although it was still night, Lady
Börte and Qo'aqūn both recognized Temüjin's reins and
tether and grabbed them. It was moonlight, he looked at
them, recognized Lady Börte, and they fell into each other's
arms. After this, that very night Temüjin sent a message to
To'oril Qun and to sworn friend Jumaaq saying, 'I have
found what I was looking for. Let us not travel all night; let
us camp here!' He had this message delivered to them. As
for the Merkit people who had been fleeing in disarray at
night, while still scattering and on the run, they too stopped
and spent the night right there.⁴

¹ See above, § 105.
² Lit., 'lying down.'
³ I.e., they barely escaped with their lives.
⁴ I.e., where they happened to be.

This is how Lady Börte was rescued from the Merkit
tribe, and how she was reunited with Temüjin.

At the very beginning, Toq'ao's Beki of the U'duvān
Merkit, Dayir Usun of the U'sa Merkit and Qo'aaqūn Darmala
of the Qa'at Merkit, those three Merkit with three hundred
men, said, 'In former days Mother Ho'edilin was abducted by
Yisūgū Ba'atur from Yeke Cilèdī, the younger brother of
Toq'ao's Beki; and they set out to take revenge for that. It
was at the time when Temüjin circled Burqan Qulun three
times that they captured Lady Börte. ¹ They entrusted her to
Çilèr Böko, the younger brother of Cilèdī. As Çilèr Böko
had been looking after her ever since, when he fled, desert-
ing his own companions, he said,
'To feed on scraps of skin
Is the black crow's lot — yet
It was goose and crane
It aspired to eat.
I, brutal and base Çilèr, who laid my hand
On the noble lady,
I have brought disaster
On all the Merkit.
Lowly, base Çilèr,
I have come to the point
That I shall lose my black head.
To save my one and only life,
I wish to creep into dark gorges.
Who will act as a shield for me?
To feed on rats and mice
Is the buzzard's, that vile bird's lot — yet
It was swan and crane
It aspired to eat.
I, theing and base Çilèr, who took away
The favoured and fortunate lady,
I have brought disaster upon

¹ See above, §§ 54-56 and 100-102.
The whole of the Merkit.
Boastful, base Čilger,
I have come to the point
That I shall lose my shrivelled head.
To save my life, worth but a sheep’s dropping,
I wish to creep into dreadful, dark gorges.
Who will be a shelter for my life
Which is worth but a sheep’s dropping?"
Thus he spoke, and escaped, deserting his own companions.

112 They seized Qa’atai Darmal and brought him back,
They forced him to wear a cangue made of
a wooden board,
They took him straight to Quldar Burqan.1

Someone informed them that Belgüte’s mother was
‘in that ṣulqī over there.’ Belgüte went there to fetch his
mother, but when he entered her tent by the right-hand door,
his mother, in a ragged sheepskin coat, went out by the left-hand door. Outside she said to someone else, ‘I am told that
my sons have become gents, but here I have been joined with
a base man. How can I now look my sons in the face?’ So
she spoke and ran off, slipping away into a dense wood.
Belgüte Noyan immediately searched for her, but could not
find her. He then shot knob-headed arrows2 at any man of
Merkit stock, saying, ‘Bring me my mother!’ The three
hundred Merkit who had once circled Mount Burqan
Were exterminated, down to
The offspring of their offspring.
They were blown to the winds like hearth-soashes.3
Their remaining wives,
Those suitable to be embraced,4
Were embraced:
Those suitable to be let into the tent
Through the door and serve as slaves
Were let in through the door.

113 Temjin, speaking gratefully to To’oril Qan and Januqa,
said ‘Being taken as a companion by my father the Qan
and sworn friend Januqa, and with my strength increased by
Heaven and Earth,
Called by Mighty Heaven,
Carried through by Mother Earth,
We emptied the breasts of the Merkit people
Who take their revenge as a man does,
And we tore their livers to pieces.
We emptied their beds5
And we exterminated their relatives;
The women of theirs who remained
We surely took captive!
Thus we destroyed the Merkit people: let us now withdraw!’

114 At the time when the Udaiyi Merkit were fleeing in
haste, our soldiers found a little boy of five with fire in his
eyes who had been left behind in the camp and whose name
was Kūlu. He had a sable cap, boots made from the skin of
a doe’s forelegs, and a dress of otter skins cleared of hair
and sewn together. They took him and brought him to
Mother Há’élin, and gave him to her as a present.

115 When Temjin, To’oril Qan and Januqa, after joining
their forces
Had smashed the jibbals,
Had captured the splendid women
of the Merkit; they withdrew from Talqaq Aral, between the
Organ1 and Selenge rivers. Temjin with Januqa, with-
drawing jointly, went in the direction of the Qorqonaq
Valley. On his way back, To’oril Qan passed by the

1 = Burqan Quldam. Cf. above, § 103.
2 = See above, § 81, n. 1.
3 = See above, § 77.
4 = Cf. above, § 87.
5 = I.e., to be taken as concubines.

1 = I.e., of their wives.
2 = Organ (= Orqan).
Hokortu Valley on the northern side of Burqan Qaldun; then passing by Qu’a’uratu Subût and Huliyatu Subût, where he hunted wild game, he withdrew in the direction of the Black Forest by the Tu’ula River.

116 Temûjin and Jamûqa got together and set up camp in the Qorgonaq Valley. Remembering how earlier on they became sworn friends, they said, ‘Let us renew our mutual pledge of friendship, let us now love each other again!’

Earlier, when they had first become sworn friends, Temûjin was eleven years old. Jamûqa had given Temûjin a roebuck knucklebone. Temûjin in return had given him a copper knucklebone, and so they had become sworn friends. Having declared themselves sworn friends, they had played knucklebones together on the ice of the Onan River. There they had declared each other friends by oath for the first time.

After that, in the spring, as they practised shooting with their firewood bows, Jamûqa split and stuck together the two horns of a two-year-old calf, bored holes in them, and gave this whistling arrowhead of his to Temûjin. In exchange Temûjin gave him a knob-headed arrow with a tip of juniper wood, and they became sworn friends once more.

This is how they declared themselves friends by oath for the second time.

They said to each other, ‘Listening to the pronunciation of the old men of former ages which says: “Sworn friends – the two of them Sharre hat a single life; They do not abandon one another; They are each a life’s safeguard for the other.” We learn that such is the rule by which sworn friends love each other. Now, renewing once more our oath of friendship, we shall love each other.’

117 Temûjin girdled his sworn friend Jamûqa with the golden belt taken as loot from Tuqša’ the Merkit. He also gave sworn friend Jamûqa for a mount Tuqša’s yellowish white mule with a black tail and mane, a mule that had not foaled for several years. Jamûqa girdled his sworn friend Temûjin with the golden belt taken as loot from Dayr Usun of the U’as Merkit, and he gave Temûjin for a mount the kid-white horse with a horn, also of Dayr Usun. At the Leafy Tree on the southern side of the Quldaqar Cliff in the Qorgonaq Valley they declared themselves sworn friends and loved each other; they enjoyed themselves revelling and feasting, and at night they slept together, the two of them alone under their blanket.

Temûjin and Jamûqa loved each other one year and half of the second year. Then one day they decided to move on from their present encampment. They broke camp and set out on the sixteenth of the first month of summer, the day of the Red Circle.

Temûjin and Jamûqa went together in front of the carts, and as they proceeded Jamûqa said, ‘Sworn friend, sworn friend Temûjin,

Let us camp near the mountain:
There will be enough shelter
For our horse-herders!
Let us camp near the river:
There will be enough food!
For our shepherds and lamb-herds!’

Temûjin could not understand these words of Jamûqa and remained silent. Falling behind, he waited for the carts in the middle of the moving camp – for it was a moving camp – then Temûjin said to Mother Ho’élán, ‘Sworn friend Jamûqa said,

1 I.e., ‘The Pass with Spruces’ and ‘The Pass with Aspens.’
2 I.e., ‘of the full moon.’ Cf. above, § 81.
3 Lit., ‘food for the gutters.’
“Let us camp near the mountain: There will be enough shelter For our horse-herders!
Let us camp near the river: There will be enough food For our shepherds and lamb-herds!”

I couldn’t understand these words of his, so I did not give him any answer and decided to come and ask you, mother.’

Before Mother Hô’elîn could utter a sound, Lady Bôrte said, ‘Our friend Jâmąq, so they say, grows easily tired of his friends. Now the time has come when he has grown tired of us. The words which sworn friend Jâmąq has spoken just now are, therefore, words alluding to us.1 Let us not pitch camp, but while we are on the move, let us separate completely from him and move further on, traveling all night!’ This, then, is what she said.

They all approved of the words Lady Bôrte and without pitching camp they set off, traveling at night. As they proceeded, they passed the Tayîlū’s encampment along the way. The Tayîlū, for their part, became frightened and that same night in great confusion actually moved to Jâmąq’s side. In the camp of the Bèsüt in the midst of the Tayîlū, our people took a little boy by name of Kököü who had been left behind in the camp. When they came back they gave him to Mother Hô’elîn. Mother Hô’elîn took him under her care.

They travelled all that night. At daybreak they saw Qèdî’sun Tqûr’asun, Qûrâqâi Tqûr’asun and Qurdisqû Tqûr’asun, the three Tqûr’asun brothers of the Jalalîr tribe, drawing near to join them after having travelled throughout the night together. Then Qèdî’sun Dûlîrûq of the Tarqut and his brothers – five Tarqut in all – also drew near. Then the son of Mûngêqû Kîyên, Óngûrû and the others, with their Cângîlû’ut and Bâyû’ut followers drew near too. From the Barûlûs came the brothers Qúbîlîs and Qûdûs. From the Mûngûqû came the two brothers Jêlî and Dûqûlûû Carrier. The younger brother of Bû’ôrû, Ôgûlî Carrier, left the Araîlû and also came to join his elder brother Bû’ôrû. The younger brothers2 of Jêlîne, Cûrûqû and Sûbêvû Bi’atûr.

1 Here = ‘words that conceal a scheme against us.’
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2 Also written Ôgûlî, Ôgûlîe and Ôgûlîe. For the title Carrier, see the Commentary.
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Here = ‘cousin.’ See the Commentary.

3 Also written Cângûlî, Cûngûlû and Cûngûlû. Meaning Temûllî’s brother-in-law. See the Commentary.
joined camp with him. From there they went on, and camped at Kökê Nûr of Mount Qara Irugin by the Senggir Stream in the Gâiregî Mountains.

The Geniges, with Qunan at their head, also came as one camp. Then came Darîtî Olgîhn — also one camp. From the Jadaran came also Mulqâlu. And the Unûn and the Szâqûkîn came — also one camp. When Temûûtín had parted company in this way from Jamuqa and had moved further on, setting up camp at Aylz Qarâqâna by the Kiumûçtu Stream, there came, also separating from Jamuqa, the sons of Sorga, Jikkê of the Jîrkin, Sâla Bekî and Taîçu — one camp; then the son of Nakan Taîçu, Qêzar Bekî — one camp, and the son of Qutula Qan, Altan Olgîhn — one camp. These, then, left Jamuqa and moved on, and when Temûûtín set up camp at Aylz Qarâqâna by the Kiumûçtu Stream, they

1 See above, § 107.

2 = a circular butte, i.e. a height in which the game is driven towards a central point. See the Commentary, § 115.
and made Temüjin gan, naming him Činggis Qa’an.

124 Having become qa’an, Činggis ordered the younger brother1 of Bo’orūq, Goğlir Čerbi,2 to carry a quiver, Qas’lun Toqura’un to carry a quiver, and the two brothers Jeld and Dogoluq Čerbi each to carry a quiver.

Qubilai, Čingis, and Qaraq Toqura’un together with Qasar were ordered to carry swords. To them Činggis Qa’an said,

‘Cut the neck of the braaggat,3
Chafe the breast of the arrogant!’4

And he said, ‘Let Belgütei and Qaraldai Toqura’un
Be in charge of the geldings,
Be my equestriess!’5
And he said, ‘Tayici’udai, Qutu Moriņi and Mulqalq shall tend the herds of horses!’6
And he said, ‘Let Arqai Qasar, Taqai, Stkegeti and Ca’urqan
Be my far-flying shafts,
Be my near-flying arrows!’7

So Degei tended the sheep. His younger brother, Gürü 규정,8 spoke:

‘I shall not let the sheep slip
Off a log cart;
I shall let not an axle-cart collapse
On the road.
I shall make the tent-cart!’, he said. And Dödei Čerbi said, ‘I shall be in charge of the domestics and servants in the tent!’9

1 Here = ‘cousin.’ See above, § 120.
2 The Čulung Čerbi of § 120 above.
3 The Kūtuluq of § 120 above.

125 Thereupon, when Činggis Qa’an became qa’an, he said to
Bo’orūq and Jelme, ‘You two,
When I had no friend but my shadow,
Became my shadows; and truly

1 Plural in the text.
2 I.e., ‘Qutu the Horse-herder.’
3 A simple for trusted envoys.
Brought peace to my mind.
In my mind you shall dwell!"

And he said,
"When I had no whip
But my horse's tail, you
Became my horse's tail; and truly
Brought peace to my heart.
In my breast you shall dwell!"

So he spoke, saying to them, "You two, who stood by me from the beginning, will you not be at the head of all these here?"

Further, Činggis Qa'un said, "When Heaven and Earth increased my strength and took me into their protection, you, the senior ones, who for my sake came over from sworn friend Jamaq in wishing to become companions, will you not be my lucky companions? I have appointed each of you to your respective office."

He sent Daqii and Sügegei as envos to To'orî Qan of the Kereýit with the message that Činggis Qa'un had been made qan. To'orî Qan sent them back with the following message: "To make my son Temûjin qan is indeed right. How can the Mongols be without a qan? In future
Do not break this, your agreement,
Do not dissolve your bond,
Do not tear off your collar!"

---

1 Lit., "us."
2 I.e., with stingîng and malicious words. For Altan and Quçar's role, see above, § 123.
3 Lit., 'younger brother.' See the Commentary, §§ 68 and 74.
4 Lit., 'Cradle Spring'
5 I.e., 'Rump-like Steppe (or Plant)'
In the course of feasting, one pitcher of kamsi was first poured for Çinggis Qa'an, Lady Hö'elün, Qasar, Saça Beki and others. As one pitcher was also poured to the women starting with Ebegi, the secondary wife of Saça Beki's father, both Qorjin Qaran and Qur'urcin Qaran said, "Why didn't they pour first for me, but began with Ebegi?" and they thrashed the steward Sikli'd. As he was being thrashed, the steward Sikli'd said, "What sort of thing is it, your thrashing me like this, just because Yisügei Ba'atur and Nekkin Taišl are dead?" So he spoke and cried out loudly.

That feast had been arranged on our side by Belgüei. He was standing outside the camp keeping Çinggis Qa'an's geldings. From the Jürkin's side Buri Bokho had arranged the feast.

A man of the Qadagin tribe stole a tether from our horse station. Belgüei caught the thief, but Buri Bokho took that man under his protection. Now, Belgüei, when wrestling, used to remove his right sleeve and go on fighting bare-armed. On this occasion, Buri Bokho's sword split open his shoulder, which had been left exposed and bare. Although cut in this way, still Belgüei, thinking nothing of it, did not bother and let the blood flow. But Çinggis Qa'an, sitting in the shade, saw what happened from the place of the feast. He stepped out and said, "How can we be treated like this?" Belgüei said, 'The wound isn't that bad yet! On my account, I fear we may fall out with our kinsmen. There is nothing wrong with me, I am recovering. Elder brother, now that we have just grown friendly with our kinsmen, do not act, wait a little while!'

---

1. I.e., 'Married Sentists.'
2. I.e., 'Seventy Marrows.'
3. = Qaan (= Onon).
Although warned is this way by Belgui to, Çinggis Qa’an did not comply: breaking off tree branches, pulling out the thorns of the kumis leather bags and grabbing them, they started to beat each other. Çinggis Qa’an and our men overcame the ğürkin and forcible seized both Qorjin Qaun and Qa’un Qaun. Later, however, on being told, ‘We want to make peace’, they returned both Qorjin Qaun and Qa’un Qaun to the ğürkin.

It was when messengers were still being sent from one side to the other to make peace that Çinggis Qa’an learned the news that the Altan Qaun of the Khat people, because Megiţi Qa’un and others of the Tatars would not enter into an agreement with him, had then sent word to Ongging Çingsang that he should array his troops without delay and set out against them. Thereupon, Ongging Çingsang had driven Megiţi Se’ilü and the other Tatars, together with their livestock, upstream along the Ulja, and was now approaching.

Having learned this news, Çinggis Qa’an said, ‘From old days, the Tatar people have been our mortal enemies, the people who have destroyed our fathers and forefathers. Now, taking this opportunity, let us jointly attack them!’ And he sent an envoy to deliver this message to To’oril Qaun: ‘It is reported that the Altan Qaun’s commander Ongging Çingsang has driven the Tatar Megiţi Se’ilü and other Tatars upstream along the Ulja and is now approaching. Let us jointly attack the Tatars who have destroyed our fathers and forefathers. To’oril Qaun, my father, should come quickly!’

When this message was delivered, To’oril Qaun said, ‘The word my son has sent is right. Let us jointly attack!’ Thereupon, on the third day, To’oril Qaun, having assembled his troops, set out with his army and quickly went to his assistance.

Çinggis Qa’an and To’oril Qaun sent a message to the ğürkin Sa’a Beka and Taču, and to the other ğürkin: ‘Now, taking this opportunity, let us jointly attack the Tatars who from old have destroyed our fathers and forefathers. Together let us set forth against them!’

They sent the message and having waited for six days from the time it should have come to the ğürkin, Çinggis Qa’an and To’oril Qaun, unable to wait any longer, together set out with their troops. As they approached, moving downstream along the Ulja to launch the attack in conjunction with Ongging Çingsang, the Tatar Megiţi and the other Tatars built a stockade there, at Qusutu Se’ilü and Naratu Se’ilü by the Ulja. Çinggis Qa’an and To’oril Qaun captured those who had barricaded themselves in this way, among them Megiţi Se’ilü from the stockade. They killed Megiţi Se’ilü on the spot; Çinggis Qa’an then took as booty his silver cradle and his blanket decorated with big pearls.

Çinggis Qa’an and To’oril Qaun [went to meet Ongging Çingsang and] told him that they had killed Megiţi Se’ilü. Ongging Çingsang was very glad when he learned that Megiţi Se’ilü had been killed. He gave Çingsgis Qa’an the title ta’an qar’ and, at the same time, he gave the title of ony to To’oril of the Kerčiyit. The name Ong Qaun thus originates from the time when it was first given to To’oril as a title by Ongging Çingsang.

Ongging Çingsang said, ‘You have done a very great service to the Altan Qaun by your joint attack on Megiţi Se’ilü and by killing him. I shall inform the Altan Qaun of’
this service of yours. Let the Altan Qan decide whether a title higher than the present one should be further conferred on Çinggis Qa'an—whether he should be given the title of jahutu.²⁴ Rejoicing in this way, Önggii Çingsang withdrew from there.

On that occasion, Çinggis Qa'an and Ong Qan plundered the Tatars and shared the booty, each taking his part, then they returned to their own encampments.³

At the time when our troops were plundering the camp at Naratu Şüün where the Tatars had halted and barricaded themselves, they happened to find in the camp a little boy who had been abandoned. Taking back the little boy, who had as nose- ring a golden loop and who wore a gold-stitched silk waistcoat lined with sable, Çinggis Qa'an gave him as a present to Mother Ho'elan. Mother Ho'elän said, ‘He must be the son of a man of rank, surely he is the offspring of a man of noble origin! The Mother named him Sükken Qudduq and brought him up as the younger brother of her five children and as her sixth child.

The base camp of Çinggis Qa'an was at Lake Harlitu. From among those who had remained at the base camp, the Jürkin stripped fifty men of their clothing and killed ten men.

When those of us who were left at the base camp told Çinggis Qa'an that they had been treated in that way by the Jürkin, Çinggis Qa'an on hearing this news became very angry and said, ‘How could we be treated in such a manner by the Jürkin? When we held a feast in the forest by the Owan they also dined the steward Şüün, and it was they who also cut Belgiti's shoulder. We were told we should make peace, and gave them back both Qurjin Qatun and

Quürčin.

After that, said we that we would set out and jointly attack the Tatars who, full of hatred and resentment, had from old destroyed our fathers and forefathers. Although we waited six days for the Jürkin, they failed us by not coming.¹ And now, by siding in this way with the enemy, they themselves have also become our enemies!” Having said this, Çinggis Qa'an moved against the Jürkin.

When the Jürkin were staying at Dolo’an Bolda’ut⁵ of Kö dés Aral on the Kělėren River, Çinggis Qa’an plundered their people. Saça Beki and Tačžu, being few in number and dispossessed of all but their bodies, escaped. He pursued them and, overtaking them at the Teletu Pass, he caught Saça Beki and Tačžu.

After their capture, Çinggis Qa’an said to Saça and Tačžu, ‘What did we agree upon in the old days?” Being so addressed, Saça and Tačžu said, ‘We did not keep to the words we spoke. Now make us comply with them!” And, admitting their oath, they held out their necks to the sword.

Making them to admit their oath and causing them to comply with their words, he executed them and cast off their bodies there and then.

Having disposed of Saça and Tačžu he returned to the Jürkin camp. As he was about to move the Jürkin people away, the three sons of Teleqeti Bayan of the Jalasir, Gü’ün U’a, Çils’un Qayići and Jbebke, were with these Jürkin at the time. Gü’ün U’a, with his two sons Müquali and Buga, came to pay homage to Çinggis Qa’an and said, “Let these sons of mine be the slaves Of your threshold.”

¹ See above, §§ 132 and 133.
² Lit., ‘leaning on.’
³ i.e., ‘Seven Seminary Hills.’
⁴ i.e., ‘Barkhat Island’; but see the Commentary.
⁵ Cf. above, § 109.
⁶ Lit., ‘with our words.’
⁷ For this expression see the Cī
If they stray from your threshold,
Cut off their heel tendons!  
Let them be the personal slaves Of your door: 
If they abandon your door, 
Cut out their livers and 
Cast them away! 

So saying he handed them over to him. 
Čila’uń Qayi, with his two sons Tüngge” and Qaś also came to pay homage to Činggis Qa’an and spoke thus: 
“Let them guard 
Your golden thresholds”, so saying, 
I give you these sons of mine; 
If they depart from your golden threshold, 
Put an end to their lives and 
Cast them away! 
“Let them lift for you 
The wide felt door”, so saying, 
I give them to you; 
If they desert your wide door, 
Kick them in the pit of the stomach and 
Cast them away! 

Thus he spoke. Činggis Qa’an gave Jehke to Qasar. Jehke, bringing with him from the Jürkin camp a little boy called Boro’ul, paid homage to Mother Ho’élun and gave him to her. 

Mother Ho’élun reared in her tent these four: the boy called Qaśə found in the market camp, the boy called Köloñ in the Bənr camp among the Tayrli₂, the boy called Sigkən Qitaq found in the Tatar camp, and the boy called Boro’ul found in the Jürkin camp. Mother Ho’élun said, “Whom but these fourlings will I make

---

1 Lit. ‘the eldest brother.’ 
2 Lit., ‘saying that he was the eldest brother of Qaśul Qaś’s sons.’ 
3 I.e., who were brave and daring. 
4 Lit., ‘Činggis Qa’an.’ 
5 There is no previous mention of this episode.
and straddled him. Belgüüt glanced backwards and, when he caught sight of Cinggis Qa’an’s eye, the Qaan hit his lower lip. Belgüüt understood. He sat on top of Buri Bökö and, crossing the two ends of his collar, he pulled them towards himself, tightening his grip. As he did that, he pressed his knee on his chin and broke it.

Buri Bökö, his spine broken, said, ‘I would not have been defeated by Belgüüt, but fearing the Qaan, I took a fall on purpose. I hesitated, so I lost my life.’ Thus he spoke and died.

After Belgüüt had pulled and broken his spine, he dragged Buri Bökö away, cast him off and left.

Of the seven sons of Qabul Qaan, Ökin Barqao was the eldest; the next one was Bartan Ba’utur, whose son was Yissügë Ba’utur. The next one after him was Qutnaq Möngöl, whose son was Bari. Overstepping the line of the sons of Bartan Ba’utur which was nearest above him in order of seniority, he became a companion of the proud sons of Barqao. Because of this, Buri Bökö, the strongest man among his people, perished, his spine broken by Belgüüt.

After that, in the Year of the Hen (1201), the Qadagin and the Salji’ut united, and the following tribes gathered at Alqui Spring:1 the Qadagin led by Buqu Corogi of the Qadagin, and the Salji’ut led by Qarjida Ba’utur of the Salji’ut; the Dörben, who had made peace with the Tatar, led by Qalj’un Bökö of the Dörben, and the Tatar led by Jalin Buqaa of the Alfi Tatar; the Ikres led by Tüge Maqa of the Ikres; the Onggirat led by Terge Emel, Alqui and others of the Onggirat; the Qorals led by Ğemq Caaq’an2 and others of the Qorals; also Buyuq Qaan of the Göç’ut Naiman from the Naiman; Quata, the son of Teqü’ta Bökö of the Merkit, Qutnaq Bökö of the Oyqrat; and, from the Tayeq’ut, Tarqiiq Kattuq, Qodan Örgöng. A’uü Ba’utur and other Tayeq’ut. Saying, ‘Let us raise Jamuqa the Jafirat as qan’, they jointly backed the backs of a stallion and a mare and together swore an oath of friendship.

From there they moved downstream along the Ergüne River, and on the large promontory of the peninsula where the Kan River flows into the Ergüne, there they raised Jamuqa as gür qan.3 After raising him as gür qan, they decided to set out to attack Cinggis Qaan and Ong Qaan.

Word of this – that they had decided to attack – was sent by Qarjida of the Qorals to Cinggis Qaan, when he was staying in the Gürelgüz Mountains. When he received this news, Cinggis Qaan passed it on to Ong Qaan. As soon as Ong Qaan received the news, he set his army in motion and speedily arrived at Cinggis Qaan’s camp.

After getting Ong Qaan to come, Cinggis Qaan and Ong Qaan decided to move jointly against Jamuqa. They set out downstream along the Kelérer River. Cinggis Qaan sent Altan, Qarqar and Döriqin as vanguard; Ong Qaan for his part sent as vanguards Senggä, Jaga Gambu and Bilge Bökö. Patrols were also dispatched ahead of these vanguards: at Enegen Güiilefi’ they set up an observation post; beyond that, at Mount Çekker, they set up another observation post; and beyond that, at Mount Çiqeroq, they set up a further observation post.

---

1 I.e., Bartan Ba’utur.
2 The Qutnaq Möngöl of §§ 48 and 50 above.
3 Lit., ‘three.’
4 Lit., ‘spring.’
5 Lit., ‘Co’q Caaq’an.’
6 Lit., ‘having a single apricot tree.’

1 Lit., ‘Universal Ruler.’
2 Lit., ‘Cinggis Qaan.’
3 Lit., ‘this news.’
4 Lit., ‘Ong Qaan.’
5 I.e., ‘having a single apricot tree (?).’
Altan, Qurban, Senggum and the others of our vanguard arrived at Uliarqat. While they were deciding whether to camp there, a man from the observation post which had been set up at Ciqquq came riding in haste and brought the news that the enemy was approaching.

When this news came, without setting up camp they went towards the enemy in order to gain information. They met and gained the information: when they asked the enemy patrol who they were, it turned out to be Jampaq's vanguard consisting of A'uçu Bagat of the Mongols, Buyirug Qan of the Naiman, Qutu, the son of Tego's Beki of the Merkit, and Quduga Beki of the Oyrat. These four had been going towards us as Jampaq's vanguard.

Our vanguard shouted at them, and they shouted back, but it was already getting late. Saying, 'Tomorrow we'll fight!', our men withdrew and spent the night together with the main body of the army.

Next day the troops were sent forward and when they met, at Koytên, they battled. As they pressed on each other downhill and uphill, and reformed their ranks, those very same Buyirug Qan and Quduga, knowing how to produce a rainstorm by magic, started to conjure it up, but the magic storm rolled back and it was right upon themselves that it fell. Unable to proceed, they tumbled into ravines. Saying to each other, 'We are not loved by Heaven!', they scattered.

Buyirug Qan of the Naiman separated from the rest and went towards Uluag Taq on the southern side of the Altai Mountains. Qutu, the son of Tego's of the Merkit, went towards the Selenge River. Quduga Beki of the Oyrat went towards the Siqgis River, making for the forest. A'uçu Bagat of the Tayülut went towards the Onan River.

Jampaq plundered the very people who had elected him qan, then he moved homewards following the course of the Ergune. As they were dispersing in this way, Ong Qan pursued Jampaq downstream along the Ergune while Cinguq Qan pursued A'uçu Bagat of the Tayülut in the direction of the Onan.

As soon as A'uçu Bagat reached his own people, he had them moved along with him in haste. The Tayülut A'uçu Bagat and Qocean Çëçëng arrayed their troops at Üwëgüt Turs on the other side of the Onan, and stood in battle order ready to fight. Cinguq Qan came up and fought with the Tayülut. They battled to and fro incessantly until evening came; then, in the same place where they had been fighting, they passed the night right next to each other. When people arrived, fleeing in disarray, they set up a circular camp and also passed the night in the same spot, alongside their troops.

In that battle Cinguq Qan was wounded in a vein of the neck. He could not stop the bleeding and was in great plight. He waited till sundown, then he pitched camp just there where the two armies had encamped right next to each other.

Jelme sucked and sucked the blood which clogged Cinguq Qan's wound and his mouth was all smeared with blood. Still, Jelme, not trusting other people, stayed there and looked after him. Until the middle of the night he swallowed down or spat out mouthfuls of the clogging blood.

When midnight had passed Cinguq Qan revived and said, 'The blood has dried up completely; I am thirsty.' Then Jelme took off his hat, boots and clothes — everything.
- and stark naked but for his pants, he ran into the midst of the enemy who had settled right next to them. He jumped on to a cart of the people who had set up a circular camp over there. He searched for kumis, but was unable to find any because those people had fled in disarray and had turned the mares loose without milking them.

As he could not find kumis, he took from one of their carts a large covered bucket of curds and carried it back. In the time between his going and coming back he was not seen by anyone. Heaven indeed protected him!

Having brought the covered bucket of curds, the same Jelme, all by himself, searched for water, brought it back, and having mixed it with the curds got the Qa'an to drink it.

Three times, resting in between, the Qa'an drank, then he spoke: 'The eyes within me have cleared up.' He spoke and sat up: it was daybreak and growing light. He looked and saw that, all about the place where he was sitting, the wound-slogging blood that Jelme had kept on sucking and had spat about had formed small puddles. When he saw it, Činggis Qa'an said, 'What is this? Couldn't you have spat farther away?' Jelme then said, 'When you were in a great plight, had I gone farther away I would have feared being separated from you. As I was in haste, I swallowed what I could swallow and spat out what I could spit out; I was in a plight myself and quite a lot went also into my stomach!'

Činggis Qa'an again spoke: 'When I was in this state, lying down, why did you run naked into their camp? Had you been caught, wouldn't you have revealed that I was like this?' Jelme said, 'My thought, as I went near, was that if somehow I got caught, I would have said, 'I wanted to submit to you, but they' found out and, seizing me, decided to kill me. They removed my clothes - everything - only my pants had not yet been removed when I suddenly managed to escape and have just come in haste to join you.'

They would have regarded me as sincere, they would have given me clothes and looked after me. Then, I would have jumped on a horse and while they were astonished watching me flee, in that brief moment I would have surely got back! So thinking, and because I wished to get back in time to satisfy the Qa'an's craving for drink caused by his parching thirst, thinking this and without so much as blinking an eye I went there.'

Činggis Qa'an said, 'What can I say now? In former days, when the Three Merkit came and thrice circled Mount Burqan, you saved my life for the first time.1 Now, once more, you restored me to life when, with your mouth, you sucked the clotting blood from my wound. And, yet again, when I was in a great plight with a parching thirst, disregarding your life, you went amidst the enemy without so much as blinking an eye; you quenched my thirst and restored life to me. These three services of yours will stay in my heart!' Thus the Qa'an spoke.

When it had grown light, it turned out that the enemy troops who were bivouacking right next to us had dispersed during the night; only the people who had set up the circular camp had not moved from the place where they had encamped because they would not have been able to get away.

Činggis Qa'an moved from the place where he had spent the night in order to bring back the people who had fled. As he was bringing back the fugitives, Činggis Qa'an himself heard a woman in a red coat who, standing on top of a ridge, was wailing loudly, crying 'Temijin!' He sent a man to enquire whose wife was the woman who was crying like that. The man went and, having asked her, that woman said, 'I am the daughter of Sogqan Sira and my name is

---

1 This event is not recorded in § 102 above.
2 I.e., to recapture.
Qada’an. The soldiers had captured my husband and were going to kill him. As my husband was being killed, I cried and wailed and called on Temujin to save my husband.” So she said, and the man returned and reported these words to Činggis Qa’an.

Hearing these words, Činggis Qa’an rode at a trot and reached her; he dismounted near Qada’an and they embraced each other, but her husband had already been killed by our soldiers.

After Činggis Qa’an had brought back those people, he camped on the spot for the night with his great army. He invited Qada’an to come to him and had her sit by his side.

The following day, Sorqan Sira and Jebe, who had been retainers of Tödöge of the Tayi’ilü, also arrived – the two of them. Činggis Qa’an said to Sorqan Sira, “It was indeed a good service of you, father and sons. 

To throw to the ground
The heavy wood on my neck.
To remove the wooden cangue
That was on my collar.

Why, then, did you delay coming to me?”

Sorqan Sira said, “At heart I felt full confidence in you, but how could I make haste? Had I hurried and come to you earlier, my Tayi’ilü masters would have blown to the winds, like hearth-ashes, my wife and children, and the cattle and provisions I had left behind. Because of this, I did not hurry, but now that the Tayi’ilü have been defeated we came in haste to join our Qa’an.” When he had finished speaking, Činggis Qa’an said, “You did right!”

Again Činggis Qa’an spoke, saying “When we fought at Kéyitén and, pressing on each other, were reforming our ranks, from the top of those ridges an arrow came. Who,

from the top of the mountain, shot an arrow so as to sever
the neckbone of my tawny war horse with the white mouth?”

To these words Jebe said, “I shot the arrow from the top of the mountain. If now I am put to death by the Qa’an, I shall be left to rot on a piece of earth the size of the palm of a hand, but if I be favoured,

For the Qa’an I will charge forward,
So as to rend the deep water,
So as to crumble the shining stone.
For him I will charge forward,
So as to split the blue stone,
In the place which I am told to reach,
So as to crush the black stone
At the time when I am told to attack.”

Činggis Qa’an said, “A man who used to be an enemy, when it comes to his former killings and hostile actions “conceals his person and hides his tongue” – he is afraid. As for this one, however, he does not hide his killings and hostile actions; on the contrary, he makes them known. He is a man to have as a companion. He is named Jirqa‘adah, but because he shot an arrow at the neckbone of my tawny war horse with the white mouth, I shall call him Jebe’ and I will use him as my jebe’ arrow.” He named him Jebe and said, “Keep by my side!”

This is the way in which Jebe came from the Tayi’ilü and became a companion of Činggis Qa’an.

---

1 She is mentioned in § 85 above.
2 i.e., Činggis Qa’an.
3 Cf. above, §§ 87 and 112.
4 Jebe means ‘weapon’, but it also designated a particular type of arrow.
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When, on that occasion, Chingsis Qa’an plundered the Tayi’lit’ut, he wiped out the men of Tayi’lit’ut lineage, such as the Tayi’lit’ut A’u’u Ba’a’tur, Qotorn Örgzen’g and Qudu’udar – he blew them to the winds like hearth-ashes, even to the offspring of their offspring. Chingsis Qa’an carried away the people of their tribe, and spent the winter at Qhuba Quya.2

Old Sür’gel’tu of the Nüñügä Ba’arin tribe, together with his sons Alaq and Naya’a, seized Tarqu tai Kiriltuq, chief of the Tayi’lit’ut, who was hiding in the woods, because he was a mortal enemy of Chingsis Qa’an. As Tarqu tai could not mount a horse, they made him ride in a cart.

As Old Sür’gel’tu and his sons Alaq and Naya’a were proceeding thus, holding down Tarqu tai Kiriltuq, the sons and younger brothers of Tarqu tai Kiriltuq said, ‘Let us take him away from them!’ They approached and overtook them. When his sons and younger brothers caught up, Old Sür’gel’tu got onto the cart and, sitting astride Tarqu tai, who was lying on his back and unable to stand up, drew a knife and said, ‘Your sons and younger brothers have come to take you away. Even if I do not kill you, telling myself that I am laying hands on my lord,2 they will surely kill me saying that I did lay hands on my lord. And if I do kill you, I shall of course be killed all the same. So, at the very moment I die, I shall die taking you as my death-companion.’

1 The Qudon Örge of § 141 above.
2 I.e., ‘Reddish Rock’ (ca.)
3 Because of his corpulence. The epithet Tarqu tai means ‘Fat.’
4 I.e., Tarqu tai’s.
5 Lit., ‘gore.’
6 Lit., ‘pillow.’ See the Commentary.

Thus saying he straddled him and was about to cut his throat with his big knife, when Tarqu tai Kiriltuq, calling loudly to his younger brothers and sons, said, ‘Sür’gel’tu is killing me. Once he has killed me, what will you achieve by taking away my dead and lifeless body? Draw back at once before he kills me! Temujin will not kill me. When Temujin was still little, because he had fire in his eyes, he had a light in his face, and because he had been abandoned in a camp without a master,1 I went there to get him and brought him back home with me.’

Saying that if I taught him He would be likely to learn, I kept teaching and instructing him just as if He was a two or three-year-old new colt I had been training.2 Had I wanted to make him die, Would I not have been able to kill him? They say that at present He is becoming thoughtful in his actions, That his mind is clear.3 Temujin will not cause me to die. You, my sons and younger brothers, quickly turn back at once lest Sür’gel’tu kills me.’ So he cried out loudly.

Tarqu tai’s sons and younger brothers conferred among themselves: ‘We came to save father’s life. Once Sür’gel’tu has deprived him of his life, what can we do with his empty, lifeless body? Better to turn back at once before he kills him!’ So saying, back they turned. Alaq and Naya’a, the sons of Old Sür’gel’tu who had withdrawn on their arrival,4

1 Because his father Yisüren Ba’a’s was dead at the time.
2 This is Tarqu tai’s justification of the episode told in § 791.
3 Lit., ‘opening.’
4 I.e., when Tarqu tai’s sons and brothers had come up and overtaken them.
now returned. *Sirg’i eti*, having waited for them to come back, moved on together with his sons.

As they proceeded on their way, on reaching the Qurquq Bend, Naya’a then said, ‘If we arrive holding this Tarqatui captive, Cunning Qu’an will say of us that we have coming laid hands on our rightful lord. Cunning Qu’an will say of us, “How trustworthy a people are these who come having laid hands on their rightful lord? How can they still be companions to us? They are people who are not worthy of companionship. People who lay hands on their rightful lord must be cut down!” Shall we not be cut down? Better to free Tarqatui and send him away from here, and go to Cunning Qu’an saying, “We, possessing only our bodies, have come to offer our services to Cunning Qu’an.” We shall say, “We had seized Tarqatui and were on our way here, but we could not do away with our rightful lord. Saying to ourselves, ‘How can we make him die before our very eyes?’ we freed him and sent him away, and we have come respectfully to offer our services.”’

So he spoke and the father and sons, having approved these words of Naya’a, set Tarqatui Kiriltuq free and sent him away from Qurquq Bend.

When this same Old Sirg’i eti arrived with his sons Ailaq and Naya’a, Cunning Qu’an asked why they had come. Old Sirg’i eti told Cunning Qu’an, ‘We seized Tarqatui Kiriltuq and were on our way here, but then saying to ourselves, “How can we make our rightful lord die before our very eyes?”, we could not do away with him. We set him free and sent him off, and came to Cunning Qu’an to offer our services.’

At that, Cunning Qu’an said, “If you had come having laid hands on your lord Tarqatui, you and your offspring would have come cut down as people who had laid hands on their rightful lord. Your thought that you could not do away with your rightful lord is correct.” So saying, he showed favour to Naya’a.

After that, when Cunning Qu’an was at Dersüt, Jaqa Gambu of the Kereiyit came to join him as a companion. When he arrived, the Merkit were approaching to fight. Cunning Qu’an, Jaqa Gambu and other chiefs engaged them and drove them back. Then, Jaqa Gambu made the Tümen Tübegon and the Olen Donggqayit, two scattered tribes of the Kereiyit, also come and submit to Cunning Qu’an.

As for Ong Qu’an of the Kereiyit, previously— in the time of Yisügei Qu’an— because they were living together very harmoniously, he and Yisügei Qu’an had declared themselves sworn friends.

The manner in which they had declared themselves sworn friends was as follows:

Because Ong Qu’an had killed the younger brothers of his father Qurququyi Buiruq Qu’an, he had become a rebel towards his paternal uncle Gur Qu’an and was forced to sneak away through the Qu’an Gorge to escape from him. With only a hundred men he got out of the gorge and joined Yisügei Qu’an. Prompted by his coming to him, Yisügei Qu’an moved his own army into the field and, driving Gur Qu’an toward Quaish, he took Ong Qu’an’s people and returned them to him. This is why they became sworn friends.

After that, when Ong Qu’an’s younger brother Erke Quara was about to be killed by his elder brother Ong Qu’an, he escaped and submitted to Imaça Quan of the Naiman. Imaça Quan dispatched his troops, but Ong Quan in his wanderings had already passed three cities and had made his way to

---

1 Dersüt? The text has Tersüt. See the Commentary.
2 i.e., as a mark.
3 For Qu’an red Qu’an. See the Commentary.
4 Lit., ’Dark Gorge.’
5 Lit., ’came to.’
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made him look after his camels, he took with him a shephard of Ajaif Qan and fled back home. After that, he fled again for fear of the Naiman and went to the gur qan of the Qara Kidad; he passed through the cities of the Lygqu and the Tangqu. He fed himself on the way by milking five goats,uzzling their kids, and by bleeding his camel.

While in these straits, he came to Lake Qase'ur. Cinggis Qa'an, on account of Ong Qan and Yisigei Qan having formerly declared themselves sworn friends, sent to him as envoys Taqua B'u'ur and Sukegei Je'an; there, from the source of the Kelurin River, Cinggis Qa'an went in person to meet him. Because Ong Qan had arrived starved and exhausted, Cinggis Qa'an raised taxes for him, brought him into the camp and took care of him.

That winter, in an orderly way they moved to new pastures and Cinggis Qa'an wintered at Quha Qaya.

Then Ong Qan's younger brothers and the chiefs said among themselves,

"Our elder brother the Qan
Has a miserable nature; he goes on Harbouring a rotten liver."

He has destroyed his brothers and has even submitted to the Qara Kidad—and he makes his people suffer. Now, what shall we do with him? To speak of his early days, when he was seven years old the Merkit carried him off; they gave him a kidskin coat with black spots to wear, and in the Bu'ur Steppe by the Seleengwe River he pounded grain in a Merkit's mortar. But his father Qurtqas Buquq Qan raided the Merkit and there and then rescued his son. And again, when he was thirteen years old, Afaif Qan of the Tatar carried him off with his mother. When Afaif Qan
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made him look after his camels, he took with him a shephard of Ajaif Qan and fled back home. After that, he fled again for fear of the Naiman and went to the gur qan of the Qara Kidad on the Cui River, in the country of the Sarta'ul. Then, in less than a year, he rebellled and left once more. He skirted the country of the Ul'ut and the Tang'ut. Reduced to straits as he went on, he fed himself by milking five goats,uzzling their kids, and by bleeding his camel. He had only a blind yellowish-white horse with a black tail and mane. Being in these straits, he came to his son Temujin, who raised taxes and indeed took care of him. Now, forgetting that he kept himself alive like this thanks to his son Temujin, he goes on harbouring a rotten liver. What shall we do with him?"

So they said among themselves, and their words were reported by Altan Aitaq to Ong Qan. Altan Aitaq said, "I too did partake in this scheme, but I could not do away with you, my Qan." Then Ong Qan had his younger brothers and chiefs arrested: El Qatur, Qulbari, Altan Taishi and the others who had thus conspired. From among his younger brothers, only Jaqua Gambu escaped and submitted to the Naiman.

Ong Qan had them brought in fetters into his tent and said to them, "What did we pledge to each other when we passed by the country of the Ul'ut and the Tang'ut? How could I think like you?" So saying, spitting in their faces, he had them freed from their fetters. After they had been spat on by the Qan himself, the people who were in the tent all rose and spat on them.

1 See above, § 151 and n. 2.
2 I.e., an evil word (or evil intentions).

2 A rhetorical question implying that they should kill him. It is evident from what follows.

3 I.e., "I could never think of you as you did with regard to me!" — implying that, were that so, he would execute them.
After having spent that winter (1201–1202) at Quba Qaya, in the autumn of the Year of the Dog (1202), Çinggis Qa’an engaged these Tatars in battle at Dalan Nemerges; the Ça’ın Tatar, Ali Tatar, Duta’ut Tatar, and Azuqui Tatar. Before fighting, Çinggis Qa’an jointly issued the following decree: ‘If we overcome the enemy, we shall not stop for booty. When the victory is complete, that booty will surely be ours, and we will share it among ourselves. If we are forced by the enemy to retreat, let us turn back to the point where we began the attack. Those men who do not turn back to the point where we began the attack shall be cut down!’ So he decreed with them.

They fought at Dalan Nemerges and drove off the Tatars. After they had overcome them, they forced them to rejoin their tribe on the Uligi Shugelji River and thoroughly plundered them. There and then they destroyed those important people: the Ça’ın Tatar, Ali Tatar, Duta’ut Tatar, and Azuqui Tatar.

As for the words of the decree that had been jointly issued, since Altan, Qaçar, and Daritai—all three—had not complied with them and had stopped for booty, Çinggis Qa’an, saying that they had not complied with these words, sent Jebe and Qubilai to take away from them the herds of horses and the goods they had acquired as booty—everything they had seized.

Having destroyed and thoroughly plundered the Tatars, Çinggis Qa’an held a great council with his kinsmen in a single tent to decide what to do with the Tatar tribesmen. Together they decided as follows:

---

1. I.e., ‘Seventy Felt Cloaks.’
2. Čecn Tatar. See the Commentary.
3. I.e., in concert with the other army commanders, such as Altan, Qaçar and Dikritai.
4. I.e., the Tatar.
5. I.e., Ça’in Tatar. See the Commentary.

---

The Secret History

‘From olden days the Tatar people had destroyed our fathers and forefathers; To avenge our fathers and forefathers, And rectify the wrong, for them We shall measure the Tatars against the linchpin of a cart, And kill them to the last one. We shall utterly slay them. The rest we shall enslave: Some here, some there, dividing them among ourselves!’

The council being concluded, as they emerged from the tent, the Tatar Yeke Çeren asked Belgütei what decision they had made. Belgütei said, ‘We have decided to measure you all against the linchpin of a cart and slay you.’

At these words of Belgütei, Yeke Çeren issued a proclamation to his Tatars, and they raised a barricade. As our soldiers tried to surround and attack the Tatars that had barricaded themselves in, they suffered great losses. After much trouble, when they forced the barricaded Tatars into submission and were about to slay them to the last man by measuring them against the linchpin of a cart, the Tatars said among themselves, ‘Let everyone put a knife in his sleeve and let us die each taking an enemy with us as a death-companion!’ And again we suffered great losses. In this way the Tatars were finally measured against the linchpin of a cart and exterminated.

Then Çinggis Qa’an issued this order: ‘Because Belgütei divined the decision we took together with our kinsmen at the great council, our soldiers suffered great losses. From now on Belgütei shall not join us in great councils; until the council ends, he shall handle those who are outside and, having dealt with them, he shall judge

---

1. Only those taller than the linchpin would be killed.
2. See above, § 149.
litigations and those guilty of theft and falsification. When the council is over and after we have drunk the ceremonial wine, only then shall Belgutei and Da'araiti join us! So he ordered.

Then on that occasion, C'inggis Q'a'an took as wife Yisüüq Qutan, daughter of the Tatar Yeke Ceren. Being loved by him, Yisüüq Qutan said, 'If it pleases the Q'a'an, he will take care of me, regarding me as a human being and a person worth keeping.' But my elder sister, who is called Yisüü, is superior to me: she is more suitable for a ruler. Recently, a bridegroom for her was taken into our family as a son-in-law. I wonder now where she has gone in all this confusion.'

On these words C'inggis Q'a'an said, 'If your elder sister is better than you, let us make a search for her! But if your elder sister comes to hand, will you yield your place to her?' Yisüüq Qutan said, 'If it pleases the Q'a'an, as soon as I see my elder sister I shall yield to her.'

On this promise, C'inggis Q'a'an issued the order and had a search made. Our soldiers came across her as she was going into a wood together with the bridegroom to whom she had been given. Her husband fled. They then brought back Yisüü Qutan.

When Yisüüq Qutan saw her elder sister, keeping the promise she had made earlier, she rose and let her sit in the place she had occupied. She herself took a lower seat.

Since she turned out to be as Yisüüq Qutan had said, C'inggis Q'a'an was pleased with her, he married Yisüü Qutan and placed her in the rank of his principal wives.

After having completely ravaged the Tatars, one day C'inggis Q'a'an sat outside drinking in company. He was sitting between both Yisüü Qutan and Yisüüq Qutan, and

was drinking with them, when Yisüü Qutan heaved a deep sigh. Then C'inggis Q'a'an, having thought it over, summoned Bo'orii, Muquli and other chief's, and said, 'You make all these people who have been assembled here— and no others—stand in groups of related families, and separate from the rest any man in a group which is not his own.' So he ordered.

As the people were standing thus in groups of related families, a handsome and alert young man stood apart from all the groups. When they said, 'To whom do you belong?', that man said, 'I am the bridegroom to whom was given the daughter of the Tatar Yeke Ceren called Yisüü. When we were plundered by the enemy, I took fright and fled. I came hither because things seemed to have settled down now and I kept telling myself, 'How can I be recognized among so many people?'

When these words were reported to C'inggis Q'a'an, he ordered: 'All the same, he has been living as an outcast, with hostile intentions: what has he come to spy upon now? Those like him we have measured against the linchpin of a cart and exterminated. Why hesitate! Cast him out of my sight!' He was cut down immediately.

When, in that same Year of the Dog (1202), C'inggis Q'a'an rode against the Tatars, Ong Q'aan rode against the Merkit. Pursuing Toq'to'a Beki in the direction of the Barqush Lowland, Ong Q'aan killed Toq'to'a Beki, the eldest son of Toq'to'a, seized Toq'to'a's two daughters Qutubqai and Ča'alun and his wives, and plundered his two sons Qutu and Ča'alun together with their people, but of all the booty he gave not one thing to C'inggis Q'a'an.
After that, Činggis Qa'an and Ong Qan rode against Buyirar Qan of the Guçgû clan of the Naiman. They reached Sooq Uzun' by the Ulûq Taq' where Buyirar Qan was staying at the time.

Unable to engage in combat, Buyirar Qan went off, crossing the Altai Mountains. They pursued Buyirar Qan from Sooq Uzun and, forcing him to cross the Altai, they chased him along the Ürûnggi River downstream at Qun Şängûr.3

While this was going on, a chief called Yedi Tbulq, who was patrolling for Buyirar Qan, was pursued by our patrol. As he was about to flee up the mountain side, his saddle-strap broke and he was captured on the spot. Pursuing Buyirar Qan down along the Ürûnggi River, they overtook him at Lake Kûl Bâq,3 and there they finished him off.

As Činggis Qa'an and Ong Qan were returning from that place, the great warrior Kôkse'û Sabraq of the Naiman arrayed his troops at the Baysarqâl Confluence and prepared to fight them. Činggis Qa'an and Ong Qan likewise decided to fight and arrayed their troops: however, when they arrived it was already getting late. They said, 'We shall fight in the morning!', and passed the night in battle order. Then Ong Qan had fires lit in the place where he was stationed and that same night moved upstream along the Qara Se'ûl River.

Jamaşa then moved on together with Ong Qan and, as they went, Jamaşa said to Ong Qan, 'My sworn friend Temêtîn for a long time has been sending envoys to the Naiman, and now he has not come with us.'

Qun, Qan, I am the sky-lark
That stays in one place;1

1. Lit., "Sooq Uzun (= River').
2. A mountain already mentioned in § 144 above. Cf. below, § 177.
4. Lit., "Red Head" (tu.).
5. Lit., "Black Tail."
message: ‘I have been robbed by the Naaman of my people and my wife. I send this envoy to request from you, my son, your “four steeds.”’ Let them rescue my people for me!’

Cinggis Qa’an then sent Borouču, Muqali, Boroqul and Čila’un Ba’atar, these ‘four steeds’ of his, and armed his troops. Before the ‘four steeds’ arrived, Senggium had just joined battle with Kūkse ’n Sabrū at Hula’an Qut; his horse had been shot in the thigh by an arrow and he himself was about to be captured.

At that moment those ‘four steeds’ arrived and saved him, and they recovered his people and his wife for him—all of them. Ong Qan then said, ‘Formerly his good father’ had saved my people who had been lost like this; now, once more, his son, by sending his “four steeds,” has rescued my lost people for me. As to my repaying these favours, let only the protection of Heaven and Earth decide how, and in what measure!’

Ong Qan said further, ‘My sworn friend Yisūgel Ba’atar once rescued my lost people for me; his son Ternuqin has again rescued for me my people who had gone away. When these two, father and son, gathered the lost people and returned them to me, for whose sake did they take the trouble of gathering and returning them? As for myself, now I have grown old, and having grown old, When I shall ascend to the heights — I have grown ancient, and having grown ancient, When I shall ascend to the cliffs — Who will govern all my people?’

---

1. I.e., the ‘four stalwarts.’ See the Commentary.
2. Borouču. See above, § 137.
3. Boroqul. See above, § 137.
4. Čila’un. See above, § 137.
5. I.e., ‘Yisūgel Qa’an’s late father.
6. I.e., the protecting power.

My younger brothers lack force of character; there is only Senggium, my one son, but it is as if he did not exist. If I make my son Ternuqin the elder brother of Senggium, I shall have two sons and my mind will be at rest.’ Having said this, Ong Qan and Cinggis Qa’an met together in the Black Forest by the Tu’lā River and declared themselves father and son. The reason why they declared themselves father and son was because in early days Ong Qan had declared himself a sworn friend of Cinggis Qa’an’s father Yisūgel Qan, and by virtue of this fact Cinggis Qa’an said that Ong Qan was like a father to him. Such was the reason why they declared themselves father and son. They made the following promises to each other:

“When we attack the enemy hosts,
We shall attack together as one;
When we chase the cunning wild beasts,
We shall also chase them together as one!”

So they declared. Cinggis Qa’an and Ong Qan also promised each other, saying, ‘Out of jealousy for us two — Should a snake with venomous teeth
Provoke discord between us,
Let us not succumb to his provocations.
Try talking only mouth to mouth’
We shall believe each other!
Should a snake with venomous fangs
Spread slander about us,
Let us not accept his slander.
By explaining only face to face’
We shall believe each other!”

And, pledging their word, they lived together in mutual affection.

1. See above, § 96.
2. Lit., ‘by teeth and mouth.’
3. Lit., ‘by mouth and tongue.’
move against my sworn friend Temüljin, I will join you and
attack his flank!"
Alan and Qütar said, ‘As for the sons of Mother
Hö’elân, for you,
We shall kill the elder brother,
And do away with the younger brother!’
Ebügejin and Noyakin – the two Qara’at – said, ‘For
you,
We shall seize his bands,
And grasp his feet!’
To’oril said, ‘The best plan is to go ahead and capture
Temüljin’s people. If his people are taken away from him
and he is left without them, what can he do?’
Qälî’un Beki said, ‘Prance Nilqa Senggüm, whatever
you decide I shall go with you.
To the farthest land,
To the bottom of the deep!’

Having been told these words, Nilqa Senggüm reported
to his father Ong Qan those very words through Sayiqan
Tode’en.
When he was told this,¹ Ong Qan said, ‘How can you
think such things about my son Temüljin? Until now we had
him as our support, and if now we harbour such evil
intentions towards my son, we shall not be loved by Heaven.
Jamaqà has a glib tongue. Is he right in what he says? Is he
correct?’² He was displeased and sent back Sayiqan
Tode’en.
Senggüm sent another message saying, ‘When any man
with a mouth and a tongue says these things, how can one
not believe him?’ He sent messages twice, three times, but
could not convince Ong Qan. Finally, he went to him in
person and said, ‘Even now, at a time when you are still so

¹ I.e., ‘These very words.’
² A rhetorical question implying that he is untrustworthy.
³ I.e., it is common knowledge. See the Commentary.
lively and well, Temüjin has not the slightest regard for us. Truly, when you, his father the Qan, will have reached the age when men
Choke on the white milk,
And are stifled by the black meat,
will he let us govern your people—the people that your father Qutulqas Burylag Qan gathered laboriously in such great number? How will he let anyone govern it?"

At these words, Ong Qan said, 'How can I do away with my child, my son? Because until now he has been our support, is it right to harbour evil intentions against him? We shall not be loved by Heaven.'

At these words, his son Nilaq Senggitim became angry; he pushed off the test-door and left. But Ong Qan, concerned about losing the affection of his son Senggitim, called him back and said to him, 'Who knows whether we shall be loved by Heaven after all? You say, 'How shall we do away with the son'? Just do what you can—it is for you to decide.'

Senggitim then spoke with the others and said, 'Those same people requested our Ca'ur Beki. Now, having fixed a day, let us invite them to come and dine at the betrothal feast and there, and then, seize them!' They all agreed and made a compact with Ong Qan to that effect.

They sent word to Cenggis Qa'an: 'We shall provide Ca'ur Beki. Come and dine at the betrothal feast!' Cenggis Qa'an, being so invited, drew near with ten men. On the way he spent the night in Father Mönglik's tent. Then Father Mönglik said, 'When we requested Ca'ur Beki, those same people despised us and would not provide her. How is it that now, on the contrary, they invite you to dine at the betrothal feast? Why do people who think themselves so important invite you, and contradicting themselves, now say, we shall provide her? Are they right? Are they correct? Son, you must proceed with caution. Let us send a message giving as an excuse that it is spring, our herds are lean, and we must fatten our horses first.'

Cenggis Qa'an did not proceed, but sent Bujqatai and Kiratari telling them to dine at the betrothal feast in his place; then from the tent of Father Mönglik he returned home.

When Bujqatai and Kiratari arrived, Senggitim and the others said, 'We have been found out. Early tomorrow we shall surround and capture them!'

Having thus pledged their word that they would surround and capture them, Altan's younger cousin, Yeke Çeren, said when he came home, 'We have decided to capture Temüjin early tomorrow. What sort of a reward might be expected by someone who delivers a message with this news to Temüjin?'

When he spoke in this way, his wife Alaqa It said, 'What is this idle talk of yours? Some people here might take it seriously!' As they were so conversing, their horse-herder Badai came to bring in the milk; he overheard this conversation and withdrew.

After leaving the tent Badai reported to his companion, the horse-herder Kiiłqiq, the words Yeke Çeren had spoken. Kiiłqiq said, 'I too shall go and find out the truth of it.' and went to Yeke Çeren's tent. Yeke Çeren's son, Narin Ke'en, was sitting outside, sharpening his arrows. He said, 'Whatever were we talking about a short while ago? We should have had our tongues taken out! Whose mouth can we now stop from repeating it?'

Having spoken thus, Narin Ke'en also told Kiiłqiq, his horse-herder, 'Fetch and bring in the white Merkit horse

---

1 I.e., with Temüjin.
2 I.e., they are not trustworthy. See above, § 167, n. 2.
3 I.e., the reward was certain a he handsome.
4 From the pasture.
and the boy with the white muzzle, and tether them: tonight, towards daybreak, we'll take out to attack.' So he said.

Kisiliq left and told Badai, 'I have checked what you said a short while ago. It is true. Now the two of us will go and take the news to Temujin.' Having both agreed, they brought in the white Merkit horse and the bay with the white muzzle, and tethered them. That very evening, in their travel-tent they killed one of their lambs and cooked it with their bedboards as fuel. Then they mounted on the white Merkit horse and the bay with the white muzzle that were tethered ready, and set off into the night.

That night they reached Cinggis Qa'an's camp. From the back of his tent Badai and Kisiliq reported the words spoken by Yeke Ceren, and what his son Naarin Kaxan had said when he was sitting, sharpening his arrows: 'Fetch and tether the two geldings, the white Merkit horse and the bay with the white muzzle'—all the words that had been said they reported for Cinggis Qa'an to know. Badai and Kisiliq also spoke, saying, 'If Cinggis Qa'an favours us with his trust, he will not hesitate to act: they have pledged to surround and capture you.'

THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS

CHAPTER SIX

On this intelligence Cinggis Qa'an believed the words of Badai and Kisiliq that same night he informed the trusted men who were at his side and, abandoning his baggage to lighten his train, set out and fled in the night.

Proceeding by way of the northern side of Ma'u Heights, he left behind Jeime Qo's of the Ursangat, for he trusted him, as his rearguard on the northern side of Ma'u Heights. He set up patrols and moved on. As he continued his advance, at noon of the following day he reached Qalaqijit Sands, where he halted to rest and eat, waiting for the sun to set.

While they rested and ate, Çigidei and Yadir, the horse-herders of Alcidai, led their geldings to pasture, some here and some there, on the fresh grass. As they moved about, they saw the dust raised by the enemy coming in pursuit, passing by Hula'an Burqat on the southern side of Ma'u Heights. 'The enemy has arrived,' they said and came back driving the geldings before them.

When they were told that the enemy had arrived, they all looked out and observing the dust raised by the enemy passing by Hula'an Burqat on the southern side of Ma'u Heights, they said, 'That is Ong Qan coming in hot pursuit'. Then Cinggis Qa'an, having seen the dust, had his geldings brought in, loaded them, and rode off with his followers. If on that occasion these two herdsmen had not noticed the enemy's approach, he would have been caught unprepared.

1 Written Man for Ma'u ('Evil') throughout. See the Commentary.
2 i.e., 'Red Willows.'
3 From the pastures.
As they approached, Jamiqa was advancing together with Ong Qan. While they advanced, Ong Qan there and then asked Jamiqa, "Who are those with soft Tenmijin who are likely to fight?" To his question, Jamiqa saud, "There are his people called the Uru'ut and the Manggut; those people of his do indeed know how to fight. Every time they turn about, their battle array holds. Every time they wheel round, too, their ranks hold.

Those people are accustomed to swords and spears from childhood. They have black and multicoloured standards — they are the people of whom we must be wary!"

On these words Ong Qan said, "If this is so, Qadas, the leader of our brave Jirgin, shall meet them: we shall send our brave Jirgin to attack them. We shall have Aciq Sirun of the Tumen Tugaben attack next in support of the Jirgin. The brave Ong Dongsayit we shall send to attack in support of the Tumen Tugaben. Qori Silemlim Taishi in support of the Ong Dongsayit shall attack at the head of my — the Ong-quin's — thousand bodyguards. In support of the thousand bodyguards we, the main body of the arms, shall move to the attack." Ong Qan also said, "Younger brother Jamiqa, you set our troops in battle array!

At these words Jamiqa drew apart and told his companions, "Ong Qan tells me to set these troops of his in battle array, but we make it as he makes it. We shall have Aciq Sirun of the Tumen Tugaben attack next in support of the Jirgin. For Ong Qan to say that I should set these troops in battle array meant, thus, that he is less capable than I am. Not much of a companion, is he! Let us send word to my sworn friend to be on your guard."

So Jamiqa secretly sent the following message to Cinggis Qaan: "Ong Qan asked me, 'Who are those with Tenmijin who are likely to fight?"' To his question I said, "I rate first the Uru'ut and the Manggut." Thus I spoke, and at these words of mine those same Jirgin were ordered to the forefront as vanguard. Aciq Sirun of the Tumen Tugaben was appointed to support the Jirgin. [The Ong Dongsayit were appointed to support the Tumen Tugaben.] Qori Silemlim Taishi, leader of the thousand bodyguards of Ong Qan, was appointed to support the Ong Dongsayit. For his support, they decided that the main body of Ong Qan's own army should stand in readiness. Ong Qan also told me: "Younger brother Jamiqa, you set these troops of mine in battle array!", saying that he relied on me. From this I realized that he is not much of a companion. How can I set his troops in battle array for him! I have never been able to fight against my sworn friend, and Ong Qan is less capable than me. Sworn friend, do not be afraid; be on your guard!" That was the message he sent.

When Cinggis Qaan received this news he said, "Uncle Jureden of the Uru'ut, let us see whom you the vanguard: what do you say?" Before Jureden could utter a word, Qyildar Sechen of the Manggut said, "I shall fight in front of my sworn friend! As for how one shall afterwards take care of my orphaned children, my sworn friend will decide." Jureden then said, "Let us, Uru'ut and Manggut, fight as vanguard in front of Cinggis Qaan!"

So saying, Jureden and Qyildar arranged themselves in battle order in front of Cinggis Qaan with their Uru'ut and Manggut troops. As they stood thus, the enemy arrived with the Jirgin as vanguard. When they came forward, the Uru'ut and the Manggut rushed against them and overcame the Jirgin. As they advanced, crushing them, Aciq Sirun of the Tumen Tugaben charged against. In the attack, Aciq Sirun stabbed Qyildar and brought him off his horse. The Manggut turned back and stood guard over Qyildar.

1. That is, Qori Silemlim Taishi's.
2. In support of the Jirgin who were being overcome by the Uru'ut and the Manggut.
Jirâchä then went on the attack with his Lü'ät troops and overcame the Tümèn Tübegèn. As he advanced, crushing them and driving them back, the Oöm Donqayit charged against him, but Jirâchä crushed also the Donqayit. After overcoming them, as he went forward, Qori Şêrümên Taiśi attacked him with the thousand bodyguards. When Jirâchä had also repulsed and defeated Qori Şêrümên Taiśi and was pressing ahead, Ŝengëm, without permission from Ong Qan, began to charge against him, but was shot by an arrow in one of his bright red cheeks. Ŝengëm fell there and then from his horse. When Ŝengëm fell all the Kereyit turned back and stood guard over him.

Having defeated them, when the setting sun touched the hilltops our troops withdrew, taking back with them Quyïldar who had fallen from his horse wounded.

Cinggis Qa’an and our men moved away from Ong Qan from the place where they had fought each other. They set out in the evening and spent the night some distance from there.

They spent the night standing in battle order. At daybreak, when they held a roll-call, Oködej, Borooql and Bo'orfu were not there. Cinggis Qa’an said, ‘Bo'orfu and Borooql as true friends have remained behind with Oködej. How could they part from each other, whether living or dying?’

When night came, our men, having brought in their geldings, spent the night in readiness. Saying, ‘If the enemy pursues us we shall fight,’ Cinggis Qa’an arranged the troops in battle order.

When the day grew light, they beheld a man approaching from the rear. As he came closer, it was Bo'orfu.
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When he arrived Cinggis Qa’an beat his breast and said, ‘Let Eternal Heaven decide what should be!’

Bo'orfu said, ‘When we went on the attack my horse was shot by an arrow and fell under me. I ran away on foot and as I was going like this, those same Kereyit, having turned back, stood guard over Ŝengëm; in the fighting’s full, I noticed a pack-horse standing there whose pack had slipped on its side. I cut off its pack, got on the pack-saddle and came away. Following the tracks left by our men when they withdrew from the battlefield, I went on, found them and here I am.’

Tarin, a moment later, another man approached. He advanced and drew closer, his feet dangling under him yet, when one looked, it seemed like a single person riding. When he came up and drew to a halt, it was Borooql mounted double behind Oködej with blood trickling from the corners of his mouth.

Oködej had been hit by an arrow in the neck vein; as the blood was clotting, Borooql had sucked the wound-clogging blood, letting it trickle from the corners of the mouth: ‘that’s how he came.’

When Cinggis Qa’an saw this, tears fell from his eyes and his heart was pained. He speedily ordered a fire to be prepared, had the wound cauterized, and drank sought for Oködej and given to him. ‘If the enemy comes after us, we shall fight him!’ he said.

Borooql said. ‘The dust raised by the enemy has shifted in the opposite direction towards Hula’an Burqat on the southern side of Mu’u Height— rising in a long trail, the dust has moved away in the opposite direction.

At these words of Borooql, Cinggis Qa’an said, ‘Hast he come after us, we would have fought him; but if we are now witnessing the enemy take flight, we shall regroup our troops and fight him later!’ So saying, he departed. After

1 = Oködej
2 = From the pastures.

I.e., as if someone else was riding.
he left, he moved upstream along the Ulquí Silig JS River and came into DalaN Demirg. Then, from the rear, Qadá’n Daldün’é came up, leaving behind his wife and children. When he arrived, Qadá’n Daldün’é reported Ong Qan’s words saying, “When Ong Qan’s son Senggum was shot in one of his bright red cheeks by an azumág arrow and fell from his horse, and the Kerevis turned back and stood guard over him, Ong Qan then said: “When it would have been better Not to stir him up, We did stir him up. When it would have been better Not to provoke him, We did provoke him — thus, alas, We have been the cause of their driving A nail into my son’s cheek. But having arrived in time to save my son’s life, let us now together rush against them!” Thus he spoke and Ačiq Sirun said to him, “Qan, Qan, desist! Pleading for a son who was yet to come, we made magic strips and uttered the prayer Xbui Xbui — we prayed, pleading for him. So at last your son Senggum was born, let us take care of him! Most of the Mongols are on our side, with Jamuqa, and with Alan and Quar. As for the Mongols who have rebelled against us and who left with Temüjin, where can they go? They are those who have but a horse as a mount, Who have but a tree as a shelter. If they do not come and join us of their own accord, we shall go out, wrap them up like dry horse dung in a skirt, and bring them here!” To these words of Ačiq Sirun, Ong Qan said, “Correct! If this is so, I fear my son may be exhausted. Take care of my son, and do not shake him while you carry him!” Having said this he withdrew from the battlefield and returned home. So spoke Qadá’n Daldün’é.

Then Cinggis Qa’an departed from DalaN Demirg following the course of the Qalqa River downstream, and counted his forces. When numbered, there were two thousand six hundred men. With one thousand three hundred men Cinggis Qa’an moved along the western bank of the Qalqa while the Uru’ut and Mangqut moved with one thousand three hundred men along the eastern bank of the Qalqa. They were moving on in this way, hunting for provisions as they went, when Quyildar, whose wounds had not yet healed,2 without paying heed to a warning by Cinggis Qa’an rushed after the game. He had a relapse and died. Cinggis Qa’an then buried him at Kołgæ-Quq, at the Or Bend3 of the Qalqa.

Cinggis Qa’an, knowing that just where the Qalqa River flows into Lake Buyur there stayed the Onggirat chief Terge Emel and others, sent Jürfedi to them with the Uru’ut troops. When he sent him off he said, “If they say that the Onggirat, from old days, Live thanks to the good looks Of their granddaughters And the beauty Of their daughters,4 they will certainly submit to us. If they say that they will oppose us, we shall fight them!” Because he had been sent with this message, the Onggirat submitted to Jürfedi. As they had submitted peaceably, Cinggis Qa’an did not touch anything of theirs.

---

1. See above, § 171.
2. Or ‘at the slanting cliff of the Or Bend of the Qalqa.’ See the Commentary.
3. Cf. above, § 64.
Then, after having obtained the Önggirat's submission, Önggis Qaan departed and, pitching camp east of Tüngge Stream, he gave Arqai Qasar and Sügege Je'ün a verbal message to be delivered to Öng Qaan, saying, "Tell this to my father the Qaan: "We have pitched camp east of Tüngge Stream; the grass is good and our geldings have gained strength." He further said, 'My father the Qaan, out of what grievance did you frighten me? If you must frighten me, why don't you frighten me in such a way at least as to let your poor sons and poor daughters-in-law sleep to their heart's content?" Bringing down the couch on which they sat According to their rank, Scattering the smoke that rose upwards From their tents, Why have you frightened them so? My father the Qaan, Have you been stung By someone standing at the side? Have you been sturred up By someone coming between us?1 My father the Qaan, what did we agree upon, the two of us? At Hula'um'ut Bolds'at of Jorqal Qaan did we not say to each other that Should a snake with venomous teeth Provoke discord between us, Let us not succumb to his provocations. By explaining only mouth to mouth We shall believe each other?2

1 In view of Öng Qaan's adoption of Önggis Qaan as his son (see above, § 164), by 'poor sons' and 'poor daughters-in-law' are meant Önggis' own brothers and sisters-in-law. If Önggis is to be blamed for something, why should they be involved too?
2 Cf. above, § 127, and below, § 201.
3 Lit., 'by teeth and mouth.'
to Toqto’a of the Merkit to please him. Having got out from the Qara’un Gorge you came to my father Yisüge Qiin and there and then said to him: “Rescue my people for me from my uncle Gir Qan.” Approached by you in that manner, my father Yisüge Qiin took with him Qunan and Haqiqi from the Tayq’ut. Saying, “I shall rescue your people for you,” he arranged his troops and set out. He pursued Gir Qan, who was at Qurban Telesit, and twenty or thirty of his men towards Qasan; he rescued your people for you. From there you came to the Black Forest by the Tu’ula River and you, my father the Qan, became a sworn friend of Yisüge Qiin. Then, Ooq Qan my father, you gratefully said, “As for the favour of this good action of yours, I will repay your favour even to the children of your children − let only the protection of Heaven Above and Earth decide how, and in what measure!” You spoke thus and were grateful.

‘After that, Erke Qara’ requested troops from Inanca Bige Qiin of the Naiman and moved against you. When he came upon you, you saved your life by abandoning your own people and, fleeing with a few men, you went to the gir of the Qara Kiat on the Cui River, in the country of the Sarta’ul. In less than a year you rebelled against the gir qan and departed once more. Reduced to straits as you went through the country of the Ul’tut and the Tang’ut, you fed yourself by milking five goats, muzzling their kids, you fed yourself also by bleeding your camel, and came to me with only a blind yellowish-white horse with a black tail and mane. When I learned that you, my father the Qan, had arrived in such straits, remembering that you and my father Yisüge Qiin had formerly declared as sworn friends, I sent as envoys Tayq’in and Sübeq’in to meet you; furthermore, from the Bürgi Escarpment on the Kelüren River, I in person went to receive you, and we met at Lake Gase’ür. Since you had arrived in such straits, I levied taxes and gave them to you. Because of your former declaration of sworn friendship with my father, the two of us declared ourselves father and son at the Black Forest by the Tu’ula: is that not the reason why we did it?”

‘That winter I brought you into my camp and took care of you. When winter was over and summer had passed, in the autumn I rode against Toqto’a Baki of the Merkit. I fought with him at Miriç’ Se’ul by the Qadiq’l Ridge. I pursued Toqto’a Baki in the direction of the Barqin Lowland. I plundered the Merkit: I seized their many herds of horses and palatial tents, their granaries − all − and gave it to you, my father the Qan. Your hunger I did not allow to last until noon, your leanness I did not allow to last until the middle of the month.

‘Then we pursued Buyirda Qiin the Gediq’in and forced him to cross the Altai from Sopg’ Unyan by the Ul’q Taq; and, going along the Ürüngü River downstream, we finished him off’ at Lake Küi’l Bāš.

‘As we were returning from that place, Kökeś’u Sabraaq of the Naiman had arrayed his troops at the Bayidaq Conference and was ready for battle. But, as evening fell, we said, “We shall fight early tomorrow!”’, and spent the night in battle order. Then you, my father the Qan, had fires lit in the place where you were stationed and in the night moved up along the Qara Se’ul River. When I looked out early next morning, you were no longer in your position, you had moved out. I said, “They certainly treat us like burnt offerings at the sacrifice for the dead,” and I moved

1 Le., to establish friendly relations with the Merkit.
2 Cf. § 163 ad fin.
3 Cf. § 151.
4 Cf. above, §§ 151 and 152.

1 See supra, § 151.
2 = Qadiq’l Ridge. For these localities see the Commentary.
3 Cf. above, § 158.
4 = Küi’l Bāš.
out too. Crossing the river at the Eder Altai Confluence, I came back and pitched camp in the Sa‘ari Steppe.

Then Kökse’s Sabraq pursued you and set fire to the wife and people of Senggüm – all of them. He captured also half the livestock and belongings of your father the Qan, which were at Telegeti Pass. Qudu’s and Cila’s, the sons of Topto’s of the Merkit, and their people were with you, but at the time of that engagement they deserted you and left, moving into the Barquin Lowland to join their father. Then you, my father the Qan, sent a message saying, “I have been robbed of my people by Kökse’s Sabraq of the Naiman; my son, send me your four steeds.” Not thinking the way you do, I there and then sent you Bo’orū, Muqali, Borouq and Cila’s Ba’atur, these “four steeds” of mine, and arrayed my troops. Before my four steeds arrived, Senggüm had just joined battle with Kökse’s Sabraq at Hula’an Quit; his horse had been shot in the thigh by an arrow and he himself was about to be captured. At that moment, my “four steeds” arrived and saved Senggüm, and they recovered also his wife together with his people for him – all of them. Thereupon you, my father the Qan, gratefully said, “My son Temüjin, by sending his four steeds, has rescued my lost people for me.”

Now, my father the Qan, out of what grievance do you reprimand me? To explain the nature of this grievance, send me your messengers. When you send them, send Qulbari Quit and Ildüren. If you do not send both of them, send me at least the latter.

To these words, Ong Qan said, “Oh! Sinful that I am! By abandoning my son

† Cf. above, §§ 159, 161.
‡ Lit. “of.”
§ I.e. Qutul. Cf. §§ 141, 142, 144, 157, 162.
¶ See above, § 163.
** Cf. above, §§ 162-163.
* Called Ildüren in § 184 below.
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I abandoned the norm.
By parting from him
I parted from my duty.

Pained in his heart, Ong Qan said, “Now, it I think evil when I see my son, let my blood be shed like this!” And, taking the oath, he pricked the ball of his little finger with his arrow-notch knife, let the blood trickle and poured it into a small birch-bark casket. He sent it by the messenger saying, “Give this to my son.”

Činggis Qan also sent the following verbal message to sworn friend Januq: “Because you cannot bear the sight of me, you caused a rift between my father the Qan and me. In the past, the first of us to rise could drink of the blue cup of my father the Qan. As I got up first and drank of it you were jealous. Now you may drain the blue cup of my father the Qan, but how much more will you be able to consume!”

Činggis Qan also sent the following verbal message to Altan and Qūqār: “When you rejected me, you two, did you say that you would leave me, breaking with me openly, or did you say that you would leave me after you had consulted only among yourselves?” Qūqār, when I said that, of all of you, you as the son of Nekgin Tairū should become qaan, you declined. When I said that you, Altan, should then become qaan and govern us like your father Qutula Qan had been governing us, you too declined. And when I said, “You, Sača and Tačču, become the qaan,” because they were the sons of Burtan Ba’atur from the senior line, I was unable to obtain their consent. Because my urging you to become qaan had no effect, when I was told by you to be the qaan I governed the people. Had you become qaan, when as vanguard I would have been sent speedingly after many foes, then, with Heaven’s protection, while plundering the enemy people.

† An error for Ba’atur. See the Commentary.
The secret history
Of my great-great-grandfather.
The personal door slave
Of my great-grandfather.

Such is my message for you."

Chinggis Qa'an also sent the following verbal message to his sworn friend Senggum: 'Although I was a son born clothed and you were a son born naked; our father the Qan looked after both of us equally; but you, sworn friend Senggum, drove me out because you were jealous that I might come between you and our father. Now do not pain our father the Qan's heart. Evening and morning, coming in and going out, always be of comfort to him. Do not distress or render the heart of our father the Qan by saying, without giving up your earlier intentions and while our father the Qan is still alive, that you will become qan.' And he also sent this message: 'Sworn friend Senggum, send me your messengers. When you send them, send me Bilge Beki and Tööden. [If you do not send both of them,] send at least the latter. When you send messengers to me, father the Qan, send two messengers; sworn friend Senggum, you also send two messengers; sworn friend Jarnagha, you also send two messengers; Atan, you also send two messengers; Qübar, you also send two messengers; Aälq Shirun, you also send two messengers; Qásu'un, you also send two messengers!' And he had these messages conveyed by word of mouth through Arqai Qasir and Sügegei Qa'an.

When the messages were delivered in this way, Senggum said, 'When did he ever say "our father the Qan"? Didn't he rather say "the old murderer"? When did he ever call me "sworn friend"? Didn't he rather say that I am like "Toqto'a the shaman wearing the tail of a Sartaq sheep"?'

1 Cf. above, § 123.
2 Aälq Shirun. Cf. above, § 134.
3 I.e., the Onon, the Töls and the Kerulen. The 'source' of the three rivers is the area of Mount Burkhan Qaidan.
4 I.e., 'Qüga the Slave.'
5 Jeges Qongtaqar. See above, § 120.
do understand the scheme behind these words of his; they are the words that precede a fight. You Bilge Beki and Tədo’en raise the war standard and fatten the geldings; there is no time for hesitation!"

And so Arqı Qasar returned from Ong Qan, but because the wife and children of Siqaqii Je’ın were there with To’orii, Siqaqii Je’ın did not have the courage to go with Arqı and stayed behind. When Arqı arrived he reported these words of Sengun to Çinggis Qa’an. Çinggis Qa’an then left and pitched camp at Lake Balljuna. When he was about to encamp, he met right there the Qorulas of Co’os Çağın. These Qorulas submitted to him without fighting.

From Alaçiq Diqi Quri of the Onggii came Asan the Santanaq. He had a white camel and was driving a thousand wethers along the Ergigne River downstream in order to buy pelts of sable and squirrels. As he drew in to water his wethers at Lake Balljuna he met Çinggis Qa’an. Çinggis Qa’an was also watering his animals at the same Lake Balljuna when Qasar, leaving behind his wife and his three sons Yegi, Yıssingge and Tuqı with Ong Qan, departed with his companions — few in number and dispossessed of all but their bodies. Saying, “I will join my elder brother, he searched for Çinggis Qa’an. He climbed the ridges of Qara’ın Jidun,” but he could not find him there; being in dire straits he ate hides and sinews and went on, eventually joining Çinggis Qa’an at Lake Balljuna.

Çinggis Qa’an received Qasar and rejoiced. They agreed to send messengers to Ong Qan. Through Qa’üludar of the Je’üret and Çaqurqan of the Ulnaqqii Çinggis Qa’an sent a message. He told Qa’üludar and Çaqurqan, ‘Tell my father the Qan that these are the words of Qasar,’ saying:

‘I watched for my elder brother But last sight of him; I searched for his tracks But could not find his trail; I called him but my voice He did not hear. I now lie gazing at the stars I with a clod of earth as my pillow. My wife and sons are with you, my father the Qan. If, hopefully, I get from you someone I can trust, I will come back to my father the Qan. Tell him that Qasar sent this message!’ He also said to them, ‘We shall follow close behind you and meet at Arqı Geği’ on the Keliren River. You must come there!’

Having agreed on the time and place of meeting, Çinggis Qa’an forthwith sent Qa’üludar and Çaqurqan on their mission. He sent Jürçedät and Arqı ahead to reconnoitre, and at once set forth from Lake Balljuna together with the army. They rode out and arrived at Arqı Geği on the Keliren River.

Qa’üludar and Çaqurqan reached Ong Qan and gave him the verbal message sent from here,” saying, “It is Qa’an’s message.” Ong Qan had set up his golden tent of thin woolen cloth and was feasting, not suspecting anything. Upon the words of Qa’üludar and Çaqurqan, Ong Qan said, “If it is so, let Qasar come!” He then said, “I shall give Itüreng in trust.” And he sent him with them.

1 This To’orii is Siqaqii’s brother mentioned in § 180 above.
2 Cf. § 141. See the Commentary.
3 = Usan.
4 = ‘Darık (as Black) Ridge.’
5 = Çağın. See above, § 120.
6 Cf. above, § 56.
7 I.e., ‘Dry Dung Hook.’ See the Commentary.
8 I.e., from Lake Balljuna, by Çinggis Qa’an.
9 I.e., as guarantor, as requested by Qasar.
And so they came, and as they were reaching the appointed place at Arqai Geçgi, the envoy İfrigen seeing the signs of a multitude in the distance, turned back and fled. Qalı‘udar’s horse being swifter, Qalı‘udar caught up with him, but did not venture to seize him; instead, going now in front of him, now behind him, he kept on obstructing his way. Çaqırın’s horse was slower; at an arrow’s shot from the rear, he hit İfrigen’s gold-saddled black gelding on the tip of its rump, so that it sat on its haunches. Qalı‘udar and Çaqırın thereupon took İfrigen captive and brought him to Çinggis Qa’an. Not speaking to İfrigen, Çinggis Qa’an said, ‘Take him to Qasar; let Qasar decide how to deal with him!’ They took him to Qasar who, without saying a word to him, cut İfrigen down and cast away his body there and then.

Qalı‘udar and Çaqırın said to Çinggis Qa’an, ‘Ong Qan is off his guard; he has pitched his golden tent and is feasting. Let us quickly move forward from here and, travelling through the night, let us attack him by surprise and surround him!’

Çinggis Qa’an approved these words and sent Jürçedei and Arqai ahead to reconnoitre. They travelled through the night and having reached Ong Qan’s camp, which was at the Jër Gorge pass of Jeje’er Heights, they surrounded it.

They fought for three nights and three days, but our men stood firm, surrounding the Kereyt, who on the third day were exhausted and surrendered. Ong Qan and Senqüem escaped during the night—how they did so was not known. One who fought longer than the others was Qadaq Ba‘atur of the Jürç. When he came out to surrender, Qadaq Ba‘atur said, ‘We fought three nights and three days. I said to myself, “How can I let my rightful lord be seized and killed before my eyes?” Unable to forsake him, I struggled and kept on fighting so that he could escape and save his life. Now, if I shall be made to die, I shall die, but if Çinggis Qa’an favours me, I will serve him.’

Çinggis Qa’an approved Qadaq Ba‘atur’s words, saying, ‘Is he not a true fighting man who says that he is unable to forsake his rightful lord and let him escape, saving his life? He is a man worthy to be one’s companion.’ And favouring him, he did not have him killed. ‘Because Quyılder lost his life,’ Qadaq Ba‘atur and one hundred Jürç must serve Quyılder’s wife and children. ‘If boys are born to them, they must in turn serve Quyılder’s descendants to the offspring of his offspring. If girls are born to them, their parents must not betray them according to their own wishes, for their daughters must be servants and attend to Quyılder’s wife and children.’ He gave this order favouring Qadaq Ba‘atur.

Because Quyılder Sechen had opened his mouth and spoken first, even before Jürçedei; Çinggis Qa’an favoured him with the following order: ‘On account of Quyılder’s service, Quyılder’s descendants to the offspring of his offspring shall receive the bounty granted to orphans.’

---

1. Lit., ‘from the furthest point an arrow would reach from behind.’
2. Lit., ‘qan.’ Cf. above, § 149.

---

1. See above, § 175.
2. See above, § 171.
THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS

CHAPTER SEVEN

Thus Činggis צfan crushed and despoiled the Kereyit people, distributing them on all sides. He gave Taqa Ba’atar of the Suldus one hundred Jirgin in reward for his services. Further, Činggis צfan ordered as follows: Ong צan’s younger brother Jaqa Gambu had two daughters. The elder one, Ibaq Beki, Činggis צ'an took for himself. The younger one, Sonqaqami Beki, he gave to Tolui. For that reason, saying that Jaqa Gambu and the personal subjects belonging to him should be kept together and be regarded like the second shaft of a cart for himself, he showed favour to Jaqa Gambu and did not take his people away from him.

Činggis צ'an also gave the following order: ‘Because of Badai’s and Kišilq’s service, they shall have Ong צan’s golden tent just as it stands, with his golden bowls and vessels, together with the people who looked after them, and the Ongqil Kereyit as their bodyguards. You, Badai and Kišilq, enjoy the privilege of young freemen to the offspring of your offspring, allowed to carry quivers and drink the ceremonial wine!

When swiftly pursuing many foes,
If you get booty,
What you get you shall take away.
When in a battle
You slaughter wild beasts,
What you slaughter you shall take away.’

He further ordered: ‘Because of the vital service performed by Badai and Kišilq, and under the protection of Eternal Heaven, I crushed the Kereyit people and, indeed, gained the high throne. In future, the offspring of my offspring who will occupy this throne of mine must

successively remember those two who performed such service!’ So he ordered.

When the Mongols subjugated the Kereyit people, they distributed them among each other so that nobody went short. They distributed the Tümen Tü'be'eri and they all took of them until they had plenty. They despoiled the Olon Dongqayit in less than a day. As for the brave Jirgin who used to strip the blood-stained clothing and possessions from the enemy, they divided and apportioned them, but could not give some to everybody. Having in this way annihilated the Kereyit people, Činggis צ'an spent that winter at Abiji’a Ködëgeri.

188 Ong Qan and Senggüm escaped with their bare lives and went away, unwilling to submit to Činggis צ'an. Ong Qan, who was suffering from thirst, was going to drink at Nekin Usun’s of Didik Saqal’s when he came across the Naiman patriline Qori Subeči. Qori Subeči seized Ong Qan and although the latter declared, ‘I am Ong Qan’. Qori Subeči did not recognise him and, disbelieving him, slew him on the spot.

Senggüm did not go to Nekin Usun of Didik Saqal, but bypassed it and entered the Col. While searching for water, he dismounted and stalked some wild assets that were standing there, plagued by gaddilies. Senggüm’s companion, the equerry Kökoča had his wife with him. With Senggüm they were altogether three of them. He gave his horse to his equerry Kökoča to hold. The equerry Kökoča led the horse away and started trotting back home. His wife said,
to pieces. Thereupon Kūksū's Ṣabraq said, "You have cut off the dead qan's head and brought it here, the next thing you do is to crush it to pieces! This is not right. The sound of our dogs’ barking has turned nasty."

1. Iranača Ḍilğe Qan formerly said:

“My wife is young, but I, her husband, have become old. This son of mine Tayang I begot only through magic. Ah, this son of mine, born a weakling, has grown weak and emaciated. Will he be able to care for and control my numerous, base and untrustworthy people?”

So he said. Now the dogs are barking and this barking sounds as if a calamity is approaching. The rule of our queen Gürbési has become harsh, and you, my qan Toriuq Tayang, are soft. You have no thought or skill except for falconry and hunting.”

Being told so, Tayang Qan then said, "I hear that there are a few Mongols yonder in the east. These people with their quivers terrified the great old Ong Qan of former days, causing him to desert his own companions and perish. Do they now want to be rulers themselves? Even if there are two shining lights, the sun and the moon, in the sky above—both sun and moon are indeed there—yet how can there be two rulers on earth? Let us go and bring here those few Mongols!"

At that, his mother Gürbési said, "What could we do with them? The Mongol people have always smelt bad and worn grime clothes. They live apart, and far away. Let them stay there. But we might perhaps have their fine daughters and daughters-in-law brought here and, making

---

1. I.e., Senggim. 
2. I.e., a shameless bitch—referring to an unfaithful wife. See the Commentary. 
3. I.e., Ong Qan’s. 
4. Doubtful interpretation. See the Commentary.
them wash their hands, perhaps just let them milk our cows and sheep.

On this Tayang Qan said, 'If that is so, what do they have for us to worry about? Let us go to those Mongols and we will surely bring back your quivers!'

To these words Kökse’s Sabraq said, 'How boastfully you speak! O Torluq Qan, is this proper? You had better stop talking!' Despite Kökse’s Sabraq’s warning, Tayang Qan sent an envoy called Torbi Taal to Alaqš Digit Quri of the Önggut with this message: 'I am told that there are a few Mongols yonder east. You be the right wing. I shall join you from here and we will take the quivers of those few Mongols!'

Alaqš Digit Quri replied to these words saying, 'I cannot be the right wing.' Having sent this message, Alaqš Digit Quri had the following communication conveyed to Cinggis Qa’an through his envoy called Yuqunan: 'Tayang Qan of the Naiman is coming to take your quivers. He approached me saying that I should be the right wing, but I refused. Now I am sending you this warning, for I fear that if he comes you may be robbed of your quivers.'

Just at that time Cinggis Qa’an was hunting in the Teme’en Steppe; he was encircling Tülinkin Ce’tَۚ۠ when Yuqunan, the envoy sent by Alaqš Digit Quri, arrived to deliver this message.

On receiving this message, and whilst still at the hunt, they at once discussed what to do. Many of the men said, 'Our geldings are lean, there is nothing we can do now.' To that Öögün Noyan retorted saying, 'How can one make the excuse that the geldings are lean? Our geldings are fat! How can we stay put when we hear such words as these?'

Then Belgeiti Noyan spoke: 'If, when one is still alive, an enemy is allowed to take away one’s quiver, what is the advantage of being? Isn’t it right for any man born that when he dies he should lie with his quiver and bow alongside his bones? The Naiman people are boastful, bragging that they possess a great country and a large population. If now, grasping the chance their boasts afford us, we set out on a campaign and remove their quivers, would this be so difficult? If we go forward, won’t their numerous herds come to a halt and stay behind? Burdened with their palatal tents, won’t they abandon them? Won’t their many people depart and seek shelter in high places? How can we stay put and allow such people to keep boasting in this way? Let us ride against them at once!'

Thus he spoke. Cinggis Qa’an approved these words of Belgeiti Noyan and, returning from the hunt, moved from Abjîqa Köteger1 and set up camp at Keltegei Qada, at the Or Bend of the Qala River.2 He counted his troops and on the spot formed units of a thousand men, appointing the commanders of a hundred and the commanders of ten. Thereupon he appointed as chamberlains’ Dödei Čerbi, Duqolqa Čerbi, Ogêle Čerbi, Toluń Čerbi, Buçarın Čerbi and Söyiketi Čerbi. Then, having appointed these six chamberlains, he formed units of a thousand, a hundred, and ten men, and he chose and recruited eighty men to serve as nightguards and seventy men to serve as dayguards. He recruited them from the sons and younger brothers of commanders of a thousand and of a hundred, as well as from the sons and younger brothers of mere ordinary people, choosing and recruiting those who were able and of good appearance.

Showing favour to Arquí Qasar, he then ordered: 'Let him choose himself his brave warriors and form a unit of a

---

1 Lit, 'Camel Steppe (or Plain).'
2 I.e., 'Tülinkin (? Hill).'
3 Cërbi. See the Commentary, §§ 120 and 191.
In the Year of the Rat, on the sixteenth day of the first month of summer (17 May 1204), the day of the Red Circle, he consecrated the standard and set forth. He rode upstream along the Kalerun River and sent Jebe and Qubun ahead to reconnoitre. When they reached the Sa‘ar‘i Steppes, the Naiman patrol was already there, on the top of Mount Qangqagün. Our patrolmen and theirs went in pursuit of one another. The Naiman patrol seized one of our patrolmen who had a white horse with a rather poor saddle. When the Naiman patrol caught that horse, they consulted among themselves and said, ‘The Mongols’ girdles are lean!’

When our soldiers reached the Sa‘ar‘i Steppes they halted there and discussed what to do. Then Dôde Cerbi gave the following advice to Činggis Qâân: ‘It is we who are few in number and, in addition to being few, we have arrived here exhausted. So, let us indeed halt and set up camp, spreading over the Sa‘ar‘i Steppes here until our girdles have eaten their fill. Let every single one of us each light fires in five different places and frighten the enemy with all these camp fires. They say the Naiman people are numerous, but they also say that their qan is a weakling who has not yet come out of his tent. While we keep them in doubt with the fires, our girdles will eat their fill. When our girdles are satiated, we shall chase the Naiman patrolmen and, pressing hard on them, we shall make them rejoin the main body of the army. If we engage them in combat in that confusion, won’t we get the better of them?’

Approving these words of advice from Dôde Cerbi, Činggis Qâân gave the following order: ‘Things being so,
let them light the fires", and he proclaimed it as law to the soldiers. Thus, they set up camp spreading over the Sa’ari Steppe and everyone was made to light fires in five different places.

At night the Nairun patrolmen, seeing so many night fires from the top of Mount Sangaqan, said, "Did we not say that the Mongols are only few in number? Their camp fires are more numerous than the stars!" They had sent to Tayang Qan the little white horse with the rather poor saddle; now they sent him this message: 'The Mongol troops have set up camp so as to cover the whole Sa’ari Steppe; they seem to increase daily, and their fires are more numerous than the stars.'

When this news from the patrolmen reached him, Tayang Qan was at Qa‘tir Usan in the Qangqai Mountains. Upon receiving the news he sent word to his son Güçüllük Qan: 'The geldings of the Mongols are lean, but our patrolmen say that their camp fires are more numerous than the stars. The Mongols are, therefore, many.

If we engage them and fight them to the end, Will it not be difficult to disengage ourselves? If we engage them and fight them to the end, They will not blink their black eyes. Is it advisable for us To fight these tough Mongols Who do not flinch even if their cheeks are pierced And their black blood gushes forth? We are told that the geldings of the Mongols are lean. Let us move, withdrawing our people across the Altai. We shall then reconnoiter our troops and lure them' after us as we go.

---

**THE SECRET HISTORY**

We shall march until we reach the southern slopes of the Altai, fighting a dog's fight. Our geldings are fat; when we have made their bellies fatter and have exhausted the geldings of the Mongols we shall turn back and smash into their faces.' He sent this message.

To these words Güçüllük Qan said, "Again that woman Tayang! He speaks such words because he has lost courage. Where would this vast number of Mongols come from? Most Mongols, together with Jamaqa, are here with us. That woman Tayang, Who dares not walk further than A pregnant woman goes to urinate, Who does not even venture so far as A wheel-lined calf reaches for its feed, has lost heart and has sent me that message, hasn't he? Güçüllük Qan through the envoy had his words conveyed to his father to hurt and distress him; to these words, whereby Tayang Qan himself was spoken of as behaving like a woman, Tayang Qan said, 'May the strong and proud Güçüllük not lose this pride of his on the day when we meet on the battlefield and slay one another! When we meet on the battlefield and fight to the end it will surely be difficult to disengage ourselves.'

Upon these words Qeri Sübeqi, a high official who held command under Tayang Qan, said, 'Your father Ilanq Bilge Qan never showed a man's back or a gelding's rump to an enemy that was his match. Now you, how can you lose heart when it is still so early in the morning? Had we known that you would have lost courage in this manner, shouldn't we have brought your mother Gürbesü, even though she is only a woman, and given her command of the army? What a pity, alas, that Kükse’ü Sabraq should have become so old! The discipline in our army has grown lax! This is, surely, the favourable time and the destiny of the

---

1 See the Commentary.
2 Lit., 'every living person', i.e. every individual in the camp without exception.
3 I.e., 'Male Water.'
4 I.e., the Mongols.
Mongols deceived by Heaven and Earth. We are finished! Ah, wussling Tuyang, it looks as if you are quite powerless. Thus he spoke and, having struck on his quiver, he trotted off and went his separate way.

At this Tuyang Qan grew angry and said, 'A life means to die, a body means to suffer: it is the same destiny for all! That being so, let us fight!' Moving from Qa'ir Usun he went downstream along the Tamir River and crossed the Oron. Passing along the eastern fringe of the Naq Cliff he reached Čakirmu'ut, where Cinggis Qa'an's patrolmen saw him as he was approaching. They sent a message to Cinggis Qa'an saying, 'The Naiman have arrived and are drawing near.'

When this news reached him, Cinggis Qa'an said, 'The more numerous, the greater damage; the less numerous, the lesser damage.' He rode against them and, having driven away their patrolmen, he arrayed his troops and together with the army leaders decided to advance in 'caragana' marching-order, to stand in 'lake' battle-formation and fight a 'chisel' combat.

Having spoken thus, Cinggis Qa'an in person formed the vanguard, putting Qasar in charge of the main body of the army and Oltuqin Noyin in charge of the reserve horses. The Naiman withdrew from Čakirmu'ut and took up position south of Naq Cliff, along the mountain fringes. Then our patrolmen arrived driving away the Naiman patrolmen and pursuing them until they joined the main body of their army south of Naq Cliff.

Tuyang Qan saw them arriving thus in hot pursuit. At that time Qaima had also set forth with his troops and had come with the Naiman. As he was there, Tuyang Qan asked

1. 'What sort of people are these, who are like wolves that come chasing a flock of sheep and pursuing them as far as the Sloepop? What people are these, drawing near in such hot pursuit?'

Jamaqa said, 'My sworn friend Temujin has been feeding four hounds on human flesh, leashing them with iron chains. They are the ones approaching in pursuit of our patrol. Those four hounds.

Their foreheads are of hardened copper. They have chains for snouts. And whips for tongues; With hearts of iron, And swords for whips. They advance feeding on dew And riding on the wind. On the day of killing They eat human flesh, those ones; On the day of battles They make human flesh Their provisions, those ones.

Loosed from their iron chains - which had surely restrained them! - they are now full of joy and are approaching thus, slavering at the mouth', he said. 'Who are these four hounds? They are Jebe and Qubilai, Jelme and Suheetqi. Those are the four.'

Tuyang Qan said, 'Let us then stay away from those vile creatures!' He retreated in haste and took up position astride the mountain.

When he saw them approaching from the rear and encircling them, leaping in delight, Tuyang Qan again asked Jamaqa, 'What sort of people are these, who are like foals let loose early in the morning - foals that after sucking

1. Lit., 'binding.'
2. I.e., as provisions for the road.
3. I.e., Tuyang Qan and Jamaqa.
their mother's milk are always gambolling around her. Why are they approaching, encircling us in this manner?" Jamaqua said. "These are called the Iris-ut and the Mongos-tat.

They rush after men armed with spears
And strip them of their blood-stained clothing.
Chasing after men armed with swords,
They fell and kill them,
And take away their valuables and clothing.

Do they not rejoice now as they draw near, bounding thus in delight?"

Thereupon Tayang Qan said, "If that is so, let us stay away from those vile creatures!" He took up position, re-treating further up the mountain.

Tayang Qan again asked Jamaqua, "Who is the one approaching from the rear, coming forward at the head of the army and drawing near like a greedy, slavering falcon?"

Jamaqua said, "The one approaching us is my sworn friend Temijin. Over his whole body,
There is not a single chink
Where a hard copper arrow can drive in its spike:
Nor a single chink
Where a wrought-iron sewing needle
Can insert its sharp point.

My sworn friend Temijin is indeed drawing near, slavering thus like a greedy falcon. Have you seen him? You Naiman friends used to say that if you saw the Mongols, you would not leave them even the skin of a kid's hoof. Behold them now!"

On these words Tayang Qan said, "This is simply dreadful! Let us take position further up the mountain!" They climbed further up the mountain and took position.

Again Tayang Qan asked Jamaqua, "Who is approaching after him?" Jamaqua said, "He is the youngest son of Mother Hó'elín. He is called Qu'shin, the Easy-going. He is an early sleeper and a late riser, yet
He does not lag behind, when the army is in full array;
He does not lag behind, when the army is in position;"
Tayang Qan said, "If this is so, let us go up to the top of the mountain!"

After speaking such words to Tayang Qan, Jamuq separated from the Naiman and went off on his own. He sent an envoy to deliver a verbal message to Cinggis Qan saying, "Tell him the sworn friend", and he said:

"At my words Tayang Qan has lost his head
And in panic he has scrambled to the heights.
Frightened to death by the words from my mouth
He has climbed up the mountain.
Sworn friend, take care!
Up they went, climbing the mountain.
And have lost the will to resist.
As for me, I have separated from the Naiman." He sent this message.

Late in the day Cinggis Qan surrounded the mountain of Naq Clifford, and he took up position with his troops and spent the night there.

That night the Naiman moved from their position and tried to escape. Tumbling down from the height of Naq Clifford, they piled on top of each other; they fell breaking their bones and died crushing each other till they were like heaps of rotten wood.

The following morning Cinggis Qan finished off Tayang Qan. Guelshul, who had been staying apart from the rest moved from there with a few, abandoning his own companions. When the Mongol troops caught up with him, he set up a circular camp at the Tainur River, but unable to hold that camp he again set out and fled further away.

Cinggis Qan utterly defeated and conquered the people of the Naiman tribe on the southern slopes of the Altai. The Jadarun, Qatagin, Saljut, Dorben, Tayishi, Onggirat and other people who had been with Jamuq also submitted on that occasion.

Cinggis Qan had Tayang's mother Gurbesli brought to him and said to her, "You used to say that the Mongols have a bad smell, didn't you? Why then, did you come now?" And Cinggis Qan took her as wife.

In that same year of the Rat (1204), in the autumn, Cinggis Qan fought with the Qus's Merkit at the Qoradai source. He dislodged him from there and subdued his tribe and all his people in the Saari Steppe. Toqool, with his sons Oudo and Cilaun and a few people, dismissed of all but their bodies, got away by flight.

When the Merkit people were thus subdued, Dayir Usun of the Qus's Merkit took his daughter Qulan Qarun with him and came to offer her to Cinggis Qan. On the way he was hindered by some soldiers and met Naya a Noyan of the Baarin. Dayir Usun said to him, "I am on my way to offer this daughter of mine to Cinggis Qan.'

Detaining him, Naya a Noyan then said, "Let us go together to offer your daughter." As he detained him, he said, 'In this time of disorder, if you go alone, soldiers on the way will certainly not leave even you alive, and your daughter too will be in much trouble.' And he held Dayir Usun for three days and three nights.

After that Naya a Noyan took Qulan Qarun and Dayir Usun, and brought them together to Cinggis Qan. Cinggis Qan then said, 'Naya a, why did you detain her?' He got very angry and, ordering that Naya a be rigorously and minutely questioned, made this case a matter of law.

While they were questioning him, Qulan Qarun said, 'Naya a said to my father, "I am a high officer of Cinggis Qan. Let us go together to offer your daughter to the Qa'an. The soldiers on the way will be troublesome." So he warned us against going alone. Now, had we met with other troops but Naya a's, no doubt we would have been

1. Cf. above, § 177.
4. I.e., made a law to deal with such matters in the future.
intercepted and would have got into difficulties. Perhaps
our chance meeting with this Naya'a was good for us. Now
this Naya'a is being questioned, the Qa'an may condescend
to inspect my body, which my father and mother bore by
Heaven's will.' She had this message conveyed to Cinggis
Qa'an.

When Naya'a was questioned he said, 'I have no other
face than that known to the Qa'an.'

If I come across maidens and ladies
Of foreign people with beautiful cheeks,
And geldings with fine croups,
I always say, 'They are the Qa'an's!'

If ever I think differently from this, let me die!'
Cinggis Qa'an approved of Qulan Qa'un's testimony;
then, that very day, he examined her accordingly and it
turned out to be just as Qulan Qa'un had stated.
Cinggis Qa'an showed favour to Qulan Qa'un and loved
her. As Naya'a's words had been confirmed, he approved
of him. He showed favour to him too, saying, 'He is a
truthful man, I shall entrust him with an important task.'

THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS
CHAPTER EIGHT

After Cinggis Qa'an subdued the Merkit people, of
the two wives of Toqto'a Beki's eldest son Qudu — Togst
and Doregene — he gave Doregene to Ogodei Qa'an.
Half of the Merkit people revolted and barricaded
themselves in the Taquq stronghold. Cinggis Qa'an then
gave orders that Cimbas, the son of Sorqan Sira, be put
in command and sent him to attack the entrenched Merkit
with the troops of the left wing.

Unwilling to submit, Toqto'a with his sons Qudu and
Chi'i-an — only a few men altogether — had escaped with
their bare lives. Cinggis Qa'an pursued them and spent the
winter south of the Altai.

In the spring of the Year of the Ox (1265), he set out
and crossed the Altay. Gučiluk Qan of the Naiman, after his
people had been captured by Cinggis Qa'an, would not
submit and with his companions — a few men in number —
went and made an alliance with Toqto'a of the Merkit.
They came together at the Buqurumur source of the Erdi;
River and arrayed their troops.

When Cinggis Qa'an arrived they fought. Toqto'a was
struck there and then by a 'random' arrow and fell. His sons
could not bury him, nor could they take his body away, so
they severed his head and took that away with them. Then
the Naiman and the Merkit were unable, even with their
united forces, to keep up the fight and fled. When they
moved away and crossed the Erdi, most of them fell into
the river and drowned. The few Naiman and Merkit that got

1 Read "right" (= "west"). See the Commentary.
2 Arai in the text. See the Commentary.
3 Erdi. Cf. below and §§ 297, 264.
through separated and went in different directions after completing the crossing of the Ertu. Güçülük Qun of the Naiman went off and, passing through the country of the U'u and the Qadu/'u, joined the gur sin of the Qara Kadan who was at the Cui River in the country of the Sarta'/u. The Merkit, led by Qudu, Qal and Çila'un, the sons of Toqto'a of the Merkit, went off and crossed the country of the Qanglin and the Kimra/'u.

After that, Çinggis Qun turned back, crossed the Ala/' and settled in his base camp. Çimbai utterly defeated the Merkit entrenched in the Taqal stronghold. Then, with regard to these Merkit, Çinggis Qun ordered that those to be killed were to be killed and the remainder were to be despoyled by the soldiers.

The Merkit who had surrendered earlier rose again in rebellion and tried to break out from the base camp, but our servants in the camp brought them under control. Çinggis Qun then spoke, saying, "I had said that they be kept together as one tribe, but these same people have now revolted", and he had the Merkit distributed here and there down to the last one.

In that same Year of the IX (1205) Çinggis Qun ordered Sübe/eeti, who had been provided with an iron curt, to pursue the sons of Toqto'a headed by Qudu, Qal and Çila'un. When he sent him on his mission, Çinggis Qun had the following verbal message conveyed to Sübe/eeti: "The sons of Toqto'a having at their head Qudu, Qal and Çila'un left it fright and haste, then turned back, exchanged shots with us and went off like lassei wild asses or stags with arrows in their bodies. If they grow wings and fly up into the sky, you, Sübe/eeti, will not fly up like a goshawk and catch them? If they turn into mammals and burrow into the ground with their claws, will you not become an iron rod and, digging and searching for them, catch them up with them? If they turn into fishes and plunge into the Tenggis Sea, will you, Sübe/eeti, will you not become a casting-net and a dragnet, and get them by scooping them out? And again, I send you to cross high mountains, pass to ford wide rivers; mindful of the long distance you have to cover, you must spare the army mounts before they become too lean and you must save your provisions before they come to an end. If a gelding is already completely exhausted it will be of no use to spare it then; if your provisions have already completely run out, how can you save them then? There will be many wild animals on your way; when you go, thinking ahead, do not allow your soldiers to gallop after and hunt down wild animals, nor let them make circular battles without limit. If you make a battle in order to give additional provisions to your troops, hunt with moderation. Except on limited battles, do not allow the soldiers to fix the crupper to the saddle and put on the bridle, but let the horses go with their mouths free. If they so discipline themselves, the soldiers will not be able to gallop on the way. Thus, making this a matter of law, whoever trespasses it shall be seized and beaten. Send to Us those who trespass our Order if it looks that they are personally known to Us, as for the many who are not known to Us, just cut them down on the spot.

Beyond the rivers
You will perhaps lose courage, But continue to advance

1 = Erit. Cf. above and §§ 207, 264.
2 Ul'ur(always in the text. See the Commentary.
3 Qut in the text. See the Commentary.
4 Aari in the text. See above.
5 I.e., among other groups.
6 Written Sübe/eeti.
In the same way; Beyond the mountains
You will perhaps lose heart.
But think of nothing else apart from your mission.
If Eternal Heaven grants you further strength and power,
and you capture Togto’a’s sons, there is no need for you to bring them back: cast them away there and then! So he ordered.

Chinggis Qa’an said further to Sibe’etei: ‘I send you on this expedition because, when I was small, I was frightened by the Udutiy of the Three Merkit circling three times around Burqan Quldm. Mortal enemies like these, now gone again, swarming oaths against me, you shall reach; were you to go

To the furthest limit,
To the bottom of the deep!’

And so, in the Year of the Ox, he had an iron cart made to pursue them to the very end and sent Sibe’etei on his war mission with these final instructions: ‘If you constantly think that even though We are out of sight it is as if We were visible, and even though We are far it is as if We were near, you will also be protected by Heaven Above!’

When Chinggis Qa’an annihilated the Naiman and the Merkit, Jumua was with the Naiman and his people were taken from him on that occasion. With only five companions he became an outcast. He went up the Tanglu Mountains, killed a wild sheep and roasted it. When it was time to eat it, Jumua there and then said to his five companions, ‘Whose son,4 having killed today a wild sheep, are eating it like this?’ While they were eating the meat of that wild sheep, his five companions laid hands on Jumua and, seizing him, brought him to Chinggis Qa’an.

The Secret History

When Jumua was brought here by his companions, he told someone to say to his sworn friend the Qa’an:

‘Black crows have gone so far
As to catch a mandarin duck,’
Black dikis5 and slaves have gone so far
As to raise their hands against their lord
Qa’an, my sworn friend,
How can you be mistaken?
Grey buzzards have gone so far
As to catch a wild duck,
Slaves and servants have gone so far
As to seize their own master,
Surrounding him and conspiring against him.
Wise sworn friend of mine,
How can you be mistaken?’

To these words of Jumua, Chinggis Qa’an said, ‘How could we let men live who have raised their hands against their rightful lord? To whom can such men be companions? Cut down to the offspring of their offspring these people who have raised their hands against their rightful lord!’ So he ordered, and had the people who had laid hands on Jumua cut down in his very presence.

Chinggis Qa’an then said, ‘Tell Jumua: “Now the two of us are united. Let us be companions!” If we become each of us like one of the two shafts of a cart, would you think of separating yourself from me and being on your own? Now that we are together once more,

Let us each remind the other of what he has forgotten,
Let us each wake up the other who has fallen asleep.
Although you separated from me
And went a different way,

1 I.e., ‘measure them on the spot.’
2 See above, § 103.
3 I.e., ‘What (sort of) persons?’
4 i.e., Jumua’s.
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You remain my lucky, blessed sworn friend.
On the day one kills and is killed, surely
Your heart was aching for me.
Although you separated from me
And went a different way,
On the day one fights one another.
Your lungs and heart were aching for me.

What was that? When I fought the Keriyit people at the Qalaqajit Sands you informed me of what you had said to Father Ong Qan.¹ That was a service you did me. Then, the fact that you sent me a message with the news that you had frightened the Naiman people
Killing them with your words,
and said to me that I could regard them as such:² that was another service you did me.³

After Cinggis Qan had spoken, Jamiuq said, 'In early
days when we were small, in the Qorqonqoi Valley I agreed with my sworn friend the Qan to become sworn friends;
Together we ate food that is not to be digested,
To each other we spoke words that are not to be forgotten,
Together we were under our blanket
Sharing it between us, but
Stirred up by someone
Coming between us,
Pricked by someone,
Standing at the side,
We parted for good,
Saying to myself that
We had exchanged weighty words,
The skin of my black face
Peeled off in shame.

¹ See above, § 170.
² I.e., as frightened to death by the Mongols. See above, § 196.
³ Cf. above, §§ 127 and 177.
of this I was excelled by my sworn friend, whose destiny was ordained by Heaven. If you want to show favour to me, let me die swiftly and your heart will be at rest. And if you condescend to have me put to death, let them kill me without shedding blood. When I lie dead, my bones buried in a high place, for ever and ever I shall protect you and be a blessing to the offspring of your offspring.

In origin I am of a different birth, and so I was conquered by the august spirit of my sworn friend who is of higher birth. Do not forget the words that I have just spoken; think of them evening and morning and repeat them among yourselves. Now do away with me quickly!'

To these words of his Čingis Qa'an said, 'Although my sworn friend has parted from me and has been raling against Us, I have not heard that he has plotted harm against my life. He is a man who should learn from experience, but is not willing to. However, to kill him is not in accordance with the omens; to harm his life without good reason is not right. He is a man of high standing. Perhaps you should give him this reason: 'Once, when Čoj Dzarmala' and Tačan stole from each other their herds of horses, you, sworn friend Iamuqa, wickedly stirred up rebellion against me. We fought at Dalan Bajlun and you forced me to take refuge in the Jerene Gorge. You frightened me then, did you not? Now, when I say, 'Let us be companions!', you refuse; when I offered to spare your life, you declined.' Tell him that. Say to him: 'Now, according to your request, you shall die without your blood being shed.'

He ordered that Iamuqa be put to death without his blood being shed and that his body should not be abandoned in the open, but be given a fitting burial. He had
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Tobuq, (75) Afjani, (76) Tujideger, (77) Sec'e'ur, (78) Jeder, (79) Olar Giureg, (80) Kinggiydatu, (81) Buqa Giureg, (82) Quril, (83) Aili Giureg, (84) Qadai Giureg, (85) Ciigi Giureg, (86, 87, 88) Ali Giureg leading the three Onggat thousands, (89, 90) Buni Giureg leading the two ikires thousands, (91, 92, 93, 94, 95) Akaqis Ligit Quri Giureg of the Onggat leading the five Onggat thousands. Excluding the People of the Forest, the commanders of a thousand of the Mongol people appointed by Cinggis Qan were ninety-five.

"Those ninety-five commanders of a thousand whom I have nominated, together with the sons-in-law," further said Cinggis Qan, "have been entrusted with units of a thousand and - Cinggis Qan declared - 'I shall now reward those among them who are most deserving.' And he said that the commanders having at their head Bo'or'ou and Muqali should come. At that time Sigi Qutuu was inside the tent. When Cinggis Qan told him, 'Go and summon them!', Sigi Qutuu said, 'Have Bo'or'ou and Muqali born of greater assistance than others? Have they given better service than others? If you want to give rewards, surely I was not less useful, surely I did not give lesser service? From the time I was in the cradle And grew up at your noble threshold, Until this beard sprouted on my chin, I did not think of anyone else but you. From the time I had a piss-pot at my crotch And, being at your royal threshold, I grew up Until this beard sprouted at my mouth, I did not make a single false step. She let me lie at her feet."

And brought me up as her own son; She let me lie at her side And brought me up as the younger brother of her children."

Now, what kind of reward will you give me?"

To these words of Sigi Qutuu, Cinggis Qan said, "Are you not my sixth younger brother? To you, my late-born younger brother, the reward: you shall be allotted the same share as the younger brothers; furthermore, on account of your services, you shall not be punished for up to nine crimes."

And he said, 'When, protected by Eternal Heaven, I am engaged in bringing the entire people under my sway, I am Eyes for me to see with, Ears for me to hear with.'

Divide up all the subject people and apportion them to Our mother, to Us, to Our younger brothers and sons according to the name of the people, Splitting up those that live in felt-walled tents, Separating those that live in dwellings with wooden doors. Let no one disobey your word!

Further, he entrusted Sigi Qutuu with the power of judgement over all and said to him, 'Of the entire people, Cursing theft, Discouraging falsehood, execute those who deserve death, punish those who deserve punishment. Furthermore, writing in a blue-script register all decisions about the distribution and about the judicial matters of the entire population, make it into a book. Until the offspring of my offspring, let no one alter any of the blue writing that Sigi Qutuu, after deciding in accordance with

---

1 Read Afjani.
2 I.e., the forest tribes of the north and north-west. See the Commentary, §207.
3 I.e., Mother Ho'elin.
me, shall make into a book with white paper. Anyone who alters it shall be guilty and liable to punishment.

Sigi Quatuq said, “How can a late-born younger brother like me take the same and equal share as that of the others? If the Qa’an wants to reward me, let him decide in favour of granting me the people from the towns that have walls of pounded earth.” So he requested, and to these words of his Cinggis Qa’an said, “You yourself have determined your own part; you decide!”

After he had made Cinggis Qa’an favour him thus, Sigi Quatuq went out and, calling the leaders with Bo’orçu and Muqali at their head, let them into the tent.

Cinggis Qa’an then addressed Father Mönglik and said:

“You fortunate and blessed man,
Who at birth were born together with me,
When growing, grew up together with me,
how many times have you helped and protected me?
Among those was the occasion when Father Ong Qan and sworn friend Senggum deceitfully invited me to the betrothal feast and on the way I spent the night in Father Mönglik’s tent.1 Had you, Father Mönglik, not dissuaded me then, I would have gone right
Into whirling waters,
Into a blazing fire.
Recalling only that service of yours, how could anybody forget it until the offspring of their offspring?2 Recalling that service, I will henceforth let you occupy the seat at the very beginning of this side in my tent. Yearly and monthly I shall consult with you,3 and I shall give you gifts and favours. I shall be attending on you, until the offspring of your offspring!” So he declared.

Further Cinggis Qa’an spoke to Bo’orçu: “When I was small I was robbed of eight horses, the light-bay geldings. I spent three days and nights on the way pursuing them and, as I was going, we met each other. Then you said to me, “You came because you are in difficulties; I will join you as a companion!” and, without a word even to your father in the tent, you were then sitting a mare, concealed your leather bucket and place in the grass. You made me leave my short-haired chestnut horse and set me on a white horse with a black back, and you yourself rode a fast dun mare. You left your herd of horses without a master and in haste became my companion in the steppe. Again we spent three days and nights in pursuit before we reached the circular camp with the stolen light-bay geldings. They were standing at the edge of the camp. We stole them, drove them away and brought them back, the two of us. Your father was Naq Yuany. You, his only son, what did you know about me when you became my companion? You became my companion because of your brave heart. Afterwards I kept on thinking about you and when I sent you Belgirti to ask you to join me again as a companion, You jumped on your chestnut horse with the arched back, You tucked your grey woolen cloak behind you, and came to join me.4 And when

The Three Merkit came against us and
Three circled Burqan Qoldun,
That mountain you circled with me.5

And when, after that, we passed the night at Dalan Nenjers with our troops pitched opposite those of the Tatar people, the rain poured down incessantly day and night. Saying that I ought to get my night’s rest, you
Covered me with your felt cloak so that the rain would not.

---

1 Cf. below, §211.
2 See above, §168.
3 I.e., to seek advice.
4 See above, §§90-93.
5 See above, §95.
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fall upon me and throughout the night you stood beside me shifting one of your feet only once. This was indeed a sign of your bravery. Other than that, what brave deeds of yours am I to mention? You too, Bo'orču and Muaqili. You urged me to carry out what was right. You persuaded me not to do what was wrong, and in this way made me gain this throne. Now you shall sit higher than all the others and shall not be punished for up to nine crimes. Bo'orču will be in charge of the ten thousand men of the right wing which extends westwards up to the Altau Mountains. 1 So he ordered.

Further, Činggis Qa’an said to Muaqili, ‘When we set up camp near the Leafy Tree in the Qorgonaq Valley around which Outula Qan used to dance; because the words that a heavenly sign foretold to Muaqili were a clear portent, I there and then, thinking of his father Gu’un Qo’a, 2 pledged my word to Muaqili. Accordingly, he shall henceforth sit upon a seat [above all others] and shall be gui eng 3 of all the people, and so it shall be until the offspring of Muaqili’s offspring.’ He gave him the title of gui eng and ordered: ‘Let Muaqili Gu’un Ong be in charge of the ten thousand men of the left wing which extends eastwards up to the Qara’n Jüdun Mountains.’ 4

Činggis Qa’an said to Qoqisi, ‘You once made a prophecy about me and, from the time I was small until now, for a long time

When it was wet, You suffered the wet with me;
When it was cold, You suffered the cold with me.

Indeed, you have constantly been a beneficent spirit to me. At that time you, Qoqisi, said, “If the prophecy comes true and if it is fulfilled by Heaven according to your wishes, let me have thirty women.” Now, because it has come true, I shall favour you. Look at the fine women and fine girls of the people who have submitted to us and choose thirty women from among them.’ So he ordered.

Further, he ordered: ‘On top of the three thousand Bar’arm that he already leads, Qoqisi, together with Taqai and Atqi, shall add to the number so as to make up a full ten thousand with the Cinds of the Adarkin, the Töölis and the Telengit, and Qoqisi shall be their commander. Freely establishing his camp along the Ersid River up to the People of the Forest, Qoqisi shall reduce the People of the Forest to submission and be in charge of the ten thousand.’ And he ordered: ‘The People of the Forest must not act this way or that without Qoqisi’s agreement. Those who act without his agreement, he should not hesitate to kill them.’

Further, Činggis Qa’an said to Jürčed, ‘Your most important service was at the time when we were fighting with the Kereyit at the Qalaqaljil Sands and were worrying about the outcome of the battle. Sworn friend Quyidan then made an oath but you, Jürčed, carried out his task. In carrying it out you, Jürčed, attacked and overcame the Jirgin, the Tübege, the Dongqayit, Quri Silemén and his thousand bodyguards, the best troops — all of them — and, reaching the main body of their army, you shot an atuamq arrow into one of Senggim’s bright red shields. 5 Because of this, “the door was opened and the reins were loosened” 6 for me by Eternal Heaven.’ Had Senggim not

1 See the Commentary.
2 See above, §§ 57 and 117.
3 The Gu’un ‘la of § 137 above.
4 For this title, see the Commentary.
5 See the Commentary.
6 Venda gneuy. For this expression, see the Commentary. For Qoqisi’s prophecy, see above § 121. 7 i.e., Quri Silemén Tašli. See above, § 170.
For these events, see above, §§ 170-171, 174.
8 i.e., Heaven opened the way to Činggis’s success.
been wounded, what would have become of us? That was indeed Jüredêî's greatest and most important service.

When he separated from me, moving along the river Qalaq downstream, I constantly thought of Jüredêî as if he were the shelter afforded by a high mountain. He then went off and we arrived at Lake Ballûna to water our animals. We set out again from Lake Ballûna, Jüredêî went ahead to reconnoitre. We took the field against the Kereyit and, with our strength increased by Heaven and Earth, we utterly defeated and subdued the Kereyit people. The most important people being cut off, the Naiman and the Merkit lost heart; they could no longer fight and were scattered.

In the struggle in which the Merkit and the Naiman scattered, Jaga Gambio of the Kereyit was killed, by reason of his two daughters, to stay with his own subject people as a whole group. But when, for the second time, he became hostile and separated from us, Jüredêî lured him with a stratagem and, after seizing him, made an end of Jaga Gambio who had broken with us for good. For the second time we exterminated and plundered the people of that Jaga Gambio. This was surely Jüredêî's second service.

Because, on the one day he is killed, he disregarded his life; on the other day he meets death together, he fought to the death, Chinggis Qa'an admired Jüredêî and gave him Ibaqa Sëkt as wife. He said to Ibaqa, 'I did not say that you have a bad character and that in looks and appearance you are ugly. You, who have entered into my heart and limbs, and who have come to me taking your place in the rank of my principal wives, I present to Jüredêî in deference to the

---

1 On his mission to the Chagatai. See above, § 176.
2 See above, §§ 182-183, 185.
3 I.e., the Kereyit.
4 Lit., 'forsoke.'
proceed in consultation with each other. And he added, "Afterwards we shall examine Bedi'ün's conduct."

Further, Čingis Qa'an said to Qunan of the Geniges, "For you, the commanders with Bo'orçu and Maqlu at their head, and for you, the chamberlains Dâde, Dâqiluq and others, this Qunan was like a male wolf in the dark night, a black crow in the bright day:
When we were on the move he did not stop, When we halted he did not move on. With a stranger He did not put on another face, With a mortal enemy He did not put on a different face.

Do not act without the agreement of Qunan and Kökő Čos. Act only in consultation with them.

And he ordered, "The eldest of my sons is Jelme. Qunan, at the head of the Geniges, shall be a commander of ten thousand under Jelme. Qunan, Kökő Čos, Deqei and Old Čusin — these four are the four that never hid from me what they saw, never concealed from me what they heard."

Further, Čingis Qa'an said to Jelme, "Old Jarj'i'udai, carrying his bellows on his back — Jelme was still in the cradle — came down from Burqan Qal'dun and gave noble swaddling-clothes when I was born at Deli'in Bolünd on the Onan River. Since he became my companion, Jelme has been the slave of my threshold, The personal slave of my door. Jelme's merits are many. Fortunate and blessed Jelme.

---

1. Written Sibe'etet.
2. Lit., "which I had pointed out."
3. Cf. above, §§ 72 and 147.
4. See above, § 163.
5. See the Commentary.
6. See above, § 191.
7. For Bedi'ün see above, § 120. There are no further references to him in the SH.
8. See above, § 97.
Who at birth was born together with me,
When growing, grew up together with me,¹
and whose companionship with me has its origin in the sable
swaddling-clothes, he shall not incur punishment if he
commits up to nine crimes.² So he ordered.

Further, Çinggis Qa'an said to Tulist, "Why is it that you,
father and son, will each be in charge of a separate
thousand? When you gathered the people — you, Tulist,
being one of the two wings of your father — you strove
together and together gathered the people. It is, indeed,
because of that that I gave you the title of chamberlain.³
Now, will you not form your own thousand with the people
that you have acquired yourself and constituted as your own
patrimony, and are in consultation with Tursangan?" So he
ordered.

Further, Çinggis Qa'an said to the steward Önggür,
"You, the three Toqu'at and the five Tarqat, and you,
Önggür, son of Möngeti Kiyan, with your Çangsh'ut and
Baya'ut, have formed one camp for me." You, Önggür,
You did not go astray in the fog.
You did not separate from the others in the fight.
When it was wet
You suffered the wet with me;
When it was cold,
You suffered the cold with me.²
Now, what kind of reward will you take from me?² At this
Önggür said, "If you allow me to choose the reward, as my
Baya'ut brothers are scattered among all the various
tribes, by your favour let me bring together my Baya'ut
brothers."³

Thereupon, Çinggis Qa'an ordered, "Yes, be it so!
Bring together your Baya'ut brothers and you take
command — one thousand!" He said further, "When you, the
two stewards Önggür and Boro'ul, distribute food to the
right and left sides,
Do not let it fall short
For those who stand or sit
On the right side;
Do not let it fall short
For those who are placed in a row —
Or who are not —
On the left side.

If you two distribute the food in this way, my throat will not
choke and my mind will be at rest. Now, Önggür and
Boro'ul, ride out and distribute food to the multitude.² So he
ordered, and pointing out their seats, he said, "When you
take your seats, you must sit so as to look after the food on
the right and the left sides of the large kamur pitchers.² Sit
with Tulist and the others in the centre of the tent, facing
north.²

Again, Çinggis Qa'an spoke to Boroqu, saying, "As for
Sigi Qutuqu, Boroqu, Gücu and Kököcu — the four of you —
my mother
On the bare ground she found you,
In other people's camps.
She placed you close to her legs,
She treated you as her own sons
And brought you up with care;
She stretched your necks
And made you into adults;
She stretched your shoulders
And made you into men.³

¹ See above, § 204.
² I. e., "conquered."
³ This, see above, § 191.
⁴ See above, § 120.
⁵ Cf. above, § 207.

¹ = Boroqu.
² I.e., of the wine table.
³ See the Commentary. Cf. below, § 254.
She surely brought you up in order to make you the companions for us her sons. Who knows how many favours and services you have returned to my mother for the favour of having brought you up? Borouql, you became my companion and when we made swift sorties on rainy nights You did not let me spend the night with an empty stomach;  
When we were engaged in battle with the enemy You did not let me spend the night without soup. Again, we crushed the Tatar people who, full of hatred and resentment, had destroyed our fathers and forefathers. At the time when

We were taking revenge, We were requiting the wrong, by killing the Tatar people to the last one, measuring them against the linchpin of a cart; and as they were being slain, Qargil Sir a of the Tatar escaped and became an outcast. Then, reduced to straits and suffering from hunger, he came back and entering the tent said to my mother, ‘I am a beggar!’ When he was told, ‘If you are a beggar, sit there’, he sat at the end of the bench on the eastern side of the tent, near the inside of the door.

‘At that moment, Tolui, who was five years old, came into the tent from outside. Then, as he ran out again, Qargil Sir a rose and seizing the child pressed him under his arm. He went out and, as he was going forward feeling for and drawing out his knife, Borouql’s wife, Alani, was sitting on the eastern side of my mother’s tent. When mother cried, “The boy is done for!” Altan followed her out and running together with her caught up with Qargil Sir a with one hand she seized his plait and with the other she seized the hand that was drawing the knife. She pulled it so hard that he dropped the knife. At that very moment, north of the khan, Jetie and Jelme were killing a harmless black ox for provisions. At Altan’s cry they both came running, holding their butchering axes, their fists red with the animal’s blood. With axe and knife they slew Qargil Sir a of the Tatar on the spot.

While Altan, Jetie and Jelme were arguing among the three of them whose chief merit it was for having saved the life of the child, Jetie and Jelme said, “If we had not been there and if, by running fast and arriving in time, we had not killed him, what could Altan, a woman, have done? Qargil Sir a would have harmed the life of the child. The chief merit is certainly ours!” Altan said, “If you had not heard my cry, how could you have come? And when I ran and caught up with him, seizing his plait and pulling the hand that was drawing the knife, if the knife had not dropped, wouldn’t he have done harm to the child’s life before Jetie and Jelme arrived?” When she had finished speaking the chief merit went, by general consent, to Altan. Borouql’s wife became the second shaft of a cart for Borouql and was useful in saving the life of Tolui.

Again, when Borouql was fighting with us against the Kereyit at the Qalaqijit, Sands, Ogodei was hit by an arrow in the neck vein and fell from his horse. Borouql got off his horse and stopped by him, sucked the clotting blood with his mouth and spent the night with him. The following morning he put him on a horse, but as Ogodei could not sit up they rode double, Borouql clasping Ogodei from behind and continuously sucking the wound-clogging blood, so that the corners of his mouth were red with it, and so he came, bringing Ogodei back alive and safe. 1 In return for my

---

1 Lit., ‘Jetie and Jelme.’
2 See above, § 144.
3 Lit., ‘a seeker of good things.’
4 Qalaqijit in text.
5 See above, § 173.
mother's suffering in bringing him up, he was indeed of service in saving the lives of my two sons. Borouqil was a companion to me; he never tired At my beck and call, At my voice and its echo. If Borouqil commits up to nine crimes he shall not be punished.1 So he ordered.2

Further, Chinggis Qaan said, 'Let Us reward Our female offspring!'

Further, Chinggis Qaan said to Old Cusin, 'Cusin, Qunan, Kokio Cos and Deghe, these four, without hinging or concealing, have always reported to me what they saw and heard; they have always informed me of what they thought and comprehended. In the Mongol tradition it is customary for a senior ranking personage to become a Bed; You are a descendant of Elder Brother the Babaran. As to the rank of Bed, you Old Cusin, who are from among us and senior to Us, shall become a Bed. When one has been raised to the rank of Bed, He shall wear a white dress And ride a white gelding; He shall sit on a high seat And be waited upon. Furthermore, yearly and monthly I shall hold discussions with you to seek your advice. Let it be so!' So he ordered.3

Further, Chinggis Qaan said, 'Because of sworn friend Quyildar's first opening his mouth and speaking at the time of battle, disregarding his life, let his descendants to the offspring of his offspring receive the

1 bounty granted to orphans.' So he ordered.

Further, Chinggis Qaan said to Qaqa' Qo'a's son Nariz To'o'nil, 'Your father Qaqa' Qo'a was fighting zealously before me at the battle of Dalan Baljit when he was killed by Jamuq.' Now, To'o'nil, for your father's services you shall receive the bounty granted to orphans.' To this To'o'nil said, 'If you are to favour me, as my Negus brothers are scattered about among all the various tribes, by your favour let me bring together my Negus brothers.' Thereupon, Chinggis Qaan ordered, 'If so, after having brought together your Negus brothers, you will be in charge of them to the offspring of your offspring, won't you?' So he ordered.

Further, Chinggis Qaan said to Sorgsun Sira, 'At the time when I was small, when out of jealousy I was seized by Tagatu Kirthup of the Tayi'uit and his brothers, then you Sorgsun Sira, because my kinmen were jealous of me,4 with your sons Cita'un and Cimbai, made your daughter Qa'dan take care of me, hid me and later, releasing me, you sent me away.5 Mindful of that good service of yours, whether In the dark night in my dreams, In the bright day in my heart, I certainly kept the memory of it; but you did come late to me from the Tayi'uit. If I show favour to you now, what kind of favour do you wish?' Sorgsun Sira, who was together with his sons Cita'un and Cimbai, said, 'If you are to favour me, let me have the free use of grazing grounds. Let me settle on and freely use

1 Cf. above, § 185.
2 This is the same personage called Qaqa' U'a (of the No'uas) in §§ 120 and 129 above.
3 See above, § 129.
4 I.e., the Tayi'uit. Cf. above, § 76.
5 See above, § 82.
6 See above, §§ 85-87.
7 Cf. Jamuqa's words in § 201 above.
the territory of the Merkit on the Selenge River. As for other favours in addition to this, let Cirgiss Qa’an decide."

To these words, Cirgiss Qa’an said, ‘Cattle on the territory of the Merkit on the Selenge, and, indeed, have free use of its grazing grounds. You shall be a freeman, allowed to carry a quiver and drink the ceremonial wine to the offspring of your offspring. You shall not incur punishment for up to nine crimes.’ So he ordered.

Further, Cirgiss Qa’an, showing favour to Cila’un and Cimbai, gave the following order: ‘Thinking of the words that you, Cila’un and Cimbai, once spoke, how will you be satisfied?’ Cila’un and Cimbai, if you want to say what you have in mind or request something that you lack, do not tell an intermediary about it. You in person, through your own mouths, tell me yourselves what you have thought, request from me yourselves what you lack.’

Further, he gave the following order: ‘You, the freemen Sorgun Siru, Badai and Kiiliqi, you too, as freemen. When swiftly pursuing many foes,
If you get booty,
What you get you shall take away.
When in a battle
You hunt wild beasts,
What you slaughter you shall take away.’

As for Sorgun Siru, he was but a retainer of Todege of the Taylikut. Badai and Kiiliqi were but horse-herders of Ceren.1 Now, with my support, enjoy the privilege of being freemen, allowed to carry a quiver and drink the ceremonial wine!’

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

1 For these privileges, see the Commentary.
2 Translation uncertain. See the Commentary.
3 Lit., ‘by your own bodies.’
4 Cf. above, § 187.
5 See above, § 146.
6 I.e., Yeke Ceren. See above, § 169.
7 The Sirg’i’eri of § 149, where this event is narrated.
8 I.e., the principle of mutual obligations between lord and subject. Cf. above, § 208.
9 Cf. above, § 149.
10 See above, § 200 and com.
11 I.e., ‘as many of theirs as.’
Further, Činggis Qa’an made the shepherd Deger bring together the unregistered households and put him in charge of a thousand.

Further, Činggis Qa’an said, "As the carpenter Güçügü’i lacks subjects to form a unit of a thousand, let these be collected from here and there and given to him. Since, from among the Jadaran, Mulqaqu has been a perfect companion to me, you two -- Güçügü’i and Mulqaqu -- be jointly in command of a thousand and consult with one another."

Činggis Qa’an made commanders of a thousand those who had established the state with him and who had suffered with him. Forming units of a thousand, he appointed the commanders of a thousand, of a hundred and of ten. Forming units of ten thousand, he appointed the commanders of ten thousand. The commanders of ten thousand and of a thousand and of a hundred were rewarded, those who were to be commended, he commended. He gave them the following order: 'Formerly, I had eighty men to serve on rosters as nightguards and seventy men to serve as dayguards. Now, by the strength of Eternal Heaven, my power has been increased by Heaven and Earth and I have brought the entire people to allegiance, causing them to come under my sole rule.' So now choose men to serve on rosters as nightguards and dayguards from the various thousands and recruit them for me. When you recruit them and have nightguards, quiverbearers, and dayguards enrolled, recruit them so as to make up a full thousand."

Further, Činggis Qa’an proclaimed the following order to the various thousands regarding the selection and recruitment of the guards: "When guards will be recruited for Us, and the sons of commanders of ten thousand, of a thousand and of a hundred, or the sons of ordinary people, will enter Our service, those shall be recruited who are able and of good appearance, and who are deemed suitable to serve by Our side. When recruiting the sons of commanders of a thousand, they shall each bring with them ten companions and one younger brother. When recruiting the sons of commanders of a hundred, they shall each bring with them five companions and one younger brother. When recruiting the sons of commanders of ten, or the sons of ordinary people, they shall each bring with them three companions and, likewise, one younger brother; and they shall be provided with fully equipped mounts supplied by the units to which they originally belonged. When strengthening in this guise the number of those who will be placed to serve by Our side, the ten companions to be given to each of the sons of the commanders of a thousand may be drawn from the units of a thousand and the units of a hundred from which they originally came. Whether or not they have a share of goods given by their fathers and regardless of the number of men and geldings that they have personally acquired and constituted as their own patrimony, a levy shall be raised -- independently of their personal share of goods -- of mounts and men according to the amount fixed by Us and, levying men and preparing mounts in this manner, they shall be given to them. And exactly in the same manner, independently of their personal share of goods and levying in precisely the same way, five companions each shall be given to the sons of commanders of a hundred, and three companions each to the sons of commanders of ten, as well as to the sons of ordinary people.' So he ordered.

And he ordered, "As to the commanders of a thousand, of a hundred and of ten, and the numerous ordinary people who have received this order of Ours, or who have heard it, anyone who transgresses it shall be guilty and liable to punishment. As to the people who have been recruited to
serve on rostrum for us, if any of them are unsuitable; for this
because they evade it, regarding their service by Our side as
too difficult, we shall recruit others in their stead and we
shall punish those people and send them to a distant place,
out of Our sight."

And he said, 'People who come to Us in order to
learn to serve inside the tent by Our side shall not be hindered.'

Since Cinggis Qa’an had issued an order, choosing
guards from the units of a thousand and, according to the
same order, choosing the sons of commanders of a hundred
and of ten, as they came forward — formerly there were only
eighty nightguards — he brought their number up to eight
hundred. And he said, 'On top of the eight hundred, add to
the number so as to make up a full thousand.'

He ordered, 'Those who want to enrol in the night-
guards shall not be hindered.' And he ordered, 'Yeke Ne’u-
arin shall be the commander of the nightguards and he shall
be in charge of a thousand.'

Earlier four hundred quiverbearers had been chosen.
Choosing them anew, he said, 'Yisun Te’e, the son of Jelme,
shall be the commander of the quiverbearers and he shall act
in consultation with Tuge’s son, Bugidei.'

And he ordered, 'When the quiverbearers together with
the dayguards join to form the various companies, Yisun
Te’e shall join as the commander of one company of
quiverbearers; Bugidei shall join as the commander of one
company of quiverbearers; Horgudaq shall join as the
commander of one company of quiverbearers; and Labaqa
shall join as the commander of one company of quiver-
bearers. These four shall make their quiverbearers join the
various companies of dayguards to carry quivers and so be


1  This Tuge is the Tange of § 137 and the Tuge of § 202 above. Although
there is no previous mention of the four hundred quiverbearers, see § 192 above
for their duties.

206  Cinggis Qa’an, bringing the number of dayguards who
had formerly enrolled with Ogle Jebsi up to a full
thousand, said, 'Ogle Jebsi from the family of Bo’eriu
shall be in charge of them.' He said, 'As for one thousand
dayguards, Bug from the family of Muqali shall be in
charge of them.' He said, 'Alcidai from the family of
Iljei shall be in charge of one thousand dayguards.'

He said, 'Doidei Cebsi shall be in charge of one thousand
dayguards and Doqolqa Cebsi shall be in charge of one
thousand dayguards.' And he ordered, 'Canai from the
family of Jarjiene shall be in charge of one thousand
dayguards; Aqvan from the family of Alsh shall be in
charge of one thousand dayguards; Arqai Qasar shall be in
charge of one thousand dayguards — one thousand chosen brave
warriors — who, in the many days of peace shall serve as
dayguards, and in the days of battle shall stand before me
and be brave warriors.'

Thus, there were eight thousand dayguards chosen from
the various thousands; there were also two thousand night-
guards with quiverbearers. Altogether there were ten thou-
sand guards.

Cinggis Qa’an ordered, 'The ten thousand guards at-
tached to Us shall be strengthened and become the main
body of the army.' So he ordered.

Further, when Cinggis Qa’an issued the order appointing
those who were to be the elders of the four companies
of dayguards on roster duty, he said, 'Buqa shall be in
charge of one company of guards; he shall marshal them'
and take his turn of duty. Alcidai shall be in charge of one

1  Lit., 'of one thousand dayguards.'

2  i.e., the senior officers.

3  Lit., 'the guards.' i.e., he shall dispose them in due order.
company of guards; he shall marshal them and take his turn of duty. Dōđe Cerbi shall be in charge of one company of guards; he shall marshal them and take his turn of duty. Dōgolqū Cerbi shall be in charge of one company of guards; he shall marshal them and take his turn of duty."

So he appointed the elders of the four companies or rosters of duty.

Cinggis Qa’in promulgated the order about taking turns of duty, saying, ‘On taking his turn of duty, the commander of the company will himself muster the guards who are to serve on roster and then take his turn of duty; after spending three days and nights with them the company shall be relieved. If a member of the Guard fails to take his turn, the guard that has so failed shall be disciplined with three strokes of the rod. If the same guard fails again for the second time— to take his turn of duty, he shall be disciplined with seven strokes of the rod. If, once more, the same man, without being sick in body and without having first consulted the commanders of the company, if the same guard fails once more— that is three times—to take his turn of duty, thus regarding his service by our side as too difficult, he shall be disciplined with thirty-seven strokes of the rod and shall be sent to a distant place, out of our sight.’ So he ordered.

And he ordered, ‘The elders of the companies shall proclaim this order to the guards every third turn of duty. If the elders of the companies do not proclaim it they shall be guilty and liable to punishment. When the guards have heard the order, if they contravene it and fail to take their turn of duty according to the order they shall be guilty and liable to punishment.’ So he ordered.

He said, ‘Elders of the companies, do not reprimand my guards, who have enrolled as guards equal to you, without my permission and merely on the ground of seniority. If any of them breaks the law report it to me. Those liable to

execution We shall certainly cut down. Those liable to be beaten We shall certainly compel to lie down and have them beaten. If you yourselves merely on the ground of seniority lay hands on my guards who are equal to you and strike them with a rod, as requital for strokes of the rod you shall be repaid with strokes of the rod, and as requital for fists you shall be repaid with fists.’

Further, Cinggis Qa’in ordered, ‘My guards are of higher standing than the outside commanders of a thousand; the attendants of my guards are of higher standing than the outside commanders of a hundred and of ten. If outside leaders of a thousand, regarding themselves as equal to and a match for my guards, quarrel with them, We shall punish the persons who are leaders of a thousand.’ So he ordered.

Further, Cinggis Qa’in issued the following order and proclaimed it to the commanders of the various companies: ‘When the quiverbearers, the dayguards and the stewards take their turn of duty, they shall carry out their day duties, each at his respective post. As the sun sets, they shall retire so as to be replaced by the nightguards and, going outside, they shall spend the night there. At night, the nightguards shall spend the night beside Us. The quiverbearers shall leave, turning over their quivers—and the stewards their bowls and vessels—to the nightguards. The following morning, the quiverbearers, dayguards and stewards who have spent the night outside shall stay at the horse station while We eat Our soup; then, they will report to the nightguards. When We have finished eating Our morning soup, the quiverbearers shall return to their quivers, the dayguards to their appointed place and the stewards to their bowls and vessels. Those who take their turn of duty on roster must all act thus, in precisely the same manner, according to this ordinance.’ So he ordered.

Lit., ‘the order.’

Lit., ‘the guards.’
He said: ‘Any person who moves about crosswise at the rear or front of the Palace after sunset shall be arrested and the nightguards shall hold him in custody for the night. The following morning, the nightguards shall question him. When the company is relaxed, the incoming nightguards shall hand over their passes and only then come in and take their turn of duty; the outgoing nightguards when relieved shall likewise hand theirs over and depart.’

He said, ‘The nightguards at night lie down all around the Palace; you, nightguards who stand guarding the door, shall hack any persons entering at night until their heads are split open and their shoulders fall apart, then cast them away. If any persons come at night with an urgent message, they must report to the nightguards and communicate the message to me while standing together with the nightguards at the rear of the tent.’

‘No one is to sit in a place above the nightguards. No one is to enter the precinct without permission from the nightguards. No one is to walk up beyond the nightguards. One must not walk between the nightguards. One must not ask the number of nightguards. The nightguards shall arrest the people who walk up beyond them. The nightguards shall arrest the people who walk between them. And the nightguards – with regard to any person who shall have asked their number – the nightguards shall seize the gelding that that person was riding that very day, with saddle and bridle, together with the clothes that he was wearing.’ So he ordered.

Elijigeds, even though he was a trustworthy person, he was not arrested by the nightguards when in the evening he happened to walk up beyond them?

SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS

Chinggis Qan said,

‘My elder nightguards who, in the cloudy night,
Lying down around my tented tent
Ensured that I slept in quiet and peace,
You have made me gain this throne.\(^1\)
My blessed nightguards who, in the starry night,
Lying down all around my Palace tent,
Ensured that I was without fear in my bed,
You have made me gain the high throne
My true-hearted nightguards who in the swirling snowstorm,
In shivering cold, in pouring rain, taking no rest,
Stood all around my latticed tent
Bringing peace to my heart,
You have made me gain this throne of joy.
My trustworthy nightguards, who in the midst
Of trouble-making enemies, not blinking an eye,
Stood all around my felt-girt tent
Withstanding their onslaught,
My watchful nightguards who, hearing the enemy’s quivers of birch-bark barely rattling,
Stood up without delay,
My swift-moving nightguards who, hearing the enemy’s quivers of willow-wood barely rattling,
Stood up not a moment too late;
My blessed nightguards, from now on
You shall call yourselves “the elder nightguards.”’

\(^1\) i.e., at the northern side.
\(^2\) i.e., between the nightguards and the tent.
\(^3\) Lit., ‘the nightguards.’
\(^4\) The Elijigeds of §§ 275 and 276 below.
\(^5\) i.e., a tent with a smoke-hole at the top.
\(^6\) See above, § 205.
The seventy dagnuars who had enrolled with Ogûle Çerbi shall be called "the great dagnuars." The brave warriors of Arqi shall be called "the elder brave warriors." The quiverbearers Yisim Te'e, Bûgidei and the others shall be called "the great quiverbearers." So he ordered.

ённ 231 Cîngis Qa'an said, "As for my ten thousand personal guards who have come to serve in my presence, chosen for personal service from the ninety-five thousand, you, sons of mine who will later sit on my throne to the offspring of my offspring, considering these guards as a keepsake from me, give them no cause for dissatisfaction, but take good care of them! These ten thousand guards — will they not be called my beneficent spirits?"

Further, Cîngis Qa'an said, "The nightguards shall be in charge of the female attendants of the Palace, the "sons of the household," the camel-keepers and the cowherds, and they shall take care of the tent-carts of the Palace. The nightguards shall take care of the standards and drums, and the spears arranged beneath them. The nightguards shall also take care of the bowls and vessels. The nightguards shall supervise Our drink and food. The nightguards shall supervise and cook the uncut mat and food as well: if drink and food are lacking, we shall seek them from the nightguards who have been entrusted with their supervision." And he said, "When the quiverbearers distribute drink and food, they must not distribute them without permission from the supervising nightguards. When they distribute food, they shall first distribute it beginning with the nightguards. And he said, "Entering into and going out from the Palace tent must be regulated by the nightguards. As the door, the doorkeepers from the nightguards shall stand right next to the tent. Two from the nightguards shall enter into the tent and oversee the large kamis pitchers." And he said, "The campmasters from the nightguards shall go before Us and set up the Palace tent." And he said, "When We go falconing or hunting, the nightguards shall go falconing and hunting with Us; but exactly one half of them shall stay at the carts."

Further, Cîngis Qa'an said, "If We Ourself do not go on a military campaign the nightguards must not take the field without Us." So he said, and gave the following order: "After being thus instructed by Us, the chamberlains in charge of troops who transgress the order and, out of jealousy for the nightguards, send them out on campaign, shall be guilty and liable to punishment." And he said, "You say, "Why is it that soldiers from the nightguards are not sent out on campaign?" It is the nightguards that watch over my golden life. When I go falconing or hunting, they toil with me; being charged with the administration of the Palace, whether this is moving or stationary, they look after the carts. Is it an easy thing to spend the night watching over my person? Is it an easy thing to look after the tents when the main base camp is in movement or settled? The reason why We say that they must not take the field separately and without Us, is because We say to Ourself in that they have already so many and quite distinct duties."

Further, Cîngis Qa'an gave the following order: "Some of the nightguards shall decide on judicial matters together with Sûgi Qatuqu." And he said, "Some of the nightguards shall take care of quivers, bows, breastplates and weapons, and they shall distribute them. Managing some of the geldings, they shall load the hunting nets on to them." And

1 See above, § 120 and comm.
2 I.e., Arqi Qaasar.
3 See above, § 202.
4 See above, § 207.
5 Çerbi âkîr. See the Commentary.
6 I.e., young domestic slaves.
7 I.e., royal.
8 I.e., the nightguards.
he said, 'Some of the nightguards, together with the chamberlains, shall distribute the sainin.' And he said, 'When the quiverbearers and the dayguards have reported on the establishment of the encampment, the quiverbearers such as Yisên Te've and Bûmak, and the dayguards such as Aššidai, Ôgile and Arqan, shall take up duty on the right side of the Palace.' And he said, 'The dayguards such as Buqa, Đōdēi Ąrbi, Doqoolî Ąrbi and Čanâi shall take up duty on the left side of the Palace.' And he said, 'Arqâli's brave warriors shall take up duty in front of the Palace.' And he said, 'The nightguards, having taken care of the tenters of the Palace, shall take up duty in the proximity of the Palace, on the left side.' And he said, 'Đōdēi Ąrbi shall constantly supervise the Palace: all the guards who are dayguards, and, round about the Palace, the "sons of the household" of the Palace, the horse-herders, shepherds, camel-keepers and cowherds.' He appointed him and gave the following order: 'Đōdēi Ąrbi shall take up duty and be constantly present, at the rear of the Palace.

Eating scraps of leftovers,
Burned dried dung. 235

1 Činggis Qa’an sent Qublaï Noyan to fight against the Qarlu’ut. Arslan Qan of the Qarlu’ut came to submit to Qublaï. Qublaï Noyan took Arslan Qan back with him and made him pay homage to Činggis Qa’an. Because he had not opposed resistance, Činggis Qa’an showed favour to Arslan and said, 'I shall give him a daughter in marriage.'

2 Sûbe’ètel Bû’âtar, who had been provided with an iron cart, had gone on a campaign in pursuit of the sons

of Toqo’ut of the Merkit led by Quru and Çla’ûn. He overtook them at the Čui River, destroyed them and came back.

3 Čebe, pursuing Güçülük Qan of the Naiman, overtook him at Sarî Qun. He destroyed Güçülük and came back.

4 The iða’ut of the Liû’ut sent envoys to Činggis Qa’an. Through the envoys Akïraq and Darbâi he had the following petition conveyed to him:

As if one saw Mother Sun
When the clouds disperse;
As if one came upon the river water
When the ice disappears,

so I greatly rejoiced when I heard of the fame of Činggis Qa’an.
If through your favour, O Činggis Qa’an, I were to obtain
But a ring from your golden belt,
But a thread from your crimson coat.
I will become your fifth son and will serve you.'

Činggis Qa’an, in reply to those words and showing favour to him, sent the following message: 'I shall give him a daughter and let him become my fifth son. The iða’ut must come, bringing with him gold, silver, small and big pearls, brocades, damasks and silks.' The iða’ut rejoiced because he had been favoured, and taking with him gold, silver, small and big pearls, silks, brocades, damasks and satins, he came and paid homage to Činggis Qa’an. Činggis Qa’an favoured the iða’ut and gave him his daughter Al Al tum in marriage.

In the Year of the Hare (1207), Činggis Qa’an sent Joci’ with the troops of the right wing on an expedition against the People of the Forest. Buqa went with him acting as a

1 i.e., western.
2 i.e., eastern.
3 i.e., at the southern side.
4 See above, § 232.
5 i.e., at the northern side.
6 For fuel.
7 See above, § 199.

1 i.e., 'Yellow Cliff'; possibly an error for Sarî Qun. See the Commentary.
2 i.e., the ruler of the Uighurs.
3 i.e., metals.
4 lit., 'the iða’ut.'
came back having subjugated the fortunate People of the Forest. I shall give this people to you.' So he ordered.

Further, he sent Borooul Noyan to fight against the Qori Tumar people. As Dabaqul Soqor, the leader of the Tumar people, had died, his wife Botuqi Tarqun was governing them; upon reaching their territory, Borooul Noyan with two others—three men altogether—set out from the main army to proceed ahead of it. In the evening, as they were going along a trail in the dense forest and were off guard, they were attacked from the rear by their patrols, who blocked the trail. Borooul Noyan was caught and killed.

When Činggis Qa'an learnt that the Tumar had killed Borooul, he was greatly angered and prepared to move in person against them, but Bo'oru and Muqali pleaded with him until he desisted. Thereupon he appointed Dörbei Doğūn of the Dörbet and commanded him thus: 'Set the army in strict order. Pray to Eternal Heaven and strive to subdue the Tumar people.'

Dörbei set the army in order and beforehand made a decoy manoeuvre along the paths, trails and passes where the army was expected to advance and which enemy patrols would keep under surveillance. Then, going by paths trodden by the red bull, he issued an ordinance to his warriors that, with regard to all the men in the army, if anyone lost heart and refused to proceed, they should beat him, and he made each man carry ten rods for this purpose, he also had axes, adzes, saws, chains and weapons prepared for the men. Along the paths trodden by the red bull he had...
them chop, bvv and saw the trees that stood in the way, thus making a road for the army to pass.

They went up the mountain and, as though falling on to the smoke-hole of the tents of the Tumat people who were busy fashioning, they took them by surprise and plundered them.

Earlier Qorqi Noyan and Qudqua Beki had been seized by the Tumat and were there, with Botuqquu Tarquu. The way in which Qorqi was seized was the following: When Cinggis Qa’an said, ‘The girls of the Tumat people are beautiful, let him take thirty wives from among them!’; Qorqi went, intending to take the girls of the Tumat people, but these people, who had formerly submitted, now rebelled and seized Qorqi Noyan.

When Cinggis Qa’an learnt that Qorqi had been seized by the Tumat, he said, ‘Qudqua knows the ways and manners of the People of the Forest’, and sent him to them, but Qudqua Beki was also seized.

After he had brought the Tumat people completely under submission, Cinggis Qa’an, because of the death of Botuqquu gave one hundred Tumat to his family. Qorqi took thirty girls. Cinggis Qa’an gave Botuqquu Tarquu to Qudqua Beki.

Cinggis Qa’an decreed that he would apportion the subject people among his mother, children and younger brothers. When he gave them their share, he said, ‘The one who killed most gathering’ the people was mother. The eldest of my sons is Qorqi. The youngest of my younger brothers is Ochqu. To his mother, together with Ochquin’s share, he gave one thousand people. The mother was dissatisfied, thinking them too few, but she did not complain.

---

To Joqo he gave nine thousand people. To Ca’adai he gave eight thousand people. To Ogodi he gave five thousand people. To Tohlu he gave five thousand people. To Qasar he gave four thousand people. To Aliadai he gave two thousand people. To Belgutai he gave one thousand five hundred people.

He said, ‘Darits joined the Kerejat.’ I shall wipe him from my sight.’ On that, Bo’orfu, Muqwil and Sigi Qurqu spoke saying, ‘This action would be like extinguishing one’s own hearth-fire.

Like destroying one’s own tent.

As a reminder of your good father, only your paternal uncle is left. How can you do away with him? He acted without thinking, so spare him. Allow the youngest brother of your good father, together with his people, to let the smoke of their camp swirl up!’ And they reasoned with him until he was so moved that he sniffed, as if he had smoke in his nose.

‘Right!’ — he said, and thinking of his good father, he calmed down at the words of Bo’orfu, Muqwil and Sigi Qurqu.

Cinggis Qa’an said, ‘I have given ten thousand people to mother and to Ochquin, and for them I have appointed the four commanders Guqi, Kokolugi, Jungiis and Qurquu. For Joqo I have appointed the three commanders Qunam, Mongk’ur and Ketu. For Ca’adai I have appointed the three commanders Qoraq, Mongk and Iqququu.’

Further, Cinggis Qa’an said, ‘Ca’adai is headstrong and is, by nature, punctilious. Kijk Cos shall stay at his side evening and morning, and shall tell him what he thinks.’

So he ordered.
For Ögödei he appointed both Ilüge and Deger. For Tolui he appointed both Jedei and Bala. For Qasar he appointed Jabba. For Akhiu he appointed Cauroq.

The sons of Father Mönlik of the Qongotan were seven. The middle one was Kókóq Teb Tenggeri. Those seven ganged up and beat Qasar.

When Qasar, kneeling before Činggis Qa’an, told him that he had been beaten by the seven Qongotan who had ganged up against him, Činggis Qa’an was angry about other matters. While Qasar was still talking, Činggis Qa’an in his anger said to him, ‘In the past you have done nothing but claim that you would not be vanquished by any living being. How is it that you have now been vanquished?’ At this Qasar wept, then rose and left.

Qasar was vexed and for four days in succession did not come before Činggis Qa’an.

After this, Teb Tenggeri said to Činggis Qa’an. ‘The decease of Eternal Heaven concerning the ruler has been foretold by heavenly signs: as follows: once they say that Temüjin will hold the nation, once that Qasar will. If you don’t strike at Qasar by surprise, there is no knowing what will happen!’

On these words, Činggis Qa’an that very night rode off to seize Qasar. When he left, Guçu and Kókóq informed the mother1 that he had gone to seize Qasar. When the mother heard this, straightaway — it was still night — she harnessed a white camel and set out in a black covered cart, travelling all night.

On her arrival at sunrise, Činggis Qa’an had tied up the opening of Qasar’s sleeves, removed his hat and belt, and was interrogating him. Činggis Qa’an, surprised by the mother descending upon him, became afraid of her.2

The mother was furious. As soon as she got there and dismounted from the cart, she herself untied and loosened Qasar’s sleeves, the opening of which had been tied up, and gave back to Qasar his hat and belt. The mother was so angered that she was unable to contain her fury. She sat cross-legged, took out both her breasts, laid them over her knees and said, ‘Have you seen them?’ They are the breasts that suckled you, and these3 are the ones who, rashing out of my womb.4

Have snapped at their own afterbirth.5

Have cut their own birth cord.

What has Qasar done? Temüjin used to drain this one breast of mine. Qaqül and Ödögin between them did not drain a single breast. As for Qasar, he completely drained both my breasts and brought me comfort until my bosom relaxed.

He used to make my bosom relax. Therefore,

My able Temüjin
Has skill of mind.6
My Qasar has skill in archery
And might, and so he was wont
To shoot and subdue
All those on the run, shooting at him.
With long-distance arrows he was wont
To shoot and subdue
All those on the run, in fear of him.

But now, saying that you have destroyed the enemy people, you cannot longer bear the sight of Qasar.” So she spoke.

1 Lit., ‘of the mother.’
2 Lit., ‘the mother.’
3 Lit., ‘yonder two.’
4 Translation uncertain. See the Commentary.
5 Cf. above, § 78.
6 Lit., ‘of bosom.’
7 Lit., ‘Temüjin.’

1 Some of the names in this section appear elsewhere in the SH in slightly different forms. See the Commentary.
After Chinggis Qa'an had at last calmed the mother, he said, 'I was afraid of mother getting so angry and really became frightened. I felt shame and was really abashed.' And saying, 'Let us withdraw,' he withdrew and returned home. But, without letting the mother know, he suddenly took away the subjects of Qasar and let Qasar have only one thousand four hundred people. That is how, when the mother learned this, the thought of it made her go quickly into decline. Jekte of the Jalayir then left in fright and fled into the Barqijin Lowland.

After that, the people of nine tongues gathered under Teghangeri. Many from Chinggis Qa'an's horse station also decided to gather under Teghangeri. When they had thus gathered, the people who were subject to Temüge Oūtigon went over to Teghangeri. Oūtigon Noyan then sent his messenger, by name of Soqor, to request the return of the people who had departed. Teghangeri said to the messenger Soqor, 'I am grateful to both Oūtigon and you,' and, after beating him, sent the messenger Soqor back on foot, forcing him to carry his saddle on his back.

Greatly affected by the beating of his messenger Soqor and his return on foot, Oūtigon the following day – Oūtigon himself – went to Teghangeri and said, 'I sent my messenger Soqor to you, but you beat him and sent him back on foot. Now I have come to request the return of my people.'

On that, the seven Qongqotan from all sides surrounded Oūtigon, saying, 'You were right to send your messenger Soqor.' Oūtigon Noyan, being dealt with in this way and fearing to be seized and beaten by them, said, 'I was wrong to send my messenger.' The seven Qongqotan then said, 'If you were wrong, kneel down and make amends,' and they had him kneel down behind Teghangeri.

Oūtigon was not given his people; so, early next day, when Chinggis Qa'an had not yet got up and was still in bed, he went into his tent. He wept and, kneeling down, said, 'As the people of nine tongues had assembled under Teghangeri, I sent a messenger called Soqor to request from Teghangeri the return of the people subject to me. They beat my messenger Soqor, they made him carry the saddle on his back, and he was sent back on foot. When I in person went to request the return of my people, I was surrounded from all sides by the seven Qongqotan, who compelled me to make amends and kneel down behind Teghangeri.' And he wept.

Before Chinggis Qa'an could utter a sound, Lady Börte sat up in bed, covering her breasts with the edge of the blanket. Seeing Oūtigon weep, she herself shed tears and said, 'What are those Qongqotan doing? They recently ganged up and beat Qasar. And now, why do they make this Oūtigon kneel down behind them?' What kind of behaviour is this? Thus they covertly injure even these younger brothers of yours who are like cypresses and pines. And truly, later:

When your body, like a great old tree,
Will fall down,
By whom will they let govern your people
Who are like tangle hemp?
When your body, like the stone base of a pillar,
Will collapse,
By whom will they let govern your people
Who are like a flock of birds?

How will people covertly injuring in this fashion your younger brothers, who are like cypresses and pines, ever

1 Lit. 'the people.'
2 Possibly Keręy tribesmen distributed among the Mongols. See the Commentary.
3 For the gift of the horse – said sarcastically, of course.
4 I.e., Oūtigon.
allow my three or four little "naughty ones" to govern while they are still growing up? What are these Mongolians doing? Now that you have left them ill-treat your younger brothers in such a way, do you view all this?" So spoke Lady Börte and shed tears.  

On these words of Lady Börte, Chingsgis Qa'an said to Ötlügin, "Teb Tenggeri is coming now. Whatever you may wish to do to him within your power, it is for you to decide!" Whereupon Ötlügin rose, wiped away his tears and, going out of the tent, stood in readiness with three strong men.  

After a while, Father Mönglik came with his seven sons. The seven all entered and, as Teb Tenggeri sat down on the right side of the Kumis pitchers, Ötlügin seized the collar of Teb Tenggeri, saying, "Yesterday you compelled me to make amends. Let us now measure up to each other!" — and, holding his collar, dragged him towards the door. Teb Tenggeri, then, facing Ötlügin, seized his collar and wrestled with him. As they were wrestling, Teb Tenggeri's hat fell in front of the fireplace. Father Mönglik took his hat, snatched it and placed it in his bosom. Chingsgis Qa'an said, 'Go out and match each other's strength and might.'  

Ötlügin dragged Teb Tenggeri out. The three strong men who had earlier been standing in readiness at the threshold of the door faced Teb Tenggeri. They seized him, dragged him out further, broke his back and cast him down at the end of the line of carts on the left side.  

Ötlügin came back into the tent and said, "Teb Tenggeri had compelled me to make amends. When I asked, 'Let us measure up to each other,' he was not willing to wrestle and lay down pretending that he could not get up. Not much of a companion, is he?"  

Father Mönglik understood and, shedding tears, said, 'I have been your companion. Since the brown earth was only the size of a clod, since the sea and rivers were only the size of a rivulet.' At these words, his six Mongolian sons barred the door and disposed themselves around the fireplace. When they rolled up their sleeves, Chingsgis Qa'an became frightened. Being pressed by them, he said, 'Make way, I am going out.' As soon as he stepped outside, querubeaters and dayguards surrounded Chingsgis Qa'an and stood by. Chingsgis Qa'an saw that after breaking his backbone, they had cast Teb Tenggeri down at the end of the line of carts. He had a grey tent brought from the back and placed over Teb Tenggeri, saying, 'Fasten the harnessing to the carts, we shall move on.' And he moved on from there.  

After they had covered the smoke-hole of the tent in which they had placed Teb Tenggeri, they blocked the door and put people to keep watch, on the third night at dusk Teb Tenggeri opened the smoke-hole of the tent and came out bodily through it. When they investigated closely, it was established that it really was Teb Tenggeri who had been seen in that part of the tent. Chingsgis Qa'an said, 'Because Teb Tenggeri laid hands on my younger brothers and spread baseless slanders among them in order to sow discord, he was no longer loved by Heaven, and his life, together with his body, has been taken away.' Chingsgis Qa'an then railed at Father Mönglik saying, 'By not restraining your sons' nature, you and your sons began thinking that you were equal to me, and you have paid  

\[1\] I.e., 'my sons.'  
\[2\] I.e., of the wine table. See above, § 213.  
\[3\] I.e., the east side.
for this with Tegiengri's life.' If I had known that you had such a nature, you would have dealt with like Jamuqa, Altan, Quca and the others.' So he raved at Father Monglik.

When he had finished railing at him, he said further, 'If one retracts in the evening what one has said in the morning, and retracts in the morning what one has said the previous evening, surely one will only be criticised until he is covered with shame. I have earlier pledged my word to you. Enough of this matter!' And, his anger abated, he showed favour to him again. He said, 'Had you restrained your ambitious nature, who among Father Monglik's offspring would have dared to consider himself equal to me?' After Tegiengri had been annihilated, the proud air of the Qongqotan was much reduced.
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After that, in the Year of the Sheep (1211), Cinggis Qu'an set out against the Kitat people. He took Vudan's1 crossed over Huluneg Daba'an, took Sòndivu and sent Jebe and Güyigünük Ba'atur as vanguards.

On reaching Cabciyal, seeing them the Cabciyal Dazu was defended, Jebe there and then said, 'We shall entice them and get them to move and come after us. Then, let us put them to the test.' So saying, he turned back. When they discovered that he had turned back, the Kitat troops said, 'Let us pursue him!', and they went in pursuit until the valleys and the mountains were completely covered with them. Upon reaching the spur of Sòndivu, Jebe turned back, rushed forth against the enemies who were approaching in successive waves and routed them. Cinggis Qu'an, pressing on with the main body of the army, dislodged the Kitat from their positions, crushed the valiant and bold Jìyin troops of the Qara Kidat and the Jürçet, slaying them until they were like heaps of rotten logs as far as Cabciyal.

Jebe took the gate of Cabciyal, and after he had captured the passes and crossed over them, Cinggis Qu'an pitched camp at Sira Degur.

Launching the attack on Jungdu, he sent troops to various towns and cities, ordering them to attack. He sent Jebe to attack the city of Dzüngjang. Jebe reached the city of Dzüngjang but, unable to take it by storm, turned back and went as far as the distance of a six days' march from there.

1 Lit., 'head.'
248 Then—from the enemy being unaware—he returned and, marching throughout the night, each soldier leading a spare horse by hand, he arrived at the moment when the enemy was unprepared and took the city of Dungêang.

After taking the city of Dungêang, Jebe returned and joined Jinggis Qa'an.

When Jungdu was under siege, a high official of the Altan Qan, Onggig Cingsang, advised the Altan Qan as follows: 'This is the destiny and  favourable time decreed by Heaven and Earth.' Could it be that the time has come when the great throne will pass to a new ruler? The Mongols are coming in great might: they have crushed our valiant and bold elite Jiujin troops of the Qara Kitai and the Jurjet, slaying them until they were utterly destroyed. Even Čâbicuial Pass, on which we were relying, they have wrested from us. If we now set our troops in order and send them out to fight, should they again be crushed by the Mongols, they will no doubt scatter and return to their various cities. And, if we rally them against their will, they will turn against us and will no longer be our friends. If you, the Altan Qan, grant permission, let us for the present submit and come to terms with the ruler of the Mongols. If the Mongols agree to withdraw, after their withdrawal we shall there and then take up another different counsel. It is said that the men and geldings of the Mongols find our country unsuitable and fall victims to epidemics. Let us give a princess to their ruler, and to the men in his army let us send out gold, silver, satin and goods in abundance. Who knows whether they will or will not agree to our proposal?'

When Onggig Cingsang had given his advice, the Altan Qan approved these words of his, saying, 'Let it be so!' Then, offering submission, he sent to Jinggis Qa'an a princess by name of Gungju and from Jungdu he sent out to the men in his army gold, silver, satin and goods—as much as, in their judgement, their strength and that of their horses could carry. He also sent Onggig Cingsang to Jinggis Qa'an. When they came and submitted themselves, Jinggis Qa'an agreed to their proposal. He ordered back the troops that were attacking the various towns and withdrew. Onggig Cingsang accompanied Jinggis Qa'an as far as the spurs called Mojlu and Vujlu, and then returned. As for the satin and goods, our troops loaded as much as their horses could carry and moved away, tying up their loads with bands of heavy silk fabric.

In the course of that military campaign, Jinggis Qa'an set out towards the Qašin people. When, moving in their direction, he reached their country, Burqan Qan of the Qašin people said, 'I shall submit and, becoming your right wing, I shall serve you.' And he offered his daughter, called Čaga, to Jinggis Qa'an.

Furthermore, Burqan Qan said, 'Hearing of Jinggis Qa'an's fame we were in awe of you. Now your august person has arrived, you have come to us, and we are indeed awed by your majesty. Being awed, we the Tangut people have said, 'We shall become your right wing and we shall serve you.' When we serve you we know that:

We are the ones who live in permanent camps,
We are the ones who have towns with pounded-earth walls.
And so, when we become your companions,
In waging a swift campaign,
In fighting a deadly combat,

1 Cf. above, § 194.
2 = Qara Kitai.
3 This is not the name of the lady in question, but the Chinese term Cang-chu meaning 'princess.'
4 An error in the text. See the Commentary.
5 i.e., west.
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We shall not be able to hasten into a swift campaign. We shall not be able to fight a deadly combat. But if Činggis Qa'an shows favour to us, we the Tung'tu people, we shall bring forth many camels. Reared in the shelter of the tall feather-grass. We shall turn them into government property. And we shall give them to you. We shall weave woolen material and make satins. And we shall give them to you. Training falcons to fly loose at game. We shall gather them all, and the best ones we shall send to you.' Thus he petitioned Činggis Qa'an. And having spoken, he kept to his word. He levied camels from his Tung'tu people and, bringing so many that it was impossible to drive any more of them, he gave them to Činggis Qa'an.

On that campaign Činggis Qa'an obtained the submission of the Altan Qa'an of the Kitat people and took a large quantity of satins. He also obtained the submission of Burqan of the Qasun people and took a great number of camels.

Having thus obtained the submission of the Altan Qan of the Kitat people, named Aqutal, and of Iluq Burqan of the Tung'tu people in that campaign of the Year of the Sheep (1211), Činggis Qa'an returned home and set up camp on the Saifri Steppe.

Again, after that, since Juhun and many other envoys of ours who were sent to Jau Gon to seek allegiance had been hindered by the Altan Qa'an Aqutal of the Kitat people, in the Year of the Dog (1214) Činggis Qa'an set out once more against the Kitat people. On setting out he said,

"After they had already submitted themselves, how could they hinder the envoys sent to Jau Gon?" Činggis Qa'an moved in the direction of the Tunggon Pass, ordering Jebe to go by way of Čabiyal. Realizing that Činggis Qa'an had gone by the Tunggon Pass, the Altan Qan entrusted the command of his troops to Ile, Qada and Hobogetir, saying, "With the army blocking the passage and disposing the Red Coats as vanguard, fight for the Tunggon Pass and do not let them cross the defile." And he sent Ile, Qada and Hobogetir in boats with the troops.

When Činggis Qa'an arrived at the Tunggon Pass, the Kitat troops came to intercept him, saying, "Our soil!" Činggis Qa'an fought against Ile, Qada and Hobogetir and put to flight Ile and Qada. Tolui and Čugi Čiğen sent then arrived and, charging at their flank, forced back the Red Coats, repulsed and completely defeated Ile and Qada, and slew the Kitat until they were like heaps of rotten logs.

When the Altan Qan learned that his Kitat troops had been slain and destroyed, they fled out of Jundu and entered the city of Nanging. As the remnants of his troops were dying of starvation, they ate human flesh between them. Because Tolui and Čugi Čiğen had performed well, Činggis Qa'an greatly favoured both of them. Činggis Qa'an set up camp at Ouvisa, then in the Sira Ke'et of Jundu. Jebe broke down the gate of Čabiyal and, having routed the enemy troops who were holding Čabiyal, came and joined Činggis Qa'an.

When the Altan Qan moved out of Jundu, he appointed Qada as Baita in Jundu before leaving the city.

When Činggis Qa'an had the inventory taken of the gold,

---

1. Read Qa'an.
2. Lit., "we defend our soil!"
3. The Čugi Čiğen of § 202 (no. 85).
4. Lit., "both Tolui and Čugi Čiğen."
5. Lit., "Yellow Plain." See the Commentary.
6. I.e., a temporary viceroy or governor.
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Tenggeri, with a hundred companions, to Cinggis Qa’an to serve as a dayguard and hostage.

As the Altan Qan had been brought under submission by him, Cinggis Qa’an said that he would withdraw. There and then he withdrew by the Cabihyaul Pasit, sending Qasar along the sea coast with the troops of the left wing. He sent him with the following instructions: ‘Set up camp at the city of Beiging. After you have subjugated the city of Beiging, proceed further and cross the country of Vusqanu of the Juret. If Vusqanu intends to offer resistance, go for him. If he submits, pass through their border towns, go along the rivers Ulia and Na’u, and crossing the Ta’ur River upstream, join forces with me at the main basecamp.’ With Qasar he sent Jurdehi, Ali and Tolun Cerbi from among the army commanders.

Qasar brought the city of Beiging into subjection, forced Vusqanu of the Juret to submit and subjugated the towns which were on the way there. Qasar then proceeded upstream along the Ta’ur River and settled at the main base camp.

After that, as Cinggis Qa’an’s one hundred envoys with Uqana at their head had been held up and slain by the Sar-tu’ul people, Cinggis Qa’an said, ‘How can my “golden halter” be broken by the Sart-tu’ul people?’ And he said, ‘I shall set out against the Sart-tu’ul people.

To take revenge, to requite the wrong for the slaying of my hundred envoys with Uqana at their head.’

1 For east.
2 ‘Basingi’ See the Commentary, i.e., the Jurdehi’s.

3 i.e., ‘How can my sovereign authority be infringed?’ The ‘golden halter’ refers to the firm bond uniting the Mongol qan to other rulers who owed him allegiance.
When he was about to set out, there and then Yisii Qa’an respectfully gave the following advice to Cinggis Qa’an: ‘The Qa’an has thought of establishing order over his many people. Climbing high passes, crossing wide rivers and waging a long campaign. Still, living beings who are but born to this world are not eternal: When your body, like a great old tree, will fall down, to whom will you bequeath your people which is like tangled hemp? When your body, like the stone base of a pillar, will collapse, to whom will you bequeath your people which is like a flock of birds? Of your four sons, the heroes whom you have begotten, which one will you designate as your successor? I have given you this advice on what, thinking about it, we - the sons, younger brothers, the many common people and my poor self - understood to be an important question. Your order shall decide! So she advised him and Cinggis Qa’an declared: ’Even though she is only a woman,’ Yisii’s words are more right than right. No matter who - younger brothers and sons, and you Bo’orcu, Muqali and others - no one has advised me like this. And also I forgot, as if I would not follow the forefathers; I slept, as if I would not be caught by death.’

1 Cf. above, § 245.
2 Lit., ‘and Us the “bad one.”’
3 I.e., ‘word.’
4 Lit., ‘a lady-person.’
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Having said this, he said, ‘The eldest of my sons is Joći. What do you, Joći, say? Speak up!’ But before Joći could utter a sound, Ca’adai said, ‘When you say, “Joći, speak up!” do you mean by that that you will appoint Joći as your successor? How can we let ourselves be ruled by this bastard offspring of the Merkit?’

At these words, Joći rose and grabbing Ca’adai by the collar, said, ’I have never been told by my father the Qan that I was different from my brothers. How can you discriminate against me? In what skill are you better than I? Only in your obstinacy you are, perhaps, better. If we shoot arrows at a long distance and I am outdone by you, I shall cut off my thumb and throw it away! If we wrestle and I am defeated by you, I shall not rise from the place where I have fallen! Let the order of my father the Qan decide which of us is better!’

So he said, and as Joći and Ca’adai both stood holding each other by the collar, with Bo’orcu pulling Joći by the arm and Muqali pulling Ca’adai by the arm, Cinggis Qa’an listened and sat without saying a word.

Then, Koko Cos, who was standing on the left side, said, ‘Ca’adai, why are you so hasty? It was you among the sons, for whom your father the Qan had cherished hopes. Before you were born, the starry sky was turning upon itself. The many people were in turmoil: They did not enter their beds to rest. But fought against each other. The crusty earth was turning and turning. The entire nation was in turmoil: They did not lie on their coverlets to rest, But attacked each other.

1 For the implications of Ca’adai’s insulting words, see the Commentary.
2 I.e., ‘word.’
3 I.e., the people.
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At such time your mother was abducted.
It was not her wish:
It happened at a time
When men met, weapons in hand.
She was not running away from her home:
It happened at a time
Of mutual fighting.
She was not in love with someone else:
It happened at a time
When one man slew another.

You speak so as to harden the butter of your mother's affection, so as to sour the milk of that august lady's heart.1

From the warm womb, coming forth
Suddenly, were you two
Not born from the same belly?
From the hot womb, coming forth
Abruptly, were you two
Not issued from a single womb?
If you incur blame
From your mother who has borne you
From her heart, her affection
For you will grow cold:
Even if you appease her
It will be of no avail.
If you incur reproach,
From your mother who has borne you
From her belly,
Even if you lessen her reproach
It will be of no avail
When your father the Qen
Established the whole nation.
His black head was bound to the saddle.
His black blood was poured
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Into a large leather bucket.1
His black eyes he did not wink,
His flat ear he did not rest on a pillow:
Of his sleeve he made a pillow and
He spread his robe for a mattress.
Easing his thirst with his own saliva.
Eating the flesh between his teeth for supper,
he strove fiercely, and
Till the sweat of his brow reached the soles of his feet,
Till the sweat from the soles of his feet went up to his brow,
he applied himself earnestly to his great task. It was the time when your mother, together with him, suffered hardship:

Pulling firmly her tall hat
Over her head,
Tying tightly her belt
To shorten her skirt,
Fastening her tall hat
Over her head,
Fixing her belt
To tighten her waist,
She brought you up, her son?2
As she gorged her food
She gave you half of it,
Her throat choking with pity
She gave you all of it,
And she herself went hungry.
Stretching your shoulders,
"How shall I make them into men?"
She said to herself.
Stretching your necks,

1 I.e., he was in constant danger of losing his life. For these images see the Commentary.
2 Cf. above, § 74.
the Qan, if the Qan instructs him on the great array of the "teachings of the hat", I shall be fine!"
Cleaning your whole body,
Causing you to lift your heels
And learn how to walk,
She made you reach
Up to men’s shoulders,
Up to goldings' cruppers.
And even now, does she not wish to see the happiness of you,
her sons? Our august Qatan, in bringing you up had a heart
As bright as the sun, As wide as a lake."
So he spoke.
Thereupon, Cinggis Qan said to Ça’adai, “How can you speak thus about Joći? Isn’t Joći the eldest of my sons? In future do not talk like that!” So he said, and at these words Ça’adai smiled and said, “I shall not dispute Joći’s strength, nor shall I reply to his claims of skill:
“Game that one has killed only with one’s mouth
Cannot be loaded on one’s mount;
Game that one has slain only with one’s words
Cannot be shown.”
The eldest sons are Joći and I. We shall, in cooperation with each other, serve our father the Qan.
Whichever of us evades his duty
Shall have his head split open;
Whichever of us looks behind
Shall have his heels cut across.
But it is Ögödei among us who is steady and reliable; let us, therefore, agree on Ögödei. As Ögödei is close to our father 1

1 Cf. above, § 214.
2 Lit., “we.”
3 Lit., “The one of us who.”
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Even if one wrapped them in fresh grass,
They would not be eaten by an ox;
Even if one wrapped them in fat,
They would not be eaten by a dog.
will they not "miss the elk breadthwise just as the rat
breathwise?" I'll say as much as that. What else shall I
say?"

So he spoke, and at these words Cüngis Qa'an declared
as follows: "If Ogidei speaks such words, that will do.
Further, he said, 'Tolui, what do you say? Speak up!'
Tolui said, 'Being at the side of my elder brother
whom our father the Qa'an has just designated,
I shall remind him of what he has forgotten,
I shall waken him up when he has fallen asleep.
I shall become a friend of the word 'yes'
And the whip of his chestnut horse.
Not being remiss in my 'yes',
Not being absent from the ranks,
I shall go forth for him on a long campaign
Or fight in a short fight.'

When Tolui had spoken thus, Cüngis Qa'an approved,
saying, 'Descendants of Qasur, appoint one of you to go-
vern. Descendants of Alüdän, appoint one of you to govern.
Descendants of Ölgigen, appoint one of you to govern.
Descendants of Belgütei, appoint one of you to govern. If,
thinking in this way and appointing one of my descendants
to govern, you do not rescind my order by contravening it,
then you will not err, you will not be at fault. Supposing
that the descendants of Ogidei are all born so worthless that
Even if one wrapped them in fresh grass,
They would not be eaten by an ox;
Even if one wrapped them in fat,
They would not be eaten by a dog,
is it possible that among my descendants not even a single
one will be born who is good?' So he spoke.

256 When Cüngis Qa'an set out on the campaign, he sent
envoys to Burqan of the Sarta'il people, with a message
saying: 'You said that you would be my right wing. As the
Sarta'il people have broken my 'golden halter', I have set
out to call them to account for their action. You set forth
too as the right wing of my arms.'

When the message he had sent was received, and before
Burqan could utter a word, A&m Gambu forestalling him
said, 'Since Cüngis Qa'an's forces are incapable of sub-
jugating others, why did he go as far as becoming fan?' So
saying, he did not dispatch auxiliary troops to them and sent
back the envoys with haughty words.

Thereupon, Cüngis Qa'an said, 'How can we hear
being spoken to in this manner by A&m Gambu?' And he
said, 'The best plan would be for us to send troops against
them at once by detouring in their direction. What difficulty
would there be in that? But now, when we are indeed
moving in the direction of other people, let that pass. If I
am protected by Eternal Heaven, when I come back pulling
in strongly my golden reins, then surely this matter shall be
dealt with!'

In the Year of the Hare (1219), Cüngis Qa'an set out
against the Sarta'il people crossing the Alai. From among
the ladies, he took with him on the campaign Qulan Qaun
and, having entrusted Ölgigen Noyan from among his
younger brothers with the main base camp, he moved forth.
He sent Jebe as vanguard. He sent Sabte'tei in support of
Jebe and sent Toubi in support of Sabte'tei.

As he sent these three envoys he said, 'Go round the

1 I.e., just like an unskilled hunter in other words, they will be totally unfit
to govern.
2 I.e., Ogidei.
outside, coming out at the other side of the Sultan and, waiting for Us to arrive, attack him from your side. So saying he sent them forth.

Jebel then went and, passing the cities of Qan Melik without touching them, he bypassed them on the outside. Behind him, Sibée'eti bypassed them in the same manner without touching them. But Toqiqar, coming behind him, attacked the border towns of Qan Melik and pillaged his peasants. Because his towns had been attacked, Qan Melik rose in rebellion against us and joined Jalalidin Sultan.

Jalalidin Sultan and Qan Melik moved against Cinggis Qa'an. Sigi Qutuq was sent as vanguard before Cinggis Qa'an. Jalalidin Sultan and Qan Melik fought with Sigi Qutuq. They defeated Sigi Qutuq and, pressing on, approached as far as Cinggis Qa'an; at that moment, however, Jabe, Sibée'eti and Toqiqar came in from behind Jalalidin Sultan and Qan Melik, overcame them and utterly destroyed them. By so doing, they prevented them from joining forces in the cities of Buqar, Semisagab and Udara.* They pursued them as far as the Sin River and when, being pressed, the Sarta'ul started throwing himself into it, many of them did indeed perish there, in the Sin River. Jalalidin Sultan and Qan Melik fled upstream along it, saving their lives.

Cinggis Qa'an advanced along the Sin River upstream and went to plunder Baktesen. He reached the Eke Stream and the Ge'ün Stream, and set up camp in the Bala'an Plain. He sent Bala of the Jalayir in pursuit of Jalalidin Sultan. Cinggis Qa'an, greatly favouring Jabe and Sibée'eti, said, 'Jabe, you were named Jirqu'adai. When you came to me from the Taymil, you indeed became Jabe. Toquer, of his own will, attacked the border towns of Qan Melik and caused him to rebel against us. Making this a matter of law, we shall execute him.' However, in the end he did not execute him, but having severely reprimanded him, he punished him by deposing him from his command of the army.

Then Cinggis Qa'an, returning from the Bala'an Plain, sent his three sons, Jodi, Ca'adai and Ogodei, saying, 'Cross the Amni River with three troops of the right wing and set up camp at the city of Cinggegi. He sent Tulai, saying, 'Set up camp at Iru, Isbür and many other towns.' Cinggis Qa'an himself encamped at the city of Udara.

The three sons, Jodi, Ca'adai and Ogodei sent the following request: 'Our troops are completely assembled. We have reached the city of Cinggegi. Of the three of us, according to whose words should we act?' Upon their request, Cinggis Qa'an sent a message to them ordering that they should act according to the words of Ogodei.

Then Cinggis Qa'an, having brought the city of Udara to submission, set out from the city of Udara and pitched camp at the city of Semisagab. Setting out from the city of Semisagab, he pitched camp at the city of Buqar. Thereupon, Cinggis Qa'an waited for Bala and spent the summer at the

---

1 I.e., at the back.
2 I.e., Jalalidin Sultan mentioned below.
3 I.e., Sibée'eti.
4 Lit., 'Overcoming them.'
5 An error for Semsigen.
6 For the identification of the localities in this and the following sections, see the Commentary.
7 Lit., 'Into the Sin River.'
8 Lit., 'Along the Sin River.'
ridge of Alan Qorqan in the former summer quarters of the Sultan. 1 From there he sent messengers to Tolui, saying, 'The weather has become warm. The other troops must set up camp too. You come and join us.'

When he sent this message, Tolui had captured the cities of Iru, Isebirs, and others, had destroyed the city of Sisten and was just destroying the city of Cuqeren. When the messengers gave him this message, Tolui, having destroyed the city of Cuqeren, returned to pitch camp and joined Cinggis Qa'an.
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Joci, Ca'adai and Ogii, these three sons of Cinggis Qa'an, subjugated the city of Orunggegi; 2 they shared the people of the cities among all three of them but did not give Cinggis Qa'an a share.

When these three sons came to set up camp, Cinggis Qa'an reproached Joci, Ca'adai and Ogii – the three sons in question – and for three days did not allow them into his presence. Then Bo'retu, Muqali and Siq Quduqu petitioned as follows: 'We caused the Soltans of the Sarta'ai people, who had refused to submit, to abuse himself and we conquered his cities and peoples. The city of Orunggegi, 3 which was taken and shared, and the sons of yours who took it and shared it among themselves, all belong to Cinggis Qa'an. Now that, with our strength increased by Heaven and Earth, we have caused the Sarta'ai people to abuse themselves like this, we – the men of your entire army – are rejoicing and are content with ourselves. Why is the Qa'an so angry? The sons have realized their mistake and are indeed afraid. Let this be a lesson for their future conduct! We fear lest the sons' natural ardor may be discouraged as a result of this. Will you not, therefore, show favor to them again and allow them into your presence?'

Upon their petition, Cinggis Qa'an, appeased, allowed the three sons Joci, Ca'adai and Ogii into his presence. He rebuked them:

Quoting ancient words,
Citing old sayings,
and reproved them:
To the point where they almost sank
In the place where they stood,
To the point where they could not wipe off
The sweat of their brow. 4

Just as he was addressing them with reprimands and admonitions, Qongqi, Qorgi, Qongqaq Qorgi and Cormaqan Qorgi – these three quiverbearers – also petitioned Cinggis Qa'an as follows: 'Like gray falcons that have just begun training, the sons are barely learning how to wage a military campaign, and, at such a time, you rebuke them in this way, piling abuse on them.' 5 Why? We fear lest the sons, being afraid, will lose heart. From the place where the sun sets to the place where it rises there are enemy people. If you incite us – your Tibetan dogs – and send us on a mission, with our strength increased by Heaven and Earth we shall bring back for you enemy people, gold, silver, satin, goods and subjects. If you say, 'Which people?', we say, 'Here in the west there is one called the Qalibai Sultan of the Bagai people.' Let us move against him!' So they petitioned him. The Qa'an was appeased by these words and his anger abated.

Cinggis Qa'an approved their proposal and issued the following order, favouring the three quiverbearers Qongqi, Qongqaq and Cormaqan: 'Qongqi of the Adargin and Qongqaq of the Dologqir shall stay at my side.' He sent

---

1 Sultan. Here Muhammad Shah is almost certainly meant.
2 Lit., 'the year.'
3 = Orunggegi. See above, § 135.
4 Liww. (see the sons.)
5 Because they were expecting so profoundly.
Cinggis Qa’an appointed them, with our resident commissioners, putting them in charge of the Kitat people.

Cinggis Qa’an spent seven years in the country of the Sarta’ul people. Then, at the time when he was waiting for Bala of the Jalayir. Bala, having crossed the Sin River, was pursuing Jalalidin Sultan and Qun Melik as far as the country of the Hindus. He lost track of Jalalidin Sultan and Qun Melik and, even though he sought them as far as the middle of the country of the Hindus, he was unable to find them and returned. He came back pillaging the people on the border of the Hindus and seizing many camels and many gold and silver billy-goats.

Then Cinggis Qa’an returned home. On the way he spent the summer on the river Erdiš. In the autumn of the Year of the Hen (1225) – the seventh year of the campaign – he settled at his Palaces in the Black Forest by the Tula.1

---

1 An error for Iru. Cf. above, §§ 258, 259.
2 The text has incorrectly Read. For all these names see the Commentary.
3 Durmaqqa and, further down, Durma. See the Commentary.
4 I.e., Yalawaci’s.
5 i.e., Cinggis Qa’an.
6 i.e., Masqat’s.
7 = Sarta’ul.

---

1 Read “spring” (qurban) for “autumn” (sumar).
2 Ordus, i.e., the royal encampment.
3 = the Tu’ula of §§ 96, 104, 115, 164, 177 and 178 above.
THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS

CHAPTER TWELVE

(= SUP. 2)

265

After spending the winter there,2 Cînggis Qa'an said, 'I shall set forth against the Tang'i't people.' He counted his troops anew and in the autumn of the Year of the Dog (1226) set forth against the Tang'i't people. From among the ladies, he took with him Yisîl Qutan.

In the winter, Cînggis Qa'an, riding his stets Josotu Lioro,3 on the way hunted the many wild asses of Arbuqa. When the wild asses passed close by them Josotu Boro took fright. Cînggis Qa'an fell off the horse and, his body being in great pain,4 'I spoke at Co'orqat. He spent that night there and the following morning Yisîl Qutan said, 'Princes and commanders, consult each other on what to do; the Qa'an has spent the night, his body hot with fever.' Therupon, the princes and commanders assembled and Toluân Çerbi of the Qongquist advised as follows: 'The Tang'i't people Are ones who have towns with pounded-earth walls. Are ones who live in permanent camps. They won't leave, bringing off their towns with pounded-earth walls. They won't leave, abandoning their permanent camps.5 Let us withdraw. Then, when the Qa'an's body has cooled down, we shall set out again!'

When he spoke thus, all the princes and commanders agreed with his words and petitioned Cînggis Qa'an accordingly, but Cînggis Qa'an said, 'The Tang'i't people will say

that we turned back because we lost heart. However, if we send envoys to them and watch right here at Co'orqat which turn my illness takes,6 and withdraw after considering their reply,7 that would be fine.' And so he sent envoys to carry the following message: 'In the past, you, Burqân, said, "We, the Tang'i't people, shall be your right wing.'8 Although told so by you, when I sent you a request for troops, saying that I was going on a campaign because the Sarta'al people had not agreed to my proposal, you, Burqân, did not keep your promise and did not give me troops, but came out with mocking words.' As I was moving in a different direction at the time, I said that I would call you to account later. I set out against the Sarta'al people and being protected by Eternal Heaven I brought them duly under submission.' Now I have come to call Burqân to account for his words.'

Burqân said, 'I did not speak the mocking words.' Therupon Ala Gamba said, 'I spoke the mocking words. As for now, if you Mongols, who are used to fighting, say, "Let's fight!" then turn towards the Alalai and come to me, for I have an encampment in the Alalai.

I have tents of thin woolen cloth. I have camels laden with goods. Let us fight there! If you need gold, silver, satin and other goods, turn towards Eriqaya and Eneji.' He sent this message to Cînggis Qa'an.

When his words were conveyed to Cînggis Qa'an, his body was still hot with fever. Cînggis Qa'an said, 'This is enough! When one lets oneself be addressed so boastfully, how can one withdraw?' Even if we die let us challenge

---

2 Lit., 'saying the illness.'
3 Lit., 'their (i.e. the Tang'i't) sir word.'
4 I.e., in cut.
5 See above, §§ 249 and 254.
6 A reference to Ala Gamba's words in § 256 above.
7 Lit., 'I forced them into righteousness.'
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Cinggis Qa’an moved away from Casatu Mountain and
set up camp at the city of Uraqi. After setting out from the
city of Uraqi, Burqan came to pay homage to Cinggis Qa’an.

Dormogen, Burqan then paid homage, presenting himself with gifts
such as, in the first place, golden images of Buddha; then
golden and silver boats and vessels, nine of each kind; boys
and girls, nine of each; geldings and camels, nine of each;
and all sorts of other objects arranged in nines according to
their colour and form. Cinggis Qa’an kept the door closed
and made Burqan pay homage outside the tent.

On that occasion, when Burqan paid homage, Cinggis
Qa’an felt revulsion within his heart. On the third
day, Cinggis Qa’an issued an order giving Iluqi Burqan the
name Sidurqu. Being thus visited by Iluqi Burqan, Sidurqu,
Tolun Cerbi seized and executed him with his own hands.

Afterwards, when Tolun Cerbi reported that he had
seized Iluqi and killed him, Cinggis Qa’an ordered as
follows: When I approached the Tang’ut people to call
them, he added, “Look to your words and account for
Our account of the poisonous words of an enemy and with Our
strength increased by Eternal Heaven, who gave him into
Our hands, we took Our revenge. Tolun shall take for
himself this movable palace brought by Iluqi, together with
the bows and arrows.” So he ordered.
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After he had plundered the Tang’ut people and
making Iluqi Burqan change his name to Sidurqu, had done
away with him, and after having exterminated the Tang’ut
people’s mothers and fathers down to the offspring of their

1 I.e., of the Tang’ut population at large.
2 I.e., ‘Upright.’ See the Commentary.

Who had tents of thin woollen cloth, who
had camels laden with goods, until they were blown to the winds like hearth-ashes.

They then gave the following order: ‘Kill the valiant,
the bold, the raally and the fine Tang’uts, and let the soldiers
take for themselves as many of the common Tang’uts as
they can lay hands on and capture.’

Cinggis Qa’an spent the summer on Casatu Mountain.

He sent troops against the Tang’uts

Who had tents of thin woollen cloth, who
had camels laden with goods, and who, with Aśa Gambu, had made for the mountains and
were offering resistance. He caused his troops to plunder
them as planned until they were utterly destroyed.

Then, showing favour to Bo’orçu and Muqali, he
ordered that they should take as much hoary as in their
judgement their strength could carry.

Further, Cinggis Qa’an ordered to reward Bo’orçu and
Muqali as follows: ‘Since I did not give you a share of the
Kitat people, the two of you take and divide equally between
yourselves the Jinai of the Kitat people. Go and make
their fine sons follow you, holding your falcons.
Bring up their fine daughters and make them arrange the
heaps of your wives’ skirts. The trusted friends of the Alan
Qan of the Kitat people are the Qara Kitat Jinai people who
have destroyed the ancestors of the Mongols. Now, you
two, Bo’orçu and Muqali, are my trusted friends.’

I.e., ‘Upright.’ See the Commentary.
2 I.e., ‘Sovereign.’
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offspring, marrying and taming (1), Činggis Qa’an gave the following order: While I take my meals you must talk about the killing and destruction of the Tang’ut and say, “Maimed and tamed, they are no more.”

Because the Tang’ut people gave their word but did not keep it(1), Činggis Qa’an for the second time took the field against them.(2) Having destroyed the Tang’ut people, Činggis Qa’an came back and in the Year of the Pig (1227) ascended to Heaven. After he had ascended to Heaven a great part of the Tang’ut people was given to Yissii Çañun.

In the Year of the Rat (1228), the princes of the right hand(3) headed by Ça’dadi and Batu; the princes of the left hand(4) headed by Öteggeñ Nojak, Yegü and Yesönge(5), the princes of the centre headed by Tolui; the princess, the imperial sons-in-law, the commanders of ten thousand and those of a thousand, all assembled in full force at Köde’i Aral on the Keliuen River. In accordance with the very decree by which Činggis Qa’an had nominated him they installed Ögödei Qa’an as gan.

Elder brother Ça’dadi installed his younger brother Ögödei Qa’an as gan. The nightguard, the quiverbearers and the eight thousand dayguard who had been protecting the precious life of their father Činggis Qa’an, the personal slaves and the ten thousand guards who had been in close attendance on the person of my(6) father the Qan were all handed over by elder brother Ça’dadi and Tolui to Ögödei Qa’an. The domain of the centre they handed over to him in the same manner.

1. Adgul masqul. See the Commentary.
2. Lit., “did not keep to the word.”
3. Lit., “against the Tang’ut people.”
4. i.e., of the east.
5. Written Yesönge. See § 183 and com.
6. A mistake for “his”? See the Commentary.
ordered his troops to advance and attack these towns and cities in every direction. Then Ögedei Qan pitched camp at Sara Degtir.

There Ögedei Qan fell ill. When he lost his speech and was in great distress, various shamans and soothsayers were ordered to divine the cause of the illness. They said, 'The lords and rulers of the land and rivers of the Kutat are raging violently against the Qan' now that their people are plundered and their cities and towns are destroyed.' When they divined by inspecting the entrails of victims and said to the lords and rulers of the land and rivers, 'You shall give anything as a substitute', with renewed anger they raged even more violently. When they divined further by inspecting the entrails and said, 'Could a person from the Qan's family serve as a substitute?', the Qan, opening his eyes, requested water, drank it and asked, 'What has happened?'

The shamans then reported to the Qan as follows: 'The lords and rulers of the land and rivers of the Kutat people are raging violently against you now that their land and waters are destroyed and their people plundered. When we divined by inspecting the entrails of victims and say, 'We shall give anything as a substitute', with renewed anger they raged even more violently. When we say, 'Could a person from the Qan's family serve as a substitute?', the illness abates. Now your order shall decide!'

After they had made their report, the Qan said, 'Who is at my side from among the princes?' To these words Prince Tolui, who was at his side, said, 'Even though there were elder brothers above you and younger brothers below you, our fortunate father Cinggis Qan chose you, elder 1

1 i.e., the Kutat's.
2 See above, § 237 and com.
3 i.e., the powerful spirits.
4 I.e., the lord and river spirits.
are orphaned and young, and of his younger sister-in-law Berüde who is widowed, until they are able to look after themselves. I have said all I have to say. I have become drunk.' On that, he passed out. Such is the manner in which he died.

273 Then Ögödei Qa‘an destroyed the Altan Qan and gave him the name Senise. He despooled him of his gold, silver, gold-embroidered and patterned satins, possessions, piebald horses and young slaves. Having established scouts and garrison troops, and having appointed resident commissioners in Naiming, Jungdu and in cities everywhere, he peacefully returned home, setting up camp at Qara Qorum.

274 Cörmän Qoqùi brought the Baigat people under subjectivity. When Ögödei Qa‘an learned that the land was reputedly good and that the things therein were also reputedly good, he ordered as follows: 'Cörmän Qoqùi shall reside at that very place as commander of the garrison troops. Every year he shall make people deliver yellow gold, nap fabrics, brocades and damasks with gilded thread, small and big pearls, fine Western horses with long necks and tall legs, dark brown Bactrian camels and one-humped Arabian dromedaries, pack-mules and riding mules, and he shall send them to Us.'

275 Batu, Bûrû, Güyük, Mängge and several other princes who had gone on a campaign in support of Sübe‘eti Br'âtur brought the Qanglin, Kibâ’ut and Bagijit people under submission. They crossed the rivers Ejlî and Jayaq, destroyed the city of Meget, slew the Orusut and plundered them until they were utterly crushed. They ravaged and brought under submission the peoples of Assit, Sêtît, Bolar.

1 Cf. above, §§ 200 and 255.
2 I.e., the enmities who came forward and were near, as well as those who stayed back. See the Commentary.
3 Tolui actually means the nephews of Ögödei, i.e. his own sons. Cf. above, § 68.
Mankermani Kiwa and other cities. Having established resident commissioners and garrison troops they returned home.

Ögídei Qu'an sent Yusüde Qorqì on a campaign in support of Jalaytar Qorqì who had earlier on been campaigning against the Jürdet and the Solanggas. He ordered that he reside there as the commander of the garrison troops.

From the Kibêd campaign, through messengers, Batu sent the following report to Ögídei Qu'an: 'By the strength of Eternal Heaven and the good fortune of my uncle the Qu'an, I have destroyed the city of Meget, I have ravaged the Ounasat people and brought eleven countries and peoples duly under submission. When we turned back, pulling in the golden reins, 2 we decided to hold a parting feast. A large tent was set up and, as we began feasting, since I was quite the eldest among those princes who were present, I was the first to drink one or two bowls of the ceremonial wine. Büri and Gıyük became angry with me because of that, refused to join the feast and rode off. As they rode off, Büri said, 'Since Batu, then, is equal to us, why should he have drunk first?'

Old women with beards like him,
Who pretend to be one's equal,
One should push with one's heels,
One should trample under one's feet.'

On that Gıyük said, 'Those old women with quivers like Batu - let us also strike their bosoms with a stick of burning wood - those ones!' And Eljigide's son Harqasun said, 'Let's attack a wooden tall to them!' So, just at the time when, having been sent to ride against a rebellious people of a different race, we were asking ourselves whether we had been successful, Büri and Gıyük spoke to us in this way and we parted in accord. Now, the order of my uncle the Qu'an shall decide the matter.' Thus he reported.

At these words of Batu, the Qu'an became very angry. He did not allow Gıyük into his presence but said, 'Following whose counsel does this mean creature fill his mouth with talk against a person senior to him? May he and he alone rot like an egg! He has turned against the bosom of a person who is senior to him. Therefore,

We shall place him in the vanguard:
We shall make him climb the town walls
Which are as high as mountains
Until the nails of his ten fingers are worn away;
We shall place him in the garrison army:
We shall make him climb the town walls
Which are made of hard-pounded earth
Until the nails of his five fingers are ground down.

And you, wretched, wicked, mean Harqasun, in imitation of whom have you filled your mouth with such boastful talk against our family? Let us send Gıyük and Harqasun away together. We could cut down Harqasun, but you would then say that we showed partiality. As for Büri, tell Batu to send him to elder brother Ça'adai, informing him of the matter. Let elder brother Ça'adai decide on it!

Then Môngge 3 from among the princes, and Alıçadi, Qongqortå, Janggi and other commanders from among the commanders, respectfully advised the Qu'an as follows: 'A decree of your father Çinggis Qu'an stated that field matters should be decided in the field, just as domestic matters should be decided in the tent. Now, the Qu'an is angry with Gıyük. This is a field matter: will the Qu'an not show favour and send Çinggis to Batu, entrusting him with the decision?' So they advised him.

1 Mankermani. For all these names see the Commentary.
2 i.e., at the end of the campaign. Cf. above, § 256.
3 To mock them.
4 Lit., 'liver.'
The Qur'an approved their words and agreeing to their request allowed Güyik into his presence. He rebuked him with the following words of admonition: 'It is said about you that when you went on the campaign, in the course of it, you did not leave unfastened the buttocks of any man with buttocks; and it is also said about you that you crushed the spirit.'

Of every man in the army.

Do you imagine that the Orusut people have submitted out of fear of that fury and anger of yours? And thinking as if you alone have brought the Orusut people under submission do you now go on, with pride in your heart, rebelling against a person who is senior to you? In the pronouncements of Our father Cinggis Qa'an, was he not accustomed to say that "The multitudes of people make one afraid. The depth of water makes one die?"

You pretend that you have accomplished it alone, whereas you set out under the shelter of Sübe'eti and Bijej, and with the full force of the army, to bring the Orusut and Kibča'ut under submission. You took one or two Orusut and Kibča'ut, but while you haven't yet acquired as boot even the hoof of a kid, you make yourself into a hero: having left home but once, you pretend that you alone have accomplished everything and come out with such abusive and provocative language. But now, owing to Monggei, Aleđi, Qongqoragi, Janggi and the others, who have restrained my agitated heart, I say, "Right! This is a field matter. They have said that it is Batu's concern. Let then Batu decide on Güyik and

1 Lit., 'mien (or courteousness), i.e. the morale and self-confidence.

Further Ogidei Qa'an ordered: 'In proclaiming the present order which announces anew the duties of all the guards - nightguards, destroyer-beaters and dayguards - who have served my father Cinggis Qa'an, I command that in whatever capacity they previously acted in accordance with the order of my father the Qa'an, so shall they act in the same capacity now. The destroyer-beaters and the dayguards shall, in accordance with the previous order, carry out their day duties, each at his post. While there is still sunlight, they shall retire so as to be replaced by the nightguards and they shall spend the night outside.' So he ordered.

And he ordered the following: 'At night, the nightguards shall spend the night beside us. The nightguards shall stand at the door and around the Palæe tent. The nightguards shall patrol the rear and front of the Palace. The nightguards shall seize people who move about at night - after sunset - and shall hold them in custody for the night. After the multitude of men has dispersed, except for those nightguards who have spent the night in duty and are to be relieved, the nightguards shall seize anyone who by mingling with them has entered the precinct.' They shall split their heads open and shall cast them away. If at night a person comes with an urgent message he must report to the nightguards and communicate the message to me while standing together with the nightguards at the rear of the tent. The supervisor Qongqorai, Siraqani and others, together with the nightguards, shall supervise all comings and goings at the Palace tent. And because Ogidei, even though he was a trustworthy person, was arrested by the nightguards when in the evening he happened to walk up
Beyond them, the nightguards too, who like those who arrested Elijjide are not contravened the orders, are worthy of confidence. Thus he spoke, and issued the following order: 'One must not ask the number of nightguards. One must not walk beyond the nightguards' post. One must not walk between the nightguards. The nightguards shall arrest the people who walk beyond or between them. With regard to any person who shall have asked their number, the nightguards shall seize the gelding that that person was riding that day, with saddle and bridle, together with the clothes that he was wearing. No one is to sit above the place of the nightguards. The nightguards shall take care of the standards and drums, and of the spears, bowls and vessels arranged beneath them. The nightguards shall supervise drink and food - the uncut meat.'

And he ordered: 'The nightguards shall take care of the tent-carts of the Palace. If We Ourselves do not go on a military campaign, the nightguards must not take the field separately and without Us.' When we go falconing or hunting, exactly one half of the nightguards shall stay at the tent-carts of the Palace and the other half shall go with Us. The campmasters from among the nightguards shall go before Us and set up the Palace. The doorkeepers from among the nightguards shall stand right next to the door. The commander of a thousand Qada'an shall be in charge of all the nightguards.'

Further, when he appointed the commanders of the various companies of nightguards, he said, 'Qada'an and Bulqadar, forming one company, shall consult together; when taking the same turn of duty they shall stay on the right and left side of the Palace respectively and marshal their guards accordingly. Amal and Canar, consulting together, shall form one company; when taking the same turn of duty, they shall stay on the right and left side of the Palace respectively and marshal their guards accordingly. Qada and Qori Qasar shall consult together and, when taking the same turn of duty, they shall stay on the right and left side of the Palace respectively and marshal their guards accordingly. Yalbaq and Qara'udar, consulting together, shall form one company; when taking the same turn of duty, they shall stay on the right and left side of the Palace respectively and marshal their guards accordingly. Further, the company of Qada'an and Bulqadar, and the company of Amal and Canar - these two companies - shall encamp on the left side of the Palace and take their turn of duty there. The company of both Qada and Qori Qasar and the company of both Yalbaq and Qara'udar - these two companies - shall encamp on the right side of the Palace and take their turn of duty there.' And he ordered: 'Qada'an shall be in charge of these four companies of nightguards. Further, the nightguards shall stand around the Palace right next to my person, and they shall lie down guarding the door.' Two men from the nightguards shall enter into the Palace and be in charge of the large kuma pitchers.

Further he ordered: 'As to the quiverbearers, Yisin Tö'e, Buykidei, Horquaqa and Labqaqa, forming four separate companies and marshalling their quiverbearers of the bodyguards, shall respectively join the four separate companies of the dayguards to carry quivers.'
Further, when he appointed elders of the dayguards' companies from among the offspring of those who had earlier been in charge of them, he ordered: 'Abūdai and Qongortaqari were earlier in charge of them, after consulting together and having marshalled one company of dayguards, shall join the dayguards' service. Temüder and Jegū after consulting together and having marshalled one company of dayguards shall join the dayguards' service. Mangquati, who had been in charge of the reserve, shall marshal one company of dayguards and join the dayguards' service.'

Further, the Qa'an ordered as follows: 'Elįgįdėi shall be in command of the Guard and all the commanders of companies shall act according to Elįgįdėi's word.'

Further, he ordered: 'If a member of the Guard when called on duty fails to take his turn, in accordance with the previous order, he shall be disciplined with three strokes of the rod. If the same member of the Guard fails again – for the second time – to take his turn of duty, he shall be disciplined with seven strokes of the rod. If, once more, the same man, without sickness or other reason and without having first consulted the elder of the company, for the third time fails to take his turn, thus regarding his service by Our side as too difficult, he shall be disciplined with thirty-seven strokes of the rod and shall be sent to a distant place out of Our sight. Further, if the elders of the companies do not muster the guards who are to serve on roster with them and fail to take their turn of duty, We shall punish the elders of the companies. Further, the elders of the companies shall proclaim this order to the guards at the time when they go on duty.'

1 i.e., the senior officers. See above, § 227.
2 Qongortaqari. See above, § 277.
3 See above, § 227.
4 i.e., the guards.

every third turn of duty and at the time when they are relieved. When the guards have heard the order, if they fail to take their turn of duty We shall punish them according to the previous order. But if the elders of the companies do not proclaim this order to the guards they shall be guilty and liable to punishment. Further, elders of the companies without permission from Us shall not, merely on the ground of seniority, reprimand my guards who have enrolled as guards equal to them. If any of them breaks the law let it be reported to Us. Those liable to death We shall certainly cut down. Those liable to punishment We shall certainly discipline. If, without informing Us, they themselves on the ground of seniority lay hands on my guards, as requital for fiats they shall be repaid with fists, and as requital for strokes of the rod they shall be repaid with strokes of the rod.' Thus he spoke.

Further, he ordered as follows: 'My guards are of higher standing than the outside commanders of a thousand; the attendants of my guards are of higher standing than the outside commanders of a hundred and of ten. If outside leaders of a thousand quarrel with my guards We shall punish those who are leaders of a thousand.'

Further, Oğdėi Qa'an said, 'We shall not cause suffering to the nation that Our father Çinggis Qa'an established with so much toil. We shall make the people rejoice, causing them to rest.

Their feet upon the ground,
Their hands upon the earth.

Sitting now on the throne made ready by Our father the Qa'an, so that people do not suffer, every year from these
people one two-year-old sheep out of every flock shall be given as levy for Our soup. They shall also provide one sheep out of every hundred sheep and give it to the poor and needy within the same unit. And when the Qa'an's brothers and the numerous troops and guards gather together at feasts and meetings, how could drink for all be levied every time from the people? From the various units of a thousand of different areas mares shall be provided and milked, and the mare-milkers shall be the ones to tend them. The campmasters shall constantly provide replacements for mares and shall in turn be herders of the milch mares. And when the Qa'an's brothers gather together We shall give them gifts and rewards. Conveying satins, gold and silver ingots, quivers, bows, breastplates, weapons and the land-tax grains into the storehouses, We shall have guards guarding them: storemen and grankeepers must be selected from different areas and made to guard the storehouses. And, dividing camps and waters, We shall give them to the people. If We select campmasters from the various units of a thousand to reside in the camps, that will surely be an appropriate measure.

‘Moreover, as there is nothing but wild animals in the Cöl country, Qa'an and Ul'turui, being put in charge of the campmasters, shall make them dig wells in the Cöl for people to live in this rather vast area, and they shall build brick walls around the wells to protect them from wild animals.

‘Further, when the messengers ride in haste We allow them to ride moving freely among the population, and as a result the pace of these riding messengers is slow and they are an affliction on the people. Now We shall settle the

---

1 I.e., for the support of the Qa'an.
2 I.e., the Qa'an's family and the officers.
3 I.e., the grazing grounds (mountain).
4 Lit., 'the Desert' (=the Gobi; cf. above, § 188), but see the Commentary.
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matter once and for all by providing post-station masters and post-horse keepers from the various units of a thousand of different areas by setting up a post station at every stage, by not allowing the messengers to move freely among the population unless on urgent business, but instead by having them ride in haste through the post stations. If we do this, it will surely be an appropriate measure.

‘When Qa'an and Bolqadar, being well informed, proposed these measures to Us We considered that they were indeed right and said, ‘Let elder brother Ça'adai decide. If these measures under discussion are appropriate and he approves them, let the decision come from elder brother Ça'adai.’”

After Ögïdei Qa'an had sent this message, a reply came from elder brother Ça'adai, saying, ‘I approve these very measures about which you have asked in your message – all of them. Thus, act accordingly!’

Further, elder brother Ça'adai’s word came, saying, ‘From here I shall have post stations connecting with yours.’ Also, from here I shall send messengers to Batu, and Batu shall have his post stations connected with mine.” And a further word came from him, which he sent saying, ‘Of all the measures, the one concerning the establishment of post stations is the most appropriate that has been proposed.’

Thereupon Ögïdei Qa'an said, ‘Elder brother Ça'adai and Batu, and the other brothers, princes of the right hand – all of them; Ötögin Noyan and Yeğü, and the other brothers, all the princes of the left hand; the princes and sons-in-law of the centres, and the commanders of ten thousand, of a thousand, of a hundred and of ten, have all together approved the following: “If, for the soup of the
Universal Ruler\textsuperscript{1} one provides every year one two-year-old wether out of every flock, it won't be a burden at all. To provide one one-year-old sheep out of every hundred sheep and give it to the poor and needy is good. If we have post stations set up and provide post-station masters and post-horse keepers to manage them there will be peace for the many peoples, and for the messengers in particular convenience in travelling.\textsuperscript{2} They unanimously approved this.\textsuperscript{3}

Having taken counsel with elder brother Ca'ada\textsuperscript{4} regarding the order of the \textit{Qa'an}, and this having been approved by elder brother Ca'ada, all the people from the various units of a thousand of different areas according to the \textit{Qa'an}'s order were made to provide every year one two-year-old wether out of every flock for the soup of the \textit{Qa'an}, and one one-year-old sheep out of every hundred sheep for the poor and needy. They were made to provide mares, and herders of milch mares were also assigned. They were made to provide herders of milch mares, storemen and grainkeepers. They were made to provide post-station masters and post-horse keepers, and measuring the distance between each stage they had post stations set up. Araqa\textsuperscript{5} and Toqutar were put in charge of them. At a single stage of the post there had to be twenty post-horse keepers, and at every stage there had to be a post station with twenty post-horse keepers each.

The \textit{Qa'an} ordered: 'With regard to the geldings to be used as post horses, the sheep to be used as provisions, the milch mares, the oxen to be harnessed to carts, and the carts, from the amount \textit{fixed by Us} from now on, if one causes \textit{even a piece} of string to be lacking, He shall be guilty and \textit{liable} to “splitting in half along the top of the head”.\textsuperscript{6}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Qo\textaei} \textit{Qa'an} said, 'This I have done after I sat on the great throne of my father: I campaigned against the \textit{Jaqut} people\textsuperscript{7} and I destroyed them.\textsuperscript{8} As my second deed, I had post stations set up so that our messengers could ride in haste all along the way; and for that purpose I had all necessities conveyed to the post stations. As to the next\textsuperscript{9} deed, I had wells dug in places without water and had the water brought forth, thus providing the people with water and grass. Further,\textsuperscript{10} I established scouts and garrison troops among the people of cities everywhere and so I let the people live in peace, causing them to rest Their feet upon the ground, Their hands upon the earth.\textsuperscript{11} After my father the \textit{Qa'an} I have indeed added four good deeds to his.\textsuperscript{12} But, being placed on the great throne by my father the \textit{Qa'an} and being made to take upon myself the burden of my many peoples, I was at fault to let myself be vanquished by wine. This was indeed one fault of mine. As to my second fault, to listen to the word of a woman without principle, and to have the girls of my uncle \textit{Oq\textaein}’s domain brought to me was surely a mistake. Even
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1] I.e., for the support of the \textit{Qa'an}. Cf. above, § 279.
\item[2] I.e., to the confiscation of half his goods.
\item[3] I.e., the people of north China. See the Commentary.
\item[4] Lit., 'I destroyed the \textit{Jaqut} people.'
\item[5] I.e., the third.
\item[6] I.e., as the fourth deed.
\item[7] See above, § 279.
\end{footnotes}
though I was the Qa'ān and lord of the nation, to participate
in wrong and unprincipled actions, this was indeed one fault
of mine.

'To secretly injure Daqolqu was also a fault of mine.
And why was it a fault? Because to secretly injure Daqolqu
who strove fiercely in the service of his rightful lord, my
father the Qa'an, was a fault and a mistake. Who will now
strive so fiercely in my service? Therefore, I have myself
acknowledged the fault of having secretly harmed, without
discernment, a person who diligently observed the principle
of loyalty in the service of my father the Qa'an and in the
service of all.

'Further,' being greedy and saying to myself, "What if
the wild animals born with their destiny ordained by
Heaven and Earth go over to the territory of my brothers?"
I had fences and walls built of pounded earth to prevent the
animals from straying. As I was thus confining them, I
heard resentful words coming from my brothers. That, too,
was a fault of mine.

'After my father the Qa'an, I have indeed added four
good deeds to his, and four deeds of mine were surely
faults.' Thus he spoke.

The writing of this book was completed at the time
when the Great Assembly convened and when, in the Year
of the Rat, in the month of the Roe buck, the Palaces were
established at Dolo'ān Boldaq of Köde'ā Aral on the
Kellüren River, between Silginçık and [...].

1 = [poison]? Cf. above, § 68.
2 I.e., as the fourth fault.
3 The name of the second locality is missing owing to a lacuna in the text.
COMMENTARY

(In the Commentary, references to n. [note] and nn. [notes] above and below are to the paragraph(s) entries in the Commentary, not to the footnotes to the translation. References to the editor are to the paragraph number followed by the note number, e.g. "see § 165, n. 3.")

§ 1. This, the first section of the SH, deals with the origins of Chinggis Qa'un's family, traced back to the partly mythical ancestors of the Mongol (mo. Mongol) tribe and its various branches or clans Tüebi, mo. oboy. The opening line Chinggis Qa'un nu kafa ur forms, as it were, a title for the whole genealogical portion of the work, viz. §§ 1-60. Scholars such as the pioneers Pelliot and Haenisch, and more recently Damdinsuren, Doorfit, Gaumard, Ojima and Ono, do not regard the opening line as a title, but connect it logically with the following sentence ("Ta'en origin [= the original ancestor] of Chinggis Qa'un was ") in accordance with the Chinese sectiona l summary (Y' 1.1b). See Êe, 121; Ha, 1; Êo, 19; TMEN, 1, 317; Ga, 7; Ow, 1; 4; Ow, 13, On, 1 (and 2001 ed. 37); Ca, 35. Cf. also Vietze 1995a, 304-305. However, as discussed by Naka (Na, 1; Na, 1; cf. also NMI, 42-43) and subsequently confirmed and explained by Popp, Cleaves and Mostard, the opening words stand per se. See the discussion in Hung 1951, 466ff; and Mo, ix-xx. There are arguments in support of both interpretations (cf. Ow, 1-4b), but like Ligei, Murakami, Cleaves, Vietze and others, I am also in favour of separating the first line from the rest. See Li, 9; Mu, 1, 5; Cl, 1; Vietze 1995a, 309; PyCPS, 39; and Section Four of the Introduction. An exact parallel is found in The Gospel According to Matthew which begins with the words: 'Book of the origin of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham.' Christ's genealogy (Mt. 1:1-17) is followed by an account of his life which forms the main portion of the work, just as the life of Chinggis Qa'un forms the main portion of the SH.

In the Chinese text, the opening line of the work is preceded by the Chinese title: The Secret History of the Yuan Dynasty.
Chapter One (Yuan-ch’ao pi-shih chuan i 元都尉史卷 I), followed by the Chinese transcription of the Mongolian translation of Yuan-ch’ao pi-shih, viz. Mongol-un niicü (= n’i’üü) tebça’i’an. As shown by other investigators, this was almost certainly the Chinese title given to the work by the Mong editors, who also created a Mongolian title for it in Chinese transcription. See Hung 1951, 484-485; Mo, ix-x; and Section Four of the Introduction.

Cinggis Qâan (w.â. Cinggis Qoan) is the appellation of the conqueror in the later Mongol tradition; the one assumed by, or rather conferred on Tensûlîn and by which he was known in his lifetime, was Cinggis Qan. The change from Cinggis Qan to Cinggis Qoan probably occurred early in the reign of Qubilai (1260-94), and the SH text, which originally only had Cinggis Qan throughout, was amended accordingly. For this question and the use of the titles qan and qâan in the Mongol period, see de Rachewiltz 1983, and below, n. 125, for the meaning of the word cinggiss, see below, n. 123. Cf. also nn. 202 and 269. For the etymology of qaz and qa’ân (= mo. qa’ân), see de Rachewiltz 1989. See also CLC, 312-313; HCLWLYTT, 62-71, no. 16; Kâazulîk 1978, 128; V.S. Taskin in MO 1980, 213-218; Fletcher 1986, 22; Hatori 1987, and Rybatskii 2000, 230. Ligeti has restored the original title Cinggis Qan in his translation (Li, p. 291). I prefer to retain the title as given in the transmitted text, standardizing however the form qa’ân, which in the Chinese transcription appears as qan and qahân (for the respective frequency of these two forms see R, 294a and 285b-286b). In certain circumstances, and in particular in the groups a’â (< a‘ân), a’ulâ’ (< a’ülüq) and a’â (< ‘üq), the introduction by transcribers in China, western Asia and the Near East of an -h- or a -w- (-wv) is merely a device to ‘bridge’ the hiatus created by the disappearance of the intervocalic velar stops -g/-g/, hence qaçan = qa’ân, bahadur = ba’âdår, Baharâri = Ba’ârînî; călavan = călā’n, mawâ = ma’â, bâgâvur = bâqâ‘ur (< bâqârîv), Hulâwû/Hülêwî = Hala’u/Hûlê’u,
taken, sensu latu, as meaning 'clan.' See Vietze 1995a, 307-308. On  yeti - yetar, cf. UGPM, 199.

The blue-grey, or bluish, wolf (Bötre čınua; mo. bõtre činua) and the fallow doe (goi'i maral; pmo. goyi'i maral; mo. goyiš/goiš [gőiš] maral) in the early legend of Mongol origins are real animals, as in the mythology of the ancient Turks whose totemic ancestor was likewise a wolf. However, in the later Mongol tradition they became a human couple: Bötre Činua and P'o'o Maar, i.e. Blue-grey Wolf and Beautiful (reading zo'o 'fair, beautiful' for goiš, etc. 'fallow') Doe. This is not surprising, since from ancient times the Mongols, like the Turks and other peoples, used names of animals as proper names. See Mo, xvi-xviii; Sodnom 1964, 40; Ligeti 1970, 305; Uray-Köhalni 1987, 137-140. Cf. P.B. Konovalov in Mongolia 1 (22): 1990-94, and MNT, I, 135-39; S. Kleinmichel in UAJ, N.F. 11:1992, 103-111; Bulag in MNT, I, 95-98; Bira 1900b, 14ff.; idem 1991, 40 (however, Bira's position is somewhat ambiguous, cf. Bira 1998/99, 17; idem 2000, 58; and MTSEBS, 355). The "modern" interpretation is still held to this day in Mongolia and China, and also has followers elsewhere. Cf. ČXII, 21; MNT, 5; Dö', 1, 3-4, n. 3; On; I, Ev-Pep, 251, n. 1 (uncertain); Ú, 1. For a discussion on the meaning of the word bõtre, see de Rachewiltz 1992. For činš, mo. činšša 'wolf (Činši Ľapuš), and the reading činšč v. činš in the 5th, see below, n. 12. Cf. also On, I, n. 4, for a highly hypothetical date (AD 758) for the birth of the (human) ancestor called Bötre Činš. For the wolf in ancient Turkic mythology, cf. Clauson 1964; Sinor 1982, 223 et passim; Golden 1997, 88-93. For mo. goiš 'fallow', (an ancient feminine form of goša?), see Mo, xxvii; TMEN, no. 293; Öt', I, 18-21, n. 10; and, as part of a same, cf. Rybaltchuk 2003, s.v. Maral is the hind or doe, female of the činšč (mo. čušč), on which see below, n. 12.

As with so many other socio-cultural traits and traditions, the Turkic and the Mongolian-speaking tribes of Inner Asia shared a common heritage. The Mongolian Heaven Above, or Heaven-on-High (de'ere tengeri; mo. degere tengeri), also commonly referred to as the Eternal Heaven (mongske tenggeri) is, of course, the Blue Sky Above (išč kök tšiššr) and the Heaven Above (išč tšiššr) of the early Turks – the physical sky or firmament being identified in both cultures with the Supreme Power governing the destiny of all creatures. Hence the 'destiny', ordained by Heaven Above, of the blue-grey wolf from which originates the line of the future Cinggis Qan. Here the mythical wolf is 'endowed with destiny' (jaya'atu; mo. jàya'atu) from Heaven, later, in the Lamaist historiographical tradition, Bötre Činua will be transformed into a descendant of the legendary rulers of India and Tibet, and into a Buddhist avatar; the correlation with the Shaminic Heaven is still evident in his designation as 'son of Heaven' in the Tibetan Blue Annals and the 17th-century Mongol chronicles. See ATM, 4th. Cf. also the biography of Allan Qan of the Tumed (BTNS, 8): degere išč-yin jaya'ar-bar törögseng... Temñoin sau-tu Cinggis Qan... and ibid., 15. As is known, the qayuns of the Orkhon Turks were also designated as 'Heaven-born' (tšiššrd boači, see GOT, 279b; cf. Bira 1974, 67; idem 1977, 197) and, indeed, the expression 'Heaven-born' (tšiššrd-bor + ?) is also found in the Chinese sectional summary of § 1 of the SH (V'-1. 1b) rendering de'ere tengeri-čiš jaya'atu. As S. Gauban has conclusively shown, in the early Mongol world-conception reflected in the SH, to be endowed with destiny from Heaven Above, i.e. to be born by the destiny of Heaven (and Earth), is not an exclusive characteristic of Cinggis' legendary ancestor, but a quality shared by all living creatures (cf. §§ 197 and 281). See MNTSZA, 25-30. Cf. also Gauban in MSA 6:1969, 68-69, 106; Bira 1991, 42ff.; Önön 1998, 168. In my view, the fact that Heaven is mentioned at the very outset of Cinggis' genealogy – as it usually is at the beginning of the Old Norse inscriptions – indicates a special intervention of the Supreme Power in the origin of the conqueror's lineage, as will be the case throughout the career of the future conqueror. See §§ 80, 113, 125, 187, 208, etc. Cf. de Rachewiltz 1973, Skryrnikova
Tengis (Tengis Gol) of northern Mongolia (51° N 101° E), but, more recently, an unspecified ‘lake’ (Ort., I, 13); Tamura (Tamura 1973, 1-14) identifies it with Lake Khulun (= Hulun) or Dalai Nör, in present-day northeastern Inner Mongolia; S.A. Gurevli (Gurevli 1974; cf. also TBG, 13-26; CTB, 4, 13, 32Ff.) is convinced that it is Lake Baikal; and, finally, T'ing Chien (YTL, 1, 1b) thinks it is the same as the Tunggelik Stream of the SH (§ 5 et passim). But Tenggis appears to be a sea or large lake (dalai), not a river. As for Lake Hulun, the identification of Tenggis with this lake is not likely, because at the time the SH was composed the Hulun Nör was called Kölen Na'ur, see § 53. And, contrary to what is stated by Gurevli (TBG, 17), Tenggis was indeed the name of the Caspian in the 13th century. In the YS, the Caspian is mentioned four times under the name K'uan T'ien-chi-sui hai 蔣天池海, ‘The Wide Tenggis Sea’ (see GGS, III, 2399a; cf. P. Pelliot in JA 15, 2:1920, 166), almost certainly corresponding to pmo. (Yekke) Tenggis Dala. For the expression yelke tenggis ‘the great sea’, see Cleaves 1959, 44 [12v]. In the 17th century the Caspian was still called Denej by Turkic-speaking people. See MR, I, 297, 722. The Aral Sea and Lake Balkash were likewise called Tenzji, as noted by Doerfler (TMEN, III, 206; cf. VWTD, III, 1045). This is not surprising seeing that the word tenjic designates any vast expanse of water, like the word ‘sea’ in many languages, a lake being regarded since remote antiquity as an inland sea. Cf. ger. See and Meev both meaning ‘lake’; and the Dead Sea, Aral’aksu More, Chi’ng-hai (mo. Köke Naruy ‘Blue Lake’), Nio no umi (= Lake Biwa), etc. Hence, the term may certainly have been applied to the Baikal in early times as Gurevli claims, not without reason. (‘Baikal’ is a Tungusic word meaning ‘ocean.’) The Baikal is, geographically speaking, the best candidate for the First Ancestor’s crossing, being just north of Mount Burkan Quldan where he and his mate the fallow doe eventually settled. Furthermore, later sources, such as AT and AT (anon.), do indicate that the Tenggis Sea crossed by Börte Chimu was ‘in the north.’ See AT, 4a; LDAT, 53; and MCT, 36, 113. Cf. Mo, xix. As we shall see, these indications are in no way decisive since the whole question of the migration of the Mongol tribe is a very complex one. And, one might add, the second mention of Tenggis as Tenggis Dalai (see above) in § 199, which obviously does not designate a specific body of water, helps keeping the problem of identification in suspense.

Whatever is meant by ‘Tenggis’, the identification of Mount Burkan Quldan is no longer doubtful. Burkan Quldan corresponds to the present-day Khenti Khan (Xentii Xan), in the Great Khenti Range (ix Xentii Nuru) in northeastern Mongolia (46° 50' N 109° E). Thus, the top of Khenti Khan one can see the sources of both the Onox, the Onan of the SH, and the Kerulen (Xerlen) rivers. It was this sacred mountain—with its historical and legendary association as the ancestral home of Chinggis’s forebears—which the conqueror chose as his final resting place (see below, § 268). See RBC, 72, 95E; Poppe 1956, 33, n. 2; Perlé 6 (cf. Perlé 87); Schubert 1973; Boyle 1970, 45; idem 1973, 75, 76; CEBEB, 8-35; and the discussion in de Rachewiltz 1998, 239-249 (also for references). For the Khenti Range, cf. also Cosmides 1993. The name Burkan Quldan has been rendered by Pelliot (NMP, I, 340) as ‘Buddha-Cliff’, but Rincén, on the basis of Dagur and the Mongolian shamanistic tradition, claims that its meaning is actually ‘Mountain of the Willow-God’, or ‘Mountain of the Sacred Willow.’ See Rintchen 1910. Cf. On, I, n. 6, for a somewhat different interpretation. Pelliot’s rendering of quldan as ‘cliff’ is supported by the Chinese gloss in § 164 and the fact that the name ‘Buda Ordor’ (see Burkan Quldan is used by Rintchen al.-Din al-Sinār means ‘heights’ in Mongolian). See NMP, I, 342, 346. Cf. also Successors, 228, 310, 314; Barthold & Rogers 1970, 209, 215-216. The interpretation of quldan as ‘cliff’ is accepted by Poppe, op. cit., 54, and other scholars; it should be emphasized, however, that the word quldan meaning ‘cliff’ is not attested in Mongolian except in 164 of the SH; in all other cases it is part of the mountain’s name. Poppe, op. cit., n. 6,
refers to the mountain called 'Qaldud-un jirikun' (The Heart of the Qaldud) west of the Tunguy Tala (‘Marvelous Plain’) of the Tula River mentioned in the famous inscription of Čoruy Tayjji at Čayan Basing, to prove that the word qaldun, plural qaldud, occurs in Written Mongol [as an appellative noun meaning “mountain” – I.R.] as late as the XVIIth century. See ITB, 10, 21 (cf. the Mongolian text, ibid., 31-32, 44). However, in the Tibetan text Mount Burqan Qaldun is called ‘Kalutun stiṣm-po’, i.e. ‘The Heart of the Kalutun’, and three lines later ‘Putson Khalt.’ The Mongolian text refers only to ‘Qaldud-un jirikun’, obviously combining the first name of the mountain with the plural form ‘Qaldud’ of the second name of the Tibetan text. The reason why a plural Mongol form was used in the Tibetan text is probably because the mountain in question is ‘adorned’ (according to the inscription) with six other high peaks, thus forming a mountain complex dominated by Burqan Qaldun. In view of this, the ‘Qaldud’ of the Mongolian text need not be taken as the plural of a noun signifying ‘mountain’ as stated by Poppe. We are still dealing with a proper name that may mean ‘mountain.’ For the meaning of burqan (sig. burqan ‘Buddha’) in otu. and mo., see TMEN, no. 732; Rahder 1966. On the toponym Burqan/Pourkian, cf. D. Theodoridis in AOH 42:1988, 87-91. For Burqan Qaldun see also L. Darštuen in Mongolica 1 (22):1990, 129-132; and MBBMTT, 238 (where the proposed etymology of qaldun < jai + dan is untenable).

For the Onan River (Onan Muren), i.e. the Onon, which, together with the Kljun River (Kljun Muren), i.e. the Kerulen (or Kerulen; kh. Xerlen), figures so prominently in Mongol history, see Poppe 1956, 35-36; Boyle 1973, 75-76; Hambis 1974, 33-34. Cf. also MBT, 230a [jaded] for the form with a. For the word ter'iin (mo. terigun) ‘source’, lit. ‘head’, cf. HCWLYTT, 44-45, no. 11.

Both the AT and AT (anom) say that the clan name ‘Mongrol’ originates from Börte Činun and Tsa Maral (see AT, 4b; LDAT, 53; MCAT, 36, 113), but no such statement is found in the SH, possibly because this fact is already implied in the opening line of the work: Činggis Qa’un na hoja’u. Later in the SH the tribe of the Mongols proper is called ‘the Mongol people (or tribe)’ (Mongol ulus, Mongool jegen). On the basis of the SH account it would appear that the original nucleus of this tribe, represented by the blue-grey wolf of the legend, migrated from an area beyond the Tenggis to the region of the Burqan Qaldun/Khentii Khan, where it settled. We know that in the time of Činggis Qan, the habitat of the Mongol tribe was in the Onan-Kerulen region, south and south-east of the Great Khentee – the ‘Onankeru’ of William of Rubruck’s Itinerarium. See SF, 208; MM, 123; MWR, 125 and n.2; RCAC, 104. According to another ancient account recorded by Rasil al-Din, these early ‘immigrants’, led by Börte Činun, came from an enclosed valley of the Ergene Qan, a name which means, according to Rasil, ‘steep cliff.’ There they had lived and multiplied after their almost complete annihilation by the Turks two thousand years before the birth of Činggis Qan. On their journey to ‘another country’ (dīgar valīb) they had to cross the arm or branch of a river (piyot az daryay), which must have been wide, if in order to cross it, they had to build a kalak, i.e. a raft made of a large quantity of brushwood. (It is worth noting in this connection, that AT and other later chronicles state that Börte Činun went to ‘another country’ [jadun pajar] after crossing the Tenggis Sea, see AT, 4a; MCAT, 36.4; WQ, 81, 105, 106, n. 5, 255-256). Cf. SL, 12, 9-10; L1, 153-154; and SL, 13 (1868: Persian text), 6. In the legends about the origin of the Turks recorded in the Chinese sources we find the same themes: a cavern leading to a plain enclosed by mountains where the wolf’s descendents lived and multiplied for several generations before coming out and eventually settling south of a mountain range. One of the legends has it that the original ancestors of the Turks lived to the west of the Western Sea (note again this reference to a large body of water), and that their tribe was defeated and exterminated by a neighbouring country. Only one boy survived, who was reared by the she-wolf. Later he had intercourse with her and made her pregnant. The wolf then fled
Cliff, rock, steep bank' (see HW, 72; TMEN, no. 309). In any case, whether Ergene Qun – *Ergeine Qun was a real place or not is of little or no relevance, insofar as the Mongol legends of origin are concerned. As noted (infra), these are a borrowing from the Turkish legends and cannot, therefore, be regarded as reflecting historical events such as a movement of tribal groups from eastern or western Mongolia, or from the north. The ancestral wolf, the crossing of a large body of water (lake or river), the migration to a mountain site and the presence of a deer – all these elements are common to the two traditions, of which the Turkish is historically the earliest and thus, presumably, the original one. Cf. RTM, 190; FFSSA, 321ff; YSLT 1:1982, 220. In view of this, I believe that it is futile to attempt to identify the Tenggis with a real lake or river, and the totemic ancestors with real people. An illustration of a rock, drawing of a female figure together with a 'cliff-hind' on a cliff overlooking the Ula River north of Ulan Bator is found in Lattimore 1963a (facing p. 5). Lattimore believes that this is a representation of 1cna Mural and 'the first corroborative evidence that she was a genuine 12th-13th century figure.' Such a conclusion seems unwarranted, particularly as there are serious doubts as to the genuineness of the rock drawing itself (E.A. Novgorodova, p.c.). I also consider as speculative the thesis proposed by Murakami, who contends that 'the Mongol legend is to be understood as a kind of story orally handed down by successive clan Shamans, and reflects partly the actual history of their migration from the place of their origin as well as later developments in the new settlements and partly the true picture of the dual system of Mongol tribal society' (Murakami 1964, 1243). All we can say is that the ancestors of the 'Mongol' tribesmen, who in the 12th-13th centuries inhabited the Orön-Kernlen region (south and south-east of the Great Khentii), had at some undetermined time been under the political and cultural influence of the Turks to the extent of grafting their own body of traditions on the Turkish legends of origin with due modifications, such as the change in sex of the ancestral wolf

(or, according to another version, was transported by a spirit) east of the Western Sea, to a mountain north (or north-west) of Kao-ch'ang (Tufan). It was in a cavern in the mountain that the she-wolf took refuge and gave birth to ten boys. They took wives from the outside and their descendants eventually migrated to the south of the Chin-shun (Altai). In another tradition, likewise recorded in a Chinese source, there is mention of a white deer with golden horns coming out of the ancestral cavern. A useful comparison of these legends and their variants is found in Sinor 1982, where the Mongol legends of origin are also discussed (see, esp., pp. 240-242, 247-249). Cf. also PSTT, 32-34; RTM, 185-195; Boyle 1975; and, more recently, Gaadaambaa 1984, 118-119. The localization of Ergene Qun presents some problems. By taking Ergene = Argun, i.e. the Argun River, and on other grounds, Tamura placed the original habitat of the Mongols in the region of the middle Argun and the Khailar (Hailar) plain, from where they subsequently migrated in a south-western direction to the basin of the Onon, crossing the Hulun Nor, i.e. the Tenggis of the SH. ‘See Tamura 1973, 1-14. (For Ergene Qun = the Argun River, cf. ST, 81/74, n. 3, 145, n. 1:12, 9, 11.) On the other hand, the origin legends of the Turks recorded in the Chinese sources state explicitly that the ancestral cavern was in the mountains north, or north-west, of Kao-ch'ang: it was from there that the forebears of the Turks migrated to the southern slopes of the Altai. If, as Pelliot assumed, this is the same cavern connected with an enclosed valley or plain of the Ergene Qun, then the latter was clearly situated also in the west, and not in the east as inferred by Tamura. See Pelliot 1929, 214, n. 2. However, Sinor (op. cit., 235) is of the opinion that the ‘ancestral cavern’, where in later times the Khitan qijuns went every year in person, or sent officials, to sacrifice, is Ergene Qun cavern is a legendary place, and the two should not be confused. I think that Sinor is right. Moreover, the first element of the name Ergene Qun is almost certainly an alternative form of Ergšine, i.e. the Argun (cf. SH, §141), while Qun is mmo. qun
and the metamorphosis of the deer into the fallow doe and the wolf’s mate. Conversely, we must assume that the Mongol legend is of much more recent origin and was borrowed from the Turks after the Mongol rose to power in the 13th century to give the ‘golden lineage’ of Cinggis Qan a fitting genealogy and an origin worthy of the great conqueror. Personally, I am in favour of this assumption. Cf. HCG, 118. On this and other issues raised by §1 of the SH, see de Rachewiltz 1992. Thus the only reliable datum is the establishment of Mongol tribesmen in the Burqan Qildun/Kheiti Khan area several centuries before Cinggis Qan, a fact illustrated by the unfolding of the story in the subsequent sections of the SH. As to the actual origin of these tribesmen, i.e. their history from T’ang times (when the tribal name `Mongol’ appears for the first time in a Chinese source, the Chia T’ang-sha, see de Rachewiltz 1996, 1997), through the Sung, Liao and Chin periods, the task of re-examining the various and often contradictory references found in the Chinese sources is beyond the scope of the present work. One problem that does special attention is the distribution of the data found in the Chinese sources collected and published by Wang Kuo-wei in the light of the information contained in Rashid al-Din’s work and in the SH. See, provisionally, MKK; KSK, 422-442; Perlett 1963 (highly conjectural and unreliable); Ratehcnevsky 1966; Hambs 1970; Tamura 1973; LCSTMKK. Cf. also Pelliot 1929a, 126-128; CLC, 145-157; Aubin 1974, 11-12 and 13, n. 11; Ch’en Te-chih in NTHHP, 1981:1; Cheng Ying-te in CNHP, 1981:2; CK’, 5-11 (= CK), 7-12; Serruys 1982, 475-476; ASK, II, 24-37. Some Chinese sources have so far escaped the attention of western scholars; among them TCHP which contains (19, 21a-b) the earliest Chinese account of Mongol origins (Pelliot had no access to this work except through Naka’s occasional quotations). Cf. below, n. 7. At the same time, it is necessary to take into account the ethnographic data collected by medieval travellers, perceptively discussed in
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Viktorova 1978. For the later Turco-Mongolian tradition of common origin, see Dobrovits 1994.

Although the blue-grey wolf has earlier been referred to as the First Ancestor, this designation should properly apply to Bataciqan, the offspring of the wolf’s mate. Rashid al-Din, the first to achieve royal power, is his in fact called Bataci Q’an by the Persian historian (SL, 1/2, 9). Rashid, whose genealogy of Cinggis Qan does not agree in many respects with that of the SH, recorded a different tradition. It is debatable whether the name Bataciqan should be read Bataciqan, following Rashid, as some scholars do (see, e.g., Do’, 14; Dui, 1; Ma, 3; cf. GGMGL, 91). The attribution of qan-ship to this early forebear of Cinggis Qan is no doubt a later development and indeed at variance with the SH account, which makes Chabul the first in the lineage to bear the title of qan (§ 52). Furthermore, AT, 4b, calls the son of Bate Cunus ‘Bata Cayan’ (cf. the ‘Bata-Cigan’ of Ke, 79, and the ‘Batecahan’ of Da’, 19), almost certainly a corruption of Batacian or Batacian. The endings -qan, -qan are fairly common in Mongol names, e.g. Cormayain, Dalduqan, Ca’uqan (-qan is the so-called diminutive suffix; -qan) as a den. noun suffix, is an ancient suffix, no longer productive in pms, which deserves investigation; cf. below, nn. 40, 201). It is difficult to determine whether we should read Batacian or Batacian. The etymology of this name remains obscure in spite of suggestions that it may derive from fr. (Kara-Khaghiz) barbat ‘qan’ (in NTHHP, 1518). See Mu, 1, 10-11, n. 8; cf. Doroment in CMMK, 1, n. 2; and Tömröötearin in Mornolica 1 (22):1990, 151-153. For the problem of Mongol names and their interpretation, see below, n. 2.

The complex issue of the lineage of Cinggis Qan and its ramifications into the various classes of the Mongol tribe has been dealt with by several scholars. See, in particular, Yamagishi 1951; Poucha 1954 (but cf. Bese 1979); Tamura 1970, 15-19; Yoshida 1984; Whiker 1984; Murakami 1985;
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names are often meaningful, but in many cases the original meaning is unknown. Names ending in -dul-dei, -tai-tei, and -jin (-jt-li) for female beings, indicate the bearer. Thus, Borjigid Mergen means ‘The Clever of the Borjigin (a Mongol clan)’; Mongoljin Qo’a ‘The Fair (of the Mongol (fem.))’; and so on. Individual names, where the meaning is clear and/or relevant, will be discussed in the Commentary, but I have not attempted to interpret all the proper names of the SH, as has been done in Ev-Pop. An important comprehensive study of these names, both Turkic and Mongolian, by the late L. Bese of Budapest, was partially completed but has not yet been published (as at April 2003). See the Introduction, pp. 199; and, provisionally, Bese 1974, idem 1978, idem 1980, idem 1988; Poppe 1975; Šastina 1975; Li, 141, n. 3; cf. also Vlad., 74 (v. Vlad., 93); Vinokurov 1985; Khatagaveva 2001, 103 and n. 15.

Tamača is called Tamač and Tamač Qan by Rainī (SL, I/2, 9, 10), and Tamačin in AT, 4b. See HCG, 401.

Qorčar Mergen, id. in SL, I/2, 9, 10; Qorčer (read Qorčar) Mergen in AT, 4e. Qorčar is a name in -tai-tei from Qor, here probably the tribal name Qor, on which see below, p. 11. Cf. HCG, 30, 69, 423; Bese 1974, 92; Poppe 1975, 161.

A’uljam Borou’l, incorrectly written Quljam Borouyal in SL, I/2, 10, and Uŋyuljam Boyorul in AT, 4b. Cf. HCG, 374; Cleaves 1949a, 501. For boro ‘grey’, see TMMEN, no. 785; Poppe 1977, 131-133.

Sali Qo’a, deest apad Rainī; AT, 4b, gives Sali Galiçu (for Galiçu). Sali is a fairly common name in 11thgur. Its original – and correct – form was Sali, which is a transcription of ch. šhe-li 証立, a Buddhist title corresponding to shk. dárya ‘teacher’. See Hamilton 1984a, 425-431. Qo’a (w.l. galoq) ‘stubborn’, a deverbal noun in -u (-y) from qo’a (w. mo. xalq) ‘to be obstinate.’ Cf. GWM, 46, § 152; Bese 1974, 92, 93.

Yeke Nidin (‘Big Eye’), id. in SL, I/2, 10, and AT, 4b. 
Sem Soči, the Sim Sauči of SL, I/2, 10; Sem Soči in AT, 4b. sem means 'silent', here probably in the sense of 'tautum.' Cf. HGC, 54.

Qarču, the Qali Qarču of SL, I/2, 10; Qaraču in AT, 4b. 'Qali Qarču' is almost certainly the result of a confusion in the text or in Rašid's source between Sim Qaču'a and Qarču, which accounts for the disappearance of the former in Rašid's genealogy and Yeke Nidin becoming the son of A'ujam Borō'ul instead of Salī Qača'u.

§ 3. Borjigijadi Mergen, id. in AT, 4b. The genealogy recorded by Rašid al-Din follows a different tradition, with Dobun Bayan (the Dobun Mergen of the SH, see below) given as the son of Qali Qarču. For an important contribution to the study of genealogies in the SH, see Ardash 1993.

Borjigijadi is the ethnic in -dai-det of Borjigij (pl. Borjigij). See above, n. 2; Poppe 1975, 162-163. The Borjigij clan of the Mongol tribe was the clan allegedly established by Bodonjar several generations later. See § 42 and 43. The etymology of the name Borjigij is uncertain. The unreliable interpretation given by Rašid (borjigij = 'man with dark blue eyes') accounts, through a further misunderstanding, also for the imaginary grey (pomo, mo. borō), or cat's eyes of Cinggis Qan, regularly ascribed to the conqueror by modern authors. See Peliot's important remarks in HGC, 118-129; cf. Vlad. I, 47, 71ff, Vlad. II, 57, 89ff, ČK, 13-14 (= ČK, 14-15). More likely, borjigij derives from borj 'wild duck' + the suffix -gin (= gin), see TMEN, no. 101 (esp. p. 224); Poppe 1975, 165; and Bese 1988, 20-21. For the Borjigij clan, besides the fundamental work by Lomi (MBOT), see also Yamaguchi 1951; Badanxanat 1969; Muratkani 1985. With regard to Borjigijadi Mergen, the AT, loc. cit., adds that he was born 'at the source of the Dobun Boyerćin which flows at the southern side of Burqan Qal’dun.' Cf. LDAT, 53. The Dobun Boyerćin River is undoubtedly the present-day Bogdyn Gol, a right-bank tributary of the Kerulen (Xarla) River.

Mongolqin Qo’a is the Mongolqin Gua of AT, 4b. Mongolqin is the feminine ethnic in -in of Mongolqin. See TMEN, no. 367; MÜTT, 283a; Ryzhatski [2005], s.v.; and above, n. 2. This is the first mention in the SH of the tribal name Mongolqin (pomo, mo. Mongolqin), on which see in particular MUKK (and Peliot's review in TP 26:1929, 126-128); Hambis 1970 and GK, 7-9; Mo; 8; Doerfer 1970, esp. pp. 73-77; Seruys 1982, 475-479; ČK, 5 (= ČK, 217-218, n. 37); HCHWL, 239-244, no. 76; ČL, 145; YSLC, 412-413; HSR, II, 24-37; Bosson 1992; and, more recently, de Rachewiltz 1996. The name Mongolqin tOI court occurs for the first time in the SH in § 52. As for go’a (= pomo and mo. yooa, not yooa as in Shl 1, 2b, and Ir 4) 'fair, beautiful,' see Mo, xvi, VMI, 44; MMSOS, 30.

Toroqlqin Bayan is contracted to Toroqlqin Bayan in AT, 4b. According to Poppe 1975, 167, Toroqlqin - Toroqlqin is a proper name in -in from torqon, torqan 'silk' (cf. §§ 135, 238). For bovan 'rich,' cf. TMEN, no. 714; BT, II, 84.

Boroqon Qo’a (AT, 4b: Boroqon Gua) means 'Grey Beast.' Boroqon (boroqon) is the feminine of boro 'grey.' See Poppe 1975, 164-165; Khabatgaeva 2001, 135; Ryzhatski [2003], s.v.

Jala’u(ı) (= mo. jalaya) 'young, youth,' and, by extension, 'young manservant, serf, domestic.' Cf. lat. puere 'young boy; lad; a boy for attendance' → 'a servant, slave.' For Jala’u see Vlad., 86; VMI, 37; TMEN, no. 1797; RH, 263, no. 16. Cf. §§ 93, 156 and com.

Bordoldz Suyalbi is the Bordoldz Qubilai (an obvious textual corruption) of AT, 4b. Bordoldz is another name derived from boro 'grey' + suffix -ldei, on which see Poppe 1975, 163; Khabatgaeva 2001, 110. For this name, see HGC, 51; WHQG, 614-64; Mo, 103.

Dayir 'brown,' as in § 245 dayir eugen 'the brown earth.' The entry in HW, 34, is incorrect; see Motaert 1962, 202; Mo, viii, n. 2; Cleaves 1949a, 501-503, 532. The term bule (the second past, or praesens perfecti, of bu- 'to be') alternates in the
SH with bülge 'et, bülge; on all these forms, which correspond to mo. buluge - bulüge, bulüge - bulüge, see ‘Trois documents’, 46); UCPM, 149-152, § 33; IS, 129-121, §§ 218-220.

‘Fine geldings’ renders külü 'at uşatı (= mo. külügiği uşatı). Külük (pl. külük) is a loan-word from tu. külük, külük ‘famous champion, hero’, and also ‘a fine (or race) horse, steed’. See HCG, 340; Poppe 1555, 40; TMEN, no. 1686; Chiodo 1994, 220. Cf., however, Chomaa 1997, where the author attempts to show that the term külük in the SH must be understood only in the sense of ‘famous, glorious, renowned, brave, intelligent’ and the like, and not in that of ‘steed, courser’. Cf. below, nn. 163 and 205. For qaf'a ‘gelding’, see TMEN, no. 8; RH, 275, no. 21.

Du'a Sooor (AT, 4b; Du'a Sooor), the Mongol cyclop. Sooper means ‘blind’, cf. rather ‘one-eyed’; cf. also Sooper ‘one-eyed’. See also NHVO, 103, n. 3; CI, 1, n. 2; RH, 275, no. 17. For this personage, cf. Murakami 1964, 1168-1179 (cf. MTSSK, Index, 14a); Gaadamba 1968, 71; idem 1981, 76-77; Céren- sodnom 1987, 154-156. According to Gaadamba, Du'a is kird dö 'giant', but this etymology is by no means certain.

Dobun Menger, the Dobun Menger of AT, 4b, and Dobun Bayan (‘Dobun the Rich’ instead of ‘Dobun the Clever’) of SL, l2, 8-12. According to Raad, Dobun Bayan was the son of Quli Quru. Dobun, without final n, means ‘hill, mound’ (Les., 255b); it is also used as a proper name; however, dobun is probably the same word found in Yuki with the meaning of ‘strong, cruel’. Cf. Uray Khan: 276, 249-250; idem 1987, 142-144.

§ 4. ‘In the middle of his forehead (mangalt damad). Mangiat (mo. id.) means ‘forehead’ as here and in § 254; ‘tip’, as in § 116; and ‘vanguard’, as in § 142. For this word, besides Hw, 107, see VMI, 53; TMEN, no. 369; and RH, 204, no. 17. Cf. also Les., 527a; and below, n. 142. Ne'urit, plural of ne'urit (= mo. ne'uriti) ‘nomadic stage’, i.e. the distance between two nomad camps; from ne'urit (= mo. ne'uriti) ‘to transmigrate, nomadize.’ See Hw, 16. The SH term is glossed nesgüel, ‘nomad camp, transhumance’, at 4b, 4b. Cf. Céren-sodnom.
were migrating from the Buzguzin river valley in the north to the Onon-Kerulen region in the south, their ultimate destination being the territory of the Uriangai lands of Buirgan Quldun. According to Pelliot, op. cit., 386, the Tünggelik Stream is one of the upper tributaries of the Kerulen, not better identified. Perleè, 11 (cf. Perleè, 101), also failed to identify the Tünggelik Qoroqan of § 5 with a particular river in the Buirgan Quldun area (cf. also Perleè, 74, and below, n. 28; there is some confusion in Perleè between Tünggelik Gorokan and ‘Tenggelik Goroka’ – it is the latter which, according to Perleè, is in the vicinity of Buirgan Quldun). In his review of AT, Poppe wrote that in that work ‘some place-names are identified with their modern equivalents, e.g. the name of the river Tünggelik yorqgan, mentioned many times in the Secret History is explained on page 8 and passim as Çunggir tala.’ See HIAS 16:1953, 278. However, according to Pelliot, op. cit., 384, the ‘çunggir tala’ (read çönggir tala) of the AT simply means ‘valley creek.’ Cf. mo. çönggir ‘depression, hollow.’ The identification of the Tünggelik is, indeed, controversial and has given rise to various misunderstandings. See HCG, 382-386. Cf. Badamzanan 1992, 91; IEDOMT, 12-15; CKA, 8 (F9), 55b.

For my part, I think that this river may well be the same ‘Tenggelik Gorkhun’ described in detail by A.M. Podzrebev in his MIM II, II, 472-475 (cf. MIM III, II, 315-317). At the end of the 19th century, this ‘little river’ (trečka) originated in a marshy area called Tenggelik Būrdi (¼ Būrk) was fed by the Bain Göl, and flowed into the Terelj Göl, the present-day Terelj Göl in a valley north-east of the Tengelji, i.e. the Senggir (kh. Çengi) River, itself a left-bank affluent of the Kerulen. The valley in which both the Tenggelik and the Tergelji flow is, according to Podzrebev, 64 km long and 6.4 km. wide: ‘It is bordered on both sides by low mountains whose summits are covered with woods. Although the valley, you cannot help remembering the Mongols’ antiquity’ (MIM III, II, 317). If this identification is correct, the Tünggelik Qoroqan and its valley – the ‘hollow valley’ to which the AT refers – must be, as far as I can judge, about 80 km due south of Khentei Khan. This distance between Buirgan Quldun and the Tünggelik may seem excessive even for Du’a Sogor’s extraordinary eyesight, but we must not forget that we are dealing here with a legendary or semi-legendary account, and one which is not even corroborated by Rashid al-Din, who makes no mention of either Du’a Sogor or the migration of the Qoril Tumat led by Qorilatari Mergen. The identification proposed above is supported, albeit indirectly, by the localization of the Bürgi Escarpment (Bürgi Ermen) mentioned in § 96, and the proximity of the latter to the Tünggelik Stream. See below, nn. 96 and 100. It is, however, pointless to speculate further on the route followed by the Qoril Tumat tribe-men on the move.

The name Tünggelik derives from tünge (¼ mo. tüngge) ‘overgrown with feather grass; intermittently flooded area’ (Les., 853b) + the denominal noun suffix -tik (liger-liy) denoting abundance of something. See GWM, 42, § 127; cf. Dondukov 1988. On the etymology of this name, see HCG, 384-385. It should be noted, however, that in Mongolian the word tüngeley meaning ‘clear, pure, limpid, transparent’ is often applied to water and streams. Tünggelik (Tünggeli) could be a front-vowel form of tüngeley (= tüngeleg = tünggelig), but it is unlikely.

§ 6. ‘In the front seat of a black covered cart’ renders niken qara’utai tergen-ı öfge-de. Qara’utai tergen was the expression designating the fine two-wheeled carts covered with black felt described by Marco Polo, which were used by the Mongol chiefs. See MPR I, 108-109. They were also called qara’u (§ 55) and qara tergen (§ 244) ‘black carts’ – to distinguish them from the ordinary four-wheeled wagons. The etymology of qara’utai, an adjective in -tai formed on qara’u, is a subject of controversy, although the actual meaning is clear and confirmed by the AT gloss (although these are not always reliable). See AT, 5a, (cf. Poppe in HIAS 16:1953, 277; HCG, 259; Vlad. 41, 517, 518; TMEN, no. 277. For the ‘black
eroneously in my opinion – by some modem scholars, such as Do\(^3\), 20, and, following him, Ma, 27-28, Du, 3, and Ce, 36). On *qo’a* ‘fair’ (not to be confused with *qo (*fallow*)), see above, n. 1, and TMEN, no. 293. Raïd al-Din has recorded a tradition concerning Alan Qo’a, her husband Dobun Bayan (=
Dobun Mergen) and her children, which in part is at variance with that of the SH. See SL\(^2\), U1, 152-156; P2, 9-16. Cf. HCG, 433b. In the YS, the genealogy of Çinggis Qan begins with Alan Qo’a ‘the mother of his ancestor Bodonur.’ See YS\(^1\), 1; CH, 8. The tradition regarding Çinggis’ ancestry recorded in the YS and the TCHP (19, 21a-b, which also confirms the reading Alan) differs from that of the SH and is close to that found in SL. For a comparison of the account in YS with Raïd al-Din’s work and the SH, cf. Tamura 1973, 15-19; Yoshida 1984; Hambis 1970; Boyce 1975; HCG, 5 et passim. On Alan Qo’a, and the name Alan (Alun), see also Murakami 1964, especially pp. 1162-1168; Perleś’s contribution in *Mongol Ardi Ulyyn erg*, dundad uilin xot sarurii tovoo, Ulan Bator, 1961 (not available to me, for a Japanese translation, see Perleś, 2-4; Oż, III, 573-576; NW, 172-174, n. 12, and Rybatzki [2003], s.v.).

For the world *iške’i išdai’i* ‘had not yet been given’, cf. the words *irgei*i *išgii* ‘had not yet come’ of the great Sino-

\( ^{8} \) As for that (lit. “those”) band of people (*tede bokh irgen ber*). The plural demonstrative pronoun *tede* is due to the presence of the collective noun *irgen*. Cf. Street 1990, 187.

Barqudai (Mergen) and Barqulin (Qo’a) are both names derived from Barq or Barqun, the tribe then inhabiting the region of the Barqulin (modern Barguzin) River east of the Baikal. The respective forms of these names in Written Mongolian are Barqudai Mergen, Barqulin Qo’a, Barqulin, and Barqal. Cf. above, n. 2, and Rybatzki [2003], s.v. The
descendants of these tribesmen are the Barguzin Buriat, who still live in the same region, and the Bargu Buriat or Bargut, who several centuries ago migrated from the Baikal to that region in Manchuria (NW). For the Bargut (sing. of Bargut) tribe is mentioned in the SH, § 239, and many references to it are found in the YS and Rashid al-Din’s work. Cf. HCG, 6, 63, 288-289; NMP, I, § 77-78. See, in particular, SL', I/1, 121-122, where it is stated that the Bargut, Qoti, Tulas and Tumat tribes lived close to each other in the same region on the side of the Selenga River called Bargut Töküm. This name appears several times in the SH as Köl Bargut Tögüm (as in the present section), as Bargun Töküm (‘Töküm, §§ 157, 177) and simply as Bargun (§§ 109, 177, 244). From these references it appears that Bargun Töküm, lit. ‘Depression of Bargun’ or ‘Bargoun Lowland’, i.e. ‘the depression where the Bargut live’ (‘Trois documents’, 462, n. 49), was the name of the Bargun valley encompassing, sensu latu, the vast area between and, probably, beyond the lower course and estuary of the Bargun River in the north and those of the Selenga in the south. ‘Bargut’ and the ‘Plain of Bargut’ mentioned by Marco Polo (MP', I, 63, 70) are without any doubt to be identified with this area, as already pointed out by Pelliot (NMP, I, § 78). Since in Mongolian köl ‘foot’ designates the mouth or estuary of a river, the Köl Bargun Tögüm was, in all likelihood, the river valley of Bargun originating from the present Ust Bargun to Barguzin and Barguzinski. See ibid., 77; HCG, 287-288; Zolkviukov 1990. Cf. Perle’s, 8 (and Perle’s, 93); IBS, 273-274; and, more recently, PB, 34ff. Pope 1956, 33-34, identifies Köl Bargun Töküm with Tural-Talatla. However, Pope renders köl as ‘lake’ and Bargut Töküm as ‘lake Baikal’. For ‘mouth of a river’, see HCG, 288. According to the SH, Bargudai Mengen was lord (ejen) of the Köl Bargun Lowland. Because of his name, and that of his daughter Bargun Qo’s, it is clear that he must have been the leader of the Bargut (he is not mentioned, however, by Rashid al-Din); but it is likely that the term ejen also has a territorial connotation, as in § 9, implying that Bargudai Mengen was the Bargut leader of the Köl Bargun Lowland (as distinguished from other Bargut leaders). For the term ejen, see K. Sugita in EM 10:1979, 49ff; RH, 269, no. 6.

Qoriltsai Mengen: Qoriltsai is the ethnonym of Qorilts, the ejen which, according to § 9, was established by this personage. Cf. Bese 1974, 92; Pope 1975, 161. He is called ‘a chief (noyan) of the Qori Tumat.’ For the term noyan ‘chief, commander, official, nobleman’, see Cleaves 1959, 67, n. 33; TMEN, no. 389; Fletcher 1986, 17; HCWLYTT, 39-41, no. 9. Cf. also below, n. 216. (In RH, 201-202, nos. 27, 28, noyan [= noyan] is given as the equivalent of tu beg ‘chief’, incorrectly rendered into English as ‘the prince.’) Cf. ibid., 116, no. 11.) Neither Qoriltsai Mengen nor the Qorilts clan are mentioned by Rashid al-Din. Qori Tumat is a double tribal name designating the two related tribal groupings of the Qori and the Tumat who, as we have seen above, inhabited the Bargun Lowland. The two names appear together here in § 9 and in § 240. In § 240 Borol Noyan is sent on a campaign against the Qori Tumat; except for the first mention, these people are called throughout the section either ‘Tumat’ or ‘the Tumat people.’ From this we may infer that either the Qori Tumat were a ‘branch’ or subtribe of the Tumat, probably the dominant one, or that Qori Tumat was a lose designation of the Tumat, which we know were tribes of fur-hunting People of the Forest (Bei-sin ren) scattered over a wide area at the time (see below, no. 240). The cases of the Aygir’un Buir’un Tatar, the Udygit and U’us Merkit, etc. See HCG, 4, 63, 273-277, 287. For the Qori tribe, see ibid., 62-64; Boyle 1975, 62. The name Qori has been preserved in the most important subdivision of the present-day Burats, like living between the Ud and Khiliok rivers, east of Lake Baikal. AT', 5a, has erroneously conflated the Köl Bargun Tögüm with the Qori Tumat. For the form Tumed v. Tumat, see HCG, 400 (cf. Pelliot 1920, 173; Sastina 1973, 233.

‘At Ariq Usun ..., that girl named Alan Qo’a was born ...’, lit. ‘that girl was the girl named Alan Qo’a born ... at Ariq.'
Bulugun (= pmo. bulugun) 'sable (Martes zibellina)' is mo. bulayun(6) id. On it, see Colman 2002, 163-164. Keremun is the common squirrel (Sciurus vulgaris). See ibid., 167. By 'wild game (or animals)' (gri) or (gri elvan) are meant mainly deer, antelopes and wild goats (N., p.c.). On Mongol hunting in medieval times, see below, n. 27. Qorilri oboq bulji is, literally, 'becoming one having the oboq Qorilri', i.e. 'taking (= assuming) the oboq Qorilri'. Obviously in place of that of Qor Tumut. In the Mongol kinship system of the 12th-13th centuries, the oboq (mo. oboz omori) was a joint patrilineal descent group with a common name, usually also sharing a common legend of origin and a traceable genealogical relationship. The totality of the related oboq-clans and their subjects constituted the tribe (irgen or oboz irgen). The leaders of these oboq-clans originating from the same male ancestor (obig) had a common 'bone' (yazih), i.e. lineage or stem (cf. ger. stem) and were regarded as members of the same family, i.e. kinsmen (uraj); hence they were bound by the rule of exogamy which was strictly observed.

In view of this, yazih cannot be considered a 'subclan', as it is sometimes referred to, but rather a common line of descent from which originated, at each level, the separate, or 'segmented', lineages of the oboq-clans; it would then be more correct to say that yazih was the 'clan' and oboq a 'subclan'. (In some instances yazih has been rendered as 'family' sensu lato, see Cleaves 1951, 53(3), 67(3), 75, n. 19). However, in view of the fact that in the 12th century the oboq already plays an important role in social organization, we shall refer to it here as the 'clan'. At the beginning of Chinggis Qan's career several of these clans, such as the Tayifut, the Uruut and Mangqut, and the Jirkin, had greatly expanded and had become large, virtually independent tribes (irgen), even though as oboq-clans they were still all branches, or subgroups, of the Mongol tribe. Cf. also the case of the Dörben in § 11, where it is specifically stated that the four sons of Du'a Soqor 'took the clan name Dörben and became the Dörben tribe.' As noted by Munkuev,
the ethnonyms 'Mongol' referred, at least in the second half of the 12th century, to all the tribes whose leaders were the descendants of the legendary Alan Qo'a. See Muknev 1979, 381. (Incidentally, Muknev's article is one of the most perceptive descriptions of the growth and development of Mongol tribal society in the 12th-13th centuries.) It is therefore correct that by then, as pointed out by M. Mori and others, the pinyin 'Oboq' as such no longer played a political role. In the Sh the term oboq is consistently rendered as hsiing ści, i.e., clan name; significantly, this term is absent from the HiHy and it is virtually ignored by the Muslim authors of the Mongol period. See Vlad, 56-64 et passim; Korteweg 1939/49, 160-163; Mori 1955; Osssé, 47-65; Sompton, 326 ff; Nakamura 1967; Kaluyzyski 1977, 81-85; idem 1986, 213 ff; CW, 27; HCG, 122-123; TMEN, no. 572 (and no. 405 for yusun); MSR, 127; K. Sugita in EM 10:1979, 37, 41, 49 ff; Fletcher 1986, 16; Kaluyzyski 1989; Skrynnikova 1990a; idem 1994, 5tf; Cleaves 2001a, 52-53, n. 84; KHV, 13 et passim; and the vast literature quoted in the above works.

We have no information about Šinclī Bayan, or Šinclī the Rich, lord of Burqan Quldun, who belonged to the Uriangqai (= Uriangqai) tribe. On this important tribe, part of which inhabited at the time the forest region of the Khentii, see NMP, I, 337; Sæntina 1975, 240-241; Altanorgil in NTT, I, 142-152; Buyandelger 1996; Jakoffendor 1977 (for the connection) between the Uriangqai and the Mongol tribe, and the episode described in this section of the Sh (p. 7f);] and, especially, Urut-Khalalii 2002. On the 'forest' Uriangqai of the 13th-14th centuries and their modern descendants in eastern Tuva, see Successors, 108, n. 51; ETE, 13-14 et passim. Cf. also Besandansart 1992, 90. For the tribal name, see below n. 12. The passage in which Šinclī Bayan's name appears is a very controversial one. The text runs as follows: Burqan Quldun-ų efeše Burqan bosqastican Šinclī Bayan 'Uriangqai-tar ne ifaf ayicw afla'u. Most translators, relying on the Chinese interlinear version and on the strength of the plural efeše 'lords', regard the

words Burqan bosqastican as a proper name and read 'Burqan Bosqastican and Šinclī Bayan, lords of Burqan Quldun', even though 1 Burqan bosqastican is a most unusual name, literally meaning 'who has raised Burqan' (bosqastican) is 'to elevate, raise, erect' — normally used in connection with monuments, buildings or any other structures; 2 this name is absent in the sectional summary, which merely says (v. 1), that Qorlaratai Mengen moved with his whole family to 'Šinclī Bayan, lord of Mount Burqan'; and 3 the corresponding passage in AT, 5a, makes no mention of Burqan bosqastican, but has instead Burqan Uriangqai followed by Singsing Bayan (= Šinclī Bayan). The 'two names' interpretation has been adopted by Harinich, Pelliot, Shirato, Liqeti, Cleaves, Bayar, Taube and myself among others. However, we should mention that Koziń, Damdinsüren, Gaadbamba, Murakami, Doronobat, Otsawa, Onon and Even Pop follow the 'one name' interpretation and regard the words Burqan bosqastican as qualifying Šinclī Bayan. Naka (Na', 7; Na, 6) lists the names Bosqastican Šinclī Bayan Uriangqai in succession, adding in a note that, translated, they mean Šinclī the Rich, of the Uriangqai clan, who raised Burqan.' Jagchid (ja, 11) ignores the two puzzling words, explaining (p. 12, n. 3) that they are perhaps a later Lamaist addition, since they are not found in the original translation (i.e., in the Chinese sectional summary) and on the ground that they cannot constitute a proper name. The two words Burqan bosqastican are, indeed, most difficult to interpret, for a literal rendering does not make much sense; to understand them as 'who has opened up (insurgated, etc.) Mount Burqan' is, in my view, to stretch the means of the text to the limit. Gaadbamba is of the opinion that Šinclī is not a person's name as generally assumed, but the name of a shamanistic forest goddess; he takes the word burqan in the meaning of ongoy (pl. ongoy) ('shamanistic spirit inhabiting a material object, tutelary deity; shamanistic ancestral idol') (see Les 6, 61a). The expression 'lord of Burqan Quldun' would thus refer to this deity regarded by the ancient Mongols as the tutelary spirit of Mount Burqan. See
to one particular individual, Šināi Bayan, who may somehow have been associated with the cult of the mountain as surmised by Gaadamba. It is a fact that, after Činggis Qan’s death, the guardian and keepers of the ‘forbidden’ precinct on the mountain were the qan and members of the imperial family. I feel sure that this was due to the pre-existing and long-standing special relationship between the Ṣināi Qaγan chiefs and the sacred mountain of their territory. Cf. Ev. Pop. 42 and 254, n. 28. With regard to stone images of Buddhas found in Mongolia, it should be mentioned that the ‘Great Buddha’ on the bank of the Khalkha River in eastern Mongolia — a 20-meter high statue which according to Olausdán 1958 (cf. MS 9:1985/86, 79-82) may go back to the Chao and Chin periods — is undeniably of a much later date.

See Haining 1992. On the shamanistic images in human shape, used chiefly for domestic worship and later known as Ṣonγ, see the early period (13th c.) JNM 9, 10, 80, 96, 141, 184-197; HDM, 143, n. 14; JWR, 59-60, n. 1; GR, 262; RCAC, 17-18; DBSS, 81-85 (cf. MSR 7:1981/82, 77-79); RTH, 223-234. All this is rather speculative, and the fact remains that, as pointedly noted by D. Čerňátský (Cé, 277, n. 10), in the SH the word is glossed as a ‘person’s name’ (A. 6). According to Uray-Köhalmi 1987, 144-145, the form ération is a pluralis majestatis (or, rather, pluralis nominis, as Schiller calls it) and the words ‘Birgan Ṣong bessayin Ṣināi hisvan urjāmyغن’ comprise the long form name of the single tutelary deity of Burqan Qaγan, viz. Uray-Šināi Qaγan, zum Çot erboren (Rechimoni). Cf. Uray-Köhalmi 2002, 255 and n. 6. This is, in my opinion, a most unlikely interpretation in view of the fact that we are dealing
here specifically with Qorilartai Mergen's migration to another territory, and the occurrence, only a few lines before, of the term *ejun* with the meaning of 'lord' of a territory (see § 8). I am, therefore, following the interpretation of the Ming editors, albeit with serious reservations on account of the complex problems outlined above. For some rather far-fetched etymologies of the name *Śiņć* (cf. ch. hsiien-shetg lit. 'a title of respect for a teacher and one's senior'; Sīć'; and *mo. sinjēći, sinjēći; sinjēći 'fortune-teller, prognosticator*', see Bürinašt 1991, 124-25, 129-30; cf. Ev-Pop, 255, n. 28; On, 2001 ed., 40 and n. 87. I think that *Śiņć* simply means 'Token (or Mark)', i.e. of good fortune = *mo. sinjēći* id.

§ 10. *Būgınütė* (deevt in *AT*, Sb. The gloss *Bügünütė* opposite *Bēlgünütė* in *AT*, 1, 9, followed by *AT*, *AT*, and *ATL* [p. 15, where *Bügünütė* is a missprint for 'Bügünütė'] is an addition by C. Žemero, who incorrectly inserted it in the Ulan Bator ms. See *Zanc* 1, 87, n. 1, and *Zanc*, 62, n. 1; cf. Pelliot 1930a, 200. The name does appear as *Bügünütė* in *AT*, 6a (§ 8, 16), cf. *ATL* 138b and *Bügünütė* are the eponymous ancestors of the Bügünütė and Bügünütė clans respectively. See § 42. In *SL* 1/1, 10-11, the two brothers are actually called *Bügünütė* and *Bügünütė* and in this (inverse) order. In §§ 18, 19, 20, 23, 42 of the *SH* the order of the two names is likewise inverted, as in the *AT* and *ET* and (cf. *GOM*, 59). It seems likely, then, that *Bügünütė*, not *Bügünütė*, was the elder of the two brothers. On this problem, see Pelliot, op. cit., 199-200; idem 1940/41, 4-5, n. 1. For the names *Bügünütė* and *Bügünütė*, cf. Bese 1978, 361, no. 10, and 362, no. 12 respectively.

§ 11. 'Before long (tēdda tāsā, lit. "while it was so much as that"
"in a short while") the elder brother Dobun Mergen died (*tēgē bolbā)*. For *tēgē bolbā* 'to become nonexistent, to disappear', i.e. *to die', cf. Cleaves 1948, 313.

*As a member of the family*, lit. 'in the kin' (*arurq*). For the term *arurq* (as *mo. arurq*) 'family, kin' < *tu. arūr* 'seed,
MO 1993, 220-224. The episode is discussed in the wider context of the 'Uringgai connection' in Lackendorf 1977, 8ff.

As for the word nökör, a key term in the tribal society of the time, it has two basic meanings: 1) 'friend', 'mate' (in the common Anglo-Australian usage) and 2) 'companion-at-arms, comrade' – a rather inadequate rendering. In this acception nökör is comparable to the drakun (bodyguard) (= drug 'friend') of Kiesewer, the Merovingian extraction and the Danish or old English housecarl (huscarl). The Mongol nökör was, in fact, a young man or fully-fledged warrior who, of his own free will, declared his allegiance and gave his support to a chief, or prospective chief, of another clan or tribe, thus forming with other liegemen like him a body of personal retainers bound in a special relationship of trust to the chosen leader and enjoying special privileges. The nökör (= nökôd, pl. of nökör) played a vital role in the transformation of Mongol society from tribal to feudal in the lifetime of Činggis Qan. They were the elite warriors of the leader's bodyguard and in time of peace assisted him in domestic and administrative matters where personal loyalty and trust were paramount. On this important institution, see Gladstone, 1882, 87ff; Vlad III, 110ff. (cf. the selections of salient characteristics in TMEN, I, 522-523; M. Morii in THG 5:1952, 56-68, and SZ 61:1952, 690-716 (cf. Sugita 1979, 42-43); Li, 1976, 90 (particularly relevant); I. Németh in AOIR 3:1953, 1-23; Cleave 1959, 69-70, n. 69; Lastemore 1969, 58-59; Munkacsy 1977, 387; Lattimore 1978, 130-132; Isoro 1978, 85-87; idem 1980, 40-41; Fletcher 1980, 17-18, 20. For the use and spread of the word nökör, see TMEN, no. 388; A. Röns-Taus in OUEIM, III, 138; MNKL, 593a, s.v. *navgôr*; Shiro 1996, HCYLTT, 205-207, no. 62; RNH, 233, no. 11 and n. 4. (An important unpublished note on nökör by A. Mostaert is to be found in the C.I.C.M. Memorial Library at Kestel-Lo in Belgium.)

'Keeping for himself the main portion of the animal which has the lungs, and the skin', i.e. the main portion plus the skin, renders a'leqin fildi arukan inu abê. Inu is here the pronoun

---

A man of the Uringgai tribe (lat. 'an Uringgadi man', Uringgadi being the ethnonym in *dafl-ehal* ~ *tai-ehal* of Uringgai) (pl. Uringgai) – Uringgai. Cf. Pope 1975, 163. The form Uringgai (Uringgai; cf. AT, 5a) appears in § 9; Uringgai (= Uryanqan; cf. AT, 31b) in § 120. The form Uringgai is attested, *inter alia*, in the YS; see GGS, I, 161a, 162b. I have used the form Uringgai throughout. (The Uryanqan' in CII, 269, last line, is an oversight for 'Uringgai'.)

*Abit* (= pmu. *abid*) 'entails' seems to be a plural of *abin*. According to Pope (p.c.), *abin* < *arbin* ~ *harbin*. Cf. kh. *zarrin* 'the lower belly.' For the disappearance of the *-r*, see Poppes in UAF 26:1954, 340-342. Cf. mo, *gahrbar* = *gabirya* 'rib' (on this word, which occurs also in the present section, see TMEN, no. 267; and RH, 211, no. 6). See, however, the important remarks on *abidara* and *abid* in Mo, 228-230. For the naming (*tair*) and other methods of Mongolian cooking in the 12th and 13th centuries, cf. Buel 1999, 207-208. For the animal itself – a *buq* (= pmu., mo *buq*; kh. *bog*), i.e. the red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) – see Colman, 2002, 163-166.

§ 13. 'Friend, share the quarry!' renders nökör *sirolga* da, lit. 'Friend, the roast!' Apparently it was an ancient and accepted custom for a hunter to share his quarry with anyone who shouted *Sirolga*, lit. 'Roast!' – an ellipsis for 'Give me some of your roast (i.e. of your prey)!' See Mostaert 1949, which critically reviews Pelliot 1944a, and which also contains a reference (p. 476, n. 9) to W. Eberhard's important note on *sirolga* in Orien 1:1948, 220-221. On *sirolga, siroljo*, cf. also TMEN, no. 342, and Mo, 82, n. 77. According to Gadambasa (MNTSZA, 11-24), the expression nökör *sirolga-da* (dat.-loc.) reflects the ancient steppe custom of sharing the hunter's prey as a way of showing one's worth as a friend in need. Thus for him the meaning of this expression is 'the friend (nökör) is known in the *Sirolga* (*sirolga-da*), i.e. by the sharing of the roast (= prey). For the survival of this custom (and further references), cf. G. Kara in
The man," lit. 'that man.' For the Mongolian demonstrative pronouns e-ne, tere 'this,' 'that' having at times the value of the English article 'the,' cf. Street 1990, 172.

'I am a man of the Ma'alig Baya'ut (bi Ma'alig Ba-
yu'adun). For Baya'ui, cf. Poppe 1975, 162, and above, n. 12. Ma'alig Baya'ut seems to be a double ethnic name. The first element is unknown; Baya'ut, on the other hand, is a well-known tribal name. The Baya'ut (= mo. Bayayud) were the hereditary household servants of Chinggis Qan's family — a role which finds its origin and justification in the legendary account recorded in the SH (§§ 15–16). See Yao Chia-chi's remarks in YSL 2:1983, 95. On the Baya'ut tribe and Rasid al-
Din's somewhat different version of the story, see HCG, 78, 86-
89. Cf. also SH, §§ 120, 213.

'I am in desperate straits' renders yada'ya yahuma, lit. 'I am going (yahuma = yahun ama, cf. A7),' being unable to cope.

Note, however, that yahuna as it is often the case in the SH, plays here the role of an auxiliary verb expressing the imperative 'Aktionssatz' of the main verb. See Aalto 1973, 35–36; cf. Mo, 195, 237, n. 221. On the role of the father in deciding the fate of his children in the Mongolian society of the time, see Ratchevsky 1976, 511, 524, n. 15; idem 1987, 69.

§ 16. For aric ele 'one of two, one of a pair,' cf. Mo, 11.

To be a servant in his house,' lit. 'he employed him within the tent' (ger dotora jaru'a aqui bule'). Jaru- means 'to use, employ (for service, on errands or missions). The derivation from jar 'order, declaration, promulgation, publication proposed by K.H. Menges in RP 2:1949, 229, is subject to caution, as indeed his entire notice concerning ital. ciariatu (ibid., 229–231).

§ 17. Baga Qontog is the ancestor of the Qatain, Buxatu Salji of the Salji ut and Bodonar Mungaq, or Bodonor the Fool, the ancestor of the Botjirin. Cf. below, § 42. The same account is given by Rasid al-Din, but with variant spellings of the names of the first two sons. See SL, 1/2, 14–15; cf. HCG, 394, 400, also.
meant the brothers of the deceased husband Dobun Mergen. *Uye qaya,* glossed as ‘branch relatives’ (♀), is a kinship term designating collateral paternal kinmen, i.e. male cousins once or twice removed. See Cleaves 1949a, 503-504; OSSSE, 61 62; id. e.s., 915k: *qasalid* (pl. in *lid of qaya* ‘second cousin on the father’s side’. Cf. also DO, 324b. Here we have a reference to the ancient Mongol and, generally, Inner Asian practice of levirate, according to which the dead husband’s brother or next of kin had to marry the widow. See Vlad’, 55; Ratcliff, 1968; Hambis 1979, 389; Holmengren 1986, 151ff. For *bo’étele ‘although, while’, the converser terminale of the defective verb *bo* (= mo. *bu*) ‘to be’ (see GMW, 103, § 384), see the interesting contribution by S. Ozawa in OMys, 1988.1, 52-53.

‘The man of the Ma’aliiq Baya’ut’ — but, according to § 15, it was the man’s little son who had been taken into Dobun Mergen’s tent. The contradiction has been discussed by various scholars; it seems that both father and son had joined the household, not merely the child. See Pelliot 1930a, 199; Li, 142, n. 18; Jackendoff 1977, 199ff.

For *te’uá’été (= tegünä’gel) ‘belonging to him, his’, cf. Lettres, 78, n. 243; Mo, 5.

§ 19. ‘One day in spring.’ For some interesting remarks on the calendar and time computing of the medieval Mongols, see Ts’ai CC 1980; Clark 1998; and Rybatzki (in Add. & Corr.).

‘While she was cooking some dried lamb’, lit. ‘while boiling dried sheep’ (*könshilemel qoqin činaqar.* *Könshilemel* is a noun in -el(-mal) from *ünölile* ‘to dry meat (by smoking, for the winter)’, the original meaning of the verb being ‘to singe the hair’, thus, ‘dried meat’ is, literally, ‘that whose hair has been singed.’ Cf. but *sünčuqar* (as *könšiga*) ‘the bad smell of burnt hair or meat’ (N.P., p.c.). For somewhat different etymologies, see TH, 216-217 (=JT, 374); Oz’, 1, 111-112; El- Ar, 33, n. 1. Cf. also Vlad’, 47 and n. 3.

*Njjet* ‘one each’ corresponds to mo. *njyiged* id. The form in -id is found only in dag. *njyiz.* The development of this form is
explained by Poppe in IMCS, 108. Cf. TIIHTT, 163a; TH, 138 (w JYT, 240).

'Immediately' is, literally, 'how could they have stopped it?' (yu'a b'ay't'alqun), i.e. they did it without interruption, right away.

'The five sons each took the five bound arrow-shafts in turn', lit. 'All five, taking turns, each person holding one of the five bundled arrow-shafts (missiš).' Missi is the plural of missiš, an obsolete word meaning 'rod, (arrow-)shaft'. Cf. § 240. Jackendoff's reservations (Jackendoff 1977, 20-22) on this score are unwarranted: the parallel passage in AT', 6a, has missiš, and there is no doubt that the Uecest of the SH had this word and not šūmûn or šūmûn 'arrows.'

As for the story of Alan Qo'a, her sons and the bundle of arrows, it is, as pointed out by several investigators, an ancient folklore motif which purports to demonstrate the advantage of unity and solidarity, particularly - as in the present instance - in times of danger or under threat. The fable, with its obvious moral, is found in Aesop's collection ('The Father and his Sons' or 'The Husbandman's [Divided] Sons', see EF, 39-41, no. 86): this motif is also found in the body of traditions of various nomadic peoples of eastern Europe and Asia, such as the Scythians and the T'u-yû-hun, long before the Mongols. In Ju'vâzîn's work the parable is transferred to Chinggis Qan and his sons. It is also reported in the later Mongol and Tibetan chronicles, albeit with some variations. See OGMGL, 45-46, and Poucha 1954, 448-449 (cf., however, Ligeti's criticism in Li, 142, n. 19, Doer 1979, 56); HWC, 41, 594; THY, 5-6 (for the translation from the Wei-shu [6th c. AD] of the relevant passage the T'u-yû-hun chief A-ch'ui and his sons); Serruys 1958, 285, n. 38; Gaadamba 1968, 71-72; Yao Ts'ung-wu in TLTC 22:1961, 1-3; Jägerfeld 1978, 95-96; Moses 1987, 63-65; Blera 1990a; idem 1990b, 14ff. Cf. also Ratchevsky 1976, 524, n. 8, and Roux 1977, 20-21. Commenting on the story concerning A-ch'ui, Pelliot wrote [P.P.-M.G.]: 'Alan Qo'a

et le paquet de flèches, cf. Pompée et la queue de cheval.' Cf. also his remarks in Pelliot 1936, 357: 'Dans l'histoire des flèches liées ensemble (çulâµa non çulâju), analogue à l'apologue de la queue de cheval dans l'histoire romaine, ...' Pelliot no doubt refers in both instances to the well-known anecdote related by Piôtarch in his Life of Serarius, XVI; cf. also Valerius Maximus, Fact. ac. dict. mem. lib. VII, 3, 6.

§ 20. 'You, my sons Belginûte and Bülgînte,' lit. 'You, my two sons Belginûte and Bülgînte.' For this and other instances (e.g. §§ 23, 45, 49, 71, 76, 77) where the numeral plays the role of the conjunction 'and', cf. Bese 1987.

'Of what clan are they the sons?' Cf. above, § 15: 'To which clan do you belong?', lit. 'What kind of person are you?' In both instances, 'what' (yu'an) refers to the clan or tribe to which the person(s) in question belonged and which, more than anything else, established his/her or their identity and affiliation. See Vlăd., 56-57.

§ 21. The resplendent (ççûgu = ãçûgu; see below, n. 72) yellow man (tira gülüm) who visited Alan Qo'a and who crept out of her tent in the guise of a yellow dog (tira wazqī) is obviously a personification and metaphor of the colour of Heaven (tengûrī - tengûiri, see above, n. 1), as Alan Qo'a explicitly says in the alliterative passage ('They are the sons of Heaven'). The story reminds us of the numerous transformations of Zeus, for similar purposes, in Greek mythology. The colour yellow (sira) associated with both the man and the dog is the colour of gold (alûn) which is, in turn, a symbol of sun and leadership, of royal authority (see below): the offspring of such a union is destined 'to become the rulers of all', as Alan Qo'a prophetically says in the same passage. The brightness of the personage, the 'light' element (radiance, moonbeams, sunrays), and the smoke-hole and door top, which permit the light to enter, are all elements associated with the sky, and hence with Heaven. (The smoke-hole, the door top, the door frame and the threshold have all numerous connotations, see §§ 105 and 246, et seq.)
The involvement of Heaven goes back to the very origin of the family line (see above, n. 1). The mythical connotations of the dog, on the other hand, are not so clear and perhaps of no special significance: the dog is traditionally associated with, and often assimilated to, the wolf and symbolizes fierceness. See, e.g., §§ 78, 195; cf. also § 66.

(The traditional image of the dog among the Mongols is discussed by Gaandan in MNTSZA, 31-40; cf. Poppe 1964b, 166; Hashimoto 1976; Uray-Kólibali 1987, 147-149). We may infer from this legend that Alan Qo’s descendants conceived by the heavenly man-dog were destined to rule the world as fierce and fearsome masters. This element of ‘fierceness’ is especially highlighted, in the case of Temüjin, in the poetic passage of § 78. In a strong military and aggressive society, fierceness and inspiring awe and fear in the enemy were the qualities most sought in and expected from the leader. This, I believe, has an important bearing on the later choice of the title Chinggis Qan born by Temüjin. See below, nn. 59 and 123. For ‘yellow’ = ‘golden’ = ‘royal, imperial, pertaining to the supreme chief’, see Serruy 1962, and the important remarks in CEME, 60-67. Cf. the designation syra orda (= sirsa ord) ‘Yellow Camp’ of Güyük’s encampment near Qara Qorum and of Batu’s encampment on the lower Volga (= ‘Golden Horde’). See HDM, 28, 141, n. 9; SDM, 230, 339. Cf. also the reference to the ‘golden tent’ (aïlan türme) of Öng Qan in § 184; and the ‘golden smoke-hole’ and ‘gold-capped pavilions’ in the Dede Qorqut epic (BDK, 11, 39, 54). N. Poppe (p. c.) suggests that by a ‘yellow man’ is meant, perhaps, a blond man; and that by a ‘yellow dog’ a light-coloured dog (not necessary yellow) is meant. Cf. Poppe 1977, 128-129, nos. 56, 57. Pelliot, on the other hand, suggested (Pe, 124, n. 1): ‘Jaume = idee d’or; allusion aux images divines du bouddhisme?’. The point is discussed further in HCG, 118, 120-121, in relation to the story, current in the 13th-14th centuries, that the descendants of Yügei (and hence of Alan Qo’s) were ‘yellow in colour’ — probably a reference to the light colour of the hair of some of them. Pelliot (op. cit., 120) refers to the colour yellow in our passage as ‘en quelque sorte “soleil”’, et correspond en outre aux images dorées des divinités. For the legend of the supernatural conception of Alan Qo’s children in the Persian, Tibetan and late Mongol sources, and its diffusion, see SÜ, 122, 14; GGMGL, 42-45 (also for some interesting parallels); CIL, 282-283; MHW, 4ff., 41-43; Bira 1990; idem 1990b, 14ff., 1991, 40-42; and Bira 2000, 59-61 (for a possible Manichaean influence on the legend). Cf. also MAR, 17-19. For the correct interpretation of the passage ‘Every night ... the door top of the tent’, see Cleaves 1949a, 504-505. For eriq ‘smoke-hole, sky hole (of a tent)’, cf. Khomonov 1970, 36, and n. 230.

‘How can you speak so rashly (or wildly, incomconsiderately) (deleme)?’ For deleme, see DO, 137b.

For bili: ‘to rub, stroke’, see Ligeti 1960, 237.

‘When one understands that’, lit. ‘When (or if) one understands by that.’

‘To ordinary black-headed men (qara teri ‘ütü gülün)’. The ‘common people’ at the end of the passage are called qaraču, a noun deriving from qara ‘black’ (for the den. noun suff. -ču, see GWM, 4), § 115; Khabagava 2001, 134). For qaraču, see also TMEN, no. 274. One of the several connotations of ‘black’ in Mongolian is ‘ordinary, low-class.’ See Poppe 1977, 121, no. 12. Cf. SOMTN, 202. The same usage is found in Turkish, see ED, 643b; cf. Choi Hyung-won in AH 9:1999, 291. Thus, qara teri ‘ütü gülün and qaraču are synonymous. ‘Black’ refers to the colour of the skin through constant exposure to the sun and weather, a characteristic of common, poorer people, ‘white’, by contrast, being a sign of wealth, nobility and rank. Cf. the expression ‘pansu nera’, i.e. ‘black belly’, which in the old Roman dialect designated, for the very same reason, people of the lower working classes and paupers in general. Cf. also BDK, 10; Khabagava 2001, 93. For other parts of the body called ‘black’ in a derogatory or insulting way in Mongolian, cf. the expression ‘blackish face’ in Ordois (DO, 310b). I think that ‘black’ in the present passage is contrasted with the
pronouns (tere) with a plural noun (missit, pl. of mission, cf. AT', 6b), see Street 1990, 186.

For the verb  (see mo. yow); 'just now, a little while ago', cf. Gantotokh 1959, 121.

§ 23. The five brothers divided the livestock among themselves. lit. 'The brothers divided among the five of them their livestock and food (adulam ide'). Adulam - adulan (cm. mo. adyasa, adyasa), means 'four-legged, domesticated animal: cattle, livestock'; ide (cm. mo. ideilen) means 'food.' These two words form a so-called 'mot-couple' (for this expression, see Pelliot 1944, 75, Mo. 42-43), the meaning of which is the same as that of the first element of the compound, i.e. adulam 'livestock.' The expression adulam ide means appears again in § 272, in a passage translated and discussed by Mostert (Mo. 225-233; see, especially, p. 231). In §§ 39 and 132 we find adul ide en, adulen (cm. mo. adyasa) means 'heird (of horses or cattle): horses, cattle' (cf. T and, no. 10; Hcwly, 244-246, no. 577) and, as pointed out by Ozawa (Op. 1, 135, n. 2), this word together with ide (en) forms a compound which is synonymous with adulam (adulam ide) ide (en). The expression adul ide (en) has survived in Burut with the meaning of 'cattle, herd of horses', and in Ordoski with the meaning of 'heird of horses'. See Mo. 225, cf. Kachitsky 1992, 23, 277-278. In the interlinear version and sectional summary these expressions are translated literally, i.e. 'livestock (or heird of livestock) and food,' except for § 23, where in the sectional summary (6) 1 (1a5) adulam ide is rendered, as 'family possessions, property' (see), the livestock repreposing, of course, the wealth of the family. We find the same rendering in Li, 11. Most scholars, including Mostert and Cleaves (see Mo. 255, Cl. 3, X, 62, 217), follow the Chinese version and understand 'heird(s) (or cattle, or horses) and food (= provisions), as I have done in my earlier translation. However, in 1979 N. Poppke pointed out to me that the expression adul ide occurs in the Burut epic Irnemec with the meaning of
‘horses and cattle (lit. “food”).’ See Poppe 1980, 263, lines 3352-3353. The correct interpretation of the two synonymous expressions in the SH had already been given in 1947 by Damdinsuren, who rendered them as a vita mal ‘livestock.’ See Da’, 28, 30.

For qubi ‘share (of the patrimony);’ see TMEN, no. 294; Murukami 1961 (cf. MTSK, 191-196, 198, 204, 214); Murukami 1983, 102; Sugi 1979, 45. For inheritance that is dealt with in customary Mongol society, see Vlad, 62-68; Rashchensky 1987, 73.

With regard to the term budatu ‘stupid, foolish, half-wit,’ Cleaves stated: “In budac ‘u we have a folk etymology based on a consonance (budac ‘u and Bodoncar)’ (cf. §V, n. 13). I am not sure whether in this particular instance Cleaves is correct, since Bodoncar already had the nickname, or epithet, of mungag. For budatu = mno. budantu, mno. bodantu, see Cleaves 1949, 127, n. 230.

§ 24. ‘Why should I stay here?’, lit. ‘While here (so long as I am here), what (is the advantage)?’

‘He got on a white horse with a black sore back and a mangy tail’ (qol da’arita qodoli se litiits qog singgula unula). A literal translation would be: ‘He rode on a white (or grey-white) horse with a black stripe along the backbone having mid-back wounds caused by the saddle, and a hairless tail.’ For qog singgula see Ozawa’s remarks in Oz, I, 140-141, n. 2 (where, however, in is, I think, a printing error for in); and Rassadin 1985, 113. Cf. § 193 Singgulagin ‘little white horse.’ For the important term gol (= mno. goli), meaning here ‘mid, part in the centre’ of the horse, i.e. his back, cf. TMEN, no. 307; Poppe 1967, no. 7. Da’arita is a denominative noun in -tu formed on da’ari (= mno. dayari) ‘wound or sore caused by the rubbing of the saddle’; see TMEN, no. 1868 (p. 177). Qodoli (= mno. yodoli), is the name of a particular type of arrow with a blunt, knob-like head, usually made of bone (see below, n. 77). A qodoli tail may have been an expression meaning ‘a tail like a qodoli-arrow,’ i.e. bare and with a butt-end—a hairless stub of a tail, but this term is simply glossed ‘bald’ in the interlinear version.

‘If I die, I die; if I live, I live,’ i.e. ‘Whether I live or die it’s all one to me!’ See VG, 54; Waley 1960, 523; and CI, 5. Cf. also AT, 6b (‘If I die or live, let my destiny decide!’), and I’a, 233, nn. 79 and 80. However, Ligeth, Ozawa, Even and Pop, and others (including, notably, Cleaves and myself [in Ra, L 122]) are of the opinion that the passage should read ‘If he (i.e. the horse) dies, I shall die; if he lives, I shall live,’ or ‘If he dies, let me also die! If he lives, let me also live!’ See Li, 11; Oz, 2, 22; Ev-Pop, 24. Cf. also Cleaves 1949a, 505; CI (1956 unpubl. version), 5; Mo, 95; Vietze 1994, 654. Disagreement on the correct interpretation of Bodoncar’s words will no doubt continue.

For talbi ‘to ride fast,’ see Mo, 49; cf. Aalto 1973, 36.

Baljum Island (Baljum Aral) is an unidentified peninsula, or more probably a peninsula on the Onon, possibly at the confluence of this river with the river Balj or Balsja, i.e. the present-day Balj Gol (the Balji Gol and Balj Gol of GM) at 49° 07 N 111° 50 E. See HCG, 41-42; Hung 1956, 21-23. Cf. Poppe 1956, 40. It is not to be confused with Dalan Baljut and Lake Baljuna of §§ 129 and 182. On these place-names, cf. L. Daršuren in Mongolica 1 (22):1990, 132-134. Aral usually means ‘island,’ but it also has the meaning of ‘peninsula; area at, or near, the confluence of two rivers (i.e. comprised between them),’ as in the case of Taljum Aral (§ 105) and of the famous Kōdō’e Aral. See SMT, 16; TMEN, no. 11; and below, n. 136 (for Kōdō’e Aral).


§ 25. For qarčiqa (= mno. qaračiq) ‘hawk, falcon (Austur putumbarius),’ see TMEN, no. 278. Cf. RH, 227, no. 20.

For kilqasam (＝ mo. kilqasam[?]) 'hair from the mane and tail of a horse, horse hair', see TCMEN, no. 1807. The word is of Turkic origin (= qil 'hair, horse hair'). On it cf. also Ryzewski 1996. Since Bodonçar's Rociñante had a hairless tail, the hair used to make the snare must have come from the mane, pace the Chinese gloss and sectional summary, both of which render kilqasan as 'hair from the tail of the horse' (Y'1, 16a-b). However, in Middle and Written Mongolian, as in the modern dialects, this term designates bokh the mane and tail hair.

§ 26 'When he had nothing to eat', lit. 'When he had no food to eat.'

For the nature of the 'wild game', see above, n. 9.

For qun (= pron. yun) 'cliff', see TCMEN, no. 309: Oz', 1, 147-148, n. 1.

They also gathered up and ate the food left over by the wolves (lit. 'what the wolves had eaten'). For tempa 'to pick up, gather', see the discussion in Hashimoto 1992.

And so, feeding his own gullet and his hawk, lit. 'feeding together (= with) his own gullet also his hawk.' Cf. J. Street's somewhat different interpretation in Street 1981, 152; and Oz', 1, 149-151, n. 5.

'He got through that year', i.e. through that winter, as it is stated in the sectional summary (Y'1, 17a).

§ 27 'He starved his hawk and let it loose.' For Mongol hunting (including hawking) as described in 13th century sources, see Harayama 1972, 41f; Katayama 1982; Jacquesson 2000; and below, nn. 54 and 115.

'Every tree stamp (qoq'ulas) ... Every dead tree (hiiñj'ulaas)...' For qoq'ulas, plural of qoq'ula (= mo. qoq'ula, qoq'ula) 'tree stump', see Oz', 1, 152-153, n. 2. Hiiñj'ulaas is the plural of hiiñj'ule, glossed in the interleaved version as 'dried-up tree' (c). At', 7a, has uññigêle (not uññigêle, as in ATL, 19), no doubt a scribal error for uññigêle. Poppe 1969, 271, writes hiiñj'ule but does not discuss its transcription or meaning. This term is undoubtedly related to the word hiiñj'ula of §§ 196, 247, 251 and 272 meaning 'dead, rotten tree/wood' (see V Sup. 1, 2a, 13a: Sup. 2, 20b; the form found in AT', 110b, is uññigêle, cf. ATL, 181. The 'uññigêle' of AT', 78, line 3428, 79, line 3492, and 223a, is not correct. Unfortunately, these forms with initial h are likewise not discussed in Pelliot 1925. Pelliot was obviously in doubt regarding the correct reading of the words in question, as can be seen in Pe, 8 (§ 27: hiiñj'ulaas), 71 (§ 196: hiiñj'ula, n. 5: 'Corr. hiiñj'ula'), 99 (§ 247: hiiñj'ula; n. 7: 'Corr. hiiñj'ula'), 101 (§ 251: hiiñj'ula). Cf. 129, n. 66 (to § 196), transcribes hiiñj'ula, not hiiñj'ula, but the form with front vocalism is confirmed twice by the AT'. Nevertheless, there are cases of words containing initial h in Middle and Preclassical Mongolian that underwent a passage from front to back vocalism (e.g. imere > umara 'back, north'). If hiiñj'ula > uññigêle, we obtain a verbal noun in -ûjû(-ûjû) from mo. uññi meaning 'hanging, droopy.' See Les. 87b. This interpretation was adopted in Oz', IV, 354, 357, n. 6; and it was rejected later by the same author, who reverted to the form hiiñj'ula in § 247. See Oz', VI, 216, 223-225, n. 7. Ozawa's explanation of the word hiiñj'ula as being the same as hiiñj'ula and merely a phonetic calque of qoq'ulas is, however, not very satisfactory.

The etymology of these words, as well as their exact relationship, remains unclear. Cf. Viete 1990, 385. As for Bodonçar's handling of the birds caught by his hawk, the text says only that he 'placed' (talbula) the ducks and wild geese until (or so that) all the dead wood (around) stalk (of rotten flesh). The sectional summary (Y'1, 17a) interprets this as meaning that Bodonçar 'hung' the birds which he could not consume on (the branches of) every withered old tree, so that there was stench all over. Like other investigators, I accepted this interpretation somewhat uncritically. See Ra, I, 122; cf. Pe, 125; Li, 12. However, I now regard it as unjustified and think that what Bodonçar did was to lay the dead birds on tree stumps and fallen trees around his grass hut. Cf. Cl, 6.
§ 28. Mount Dülüren has not been identified; it is, in all probability, an elevation in the mountainous area between the Onon and the Baliji (Balji) Göl; the Tüngelik Stream mentioned in this section apparently is not the river by the same name mentioned in § 5. According to Perelš, 9, it corresponds to the present-day Tengeleg Gol, or Ugalzår Tengelegin Gol, an affluent of the Balji (see above, n. 24). Cf. Badamxatan 1992, 91; JEDGMT, 14-15; CKA, 8 (F9), 55b. It is indeed difficult to reconcile the situation of the Tüngelik Qorqan of § 5 in the Sengær-Kerulen region with that of the Tüngelik Qorqan in the Balji-Onon region. However, Pelliot seems to have held the view that both § 5 and § 28 refer to the same river. See HCG, 381f.

'Kumis', i.e. fermented mare's milk (esig). On this beverage see NMP, I, 240; Mo, 26-27; MSR, 149; Underdown 1977.

'To sleep', lit. 'to spend the night' (qonqo). I

§ 29. For the correct interpretation of the passage Tede irgen] yabaldaha, see No. 4-6. See also Cleaves 1955, 28, n. 6, regarding the use of the postponed conjunction ba ... be. Cf. Street 1981, 161. For a further elaboration of the story of Bodorčar's encounter with that band of people, cf. the Chinese account in YS 1, 11-12, CH, 9.

§ 31. 'The people said', lit. 'Those people said.'

'Where he spends the night, the one really knows' (maqa qa'a qono [for qonqo] aq'a), lit. 'Who really knows (maqa) where (qa'a) he has spent the night? ' - a rhetorical question. Maqa (= pmo. mana) is a word expressing doubt, often implying a negative answer in interrogative sentences as here (\'who knows?\' = "no one knows"); but also possibility and even likelihood (\'perhaps, possibly, surely\' as in § 189 ad fin. In the classical language it is sometimes a synonym of mâyud 'really, truly.' Both maqa and maqat (= pmo. mo. mâyud) appear in the SH. See HW, 106. Maqa has disappeared in the later literary language, coalescing with mo. mâyud. See 'Trois documents', 463, 474; Matériel II, 16, 57. In view of the above, I have rendered maqa in the SH (§§ 31, 141, 155, 167, 189, etc.; see R, 263a) in different contexts, keeping in mind that this word cannot be semantically disassociated from maqa. Qa'a 'where' corresponds to pmo and mo. qamija (= qamija). The mno. form qa'a of the SH (§§ 31, 83, 174, 194) and the HIIY (IIA, 6a) are due to qamija > qa'ma > qa'a > qa. For tsa > d, and tsu > ils (qamija = qamija), see IMCS, 64; SG, 198, for mno. qa'ma, 102.

In Middle Mongolian we find the form qama (= qamâ), as well as qama (= qamâ). See VMII, 42. Cf. the modern forms xos. xamâ (kh., bur.), xamâ (kalm.), qa, xamâ (ord.). Qamâ < qamija; qâna < qa (< qamija) + the local adverbial suffix -nail -ne; cf. GWM, 58, § 213). See KMG, 44, § 71 (19). The reading qamija of the SH is confirmed by AT7, 7b (§ 31), 19b (§ 83) and 54b (§ 174). However, Shi 1, 19a; OZ, I, 392; Ba, I, 44; and El-Ar, 50, give the written form of qa'a as qaya by transcribing a'sa as aya (cf. IMCS, 60). This establishes a form qaya alongside qamija which in my view (and pace OZ, IV, 3:07, n. 10) is not justified, for the latter is only form, together with qamija, attested in Preclassical Mongolian. See the Preclassical Mongolian version of the Hsiao-ching: qamija: and the fragmentary Mongolian poem from Turfan: qamija (MPH2, 110, 186; Poppe 1959/60, 262, 271, n. 29). With regard to Written Mongolian, DO, 320a (s.v. gil) gives both qaya and qamija. Kow., 804a, gives only qamija, qamija-y, but on p. 732b we find the entry 'qaya yaya tr'acarente, de temps en temps, quelquefois', and on p. 819a 'qaya, qaya yaya un jour, parfois, quelquefois, ci et là' (cf. GOL, II, 57c). Les., 905a, has the entry 'xay-a, 2. See xami-y, 1 ... jay-a = xja = xja. Here and there, now and then, from time to time, occasionally.' See also ibid., 923b: 'xami-y, 1, [= xam-y; x = xa] adv. Where', Further, Kow., 736a. registers the entry 'qayasi kereg quelque chose, d'une maniere quelconque, etc.' Les., 907b, has 'xayasi' referring the reader to 'xamiyas'; the entry on p. 924a, 'xayasi'
to ensure proper leadership (and, ultimately, the order of society), see Vlad’, §3 and n. 8, TOG, xxv, 517 (nos. 155, 156; cf. FO, 539, nos. 155, 156); Aubin 1975, 507 and n. 19; Jackendoff 1977, 28; Khomonov 1981, 57; Cernosekdom 1969. 94, WTY, 11. | For an old Russian saying which is but a variation on the same theme, cf. the Lay of Igor’s Campaign (Slovo o polku Igor’evе), where we read, ‘It is difficult for a head to the body to be without shoulders. But it is also a misfortune for the body to be without a head.’ See MRECT, 189.) Bugs Qangzi was no doubt acquainted with this saying, but paid no attention to it because he could not relate it to anything: he merely took it as an inane utterance of his simple-minded brother. It should be noted that the term ‘collar’ (faqua – this word can also mean ‘cape’), see Serruys 1957, 154 and n. 56; TMEN, no. 1802) was used metaphorically for ‘leader’, as in §126. Cf. ch. ling 亦 ʻneck, collar; to lead’ in expressions like ling-hsiu 結繫; ‘collar and sleeve’ → ‘leader’. ‘Did not attach any importance to these words of his’; lit. ‘these words of his, he did not regard them even as anything.’ See Mo, 71. Cf. Street 1990, 179: ‘His older brother Bugs Qangzi was unable to make anything of that remark of his’; and On, 7, more freely: ‘His words had no effect on his older brother Bugs-Qangzi.’ §34. ‘When he repeated the same words’, lit. ‘Again, when he spoke the same words.’ ‘Ignored them’, lit. ‘not regarding them even as anything.’ Cf. above, n. 33. ‘To which’, lit. ‘at those words’. ‘What kind of words are those you have just been repeating?’, lit. ‘What same words have you been saying since a little while ago?’ Tuyar (= mo. tuyar) means ‘just (or right) now; just, before; earlier, a little while ago’, referring to the immediate past. Cf. Gantogtok 1990, 125. §35. ‘High and tuusun’, lit. ‘head and hoof.’ Si’ina ‘hoof’ = mo. epistle id. In general, this term designates that section of the
animal’s leg comprising foot, shin and ankle, with the skin (N.P., p.c.). Cf. DO, 621b. See Vlad, 83.

For the verb hu ‘af (p.no. aqil-) ‘to run, ride ahead or fast (against)’ → ‘to raid, capture, attack’, cf. HW, 63 and 74, 75 (with considerable confusion among the entries); Pelliot 1925, 203-204, no. 5; Mo, 202, n. 184, Letters, 39-40.

§ 36. For the verb eyetiqudu ‘to take counsel with, consult with’, see the pertinent remarks in Cleaves 1986, 193-194, n. 15. Cf. below, n. 191. The account of these events in YS 1, 2, is shorter and somewhat different. See CH, 9.

§ 37. ‘As a scout.’ The word algincı ‘scout, spy’ is an important military term and one, like manglai ‘forehead’ → ‘vanguard’, frequently occurring in the SH (see R, 182a, 262b), sometimes also with the meaning of ‘advance guard or party, vanguard’ (see, e.g., §§ 123, 179, 195, 276, 279). This word is possibly related to tu. aqqa-, aqqa-, aqqa- ‘to praise’; cf. ma algındımbı id. < algı ‘rumour, hearsay, fame, renown’? > ‘knowledge, information, intelligence.’ Cf. TH, 90 (= JYT, 160); Če, 287, n. 36. Both algıncı and its derivative verb algıncilı ‘to reconnoitre; to be (form) the vanguard’ are not found in Written Mongolian and the dialects. They are, in fact, omitted or misunderstood in the AT text of the SH. The word algıncı deserves further investigation. The connotations of the terms algıncı and manglai are discussed in Hasumi 1982 where, however, the explanation of algıncı is not wholly convincing. Cf. also Róna-Tas 1986, 136-137. For algıncı ‘vanguard’, see Poppe 1967, 569, no. 2; Rassadin 1995, 113.

§ 38. ‘Reconnoitring’, lit. ‘as a scout’, see above, n. 37. ‘To which clan do you belong?’, cf. above, n. 15, and Ordosica, 53, n. 29.

For the Uriangkai tribe, see above n. 9. Here we are dealing with a branch or subtribe of the Uriangkai called the Adanggaa(n) Urianggaa (or Urianggaa/Urianggat; see above, n. 12); cf. above, n. 8, the case of the Qori Tumat. An Adanggaa Urianggaa tribesman is also mentioned in § 44 as the putative father of Je‘ured. Cf. Jackendoff 1977, 24ff. (however, Jackendoff, p. 24, misinterprets ‘Mystaarten in Mo, 5, regarding ‘Bodonal’s hosts’ as being Urianggais). We have no information about the Jarc'ut, but in § 97 the story is told of how Old Jarc'uted of the Urianggai tribe, coming from Burqan Qaldun, brought his son Jelme to Temulin. His name indicates that he was an Urianggai tribesman of the Jarc'ut clan, we may therefore assume that the woman captured by Bodonal was also a member of the same Jarc'ut clan, belonging to a subgroup of the Urianggai, which, as we know, was a tribe spread over a wide territory.

§ 39. ‘Got enough livestock, people to serve them, and a place to live’, lit. ‘attained to livestock and food (ada‘a ‘ide‘en, see above, n. 23), subject people and servants (haran tutqar), living and dwelling.’ For gir- ‘to reach, attain to’ = ‘to obtain a sufficiency of’; cf. below, n. 118. Haran tutqar (= p.no. aran tudqar) may be compared to the expression gergen tutqar ‘domestics and servants’ of § 124, and gergen tudqar id. of the Preclassical Mongolian version of the Hisiao-ching; see Cleaves 1949a, 522-525. The term haran (pl. harar) = peno and mo aran, arad, designated both the ‘people’ = ‘the common people’, i.e. the ordinary tribesmen, and ‘people doing service for others’ (= ger, Diensteleute), obviously because this was normally the case with the former group; cf. mo. aran kibegın ‘servants’. However, to render haran tutqar menin as ‘servants’ is, I think, to restrict too much the meaning of this expression. In spite of various attempts to trace the origin of the word tutqar ‘servant’ to Turkish, its etymology remains obscure. Cf. TH, 268 (= JYT, 464); Öz, I, 183-184, n. 2. For the term haran (aran), see Vlad, 2, 280a; H/CWLYT, 152-153, no. 42; VMI, 34; RH, 203, no. 9; Fletcher 1986, 16, and below, n. 147.

From an examination of §§ 23-39 of the SH one can deduce that after Alan Qo’a’s death and Bodonal’s departure from home the family fortunes must have declined. This may account for Bugu Qatagi’s search for Bodonal, and for the subsequent
§ 40. From this paragraph on we have more explanations of personal and clan names based on popular etymologies relying, as we noted before, on sound affinity. Thus Jajrada, Jadaran and Jadardai are related to the word jāt (πάμ. jād) meaning ‘foreign, other (different),’ possibly with the addition of jāran ‘people,’ thus Jadaran < jād + jāran. Jajrada is the ethnonym of Jajarat or Jajar, a form no doubt related to Jadaran (pl. *Jadar) through an intermediate form *Jadrin or *Jadrat. Cf. HCG, 28-29; Oz. I, 186, n. 1; Cleaves 1956, 273, n. 784; Poppe 1975, 162; and on Jadaran – Jajar in Bese 1988, 23-24.

For ebīge ‘ancestor,’ see Lettres, 65.

‘Of that Jadara,’ i.e. ‘of that man of the Jadaran clan,’ namely Jajrada. For the word jāt < tu. jat ‘foreign, irrelevant,’ cf. Poppe 1955, 39; MSR, 132; Oz. I, 186, n. 1. On the value of these (often fictitious) genealogies, see Pelliard’s pertinent remarks in HCG, 344.

For the position of clan members in early Mongol society whose paternity was doubtful, see Vlad, 64.

In the genealogy given in this section, Jamaqua of the Jadaran, the great friend and then rival and foe of Cinggis Qan, is only four generations removed from Bodoncar. This is certainly incorrect. Cf. HCG, 27. Qara Qada’an (‘Black Qada’an’): Qada’an was a common name in Mongolian, formed on qada ‘rock’ + the nominal suffix -an (see Bese 1974, 92. For Jamaqua, see below, n. 104; cf. also n. 141.

§ 41. The clan name Ba’arin (πάμ. Bayararin) and its ethnonym Ba’aradai (πάμ. Bayaradai) are erroneously related in folk etymology to the verb hari: ‘to seize, catch; to take by force, abduct,’ while Menen is related to mene in the expression mene metii which is glossed in the interlinear translation as ‘uncomfortably or undeniably numerous (in terms of times or quantity), overburdened’ (§ 9). In § 26 the same expression is glossed ‘incessantly, pressingly, repeatedly’ (§ 26). In Written Mongolian mene means ‘there! here! suddenly, immediately, just like that, really so.’ Cf. Les., 356a; Gol., III, 213b. N. Poppe (p.c.) rendered the expression mene metii as ‘in the same way, likewise; in great numbers.’ Cf. Cleaves’ rendering ‘as if in heaps’ (Cl. 8). Cf. also Oz., I, 188, n. 3, 197, n. 1; Cleaves 2001a, 22, n. 11; TH, 224 (= JYT, 386). However, metii(n) as such does not seem to be attested in the ancient language and is one of the words deserving further study. As pointed out by Ligeti (LI, 142), the derivation Ba’arin < hari- is inadmissible. For the Ba’ar, see HCG, 34, 300; Cleaves 1956, 202, n. 2; Serruys 1986. On Ba’aradai see Poppe 1975, 162, and below, n. 216.

Boké (π. bëkë) means ‘strong man, wrestler,’ wrestlers being then, as now, chosen from among the strongest men in the land. This word has retained both meanings in the living languages and dialects; see, e.g. DO, 85b ad fin.; MED, 63b. Cf. Les., 126b; TMEN, no. 803.

For polygamy in early Mongol society, see Ratchnevsky 1987, 71.

§ 42. ‘From Belginutel stormed the Belginutel clan; from Bügünütel the Bügünütel clan; etc.,’ lit. ‘Belginutel was the ancestor of those with the clan name Belginutel, Bügünütel was the ancestor of those with the clan name Bügünütel, etc.’

For the Belginutel, see HCG, 398; Bese 1988, 20; for the Bügünütel, see ibid., 21. For Buq Qatagi and the Qatagin (= Qataqin) – Qadagin, see the important note by Pelliot, ibid., 393-397; and Poppe 1975, 165. The Qatagin were closely
related to the Saljīt clan, see HCG, 394, 397-400, and the other references listed on p. 462a; Bese 1988, 33; and Poppe, loc. cit. See also QA’AT, passim. In the present passage the name of the eponymous ancestor is written Buqatu Saljiī pro Buqatu Saljiī; cf. §§ 17, 19, 23.

Bodōncār is presented here as the ancestor of the Borjigūi clan – the royal clan of the Mongol tribe – but the clan name Borjigūi is already attested in the ethnico-linguistic Borjigūi in the Qanūrū tribe, who was Qanūrū’s son (see § 3) and the great-grandfather of Bodōncār. On this question, see HCG, 118; for the Borjigūi clan, see also the references given above, n. 3.

§§ 43, 44. According to Rasīd al-Dīn, Bodōncār had two sons called Buqat and Buqatā (SL2, U2, 17); Barīm Šīrātū Qabīchī is listed (ibid., 29) as the second son of Tumbina Xan, i.e. the Tumbina Selon of the SH, §§ 47-48. Barim Šīrātū, lit. ‘having the Legs the Size of a Fist’, i.e. very short-legged, was Qabīchī’s nickname. See Cleaves 149a, 506; Bese 1978, 360, no. 9; Būrīhānī 1991, 110, 127. For the title ba’ataur (= mo. buyāntur) ‘brave, valiant’ added to his name, see below, n. 50. According to YS1, 1, 2, Bodōncār had one son, Barim Šīrātū Qabīchī, who was the father of Menen Tudun. Cf. CH, 9. On Barim Šīrātū Qabīchī’s genealogy, see below, n. 45, and Liger 1972, 9.

“Bodōncār also took as concubine a housemaid of Qabīchī Ba’ataur’s mother, who had come as dowry”, lit. “Bodōncār took as concubine (tātufu bule) the one who had come as infe of Qabīchī Ba’ataur’s mother.” Infe is glossed as ‘one who follows the bride’ (ØR18), i.e. the person who goes with the bride as part of her dowry. These persons were domestic personnel (servants, householders, cooks, and the like) forming at times entire families and consisting, in the case of the chiefs’ daughters, of hundreds of individuals. For this institution, see the extensive literature cited in n. 208 below.

For Je’uret (ethnico of Je’uret) and the Je’uret, see HCG, 448a (index); Poppe 1975, 162. It is not clear whether Je’uret should be read Jeʿūrēt in view of AT’, 8b: Jegiūriyed. Cf. HCG, 142, St, 8, n. 69; a, 15; Jegiūriyed; Ce, 43: Jegiūriyed. The text actually has Je’ūret (= Je’uret). Cf. the forms nēca for nūtāca. See below, n. 170. For the clan name Jeʿūret, cf. also Poppe 1975, 166.

‘Could take part in the ḏugeli, lit. ‘was in the position (orun) of having ḏugeli’, i.e. was eligible to participate in the sacrifice. This is the interpretation of the words ḏugeli oron bule’ proposed by N. Poppe (p. c.). For the reading ḏugeli-dur for ḏugeliṭa, originally proposed by Śrīnātū (see Shi 1, 25b), and orun taken as converb module of orun ‘to enter’ following the Chinese interlinear gloss, see Oz, 1, 190, 193, n. 6 (1). ḏugeli-dur is the reading found in AT’, 8b; however, none of the editions of Y supports the emendation nor does the interlinear gloss indicate that this word is in the dative-locative case. The reading ḏugeli-di of Bese 1986, 241, is unlikely, because the suffix -(a)-tul-(-dul-di) is unknown to the language of the SH and the HIIY, although attested in the MA. See R, 218a, 320a; SMD, 33; Kurnabashi 2002. Whatever the reading (still doubtful), the meaning of the sentence is not affected and is perfectly clear.

The term ḏugeli designating this particular ceremony is glossed in the interlinear translation as ‘to hang meat on (lit. “with”) a pole and sacrifice to Heaven’ (以竿懸養於天). For the etymology of ḏugeli (= ḏugeliṭ), see the remarks in Bese 1986, 242-243, and below, n. 272. The word ḏugeli is registered in Kow, 243a4, with the first meaning of ‘mounton suspends at a pole’, i.e. the ‘hide of a sacrificial animal with the head and legs raised on a long pole’. See BRS, 270b. For a more detailed description we must turn to BDS, 55b-55a. According to this work, ḏugeli consists of the head, the four limbs, the skin and the tail of the sacrificial animal, cut off from the body and in the fashion of a stuffed animal, which is placed on a birch pole stuck firmly in the ground. The head of the animal is decorated
with many-coloured ribbons and fur bark is placed between its teeth. The animal is left on the pole until it is totally disintegrated through rotting and weathering. The beliefs relating to this ceremony among the Buriats as described in BSZST show a contamination with Buddhism (concept of transmigration) which must be due to later influence. For further details and bibliographical references to this sacrifice, see the informative article by Bese on the subject (Bese 1986). As indicated by the historical data collected by Boyle, this form of sacrifice, in which the victim is usually a horse, was widely practised among various peoples of Inner Asia from ancient until recent times as a funeral ceremony and as an offering to Heaven, i.e. to the Sky-God Tengri. See Boyle 1965 (esp. pp. 147-150); Tonika 1965, 173-174. Although the Chinese gloss referred to above confirms that *jügel* was indeed a sacrifice to Heaven, Ligeti is no doubt right in assuming that in this particular case it may have been one offered to the ancestors of the family or the tribe, since Je'uredci was excluded from it because he did not really belong to the family (see § 44). See Li, 142-143, n. 43. Cf. also QAQAT, 6 et passim. Poppe (op.c.) saw this sacrifice still carried out among the Ekhirisi-Buriats of the Baikal in 1932. See Bese 1986, 243 and n. 3. Cf. IBS, 249; Chihoodo 1992, 133; Gantogtox 1994, 147-150.

Regarding the paternity of Je'uredci, cf. the doubts surrounding the paternity of Alan Qo't's three sons born after the death of Dobun Mergen, their paternity attributed to 'the man of the Ma'alig Baya'ut' (§ 18). In the present instance, it was the case of a son (Ja'irada) siring a child (Je'uredci) from one of his father's secondary wives. This must have been a fairly common occurrence. For the Andaqna Uraingpat, see above, n. 38. Cf. Jackendorff 1977, 24-26.

'Was constantly in the house (lit. "in the tent").' For *dara'a* (*pomo. daraya* 'constantly'), see Cleaves 1953a, 246-249; idem 2001c, 99, n. 102.

'They made him take the clan name Je'ureyit.' As noted by Aubin 1975, 561, n. 86, it seems that in the ancient Mongol society it was the custom for an illegitimate son of a noble household to leave the family at the time of the division of the family patrimony and to establish a new clan, of which he became the eponymous ancestor. Cf. Vdl', 63.

The names Je'uredci, Je'ureyit and Je'uret are all related, in popular etymology and merely on assonance, with the word *jügel*.

§ 45. The genealogy given in this section is at variance with that found in AT and SL. See *Chapitre CVII*, 14-17, nn. 6, 9, 11; Ligeti 1972, 9-10 and n. 17; HCG, 54, 65, 75, 107, and below, n. 46.

For the epithet *tudun* (an old Turkic title of Chinese origin) in the name Menen Tudun, see TMEN, no. 1194; Essedy 1965, 89; de Rachewiltz 1969, 285, n. 16; Bese 1974, 94-95; and, most important, Oda 1987. The names Qüli, Qüli'ii and Qüli'ün are regarded as variants of the noun *qüli* (ui) 'strange'; see Bese 1974, 93. For the etymology of Qüli'ün see HCG, 395.

For Qulaldii (< *qara* 'black' + *alii*), see Poppe 1975, 163. Cf. above, n. 40.

For *kolluk* (= *mo. kiliiq*) 'steed' — 'hero' and its etymology, see HCG, 340; NHNO, 59; Poppe 1955, 40; TMEN, no. 1686.

For the word *nuclir* 'falcon' (*Falco peregrinus*), see TMEN, no. 1728, Mo, xviii.

§ 46. The genealogy given in this section is again at variance with those found in other sources. According to the SH, Qaidu was the son of Mother Nomolun (Nomolun Eke), wife of Qaz Külük; however, according to Rašid al-Dīn (SLI, 12/2, 18-20), Monolun (= Monolun) was the wife of Dutum Menen (= Menen Tudun), from whom she had nine children, Dutum Menen being the son of Buqa, Bodonar's eldest son. According to the AT, Qubintii (called Barim Sigratu Qubidii Bayat or SH Barim Sīrātu Qubitii) had a son named Bekir Bayat, not mentioned in the SH, who was the father of Maqa Tudun (= Menen Tudun). Menen Tudun married Nomulan Turun (= Nomolun Eke), mother of his seven children. Cf. ATI, 8b; Ligeti 1972, 9-10.
and n. 17. According to YS¹ 1, 2, Menen Todun’s wife Monolon also bore seven children. The story of Monolon and her children has no counterpart in the SH. Indeed, both Raśid al-Din and the YS have a lot to say about Monolon/Monolon, Nā’in (= Nā’in – according to Raśid’s account the uncle of Qaḍa, but according to YS an elder brother of Qaḍa’s) and Monolon’s youngest son Qaḍa. See YS¹ 1, 2-3. Cf. CW, I2-14; EM, 37-40. On Raśid’s authority, supported by the YS (YS¹ 1, 3), Qaḍa is the first Mongol tribal chief to establish control over other tribes and to assume, on the strength of that, the title of qan. See SL², I2, 20ff. It should be noted, however, that no such title is conferred on him by the SH account. For the name Nomolon (Monolon through metathesis), formed on nomen ‘mole-cat or rodent mole (Myosélmus)’ + the denominal noun suffix -lan, see Poppe 1975, 164; Bese 1980, 319, no. 9; and Rybatski [2003], s.v.

The origin of the clan name Noyakind and of the name of its founder Noyakinda is explained on the basis of popular etymology with the word noyamık (= noyamik; pmo. noyamisju) ‘acting like a chief’, or ‘prendre des airs de noble’ [A.M.]. Cf. On, 9: ‘lordly.’ For the term noyam, see above, n. 8. On the Noyakind, see HCG, 33. Cf. Poppe 1975, 165; Bese 1988, 28-29. Likewise the Barulas and its chief Barulata were so called because the latter was a ‘voracious eater’ (or ‘glutton’; bara). For this clan name, see Poppe, loc. cit.; Bese, loc. cit. On the word bara and the name Barulas, cf. Ligeti 1966, 132, 136, n. 22; TMEN, no. 86. For the Barulas, see also Grupper 1992/94. Eredentis means ‘knowledgeable, able’; and the meaning of taši’en is probably ‘belt loops on trousers.’ Cf. HCG, 126, 157; Les., 831b-832a. The Buda-at got their name because they did not observe seniority (lit. ‘did not have a head [= chief’] when they cooked (lit. ‘stirred!’) porridge (buda-an, mo. buduvan, ‘gruel made with millet’). The meaning is: at mealtimes they did not observe distinctions of rank and rules of precedence, and each one tried to grab as much of the food as possible [A.M.]. Cf. Ligeti 1971, 145; for the Buda-at, see HCG, 64-65. The Adargin, or Adarkin, and their clan founder Adarkin, got theirs because Adarkin ‘spread slanders’ (adar-) among his brothers. Adarkin is called Adar Mergen in SL², I2, 30-31. For the name Adar, cf. Cleaves 1951, 93, n. 103. For this clan name and Adarkin, see Poppe 1975, 162, 165; Bese 1988, 17-18. On the passage relating to this clan and the corresponding passage in the AT, see Ligeti 1972, cf. Mo., 169-172, n. 155. See also § 164.

For the Uura’at and the Mangut, see HCG, 32-33, 167-169, Šastina 1975, 234-235; Bese 1988, 39 and 27-28 respectively.

Dçoqolidai (⇒ Dçoqolidai < doqlangi means ‘lame, limping.’ Cf. ‘Trois documents’, 473; Mo., 103; Popp 1975, 162.

§ 47. Bai Śingqor Đošlin means ‘As Fierce (or Crue) as the Rich Gerfalcon.’ See Cleaves 1949a, 507. ‘Rich Gerfalcon’ (bai āingqor < tu ‘ [be] rich’ and mno. āingqor ‘gerfalcon’) is the designation of a particular kind of grey, which however cannot be identified with any degree of certainty. In modern Turkish it designates the same falcon (Falco biarmicus) of Asia Minor, but the latter is not found in Central Asia and Mongolia. See TEL, 1195b, s.v. ‘āingqor.’ Cf. VWTI, IV, 1940. On āingqor, see also below, n. 54. For a different interpretation of the name Bai Śingqor Đošlin, see Bese 1978, 351-358, no. 6.

Regarding the passage on Cəraqa Lingqu, the text actually reads ‘The sons of Cəraqa Lingqu, Sγggum Bilge and (–an; see below, n. 72) Ambqaqai, took the clan name Tāyil’ül.’ However, Ambqaqai was not the son of Cəraqa, but of Sγggum Bilge (cf. the sectional summary in Y¹ 1, 29b; and § 52), as shown by Pelliot (Pelliot 1940/41, 5-7; HCG, 132-133), the text has a lacuna at this point which can be filled by the corresponding section in AT; 9b. The amended text reads: Cəraqa Lingqu yin kā’ān Sγggum Bilge bül’e Sγggum Bilge-yin kā’ān Ambqaqai Qa’ān kə’ilən Tāyil’ül abqogol bolba. Cf. Li, 143, n. 47, Ligeti 1972, 9; Clark 1978, 42-43; MNTLAT, 16; Street 1968/687, 35 (43), renders the SH passage: ‘The son of Cəraqa-Lingqu was Sγggum-Bilge; [he, with
others including [his son] Ambaqai, formed the Tayebiud clan.

However, this rendering is forcing the grammar of the text. On Čaraqgi Lingqä (< lingqam << ch. ling-kung etc.>) a polite designation of the Grand Secretary, here used as an honorary title), see HCG, 23-24; Chapitre CVII, 11-12, n. 2; 13-14, n. 5. For Čauqin Orqegi see below. In the name Tumbinai Selcen, see also the epithet ‘wise, prudent’; see TMEN, n. 207. See in Ev-POP, 47, Tumbini is rendered as ‘Mathiìu’; i.e. ‘Heavy-jowled’, but I do not know on what authority. On this personage, see HCG, 53, 54, 65; and below, n. 48. The name Senggam Bilge is composed of senggam (< senggän << ch. hsing-kang etc.>) a polite designation of the minister and also a complimentary title given to members of the gentry) and of the epithet bilge, a Turkish borrowing meaning ‘wise.’ See HCG, 334, 250; and Pelliot 1930b, 45-46; idem 1944b, 54; TMEN, nos. 1221, 1274; HCSL, 434; Pritsk 1988, 170. On Senggam Bilge, cf. also HCG, 14, 132-133; and below, n. 162.

On Ambaqai (‘Islati in AT, 9b, the Hambaqai Qan of Rašid al-Dīn) and one of the important Tayächi ut tribe, see HCG, 464b and 465b, s.vv. ‘Tayächi ut’, ‘Tayächi and ‘Tayächi ut’; Poppe 1975, 165; Clark 1978, 33-39; Yoshida 1986; S. Sinkevič in EMT, 1, 61-69; and below, n. 52. For the section devoted to the Tayächi ut in Rašid’s work, see SL, 1/1, 180-183; for Ambaqai and his descendants, cf. also ibid., 1/2, 22ff. Ambaqai’s widows are mentioned in § 70.

For the SH form berigen (= mo. berigen) ‘wife of an elder brother’, cf. dag. berigen id. See TMEN, no. 88; Puščevč̣ Bašanbham 1996, 157. The word berigen is in accordance with the name Besitai and the Berend clan, on which see HCG, 156; cf. DO, 67b.

On Čauqin (AT, 9b id.) Orqegi and his descendants, from whom originated several important clans, such as the Oronar, Qongqotan, Arulat, Sünit, Qutbqaras and Geniges, see the relevant entries in HCG; Chapitre CVII, 12-13, n. 3; Hambis 1975, 40-41; TMEN, no. 18 (Arulat); CCL, 54-60; and Bese 1988, 32 (Qutbqaras). Cf. also Cleaves 1949a, 507. (The reading Čuqin in CI, 10, is incorrect.)

For the lineage of Qaidu, from his three children to Yisigei and Därüq Túcig, see the section in Chapitre CVII, 10-23, which contains the important commentary by Pelliot.

§ 48. The information handed down by Rašid al-Dīn continues to be at variance with that of the SH. The former ascribes nine sons to Tumbinai Selcen, two of whom (the sixth and fourth respectively) correspond to the Sem Selçük and Qubul Qan (read Qan) of the SH. See SL, 1/2, 29-30. However, the SH form Sem Selçük is erroneous; the correct form of the name is Sam (or Sem ?) Qacilai). See Cleaves 1949a, 507-508; Pelliot’s remarks in HCG, 53-55, and Chapitre CVII, 14-15, n. 7, 16. n. 10, also with regard to the conflicting genealogies. As noted by Pelliot, in the genealogical tradition there has been an obvious confusion between the lineages of Menen Tudun and Tumbinai: in SL, 1/2, 30, Sam (Senn) Qacilai is actually called Sam (Sem) Qacilai, the second element of this name being in reality the name of Menen Tudun’s fifth son and the father of Adärkudai (see above, n. 45).

For Bülteči (read Bultuči) Ba’atar, see HCG, 54-55. His son was Mergen Sechen, whose name is suppressed in the SH. Rašid is also silent about him. However, he has been preserved in the AT (AT, 9b). Cf. Ligeti 1972, 10.

Qubul is erroneously called qan; he was only a qan, like Qutula (who in the SH is twice called Qutula Qan and three times Qutula Qan). Cf. above, n. 1; and YS’ 1, 3, where he is correctly named Qubul Qan. There is a fairly long account on Qubul Qan in SL, 1/2, 32-36; he, like his great-grandfather Qutula, obviously played an important role in Mongol tribal history before Činggis Qan. Cf. EM, 40-43; G[Q], 8-9 (= CK, 9, 10); and below, n. 52.

As for Qubul’s lineage, Rašid’s account also ascribes seven sons to him. On them, see the relevant entries in HCG (in particular pp. 19-21, 66-67, 76-78, 117-118); Chapitre CVII, 17-
the Chinese sources, such as the SWCCL, the YS, and others, where the transcription p'ieh-chi 筆記 = begi, not beki. The reliability of the Chinese transcription can of course be questioned, particularly in view of the fact that in most cases where the SWCCL has beki the SH has beki; furthermore, while for example the title of Tului's wife Sorqagan (→ pmo Sorqagan) is regularly beki in Chinese (except for the SH, cf. § 186), the Persian sources always write begi. However, the SH form beki is not conclusive, because in the SH system of transcription no. g is often rendered by k (e.g. SH niken for nigen, ketul- for getul- et al., see 'Quelques problèmes', 240-243); moreover, begi 'prince' is the form also found in the earliest Mongol-Chinese vocabulary (MKJY, 8a; cf. Kara 1990, 284). Begi cannot, therefore, be dismissed as an aberrant form. I think that we are dealing here with the one and only honorific title conferred on both men and women (cf. e.g. 'the Honourable'), and with a clear case of alternation beki ~ begi (for a completely hypothetical foot); see §§ 197, 257. In my view, this alternation reflects the phonetic bias of the early transcribers — often persons of Turkish background (or who used Uighurs and other Turks as informants) — who were probably influenced by the well-known Turkic title beg 'noble, lord' (on which cf. Pritsker 1908, 764); moreover, in Uighur-Mongol script beki and begi are distinguishable. (It is not even clear whether the name, or epithet, transliterated as P'KY occurring in Old Turkic proper names should be read Begi or Begi. Cf. CBIMP, 111a: DTS, 95, s.v. 'begi'; see also BT, II, 367a.) This problem deserves further investigation.

For Taïçu, see HGC, 66-67, 180-181. As for the clan Yürki – Jürki, often mentioned in the SH as the Jürkin or 'the Jürkin people', its subsequent clash with Çaïgis Qan, and the defeat and death of Saçta Begi and Taïçu are described in §§ 130-136. Cf. also § 139 for the folk etymology of their clan name.
that all the Kiyan descend from Mönggetu Kiyan, i.e. from Barton Ba’atar’s son (ibid., 49). This complex question, and the relationship between the Kiyan (Kiyan) and the Borjigin, has been discussed in Vidal, 89; Yamaguchi 1951; Sumura 1973; and Murakami 1952. Mönggetu means ‘Who Has Beauty Spots (or Moles).’ Möngge = mungge ‘beauty spot, mole, blemish.’ See HCG, 117; TMEN, no. 378. Cf. below, n. 68.

For Nekin Taisi, see HCG, 184-185. For the title taisi of Chinese origin (tai-shih 諭馨 ‘Grand Instructor’ > mmuo. taisi, prmo. taisi > mo. ‘uyinsi, where s = 8), see Pelliot 1930b, 44-45; Tom CM 1935, 446-475; HCG, 13, 149-151, 184; Ecsedy 1965, 89; TMEN, no. 249; Serruys 1977. It should be noted that here, as elsewhere in the SH (§§ 53, 54, 56, 58, 122, 130, 152, 170, 171, 177, 179), this title is confused with that of ilt-i-зу ‘Heir Apparent’ (mmuo. taisidi, taisi, prmo. taisi [where s = 1] > mo. tayun). Cf. MMAHS, 114. Note 137; Cleaves 1964/65, 55-56, n. 32; Kara 1964, 162, n. 45. Whereas in IR 1 adopted the transcription taisi to conform with the ilt-i-зу, in the present translation I have restored the correct original reading taisi (which is confirmed by Rašãl-ad-Din) throughout.

On the basis of the Chinese transcription, the name of Činggis Qan’s father can be read either Yisüge or Yeseüge, and scholars’ opinions are divided on this point. See HCG, 1-2. I have opted in favour of the former mainly on the strength of the reading Yisüngge of the so-called ‘Stone of Chinggis’, i.e. the stele in honour of Činggis Qan’s nephew Yisüngge, and the form Yisüte of the SH. See de Rachewiltz 1974, 191; idem 1976, 500, n. 24. Moreover, the word for ‘wine’ from which these names derive is regularly written yisun, not yisın, in Peceslān Mongolian. Cf. e.g. Weiren 1967, 16, Text A, line 1; Herrmann & Doerfer 1975, 70, line 28. Cf. also Bese 1974, 92-93. The Persian-Arabic descriptions are ambiguous in this respect, but al-Umari has Yisükai (MW, 92), and so has the Mu‘izz. Finally, RH, 242, no. 3, gives likewise yisun. I think that although the Peceslān Mongolian form of the name was undoubtedly Yisüge, the contemporary Middle Mongolian
pronunciation may well have been Yisügei - Yesügei, the alternation yi - ye reflecting dialect variations. See IMCS, 41, 127, 162, 246.

As for the title ba'atur (= pno. mo. bayatur < tu. butur, bayatur) 'brave, valiant' which Yisügei bore (like his father), it is one of the most common epithets of the steppes 'aristocracy', either acquired through personal merit or by belonging to a noble lineage - hence one usually borne also by tribal chiefs. It has, of course, military connotations. See Vlad, 93, 280 et passim; TMEN, no. 817; ED, 313b. Cf. also BT, II, 366b; and below, n. 192. Yisügei never bore the title of qan in his lifetime; it was conferred on him posthumously. Cf. CK', 14 and n. 62.

Däräti Otlügin, the most famous of Çinggis' uncles, is called otlügin because he was the youngest son of Barton Ba'atur; cf. above, n. 48. On Däräti, whose name appears also in the form Da'urati (= Däräti, §§ 154, 242) meaning 'Who Has Sore', see Chapitre CVII, 19-20, n. 22-23; HCG, 68; Bese 1974, 92.

Büri Bökö means Bür (cf. tu. bör 'wolf') the Strong, bökö - bökö being the regular designation of an unusually strong man or athlete, hence the extended meaning of 'wrestler' that it eventually acquired. Cf. TMEN, no. 833. For Büri Bökö and the incident involving Çinggis' half-brother Belgüeti, see § 131; for another confrontation with Belgüeti and Büri's death, see § 140. On him cf. also HCG, 189-190.

'Who split open' renders qanggas čebčelqan. Cf. § 131 qanggas čebčelqan. AT' (10a, 36a) has in both instances qarsu 'assunder', an 'intensifying adverbial particle placed before verbs expressing breaking or breaking' (Les, 905a) instead of qanggas. However, qarsu is not qanggas. On the latter term, see Oz', 1, 208, n. 1; TH, 164 (= JYT, 286). I am not convinced by the interpretations proposed so far and my rendering is therefore mainly (but not entirely) based on the Chinese interlinear glosses. I would like to draw attention to Kozin's statement that qanggas (i.e. qanggas) = mo. qamqa (i.e. qamqa). See Ko, 540.

§93. Mo. qamqa, kemke means 'into pieces, assunder' (Les., 451b), and qamqala, kemkele- 'to break to pieces, smash, to make a dent' (ibid.). I suggest that the relationship between SH qanggas and mo. qamqa (=qanggas) is the same as that between SH quqas (= qyqas) and mo. qayta, or between SH quqas (= qyqas) and mo. qayta. For these words, and the function of the suffix -qas, see below, §§ 55, 72 and 101. Cf. however, Murayama 1951, 52; and Oz', 1, 208, n. 1.

In the forest (tun-tur) by (lit. 'of') the Onan', i.e. by or along the Onan (= Onon) River. The forest in question is the one mentioned in §§ 130 and 136. In § 81 the story is told of how Çinggis, then Temüjin, having been captured by the Tayi'qut, was taken to their camp which at that time was near the forest of the Onan' (see also the reference to this forest in § 82). From §§ 129-130 we can infer that the forest was in the area of the Jerene Gorge (Jerene Qebelqi) where Temüjin sought refuge after the defeat at Dalan Bajlit. We are therefore, in the mountainous region south and southeast of Burgan Qaldun (Khentii Khan) between the Kerulen and Senggii rivers and the basin of the Onon. Clearly, by 'the forest of the Onan' was meant the wooded area along the upper course of the Onon, where the river meets its first right-hand affluents such as the Egin (Ejin) Gol and the Rutchu (Baršin) Gol. This area is indeed known for its dense and rich vegetation; see Murzaev, 411. The word for 'forest' (mo. qi. ayqa) is fun, a rare word with, apparently, the specific connotation of a wooded area along a river. Cf. the Tu'ula-vin Qara Tün, or 'Black Forest by the Tu'ula', of § 96 et passim. There remains some uncertainty even with regard to its reading: tun or tun (Cleaves, for example, reads tun; see CI, 256b). The reading tân, adopted here, is based on the consistent spelling of the word in the AT and on the form tîn (< tun) 'thick forest' of the Jusu-uda Khorgin dialect of Inner Mongolia. See AT', 9b, 35b, TH, 271 (= JYT, 469-470). Cf. also Pelliot's remarks in HCG, 258.
THE SECRET HISTORY

§ 51. The eldest son of Qutila Qa'an (read Qaan) was called Joci, like the eldest son of Cinggis Qan. Both the reading and the meaning of this name have been subjects of controversy. Scholars are still divided on whether one should read Joci or Joci: Mostert, Cleaves, Ligeti, Ratchevskiys, Ozawa, Eldengilet, Ardabyl, Onson, and Taushe have adopted the former; Pelliot, Hambris, Aubin, Gaddamara, Cerensodrom, and Even and Pop the latter. The problem is discussed in detail in NHHO, 10-28. Cf., however, CK, 31, n. 124, where Ratchevskiys, siding with Poppe (HJAS 13:1950, 265) and Doerfler, TMEN, no. 167, is in favour of the reading Joci, which I also think is the correct one, the meaning almost certainly being 'guest (of honour).'

Girma'u is the Girmiya or Kirmiya of AT1, 10a. If we split this name into two words, i.e. Gir Ma'u, as Ozawa does, its meaning would be 'Dirt Bad'—certainly an unusual name, but not impossible. See CK, 21b, and Murakami's remarks in Mu, 1, 64, n. 20. Whereas Raifid al-Din knows the first and third sons of Qutila, whom he calls Joci Xan and Altan respectively, he makes no mention of the second. Cf. HCG, 124-125. For Altan ('Gold'), who appears in § 122 with the epithet aligim (being the youngest son; see above, n. 48), see ibid., 125. In the YS, the term has been written without lineage from Qutila to his son Bai Sungorq, to Tumbyina, Qaban Qan (1), Barton and the latter's son Yisigetq. See YS 1, 1, 3.

Qulan of § 48 is called here Qulan Ba'atur. As for Yeke Qeren (or Caran), he is mentioned again in §§ 169, 187, 202 and 219, always in connection with the title Qaziliq or Bariq. The two herdsman, who by reporting to Cinggis the words spoken by their master, rendered him such a great service that they were subsequently rewarded with the title and privileges of dariqan ('freeman'). See §§ 169 and 187 for the account of their deed and Cinggis's reward, and my remarks in n. 169 concerning the name Yeke Caran. The name Badai is attested in Raifid al-Din's work, but that of the second herdsman is consistently written Qaliliq, i.e. Qiiliq. See SL, I/1, 171; I/2, 124, n. 7. The Chinese transcriptions can be interpreted either way, but in at least two instances (HYC, B, 7a: YS 136, 32v) they support the form Qiliq. AT1 has Qiiliq throughout, see loc. cit. et passim (cf. ATI, 197a). On the strength of Raifid's text I adopted the form Qiliq in my earlier translation and in R, like Hoenisch and Ligeti had done in their translation. Although Pelliot 1930b, 32, writes: 'Badat et Qiililq (Qiiliq dans l' Histoire secrete)', his transcription and translation of the SH have Qiliq (Pe, 10, 128). The form adopted by Ligeti in his transcription of the text is Qiiliq (L1, 33), whereas Ozawa has Qiiliq (Oz., 1, 210), and Cleaves Qiiliq (Ct, 274a). Vlad', 87, writes Qiliq. I think that the original form of the name was indeed Qiliq (<a>Qiliq</a> 'kindness.' See ED, 75a4; DTS, 31b9.

The two Kereyit herdsmen were made dariqan (pl. darqait), a title rendered somewhat inadequately as 'freeman', cf. Cl, 11 et passim; perhaps a better rendering would be 'privileged.' If under bondage, the persons concerned were usually as a reward for meritorious services— was released from servitude and enjoyed special hereditary privileges, such as exemption from taxes as well as remission of punishment for infringements of the law (jasaq) up to nine times (see below, n. 203). The institution of dariqan is one of the cornerstones of Mongol medieval society and has been written about both in and its Turkish antecedents. See Vlad', 281a; Pelliot 1930b, 32-33; Li, 164-165, n. 187; TMEN, no. 879; BT, II, 135a; CLC, 18-46; Etani 1963; HCLWLPCT, 17-185, no. 50; Wang MS 1969; Rona-Tas 1986, 135; Pritsk 1988, 774; YShi, 26-27; Bazin & Hamilton 1991, 12. Additional references that he found in the works of the Yuan authors. For Badai and Qiliq, see also Vlad', 86-87, 125; and below n. 187. For uraq 'family, kin', hence 'issue,' cf. above, n. 11.

§ 52. 'Qaban Qan (read Qaan) rules over all the Mongols' (gumun Monggol, Qaban Qan meden abe). For the tribal name Monggol (mo pino., mo. Monggo) 'Mongol,' see above, n. 3. This sentence and the reference in the same section to
Ambaqui’s rule over ‘all the Mongols (qamaq Mongol) have been the subject of controversy. On the basis of this passage, some modern Mongolian and Soviet scholars have in fact assumed that there existed a large and important group consisting of ‘Mongol’ clans proper, ruled in succession by Qubilai Qan, Ambaqui Qan and Quitula Qan, which was actually called Xamag Mongol (= mo. Qamrog Mongol) – a pre-Cinggisid Mongol state, or state confederation, referred to also as Xamag Mongol Uls (mo. Qamrog Mongol Uulas). See IMN, 102, 109 (cf. HMPR, 99, 106); BMANM[2]; 140; and, especially, MT, I (Xamag Mongol Uls [1101-1206]). Cf. also Buell 1981, 137; Ozi, I, 212-213; and Skrynnikova 1989a. I agree with N. Munkuev that no such ‘state’ with that name existed, and that the assumption is ‘simply due to an unwarranted extrapolation from the expression qamaq Mongol of § 52, which means only “all (or the entirety of) the Mongols.’ See Munkuev 1977, 379ff. (Munkuev’s important contribution has unfortunately not been included in CPE); cf. Yao 1964, 3H, Ozawa, loc. cit.; Khazanov 1980, 30, NOW, 238; and MTSTBS, 355-356, where S. Bira also rejects the notion of a ‘state of Qamrog Mongol.’ As Munkuev points out, the expression qamaq Mongol ulas does not occur in the SH; it is found, however, in the second line of the inscription on the stele in honour of Yelbenge. Secret Reichwetl 1976, 487, for the text, and idem 1983, 275, for the revised rendering (‘the entire Mongol nation’). Since the inscription dates from 1226 at the earliest, and by then we know that the Mongol state was called Peter Mongol Ulas, ‘The Great Mongol Nation’ (or ‘The Nation of the Great Mongols’), the expression qamaq Mongol ulas (w/?) was obviously used in Cinggis Qan’s time in much the same way as when we say ‘Great Britain’ and ‘all Britain’, the former being the official designation of the state created by Cinggis, the latter merely an expression designating the multitude or totality of the peoples of that state. Cf. the expression qamaq Mongoljin (= Mongol) keiten ‘all those having the Mongolian tongue’, i.e. all those who speak Mongolian, in The

Bedistwa-a cha’-a avatar-an taycilin of 1312’ (Cleaves 1954, 54 [4-166b, line 6]; 85, I/2, n. 514); and the expression qamaq qarai ulas ‘all the vassal states’ in the Preclassical Mongol version of the Hei-khi-ching, 16a (de Reichwetl 1982, 32, 44). On these problems, cf. de Reichwetl 1983, 274-275; Hisso CC 1985; Cleaves 1986, 191, n. 4, and, more recently, de Reichwetl 1993, 94, n. 20; idem 1994, 374ff. For the term ulas see also below, n. 53. The expression qamaq Mongol ulas occurs also in ET‘, 53b (cf. ET‘, 53v27-28) with the meaning of ‘all the Mongols.’ For qamaq ulas in the ET, see ET, 1, 72, n. 105. As for the expression qamaq Mongol of § 52, cf. the expressions qamaq Mongol Tajiqlit ‘all the Mongols and Tajiqlit’ (§ 57), qamaq Merkit ‘all the Merkit’ (§§ 104, 111), and qamaq Qa’at Merkit ‘all the Qa’at Merkit’ (§ 105). In §§ 164 and 254, we find the expression qamaq ulas ‘all the people’, ‘the whole nation’, as well as ulas ulas ‘many people’, and qarai ulas ‘the entire nation’, which from the context appear to be all virtually synonymous. From the above it is quite evident, I think, that the expression qamaq Mongol in the SH refers to the totality of the ‘Mongol’ people, i.e. of all the clans or subtribes forming this tribe, and that it was not a national appellation at the time, nor did it become one later with the establishment of Cinggis Qan’s empire. (It is noteworthy that no reference to Xamag Mongol is found in MNR.) Qamrog Mongol indicates that we must take the name Mongolulsensu latos as embracing all the yasunlineages (and clans and subclans deriving from these lineages) issuing from Alan Qa’as offspring, and not sensu stricto as designating only the clan formed by the members of the Kiyat Borjigin lineage to which Cinggis belonged (see below). Cf. CK, 9-10, n. 43. In all likelihood, it is to this early confederation of ‘Mongol’ lineages that Chao Wufeng refers when he says (MTPL, 3b) that ‘Formerly there was the Meng-ku-sa’ (see C. MDII, 50; CG, 16, 19-20, 3. The leading role of Qubilai Qan is stressed by Rashid al-Din, who calls him the ‘ruler and leader of his tribes and subjects’ (SL‘, I/2, 35), thus echoing what is said about him in the SH.
lineage — with their immediate dependants of course. The SH acknowledges the close kinship of members of this lineage with the ‘collaterals’ Taych’ut relatives as evident in §§ 74, 76, etc., in which the latter are called Taych’ut aya de’ut (‘our’ Taych’ut brothers), where ‘brothers’ = cousins (of the same generation). The line of Qaud had branched off with his three sons forming lineages and clans of their own, clans that in time became fully fledged tribes, such as the Taych’ut, the Besiit, the Oronar, the Arulat, etc. On this process, cf. Vlad’, 89-92; Lattimore 1963b, 60; Munkwev 1977, 381-383. On the role of the ‘will’, i.e. personal designation in the case of succession to leadership, cf. Ratchetinsky 1987, 66, 73.

On the other hand according to Ralit al-Din, Qaud Qan’s successor was Qutula Q’an (read Qan) — Ambaqi, the great-grandson of Qaud, being only the chief of the Taych’ut — and Qutula’s successor was, in turn, Yalq’gel Ba’atar, the father of the future Cinggis Qan. See SL’, 1/2, 41ff. Ambaqi, while prominent in the Persian historian’s account, plays no part in the SH. See YS’ 1.3.

*For mede’ to know; to rule*, cf. ras. védas ‘to know; to manage, control.’ For SH meden abaa = AT meden yababa, see Aalto 1973, 34.

§ 53. The Ayiru’ut Buur’ut (or Ayiru’ut Buurl’ut) were one (or two) of the major subdivisions (subtribes) of the great and powerful Tarar tribe, whose principal habitation at this time was in the region of the two lakes Buyur (i.e. the Buir Nôr) and Kölen (i.e. the Halun or Dalai Nôr) in northeastern Mongolia and northeastern Inner Mongolia respectively. The Ayiru’ut Buur’ut lived along the Urt’ul River, the Urshun (Wurshun, Orshun, Orchun) of our maps, kh. Urtun Gol. See HCG, 3–4; Pelliot 1944b, 44, 53, n. 3; Hambis 1974, 26–29. (When Pelliot and Hambis write ‘Bûyûr’, ‘Bûir’, read ‘Buyur’, ‘Buir’.) For this subgroup see also Bese 1988, 36. See also below, n. 155.

For na’ur (= no. natão) > nîr = nôr ‘lake’, see SG, 88; IMCS, 163; TMEN, no. 381. Cf. also RH, 245, no. 2 (nour).
Ambaqqi was taking (for hide- ‘to accompany’, see Pelliot 1925, 234, no. 61) his daughter to be married into the Ayiru’ut Buira’ut tribe, following the exogamous custom of the Mongols, on which see Visotsky, 58-59, and below, n. 61. It was also the custom for the father of the bride to accompany his daughter to the bridegroom’s house. See Holmgren 1986, 131ff. Cf. SH, § 94. Evidently, up to this time relations with the Tatars must have been cordial enough to warrant such an undertaking, however, on the way Ambaqqi and, presumably, his party were seized by ‘Tatar jiyin men lit. “people” – turgan’ who delivered him to the Altan Qan’ of the Kitai, i.e. to the Jurchen/Chin ruler of north China (more about him later). The ‘Jiyin people’ of §§ 53 and 266, and the ‘Jiyin troops’ (Jiyin čeri’ ut) of §§ 247 and 248, designate people from various ethnic groupings along and beyond the Chin frontier zone, employed as border-defence corps in the service of the Jurchen rulers. They were drawn from such diverse populations and tribes as the (southern) Tatars, the Kitans and the Jurchens themselves (see the above-mentioned paragraphs of the SH). Some scholars have identified them with the Chiu Army (Chiu-chin, etc. = čeri’ ut). On the Chiu, Chin and Yian sources. The so-called Chiu Army consisted of troops stationed along the northern frontier to guard the border areas from incursions from the north. Originally made up of Kitai soldiers during the Liao dynasty, it subsequently (i.e. during the Chin period) included auxiliary forces from other allied groups, although the Kitai element apparently predominated. Among the Chiu, the Chinese sources also mention Tangut troops as well as troops from other minor ethnic groups along the border (see Ok, I, 216, n. 1). R. Dunnel (CHCAR, 207) defines them as ‘tribally mixed border guards.’ Textual evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the identification of the Chiu with the Jiyin. However, contrary to opinions expressed in the past, I do not believe that there is any phonetic relationship between the Chinese and the Mongol term, since in the 13th-14th century chiu ėl resulted in ēlī, not jīv. See, e.g., MKTV, 120b (= B, 176). In my view, the relationship between the two terms is semantic. The term jīvīn, possibly of Kitan origin, derives most likely from the verb jīv in- (see jīv-) + the deverbal noun suffix -n. In Written Mongolian, jīv- means ‘to assemble, put together from various pieces, arrange according to colour, to attach to.’ See Kow., 2407b; Les., 1038b-1038a. For the suffix -n, see GWM, 49, § 175. Thus, jīvīn would mean ‘something assembled (i.e. put together, combined) from different sources or made up of different kinds.’ In Chinese, the word chiu ėl (= ēlī) means ‘to join, band together, unite (in a group, confederation, etc.).’ See CED, 171a; CEDMU, 1245c-1246a. The idea expressed by both terms is of something – in this case troops, an army – brought together from different places or made up of different kinds of people, as in fact these auxiliaries were. On the Jiyin problem (their identification, history and role, especially during the Mongol conquest of north China), see the comments and bibliographical references in n. 247. The Tatars had close relations with the Chin court, as they previously had with the Liao court (in the standard histories of these two dynasties they are usually called Tsu-pu ēlī – chiu ēlī – a puzzling term); for the Chin period, besides the Chinese sources, conveniently tabulated by Wang Kuo-wei, there are also accounts of these relations in Rāfi al-Din’s work. They concern, in particular, the chieftainships of Qurula and Ambaqqi, during which the Tatars, with the support of the Chin court, played a very active role against the coalition of Mongol and Tayūl’s tribes, bringing to a halt their ascendancy in the steppe. See SLI, 1/1, 104-105, 181; 1/2, 42-44, cf. EM, 43-48. On the Tatar tribe during the Liao and Chin periods, see TTK (cf. Pelliot 1929a; 125-126; HCSL, 101-102, and 742b (s.v. ‘Tatars’); Chou LH 1980, ¥5 TC 1984, and the various other contributions on the Tsu-pu included in LCSTMKK; and Li, 143, n. 53. For the Mongol (Mongol) tribe during the Liao and Chin, see MKK (cf. Pelliot, op. cit., 127-128); KCSS, 421-442; ČK, 7-10 (= ČK, 7-12); Klavtornyj 1993. For the subdivisions of the Tatars in Činggis’ time, see HCG, 2-9; YCS, I, 26-28 (cf. Han Jū-lin in SALT 3:1986,
order to convey his last instructions to Qutula and Qada'an Taišī. Regarding the choice of these two personages, we have seen how with Ambaqa'i political power had passed from the line of Bai Singgor Doqlin, Tumbunai Seen and Qubul Qan to that of Caraqi Linggiu and Senggem Bilge, i.e. to the Tsoqul clan. By sending his final instructions to both Qutula and Qada'an Taišī, and by referring to their (i.e. to one of them) becoming the supreme leader, Ambaqa'i left open his succession to either line. (Qada'an Taišī is given here as one of Ambaqa'i's sons, but we know that the sixth son of Qubul was also called Qada'an. It is possible, however, that this is due to the confused tradition regarding the genealogy of Qubul and Ambaqa'i, and that in reality there was only one Qada'an; see HCG, 157; Li, 144, n. 53. For Qada'an's title of tašīr, incorrectly transcribed as t'ai-tašī, see what has been said above, n. 59, about Nekün Taišī). However, it is worth noting that Qutula is mentioned first and it is quite clear from the sentence that Balalaqa'i should speak to Qada'an Taišī after having spoken to Qutula. As we learn from § 57, a general assembly of 'Mongol' and Tawki-ut' eventually elected Qutula as qa'an (read qa'n), thereby reverting the line of succession to Qubul's clan and reaffirming the tribal supremacy of the Mongols proper. Tribal leadership is expressed in the formula qamqam qa'an ulus-un ejen qa'an (read qa'n) of all and lord of the people': I render ulas with 'people' rather than with 'nation' because at this time one cannot yet speak of a 'nation' or 'empire' - meanings that ulas will acquire much later. For these connotations and the evolution of the term, see Besse 1978, 359, no. 8. He was a Besiūtan (Besiitū), who evidently happened to be at hand when Ambaqa'i was captured and led south. (The Besiūtan clan 6əbəq is mentioned in § 47 as being formed by a son of Caraqi Linggiu called Besiitū.) However, I do not think that Balalaqa'i was there first, viz. Ulatałut (called on this important word see TMEN, no. 656; and Erdal 1993, 94-99) as implied in Cl, 11. With Pelliot (Pe, 128) I understand the passage to mean that he was merely used as such by Ambaqa'i in
The Merkit tribe to which Yeke Çileidi belonged was the Uduyat Merkit. He was the younger brother of its chief Tosjo’a Beki (see § 111). For the ethnic Merkidei (= Merkitei), cf. HCG, 227; Poppe 1975, 163. On the various Merkit tribes that formed one of the major peoples of Mongolia whose habitat in the twelfth century was the region of the Lower Selenga, south of the Baikal, see HCG, 227-228, 271-278. See also below, n. 102. Yeke (‘Big’) Çileidi is known only because of his bride Höölain, a girl of the Oqquû’a ut. The Oqquû’a ut (‘Oqquû’ut; cf. AT,108: Oqqumun) were actually a subtribe of the Onggirat or Qonggirat (see n. 61), another important tribal group living in the region of the river Khalka (Xalkyin Gol) in eastern Mongolia – the easternmost Mongolian people at the time. The Oqquû’a ut lived in close proximity to the Onggirat. See SL’, 1, 162, 164; cf. HCG, 424, 426, 428.
"An unusually beautiful young woman", lit. 'a young married lady (čiki qatu) who had a different (= unusual) appearance.' For the term qatu (pl. qadun), the feminine counterpart of qan and qatan, and the polite designation of somebody else's wife and of any lady of rank, see TEMEN, no. 5; Vlad, 1965; 32, n. 7; HCYWLYT, 71-74, no. 17.

In the SH the term qatan (pl. qatau; mo. qataud, qataud) occurs 23 times, while the form qadun (pl. qadud) occurs 29 times (see R, 285b, 293b). Cf. Matériel I, 86, 89. For r, see 'Quelques problèmes', 244; Muriel II, 47, (17v, 5). On the form in d. do. er. of temen remarks in TMEN, III, 139 (no. 1159).

With very few exceptions this form is found only in the Chinese translations; certainly of consistency, in the present translation the 'regular' Middle Mongolian form qatu has been used throughout. For the form qatun occurring twice in § 65, see below, n. 126.

The expression čiki qatu as a compound means 'young noble woman (married or unmarried)', and as two separate words 'maid (a young woman) and lady (married woman of rank).'

Cf. Khakhasi 1992/93, 280-282; Mo, 107; Cl, 12; Oz, I, 33-34. The girl in question, Höölün (her name appears in § 55), may have been very young indeed, perhaps not older than fifteen; however, her age at the time cannot be precisely determined. Cf. Hambis 1975, 31-12.

For Nekin Täsü and Dārtari Ožugün, see above n. 50.

The events that led to the abduction of Höölün as described in the SH represent a tradition which is at variance with that handed down in later chronicles, such as the AT (anon). See Uray-Kohálni 1970, 262-263.

§ 55. 'At their coming', lit. 'with their arriving.'

This section contains some interesting words, such as qubi, a feminine form in -i of qubu 'pale yellow (horse)'; a metonymy identical to eng. 'dun'; quburti 'hill', so far an unattested word, but cf. mo. qurchi 'a small elevation', see QNTT, 473a, and Kow, 1042a-b; nambuus 'over, across', also otherwise unattested, but c.f. ts. tumbas 'jumping over or across', see TH, 134 (s. JYT, 234; qellis 'round about' from qell, 'to cover, wrap up, to surround.' Clearly, as Ožugün 1977, where however oki, öki should be read oki, öeki. For qatu(n), the feminine counterpart of qan and qatan, and the polite designation of somebody else's wife and of any lady of rank, see TEMEN, no. 1159; Vlad, 1965, 32, n. 7; HCYWLYT, 71-74, no. 17.

For qatun (mo. qatud, qatud) occurs 23 times, while the form qadun (pl. qadud) occurs 29 times (see R, 285b, 293b). Cf. Matériel I, 86, 89. For r, see 'Quelques problèmes', 244; Muriel II, 47, (17v, 5). On the form in d. do. er. of temen remarks in TMEN, III, 139 (no. 1159).

With very few exceptions this form is found only in the Chinese translations; certainly of consistency, in the present translation the 'regular' Middle Mongolian form qatu has been used throughout. For the form qatun occurring twice in § 65, see below, n. 126. The expression čiki qatu as a compound means 'young noble woman (married or unmarried)', and as two separate words 'maid (a young woman) and lady (married woman of rank).'

Cf. Khakhasi 1992/93, 280-282; Mo, 107; Cl, 12; Oz, I, 33-34. The girl in question, Höölün (her name appears in § 55), may have been very young indeed, perhaps not older than fifteen; however, her age at the time cannot be precisely determined. Cf. Hambis 1975, 31-12.

For Nekin Täsü and Dārtari Ožugün, see above n. 50.

The events that led to the abduction of Höölün as described in the SH represent a tradition which is at variance with that handed down in later chronicles, such as the AT (anon). See Uray-Kohálni 1970, 262-263.

§ 55. 'At their coming', lit. 'with their arriving.'

This section contains some interesting words, such as qubi, a feminine form in -i of qubu 'pale yellow (horse)'; a metonymy identical to eng. 'dun'; quburti 'hill', so far an unattested word, but cf. mo. qurchi 'a small elevation', see QNTT, 473a, and Kow, 1042a-b; nambuus 'over, across', also otherwise unattested, but c.f. ts. tumbas 'jumping over or across', see TH, 134 (s. JYT, 234; qellis 'round about' from qell, 'to cover, wrap up, to surround.' Clearly, as Ožugün 1977, where however oki, öki should be read oki, öeki. For qatu(n), the feminine counterpart of qan and qatan, and the polite designation of somebody else's wife and of any lady of rank, see TEMEN, no. 1159; Vlad, 1965, 32, n. 7; HCYWLYT, 71-74, no. 17.

In the SH the term qatu(n) (pl. qatau; mo. qataud, qataud) occurs 23 times, while the form qadun (pl. qadud) occurs 29 times (see R, 285b, 293b). Cf. Matériel I, 86, 89. For r, see 'Quelques problèmes', 244; Muriel II, 47, (17v, 5). On the form in d. do. er. of temen remarks in TMEN, III, 139 (no. 1159).

With very few exceptions this form is found only in the Chinese translations; certainly of consistency, in the present translation the 'regular' Middle Mongolian form qatu has been used throughout. For the form qatun occurring twice in § 65, see below, n. 126. The expression čiki qatu as a compound means 'young noble woman (married or unmarried)', and as two separate words 'maid (a young woman) and lady (married woman of rank).'

Cf. Khakhasi 1992/93, 280-282; Mo, 107; Cl, 12; Oz, I, 33-34. The girl in question, Höölün (her name appears in § 55), may have been very young indeed, perhaps not older than fifteen; however, her age at the time cannot be precisely determined. Cf. Hambis 1975, 31-12.

For Nekin Täsü and Dārtari Ožugün, see above n. 50.

The events that led to the abduction of Höölün as described in the SH represent a tradition which is at variance with that handed down in later chronicles, such as the AT (anon). See Uray-Kohálni 1970, 262-263.

§ 55. 'At their coming', lit. 'with their arriving.'

This section contains some interesting words, such as qubi, a feminine form in -i of qubu 'pale yellow (horse)'; a metonymy identical to eng. 'dun'; quburti 'hill', so far an unattested word, but cf. mo. qurchi 'a small elevation', see QNTT, 473a, and Kow, 1042a-b; nambuus 'over, across', also otherwise unattested, but c.f. ts. tumbas 'jumping over or across', see TH, 134 (s. JYT, 234; qellis 'round about' from qell, 'to cover, wrap up, to surround.' Clearly, as Ožugün 1977, where however oki, öki should be read oki, öeki. For qatu(n), the feminine counterpart of qan and qatan, and the polite designation of somebody else's wife and of any lady of rank, see TEMEN, no. 1159; Vlad, 1965, 32, n. 7; HCYWLYT, 71-74, no. 17.

In the SH the term qatu(n) (pl. qatau; mo. qataud, qataud) occurs 23 times, while the form qadun (pl. qadud) occurs 29 times (see R, 285b, 293b). Cf. Matériel I, 86, 89. For r, see 'Quelques problèmes', 244; Muriel II, 47, (17v, 5). On the form in d. do. er. of temen remarks in TMEN, III, 139 (no. 1159).

With very few exceptions this form is found only in the Chinese translations; certainly of consistency, in the present translation the 'regular' Middle Mongolian form qatu has been used throughout. For the form qatun occurring twice in § 65, see below, n. 126. The expression čiki qatu as a compound means 'young noble woman (married or unmarried)', and as two separate words 'maid (a young woman) and lady (married woman of rank).'

Cf. Khakhasi 1992/93, 280-282; Mo, 107; Cl, 12; Oz, I, 33-34. The girl in question, Höölün (her name appears in § 55), may have been very young indeed, perhaps not older than fifteen; however, her age at the time cannot be precisely determined. Cf. Hambis 1975, 31-12.

For Nekin Täsü and Dārtari Ožugün, see above n. 50.

The events that led to the abduction of Höölün as described in the SH represent a tradition which is at variance with that handed down in later chronicles, such as the AT (anon). See Uray-Kohálni 1970, 262-263.
In every black cart’, ‘black cart’ rendering mno. ṣuqa’u. For this term, see above, n. 6. Cf. also Khomonov 1981, 49. Ḥo’el’in is quoting an old saying here. Cf. Cereonsdomn 1986, 72.

‘You will always find a girl or a woman like me.’ Cf. the corresponding passage in AT, 10b: ‘A woman or a girl looking like me can surely be found.’ Cf. LDAT, 62, where this passage is rendered differently. For the expression ƙi ṣuqa, see above, n. 54.

‘Name her also (tak) Ḥo’el’in.’ For takṣeši ‘also’, see Oz, III, 228-229, n. 9; IV, 268; Matièreli II, 88; and Cleaves 2001b, 67, n. 14. For its other usages, see below, n. 149.

‘Save your life!’ (amin-ƙiyan ṣuqa). For ṣuqa (= pno. ṣuqy) ‘to save’, cf. TH, 179-180 (= JVT, 312-313; Oz, I, 229, n. 10; and Mo, 52.

‘Never forget to breathe my scent’, lit. ‘Go smelling my smell!’ Here, however, the verb ‘to go’ (yaba) plays the role of an auxiliary denoting continuity of action. Yeka Čledu was to keep Ḥo’el’in’s skirt, the smell of which would keep on reminding him of his lost bride. See Moserta 1927, 151. On this auxiliary, see above, n. 15.

In the SH, the verb ‘to take off’ is mulitàt. Cf. HW, 111; and the HII (Matièreli I, 76). In Written Mongolian we have mulitàt, mulitàq, as well as mulitàt, mulitàl, ‘to take off, remove.’ See SG, 128. It is impossible to say whether the form found in our passage is mulitàt or mulitàq only on the basis of the Chinese transcription.

For human odor as a medium for remembrance, cf. also the case in § 245, which describes how Father Mönghik took his son Neb Tenggeng’s hat, smelled it and placed it in his bosom. This practice has been discussed by various scholars, who found modern parallels for it and have offered different interpretations of the significance and symbolism of Ḥo’el’in’s dramatic gesture. See Moserta 1927, 151 and n. 2; Olsháč 1947; C.R. Bawden in RSOAS 40:1977, 449. The term for ‘shirt’ in the passage in question is čamo, a Mongolian term probably of Chinese origin (¼ < ch. shen-шу > r < ‘woman’s dress, shirt’). Olsháč, op. cit., 56, suggests a possible Greek derivation and relationship with fr. chemise and ital. cuciuma.

The word ṣuqa (¼ pno. ṣuq) in the expression ṣuqa ‘dara’-a ‘to go away swiftly, flee in haste’, is an adverb in -a from ṣuqa (= ṣuqa). The word ṣuqa is not attested as such in Preclassical and Written Mongolian, but Orods has ṣuqgy ‘abruptly, with a jerk’, which corresponds to mo. ṣuqa iđ; the SH has ṣuqal ‘to pull out, draw out’ (= mo. ṣuqaj, ṣuqal). See TH, 94; DO, 175a. I wonder whether SH ṣuqa is not the same word still found in Orods with the initial original Chinese *suc* prefixe (]+= a), plus the suffix -a. Cf. SH ṣuqa (= mo. ṣuq) ‘separately’, and mo. ṣuqa ‘asunder’ and ṣuq ‘half, separately’. However, the meaning of ṣuqa as supplied by the Chinese gloss is ‘in haste, swiftly.’ For the noun suffix -a, see Nominalsuf, 98-99, § 6; Murayama 1953; LSHM, 38; and JS, 52, § 77. Murayama and Street regard -a as a conventional suffix, incorrectly in my opinion. Cf. Oz, I, 208, n. 1; 227, n. 4; and above, n. 50.

§ 56. Yисибе Ba’atur took the halter and guided the cart of Lady Ḥo’el’in, lit. ‘Yisige Ba’atur led Lady Ḥo’el’in by the halter (delbege dečé).’ Mo. delbeg(e) means ‘rein(s), bridle’, as well as ‘halter, tether.’ See Les, 247b; MJK, 1158a. Cf. tu (Dialects of Tobol and Kazan) tilbige, tilb ‘reins’ (VVTD, III, 1389). In the language of the SH delbege means only ‘halter’, as clearly indicated by the Chinese gloss chiang-so 兢系 ‘rein- rope’ (‘halter’), the term for ‘reins’ being fila- – fila- a. See HW, 90.

The word kiligu ‘shaft(s) of a cart’ appears in the SH also in the forms kiliggi and kiliggin, see HW, 101, 102. The word is not attested in Written Mongolian nor in living languages and dialects. The term for ‘shafts’ in Written Mongolian is ilu, and it has been suggested that ilu < *ilun < *ilun < *ilu > kiligu – kiligu. See Oz, IV, 129, n. 18. The problem requires further investigation.
"My good lord Çildeü", lit. "My elder brother (aqa) Çildeü." Here aqa is simply a term of respect which I have rendered as "good lord", faune de mars. See Cleaves 1963, 66-69; cf. Cleaves 1949a, 508-509.

The tuft of hair typical of the hardressing of the medieval Mongols was called kegel – kekül, corresponding to mo. kekül, kiskül (or kekül, kiskül; cf. kh. xiskul) 'long hair, forelock of a horse, tuft of hair, braids.' On it, see TMEN, no. 320, and the numerous references contained therein, to which we must add Mastaert 1927, 154-155; Pelliot 1930, 258, no. 17; Serruys 1957, 151-152, n. 46; VMI, 48-49 (very important); Lediyad 1963, 230; Cleaves 1979, 74-75; and D. Bayar in MTN, 1, 252-257. For the (?) Kitán term kaxiv (한서, 光緒, etc.) and its possible relationship with mo. kiskül, cf. below, n. 74. For some illustrations of the kegel, see below.

For the words kysizümser 'has never blown' and döölösümser 'has never hungered', both formed with the negative suffix -saert/-smars, see Lewicki 1939/40, 255-260; Hashimoto 1984 and 1985. Cf. also Matériel II, 52; MNITLAT, 21, n. 58. As for the auxiliary buliyi, a normally feminine form (see UGPM, 150, § 33; 25, § 130, § 230) which also applies to a male, cf. the form gärbi in § 74.

"In the steppe", lit. 'in the steppe-land (ke' er qaršar-a). For ke' er (and mo. kepera) 'uninhabited place: open country; desert; steppe; wasteland; plain: river valley', see TMEN, no. 347; HCG, 449a (Index); SMT, 27; DN, 124. For a possible derivation from tu. kisgär 'verdant', cf. L. Bazin in AOH 16, 1982, 58. Hölün is again making use of a popular idiom to describe Çildeü. Cf. Cirendsoom 1966, 70.

"But how is it now? How fares he, ... now backward?" For this passage, cf. Mastaert 1927, 152; Cleaves 1953, 72, n. 8; idem 1964/65, 50-51, n. 9; Street 1966, 239-241, 248-249, n. 16 (but see the revised translation in Street 1986/87, 29, which, like that of Dammstreu following the AT, makes Hölün, not Çildeü, the subject of this sentence). As already pointed out by Mastaert, op. cit., 152-154; Serruys 1957, 151-152, n. 46;
Although the expression ʰeɪ ʃaħaɾ should not be taken literally, in the present instance it would obviously refer to the wooded valley of the Onon along which Hō’el’in and her captors were travelling. As for Hō’el’in’s voice ‘resounding throughout’ wood and valley, the verb used in the SH is ᵈa’ar-s(-=mo. ᵈa’ars-) ‘to (re)sound; to spread’; cf. ord. ᵈgGIS- ‘se répandre partout (bruit, renommée).’ See DO, 164a. In our passage this word is glossed ‘to shake, agitate’ (�חא), but must be understood in the sense of the resounding effect the loud wailing had in the forest, conjuring up the image of the river being actually shaken, just as the waters of the river were being stirred by it.

‘Has already crossed many streams,’ lit. ‘has crossed many waters (usw).’

For qa’ulqa (transcribed qa’ulqsa in both §§ 57 and 58, and in § 183), a puzzling obsolete word meaning (according to the Chinese glosses) ‘path, way; ditch,’ see TH, 163 (= JYT, 284), where it is identified with oir. qa’yala(t) ‘way, road.’ Cf. MUL, 187a, line 3 (where, however, the gloss [Qan] is by Damdinsuren and almost certainly suggested by the meaning of the term in the SH). Deest apud OECD. I wonder whether the Chinese transcription qa’ulqsa does not actually represent an original יסוד. Mo. ya’u (< ch. kou mish) means ‘ditch, hollow, trench;’ cf. ord. ʿaṭ ‘fossé; traces ayant la forme d’un sillon’ (DO, 310a). Mo. ʿaṭula-, a denominal verb in -la, means ‘to make a ditch, etc.’ An alternation *yaṭula – *yaṭul- would be quite normal, cf. ʾiflal, ʾifal- ‘to boil until soft’, ʾifūla, ʾifal- ‘to unroll’, etc. *Yaṭula could then be a deverbal noun in -ya with the same meaning of yaʿu, viz. ‘ditch, hollow; furrow-like trails.’ These meanings would fit the context in both §§ 56 and 57. (For the dev. noun suff. ya, cf., e.g., ʾayṣar ‘a belt to which a quiver and a bow case are attached’ < ʾayu- ‘to attach to or suspend from a belt’; for the transcription qa’u [yaʿu] – qau [yaʿu], cf. below, n. 170.) However, this interpretation remains hypothetical since we do not know when the Chinese loanword ʿayu and the verb ʿayala- first came into usage in Mongolian. An unrelated word transcribed as qaʿulqqa[t] occurs in § 75. See n. 75 below. Cf. Ceposodorn 1991, 4–6; and Cosima 2001a.

‘If you call him ... He will not see you/If you look for his tracks, His trail you will not find.’ This is a version of a saying that still survives in the Ordos dialect. See TOO, xv, 581, no. 436 (cf. FO, 597, no. 436). It is used with reference to a member of the family who is dead – or, as here, gone, never to return. The SH graphically expresses (and, at the same time, poetically) describes the way Yisūḡi got himself a wife in one of the customary ways wives were obtained in the steppe societies of Inner Asia. See Holmgren 1986, 144–145. It does not say, however, that Yisūḡi already had a wife, but we know that Temül’in had two half-brothers, Bekter and Belgüeti (§ 76). Bekter was killed by Temül’in and his brother (Joci) Qasar (§ 77). Later Belgüeti’s mother was seized by the Merkit and subsequently rescued by her sons (§ 112). It is unlikely that Belgüeti’s mother, whose name is not mentioned in § 112, was Old Qo’aśin (see §§ 98–103), as suggested by Ratelevsky (CK, 15, n. 65); almost certainly Old Qo’aśin was a maid servant in Hō’el’in’s household. The name of the mother of Bekter and Belgüeti and, therefore, of the other wife of Yisūḡi, is supplied by the AT, where (136) it appears in the passage (corresponding to § 60) of the SH in the form Sulqigil (or Sulqgil) Eke, i.e. Mother Sulqgil (or Sulqgil), the text specifying that she was Yisūḡi’s ‘second wife.’ Cf. below, n. 60. (This is, however, at variance with the earlier statement in AT9, 9b–10a, that Lady Sulqgil, or Sulqgil, was the wife of Barten Ba’atur; see above, n. 50). Later Mongol chronicles give differing accounts.

See Pellet 1940b/41, 76; CK, 15, n. 65. Cf. also HCOG, 185, n. 14. Whatever the name of Bekter and Belgüeti’s mother, there is no doubt that Hō’el’in was not the only wife of Yisūḡi; this is why the SH speaks of ‘mothers (in the plural) and sons’ in §§ 72 and 74. In fact, according to Rūrid al-Dīn, Yisūḡi had several wives from various tribes, of whom Hō’el’in was the principal...
one. See Sl, 1/2, 51; and the discussion in Hambis 1975, 7-8, n. 12; 32 and n. 52. On his children, see also below, n. 60.

Hö-elün’s abduction by Yisigét was the cause of a major feud between Ciledi’s tribe, the Merkit, and the Mongols, i.e. the Mongol tribe as represented by Yisigét’s lineage and subjects. On this feud see Clark 1978, 37-38. For another aspect of this episode, see Särkäzi 1978, 152-153.

As it has been noted on several occasions, the line of descent from Alan Qo’a to Yisigét differs in various genealogical traditions that have been handed down in the Mongol, Chinese and Persian sources. For further details on these traditions, besides Chapitre VII, 10-20, Tamura 1973, 15ff., and Yoshida 1984, cf. also MW, 176-178, n. 18.

§ 57. ‘According to the message of Ambaqa Qa’an, which had nominated both Qada’an and Qutula’, lit. ‘According to (or in consequence of) the dispatch (ilekse’er) of Ambaqa Qa’an naming the two Qada’an and Qutula.’ I read ilekse’er, conversion abstemporale of ile’- to send, dispatch’, like Pe, Ko, L2, Bu, Ir, St, Fa, Ce, and Dal, instead of trekke’er as in H, Shi, Oz, El-Ar, and Aalto 1973, 36. See § 53 and com. regarding the message Ambaqa sent through Balaqaqi after his capture by the Tatar allies of the Jurchens. Both Qada’an Taudi and Qutula had been ‘named’, i.e. nominated as candidates for the succession to the qan-ship of the Mongol (Mongoloid) and Tayidát clan. The election, lit. ‘raising, lifting up’ (see below), was done, more mongolico, at a general assembly of these clans held at a locality known as Qorqonjak Jabur, or Qorqonjak Valley. For Jabur ‘river valley’, see above, n. 56; as in § 56, here too this term is glossed ch’üan. This wooded region crossed by the river Onon, which is mentioned several times in the SH §§104, 115, 116, 117, 201, 206) and which was the site of Mönge Qa’an’s qurila of 1257, has not yet been identified, but it must have been towards the sources of the river on the eastern slopes of the Khentei mountain range. See HCG, 42; Petech, 11; Boyle 1973, 75. (On the qurila or great assembly, see below, n. 282.)
subject Khaza'nov's comments in NOW, 234ff.). Nevertheless, certain important facts emerge from these events, viz.: 1) the rivalry for tribal leadership between the two main branches of Quda'o family, the one originating with his eldest son Bai Singqor Duqin (from which issued Yiysi'gei and Tenisgüi), and the other originating with Caraqg Lingqui (from which issued Ambaqai and the Taycüi); this rivalry, put aside when unity was necessary to fight a common foe, be it the Xurchen or the Tatar, turned into alienation, then open conflict, after the death of Yiysi'gei in the 1770s and '80s; it ended with the crushing of the Taycüi in 1201 (according to the chronology of the SH); 2) an irreconcilable tribal feud between the Mongols and the Tatars, the causes of which are complex, but intimately related to the dominant coalition of the Tatar tribe before the emergence of the Mongol tribe, and to the policy of the Ch'in court towards the tribes in the north in the 12th century; this, too, ended with the elimination of the Tatar grouping (in 1202 according to the SH); 3) a growing animosity against the Ch'in state which eventually also turned into open conflict, culminating in the destruction of Ch'in by the Mongols under Ögödei Qa'an in 1224-4; 4) a bitter feud with the Merkit caused by the abduction of Ho'oq'an by Yiysi'gei and his brothers; this again ended with the annihilation of the tribe in 1204. Thus the antecedents of many important campaigns waged by Chenggis are to be found in the policies and actions of his forebears, or in events in which they had been implicated generations earlier. On this question, cf. the above-mentioned contribution by L. Clark (Clark 1978), which highlights the role of revenge in the steppe society of the 12th-13th centuries as documented in the SH and the AT.

"After raising Qutula as qan (lit. "pra")". The verb 'to raise' (ergü-e-, ergü, no ergü-szé-) refers to the ancient Tuco-Mongolian custom of lifting up the qan (or qayan) on a white or black felt rug as part of the inauguration ceremony. This custom was already followed by the T'o-pa and T'u-chi-she Turks, and it is well attested for the Mongol period. See Boeddborg 1939, 242-245; HCSL, 223; D'O';hsnon, II, 528-529, MF, 21Hf.

"Around the Leafy Tree of Qorqonag" (Qorqonag-un Saqlaqar-un Midun horcin). The term saqlaqar, tao saqlaqar, denotes a tree that spreads downwards with dense branches and foliage. See QNTT, 529H; MKET, 1936a; cf. Lés. 658b. The meaning of the Chinese interlinear gloss is simply 'loose, dishevelled (as of hair)'; see HW, 131. The Leafy (or Branching, as in Cl, 14; cf. Mo, 88) Tree is referred to again in §§ 117 and 206 (written Saqilt [= Saqlar] < Saqlaqar [= Sajlaqar]), always in connection with a celebration involving feasting and dancing. It is also mentioned by Raśid al-Din in a passage concerned with this section of the SH: 'Thereafter, Möngke Qa'an held a quriltai in a place called Qorqonag, which lies in the middle of Mongolia. It was in this place that Qutula Qa'an, when he had gained a victory, danced under a tree with his nökeri until the ground filled into a ditch.' (Successors, 223.) In Raśid's account, the celebration was not connected with the election of Qutula, but with a victory in a military campaign. In both the SH and the AT, the event immediately following the feast at the Leafy Tree in Qorqonag Valley is the campaign of Qutula and Qada'an against the Tatars in revenge for Ambaqai's death (see § 58; AT', 11b). It is therefore possible that, as already suggested by Clark 1978, 51, n. 18, the feasting and dancing may have had some ceremonial significance in connection with a military campaign—whether specifically for revenge remains to be seen. There is no doubt, I think, that the Leafy Tree and the dancing carried out around it—largely consisting of stamping of feet, it seems—went together, and that there was a ritual (shamanistic) significance attached to them. See Perleée, 11 (= Perleé, 100), also for references to this practice in later Mongol literature, and in its survival in modern times. Cf. MBMTTS, 284-305; Ilzane 1974, 79; Chiodo 1992, 146, n. 106; Urny-Köhlim, 1994, 318; X. Sampaldendev in MNT, I, 195-202, I. Kabzin'ska, ibid., 245-249, MMS, 43-45,
and, especially, Wu C 1966. For horcin (= mo. orcin) ‘around’, see Pelliot 1925, 220, no. 35.

‘Up to their waist’ (gubkir-tu), lit. ‘to the ribs.’ For the use of the dative suffix -(ta) for the terminative case, see Hashimoto 1977.

For the word Öbek ‘dust’, a hupas legomenon in the SH, see TH, 126 (= JYT, 221) (where, however, the reference to bar. ulgence is not relevant). For the saying in verse – a popular idiom – see Čermánsdm 1986, 82.

§ 58: ‘When Qutula became qal’un’: cf. § 124 for an identically phrased opening.

The first element of the name of the Tartar chief Ködon Baraqa is no doubt identical with the name of Ögodéi’s second son Ködon, the Ködon of Rašid al-Dîn. See Successors, 539b (Index), HCG, 134. The name Jali Buqa (‘Flame (= Fiery, Powerful) Bull’) of the other Tartar chief appears in § 141, in the form Jalin Buqa. On this name and the identity of this personage (or personages?), see below, n. 144. Jalin corresponds to tu. yalin ‘Flame’ (= mo. jali). Bese 1974, 94, takes jali in its other meaning of ‘crafty.’ See Les., 1051b. There is a considerable amount of literature on the word jali; cf. MMHS, 90-91, Note 25a. Cf. also below, n. 141.

‘To take revenge/to requite the wrong’, lit. ‘To avenge the vengeance/to requite the requital’ (ösöl ösöl kišal kisan): cf. §§ 154, 214 and 254 for the same idiomatic expression. For ösöl (= ös) ‘vengeance’ and its concept in medieval Mongol society and culture, see Hamayon 1986 (cf. Hamayon 1978, 89-90); Jaghid 1978, 97-98; Fletcher 1986, 14; and the contribution by L. Clark (Clark 1978), where the subject is discussed in detail. See also my remarks below, n. 149. As for the alliterative four-word idiom, it is recorded also in Turkish in a short rock inscription recently discovered near Bugat Sum in northwestern Mongolia. See Battulga 2000.

After the section corresponding to § 58 of the SH, i.e. between §§ 58 and 59, the AT (AT², 11b-12a) inserts a short declamatory piece by a certain Ködeï (?). Secen addressed to Ambaqaq’s ten sons and Qabul’s seven sons, which is undoubtedly of a later date (12th-16th c. ?), but interesting enough for Žemaro to reproduce it and translate it in Žemč., 92-96. See Žemč., 65-68 (there are, however, several errors in the transcription of the text) and MNTLAT, 23.

§ 59. Regarding Yisügê’s campaigns against the Tatars, cf. SL², 12, 50, 75-78, 75; SWCCCL², 1b; YS¹, 1, 3. The last two sources, which are very scanty, both agree that Yisügê fought the Tartar tribe and captured the chief Temüjin, i.e. Temüjin Öge (the SWCCCL speaks, like the SH, of two chiefs, Temüjin Öge and Quru Buqa; the latter an error for Qori Buqa). Rašid’s account, describing the dominant position Yisügê had attained as tribal chief, mentions the hostility of the Tartar and other tribes and now, in MH 549/1154-55 (this is the correct reading, against the 547/1152-53 of SL², 12, 75) he fought the Tartars led by Temüjin Öge and Quru Buqa, i.e. Qori Buqa (but, in another passage, he says that they were brought under submission). Returning triumphantly from this campaign he stopped at a place called Delin Boldaq; soon after, that same year, Činggis Qan was born. See HCG, 9-11. In AT¹, 12a, the Tartar chiefs are called Temüjin and Qoribaya, and the place where Činggis Qan was born is written Delin Bolday. Cf. IDAT, 65.

With regard to the names of the two chiefs, the first element of the name Temüjin Öge means ‘ironsmith’ (= temir ‘iron’ + den. noun suff. -in ~ -in; see below). The second element, Öge, may also be read as Öge or Öke; these words were indistinguishable in Mongol script. It is, in all probability, tu. ögê, originally meaning ‘intelligent, wise; a manure man’, used as a title roughly equivalent to ‘Counsellor’ (the same word may be at the root of the name Ögodéi – Ögedëi). See HCG, 9-10; TMEN, no. 614; DTS, 379a; ED, 101a-b; MIBT, 185, 80r; (where ‘Öge’ should probably be read ‘Öke’). In Qori Buqa, the first element may be the ethnic name Qori already found in the
compound Qori Tumat (see above, n. 8); alternatively, it may mean 'twenty' (q gorin). Cf HCG, 10, 62-64; Bese 1974, 92, Buqa means 'bull.'

Evidently, Yisäigöl succeeded in raising a number of Mongol and Tayïl'ut clans under his leadership, possibly after the death of Qumlâ as suggested by Hambis 1975, 21, n. 36, but not enough to be elected qon, since the only title he bore in his lifetime was that of be'ëutâr (see above, n. 50). After his victory over the Tatars he returned to his encampment, which at that time was at Délil'ün Boldaq ('Spleen Hill') on the Onon (cf. above, n. 54) and where Hó'élinun soon after gave birth to her first child, the future Cinggis Qan.

Délil'ün Boldaq has been identified with a hillock, now known as Boldagîn-Eren Tolgo, situated near the Balji (Balz) River (see above, n. 24), in the neighbourhood of the mineral spa and tourist resort of Gurvan Nuur ('Three Lakes') at Dadal (Sum), 49° 07' N and 111° 50' E. See Zám'yan 1958; Dordzăuren 1960, 196, with references, 9; RBC, 67-68; Aushin 1974, 15-15; IEDGOT, 15-18. (This locality should not be confused with the other famous place in Mongol history, Dolo'n Boldaq, on which see below, n. 136.) Boldaq (m. boldey, boldey) means 'an isolated hill or hillock', see HW, 17; cf. SMT, 16; HCG, 11. However, other localities have been suggested; see, e.g., CKA, 10 (E 11), 54a. In my opinion the identification of Délil'ün Boldaq with Boldagîn-Eren Tolgo is not justified, and the site of Cinggis' birthplace on the Onon is unknown. See de Rachewiltz 1998, 249-241.

'Right there', or 'right there and then' (jób tende). There is no agreement in our sources on the date of Temüjin's birth. The discussion is detailed by Pelliot in NMP, I, 281-288; cf also HCG, 126; Hsing 1931, 475-476. Pelliot's conclusion, now widely accepted by Western historians, is that the most likely but by no means certain year for his birth is 1167. However, the Chinese traditional date of 1162 is still the officially accepted date in China, Mongolia and Russia. Rachewiltz, who has carefully reviewed the problem in CJK, 16-18 (c. CJK, 17-19), is of the opinion that Temüjin was born towards the mid-1160s. Certainly, the year 1155 obtained from Râšîl al-Dîn and adopted by Barnhold, Vladimirov, T'ü Chi and other scholars earlier on is the least acceptable, as shown by Pelliot who has also dismissed the all too precise date given in the A7 (see LDAT, 65) as a later interpolation. This date, corresponding to 31 May (not 1 February, as stated by Pelliot) 1162, was adopted as the official birth-date in the MPR. See BNMAUT, 147; cf. BHM, 166 (30 May 1162). The present official birthday of Cinggis Qan in the Mongolian Republic is 3 May (as from 2002). The year of birth (1162) remains the same. See The Mongol Messenger of 10 April 2002. Articles on the year of birth of Cinggis, such as Chou CS 1962, Shao HC 1962, and Katsufuji 1977, as well as the lengthy section on it in CHIC, 39-43, are largely reviews of previous theories and do not contribute anything new to the solution of the problem. For reasons that will become clear further on (see below, n. 104), I am also in favour of the year 1162 for Temüjin's birth.

The story of the new-born child holding a clot of blood (e'delim, cf. DO, 221b, 503a) in the palm of his hand is an ancient Asiatic folklore theme, possibly of Buddhist origin, containing the advent of a fierce and merciless conqueror. See NMP, I, 288-289. HCG, 12; Gaadamba 1968, 73; reserve 2000, 37. The symbolic birth of a conqueror with blood on his hand(s) will later be attributed also to Timur Leng (Tamerlane, 1336-1405), and with good reason. The element of fierceness implied in the sorcery is brought out vividly in Hó'élinun's 'Lament' in §78. This undoubtedly early Mongol tradition may have played a not insignificant part in the choice of the epithet cinggis in the 'title' Cinggis Qa in subsequently conferred on the conqueror, the meaning of which is probably 'fierce'. See Ong, 123. In the AT account, the blood clot is described as black (qara mâfûn). See AT1, 129. The Mongolian term for 'to catch, hold in the hand' is lo'taqqa, corresponding to mo. ajjiil, not qa'ta as in Pe, 17, L1, 47, and R, 293b. See Poppe 1969, 270; idem 1975b, 155. Sl 'a (mo. sîn, sîn)
"knucklebone" is actually the astragalus or anklebone of the animal, usually a sheep, used by the Mongols in games (cf. § 116) — an almost universal practice. On this word see TMEN, no. 1248; DQ, 600a; Ox., I, 246, n. 3. For the symbolism of the knucklebone in Altaic folklore and tradition, see Roux 1976.

As stated earlier, the name Temüujin ("ironsmith") is formed on temüür "iron" + the suffix -ün, which is an ancient allomorph, now no longer productive, of the nominal noun suffix -čün designating names of vocations. See LSHM, 54, 4,111; JS, 28-29, § 25; Bese 1974, 93; Pope 1975, 167. On this name see also the important note by Pelliot in NMP, I, 289-291; HCG, 9-10; NHHO, 32, n. 3, 109; Sinor 1982, 248-249.

One of the name-giving customs of the medieval Mongols was to name the newborn child after an object or person that attracted the mother’s attention after she had given birth. In the present case, the person was a (presumably) valiant tribal chief: naming the child after him would also ensure the acquisition by the child of the chief’s valour and martial spirit (on the Mongols’ belief in the magic of names, see below, n. 267). From this we can infer that Temüüji Üge was probably slain on that occasion. Cf. SLI, II, 58. For an interesting historical precedent of this practice culled by Lattimore from the Tso-chuan traditionally, see Lattimore 1960.

For the story of Cinggis Qan’s birth and its development as a literary motif in later Mongolian historical and pseudo-historical works, cf. Sagarat 1995.

§ 60. The five children of Yistegi and Hû-elüün listed in this section are Temüujin, Jochi Qasar, Qa'ilün, Temüügi, and the only female, Tsałükün. Qasar is called Qasar and Jochi Qasar, a double name; Qa'ilün, the third son, is called Qa'ilün and Qa'ilün Ilüü, the name followed by an epithet. Temüügi, the youngest son, is called Temüügi and Temüügi Qelüün, the second son of the name also being an epithet. Jochi (the name also of Cinggis’s eldest son) means ‘Guest’ (see above, n. 51); Qasar was the name of a kind of wild dog (see below, n. 78). On

(Jochi) Qasar see the important note (1) by Pelliot in HCG, 171-175. If Temüügi (Cinggis Qan) was born in 1162, Qasar must have been born in 1164; he probably died in, or soon after, 1213. On his descendants, see Chapitre CVII, 24-29. Qa'ilün bore the name same as the fifth son of Menen Tudun, see above, n. 45. The epithet elüü means ‘envoy, messenger’ — possibly because Qa'ilün may later often have been employed in this capacity. He was presumably born in 1166. On his descendants, see Chapitre CVII, 29-34. Temüügi is a name formed, like Temüujin and Temüügi, on temüür ‘iron.’ Cf. Bese 1974, 93; Pope 1975, 167. The epithet elüügi (on which much has been written) designates his role as ‘guardian (or keeper) of the hearth’ — Temüügi being the youngest son and, therefore, the one who by tradition inherited the native domain and domestic patrimony, the so-called ‘yurt’ (< ts. yurt; see TMEN, no. 1914). The term elüügi means, in fact, ‘lord of the hearth’ (< ts. or ‘fire’ + elüü (< elüügi, elüügi) ‘prince’). On it, besides the references given above, n. 48, cf. also MSR, 136; NHHO, 109; Boyle 1956, 153 (4); Róna-Tas 1986, 135; and Fletcher 1986, 26. It is worth noting in this respect that Temüügi’s later domain or apagane was in the northeastern corner of Mongolia, just south-east of Lake Hulun (or Dalai Nür). See HCG, 178; HYC, A, 166; TOA, 64-65. It was from this general area — broadly the region of the Hailar plain — that the Mongol tribe had in earlier times migrated to the Khentei and Onon-Kerulen region, as we have already seen (above n. 1). The situation of Temüügi’s domain would confirm that the Mongols in Cinggis’ time still regarded this easternmost region as their ancestral and hereditary domain; and it is, perhaps, not purely accidental that it was also in this region (although somewhat further south) that Cinggis and his faithful companions drank the muddy waters of the Bajun, thus sealing their famous covenant (see below, n. 182). Cf. Paila-to-köchii elüügi (see above, 1984.3, 35-38). If Cinggis was born in 1162, Temüügi was born in 1168. For his descendants, see Chapitre CVII, 34-48.
According to the same chronology Temülün, Chitgis’s only sister, would have been born in 1169 or 1170 (she was still in the cradle in 1170). Her name is also formed on temür with the feminine suffix -ülün(-lan); cf above, n. 55. For this name see also Pelliot in TP 29:1932, 51; Pelliot 1915, 930, n. 21; NHIO, 84, 109; Bese 1974, 93; idem 1980, 319, no. 14; Poppe 1975, 164; Rybachy 2003; s.v.

For the feminine form törebi (prateritum perfecti of töre- to be born), see UGPM, 146-147, § 32; IB, 129, § 217, 206-207, § 325; YMT, 27-28, 84.

Besides the five children that Yesűgi had from Ho’o’elun, we know that he had two more sons, Bekter and Belgutei, from another wife, called Sujilig or Suljil. In A1, 13b, in the passage corresponding to § 60 of the SH, we read the following: Yesűgi Bayatur-un noksge gereg Suljilig (? Suljilg) eke-eke Begter Belgutei ayar bülde ‘From Yesűgi Bayatur’s second wife, Suljilg (? Suljilg) Eke (“Mother Suljilg [Suljilg]”), Begter and Belgutei were born.’ Cf. ATL, 31; LDAT, 67. On Suljilg/Suljilg Eke and Dayasi Qatur – Bekter’s and Belgutei’s mother according to the ET – see HCG, 185-186. According to Pelliot this passage was in the original text of the SH. See Pelliot 1940/41, 11-12; cf. above, nn. 50 and 56. I hold the same opinion as Pelliot and have, therefore, added the passage in question in brackets in my translation. Bekter (= Begter), the eldest, was killed when still a boy by Temülün and Qasar, as related in § 77; Belgutei was spared and seems to have got on well with Temülün. He had numerous descendants. On him see HCG, 185-187 et passim; Chapitre CVII, 48-51.

For the word qanun (= mo. nanun) ‘three years old’, cf. Cleaves 1949b, 432-433; Vietze 1990, 382. This term is still used for people in the Burzit sagas and epics; elsewhere its use is restricted only to animals (N.P., p.c.).

With regard to the ages of Yesűgi’s children as given in this section, a note of caution is, I think, called for. The figure of “nine” for Temülün’s age (eight according to Western reckoning) may well have been chosen for the special symbolic value attached to this number, moreover, the exact spacing of two years between the children may also be artificial, the age sequence (with the child reckoned as one year old at birth) being 1, 3, 5, 7, 9. Cf. O. Pure’s remarks in OCNEID, VII/Summary, 39. As pointed out by other investigators, the number nine has a special connotation for the Mongols, as well as for other peoples (including Turks and Tibetans), because it is the last of the simple numbers of the decimal notation it is regarded as a “complete number.” Hence, nine keeps on recurring in Mongol shamanistic rituals and in many aspects of ordinary life. For the same reason, it has often the meaning of ‘all.’ Cf. MB, I, 217; and LRC, V, 433, 433/2, 40 and n. 109 [P.P.-C.R.A.C.]; Moses 1986 (esp. p. 290); idem 1996, 87-89; NNTB, 16ff. Much has been written about the symbolic value of this number since ancient times among the Altai people, as well as in China. See, in particular, MP, II, 392, no. 2; HCSL, 750; TMEN, no. 976; PC, 167ff.; de Rachewiltz 1960, 247-250, no. 116; FTC, 21 and n. 20; Sirkozi 1971, 43-44; Bese 1987, 47-48; Rybachy 2000, 220-221. For other examples of the use of nine in the SH. cf. §§ 61, 77, 80, 103, 202, 203, 242, 245, 267. See also Li, 149, n. 99, 185, n. 267. For the ancient Japanese the mystic number was eight, and it is interesting to note that for them the number 80 (8 x 10) also meant ‘innumerable, all.’ As is well known, nine was also the canonical number for the ancient Greeks. As shown by D. Cede, other numbers with symbolic values, such as three, occur frequently in the SH. See NNTB, 14ff.; MH I, 1993, 137-143.

§ 63. The Olguunu’ut were a clan of the Onggirat or Qorgirat, one of the leading tribes of eastern Mongolia, whose habitat was the region of the Khalkha (= Qalqa) River (kh. Xalxyn Gol), in what is the present border area between Mongolia and the northernmost part of Inner Mongolia. See HCG, 402-409; Vlad, 58-59; and above, n. 54. For Qorgirat – Onggirat, see Pelliot 1944, 77-78, no. 1. Ho’o’elun was an Olguunu’ut. The tribes of Mongolia practised exogamy, i.e. it was forbidden to marry
within the clan and wives could only be taken from other, unrelated clans. A frequent practice was to get wives always from a particular clan. In such cases the parents of the bride and of the bridgroom called each other *quda*, a term designating the father of one’s son-in-law or daughter-in-law, which has no counterpart in English. In the case of the Onggirat and the Mongols, we know that marriage relationships between these two tribes existed already at the time of Qubilai Qan (SL: 1/7, 104); they continued throughout the 13th century and well into the 14th, with many imperial brides being chosen from among the Onggirat. See Vlad, loc. cit.; NMF II, 869-870; Mu I, 84-86, n. 13; Rutchenovsky 1976, 513; Yeh HM 1982; Holmgren 1986, 138-140; idem 1991, 85-86; however, cf. Okada 1985 for a different view on the role of the Onggirat in providing imperial princesses to the Mongol court. Several contributions (of uneven value) on the Onggirat have appeared in China; for a survey, see CKYSC, 1981:1, 2; 1983:1, 6; 1983:2: 5; CKYSC77, 1983:5-8; 9; YSIC, 42-43. For the term *quda*, see below, n. 62.

Relatives (of the female line) of a chief are called plural of *qorgii* (= *prno*, ñ. törkön, törken, törkim); this term designates the relatives from the mother’s side. See Vlad, 59, 74; Čleaves 1949a, 509-510; Oz, I, 249-250, n. 1. *Hó’elín* is called here, for the first time, ‘Mother Hó’elín’ (*Hó’elín* Eke).

For the term *naqcul* (= mn. *naqcula*) ‘maternal uncle’, see TMEN, no. 338; RH 232, no. 29 (*naqcula*).

The two mountains Çekker (*prno* Çegör) and Çigrũ (*prno* Ciqrũ; the text has ‘Ciqrũ’ are as yet unidentified. On their situation in the region of the river Khalkha, see the long note (2) by Pelliot in HCG, 423-429; cf. BBC, 111 (where Schubert’s incorrect reference to Pelliot and Hambis has unfortunately invalidates his identification). It is surprising that these two important landmarks have not yet been identified by Chinese scholars, Çekker in particular, in view of the fact that this mountain is often mentioned in the Mng and Ch’ing sources, about which see Hambis 1974, 35-36; Franke W 1949, 16; and also TMITC 90, 25b and 27b. It is clear from such sources that Mount Çekker was west of the Urshun River and by taking into account Pelliot’s discussion in HCG, it must be found in proximity of the northern shore of the Huur Nór. The two mountains are perhaps to be identified with the Dulan Qara Mts., between the Kerulen and the Urshun, in JA, no. 385 (= Map 4, at 48° N and 117° E). Cf. also TSK, 34, 35, 138, where Wada Sei claims that Mount Çekker was just south-west of Lake Hulun, hence in the same general area. The Oqunqul territory was somewhat farther east, possibly in the area of present-day A-mu-ku-lang (Amagulang) in the New Barga East Banner, south-west of Hailar.

For Dei Sečen, i.e. Dei (= Deyi) the Wise, chief of the Onggirat of the Bosqu clan, see HCG, 411-414; S7, 115, 2915; Chapitre CVIII, t. 2bis (pp. 18); and Pai-la-tu-ko-eh’1979.

As noted by Pelliot, the SH account of Yüsügé’s meeting with Dei Sečen and the ensuing scene (§§ 62-66), rich in poetic flavour, has no counterpart in Raidū’al-Dhn’s account (which gives a different and more sober version), and bears all the marks of a ‘romanesque’ rendering in line with the epic character of the work. See HCG, 413. The age of nine given for Temül’in’s visit is also not accidental but of symbolic significance, as noted by other investigators. See Bese 1987, 47; cf. above, n. 60.

§ 62. Dei Sečen addresses Yüsügé as *quda*, i.e. as a relative by marriage because of the special relationship that obtained between the Onggirat – one of whose clans was the Oqunqul – and Yüsügé’s family. See above, n. 61. For the term *quda*, besides Vlad, 58-59, see MSR, 133, 137; TMEN, no. 296. Oz, I, 252-253, n. 1.

‘Who has fire in his eyes; Who has light in his face.’ This expression, characterising looks of unusual radiance indicative of an exceptionally bright mind and personality, is a commonplace in Mongol oral literature, particularly the Khalkha Epic. See MNTSZA, 104-106; Sastina 1977, 464; Čerěvščinom 1986, 74, 77, 79; Šagarsuren 2000, 121-122. Cf. also § 66.
where the same words, but in inverse order, are applied to Temüjin’s bride-to-be Börte.

§ 63. ‘I had a dream last night, I did’, lit. ‘I, this night I dreamt a dream, I.’

Dei Sečen’s dream is full of symbolism. The gerdafalon, a majestic and powerful creature, the king of hunting birds, is aptly chosen as a manifestation of the sildar of the Kiyat (see below); it is all-white – the auspicious colour par excellence. It holds both the sun and the moon, the two bright ‘lords of the sky, in its claws, an action symbolizing the bringing of glory and renown to Dei Sečen and his people. The timing of the dream coincides with Yisügei’s and Temüjin’s visit. All fits. For the gerdafalon (singgor), see above, n. 54; cf. also RTM, 258; Szkynnikova 1992/93, 57-58. For white as an auspicious colour, and white animals, cf. the references in §§ 80, 189, 202, 216, 219, 239, 245 and 267; Nu’, 312; Pelliot 1930, 265; Cleaves 1949, 125, n. 212; KCHR, 13-14; MM, 61; MP’, 1, 222 (cf. MP², 273, n. 4, 390); NMP, 1, 230; D’Ossian, III, 529 n.; Vlad, 60; RTM, 214; FTC, 20-21 and n. 20; de Rachewiltz 1960, 253-255, n. 119; Poppe 1977, 123, no. 27; Aubin 1978, 42ff.; Fedotov 1997 (esp. pp. 34-35); and below, n. 202. Cf. also ICSL, 42, 121, 129 et passim; K. Shiratori in TGYN 18:1929/30, 235-241; IBŠ, 162-163; Chioldo 1992, passim; MNTB, 27. For white, black and colours in general among the Mongols, besides Poppe 1977, see also Cevé 1959; and, especially, Khabataeva 2001. For another example, in a Türkic epic, of a dream involving a falcon, cf. BDK, 45 (see also ibid., 10). The association of white with luck and a happy destiny is almost certainly a concept borrowed from the Inner Asian Turks (ultimately, Manichean?). Cf. GFT, § 24. See also Choi Hyöng-won in AH 9:1999, 286-288.

‘I had my dream… bringing your son’, lit. ‘I saw my dream… leading your son.’

For the Kiyat (pl. of Kiyan) ırigen, i.e. the members of the Kiyan yasan-lineage of the Borjigin to which Yisügei belonged, see above, n. 50. A few paragraphs later (§ 67), Yisügei is called Yisügei Kiyan, i.e. Yisügei the Kiyan. A genealogical table of the Kiyat is found in Doľ, 29.

‘The august spirit (sildar) of you, Kiyat people, has come in my dream and has announced your visit.’ Both the Chinese interlinear version and the sectional summary render sildar as ‘good (or lucky) omen’ (ch’i-ch’ü ㄆ ng), whereas in §§ 201 and 249 the same term is glossed ‘august (or majestic) spirit, majesty’ (wei-t’ing ㄆ ㄆ ). Sildar (= sildar) is an important term in the shamanistic conception of the world held by the Mongols, which is closely related to that of the early Turks and other Inner Asian people. Sildar is the spirit or spirit that animates, guards and protects a being (and by extension, a lineage) so that he can fulfill his destiny, which, as we have seen (above, n. 1), is preordained by Heaven. The chief characteristics of sildar, which must be distinguished from the individual ‘soul’ (see below), are ‘strength’, ‘might’ (ne’t’u), ‘fortune’ and ‘good fortune’, or ‘charisma’ (so > sua ‘fortunate, endowed with charisma’; see below, n. 74), both essential elements for achieving success with Heaven’s protection (the’el, rmo. and mo. ibegel; for b-h, see Letters, 72). This inborn ‘virtue’, if power, appears in individuals who are destined to become great leaders as a majestic aura, and the symbol of a prosperous household, conferring on them the qualities of what we may call today a ‘charismatic personality’. Embodying, as it did, the concepts of ‘strength’, ‘good fortune’ and ‘Heaven’s protection’, sildar in time came to assume the role of a protective spirit in relation to the family or clan, without being related to it. Thus sildar, as a force resulting in Heavenly-bestowed good fortune, and as the tutelary genius of the clan, was the very essence of the might and grandeur which a ruler and his family and descendants enjoyed. Perhaps already in Činggis Qa’an’s time it was believed that the sildar of the ruling clan could ‘animate’, as it were, a symbolic object like the great war standard (tuq), conferring special powers on it; we have ample evidence of sacrifices being offered to the standard at the beginning and at
destiny cannot be fulfilled without **süder**. In the 12th-13th centuries **süder** seems to combine the connotations of both the Roman *virtus* and the Christian *grace*, devoid however of moral undertones. On the problem of **süder**, see provisionally Banazarov 1981/82, 75ff.; Vlad., 157; Kotwicz 1934, 146; MMHS, 72-76, Note 1 (d); 90-91, Note 25(a); 333, n. 8; idem 1957, 548-550, n. 37; and ET, 1, 29, n. 64; Särköni 1971, 43-44; KCHT, 44, n. 71; FTT, 21-22 and n. 23; BSĐT, 94b; Heissig 1981; Bawden 1985, 10-14; Skrynnikova 1989c; idem 1992/93; idem 1993; idem 1994, 27ff.; and, more recently, KHIV, passim. For słös sünsen and its relationship with **süder**, cf. also Bawden 1962, 93-94 and n. 7; de Rachewiltz 1982, 71, n. 168; Cleaves 1985, 253, n. 79; RTM, 161-162; MSMOS, 65-66; BSĐT, 96a-b; TH, 242; IBS, 244-248; and, especially, Bazin 1987. For ss. gűči and *the el*, see below, nn. 74, 113, 125. For further comments on the problem of the soul, or souls, among the medieval Mongols, see below, note 201.

For the use of the particle *el* in the present section, see Street 1986, 8-9 (4), 11 (10).

**§§ 64, 65.** The entire section, from ‘With us ...’ to ‘their beauty’ (beginning of § 65), has been translated and discussed by Mostaert (Mo, 8-12, 194, 224). The following are a few additional comments:

Je e ‘daughter of the daughter’ is no. *jęje*. Cf. kh. 266, ord. 056 id.

‘We do not strive for dominion’, lit. ‘We do not contend with others over the *ulus*,’ i.e. over the possession of territory (one cannot define *ulus* as ‘empire’ at this time).

‘For those of you who have become qa’an’, for qa’an read san – qa’an would be anachronistic in this context and it must therefore be (as in other cases) a later substitution. See above, n. 1, and Section Four of the Introduction.

‘On a large cart’ (qsaaq tegen-tii). I have rendered qa’aaq tegen (i.e. a Qazaq [= Kazakh] cart or chariot) as ‘large cart’
following the Chinese gloss, and also on the strength of Pelliot’s remarks in NMP, l. 331; II, 870; and NHHO, 217-218. However, mo. geiyr terge and bur. sahuq terge designate a ‘light two-wheeled one-horse carriage’, i.e. a gig. In view of the subsequent reference to a ‘carriage with front seat’ (see below), a larger sort of two-wheeled cart must be meant. For other references to camel-drawn carts, see Poppe 1961. Cf. Vlad., 47. Bu’ura, mo. bu’ara, is a Mongol borrowing from tu buyara, a term designating the (two-humped) camel stallion, and specifically, the Bactrian camel. See TMEN, no. 747; ED, 317b-318a. Cf below, no. 152 and 274, for further references to camels in Mongolian.

‘We trot them off to the qa’un’, lit. ‘We go to the qa’un making the camel trot.’ I use the word qa’un again to be consistent with the text (see above), but it should of course be qan.

‘Seat them by him’, lit. ‘seat them together (qantaa),’

‘We do not strive for dominion, nor for people (ulus irgen),’ lit. ‘We do not contend with others over dominion and people.’ For ulus ‘dominion, domain’, see below, n. 202; for irger ‘people’, cf., above, n. 5.

‘Have the qa’ana as shields/Have their daughters as intercessors (lit. “petitions”),’ i.e. when the daughters and granddaughters of the Ogngirit marry powerful chiefs and become qa’ana, they serve as shields against the Ogngirit’s enemies; and by the requests they make to their husbands, they obtain favours for the Ogngirit. In a letter to me of 29 September 1971, H. Serruys wrote: ‘In connection with the custom of the Ogngirad (§ 64) not to strive for dominion, but to build their influence on their girls married to the rulers, it is interesting that in the 16th-17th centuries Austria had the same reputation:

Bella gerant alii, tu felix Austria nube;
Namque Mars alius, dat thi regna Venus.

I found this in a book on Charles V, but there was no reference. I thought it was very interesting to find a parallel so far from Mongolia.’

With our boys, when they seek a bride, etc.’ What Dei Sechen means is that, whereas the parents of a girl sought as wife for an Ogngirit boy ‘look at the camp’, i.e. consider the wealth of the boy’s family before the match is concluded, the parents of a boy seeking an Ogngirit girl as wife consider only the latter’s beauty, for which the Ogngirit girls are famous. The above interpretation of Dei Sechen’s words, which in no way constitute a popular saying (for another example, see § 66), is based on the one proposed by Mostaert (Mo, 12), however, another interpretation is not only possible, but plausible, viz. ‘Our boys look after the camp (i.e. they stay at home); Our girls are looked at (i.e. are admired) for their beauty (i.e. they marry into other clans and leave home).’ This interpretation goes back to Kozin (Ko, 86-87); it was followed by Damindusuren (Da’, 37; Da’, 31); it was defended by Gaambamba (MNTSZA, 106-111); and it was subsequently adopted by several other translators, including Ozawa (Oz., 2, 265-268, Oz., 1, 41). Mostaert’s interpretation is supported by the Chinese sectional summary (Y² 1, 46a), and it may be assumed that the Ming editors had on the whole a better understanding of the text from the folkloristic point of view than we have now. For mantuu ‘nomadic camp’, see above, n. 1 ad fin.

‘Take a look at her, qada’, lit. ‘let the qaana see her!’

§ 66. When Yisügei saw Dei Sechen’s daughter, he saw a girl ‘Who had light in her face/Who had fire in her eyes’, i.e. a perfect match for Temüjin, who had himself been so described in § 62 by Dei Sechen. The girl, Börte, was somewhat older than Temüjin, but this did not matter much in Mongol society; in fact, as Lastmire has pointed out (Lastmire 1963b, 55), it was considered a good thing for the first wife of a steppe aristocrat’s son to be a few years older, since ‘if he became a successful war leader and tribal chief [he] would later have other wives and concubines … She would reach puberty earlier, would be ready to initiate her husband sexually and also be able to guide and counsel him in worldly matters.’ As regards counsel, we know
that this is indeed what happened. See, e.g., § 118. Thus, assuming that Temüjin was born in 1162 (see above, n. 60, and below, n. 104), Börte must have been born in 1161. The year of their encounter, and engagement, was then 1170, since Temüjin was nine (= eight) at the time. The year of her death is not known, but she must have died after 1206(? and almost certainly before her husband. See below, n. 245. She is only briefly mentioned among the imperial consorts in YS' 114, 2869.

Börte means 'sky-blue, bluish, blue-grey'; as a proper name it corresponds exactly to our 'Celeste.' See de Rachewiltz 1997; Rybarzki [2003], s.v. Cf. above, n. 1.

'He was pleased with her,' lit. 'he let her enter into his mind (= heart, affection).’ Cf. Mo, 73.

For manaqaši ‘the following morning,’ cf. § 196, where the same form occurs, with the same meaning (see HW, 106). However, in §§ 210, 214 and 245 we find manaqaš (= pmn., mo. manaqar) id., and in §§ 72, 143 and 146 manaqar is glossed 'the next day’ (の日). In AT, 1, 14b et passim, the regular form is manavarši. It would appear, then, that manaqaš = manaqarši, the character in transcribing -r- having been inadvertently dropped by the copyist in §§ 66 and 196. Cf. Oz., 1, 269: manaqarši. I am not sure, however, that this is the case, for it is possible that manaqaš = manaqarši, like kelemči = kelemči, kelemči = kelimči ‘interpreter’; cf. Toba kelimčin id. See Mo, 17; 18; TMEN, no. 335; Ligeti 1959, 236; idem 1970, 292-293, no. 1; de Rachewiltz 1982, 86, n. 369. Cf. also RH, 236, no. 25 (manaqar ‘tomorrow’; mo. manqar, id.). For kelemči, see e.g. ET, 76260. In both instances we have -n- zero, as in sildar – sildar; see above, n. 63 (for malme and maršmer, see GWM, 48, §§ 165, 169). One cannot, therefore, exclude the possibility of manaqar = manaqaš, particularly in view of kalm. moždir = mo. manqar edir ‘tomorrow.’ See KAŠ, 342b; cf. KW, 256b: manqarır. Cf. also LLSI, 121b: mana (= maniš?)! id.
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"If I gave her away ... if I gave her away ..." In Mongolian these two sentences are expressed as two rhetorical questions, with the interrogative particle -wál-wul (= -bāl-bāl) following olonta ‘many times’ (here rendered as ‘after much’) and ēō enu ‘few times’ (here rendered as ‘without much’). Cf. Cl, 17. Dei Sechen’s words are somewhat ambiguous, however, and they could be understood as referring to his daughter, not to himself. See, e.g., the renderings in Ha, 10-11; Poppe 1964, 367; Ratchevsky 1976, 512; idem 1987, 70; and my earlier version, Ra, II, 131.

‘The fate of a girl is not to grow old in the family (lit. “at the door”) in which she was born.’ On this proverb quoted by Dei Sechen, see Mo, 12-13; Khomonov 1981, 59.

'I will give you my daughter, and you, for your part, leave your son here as my son-in-law,' lit. 'I will give my daughter, and you, for your part, go, leaving your son as son-in-law (geṛegė-te).’ But here the verb ‘to go’ (če) plays the role of an auxiliary of action or achievement. Cf. Mo, 156; Aalto 1973, 36. For the use of the postponed conjunction be ... be, see above, n. 29; cf. Street 1981, 161. Geṛegė is the plural of geṛegeqn (written gürgeq in § 251; cf. the pl. form gürget in §§ 68, 270 and 280). The plural is used to generalize the meaning of ‘as (one does in the case of) sons-in-law,’ as noted by Vladimirsov (Vlad., 3, 59, n. 5). Cf., however, Oz., 1, 272, n. 5. For the term gürgeq (pmn. kürgeq, ko. kürgeq) ‘son-in-law,’ also used as a title, see TMEN, no. 340; VMI, 52; Rošano-Tas 1986, 136. Ligeti has stated (VMI, 52) that the form gürget of the SH is an incorrect reading for gürgeq (= gürgeqen) and should therefore not be retained. This also applies to the plural form gürget, to be read gürgetter; see L', 41, 244, 257. This may be so, but it is by no means certain, since in the Chinese transcription system of the SH, the graph ㄧ ㄒегоūnually renders the Mongolian syllable ri, not the letter r. Note that the word gürgeq, convertable modals of gürgeq, occurs nine times in the same context (SH: see B, 230b, always with the graph transcribing r (ㄦ). Cf. GBMKA, 423-424. Why should an aberrant transcription (r
for $r$ occur six times (see R. 230h-231a, seven times in KCl, 705, but see below) in the words gürget and gürget ‘son(s)-in-law’, and not once in the homophone verb gürget. Furthermore, the form kürget instead of kürget occurs in AT1, 56a, corresponding to the gürgeten of SH, § 156 (ATL, 117, has ‘kürjet’ which is incorrect). I think that the original manuscript of the SH on which the Ming translators worked had kürgeten kürgeted; however, it is still a moot point whether these were true phonetic variants of kürgeten, kürgeted (= e – i in the second syllable is a common phenomenon in Mongolian), or merely graphic variants, the letter $i$ being in reality an e (the two can easily be confused in Uighur-Mongol script). In this connection, it may be of interest to note that (1) AT1, 14b, has kürgeted-te (twice), but kürgeted-te in 31b; and (2) in the present section (§ 66) of the SH, Y1 and Y2 have the reading gürjet in the first occurrence of this word but Y1 has gürjet. Pe, 13, and R, 26, line 1330, follow Y1. Y1’s. In the later sections of this is the correct reading in view of the two other occurrences in the same section; furthermore, the reading in Y2 militates in favour of gürget and gürgeten in the later sections being only graphic variants, i.e. gürjet, gürjeten = gürget, gürgeten. I must also add that in the Chinese transcriptions of the Yüan period, li li- li le (96) even in cases where the original Mongol word definitely has le, as in kelemecicici. Cf. Ligeti 1959, 236. For monn. kürgeten, cf. also RH, 232, no. 1.

On the Mongol custom of leaving the bridegroom with the bride’s family as live-in son-in-law, and its implications, see Vlad2, 59; Ratchevsky 1976, 512, 512-526, n. 22; ČK1, 19-20 (= ČK2, 21); Holmgen 1986, 132-133. The fierceness of the Mongolian dogs is well known, and it comes as no surprise that young Temüjin was scared of them. Cf below, nos. 78 and 260. Yissüge’s fatherly concern is one of those human touches that brighten up the SH narrative. On this aspect of the work, cf. A. Särközí’s remarks in Särközí 1978, 148.

---

86, 68. Sira Ke’er (‘Yellow Steppe’) is an unidentified plain near Mount Čekler and therefore not far from the Buir Nör and the Urshun River, but already in Tatar territory. See HCG, 424, 427. Cf. Perleé, 11 (= Perleé, 98), where it is localized in the area of the Buir Nör and the estuary of the Kerulen; however, its situation in the Kerulen basin, already proposed by Wang Kuo-wei, has been disproved by Pelliot (op. cit., 427). Nevertheless, the territory in question being west of the Urshun (see above, n. 61), this locality must be situated between the two lakes Hulun and Buir.

‘Some Tatars’, lit. ‘Tatar people.’ It is surprising that, given the long-standing feud between the Mongols and the Tatars, Yissüge should have deemed it wise to partake of their hospitality – an action that soon proved to be a fatal error of judgement on his part. See §§ 53, 58, 59; cf. Clark 1978, 36-37. Obviously, Yissüge was simply complying with a basic rule of nomadic life, sanctioned in one of the yesül (= jasaq) mentioned by al-’Umarī: ‘Wer an Leuten vorbekommen, das hat, ohne erst um Erlaubnis zu bitten, Platz zu nehmen und mit ihnen zu speisen.’ See MW, 97. Interesting enough, the Tatars called him ‘Yissüge the Kiyan,’ referring to his lineage.

‘Remembered’ (lit. ‘thinking of’) their grievances. For kessä ‘grievance, enmity,’ cf. § 281 kegesüle- (a denomin
verb in -tel-lu from kegesi) 'to secretly harm (because of a personal grudge).’ See below, n. 281. Both the noun and the verb are obsolete and no longer in use in any Mongolian language. Pe. 14, has kegesilen following AT, 21a (cf. AT, 15a), but the emendation is not justified.

‘With the secret intent to harm, they gave him poison mixing it with his food,’ lit. ‘With the secret intent to harm, they poisoned him, mixing poison which they gave to him with his food.’ ‘With the secret intent to harm’ renders the Mongol ovsilad. The verb ovsilad- ‘to harbour secret thoughts (of hate, revenge); to secretly harm’ appears four times in the SH in the forms ovsilat- (§§ 67, 245), ovsula- (§ 68), and ovsilət- (§ 281). This verb is not attested elsewhere in these forms that I know of. Cf. Mo, 157. As suggested by N. Poppe (poc.), ovsilət- is probably a misreading for ovsilət-, the two forms being easily confused in Uighur-Mongol script. Cf. the ‘osteledin’ of AT, 15a. Now, ovsilət- (‘ovsilət-) is no doubt a variant of mo. ölesë (-ı̈sile-) ‘to harbour hate or resentment against s.; to avenge, take vengeance’ (Kow., 514a-b), a verb ultimately deriving from *ō̃- hate, revenge.’ (For -t - zero, cf. üdert- - üderti- ‘to rest and eat,’ see HW, 158.) See also below, n. 281. ‘They gave him poison:’ the verb gofi-, glossed in the interlinear translation as ‘to poison’ (tu  şi) is a hapax legomenon. Ch. tu can also mean ‘to grievously harm, injure’ (n. 44). In the HIYI, Ilb., 11b, there is a verb gülīfe- (? for gülīfe- or gülīfel-) meaning ‘to grievously injure (= to kill).’ Cf. Matiër II, 18, 57; Matiër II, 94 (11v.5); Cleaves 1985, 246, n. 41. Cf. also kh. gür, kalm. gūryo, ‘to risk (one’s life);’ ord. gožerle- ‘to do violence to s.’ Possibly the two verbs gofi- and gülīfe- are related, the alternation of back and front vocalism being well attested. Cf. yutul- - getul- - celi- - celi- - siyul- - suyul- - etc. See Ö2, 1, 275-276, n. 5; Vietze 1990, 381-382. Cf. SG, 131-133, § 68; de Rachewiltz 1983, 20; Matiër III, 16, 21, 36, 54, 71. If so, the translation should literally run as follows: ‘they grievously injured him mixing poison which they gave to him with his food.’ For the expression (idegen-dür qura qoqil- ‘to mix poison (in the food),’ see Kow., 925a. Cf. GOM, 65, for the parallel account in Sayang Selen’s chronicle (ET, 26v-2931). ‘Felt ill,’ lit. ‘went bad’ (ma’ul otut), where ‘bad’ (ma’ul) = ‘ill,’ and ‘to go (or) = to be in a certain state or condition,’ corresponds here to yabs- id. See the AT (15a) gloss (ma’ul adaran = ma’ul-bar yabun), which has been misunderstood in LDAT, 70, and ATL, 34. ‘After three days,’ lit. ‘going three days and nights’ (qurban qonog sambu). For qonog see mo. qoney ‘a day and a night,’ cf. TMEN, no. 1539; DO, 353a. ‘Being in a bad way,’ lit. ‘being bad (= ill).’ Cf. Cleaves 1959, 60 [126], and 90, n. 352, where however it is not stated that ‘to be (or become) bad actually means ‘to be (or become) ill.’ For ma’ul ‘ill,’ cf. ord. məq ‘indisposed; qui va mal (malade)’ (DO, 472a).

‘Who is at hand?’ For dergede ‘at the side, in the presence of,’ cf. de Rachewiltz 1982, 80, n. 282. Old Čaraça (Čaraça Ebiçen), the father of Monglik, reappears in §§ 72 and 73. A variant of his name is Čaraqif (cf. §§ 29, 47); on its etymology, cf. HCG, 24; Poppe 1975, 167. For Čaraqa - Čaraqi, cf. Ilige - Iligei, Çölte - Çöltei, etc. (see SG, 295-299, § 159). Čaraqa was a Qongqatan; for this clan see § 47 and com. Ebiçen ‘old man; elder, venerable’ is a title of respect. Cf. HCG, 23-24; TMEN, no. 4; MSR, 133. For other examples, see §§ 97 Jarči ilid. Ebiçen, § 120 Čsin Ebiçen, § 149 Şirgõ’seti Ebiçen. His son Monglik, also known as Monglik Ebiçen, or Father Monglik, is an interesting figure, not only as the father of Köükçi Tek Tengber (see § 245), but also for having been regarded, with some justification, as the man whom Ho’elün married after Yişiğei’s death. For the arguments in favour and against this hypothetical marriage, see HCG, 22; Hambs 1975, 23-24, n. 39, 51ff. There is no doubt that there existed a special relationship between the families of
Yisügi and Çaraqi, and that this relationship, which has been discussed in detail and with perception by Hamis (op. cit.), continued in the following generation between Temülji/Cinggis Qan and Mönglik (and the latter’s son Kököö). From § 69 onwards Mönglik is regularly called ‘Father’ — an epithet that Yisügi’s children applied to him because, as the most trusted man in the household and the one whom Yisügi had charged with the care of the whole family after his death, they naturally regarded him as their second father. And it is noteworthy that in § 68 Mönglik calls Temülji ‘son.’ Mönglik’s name, of Turke origin, means ‘White Hair Beauty Spots’ (or Molm). See HCG, 117. Cf. BT, II, 193; and Rasasid 1995, 110. Cf. above, n. 50. On his death-bed Yisügi calls Mönglik ‘my boy (or child: čaqa mina);’ this means that he must have been considerably younger than Yisügi, but old enough to assume responsibility for the family, i.e. probably between twenty and thirty years of age, as surmised by Hamis 1975, 20. For the word čaqa ‘boy, child,’ cf. Rasasid 1995, 114; and below, n. 249. ‘I was secretly harmed.’ For oyisulaqqa’a (almost certainly to be read oyisulege’e), see above. The AT has, in fact, oyisulegebe ‘AT’, 158), which has been incorrectly transcribed as oyisulada’ha in ATL, 35. ‘You take care,’ lit. ‘You be in charge (či mede) of taking care.’ For this passage, see Mo, 13, 234; Cleaves 1985, 247, n. 46. ‘Your younger brothers ... your widowed elder sister-in-law’: these are figurative terms, not to be taken literally. In the first instance, Yisügi regards Mönglik as his eldest son and his children as Mönglik’s younger brothers; in the second instance, anticipating the situation after his own death, Yisügi regards Mönglik as his younger brother (taking his place in the family as it were) and Hö’elöin becomes then Mönglik’s elder sister-in-law. Cf. the case of Tolu’s children and of his widow Bertide in § 272. With regard to the year of death of Yisügi, probably 1170, see above, n. 54.
help of some scanty information provided by the YS and other Chinese sources, and taking also into account the narratives of European medieval travellers, such as John of Pian di Carpine, we can reconstruct the 'food-sacrifice' in its essential lines. It consisted, apparently, in a simple ceremony, carried out in spring (and possibly at other times too) by a shaman and/or shamaness, with the participation of the female members of the family of the deceased acting as assistants. A hole was dug in the ground where the food offering (i.e. meat) sprinkled with kumis or other alcoholic drink was buried. A prayer, or invocation, was recited and at the end the assistants consumed the remainder of the meat and drink. This form of sacrifice to the dead is very ancient, and we know that it was already performed in Liao and Chin times. See Mo, 18-20, n. 14; Li, 145, n. 70; Ratchnevsky 1970, 429-430 (III); idem 1976, 521; Franke H 1979, 142-143; IBIS, 230-234; Even 1994, 175. It is my opinion that the two words qafara ineru may actually constitute the beginning of the invocation made at the ceremony in question (cf. the enigmatic words abu ai baluti of the invocation mentioned in § 174, see below, n. 174). The purpose of the invocation was to call the souls, or spirits, of the ancestors to the ritual meal prepared for them, so as to secure their continued blessing on the clan. Thus, the invocatory formula must have contained words to that effect, in primis an entreaty to come and accept the offering. This, I think, may explain the use of the directive in both words which I understand as meaning 'To (it, 'towards, in the direction of') the ground, to this side (i.e. in this direction'), i.e. 'Come to the ground (or place) of sacrifice, to this (= our) side (or 'down here').' For uig. ineru 'vers le bas', cf. CBBMP, 105a. The invocatory formula would then be repeated in conjunction with the name of each of the ancestors whose 'soul' was in turn called by the shaman to 'come down' and join the sacrificial meal. I believe that the invocatory formula, consisting of the two words qafara ineru (which Mostaert rightly calls 'une expression toute faîte', see Mo, 17), was used, as a synecdoche, for the whole ceremony and, indeed,
as the regular designation of the sacrifice — much in the same way as in the Christian religion a set word or expression is used for the same purpose. Cf., for instance, the very name for the Eucharistic sacrifice, the ‘Mass’ (lat. missa), which comes from the formula of dismissal of the congregation at the end of the service (in, missa est). Clearly, by excluding Höl'elin from this important ritual on the pretext that she was late, Ambagai's widows intended to cut their ties with their Kiyat Bogjinagnates now that Yisigüe was dead, and so reassert the leadership of the Tayi'eulut within the Mongol tribe, as confirmed by their subsequent actions. Cf. Vlad.; 63; MSI, 402-412; Lattimore 1963b, 60.

With regard to the name Orbei, the SH form can be read either Orbai or Orbei; the latter reading is supported by AT, 15b. Cf. Rybatski (2003), s.v. For the name Soqatai, see ibid., s.v.


‘She was left out’, lit. ‘she was left behind the others’: as the other participants in the ceremony had all been given a share of the food offerings, there was no share left for Höl'elin.

You say to yourselves that Yisigüe Ba'atur is dead’, lit. ‘You say, “Has Yisigüe Ba’atur not died?” This and the following clause ending with yekin qofda ‘olumun tu, lit. ‘why do you leave me behind?’, are rhetorical questions which I have rephrased in my translation.

The ‘share of the offerings to the ancestors’ renders yekin-in kešiš, lit. part (= share) of the Great Ones (= the ancestors)’, i.e. the portions or shares of the food offerings to the souls of the ancestors which the assistants burnt in the ground, as distinct from the remainder of the offerings which were shared among and consumed by the assistants. Cf. DO, 262b, s.v. ‘Gešiş.’

Kešiš (= pro. kešiš, kešiš in tu, kešiš in el), as a military term came to mean ‘turn of duty, guard duty’, and by extension ‘the alternating sections of the gio’s bodyguard’, hence ‘the Guard.’ On this important term and

institution, see Mo, 244-249; Haentisch 1961, 144-149; Urany-Köhalmi 1971, 276-279. Lattig 1973, 150-151, no. 2; and below, nn. 191, 197.

The two words bile‘ur (w.f. bilegiür) and sarqueit (w.f. sarqueit) are technical terms of the sacrifice meaning ‘remainder of the sacrificial meat’ and ‘remainder of the sacrificial drink’ respectively. The Chinese interlinear gloss renders sarqueit as ‘sacrificial meat’, but the correct meaning is no doubt the one given above. See Lattig in AOH 14, 1962, 323-324; Lattig 1973, 151-151 (3 & 4).

Regarding the term bile‘ur, H. Sergys (p.c.) wrote: ‘In Fr Mostaet’s copy of Sur quelques passages ..., p. 122, there is a pencil note to bile‘ur: “bilegiür idésten”; “ceux qui mangent l’excédent de la viande de sacrifice.” But no reference, except yxigraph of Fr Daty (long dead). I have no idea which xylograph he is referring to. The only xylograph I have (from Fr.M.) is the Savin tige-tu endintin sing mereti sastir. Doubtful if that is it.’ For sarqueit, see also TMEN, no. 1236; DO, 562b; Poppe 1955, 41.

The entire §§ 70, as well as §§ 71 and part of §§ 72, have been translated and discussed in Mo, 14-24.

§§ 71, 72. The section from ‘At these words’ to ‘Onan River’ has been translated and discussed in Mo, 22-24.

After repeating in harsh terms to Höl'elin (whom they accuse of claiming rights she no longer had), Ambagai’s two widows turn to the Tayi’eulut people, i.e. to their chiefs, exhorting them to move camp and break away from Yisigüe’s family and retainers, thus severing all relations with the rival clan. The Tayi’eulut breakaway may be compared with Temijn’s breakaway from his anda and kinsman (through Bodončar Mungcaq) Jamuqa. See § 118; cf. Lattimore 1963b, 60-61. In § 72, the expression ‘mothers and children’, which occurs twice, is correct: it was only Höl'elin and her children that were left behind by the departing Tayi’eulut but also the mother of Beker and Belgütei, Tṣigil or Tsigil. See above, n. 56. There is a
reference to her in § 101 confirming her presence in the family. There were also retaisins, like Old Caraqa and Old Qa’uljin (see below, n. 98), as well as Caraqa’s son Mnglik whose position in the family has already been discussed (n. 68).

‘The following day’ (manugaati idar) occurs again in § 146, and is found also in the second line of the Qura Qoto manuscript fragment 110 in the P.K. Kozlov Collection of the IVAN RAN Library in St. Petersburg, albeit in mutilated form (manugaati idar).

Tarqutai Kiritaq and Tööön Girtte (‘The Foul’) were two Tayi’il’ut chiefs. Apparently, the former was the son of Adai Qa’n, himself a grandson (or son?) of Ambaqai. For his name, probably an ethnic name from Tarqutai (Täri, mno. Tarqut) rather than an epithet meaning ‘Fat’, see Bese 1988, 34-35; HCG, 16. He appears several times in the SH (see, especially, § 149) and is mentioned in the SWCCL and by Rašid al-Dim. See HCG, 14-16 and 465, for further references to him. Tööön Girtte is probably the same personage called Töööge (Töööge > Tööön > Tööön) in §§ 146 and 219, and he is no doubt to be identified with Yisügüi’s ‘close attendant’ (išhir) Tööön Qoqrifin of the SWCCL (= YS), and the ‘senior kinsman’ (dqr) Tööön Qahurçii (= Ba’urçii – Qa’urçii) of Rašid. See HCG, 18-21, on him and the problems concerning his identification (he was known by several epiteths). Cf. also Hambis 1975, 22, n. 38. As stated in the SH, other Tayi’il’ut leaders joined them and so the entire Tayi’il’ut people moved away from Yisügüi’s camp which, as we learn from Rašid, was at the time ‘between the Oron and the Kerulen’. See SL, II, 85. The Tayi’il’ut moved further east along the Oron River. (For the localization of the Tayi’il’ut, see Badamzaxtan 1992, 91.) Tarqutai Kiritaq obviously regarded himself as Ambaqai Qan’s heir and successor, and therefore as the legitimate leader of the Mongol people, a claim which, inevitably put him on a collision course with the still young Temüljin, Yisügüi’s eldest son by Horselum. See below, nn. 79 and 219. Yisügüi’s eldest son by his other wife (Suugil or Suqil) was Bekter, but he will soon be eliminated by Temüljin, who thus disposed of the only other serious contender within his own immediate family. I think this is the true reason for the callous murder of Bekter, not the trivial one reported in the SH (see below, n. 77). It is in the light of these circumstances that Yisügüi’s immediate recall of Temüljin from Dee Sečen’s camp must be understood: Yisügüi was well aware that after his death the succession issue would flare up again. In the YS it is stated that irreparable disunity and conflict between Yisügüi and his Tayi’il’ut kinsmen (Ba’urçii) was caused by Tarqutai’s authoritarianism (ačıq). See YS I, 1, 3.

For the use of the so-called enclitic -tari-tari = ‘and the other’, cf. Mo, 30 and n. 24, 93-94; DQ, 644, s.v. "tari"; and, more recently, the interesting remarks by N. Otrolovskaya in YMT, 34-36, 50-51. This enclitic functions as: 1) an apposition indicator, to be rendered with a comma or a dash (Astan B = A, or B – A; cf. § 90); 2) conjunction (‘and’) between related nouns/names (A, B, C-tari D = D – A, B and C; cf. § 183); 3) a categorizing particle for ‘things’ of the same group or kind (hence an extension of [2]), to be rendered with ‘and (the) others’, i.e. of the same kind (A-tari B = B and the others: A, B-tari C = C – A and B others; cf. §§ 99 and 176). [A usage coincides at times with that of ki et (= pmo, mo, kiri). See Oz’, III, 29-32, n. 7, 208-209, n. 1 (with reference to §§ 130 and 150). Cf. also below, n. 133, for additional comments.

‘Tried to stop them’ and later ‘Why do you hinder us?’, the verb in both instances is itiq = (= mo. itiq) which has these meanings as well as those of ‘to exhort, persuade’, i.e. ‘to urge s. to do or not to do s.’ Cf. HW, 84; Les, 401 a.

The words ‘The deep water has dried up, The shining stone is shattered’, which are in fact a proverb that the SH puts in Tööön Girtte’s mouth, are also reported in the SWCCL § 3a, SL, II, 85, and YS I, 1, 3. Their meaning, as explained by Rašid (loc. cit.), is ‘I have made a firm decision because there was no other choice for me’. As to the possibility of any hesitation, it
is prepositional (i.e. it is out of the question - I.R.)'! In other words, 'The situation has deteriorated to the point where things can no longer be mended.' After quoting the proverb, the SWCCL makes Tödön say 'What is the point in staying?' See HCG, 17:18. This Mongol saying, which occurs again in §§ 147 and 209 (with slightly different wording), has been discussed by Gaadamba (MNTSZA, 111-113), Cereernochn, 1986, 77, 78, and Ozawa (Os, II, 28-30, nn. 8, 9). The latter's interpretation of the word چیژ in 'hard' instead of 'shining (or bright)' is, however, unacceptable. It is true that in the version of the proverb reported in the Chinese sources the stone is described as 'hard' or 'solid' (3), and this meaning certainly seems more appropriate than 'shining' or 'bright', but the word چیژ occurs several times in the SH regularly glossed as ین 'brilliant'. See SH, 25. چیژ = چیژ (mo. چیژ, kh. چیژ) 'white, whitish, light'. See TH, 314 (=JYT, 545). The meaning of 'bright' for چیژ is also confirmed by the Chinese sectional summary (Y 2, 4a). In the corresponding passage of the AT, the word چیژ is indeed preserved, but it is misplaced in the text, see AT, 7a. The reason for the choice of the word چیژ as the attribute of چیژ 'a stone' in this popular saying is, I think, simply due to alliteration with the word چیژ 'deep'. The Chinese rendering of the Mongol proverb in the SWCCL and YS is apparently an 'improvement' on the original. On the phraseology of this proverb, cf. also Bese 1969, 129-130.

For the expression چیژ گاظ 'along the spine', cf. Cleeves 1949a, 511. چیژ, mo. چیژ, is 'the spine' or 'back' (see Les., 1065a); چیژ, mo. چیژ, means 'along, lengthwise, following the line (or course) of, downward(s)'. (see Les., 365a). This word, which occurs again in § 207: چیژ گاظ 'along the چیژ River', is discussed at length in Ozawa 1977a, 495-500. However, the nature of the word deserves further investigation. Vladimirivciv has already noted the correlation between چیژ 'to lower', چیژ 'along, onward, down', and چیژ, qotl. چیژ 'down' (SG, 160, 319). For چیژ چیژ, cf. چیژ چیژ, for the
teeth to show > چیژ 'smile'; for the unusual suffix -چ forming nouns as well as adverbs, see above, nn. 50, 55 (this dual role of -چ is very similar to that of the suffix -چ, on which see GWM, 49, § 181; 59, § 216 [a]); cf. JS, 52, § 77. 'The verb چیژ is formed on چیژ 'low'; cf. qara 'black' > چیژ 'to darken' (see 'Verbstamm.', 56, § 70). For چیژ 'low', cf. ou., qotl. چیژ 'down'. Besides چیژ (چیژ) we have several deverbal nouns deriving from چیژ, such as چیژ 'violet, narrow canal' (چیژ 'suff.; see GWM, 47, § 159), چیژ 'passage, thoroughfare' and its synonym چیژ 'lane' (چیژ 'suff. -m and -mi; see GWM, 47, § 164; 48, § 111). Regarding the latter, it has been suggested (MCS, 208) that it is from this word (چیژ) that ch. چیژ چیژ (چیژ) 'lane, alley (in Peking)' may derive. I doubt this since the term in question, when first attested in writing (in Yuan literature), appears only in the form چیژ- (see SYYT, 629b; DJK, X, 34066); in the Peking vernacular the two forms regularly used are چیژ and (hzaa) چیژ- (小) 'luminary'. It is, however, possible that چیژ may originate from چیژ, which has the same meaning as چیژ (cf. MKT, 197b), even though the Chinese phonetic rendering is not quite accurate: چیژ presupposes an original *hunug, rather than چیژ. Moreover, there is no textual evidence for the existence of چیژ and چیژ in Mongolian classical or preclassical texts that I know of, which is surprising if these words were already in common usage in the 13th-14th centuries. Indeed, according to Ramsted (KW, 153a), it is چیژ which is a borrowing from Chinese, not the other way round. Nevertheless, چیژ - if this word existed in the Yuan period - is a better etymology than any proposed so far, such as a derivation from mom. qoton 'town' (suggested to me by the late Fang Chaoqing in 1961), or from Manchu (see SDJ, 1329d). For other less likely derivations, cf. HCLWYTT, 335-339, no. 110. Ma. چیژ 'alley, lane' is definitely a borrowing from ch. چیژ. Cf. STMY, I, 479a.
Finally, it is worth noting that in the sentence beginning 'As they set out', the verb ne'ü, lit. 'to transmigrate', is in the passive: ne'ü'de'gurin, i.e. 'when they underwent their transmigrance'; cf. also §§ 73 and 74. See Poppe 1964, 375.

§ 73. 'Your good father' = 'your late father', i.e. Ysügi. For 'good' (tayin) = 'late', see 'Trois documents', 455; Lettres, 59. The people 'gathered' by him were the people he had conquered, i.e. his subjects. For this use of the verb qurquris 'to gather, assemble', see below, n. 196.

'This is how I was treated', lit. 'I was done so.' Cf. Poppe 1964, 374. According to Raïd al-Dîn, Old Carâqa died just as Tênûgin left his tent in tears. See SL2, I/2, 85. The order of these events in SL is somewhat different from that in the SH.

Regarding Hû'elîn's courageous but ultimately fruitless effort, Ligeti has already noted that her display of the war standard of Ysügi's clan was a symbolic gesture indicating her determination to challenge the action of the Tayî'ilut, and to rally the subjects that had deserted her by assuming the power formerly invested in her husband - the sacred power symbolized by the standard. The standard (tayq, mo' tay) played a most important role in the great tribal events, such as the beginning and the end of a military campaign. See Lt, 145, n. 73, also for a graphic description of one of these ceremonies in the time of Habur (quoted from the work of Habûr). On the great standard of the Mongols in the time of Čingis Qan and later - the white tayq 'with nine feet', i.e. with nine tails or streamers made of yak tails - see the references in the MTPL and HTSL (= MDBL, 76, 186-187; CG, 72, 74, 132, 146, 174, 195), and in Serruys 1945, 156. Cf. also Pellet 1930b, 32; and his remarks in HCG, 22-23, and NMP, II, 860-861. On the term tayq of Turkic and ultimately Chinese origin, see TMEN, no. 969. For further mentions of the standard in the SH, cf. §§ 106 and 202; and above, n. 63. The denominative verb tayla-(w.f. tayla)-'to hold the standard' is unknown in Written Mongolian and in the living languages and dialects. With regard to this word, both the interlinear gloss and the sectional summary in the SH raise problems of interpretation concerning which see HCG, 22-23; Ratchnevsky 1966a, 182; TH, 361, 263 (= JYT, 457-458).


For the corresponding passage in the SWCCCL and in Raïd al-Dîn's work, see HCG, 18; SL2, I/2, 85. According to Raïd, loc. cit., there was actually an armed confrontation between the two sides; in the end Hû'elîn succeeded in causing part of the Tayî'ilut tribesmen and of her ulus (i.e. her subjects) to come back.

The verb icî while 'to return' corresponds to mo. nîci- id. For it-ʻit, see HCG, 332; Oe', II, 35-36, n. 6.

§ 74. 'The Tayî'ilut kinsmen', lit. 'The Tayî'ilut brothers' (aqâ de'î). The expression aqâ de'î ('elder brother[s] and younger brother[s] = 'brothers') refers here in particular to the Tayî'ilut leaders Tarqarî Kirtiçuq and his younger brothers (cf. § 149) who had agrarian links with Ysügi through Ambaqai, Carâqa Linguq and Qađu. Tarqarî and Ysügi were, in fact, cousins of the same generation, both being collateral descendants of Qađu in the fifth generation. One may indeed render aqâ de'î with 'cousins.' In many languages the terms 'elder brother' and younger brother are used as indicators of seniority and juniority for male paternal cousins within the generation of ego. Cf., e.g., ch. xiiqû 3 (lit. = tsu-xiçiun ლო) and ti 0 (lit. = tsu-0 ლო) 'elder cousin' and 'younger cousin' (see Fegg HJ, 1937, 149); gr. ἀδήλος 'brother, kinsman'; etc. The Mongols, too, used these terms to express relationships beyond those of blood brothers. See E. Bacon's remarks on the subject in NMP, II, 860-861. See also NMP, I, 75; Cleaves 1949, 115, n. 125; MSR, 135-136. Cf. §§ 68, 120, 180; and below, n. 104. In most translations of the SH it is not really clear whether the 'Tayî'ilut brothers' are Tarqarî Kirtiçuq and his own brothers, or whether they are 'our Tayî'ilut brothers (kînmen)', said from the standpoint of
Yisşügen’s family – which ultimately comes to the same thing. Cf., e.g., Oz, I, 58; Ev-Pop, 58; On, 19; CI, 20; and Ta, 23.

That the latter interpretation is the only correct one is unequivocally shown by the expression Tayel ‘i’ aya de ‘iye’en ‘of our Tayel brothers (kinsmen)’ in § 76; cf. also Sorqan Şira’s words in § 82.

The verb tel’i’ (n.m. tel’iye, tel’iye) which recurs in §§ 74 and 75 means both ‘to feed, nourish’ and ‘to rear.’

‘Palling firmly her tall hat/Over her head’ renders ukalalaita boqtatatalu, lit. ‘Putting the boqtat on her head until it was fast.’ For boqtatalu = (n.m. boytatalu) ‘to put on the boqtat, see Mo, 201-204; TMEN, no. 89. The boqtat or boqtat = (n.m. boya, boytay; m.o. boyo) is the characteristic headdress worn by high-ranking Mongol ladies and known in Chinese at the time as ku-kus kuan (lit. ‘lita’, ‘lit.’ etc. hit (lit. it) ) of ku-ku hat’, or simply as ku-ku. This term itself is a transcription of a non-Chinese word (’gagā). It is tempting to relate it, as other investigators have done, to mno. kagel (= ’kāl), kēl, m.o. kakkāl, kēl ‘long hair, tuft of hair, braids’ (see above, n. 56), particularly since one of the meanings of m.o. kakul is ‘ornaments pour la chevelure’ (Kow., 2632a). Cf., e.g., HCWLYTT, 309-327, no. 107 (a valuable contribution); Huang SC 1984, 207-208; and TH, 151-152 (n. JYT, 263-266). The boytatalu was a very ornate headdress, decked with feathers, gems and pearls. One of its main features, together with its unusual length and shape, was the strings of pearls hanging down on the sides just like tresses, so that this headgear was a true ‘chapecu a tresses’ – which is exactly what ku-ku kuan means if ku-ku = kakkāl(l). This equivalence is, however, uncertain and the above explanation remains purely hypothetical, also because it is not clear why the Chinese would adopt such a designation instead of simply using the word boqtat in transcription. (One possible, and most likely explanation is that the term ku-ku is of Kitian origin.) We have detailed descriptions, as well as pictorial evidence, of the boytatalu (q) in the 13th and 14th centuries, mostly through the accounts of contemporary Chinese and European travellers.

Cf., in particular, CG, 79, 80, n. 3, 119; MDHL, 80, 81, 191, 192; HYC, A, 18a-b; TOA, 67 (cf., however, Peliot in TP 28:1931, 420); SF, 35, no. 1, 182-183, 258, n. 6 (cf., however, RCAC, 150, 473, n. 3; MM, 7-8, 102; MWR, 88, 89 and n. 92; CW, Il, 222, 222-224, n. 5; and CEME, 16-18. Cf. also Semory 1945, 136; Mostaert 1957a, 97-98; Peliot 1925, 222; and Z. Batsalaxam in MNT, I, 258-262. For an illustration of the boytatalu as worn by Qubilai’s wife, the Empress Cabu (or Cah), in the famous portrait from the Palace Museum, see CCKTFSYC, 388, fig. 157 (right). Cf. also Ess 1977, pl. la, 1a. For further data on the boytatalu, see the use of this term in Turkish and Turkic, and related problems, see CCKTFSYC, 388-389; Mostaert 1927: 147; TMEN, no. 89; RH, 300, no. 40. The form boqtat appears as bochta in a Venetian document of 566. See MP, I, 556. Cf. de Rachewiltz 1997a, 175. For boqtat = boytatalu, cf. tu. (tag) yasɔ = yusaq c mmo. jassaq ‘law’.

In § 254 we find two variations on the theme of Ho’elun wearing the boqtaa expressing essentially the same idea, viz. the wearing of the headdress firmly in position (which must not have been easy in view of its shape). Ho’elun’s reason for wearing it: such circumstances as are described in the present section is, again, symbolic. As Peliot has pointed out (NHII, 43), the belt, which is mentioned in conjunction with the boqtaa, is a symbol of authority. The boqtaa, a formal headdress to be worn only by married ladies of rank, is a status symbol. By wearing boqtaa and belt, Ho’elun symbolically reaffirms her authority and position at a time of great adversity.

‘Tying tightly her belt/To shorten her skirt’, lit. ‘Girding herself until (= so as to shorten her skirt (i.e. by ‘sucking it up’).’

See Mo, 200, and 200-203, n. 184.

Along the Onan River, Running up and down’, lit. ‘Running upstream and downstream along the Onan River’. The word for downstream is trada – a hapax legomenon. It is apparently an adverb in -dal-de like o’de ‘upstream’, and a synonym of huru’ (m.o. uraro) ‘downstream’ (see HW, 79).
The rendering is based on the interlinear Chinese gloss and makes perfect sense, irada being in juxtaposition to o‘de. TH, 111 (= JYT, 198), and Oz‘, III, 38, 44, n. 7, followed by On, 19, understand differently and see irada the dative-locative of ira ‘edge, border’, a rare word attested in the MA, 1976, in the form iratu ‘having an edge’. However, if we accept this interpretation, the rendering of the above clause is, in my view, not as satisfactory. (Running upstream along the edge (= bank) of the Oxan River)."

‘She gathered crab apples and bird cherries.’ For temgii ‘to pick up’, see Hashimoto 1992; cf. also the SH, § 26. For olirin, mo. olir, kh. olir, ‘the crab or wild apple’ (Malus pallasiana), see MOUNT, 59. In Inner Mongolia olir (olir) designates Malus baccata. See UJIT, 725. For moyilsun, mo. moyil, kh. moll(on), ‘the bird or sour cherry’ (Padus, L. [= Prunus padus]), see UNT, 68, no. 1943; UJIT, 746. Cf. Oz‘, II, 44-45, nn. 8, 9. It should be noted that some of the Chinese botanical glosses in the SH are not wholly reliable; for example, olirin is glossed tu‘li = $S\{ small coarse pear’ (Prunus persicaefolia: see CMP, 132, no. 432; CKKTCWTC, II, 233), which is not an accurate definition as the fruit in question is a wild apple, not a wild pear. Moyilsun is merely glossed ‘name of fruit’ ($\{\). For the plant suffixed su‘li-sun, see Poppe 1981, 387-388 (4). Cf. MÖTT, 2756b, no. 371.

‘Day and night she fed their hungry gullots.’ For the expression go‘olat teflaughter ‘to feed the gulllet’, see Cleaves 1985, 245, n. 33.

‘Born brave’ renders sôlütütel törekken, lit. ‘born with gall’, i.e. with courage. As noted by Cleaves, the Mongols, like the Chinese, believed that the gall is the seat of courage. See CL, 21, n. 5. Cf. below, n. 139.

‘The noble mother’, this expression, which occurs three times in § 74, is literally ‘the lady mother’ (u‘jin eke). U‘jin, Höl‘e‘lin’s epithet, is the designation of ladies of noble birth, such as, e.g., the daughter of the Merit chief Toqto‘a, Hül‘a’ur U‘jin (§ 177). See above, n. 55. I regularly render Höl‘e‘lin U‘jin as Lady Höl‘e‘lin; only in the present instances do I translate U‘jin as ‘noble’ simply to avoid the awkward rendering ‘the lady mother’, or the equally unsatisfactory ‘the u‘jin mother’, or ‘U‘jin, the Mother.’

‘Her sons who were devout/With Heaven’s good fortune’ renders suuran k‘ölül-sun. Suuran, plural of sutai (as u‘fortune, Heaven’s favour + poss. suff. ‘-ai’) ‘fortune (= recipient of Heaven’s fortune or favour)’, is really much more than ‘fortune’ in the English sense. Sutai is the designation of men destined by Heaven – blessed with Heaven’s favour or good fortune, as it were – to rule over others. It is, in other words, an attribute of royalty implying the possession of a charismatic quality. See above, n. 63. Cf. Ligeti’s renderings ‘majestuous’, and ‘Majesty’ in Ligeti 1973a, 5-6, And see Leiters, 19-22, for a much longer discussion on su (= sua), and TMEN, no. 217, on sutai – also for further bibliographical references. There is, indeed, a vast literature on the subject: among the most recent contributions see, in particular, Mori 1981, SKE (showing that tu. qui. qutlet correspond to mo. su. sutai); Bawden 1985; Bazin 1987, 220-223; Skrynnikova 1987, 1988, 1989 and 1990; KHIV, passim; Bira 1991, 40ff; idem 2000, 63ff.

‘With a pointed stick from a spruce’ renders cögôrsün širö baršu, lit. ‘taking (or holding) a pointed cögôrsün stick.’ In Inner Mongolia, Cögôrsün designates Cunninghamia lanceolata, i.e. the Chinese fir. See UJIT, 28; cf. WTCWC, III, 4022.1; UNT, 103, no. 15116. In Mongolia, according to Cev., 795b, cöörs (cögôrs) is the name applied to a species of spruce (ga‘uur. Pixea Dietr. or P. obovata). Cf. Kow., 223a: cögôrs ‘picea.’ QNTT, 760b, confirms that the cögôrs is a tree like the spruce and adds that the Chinese call it shan-mu (SH: = Cunninghamia lanceolata); however, this tree does not grow in northern Mongolia and this designation can, therefore, apply only to the Chinese fir, which as stated above, is indeed known in Inner Mongolia as Cögôrs. The Chinese glosses of the 14th century, including those of the SH, render Cögôrsün as ‘juniper tree (Juniperus chinensis),’ See the extensive note 161 in
have since ancient times been marginal or famine food in Asia as well as in Europe. On it, see ÜNT, 99, no. 15086; ÜÜT, 732; MOUNT, 30; Cev., 145a; YYPL, 92, FF, 24 (4.20), 31 (6.18); TEF, 159-160. Cf. Buell 1959, 119; ldem 1959, 76, n. 16; Oz., II, 48-49, n. 14; Poppe 1981, 384 (1). The sons who were fed on wild garlic (qalvarsun) and on wild onion (mangirsun). For qalvarsun, see qalvar, kh. xalvar, "wild garlic (Allium victorialis)," see MOUNT, 33; ÜÜT, 254, cf also Vietze 1990, 383. For mangirsun, see mangir, kh. mangir, "wild onion (Allium seneceus)," see MOUNT, 33; ÜÜT, 252. On the mangirsun "eine wilde Zwiebel" cf. the description in RBC, 61. For both these plants see also Oz., II, 49-50, nn. 15 and 16. As in previous instances (see above), the Chinese glosses of the SH are not quite accurate, as they render qalvarsun with shan-hsieh Lw: "wild onion," and mangirsun with hsieh tI: "shallot, garden shallot, scallion (Allium bakeri = Allium chinense)." These are, however, close approximations.

'Time became rulers,' lit. 'attained to becoming gims' (qat bolura gürörü). For the use of the past perfect in -br, normally the feminine form of -ba- be, -bai-bei, but applied here to males, see UCPM, 141-147, § 32; Doerfer 1955, 251; Oz., II, 50-51, n. 17. Cf. the form hülit in § 56.

'Were fed on wild lily bulbs': the lily in question is in fact the wild scarlet lily (Lilium concolor), in Chinese shan-tun (šün). See CMP, 222, no. 683; ÜÜT, 275. However, in the new botanical nomenclature adopted by the CKKT, shan-tun corresponds to Lilium fulvum (see ibid., V, 453). The SH term is fa:waqasa (wst. *fa:wasa[n], an obsolete word preserved only in Dagur in the form fügös according to TH, 287 (= JYT, 498). Whereas Bo, 31; Ba, 136; Shi 2, 6a; Du, 25; and El-Ar, 144, write fa:waqasa (Al, 20, has incorrectly füyasa), Ma, 46, writes füyasa (t), and Ir, 46, fa:waqasa. Çitögöno, no. goligöme, kh. goligöme, is the generic name for Potentilla L.; the species dog by Mother Hööl'in was almost certainly P. anserina or Silverweed, the roots of which

Cleaves 1951, 102-103. In the Sino-Mongolian inscriptions of 1335 and 1338, čiğorsun renders ch. po versible "cypress"; but po may designate also the juniper, as in the case of yuan-po 翠柏 "Junipers chinensis (Salubia chinensis)" and shan-po 朶柏 "Junipers squamata (Salubia squamata)." Cf. ibid., and CKKT CWTC, I, 321, 320. Mosteart 1949, 474 and n. 6, adopted the rendering 'genévier' (cf. Pe, 134: "genévière"), but in Mo, 157, he translated čiğorsun as "cypres." The Chinese renderings are indeed inconsistent and, as in the case of olister above, not very reliable. It is clear from the use of this term in Mongolia that čiğorsun must designate a spruce (almost certainly the Siberian spruce, Picea obovata) rather than a cypress or juniper, and I have translated it accordingly. It is possible that the inconsistency in the Chinese definitions is only apparent and due to the fact that certain Chinese botanical terms, such as po 仏 (see above) and shan 營, were (and still are) used to designate various taxa of the order Comiferales, taxa that in modern botanical classification belong to different families and genera within this order. In the case of shan, this term is applied to a variety of conifers including those of the genera Picea, Cunninghamia and Cryptomeria; this accounts, inter alia, for the wrong identification of čiğorsun with the cypress, the cedar, the Japanese spruce, the Siberian fir, etc., in MEPD, 547a; Les., 201a-b; MMED, 768a; UNT, 103, no. 15116; Gol., III, 308b; Poppe 1950, 279. As for ěr (仏 pmo, sìr, but čero-a as in ALT, 38, 39) "pointed stick," cf. Mosteart 1949, 474.

'She dug for roots of the great barrel/And for those of the silverweed.' For sudan (仏 sudasan), pmo and mo. sudan, sudisian, kh. sudisön, "great barrel (Sanguisorba officinalis)," see MOUNT, 27; ÜÜT, 771; TMEN, no. 219. Cf. also Cev., 483a; Oz., II, 47-48, n. 13. The forms sudan and sudusun in Cl, 21, and Cleaves 1956, 263, n. 690, must, I think, be read sudian and sudisian. Çitögöme, no. goligöme, kh. goligöme, is the generic name for Potentilla L.; the species dog by Mother Hööl'in was almost certainly P. anserina or Silverweed, the roots of which
word is not glossed in the interlinear version and is left out in the
sectional summary; the AT is also of no help and neither
MUIT nor TH provide any useful clues. Ha, 13, renders it as
'stolzen'; Ko, 89, ignores it; Pe, 134, translates 'affamé' ('1'),
relating in note 3 the SH term to mo. ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ (i.e. ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ) crier famine' of Kow., 954b; Li, 21, has 'szívóz' ('tough'); Mu.,
I, 108 (and 117, n. 9); follows Pelliot and refers also to mi.
ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ crier famine' of Kow., 954a; OZ., II, 55, n. 2, relates
the word in question to dagul., dagul.- meaning 'for
children to ask their parents insistently for all sorts of things;
to nag; to hanger for (after in many ways)', and accordingly
translates it as ِئَزَعَأَرْنَا 'mischief (or important).
ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ (or ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ) probably represents a w.f. ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ, from
ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ, a verb which is not attested as such; however, as noted
by Pelliot and Murakami, we have mo. ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ and ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ both
meaning 'to plead poverty, have the appearance of one who
is dying of hunger' (Les., 344a). The latter verb also has the
meaning of 'to be reduced to begging because of starvation.' See
QNTT., 444a; cf. G. II, 162b. Both ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ (i.e. ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ) and ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ (or ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ) are formed on ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ, which in turn is
ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ + -l-. For the suffixes -k., -lä, -d., see the relevant
sections in 'Verbstamm.' Now, mo. ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ project, lean forward,' and ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ 'projecting, leaning forward,' an advert in ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ (see GWM, 58, § 212) also formed
on ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ. For ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ, cf. ma. gülh 'curved toward the front,
extended forward'; and gülh-bämbi 'to stand with the mouth
gaping; to be so hungry that one is reduced to begging.' See
CMEL., 99b, 100a; SSTM., I, 137b. The basic idea conveyed
by verbs derived from ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ 'inclined forward' is of 'being bent
forward and incapacitated (because of hunger or distress); cf.
the secondary meaning of ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ to try to speak but be unable
to express oneself; to stutter (as when in a hurry)'; and the
expression ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ to keep demanding, importune with
requests' (Les., 344a). This agrees with the meaning of dagul., dagul.- to which Orazwa refers. As we are dealing with

The poetical passage on Hô'élî'lan in the AT, 16b-17a,
differs on many points from the SH version, and is obviously a
product of a later remanence. Cf. LDAJ., 72-73; MNTLAT.,
32.

§ 75. 'The hungry, nagging sons' -- a somewhat inadequate
rendering of the expression ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ (kōži). The word
ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ (Y' and Y': ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ; Y': ْثَلَّسَلَّٰٓ) is of difficult
interpretation and several translations have been proposed. This
the same basic word (and concept), it is possible to reconcile the etymologies proposed by Pelliot, Murakami and Ozawa. The meaning of SH ga'oduqatt) would then be 'hungry and importuning (= begging, asking insistently) for food', a meaning that also fits the context well. See de Rachewiltz 1995, 279-280.

‘Who were fed on wild leek (qogqam)’. For qogqam, mo. yooyq, xooyq, kh. goqyq, oit. yooyq, ‘wild leek’, also commonly known in the U.S.A. as ‘garlic chive’ (Allium tuberosum according to UU'T, 253, but Allium odorum according to MOUNT, 72), cf. Oz’, II, 54, n. 1; Vietze 1990, 380-381; MED, 94a; MKÊ, 1702a.

‘Became handsome and good’ renders goqila ‘asay bolha. This rendering is only tentative insofar as the word goqila ‘as is concerned. Indeed, this word raises even more problems of interpretation than qa’udligi’i. Like the latter, it is not glossed in the interlinear version nor is it attested elsewhere as such. The AT is also of no help. Naka, Pelliot and Cleaves have refrained from translating it; most of the translations proposed so far are contextual interpretations, or based on doubtful etymologies (this applies also to my earlier interpretation in Ra, II, 135, which is no longer tenable). The word itself can be read either goqila ‘as (in Y and Y’) or goqilas ‘as (in Y and Y’); it must, therefore, be a plural of a w.f. *goqila or *goqilas, or, alternatively, *yooyq in *yooyq, or, *yooyq. Oz’, II, 54-57, n. 3, suggests a possible correlation between the SH term, kh. xoolog ‘snow cock’ (MMED, 640b; cf. Cev., 638b), and go. xoolog (pl. xoologi) ‘lively, full of vigour (said of children).’ Unfortunately, there is no evidence for a metaphorical use of kh. xoolog; however, the Gorlos expression, even though it has apparently no counterpart in any other Mongolian language, cannot be rejected. For my part, I am rather inclined to see in goqila ‘at an ancient dialect variant of mo. yooylota (poyylot), the plural of yooyl, kh. gooyqog, ‘rather beautiful (fine, smart).’

For a somewhat different, but still plausible interpretation, see Mu, I, 108-118, n. 10; cf. also Vietze 1990, 386; Certoixothom 1991, 5.6. The etymology proposed in TH, 182 (= JYT, 317), i.e. goqila ‘as = bur xoolog (see BRS, 578a) ‘officious-like’), is not satisfactory.

‘And grew up into fine men’, lit. ‘after becoming (bolhun baraj) fine men’. For the auxiliary of completion bura, see Mo, 114, n. 106; Alto 1973, 36.

‘Truly valiant and bold’ renders erekkin omooqpul e lebdabu, lit. ‘They became truly (ele) valiant and bold.’ I take ele as being emphatic here (= ‘truly’); cf. however, Street 1986, 26-27 (43) and 55-56, n. 26.

‘Mother Onan’: for the epithet ‘mother’ applied to rivers, cf. rus. matasika Volga. The river is called ‘mother’ because ‘it feeds’, but the personification in the present case may also have religious (shamanistic) connotations, as in the case, e.g., of ‘Mother’ Earth (Eiigen [= Otegen, Oitegen, etc.] eke) and ‘Mother’ Fire (I’ul eke). See Mostaert 1957, 99, 101, n. 8; idem 1962, 201; CI, 21, n. 8.

On the subject of fishing among the early Mongols, see Uray-Kholmuy 1984, 729ff, where the technical terms in the SH are discussed. Cf. also MSKK, 37-41; Byaratski 1996; and the important notes in Oz’, II, 59-65.


With regard to the fish listed in his poetic section, the jehoi, mo. jebbe, jibbe, kh. zeeve is the Siberian salmon (Salmo lenus); qidara, mo. id., kh. nulcar (cf. also ms. hadara), is the grayling (Salmo thymallus), a small fish in clear, cold waters. Jiramai fisina is the ‘small fry’; jiramai is the plural of *firam ‘small fish’, cf. ks. *zeram id. rendered as ‘fingertips’ in the present translation on Poppe’s suggestion (p.c.). On jiramai, cf. also Pelliot 1949, 624, n. 30.

‘Then, with grateful heart.They fed their mother’, lit. ‘Then they fed the benefit of their mother’ – a typical Mongolian turn
of phrase. The 'benefit' (hacli) implies the repayment of a favour. Cf. AT', 17a, where SH hacli is replaced by acilan 'benefitting, returning a favour.'

§ 76. Qasar is, of course, Joet Qasar, Temujin's next younger brother; Bekter and Belgeiti were their half-brothers. See above, n. 60. The names of the two half-brothers are mentioned here for the first time: Bekter disappears from the scene, and is mentioned often in the SH and in other sources. See HCG, 185-187 (and 437a, s.v.); Pellet 1940/41, 11. Regarding their names, bekter is mo. beker 'a coat of mail worn under a garment' (Les. 94a); cf. TMEN, no. 758; belgeiti = mo. belgeiti 'having a sign (or mark?)'; cf. HCG, 186-187. On Bekter's and Belgeiti's mother, see above, n. 60, and SH, § 112.

The dramatic episode that unfolds itself in §§ 76-78 and finds ultimate expression in the beautiful and highly poetical 'Hoi eljin's Lament' is discussed as a theme in Mongol literature in Saglina 1977, 465ff. It is without doubt a most important episode in the characterization of Temujin as a ruthless individual from his early years, already foreshadowed by the clot of blood held in his hand at birth. The association with Qasar in the fratricle is also significant in view of the prominent role that Qasar will play in the later Mongolian literary and folkloristic tradition.

'Angling', lit. 'pulling a fishing hook.'

'A shiny dace (niken gege e soqosun). The term soqosun (= pono. soqosun) designates a small freshwater fish related to the carp. It has survived in dag. suqos, which is Leuciscus walecki (Dyb.), of the family Cyprinidae; however, the term suqos may also designate a 'small white (= silver) fish.' See TH, 239 (= JYT, 413); MKT, 927c (where soqosu is rendered 'small sand-blowing fish', i.e. a bottom-feeder); and especially CKCTWC, 41-42, and pl. 43. For the passive construction of the sentence in Mongolian, see Poppe 1964, 373.

'They so be malicious? [Stop it!].' This translation is uncertain. The text (reconstructed from the Chinese transcription) reads simply yegii ufei, which in principle represents a w.f. yegii ufei; however, in this case the transcription is deceptive, insofar as 'ufei' = 'ufei' (as in yeki ufei of § 149), therefore the correct reading is yegii ufei; cf. AT', 17a: yegii (= yegii ufei, see YAT, 82). Yegii ufei is the dubitative form of *yegii-, an obsolete and otherwise unattested verb, glossed in the interlinear version as 'cease', 'stop' (b). The same gloss appears again at the end of this section correctly rendering the word baii ufei, lit. 'let it be!' If we compare the text of the SH with that of the AT, we see that the latter contains the word baii ufei not only at the end of the section, like the SH, but also immediately following the word yegii at the beginning of the section (AT', loc. cit.: ATL, 41); and MNTLAT, 34, where, however, Colmaa reads yegii instead of yegii. It seems then that the word baii ufei has somehow dropped out of the original text, while the Chinese gloss pertaining to it has been retained, but wrongly placed against the word yegii ufei, which as a result remains unexplained. This word, obviously already an obsolete one in the 17th century, has required a gloss in the AT reading yasi u tula 'what for', 'why?', which like other glosses in the AT is almost certainly incorrect, the author of the gloss merely guessing at the meaning of the word and, possibly, relating it to yeki ufei (= yekigii ufei) 'what will (I, one) do?', 'what to be done?' (cf. below n. 149). Most modern scholars have either followed the Chinese gloss, or they too have equated yegii ufei with yeki ufei. Neither solution is satisfactory. (Pellet was also puzzled by the word yegii ufei, see Pe, 96.) I think that Ozawa's suggestion (Oz', II, 70-71, n. 6) is well worth considering. He identifies yegii- with kh. ufei- 'to mock, jeer; to make malicious remarks, slander.' See Cev., C22a. Yegii ufei would then mean 'I fear you are speaking maliciously.' If, as I suggest, we restore the missing word baii ufei (see above), the text would read 'I fear you are speaking maliciously (or you are maligning them).' Let
it be! (= Don’t co it!).’ My slightly freer rendering follows this, still very tentative, interpretation. ’We have no friend but our shadow. We have no whip but our horse’s tail’ – a popular saying or proverb aptly used by Mother Hô’el’lin to describe the family’s predicament. According to S. Jagchid, this old proverb was ‘a common warning of that period, serving to admonish people not to separate from blood relatives but to cooperate and unite together with other members of their clan or tribe’ (Jagchid 1978, 96). The word čècù’a (w.f. čècùya) ‘whip’ in this saying is obsolete and has not survived in any modern languages or dialects, as already pointed out by Khomonov. See Khomonov 1970, 35. The translation is therefore based on the interlinear gloss and sectional summary, as well as on the interlinear gloss in § 77, and on the interlinear gloss and sectional summary of § 78, as the proverb is cited again in these two paragraphs. In § 125 the word čècù’a occurs again in the same line context, also glossed as ‘whip’ (第7). The consistency of translation in these several instances indicates that the meaning of the word was known to the Mong translators. Furthermore, as noted by Khomonov 1981, 56, this saying occurs in the Geser epic of the Buriats (Ekhirt-Bultag recension), where the word čècù’a is replaced by the word min’sa, also meaning ‘whip’ (but min’ās, mo. min’ala, the min’āsa of the SH, §§ 195, 255; cf. HW, 109). This removes any possible doubt as to the meaning of the word and, at the same time, disproves the alternative interpretations put forth in Do, 38 and 42, n. 12; TH, 317 (= JYT, 550); Oz, II, 67 and 71-72, n. 7; El-Ar, 157-158, n. 5; and On, 21 and n. 67, where čècù’a is rendered as ‘fat’, i.e. ‘the thick deposit of fat that builds up on the tail of the Mongolian sheep’ (cf. the 2001 ed., 65 and n. 167). Now čècù’a may be related to čècùya (= čècùya) ‘fat tail’ of MA, 322a, which is merely a phonetic variant of čècù. čècù id., but if so, the word must have undergone a semantic change (‘tail’ > ‘whip’) iso far as the Mongolian proverb is concerned. Cf. CC, 310, n. 92. The later native chronicles which report the episode (AT’, AT [anon.], ET) also quote the proverb, but the word čècù’a (*čècùya) appears in corrupt forms, thus distorting the original meaning. Cf. AT’, 17b et passim (see AT1, 153b, s.v. ‘čècùya’; AT1, 41, 42, 44, 80); čòçège ‘cup, goblet’, MCAT, 41 (14), 120 and n. 7; čècùya pro čècùya, metathesis for čècùya ‘tuft (of hair)’ (see below); ET’, 27f17 (see PPET, 138-141); čòçège, corresponding to čòçège of the AT. Cf. also LDAT, 74, 320, n. 32. This is also the case with the Žordas variant of the proverb, in which čècù’a is replaced by čècùa’uq (čècùya) ‘tuft.’ See TOO, 584, no. 446; cf. FO, 581, no. 446, and n. 1; DO, 190a.

‘How to take vengeance for the outrage committed by our Tayîč’ut kinsmen,’ lit. ‘how we shall avenge the sorrow (pîdeja) of (our) Tayîč’ut brothers.’

For the expression yekin evi icē’in bui uz, lit. ‘how (is why) are you without accord?’, see Ligeti 1958, 234, n. 51; idem 1971, 145 (7).

The reference to the five sons of Mother Alan of old’ in Hô’el’lin’s reproach is of course intended to mean Alan Qo’a’s sons (two of whom were also from an earlier marriage) and their discord, as described in SH, §§ 8-22. On the theme of ‘the quarrelling sons’, see Moses 1987, 63 (for the relevant passage).

§ 77. ‘The other day (oçègen), or ‘recently’; cf. DO, 542b. For oçègen tādar ‘yesterday’, see below, n. 245. ‘A lark we shot with a knob-headed arrow (bîlî’ar gōdolqonqar- [acc.]). The word bîlî’ar is not glossed in the interlinear translation, but is rendered in the sectional summary (Y2, 10b) as ‘sparrow’ or ‘small bird’ (足鸟). The word occurs again as a personal epithet in § 220, and in the form bîlî’ar (< *bîlî’ar > bîlî’ar) § 160, glossed as ‘small bird which speaks to Heaven’ (仰天鳴叫). i.e. ‘lark’, a meaning confirmed also by the early Žino-Mongolian glossaries (cf. Oz, II, 75, n. 2; Kara 1990, 285; cf. RH, 229, no. 7: bîlîdar [read bidîlar] ‘nightingale’). The word has survived in dag bîlîdar ‘lark’ (THHT, 18a). Cf. rо. bîlîvāqia ‘any small bird’ (bîlîvāqia is bîlîv’ar [< bîlîvur] + den. noun suff. -qal, and bollūmar.
holjinur, boljinur ‘lark’; bur. bužamar, bužamur: kh. bolžınür. Id. for J – d (f < d), see IMCS, 114-115. The word is back-vocalic, not front-vocalic as given in L1, 46, R, 29, 1966; Oz, II, 73, 75, n. 2, III, 272, 275, n. 2; and the RH (see above). According to Pelliot (HCD, 326-327), the lark is in question is Alauda alpestris, the Alpine skylark. Cf. also Pelliot in TP 37:1943, 42:2; Hung 1956, 17, n. 6. The verb qodolit- ‘to shoot a knob-headed arrow’ is formed on qodoli with the denominal verbal suffix -t (= mo. -d). Qodoli (= mo. yolodi) was the generic name of a type of arrow which had a round, blunt head made of bone, horn or wood, often pierced with holes, thus producing a whistling sound when discharged. These ‘specialized’ arrows were used for various purposes (stunning birds and small animals, for children to play and practice shooting with, for ceremonial purposes, etc.). Much has been written about them. See, in particular, Uray-Khálhali 1953, 55ff; 65ff; TMEN, no. 297; Reid 1962, 85; and RH, 287, no. 3. Cf. also §§ 112, 116, and coln. On hunting with qodoli-arrows, cf. Harayama 1972, 18.

Just like that ... the same way” (tevin gi ... tevin gi). For this use of the emphatic particle gi (= mo. ki), see Street 1982, 628-629.

They flung open the felt door”, lit. ‘they cast aside (o’oruu) the felt door’ – corresponding to our ‘slammed the door.’

On a hillock” (bulgan de’er). Bulgan ‘isolated hillock, knoll, mound’ occurs only once in the SH and is an obsolete word with initial b (not listed, however, in Pelliot 1925 and Poppe 1969). For the survival of this word in Ordos and Burut, see DO, 15b, s.v. ‘a’ru’ga; Gantogtokh 1989, 117; Gantogtokh 1990, 123. Cf. mo. ulqin ulqin ‘uneven’, and the entry aqin ‘protuberance, swelling’ in MKT, 244b; and MKET, 505a-b. See also BGE, 175. In ET, 40v-50, the text Temir Ulqi is mentioned as the name of a daba, i.e. a hillock, or knoll.

For the words ‘the nine horses, the light-bay goldings’ (Iqi qatan yiisun mori) – a case of noun apposition – see Mo, 29-30. Cf. Colman 2001b, and below, n. 90. The number of horses belonging to Höl’elün’s yurt is always given as nine, even when it should be ten (§ 99), because the number nine had special symbolic connotations for the Turko-Mongolian peoples, a sort of ‘sacred’ number appropriate for things and events pertaining to exalted personalities. See above, n. 60. Cf. also below, n. 90, for the subsequent fate of the horses.

‘And ask ourselves who shall be able to take vengeance on them’, lit. ‘And say, “By whom shall we able to take vengeance?”’

‘Why do you regard me as a lash in the eye, a thorn (qagasan) in the mouth?’ Qagasan (= pmo. qasasan) is glossed as keng ‘thorny tree, stem of a plant; obstruction’, and its meaning in Written Mongolian is ‘fishing hook; sharp point of a hook’ – the basic idea being of something sharp and harmful. Cf. dag. hawas ‘a small thorn’ (Oz, II, 80, n. 11, on the authority of Mr. U. Onon). In On, 21 and n. 69, qagason is however rendered as ‘fishbone’ following TH, 167 (= JYT, 291). Cf. Ev-Pop, 60: ‘un corps étranger’, which, although not a literal translation, conveys the general meaning. The expression – an idiomatic one – is descriptive of something alien, irritating and a nuisance, something to get rid of.

‘Do not destroy my hearth, pray do not make away with Belget!’ Among the Turko-Mongolian people, to destroy the hearth, or to put out the hearth-fire, was a common metaphor for the destruction of one’s yurt, the extermination of the whole family and bringing the family line to an end. Cf. § 87; BDK, 100. Bekter and Belgetei were only half-brothers of Temujin and Qasar; even though they all lived together, in reality Bekter and Belgetei belonged to the yurt of Yüsget’s other wife Sudigil (or Sudgil). It is, of course, to the hearth of that yurt that the doomed Bekter refers in his attempt to have the life of his brother spared by Temujin and Qasar. As stated earlier (n. 72), the elimination of Bekter, the elder of the two half-brothers, was almost certainly not decided merely on the grounds of their high-handed behaviour, even accounting for the fact that 1) trivial incidents like the ones described were no doubt serious
matters in the strict circumstances in which Hö‘elün and her family found themselves at the time, and 2) the harsh norms of steppe life exacted severe retribution on transgressors. See, on this subject, Ratchnevsky 1987, 69. I believe that these incidents were only a pretext to eliminate the other son of Yisügei who could claim to be his legitimate heir and successor. The claims and aspirations of Bektu would no doubt originate from his mother (who was still alive), and may have well determined the attitude of her two sons that is reflected in their behaviour as described in the SH which ultimately precipitated the crisis. Concerning the death of Bektu and the subsequent relationship of Temüjin/Cinggis Qan towards his surviving half-brother Beltüeti, see HGC, 185-187 e: passim; Chapitre CVII, 48-51; for the accounts in later Mongol sources, cf. Clark 1978, 53-54, n. 36.

The Mongols used various terms to avoid explicit references to killing, death, and the spilling of blood because of taboos associated with them which were part of their shamanistic and animistic beliefs. Cf. the expressions ‘to destroy the hearth’, ‘to cause someone to blow to the winds like hearth-ashes’ (see §§ 87, 112, 265), ‘to smite the proud (= mighty) framee of the tent’ (see §§ 105, 109). These and other expressions were designed to circumvent this problem. ‘To abandon’ (or ‘to reject, forswear’) (teg-i) is another euphemism for ‘to kill’. Cf. ch. 179: ‘to dismiss, to reject = ‘to kill’; eng. ‘to dispatch’, ‘to make away with’, etc. The SH is very rich in such figures of speech, and similar turns of phrase are also common in other Mongol contemporary documents, such as imperial edicts, letters of the Mongol rulers to rulers of other countries, etc. On the phraseology of death and killing among the Turkish and Mongolian peoples, cf. MCPA, 92-96.

§ 78. This section contains the so-called Hö‘elün’s Lament’ – a beautiful and powerful piece of early Mongol poetry.

‘You who have destroyed life! ... You have destroyed!’ On these words, see Cleaves 1949a, 512-514.

‘This one (i.e. Temüjin) was born (Clutching a black clot of blood (lit. “holding a black clot of blood in his hand”)):’ see § 59 and com.

‘Like a Qasar dog.’ Qasar (= Khazar) was the name of a particularly fierce kind of dog, used also as a proper name or epithet, as in the case of Temüjin’s brother Jöli Qasar, i.e. Jöli the Qasar (see above, n. 60). For the term qasar and the name of the Khazars of the Volga – Qasar being the Mongolized form of the name – see Pelliot 1944, 98, n. 1; NIHBO, 258, n. 2; HGC, 174-175; TEMEN, no. 281; BT, II, 335. Cf. also P. Aale in MS 36:1984/85, 684; Gantogtjog 1989, 117; cf. Gantogtoj 1990, 123. The species of dog in question has not been identified; given its designation. according to Pelliot it was probably a dog of Kazhar origin (cf. our ‘spaniel’), but information on this breed is lacking. Qasar is still used as a dog’s name in the modern Ordois dialect. See DO, 296b; TH, 173 (= JYT, 301).

Several other animals and wild beasts – real and mythical – are mentioned in this passage: the panther (qabilan, see TEMEN, no. N 128 = 2073; Poppe 1955, 40; Vieze 1990, 582), the lion (arsalan, see TEMEN, no. 455), the manguq (written manguq = mo. manguq) or dragon-snake (see below, n. 195), the gferfalcon (singqor, see above, n. 54), the pike (curuqa, mo. curuqaq), the camel (bu‘ara, mo. bu‘ura, see above, n. 64), the wolf (čino, see above, n. 1), the mandarin duck (anggir, see TEMEN, no. 563), Bazin 1971), the jackal (či‘ebiri, mo. či‘ebiri), the tiger (bars, see TEMEN, no. 685; Poppe 1955, 38), and the baraq (baruq in the text, but correctly barang in AT^, 18a), probably the same as tu. baraq, ‘a long-haired dog of somewhat fabulous character’ (Pelliot, NMP, I, 75; cf. NIHBO, 57), regarded by the medieval Turks as ‘the swiftpest and best hunter of all dogs’ (Ma‘nūn Ḳalṣir [ca. 1075] apud ED, 360a: cf. Dankoff 1971, 102; CTD, III, 66; and also Cleaves 1949a, 515). Eng. ‘brach’ seems to ultimately derive from baraq. See TEMEN, no. 728. But baraq designates also other animals, and humans too, with shaggy hair, as ‘shaggy, hairy’ was undoubtedly the original meaning of the word, a meaning still
preserved, e.g., in Kirghiz barak (see KIRB, 1, 109). However, this word must not be confused with baraq ‘ravenous, gluton’ of § 40 (see above, n. 46), nor with baraq = boraq (< Ar arb), the legendary steed mentioned in the Koran, even though the latter may be indirectly (i.e. via Middle Iranian) related to tu. baraq. Cf. Ligen 1966, 136, n. 22; Dankoff 1971.

"Like a dragon-snake swallowing its prey alive," lit. "Like a dragon-snake which says ‘I shall swallow my prey alive.’"

"Like a wolf stalking its prey under cover of (lit. ‘relying upon or taking advantage of’) a blizzard," i.e. to avoid being seen. For borqoran ‘blizzard, snowstorm,’ see below, n. 108.

"Like a mandarin duck eating its chicks: When it cannot manage them, in other words, when it is unable to follow them and keep them under control. For yel-: ‘to go after, to drive in front, lead, control, manage,’ see VM, 7, n. 16.

"Like a jackal gaining upon with its pack: When one threatens its den,” lit. “Like a jackal that, when one touches (threatens) its den, acts in concert with other jackals to defend it.” For the verb ōmēr- (< omer-, omer-, ōmēr-) ‘to lead on or band (together),’ see Letres, 77.

"Never hesitant,” lit. “that does not hesitate.”

"You behave [in this way] to each other, saying that you cannot live together!” lit. “You behave to each other, saying, ‘How shall we live?” ‘Hoe’lān refers to the previous statement by Temgilin and Qasar to the effect that they could no longer live together with their half-brothers. See the beginning of § 77.

The word eyin ‘in this way,’ lacking in our text, may inadvertently have been dropped from the original since it is found in the corresponding passage in AT, 18a, and is also rendered in the Chinese sectional summary (VIS, 2, 13a). Cf. NMTL, 36.

"Citing old sayings/Quoting ancient words,” i.e. making use of proverbs and aphorisms, something we know from another passage (§ 344) Hoe’lān was want to do. This was, indeed, a well-attested Mongol custom among the medieval Mongols; Činggis Qan practised it (see § 260), and some personages, such as Ča’adai (Čāqatai) and Oqodi – Činggis’ second and third sons respectively – and Temür Olijiati, the grandson of Qubilai, were adept at quoting and reciting sayings of a genocidal nature (biling) ‘often couched in rhetorical and obscure language’ (successors, 15). On this practice, and on the proverbs and sayings in the SH, see Gaundamba 1968, 81-82; idem 1969, 165f; Cerensdom 1986 (esp. pp. 72, 77). Cf. also de Rachewiltz 1982b, 427-428; and Section Six of the Introduction. Oqodi ages ‘ancient words’ = oqodī-an ages ‘the words of the old men (or of the men of old, i.e. the ancients).’ Cf. below, n. 117. For oqodi ‘old man, elder, senior,’ see TMEN, no. 40.

‘Mightily revelled her sons.’ For ma’ula – ma’ula- (< mo maula, mawula-) ‘to speak ill (or evil) of, to curse,’ cf. e.g. TDB, 22 (F3v20l), 112, 163, n. 17. See also Ož, II, 90, n. 14.

§ 79. "At the head of his bodyguard (turqat’a)." Turqat’a (< pmu turqayd) is the plural of turqag (< pmu. turqay) an important term designating the daytime bodyguard of the qan. In the organization of the Guards, just as it was laid down by Činggis Qan, the guards (selšen) were divided into dayguards (turqat’a) and nightguards (kešbeš’iil). See §§ 191-192, 226-229, 269, 278, and below, n. 191. In the case of Tarqutai Kiritaq, a chief of the Tayšišt’a, this distinction may not yet have obtained and his personal guard could simply refer to the pick of his men acting as his personal guard whether by day or by night; this is, indeed, supported by the Chinese interlinear gloss which renders turqat’a as ‘companions’ (朋友), which is also the way the term is rendered in CI. 24. Cf. Mu, I, 122; Ož, II, 92 (‘guards’), and Ož, I, 63 (‘companions’); On, 23 (‘servants’); Ev-Pop, 61 (‘gardes de joute’). Also, the ‘thousand turqat’a’ of Öng Qan of the Kereity mentioned in § 170 was no doubt his Guard, hence a body of picked men, used as a crack unit ahead of the main army. The original Turkish term turqag, borrowed into Mongolian, designated the man who was ‘constantly standing’ i.e. ‘the sentry’ (‘bodyguard’). For the term turqat’a, see Pelliot. 19300, 29-30; HCG, 52; TMEN, no. 882; Poppe 1967, 515-517.
no. 10; ED, 539b; HCYLYT, 202-204, no. 60; MEYD, 149, n. 16; YTSHT, 65R; RH, 305, no. 26.

Tarqatii Kirtqat’s words are not as easy as they seem because the Chinese-linguistic affixation and the free rendering in the sectional summary. The ones we left behind (goluq). The word goluq = (mo. goluq) is a de-

parallel noun (pl.) from golu- (= mo. yolu-) to reject, refuse. Tarqatii alludes to Yisügii’s small children he and the Tayčii’ut rejected. I left behind when they abandoned Hō’elun and her family after Yisügii’s death (§ 72). This is the interpretation supplied by the sectional summary (Y. T. 14b), which I regard as the correct one. However, the verb golu- (goluq) means also to hate, loathe, abhor (cf. Les., 359b), and this meaning is well attested in Preclassical Mongolian. See Cleaves 2001a, 47, n. 74. The author(s) of the Chinese gloss of SH goluq= ott-me (

'the wicked or hateful ones’ obviously understood the Mongol word in the latter meaning. Haensch (Ha., 15) and Cleaves (Cl., 25) have followed the gloss. See also Cleaves 1982, 80, n. 25. Several other interpretations have been proposed (see Vriez 1990, 38l), and the same translator has offered more than one solution. Cf. Pe, 136 and n. 4; Ozii, II, 92, 93, n. 2; Ozii, I, 63; EV-Pop, 61 and 265, n. 20; Vriez, loc. cit. See also On, 23, n. 74, citting AT, 101-102, n. 2, thus forcing both the reading of the SH and that of AT (Liget’s emendation of the text in ATL, 44, is arbitrary but correct; his rendering of goluq in Li, 23, with ‘The naked little birds’ is, on the other hand, unjustified in my view). For go-gi: ‘to meet,’ cited. It appears the ‘snotty ones’ ‘Hülget; Cl., 25; ‘drivellers’), cf. the epithet nisqayi ‘snotty’ by Joro (Geeser Qan) was always referred to in his youth. See GQI, I, 64 et passim; TBGC, 36, n. 13 et passim; DO, 220b. The Chinese sectional summary interprets the words in question as a simile between Temüjin and his brothers or the one hand, and the chicks of flying birds growing wings and the young of running beasts growing in size on the other. Cf. Ws, 228. (Murakami’s interpretation of goluq as ‘chicks of pheasant’ is, however, untenable, since it is based on a misinterpretation of the word for ‘pheasant’ [jāwur] in the Sino-Mongolian glossaries of the Yuan and Ming periods; see Mu, I, 130-131, n. 2). Tarqatii’s words to the effect that Yisügii’s sons have grown up — implying that Temüjin has now become a threat — are of course in themselves threatening. ‘Belgiiire tore trees’, lit. ‘Belgiiire tore trees (mudur) in such a way as to break them apart (qaquru).’ For the adverb qaqqu, see below, n. 101. For modun — mudun (pl. mudun), see ‘Quelques problèmes,’ 268, IMCS, 25.

‘Erected a palisade (šihe’e).’ For šihe’e (= mo. sīhe) ‘palisade, abatis, fence’, cf. YNEN, no. 227. See also the remarks on šiha in n. 198 below.

‘They were battling in this fashion when ...’ lit. ‘When they were fighting each other’ (balqaldun bīkū-tūr). For balq: ‘to fight, battle, etc.’, see below, n. 150. ‘The rest of you’, lit. ‘the others of you.’


The Terqini Heights (Terqini Undir) is an unidentified mountain or hill situated near the area where Hō’elun and her family were encamped at the time. This locality is mentioned only once in the SH. Perleé, 9 (cf. Perleé, 96) situates the Terqini Heights broadly in the area of the eastern Khentei at 45° N 109° E, and suggests that it may have been the name of Delūūn Uul near the sources of the Kerulen. This fact is simply impossible to establish; however, the locality in question was not in doubt in the region of the upper Onon and Kerulen rivers, and the eastern slopes of the Khentei Range. For a diagrammatic illustration of how the Tayčii’ut kept watch on Temüjin’s hide-

out in the mountain forest, see Ozii, II, 97, n. 8.

§ 80. For the section ‘Temüjin spent three days and nights ... three more days and nights there’, cf. Street 1984, 128-129 (2),
especially with regard to the corroboreeoratory part, else on it, e.g., also TMEN, no. 2006, 350.  
"The saddle-girth could of course have loosened up", lit. as for the saddle-girth, of course let it pass (= it could certainly happen for it to get loosened up). For komambele 'breaststrap' (= komambele-like to attach the breaststrap), see Khomono 1970, 35; for olang 'saddle-girth' and olangla: to fasten the saddle-girth, see Pelliot 1941, 83-83 (15); Khomono loc. cit.  
Is this a warning from Heaven?", lit. Is Heaven warning me? — the first of many instances in which Cinggis Qan refers to Heaven's ((tengeri) intervention in his affairs. Cf. de Rachewiltz 1973, 27.  
"A white rock the size of a tent (qošiq). For this simile, see Cleaves 1959, 27, n. 172. For qarq 'rock, stone', cf. Lettres, 45-46. Qošiq (mo. qošiq) is a derivation in -iq (-i) from a Turkic borrowing (< qoš 'a conical pole-ent with felt-cover, travel-ent' < tu. qoš 'a temporary dwelling') as for Poppe 1955, 40-41; Hovhdaun 1975, 72; MSR, 120; Khomono 1970, 36; Ozr. II, 104-105, n. 5. The transmission qošiq of Lk; and KCI, 807, is incorrect. Cf. ATI, 188: qošq, and the word kiišiq, above, n. 51. The difference between a qoš and a qošiq seems to have been that the latter was provided with a smoke-hole (erage). See § 246. In a letter to me of 18 March 1981, N. Poppe wrote with regard to the word qošiq: 'Its Turkic etymology cannot be located. The form qošqiq may have originated in Mongolian, although qoš is a Turkic word. In Kalmuck qoš is "temporary camp", "camp." The -q in the second syllable is a connecting vowel. For qoš, see also below, n. 169. For the use of a qošiq in funeral ceremonies, see below, n. 245.  
"Already (lit. "again") nine days and nights (yisam qonag). The nine (363) days and nights that Temüjin spent in hiding in the forest as a result of Heaven's warnings, as well as the white colour of the rock that blocked the way, have a symbolic meaning, as is evident from the context. Cf. Moses 1986, 390- 
291; Beso 1987, 47; MNTR. 17. Cf above, no. 60-61. It is also obvious from the text that the verb qonag: to spend the night' means here, as in other passages (cf. e.g., §§ 90, 227), to spend a day and a night, i.e. a full day. The Mongol us to count the days by the number of nights that had elapsed (qonag > qonag 'a day and a night'; cf. rus. suki 'day and night, the twenty-four hours'), much as hoteliers reckon the 'guests' stay at the hotel by the number of nights, not days, spent there. For qonag, cf. above, no. 67, 68. 
"With his arrow-sharpening knife (sumuh kituguai-baljyvan). For kituqai, mo. kituqai, 'knife', see Pelliot, op. cit., 94-96 (6); for final -i ~ -po, cf. mayai, mayai; malayai, malayai; etc. See SG, 295-299, § 159. In rendering entire passage I now adhere to Khonono's interpretation, followed also by Cleaves, which is at variance with that of Nakai, Pelliot and, more recently, Ozawa, and which I too had adopted in my earlier version. Cf. Ko, 92; Cl, 25-26; Nač, 51; Pe, 137; Ozr. II, 100; Ra, II, 139. For hagtori: to cut', see Pelliot 1925, 221, no. 40.  
They seized him and took him away (barhu abu othu). For the use of ox- to go' as an auxiliary verb, see above, n. 66. For cf. also Mostaert 1956, 6-7. 
§ 81. The Mongol avil at the time in question was, in its narrower sense, a small nomadic camp consisting of only one or a few tents (yurts, mo. ger), with carts and animals, belonging to one family; in this sense, avil may indeed be rendered as 'family'. See Vlad., 44 et passim; Li, 146, n. 81; TMEN, no. 503; Perle 1962, 26; Sugiura 1975, 37, 47, 51; Sumyeabaatar 1985, 361; EMPR, 101, where the term avil is rendered as 'individual family'; and F.W. Cleaves in HIAS 13:1950, 23, where it is rendered as 'nomad house' (but 'camp' in Cl, 271b). Cf. also Ozr. II, 110, n. 2. For its Old Turkic counterpart (ayil), cf. also Prutschi 1988, 758. A group of related families (ayil) formed an avinr, on which see below, n. 156.  
The day of the Red Circle (hula-an tengeri ilid). Regarding this expression Cl, 26, n. 29, writes: 'The meaning of
hala'ın "red" is not clear. The words tergel idür were used of the fifteenth of any lunation, but as we see from the Secret History, the words hala'ın tergel idür were used only of the sixteenth of the fourth lunation, an auspicious day. In both cases the word tergel may refer to the "disk of the moon." Cf. On, 96, n. 241. The expression hala'ın tergel occurs again in §§ 118 and 193 also with reference to the sixteenth day of the first month of summer. In § 118 and 193 the words are glossed in the interlinear translation as 'red disc (or hala)' (hala';) in §§ 118 and 193 as 'red brightness' (赤光), but I suspect that hala'ın 'brightness' stands here for hala'ın 'disc, hala.' Clearly, this expression was the Mongolian name for that particular day, viz. the 'day of the Red Disc' and this, the sixteenth day of the month, the reference was more likely to the bright disk of the full moon rather than to that of the sun (pace Ozawa, who on the basis of modern Mongol usage is of the opinion that the expression in question refers to the red and bright orb of the sun, see Oz.', II, 108-109, and 110-112, n. 3; Oz'. I, 65). Cf. MSR, 177. For the Mongol calendar and the names of the months in Middle Mongolian, see below, n. 282. We do not know Temür's age at the time nor the date of these events (on Rašid al-Din's account see below); however, the sixteenth day of the first month of summer would have fallen within the month of May in the solar calendar: a day of full moon and the first full moon of summer, it was an important and, as Cleave says, auspicious day in the nomads' calendar (cf. §§ 118 and 193) and the occasion for a great feast.

The 'cange' (buga'arda, e.g. buga) to which our text refers consisted of a heavy wooden frame fastened on the neck to allow the prisoner to walk while preventing his escape. A leash attached to the cange was held by the unpossessing youth guarding Temür. The word buga'arda is of Turkish origin, and it has passed also into Hungarian (bekô, békyl 'fetters'); it has been exhaustively dealt with by various scholars. See TMEN, no. 725; ESTY, II, 248-250; MNTK, 246-248; and, more recently, Czyma 2001. In § 146 the term used for 'cange' is jarybal - a purely Mongolian word. However, the modern word for 'cange' is dongge. As already noted by Ligeti (Li, 146, n. 81), there are certain differences between the account given in the SH and the one recorded by Rašid al-Din, for which see SLI, I, 172-173. According to Rašid, Temür's cange (pers. dâlax) had caused a bleeding wound in his neck; he was helped by a kind old woman who nursed his wound, and he subsequently escaped, hiding in a nearby large lake (nûvar-ı bçâqar) where he lay in the water with only his nose exposed. Rašid gives the name of the old woman (? Taiju Ege'éi pro Tayiši'ut Ege'éi), but makes no mention of the youth who had been put in charge of Temür nor of any blows. Cf. SLI, 1 (1858), 224-225; DT, I, 442-444. In any event, 'Tayiši'ut Ege'éi' was almost certainly not the old woman's name, for it simply means 'a (or the) Tayiši'ut elder sister (? = an older woman; a concubine, of TMEN, no. 67).'

'After the people at the feast had dispersed,' lit. 'Letting the people of the feast disperse.' The Chinese sectional summary states that Temür hit the youth with the cange (ye2, 18a; cf. Wa, 229), an interpretation followed by various scholars and popularised by R. Grousset (see CW, 51); however, the Mongolian text is not so specific, as Ligeti (Li, 146, n. 81) rightly pointed out. Cf. Ha, 16; Pe, 137; Ko, 92.

The youth is described as a 'weakening' (gelbère; AT, 19a), has gilbère, read kilbar 'simple-minded' in MNTL, 38. For this obsolete word, see Oz', II, 112, n. 6; Gantogtokh 1989, 117-118; cf. Gantogtokh 1990, 124.

§ 82. For the first sentence, see Mo, 24. For alda- 'to lose (as "to let escape"), cf. TMEN, no. 533.

For the word saray 'ar (mo. sarayul) 'moonlight', cf. DO, 564a.

Sörgan Şira was a chief of the Suldus (not Soldius! Cf. Poppe 1950a, 265), who at the time were subject to the Tayiši'ut. For these subordinate tribes, see Lattimore 1963b, 59-60. On the Suldus, see HCG, 59-60; Li, 164, n. 186. On
Cila'run became one of Cinggis Qan's 'four steeds (= stalwarts') (dīrben kallu 'üt), the others being Bo'orbū, Muqali and Boroqil (Boro'ū). See HCG, 340-342; and, especially, YTSHT, 141-143. Cf. below, nn. 90, 97, and 163. It is frequently referred to as Cila'run Ba'atur, and he and his descendants are often mentioned in the Chinese sources (YS, SWCCL, wen-chi, 交集 of the Yuan period, etc.).

‘Felt in their hearts very sorry for me’, lit. ‘their bosoms and hearts pained for me.’

‘They took my cansege, relieved me of it, and ...’ Mostaert (n.90) translates, ‘ils ont pris ma cansege et m'en ont debarrassé.’

For sudala- ‘se defaire de ses entraves’, see DO, 591a. Cf. the Chinese interlinear gloss which renders su dahla with suan ‘to loosen, slacken, untie; to let go.’

‘Enabled me to spend the night resting’ renders the gono 'a a'ululū of Y and Y; Y has gono 'a a'ululū, where gono is an incorrect reading for qonon. Cf. above, n. 31.

§ 85. For the preparation of fermented mare's milk or kumis (< tu. qumiz; nano. esiš. mo. esiš, išša), the mare's milk (jan) was poured into (ṭišür-) a large leather bag (ṭišür) in which it was churned (bišū) with a wooden beater or churner (bišū 'ür) until it fermented. In Sorqan Sirâ's tent this familiar operation was carried out from evening until dawn. The preparation of kumis by the Mongols is first described in detail in Western literature in William of Rubruck's Itinerarium; however, classical authors, such as Herodotus, already give a good description of how this drink was prepared by the Scythians. See SF, 177-179; MM, 98-99; GR, 95-96; MWC, 310a, s.v. 'Qumiz'; MP, 171; MP, 1, 285, 259-260, n. 2; HMP, I, 240, s.v. 'Chemis'; Aalto 1966, 20, 26-27; Li, 146-147, n. 85; MŚR, 149-152.

The bird called in Mongolian tumtai, rendered here as 'sparrow-hawk' (see Waley 1960, 534), has been identified with the merlin or Falco columbarius. See Oż, II, 137-138, n. 7; the merlin or Falco columbarius. See also Mo. tumtai of the SH is confirmed by the AT, 20a. See also Mo. tumtai of the SH as read.
27-29, 275. A detailed description of this bird is found in MKT, 242a, s.v. "turanidai" (="toramata"), ibid, 238a; but in MKT [1990 ed.], 1078a, and MBT, 1466b, this word is entered as "toramatai". Cf. also RH, 70, no. 21 (where "toramatai" is glossed 'merlin; male of any kind of hawk'). I translate *siibauqan* as 'sparrow' rather than 'small bird', not only on the strength of the Chinese gloss (κεκλεγμένος, which may mean either, but also because of its apposition to *turamatai*. However, the term *siibauqan* (≠ mo. *siibauqan*, a diminutive in -an of *siibauqan* "bird", hence, lit. "birdie") covers a number of 'small birds', such as the sparrow, the bunting and the lark. See Oz., II, 136-137, n. 6.

The expression used by Cambic and Čila'um to make their point, viz. that Temiūn is given protection, is an idiomonic one, almost certainly an old proverb or saying which has its roots in the oral tradition of Inner Asia. Cf. HWC, 242 and n. 8; Jagchid 1978, 94; FPET, 48-50; and G. Karat's paper devoted to it (Kara 1995).

They smashed open (cuvaluation) Temiūn's cangue.' Cf. 21, translates 'they removed', but cuvaluation is glossed ch'üeh hê 'to break, crack', and corresponds to mo. cuvaluation-'to take apart, destroy, break.' See MKT, 1265s. Cf. Oz., II, 138, n. 10.

They entrusted him to the care of their younger sister called Qada'an, lit. 'they caused their younger sister called Qada'an to take care of him.' For days 'younger sister', see Cleaves 1950, 119, n. 129; Oz., III, 308-309, n. 1; Kara 1990, 292, s.v. 'dīt.' For the common name Qada'an's Qad'in (< qada' rock, which appears in § 48 as a man's name, see HCG, 457b (Index); for Qada'an, the daughter of Sorqan Śira, see ibid., 153. She will reappear in § 146, and is last mentioned in § 219.

§ 86. 'They were reaching the back of the cart (kōl). Kōl is literally, 'the foot', hence the 'extremity, the other end.' See Les., 484a (b).

For isert 'bed, couch, bench', cf. Oz., III, 351, n. 11; Khomono 1970, 33; and b-low, n. 214.

§ 87. 'You nearly (alddaa) had me blown to the winds like hearth-ashes.' For the image of the destruction of the hearth and the scattering of the ashes, hence the destruction of the yurt and the annihilation of the family, cf. § 77 and com. See also Cleaves 1949a, 516-517. In this sentence, the verb alddaa preceded by the convertivus mode (keyisgen) indicates an action which almost happened. See Les., 296 (b).

A tanwēy burren mare with a white mouth ('cqi auremik qulaqcin), and, implied, with 'a black mane and a black stripe along the backbone.' See Me, 67 and 70, n. 63; Poppe 1975, 164.

A lamb fattened on the milk of two ewes', i.e. a much fatter lamb. Cf. Poppe in CAJ 2:1956, 312, and Waley 1960, 524; as Ligeti has pointed out, Waley is right. See Li, 147, n. 93.

For the two leather buckets or pails to carry milk for the journey, called goyur (AT, 208; koypir) and ndmgoqua (ibid.: nwmgoqua) respectively, see Khomono 1970, 30; TH, 134 (= JY, 234); Oz., II, 149-150, n. 5. Cf. also Mo. 199.

'Steel for striking fire' (kete). In our context kete almost certainly designates only the piece of steel (shaped like a sickle) used for striking fire rather than the tinder box with flint and steel. Cf. CI, 29 and n. 37. In the MA, 174b, kete corresponds to čag. čagmay 'steel for striking fire.' In the modern Mongolian languages it can mean 'steel for striking fire', 'flint and steel', or just 'flint.' See Khomono 1970, 38; MED, 479b.

The reason why Sorqan Śria did not give Temiūn a saddle was that, if he were caught, he would not look as if he had stolen it, and he did not give him the strike-a-light so that he could not make a fire and thus produce smoke. Furthermore, by depriving him of both a saddle and the fire-making implement, and providing him with lamb and milk just sufficient for his journey, Sorqan Śira ensured that Temiūn would return immediately to his family. It should be noted, however, that in the parallel passage in AT, 20b, Sorqan Śira does give Temiūn both saddle and steel. This poses a problem of interpretation that cannot be
solved at present. Cf. Do¹, 48, n. 12; Do², 36, n. 1 and 2; AT*, 109-110, n. 4; MNTL, 42.

§ 88. 'The place where they had earlier built the palisade (libe'eleji) and barricaded themselves' - referring of course to the events described in § 79.

'Following (lit. "by means of") some tracks (alurqi) in (lit. "of") the grass.' Alurqi (m. n. alurqū) actually means 'bent, inclined', said especially of grass when stepped upon on paths and tracks. Cf. Do², 481b. For initial n = zero, see Mo, 42, n. 40; Lettres, 25.

The Kimurqa Stream (Kimurqa Qoroqan) is one of the small right-bank affluents of the Oon, north-east of the Senggir (Tienker, Cenzer) River, itself a left-bank tributary of the upper Kerulan. See HCG, 42, 280, and below, n. 89; cf. Perleè, 11 (cf. Perleè, 99), where 'left side' is a mistake for 'right side' (dessert apud Perleè). Although the identification of the Kimurqa is certain, the Qorquqia Hill (Qorquqia Beldag) and the Beder Promontory (Beder Qoli'un) have not been identified. For the term beldag 'an isolated hill or hillock', see above, n. 59; for qoli'un 'spur of a mountain, promontory', see above, n. 55. It is clear that this term is used here with the latter meaning.

§ 89. Kikö Na'ur (= m. Koke Nayar) or 'Blue Lake' is a common name for lakes in Mongolia. The one in question was near, lit. 'of', (Mount) Qara Jiğijn ('Black Heart') and the Senggir Stream, i.e. the present-day Cenzer or Cenzerin Gol, in the area of (lit. 'within') the Gureligü Mountains, i.e. the mountainous region south of Burqan Qidan (Khenet Khan) which separates the Kerulan and Senggir rivers from the first right-bank tributaries of the Oon. See HCG, 41-42, 50; Perleè², 8 (cf. Perleè, 89-90). For the situation of Kikö Na'ur, Qara Jiğijn and the Gureligü, now established beyond doubt, and hence the identification of the exact area where Temülün and his family moved and set up camp, see RBC, 78, 83; and Schubert 1970, 525, n. 7. For Y. Irinën's identification of the Gureligü with the Ch't-li:ču' ᱣ (tšiba) of the YS, see below, n. 26b. The lake itself, a small one (not marked on our maps), is just north-west of present-day Cenxermandal Sum (Xenti Almag), i.e. near the very sources of the Senggir and some 40 km east of the Kerulan, indeed contiguous to the small 'Black Heart' mountain of the SH (47⁰ 50' N and 108⁰ 50' E). Burqan Qidan is a little over 100 km ïde northeast and Koko'e Aral, another famous locality (see § 136 and com.), about 85 km due south. Our Kikö Na'ur is mentioned again in § 122, as it was in this locality that Temülün was first elected qan by his supporters. Because of such a momentous event this otherwise inconspicuous lake receives also a mention in the TMIC, 90, 28a. For the Senggir River, see also NMP, 1, 340 (where, however, 'in front [m to the east] should read 'in front [m to the south']"; Murzaev, 518a (Index). Jiğijn (= m. jirikän) as a topographical term means 'a mountain with an oval pointed top' (Poppe 1956, 41, n. 36); cf. SMFT, 29. For Koko'e kike, see LNC, 50; on this word see also TMEN, no. 1677; Bertaget 1970. In § 243 the form kike appears in the proper name Kike Cos (= Kikö Cos; cf. § 258).

'Killing marmots (torbagaq) and field-mice (kicigür) for food' - an indication (confirmed by the fact that the family's wealth consisted of only nine horses) that the fugitives were in strained circumstances. Cf. Čilger Bökö's words regarding the rats and mice being the fare of the common bird in § 111. The move to the north was no doubt prompted by fear of further raids and retaliation on the part of the Tajikt'i:lt. For torbagaq (= m. torbagaqula) 'marmot (Marmota sibirica or M. baikalica)', see the important remarks in Cleaves 1956, 263-265, n. 692; and Colman 2002, 164-166. Kicigür is a rather obsolete word; the AT has the related term kicigüne instead (see AT', 20b). Kicigüne occurs in § 111 of the SH with the meaning of 'mouse'; this word has survived in kaim. kicik 'small mouse' (KaRS, 33-41) and in other dialects (see TH, 219 [m. JYT, 378]). Kicigür is still used in the Ural dialect of Inner Mongolia to designate a sort of field-mouse living in hilly areas (ibid.). Cf. Pelliot 1944b, 40-41.

The eight horses, the light-bay geldings. For these words see Mo, 29-30, and above, n. 77. Cf. PPEF, 51 (where, however, Knueger’s criticism of Mostaet’s rendering is unwarranted since it disregards the Chinese gloss); Colma 2001b; and MNTLAT, 43, n. 121. There were only eight because one had been taken by Belgæti, who had gone marmot-hunting.

Standing by (dergede) the tent. The word dergede can mean either ‘at the side of’, beside, near, at’, or ‘in front of’, in the presence of (o). Translators are divided as to its meaning in the present context: in either case it designates proximity, hence my rendering. Cf. above, n. 68.


‘On (lit. “riding”) a short-tailed, short-haired chestnut horse (oqogur dargi gqogur).’ Oqogur = mo. qoqar ‘short;’ dargi probably corresponds to ord. t’argi ‘short (said of hair and grass);’ shallow’, rather than to bur. darxii, an intensifying word for colours, because two lines down dargi occurs before oqogur, moreover gqogur is not a colour name, but the designation of a horse of a particular colour. Cf. CL, 29, n. 40; Oz’ii, 161, n. 4. This word is not glossed in the SH. For gqogur (= mo. gqogur) ‘chestnut (horse),’ see TMEN, no. 1536. Cf. below, n. 124.

So laden down with marmots that it staggered (nigasaqaljata).’ The verb nigasaq is a hapax legomenon and the rendering is based on the interlinear Chinese gloss. Ozawa reads niq saq- ‘to be very densely piled up (or accumulated)” and translates accordingly (Oz’ii, 159, 161-162, n. 5), but saq- is always transcribed sa’a- in the SH (cf. IHW, 130) and if he is right, we would expect a form nigasaqaljata. However, as suggested by TH, 137 (= JYT, 238), SH nigasaq- may correspond to mo. nisbiere- ‘to be exhausted, to break down’; and

mo. nisbiere ‘until (= to the point of) collapsing, breaking down.’ This interpretation would fit the context (‘laden down with marmots to the point of collapse’), but then why the durative suffix -iss‘expressing motion (see GWM, 64, §239)? I think with Ligeti that the motion refers to the horse, not to the marmots as understood by CL, 29; it was the horse, so laden with marmots and bending under their weight, that walked with an unsteady gait. Cf. Li, 25.

‘A brisk lad (gurumele ko’i g’ion).’ The word gurumele occurs again in §156 glossed miao-t’lao 既勞 ‘slender, slim.’ In the AT passage corresponding to §156, the word is written gurumele ot kârmel (AT, 56a). This word seems to be a direct borrowing from tu. kûru’i ‘good-looking.’ See VWT, II, 1258; cf. MA, 377b: kûrûmûk er ‘handsome man.’ This was already noted in TH, 208 (= JYT, 361), and Oz’ii, 162, n. 6. I should add, however, that according to the SH glosses, gurumele has the meanings of ‘brisk, alert’ and ‘slender;’ in the latter accretion (§156), the Chinese version employs the two-character expression miao-t’lao meaning literally ‘as slender as a shoot and a twig.’ Whereas a word gurumelekûrîmele meaning ‘good-looking’ is unknown in Mongolian, Written Mongolian has kûrûmeli, kârmeli, kb. kârmel, ‘sede, edge’ (less., 506b; Cev., 747b), i.e. a word designating a slender, grass-like plant. I wonder whether the latter word may not account for the meaning of ‘slender’ of the Chinese gloss, particularly since the extended meaning of miao-t’lao is ‘graceful, elegant.’

‘Without even (ba) going to his tent.’ For this use of ba, see Street 1981, 162-163.

The ‘leather bucket (nambruq, and (leather) pail (sa’ilPa)’ were those that Bo’or’u had been using for milking the mares, as specified in the free summary (Y’s 2, 31a-b). For nambruq, see above, n. 87; for sa’ilPa (= pmo., mo. saynul), cf. RH, 79, no. 5: saulpa. ’Concealing them in the grass’, lit. ‘concealing (bogqas, cf. below, n. 205, and Cleaves 1951, 84, n. 56) them in the steppe (or grassland: ke’er-e)."
Men's troubles are the same (lit. "one") for all", i.e. 'we men have similar troubles, we all share the same problems.'

Naqu Bayan, i.e. Naqu the Rich. On him see HCG, 346, 348, 352. He belonged to the aristocratic Arulat or Arfat tribe, on which see ibid., 344-345, 434b (Index). This tribe was first mentioned in § 47. As noted by Vladimirivcov, the Arulat and the Borsjgin were related through Qaidu, and the former was the cadet branch of the family. See Vlad,9, 98. The name of Naqu Bayan's famous son appears in various forms in different sources, see the discussion in HCG, 342-343. In the SH he is called Bo'orchu (= pmo Boyurdu) throughout. He and Musqul (see below, n. 137) became the leading companions-at-arms of Chinggis Qan, Bo'orchu being the first friend (nabor, see below) and the first of the four steeds (= stalwars). See above, n. 8. Pelliot has devoted a long note (29) to him in HCG (342-360). On Bo'orchu, see also LDAT, 406a (s.v. "Bo'orchu"); MCAT, 124-125, n. 3; ANT, 187a (s.v. "Boyarci"); CKZH, 4-5; YTSHT, 145ff; ISK, 760 (Index); Chiode 1994, 195-199; and below, n. 205. His dates are uncertain: born between 1165 and 1170, Bo'orchu was no longer alive by 1236; he may actually have died in or about 1227. Cf. HCG, 347 (where, however, the calculation for his date of birth is based on the assumption that Chinggis Qan was born in 1167, not in 1162).

In MCAV, 124, n. 3, C. Bawden refers to the name Boyorq appearing in Chinese sources as early as 1305 (following Pelliot in HCG, 345). His name, in the form Boyorq or Boyorq, appears also in one of the Mongolian documents (INV. 1964 no. 2271, G110, line 5) from Qara Qoto in the P.K. Kozlov Collection of the IVAN RAN Library in St. Petersburg, in a passage where our nabor is addressed (presumably by Chinggis Qan) as cing sedek-ti Boyorq (or Boyorq) minu 'my true-hearted Boyorq (or Boyorq).' The Qara Qoto ms. fragment (from the 'Precepts of Chinggis Qan;' see below, n. 205) dates probably from the 13th century. Cf. Munkuyev 1970, 343. For nabor 'friend, companion, etc.', see above, n. 13, and, in particular, Ligeti's pertinent remarks in Li, 147, n. 90. Cf. also

Issos 1983, 40-41. In my translation of §§ 90 and 92 I have used 'friend' and 'companion' interchangeably (whereas the Mongolian text has nabor throughout) not only for stylistic purposes, but also because both concepts are implied in the Mongol term and cannot be rendered in a single word in English.

'They came upon people in a circular camp'; lit. 'they arrived at a circular camp people (gur'en irgen). Gur'en (~

gur'en [this is the most frequent form], mo. kuriyen[]), lit. 'circle' (Pelliot's 'enclos', see Pe, 141), was 'an encampment around which the carts are drawn up in the form of a circle for protection' (Cl, 273a). Rafid al-Din explains that the kuren (= kuryen) was made up of 'many tents pitched on the steppe forming a circle' (SL, i/2, 18). In contrast to the ayil which, as we have seen (above, n. 81), was composed of one or more tents belonging to a single family, the 'circular camp' was a larger conglomeration of tents belonging to different households, thus comprising various ayils, which in time of warfare became a fortified military camp. Old people, women and children were sheltered within the inner ring, as were the valuables, victuals and weapons. These large camps eventually came to designate tribal units which, in the Mongol military system, were assimilated to sections or wings of the army. The term gure'n (kuriyen) has therefore different connotations pertaining to the social economic and military organization of the semi-nomadic tribes of Mongolia as these evolved in the time of Chinggis Qan in the 12th-13th centuries. The institution of gure'n, like that of ayil, has attracted scholars' attention because of its importance in this formative period of Mongol society; it has also raised a good deal of controversy. See Vlad,1, 283a (Index); TMEN, no. 341; HCG, 52-53, 322 (where the term in question is rendered as 'enclos circulaire, encinte circulaire, camp'); Mu, i, 150-152, n. 11; Sugita 1979, 51-53; Li, 151, n. 120; CK, 42, and n. 14 (cf. CK, 232, n. 15); Oz' II, 166-168, n. 13; Isso 1989 (esp. pp. 9-13). Cf. also below, n. 129.
THE SECRET HISTORY

92. ‘Without you’, lit. ‘apart from you’ (cimudalg’a anggida), i.e. except for your help.’
‘Am I now to take the horses as booty?’ (qilfe- ‘u ke’ ciyabu bi), lit. ‘Shall I take the horses saying, “Is it booty?”’ The word I have transcribed as qilfe- ‘u (see R, 36, line 2103) is actually written qilfe- ‘u (= qilfe- ‘u) in the Chinese phonetic transcription of the SH. However, this is an aberrant transcription, the correct form being qilfa- ‘u (qilfa- ‘u), i.e. qilfa ‘booty’ (cf. § 153) of the interrogative particle - ‘u (cf. sa- ‘u in § 86; cf. Mo, 102). The reading qilfa is supported by AT, 22a: qilfalgala (read qilfa-lagalga); cf. ATL, 52. See also below, n. 254.
‘The property of my father is ample for me’, lit. ‘What my father has accumulated (jë’eksen) will be until completed (a fully, entirely) (tiqetele) for me.’ For jë- ‘ë – jë- ‘ë (= mo. jëjë) ’to store up, accumulate, goods, amass (a fortune)’, cf. ord. jëjë ‘amasser des biens petit à petit’ (DO, 212a). Tiqetele is a fossilized convorbum terminalis of tiqë ‘end, complete’ functioning as an adverb meaning ‘fully, amply, plentifully, in a quite adequate manner.’ Cf. Mostaert 1939, 320; Cleaves 1951, 80, n. 49; and idem 1991, 132, n. 16. In AT, 22a, tiqetele is glossed barasi üger ‘inexhaustibly; (in) plenty.’ For tua ‘help’ = ‘voluntary assistance (out of kindness)’ as opposed to mo. yabiyu ‘obligatory assistance (out of duty),’ see Jahjagh 1978, 99.
93. ‘What is the matter?’ (ya’an bolba). Mostaert (n.1) translates ‘Qu’ay-a-t-il donc?’ However, the expression ya’an bolba can also be rendered ‘What (has) happened?’, as other translators have done. Cf. On, 28; Ev-Pop, 67; Oz’, I, 74.
‘As provision for the road’: günsä (= pmo. künsä[n]) means ‘victuals, provisions’– usually for travel. Cf. DO, 457b; BOEG, 182.
‘Which they loaded on the horse’, lit. ‘as loading’ (de’arge). De’arge is a deverbal noun from de’- (pmo. degar) ‘to load something on a horse.’ Cf. kh. düür ‘to carry someone or something in front or behind while riding on horseback’; ord. düür- ‘porter quelque chose à cheval, soit devant soi, soit
derrière soi, soit entre les bras.’ N. Poppe (p.c.) has heard the word de'urge used with the meaning of ‘loud placed across the saddle.’ Cf. below, n. 99.

For the adverbial expression mono (= mona) goyina ‘hereafter, in future, later on,’ see McO, 156. Here, being combined with the negative particle bu, it is rendered as ‘never.’

‘Were worrying about him’ (herüfi afo). The verb herü ‘to be said, distressed, worried, anxious’ occurs three times in the SH (§§ 93, 94, 208); it occurs in the AT¹, 22b, as erü, but this verb is not found in dictionaries of Written Mongolian. It occurs, however, in other Middle and Preclassical Mongolian texts. Cf. Pelliot 1925, 215, no. 21; TH, 192 (= JYT, 333). (Not to be confused with mo. erü- ‘to dig’.)

§ 94. The Kerulen River (mo. Kerülen Mören, kh. Xerlen Gol) is mentioned here for the first time in the SH in the metathetical form Keliuren (Müren), which is regular throughout the work. On this river, which is so important geographically as well as historically, and its name in the Chinese and Persian sources, see Pelliot in TP 31:1934/35, 166-167; and NMP, I, 330; Poppe 1956, 35; Perleš, 7 (cf. Perleš, 91); and, especially, Hambis 1974, 21-26 (where on p. 24, line 3, ’[Küüllüü]’ is an error for ”[Küüllüü]”). In the Introduction and the Commentary I have adopted the form Kerulen (in preference to Keliuren), which is the one found in most atlases. (Pelliot has ‘Keroulen’ and ‘Kerülen,’ but never ’Kerulen.’) See HCG, 27, 31 et passim.

For the earlier encounter between Temüjin and his future bride Börte, see the account of Yišügel’s visit to Del Sechen in §§ 61-66. This time Temüjin goes to fetch the bride in the company of his half-brother Belgisitei, leaving his younger brother Qasat at his camp on the Senggür (see below) to protect the family during his absence. When this event took place, Temüjin must have been about eighteen years old; Qasat, we know, was two years younger (see § 60); Börte was one year older (§ 66). See below, n. 104.

‘And now at last I see you!’ lit. ‘and now I barely (= with great difficulty or by good fortune) saw you!’ Del Sechen implies that he feared he would never see Temüjin again. Cf. Li, 27. For the expression auran (= auri) aje, cf. Cleaves 1959, 85-86, n. 276; TH, 95 (= JYT, 168); and C. Kašin in XZS 15; 19/1982, 169-178.

As we have seen in the section on Ambaqaqi Qan (§ 53), it was customary for the Mongols to accompany their newly-wed daughters to their husbands’ home – with dire results, alas, in Ambaqaqi’s case. Mindful, perhaps of Ambaqaqi’s warning about taking one’s daughter in person to her betrothed, Del Sechen accompanied Börte only part of the way and then turned back, letting his wife Cotan complete the journey. Mo, 7, views the matter somewhat differently and claims that, in his message, Ambaqaqi ‘met en garde son successeur éventuel et veut dire qu’un souverain ne doit pas s’exposer à la légère et faire comme les gens ordinaires qui conduisent en personne leurs filles à la demeure de leur mari, comme nous voyons Del-sechen le faire au § 94.’ Cotan’s continuation of the journey was in compliance with the traditional custom for the parents of the bride to bring gifts to the bridegroom’s parents. See § 96 and com. For the so far unexplained name Cotan, see Rybatzki [2003], s.v.

The locality where Del Sechen stopped and turned back is called Uraq Cöl (‘Uraq Desert’). Perleš, 7, identifies it with present-day Öröq Bulan on the upper reaches of the Kerulen at 49° N and 109° E, but it seems more likely that it was further south, at the great bend of the river. The text speaks, in fact, of the Keliuren-å Uraq Cöl Nu, lit. ‘the Uraq Cöl Bend of the Kerulen.’ Nu (¼ na’u ¼ nám) lit. ‘corner,’ as a geographical term designates the dry land, i.e. a meadow or plain in the winding of a river. See TH, 139 (= JYT, 242); Les, 594b; MKT, 396b. (Although this term need not be an integral part of the place-name [cf. HCG, 162], I have preferred to render it as ‘Bend’ throughout. The party had to cross the Kerulen to reach the Senggür and, further upstream, Temüjin’s camp, which was
still situated in the Gureqil Mountains (see above, § 89). It is clear from the text that Dei Sečen left the party when this reached the Kerulen and before it proceeded northwards along the Senggir, hence somewhere near the confluence of the two rivers. In the corresponding section in AT¹, 22b, it is stated that Dei Sečen "returned home upstream (šigue) along the Kerulen having developed a body fever", i.e. because he had fallen ill. This seems to be an interpolation, however, since to return home Dei Sečen would have had to ride along the Kerulen downstream, not upstream.

§ 95. ‘He jumped on (lit. "rode") his chestnut horse with the arched back.’ Belugu's, chestnut, or sorrel horse (qongquer) 'with the arched back' (bügélûtar) is the same ‘short-tailed, short-haired chestnut horse' mentioned in § 90. ‘He tucked his grey woollen cloak behind him’, lit. ‘He put (i.e. packed) his grey (i.e. plain, coarse) woollen cloak on its back (i.e. on the back of his horse),’ for the verb bokakir- ‘to load, or carry on, the back (of an animal),’ see TH, 159 (= JYt, 278-279); Oz’, II, 189, n. 3. Mo. boltgere- means ‘to throw or fling over.’ N. Poppe (p.c.) understands our passage as meaning ‘He threw his grey (coarse) woolen cloak over himself.’ The term örmge (örmge, cf. §§ 205, 249) of Turkic origin had two meanings, viz. ‘woollen material or cloth’ and ‘woollen cloak.’ See TMEN, no. 466; Koster, 17. ‘The meaning of which is ‘càdeau offert au père et à la mère du mari quand [la nouvelle bru] se presente devant eux’ (Mo, 32). This explanation is based on the Chinese gloss, for the term itself is nowhere else attested in this form. It has been suggested (TH, 253; JYt, 457-458) that örmge is a deverbal noun in -g of örmik, a verb which occurs only in a fragment of a Mongol blockprint calendar from Turfan, the meaning of which, in that context, is apparently ‘to plant.’ See MKAT, 22; MBT, 222b, s.v. I also think that örmge < örmik, but in my opinion örmik = mo. sidke, one of its meanings being ‘to dress’ (see Kow., 1493a). This indicates that, as in the case of örmik’s synonym emägel (which occurs further on in this section), the idea of a wedding present is originally related to that of a ceremony. For other references to the Mongol custom of presenting garments as wedding presents to the bridegroom’s family, see Mo, 32, n. 29. For daqa ‘(fur) coat’, see Li, 147-148, n. 96; TMEN, no. N 90 (= 2035); and RH, 300, no. 42 (‘a garment which protects from the rain, rain-garment’). As noted by Mostaert (op. cit., 31), the arrival of Börte accompanied by her mother took place when
Hsi-chün and her children were still encamped along the Senggir (see § 94), and not after they had settled at Bürgi Ergi. The whole passage is translated and discussed in Mo. 30-32.

In earlier days, Ong Qan of the Kereyt tribe and their father Yisügei Qan had declared themselves sworn friends', lit. 'In earlier days, Ong Qan of the Kereyt people (Yigen = tribe) had declared himself anda with their father Yisügei Qan.' Ong Qan was the chieftain of the important Kereyt (Kerei) tribe, whose territory at this time covered a large area of central Mongolia and east the Oton-Kerulen region where the Mongols lived, and extending southwards from the Tölö basin to the fringes of the Jurchen-controlled territory in north China. Ong Qan was the double, hybrid title (Ong < ch. wang 'prince, king' + qan of To'tori (pmo. Tovoril [see ATI, 260b-261a] < uig. toyir 'bird of prey'); in the SH his name appears in the forms To'tori, To'toril Ong Qan and To'toril Qan; see Cl, 2660-267a (index). At the time of these events, To'tori could not yet have been referred to as 'Ong Qan', since the title of wang (ong) was conferred on him later (see § 134) - it is, therefore, anticipated here. He and Yisügei had becomeandas before Temüjin's birth. The story is related in the SH, §§ 150 and 177, and in SL, I, 1, 127. Cf. D'Ossian, I, 51-52; CW, 31-32; as well as HCG, 233-248 (see n. 150 below). For the title of Ong Qan and the various forms and transcriptions of the names To'tori and Kereyti, see HCG, 207-213; TMEN, nos. 623 (ong) and 1345 (toyir). Cf. also Besse 1974, 94. For the Turkish and Nestorian-Christian background of his family and of the Kereyti tribe, see HCG, 208-209; Duvalier 1948, 308-309; Ck' and Ck, 2-3; and Ch'en TC 1966. On the Kereyt, cf. also Poppe 1975, 116, n. 36; Şastina 1975, 238-240; and Besse 1988, 25-26.

The relationship between the Kereyti tribe and the Uighur (and also Onggüt) Turks is an interesting one and deserves a separate study. In the Yüan designation the 'Uighur' was sometimes applied to the Kereyti and vice versa; and 'Kereyti' might even refer to a Central Asian Muslim (as in the case of the merchant Hasan in YS' 122, 2016). Cf. RCAC, 243-246 (esp. pp. 244 and n. 6, 246 and n. 1); ISK, 111. As is known, Ong Qan of the Kereyt is related to the legend of Prester John, being one of the personages identified with the mythical King David. See, provisionally, NMP, I, 303-304 (s.v. 'Prester John'); BIC, I & II (reprints of lectures given in 1966 and 1980); PEGK, 114, 142-143; the literature listed in de Rachewitz 1996a, 60, n. 2; and SIK, 136-139 et passim. (The vast material collected by P. Pelliot on Prester John and deposited in the Bibliothèque du Musée Guimet in Paris must still be edited and published.) Ong Qan plays a very important part in the life of Temüjin/Cinggis Qan as portrayed in the SH; for his 'characterisation' in the SH, cf. Gaalambu 1984, 87R. (esp. pp. 95-96). On him, cf. also Buyandelger in SHM 3:1989, 11f.; and C.V. Dmitriev in MO 1998, 25-29. For a critical appraisal of the early relationship of Ong Qan and Temüjin, and its historicity, see in particular Okada 1972, 65. Cf. CIIH, 84E.

The term anda is rendered here as 'sworn friend' rather than 'sworn (bond) brother', or 'with oath', in view of the argument put forth by F. Isono, supported by O. Lattimore. See Isono 1978; idem 1983; and Lattimore 1978, 131-132. Isono (1978, 83) writes: 'The use of the term anda in the Secret History seems to suggest that in the mind of the Mongols of Chingis Khan's time, anda was a political and military alliance rather than a sworn blood relationship, and that there was an element of equality in the concept of the anda relationship.' Lattimore (1978, 131) defines anda as an 'alliance by oath.' Cf. also Lattimore 1963bb, 58. Isono 1983 adds further evidence in support of the 1978 interpretation. In the SH the term anda is glossed ch'i-chiao or ch'i'huo and ch'i'ho matched 'sworn alliance, intimate friendship or (union)' (see HW, 7; cf. Cl, 271a, s.v. 'anda'). Various Sino-Mongolian glossaries render anda as 'friend' (friend) (YI, LLSL, etc.); and 'sworn friend, intimate friend (lit. "friends who have exchanged objects [= gifts"] and the like, in which the concept of "what is mine is yours and what is yours is mine" is implicit. These definitions are also found in texts of the Yüan period (see HCWLYTT, 116-119, no. 26,
and so is the Black Forest (Qara Tūn). The ‘Black Forest’ designated the wooded region east of the great bend of the Tūlā as far as the Sa’āri Steppe (or Valley: Sa’āri Ke’er; see below, n. 128), which itself was west of the south-west corner of the great bend of the Kerulen, but also sensu lato west of the whole length of the river from its source to the great bend. See HCG, 258-261. Since in our passage (as well as in §§ 164, 115, 164 and 177) the Black Forest is mentioned as being of ‘ot’, i.e. by or along, the Tūlā (the sectional summary, Y', 2, 406, says: ‘the black forest along the Tu’ula River’), we may assume that Ong Qan’s camp was in proximity of this river. The seasonal camping grounds of the Keryet chief are known to us through a passage in Rasīd al-Dīn’s work; the place-names of these encampments have been critically discussed and partly identified with known localities in Mongolia in Boyle 1973a. However, none of the place-names listed by Rasīd can be positively identified with Qara Tūn, although it is quite evident from the various references to it, in particular those in §§ 115 and 164, that right there was situated his hill-top or main camp, in this period. Perlée, 9, identifies the Black Forest of the SH with the present-day Tuylūn Sugai (‘Tuula Forest’) ‘at 47° N and 111° E’, but this location (somewhat east of the great bend of the Kerulen) is obviously too far to the east in relation to the Tūlā River. There must be an error in his coordinates; however, the identification of Qara Tūn with Tuylūn Sugai is undoubtedly correct (cf. Da2, 46, 62, 67), and in agreement with Peliot’s localization mentioned above. I think that Ong Qan’s main camp was actually in the area of present-day Ulan Bator and the Bogdo Ula Mts. just south of it (I hope to discuss this problem in a future paper). For the word tin ‘forest’, see above, n. 30; qara ‘black’ = ‘dark, somber’. As a place-name, Qara Tūn is the exact Mongol counterpart of Ger. der Schwarzwald.

‘I took a wife’, lit. ‘I had a wife a little at my tent’ (gergei baul’[a]). For the expression gergei baul’[a] (= pno. bayul’), cf. Cleaves 1951, 91, n. 92. The reading ‘bawal’[u] in Li’, 57, is
'I have brought the wedding gift (emügel) to you.' In the interlinear translation the word emügel is glossed shàng chén shìlān 'offer a gift to the husband's parents when the daughter-in-law presents herself to them (for the first time)' (see the sectional summary, Y² 2, 40b; it is therefore synonymous with šilkal (šíkäl) discussed above. Emügel is a deverbal noun in -1 from emüge (= mno. emüxeke-), factitive of emä- 'to dress, wear, put on'; thus, like šíkäl, it designates a present in the form of a garment. As noted by Mostaert, ord. imügel (corresponding to our emügel) nowadays designates 'les pièces de toile and les pièces de vêtement de dimension réduite que la famille du jeune homme donne aux parents de la jeune fille et que ceux-ci à leur tour distribuent en cadeau aux membres de la famille et aux invités à la noces' (Mo 32, n. 29). 'The place of the kidneys must be in the back.' That of good faith must be in the breast!' This is a proverb or idiomatic saying similar to, but not identical with, the English idiom 'to have the heart in the right place.' The Mongolian 'version' actually means that good faith (lit. 'purity, sacredness': ēgēre) must be in the right place, i.e. in the heart, just as the kidneys are in the back. In other words, 'I shall not betray your trust, which is a sacred obligation placed in my heart: I shall keep my word!' I have followed Poppe's suggestion in reading ēgēre for the ēchēre 'disparagement' of the text, and my interpretation is also close to Ligeti's. See Poppe 1950a, 266; Li, 27. For other interpretations, cf. Dö 46; Ör, II, 192, and 196-198, n. 7; Cl, 33; On, 30 and n. 92. Mrn. and mno. ēgēre corresponds to mno. ēgēr, kh. cêer id. For mno. -ē - zero, cf. SH öneri—śineri (HW, 124; cf. Lettres, 77). AT 23a, has ēgīre pro ēgēre (AT 1, I, 49, and ATL, 54, have tacitly amended ēgēre to ēgēre). An interesting study of this idiom is found in Būrinbat 1990.

§ 97. Jarši'udai (= pmo. Jarši'udai), the father of Jelme, belonged to the neighbouring Uriangkai tribe of Burqan Qaldun/Khentei Khan (see above n. 9). His name indicates that he was of the Jarši'ut subtribe or clan, on see above, n. 38. He was by profession a smith and, as such, a man of standing and wealth, as evident from his remarks concerning the gift of sable swaddling-clothes for the infant Temūjin. His earlier association with Yišiğei Ba'atur was not based merely on personal friendship, but also on subordination to the Kiyat Borjigin lineage as represented by Yišiğei, and now by Temūjin: his subordination is clearly expressed in the offer of his son Jelme to the latter. We know in his heyday Yišiğei had his authority recognized by various tribal chiefs; this authority was lost with his death and could not be regained by his widow Hö'elün. We now see it acknowledged again in the gradual rallying of previous allies and subjects, a process greatly helped by Öng Qan's support and the subsequent alliance with Jelme. Cf. also TH, 100 (as JYT, 177-178).

11. 'Smith's bellows' (ku'arje = pmo. kujaṛge: AT 1, 23a; ku̍rge = ku̍g̴rge) This term corresponds to mno. kujaṛge, kujaṛge, kujaṛge (kh. saṭrge), which has converged with kujaṛge, kujaṛge (mno. ku'arje = pmo. ku'arje) 'drum'; cf. below, n. 106. In § 211 the same word occurs in the form gurẹge (< gurẹge) for ku'arje. The Mongols' use of iron and their knowledge of metallurgy came from the Turks, the metal workers par excellence in the Altai world. Cf. Pritsak 1988,

Jelme is one of the great names in the Činggis Qan saga. Together with Qubilai, Jebe and Sūbe-eti, he is part of the legendary team, or group, of elite warriors known as the ‘four hounds’ (dīvenen noqas), parallel with the team of the ‘four steeds (= stalwarts’) (dīvenen kāliitu), on which see above, nn. 84, 90, and below, n. 162; HCG, 340-341. His feats are described in the Sf, the Chinese sources and the works of the Persian authors. Cf. HYS 123, 1a-6a; MWESC 29, 1a-3a, 9b; S1, 1/1, 157, 158; S2, 1/2, 270; TDMI, 383. Rašid al-Din regularly calls him Jelme Ube (? = Uge). Cf. HCG, 138. On the title age, see above, n. 59. Jelme had two younger cousins (lit. ‘younger brothers’), Ca’urgen and Sūbe-eti, who will make their appearance in § 120. See below, n. 120. On Jelme cf. also HCG, 155, 164; Li, 173, n. 211; Rачachevsky 1968a; Jackendoff 1977, 26; ČK, 199b (Index); and Chiiodo 1994, 207-210.

For Deliün Boldaq (‘Splendid Hill’), Temūljin’s birthplace, see above, n. 59.

‘For toqul’ (= prn. toqulal, fact. of toqul) = mno. toqul- (<toqulna) ‘to saddle a horse’, cf. TMEN, no. 140.

‘And handed him over to Temūlin’; lit. ‘he gave Jelme to Temūlin.’ The whole episode is recalled in § 211, when Činggis Qan rewards Jelme for his ‘many services.’

98. For the Mongolian construction of the first sentence, see Aalto 1973, 35.

Old Qo’aquq (Qo’aquq Emegen). Qo’aquq, w.f. Qoyuquq (but Qoyuquq in AT, 236) is a feminine name in -quq (-yequ) from qo’ ‘tawny, fallow (colour).’ See above, n. 1; JS, 33, § 31; Poppe 1975, 164; Rybtzki [2003], s.v. Emegen ‘old woman’ is the feminine counterpart of ehiyen (on which see above, n. 68) – here used as a term of familiarity, as in the case of Old Čuqaq.

‘The earth is shaking (qōlar derbeliini) and one can hear (lit. ‘is heard’) the sound of stamping hoofs (tabūri’ın sonostama).’ For derbel- ‘to shake, quake’, see MRT, 1162b, s.v. ‘derbelje’; cf. de Rachewiltz 1982, 86, n. 368; Cleaves 1985, 251, n. 65. Tabūri’ın (w.f. *tabirüquq) = mno. tabūrquq- tabūrquq ‘the sound of stamping feet or trampling hoofs (of horses or other animals).’ Cf. DO, 698b; O2’, II, 204, n. 4. See also Khomonov 1981, 61.


‘Mother Hō’elīn put Temūlūn in front of her on the horse (de’ure).’ For de’ur-, see above, n. 93.

‘One horse was harnessed (lit. ‘made ready’) as a spare horse.’ For kōlī’ ‘spare or led horse’, see above, n. 66. Cf. also Mo, 254.

‘There was no horse left for Lady Bōtte’, lit. ‘A horse was lacking (dutabá) for Lady Bōtte.’ One horse is not accounted for in this enumeration: Bo’ordu’s ‘chestnut horse with the arched back’ which he took with him when he joined Temūlin (§ 95). As Ligeti pointed out, the author of the SH has purposely avoided altering the original figure of nine because of its symbolic value. See Li, 148, n. 99; and above, n. 60. Besides Bōtte, Belgutel’s mother Suqiq (or Suqifil) and Old Qo’aquq, the maidservant, were also left behind for lack of horses. For the use of mori v. morin ‘horse’ in this section, see Özawa 1977, 96-97.

§ 100. We know that Temūlin’s encampment at the time was at the Bürgi Encampment (Bürgi Ergi), south of Burqan Quldan. See above, n. 96. It is towards this familiar mountain and its thick forest that Temūlin and the other fugitives make their way after abandoning the camp and leaving Bōtte, Old Qo’aquq and Belgutel’s mother behind. Old Qo’aquq hides Bōtte in a ‘ragged black covered cart’ (bōken qara’utai tereq). The Mongolian word which I translate as ‘ragged’ (bōken) is puzzling and my rendering is tentative. The term is not glossed in the Chinese interlinear version and is dropped in the parallel text in AT, 24a. Cf. Cleaves 1949a, 517. I base my interpretation
on kalm. bókk 'humpbacked, knobby.' However, bókkón may be related to mo. bökágę, bökégę 'awning or cover on a vehicle', in which case the expression may designate a type of covered cart. Cf. Oz. ii, 210, n. 2; and Oni. 31 and n. 95, following TH, 158 (= JýT, 277); MKet, 1060b, 1077a. Against this interpretation stands the fact that qara'utai tergeq already designates a covered cart. See above, n. 6. Ev-Popp, 69, leaves the word untranslated. "Put her", lit. 'made her ride.'

'An ox with dappled loins' (bő'ree daqą åker). For bő'ree (= mo. bőgere) 'kidney(s), loins', see TMEN, no. 807. A more precise description of the ox would be 'an ox with a white spot on the lumbar region and with large black spots on the loins' (Cl, 34, n. 60).

'Moved upstream along the Tenggelik (= Túngtelik) Stream'. This statement clearly shows that the Túngtelik Stream (Túngtelik Geronqan) was near the Bürgi Escarpment. Thus indirectly supporting the identification of this river with the 'Túngtelik Gorjón' of Pozdnev, the situation of which is in the general area of the Bürgi Escarpment. See above, n. 5. In Túngtelik - Túngtelik we have a common alternation of ā and e in the first syllable; however, the original text may well have had Túngtelik, since initial Tū- is confirmed by AT, 24a. In this case, Túnggelik represents the reading of the later transcribers (cf. the form Túnggelik recorded by Pozdnev).

'In the dim light (or in the twilight)' renders hērti baru-da (AT), loc. cit.: ērā baru-da, a hapat legemom in the SH. For this expression, cf. Pelliot 1925, 216, no. 22; TH, 192 (= JýT, 333); and Oz. ii, 211, n. 5. 'Some soldiers', lit. 'army people' (čerik haran). For the important military term čerik (= mo. čerig), see Poppe 1967, 512-513, no. 6; TMEN, no. 1079; and Pratsak 1988, 769. 'And asked who she was', lit. 'Asked, saying, 'What kind of person are you?'' Cf. above, n. 15.

'I belong to Temśljın', lit. 'I am of Temśljın's household' (bi Temśljın-ui ebi). Cf. Lettres, 78, n. 243, for the use of the possessive ending -u'ei (<-ágelỹ'u'ai (<-uyai).
although the meaning is the same, I have rendered it somewhat differently in English for stylistic reasons.

"The elders of the soldiers", lit. 'The elder brothers of those soldiers.' It seems that here aqua-nar, 'elder brothers', refers to the senior soldiers, i.e. the leaders of the raiding party, in other words the 'Three Merkis'. Tqo'a, Dayir Usun and Qa'atayi Darmala (see §§ 102, 103), who obviously had taken their younger brothers and sons with them. Cf. LI, 28-29. For aqua meaning 'senior, chief', see HCG, 68. Cf. Cleaves 1963, 69ff.

"The door of the closed cart (qa'atayi tergen)." The word qa'atayi is not glossed in the Chinese interlinear version, it is not translated in the sectional summary and it is dropped in the AT. It has puzzled earlier translators. However, it can only be explained as qa'atayi = qa'atayi < qa'atayi < qa'atai - 'to close.'

"Qa'atayi would, therefore, be the nomen imperfecti (in -'i-a-e, -mo. qa'at-ge) + the denominal noun suffix -tail-sei, meaning 'closed, barred', Cf. bur. xaggaatul id. See Oz', II, 220, n. 7.

For a similar development, cf. mo. alyadiwaita 'faulty' < alaya -'to miss, lose, err.' For qa'atai (= mo. qa'tayi), and qa'alqa (= mo. qayla) 'door, gate', see de Rachewiltz 1989, 292ff.; TMEN, no. 313.

'A lady sitting inside': the expression used for lady is qa'tayge kaimin. 'Qa'tayge' is undoubtedly an error for qa'tani 'lady' + the emphatic fe which I have rendered as 'indeed.' AT, 24h, has qa'tani kaimin. For this expression, see Cleaves 1983, 42, n. 15.

§ 102. The passage from 'in pursuit of' to 'were unable to catch him', has been translated and discussed in Mq, 32-35. The following are a few additional comments. For qa'atul - 'to circle, go around', below, n. 111. 'They made detectives', lit. 'they strayed from (= wandered off) the right direction.' For buttii - 'to stray, go off' (hence also to 'get away, evade, escape', see § 103), cf. DO, Add. et Corr. to p. 94a, line 10 from bottom.

For the expression eyin teyan 'this way and that', cf. also Cleaves 1955, 35, n. 19. 'Tangled woods', 'impenetrable a forest', lit. 'difficult woods', 'difficult forest.' For the simile of the snake, cf. Khomonov 1981, 60; Cl, 35-36, n. 65. The SH statement that the Merkit horsemens 'circled Burqan Qaidun three times' must be taken cum grano salis in view of the size of the mountain and the symbolic value attached to the number three (see above, n. 60 ad fin.). This hyperbole is repeated in §§ 111 and 145, like other clichés in the Cinggis Qan saga. However, in § 111 it is Temjiij who circles the mountain thrice, pursued by the Three Merkit.

The 'Three Merkit' were the chiefs of the three most important Merkit tribes, viz. the Udyuit, U'si and Qa'atayi Merkit, whose names are given as Tqo'a, Dayir Usun and Qa'atayi Darmala (for the incorrect form Qo'as for U'si, see below, n. 197). See HCG, 271-280. For the Udyuit, cf. also Poppe 1975, 166. In § 109, Tqo'as is mentioned with his title of beki (on him, see HCG, 271 et passim), and in §§ 111 and 112 the Three Merkit's forces are given as three hundred men. Cf. Ligeti's remarks in Li, 148, regarding the reliability of this figure. As Ligeti points out, the joint Merkit forces that raided Temjiij's camp must have been sizable. However, the whole episode is regarded as unhistorical by Okada 1972, 62-63.

'Now these Three Merkit had come to take their revenge (lit. "to avenge that avengement") because Mother H'e'elii had formerly been abducted from Ciledi.' For this sentence, cf. Poppe 1964, 374. For H'e'elii's abduction, see above, §§ 54-56; cf. Clarke 1978, 37-38. The parallel account in AT, 24h, adds that Botte was given to Elger Bokot, the younger brother of Ciledi. Cf. SH, § 111.

'Returned to their homes' (gyit-tiyr-iyen afiraha). The parallel passage in AT, loc. cit., says ger-tiyr-iyn qariba 'returned to their tents.' It has therefore been assumed by some scholars, notably Pelliot (u.a.) and Dambinsuren (Dq', 48), that SH gyit is a plural of ger 'tent, home, dwelling.' Cf. 11W, 50. However, as already noted by Kozin (Ko, 534, 617) and, later, by Ozawa (Oe', II, 227-228, n. 8), gyitt = mo. keyid 'abode (for monks), monastery.' Cf. 'ph. gyid, gyid "dwellings" (MMHJS, 405)

The alliance of these three key figures — Temujin, Ong Qan and Jamaqa — and their subsequent dramatic split forms one of the main historico-epical themes of the SH. As already pointed out by Ligeti, while the former anda-relationship between Yisügei and Ong Qan was acknowledged, the resulting adoption of Ong Qan as Temujin’s father was not self-evident at the time, since this father-son adoption was formally sanctioned by oath at a solemn ceremony later, as described in § 164. See Li, 149, n. 104.

For To’orl Ong Qan, chief of the powerful Keretit (Kerit) tribe of central northern Mongolia, see above, n. 96. As we have seen, at the time of these events Ong Qan was staying at his main camping grounds in the Black Forest (Qara Tlion) along the Tula River.

Temujin’s words ‘The Three Merit ... return her to me’ have been discussed in Mo, 40-43, particularly with regard to the ‘mat-couple’ eme ko’u (‘woman/wife — child’) = ‘wife’. See, however, Onon’s objections in On, 34, n. 102, and Kalyużyński 1992/93, 278-280. Cf. below, nn. 146, 174, 185. For the passive construction of the sentence in Mongolian, see Poppe 1964, 370, 373. For genen ‘taken by surprise; unaware; etc.’, cf. Mo, 46, 87-88; Ozl, II, 244-245, n. 2; and below, n. 170. ‘We have come now to ask you ...’, lit. ‘We have come saying, “Let my father the Qan rescue and return my wife to me!”’

Much has been written about the word nido’ni ‘last year.’ See Mo, 40-42, n. 40; Lettres, 24-25; Ozl, II, 246, n. 5; Til, 138 (= JYT, 240). Cf. also RH, 237, no. 4. For the negative interrogative etsi ‘before the verb igüde- ‘to say’, cf. ‘Trois documents’, 466. Temujin’s words quoted by Ong Qan, and the latter’s reply in alliterative verse, are found in § 96; cf. also § 150. Note the slight differences in phraseology and the inversion of the last two lines in the ‘kidneys and good faith’ simile.

I shall now fulfil that promise.’ For the expression kige-dür-iyn gür- (= kür-), lit. ‘to attain (= accomplish) one’s word’, see Cleaves 1949a, 518, 525, Lettres, 31. Cf. below, n. 127.

Jamaqa, the childhood anda or sworn friend of Temujin (see § 116 for the retrospective account of their friendship) was a chief of the Jadaran or Jairat (see above, n. 40, and below, n. 141). He was related to Temujin through their common ancestor Bodončar, but, as stated earlier, Jamaqa’s genealogy as given in SH, § 40, is certainly incorrect. See HCG, 27, The kinship ties between Temujin and Jamaqa are emphasized in the next section (§ 103). The appellation used by Ong Qan is de’i, lit. ‘younger brother’. However, this term had three meanings, viz. ‘younger brother (= brother-german)’; ‘younger cousin (= male [paternal] cousin) of any collateral line, younger than ego (i.e. an indicative of juniority within the generation of ego)’; and a term of affection towards a junior person. See QNTT, 713a; HCG, 30; DO, 167b; and above, n. 74. Cf. ch. tii and tsi-ti tii (Feng HY 1937, 149). Clearly it is here a term of endearment that Ong Qan uses for Jamaqa. On Jamaqa and his tribe see HCG, 27-29; EM, 430-434; on his personality and relationship with Temujin/Cinggis Qan, see Vlad, 105-108; Latimore 1963b, 58, 60, 62; idem 1978; Gaandamba 1968, 93-95. Further references to Jamaqa will be given later on, as there is now a vast literature on the subject.

For the expression kelen kiji ile- ‘to send a message’, cf. Mo, 84; Lettres, 37.

For the Qorgoa Valley (Qorgoaq Jura) at the headwaters of the Onon, see above, n. 57.

A military unit of 10,000 men (tümex), pl. tümex; no. tümen(-x), tümed), sometimes called a myriarchy, was the largest army unit in the decimal system of military organization of the Inner Asian tribes (10, 100, 1,000 and 10,000), only theoretically comprising 10,000 men. In effect it was often considerably less. See Vlad, 134 et passim; NMP, II, 585-589. Cf. Li, 149, n. 104. On the tümen-division see, especially, TMEN, no. 983; cf. also Bratik 1948, 169-770. In the present
passage the word appears in its plural form (kımên) because it is a question of two such units, but 'two kımên' is obviously a literary exaggeration, particularly in the case of the force which Jumãva was asked to assemble. See below, n. 106. In the campaign against the Merkit, Ong Qan’s force was to form the right wing (lit. ‘right hand’: barã qar) of the army, i.e. its western wing. Jumãva, whose encampment was further to the east in relation to Ong Qan’s, was to lead the left wing (lit. ‘left hand’: je’en qar), i.e. the eastern wing. The directions are erroneously reversed in the AT, 25b, and this error has unfortunately passed into BHM, 180. This passage is important because it shows that the Kereyit tribe was organized for military purposes in units of ten thousand, and that it followed the system of ‘wings’ (lit. ‘hands’) – the earliest reference to such military organization in a Mongol tribe in the 12th century.

There is little doubt that the Kereyit army of Ong Qan provided the blueprint for Çinggis Qan’s later reorganization of his own army. See below, nn. 191, 202. For the location of the ‘Three Merkit’, see below, n. 105.

‘Let Jumãva decide on the time and place of our meeting’, lit. ‘Let our appointment (bolja’an) be decided by Jumãva.’ The term bolja’an (='no. boljavi[an], boljavi[an], boljavi[an]), ‘appointment, rendezvous’, refers to the ‘meeting point’ both in time and place, not only in time as generally assumed. Cf. TMEN, no. 107; and below, n. 106. For the strict adherence of the Mongols to the time and place of the meeting agreed in advance as an essential element in their military strategy, see Sinor 1975, where (pp. 242-243) the present campaign is also mentioned as an example. Cf. also Serresy 1945, 156.

With regard to the date of these events, assuming with Pelliot that Temüjin was born in 1167 and taking into account the fact that 1) his eldest son Jöji was born very soon after the Merkit’s defeat and Börte’s rescue, and 2) that Ögedei, Temüjin’s third son, was born in 1186 (a reliable date, see NMP, I, 125, 253, 287; Pelliot’s authority is the YS 2, 37). We must infer that Jöji was born at the latest in 1184 and that the
§ 105. ‘My bed was made empty’, i.e. ‘they carried off my wife.’

The word for ‘empty’ is hoitorgi, which occurs twice in this form in the present section, and as hoitorgi in §§ 113 (twice) and 240. On this interesting word see de Rachewiltz 1999, 235-240.

‘You and I, (bida) Are we not from one family (önêr)?’ For oînêr ‘enlarged family, clan’, see Cleaves 1949a, 519-520. And, a few lines down, ‘You and I Are we not of kindred blood?’, lit. ‘of kindred (live) or (their relatives)’ (heitên-û urag). Temûjin, requesting Jampa’s assistance against the Merkit, emphasizes in this way the common bond of their blood relationship. See above, n. 104. As noted by Cleaves (Cl. 39, n. 4), ‘the liver denotes intimacy and close relationship.’ Cf. also Mésuré 2000, 39.

‘How shall we take our revenge? ... How shall we avenge this injury (lit. ‘our revenge’)?’ Cf. § 58. For the altercation in this stanza, see Poppe 1969, 273.

‘Remembering the help and good things done to me in former days by his (read inu for minû) father Yiisûgi Qan, I shall stand by (lit. “be a friend to”) Temûjin.’ This sentence has been rendered in various ways (cf. Da’, 54; Li, 3; Do’, 64; Mu, I, 178; Cl. 40; Oz’, II, 252, Ta, 41; Ev-Pop, 75); however, in view of the specific statements in §§ 164 and 177 (Y’s 6, beginning of 25b) it can only be understood in the above sense, i.e. ‘I, To’oril Qan, mindful of the assistance I received in former days from Temûjin’s father Yiisûgi Qan, will (in turn) help Temûjin.’ In the text, the pronoun minu ‘my’ is an obvious error for inu ‘his’, i.e. Temûjin’s father—a mediation supported by AT, 26a, where the corresponding passage has, in fact, inu instead of minû. This may not be the only instance in the §8 of minû for inu: cf. § 26b, where gur edge-yin minû may stand for gur edge-yin inu; however, this is debatable (see below, n. 269).

For the entire poetic passage from ‘Now, ...’ to the end of § 105, see Mo, 43-48. The following are additional comments on individual expressions, localities and people.

Cl. 40, following Mo, 47, translates golme as ‘shabrack’; however, as pointed out by H. Serruys (p.c.), this is not the saddle cloth, as shabrack is usually understood, but the two pieces of leather—on one each side—hanging from the saddle, between the rider and the horse’s ribs. Cl. DO, 270a (and ibid., 270b-277a); Khomontor 1970, 35; On, 36. For dafa- ‘to hit, strike’, cf. DO, 110a.

The Bu’ura Steppe. Bu’ura (＝ mo. bu’ura) means ‘male camel’ (see above, n. 64). The name of the steppe or plain (ke’er, mo. kege’er)—actually a river-valley (see above, n. 56)—comes no doubt from the homonymous river, the present-day Buuryn Gol, which flows into the Selenga south of Kyakhta. According to Pelliot (HCG, 279), the Bu’ura Steppe was just east of Kyakhta, but Perles’ 10c (cf. Perles’, 94), places it ‘near the towns of Altanbulag and Sixktar’, i.e. south of Kyakhta. See below, n. 109.

Toqto’a, Dayîr Usun and Qa’tai Darmala were the ‘Three Merkit’ chiefs. See above, n. 102.

‘A loose quiver’ (dabêtis qor), i.e. a quiver with a slack strap. The Chinese gloss renders dabêtis as ‘having a cover’ (川), i.e. ‘with a cover’ (or lid’), but mo. dabêtis means ‘slack, loose — as a bow with a long string’ (= ma. mise). See QNTT, 692b; cf. Oz’, II, 253 and 258-259, n. 10. Some of the other interpretations, e.g. Ya, 47, 295, n. 365, are rather speculative. For qor (＝ qorîl ‘quiverbearer’), see TMEN, nos. 299, 301. For dayîjî- (＝ dafa- ‘to revolt; to abandon one’s party’, hence ‘to desert one’s own companions’, see below, n. 188.

The Orqon and the Selenga are, of course, the Orkhon (kh. Orxon) and the Selenga (kh. Sêléngê) rivers; and Talqun Aral was the name of the peninsula formed by the confluence of the Orkhon and the Selenga south-west of Kyakhta, corresponding broadly to modern Tsagaan (Cisgaan) Aral. Cf. HCG, 280; Perles’, 9c (cf. Perles’, 95). For the term aral and its connotations, see above, n. 24 and below, n. 136. The Ming translator(s) did not gloss the word aral but merely transcribed it. The text does not have the word ‘between’ (ja’ura) which
has been dropped in the Chinese transcription, but is retained in the Chinese summary; and in the AT. See Mo, 43, n. 42; and AT, 26b.

‘When the saltwort (qamqul'u) is carried by the wind’, i.e. when the saltwort tusfs are uprooted and roll in the steppe carried by the wind. These, seen from afar, are taken for enemy horsemen by the chief of the Qa'at Merkit, Qa'at'a Darmala, who escapes in flight from the forest—a very graphic image. See Mo, 45. As noted by Mostaert, qamqul'u (= prono. qamqulisun; cf. AT, 26b id.) corresponds to mno. qamqul, ord. qamqul or qamqil, and kalm. qamqilo or qamqil — all terms designating a saltwort (genus Salsula) which, when uprooted by the wind, becomes a sort of tumbleweed rolling through the steppe. However, some modern Mongol languages separate the two forms given above, thus kh. xamsag (w.f. qamqay) is a ‘name given to several varieties of artemisia’ (MMED, 611a), specifically referring to Lmodesia and Salsola collina according to MED, 425b; but, according to ğUT, 488, qamqay corresponds to Corispermum his scopifolium. On the other hand, kh. xamsul (w.f. qamquil) designates a ‘type of tumbleweed’ (MMED, 611a); the Corispermum (MOUNT, 14); and Salsola collina (ĠUT, 503; MED, 425b, 426a). ‘A Buriat, xamsul is the name of Gyosophila paniculata (ru. perskati-pole). See BRS, 544a.

The Chinese glosses of the SH and the HIIY are vague and inaccurate; therefore, it is not possible to determine exactly to which species of saltwort the term qamqulisun applies: it may well be simply a generic name like ‘saltwort.’

The Qarja Steppe has not yet been identified, but it must have been in the same broad area around the confluence of the Orhon and Selenga rivers, near the present border of the Buriat Republic and Mongolia.

The river Kilqo is the present Kilok (bur. Xolgo), the important right-hand affluent of the Selenga. See HCO, 281; and Poppe 1956, 36-37. AT, 26b, has ‘Silqo’ for ‘Kilqo’, an obvious clerical error.

‘Sodge’ is a generic rendering of saqal bayan (lit. ‘rich beard’), which is properly the designation of a species of Cyperus (mo. saqal ebeš, kh. saqal ıvıs) rendered in the Chinese version as chu-tsun t‘aö 燕強‘ bristle-grass’, and used by the Mongols to make rafts (tai) when crossing rivers. See Li, 149, n. 105; D. Sinor in UJ 33:1961, 162; Ož, II, 261-262, n. 15. Cf. Ta, 295-296, n. 368. For tai ‘raft’, see TMEN, no. 1218.

‘In good growth’, lit. ‘in good state.’

‘Descending on (lit. “entering from upon”) the smoke-hole of that cowherd Togto’a’s tent’, i.e. as though falling from the sky on to the roof of his tent; in other words, making a surprise attack on him.

‘Its proud (= imposing) frame (erkin e’ede) ... the sacred frame (qatuq e’ede).’ The frame of the door, like the threshold, had a numerous connotation for the Mongols, as the images of the household gods (onggot) were placed on both sides of it. Cf. Mo, 46-47; MP, I, 385-386, n. 4. I render erkin (= mno. erkin-erkin) ‘important, excellent, masterly’ with ‘proud’ to convey the special strength of the word in English, as in ‘a proud structure, ship, etc.’ For the seminal term qatuq (= qatuqta, qatuqta) ‘sacred, blessed (= favoured by Heaven, etc.),’ see Lettres, 22; TMEN, no. 1568; Mori 1981; Bazin 1987, 215ff.; Pritsak 1988, 752-753. Cf. also above, n. 74 (on saariin and so), and below, no. 111 and 200.

For da’ari- ‘to hit, strike, knock down’, cf. TMEN, nos. 192, 1868.

For the two ‘preverbs’ embik ‘in such a way as to break it down’, and qoquru (= prono. qoquru) ‘in such a way as to break it up’, cf. Bese 1969, 125ff., and above, n. 101.

§ 106. Jamula calls To’oril Qan ‘elder brother’ for the same reason that the latter calls him ‘younger brother’, see above, n. 104.
'I have consecrated my standard' (tuq-i 'ayan su'uba bi), lit. 'I have sprinkled my standard with kuma' – the consecration of a banner, or standard (tuq), consisting of a ritual drink offering, known as su'ula, to the spirit of the banner. The 'sacrifice' to the war standard at the outset of a campaign is a well-known custom which has survived among the Mongols until recent times. See Mu, II, 264-265, n 2; Cleave, 1936, 268 and n. 726 (but no follow-up); Li, 145, n. 73; Ratnerchevsky, 1970, 427; Skrynnikova 1929/29, 53-54 (and TMN, 73); KHIV, 87. Cf. also below, n. 193. For su'ula and su'ula, see above, n. 103. For the word 'tuq' (= m. tuq), see above, n. 71. For the verb 'birkir', see above, n. 118. For 'birkir' = 'to roar, bellow (of a bull)', cf. bur. birquirid. See Gantogtokh 1989, 118. The 'bellowing' of the drum refers, of course, to the drum's covering of bull hide. Cf. Oz., II, 269-270, n. 3. For körürge (= prn. köyüşürge legürge, mo. köyüşürge, körürge) = 'drum', see TMN, no. 359; RH, 288, no. 9. Cf. Khomonov, 1979, 39. In § 232 we find the form guürge. See below, n. 232. ‘I have put on my armour’, lit. ‘I have put on my steel-hard dress’ (qatangyu de el-'yen emiše bi). For qatangyu (= prn. qataungyu) ‘as hard as steel’, cf. bur. xatan ‘steel(s)’, mo. qataungyu, qatyu ‘strong, hard.’ For the nasalised form, cf. mng. gə diá id. See IMCS, 68 and 131; VGAS, 50. ‘I have placed on the bowstring my arrow with its nock/Of wild peach bark.’ The arrow used by the Mongols had a nock or ‘button’ (ono) of wild peach bark (qatuaras, mo. qaquras) fixed to its butt-end, which the warrior notched with his arrow-sharpening knife (numuq küpper, cf. above, p. 80). ‘My leather-strapped breastplate’, lit. ‘my breastplate that has fastening thongs (hüdeser).’ The ‘fastening thongs’ (hüdeser < *hüdesesi, mo. idiadesesini)n are the leather thongs holding the plates of the armour together. This word was incorrectly identified in Pelliot 1925, 237, no. 66. Cf. Oz., II, 271-272, n. 8. ‘My hilted sword’ (onggiu üldii-he'et). Onggiu is onggi + the possessive suffix -tu. Whereas onggi is glossed ‘hilt’ (lt) in the interlinear Chinese version, this word in the modern Mongolian languages means ‘socket of a handle (or hilt).’ See Oz., II, 272, n. 9. However, this clearly indicates its meaning in the present context (a sword ‘with a hilt socket’ does not make sense), hence onggi is used in our passage with the extended meaning of ‘hilt (with a socket),’ no doubt to distinguish this type of superior sword from an ordinary sword cast in one piece, as correctly surmised by Ozawa and Oron (Oz., II, 272, n. 9; On, 37, n. 114). For üldii ‘sword’, see above, n. 71. For the word ‘letteest’, see above, n. 81; TMEN, no. 69; RH, 284, no. 18; Khoromov 1970, 38. ‘On the southern side of Burqan Qaldun,’ lit. ‘by the front (s south) of Burqan Qaldun.’ From the present section it appears that Jamuqa’s ‘two units of ten thousand (tümel)’ consisted of one tümel of his own troops and one tümel of Temüjin’s troops. As rightly pointed out by Ligeti (Li, 130; n. 107), this numerical exaggeration would be unacceptable even if we did not take the figure of 10,000 men literally (see above, n. 104). It is simply impossible that Temüjin could have assembled in such a short time even a fraction of that figure, given the desolate state in which he found himself when he approached Ong Qan. This literary exaggeration is due to the tendency of the author(s) of the SH to project anachronistically back into time only notables and titles, but also inflated figures of armies. For the usage of the number 10,000 in the SH, cf. Moses 1995, 95. The meeting place (boffilı qafar, see below) chosen by Jamuqa was Botoqan Bo'o'ji, an unidentified locality at the sources of the Onoon, on the east side of the Burqan Qaldun, i.e. Khentei Khan, area. To'oril, whose main camp was at the Black Forest of the 'Ula, hence much further to the south-west, was to proceed north-eastwards, meet Temüjin (whose camp was still at the Bürgi Escarpment on the upper Kerulen) south of Burqan Qaldun, and from there move together northwards to Botoqan Bo'o'ji. Jamuqa, whose camp was on the Onoon, had simply to...
follow the river upstream, i.e. westwards, to reach the meeting place. ‘The appointed meeting place’ renders bolqal (< *bolqal*, cf. AT1, 27a, 27b [4 times] qajar). In the old language bolqal = bolqal, cf. the letter of Aryan to Philippe le Bel, line 19: bolqal-qar ‘la date convenance’, and line 22: kem bolqal ‘date convenance’ (Lettres, 17-18, 31, 32). Thus it would appear that the vowel of the second syllable in the SH form of bolqal was a long one (a < a < a < ape), and this accounts for the modern bolqal in L2, 67, 68; and in R, 43, 44, 197b. It should be noted, however, that there is no supporting evidence for a long a resulting from contraction in the corresponding forms in the modern Mongolian languages (kh. bolzol, bolzor; bur. bolzor; etc.); hence, the reading bolqal in Lettres and in OZ, II, 268. Nevertheless, the form bolqal of the AT cannot be ignored, particularly since it was no doubt the form appearing in the SH text used by Blo-bstan bstan-’jin, as evidenced by the insertion of a gloss (bolqiyad) opposite bolqal (AT1, 27a, line 11, and 27b, lines 12, 12; bolqiyad). In Written Mongolian there is only bolqel (< *plno. *bolqal). In the Chinese version of the SH, bolqal and bolqal-an (§ 104) function as synonyms, both being glossed vih ei hjr ‘apointment for a meeting, rendezvous.’ See Hw, 19. Bolqal-an (AT, 25a; bolqay) is, of course, mo. bolqaya, bolqayu(n), bolqayu(n) id. For these and other related forms, see SG, 219; TMEN, no. 107. Cf. also Róna-Tas 1986, 136, 138.

With regard to the joint campaign against the Three Merkit as it unfolds in the following paragraphs (107-112), see EM, 70-71, ÇK1, 32-33 (< ÇK2, 35-37); CHHC, 81-88; and especially HCG, 278-281. Cf. also Sinor 1975, 242-243. § 107. The Tani (‘Big Pearl’) Stream (Tana Qorqan; qorqan < qorqan, qorqan, mo. qorqan[n]; see above, n. 5) was an affluent of the Tungelik (see below).

To’rill’s younger brother Jaga Gambu had been brought up in the Tangut kingdom of Hsi Hsia in north-west China, and this accounts for his Tangut name, or rather epithet. According to Radul al-Din (SL, 130-131), Jaga means ‘country’, and *kambu (*kambu, *gambo) means ‘great, eminent’. The meaning of *Jakambu as given by the Persian historian is high dignity (emir) of the country (i.e. of the state).’ The Tibetan and Tangut components of this epithet are discussed by Yu N. Rerikh, whose article (Rerikh 1961) supersedes Pelliot’s remarks in Pelliot 1938, 50-51, n. 1, and in HCG, 226-227. Thus, in Jaqa (= Jaya = Jä; cf. AT1, 27a; Jya) Gambu we would have a title used as a name, a not uncommon occurrence. Cf. the Aša Gambu of § 256. (I am grateful to Prof. Ruth W. Dunnell of Gambier, Ohio, for bringing Rerikh’s article to my attention.) However, a recent discovery has cast doubts on the above interpretation. Prof. H. Franke of Munich writes (p.c. of 7 Oct. 2002): ‘The title Gambu occurs frequently in Chinese texts from the Yuan period in various transcriptions which all go back to a form to be reconstructed as Gambu or Kambu. I have now found that Gambu is in reality a Tangut word, meaning “commander of an army”, in Tangut nga-mbyu. The Tangut characters for this word are nos. 5162 and 3468 in M.V. Sforinov’s Grammatika tansukhskogo yazika, vol. 2 (Moscow, 1968). For the translation of nga-mbyu see E. Kyčovský and Herbert Franke, Tungusische und chinesische Quellen zur Militärsgesetzgebung des 11.-13. Jahrhunderts (Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Klasse, Abhandlungen Neue Folge Heft 104, München 1990), p. 76, no. 237: “Kommandierender einer Armee, General, Feldherr.” Also Ch’eng Ch’ü-fu in his family history of Hsi-li Gambu in Ch’eng Hsiieh-lou wen-chie (Taipei 1970), ch. 15, 16b, says that Gambu (here written 賀布) is a military office of the Tanguts (河西藥師).’ See Franke H 2002, 260. For the Hsi Hsia kingdom, cf. below, n. 151.

‘Halted at Ayil Qaraqana,’ or ‘Set up camp in Ayil Qaraqana.’ On Ayil Qaraqana, an unknown locality on an unknown branch of the Onon which see n. 88 above – see HCG, 280. For the word qaraqana (= mo. qaraqana), see below, n. 195.
The reason for Temüjin's withdrawal from Bürghi was, it seems, to avoid hindering the progress of To'oril and Jaqa Gamba, and their large body of mounted warriors. Temüjin left Bürghi, on the right (= western) bank of the Kerulen, and moved upstream along the Tunggelik, reaching the Tana and thence the Kinme. For the Tünggelik Stream, see above, nn. 5 and 100.

§ 108. 'Jamaqa, seeing the troops of Temüjin, To'oril and Jaqa Gamba' (Jamaqa ade Temüjin To'oril Jaqa Gambutan-ü cüri 'ildi 'iğer'). In Summer; see Temüjin, To'oril and Jaqa Gamba.' Here the enclitic -'an = 'and' (cf. lat. -que); see the example from § 183 cited in Mo, 30. It cannot mean 'and others' since only those three army leaders are involved.

'Even if there be a blizzard (boroo'an).' Boroo'an 'blizzard, snowstorm.' appears in the form borooqan (cf. borooyan). Mo, borooyan means only 'rain' (syn. with guna, the latter being also the word for 'rain' in the SH, as in the present passage). For boroo'an (cf. tu. boron), see TMEN, no. 100; RH, 200, no. 19 (for no. 18, where borau is the metathetical form of boraan (= boru'an); Sinor 1977; Resseve 1992; and the references cited in those works. The alliterative passage is a saying emphasizing the need to be punctual at a rendezvous, employed here with special reference to a military operation. See Cétrénmod 1986, 79. The extreme importance given to punctuality in such circumstances by the Mongols has already been mentioned. See above, n. 104. Cf. Lorincz 1975, 121.

The ancient Mongols verbally sealed and formalized an oath or promise simply by uttering the word 'yes' (fe), so that for a Mongol to say 'yes' was tantamount to pledging his word. Cf. § 255. Hence 'to be remiss in one's 'yes' means simply 'not to keep one's word.' For andaqar-tan = andaqar-tan (cf. pl. by oath), cf. Lettres, 66. For the expression used by Jamaqa, see also Gaudamba 1968, 105. For Jerge 'rank,' in the military sense, see TMEN, no. 161.

'Tis it up to younger brother Jamuqa to punish and lay blame', lit. 'Let younger brother Jamuqa decide himself the punishing and blaming.' Cf. Lettres, 83, where, however, gudulaqan and cimirlaqan should correctly read gudulaqan and cimirlaqan. On these two words see Oz., II, 281-282, nn. 6 and 7; Vieitez 1990, 385. For other examples of the use of the expression medeşiğii 'let decide,' see Lettres, 83-84.

§ 109. 'Starting from Botoqa Be'orjin they arrived at the river Kiloq.' The troops of the Qaban, Temüjin, Jaqa Gamba and Jamaqa left the upper reaches of the Onon and proceeded, in a northwesterly direction, towards the Bu'ura Steppe (Bu'ura Ke'er) near present Kyakhta (see above, n. 105). As already stated by Pelliot (HCG, 281), it is most unlikely that they would have crossed the river Khilok — the Kiloq of the SH — to carry out their plan of attacking the enemy by surprise en route. This enormous detour would have forced them to cross the Khilok twice, as well as the river Chikoi, in order to reach the enemy camp. However, they did cross a river and from the strategic point of view this could only have been the Chikoi. A possible explanation is that the 'Kiloq' of our text is a mistake for 'Čikoi,' i.e. the Chikoi, an error which may be due to the fact that these two rivers run close to each other both flowing into the Selenga. In the 13th and 14th century works, confusion among the rivers of Mongolia is by no means a rare phenomenon. Cf. Poppe 1956, 36ff. On the Chikoi/Chikoi, see ibid., 36. However, not only is the Kiloq River the one also mentioned in § 105, but it is this river and not the Čikoi that likewise appears in the corresponding passage of the AT (260, 276). If, then, 'Kiloq' is the correct form, the only alternative explanation is that the SH account of the joint campaign against the Merkit is a conflation of two, or perhaps even three, separate operations carried out at different times against this tribe, as suggested in fact by Pelliot after a comparative analysis of all the sources. See HCG, 266-267, Ligeti (Li, 149-150, n. 106) has correctly pointed out that the Bu'ura Steppe must be situated south of the
Kihlok (not to the north of it, as in Haensch’s map in Ha, 194); this is also confirmed by the fact that the campaign ended at Taqquin Aral, at the confluence of the Orkhon and Se Lena rivers (see § 115). According to Ligei (loc. cit.), the joint forces dis- cross the Kihlok twice to attack the three Merki tribes by surprise from the rear, the first crossing having probably been effected more to the east, by fording, before the beginning of the actual hostilities, so as to avoid a second, dangerous crossing during the campaign.

‘Descending on the smoke-hole…’: cf. above, § 105, where the poetic passage is almost identical. Cf. also Okada’s remarks in Okada 1972, 63.

The section ‘While Toqto’a Beki was asleep … at full speed,’ is translated and discussed in Mo, 48-49 (cf. also ibid., 123). In this section Toqto’a is mentioned for the first time with his title of beki, on which see above, n. 49. Cf. HCG, 271.

For the Bargjin Lowland (tšigam), corresponding to the Bargjin valley between the estuary of the Bargjin River and that of the Selenga see above, n. 8.

For the expression čo’en beyses-ıyan, lit. ‘few in number and with nothing other than their bodies’, see Mo, 176-178, n. 158. Cf. below, n. 197.

§ 110. This section, describing Börte’s rescue from the Merki camp, is, together with ‘Börte’s Lament’ (§§ 77-78), Qargul Šira’s attempt on little Tolu’s life (§ 214) and a few others, one of the literary highlights of the SH. It has a romantic flavour which is, on the whole, absent in the harsh milieu of this early narrative. Cf., on this subject, Šačkóži 1978. However, as already noted by Pelliot (HCG, 266), the story of Börte’s rescue as told in the SH is of doubtful historicity, and quite at variance with Rašid al-Din’s sober account. See also NHIO, 25, n. 2.

‘Our troops’ (bidan-u čeri‘a). This is the first of several instances in which the SH narrator identifies with Činggis Qan’s side — as if he were an actual participant in the action just being

Described For the usage of this literary device, cf. Coimaa 1994.

The verb diirhe- can be rendered ‘to flee in disarray’, ‘to flee in haste’, or ‘to flee in panic’ — as when routed by the enemy.

For the connotations of tala- ‘to plunder, spoil, ravish’, cf. TMEN, nos. 923, 926. A comprehensive study of the early Mongol terminology concerning warfare, raiding and plundering, maiming and killing is long overdue. See, pro- visionally, GGML., 110ff.

In the present section much use is made of the auxiliary verbs yahu- ‘to go’, and ayısu- ‘to approach’, on which see above, nn. 15, 55; and Aalto 1973, 37.

‘He came upon her’ (učrįža). It may seem premature to introduce the verb ‘to meet, encounter’ (učrįza-) at this point in the narrative, but what immediately follows is, strictly speaking, parenthetical matter in which the main action is already over. I have overcome the problem by simply adding ‘for.’ Cf. Cl, 45; and Oz, II, 291 and n. 1.

For čiibur ‘tether, halter (strap),’ see TMEN, no. 181; RH, 80, no. 12.

‘They fell into each other’s arms’, lit. ‘they threw themselves on each other and embraced each other.’

‘That very (or same) night’ (šoši bő‘et) is, literally, ‘having been (= while it was still) night.’ Bő‘et (= mo. bögäd) has the meanings of: 1) ‘having been’ = ‘while being’, ‘while’, ‘during’; 2) ‘and then’ — an extension of (1); and 3) ‘precisely, that very (same),’ also an extension of (1). Cf. GHMBK, 581 (s.v. ‘bő‘éd’), 583 (s.v. ‘bů‘éd’); VG, 90-91, and, especially, Oz, IV, 12-16, n. 1.

‘As for the Merki people … right there.’ This sentence has been understood differently by various translators. I agree with those among them (Pelliot, Kozin, Damdinsüreń, Ligei, etc.) who take ‘right there’ (män tende) to mean the very place where the fugitives found themselves, not ‘the same place where Temüjin had stopped to pass the night’ (Cl, 45, n. 19). It is
unlikely that the fugitives would have settled for the night in exactly the same spot where their enemies had encamped.

§ 111. ‘At the very beginning’ (tūrin uritā), lit. ‘Formerly at the beginning.’ For tūrin ‘at the beginning’, see de Rachewiltz 1982, 57-58, n. 29; Cleaves 1950, 106, n. 114; idem 1982, 86, n. 66; Oz’, II, 297-298, n. 1.

The name of the tribe of Qa’atāi Darmaia, the Qa’at merkit, has dropped out of this paragraph; I have added it following AT, 28a (where ‘Aṣrād’ is a copyist’s error for ‘Qarad’).

‘Mother Hō’elūn was abducted by Yisgüei Ba’at’ur (Yisgüei Ba’at’ur-a Hō’elūn Eke-yi buffa abtačuli). For this passive construction, see Poppe 1964, 370, 373.

‘It was at the time when Temūijn circled Burcqan Quldun three times’, i.e. when the Merkit raiders pursued him around the mountain, as colourfully related in § 102. My earlier rendering of these words (Ra, II, 155) is incorrect. The verb qa’di/i (‘is mo. qadīt) ‘means to go round, (encircle’; cf. § 102 where, as here, this verb (again in the fictive form!) is rendered in Chinese as jiao hš id. The sentence in question is a temporal one and, as usual in Mongolian, the subject, i.e. Temūijn, is in the accusative. See GWM, 149, § 517; JS, 181, B (third example); cf. the opening sentence of the so-called ‘Stone of Chingis’ (de Rachewiltz 1976, 487) for the same construction. Cf. also the SH, §§ 145, 199 and 205.

Čilger Bökö was the younger brother of Yeke Čilgē, the first husband of Hō’elūn, who by this time may have been dead. In Mongolian čilger has several meanings, but in the present case it must signify ‘strong, robust’ (cf. kh. čilger id.), rather than ‘elançé, fitnece’ (Bese 1974, 92). Bökö means ‘a person of great physical strength’, hence ‘wrestler, prize-fighter’ (see above, n. 41). Obviously, Börte was given to him to right the wrong done to his elder brother.

The entire poetic passage has been translated and discussed in Mo, 50-53. There are several words in it of which the exact meaning is not quite clear. Cf. Poppe 1950a, 266-267. In the following I shall amplify on some of these obscure words and, at the same time, give additional references to some others.

For the expression qulūysa meaning ‘scraps of skin’, cf. Vietze 1990, 382-383, as well as Oz’, II, 298-299, n. 3. ‘It aspired to eat’ or ‘It hoped to eat’, the verb jēš’il- (= mo. jesi- ‘to estimate, imagine, etc.’) may be rendered either way.

See Oz’, II, 299, n. 4.

‘I, brutal and base Čilger’ (qatar ma’i Čilger h). The word qatar, not glossed in the text, has puzzled previous translators and has been left untranslated by Mostaert and by Cleaves. AT, 28b, has qatar or qadar. I have no doubt that it is tu. qa’dir ~ qadar ‘grim, brutal, rough, harsh.’ See DTS, 401b. 403a; ED, 603b; TMEN, no. 1381. Cf. yak. xadaat ‘obstinate, stubborn.’ The Ming editors and translators who evidently did not know this term transcribed it incorrectly as qatar instead of qadar owing to the ambiguity of the Uighur script. See de Rachewiltz 1995, 280. For other interpretations, cf. Poppe 1950a, 267; TH, 173 (= JYT, 302); Vietze 1990, 384. Ma’i(i) (‘is mo. ma’i[i]), lit. ‘bad, wicked’ (x sayin), is a term employed here to designate, in a self-deprecatory manner, a socially inferior person, a base-born individual. Cf. Mo, 183, 225. On this word see also TMEN, no. 361.

For qaraq ‘lowly’, and qara teri’in ‘black head’, see below.

‘Who will act as a shield for me?’, lit. ‘By whom shall I be shielded?’ Cf. Poppe 1964, 376.

For quladu (kh. kalt sūwha) ‘buzzard’, see WTCWC, III, 4136.1; MMED, 687a. However, in Buxari zadlu (< quladu) is the ‘hen-harrier’, a hawk of the genus Circus. See BBS, 60a. Cf. Gantogio 1990, 124.

For qulaqana (< qulaqana (‘IS. qulaqana)), see Cleaves 1961, 73, n. 7. Cf. also TMEN, no. 308; RH, 220, n. 9. For kāchugane ‘mouse’, see above, n. 89.

‘I, thieving (qunar) and base Čilger.’ The word qunar, like qatar, is not glossed and has likewise puzzled SH translators. I believe that it, too, is a Turkeic word, meaning ‘stealing, carrying
off' (a participle of *qan* -to steal, carry off'). Cf. DTS, 466a; ED, 632b. This interpretation fits well in the present context, in which Čîlîger accuses himself of having abducted (lit. 'gathered') Lady Böre, thus behaving like a robber. For other interpretations, cf. Poppe 1950a, 267; TH, 183 (= JYT, 319). See de Rachevitz 1995, 230-281.

The epithets 'favoured' (*qutqat*), and 'fortunate' (*sata*) are derived from the present context, in which Čîlîger accuses himself of having abducted (lit. 'gathered') Lady Böre, thus behaving like a robber. For other interpretations, cf. Poppe 1950a, 267; TH, 183 (= JYT, 319). See de Rachevitz 1995, 230-281.

The expression *qutqat* (p. mo. *qutqat*) *sata*, cf. Letters, 22. For *qutqat* see above, n. 105; for *sata* - *sata* (pl. *sata*), see also above, n. 74.

'Boastful (*qokir*), base Čîlîger.' *Qokir*, like *qatir* and *qummar*, is left untranslated in the Chinese interlinear version. It has also been variously rendered, with several translators opting for 'foul', 'mean', 'crooked', 'miserable' and the like on the strength of mo. *qokir* 'dry dung, dirt, rubbish', *qokir* (kh. *kukur*) 'emaciated, surly (see below)', and *gokijir* (kh. *kukijir*) 'lean; crooked'. However, the word *qokir* also has the meaning of 'boastful, boastful, braggy' (WYWC, II, 2430.4; Gol., II, 145c), with the related connotations of 'liar, joker' (cf. kalm. *xok* id.). In this acceptance, *qokir* is an adjective, whereas the extended meaning 'foul' (adj.) from 'dung' (subs.) is not warranted. The rendering *gametina* 'obstinate, stubborn' of O2, II, 296-297, 302-303, n. 12, is based on kh. *xokir* which, according to Cev., 699b, means 'having an unfriendly and nasty character; surly (*sukur*)'. The word 'boastful' fits the context well, insofar as it describes a 'commoner', like Čîlîger Bokî, who 'has put on airs' by possessing a noble lady, and I therefore believe that this is the meaning obtained in the present case. The main point of Čîlîger's poetic self-criticism is that a lowly, common tribesman (*quruq*) ought not to covet things pertaining to a noble chief, or lord. Cf. Moore, 52. See de Rachevitz 1995, 281-282. As already noted (see above, n. 21), *quruq* 'commoner, common people (i.e. tribesmen)', and *quruq teri* (= lit.
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'black head' (of a commoner), are synonyms containing the common element 'black' (*quruq*), and refer to low birth and status, standing here in opposition to the white colour of the birds (goose, crane, etc.). 'White' (*gāruq* and *sāguq*) is the colour symbolizing all that is noble, aristocratic and good, hence a symbol of good luck. Cf. n. 63 above. (By contrast, in China white traditionally denotes what is common, vulgar, unlucky and of no value.) For a discussion (along parallel lines) of the terms *qatir*, *qummar* and *qokir*, cf. Doerfer 1996.

'My shrivelled head' (*gokimai teri* = shrivelled, or withered, by constant exposure to the sun, characteristic of the 'black' head of a common tribesman.

'Worth but (i.e. only)', lit. 'so much as' (= *tedii* = 'no more than'.

'Dreadful (*quruq*), dark (gorangggu) gorges.' The word *quruq* = *quruq*, the possessive suffix -tu = -tu. According to TH, 171 (= JYT, 298), *quruq* is still used (as a dialect form) in Inner Mongolia with the meaning of 'obscure, dark.' In their usual acceptation, however, *quruq* and *quruq* (= *quruq*) mean 'envious; nasty, awful.' See Kow., 833b-834a; Gol., II, 97c; Les., 935b; MKeT, 1255b. Čîlîger wishes to hide in such a dark and horrible gorges where his pursuers would not dare to follow him, and in this way save his life which is now worthless.

'Shelter' (*goriya*), lit. 'protected enclosure (or pre-cinct). *Goriya* = *goriya* id. + the relatively rare denominative noun suffix -tun (= pomo., mo. —toon, see 'Trois documents', 452-453), and not goriya + -tun (Relativussuffix), as stated in TMEN 443. Cf. Gz, II, 506; Bä, I, 317. Thus, pomo. *goriya* = pomo., mo. *goriya*. On this important word, see TMEN, no. 303.

For the bird and animal similes in this section, see Boyle's comments in Boyle 1978a, 183. Cf. also Lorinzech 1975, 121-122.
'chief, noble', which reappears in §§190 and 191. See HCG, 185.

'He then shot knob-headed arrows at any men of Merkit stock (Merkitdei yuatsu gu'it-ni).' For the knob-headed arrows (qodolit), see above, n. 77, and below, n. 116. For the generalizing particle ele used in this context, see Street 1966, 207-209. Yasu is, literally, 'having the bone (yasutai)', Yasaun is one of the main kinship terms in the social organization of the Mongols, designating a common (patrilineal) line of descent, thus meaning 'lineage, stem', as well as 'stock', as in ger. Stamm. See above, n. 9. For this term, cf. TMEN, no. 405 (and the references contained therein). Cleaves 1951, 75, n. 19; Yang LS 1956, 49-51; MSR, 129; Fletcher 1986, 16. Hence, 'having such a bone' = 'being of such a stock.' Cf. mo, yasarue id. See Les., 430a-b. But why did Belgüte shoot qodolit-arrows, i.e. blunt arrows, at any man of Merkit stock that he saw in the encampment? I think it was simply to mark them for killing. These bone-tipped arrows, often pierced with holes so that they whistled as they flew (see below, n. 116), were used for a variety of purposes, including ceremonial ones. By hitting a person with such an arrow it meant that that person must die; the actual killing was carried out by the soldiers or guards. It should be noted that, in the present instance, the 'ceremonial' hitting with the arrow was accompanied in each case by the words 'Bring me my man' (ma'ai), which appears in the context of the ritualistic formula by which the victim was held individually responsible for the collective crime committed upon the person of Belgüte's mother. For the earliest recorded instance of the use of 'whistling' arrows to indicate a person to be killed, see the interesting episode from the life of the Hsiung-nu chieftain Mao-tun 惠屯 (209 B.C.) in Kreuger 1961. Cf. also KWL 57, 14a (shen-tao pei 神射策) of Yeh-lü Ch'iu-t's'ai 耶律楚材, 1189-1243, by Sung Tzu-chen 宋子真 [1267] for another episode involving the use of 'whistling' arrows in Ögödei's reign (1231). See KIPMX, 75, 108-109, n. 114.
Those suitable to be embraced ... through the door”, i.e. they seized the Merkit women and turned them into concubines and slaves, as was the custom. The expression ‘to be let through the door’ (e’ilen-tür oro-uldu) is a euphemism for ‘to serve inside the tent as a slave (or serf).’ Cf. Orz, II, 308, n. 5. For the binominal expression (‘mo-couple’) eme ko’lan = ‘wife’ rather than ‘wives and children’ (as in On, 41), see above, n. 104.

§ 113. ‘With my strength increased by Heaven and Earth.’ For the early Mongol concept of Heaven (tengerii) and Earth (qajar) bestowing strength (gucu) and protection (ihe’el) on a man destined to be a ruler, see de Rachewiltz 1973; Skrynnikova 1989b; KHIV, 62 et passim. For the connotations of the word gúcùu (no. mi, klicãI) ‘strength, power’ < tu. kac I id., see TEMEN, no. 1662; Skrynnikova 1987, 126-128; KHIV, 100ff. (For the suffixless form with loss of final n in the present passive construction, see Poppe 1964, 373, 374.) The Mongol concept of Heaven-granted strength is also borrowed from the Turks. See Clauson 1962, 92-96; de Rachewiltz, op.cit.; Mori 1981, 50-51. On these terms and concepts, see also above, nn. 16, 73 and 113, and below, n. 125. In the present section we have a combination of tendgerii and qajar (as in §§ 121, 125, 208, 224, 254, 260, 281), and of tendgerii and etiggen (töögen in § 255). Etüügen – öögen has the regular epithet eke: eke etüügen – öögen eke ‘Mother Earth.’ Whereas qajar means ‘earth’ sensu lato – including the Earth-deity –, etüügen – öögen (öögen < öögen – etüügen = öögen, möo, etüügen, öögen, öögen), eke is the Earth-deity sensu stricto. (For the association etüügen – öögen and tendgerii – qajar, see also the beginning of Hung-wu’s letter to Afsari in the HJY, Matérél I, 1 (1r2), 15; and Cleaves 1959, 59 [9r]. The Earth-goddess was known also by other names, such as Načịy, etc. (see below). In the early shamanistic conception of the Mongols, (Mother) Earth is the counterpart of Heaven (Above), the Supreme Power of the Turkic and Mongolian speaking peoples of inner Asia. See above, n. 1, and, specifically on the role of the Earth as goddess, DBSS, 65-72 (e Banarzov 1981/82, 65-70); Lot-Falck 1956 and 1975; Roux 1962, 199-206; RTO, 132-137. The name öögen – öögen and its relationship with tu. Öüken, the name of the sacred ‘mountain’ of the Turks (Tu-chiue) corresponding to the Khangai range, have been discussed by various scholars, also in connection with the other names (Načịy, Itoja, etc.) of Mother Earth. See, in particular, Pelliot 1929, 212-219; NMP, II, 791-792, s.v. ‘Natagii’; Cleaves 1949, 129-130, n. 246; idem 1954, 124-125, n. 326; de Rachewiltz 1982, 61, n. 66; Mostaert 1957a; idem 1962, 201, 218, n. 21; Orz, II, 311-312, n. 2; Sinor 1939, 551-555; Dien 1986, 19; SWPB, 123-124, 11,10; STLT 1:1982, 225; Matérél II, 4; Cleaves 1991, 136-138, n. 35 (with further references); ASTJ, 25ff.; G. Kara in Shamsan, 1998, 176-177; and TI, 98-99, n. 255. Cf. also below, n. 238. For the geographical situation of Öüken in Mongolia, see RBC, 187; and Klyashtorny 1982, 346 (cf. below, n. 273). The meaning of Öüken is, probably, ‘Lord of Prayer’ (< tu. öüük ‘prayer, request to a superior’ + qan ‘lord’, the latter term often applied to imposing mountains); cf. tu. Tamyan ‘Lord of the Wall’ (< tam ‘wall’ + qan) for the Tšin-shan, and Qadirqan ‘The Severe Lord’ (< qadir ‘severe’ + qan) for the Khungan range. For öüük see below, n. 154.

The words erketü, eke, ere and ebr in the poetic passage are in e-alliteration; therefore, the epithet eke is placed before öögen instead of after it, as it should be. Tengerii, ‘Heaven’, is qualified as erketü ‘mighty, powerful’, but this term means more than that: it designates the ‘majestic’ power, or authority, of a ruler, be it of heaven or earth. Cf. tu. erelgi id. in ED 224a-b. See also Clauson 1962, 96-99. For the alliteration in this stanza, see Poppe 1969, 273-274. (The form tendgerii, instead of the usual tendgerii, occurs twice in this section, and again in §§ 121 and 125.)

‘Carried through (gürgefů)’: the victory over the Merkit was decreed by Heaven and made possible by Mother Earth. In
other words, She created the favourable conditions for it to be achieved.

'Of the Merkit people/Who take their revenge as a man does
(ere halittu). 'Ere halittu is, literally, 'man-vengeful.' I base my interpretation on an unpublished note by Mostaert. For other interpretations, see Pe., 151; Li., 36; Cl., 47; On., 47.

'To empty the breast and tear to pieces (lit. 'to break off a piece of') the liver' can be understood both figuratively, in the sense of causing extreme affliction and irreparable damage, and literally, as referring to the ancient and well-known ritual of tearing out the living heart and/or liver of war prisoners. Isolated cases of this practice are recorded in Mongolia even in the 20th century. See MiHM, 33, 197, 320; and LC, 86-88.

'Ve emptied their beds': cf. § 105 and com.

'Thus we destroyed (busanajqatu) the Merkit people: let us now withdraw! (icaru.)' The verb busangaqa- (pms. busanjaq-) corresponds to mo. busanyiul- 'to destroy, ruin, scatter.' According to Oz., II, 313, n. 5, the correct reading is busanyua- (< busanja- (fact. of busan)-), but the form busangaqa is confirmed by § 208 (twice), as well as by AT!, 29a. As for icuu- 'to withdraw' see Lettres, 25; cf. above, n. 73.

In this and several other passages of the SH we encounter words like 'to destroy (annihilate, bring to an end) (busangaqa-, bara-, uitéke, muqatqa), besides those for 'to plunder' (da'tul), 'to crush, suppress' (daru), and 'to subjugate' (doresvida'ul). 'To destroy' or 'to annihilate' a people (as tribe or subtrbe) must not be taken literally -- it is merely a way of saying that on that occasion a particular group of people lost through defeat their power and unity, and no longer counted as a force to be reckoned with, chiefly because their leadership, viz. the members of the leading clan(s), were usually systematically killed (unless they managed to flee before the debacle). Accordingly, this 'destruction' could be a temporary or permanent event. We find the same terminology in the Old Turkic literature. See also the remarks below, nn. 133 and 154.

§ 114. This paragraph has been discussed in detail and translated in Mostaert 1956.

'With fire in his eyes' for this expression, cf. §§ 62, 66, 82 and 149.

The name of the five-year-old (= four-year-old in Western reckoning) foundling was Kükü, meaning 'Strength', or 'Might' (see above, n. 113), written Kükü in § 138 et passim. For k₂-g in the SH, see 'Quelques problèmes', 240-243.

In the SH the word for 'boots' is qutatul (cf. § 145), corresponding to mo. tutul. For this word see TMEN, no. 263; Serruys 1982, 475-476; Gantogtokh 1985, 119-120; Gantogtokh 1990, 125.

'A dress of otter skins.' The otter is called souu-ulu bulagan (m. bulayan), lit. 'water sable.'

For the important term sauq = sauqat (= pms. sauq, sauqat) 'present' and its history and connotations, besides the references given in Mostaert 1956, 9, n. 10, see TMEN, no. 272; HCWLYTT, 32-39, no. 8; and R, 291, no. 33. sauqat 'present.' Essentially, sauqatit designated presents one took on a journey to repay the hospitality also received, hence a sort of due which the receiver expected by custom -- often mistoken by outsiders for a bribe.

With Kükü (Güüü) begins the series of orphaned infants and children of enemy tribes, defeated by the Mongols and their allies, who were adopted by Hő'elün or Börte, and who thus acquired the status of brother or son of Temüjin/Cinggis Qan. Four foundlings are mentioned in the SH, viz. the Merkit Kükü/Güüü (§ 114), the Besüt Kükü (§ 119), the Tatar Şigion Qutuq (§ 135), and the Hülün Boroqul/Boroqul (§ 137). Three more are mentioned by Rašid al-Din: the two Tatar Tutuqi ut brothers called 'Külü' (? Tului) and Qara Mengiqtar Uha (? Uge), who were not regarded by Cinggis Qan as his adoptive sons; and the Tungu Čaçan (Čayan), whom Cinggis regarded as his fifth son. See SL, 1/1, 108-109; 2/2, 266. The theme of Hő'elün's numerous adoptions is, according to Pelliot, 'un thème épique fortement sujet à caution' (HCG, 375), and therefore of doubtful
§ 115. ‘Had smashed the lock-carts’ (cörag čarq ger čoŋgil uļa). The word cörag is not glossed in the interlinear translation; however, it is listed in the HILY, I, 11a, in the form čo arga with the meaning of ‘lock.’ See Materia 1 I, 47. The corresponding form in Written Mongolian is čoŋgalarg. See Kok., 220a: čoŋgalarg, čoŋgalarg, čuarg, čuarg, čuarg. Cf. Gol., II, 293b: čuarg, čuarg, and Kh. čuerga ‘lock, satchel or hole for a bolt.’ For mo. uļa = mno. a, cf. the same phenomenon in Dagur (IMCS, 62-63). Thus, SH čoqagan = čoqagan < čo lqagan (w.r. čoŋgalarg). Cf. TH, 318 (c. JYT, 552); and Oz2, II, 318, n. 1. See also § 124: čoqargtai tergeg ‘lock-cart,’ lit. ‘cart having a lock.’ The cörag čarq, lit. ‘lock-tent,’ was the locked tent-cart where goods and valuables were stored. These carts are mentioned by medieval travellers like Ibn Battuta. See Li, 150, n. 115. Smashing these movable treasuries to seize their contents, and ravishing the beautiful women (see the second line of this allegorific passage) were the highlights of a successful raid. The word for ‘to smash’ in our passage is čoŋgil’d, participative of čoŋgil, which corresponds to mo. čoŋgil ‘to pierce, punch, perforate.’ Cf. ord. čoŋgil [sic] ‘to demolish a building’ (according to TH, 317 [= JYT, 550-551]). However, AT, 29b, has čoŋgilarg (not čoŋgilargi) as ATL, 73), which suggests that the original text may have read čoŋgilargi instead of čoŋgilarg alongside mno. čoŋgil uļa; hence Ko, 227: čoŋgoralg (cf. ibid., 537 and 611); L2, 73: čoŋgil uļa; and Jr, 81: čoŋgilarg. Cf. also Pelliot’s ‘čoŋgil uļa’ in Pe, 29, n. 5. For mno. *cörag*, cf. mo. cöra ‘to be pierced, to burst open.’ Oz’, II, 317, Ga, 53, and Cé, 85, follow the SH reading. Although I opt for the form in -č, which is found in all editions of the SH, the form in -î cannot be excluded on the grounds of the AT reading. In either case the meaning is not affected. ‘The splendid women.’ Here the term ‘splendid’ (čoqat) has class and status connotations, indicating women of rank, as evident from both the Chinese interlinear gloss and the continuous verse. See C., 48, n. 39. Orqan = Orqan (< Orqan); for o < a in the second syllable, see IMCS, 54.

For Talqun Arai, see above, n. 105.

Temtilin and Jamuqa returned together to the latter’s camp on the Onon, i.e. in the Qurqoqa Valley (see above, nn. 57, 104). To’or returned to his camp on the Tsaga (see above, n. 96) by way of the Hohkūr Valley north of Burqan Qaldan – this valley in the Great Khentei is still unidentified – and the two mountain passes (2) Çaqa’aratan Subêt and Huliynatu Subêt. According to Perleé, 7 and 5, the former corresponds to present-day Gacuur or Çaqa’uryn Am east of Ulani Bator at 47° N and 107° E, and the latter to Ulusiin Am (Ulusiin Am) at 49° N and 107° E. Perleé, 5, states that the term subêt is the plural of subêt, a term used by the Mongols in ancient times for a mountain pass (= am[al]sar). Cf. Perleé, 92. This term may be related to śibhe ‘opening, narrow passage.’ There are two subêt mentioned in this passage: Çaqa’uratan (= pmq. Çaqa’aratan, lit. ‘Having Spruces’) and Huliynatu (= pmq. Ulunatu, lit. ‘Having Aspen’) Subêt. In the YS’ 2, 29, there is mention of a region called ‘the region of the Three Subêts’), where Tolui visited his brother Ögedei in the summer of 1229. Tolui was then regent of the empire and, as ‘guardian of the hearth’, his residence was at Cinggis Qan’s former ordo at Kūde’e Arai by the Kerulen. We know that soon after this meeting the great qaśqula that elected Ögedei was held right there (see de Rachewiltz 1993/94, 4-5; and below, n. 269). We also know that Ögedei liked spending part of the summer in the mountains (see Boyle 1972, 127). It is then logical to assume that ‘the region of the Three Subêts’ of the YS was the mountainous area south of Burqan Qaldan (= Khentei Khan) and east and north-east of present-day Ulan.
Bator, thus confirming the localization given for the two *subäit in the SH, and Perle's identification.

For *abatun* 'to hunt by making a circular batteu,' and Mongolian hunting practices, see Vlad, 48-49; TMEN, nos. 1, 570, 582; Harayama 1972 (esp. pp. 1-3); Munkuev 1976, 118, MCV, 27-37; the important contributions of J.A. Boyle, S. Jagchid and C.R. Bawden, D. Sinor and others in JAV (cf. also IACME, III); and M. Tatar in DMI, 130-153. Cf. also BM, 245, and MSKK, 29-36. The subject deserves a comprehensive treatment which is still lacking, and not for want of material.

§ 116. This is the first reference in the SH to an earlier oath of *anda-ship (sworn friendship) between Temüjin and Janmuqa, at the time when the former was only eleven (11) years old. However, it was only after the defeat of the Merkit that the two friends became truly *anda* (see above, n. 96).

*Let us now love each other again* (*amaraldava*). For the verb *amaraldawa* *amara-* to love, to show or express friendship, cf. Lettrea, 79.

The more solid knucklebones from the tarsus of the roebuck, or made of molten copper, were used for playing the popular game on ice; otherwise, those from a sheep's tarsus were normally used. See li, 150-151, n. 116. The text literally reads, "they became sworn friends through (by means of) an ankle bone filled with (lit. "having") copper (not brass)." Through or by means of, expressed with the instrumental case following *hi* (like *no. *zama*) an anklebone, has dropped from our text but has been preserved in the corresponding passage in AT, 30a (*gara-ba*). Cf. Poppe 1938, 155-156.

My rendering *copper knucklebone* (*cõnggul*) is based entirely on the Chinese interlinear gloss *gonglu* the gloss *gong* in *'knucklebone in which copper has been poured', but ch. *lung* itself can mean *copper* as well as *'brass' and 'bronze.' Unfortunately, the word *cõnggul* is not elsewhere attested with any of these meanings. This has led to differing interpretations.

Cf. TH, 315 ( = JYT, 548), and Oz', II, 323-325, n. 2, which claim that *cõnggul* = metal. *'cõnggel' something bent like a hook' ( *cõnggelde* to bend'; cf. MA, 132a); and according to Ozawa, *cõnggulak* = *cõnggulugir*, i.e. *cõnggul* and the denominal noun suffix of manufacture *-lid* and the possessive suffix *-ti. Cõnggulugir would then mean *made with something bent like a hook*, and *cõnggulugir hi* a 'knucklebone bent like a hook' (ibid., 322). Cf. El-Ar., 300; On, 42 and n. 124. However, AT, 30a, which has the reading *cõnggel* *dar* (cor. *cõnggulugir*), has also a gloss to this word reading *nayadum* "for play", obviously relating the word in question to the *cõnggel* 'fun, amusement.' Cf. LDAT, 95. For other interpretations, see Ta, 305, n. 403; Ce, 85, 334, n. 165; Vietze 1990, 386-387. In my opinion, the Chinese gloss cannot be dismissed without grounds, and the arguments proposed so far are not wholly convincing. Knucklebones loaded with metal were well known; in Russian there is a special word for them, viz. *svinočitku* 'knucklebone loaded with lead.' For knucklebone games still played by Mongolian shepherds, cf. QNS, 17-28.

*Dar* ('no. *dóta*) yor 'whistling (lit. "sounding") arrowhead.' These heads, usually made of perforated bone, were used since ancient times by the Chinese and Inner Asian nomads to make the famous "whistling arrows" (ch. *ming-ti* *šā*). See what has been said above (nos. 77 and 112) about the 'knob-headed arrows' (*qodoli*), some of which were also bored to produce a whistling sound. On the whistling arrows (mo. *boroy*, etc.), see PHDA, 224-226; Uray-Khövhali 1953; Wallacker 1958; Li, 150-151, n. 116; and Reid 1992, 88. In the HKSL, 18a, they are mentioned in the list of various kinds of arrows used by the Mongols. See CG, 174-176; cf. MCAT, 132, 26, n. 1; GGMGL, 142. During Jinggis Qan's life the Chinese defector Liu Wen had gained renown at the Mongol court for his skill in making whistling arrows. See TOA, 38; HYL, 25, 66, n. 154. William of Rubruck received from Môngke Qayan as a present for the king of France a strong bow and two
arrows with heads of silver, full of holes, which – he writes – 'sibilant quando taciturn quasi fistule' (SF, 255; cf. GR, 169-170; MWR, 185 and n. 3). No mention of these arrows is found in Marco Polo's book. For several references to whistling arrows in Chinese literature, see PWYF, V, 40266; DKJ, XII, 46672.134. Cf. also Taerenosodom 1971, 199. Jamuqa made the whistling arrowhead himself by gluing together 'the two horns of a two-year-old calf', i.e. the four halves of the two horns of a calf, as correctly interpreted by Cleaves (CI, 49). For his part, Temüjin gave Jamuqa a qodüli-arrow, i.e. a knob-headed arrow (see above, n. 112), the knob (lit. 'tip': mongol: see above, n. 4) of which was made of juniper wood (arca). Arca (= mo. arcu; kh. arc) is the Juniperus L., not the cypress (Cupressus and Chamaecyparis) as in Cleaves (loc. cit.). See TMEN, no. 448. 

For the symbolic meaning of the exchange of knucklebones and arrows between the two andas, cf. Roux 1976, 559; idem 1977, 18. See also below, n. 117.

§ 117. This section, fully translated and discussed in Mo, 53-59, begins with the quotation of an alliterative saying of 'the old men of former ages' (lit., 'the former elders': uradis öögüs), i.e. with a proverb to the effect that two persons that have declared themselves andas shared the same life, hence the need for mutual love and protection. For this saying, see Gadamba's remarks in which he equates 'life' (amin) with 'mind' or 'thoughts' (sanaya) (MNTSZA, 118-120). Cf. also Perlee 1962, 26-27. For the word arci 'safeguard, protection', see TH, 95 (= JYT, 169).

In the previous section we were told how on an earlier occasion (when Temüjin was eleven [or ten] years old) Temüjin and Jamuqa had exchanged gifts to consecrate their oath of andas-ship – these gifts being an integral part of the ritual. In renewing their sworn friendship now as adults, a further exchange of presents takes place with more appropriate objects. These consist of golden belts and beautiful horses – all valuable things and, in the case of the belts, also of great symbolic significance. See above, n. 103; Li, 148, n. 103, and 151, n. 117; cf. Roux 1975, 60; idem 1977, 18-19; Aubin 1973, 466, n. 8; 489 and n. 73; Särköözi 1978, 146; Göckenjan 1998, 141.

Toqto'a's mare is defined as exxel 'mare that has not foaled for several years', and qal'ün (= mo. qall文件), a term properly designating a horse with a coat varying from yellowish white to yellowish black, with a black mane and tail, and a black stripe along the spine. See Mo. 58. Cf. TMEN, no. 260; HCWLYTT, 134-136, no. 44; RH, 79, no. 3. See, however, below.

For the particle gii (= mo. ki) 'also', see Street 1982, 627. Cf. 'Trois documents', 460.

Dayir Usun's horse was 'kid-white' (iniğün čaq'a'an), i.e. its coat was white like a kid's coat. For iniğün, lit. 'young sheep', cf. Hung 1956, 30, n. 5; RH, 218, no. 26 ('a kid'). It also had a 'horn' (eber), i.e. a protuberance on its forehead in the shape of a horn – a well-known phenomenon with horses. See Mastaert 1950, 3-4; Mo, 56. There has been some divergence of opinion among scholars on how to interpret the words eberü iniğün čaq'a'an. See Luhsangaldan 1989. According to this author, eberü means 'having whiskers' (saqaltai) rather than 'having a horn.' However, his argument runs counter to both the Chinese interlinear gloss and Mastaert's cogent remarks on the subject. It is also not certain whether the expression eberü iniğün čaq'a'an is purely descriptive or is the actual name of the horse. Cf. Mastaert 1950, 4, and Mo, 55, from which it appears that Mastaert actually regarded it as the horse's name. This also applies to the words exxel qal'ün discussed above, which may well be the name of Toqto'a's horse. Cf. Ev-Pop, 83.

For the Leafy Tree (Saqlaqar Modun – Modun) in the Qorqonaq Valley (Qorqonaq Jubur), see above, n. 57. Our passage specifies that the Leafy Tree was 'on the southern side of the Quldaqar Cliff in (lit. "of") the Qorqonaq Valley' (Qorqonaq Jubur-un Quldaqar Qun-nic eber-e). The Quldaqar Cliff is mentioned only once in the SH and its situation is
unknown; apparently it was somewhere in this unidentified valley at the headwaters of the Onon River on the eastern slopes of the Khentii. The fact that it was at the Leafy Tree that Temüjin and Jampa renewed their pledge confirms the assumption made earlier that the Leafy Tree was a place consecrated by tradition and a locality where important ritual acts were carried out accompanied by dancing and feasting. Cf. §§ 57, 206. For modun – madun, see above, n. 79.

For the words toy disillusion ‘feasting’, see Cleaves 1949a, 520; Popepp 1955, 41.

‘They slept together’, lit. ‘they spent the night together.’ For könile ‘blanket’, see Cleaves 1985, 249, n. 57. Some scholars (e.g. Onon, Ozawa, Even and Pop) relate qaça ‘alone’ (ch. tu λ κι) to könile-de’en, lit. ‘in their blanket’, and understand ‘under one blanket’, but this is not correct. Cf. § 201 for Jampa’s recollection of these early events.

§ 118. ‘Temüjin and Jampa loved each other’. lit. ‘When Temüjin and Jampa loved each other, they loved each other.’

‘From their present encampment’, lit. ‘from that encampment where they had been staying.’

‘They broke camp and set out...’, lit. ‘When they moved on, they moved on...’

Alaşqù, which I translate as ‘shelter’, is a Turkic word designating a type of tent or, as is more likely in the present context, a light summer hut made of tree-bark or twigs. Cf. Popepp 1955, 38; Mu, I, 219-220, n. 11; Khomonov 1970, 36; MRS, 121; TS, 94; Rassadin 1995, 113; and especially TMEN, no. 519. A literal rendering of the sentence would be ‘Let our horse-herders reach (= have sufficient) tents.’

‘There will be enough food. For our shepherds and lamb-herds!’, lit. ‘Let our shepherds and lamb-herds reach (= have sufficient) food for the gullet!’ For goničüt ‘shepherd’ (pl. goničüt), see TMEN, no. 118; Popepp 1975, 167. Here we find the form goničüt instead of goničüt. Cf. goniint for goniint (§ 124); gunt for qut (§ 272); and qaunt (= quanta?) for qaut (§ 198). See Mo, 109; Matriel II, 38 (13r, 3). The verb gur (= mo, kür-) ‘to reach, attain to’ indicates here the attaining of a state of sufficiency or even plenty. See Kova 263b; H. Th. et al. 134, 147. This is important to understand Jampa’s apparently cryptic utterances, which somehow remind us of Bodončar’s riddle in § 33.

It is clear that Jampa is offering Temüjin a choice: either to pick camp on the wooded mountainside, where the horse-herders would be better off since they would be able to build themselves shelters with bark and twigs, or to pick camp along the river, where the shepherds could better graze for their animals. On the face of it, Jampa’s question is anything but an idle one; on the contrary, it must have been dictated for a practical exigency. What may have puzzled Temüjin and made him suspect an ulterior motive, was the way Jampa put the question and the fact that he left the choice to him, ostensibly the junior partner. It was, however, Börte who, with her sudden intervention (she did not even give Hő’el’iän the chance to express her opinion), fanned Temüjin’s suspicions and was actually responsible for his decision to abandon his partner. One may argue, as Lattimore does, that Jampa, prompted by power rivalry and seeking a confrontation with his endu, would have opposed Temüjin’s choice in any case, hence Temüjin’s legitimate doubts. Equally plausible is Grousset’s suggestion that Börte’s action can be explained by her desire to precipitate a confrontation with Jampa who, she may reasonably have felt, was an ambitious man and Temüjin’s major obstacle to tribal dominance. She played an almost identical role in relation to Kōkōču Tēh Tenggēr (§ 245). See Lattimore 1963b, 62; CW, 77. But one should not lose sight of one important thing that tends to be overlooked, viz. the ‘riddle’ element in Jampa’s question (note that in the SH account the words are in alliterative poetry), a riddle that Temüjin admits he ‘couldn’t understand.’ Börte’s words, too, indicate that she could not understand the meaning of the words, but she believed they
concealed a scheme against Temüljin, hence her reaction. If neither Temüljin nor his wife could understand Jumaqa's poetic riddle, what hope have we, who are so far removed from that culture, to understand what was the real meaning of those words?

I am of the opinion that the story of Jumaqa's cryptic utterances and Börte's interference is nothing but the post eventum, 'official' justification for what was, in effect, Temüljin's callous betrayal of his sworn friend and ally. He used this technique throughout his career, as amply shown by the SH, and we need not be deceived by poetic riddles. The separation from Jumaqa was no doubt due to Temüljin's ambition to gain supremacy — as a leader in his own right — over the subtribes and clans that owed allegiance to the Mongol (= Mongol) tribe, as subsequent events will show. However, it seems that the actual rupture of the friendly relations between the two andas was somehow engineered by Temüljin's senior relatives Alain and Quçar, who were at that time in Jumaqa's camp (see §127). The exact circumstances (and backstage machinations) which culminated in the break-up will never be known and we can only make a guess on the basis of the available source material, much of which is tendentious. This paragraph has caused a good deal of controversy among ideologically motivated scholars and different interpretations have been put forth (of them patently spurious) which have further coloured — and clouded — the issue. Cf. GKV, 30-32; Vlad 1978, 105-107; Ko, 38-41; Da 62; Latimore, loc. cit.; idem 1978, 133; Gumilyov 1974, 201; Hambis 1975, 14, n. 23; H. Hasumi in ACS 28/1978, 1-13 (covering SH, §§ 118-123); Hamayon 1979, 128-129; Ja, 134-135, n. 3; ÇK, 34-35, and, especially, note 134 on p. 34 (= ÇK, 37-39, 230, n. 163); Naçar-Darji 1989 and Nasaygör 1990 (reviewing also Barthold's, Kozin's and Gumilyev's theories); On, 43, n. 127 (cf. the somewhat expanded 2001 version, 96-97, n. 245); Wu Pao-shan in ÖMBYS, 1990, 2, 116-118; and Meserve 2001, 94.

These words of Jumaqa … these words of his,” lit. “this word of Jumaqa … this word of his.” For the use of one “this” and tere “that” in the SH, see Street 1990 (esp. pp. 179, 180).

“Grows easily tired” (uudamguqu), i.e. “bored (= fed up”). Cf. mo. uyid- “to be bored, fed up.” Cf. also §119.

“Let us separate completely (sit’ui-a).” Sit’ui-a (= pino. sityui-a) is an adverbial drone of sityui — sityui (cf. AT, 31a). Cf. mo. situyun “straight(forward), upright.” In other words, the separation should be ‘neat’, hence ‘complete.’

§119. The Tayyıl’ut, it will be remembered, were last mentioned in §§ 79-87, quite sometime before the current events. Then it was Temüljin who was in dread of the Tayyıl’ut ‘relatives’ who had captured him and from whom he had so successfully escaped. But now Temüljin has become a leader in his own right and when the inevitable split with Jumaqa occurs, the Tayyıl’ut, still hostile to him, naturally side with Jumaqa as many other clans did, the Besüt among them. The Besüt were also related to Temüljin’s line via the common ancestor Qaidu (see §47). On them, cf. HCG, 156.

Kökéli is the second of the several foundlings adopted by Hû’êlin and Börte (see above, n. 114). He was found in the Besüt camp which, according to the SH, was within the larger encampment of the Tayyıl’ut (cf. §138), and consequently was a Besüt, not a Tayyıl’ut (Aubin 1975, 471). He became a commander of a thousand (no. 18 in §202); his last appearance is in §244 of the SH. On him, cf. U, 362-363, n. 55. He must not be confused with Kökéli (Teb Tenggeri), one of Father Mönjlik’s sons (see §244 and com.).

In this section (§119) we have the first occurrence of the term bidanu’ai ‘ours’, i.e. ‘our people’ = Temüljin’s people, the Mongol tribe. This may indicate that the narrator was an actual witness or participant in the events, as suggested by Gumilyev. See Gumilyov 1974, 196 (where, however, §120 is a mistake for §119). Gumilyev’s date of 1182 for the split between Temüljin and Jumaqa is based on Radif al-Dîn (see SL2, I/2.


120). In view of what has been said earlier (see above, n. 104) and the fact that a year and a half had elapsed between the Merkit’s defeat and the separation of the two anda an (see § 118), I think it more likely than the latter episode occurred in 1185 or 1184. It should be noted that Raśīd’s account of these events differs from the SH version, as do also the accounts in the SWVCCL and the YS. For these discrepancies, which at present cannot be reconciled, see SL: 3, 32, 85-86; YS: 1, 3-4; HCG: 24-25, 265-267; GK: 37-39. Also see EM: 566.

§ 120. ‘The three Toqura’un brothers’, lit. ‘these three Toqura’un elder brothers and younger brothers.’

This section contains an interesting list of Temŭjin’s early noksıň (see above, nn. 13 and 90), recorded for posterity with the tribes and clans from which they came – twenty-one altogether (however, the Jalair are mentioned twice, and the Barulas also twice). Except for one group (the Bā’aria), none of them actually formed a gure’een (n. mo. kairgen) or circular camp (see above, n. 90). Nevertheless, they represented the nucleus of the tribal power that allowed Temŭjin to begin the difficult ascent to supreme supremacy. At this stage Jambaq commanded more prestige as a leader, as evidenced by the support he retained from among other major groupings which, not long after, led to his resounding victories over Temŭjin at Dalan Bajjut (§ 129). Indeed, Temŭjin’s decision to break with Jambaq may appear to have been somewhat hasty and premature, although ultimately it paid off handsomely. Cf. ČK, 35-37 (ČK: 39-40).

Several of the clans and tribes are already mentioned in the previous chapters. They are the Barulas (§ 46), Mangqut (§ 46), Arual (§ 47), Utangqat (§ § 9, 12, 97), Basılı (§ 47), Suldu (§ 82), Qorgqotan (§ 47), Olqumut (§ 54), Dörben (§ 11), Noyakın (§ 46), Oronan (§ 47), and Basılı (§ 41). These, and most of the other tribes, clans and personages mentioned in this section are discussed in HCG, passim (see the Index); and in Mu, I, 222-242. Most of the personages listed appear again, and repeatedly, in the SH, and they are known to us also through the Persian and Chinese sources. Cf. Honda 1952, 61ff. The etymologies of many of their names are discussed in Poppe 1975, 161, 163, 165, 166; and in Besse 1974, 92, 93, 94; idem 1978, 358-359, 361-362; idem 1980, 332; idem 1988, 18-19, 22-23, 26-27, 33-35, 38. Some additional references are given below.

Of the three chiefs of the important Jalair tribe (on which cf. HCG, 65-66 et passim, and below, see SL: 1, 32, 85-86), the younger brother, Qardalı Toqura’an, appears again in the SH (§ 124). Qad’a’an Daldurqan is one person, not two (Pe, 154, n. 1; Ha, 31; Do, 83; Oz, 11, 342); see §§ 124 and 174. The Çangqul ut and the Baya’ut were two subordinate tribes of the Kiyat. There was a long discussion on them in HCG, 82ff. Cf. also below, nn. 213 and 239. For Önggūr, the son of Monggut Kiyat, besides HCG, 77 et passim, see also W.K. Park in MH 2:1994, 48-62; and below, n. 213. For Jetee of the Mangquat, see Boyle 1956, 149. Jetee’s brother Doqoluq Çerbi has been wrongly identified by Raśīd al-Dīn with Bo’orçu’s brother and the Arilat clan. For the source of this error see HCG, 355, and Li, 175-176, n. 227. Cf. also Boyle, loc. cit.; TMEN, no. 205; Ratheusnvsky 1966, 183, n. 12; and TDML, 464. Doqoluq’s designation of çerbi (pl. çerbañ) ‘chamberlain’ (cf. also Ogolên Çerbi and Söyikëti çerbi in this section) is a well-known ancient Mongolian official title, but its functions are still imperfectly known since they are nowhere spelt out in detail in our sources. Apparently, one of the main functions of a çerbi was to supervise the domestic staff of the qan’s establishment. See below, n. 191. (The appointment of Doqoluq, Ogolên and Söyikëti as çerbin is actually recorded in § 191.) The name of Degei’s younger brother Kūçġür is transcribed as Gqoolgür in § 124. For Kūçģür – Gqoolgür, cf. ‘Quelques problemes’, 242-243. For this name see below, n. 141. On him see also § 223, where he appears with the epithet möcì ‘carpenter’ because of his appointment as manager of the tent-carts. Taki of the Suldu is called Taqai Ba’aturn in §§ 151 and 186, and Dqai in § 126. For this personage, see HCG, 126-128, 334-335; and below, n.
186. Cf. also Rybatski [2003], s.v. 'Taqqi – Dişqi.' For Ögöl en (- Ögöl en – Ögöl en – Ögöl en) Cerbi, see Boyle 1963, 237, no. 3, and Besee 1980, 238. As noted by Pelliot (HCG, 348), Bo'ondu was an only son (cf. § 90), hence Ögöl en Cerbi, who is called here 'younger brother' (de'i), must have been his younger cousin. The same applies to Ça'urqan and Sübe'eti, who were Ögöl en cousins, not brothers, of Jelme. (Ça'urqan and Sübe'eti were the sons of Qabhar; Jelme was the son of Old Jači'udai, see § 97.) For this usage, see above, n. 74. For the Arual (cf. § 47), see also TMEN, no. 18. For the role of the Uragqai Ça'urqan (on his name see below, n. 183) and Sübe'eti (on whom see below, n. 199), cf. Jackendoff 1977, 277f. As in other similar instances the SH, Sübe'eti's epithet Ba'atur (on which see above, n. 50) is introduced here anachronistically. It would seem that the designations conferred on the above personages on this occasion were confirmed in 1204, at the time of the reorganization of the army by Chinggis Qan prior to his campaign against the Naiman, but another interpretation is possible, viz. that they are called Cerbi here (and in § 124) retrospectively, as indeed is the case of Sübe'eti's apellation of Ba'atur. See below, n. 191. For Söyikteti Cerbi see HCG, 256; Boyle 1963, 242, no. 16; Hambis 1975, 42ff., and below, n. 191. Sükegei Je'ün of the Sükeken (corr. Sügegen, see HCG, 129) appears several times in the SH (§§ 124, 151, 177), also with the correct spelling Sügegii (§§ 126, 177, 181). On him see HCG, 127, 255-257; Besee 1988, 33-34. Ça'agan Ü'ta (on this name see HCG, 137-138) was a Ne'üde (w.f. Ngädei), i.e. a member of the Ngäs (or Ne'ü < Ngäs) tribe, on which see ibid., 70. See also below, n. 129. For the Qorulas (~ Qorulas), see below, n. 141. For the name Möri ('Carpenter') of Möri Beldüi, see Cleaves 1951, 99-100, n. 152. On him see also below, n. 209. For the name Ikirei, cf. also TMEN, no. 651. With regard to Butu, son of Nekini of the Ikirei, the SH says that 'he had made his way here', i.e. he had come to Temüljin's camp 'as son-in-law' (giiregi'te). This is a set expression meaning 'as (one does in the case of) sors-in-law' (see above, n. 66) and should not be taken literally. (Butu had come to stay with Temüljin because he was engaged to his sister Temülün (see § 60), who must have been fourteen or fifteen at the time. Butu did indeed marry her; later, after her death, he married Chinggis Qan's daughter Qoqin or Qoqin Boki (see § 165; cf. also § 202). His name should probably be read Botu, not Butu, on the strength of other Chinese transcriptions. On him see SL, 1/1, 132, 164, 165, 2/1, 70, 179, 271, CG, 244b (Index); HCG, 49-50; Ratcliff’sky 1966, 184, n. 12; idem 1976, 525-526, n. 22; and Besee 1978, 361-367, no. 11. For the Barulas and Qaraqar, cf. § 202, and Grupper 1992/94, 21-22. Qorçi is here a proper name – the name, in fact, of a famous future commander (see §§ 202, 207, 241); however, the word qorçi is a well-known Mongolian official title meaning 'quiver-bearer', and one held by several personalities in the SH. See CI, 257b-258a. Cf. above, no. 2. For this title, see HCG, 20, 75; TMEN, no. 301; HCWL, 98-99, no. 21; MKSLT, 1, 725-736; and also DO, 709b. For Old Üsun (Üsun Ebügen), see below, nn. 210, 216. For Kükö Ços of the Ba’arin (see above, n. 41), cf. also Guadambha 1968, 86-87. Several of the personages in this section havecompound names, such as Qada’an Daldurqan and Sükegei Je’ün. In a few instances the Chinese interlinear version glosses each element of a name as a ‘person’s name’, thus making it appear (as in the case of Qada’an Daldurqan) that we are dealing with two individuals instead of one. This is due to the fact that the Ming authors of the interlinear version were not aware that these were double names. See CI, 52, nn. 49 and 50; and Pelliot’s comments in HCG, 333. *'Also came as one camp (giiregi'ni), i.e. forming a circular camp. For giiregi'ni, see above.  

§ 121. The Ba’arin clan to which Qorçi belonged claimed descent from Bodonçar and the woman of the Jači’uti whose capture is related in § 38. The Jači’uti, alias Jadaran, clan to which
Jamaqa belonged also claimed descent from this couple. See §§ 40, 41. Cf. above, n. 104. This accounts for Qoröö’s remark about their common origin. As already noted by Gaadamba, the graphic expression he used is an idiom or set phrase from everyday parlance stressing the common origin from the same mother or ancestress (not from the same father or ancestor alone, who may have had several wives). See MNTSZA, 120-123 (see below, however, regarding Gaadamba’s interpretation of the word keke of the saying in the question); Gereosodnom 1986, 80. Cf. Besie 1973. In the free sectional summary the idiom in question is rendered with its Chinese counterpart t’ang-pao 同 pago, lit. ’from the same womb’—still a common term expressing consanguinity. The forefather Bodonchang is called boqdo, glossed hsiien-ming 西院明 ‘wise and enlightened.’ In the SH the form boqo alternates with boqda (= mo. boyo), from which it derives through assimilation of the vowel of the second syllable to that of the first syllable. Cf. §§ 200, 254: boqda, and § 254: boqta (pro boqda). Here, however, boqdo is a term of respect for the illustrious ancestor, corresponding to our ‘august, blessed.’ Cf. Pe, 154. Strictly speaking, Bodonchang Boqdo is Bodonchang the August. Cf. § 254, where this epithet is applied to Cinggis Qan’s deceased mother Hê’oân. 

’Womb water’ (keke), i.e. the amniotic fluid: hehi (< keke = keke) in the contemporary Naiman dialect of Inner Mongolia. See TH, 210 (= JYT, 364). The rendering ’caul’, i.e. ’placenta’, by several translators (e.g. On, 45, but see his revised version in the 2001 ed., 99) is supported, however, by MUIT, 1001a, where this meaning is listed together with that of ’amniotic fluid.’ In MNTSZA, 120-123, as well as in T’a, 310-311, n. 419, Gaadamba interprets keke as corresponding to ele ‘mother’, which is unwarranted. I think it is better to follow the Chinese gloss pao-chiïang 當章, lit. ’womb fluid’.

’We would not have parted from him, but a heavenly sign appeared before my very eyes explaining the future to me’, lit., ’We would not have parted from Jamaqa, but a portent (ja’arin) came (occurred) and showed the future to my eyes.’ The word ja’arin (= pmo. jayarín) is a deverbal noun in -rin from ja’a- (= pmo. jaya- = fiya-, mo. fiya-) ’to announce; to foretell.’ For the suffix -rin designating the result of an action, see OWM, 49, § 179; MUIT, 2857b-2858a, no. 523 (cf. sa’ari – sa’arin ’sent’); Mo, 223, n. 209. Thus, ja’arin is, literally, ’announcement; foretold, sign’, i.e. ’portent, omen’—rendered in the Chinese gloss with shen-kao 神考, lit. ’divine announcement’ = ’a portent or omen from Heaven (or the gods).’ I have, therefore, rendered ja’arin as ’heavenly sign.’ Cf. Pe, 155: ’signes célestes’, Ha, 32: ’himmelsches Ziehen’, etc. This word occurs again in § 206 in the full expression tengeri-sin ja’arin ’heavenly sign’, and in § 244 in the plural form ja’arins ’heavenly signs’, as also in the second occurrence in § 121. The use of this term, which derives from a verb meaning ’to announce’, is justified by the fact that these ’signs’ consist of a portent conveying a verbal message from Heaven—a phenomenon also common to other cultures (cf. the ’signs’ in the Bible). I think that this is a satisfactory explanation. However, some scholars, both in Mongolia and in the West, suggest or claim mainly on linguistic grounds that ja’arin designates either a person, i.e. a shaman, or a heavenly spirit ’esprit céleste’) acting as an agent of Heaven. See Humphrey 1994, 201 (and the references to Mongol scholars in note 12, where, however, that to Dashberen 1985: 151’ is not ad rem), and Ev-Pop, 85, 174, 204. In view of the above, I am of the opinion that this is definitely not the case. Note 133 in On, 45, which is based on TH, 287 (= JYT, 496-498), is somewhat misleading since it is not true—as Onon claims—that ’in Orkhon Turkish ja’arin meant ’to foretell, prophesy.’’ Tu. yarin means ’shoulder-blade’, and a semantic relationship between this word and mmo. ja’arin ’sign, portent’ (as postulated in TH, loc. cit.) is purely hypothetical. Cf. Oz’d, II, 349, n. 3; TMEN, no. 150; and CCME, 204. The tent-cart (ger tergen) was a mobile tent (yurt), i.e. a tent permanently mounted on a cart. Some of them were apparently very large and, according to some early accounts, had to be
drawn by up to twenty-two oxen. See William of Rubruck’s description in his *Itinerarium* (SF, 172-173; MM, 94; GR, 90; MWR, 73). They are often mentioned by medieval travellers. Cf. Li, 151-152, n. 121. See also Cleaves 1955, 37-38, n. 26; CEME, 15-16; and in particular Gervers & Schlepp 1995 for a redimensioning of the facts.

‘With uneven horns’ (sof'fel'e eberi), i.e. with ‘horns the tips of which are not on the same level, but where one is lower than the other.’ See DO, 581b. This is, of course, because one horn had partly broken off. For an interpretation of the symbolism of the fallow cow and the hornless ox in terms of an ‘animal judgement’, see Meserve 2001, 94-95.

‘She kept saying, bellowing repeatedly’, lit. ‘saying and saying, bellowing and bellowing’. ‘Raising more and more dust’, lit. ‘raising and raising the dust.’ Note the repetition of the same words to create a stronger effect. For the word mupqalar ‘hornless (ox)’, cf. § 214; see HCG, 57; and Pao, 57, n. 60 (Pao, however, was not aware of Pelliot’s remarks in HCG).

The ‘wide (lit. “great”) road’ (yeke terge'ir) is the royal road along which Temujin proceeds on his way to supreme power. The qan’s imposing tent harnessed to the ox symbolizes the whole domain and people (ulus) which Heaven and Earth have jointly decided to entrust to Temujin. According to Ligei, the great shaft under the tent – its “backbone”, as it were – is the very symbol of sovereign power. See Li, 152, n. 121. The quality of ‘greatness’ (yeke) attached to all these images pertains to the supreme leader and the royal clan.

‘Lor’d of the people’ (ulus-un ejen), an expression often rendered as ‘Lord of the nation (or country).’ Cf., for example, NA, 96; Ha, 32; Li, 39; Mu, 1, 243; Do', 84-85; Ja, 140; Ta, 53; CL, 53; On, 45 (“nation’s master”). Such a translation is certainly acceptable; however, I prefer to be consistent with my translation of the same expression in § 53. Cf. Pe, 155, where a similar consistency is observed. We must not forget that, historically, we are supposed to be still in a situation which is not fundamentally different from that of Ambaqai’s time, even though the author(s) of the SH, writing much later, probably used here the word ulus in the then current meaning of the ‘qan’s patrimony’, i.e. the Mongol nation sensu lato, the empire. Nevertheless, the same expression occurring in the Chü-yung koan inscription in ‘Phags-pa script (1242) is also rendered as ‘Lor’d of the People’ in MMHS, 61. For further remarks on the subject, cf. also KHIV, 28-29; above, n. 53, and below, n. 202.

For the verb fi'la'-ja'a’, glossed kao toy ‘to announce, inform, tell’, which has in the present context also the extended meaning of ‘to reveal in advance, foretell, prophecy’, see above.

For the office of commander of ten thousand (timen-i novan), see below, n. 191.

‘So many great affairs (törb), lit. ‘so many principles (or norms, laws)’. Törb, glossed here tuo-li as ‘principle’, refers to fundamental matters concerning governance. For this pregnant word, see TMEN, no. 134; the discussion in KHIV, 45-51, 116ff.; and WG, 481 (Index).

‘To take freely’ (darqan), i.e. enjoying the status of darqan ‘freeman, privileged.’ See above, n. 51.

Qorq‘i asks as reward for his prophecy to be allowed to choose thirty beautiful women as wives, i.e. one for each night of the month. On polygamy among the Mongols, cf. Ratz’evskiy 1976, 514-515. Qorq‘i’s request was eventually granted. See §§ 207, 241.

‘Heed me closely’, lit. ‘listen turning toward me’ (minis eserq şonas).

§ 122. The Geniges claimed descent from Čańjin Öztegei, the third son of Qaidu (see § 47). Cf. HCG, 74, 344. They likewise came as a circular camp (gure’ en); see above, n. 120. The same applies to the other groups mentioned in this section. To avoid the continuous repetition of the word ‘circular’ throughout the translation of this section, ‘camp’ stands for ‘circular camp.’ Qunan (= pmo, mo. Qunan) means ‘Three-Year Old.’ See Cleaves 1949b, 432-433. Qunan of the Geniges appears again in §§ 202, 210, 216 and 243.
For the word tert'iten ‘having at the head; and others’, see Ligeti 1971, 142-143.

Dārātā Očgīn was the younger uncle of Temüjin mentioned in §§ 50, 54, 56. On him see above, n. 50.

For the Jadaran or Jažirat olan, see § 40, and above, n. 104, 121. Cf. also Ratchnevsky 1987, 64. For Mulalqātu, see also §§ 124, 223; Mo, 134.

On the Üjün (= Ünjin), a clan or subtribe (oboq) of the Oronar, see HCG, 71, 73, 76. For the Saqayit, see ibid., 71; Poppe 1975, 166, 167.

For the unidentified locality A vil Qaraqan on the Kimerq Stream, see above, n. 88, 107.

Sorqutu Jürki (or Uyrbik) first appears in § 49 under the erroneous name of Qurutq Uyrbik. See above, n. 49. For the Jürki(o) or Uyrbik(n), the oboq that claimed descent from Sorqutu Jürki, see Vlad, 90-91; HCG, 200-201; Cleaves 1955a, 385; Hao Shih-yuan, CMKKSCK, 279-285; and Poppe 1975, 165. Cf. below, n. 139. Sača Beki (called Seče Beki in § 49; for the title bek see n. 49), was Temüjin’s first cousin. For his brother Tačiši, also mentioned in § 49, see HCG, 180-181.

For Nekün Tačiši, the second son of Barten Bal’at, see §§ 50, 54, 56; HCG, 184-185.

For Nekün Tačiši’s son Qučar (= Quqar) Beki, see HCG, 68-69, 184. Being the son of Nekün Tačiši, he was also Temüjin’s first cousin.

Altan Očgīn is the Altan of § 51, third son of Qutula Qun, and therefore first cousin of Ülgütei. Cf. HCG, 125, where Pelliot’s criticism of T’a Chi is, however, unwarranted. For his designation ògjìin, see above, n. 51.

Regarding the movements of Temüjin and his new allies, it is evident from the last paragraph of this section that, after having spent some time at Ayil Qaraqana by the Kimerq to gather the clans that had defected from Jamaq, Temüjin returned to his home grounds at Qun Ljigen in the area of (lake) Kókó Na’ar, the river Senggür and the Gürğête mountains (see above, n. 89). Appropriately, it was there that he will be elected chief of the confederated tribes as related in the next section.

§ 123. This is one of the most important sections of the SH, since it records Temüjin’s ‘first’ election as qan and his alleged assumption of the name Êmgis, both events raising complex issues. The promoters of such an election are his three cousins Altan, Quqar and Sača Beki mentioned in the previous section (§ 122), who, as the more senior members of the Kiyat Borgen lineage, unanimously agreed to appoint him their leader and chief of the new tribal federation. Sinor’s statement that none of the three men in question were ‘of outstanding importance’ (Sinor 1993, 247) is inaccurate considering that these men were all rightful pretenders to qan-ship and, as pointed out by Ligeti (Li, 153, n. 130), they actually abdicated their birthright in favour of Temüjin with their oath of allegiance. The text says: Altan Quqar Sača Beki birun (7) eyereldijï. The word birun, convertivum praeparativum of bûr ‘to be’, is somewhat puzzling here; the Chinese transcription putun 八鲁, glossed hzung ‘together’, may indeed stand for bolun ‘together’, or for birun – birun ‘all’ (for i – ú, cf. ülig – ülig, etc.), as suggested by Oz, II, 359, n. 1; and El-Ar, 328, n. 1. Cf. Pe, 32, n. 5; H, 111, n. 123. However, in the SH birun is used also as subject emphasizing, as in § 90: nûkõn rû birun … ayitu ‘Friend, you came …’. The Chinese glosses indicates that the more likely reading should be bolun, but the Chinese sectional summary renders the word in question with chung-zen 共人 ‘everyone, all.’ Moreover, the reading birun is supported by the ‘bûkun’ of AT, 326 – an obvious coyint’s error. Though the problem is unsolved, the meaning is clear. The issues concerning the election will be discussed further on, also in the light of § 179.

“Palatial tents” (ordo ger), lit. ‘ordo-tents’; i.e. the large and splendid tents belonging to the ordo or qan’s ‘Palace’ (often used in the hon. plural: ordos; cf. HW, 126), a tent complex consisting of his residence and those of his dependants. For
these tents, see Gervers & Schlepp 1995, 102, 115. In the present translation, ordo ger as a generic term is rendered ‘palatial tent(s)’; however, when used with reference to Činggis Qan’s own residence, especially in his ordinances concerning the Guard (kešik) duties, it is rendered as ‘Palace tent.’ This is the first occurrence in the SIF of the word ordo, an important term in Turkic from which it passed into Kitan, Mongolian, etc. In origin, ordo designated the camp of the elite cavalry guard of the qan in the middle of which stood the qan’s tent or yurt. An excellent description of the ordo organization of the Kitans is found in the Liao-shih. See HCSL, 752a, for the numerous references to this term. For its usage in Turkic, see ED, 203a-b; and DTS, 370b; and for its diffusion, see TMEJ, no. 452. Cf. also Yanai’s important essay in MSK, 663-678; Pollot in TP 27:1930, 208-210; Munkuev 1976, 430, n. 19 (where, however, the reference to Weng Tu-chien’s article is not pertinent); MSR, 120, 121; Pritsk 1988, 772; and below, n. 229. There is no textual justification for the six words that Poppe (1975b, 155) claims should be inserted between ger and qari irgen-i.

‘Foreign people’ (qari irgen). For the term qari ‘foreign (= other, different from us),’ see de Rachewiltz 1982, 59, n. 50; cf., however, Ligeti in AQH 38:1984, 330, n. 30; and de Rachewiltz in ZAS 19:1986, 32. See also Sugi 1979, 45; OZ’, II, 360, n. 2; and below, n. 255.

‘Ladies and maidsens (ökün qatun) with beautiful cheeks.’ As noted by Rachtevsky, the finest looking women were reserved by right for the qan. See Rachtevsky 1976, 513. For the expression (Œr)qatun(n), see above, nn. 54 and 55. Cf. the episode about the beautiful Qulan and Naya’a related in § 197, which illustrates the application of the jasaq in this regard. Cf. also Vernadsky 1938, 342, 351. Poppe’s rendering of the passage from öngge sayın to öksi ba (Poppe 1975b, 155) is vitiated by an unwarranted insertion of several words in the Mongol text.
in H, 25, and Ligeti in L1, 80 (but not in the latter's translation, cf. L1, 40: 'black-haired relatives?'). Ligeti's reading in L1 has been adopted also by Gadaamba (T'a, 59). Opinions on the interpretation of this expression vary a good deal. I again think that the Chinese gloss cannot be lightly dismissed and that the expression qara ści must be closely related in meaning to qara, also in view of the parallelism of qatun eme and eme kūl̄it 'women (= wives). Clearly, emes means 'men in the sense of 'domestics, retainers', and qara (~ qari) 'family livelihood', i.e. 'goods, possessions'. Therefore, I translate emes as 'retainers and possessions'. I should add that this expression is confirmed by the A1, 33a (where however _recv is written_re). Qara ~ qari presents no real problem, for the alternation_a ~ i in the second syllable is attested elsewhere in the SH. Cf. § 57 qara to assemble, and § 164 qari- id. (see HW, 72; cf. 'Quelques problèmes', 268). Finally, I think that qari ~ qara (< qari) is used here in the derivative meaning of 'belonging, dependant' (< foreign, subject, see above); and ści is probably the same word that occurs in the compound ści ści, 'debt, obligation, duty', which must have had a wider semantic range at the time - the general idea being of 'things' that pertain, are due to, or belong (by right) to one's family. Although this agrees with Gadaamba's literal interpretation of the two terms, the actual meaning of the expression qari ści as understood by him (= 'external class', i.e. those clans that, by agreement or tradition, regularly gave their young women in marriage to men of certain other clans) is quite different. I believe that in the text adduced by Gadaamba to support his interpretation, the expression qari ści (read qari ści) has exactly the same meaning as in the SH. See the passage in question in ÇÇÇ, 155. Cf. ELL, 17.

For qara teri 'black head', see above, n. 21, where the connotations of the word qara 'black' are discussed. Here Altan, Quçar and Saça Beki want to emphasize their inferior position as retainers of Temüjin in a graphic, physical way. For the expression eme kūl̄it, another 'mot-couple', see above, n. 104; Mo, 42.

'Cut us off', lit. 'causing to part' (hiričeı ulfa). Hiričeı ulfa is the factitive of hiričeı to part, separate (from)', a rare word in Mongolian, but occurring three times in the SH in the forms hiričeı (~ 123), hiričeı (~ 178) and iriceı (~ 203), which shows the instability of the initial h- in the 14th century. See 'Quelques problèmes', 260. This expression disappears from the later literary language as well as from most living languages and dialects. On it, see Th, 193 (< JYT, 335).

'Into the wilderness', lit. 'into a land without a lord' (eje [A1], 33a: eješ ügei qajar-o, i.e. 'into a no-man's land'. For this expression, see Kow. 1009b, Les., 390b. Cf. below, n. 149. Note that this sentence, which concludes the three men's formal pledge to their leader, ends abruptly without being followed by the usual quotation verb ke'e- (ke'en, ke'eši). The same occurs in A1, 33a. See Cleaves 1982, 81, n. 30. Cf. below, nn. 124, 125 ad fin.

For the expression üge haranu, 'to take counsel, deliberate; to pledge one's word', cf. Lettres, 78-79.

'(They) made Temüjin qan, naming him Çinggis Qa'an. As is known, Çinggis Qan was elected supreme tribal leader at the great assembly in the Year of the Tiger (1206; see § 202), and it was apparently on that occasion that he was also given the name of 'Çinggis' (see below). The title he held was, of course, qan, not qa'an, the latter being a retrospective confirmation. However, it seems likely that it was at the earlier election described in the present section that Temüjin was made qan, almost certainly in opposition to his rival Jampa and his confederate tribes which elected the latter as their leader, and which in the year 1201 (~ 1201) conferred on him the title of gir qa (~ gàn). See the SH, § 141 and com. This raises a chronological problem. When did the first election of Temüjin as qan take place? In view of what has been said in n. 119, this election must have taken place about 1184, i.e. some twenty-two years before the great Qurila of 1206. Cf. Chia & Hung 1981, 166, who also suggest 1183 or 1184. Pelliot, who discusses this problem in NMP, I, 295-296, has unfortunately confused the
first proclamation of Temüjin 'as king of the Mongols' with Jampaq's proclamation in the Year of the Hen (1201) as described in SH (§ 141), and his argument is therefore invalid. However, it is true that the Year of the Rooster can be either 1189 or 1201, and if Temüjin's first election was held in or about 1184, it would seem more likely that Jampaq was elected qan in 1189. This, however, runs counter to Rāhil al-Dīn's chronology, according to which the events surrounding the election of Jampaq happened in 1200 (see below, n. 141). If we assume with Pelliot, Ligeti (Li, 152, n. 123) and Cleaves (Cl, 68) that the Year of the Rooster corresponds to 1201, we are left with a gap of about seventeen years between 1164 and 1201; during which the events described in §§ 120-141 took place. The dating of the first election remains doubtful and no exact year can be assigned to it; but it certainly occurred quite some time before that of Jampaq. The statement in On, 46, n. 136, that the first election 'ceremony took place in 1189 A0, when Chinggis Qahan was 28 years old' is in line with the date adopted by official Mongol historiography, as well as by Mongol historians in China. See OMT, 861; BNMAUT, 206. Bira 1991, 34; Rasinodzer in M.K.R, 1990, 2, 30. Cl Kradin 1995, 136-137. The date (1189) as well as Temüjin's age at the time (28) are, in fact, those given by Sayang Sechen and the later Mongol chronicles (see ET, 291r-03; GOM, 71; Zamec, 33), which also give 'Kodige (= SH Koko) Aral of the Kerulen River' (see below, n. 136) as the locality where the election was held. This is at variance with the SH account, according to which Temüjin was elected qan at Koko Na'ur of Qara Kirgjen. Clearly, we are dealing with different traditions. Temüjin's age of twenty-eight (twenty-seven by our reckoning) rests of course on the date of 1162 for his birth. See above, n. 104. As is well known, the SH is weak on chronology, the 'Year of the Rooster' (takuya fil) of § 141 being the first firm date given in the work. It is indeed remarkable, as L. Clark points out (Clark 1978, 44), that whereas Jampaq's election date is mentioned, no date is assigned in the SH to both Temüjin's election as qan and his assuming the designation 'Chinggis Qan.' From § 124 on, Temüjin actually ceases to be called Temüjin and is only referred to as 'Chinggis Qan.' In subsequent passages of the SH (§§ 125, 126, 127, and probably also § 124, where the word qan at the beginning of this section may have dropped out (see Pe, 32, n. 6, and below, n. 124); reference is made to Chinggis Qan 'having become qan,' thus reinforcing the impression that the title of qan and new name or designation were conferred at the same time. Rāhil al-Dīn (SLI, 1/2, 252) claims that the name 'Chinggis' was given to Temüjin by the Mongols after the defeat of the Keresit in 1203, and (ibid., 120) that the designation 'Chinggis Qan' was 'confirmed' in 1206. On the other hand, in another passage of this work (ibid., 253; cf. also SLI, 1/1, 167), he relates that Chinggis Qan was so named in 1206 by Koko Nai Tenggeri (see below, § 244), no doubt following Juvanid (HWC, 39). The SWCCM, 57a, and the YS11, 1, 13, both state that Chinggis Qan received this 'honourable appellation' in 1206 and there is no reference in these works to an earlier enthronement. Some scholars, e.g. Vladimiricv and Grousset, are of the opinion that the title 'Chinggis Qan' was conferred on Temüjin at the time of the first enthronement as qan and later reaffirmed or confirmed at the qurilat of 1206. See GK, 33-34, 54; CW, 80, 166. Other scholars, among them Hambis and Ratchnevsky, believe that Temüjin was elected qan at the first enthronement and that he assumed the title 'Chinggis Qan' in 1206. See GK, 59-60; ČK, 40 (a ČK, 43). This is also the official position of most contemporary Mongol and Russian historians. See HMPR, 107-108. CL BNMAUT, 206, 214; BNMAUT1, 148, 149. See, however, Bira 1991, 34, for whom Temüjin was given the title 'Chinggis' by the shaman Koko Nai at the (first) enthronement in the year 1189. Ligeti (Li, 152, n. 123; 169-170, n. 202) says that, at the first enthronement, Temüjin was given the name 'Chinggis' and was invested as qan by his clan, and that this election 'within the family' provided him with a legal basis but little real power; in 1206 the proper election took place, with all the aristocracy of the steppe...
With regard to Temüjin's election as qan by Altan, Qučár and Sača Beki, it is important to note the following. In §123 there is no mention of these three personages claiming the leadership, i.e. the qan-ship, for themselves, something they were entitled to in view of their seniority. However, when Temüjin sent his famous messages to Ong Qan and Janmuqa reproaching them for their objectionable behaviour towards him, he also sent a message to Altan and Qučár (who had by then turned against him), the wording of which is preserved in §179. From Temüjin's tirade it appears that he had originally offered the qan-ship to both Altan and Qučár, as well as to Sača Beki and his brother Tačču (see n.122), because they were the sons of Nekčin Tačči, Qutula Qan and Bartan Ba'atur 'from the senior line' (see n.179 for the error in genealogy in the case of Sača and Tačču). But, according to Temüjin, they had all refused in spite of his urging, and it was in fact they who insisted that he should become qan. Had one of them taken up the leadership, Temüjin would have served him, and would indeed have performed all those tasks to which Altan, Qučár and Sača Beki refer in the poetic passage in §123. This retrospective justification on the part of Temüjin to legitimize his earlier assumption of power must be taken with all due reservation, since his protestations were not so much directed to the personages in question, but rather to all the other tribal chiefs whom he was trying to win to his cause. Cf. Bira, op. cit., 33-34. We must also take into account the fact already mentioned (see above, n.118) that, according to §127, it was the same Altan and Qučár that were responsible for the rupture between Temüjin and Janmuqa by causing ill feeling between the two andas. In §127, Janmuqa asks these two personages why they had not elected Temüjin qan when he and Temüjin were still friends, and what they 'have in mind now' after electing him qan. Thus, the role of Altan and Qučár is extremely ambiguous at a time of shifting alliances and broken loyalties, when it was not yet at all clear which of the two former sworn friends, now rivals for leadership and power, would emerge as victor.
For some interesting remarks concerning the formal oath of loyalty as preserved in the SH, see Li, 152, n. 123; Ratchevsky 1987, 66-67, and Barkman 1991.

Ligeti, loc. cit., is no doubt correct in regarding Teménjín’s election to qan-ship as an election ‘within the family’, i.e. by his own clan. Therefore, one cannot regard this as a proper qurilta or assembly. In those cases where a proper qurilta was held, the word ‘to assemble’ (č’il- i qurit) is regularly present in the SH. See §§ 141, 202, 269, 282. Cf. Endicott-West 1986, 528ff.

§ 124. Upon his election as tribal chief (read qan for qa’an). Teménjín – now already called Chinggis in the SH (see above, n. 123) – appoints his first office-bearers, as was the custom. See Li, 152, n. 124. As a mark of their office dignity, he gives his newly appointed čerbi, or chamberlains, a quiver each to suspend from their belt. On the office of čerbi and the personages in question, see above, n. 120. For the ceremony of the ‘remise du caquarso’, and the expression qor aqurat (‘to attach or suspend a quiver to the belt’), cf. Roux 1975, 58; idem 1977, 23; D. Dalibard in MNT, i, 81-86; Gökçenjan 1988, 145.

Several of the names in this section are of personages mentioned in §§ 120 and 122. Ögedei Čerbi is the Ögedei Čerbi of § 120 and the Ögedei Čerbi of § 191. Qalq’il Toqu’ur’ is the third of the three brothers, all chiefs of the Jalayir, mentioned in § 120. Jetei and Duquluq Čerbi (his title has dropped out in C5, 55). As well as Öngqir, Suykelti Čerbi and Qada’an Daldurkan were also mentioned in § 120. For the others, see below.

‘Your morning drinks… your drinks/In the evening!’, lit. ‘The morning drink!… the evening drink!’ For megüd ilil (= pmo. megüdgelil) – ‘to cause to lack’, cf. ‘Trois documents’, 443; for oolddla ‘neglect’, cf. Cleave 1992, 149, n. 47. After proclaiming their diligence, they are appointed ‘cocks’ or rather stewards (ba’urétin, mo. ba’uratin). For this important office, see TMEN, no. 82; Ratchevsky 1970, 420, n. 21; HCWLYTT, 57-60, no. 14; MKSLT, i, 707-723; Miller 2000, 265-212; and CCMFE, 127-128. As pointed out by Ratchevsky 1965, 99, n. 46, the office of ba’ur’i was more than that of a simple cook: the holder was in charge of the administration of victuals and was also the chief cup-bearer.

For Dgegöi of the Besüt see above, § 120, and below, §§ 210 and 222. For the first four lines of the poetic passage concerning Dgegöi’s duties (which earned him the epithet of qoniti or ‘shepherd’, see § 222), see Cleeves 1949a, 520-522; and Bose 1970a, 341ff. The following are some additional references to individual words and expressions in the passage in question: štege irge ‘a two-year-old wether’, cf. Gantogtokh 1989, 118-119; Gantogtokh 1990, 124; šilen ‘broth, soup’, cf. TMEN, no. 246; Khomonov 1970, 38; RH, 293, no. 44; and SFOQ, 43-44, n. 68; qoŋqoŋ ‘night’ (more precisely ‘a day and a night’), see above, nn. 67, 68; for alaŋqil’ut (= mo. alaŋgil’ut) ‘pied, motley’, cf. Poppe 1975, 166; for the term qoniti (= qoniti) ‘sheep’, see above, n. 118. Alam ‘bottom of the cart’ is a problem word. Haenisch (HW, 4) and Ko, 539 (following HW), read alan; Pe, 32, and L2, 81 (followed by most others) read alam – all of them rendering the term according to the Chinese gloss ‘bottom of the cart’ (‘戛巴’). Al, 49, and Bö, 81, read aral ‘shaft or body of the cart.’ TH, 93 (= JYT, 165) reads alan, but understands ‘enclosure (pen) for domestic animals’, following VWTD, 1, 251 (s.v. ‘aran’). On, 47 and n. 137, agrees with the latter and translates ‘sheep-pen.’ Oz’, II, 370-371, n. 5, adopts the etymology proposed by TH, but reads aram, which is more in line with the Turkic form. The form alam is confirmed by AT², 33b, and the Chinese gloss is too specific to be dismissed. The etymology proposed by Poppe (< tu. allo the ‘bottom part’) must be the correct one. See Poppe 1955, 38; Mu, I, 264, n. 6. Qonqiti ut qoniti (= qoniti) ‘brown sheep.’ For qongqi qongqi ‘chestnut horse’ (cf. above, n. 90), see Vietze 1980, 386; gatam – gatam (= ‘sheep-fold, enclosure (= town’), see MA, 302a; Mu, I, 264-265, n. 8; Khomonov 1970, 36; and below, n. 247; qonqiyasan (in the text yonqiyasan) ‘tripe’ or, more strictly, ‘rectum (anus)’, cf. Vietze, loc. cit., and Gantogtokh 1989, 119;
Garnotex 1990, 125; go’lançær = mo. qyləlançær ‘gluttonous’; cf. Poppe 1975, 162.

It is interesting to note that the quotation verb ke’r- in the usual form ke’en (= mo. kemen) ‘saying’, is omitted at the end of this poetic passage, here presumably dropped in the transmission of the text since AT, 33b, has retained it. Cf. above, n. 123.

Degesi’s brother Güçügür is mentioned in § 120, where his name is transcribed as Küçügür. See above, n. 120.


For tenggiyeti, lit. ‘having an axletree’, cf. Cl, 56, n. 57; Oz, II, 372-373, n. 9. As noted by Ozawa, tenggiyeti appears to be an error for tenggiligeti (in the Chinese transcription 톨이계, tenggiyē) meaning ‘axletree’. See above, n. 101. On the other hand, tenggiye may be a word in its own right with the same, or a related, meaning. Cf. Do, 69, n. 8.

Déedi Çerbi – Çerbi is the title he acquired because of his functions (see above, n. 120) – will appear again in the SH (§§ 191, 193, etc.). His name can also be read Dodai. Cf. Cl, 56 et passim; Cleeves 1949a, 528. The Chinese transcription permits both readings; my reason for adopting the form Déedi (as in Pe, 33, and L, 81, where ‘Déedi’ is an error for ‘Déedi’; cf. ibid., 149) in preference to Dodai is that the former is the reading found in AT, 33b.

Gergen utgar (= pmo. tudgar) ‘domestics and servants.’ For this compound, see the important remarks in Cleeves 1949a, 522-525. Cl, 56, renders it as ‘maidservants and manservants.’ Cf. Oz, II, 373, n. 12.

For Qubilai of the Barulas, Çılğüete of the Suldus and Qarqar (= Qaraqar) Toqqu’un of the Jalayir, see § 120. Qasar is Joći Qasar, Çigung Qan’s younger brother. The function of these officers (as intimated by the fearsome but rather vague command) is to chastise those whose excessive pride and arrogance oppose them to their leader. To carry a sword (ildi = mo. ildiæ[s]; pl. ildiæ), i.e. to be an ildiæi (= mo. ildiæi), was a special prerogative; indeed, this very designation became a title, like görçë, lit. ‘quiverbearer’, etc. Cf. TMEN, no. 69, ETI, 91a, s.v. ‘ildiæi.’

For the verb ongali: ‘to cleave, cut in two’, cf. § 208: ongali‘da ‘to be cut off.’ On this word see Oz, II, 375, n. 16.

Belgüete was Çändig Qan’s half-brother; Qurlulai Toqur al of the Jalayir was the younger brother of Qurqi (= Qaraqar) Toqur’un (see above, and § 120).

Aqtagi ‘querity’, from aqta (= mo. aqta) ‘gelding’ + the vocational suffix -çi. For this word, see TMEN, no. 9; CLC, 115.

Tsaytûl’udai, Qurqi Morçë and Mulqulqu. Most translators have taken Tsaytûl’udai as the ethnonym of Qurqi, Morçë and Mulqulqu. However, Besse 1987, 45-47, has conclusively shown that Tsaytûl’udai is a person’s name (probably the same personage of the Suldus tribe mentioned in § 120), and that, consequently, Morçë ‘The Horse-herder’ must be the appellation of either Qurqi or Mulqulqu. In my opinion the appellation can only apply to Qurqi (= QuduQudu), possibly to distinguish him from other personages by the same name. For the various forms of this name, cf. HCG, 284ff. Mulqulqu is almost certainly the same personage of the Jadaran tribe mentioned in §§ 122 and 223.

For Arçai Qasar of the Jalayir, see § 120; he will reappear in § 127 et passim. Taqa of the Suldus is the Taki of § 120, and the Daqæ (= Taqæ) of § 126. He is repeatedly mentioned in the SH. On him see above, n. 120. The full name of Sükegei (read Sügegei) is Sügegei Je’un; cf. §§ 120, 177, 181. On him see above, n. 120. Ça’urqan and Sübe’et’ei Ba’uds of the Uriangai were the two younger brothers of Jelme; cf. § 120.

The couplet ‘Be my far-flying shafts/Be my near-flying arrows!’ has been the subject of much discussion and speculation. See Yü YA 1949; Khomonov 1970, 39, s.v. ‘odola’.
Vietze 1990, 385; Cérénsohnom 1986, 78; Tserensohnom 1993, 196-197; Ga, 317, n. 437; On, 48, n. 140. *Qo ileeq and odora* are the names of two types of arrows (see the Chinese interlinear version and HW, 66, 121); they are used here as a simile for reliable men that could be entrusted with long and short range missions, i.e. special envoys and couriers (cél/eś), as evident from §§ 126, 127, 151, 177, 181 and 183. Cf. Serruys 1958, and below, n. 177. Unfortunately, it is impossible to establish with certainty which types of arrows are meant, and even the correct reading of *odora* (? odola) is in question. Cf. Oz, I, 132-133, n. 10. The reading *odora* is supported by AT, 33b, where, however, this word is incorrectly glossed as *udurdiq* 'leadership, guidance.'

For the last passage in poetry, cf. Khomonov 1981, 56; idem 1970, 33, 35. See also Cleaves 1953, 87, n. 29; Legeti 1971, 147.

For kerti-e ‘keriye ‘crow’, cf. MEN, no. 329.

'1 shall hoard up', lit. 'I shall collect.'

'Felt covering' (nembe-e isgel), lit. 'covering felt.' For isgel = isgel 'felt', a term employed in the present section with reference to both a felt blanket or coverlet (used for horses as well as for humans; cf. the Chinese sectional summary, Y, 3, 48a) and a windshield for the tent, see Gervers & Schipple 1995. The form with s- occurs in § 202; isgel occurs again in § 203. For the latter, cf. mo. isgel, esgel id. Isgel is a form found in other early texts. See, e.g., Matériel I, 99; isgel 'teurti'; MA, 323b: isgel 'felt'; RH, 251, no. 12: isgel 'felt'; and 278, no. 6: isgel id. Cf. Khomonov 1970, 33; Oz, V, 100, n. 1.

'On your tent!', lit. 'in the direction of the tent!'

**§ 125.** 'When Cinggis Qajan became qan.' Cf. AT, 33a: Cinggis Qayan qayan belfij 'when Cinggis Qayan became qayan.' In § 124 we had Cinggis qan holulat 'Cinggis having become qan.' Cf. AT, 33a: Cinggis qayan bolüeq id. Thus, in §§ 124 and 125 Cinggis is said to have become qan and qan. This inconsistency, coming immediately after the last sentence of § 123 (to the effect that Temüjin was made qan – but qayan in AT, 33a!), indicates that all the terms qan (qayan) in these sections are the result of later editorial changes, the original recension having qan throughout. Cf. also § 126 where it is clearly stated that Temüjin had been made qan, not qayan as in § 124 (in the AT). All, the titles qan of § 126 have been changed to qayan. In the SH, §§ 57 and 58, we have a parallel case with regard to Qutula, who in § 57 was 'made qain' and 'raised as qan', and in § 58 'became qain' – again a confusion of titles due to later editors of the text. Cf. above, n. 1.

Jelme of the Urtangai has last been mentioned in § 120 in connection with his two brothers Ca'unqu and Suh-išät. On him see above, n. 97. While Jelme was one of the four 'hounds', Bo'orū was one of the four 'steeds' (see above, n. 90); being among the oldest and chosen companions (nokkhi) of Cinggis Qan, they are put in charge of all the other officers – cumulatively referred to as *töbög* 'the senior ones' (for this term see above, n. 78) – that Cinggis has just appointed.

For the first occurrence of the sayings quoted in the alliterative passages, see §§ 76, 77 and 78. For the use of the corroboration particle *fe* in these passages, cf. 'Trois documents', 461. 'You shall dwell!' (adaqin) is, literally, 'Let it be!', but as already noted by Pagba, what is meant is 'You shall be!' See EQ, 62.

'When Heaven and Earth increased my strength and took me into their protection', lit. 'When I was protected by Heaven and Earth, my strength being increased.' For this passive construction, see Poppe 1964, 369, 370 (where, however, the pronouns *you* and 'your' should be replaced by 'I and my'). For the concept of Heaven’s and Earth’s bestowal of protection and strength on Temüjin/Cinggis Qan and his lineage, see nn. 1, 113; de Raczewitz 1973. The theme is a recurrent one in the SH and other 13th century documents.

'For my sake', lit. 'thinking (fondly, i.e. out of affection or love) of me.' Cf. Mo, 178, n. 159: 'par affection pour moi.'
This passage is understood differently in On, 49. However, the Chinese sectional summary (Y"3, 49b) leaves no doubt as to the correct meaning. See Pa, 63. Cf. Do", 90.

'My lucky companions' - lucky (allegation, pl.) because they were going to share in his good fortune. Cf. the frequent compound expression ēkīta qīntaqa 'lucky (or fortunate) and happy' (§§ 200, 204, 211), which is also used to emphasize the fact that the individuals in question had the good fortune of being associated with Cinggis Qan, or of being Mongols.

'I have appointed each of you to your respective office', lit. 'I have appointed you (Ten-il) to office in all (i.e. separate, different) directions (jāk jāk).' This last, closing sentence is understood differently by Ozawa ('[Thus] he appointed them each one separately', i.e. each of them to his office). See Oz', II, 378 and 380, n. 5. Cf. also El-Ar, 341. It is true that the sentence ends abruptly, without the closing quotation verb ke'be 'he said' which we would normally expect. This fact had alerted Naka to the possibility of a lacuna. See Na', 120, Na', 102 (cf. also Mu, I, 260). However, in order to accept Ozawa's interpretation it is necessary to substitute the pronoun tan-i 'you' (acc.) with nen-i 'them'; nevertheless, the sentence still remains an awkward one. In my view, the substitution is not warranted, since there are several such cases in the SH, and at least one other case in the HIHY (Ib, 21r, 2), where the verb ke'r- at the end of a quotation is omitted. See SH, §§ 105 (ad fin.), 123 (after the last quotation), 124 (after Deger's words), 135 (after Mother Hö'elän's words), and 269 (after the last quotation). Moreover, the absence of the final quotation verb in the present section is confirmed by the AT', 34a. Therefore, we must regard this phenomenon as a peculiarity of the language of these documents. See above, n. 123. For tali- 'to appoint to an office', cf. TMEN, no. 129.

§ 126. Daqaí (Taqaí) is the same personage called Taki in § 120, but Taqaí in all other instances. On him see above, nn. 120, 124. Cf. CI, 58, n. 64. For Sügegei, i.e. Sügege Je'ün, see also nn. 120, 124. For the role of Daqaí (Taqaí) and Sügegei (Sügegei) as envoys, see Yü Ya 1949, 3. Cf. § 151 and con.

'With the message that Cinggis Qan had been made qan', lit. 'saying that one had caused Cinggis Qan to become qan'. For the question of Cinggis' name and title, see above, n. 125.

To'oril Qan, i.e. Öng Qan of the Kereit, was last mentioned in § 115, when he returned to his encampment in the Black Forest on the Tila after the successful joint campaign against the Merkit. In the present section, To'oril calls Cinggis Qan 'my son' because Cinggis regards him as his adopted son owing to To'oril's earlier bond of anda-ship with Vitigei Bā'su'ter. See § 96 and above, n. 104.

'To'oril Qan sent them back with the following message' renders the final two words ke'šu ileiši (read ileiš < ileiš 'u), which are translated by Cleaves as 'sent saying' (Cl, 58), the subject being To'oril Qan. Walesy 1979, 555, understands them simply as 'thus he (i.e. To'oril Qan) spoke.' Cf. Cleaves 1979, 73. Oz', II, 382, regards ileiš as a conversable imperfect instead of a contracted form of the präteritum imperfect of ile- 'to send', and leaves the sentence unfinished ('he sent saying ...'). The correct form, already given in Bo, 83: ilege'išuši (en pmo. ileiš'ūši, pmo. ilege'išušuši), is also found in Pa, 62: ilege'išušuši, and is confirmed by AT', 34b: ilege'išuš (where pmo. ile > mo. ilege-). For ši'ū (ši'ū) - ši'iš (ši'ūši), cf. JS, 131-132, § 221; UGPM, 158-159, § 34; KCl, 914-915. However, in view of the Chinese transcription, I think that the original text used by the Ming editors actually had ilege'išuši.

'How can the Mongols be without a qan?', lit. 'How can the Mongols be (or live) without a qan?' Here we meet for the second time the n-less form qa (= qan) about which see above, n. 57. For the rhetorical question posed by To'oril Qan, cf. Ligeti 1971, 145.

'Do not dissolve your bond', lit. 'Do not dissolve (= undo) your agreement and bond (= binding decision) (= janggi).'

For janggi, see TMEN, no. 151.
'Do not tear off your collar!', in other words: 'Do not remove (or reject) your leader now that you have one!' For this simple, see § 33 and corn.

§ 127. For Arqai Qasbar and Ča'urqan, see §§ 120, 124; for their role as envoys, see Yū Yū YA 1949, 7-8.

For Altan and Quær, with Saqa Beki, had played a major role in the election of Činggis Qan, see § 123 and corn.

'Give this message to...', lit. 'when he sent saying, "Say to..."' For āqulefah ile, see Aalto 1973, 36.

'Did you... cause a split... without causing... to fall apart?', lit. 'Did you cause to separate ourselves... without causing to separate ourselves?'

'Poking in the flanks/Pricking the ribs/of the sworn friend?' Here 'flanks' (sibbe) and 'ribs' (qabirna) indicate the region of Temüjin's heart and liver which Altan and Quær had 'needled', thus provoking his animosity against Jamuaq. The needling implied in this saying is that causing stinging, i.e. malicious, words. The verb qutuq- (= moq. qutuq, qutuq-) 'to prick, sting' is used also metaphorically in the sense of 'to excite, induce trouble.' Cf. Kow., 784a; Les., 90a. For this imagery, see Mo, 98, n. 93; cf. below, §§ 177 and 201. See also Cerem-sodnom 1986, 70.

'Just what did you have in mind now', lit. 'Now, thinking just (ele) what thoughts.' For the particle ele in this context, see Street 1986, 10-11, 4.2.

'Keep to the words you have spoken.' For the expression āqulekseen āqes-tür-luyen ēr-, cf. Latt., 31; and above, n. 104.

'Be the good companions', lit. 'be companions in a good (= fitting) manner.

§ 128. In this and the following section (§ 129), Ta'iṣar is called the de'ā, i.e. younger brother, of Jamuaq. In view of Jamuaq's explicit statement in § 201 that he had no younger brothers, the word de'ā must be taken here in its other meaning of 'younger kinsman' (such as a younger cousin, cf. §§ 120, 124, 128). On Ta'iṣar see HCG, 29-31, and below.
Joći Darmala, alias Coji (Čuki) Darmala (cf. § 201), was a Jalyar subject of Cinggis Qan. On hire and the story of the horse theft, see HCG, 25-26. Cf. also Li, 152, n. 128.

"The same Joći Darmala ... arrived at the fringe of his herd", lit. "As for Joći Darmala, robbed of his herd of horses and his companions having failed, the same Joći Darmala went in pursuit and at night arrived at the side of his herd." For this passage, cf. Motaert 1956, 7; Cleaves 1953, 87, n. 29; Poppe 1964, 373, 376.

"Crouching over the mane of his horse", lit. "lying with his liver (= belly) over the mane of his horse."

"That split his spine apart (qayura)." For the word qayura and its connotations, cf. above, n. 101.

In the SH, Taïčar’s theft is presented as a casus belli between Cinggis Qan and Jamuka, or at any rate as the formal beginning of the hostilities between the two former sworn friends. Stealing a herd of horses was certainly a serious crime and Joći Darmala’s action in killing the culprit was justified (see Ratchnevsky 1987, 77); however, as pointed out by Ligeti (loc. cit.), there is a serious anomaly in the account as given in § 128. From § 201 we learn that the two protagonists, Joći Darmala and Taïčar, had been stealing horses from each other, a statement which throws a different light on the events in question. It is, therefore, impossible to determine who actually started the feud. The SWCCCL, 3a-4a, SL1, 1/2, 85-86, and YŠ1, 3-4, relating this event along similar lines, blame Taïčar, who is variously referred to as ‘a tribesman’ and ‘a relative’ of Jamuka’s, for the horse theft and, consequently, for the hostilities that followed. As we would expect, in all these sources Jamuka appears directly or indirectly as the villain, but occasionally (as in § 201) the cat is let out of the bag, as it were, and we catch a glimpse of what may have been the true state of affairs. For the theme of revenge colouring this episode leading directly to the battle of Dalan Bailut and the gruesome death of the Činšes leaders, and (ultimately) to Jamuka’s demise, cf. Clark 1978, 35-56, n. 47.

§ 129. Jamuka, at the head of the Jadaran, and his allies making thirteen tribes and forming altogether three units of ten thousand', lit. 'the Jadaran having at their head Jamuka, with thirteen tribes (qurin) as companions (= allies), becoming three units of ten thousand (qurban timen).'

For qurin (pl. qurin) ‘tribe’ (cf. ‘other, foreign’ group of people’ = nation, etc.), see HCG, 53; de Rachewiltz 1982, 59, n. 50; above, n. 123, and below, n. 255.

The Ala’ut Turqa’ut (‘Mottled Sentinels’) mountains apparently were two contiguous mountains or hills separated by a narrow pass. See HCG, 41-42, 52. Their location is not certain. According to Perléé, 4 (cf. Perléé, 85), they correspond to the present Erêx Taranq (Erkheq Tarkhag) in the Tuvin Republic, but this identification, based mainly on phonetic grounds, would place them too far to the west. As suggested by Pelliot (op. cit., 42), they must be in the Gürëlgü region, i.e. in the area of the Gürëlgü Mountains south of Khenti Khan, on which see above, n. 89. Cinggis Qan was, in fact, in that region himself at the time as specifically stated in the next sentence.

For Mülke Togat and Boroldai of the Irikes, see HCG, 51. Boroldai is wrongly identified by Haenisch (HW, 173b) with the Boroldai Suyaltai of § 3. For the name Boroldai, see ibid. For the Irikes, a subtribe of the Congirat, see HCG, 31-32.

The ‘thirteen army corps drawn from Cinggis’ thirteen ‘circular camps’ (qurë et, pl. of qurë en – qurë in, see above, n. 90) are listed in the SWCCCL, 6a-9b, and in SL1, 1/2, 67-88. See HCG, 35-37, and Pelliot’s commentary; Ligeti’s discussion in Li, 153, n. 129; and Ligeti 1972, 7-8. Cf. also CLC, 1-17; Honda 1952, YCS, I, 69-71; Mu., I, 275-277, n. 10; and CH, 67-83. In these contributions, the composition of the camps, i.e. the respective clans or subclans forming them, and (especially in Honda’s study) the role they played in establishing the backbone of Cinggis Qan’s military power, are examined in the light of the Chinese and Persian sources, and of the SH. The thirteen camps’ composition was the following: First Camp: Mother
represented in § 120, such as the Sükeken, Neğiş and Qorolas, which are also listed among the thirteen camps. Clearly, the lists of these camps as given in the Persian and Chinese sources are not comprehensive insofar as the clan composition is concerned. As shown by Honda and others, the creation of the three tümen was an important step towards the reorganization of the Mongol army in the following decades. See below, nn. 191 and 202.

The location of Dalan Baljut (‘Seventy Marshes’), one of the famous places in Mongol history, cannot be precisely identified, but it must have been in the basin of the Kerulen, near the sources of the Senggir. Cf. Perles’, 9 (as Perles’, 88), who situates it at 51° N 113° E, i.e. much further to the north-east.

The Jerene Gorge (or Defile: qabqiqasi) has also not been identified, but it appears from the context that it was near the Onon. Incidentally, this is the only section in the SH where we find the form Onon instead of the regular form Ornon. See above, n. 1. For qabqiqasi, cf. below, n. 184.

The battle of Dalan Baljut is not only the first great battle waged by Cüngis Qan as sole leader of a tribal confederation, but it is also one in which he was defeated, in spite of the fact that it was one of the centers of the Sükeken, and of the Sükeken (read Súrgegen, see above, n. 120). The battle of the Sükeken, who withdraws across the Ala’ut. According to the SWCC1, 10a and the VS2, 1 (4), all make Cüngis Qan win the battle and, in their version of the story, it is Jamaqua who withdraws across the Ala’ut.

The Menen Bar’ari, actually formed a circular camp. However, ten of the twenty-one allies came from clans of the Jálár tribe, members of which were apparently divided between the fifth and sixth camps, and there are tribal and clan names listed in
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Jamaq, of seventy wolves after his defeat of Činggis Qan’s forces, the wolf being the mythical ancestor of the vanished tribe. (The name Činš of this Mongol subtrube means of course ‘The Wolves’; and seventy is a numinous number.) Sinor (op.cit., 246) writes: ‘The ritual consummation of wolves is tantamount to eating the defeated Wolves (i.e. the Činš tribesmen — I.R.). The victor’s triumph is clearly asserted by the ingestion of the enemy totem.’ Sinor (ibid., 243) also takes issue with my translation ‘he had the princes (not “prince” as in Sinor’s quotation — I.R.) of the Chinos boiled alive [my italics] (actually the word “alive” is in my text, indicating that it is not in the original — I.R.) in seventy cauldrons . . .’. Sinor writes (ibid., 243-244): ‘De Rachewiltz’s insertion of the word alive is unnecessary; it tilts the balance of the narrative in favour of one of the two possible interpretations. The Secret History leaves open the question of whether the Chinos were boiled dead or alive, and so should w. 123. I too would, Chino = Čino = wolf. The Mongol text puts the name in the plural. Instead of “the princes of the Chinos” one could translate “the sons of the wolves.” The word kürüs has the primary meaning of “sons.” It would also be surprising if the small tribe of the “wolves” had seventy “princes.”

I have the following objections to Sinor’s suggestion: 1) kürüs is a term usually employed for humans and I very much doubt whether it would have been used in the sense of ‘cub’ or ‘young, offspring of a wolf’, for which other terms exist in Mongolian (jilgčaj — jilgčaj, mo. jilgčaj[r], etc.), 2) (and more importantly) the sentence in question in our passage is linked with one immediately following it concerning the beheading of Çaqa’an U’s of the Ne’us (= Negis) and Jamaq’s dragging away of the head. Contextually speaking, it seems to me that the narrator of this story describes two gruesome acts perpetrated by Jamaq on human beings. If the boiling of ‘wolves’ seems rather incongruous in view of the fact that the wolf was the mythical ancestor of both Temüjin and Jamaq, hence their common totem, the boiling of ‘sons’ of ‘wolves’ is
even more so in my view. Personally, I would discard this interpretation even if ko'atu can be applied in a figurative way to wolves' offspring. (I may add that native Mongol scholars, from the early Ming translators to Damsdinsüren, S. Jagchid, Doronbat, etc., all understand the sentence in question as meaning either 'the princes of the cinös', or 'the young ones [i.e., the children, lads, youths - cf. Ligeti's interpretation mentioned above of the Cínös']: 3) regarding the 'seventy cauldrons' (dalan toqo'or) and Sinor's claim that this is a numerious number, I would say that among the Mongols seventy is not a particularly numerious number (such as nine), but rather a word used to denote an indefinite number, or 'many' in general; indeed, Ozawa suggests that this may actually be the meaning in our passage. See Oz', III, 20, n. 8. (In ancient Japanese 'eighty' played an identical role.) This question and the likelihood that there could have been so many Cínös princes must again be looked at contextually. The battle was fought at Dalan Balkut, which literally means 'Seventy Marshes.' I think that the 'seventy cauldrons' are a direct reference and a symbol one at the same time - to the place where this momentous event took place: one enemy boiled for each marsh. It is a perfect correspondence numberwise, and I doubt that it is purely coincidental. Since this was essentially a ritual sacrifice rather than sheer revenge, it was only natural that the victims be chosen from among the members of the leading families, hence the term 'princes', even if, strictly speaking, this term is anachronistic in our context. As already pointed out by Ligeti (loc. cit.), in the battle of Dalan Balkut it was the thirteenth camp, formed of Negit clansmen, also called Cínös (see below), that suffered the greatest losses; 4) the unfortunate sacrificial victims were in all likelihood boiled alive. Just as in the other cruel traditional practice of tearing out the heart of a live captive, one would not expect to see, in a ritual of this kind, dead enemies being boiled. The practice of boiling enemies alive in cauldrons is well attested among the Turkish peoples of northern Asia since ancient times. See Uray-Kohalmi 1970, 255-257; cf.

Ratkevsky 1987, 82; Čk', 43 (= Čk', 46-47); Tömöreren 1995.

J.-P. Roux in Turcica 12:1980, 61 and n. 108, seeks a correlation between Jamaq's dragging of Caq'än U's's severed head behind his horse and the numerous quality attached to the human skull, but Jamaq's act can be explained in terms of sheer spitefulness.

The Cínös ('Wolves') were also known as Negús (or Ne'lıs), a name that has not yet been explained satisfactorily. See HCG, 70, 131-135. The ethnic root found in the SH is Ne'di (Negiden in AT', 35a), and their chief behoieved by Jamaq was Caq'än U'a, i.e., the same personage listed in § 120, whose name appears in the form Çaqan (or Çaqan Qo'a in § 218. (In the same paragraph, the form Negüs appears three times). For a recent contribution to the problem of the Cínös, see Z. Ufraf in BIAMS, 2000:1 (25), 2(26), 63-68.

As for the name Cínös v. Cinos, it should be pointed out that in 13th and 14th century Eastern Middle Mongolian the word for 'wolf' was cino, whereas in Western Middle Mongolian it was cino. In written Mongolian we have cino. All these forms derive from *cino (or *cinq) or *tuno (or *tinki); those forms with the short final vowel in the literary languages (e.g. Uiran) and in the dialects (up to the present day) are simply due to regular vowel reduction (a, o > a, o). Cf. AT', 4b: ciño, and AT', 35a: Cinos. On this well-investigated word and its evolution, see SG, 182, 301-302; Poppe 1946b, 164-165; IMCS, 43, 71 (where, however, there is some inconsistency in derivation); HCG, 37, 131ff.; Ligeti 1955, 131; Bese 1988, 25; TMEN, no. 191: RH, 220, no. 8, and, especially, Ligeti 1970, 305-306. The reading Cinos (Cínös) of L', 68: L', 58; KCI, 673; R, 210a; RA, IV, 56, and VIII, 30; O', III, 13, and V, 140, and of most other transcriptions and translations should, therefore, be amended to Cínös (Cínös). This of course applies also to börte cino, instead of the correct börte cino, in SH, § 1. Cf. Mo, sq., O', 1, 3, etc.
§ 130. Jürčedei of the Uru'ut (Uurt), later (§ 171) also called Uncle Jürčedei (Jürčedui Ebin), appears frequently in the SH. He was one of the military leaders listed as a commander of a thousand in § 202 (no. 6). The name Jürčedei is apparently an ethnonym derived from Jürčen. Cf. Poppe 1975, 162. (For the origin of the name Jürčen, see below, n. 247.) Quyilidar (-Quyilidar) of the Mangput is likewise a known figure, indeed a heroic one, and we shall have more to say about him in connection with his last campaign and death. On him and his name, see HCG, 165, 167-168; Poppe 1975, 164. Cf. below, n. 171. The Uru'ut and Mangput tribes, first mentioned in § 46, are usually named together and their leaders acted in concert during a campaign, indicating strong ties deriving from their close kinship. According to § 46, their clans descended from Način Bāstat'ur's sons Uru'udai and Mangguñuai. Način Bāstat'ur was the brother of Qači Külük, lineal ancestor of Činigis Qan. Thus Menen Tutan, father of Način Bāstat'ur and Qači Külük, was the common ancestor of Činigis Qan, Jürčedui and Quyilidar (this form of the name is the usual one). It is no doubt on account of Jürčedei's age and seniority that Činigis calls him 'uncle' (ebin). Part of the Mangput tribemen had separated from Jampaq already before Dalan Baljuq. See § 120. For the Uru'ut and Mangput tribes and their chiefs, see HCG, 7, 32-33, 165, 167-169, 236, 243; Peliot 1933, 919; idem 1944a, 81, n. 2; and below nn. 171, 175. There are also biographies of Jürčedui and Quyilidar in the YS§ 120, 2962-2963, and 121, 2967-2988 respectively.

Father Mönglik, son of Old Čaraq of the Qongqotoqat, was last mentioned in § 69. It transpires from this passage that at the time when Teműlin left Jampaq, Mönglik and his family had followed the latter. Cf. Hambis 1975, 23ff., where the special relationship between Činigis Qan and Mönglik is discussed in detail, also in the light of other sources. See above, nn. 67, 68. According to Hambis, it was this family relationship that accounted for Mönglik's rejoining Činigis Qan after Dalan Baljuq, although Jampaq's excessive cruelty as displayed after

the battle may also have played a part (cf. GK, 45-46). Indeed, except in terms of family ties, how can one explain the detection from Jampaq's camp of Jürčedui, Quyilidar and Mönglik so soon after Jampaq's victory, i.e. if we are to believe the chronology of the SH? Although the sequence of events for the period in question does pose a problem (see above, n. 129, and below towards the end of the present note), there is no reason to doubt that the return of these personages and that of their followers at that particular time heartened Činigis Qan, who obviously felt that the tide was now turning in his favour. Hence the occasion for rejoicing at a feast (qurum). To understand properly what follows, it must be realized that on such formal gatherings a strict adherence to customary rules concerning rank and seniority was observed, breaches of which were considered as very serious offences; this especially applied to the serving of food and drink, and to toasting in particular. We have already had an inkling of this custom in § 70, on the occasion of a sacrificial meal from which Ho'elun was excluded or account of being late. Chinese, Persian and Latin sources contain much information concerning the rules on precedence, etc., followed at the Mongol court in the 13th century. See below, n. 154.

Qasar is, of course, Joči Qasar, the younger brother of Činigis Qan; Sača Beki and Tači have been mentioned repeatedly in the previous sections.

For the words hulan 'together with' and ki'et 'and others', see Oq. III, 25-29, n. 6, 29-32, 7, 7, and below, n. 150. Ebegei was the (favourite?) secondary wife or concubine of Sača Beki's father Sorqatu Jürki (on whom see above, n. 49) and in our text she is called Sača Beki's 'little mother' (ači ighen [= pmo., mo. acqigten] eke), a term misunderstood by earlier investigators and explained in Mo, 60-61 (where this passage is discussed and translated); cf. also Mostaert 1950, 4-5. We may add that the usual terms for 'concubine' in Written Mongolian are bayaq(an) e/me and baya ekner, meaning 'little mother' and 'little wife' respectively, 'little' here 'secondary.' Cf. ch. hitaio-chičh n. 3. (The somewhat puzzling gloss pi-che (phye) 2841
*bįį for ‘concubine’ ≠ in LLSL, 125a, is merely a transcription of ch. fe-i-tzu [Tu] ‘imperial concubine’; cf. mo. pei, peyti id. It should not be confused with mo. bįį < beįį < ch. pei-tzu [Ti], the title of daughters of noblemen, etc., on which see ETI, 207.) Qorljin Qutan and Qu'ur'un Qutan were the two principal wives of Sorqatjürki, the former being Saça Beki's own mother. On Ebegei and Qu'ur'un Qutan, see JCG, 182-183; where Pelliot suggests that Ebegei may have been the real mother of Saça Beki, which would explain both the fact that she was served first and Qu'ur'un Qutan's jealousy. However, this is not what is stated in the accounts of this event in the SWCC1, 14a-b (cf. HCG, 170-171), and YS2 1, 4-5; both sources claiming that Qu'ur'un was Saça Beki's own mother. The version of the story as related in the SWCC and the YS is somewhat different from that of the SH; indeed, the order of events for this period in Rašid al-Din's work, the SWCC and the YS is at odds with the SH, and other events may well have intervened between the defeat of Cinggis Qan at Dalan Balljut and the rallying of the Uru'ut and other tribes. See CK^1, 41-44 (cf. CK^2, 44-47). On Ebegei's, Qu'ur'un's and Qorljin's names, see Rybacki [2003], s.v. on Qorljin Qutan's name, cf. Bese 1974, 92; Poppe 1975, 167.

"One pitcher of kamīst’ (niken tāšīge). On tāšīge see Mo, 61 and n. 55; Cleaves 1944a, 448, n. 22; CLC, 140; Serruys 1981, 115; idem, MS 24:1965, 478; and Gantotogk 1994, 146-147. See also below, n. 213. It appears that the steward, or cook (ba'ur'tu, see above, n. 124), Siki'tur (i.e. Sīgūr) was responsible for breaches the etiquette and unwittingly causing the trouble that followed.

Nekun Tali was a brother of Yisigëi (here called Yisigëi Ba'gårur pro Yisigëi Ba'gårur), hence an uncle of Cinggis Qan. See above, n. 122. Siki'tur implies that, had they been alive, the two jūrinj qutans would not have dared treating him in such a manner (cf. Hōrel's words to the same effect in § 70). This indicates that he was probably an old family retainer, but this is the first time that he appears in the SH (he will reappear in § 136). For his name (possibly meaning 'broom'), see HCG, 183-184.

§ 131. 'Had arranged the feast'; lit. 'had set in order that feast.' The two men in charge of the joint celebration were Belgersi, Cinggis' half-brother, and the great athlete Birū Bokō (the Strong), already mentioned in § 50 (on him see also § 140). Belgersi was 'keeping', i.e. was in charge of, the geldings in his capacity of uqūd or equerry, a function that he shared with Qaladai Tuqar'un. See § 124 for their appointment.

For the Qagāgin (= Qataqin, cf. § 42) tribe, whose leading clan according to the SH originated with the eponymous ancestor Buq Qataqin, see above, n. 42. For the ethnicon Qagāqata, cf. Poppe 1975, 162-163.

'Horse station' renders Mongolian kirē'sė, a term glossed in the SH as '(place where) one lights off a horse'; and in YS^1, 1. 5, as 'the place where one tethers horses outside the forbidden area (i.e. the qan's tent). This term deserves comment. The transcription kirē'sė is actually incorrect, the correct form being kirē'ei (pl. kirē'sēi), see §§ 229, 245. The preclassical form was kirēgi ('see the corresponding passage in AT, 774a and 963); however, as such it is not attested in the later literary language, which only has kirēgēti (= kirēgēti) 'tied, with the feet bound crosswise' < kirē-kirē 'to bind (the feet) crosswise.' Cf. kalm. kert 'binding; caravan'; kirg. kirē 'caravan'; etc. [N.P.]. The kirē'ei, where the thief in the present episode was caught, was the place outside the area of the chief's tent where the horses were stationed and where the saddles and other valuable equipment and articles were kept under guard (see §§ 229, 245). This place is mentioned by John of Pian di Carpine in his report; see SF, 117; MUs, 'to bind (the feet) crosswise.'
As suggested by Grousset (CW, 86), the Qadagin thief (qiuqaq; for this word cf. HCLYTT, 15-18, no. 5) must have come from the Jürkin party, hence Bûrû Bökö’s intervention. The present passage dealing with the fight between Belgüeti and Bûrû Bökö does not lend itself to a smooth literal translation because the actions are described in quick succession. For a closer literal rendering of the Mongolian, cf. CI, 61.

‘Bûrû Bökö took man under his protection (hoymiçału).’ Both the interlinear gloss and the sectional summary render hoymiça- as ‘to protect, to take the part of’ (kh ını). See Y’ 4, 3b, 10a. This verb is a hapax legomenon in the SH. On, 51, following TH, 196 (= JYT, 339-340), takes hoymi- = m. aysıma- ‘to be angry’ (see Les., 216). Oź, I, 43-44, n. 6, relates hoymi- to qoymar ‘the back; northern part (of a yurt)’, and, reading qoymarçału instead of hoymiçału, renders it as ‘to protect’ (< ‘to be behind’). The Chinese gloss is probably also, because the passage aysı > aysı postulated by TH is unlikely. However, although the SH gloss is supported by Rafid al-Din (see SL, II, 92: ‘defended’), the TH interpretation is supported by the SWCCI, 15a (cf. HCG, 171) and the YS l, 5, both sources stating Bûrû Bökö ‘became angry.’ The ambiguity, therefore, remains.

‘Thinking nothing of it’ (ya’un-a ha iltu bolgan). For this expression, lit. ‘not making it (i.e. the fact that Belgüeti had cut his shoulder) to be even anything (= nothing),’ see Mo, 71; Cleaves 1955, 40, n. 31; Street 1981, 163. Cf. also VG, 91.

‘How can we be treated like this?’ i.e. ‘How can we let them treat us in this way?’ in Mongolian ker eynik kikden büle’ei bida, lit. ‘how did we undergo such doing?’ Cf. Poppe 1964, 374; CI, 61.

‘I fear we may fall out with our kinsmen.’ ‘To fall out (with)’ renders Mongolian maq’un bol-, lit. ‘to become unfriendly’ (cf. HWW, 608: ‘friend’ [IIB 7]; Matériel I, 94). For this expression, see Oź, III, 49-50, n. 16. For a different interpretation, see Poppe 1975b, 155 and n. 94. This last section has been translated and discussed in Ligeti

1958, 232-234, n. 51. Ligeti’s interpretation is somewhat different from the one proposed here.

The chief of the Jürkin, Salça Beki, was the grandson of Okin Balqâ, eldest brother of Bartan Ba’anur (Cinggis Qan’s grandfather) and was, therefore, a cousin of Cinggis Qan. This is why in our text Belgüeti calls the Jürkin ‘brothers’ (aqa de’i), here rendered as ‘kinsmen’; cf. §§ 120, 124 and 128; and above, n. 74.

‘There is nothing wrong with me,’ lit. ‘I am not hindered (= disabled.’ Cf. Cleaves 1949a, 525-526; idem 1959, 88-89, n. 318.

‘Do not act, wait a little while!’ lit. ‘let be, stay some moments!’ (büülü gi qorumut buvi). For these words, cf. VG, 88. Belgüeti is concerned lest Cinggis Qan should act hastily to seek vengeance, thereby ending the already fragile relations with the Jürkin and starting a new feud. Belgüeti’s counsel, however, did not prevail. For the ensuing feud with the Jürkin, cf. Clark 1978, 40-41; Rachnevsky 1987, 75. It should be pointed out that the story as related in AT, 36a, is somewhat different in detail from that of the SH. See LDAT, 105, for a translation of the relevant passage; cf. also MNTLAT, 79-80.

§ 132. The AT, 36b-37b, contains a lengthy epic account of the fight with the Jürkin involving Qasar and Belgüeti, but this is almost certainly a later interpolation. See LDAT, 105-106. Cf. Dał, 75.

‘The chumans of the kunis leather bags’ (büülüs-un büle’i’u). For the churning of kunis (rıkša) in large leather churns (büülüs) with long wooden beaters or churners (büle’i’u, sing. büle’u), see above n. 85. For these bags (büüge, pl. büülüs), see Serraër 1981, 115; Khomonov 1970, 30; Oź, III, 54, n. 2.

The two ladies Qurtün Qatan and Qu‘urün Qatan, principal wives of Sorqutn Jürki (Qurtün Qatan was also Salça Beki’s mother), were mentioned earlier (§ 130) in l. 14a: saqajadu ‘in connection with the episode involving the steward Süül’u and the breach in etiquette – the incident, in fact, that started the present quarrel. In our
as e (a, e, e) and i(a)(y)(a). As a result, ji is variously transcribed as seng (sän, etc.) and xiang (shän, etc.). In the Phags-pa transcription there is, indeed, an alternation between the letters e (ibid.) and y (a) (no. 29 in Figure 8 in MMHS, 19) in the same word within the same document (e.g. in the PCH, chia $\text{ch}$ is transcribed as ge as well as gia $\text{gía}$), and this alternation has not been explained satisfactorily. See Dragunov 1930, 781, no. 9; 780, no. 399; PCH, 12, n. 2: 23, n. 197: 32, n. 386: 44, no. 208: MKY5CP, 151, A: 16a; PSPS, 109, no. 134: MKYL, 28: hpc, 66-73, 137a; cf. also Clauson 1959, 308ff; Denlinger, 425: Pulleyblank 1970/71, 198. These transcriptions reflect the Old Mandarin pronunciation, which is also preserved in the CYY.

In this work, however, the value of ji is unquestionably siang. See JY 37, 393, no. 5547, 408, no. 5810: KGJ, 368, no. 96: Tdöö 1964, 33. The Middle Mandarin pronunciation is provided by Chinese words in Uighur-Mongol script and vice versa, i.e. Mongolian words in Chinese transcription, as in the SH and the YS. The evidence from these transcriptions is likewise inconclusive, showing as it does a similar ambivalence (seng/siang) for $\text{sh}¥$ and its homophones $\text{sh¥}$. For example, in the SH $\text{sh¥} = $ seng (as in the proper name/title Songgum $\text{Sönggün}$); in the YS $\text{ch¥} = $ sang; and in the documents in Uighur-Mongol script $\text{sh¥} = $ seng or seng. See V 1, 29a, 32b (§§ 47, 52); GGS, II, 1428a-1430a: $\text{*Sañyabal, *Sañyudar}$. $\text{*Sañyakti, etc.}$; Cleaves 1949, 131-132, no. 266 (where, however, it is incorrectly stated that $\text{sh¥} = $ stress audap Dragunov; see above): satsang (= ch. tsa-lhansi $\text{sh¥}$ *Chief Minister*); but cf. Litg. in IVMCT, II, 55: satsang, and ibid., I, 142: gongseng-sau (= ch. kung-hsiang fu 佉訕府 "Administration of the Heir Apparent's Palace Assistants"). For the SH transcriptions of $\text{sh¥}$ and $\text{ch¥}$, see also Hatori 1973, 43. The Old Turkic and Uighur transcriptions show the same ambivalence (e.g. in the term $\text{sa}p^\text{n}d\text{a}l\text{t}¥n} (> \text{mo. sengün > senggün})$. Cf. OeECD, 155, no. 39: AG, 362a; DTS, 485a, 496a; Geng & Hamilton 1981, 490, s.v. 《ch¥-seng》. This ambivalence must, therefore,
have existed in the Mongol period also with regard to the Turco-Mongolian pronunciation of ch'eng-hsiang. In this connection, it must be emphasized that for the contemporary reader of such transcriptions in Uighur-Mongol script it would normally have been impossible to decide, without previous knowledge of the original term and on the basis of the script alone, whether the word in question – or part of it in the case of a composite term – was to be read with front or back vocalism. In view of all this it is not surprising to find the above-mentioned inconsistencies in transcription in Lijet’s works. For the title cingsang, see also TMEN, no. 184; DOTIC, 126b-127a, no. 483; for sesgigion see TMEN, no. 1221, HCG, 334; DOTIC, 232a, no. 2331. Our Ongging Cingsang must not be confused with the homonymous official mentioned in § 248, about whom see below, n. 248. We know from the Chinese sources that the Chin court had put Wan-yen Hsiang in charge of the expedition against the rebellious Tatars it the end of 1195, and that the Tatars were defeated soon after by the Jurchen army. See CS 10, 237; 94, 2085, 2088-2089. All the Chinese sources concerning these events have conveniently been brought together by Wang Kuo-wei. See KTCL, II, 676ff.; cf. Pelliot 1929a, 126-128; Hambs 1970, 131. The Tatars’ retreat on the Ulja – the present Uleyn (Uldz, Uldza, etc.) – Gol between the Onon and Kerulen rivers at 49° 56’ N and 115° 31’ E (on the Ulja River see Hambs 1974, 34) – took place probably in May-June 1196. On the chronology of these events and the role of the Tatar chief Megiljın Se’iltu, see HCG, 192-200; CW, 90-91; Gk, 49-50; Chia Chung-yen 賈政鴻 in YSPFCX 9:1955, 18ff.; and Kung Fang-ch'en 賈芳震 in WELST, 1980.1, 111-112. See also below. ‘Without delay’ (bu su'a)ara, lit. ‘do not hesitate.’ ‘Livestock’ (ada'unide'en). For this expression, see above, n. 23.

§ 133. The paragraph divi5sion in the text occurs, most arbitrarily, after the words ‘Having learned this (lit. “that”) news’, and not before them as we would expect.
a joint attack’, the exact meaning of this verb is 'to: join with an ally attacking the enemy from another side.' See Letters, 28. Cf. tu. qa-sa- (< qa:sa, qa:sa) ‘to surround.’ See DTS, 437b, 438b, ED, 589a.

'It is reported’, lit. ‘they say’ (ke’emāi).

‘Set out with his army’, lit. ‘caused the army to arise.’

‘Quickly went to his assistance’ renders ọteler ikitēnē. Ọteler, conversum modale of ọteler- (< ọdeler- , ọdöler-) ‘to do something immediately, to hasten’, means ‘speeding, hastening.’ ikitēnē is not glossed in the Chinese interlinear version, but in the free summary the whole expression is rendered ‘he came in person’ (Y2 4, 14b; cf. Cl, 62 and n. 10), I do not know on what ground. AT, 38a, is of no help because it has ọrụ ‘coming’ in place of ikitēnē. Ozu, III, 61 and 64, n. 6, reads yìgīnụfà = fìgīnụfà from fìgīnụ- ‘to exert oneself, to endeavour’, whereas Onu, 52, and Ce, 100 (cf. also pp. 358-359, n. 209) take ikitēnē to mean ‘to set forth’ and ‘to lead, to set forth’ respectively. According to TF, 110 (= JYT, 196), in the modern Bureg dialect ikitēnē has the meaning of ‘to be panic-stricken, or in a great rush, as a result of being reproached.’ This meaning cannot be ignored; however, I am rather inclined to see in ikitēnē - a borrowing from tu. ikkale- ‘to support, feed, attend to.’ See DTS, 207a; AG, 337b; ịgīdule- , ịkple- ‘feed.’

I take it, therefore, to mean here ‘to go to someone’s assistance.’ For I -n in Turkic and Mongolian, see SICTVF, 350; MXTXÜ, 169. I think the latter interpretation, albeit tentative, is preferable on two grounds, viz. that the idea of hurrying is already expressed by ọteler- and, secondly, a borrowing from Turkic would explain why the word was not understood (and so left untranslated) by the Ming editors.

The two place-names Quinu Sùtí’en (‘Birch Rampart’) and Naratu Sùtí’en (‘Pine Rampart’) clearly indicate a wooded area near the Ulja, one that would offer the Tartars the opportunity to build a stockade (goqīn). On these names and their connotations, see HCG, 202. The term goqīn = mo. goqīan, rendered as ‘fortress’ in Cl, 63, and as ‘barricade’ in On, 53, actually means a fortified enclosure, more solidly built with timber than the ‘palisade’ (šibé’e) of § 79, the latter being more of a fence than a proper stockade, as we would expect in the respective circumstances. For goqīan, see TMEN, no. 1555; RH, 249, no. 23.

The Tartar chief’s silver cradle (mọnggūn ọlẹgẹ; not ‘golden’ as in Ha, 39) and his precious blanket decorated with big pearls (tanụtụ kọnjifile, lit. ‘blanket having big pearls’) are mentioned as they formed that part of the booty that Činggis Qan took either for himself or to be shared with Tc’orl Qan (see § 134). For the corresponding versions in the SWCCL and Rasid al-Din, see HCG, 192, 202-203. For mọnggūn (= mo. mọnggūn) ‘silver’, cf. TMEN, no. 377; Rybatzki 2002, 93-94. For ọlẹgẹ ‘cradle’, cf. ord. ọlọgị id. (DO, 533a) and Khomutov 1970, 32. For tanụ ‘big pearl’ (as opposed to subut [small or smaller pearl]’), see Matériel l, 99; Poppe 1958, 41; Pelliot 1929a, 150; HCWL’YTT, 130-139, no. 33; Huang SC 1984, 210, 213; and below, n. 238. In the later literary language and in the modern languages and dialects, tanụ came to designate only mother-of-pearl. See Lés, 76a; Cev., 519b; MKET, 2217a; Khomutov 1970, 40. For tanụtụ, cf. Cleaves 1951, 96-97, n. 124. For the ‘pearled bed covering’ (tanụtụ kọnjifile), cf. CEME, 3 and n. 11.

As pointed out by Pelliot (HCG, 199-200), Činggis Se’ülüt was apparently not the leading man among the Tartars that had rebelled against Chin, but only one of the chiefs; the role of Činggis Qan (witness also the mention of the rich booty he gained) has, therefore, been purposely magnified in the SH. As Ligeiti says (Li, 154, n. 132), the victory in itself may not have been so important, but ‘it is significant because this is the first time that the attention of the new qas is attracted towards the South, the land of inextinguishable riches. The silver cradle and the blanket decorated with genuine pearls, which is the booty from Megjijn-seülüt, are gifts, evidently from the South (i.e. from the Chin court – I.R.). Chinese titles, too, are opening up a new perspective for their bearers.’ Historically, the joint campaign
against the Tatars is a turning point in the career of Cinggis Qan precisely because of the new vistas that it opened. Unfortunately, as stated earlier (n. 129), the years between Dalan Baljut and the victory over the Tatars are very poorly documented insofar as Cinggis Qan’s activity is concerned.

§ 134. ‘Cinggis Qan’ and To’orl Qan [went to meet Onggig Cingsang].* The words in square brackets, missing in Y, have been supplied following AT, 38a. Cf Pe, 36, 162; Cl, 63, n. 11; Oz’, III, 68, n. 1. Without these words the two subjects of the sentence are left without the essential predicate.

The title fa’ut quri (§ 179: ea’ut quri) conferred by Wan-yen Hisiang on Cinggis Qan for his role in the joint campaign is still unexplained despite several attempts to interpret it. Among the more recent ones see, in particular, those by Chia Ching-yen and Hung Chün (Chia & Hung 1981, 166-167), Ts’ai Meipiao (Ts’ai MP 1983, 16-17), and TH, 288 (≈ JYT, 499-500). Cf CKSYSCT, 1982:1, 2; 1985:1, 7. Some of these interpretations have been adopted by Ozawa and Onon (see below). For earlier discussions, cf. Ck, 49, n. 49; TMEN, no. 152. The form fa’ut v. ea’ut is supported by Raśd al-Din, but this in itself is not a determining factor. See HCG, 203-205. The attempt to relate it to the term chia (chün) 41(38) designating the Jüyin (troops) (see above, n. 53) is unsound on phonetic grounds and also because the troops in question are already called ‘Jüyn’ in the SH. Cf. On, 53 and n. 151. It is more likely that the word fa’ut is a plural in 4 of 6 characters ‘hundred’ (= mo. Jayzin, Jayud). But why would the Jurchens use a Mongolian word? One would have to assume that, as some scholars claim in the case of the second element quri, fa’ut is here a Khan word, identical with the Middle Mongolian form (the Kitans spoke a Mongolian language). However, the meaning of quri is also not clear. It definitely was an old title, as it is found in the combination digi guri, the title born by Alaqaq, the ruler of the Onggig. See § 182 and cm. Pelliot was of the opinion that it may have been a former Khan title still used by the Jurchens. See NMP, I, 291-295; HCG, 205. Doerfer (TMEN, no. 152) raises the question of why the Jurchens would use a title of their predecessors and former enemies, and not a Khan title; however, as pointed out by Pelliot (NMP, I, 294), the Jurchens continued to use Khan titles up to 1149, and may have continued to use them after that date in certain circumstances. The Jurchens had a title or, rather, rank of *qurun meaning ‘leader of several tribes’ and an alternative quru – quri is certainly possible (see HCG, 205-206); moreover, the reading with final 4 is supported by the AT, 38a (ad fin.). In the SH, § 177 (the 147 in TMEN, no. 152 is a misprint), there is a personage called Qulbari Quri who in § 152 is simply called Qulbari. Quri is evidently his title. In view of the fact that this personage was a Kereyit, and that Alaqaq was an Onggig, one may suppose that quri was probably a Turkic title, but this word is not attested in the Turkic languages. Also, in the Chinese sources (YS, YTC, etc.) and in Raśd al-Din’s work there are several instances of Mongolian personages, including a noblewoman, having quri as a title (or as part of their names). See MIC, 104, n. 131 (for the YTC, see the Qutu(qiu) Quri in ch. 58, 69); NMP, I, 294. Indeed, in SL, 1, 22, we find a ‘Mongke fa’ut quri’, who was a Tatar chief at the time of Ambaqaq Qan. He had also, presumably, received his title from the Jurchens. Thus, this title, whatever its origin and meaning, was a Jurchen title given to leaders of foreign tribes, but apparently – in view of what follows – not a very high one. The suggestion that quri is the transcription of the Chinese official title hu-44胡理 (see TH, 288 [= JYT, 499-500]; cf. Oz’, III, 68, n. 3) must be discarded, since this title does not seem to have been used before the Ch‘ing dynasty. See ÐJK, X, 36048.75. I have rendered it tentatively, as Commander of Hundreds, as Pelliot and others have done, rather than Commander of the Tribes (邊部將領). As rendered in CKTS, 20.

The higher title conferred on To’orl is the Turco-Mongolian form of ch. wang 王 ‘king, prince’ (ong < wang), likewise a purely honorary title often conferred by Chinese and non-
Chinese dynasties on chiefs of foreign tribes. See HCG, 211-213, and above, n. 96. Whereas the title Ju'ut Quri may have been conferred on Činggis Qan by Wan-ya en Hsiang sur le champ, as it were, it is most unlikely that the latter would have conferred that of Wang on To'oril without a special rescript from the Chin emperor (Chang-tsung). Furthermore, it is doubtful whether the scoring of such a victory over a rather small rebellious Tatar group would have been rewarded with a princely title from the Chin court. This may have occurred some time after the event, or on a different occasion altogether, but there is no doubt that it was given to him, since in our sources To'oril is regularly called Ong Qan, i.e. 'the qan who has received the title of Wang.' See HCG, 211-212; ČK, 48-59 (= ČK2, 52-54). Indeed, this hybrid honorific appellation is already used for To'oril in SH, § 96, in an anticipatory fashion long before these events. It should be pointed out that, pr incely though the title was, it did not carry the same force and importance when conferred on a tribal chieftain. On these questions, besides the relevant discussions by Pelliot and Ratchnevsky cited above, see also Ligeti's remarks (Li, 154, n. 134).

'To'oril of the Kereyit', lit. 'To'oril of the Gereyit.' 'Gereyit' is an error in transcription for 'Kereyit.' The same error is found in § 242.

'Should be further conferred on Činggis Qa'an', lit. 'should be added to Činggis Qa'an.'

Jautau is the Mongolian reading of ch. chao-tao 稱謂, which is short for chao-tao shih 称謂示, lit. 'Imperial Commission in Charge of Submitting and Punishing (Rebels),' i.e. Pacification Commission. For this office in the Chin and other dynasties, see DOTC, 117b, no. 303; and NMP, I, 293 (where, however, the transcription 'jao-tao' is untenable). Ci, 63, and Oz, III, 67, 69, transcribe Jautau and Jautay respectively. Li, 46, has dzautau (＝ Jautau), but jen-ta in L7, 89 (cf. also [je]t-ta in ATL, 92). For the reading jau, based on its Middle Mandarin pronunciation, see KGI, 245-246, no. 56 (s.v. Jiu). For Kitán jauta, cf. O. Kara in MSt 21:1998, 79.

"Rejoicing in this way, Ongging Činggis withdrew (ičuš) from there." In L7, 89, the word ičuš (＝ mo. nicaš) has dropped from the text.

§ 135. For the Tatar fortified camp at Nanatu Šitu'en by the Ulja River, see above, § 133.

'They happened to find' (oliš-ul). The third past tense in -ju-ul (praeteritum imperfectum) indicates that the person narrating the event was a personal witness and that the event was a surprise to him (see GWM, 93, § 352). Cf. YMY, 85.

'Who had as nose-earrings a golden loop' (altaa e'meke dorebélit). The earlier translators, from Naka, Haensch and Pelliot to Ligeti and Cleaves, followed the Chinese interlinear gloss and sectional summary, and took the words e'meke dorebél to mean 'a nose-ring' or 'a round ring (for the nose)', even though in Written Mongolian and in the modern Mongolian languages and dialects egenne, egenüü means only 'earring', and dorebél, dorebél 'halter'; cf. mo. dörö 'nose-ring (for cattle).' See Ls., 298b, 269a; TH, 285 (= JYT, 494-495); and below, n. 232. Most of the more recent translators, from Murakami to Onon and Cerensodnom, take e'meke and dorebél as separate words and translate 'golden earring (or earrings) and a (golden) nose-ring.' This is also the interpretation adopted by Ozawa. See Oz., III, 75-76, n. 4. In my opinion, the interpretation of the Ming scholars (who worked on two somewhat different mss.) cannot be dismissed as erroneous, and I believe that the words altaa e'meke dorebélit refer to a single object, viz. to a golden loop used as a nose-ring. In the Mongolian text we have two suffixes in juxtaposition (-i) of two separate objects, i.e. the golden nose-ring and the gold-stitched silken waistcoat. With regard to the latter, according to H. Sermuy (p.c.), the transcription dasti torqan (lit. 'gold-stitched silk') in R, 58, line 3705, and L7, 89, should be amended to daši torqan.

The word daši is transcribed in Chinese as 種子。The
transcription daifu is indeed already found in Pe, 37 (‘dagI’); cf. H, 29: ‘dace’), and is the transcription given by most present-day investigators. Cf. Mu, 1, 295, n. 17; DaI, 68; EIr, 369; Ga, 68; Ce, 102. Ir, 202, writes daI, but see his note 1 on the same page. By the 14th/15th century, ch. tsu .STATE.TS > rino fi, as in ch. t'ai-tzu 大子 (“imperial son, prince”) > tavi. See HCG, 150–151. Cf. Serruys 1977, 354. In Hattori’s system of transcription, ertz > dct. See Hattori 1973, 41; cf. Oz, III, 71: ‘dacz.’ In the 13th and 14th century documents in Uighur-Mongol script, the regular transcription of ch. tsu ertz is sI (see, e.g., K’u-ne fu tsu 孔夫子 > Kungvus in the Mongolian Hsiao-ching; cf. de Rachewiltz 1982, 82 et passim). Hence the above-mentioned transcription daI in R, L, and Ir. See also St, 46, line 4172: daI. SH daI = mo. taI ‘a kind of two-coloured damask or silk’; cf. mo. taI torya id. (Les., 789a; cf. Kow., 1654b), and ord. t’ai t’erqo ‘espèce de tissu de soie’ (DO, 639b). TaI is also the form found in AT^3, 38b. The expression daI torga is a compound meaning ‘golden thick silk’ or ‘golden satin’ (金緞), i.e. gold-stitched satin or damask. Neither element of the compound is of Mongolian origin. Torga is a clear borrowing from tu. torga ‘silk fabric.’ See TMEN, no. 884; ED, 539; Cleave 1950a, 443–444, n. 10. As for daI, it seems that the Chinese ‘transcription’ of this word in the SH, i.e. ta-tzu 子, is actually the original term borrowed into Mongolian. Written as ta-tzu 虫子 (and being interchangeable with 子), it occurs in YS^3 78, 1936, in the section on ‘Ceremonial Caps and Robes’ (儀服) of the ‘Monograph on Carriages and Robes’ (車服). In combination with ‘gold’ (金紺子) and ‘silver’ (白金紺子), as types of ‘warm cap’ (暖帽) worn by the emperor on certain official occasions. Since the term is not glossed like other terms (in non-Chinese languages) in the same section, it is clear that it is a Chinese expression which, however, is not found in our dictionaries. (But cf. by analogy the well-known expression tsa-tzu 賽子 ‘sack, bag’ from sI 背 ‘a wrapper or tippet.’) From the use of ta 子 (and 虫) in the sense of ‘thick, coarse,’ it would appear that ta-tzu originally designated a kind of thick fabric, possibly cotton. Cf. the expressions pai-ta (麻) ‘thick, white cotton cloth,’ and ta-pu 絃子 ‘a kind of coarse cloth.’ The Yuan imperial caps were almost certainly made of gold- and silver-stitched thick fabric. In view of this, we may assume with a fair degree of certainty that the Chinese loan-word in the Uprok of the SH (see Section Four of the Introduction) was actually daI, eventually replaced by daI. Cf. the Uighur Turkic transcriptions zi and tsi of ch. tsu 虫 (Cagbog 1952, 111; Essev 1965, 89, 90), which may also justify either reading (tsi = fi). The story of the founding of Sigi Qutuq (for his name see below) in the Tatar camp and his adoption by Hō’el’ün is one in a recurrent theme of such events, beginning with Kūli (Kðłu), and involving other Hō’el’in or Činggis Qan’s wife Börte. See the remarks on the subject in n. 114 above, and Aubin 1975, 471–472. In the case of Sigi Qutuq, the SH account makes him the adopted son of Hō’el’in, hence Činggis’ foster-brother. However, this report is at odds with the account given by Raśid al-Din (SL^3, U1, 107), according to which Činggis Qan found the little boy ‘on the roadside’ at the time of the conquest of the Tatar people, and gave him to Börte who had not yet borne a son and wanted one. She brought him up as her own child, and when grown up Sigi Qutuq regarded Činggis Qan and Börte as his true parents. As shown by Ratchevsky 1965, 89ff. (cf. ISK, 75–76), the SH account is not reliable for various reasons, and Raśid’s report (as is often the case) comes closer to the historical truth. Indeed, it is most unlikely that – the event having occurred in 1196 – Sigi Qutuq 1) would have become the adoptive ‘brother’ of Činggis who was more than thirty years older; and 2) that he (Sigí Qutuq) would have become a commander of a thousand and a grand judge (jarrāq) only ten years later. On the other hand, Raśid’s account is certainly incorrect according to the statement that Börte still had no child, since in 1196 she had already borne lōči (1184), Ča’adai (1185) and Tolui (between 1186 and 1190). Sigí Qutuq had a brilliant career and apparently enjoyed a long life, dying at the age of
eighty-one. For an account of his life and character, and the theory that he may have been the author or compiler of the SH (or, at least, one of them), see Ratchnevsky 1965, and ISK, 75-94 (where, however, the date of ca. 1180 for his birth may be too early in my view); Li, 170, note 203, 206-207. Cf. Chihoodo 1194, 205-206; Lyu Zinsi in MNT, I, 111-113; Boyle 1963, 241; and below, p. 203. See also Section Three of the Introduction.

In the present section, Ṣiḡi Qutuq is called Ṣiğken Quduq, an alternative reading being Ṣiğken Qutuq (cf. § 138). For these alternative forms, see CI, 64, n. 14; Cleaves 1956, 24, n. 43. Ṣiğken is the diminutive/endearment form of Ṣiḡ, a word meaning ‘the flesh between the teeth.’ See HW, 139. According to Rašid al-Dīn (SL, 1/2, 174) this was his nickname or sobriquet – possibly because of a physical characteristic of the child. Qutuq has been explained as ‘the Turkic form of Mongolian qutuq “happiness, bliss”’ (ISK, 76). This interpretation, which supersedes Ratchnevsky 1965, 87, n. 1 (where various theories are discussed), needs qualifying. The word qutuq as such does not exist in Mongolian and cannot be explained grammatically. It is, however, found in the name KWDKWK P'DWR (= Quduq Baδur or Qutuq Bitur [= Bayarjar] in an Uighur document published by Malov (USD, 28, no. 22, line 8). It appears to be a hapax legomenon. If read Qutuq, it can be either a noun formed on tu, qut ‘good fortune, happiness, etc.’ with the denominal noun suffix -nu (designating qualities; cf. AG, 62, § 60) and the connective vowel -u, or the nomen actors in -nu of qut ‘to cast, found’ (see ED, 596a). In either case, tu, qudulqatutuq borrowed into Mongolian would have become mno, qudgulqatutuq, or qudgulqatutuq, but not qutulqutuq. What is certain is that the Mongols assimilated this unusual word which, incidentally, was fairly common as a proper name in the Yuan dynasty, to qutuq; so that, e.g., in the AT and the LT Ṣiḡi Qutuq becomes Ṣiḡi Qutuq. See ATI, 247b; ETI, 187a. For the name Qutuq – Quduq in the Yuan period, cf. Cleaves 1956, 241, n. 438. Whereas the SH, Rašid al-Dīn (following Juvaini) and Jazārī employ almost invariably the form Qutuq, the Yuan transcriptions are overwhelmingly in favour of the reading Quduq. Ṣiḡi Qutuq will be mentioned again in the SH on several occasions. See, in particular, § 203.

It is noteworthy that, as in §§ 105, 123, 125 and 260, the word ke’ren, lit. ‘saying,’ marking the end of a quotation, is missing after Ḥōelān’s utterance both in the SH and in the corresponding passage of the AT (§ 38b). Cf. above, n. 123.

§ 136 ‘Base camp’ is the somewhat inappropriate translation of the term d’urq, which designated the encampment area of old people, women-folk, children, servants with the baggage and supplies (i.e. the ‘train’) were left when the men went to fight, and where they returned after the fight. Pelliot 1930, 259, no. 24, calls this the ‘camp à l’arrière; and Li, 46 and 154, n. 136, renders it as töršeđżor ‘tribecamp.’ The written form of a’urq was a’urq, but the corresponding passage of the AT, 39b, has a’urq. In the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362, line 23, we find a’urq (see Cleaves 1949, 64), which Cleaves renders as ‘camp’ (ibid., 87). Cleaves says that ‘the orthography a’urq for a’urq with the omission of the vowel u in the second syllable may be compared with that of r’a’urq for lurq’ (ibid., 112, n. 102).

Actually, a’urq is the original Turkic form of the word borrowed into Mongolian. For tu, a’urq ‘heavy bag, train,’ cf. TME, no. 496; ED, 90b; RH, 278, no. 8: a’urq ‘house gear’ (the reading a’urq is preferable to ariq). Pelliot, loc. cit., gives a’urq and a’urq as the original forms of the word, but a’urq is a (later) Chaghatai form. See Poppe 1967, 510, no. 3, as well as the follow-up in Poppe 1975b, 157, n. 99. This development has appeared from the literary language but has apparently survived in some modern dialects with a different meaning from the original one. See O’z, III, 82-85, n. 1; TH, 86 (= JYT, 151-152). Cf. Damdinsüren 1974, 107-109 (his interpretation is, however, to be taken with caution, especially in relation to en: a’urq ‘store-place’). On the d’urq during the Yuan dynasty, see MCMH,
however, in the second instance I have slightly paraphrased the sentence to convey the implied emphasis. For the expression *ôttem kiten*, which I render here 'full of hatred and resentment', see above, n. 133, and below, n. 149.

'They failed us by not coming,' lit. 'we underwent (their) not coming.' Cf. Poppe 1964, 375. Cl. 64, translates 'neither was it come [by them]', which is not very clear. For the event in question, see § 133.

'And now, by siding in this way with the enemy, they themselves have also become our enemies!' 'By siding with (lit. 'leaning on') the enemy,' i.e. by taking advantage of the fact that we are involved in a campaign against the Latar' (Cl. 64, n. 15).

Dol'exan Bolda'ut ('Seven Solitary Hills') was the name of several distinct sites in Mongolia, hence our text is careful to specify that the one in question was that of Kōde'e Aral of (= on, by) the Kelliren (= Kerilin). *Bolda'ut* (= pmo. bolday, mdo. boldar), glossed as 'single (or isolated) hill' (286). For this word, cf. Mo. 258. See also Poppe 1975, 166. Kōde'e, also written Kōde'ü (§ 269) and Kōde'e (‡ 252), is mdo. skدغه, skدغه 'open country, steppe', hence Kōde'e Aral is, literally, 'Steppe (or Barren) Island.' However, aral 'island' means here 'peninsula,' i.e. sensu lat. the area at, or near, the confluence of two rivers (cf. above, n. 24). These two rivers are the Kerilen and Senggir (kh. Цөөр Гол). See NMP, I, 322. In this acclamation, Kōde'e Aral must be taken as referring to the whole region comprised between the two rivers and the Bayan Mountains (Bayan Uul). *Sensa stricto* Kōde'e Aral has been identified with a plain some 60 km west, as the crow flies, from the confluence of the two rivers and within sight of the Kerilen, directly south south-west of present-day Delgerxaan (Sum). It is now called Bayan (Ulaan)-ny Tal. The seven hills which have given the name to the place have also been identified and their generic name is still Dolod, i.e. 'The Seven.' Their individual names are Dørvel ("The Cube"), Stul ("The Tail"), Ix Ulan Tolgoi ("Big Red Hill"), Boga Ulan...
Tolgoi (‘Small Red Hill’), Onon Uvo (‘Many Cairns’), Taxilag (‘Place of the Sacrificial Offering’) and Gacaa (‘Mountain from which Several Rivers Spring’). See RBC, 110; Del, 14-15; and Damdinsuren 1974, 106 and 107 for the relevant maps. The term religious establishment called ‘Doloed Jisa’, marked on the 1:1,000,000 Map of the World (U.S. Army Map Service) at 47° 05′ N and 108° 52′ E, must have been situated very close to these hills. Ködö’s Aral later became the site of the chief ordo, or camp, of Činggis Qan and thereby one of the ‘sacred’ places of the Mongol imperial family, where quritas were held, including those which elected Ögedei in 1229, Möngke in 1252 and Yisän Temür in 1323. It was here, in fact, that the SH was recorded for the first time in writing. See § 282 (where we find the name Dol’an Boldaq in the singular) and con. Cf. Schubert 1966, 53-58; Perlee’, 7 (= Perlee’, 92); CKA, 24 (E 8); 54a; Jinggin in OMBIS, 1990,2, 93-98; and Section Two of the Introduction. In 1992, the joint Mongolian-Japanese Gurvan Gol Project team made significant findings in the area which have still to be properly evaluated. See GG, II, 10 et passim; CXEDN, 31; de Rachewiltz 1998, 251-254. Cf. The Far Eastern Economic Review of 2 September 1993, 30-31. There is no doubt that prior to the establishment of Qara Qorum as the Mongol imperial residence in the 1230s, Ködö’s Aral was, as the main qan’s encampment and headquarters, a sort of capital. Unfortunately, this fact combined with Damdinsuren’s speculative association of the term ā’urag of the SH (see above) with the name Avarga (Avargin Gol) of the small river due south of Delgerxaan, has led a number of investigators to believe that the site at Ködö’s Aral was Činggis Qan’s ‘ancient capital ‘Aurag’, and that the archaeological remains in situ were the ruins of the ‘Aurag Palace’, which is totally unwarranted. See de Rachewiltz, loc. cit.

‘Being few in number and dispossessed of all but their bodies’—an idiom for which see above, n. 109.

On the Telėtii (< Telėttii) Pass (amasar) to the west, or north-west, of the Tula River but not yet identified, see HCG, 262-263. Amasar is, literally, an ‘opening’ or ‘passage’ (< amatu’s ‘mouth’), and can equally be applied to an embouchure, i.e. to the mouth of a river, a valley, a gorge, a defile. Here it means ‘outlet’ (cf. 64). Cf. Dogusuren 1977, 180. The name Telėtii appears again, in the uncontracted form Teletīti, in §§ 152 and 167; and, as a proper name, in § 137. Teletīti (< telētī) means ‘having a cart’; cf. Pelliot’s ‘carrossable’ in HCG, 265. Perlee’, 11 (‘Perlee’, 101) thinks that the Teletii Pass of § 136 is a different locality from the other two and does not seem to be the case. ‘Words’ (iigelā), i.e. the solemn words or oath which Altan, Quçu and Saqa Beki had sworn at the time of Temüjin’s election to qan. See above, § 125. As emphasized by Ligeti, there was no ordinary oath and the punishment for breaking it had to be commensurate with both the solemnity of the pledge and the dignity of those who had sworn their loyalty to the qan. The execution of Saqa Beki and his brother Taiku — the senior cousins of Činggis Qan — meant also the removal, at the same time, of the two possible and indeed rightful pretenders to the leadership of the Mongol tribal confederation — no doubt an important factor in the decision to get away with them. See LI, 154-155, n. 136. Cf. also Hambis 1975, 19 and n. 32. Interestingly enough, considering the princely status of the culprits, this execution was carried out by the sword, i.e. with loss of blood, whereas customarily it should have been a death without letting of blood. See below, n. 137. This was undoubtedly an intentional mutilation of the punishment. According to Pelliot (HCG, 223), the liquidation of Saqa Beki and Taiku took place in the winter of 1196-1197, following the campaign against the Tatars of the summer of 1196.

For moderne-‘to become’ aware, acknowledge, admit’, see OZ, III, 89, n. 8; TMENs, no. 379. ‘Hand executed them’ (fulu’ efū). The Chinese gloss has simply wan-pēi 空獨 ‘finished’ or ‘accomplished’. Scholars are greatly divided about the interpretation of the verb fulu’ē (<-
būtē-) ~ būtē'-(= pmo. būte'- ~ būte'-). See l'α, 323, n. 457, for a review of their interpretations. They variously take it to mean 'to finish = to execute kill', 'to finish = to accomplish (the matter)'; and 'to suffocate', i.e. 'to execute suffocation' (mo. būte'-; see on, 54 and n. 154; Ex-Pep. 98, 274, n. 37; cf. Meserve 2000, 37). AT, 39a, has the reading bindēgē v. the bindēgē of the SH. In the SH, the verb būte'- is used elsewhere with the meaning of 'to kill' (cf., for example, § 267 and the beginning of § 268, where it is rendered in the Chinese sectional summary with sha _kses conducive to. Therefore I think, also in view of the context, that būte'- can only mean here 'to make an end of, finish with' = 'to kill.'

"Cast off their bodies", or 'left them behind' (gētei), abandoned them without burial in the steppes - as a further mark of indignity and disrespect. See Tomka 1965, 166. Cf. below, no. 13 and 140.

§ 137. 'As he was about to move the Jürkin people away', i.e. forcibly decamp them and distribute them as slaves among his own people (as was the custom) after slaying the leading members of the clan. See § 139 ad fin. The expression 'reorganizing the Jürkin people' in On, 54, is therefore an inappropriate euphemism for the destruction of the Jürkin clan as such.

For the Jahlit/Syairi tribe, see above, no. 120. For Teletggetu Bayan and his descendants, in particular his famous grandson Muqali (1170-1223), see HCCG, 360-371; de Rachewiltz in ISK, 3-12. Cf. also Chiold 1994, 199-203. Teletggetu Bayan belonged to the 'White' clan of the Jahlit (Çaqqte Jahlit; cf. HCG, 66, 365), whose territory in the 12th century was situated to the east of the Ögon River in northeastern Mongolia. He had three sons: Gu'un U'a, Cila'un Qaygii and Jebke. The eldest, Gu'un U'a, married Kōlki who gave him five sons. The names of two of them are not known: the other three were Muqali, Buqa and Daisun (this last one not mentioned in the SH, but known from other sources). Muqali became famous as one of the already mentioned 'four steeds (= stawlvars)' (L̄ńbhen kāl̄i'at) of Činggis Qan, the third being Bo'ore', Borouqi and Cila'un. Muqali is usually listed as the second 'steed', after Bo'ore', who had precedence over him as Činggis' earliest companion. See above, no. 90. Muqali had a brilliant career, and died somewhat prematurely in China in April-March 1223. He is frequently mentioned in the SH. On Muqali and his family, see HCCG, 453b (Index); Vlad. 1, 276b (Index); ISK, 3-12, (on p. 5, line 2, '1220' is an error for '1229'), 786b (Index); and below, no. 202, 206. On his brother Buqā, see ibid., 84, 365, 370, and the SH, §§ 226-277, 234 and 239. Buqa - a common Turkic and Mongolian name - means 'bull'. As pointed out by Ligeti (Li, 155, n. 137), after the defeat of the Jürkin, the Jahlit entered, as it were, the environment of Činggis Qan, thus continuing to play an important role as a leading Mongol tribe. 'Came to pay homage'. For the verb a'̃l̄ija, 'to present oneself before someone to greet him', see Mo, 223; TMEN, no. 137.

For the words 'Let these sons of mine be the slaves ... Cast them away', cf. Mo, 182, where this passage is translated. The following are some remarks on individual terms and expressions.

'Slaves of your threshold ... of your door', i.e. attached to the tent of Činggis Qan as his personal slaves (cf. lāi, famāli). The term emûq qualifying bo' ol carries the meaning of 'private, personal (property)' (see below), whereas bo' ol (pl. bo' ol, mo. boyol, boyol) is the general designation for 'slave.' On bo' ol and slavery in early Mongolian society (12th-13th c.) there is a vast literature, but the best discussion of this topic in a western language is still the one by Vladimirkov. See Vlad. 1, 281a, s.v. 'bo' ol = bâl' (cf. p. 113 for our passage). Cf. also below, no. 180. For the treatment of the subject in post-war Soviet Union, see HMFR, 102ff., cf. also Munkuev 1977, 387-389. The argument in the former MPR is developed in numerous publications and is summarized in BNMAUT, 195-198; cf. also HMFR, 102ff. Numerous are also the studies devoted to this
hamstringing them, would indeed impair their movement. But even this punishment is not enough: unlawfully to quit the qan’s tent should carry the death penalty, an injunction reiterated in the two poetic passages of the present section. The expression ‘to cast away, leave behind, abandon’ (ge-h = pmo, mo. gege-j) is often used in conjunction with verbs denoting killing, and it obviously refers to the bodies of the executed men. It is virtually synonymous with o’orki- (= pmo. ojorki-), since it occurs in the same context. Cf. above, n. 136 (ad fn.), and below, n. 140. See Tomká 1965, 166. For keuyi- (= mo. eyiy-) ‘to go away (from), desert’, cf. Poppe 1969, 274. As noted by F. Aubin, the versified discourse of Gúlin U’a may overemphasize the subservient role of the children he was handing over to Chinggis Qan, the transfer of the children being merely a transfer of paternal authority, hence, on Chinggis’ part, a sort of adoption (Aubin 1975, 485, n. 55). Cf. however, Ratchnevsky 1976, 511, and idem 1987, 65. See also §§ 180 and 211 for identical references to loyalty and subservience with regard to other personages. As for the use of the pronoun inu ‘his’ for inu ‘their’ in the passage in question, cf. also §§ 145, 176, 179, 249, 254, 278, and Maturiel II, 6 (br.).

Telegeti Bayan’s second son Çia’an Qayiqi had two sons, Tüngge and Qasi, who were also given to Chinggis Qan. Çia’an Qayiqi does not appear in the SH; as for Tüngge, his name is probably to be read Tüge, for it is with this name that he is mentioned again in §§ 202 and 225. The name Qasi (? < sh. Ho-ha, i.e. His Haa) is also doubtful, and the AT¹, 39b, has actually Qasur instead (not ‘Qas’ as in ATL, 95). See HCG, 365, 367-368, where Pelliot transcribes the form Tunge as Töngge. According to Ligeti, Töngge (Tüngge) is a corruption of Tüge. See Li, 175, n. 225.

‘Let them lift for you! The wide felt door.’ The door of a Mongol tent is often just a heavy felt curtain, hence the expression ‘to lift the door.’

‘Kick them in the pit of the stomach’, lit. ‘Kicking their hearts’ (öré inu mideriši). This is a well attested way of
executing people without shedding blood. As we learn from John of Pian di Carpini’s account, Michael, Duke of Chernigov, suffered this fate in 1246 for refusing to pay homage to the image of Činggis Qan. See SF, 38, MM, 10; SDM, 343.

With regard to Češke, other sources confirm that he was assigned to Jolt Qasr. See HCG, 369; Hambis 1975, 10, n. 15. According to the SH, he presented Mother Ho’el’ina with a boy he had found in the Jürkin camp after the raid—an epic theme which, as Pelliot points out (HCG, 375), is “fortemut sujet à caution.” Cf. above, n. 135. The new founding is Borou’ul (Boroqul, prz. Boroqul, from boroqul ‘grey’), of the Hūtin tribe, who later became also one—the third—of Činggis Qan’s ‘four steeds’ and a leading commander (d. 1217). On him see Pelliot’s long note in HCG, 372-378; YTSH, 148 et passim; Martin, 346a (Index); Chioqio 1994, 203-205. In the SH his name occurs in the forms Borou’ul and Boroqul (Boroqul > Borou’ul), also followed by Noyan (§ 240) because of his rank as a commander of 4,000 (no. 15 in the list of § 202); however, the most frequent form of the name is Boroqul. See R, 1998-200a.

§ 138. This section is entirely devoted to the four foundlings adopted by Mother Ho’el’ina, viz. Gǔči (= Gúči, see § 114), Kőkőči (see § 119), Sigikon Qutuqa, i.e. Sig Qutuqa (see § 135, where his name is written Sīkiken Qutuq), and finally Boroqul, i.e. Boroqul (see § 137). They will all become leading and, indeed, legendary figures in the epic rise of Činggis Qan and the creation of its empire. In the alliterative couplet they are referred to as the (future) ‘eyes and ears’ of Ho’el’ina’s sons, Činggis in particular of course, as we can also see from the same refrain utter by him in § 203 when addressing Sigikon Qutuqa: ‘Be Eyes for me to see with/Ears for me to hear with.’ This is obviously a set phrase or idiom (very much like the couplet in § 124: ‘Be my far-flying shafts/Be my near-flying arrows!’) describing a person who can be entrusted with important services and delicate missions; one, therefore, who is most reliable. Cf also § 251, ad fn. 1). On this idiomatic phrase, see Čerensdodin 1986, 7°, For 7°, p. 54. For Činggis’s ‘aor’?, cf. TMEN, no. 1106. § 139. This section dwells on the background of the Jürkin tribe, explaining its origin through the word, a well-known device of using a popular etymology.

‘As for the manner in which those Jürkin people came to be . . . Jürkin, i.e. ‘came to be named Jürkin’.

For Qabul Qan and his sevenspring, see above, n. 48; for his son Ökin Baraqqa (= pr: Baraqq) – here erroneously called Ökin Baraqqa – cf. §§ 48, 49, 50, 1, 40a. The correct reading Baraqq is fixed in n. 15 and Yürk: and, erroneously, for Sorqan Jürkin (= Sorqan Yürk) – Ökin Baraqqa’s son and Yaguł’s cousin – see above, n. 49; for the Jürkic: or Yürkic (-n) clan which supposedly originated from him, see the references, 97.

Yao Chia-chi 1936 in IFLS 2: 199.

The words within angled brackets are almost certainly a duplication, due to a copyist’s error. Of the same words (jürkin belatar) appearing earlier in the passage, they are, in fact, not found in the corresponding passage.

The short poetic passage has been discussed by Gađamba as well as by Bese. See MTSZA, 123, and Bese 1973.

‘Who had gall in their liver above, n. 74. (Who had) thumb. Had skill in shooting (arrows) in juriđan: ‘having skill (pl.) in shooting’, cf. Pelliot 1925, 211-212, no. 14, and 209-211, no. 13 (jarti) is not discussed; Ozí: filled with heart – again metaphorically for ‘courage pluck’.

‘Filled with courage’, lit. ‘steam’ – a’ur (= no. a’ur) full of fury’, lit. ‘full of air’ (cf. § 78). I have adopted ‘air’ – ‘anger’, ‘rage’ or ‘fury’; I think, fits the context
better. See Cl. 67. For 'a'ir 'air', cf. gr. νεφελ 'breeze, fresh air'.

As for the word translated here as 'inflexible', the text in Y 4, 26a, has fornikes, a word unknown in Mongolian and left untranslated in Chinese. Haenisch (Ha. 41), Pelliot (HCG, 200-201), Ligeti (Li. 48) and others have rendered it as 'irresistible' on the basis of the paraphrase of this passage in the free sectional summary (Y' 10b), and in the case of Pelliot of a hypothetical Turkic form *yörgem < Yu. *yörg- 'to go') which has been adopted in Mu, I, 302, 310-311, n. 13, with the meaning of 'invincible'. According to Poppe (p.c.), fornikes is the negative verbal noun in -masl-más (masl-máž) of tu. yörg- 'to wrap up or around' (see Ed, 965b). Cf. yak sûrd- (with yak, s. - <r>) 'to entangle, to wrap around, to involve a person.' Cf. SYY, II, 2307. In the corresponding passage of AT', 40a, we find a form that can be read yörkimay/yörkim or jörkimay/jörkimay. Sástina (LDAT, 334, n. 39), following Kozín (Ko. 357), reads this word as jörkimay, but whereas Kozín, relating it to kalm. förmög, renders it as 'invincible' (Ko. 541, § 139), Sástina (op. cit., n. 111), makes it derive from the verb jörkila (read jörkila- (jörkila-) 'to raise one's own voice.' Ligeti (ATL, 97; cf., however, also Ligeti 1936, 123-133) has jörkimay, and Vietze and Lubans (ATL, 29, line 1270) jörkimay, but Šágdar, 48, reads zörmög, i.e. jörkimay (n. jörkimay) 'willful, intentional, having a purpose, courageous.' The latter interpretation has been adopted for the SH reading by Černosadov (Če. 105). However, both the SH and the AT postulate an original form in *rki- (*rqi-), rather than *ri-. A reading yörgimay could be a noun formed on yörgi-, kh. id., 'to be willful, to boast.' Cf. Šagő, 551b; MMED, 205a. (For the dev. noun suff. -mus/ meg, see GWM, 48, § 166.) This meaning would also fit the context, but consonance with the name Jürki, with which it is related in folk etymology, would require a word beginning with j rather than y. However, the alternation j-<r (Jo-<ye, etc.) is quite common; indeed, according to Pelliot (HCG, 200-201) Юркин(n)

§ 140. The story of the great wrestler Büri's defeat and miserable death provides an excellent illustration of Cüngis Qan's shrewdness, and of his ability to dispose of men he disliked or a perceived as a threat. What the text clearly implies in the final section of this paragraph is that Büri Bökö, because of his physical superiority, was too proud to consort with the descendants of Baran Batár, i.e. the line of Yüslüge and Cüngis Qan, giving his allegiance instead to the descendants of Öokin Barsaq, i.e. to Soogeq Yürük (or Jürük) and his sons Saqa Beki and Tačış (Büri Bökö, himself a Borjiqin, belonged to the
junior line of Qabul Qan, being the son of Qutuq Möngü Möngërg). Thus, by joining the rival camp of the Jürkin and, furthermore, by attacking and humiliating Belgüeti, Bürü Bökõ had, in fact, sealed his fate and it would only have been a matter of time before Çingis Qan disposed of him. Cf. the case of Kökööçë Teb Tengeri in §§ 244-246.

Bürü Bökõ is first mentioned in § 50 as the son of Qutuq Möngü, whose name in the present section is given as Qutuq Möngör. (For Möngür/Möngö cf. HCG, 76-77.) The earlier incident involving Belgüeti at the feast in the forest by the Onon during which Belgüeti was wounded at the shoulder is graphically related in § 131. From § 140 we learn of another occasion on which Belgüeti suffered at the hands of Bürü Bökõ. Bürü is portrayed in the SH as a magnificient athlete - indeed the best wrestler at the time - but proud and arrogant. For his name, see above, n. 50. He is called here 'the strongest man among his people' (ulus-un bökõ), lit. 'the strongest (= the champion athlete/wrestler: bökõ) of the people', and soon after 'the invincible' (üü ilgäsqaq guüüin), lit. 'a man not to be overcome.'

"Let himself be topped", lit. 'fell for the sake (or in favour) of Belgüeti' (anaga öbexe). For the use of the verb ök (= mo. öğ) 'to give' as an auxiliary indicating action in favour, or for the benefit of someone else, cf. Aalto 1973, 37; Cleaves 1986, 54, n. 42.

"Straddled him", lit. 'got on his backside (sa'arti)." For sa'arti (= pm. sa'art) 'backside, buttocks', cf. Mustaert 1962, 211; and On, 56, n. 159.

For ölegi 'lower lip' (AT, 40b: id.), cf. kh. ulüü 'a running sore on the lip'; bur. älüü 'jaw.' For this obsolete word, see Öz, III, 112-113, n. 7; Gantogtox 1990, 124-125; MKEI, 327b.

'He pressed his knee on his spine and broke it!' (niru'u isu ebusüdəлици qopuqju žebë). Cf. 68, renders žebë as 'dispatched [him]', taking the verb žeb- literally. However, žeb- is here simply an auxiliary of action, sometimes even of completed action, as in the expression žubu žebë 'he died' a few lines below. Cf. Waley 1960, 525; Aalto 1973, 36; Öz, III, 113, n. 9.

"I took a fall on purpose (arqadan)," i.e. intentionally, as he well knew that defeating Belgüeti would have displeased Çingis Qan, what he was not aware of, apparently, was that Çingis had already planned his demise. Arqadan is the conversive modal of arqada (= mo. arqada) 'to do something with a (disguised) intent' - arqa (= mo. arqa) meaning 'a (clever, astute) plan, a ruse.' Cf. Les., 51a-b, 116a. Arqadan is used adverbially, as conversa modalia often are. Cf. Öz, III, 14, n. 11.

"I hesitated." For arivâ 'to hesitate, waver', cf. below, n. 169.

"I lost my life," lit. 'I was attained (= touched, affected) as to my life' - an idiomatic expression.

"After Belgüeti had pulled and broken his spine," lit. 'Belgüeti, having pulled his spine so as to break it in two (quara)." Cf. above, n. 101.

'Cast him off' (o'orkišu). On o'orkiš (= pm. o'orkiš) for orkiš (= orkiš) 'to throw, cast off (or away),' cf. Mo, 63, n. 59.

As in previous instances (cf. §§ 136, 137), the body is to be 'cast off,' i.e. left on the spot and without burial as the ultimate mark of disrespect for the dead person. See above, n. 136 ad fin. Cf. the similar fate of Kökööçë's body (§ 245).

For the importance of the wrestling match to settle disputes, etc., and as a means of performing a killing without loss of blood (with all its symbolic and religious connotations), see Uray-Köhalni 1970, 257-258. Cf. also Rachnevsky 1987, 75-76.

This section ends with a brief genealogical 'reminder' to explain Bürü Bökõ's position in the lineage of Qabul Qan (cf. the scheme in Wa, 251), and how by 'overstepping the line' because of his arrogance - born of his physical superiority - he met his end.

'Whose son was ... whose son was,' lit. 'his son was ... his son was.'
For Qutuq Mönghla/Monggin, see above.

The last paragraph has been understood by the various translators of the SH in two different ways, viz.:

(1) Būrī Bōkō became a companion of the ‘sons’ (tenun laot) of Ōkīn Baraq (i.e. he joined the Jūkīn camp whose leaders were the son and grandsons of Ōkīn Baraq), because he ‘excelled in wrestling’ (barīlda’u ...ala) over the ‘sons’ of Bārtan Ba’at’ar (i.e. Yuśīgī and his children). In other words, owing to his arrogance as a champion he gave his allegiance to the members of the senior line, who themselves were, as we have seen, a proud and arrogant lot.

(2) Būrī Bōkō became their companion by ‘overstepping the line’ (ala) of the sons of Bārtan Ba’at’ar ‘which was the closest to him in order of seniority’ (barīlda’u). In other words, he, a member of the junior line, went over to the Jūkīn leaders belonging to the senior line of Ōkīn Baraq, thus bypassing the middle line of Yuśīgī Ba’at’ar which was the one next to him in seniority. The order of seniority being of paramount importance in Mongolian society, this action of Būrī’s was, of course, a serious infringement of clan rules.

The differing interpretations rest on the correct interpretation of the words barīlda’u (w.f. barīldapá), nomen imperfici of barīlda ‘to wrestle’ or ‘to be very close to each other (in age, etc.),’ and ala ‘(going) beyond, further, over’, hence ‘surpassing or overstepping.’

The former interpretation has been adopted by (among others) Haensch, Kozin, Damdinsüren, Ligeti, Murakami, Ozawa, Onon, and myself (in 1974). The latter interpretation by Pelliot, Mostaert (ut.,), Waley, and Cleaves. On mature reflection, I am now of the opinion that this interpretation is the correct one. The purpose of the entire last section with its genealogical references is, in fact, to show – graphically as it were – in what exactly lay Būrī’s fault, viz. the overstepping of lineage boundaries. However, instead of ‘closest to’, I prefer to translate ‘nearest above’, since I feel that this expresses the meaning of the original better. Cf. Bilgünd dét 1994, 215: ‘The imperial wrestler Būrī Bōkō died suffering his backbone broken by Belgeit because he made companions with furious [sons] of Baraq, which made [their] relations far from the sons of Bārtan Ba’at’ar.’

For further comments on § 140, cf. also Viad., 111-112; Clark 1978, 41; CK’, 51-52 (= CK’, 55-56).

§ 141. The Year of the Han (takīya ha) is the tenth in the twelve-animal cycle used by the Mongols for chronological calculation, corresponding here to 1201. See ICM, 102-106; ZAS 15:16:1982, 477. This is the first date given in the SH. The present section lists the tribes, with their respective chiefs, which formed a coalition to oppose the one formed by tribes supporting Činggis Qan after the realignment of the tribes and clans following Činggis’s first election (§ 123) and his campaigns against the Tatar and the Jūkīn. The order of events in the SH is at variance with that of the SWCL and Rašīd al-Dīn, and also with the YS: therefore, the circumstances surrounding the opposing tribal alliance and the resulting election of the anti-quan Jamuqa are likewise different. The list of tribes and chiefships in the SH is much fuller (eleven tribes and subtribes are mentioned) and more detailed than those in the Chinese and Persian sources; however, because of a four-year gap in the narrative of the SH (1197-1200), Rašīd’s chronology appears to be more reliable, as also that of the YS. See HCG, 393ff.; CK’, 52-61 (= CK’, 56-65); CK, 53-70; Clark 1978, 43-44. Cf. also Ligeti 1966, 131.

The meeting of the tribal leaders took place at Alquī Bulaq (‘Sarsaparilla Spring’), a locality which has not been identified, but which must have been near, or on, the Ergine Mūren, i.e. the Argun River, upstream from the point where it meets its eastern tributary, the Kan Mūren, which is the present Gan River (Gan Gol), cf. HCG, 410-411. For Alquī see below; for bulaq (= mō. bulay) ‘spring’, see above, n. 128.

On the Qadāgān and their chief Buqu Čorogî, see HCG, 393-397, and above, n. 42, on the Saḻ’ūt and Çërgīsī Ba’at’ar, see ibid., 397-400. I have rendered teri’iter, lit. ‘having at their
head’ as ‘led by’ to lighten the style of this passage. Please note that I have also put the main verb (’či utu ‘gathered’) before the enumeration of the tribes.

The Dörben tribe is first mentioned in § 11 of the SH; as we learn from § 120, some of its chiefs had joined Çinggis Qan. For the name Qaql’un (= Qaql’un), see HCG, 395.

A Tatar chief called Jali Buqa is mentioned in § 58. The similarity of the names, indeed their identity (Jali = Jalin; see below), and the fact that both men were Tatar chiefs, has led Ligeti to regard them as one and the same individual. See Li, 220, s.v. ‘Dzalin-buka.’ I am not sure whether this is correct in view of the time gap, since Jali Buqa was already a chief in Qunala’s time and was, therefore, probably a contemporary of Yisigei, whereas Jalin Buqa was active in 1201, i.e. about forty years later. Since this personage is not otherwise known, it is difficult to solve this problem. As for the name Jali(n) Buqa, the second element is the word for ‘bull’ – a common Turco-Mongolian name. Jali(n) is read Jari(n) by Murakami who takes it to be mu. jayar(n) > jari(n) > jari(ñ) ‘heavenly sign, omen.’ See Mu, 1, 77, n. 2; 318, n. 5. I think, with the majority of the scholars, that jali(ñ) = mu. jali ‘flame,’ cf. tu. yalin id. Since the regular Mongolian form is without the paragogic n, the name Jalin must be regarded as the tuciized Mongolian form of the name, which is not surprising in view of the Turkic, or partly Turkic, background of the Tatar tribe. Cf. Klyashtorny 1993. It should be noted, on passant, that in the 13th and 14th century texts, the word jali ‘flame’ usually appears in the well-known combination su(u) jali, lit. ‘the fortune and flame (= grandeur),’ i.e. the majestick aura or charisma of the sovereign (cf., e.g., Cleaves 1949, 79a; idem 1953, 36a; see also above, n. 74), but in the MA, 206b, it is registered with the meaning of ‘rest, peace, tranquillity’ (rus. pokol). This meaning is not found in our dictionaries of written Mongolian, the secondary meanings of jali recorded in them being ‘craft, ruse, fraud, trick.’ Cf. Kow, 228a; Gol., III, 330c; Les., 103b. However, mo. jaliqay (= jali + the den. noun suff. -qai) means ‘crafty’ as well as ‘lazy, indifferent.’ The latter meaning is not doubt derived from jali ‘rest, etc.’ Cf. also mo. jaliqay ‘lazy.’ Here we have a definite correspondence with tu. (Baraba) yikat ‘laziness.’ See SG, 313; and Müit, 2332h, for further examples. This correspondence, which is not discussed by Poppe (VGAS) or Ränsänen (VEWT), deserves attention.

For the Ali Tatar, see HCG, 240-242, 245. As for the Ikires (on which cf. ibid., 31-32, 41, 59, 407), some of them had already joined Çinggis Qan, see § 120.

Terge Emel is an emendation of the text, which has ‘Dergek and Emel,’ taken by the editors of the SH to be two separate individuals, as evident from the glosses. Cf. also § 176, where we have ‘Terge and Emel (= Emel).’ See HCG, 407-409; Li, 155, n. 141; Ligeti 1966, 135-136, n. 18. Cf. Mo, 94, n. 89. (For the initial a [a] = e in Uighur-Mongolian script, cf. Lettres, 13.)

Alqū (as in Alqū Bulaq; see above) = Alqii (‘Saranapari-la’). Cf. Gol., I, 35c (> Les., 31a), and kalm. alqii id. (KW, 7a).

For the Qorolas, see § 120, where its chief Seeli’ is mentioned among the tribal leaders who had then joined Çinggis Qan. The name of the chief that Suqii(<J) = mo. jali ‘flame’ acquires in the transcriptions of our text is Çanqai or Çanq’ai, as written by Qonqirad and the Ikires. See HCG, 59-60; however, in spite of Pelliot’s learned note, the identity of this tribe and its relation with the later Qorol is not clear. Cleaves (Cl, 52, 69, 110, 111) and Ono (a. 16725: 366a) read the name in question as Qorol or Qoralas; Ligeti transcribes the same name, as given in the passes corresponding to the SH, §§ 120 and 141 in the AT.
(AT, 31b, 41a), as Qorlos and Gorlos respectively (ATL, 78, 99). To read the name with initial I instead of Q, and to automatically identify it with the Gorlos (as Gaadaamsba and Cerensoom do following Dandinsiüm and, ultimately, Kozin and the AT) is, I think, unwarranted at this stage.

The Naiman ("The Eight") tribe is mentioned here for the first time. It was one of the most important tribal complexes at the time. Their centre of gravity was in northwestern Mongolia, in the area between the Khangai and Altai Mts. The titles and names of their ooms, who belonged to the Gūčūh clan (see below), are Türkic, but the name of the tribe is Mongol and so, no doubt, were most of its tribesmen. See HCG, 215-221; Murayama 1958/59; Li, 161; n. 196; Čėk, 1 and n. 1, et passim; Šastiša 1975, 235-238; YShi, 73-74. Cf. also Hung 1956, 31. For the Naiman leader Buyruq (tu. Buyruq) Qan who rallied to Jamuqa, see Pelliot 1944b, 44-48; HCG, 297-298 (for a discussion of his name); CLC, 321-322; Pritsak 1988, 768; and further on, §§ 151 and 158. Gūčūh (=- Gūcūh of § 158) is the plural of Gūčūh which in the form kūčūgūr (=- kūᶜū’ur) appears in the SH, § 89, as the designation of a sort of fieldmouse. See Pelliot 1944b, 40-41; HCG, 221, 307. However, according to Poppe (p.c.), a clan or tribe is unlikely to have assumed such a derogatory name. He suggests that the name may be related to kε̄kε̄ḡε̄m ‘buzzard, lannergeyger.’ See KIR, I, 474b (=- 462b, s.v. ‘żura’ I, 1) We know that the Naiman were strongly influenced by Türkic culture. Cf. below, nn. 151, 158. Kūčūgūr (=- Gūcūhur) appears as a proper name in §§ 120, 124, 202-223. Cf. Bese 1988, 26-27. For k- g, see ‘Quelques problèmes’, 240-241.

For Toqto’a Eeki of the Merkit, see above, nn. 102 and 109. The name of his eldest son, ‘Qutu’, poses a problem, since he is called Qutu in §§ 142, 144, 157, 162 and 236, but Qutud in §§ 117, 197, 198 and 199, and the probably correct (i.e. original) reading should be Quto (see HCG, 284-287); in any event, we are dealing here with a different personage from the Quto (Murtič) of § 124.

Quduqa Beki of the Oyirt will reappear in the following sections (§§ 142, 143 anc 144). The name Oyirt occurs here for the first time. For this important tribe – the ancestors of the present-day Oirats and of their largest language group, the Kalmucks – see NCHK, I, 4-5 et passim; Mu, I, 320, n. 10; A. Oëir in MNT, I, 70-72. There is a vast literature in western languages, Chinese, Mongolian and Japanese on the later Oirats and Kalmucks. See, provisionally, IEEC, 321-325; PCA, 310b (s.v. ‘Kalimu’), 314b (s.v. ‘Oyrat Federation’); DHMEM, 262 (s.v. ‘Oirat’); MUFGK, 589 (s.v. ‘Kal’mucken’), 602 (s.v. ‘Oirad – Oyirad’); HKMYS; OLTMSKL; OTSB; HEM, I, 2 et passim; HEMAC, 84a; NHMO, 262a; MCS, 452b (s.v. ‘Kalmuck Mongols’) and 456a (s.v. ‘Oirad Mongols’); HMM, 466a (s.v. ‘Kalmucks’) and 470a (s.v. ‘Oirats’); Okada 1972a; idem 1974; idem 1987; Miyawaki 1984; and below, n. 239. For their habitat, see below, n. 144.

For Tarqutai Kirtinuq of the Tayıl’ut, see § 79; for Qodun Orćenq and A’ułu Bas’atour, see HCG, 147, 158-162. The reading Orćen instead of Orćan is supported by AT, 41a. In this section the word qan occurs again in the form qa (three times), as in §§ 57 and 126. See above, n. 57.

The ‘confederates’ of Akuqi Bulaq (‘Sarsaparilla Spring’) were elected as their leader Jamuqa ‘the Jajirat’ (Jajiradai). Jajiradai is the ethnonim of Jajirat or Jajirat, and in § 40 it is used as a proper name. In the same § 40, Jamuqa is said to belong to the Jadaran clan, which is the same as the Jajirat (pl. Jajirat). See above, n. 49, and HCG, 28-29; cf. Bese 1988, 23-24. The election occurs in two stages. In the first stage, the tribal leaders convene, resolve their differences and make an alliance, deciding to elect as their leader (qa), but actually qa (in the text; see above) Jamuqa. The alliance is formally consecrated with the ritual harking of a stallion and a mare. For a discussion of this practice, see HCG, 411; Serroux 1958, 290-291; Li, 156, n. 141; Aubin 1978, 44-45; Sinor 1990, 302-303. Cf. also L. C. Goodrich in JAOS 82:1962, 542 and n. 62 for further references. Regarding the sacrifice, the SH account is again at variance with
gloss ("the land corner of the island") clearly indicates that the translators had in mind a peninsula, not an island, i.e. the peninsula formed by the bend of the river at the confluence, as Pelliot correctly interpreted. Mač has been written about the title giř gagn, used earlier by the Qara Kitai rulers of the Western Liao (919) (see below, n. 151), as well as by the Kereit tribal leaders. Its meaning is "Universal Ruler." See HCG, 248–249; NAP, I, 225–226; TMEN, no. 1672; HCSL, 431; Kuhayzinski 1978, 129; G. Kara in OMTS, 1988, 56; ČK, 57 and n. 83; Zimonyi 1985, 1988. Obviously, Jamuqa was given this high-sounding title not only to match, but also to overshadow the title of gann assumed by Činggis. As noted by Clark 1978, 44, the present events culminating in Jamuqa’s election are entered in the SH under a specific year, but no date is given for the earlier and, from the SH point of view, more important election of Činggis Qan (§ 123). Clark explains this with ‘a different textual background in the two instances, that is, the availability and use of annals in the second (141) but not in the first (123).’ It is also possible that the date was introduced in the text because this is the first instance of a qurtla, or general assembly of tribal chiefs, whereas, as already pointed out, Činggis’ election – or rather pre-election – was essentially a family affair. See above, n. 123 (ad fin.).

Nothing is known about Qoridai of the Qorolas who informed Činggis Qan of the coalition’s plan to attack him and Ong Qan. Qoridai (Qor = suff.: - dai) rather a common name among the Mongols. Cf. HCG, 62–63; Bese 1974, 92; Poppe 1975, 162. His identity is confirmed by Rašid al-Dīn (SL, I/2, 130), where also more details of his mission are given. However, the story as related in the SH and the SWCECL (as well as by Rašid) is quite different from that of the SH and the differences have been highlighted by Pelliot (HCG, 411 ff.).

The Mongol term here variously translated as *word* and *news* is kele, lit. ‘tongue.’ Its usual meaning in contexts such as the present one is that of ‘oral and secret information,'
intelligence.’ Cf. also the expression kele ab- in the next paragraph
and in n. 142 below.

‘Passed it on’, lit. ‘sent, bringing this news.’

‘As soon as Ong Qan received the news’, lit. ‘Ong Qan having Činggis Qa’an caused him (i.e. Ong Qan) to receive the news.’

According to our text, Činggis’ camp at the time was ‘in Görelig’, i.e. in the Görelig Mountains south of Khentei Khan (see above, n. 89), last mentioned in § 129 (deest apud HW, 175b).

§ 142. For Altan, Quca and Darlai (Otogiin), see above, n. 122.

‘Sent as vanguard’s’ (manglai yaba’ulba). Manglai is, literally, ‘the forehead.’ As a military term it means ‘the vanguard’, see above, n. 4. In the present section, this term occurs in the two forms manglai and manglan, the latter being the plural. See Street 1990a, 355, 3.2 (A).

Senggüm (= Senggün), Ong Qan’s son, is the same personage called Nilqa (= Ilqa) Senggün elsewhere (§§ 165, 166, 167). On him and his name, see HCC, 331-335, and below, n. 162.

Jaqa Gambu, Ong Qan’s younger brother, has already been mentioned in §§ 107 and 108; whereas Bilge Beki, mentioned here for the first time, will reappear in § 181. For Bilge (= tu. bilgi ‘wise’) in proper names, see HCC, 80, 250, 396; Rybachytsky 2000, 228-229.

‘Patrolman’ renders Mongolian gara’ul (= mo. qarqul) from qara- ‘to look at’ and the deverbal noun suffix -ul (= mo. -ul). In modern usage it means ‘watchman, guard.’ See GWM, 46, § 153. For this term, also TMEN, n. 276; ‘Trois Documents’, 437, n. 22; Róma-Tas 1986, 135; Kahluzhskiy 1978, 131; Nam 1994, 197. For a detailed description of the use of patrolmen or scouts by the Mongol army, see HTSL, 20a-b, CG, 183-184. ‘An observation post’ is, literally, ‘one post of patrolmen’ (niken sa’anin qara’ul). For sa’anin (= mo. saanin), ‘is, seat’, see TMEN, n. 211; Od’. III, 128, n. 1.

THE SECRET HISTORY

Engeen Gületi (‘Having a Single Apricot [Tree]’?) is an unknown locality, but judging from the context it must have been a hill or mountain in the general area of the two mountains Čekher and Ciqurq in the region of the Khalha and Urshun rivers in eastern Mongolia, just like the locality called Ukiya. Mount Čekher and Mount Ciqurq are first mentioned in § 61. See above, n. 61.

‘To gain information’ is the regular rendering of Mongolian kele ab-, lit. ‘to catch a tongue.’ Cf. Les., 447a: ‘To receive or gather information.’ Cf. also Mo. 80. However, as pointed out by Ligei, this is a technical term meaning ‘to catch an enemy who voluntarily or under coercion gives information about his own camp’ (Li, 136, n. 142). This kele, as a military term, means both a prisoner who could supply secret information under interrogation, and the information itself. A similar usage is found in Russian, yazym meaning ‘tongue, language’ as well as ‘military information.’ Cf. also mo. kele ilege ‘to send a tongue (= a spy).’ For the gathering of intelligence during a military campaign in Činggis’ time, cf. Nam 1994, 196-198.

The men forming the vanguard of Jamiuq’s army were mentioned in § 141.

‘Our vanguard shouted at them, and they shouted back (ungilaladul ungilja).’ Cl. 69, translates ‘Our vanguards cried unto those. While they were crying, ...’. However, I think with Ozawa (Oz’, III, 130, n. 5) that the expression ungilaladul ungilja means ‘to shout at each other’, lit. ‘to shout, shouting at each other (= exchanging loud calls).’ The literary Mongolian meaning of ungilja, mo. ungili, is ‘to read, to recite’, but its original meaning was ‘to call, to shout.’ However, in Preclassical and Middle Mongolian, this verb is already attested with the meaning of ‘to read, to recite’, with special reference to holy texts and scriptures, such as the Koran and Buddhist stasas, in the forms umsi- and ungilji-. Cf. Cleaves 1954, 68a (s.v. ‘umsi-’), and MA, 364b, 505b. For umsi- – ungilji-, cf. IB/CS, 32 (where, however, м – нг [ŋ] is not discussed); MXTXU, 170.
For jibšer- (AT), jibšīyere-: 'to organize one's forces, reform one's ranks', cf. TH, 298-299 (= JYT, 519).

The ancient Inner Asian method of corrugating up rain and billiards required the use of a rainstone which was put into water. This magic stone, usually a boxaor (i.e. a hard-core concretion found in the stomach or intestines of certain animals, mostly ruminants), is called yut syat in Turkic and jada in Mongolian. Thus, this term acquired the extended meaning of 'rain-magic' and 'magic rain (or storm)'. See Pelliot in TP 13:1912, 436-438, n. 1; Pelliot 1930c, 299-301; NMF, I, 424-425; NHIO, 8-9, n. 3; SI, 525-528; TMEN, nos. 157, 1822, 1833; Poppe 1955, 59; Li, 150, n. 143; Boyle 1972a, 84ff.; BBS, 190-191, 251; ČK, 58, n. 88; and Korell, 1989, for other examples of this practice, as well as the full treatment of the subject in WMIA. In our text, jada is rendered in the Chinese interlinear version as 'the operation (lit. "affair") that can bring about wind and rain', and 'wind and rain' (Y 4.20) reference is made to the magic stone. The expression jadalaqen bolon is, literally, 'doing (fr. "se mettant à" [A.M.]) jadala-', Jadala- meaning 'to make a jada', i.e. 'to conjure up a rainstorm'. For the entire sentence cf. Lettres, 76.

'We are not loved by Heaven!'—in Mongolian the verb is in the past tense (ta'alaqada, not ta'alaqadaha as in L', 96) because this is a general statement of fact made at the time of, or immediately after, a particular event. For the common use of the Mongolian past (in its various forms) for our present tense, cf. for example the copula billage used for both past and present events ("was" and "is"); and expressions like psyrusian billage = 'originates.' See Mo., xiii.

For mihšīr (MKM V, 2, 99-103 (esp. p. 103) [5]). For the concept of Heaven's love and protection as a prerequisite for success, see de Rachewitz 1973, 27. Cf. §§ 167, 246.

§ 144. The Ulha Taq (= Uliu Ta', Turkic for 'Great Mountain') on the southern side of the Altai has been identified by Perlee with the Butaq Uul, or Bulak Ulz, near the Sinkiang border at
context, the debt of vengeance – in the present case towards the hated Tayiū’it – had priority over Cinggis’ personal ambitions. 
Jamaq’s former allies dispersed in various directions, clearly heading for their home grounds. We do not know who were those among them that Jamaq ‘plundered’ in his flight. The Naiman returned to their (winter) camp in the Uliq Taq area (see above), the Merkit made for theirs along the Selenga south of the Baikal (see above, n. 54), while the Oyrat headed for their forest grounds along the Ulüqij River west of Lake Khabsgul (or Kōbsgōl, kh. Kùvsqōl Nuur). The Tayiū’it, too, made for their camps on the Onon, but with Cinggis Qan on his heels, their chief A’ułu Ba’aitur hastily moved his people and, crossing the river from the south, prepared to fight the pursuer. The place where the encounter took place is called Hile’it (incorrect for Ulengü Turus, a yet unidentified locality). This place-name has been extrapolated from Pelliot from the SH text with the help of the parallel accounts in Raqšid’s work and the SWCCCL; in fact, the SH treats this double place-name as two separate meaningful words (hile’it turasat) glossed as ‘the remaining ones having square shields’ (多餘方陣者). The correct reading is Ulengü Turas-tur at Ulengü Turas.’ See Pelliot 1930a, 200-202; HCG, 392. This obvious error of the Ming editors of the SH has been retained in some modern translations, although with reservations, in order to adhere to the text as handed down. Cf. O’z, III, 137, 139, n. 3; and O’z, i, 155, 173, n. 4; Cl, 70 and n. 34; Ta, 70; On, 59 and n. 163. Li, 50, transcribes the place-name as ‘Hilel-i turas’, which presupposes a written form ‘Olegld Turas’ unsupported by the majority of mss. of Raqšid al-Din and by the SWCCCL. The meaning of the name Ulengü Turas is not clear. It has been suggested that in this context, turas may be a plural of tura ‘fortress’ or ‘shield’ (cf. TMEN, no. 958); however, according to the SWCCCL, this locality was a plain, or grassland (veh $20). See Pelliot, loc. cit. Cf. Ligeti 1972, 9, n. 16. With regard to hile’it, Poppe 1975, 166, writes: ‘hile’it “superior” plur. of SH hile’it “superior”, Mo. ilegai, Kh. illa, Bur. sulm “il.” However,
Pope’s interpretation is not pertinent in view of the reading Ülengit.
‘Right next to each other’, lit. ‘being (or standing, holding a position) against (= in close proximity to) each other’ (tištāqīs) – so close, in fact, that they were touching each other [H.S.]. Cf. HW, 142.
‘When people arrived, fleeing in disarray.’ The people in question were, of course, the Tayyī‘at women, children and old people displaced by the Mongol attack and the ensuing battle. As was the custom, they formed for protection a fortified ‘circular camp’ with their wagons and carts – the gūre’en (on which see above, n. 90; cf. also § 145) – as close as possible to their own troops. ‘Alongside, lit. ‘with.’
§ 145. ‘The bleeding’, lit. ‘the blood’ (āstun).
‘Was in a great plight’ (aṃdātāraṃun), i.e. in a fluster for being frustrated in his attempt to stanch the blood. Cf. mo. amāru: ‘to be in a hurry, excited.’
Jelmė’s prompt action probably saved Činggis Qan’s life, but it is not clear at first sight what was the purpose of it. The same technique is described in § 173 when Öggöl (Činggis’s third son), also wounded in the neck, was treated in the same manner by Borouq: the clotting blood was removed from the wound by sucking. In Činggis’s case, the bleeding could not at first be stopped and this had him worried. When it did stop, and the blood coagulated, Jelmė kept on removing the clot so as to let the blood flow freely. Grousset (CW, 103) says, ‘In the manner of the Mongol “doctors”, he (Jelmė – I.R.) sucked the clotted blood from the wound.’ However, neither Grousset (cf. also EM, 114), nor Vladimircuv (GKV, 38-39), nor most of the biographers of Činggis Qan and commentators of the SH explain the true reason for the removal of the clotted blood. Cf., e.g., ČQT, I, 252. This, as correctly surmised by Ratchnevsky, is found in the fact that among the steppe nomads it was common to use poisoned arrows; hence, the continuous flow of blood from the wound would reduce the danger of dying of poison, and the prolonged treatment had the effect also of preventing an air embolism. See CK, 59 and n. 93 (= CK, 65); cf. Ev-Pop, 277, n. 72; Kaszuba 1996, 63 (where, however, the numbering of the notes is incorrect); and Mersov 2000, 41. Jelmė, then, appears to have been smarter than Činggis, who had previously tried to stanch the blood. There is no mention of this event in the Persian and Chinese sources; it may indeed be an epic piece not resting on actual fact (see also below, n. 146). For this episode in relation to Jelme’s shooting at Činggis’s horse (§ 147), see below, n. 147.
For qebčasum ‘clothes, garments’ (= qebčon [§ 136], cf. GWM, 44, § 137), see TMEN, no. 263. Cf. Gantogtoj 1990, 125.
‘Everything’ (bāqādā-yi [acc.]). For the position of bāqādā in the present construction, cf. Cleaves 1959, 82, n. 220.
‘But for his pants’, lit. ‘with only pants’ (qangō dōt onijin). This can only refer to trousers or breeches, not to undergarments, i.e. underpants, which the Mongols of the time did not wear, as aptly pointed out by H. Serreys (p.c.). Hence, renderings like ‘inner pants’ (On, 59) are not accurate. For dōt oni = mo. doṣan, doṣonji ‘trousers, pants’, cf. Oz, III, 155, n. 10. On the question of why Jelmė would have stripped himself of most of his clothing (as a preliminary to an execution?), cf. Lackendorf’s remarks in Lackendorf 1977, 30.
For the word čurama in the expression čurama niqūun ‘stark naked’, cf. DO, 719b.
‘Into the midst of the enemy’ (dayin dostorā’un). For dostorā’un (= pmo. dostorun), see Ligeti 1971, 147. AT1, 42a, has dostor (or dostorā) ‘inside, within.’
‘The people who had set up a circular camp (gūreleken = gūreleken) over there’ – referring to the enemy barricade of carts set up nearby as related in § 144.
‘A large covered bucket of curds’ (hār tešī tarag). This expression has been the subject of much discussion and varying interpretations. See Oz, III, 155-157, n. 12. The above translation is based on the Chinese gloss (一個大器皿盒的點).
All about the place where he was sitting', lit. 'all about that place where he was sitting.'

'Couldn't you have spat farther away?', lit. 'How would it have been if you spat afar?'

'I swallowed what I could swallow and spat out what I could spit out,' lit. 'I swallowed the swallowing (= what is swallowed) and spat out the spitting out (= what is spat out).'

This phrase can also be rendered: 'Some I swallowed, some I spat out.' For jalki - jalgī 'to swallow', cf. Moestaert 1956, 6, n. 8. In view of the circumstances it seems strange that Çinggis Qan should have been upset by the bloody mess made by Jelme. As is well known, the Mongols had taboos concerning the spitting of blood on the ground, and on chewing (cf. Jackendoff 1977, 30); however, I think that the point of the episode is to enhance further Jelme's devotion to his master by stressing the fact that he was even forced to swallow much of the blood himself.

'Quite a lot went also into my stomach!', lit. 'how much also went into my stomach' - a rhetorical question.

'And have just come in haste to join you' (danūr edbi idīfī īreba bi). For the verb idīre 'to catch up (with someone), to overtake (§ 146 ad fn.), to fast approach (§ 189)', see below, n. 189.

The passage 'Then, I would have jumped on a horse ... I went there' has been translated and discussed in Mo, 61-63 (where, on p. 63, a more literal rendering than mine is provided).

Please note that the phrase 'in that brief moment' (lit. 'in the time as long as that') I would surely have got back! is put as a negative rhetorical question in the original ('would I not have come back?'). Also, my rendering 'because I wished to get back in time' is, literally, 'saying, 'I would that I arrive in time."

The idiom 'without so much as blinking an eye', i.e. 'boldly, resolutely', is, literally, 'the eye remaining black' (nidīn qara).

This is the generally accepted interpretation. Cf. Na², 133; Mo, 62-63; Da¹, 81; Li, 51; Cl, 72; On, 60; Ev-Pop, 104. However, some scholars disagree. Pe, 169, n. 1, suggests 'Aveuglement?"
A 'avegcoli?'; Do', 113 (and 115, n. 2) renders it as 'going against the staring eyes' on the untenable assumption that qara here does not mean 'black' but 'to look at' (§); and Oz', III, 149, after having discussed the previous interpretations (ibid., 161-162, n. 21), opts for the rendering 'without even looking opposite (or across)', thus adopting Pelliot's suggestion. Cf. Oz', I, 174, n. 4. The issue is unfortunately not cut-clear-cut, also because AT', 43a, has nidun qara accompanied with the gloss ajelte 'viewpoint'; having a view', which is not pertinent. Sastina (LDAT, 116), following the general interpretation, translates 'without blinking the eyes.'

'In former days, when the Three Merkit came and thrice circled Mount Burqan, you saved my life for the first time.' See §§ 102-103 for the event in question. Although Jelme is mentioned (§ 103) in connection with it, his role as 'saviour of Činggis Qan is not fully explained, like Bo'orul' role as referred to in § 205. Cf. 72, renders qaci bâlqâ dar as 'at the moment when ... were making [me] to go round about', instead of 'circled.' However, in view of a number of the obvious meaning of qaci̇ul' 'to circle' in § 102 (cf. Mo, 33, Cl, 35), and the identical acceptance of this verb in the temporal clause of § 111 (see above, n. 111), I think there is no justification for altering the translation. Cf. Oz', I, 157. The use of the factitive form in the SH for non-factitive purposes deserves thorough investigation. Cf. also § 199 and 205. 'You saved my life' is, literally, 'you took out my life', i.e. out of danger.

'You restored me to life', lit. 'you opened up my life', i.e. 'you let it flow (again).'

'Disregarding your life', lit. 'forsaking your life.'

'You quenched my thirst', lit. 'you provided me with sufficient drink.'

'Restored life to me', lit. 'you made life enter into me again.'

§ 146. According to the sequence of events as presented in the SH, Činggis resumes his campaign the following morning by pursuing the Tayi̇l'utt fugitives. This means that either his neck wound was not as serious as we are led to believe in § 145, or (as is more likely) the whole episode concerning Jelme is an epic theme, as so many others in the SH, regarding which cf. Pelliot's remarks in HCG, 82.

For Sorqan Shari of the Sudus, a retainer of the Tayi̇l'utt, see above, n. 82. His daughter Qada' an had already been mentioned in § 85. Her husband was a Tayi̇l'utt.

The man went ... the man returned', lit. 'That man went ... that man returned.'

'As my husband was being killed' (erre-yi'ên alaqadurun). For this passive construction, see Poppe 1964, 375-374.

'He dismounted near Qada' an ..., but her husband had already been killed by our soldiers', lit. 'Činggis Qan' s dismounted at (= by, near) Qada' an ... Our soldiers had beforehand (= already) killed her husband.'

'Great army' (yeke 'erekî). 'Great here is either an epithet for the qan's army (cf. above, n. 121) or, as suggested by N. Poppe (p.c.), it designates the main body of the army. The latter interpretation has been adopted in On, 61, and Ev-Pop, 105.

He invited Qada' an to come to him and had her sit by his side', i.e. in a place of honour, meaning probably (but not necessarily), that he took her as a secondary wife. See HCG, 153. Činggis Qan was indebted to Qada' an, as to the rest of her family, for his escape from the Tayi̇l'utt camp as related in §§84-87. His obligation is aptly recalled in the poetic passage of this section.

Qada' an's father Sorqan Shari turned up soon after together with another personage who will become a legend in his own time, viz. Jebe. Jebe, whose original name was Jirqo' adai, was a Besi, a clan related to the Tayi̇l'utt through their common ancestor Caraqi Linggu (see above, n. 47, and HCG, 132), some members of which had earlier rallied to Činggis Qan (see § 120). However, most of the Besi had apparently remained with the Tayi̇l'utt as subordinate tribesmen. Cf. §§ 119 and
"The wooden canege", lit. 'the canege wood' (farbiyal mudan), i.e. the wood that constituted the canege — in opposition to kânda mudan 'the heavy wood' of the preceding verse. The term for 'canege' used in §§ 81, 83, 84, 85 and 112 (see above, n. 81).

'Why, then, did you delay coming to me?' The question is pertinent in view of the fact that other Reisi tribemen had rallied to Činggis Qan earlier on (see above). However, as Sorqan Şira explains, it was essential for the family's safety to wait for the right opportunity to desert the Taylîut. I. II. 1963b, 60, writes: 'It required nerve and good timing to elude the obligations of collective responsibility imposed by the institution of the subordinate tribe.' Cf. also ibid., 64; and Ratchetvsky 1987, 65.

"My wife and children", lit. 'my wife and child (or son: eme kǔ'ān) in the singular; however, I know that Sorqan Şira had more than one child. See § 85. Thus here, as in other instances, eme kǔ'ān is eme kǔ'āt. Cf. Kalužyñski 1992:23, 278-280; see also above, n. 104 and below, n. 174, 185.

"At heart (lit. 'within myself') I felt full confidence in you" (bi dotòrañ an bōlen ikel seti, bōlen 'ready, in order', the word conveying the idea of 'trust' like its Chinese counterpart pei). The sectional summary reads: 'In my own heart I was already relying on you' (桻身己心負盡). Hence I am inclined to take the expression bōlen ikel to mean literally 'ready-made (= complete) confidence (or faith, trust), rather than 'present support.' See Öz', III, 170-171, n. 5, 6.

"We came in haste to join our Qan'ân, lit. 'we came overtaking (idūc̄qā) to join our Qan'ân.' For the verb idīṛe-, cf. above, n. 145, and below, n. 189.
§ 147. For the battle of Köyüten, see § 143 and com.

The passage ‘Who ... the white mouth?’ has been translated and discussed, e.g. ‘To sever the neckbone,’ lit. ‘to break the first vertebra (i.e. the atlas).’ The expression aman niri’a designates the first cervical vertebra or atlas. See Mo, loc. cit.

The particular characteristics of a qula or ‘tawny horse’ (‘yellow horse’ γύλα, according to the Chinese gloss) are a fallow coat, a black mane and tail, and a black stripe along the spine. Cf. also above, n. 87.


‘If I be favoured’ (suyorqaqda’as). The verb suyorqaq - ‘to show favour, to grant permission, to bestow, etc.’ is, together with the deverbal noun suyorqal ‘favour, grant’, an important social and economic term in medieval Mongolian phraseology. On it see Pelliot 1930x, 302-303, n. 1; TMEN, nos. 228, 229; Murakami 1961, 311ff. (cf. MTSK, 173-186 et passim); idem 1983, 102; Sugita 1979, 43-45; TUEMC, 109, 184; ISK, 155, 178, 469. In the present context, however, suyorqaqda’as must simply mean ‘if the Qan’s deigns to spare my life.’

Regarding the poetic passage and images such as ‘to divide (lit. ‘to cut across [or asunder]’) the deep water’ and ‘to crumble the shining stone’, cf. the saying in § 72 and com., and § 209. The verb qal- ‘to lay hands on’ has also the related meaning of ‘to provoke, to attack’, as in this passage and in §§ 174 and 209. Cf. Mo, 52. The meaning ‘to attack’ given in Kow., 796b, is not registered in Les., 916a.

‘For the Qan’ (q’an-u emine), lit. ‘before the Qan.’ For emine = ‘in favour of, for’, cf. Cleaves 1962, 102, n. 36; Buck, 99-100, n. 31.

‘In the place which I am told to reach ... At the time when I am told to attack’, lit. ‘In the place which (= where) he (i.e. the Qan’) shall have said, ‘Reach! ... At the time when he shall have said, ‘Attack!’’’ Cf. Cl. 74. Jebe means that he will do his utmost to carry out the orders of his new leader if he is spared. The different colours and characteristics of the stones (blue, black, shining) have, I believe, no symbolic value in these old sayings, but are there for stylistic reasons, such as contrast and parallelism, as well as for poetic imagery. The linguistic features of the alliterative passage, in particular the use of the so-called preverbs, such as buqqata ‘(to cleave) asunder’ and čerqu ‘(to break) to pieces’, are discussed in Bese 1969, 123-125; LSHM, 38; and OZ, 111, 176-178, nn. 4, 5. Cf. also Cerénsdörn 1986, 77-78.

‘When it comes to his former killings and hostile actions’, lit. ‘the fact that he has killed and that he has acted as an enemy.’

‘Conceals his person and hides his tongue’ - obviously an idiom for ‘to keep out of the way and avoid talking.’ Cf. the English colloquialism ‘to lie low.’ For the Mongolian expression, cf. VG, 57-58.

Qirq’sadai means ‘The Six’, or, as Pelliot writes, ‘Sixizine’ (HCG, 155). Cf. Poppe 1975, 162. On the other hand, Ligeti is of the opinion that if means ‘man of the Qirq’an clan’ (Li, 156, n. 147). However, H. Serruyx (p.c.) writes: ‘Ligeti seems to have understood Qirq’adai, but is there such a clan (Qirq’anair?)? For Qadai, i.dai, cf. HJAS 14 (1951), 353; visiširte ‘Le Neuf.’ I understand Qirq’adai ‘Mr. Six’, ‘The One Six’.” Cf. also ‘Trois documents’, 473.

Jebe, besides its usual meaning of ‘weapons’ in general, apparently designated also a particular type of arrow which has not yet been clearly identified and which, as we can infer from the context, was the one Qirq’adai had used to kill Çinggis Qan’s horse. See the discussion in HCG, 155-156; TMEN, no. 156; and OZ, III, 175, n. 1. However, Cleaves understands differently, and perhaps correctly, as follows: ‘The name Jebe means “Weapon.” He is so named, as we see, from the fact that he shot the jebeleqqa qula, “the war qula” or, more literally, “the qula which served as a weapon (jebe),” and that Çinggis Qahan says: “jebeleye imayi” “I shall use him as a weapon (jebe),” i.e.-
"instead of my jebelegi uqa which he shot." (Cl, 75, n. 43.) For the verb jebele-, cf. TMEN, no. 153. Mostuert (u.n.) understands: ‘je me servis de lui à la guerre.’

Keep by my side!, i.e. like the jebe-arrows (or the weapons) that one carried in the quiver or at one’s side.

The Jebe episode as related in the SH may also be an epic theme like that involving Jelmé (§ 145). For the treatment of this episode in both its social and historiographic aspects, see Jackendoff 1977, 29-31.

§ 148. ‘The men of Tayîlı’u line-age’ (Tayîlı’utatay vassita gu’n’an). For vassita, lit. ‘having the borne’ (= lineage), see above, n. 112. From the expression hânci’ser keyisgen ‘blowing to the winds like hearth-ashes’ (on which cf. above, n. 87), we may infer that Cinggis Qan also rooted out the family of A’uçu Ba’atür and the other Tayîlı’u chief as was to be expected in view of the long and bitter feud. Cf. Ratchevsky 1967, 77. On A’uçu Ba’atür and Qotosa (= Qodun) Örceng (called here Qoton Örceng – Qoton and Qotom being indistinguishable in Uighur-Mongol script), see above, n. 141. For the name Qudu’dar (§ Qudidar), see HCQ, 390-391. Cl, 76, and On, 63, render kidas as ‘to slay’ and ‘to kill’ respectively; however, this verb has a stronger meaning, as it combines the idea of ‘to kill’ with that of ‘to annihilate’, as is evident also from the Chinese glosses (see GHMBK, 461). Cf QNTT, 365a; TMEN, no. 351. Thus, from this section one gains the impression that the Tayîlı’u leaders themselves perished in the onslaught; in fact they no longer appear in the SH narrative, except for Tarqutai Kirištuq who escaped and whose fate is related in the next section. However, the accounts of the same event in the YS’ 1, 4, SL’ 2, 116; and SWCCL 1, 24b-25a, differ from the SH. The YS states that Qanggu (= A’uçu [Ba’atür]) was defeated and put to flight. Rasid al-Din says that A’uçu, together with Qoton Örceng (these names are spelled differently; cf. HCG, 147, 158-160) fled to the Barqin. Another Tayîlı’u chief, Quril (Ba’atür), who is not mentioned in the SH, took refuge with the

Naiman, while Tarqutai Kirištuq and Qudidar were killed at Ulengüi Turas (cf. above, n. 144). The SWCCL agrees with Rasid; however, it specifies that Tarqutai Kirištuq and Qudidar were only ‘captured’ by Cinggis Qan (cf. HCG, 390) in the Ulengüi Turas steppes. A’uçu Ba’atür appears again in the SWCCL, 31a, s.a. 1202. For the discrepancies between the above accounts and the SH, cf. HCG, 161-162. Remnants of the Tayîlı’u tribesmen supporting Jamuqa were not conquered by Cinggis until 1204. See § 196.

Quba Qaya, Turke for ‘Reddish (or, better, “Orange”), i.e. between red and yellow; but see ED, 581a ‘rock’; was the name of a mountain in eastern Mongolia near the Manchurian border which, according to Perle, 8 (= Perle’s, 93), should be identified with present-day Xuva Dubu (mo Quba Dubu) at 48° N 109° E. Cf. RBC, 89; Boyle 1973, 73. For tu. qayu ‘rock’, cf. TMEN, no. 316. As noted by Pelliot (HCG, 418-419) and Li, 126, it is strange to find a Turkic place-name so far to the east; Pelliot suggests that it may come from the Turkic-speaking entourage of Ong Qan; in Rasid al-Din’s chronicle (SL’, 57, 118) this name appears twice, but it is Ong Qan, not Cinggis Qan, who spent the winter there. According to the Persian historian, Cinggis wintered on the confines of north China, in a locality called Çekker – no doubt the Mount Çekker of § 61, etc., in the region of the Khalkha and Urshun rivers, i.e. in the same general area of Quba Qaya. See above, n. 61. Quba Qaya as a wintering place for Cinggis Qan is also mentioned again in § 151.

§ 149. This section is an important one for the ideological message that it conveys, viz. the Mongol concept of loyalty to one’s ‘legitimate’ chief or ruler as illustrated in the case of Tarqutai Kirištuq’s capture by Sīrgû’ta and his sons.

In the parallel text of the AT, between §§ 148 and 149, the author has inserted an interesting narrative of an encounter of Cinggis Qan and six of his companions (nûklûf) with a force of 300 Tayîlı’u (AT’, 45a-50a). The lengthy narrative has been incorporated in Damdinsüreng’s version of the SH. See Da’, 95-
107; Da'h, 89-100. Another version of this narrative is found in the ÇQÇ, 126-138. This well-known epic piece of a later date (16th-17th c.) has been translated both partially and in full, and has been dealt with by several scholars, besides being reprinted in Damdinasuren’s anthology of early Mongolian literature (MÜJ, 30-36). See Zam*c., 70-72; LDAT, 118-128; Da'h, 103-126 (the Chinese translation of D)’; Sagadar; 54-62; Clark 1978/79.

Old Sirgü’erti of the Nüüüt (‘Naked’) branch of the Btarin (Btarm) tribe and his sons were former subjects of the Tayčil (Tayči) tribe. For this tribe, see HCG, 34; Cleaves 1956, 202, n. 2. Sirgü’erti, who was later appointed commander of a thousand of the Left by Çinggis Qan, is the ancestor of the famous Generals Bayan (1237-95), on whom see Cleaves 1956; ISK, 584-607. For Sirgü’erti and his sons, see the SH, § 220; HCG, 158, 162-164; and Cleaves 1956, 202-203, n. 3. His younger (? son Nay’a (> Nay’a, pmo. Nayaya; see AT’, 51b) is mentioned again in § 197 in connection with the handing over of Dayir Us’n’s daughter, the beautiful Qulin, to Çinggis Qan during the campaign against the Merkit in 1204. See below, n. 197. For Alaq’s name (‘Multicoloured’), see Bese 1974; Rybarski [2003], s.v.

Tarqauti Kirilku, the most senior Tayčil (Tayči) chief and long-time enemy of Çinggis Qan, was last mentioned in § 141, and according to other sources (see above, n. 148), was killed in battle at Ülenqar (Ülenqar) in 1201. In the present account (which may well be spurious) he fled to the woods after the defeat of his tribe on the Onon following the battle at Kıyiten. He was captured by Sirgü’erti who put him in a cart. The free Chinese summary says that he could not ride a horse because he was too fat (Y 5, 8a); the epithet Tarqauti (= pmo. Tarqauta) means, in fact, ‘Fat’, hence his nickname ‘Fat’ Kirilku. He is referred to as an òštâ gu’l-am, lit. ‘a man who has hate’, which has been taken to mean several things: 1) ‘a hating man’, ‘a man full of hate’; 2) ‘an enemy’, ‘a mortal enemy’, ‘an old foe’; 3) ‘a hated man’; 4) ‘a man against whom one has a grievance’; 5) ‘a man from whom one must exact revenge.’ Hence the different interpretations that we find in the modern translations. In § 133 we first met the plural form òštârin (òštâr), which I rendered ‘mortal enemies’, since this expression was specifically applied to old foes forever harbouring feelings of hatred and seeking revenge, i.e. to implacable enemies. ‘Mortal enemy’ is, indeed, the rendering adopted by Hænisch (Ha, 48; but only as ‘Feindesvolk’) in § 133, p. 38 and Ligeti (Li, 45). The word òštâ means, in fact, both ‘hatred’ and ‘revenge’, the two concepts of odum and uštu being inseparable in the Mongol tradition. Polemics, which is still reflected in the modern languages and dialects. Cf., e.g., ord òštâ ‘hatred’, ‘hatred’, ‘sword’, ‘knife’; kh. òštâ, id.; kalm. òštâ, id.; etc. This problem has been discussed in detail by F. Hamayon (Hamayon 1986; cf. idem 1978, 89-90) and others (see above, n. 58). The Chinese gloss for òštâ and òštën is ‘who has hate’ (òštâ-hâr), but for òštâ in § 267 it is ‘revenge’ (òštâ-ì-yen abâl’ì fêh we took our revenge.’ (In Chinese, the word ch’où ch’i [§ 9, 0] means also ‘hate, hostile, enemy’ as well as ‘revenge’). The verb òštë – òštë (§ 58 et passim; cf. HW, 128; GHMBK, 345) is glossed to ‘requit, avenge’ (òštë). The same verb in the literary language (òštë-) and in the modern spoken languages and dialects means ‘to hate, to harbour a grievance; to act as an enemy; to feel vengeful.’ See Kow., 515a; Les., 645a, Òz’, 1, 244, n. 2. These meanings are all present in no. òštë, òštën (= òštë-yët, òštë-yët; see below) ‘hostile, enemy, vengeful, full of animosity, etc.’, and òštën (= òštë-yët) ‘enemies’, foes,’ Les., 645a-646a.

Cf. kalm. òšt’ ‘feuding, baw, rača; òštë kân ‘ein feindselger, rachsächter mensch’ (KW, 301b). Therefore, it is evident that, since the basic concept of ‘hatre’ implies also that of ‘desire of revenge’, a man ‘who has hate’ (i.e. a hostile man, an enemy) is a man ‘who has the desire of revenge’, ‘a venged man’ (‘ein rachsächter mensch’), rather than a man ‘from whom one must exact revenge’ (‘meritant vengeance’, as in Ev-Pop, 109, § 149; cf. ibid., 95, § 133, ‘dant nous devons tirer vengeance’). The interpretation in Ev-Pop is based on the
notion of vengeance as elaborated in Hamayon 1986, 110-112, where (p. 110 we read: ‘Avoir de l’ulos (osten, HS, 133, 149) revient a avoir une dette de vengeance et ostal usuk (HS, 58, 102, 105, 154; Haenisch 1962: 128, “tier vengeance”), a s’en acquitter.’ In other words, osten tregn are people ‘who owe revenge’, i.e. that one must exact revenge from; and ostal usuk (o ostal e) means ‘to take one’s revenge’ on such people. I think Hamayon is perfectly correct with regard to ostal osta, but I disagree with her concerning osten (osten litiiti), the meaning of which, in my view, can only be, as I explained before, ‘possessing hate/revenge (i.e. desire of revenge) = helper/ vengeful’. Whereas osta in the sense of ‘requisit, retribution’ was, and remains, inseparable from the concept of “hate”, mno. hacti, meaning also ‘requisit, retribution’, was neutral insofar as it can signify ‘revenge’ as well as ‘benefit, reward’ according to the context. See HW, 74; Matériel I, 59. Cf. mno. hacti having ‘(one’s) revenge’ (TDB, 47: F37v; 170, n. 271; Kow., 119f). This dichotomy has been noted by other investigators; cf., e.g., Humphrey in MNT, I, 203-206. Now (hacti) is a true Mongolian word which the early translators and commentators of Buddhist texts used to render sh. phula (“tib. bra iz”)’ fruitn, result) (of act(?)); skr. kri (“tib. lam, dron) ‘deed or service done, benefit’; etc. Cf. Cleave 1954, 56a, MTVB, 127b, s.v. ‘act’. Thus, although originally a neutral word, through Buddhist usage act! acquired in time the positive connotations that we find associated with it in literary Mongolian and the modern dialects. Cf. Les., 7b; DO, 35b; MMED, 38c; etc. On the other hand, osta (ista) – almost certainly a borrowing from Turkic – retained the negative connotations which were already present in t. osta (“m. osto) ‘malice, wrath’ and ‘revenge’; osta (“m. osto) ‘to feel hostile, to desire revenge.’ See ED, 18a-b, 21a; DTS, 375a. Cf. VGAS, 63, 109; TMEN, no. 575. In the SH, besides ota we find also the deverbal noun in -ot (§ 55, 102) with the same meaning, and, in the later literary language, the deverbal nouns in -ye
abduction of Temûjin is given a totally different interpretation from the one related in § 79ff.

'I kept teaching and instructing him (surqan sûyın yahula'tu) or, alternatively, 'I kept on admonishingly teaching him'. For surqan sûyın, cf. Cleaves 1985, 245-246, n. 35.

'He is becoming thoughtful in his actions'. Lit. 'His reason (a'ıy = the ability or faculty to behave rationally) enters (i.e. begins).'

'Once Şirgû'tu has deprived him of his life', lit. 'When Şirgû'tu has finished (bara'a) killing (= has killed) his life.'

For the verb bara'a - 'to finish' as the auxiliary of completed action, see Mo, 114, n. 106, where the present passage is quoted and translated, and above, n. 75.

'Having waited for them to come back', lit. 'having let them come back.'

'The Qutuqul Bend' (Qutuqul [- Qutuqul] Nu'u). For nu'u (> nî in § 94) 'dry ground or plain in the winding of a river', see above, n. 94. This is an unidentified locality in the region of Quba Qaya. Cf. HCG, 162; Perlee, 11 (= Perlee, 100). Perlee, loc. cit., says that it was probably near Gut Dob (i.e. Quba Qaya) of the Kerulen, but I think it more likely that the locality in question was near the Khalkha or Ushun rivers (see above, n. 148).

'People who are not worthy of companionship', lit. 'people without companionship' (nöküdelegi'ün haran). Cf. Ligeti 1971, 145: 'gen's sans compagnonnage'.

'Must be cut down' (mökörü'üldæke). The A'T, 52b, writes mökörügilâldæken with the gloss marja bolyadän, lit. 'cause (zrzp) to become bad', i.e. 'execute!' Mökörüüldæken (cf. the form mökörü'üldægûi almost immediately after) is the passive of the nomen futuri, expressing the necessity to cut (see GWM, 169, § 607), of the fascitive of mökörü, ~ mökore- 'to be completely incapable', which in turn is a middle verb in -ral-re- of mökore- 'to suffer a set-back or ill luck, to collapse, etc.' See DÖ, 468a; Les., 545a-b. For -ri = -ral-re, cf. mo. čuhuri, čuhura- 'to flow, move o. after a.' < čuhur'- id.; SH čaburt'ul- id.
"As asked by several other investigators, Cinggis Qan valued above all loyalty to one's chief, and this was, indeed, the foundation of his power and the guiding principle of his jasaq, or normative law. There are several illustrations of this principle in the SH (cf., e.g., §§ 188, 200, 220); by and large, we can say that the message conveyed by the SH is essentially one of vauntedness with the will of Han to ensure its protection, and of loyal service to one's rightful master to ensure his favour. To break these two rules is tantamount to self-destruction. However, to join a new leader who has validated his claim through victory is done not only with impunity, but brings its own reward. See Li, 157, n. 149; Jakeš 1978, 106; ČK', 60 (= ČK', 65); Ratchnevsky 1987, 67.

As for Tarqai Kiliutuq, the fact that he never reappears and that Râlif al-Dîn makes him die at Ülengü Turas, stating in another passage (SL', 134), that he was killed by a son of Sogqan Sîra, indicates that his hopes for a pardon were dashed and, instead, that we would expect him to have been executed immediately after being handed over to his unforgiving enemy. However, as stated earlier, while Tarqai Kiliutuq undoubtedly perished, the whole episode related in § 149 may well be anecdotal. ČK', 61 (= ČK', 65).

§ 150. In our text the place-name Dersût is written Tersût. According to Li, 157, n. 150, it means 'the Nestorian', tersût being a plural of ters (see pers. tarsu) 'Christian'. (cf. TMEN, no. 880), used here to designate those Nestorian Christians of Turkic tongue who lived in the area of Almašîq (near modern Kulja/Kul'dax-hing) west of the Issyk-kul and north-east of the present Sinkiang border, on this town cf. YShi, 2. This may have been prompted by an early note of Pelliot where he writes, 'Peut-être faut-il comprendre "chez les Tarsîs"' (Pe, 173, n. 1.) Later, however, Pelliot suggested that the reading Tersût of the SH is an error of the Ming transcribers: the original text should...
have been read ‘Dersūt (in Uighur script indistinguishable from Tersūt) = *Dersūt (pl. of deresin) ‘feather-grass, broom grass, Lasiocroftis splendens’; see below, n. 249). See HCG, 225-226. Perelle has also failed to identify this place; however, he wonders whether the name should be read ‘Tehēlu’ and be identified with Gurban Teel (probably corresponding, according to Perelle’s, 8, to the Qurban Telesht of SH, § 177; see below, n. 177) at 4° N 116° W. Cf. Perelle 11 (= Perelle, 89). Regarding Dersūt, H. Serruy writes (p.c.), ‘This name as a place-name appears often in the Minā shih-lu. Monzol place-names are usually names of natural phenomena; and to find the name of a people, or a tribe, as a place-name is rather unlikely. Especially at that early time: the Nestorians could not yet have had such influence that their name became a place-name. That takes time.’ On the other hand, Ligeti’s interpretation may apply to the Dersūt of Rāsid al-Dīn (see Successors, 105 and n. 25, 162, 197, 224), since in Rāsid’s account it refers to the place in Central Asia where Qubilai sent his army against the rebellious Qidū; and this place, as we also know from the YS, was actually Almaqū. See YS 9, 191; 63, 1569; 127, 3113. Cf. KK, 107ff.; Boyle 1973, 75. However, it is very improbable that in this period (1201-02) Činggis Qan was so far out west. This name, which appears only once in the SH, is written Tarqūd pro Tersūt (= Dersūt) in AT, 53a; it has misled Ko, 363 (‘Tāyrūd’). Cf. HCG, 225; Grabar 1985, 28-29, n. 10. See also Murakami’s remarks in Mu, II, 29-30, n. 1. While adopting the reading Dersūt proposed by Pelliot, I have some reservations in view of the AT reading lacking the vowel -el-a after the s (incorrectly written as qy). Jaqa Gambu, Ong Qan’s younger brother, was last mentioned in § 142, when Ong Qan had sent him ahead as vanguard before the battle at Közysten. According to Rachnevsky, the mention of Tersūt and of Jaqa Gambu in connection with a joint campaign with Činggis Qan against the Merkit indicates that the campaign in question — chronologically misplaced in the SH — actually refers to the 1197 expedition of Činggis Qan, Ong Qan and Jaqa Gambu against Toqto’a Beki and the ‘Ulujit Merkit recorded by Rāsid al-Dīn. See ČK, 53 and n. 65 (= CK, 56-57).

‘Činggis Qa’an, Jaqa Gambu and other chief’ (Činggis Qa’an jaqa Gambu ki’et). For this usage of ki’et (= mš. kīged) ‘and others’ = ‘and others like them’ (i.e. chiefs like Altan, Qūdar and Dārītai), which coincides with that of ‘sār-tān, see Cleaves 1949, 127, n. 223; idem 1950, 110, n. 51; O’I, III, 208-209, n. 1. Cf. above, nn. 72, 130.

The ‘Tümen (Ten Thousand) Tübeg’en — a branch, or clan, of the Kereyit — reappears later with the same epithet (§§ 170, 171, 187), except in one case (§ 208) where it is simply referred to as Tübeg’en. Likewise, the Olon (‘Many’ or ‘Numerous’) Donggayit, also a clan of the Kereyit, reappears with (§§ 150, 170, 171, 187) and without (§§ 170, 171, 208) the epithet. This has created a certain inconsistency in the rendering of these names in ČI, 79, 96, 98, 115 and 118 (note 13 on p. 79 is not helpful). The names of those clans were, of course, Tübeg’en (Tübe’en; cf. § 187) and Donggayit (Donggayit), but their frequent designation as Tümen Tübeg’en and Olon Donggayit indicates that these epithets had virtually become part of their names in common Mongol usage. Such numerical designations were, indeed, used frequently by Turkish and Mongolian tribes from early times, as already noted by Pelliot. See HCG, 228-229, where the two clans in question are discussed, and NCHK, I, 56, n. 38, for the epithet tūmen. Cf. also Poppo 1975, 167 (where ‘dongayit’ should read ‘donggayit’). In the ET, the Kereyit tribe itself is referred to as Olan Kereyit, i.e. the Many (or Numerous) Kereyit. See ET, 396f; GOM, 87.

These two branches of the Kereyit tribe, of which Jaqa Gambu was one of the leaders, had obviously separated from the main tribe for reasons unknown to us; and it was Jaqa Gambu who, having just rallied to Činggis Qan, brought them back and made them also join the latter. I share the opinion of Hesnisch (H, 50), Murakami (Mu, II, 23), and Onon (On, 65) that the
subject of the sentence is Jaqa Gamba, as he was a Kereyt chief and the verb is in the factitive (pre'te'le').

In this section, Ong Qan and Yisügei Qan are called Ong Qa'an and Yisügei Qa'an respectively. This, the only occurrence in the whole work where they are referred to with the inappropriate title of qa'an, must be a later editorial or scribal error, since the original would have had only qan as in all other instances (see R, 279b, 342a). It should be noted, however, that the AT has Ong Qayan throughout, and Yisügei is never called either Qan or Yayan, but only Bayayar. See ATI, 222b, 277b-278a; and above, n. 59.

'Because they were living together very harmoniously', lit. 'In that they lived together nicely in peace (sayībar el). 'El (= il) is an important term, like its Chinese counterpart ping 𨀩 'peace; to pacify.' The word is common to both Turkic and Mongolian. See TMEN, no. 633; ED, 121b-122b; C.F. Carlson in AB, 61; and, especially, Erdal 1993, for its various connotations. In the sense of 'peaceful' when applied to people, it meant the people who had been 'pacified,' viz. who lived under the Mongol 'peace,' i.e. the subject people, in contrast to the 'rebel' (bulqa) people, i.e. those not yet pacified (= brought under submission). See 'Trois documents,' 454; Lettres, 27. Cf. below the remarks on the term bulqa.

'They had declared themselves sworn friends.' The declaration of anda-ship or sworn friendship between Ong Qan and Yisügei was mentioned in § 96; the background story is repeated in § 177, with additional details. The various versions of this story (Rašid al-Din, the SWCCCL and the YS) are at variance and at times inconsistent with each other. For a critical analysis, see HCG, 233-248. Thus, in our text, and in the parallel passage in AT², 53a (cf. LDAT, 130), the statement that Ong Qan had killed (Ha, 50, and Li, 55, understand 'wanted to kill') the younger brothers of his father Qurqaq Buluyan Qan, viz. his uncles, is incorrect; the 'younger brothers in question were actually Ong Qan's own brothers, not his father's. They were Tai Tamor Taih and Buqa Temur; another brother, Erke Qara, had escaped in time to the Nairman. Jaqa Gamba remained on good terms with Ong Qan. See the SH, §§ 151, 152 and 177. Ong Qan's father was called Qurqaq, syr. Qurqaqçu (pers. Qurqaqéz/qurqaqéz; cf. SL², l/1, 130). i.e. Cyriacus; and the latter's father was called Marqus (this name is written Maryus in an Arabic-Mongolian document of 1272), syr. Maryez (pers. Maryez; cf. SL², loc. cit.), i.e. Mark — both names indicative of the Christian (Nestorian) faith of Ong Qan's family. See Pelliot 1914, 627; idem 1944b, 52f; HCG, 233, 236; Dauvillier 1948, 308-309; ČK‘, 3 (cf. ČK‘, 4). Buyurq appears as a name here and elsewhere (see, e.g., the Buyurq Qan of the Nairman in §§ 143, 158), but it is actually a title used from antiquity by Central Asian Turks, the Turkic form being bururq. On the origin and possible meaning of this title, see Pelliot 1944b, 44-45; HCG, 297-298. Gür Qan, the name of Qurqaq’s brother, is also a title (see above, n. 141).

'He had become a rebel (bulqa).' For the word bulqa (= pno, no. bulqa) 'rebel,' which is an analogue of el (= il) 'peaceful' → subject, see Cleaves 1949, 111, n. 89; 'Trois documents,' 492-493; TMEN, no. 768; Poppe 1955, 59; Fletcher 1986, 19. Bulqa belongs to the category of nomina verba, functioning as both substantive (’rebel, hostile’) and verb (bulqa- ‘to revolt, rebel, be hostile, to oppose resistance; battle, fight’). See Kara 1993, 153. For el (= il), see TMEN, nos. 25, 653; Erdal 1993; CCME, 21-22. Cf. RH, 79, no. 2: il ‘obedient.’ On the Mongol concept of ‘rebellion,’ i.e. the refusal to submit voluntarily to the Mongol ruler’s authority, see de Rachewiltz 1973; idem 1996b, 6.

According to Pelliot (HCG, 260-261), the Qara’un (‘Dark’) Gorge (Qara’un Qabsal) must be situated in the mountains just north of Kyakhna. Perleé (10 (= Perleé, 99), places it more broadly in the area ‘along the Selenge,’ i.e. the Selenga River; in the earlier version of his article he gives as coordinates 49°N, 105°E, thus placing it in an area south-west of Kyakhna. See Perleé, 70. The interference Chinese gloss defines Qara’un as a ‘name of a mountain(s).’ See Y, 5, 96, and the sectional
summary, ibid., 10b. For qara'un (= pmo. qarayun) 'dark, black', see TMEN, no. 277.

'Prompted (= affected) by his coming to him' (imayi o' er-dar-iyen irekdeji). For this passive construction, see Poppe 1964, 374-375. Cf. Cl, 79: 'receiving him unto himself'; On, 65: 'asked him to come (back) with him'.

Qaššin from ch. Ho-hsi 鄂錦 (The territory) west of the (Yellow River), was the designation of the Tangut state of Hsi itisia 西氏(ia) ('Western Hsia'), founded in AD 1032, which before its destruction by the Mongols in 1227 comprised part of the Orūs and Shensi, as well as Kansu and Ninghsia. Its capital was Chung-hsing 重熙, the former Ning-hsing hsien 宁星縣 (now Yin-ch'uan 頭川 in Ninghsia), known by the Mongols as Erliyaya. See below, no. 249, 265. Rašid-al-Din calls the Hsi Hsia kingdom Qaššin as well as Tangut. See NMP, I, 315. The latter name, in the forms Tangut (= pmo. Tangru) and Tangut (where -ut - -u-'), are also found in the SH. See below, n. 151. For Qaššin cf. also OITG, 350, s.v. 'Khes'; L. Ligeti in MS, 308; Li, 157, n. 150, and 184-185, n. 266; and Cleaves 1988, 156, n. 4. The literature on the Hsi Hsia kingdom, and Tangut studies in general, has become extensive in recent decades thanks to the contributions of Russian, Japanese, Chinese, and American scholars. The best concise history of Hsi Hsia in a Western language is still OITG. For an excellent survey, see also R. Dunnell in CHCAR, 154-214, and in JAH 18:1984, 78-89. Important contributions on the subject are also found in HHYCLC and HHSIWC; and the largest collection of Chinese source material on the Hsi Hsia is TNEKTHL.

'He took Ong Qan's people and returned them to Ong Qan.' The people (irge orga) in question were those belonging to Ong Qan, left behind at the time of his flight through the Qara'ân Gorge. Yisügei brought them together and returned them to Ong Qan. See § 164, and the sectional summary of our § 150 in Y² 5, 10b (cf. Wet, 102-103). For the expression irge orga

|- irgen organ, etc.; pmo. irge orga, irgen organ, etc.), see Mo, 230-231; Cleaves 1982, 79, n. 22; idem 200a, 34-35, n. 46.

§ 151. For Ong Qan's brother Erke Qara and the background story, see above, n. 150, and HCG, 425b (Index). For the parallel account of this episode in the SWCC and in Rašid al-Din's work, see HCG, 231-232; SL, 1/2, 110. On Inanča Qan, or Ilanča Bile Qan (§§ 177, 189, 194), whose full Türkic name was İnançi Bilği Bile Qan, see HCG, 250-251; cf. also TMEN, no. 669. He was the father of Buyruq Qan, whom we have met in §§ 141-144 (see also further, § 158) and of Tayang Qan (see § 166). The Naiman princes bore Türkic names and titles, as well as Chinese ones; Nestorian Christianity had also penetrated their clans. See HCG, 214-221; Duvallet 1948, 308. Ong Qan's second flight is recounted again in § 177, also with additional details. 'In his wanderings had already passed', lit. 'he had gone wandering about' (bitiin yorılı). The basic idea of bitü-i 'to go, or change, from one (place, person, etc.) to the other', hence 'to do something in succession; to roam'. Cf. Les., 108a.

According to Li, 157, n. 151 (following Nai, 169), the 'three cities' (querban balaqat) designate sensu lato the three countries, or people, of the Tanguts, i.e. the Hsi Hsia (Qaššin, see above, n. 150), the Uighurs and the Qariqs, that is Qan Qan's way to the Qara Khan ("Black Khan"), or Western Liao (Hsi Liao Hsien), empire in Central Asia. I think that the 'three cities' may well refer to the capitals of these three countries, viz. Erliyaya (Chung-hsing, see ibid.), Bel Balq (north-east of modern Urumchi in Sinkiang, cf. below, n. 238) and Qayulq (18 km south-west of present-day Taldy-Kurgan in southeastern Kazakhstan, cf. below, n. 235). It will be remembered (see above, n. 107) that Ong Qan's family had old ties with the Tangut kingdom, where Jaga Gambu had been brought up. At the same time, Ong Qan, no doubt because of his Nestorian persuasion and background, had also cultural ties with the
Nestorian communities among the Uighur and Qarluq Turks, as well as with those in the QaraKitai empire. The ruler, or gür qan (on this title see above, n. 141), of the QaraKitai was then Yeh-liü Chih-lu-kü (äxiguelej), later (in 1211) deposed by the Naimen prince Gükülük (« tu. Kükülük), the son of Tayang Qan. See HCG, 251-252. The QaraKitai capital was Quz or Üz Ordo, the Türkic name of Bálásyäj (formerly the capital of the Qarakhanids), on the Chu (Cu) River, 24 km south-west of Toqmäq in Kazakhstan, Bálásyäj being perhaps a Sogdian name. See NMP, 1, 224; cf. de Rachewiltz 1962, 53, n. 75. In our passage the QaraKitai empire is called Qara Kida; however, in the SH the same name (with Kida ~ Kita) designates also the Kirgiz of north China who were subjects of the Jurchens. See below, n. 247. On the Qara Kitai, Qara-Khitai, Qara-Kitai, etc., see HCL, 619-674; the references in NMP (see vol. III, 220a-b); HCG, 252; CHEIA, 410-412; FSHCA, 1780 (Index). For the early Qarluq Turks, see Uchida Gimbô 内田清伊 in THTR, 57-70, and Eccedy 1950; for their later history see HCL, 735a, s.v.; MK, 664b, s.v.; Li, 176, n. 235; Mu, III, 79-80, n. 1.; TIKCA, 22ff.; TMEN, no. 1388; NNRS, Index, 12a. Cf. also below, n. 198, 235.

Ong Qan's journey to Qasim/Hsi Hsia was no doubt prompted also by the need to reach Central Asia by a route other than the one which went through the hostile Naimen territory; we know that there was in fact a route, which later became well established (with post stations, etc.), from central Mongolia to Erkaya through the Gobi (Chê). Cf. Pelliot 1920, 178-182. After having quarrelled with the gür qan, Ong Qan on his return journey passed again through the cities (balaqat) of the Uyiquq (in the text Uyiquq, pl. of *Uyiquq = prn. Üyiquq, Üyiquq) and the Tangqut. In the next paragraph these two names are written Uit'ut (where ገ = ገ) and Tang'ut, as in § 177. In § 238 we also find the form Uit'ut. In §§ 198 and 279 we find the ethnic name Oit'urt (< Üyiquqta). In all other references, Tangqut is written Tang'tut (see CI, 263b). For the name Üyiquq = Uit'ut (< tu. Oit'urt), see Cleaves 1949, 100, n. 29; NMP, II, 753; HCG, 253; Poppe 1975, 166; MBB, 230b. For ąxi (< ąxi) > 'tu', see IMCF, 66. The Uighurs of Turfan, Karasahr and Kucha and their ruler the inid qut', were then vassals of the QaraKitai gür qan, against whom they rebelled in 1209. See § 238 and com. on the Uighurs in the 12th-13th centuries, see TDMI, 567a, s.v.; 573b, s.v.; NUKSK, 1-17; LUSQ, 29-30; Allsen 1983; de Rachewiltz 1983a, MI, 67-68; KOSUG, 56r.; WWTELT, 103f.; TINCA, 56-61; ISSUDNk, 66ff.; ISK, 802e; s.v.; CEME, 136e; s.v.; CHCAl, 827b, s.v. Tangqut = Tang'ut (＞ Tang'ut) is a Turco-Mongolian designation of Hsi Hsia: 'the Qasim people' (Qasim qen: § 249) are also called 'the Tang'ut people' (Tang'ut qen: §§ 249, 250, etc.), as well as 'the Tang'udit' (§§ 265, 266), i.e. 'the Tanguts.' For this designation, see Li, 184-185, n. 265; Dunell 1984. Cf. also below, n. 249. BaIaqat (= pno. balayad) 'cities' is the plural of balayasan (= pno. balayasan), corresponding to mo. balad, balayad respectively, see TMEN, nos. 95, 712; Or', VI, 534-555, n. 7. Bose's objection to the readings balayasan and balaqat (Bose 1978, 359, no. 8) is unwarranted. Cf. VMI, 18: balayasan; RH, 248, no. 21: balayasan; 'ph. balaqad (MMHS, 120a).

'ristolizing their kids' (irigilej). In § 177, where the story is retold with some additional details, the same verb occurs in the form irigilej(e) (= irigilejë). In both cases the Chinese gloss is chi-chao ㄔㄕ. The verb chi pā means 'to grasp, seize', as well as 'to restrain, detain.' In the AT, 53b, irigilejë is glossed adyanlan 'tending'; the section corresponding to § 177 is missing. The Chinese sectional summary does not translate the irigile-jë, irigile-jë of the text. Starting with NaL, 170, most translators of the SH have rendered this verb as 'seizing' or 'seized' (the five goats), and recent translations still follow this early interpretation. Besides CI, 80, cf. DoL, 120; Ta, 79, 173, translates 'qu'il faisait atcrcher' (id. on p. 174), with a footnote saying: '[Le verbe irigilej est gléssé (V. 11 b) pā kiu "saisir"; cf. Haenisch, Die Geheime Geschichte, 52.]' However,
in the original source was to the kids being muzzled, not to the goats themselves; in the SH the kids are also meant but are not mentioned. Therefore, the Chinese gloss "chū-chō shuǐ" must mean ‘restricting the kids’, and not ‘seizing’. One wonders whether Pelliot’s rendering in Pe., 73 and 174 ‘qu’il fasse un attache’ (italicised in the original) indicates a second thought on his part. This is a perfect example of a Chinese source helping the understanding of the text of the SH. For ima'an (pl. 'ima'at), mo. imayan, ‘she-goat’, see Hsung 1956, 30, n. 5 (where the Ong Qan episode is briefly dismissed), and L. Desclaux’s interesting study on the names of the goat in Turkic and Mongolian (Bazin 1957). Cf. also Liégeois 1965, 280, no. 20; RH, 218, no. 23.

For qara- ‘to bleed’, cf. TMEN, no. 1357.

Lake Güse'ür (Güse’ür Na') has been tentatively identified by Perleé, 8 (= Perleé, 90) with a lake, now apparently dried up, in the area of the Gurvan Xogvöl Mountains in the Dormogov' Almag, at 43° N 109° E. This lake or marsh is an important locality, connected with the seasonal movements of the Mongol court during the reign of Ögedei Qa'an (1229-41), when it was the emperor’s usual autumn residence. According to Rašd al-Dîn, before becoming the Mongol qa’an's autumn residence, Lake Güse’ür had been one of Ong Qan's two summer encampments. As indicated by Boyle, this also was the place where Güyük’s election was held. See Boyle 1972, 128-129; idem 1973a. According to Pelliot (HCG, 254), the Chinese sources point to a locality north of the Gobi and to the south, or south-west, of the Tula River. More specifically, for Boyle the lake (or marsh) in question ‘is to be looked for somewhere in the aimak of Övör Hangai, between Qara-Qorum and the modern town of Arbii Heere’ (Boyle 1973a, 109). The localization of Perleé is unsupported and undoubtedly incorrect, being far too to the south-east. Since Ong Qan was coming from Tangqu/Hsi Hsia, i.e. Ninghsia in the south, and was obviously aiming north, or northeasters,
towards the Tula and the Onon-Kerulen region. Lake Gusei'ür would have been right on his way.

For Taqai Ba'atur and SükegeiJe'is — whose names appear in different forms in the SH — see above, n. 120. For their role as Çinggis' trusted envoys, see above, § 124 and corn.

In § 150 we left Çinggis Qan at Deresüt (¿? Deresüt), an unknown locality. Here he is back to his native grounds on the upper course of the Kerulen south of Khentii Khan. The account in § 177 is more precise and informs us that he was actually at Birgi Ergi, the 'escarpment' on the Kerulen (see above, n. 96) where Çinggis had his gure'en. From there, he went to meet (lit. 'went towards': eserğe oltu) Öng Qan at Lake Gusei'ür and brought him into (lit. 'let him enter inside') his camp. Öng Qan was starved and exhausted (furajül). For this verb (m. tnu), cf. DO, 682b. Çinggis 'raised taxes' (qubbüri qubélί) for Öng Qan from his own people, not only to feed him, but also to assist him in restoring his fortunes, for which he obviously needed considerable material help, as clearly stated in the SWCC (see HCG, 232). For Çinggis' 'recollection' of these events, cf. § 177. The term for 'taxes, levies' is qubélί; 'to raise taxes' is qubélί. (For the dev. noun suff. -r, see GWM, 49, § 179.) For these important socio-economic terms, see TMEN, no. 266; Mu, II, 43-44, n. 19; Qo'li, III, 216-218, n. 2; and, more recently, Whaley 2001, 158f. Besides Schurmman 1956 (already cited in TMEN, no. 266, pp. 390-391) and idem 1951, 303-304, cf. also Smith 1970, 70; Dardess 1972/73, 117ff; and, below, n. 279, on early Mongol taxation.

The question is: when did this second flight of Öng Qan take place? According to the usually unreliable chronology of the SH, Çinggis Qan helped Öng Qan (after the latter's retreat from Central Asia and Hsi Hsia) in the autumn-winter of 1201-1202, i.e. before the battle at Dalan Nermügi against the Tatars in the autumn of 1202 (§ 153). Râšid's chronology and sequence of events is completely at odds with the SH, but it is also unconvincing, as already pointed out by Pelliot (JCG, 260-261). Cf. the discussion by Hambis in GK, 56-57: his conclusion is that Öng Qan's second flight occurred in the period within ten years before 1196, but not in 1196. Therefore, Râšid's date of 1196 for Öng Qan's return adopted by Grousset (CW, 87-88; cf. also EM, 85-86) appears to be invalidated; this is also the opinion of Ratchenchevsky who, however, owing to conflicting statements in our sources, cannot, like Pelliot, offer an alternative date. See ČK, 47-48 (= ČK, 50-51). Perhaps one should re-examine the chronology of the SH in this particular instance. Pelliot (ibid., 265) already indicated that Öng Qan's return to Mongolia is in all likelihood post-1196 (joint campaign against the Tatar Mügelin Se'ülti, SH, §§ 132-133), in fact post-1198 (Öng Qan's campaign against the Merkit), see below. In both the SH and the YS (YS 1, 7) Çinggis' campaign against the Tatars, which is unquestionably of 1202, is recorded immediately after the unpleasant episode of Öng Qan and his brothers related in SH, § 152, which in the latter source follows Öng Qan's return. At the end of the present section of the SH, the text says that after Çinggis had given shelter to Öng Qan and raised levies for him, they transmigrated and Çinggis Qan 'wintered at Quba Qaya', which, as we know, was in the region of Mount Çekeş in eastern Mongolia (see above, n. 148). It is, therefore, interesting to note that in both Râšid al-Dîn's work (SL', U, 118-119) and the SWCC (27a-b; cf. HCG, 264), it is stated that Öng Qan and Çinggis Qan spent the winter before the Tatar campaign, i.e. the winter of 1201-1202, at Quba Qaya and Mount Çekeş respectively. While Öng Qan was definitely with Çinggis in the earlier attack on the Tatar in the summer of 1196, also a firmly established date (see above, n. 153, HCG, 265), and although Öng Qan's campaign of 1198 against the Merkit is placed in the SH, § 157, s.a. 1202, it is clear by all accounts that Öng Qan did not participate in the final campaign against the Tatar. This may well be due to the fact that he had not yet fully re-established his authority over his people, created a real family and clan discord (cf. § 122). Such an interpretation is all the more likely if we accept the chronology of the SH which
makes Ong Qan return to Mongolia barely one year before
Chinggis moved against the Tatar. All in all, I think that the Ong
Qan episode should fall between 1198 and 1201, rather than
before 1198 as now generally accepted. The chronology of
the SWCL followed by Hamblin (loc. cit.) and Okada (CHH, 88-90)

The camp (gür eh), i.e., into his
'circular' or fortified camp. See above, n. 90.

'I hit a way they moved to new pastures', i.e., they
moved gradually, by stages (jerge'eh), as one does when tran-
migrating for the winter or the summer. I do not think that
in the present instance jerge'eh (= mo. jerge-he) can be rendered
'together', or 'at the same time, simultaneously', or 'in [parallel]
ranks', as done by other translators. The Chinese gloss ( şehi)
is unambiguous and makes sense in the context. Cf. Na, 147; Pe,
174; Li, 55. For a somewhat different usage of this term, see §
159 (ad fin.) and com. 

§ 152. 'Our elder brother the Qan', lit. 'This Qan, our elder
brother.'

'A rotten (lit. 'stinking') liver (hümegei helige)', i.e., a foul
character, or nature, an evil mind - the liver being regarded by
Mongols and Turks alike as the source of the emotions.
The word hümegei (= mo. imekei, ömekei) has all the connota-
tions of eng. 'foul' (as in 'foul smell', 'foul language'). Cf. kh. ömei
'smelly, rotten, putrid.'

For hümegei and helige, both with initial h, see Peliot 1925, 239, no. 72 and 211-212, no. 14. The
expression 'to have (lit. 'in blood of one's bosom': ehbir = mo.
ëbirle) a stinking liver' was a current idiom at the time, cf.
Pelliot 1944b, 63, n. 6; HCG, 243, 421. See also Oz, III, 228-
229, n. 2; and MKCT, 671a-b. In the modern literary language
(helige 'liver' has been replaced by sanayu 'thought, mind, etc.'
in the expression ömekei (ömekei) sanayu 'evil mind, evil
intention, ill will.' Cf. Da's, 104; MKT, 2826.

'What shall we do with him? (e'aini ker kihan bida). For
this expression, cf. Cleaves 1944/65, 51, n. 9.
8a [the ‘Chi’ in TOA, 120, is a mistake for ‘Chu’; cf. MR, I, 98] and in other sources; see HCSL, 653; DDKO, 366; HYTM, 20.] The term Sarta’ul (= pno. Sartaqul) designated sensu lato any Central and Western Asian Muslim, and, sensu stricto, the people of Khwārazm (Sarta’ul irgen). By ‘the country of the Sarta’ul’ is meant, very broadly, the entire Turkestian region. Much has been written on this term, its history and etymology. See NMP, II 647, s.v. ‘Ergiwal’; NHIO, 34; Cleaves 1949, 101, n. 33; Hambis 1960, 150-153. NHIO, 118, n. 152; MS, II, 47-49, n. 24. Cf. also Vlad., 169, 176; PM, 112; and RH, 258, no. 3 (in note 2 on p. 258, it is stated that ‘In the Mongol era, it [i.e. the term sartuul – I.R.] denoted both “Muslim” and the “urban Iranian population”’). I shall only mention one problem in connection with the form Sarta’ul (= Sartaqul). This form is well attested as is also Sartaqin (= pno. Sartaqin), which occurs in § 181, and Sartaqai (= pno. Sartaqtai) in §§ 182, 263. All these forms are indeed found in the AT. See AT, 244b. They all have the same meaning. Cf. the SII, where they are glossed “Hui” and “Muslim” (III, 132). The written forms Sartaqin and Sartaqai clearly indicate that the noun on which they are formed is Sartaq (mno. Sartaq, with an -q); cf. NHIO, 34. According to Pelliot (NMP, II, 647), Sarta’ul derives from Sart, Sartaq, Sartaqin with a final -ul. In Uighur script, this final is written -ul. Apart from the fact that Sarta’ul cannot derive from Sart (or Sartaqin), but only from Sarta or Sartaq (= Sartaq) (as correctly noted by Pelliot in HCG, 151, 253), the suffix -ul is not obvious, since it normally functions as a deverbal noun suffix and not as a denominal noun suffix. Cf. GWM, 46, § 153. However, in some rare cases, as in the present case, the suffix -ul is actually used as a denominal noun suffix (cf. also below, n. 174). See MUJT, 2629, no. 183 (1). Alternatively, could Sarta’ul be an ancient plural in -(ul) of Sartaq (Sartaq)? For this, still hypothetical, plural (not registered in our grammars), cf. D. Siner in AM 2:1925, 214; Mo, 8; but see Doerfer 1970, 76; Street 1990a, 374 (8. 4). With regard to Khwārazm, I shall employ this transcription (rather than Xvahrzm, Khvārazm, Whārazm, Khwarezm, Khurezm, etc.) because it is the one more commonly in use.

In less than a year, lit. ‘a year not having elapsed.’

For the forms Ust’ul (pl. of Ust’ul = Ujiur – Ujiur) and Tang’ul (= Tangqut) see above, n. 151.

From the present account of Ong Qan’s wanderings and his plight we also learn that he spent less than a year with the gur qan of the Qara Kaitai in Central Asia, and that, on his return journey, besides the five goats and the camel mentioned in § 151, he had a blind yellowish-white horse with a black tail and mane (soqor qali‘un morita). No doubt, some of these ‘embellishments’ are literary clichés used to characterize a particular situation, viz. a state of extreme hardship and distress. Further on in this section, we also learn that Ong Qan was alone in his predicament (as we may have been led to believe), but had a number of followers with him.

The words ‘Now, forgetting that he has kept himself alive like this thanks to his son Temüjin’ (edl’e Temüjin kii‘man-tair tevin yabarqan-iyan samartu) have been translated in several different ways owing to the wide semantic range of the verb yaburu ‘to go, walk; to act, live or conduct oneself as, be like; to undertake, practise; and, as an auxiliary verb, ‘to keep on (doing),’ i.e. expressing continuity of action. The interfering gloss translates yabarqan-iyan as ‘he went (or conducted) himself (acc.)’ (Y/T 775/BP), with the ambiguity unresolved.

The sectional summary (Y’s 5, 16b) similarly paraphrases ‘he forgot the previous favour.’ Cf. Wa, 257. The AT, 54a, has the same wording of the SII which Sastina renders as ‘And now, when he lives thus with his son Tömenin, forgetting what had been (a torn, toho bylo, i.e. what had happened between them),’ See LDAT, 132. Since the nomen perfecti of yaburu is in the reflexive-possessive accusative case with Ong Qan as the subject, the action of that verb must perforce refer to Ong Qan, not to Temüjin, hence Cleaves’ rendering ‘forgetting the fact that he was so gone unto [his] son Temüjin’ (Cl, 81) – as against the renderings of most other translators down to On (2001 ed.).
128 ('Now, he forgets what his son Temüjin did for him'). I agree with Cleaves (and with Naś, 149, before him), but I take yahu- in the meaning of 'to keep going, to keep alive'; cf. ord. jawu- 'rest en vie, vivre, durer' (DO, 399b). And I take the dative case applied to Temüjin (Temüjîn-tür) to be a dative instrumentalis ('by means of, by virtue of, thanks to'). Cf. the expression mungke tenggiri-yin gu'n-tür 'by the strength of Eternal Heaven' in § 224. See below, n. 224.

It is noteworthy that in the earlier account (§ 151), Činggis Qan is referred to as Činggis Qan'an, whereas in the present version of the same account he is called Temüjin. Because of this inconsistency, and the fact that in the present account the speakers, i.e. Ong Qan's brothers and the Kereyit chiefs, say that Ong Qan 'came to his son Temüjin' instead of 'went to his son Temüjin' (cf. a few lines before where it is stated that he 'went to the gür qan of the Qara Kidar'), it is difficult to draw any conclusion concerning the time of the event. See the discussion in n. 151 above.

For Altan Ašuq ('Golden Helmet') and the other conspirators, see HCG, 419-422. In the Chinese and Persian sources they are named as güli Bari, Altan Ašuq, El Qutar (or Qotor) and Qonqor (or Qonqur). In the SH the last personage is not mentioned, instead we have Alin Taisi, whose name appears, albeit incompletely, in the SWCCCL, and in its full form in Râšîl al-Dîn's parallel account. (The SH has, incorrectly, 'Arin' instead of 'Alin' = tu. alin 'forehead'; and 'Taisi' x̌̄ f for 'Taisi' x̌̄ f; cf. above, n. 50.) After Ong Qan's defeat in 1203, Altan Taisi escapes and, following Jaqa Gamba's example, joins Tayang Qan of the Naiman. See SL3, 1/2, 118; SWCCCL1, 26b-27a. It should be pointed out that all these personages bear Turkic names — a further indication of the Turkic background of the Kereyit leadership. For El Qutar, cf. Beze 1978, 366-367, no. 17; for Qulbari, cf. also below, n. 177. For the name Altan (= rno. Altan 'Gold'), which occurs again in § 238, see below, n. 238.
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'Their words', lit. 'the words that they had thus spoken to one another.'

Who had thus conspired, lit. 'who had thus spoken to one another."

For bari'as (w.f. bariyas; cf. āt, 54b) 'fetters', cf. no. bariyə id.

Ong Qan's words to the conspirators are interesting and deserve attention. Firstly, he recalls a mutual pledge (for 'what did we say to each other?') which is not self-evident. However, from the parallel accounts in the Persian and Chinese sources, it appears that during their arduous return journey, Ong Qan and his few followers (this is the first time we learn that he was not alone), i.e. the very same people who now conspired against him, had made an 'inviolable' oath that could only have been one of mutual loyalty and support to the bitter end. Cf. SL2, 1/2, 118; HCG, 417; YS 1, 7. Secondly, Ong Qan says: 'tari meti ya' a setki gö bi.' These words have been misunderstood by most translators (including myself in Ra, Y, 153; cf. also Li, 56; OZ3, 127; On, 67 [the revised producing in the 2001 ed., 124, is much better]; Ta, 80; Ev-Pop, 115), but the correct interpretation is actually given in the Chinese sectional summary (Y 5, 17a): 'You are like this, but I am not like you.' These words have been correctly paraphrased by Waley as follows: 'That is the kind of people you are, but I am not going to behave so as you would behave to me.' (Wa, 257; cf. Pa, 77.) This interpretation is confirmed by Rašîl al-Dîn, loc. cit. Mostaert translated: 'Pourquoi aurais-je des sentiments comme vous?' [A.M.] Cf. CI, 81: 'How could I think as ye?' The meaning is clear: 'If I were to think, and act, as you did, I would make an end of you, but I am not going to do that because I am not like you, therefore I shall spare you.'

'He had them freed from their fetters', lit. 'he had their fetters loosed.'

'After they had been spit on by the Qan himself'; the 'himself' is necessary because of the corroborative particle ele. See Street 1986, 17 (27)."
§ 153. Since the text speaks of the autumn (not the spring, as in Ha, 52) of the Year of the Dog (= 1202), ‘that winter’ should refer to the 1201-1202 winter, of which mention is made at the end of § 151, where it is stated that Chinggis Qan had spent it at Quba Qaya (a fact confirmed by other sources, see above, n. 151). The year 1202 for this campaign is confirmed by the SWCC1, 30a, where the entry concerning the encounter at Ulqii Sülügelji and the incident involving Altan, Quar and Dñartei is registered. Cf. SL1, L2, 120, where the Year of the Dog (= 1202) for these events is given correctly, but the corresponding year of the Hegira (and its Christian era equivalent) is incorrect (578/1182 pro 598/1202). Cf. GK, 61-62, 72-73; CK1, 61-62 (= CK5, 66-67).

For the Tartar tribes engaged by Chinggis, see HCG, 4-5, 240-245; Li, 158, n. 153. Ca’ān = Caqān (= Caqāan, pmn. Caqyān) ‘White.’ The form Ca’ān = a hapax legomenon in the SH – is unusual, as one would normally expect Caqāan or Caqān (see R, 206a). Cf., however, the names Ca’ālan (§ 157) and Ca’ālai (§ 242 et passim), both apparently formed on ca’ān (= Ca’ān) ‘white’ (+ the den. noun suff. ṭan and -dāi). See below, n. 242, for a possible explanation. The transcriptions Ca’ānan of Li, 109, and Caqānan of Ra, 46, and On, 67, are incorrect, as is the Chaggaan of O2, 236. Further on in the same section we find the form Cahān (= Ca’ān) pro Caqān (= Caqān). See above, n. 1. For the Caqān Tatar, see Bese 1988, 37. On the Alkd Tatar, cf. also Pelliot 1944b, 56, n. 4, 60; and, for the name Alkd, idem 1935, 90ff.; and Bese 1988, 35. The word ‘Tatar’ after Dutu’ut has been inadvertently dropped from the text, but it is found in the printed version.

The text has Aluqai (Tatar), but the correct form is Aruqai, as shown by the AT1, 54b, and this is indeed the form adopted by Ljeti in Li, 56. However, in Li, 109, and ATL, 114, Ljeti gives as the correct form Aluqai which is unwarranted and which has unfortunately passed into On, 67 (the 2001 ed., 153, has ‘Aluqai’, still incorrect). Cf. Bese 1988, 35-36. The present campaign against the Tatar tribes is the final act of the ongoing feud between Chinggis’s family and the Tatars (cf. §§ 67-68 and 132-134). See Clark 1978, 35-37; Ratchevsky 1987, 77.

Dalan Nümegi’s ‘The Seventy Felt Cloaks’ was the name of a place or, rather, an area, near the Khalkha (Qalqa. Xalx) River in eastern Mongolia, as evident also from §§ 173 and 175, and which, according to Perle, 9 (= Perle, 88), was in the basin of the Nümnörag Göl (= mo. Nöör örgö-yin Tol) – an affluent of the Khalkha – at 47° N 119° 30’ E (On, 16) (= 47° 18’ N 119° 30’ E). I incline to the view that the Dalan Nümegi was the designation of a wider area (rather than of a specific place) because in § 173 Chinggis Qan ‘entered it’ (oroobat). The Chinese sectional summary (Y’s 5, 16b) does, in fact, refer to it as ti-mien ḥ坶 ‘territory, area.’ Moreover, its very name ‘The Seventy Felt Cloaks’ points to a hilly area, which I believe must be situated near, or be part of, the western slopes of the Khingan Mountains.

Chinggis Qan jointly issued the following decree, lit. ‘Chinggis Qan spoke together the decree’ (Chinggis Qan on jasaq tigeldüririn). ‘To speak the jasaq’ = ‘to set forth (declare, promulgate, issue) the jasaq.’ However, the verb is in the reciprocal form, often used in the SH for the cooperative (-ldu-9u-9a-for -ldu-9u-9e-), and vice versa. See Haenisch 1950, 19-20. This has led translators to understand this sentence in several different ways: ÇQ gave the order to all (ÇQ, 45b; cf. O2, 81). See also Poppe 1975, 166; Bese 1988, 37-38. The text has Aluqai (Tatar), but the correct form is Aruqai, as shown by the AT1, 54b, and this is indeed the form adopted by Ljeti in Li, 56. However, in Li, 109, and ATL, 114, Ljeti gives as the correct form Aluqai which is unwarranted and which has unfortunately passed into On, 67 (the 2001 ed., 153, has ‘Aluqai’, still incorrect). Cf. Bese 1988, 35-36. The present campaign against
cooperative, thus indicating that the reciprocal has cooperative force. In view of what follows, it seems clear to me that the joint promulgation of the decree can only refer to it having been agreed upon by Çinggis together with the other military leaders, chief among whom were his own kinsmen Altan, Quçar and Dāritai. I think that the reciprocal/cooperative form is used precisely in anticipation of what these very personages did, i.e. contravening the mutually agreed order. It is inconceivable, in my view, that Çinggis would have discussed the Jasaq with his soldiers to obtain their consent as stated by some of the translators; conversely, it makes perfect sense to have discussed the order with the other commanders. As for the Jasaq (eq. *jasaq*), i.e. in the present instance the decree or ordinance (with normative force), issued by the qan, see above, n. 74, and the discussion in de Rachewiltz 1993 (the relevant passage is cited on p. 97). Most of the major contributions to the Jasaq problem are reviewed, or mentioned, in the above paper; however, several others, either irrelevant to the discussion or not available at the time, were omitted. Among them, the articles by Perlée in SM 3, 13-15:1962, 24; Çige & Öyun in ÖMNSÜ, 1988.1, 123-138; Safin in Mongolica 1 (22):1990, 80-91; and Bira in MTTSB, III, 256-262; as well as Çinhöö, this last work being a study of both the Jasaq and Çinggis Quç’s *bilige*, i.e. his ‘wise sayings’; and the important joint work EBCIZ. Cf. also D. Dalcèren in MNT, I, 40-48; and, more recently, Skrynnikova 2000; and, by the same author, KHIV, 42ff. I think the subject is virtually exhausted, at least for the time being.

For olji ‘booty, plunder’, see TMEN, no. 27; de Rachewiltz 1985, 216-217; and RH, 291, no. 34 (where we find the aberrant form *oljam* ‘gift’). Cf. also above, n. 92. The early Mongol regulations concerning the acquisition and allocation of war booty and spoils deserves a thorough study. See, provisionally, the pertinent remarks in CK, 61-62 (eq. CK, 66).

‘When the victory is complete’, lit. ‘When (or if) we have finished overcoming.’


‘If we are forced by the enemy (nokor gu’ur-e) to retreat.’ For this construction, see Poppe 1964, 369. The word nokor ‘companion’ accompanied by gu’ur ‘person’, occurs here with the unusual meaning of ‘enemy’ (cf. also § 267). Mostaert (Mo, 112) does not comment on it. Doerfer (TMEN, no. 388, p. 521) suggests that the original meaning of nokor is ‘the other’, hence in its positive (‘companion’) and negative (‘enemy’) connotations. Cf. mmo. nokor ‘the other, the second’. See HW, 118, 119, s.vv. ‘nokor-e’ and ‘nokor’. Doerfer cites indulge: *ghosits* ‘the stranger’, gohitas ‘the guest’, and lat. *hostis* ‘the enemy’. We may add ch. *ko* & *guest, stranger* → *enemy*. Cf. the *Kung Yang chuuan* āpásás in CCCC, III, 202: *ě* XV, 2 ā. However, SH nokor-e corresponds to mmo. nöğüge, not nööge, and the initial vowel of the second syllable is ā in virtually all Mongolian modern languages and dialects, which is strange if nokor and nokor-e are related. The Chinese transcription of the SH alone cannot, of course, be relied upon to establish such a relationship. However, it should be noted that the form with k is well attested in *Phags-pa*, but, as pointed out by Poppe (MMHS, 33), ‘Phags-pa offers numerous instances of confusion between k (‘ph.’) and g. Cf. Materiél II, 3, 115-116; *Quelques problemes*, 240-243. For mmo. nokor-e, mmo. nööge, Poppe (IMCS, 248) postulates cmo. *nööge*. On the basis of the modern dialects, Tömörtoogoo (MXTXU, 88) postulates Pmo. *nööge*. Cf. Özé, III, 237, n. 2; VI, 423-424, n. 6. I am not convinced that the vowel of the second syllable was ever ā. Cf. MIBT, 1, 479b. This complex problem deserves further study.

‘To the point where we began the attack’, lit. ‘to our place from where we stormed at the beginning’ (*tärin-ū dohtilagsan qaʃar-turijan*). For *tärin*, cf. above, n. 111.

Ulqii Silügel is the name of a river in the same general area, for we know from §173 that Ulqii Silügel upstream, one reached Dalan Nemüreg. As this was near the
Khalkha River, the Ulqui Šijëlgeji must be identified with one of the three rivers whose sources are not far from it. The most likely candidate is obviously the Ulkihi (Uluki = Ulugh’i): ‘Ulqui’ in CW, 110, following D’Ohsson. I, 64, n. 2, and, ultimately, the map of D’Anville in the south-east at 46° N 119° E. See Poppe 1956, 41; NMP, I, 526. The Ulqui corresponds to present-day Urgen (= Orgen) Gol (Uchignol, Wu-lie-chi ho). This river receives the waters of its western tributary, the Seljin (= Seyčjil) Gol (Wu-lan-chi-i ho). While I agree with Pelliot (HCG, 410) that the Ulqui Šijëlgeji is one, not two rivers, its double name indicates perhaps that it is the Šijëlgeji of the Ulqui’, which may well be the Seljin Gol. See Yana'i map (in MSK) at 46° N 119° 30’ E. Cf. MWESC 2, 20a, for references to these two rivers in Chinese sources; MGYMC, 88; and Mu, II, 58-59, n. 6.

Fort moqaqa (moqaqa—in § 177; for a—cf., ‘Quelques problemes’, 268-269) ‘to destroy’, cf. TMEN, no. 376; de Rachewiltz 1982a, 416; and above, nn. 113 and 133.

Altan, Qajar and Dzsiri were last mentioned in § 142. Their relationship with Činggis Qan must always have been an uneasy one for reasons of seniority and leadership within the kin, Altan being Yisgil’s cousin and therefore ‘uncle’ to Činggis, Qajar being the first cousin of Činggis; and Dzsiri, Yisgil’s younger brother, being a true uncle of Činggis. See above, n. 123. It seems that their infringement of the ‘decree’, i.e. the joint agreement regarding the collection of the booty, was a deliberate act of defiance against Činggis Qan’s authority, eventually leading to their disaffection. Cf. ČK, 61-62 (= CK, 66-67); Hambis 1975, 16, nn. 26, 27; 19.

‘Had not complied with them’, lit. ‘had not complied with the words.’

For ya’u ke ‘all one’s belongings or personal effects, baggage; goods and things (in general: f. ‘ni impore quet’), see Mo, 84-85; Čigeti 1971, 152; Ou’, III, 238, n. 4.

The confiscation of the princes’ booty was carried out by Jebe—here on his first official mission (as ‘a jebe-arrow’, see § 147)—and by Qubilai of the Barulas tribe (see § 120). These two captains, with Jehe and Sübe’ot, will later be known as the ‘four hounds’ (dörben noquc) of Činggis Qan. See § 195 and corm.

§ 154. ‘To decide what to do with the Tatar tribesmen’, lit. ‘saying, “What are we going to do with their tribe people?”’

‘In a single tent’, lit. ‘entering into a single tent.’

The ‘great council’ (yeye eye) was no doubt a ‘family council’ (geb Familiennat), as stated by Rachewiltz 1987, 104, on the strength of the reference to the ‘kimmén’ (uslug), but it must have included also the chiefs (moyat) and companions (sokiet) who had to carry out its decisions. The later (yeye qarlik, or great assembly, was the natural development of the yeye eye. Cf. below, n. 282.

For the poetic passage beginning ‘from olden days . . .’, cf. § 133.

Some translators treat this as a prose passage, but see Da, 106, and Če, 119-120. For the expression ḍiwl ḋišq jisal kisaj, see above, n. 58.

‘We shall measure the Tatars against the lining of a cart’, i.e. all those who stood higher than the lining in the ailexter of a cart were to be killed—in practice, this meant everyone except small children. The practice is well known, and it was applied to males only. Cf. HWC, I, 106-107. However, as pointed out by Liqeti (Lt, 158, n. 154), not all the males of a tribe had to suffer this fate, but only the members of the leading clan (obouq) belonging to the same ‘bone’ (yasa[i]), i.e. whose lineage stemmed from a common ancestor (see above, nn. 9 and 112). See also the reference in § 139 to the destruction of the Jürkin clan. Cf. above, no. 113, 133. ‘And kill them to the last one, We shall utterly slay them’ is, literally, ‘We shall kill them, We shall slay them until we exterminate them.’

‘The rest’, lit. ‘those who shall have been left.’

‘Some here, some there, dividing them among ourselves’, lit. ‘In all directions (fik fik) we shall apportion them to each other.’ The idea was to completely break apart and scatter the survivors in order to destroy their tribal unity.
Yeke Çeren (?Çaran), a Tatar chief, must not be confused with the formidable son of Çinggis Qan’s great-uncle Qulan Ba’atun, on whom see §§ 51, 169.

For turgayq ‘proclamation, announcement’, cf. TMEN, no. 132.

‘Surround and attack’ renders e’erike’in. E’ere- (= mo. gere-) is ‘to assault, attack (usually by surrounding the enemy)’. hence my translation.

‘Each taking an enemy with us as a death-companion.’ For this expression see above, n. 149.

‘From now on Belgüte shall not join us’, lit. ‘After this, Belgüte shall not enter into (= participate in, join).’

‘He shall judge litigations and those who are guilty of theft and falsehood’, lit. ‘he shall judge (jarqulatagq) quarrels and those who have committed theft and deceitful deeds.’ Cf. ‘Tross documents’, 464. For jarqul- (= mo. jar(q)a) ‘to judge’ < jarqa (= mo. jarna) ‘judgement’, see below, n. 203. In other words, Belgüte was to be in charge (jasa- ‘to manage, handle, deal with’) of the commoners outside the council, settle their litigations and, as judge, mete out punishments in matters of theft and falsehood, while Çinggis Qan and the other chiefs were busy inside the tent with the affairs of the council. This passage is noteworthy on two counts. Firstly, the appointment of Belgüte, Çinggis’ half-brother, as the first judge (jarqul, mo. jar(q)a) at the fledgling Mongol court – an office that will assume great importance later on. I shall expand on this in n. 203. Secondly, the magnanimous attitude of Çinggis towards Belgüte after he had committed such a serious offence as the disclosure of the council’s decision to an enemy chief, and the subsequent losses incurred by the Mongols as a result of that indiscretion. While excluding him from the council and major policy decisions, Çinggis still conferred on him substantial authority. The relationship between Çinggis and Belgüte is an interesting one, deserving closer scrutiny. Cf., for example, the famous episode involving Bürü Bökö (§§ 131, 140), when Çinggis intervened to take revenge on behalf of Belgüte to the extent of arranging the killing of a rival athlete, an unconscionable action. More information on Belgüte can be gathered from the Persian sources and his biography in YS¹ 117, 2905-2906. Cf. HCG, 437a (Index).

‘The ceremonial wine’ renders the term êtöq (= pmo. ôtöq), which derives from tu. ôtöq ‘prayer, request to a superior.’ See TMEN, no. 574. In the interlinear gloss it is translated as wine which is offered’ (酒). This was a formal invitation to drink, performed according to established rules, at official banquets, ceremonies and gatherings (qurin). The ritual followed at the Mongol court during the Yuan period is known, and we have a good deal of information from western and other sources. See, provisionally, Pelliot 1930b, 33, n. 1; MP¹, 217-220; MP², I, 381-384; MP³, 124-127; Li, 153, n. 130, and 164-165, n. 187; Ratneshwry 1976, 527, n. 38. Cf. also above, no. 70, 130, and below, n. 275.

The name of Darairi (Ögïiin), Çinggis’ uncle, is written here Da’ariit (w. Dayaritar > Da’aritar > Daritari) as in § 242. It is interesting that he should be mentioned together with Belgüte, which implies that he, too, was culpable of the same or some other infringement, possibly in connection with the events related in the previous section (§ 153 ad fin.).

§ 155 ‘Then, on that occasion’, renders Mongolian tende … tende, lit. ‘then … then.’ Yisüa (<< yisü[a] ‘nine’ + dim. suff. -gen, see below, n. 239) is already called eadan = gataan (see above, nn. 54, 132-133), although she became so only after she was taken by Çinggis Qan as one of his (secondary) wives. On her name, cf. Bese 1974, 92-93; Rybakzki [2003], s.v.

‘He will take care of me, regarding me as a human being (gül’un) and a person (bodo) worth keeping.’ For this sentence, see Mo, 70-72. On, 68, renders gül’un ‘as a human being’ and bodo as ‘a beast of burden’, explaining a note 185 on the same page that in Mongolian bodo ‘refers to domestic animals, either an ox, horse or camel’, and citing § 135 where this word appears with this meaning. Cf. the 2001 ed., 130 and n. 347 (in
this version gû'ân becomes 'a chess pawn', and bodo 'a camel'!). However, then as now, bodo (= mo. bodû, kh. body) has two meanings, viz. 'large cattle' and 'object, body, substance, etc.' Cf. Les., 108b; MMED, 65a; TMEN, no. 812 (pp. 360-361); MKET, 1003b. Both these meanings are attested in the SH with their corresponding Chinese glosses. See HW, 16. Clearly, the meaning of bodo must be taken in the second acceptation, as the Ming translators did in their interlinear rendering (sr). Ev-Pop. 115, translates 'ne pourrais-je pas me considérer comme une simple personne?'; without taking into account the meaning of avarams 'will take care of me', rendering gû'ân as 'one simple person', and turning bodo-da into bodo-đa 'reckoning', as in Čc. 121. This interpretation is untenable. Cf. Ož, III, 250, n. 1.

'My elder sister, who is called Yisî', lit. 'a sister older than me, called Yisî.' For egelc 'elder sister', cf. TMEN, no. 67; Mo, 72; RH, 231, no. 27. Yisî is a name also formed from yisîn 'nine.' Cf. Besé, loc. cit.; Rybatskii [2003], s.v. The final -i is a feminine form suffix. This phenomenon is reflected in verbal endings, such as -mul-mi, -yul-yî, -ul-i, -bul-bî, etc., on which see Osawa 1992. Cf. MÜTT, no. 5, III, 2 (p. 2505a). Cf. also above, n. 55, and below, n. 214.

'She is more suitable for a ruler (qan gû'ân-e). The compound expression qan gû'ân, lit. 'ruler person,' means 'a person who is a ruler,' i.e. 'a ruler.' Cf. below, n. 276.

'A bridegroom for her was taken into our family as a son-in-law' renders gûreken gûreken bolgî, i.e. 'a son-in-law was taken for her as (or became) a son-in-law,' meaning that the young man to whom she was betrothed had come to stay for some time in the house of the father-in-law 'as a son-in-law,' prior to taking his wife to his own house. This ancient Mongol custom is described earlier in the SH (§ 66). Cf. Vlad., 59.

Since this practice meant the virtual marriage of the couple, who lived together in the father-in-law's house as man and wife, the Chinese section summary (Y 5, 24a) says simply that she was married to him. He is, in fact, called ere 'husband' in the next section (§ 156). For gûreken - gûreken - gûre- en 'son-in-law,' bridegroom,' see 'Trois documents', 474; Cleaves 1953a, 247. For the form bûleki of the preseans perfecti of bu-'to be,' cf. 'Trois documents', 460; and above, nn. 3, 56, 74.

'I wonder now' renders edî-le maça. For maça (= prn. maça), cf. § 31, where it was translated 'no one really knows.' See the remarks in n. 31 above. The meaning is essentially the same: the speaker expresses ignorance as to the issue in question, and this is done by means of the adverb maça 'really' in the form of a rhetorical question.

For qa-aqî (= mî. qamîyî) 'where' (lit. 'towards where?'), cf. ord. aqî-le (aqî) id. See DO, 342b-343a. In their reconstructions of the Uighur-Mongol text of the SH, some scholars write qayayî (see, e.g., Oz., III, 484) and some qamîyî (see, e.g., Ir. 128). I think the latter form is the correct one in view of the fact that SH qa-qa 'where' = prn. qamîyî (see above, n. 31), and that in AT*, 55b, we find qamîyî. For the directional suffix -yî-le, see GW, 58, § 211; 59, § 216.

Bodulcan 'confusion, disorder' is a hapaq legomenon in the SH. It corresponds to mî. bidulcan. The verb bodul- 'to create confusion' is found in the Preclassical Mongol version of the Hsiao-ching. See de Rachewiltz 1982, 35 (244a), 47. Cf. TH, 154 (= YJT, 270).

"If... it is expressed with the combination bûksen bôести, in which bôesti = 'it.' The form bûksen (= prn. bûstên), nomen perfecti of bû-'to be,' would normally indicate a (completed) past state; it is used here because the elder sister is not actually there to be seen, and one only knows that she was, or had been, as described. Cf. Pope 1954a, 413, n. 9; VG, 93; Oz., III, 252, n. 3. In English, however, one should use the present tense.

'Better than you' (ömadasça sayin) can also be translated 'more beautiful than you'.
'Will you yield your place to her?' (javilaju ogkú-yi). Ogkú-yú is the nominative future of the verb ok (־mo. ogq; used here as an auxiliary) followed by the interrogative particle -yú.

The corresponding form in the AT, 52b, is eskúkú-úi. This is the form given also in Ozv, Ill, 484, for the original text of the SH in Uighur-Mongol script, whereas that given in Ir, 128, is ogkúkúi. The interrogative particle which in Classical Mongolian is written -i-n, -i-í-kú, -á (cf. GWM, 172, § 622) occurs in Preclassical Mongolian as -i-iy, -iy-a, -iy-i, -iy-i, -iy-i, -iy-i, -iy-i, -iy-i. It is clear from the presence of the interrogative -iy- in the phrase that the adverb of the interrogative particle -i-n is long, i.e. -i-í-kú; hence, in association with the connecting consonant and, we have -iy-iy. Cf. 'Trois documents', 465; Mo, 90-91, n. 87, 238, n. 221; Cleaves 1982, 77, n. 13; and Lettres, 14, 67, for the 'consonne de liaison' (however, Mostaert and Cleaves ignore the lengthening of the vowel). As for the transcription ogkú-úi in our passage, this is not the only possible one, since ogkú-úi is also plausible and is, indeed, the form adopted in Ozv, Ill, 248. Cf. Pe, 48, n. 4: ogkú-úi. The form ogkú has been chosen here in preference to ogkú because the former is the regular nominative future of ok- in the SH (see R, 277b). In view of the above, the reconstruction of the original form in Uighur-Mongol script of ogkú-úi remains purely hypothetical. For mmo. ogqú = mo. ogkú, cf. "Quelques problèmes", 242-243.

'As soon as I see.' Cf. Cl, 83: 'If I but see.' Cf. also Street 1986, 42 (85), where ele in the present context is rendered as 'precisely.' However, the Ming translators understood this clause in the way I rendered it. See YB 5, 24a; Pa, 79. Cf. also Da, 107, where the immediacy is expressed with the adverb darúl 'at once.'

'On this promise,' lit. 'at this (= her) word' (ene tage-tar). In Mongolian, as in English, 'word' (tage) means also 'promise,' thus, further on, the expression 'keeping the promise she had made earlier,' is, literally, 'reaching the word(s) she had spoken before.' Činggis Qa'an issued the order (tungquaq). For tungquaq (= mno. tungquq), lit. 'to cause to proclaim (or to announce),' cf. TMEN, no. 145; Cleaves 2001a, 47-48, n. 75. Cf. above, n. 154.

'Came across her' (jogal'ai), i.e. unexpectedly, as indicated by the third past, or präteritum imperfect, used by the narrator. Here the narrator himself was, I believe, with Činggis at the time, witness of the use of the expression 'our troops;' indeed, he must have been quite close to him to relate this event in such great detail.

'Since she turned out to be... of his principal wives,' lit. 'Since she turned out to be like (= in accordance with) the words of Yisüg Qutan, he let her enter into his thoughts (= heart, affection). He took Yisü Qutan as wife and made her sit in the row of his principal wives.' We know that the qan's wives, like his high officials and courtiers, occupied well defined places at court according to their official rank. Yisü Qutan was placed among Činggis' wives of the second rank (gerge), and was the first, or principal wife belonging to the third ordo or 'palace.' Yisü Qutan was the first of the wives belonging to the fourth ordo, so that Yisü was, indeed, superior in rank to her sister. See YS 106, 2695-2696, where the two qutans are called Yisü and Yisüg respectively (cf. below, n. 156 ad fin.). Mo, 74, n. 71. However, the entire passage is understood differently by Poppe. See Poppe 1964, 375. Cf. Ratchevsky 1976, 516, 527, n. 38. For the expression 'to make enter into one's thoughts' (oyin-deriyan oro' ai'), see Mo, 73. Cf. § 66.

§ 156. 'After having completely ravaged the Tatars,' lit. 'After having completed the ravaging (daulín = da'ulín) harbýu) of the Tatar people.' For the auxiliary of achievement bara-, cf. above, no. 75, 149. On daulín for da'ulín, cf. below, n. 170.

'Having thought it over,' lit. 'thinking within himself' (dotori' an setbýu).
'And no others' renders the restrictive particle ele 'only, just.' The passage 'You make ... not his own' reads, literally, 'You — only these people that have assembled, stand you all in groups of related families (ayimaq ayimaq) — separate the persons of a group other than their own.' The words 'only ... of related families' are interpolated as a direct order of Cinggis to the people in question, the meaning being, however, 'let these people, etc.' as already pointed out in Cl. 84, n. 32. Ayimaq (= mo. ayimaq) is a term designating a group of ayil, or related families, camping together — not a 'tribe' at this time — hence A. Waley's rendering 'camping-group' (Wa, 259). Cf. Vlad., 176-177; Mu. II, 68-70; Oz., III, 258-259, n. 2. There is a good deal of literature on this important term and its usage before, during and after the Yuan period. See TMEN, no. 61; Ratchevsky 1966, 180; Aubin 1974, 15, n. 16; RLGYC, 119ff; cf. also Cleaves 1955a, 365, n. 26; and idem 1961, 67, n. 23. The Chinese interlinear gloss renders ayimaq as 'tribe' (族), reflecting too later development of this early social grouping. For the period we are concerned with, the term 'tribe' properly applies only to slus (훈). Therefore, the rendering 'tribe' that we find in Cl. On, and Ev-Pop is not, in my view, accurate. For the ayil, see above, n. 81. 'Separate (imp.)' renders öere böldĕçekken, lit. 'cause to be alone (= set apart).' The verb böldĕçit (mo. böldĕşit) 'to be alone (or on his own, isolated)' occurs again in §§ 170 and 196 (in § 170 preceded by öere = öere; the öere of L.', 124, is a misprint). For a possible semantic connection between this verb and boldag (mo. boldag) 'isolated hill' (see HW, 17), both deriving from *bolđa- ~ bolďe- 'to stand alone', see Oz., III, 259-260, n. 3. Pelliot had already hinted at such a connection [P.P.-C.R.A.C.].

'Ahommande and alert young man' (niheen fala'yu sayin gürimele gülün). For fala'yu — fala'yu 'young', cf. mu'u — mu'u 'bad', etc. See SG, 299; and above, n. 3. For gürimele 'brisk, alert', cf. above, n. 90.

'To which clan do you belong?' (če yu'ün gülün bad?). For this expression, see above, n. 15.

‘He has been living as an outcast (o’orčaql), lit. ‘he has gone becoming an outcast.’ In the interlinear gloss, o’orčaql is rendered as ‘bandit, robber’ (jom, § 200: taj), an extension of its primary meaning of ‘outcast, runaway; a vagabond, a man who avoids company’, hence a man who lives by expediency (N.P. p.c.). In a nomadic or semi-nomadic society, a person who is detached is isolated from his kith and kin, or cut off — for whatever reason — from his tribe, is ipso facto, an outcast, and the step from outcast to outlaw is but a short one. He then, as Ligeti points out, automatically becomes ‘a free prey whom no one and nothing protects’ (Li, 158, n. 16). O’orčaql is, in fact, a deverbal noun from o’or- (mo. oyor-) ‘to let off, drive away, to abandon’ (for the suffix -čaq-čaq [cf. -čaq-čaq], see MÜT, 2813a, no. 447 [2]). Cf. HW, 125; Les., 603a: oyar- ‘to leave, abandon; to neglect’; oyorčaql isolated, deserted, abandoned, lone.’ Cf. also DO, 522b; and MMED, 396a. The secondary meaning of ‘bandit, robber’ is attested in later literary texts. See Th, 114 (= JYT, 202); cf. MKFt, 403a. However, I think the correct rendering here (as in § 200) is ‘outcast’ or ‘runaway’ (the ‘jučiti’ of Mo, 125), for this describes exactly the young man’s situation. For further comments on this word, see Oz., III, 259-260, n. 3; C., 375-376, n. 258; Sassadin 1995, 113; and below, n. 214.


‘Cast him out of my sight!’ lit. ‘Cast him behind (= out of) my eyes!’ In the present context the meaning is: cause him to disappear, wipe him out.

For some comments on the pathos of this episode within the context of love and friendship as portrayed in the SH, see Särközı 1978, 152.

The episode described in this section is not related in the SWCCL nor in Râfîd al-Din’s work, but both Yasûqen and her sister Yasû in are often mentioned by Râfîd, who however calls them Yeşâqen — Yeşîket and Yeşîlûn respectively. See SL, I, 202a (Index), and I, 286a (Index). Whereas Yeşîket can
be put down to a scribal error, the form Yesülün (= Yiylüün) for Yiylü — cf. above, n. 155 — is difficult to explain since Yiylü is a woman’s name in its own right. See Bese 1980, 319, no. 16. For initial ye — yi, cf. HCG, 2, and above, n. 50.

§ 157. The SH places Ong Qan’s campaign against Toqto’a Beki s.a. 1202, but the chronology of these events is unreliable and the present campaign against the Merkit no doubt took place a few years earlier, in 1198, or very soon after (SL2, 1/2, 111, gives 1197-1198). See above, n. 151, and below, n. 177. Cf. HCG, 265-266; GK, 59-62. We last met Toqto’a Beki in § 109 when, defeated by the joint forces of Ong Qan, Temüjün and Jamaqa, he had fled and ‘entered the Barqijin territory’, i.e. the Barqijin Lowland (tökön; tögüm in §§ 8 and 177). On this area east of the Baikal, see above, n. 109. As noted by Pelliot (HCG, 288), ‘Le Barqijîn-tögüm apparait à plusieurs reprises comme le lieu de refuge où se rendent gens ou tribus chassés de Mongolie; ils “entrent” au Barqijin.’

For Tögsü Beki, Toqto’a Beki’s eldest son, see ibid., 281-282.

On Qutuqtaqi and Ça’alan, see ibid., 282-284. For the etymology of the name Qutuqtaqi, see Rybatzki [2003], s.v.; for that of Ça’alan, see HCG, 282, but cf. Bese 1978, 365, no. 14; idem 1980, 319, no. 7; Rybatzki [2003], s.v.; and above, n. 153. As noted by Pelliot, loc. cit., 282, the text has ‘Ca’arun’ for Ça’alan owing to a scribal error. The words oki ina are probably a later interpolation (they are not found in the corresponding passage in AT1, 568); Qutuqtaqi and Ça’alan must have been the wives, not the daughters, of Toqto’a. Hence the text should in all likelihood read: ‘seized Toqto’a’s two wives Qutuqtaqi and Ça’alan.’ On, 69, following Mu, II, 70, translated: ‘He took Toqto’a’s two girls, Qutuqtaqi and Cha’alan as his wives’, but in the 2001 ed., 132, following Ci, 85, he rephrased the sentence as follows: ‘He took Toqto’a’s two daughters, Qutuqtaqi and Cha’alan, and his wife.’ Wei, 109, had also taken the verb yao 3E of the Chinese sectional summary in the sense of ‘to take for himself’, which may be interpreted, of course, as ‘to take as wife or concubine’, the Mongolian verb ab- (which is regularly glossed yao in the SH) having both the meaning of ‘to seize’ and ‘to take as wife’. Cf. also Fr.-Ar., 458, n. 3, quoting Hsieh, 81, where this phrase is understood in the same way. And we can add to the list Al, 76, who was probably the first to come up with this interpretation. However, neither the SWCCL nor Rashid al-Din speaks of Ong Qan’s taking the two ladies as wives, although both sources mention the event in question. See SWCCL 1, 21a, and SL2, 12, 111, where, in both instances, the verb used is ‘to capture.’ See HCG, 264. Oddly enough, as already pointed out by Pelliot, op. cit. 283, in this single passage of his work Rashid refers to the two women as being the daughters of Toqto’a Beki, whereas elsewhere they are always called his wives. There is, therefore, a strange contamination here with the SH which is difficult to explain and which points to two diverging traditions.

Toqto’a’s son Qutu (= Qodu) was mentioned earlier in §§ 141 and 144. See above, n. 141, for the problem concerning his name. On Cila’ün, mentioned here for the first time, see HCG, 287. Cf. § 177 and comm.

‘Gave not one thing’, lit. ‘did not give whatever (ya’u ber).’ For this use of the particle ber, see Street 1981, 156ff. Failing to share the booty with an ally was a dishonourable act and an infringement of the customary law. See Çinggis Qan’s later reproaches to Ong Qan on that score in § 177. Cf. SL, 1/2, 128.

In the SWCCL 1, 21a, and YS1, 6, the fact that Ong Qan kept all the booty for himself is also mentioned. See HCG, 265.

§ 158. This entire section has been translated by Pelliot in HCG, 310, where, however, ‘(maqulaq-) is a misprint for ‘(maqala-).’

Buyuir Qan, on whom see above, §§ 141-144, 151, was the son of Ihai Bilgal (the Ihana Qan of § 151), and Ihai Bilgal Qan of §§ 177, 189, 194 and the (elder?) brother of Tayyang Qan (see below, § 166), with whom he had quarrelled. His domain, or camping and grazing grounds (nunläq), was in the
region of the river Urungu south of the Altai, his brother having retained the ancestral Naiman territory further to the north-west, i.e. the region of the Black Yrtsh and Bukhtarma rivers. Thus Chinggis, who was coming from the east, clashed first with Buyuirq. However, in this passage the SH has apparently again confused two different expeditions, as in the case of the joint campaign against the Merkit related in §§ 104-112. At any rate, the campaign against Buyuirq seems to have taken place also in 1199. On all these chronologically complex questions, see HCG, 297-311; CK, 63, 73, and CK', 53-56 (= CK', 57-61). For Güleggü (Güdağir in § 141), see above, n. 141.

As pointed out earlier (n. 151), the Naimans were strongly influenced by Turkic culture, as evident in their nomenclature. In this section, most of the geographical and proper names are Turkic or part-Turkic (i.e. Turco-Mongolian hybrids): Ulug Taq (= tu. Uluy Taq 'Great Mountain'); Soqqar Usun (< tu. soqqar 'cold' and mo. usun 'water'), i.e. 'river'; cf. SMT, 25; Dogstüren 1977, 188; Qum Singir (< tu. Qum Senjir 'Sand Promontory'); Yedi Tubaq (< tu. 'Who Has Seven Balls'); Kılıç Baş (= tu. Qizil Baş 'Red Head'). On the Ulug Taq and the Altai mountains, see above, n. 144. Soqqar Usun, mentioned in the Chinese and Persian sources, has been identified with present-day Söög Gol or Sogogiyin Gol, north-west of the city of Kobdo (Xovd), at 49° 01' N 89° 27' E. See Pelliot 1920, 173; TH, 239 (= JYT, 412-413). Cf. also HCG, 310. According to Perleș, 5 (cf. Perleș', 90), Soqqar Usun at 47° 90° E is still called Soqqar Usun. The Üründü (< Üründü, also a Turkic name of uncertain etymology) is the well-known river Urungu (kh. Üründü; ch. Wu-lun-ku ho 乌倫古河), in the Altai-Kobdo area (west of the Altai and south of Kobdo), but actually in northern Sinkiang. See HCG, 314-316; Hambis 1974, 38-39; TH, 132 (= JYT, 231). Qum Singir is an unidentified locality on the upper course of the Urungu, probably near present Bulgan (ch. Pu-chan 布連河), at 46° 07' N 90° 31' E. See HCG, 315-316. Lake Kılıç Baş is the modern Pu-lun-t'o hai 布倫托海 (Uründü or Ülengüür Nur) – the Ulyungur Nor of (still) most maps – into which flows the Urungu, always in northern Sinkiang. See HCG, 311-315; Hambis 1974, 39. Cf. Li, 159, n. 158, also for the other place-names; Ligeti 1966, 128-130; Poppe 1955, 40; TMEN, no. 1482. On Yedi Tubaq, see HCG, 317-318; Li, loc. cit.; On, 76, n. 188.

For qara'il 'pavilion', see above, n. 142. Qara'il yabay is, literally, 'to go as a pavilion.' Cf. Or, 111, 268, n. 2.

For bolun, lit. 'becoming' = 'being on the point of ...', 'being about to ...', cf. VG, 51-52 (where, however, on p. 52, '§ 159' is a misprint for '§ 158').

For the words olang-nyan tasurapdag (lit. 'undergoing the breaking of his saddle-strap'), see Poppe 1964, 376.

The events in this section are retold with additional details and slight variations in § 177. § 159. On Kökse'i (- Köksegi) Sabraq, see HCG, 318. He was one of the leaders of the army of Tayang Qan of the Naiman whom Tayang sent to meet the forces of Chinggis Qan and Öng Qan that were approaching his territory. For kökse'i (- q.) Köksegi 'chest pain'; cf. TMEN, no. 1678. Cf. below, n. 165. Qatgaluqstä, lit. 'fighter, warrior', i.e. 'good at fighting', 'a great warrior.'

The Bayidakar Confluence (Bayidakar Belić) was an area just south of the point where the river Bairdarik (i.e. the Bayidarik or Bairdagar Gol) meets its main tributary, the Draik (or Drzq, Zág) Gol, south of the Khangai Mountains. See HCG, 321-322. According to Perleș, 6 (cf. Perleș', 86), this locality at 47° 90° E (the '74 of Perleș') is a misprint, tacitly corrected in Perleș', 8, which has unfortunately passed into Perleș's text. It is now called Zág Bairdagar Belić. Cf. Hambis 1974, 39-40. For the name Bayidakar - Bairdagar (cf. § 177), see Cleaves 1936, 273, n. 784. Belić is a term meaning 'the place or area where two rivers meet', i.e. 'the confluence.' In § 161 (Y 5, 31b) it is glossed lu-i'k'um 류감, lit. 'the mouth of the valley' – i.e. of the river valley. It can, therefore, be loosely rendered as 'vallée'
That same night (sùni bô'et), lit. ‘having been (= being still) night.’ Cf. above, n. 110.

Quray al-Baqi‘ (‘Black Tank’) is a river not identified by Pelliot (HCG, 325) which, according to Perles 1, 91 (cf. Perles 1, 91) it is probably the present Xar Stûlîn Gol (north-east of Zag Bâldrajin Bêlîr at 47°N 100°E), a river which is not marked on our maps.

§ 163. The ‘anti-qara’ Jamuqa, who suddenly reappears here after the debacle described in § 144, had actually rejoined Qan Qan and Chinggis Qan in this campaign, but, according to the SH, only to play a treacherous role. On these events, see OK, 62-64; ČK, 53-56 (cf. ČK, 57-61).

Has been sending envoys to the Naiman, lit. ‘had envoys at the Naiman’, i.e. he had been having relations with them. Cf. § 166.

The skylark that stays in one place (qâq qawîrûqanà). The qawîrûqanà of the SH has been identified with nûq qawîrûqatî, kh. xârbâqi, the Mongolian skylark, or stopper lark (Melanocorypha mongolica). See HCG, 326-327; Li, 159, n. 160; Ozû, III, 274-275, n. 2; Viette, 1990, 384-385. On the other hand, Moesta identifies the qawîrûqanà with ord. žîrænånà lîwā ‘nom d’un petit oiseau’, the written form of which is qawîrûqanà ‘the seagull’ (DO, 346a, and Addenda et Corrigenda, xiib). Poppe, for his part, writes (p.c.): qawîrûqanà = Khalkha xârbâqi ‘Falco Eleonorae’, Engl. ‘Pigeon hawk’ (see Bull. of the Terminological Commission of the Mongolian Acad. of Sc., Nos 78-80, Ulaanbatar, 1970, p. 24). I think Pelliot is correct in view of the contrast implied in Jamuqa’s utterance. The term bît‘ûr corresponds to the bîtîr of §§ 77, 220. See above, n. 77. I translate aţrîr as ‘migratory’, since both the ideas of moving away and returning, of coming and going, are conveyed by the verb aţrîr—See Hw, IV, 1, 275, n. 2. The contrast expressed by the poetic simile is, of course, that between a stable and loyal person and one that is fickle and treacherous. Cf. Hung 1956, 17, n. 6. For
the variant sīmīl used in the same story recorded in the SWCCCL, 22a, in SL, 1/2, 113, and in the VS 1, 9, see HCG, 326-327.

Gūrūn Ba‘urut is also known to us from Rāṣīl al-Dīn and the SWCCCL, see HCG, 295 and 326-329. Pelliot (ibid., 328-329) has discussed the apellation Ubbīqta – an ethnonym of *Ubbīq (*Ubbīr) – of the SH, and suggests that it is probably an early scribal error for Ubbīrīsī, lit. ‘With the face’ Bāyād (i.e. red, for shame), so that it would in fact be a nickname (‘Red Face’) by which Gūrūn Ba‘urut was also known. AT, 57a, has the corrupt reading Ubbīqīsāl Gūrūn (not Gūrūn as in ATL, 119) Bayurut. See, however, Bess’s remarks in Bese 1988, 29-31, countering Pelliot’s interpretation, proposing instead the reading *Oubbīqta ‘male member of the Oubbīq’ (‘clan’)‘ for the epithet of Kūrūn Bayurut (ibid., 30).

‘How can you speak so deceitfully’, lit. ‘How can you speak deceiving (lūsarūtu) thus’. Lūsarūt ‘to deceive’ = m. lūsarūt-id; cf. m. lūsrūtu, lūsrūtu ‘to flatter, to deceive cunningly’. See TMEN, n. 169.

‘Speak ... backbiting and slandering’ (ālkīn jīngān ūgūlēyō). Cf. No. 169, 155, where the expression ālkīn jīngān ūgūlē is rendered simply as ‘médrē, calomner’. See also Ligei 1972, 3, n. 3; OZ, III, 277-278, n. 6. (The ūgūleyē of L, 114, is a misprint for ūgūlēyē.)

‘Your upright (silīn) brother’. For silīn (pmn. silīya, sīlyun; m. silīyan) ‘upright, noble, sincere, etc.’, see Cleaves 1950, 113, n. 75; de Rachewiltz 1982, 75-76, n. 224. Cf. also DO, 634b. Here Činggis is referred to as a ‘brother’ (aqā de) of Jamaqa, the term ‘brother’ used serasu lato with the meaning of ‘cousin’, the two being indeed cousins by reason of their common ancestry from Bodončar. See above, n. 104.

§ 161. ‘Early next morning, at daybreak’, lit. ‘Early next day (the morrow): managār, see above, n. 159, the day lightening.’

‘He wanted to fight’, lit. ‘Saying, ‘let us fight!’’
Kozin's interpretation (see LDAT, 136). Coyaji's commentary (AT', 250) is also of no help. In view of this, and the fact that Kozin's, Damdinshuren's and Gaoshe's interpretation is at variance with both the Chinese gloss and the sectional summary, one cannot accept it without reservations.

'No longer counted them as people to be reckoned with', lit. 'did not count them as people'— 'people' (haran) meaning here 'fighting men', i.e. a fighting force that could still cause much trouble to the Mongols. As noted by Ev-Pop, 280, n. 51, there is a similar statement in the SWCC1, 24a, where we read that, after routing the Naiman with his brother Qasar at *Hulun Janče (possibly a mistake for Hulun Cheg[i]), Cinggis Qan saw that the power of the Naiman had been reduced and there was no (longer) need to worry (on account of it). Cf. HCG, 387.

However, this applies to another, subsequent campaign which is not mentioned in the SH nor by Railid al-Din, but which is recorded in the YS 1, 7, where the account ends with the words 'The power of the Naiman was henceforth reduced.' Cf. Pelliot’s remarks in HCG, 387-388; and ÖK, 65. It seems that in the course of the later editing of the SH a sentence that was transposed from another entry in a Chinese or Mongol source to the SH. This final sentence of § 161 is, indeed, somewhat incongruous as later events showed that the Naiman, in spite of their internal feuds, were still a power to be reckoned with.

§ 162. Senggum (= Senggum) is Ilaq Sengum, the son of Ong Qan, called Nilqa Senggum in §§ 165, 166 and 167; always Ilaq (I-la-ha 色利哈 [释利哈]) in the YS, see YS/MYS, 14a; and Ilaq Senggum – Nilqa Sengum in Railid al-Din’s work. See SL, 1/1, 130, 131; 1/2, 114 (twice). Nilqa is a nickname meaning ‘junior, little one (= the youngest boy or son).’ Cf. § 195 (see, however, On, 73, n. 199). Sengum (> senggum) is a mongolized form of the Kitan/Liao title hsiangs-wen 西涼文, itself a transcription in Chinese of the Kitan form of the original Chinese title hsiang-kung 西 órg "His Excellency the Minister", usually given to ministers and heads of the Secretariat. See HCG, 334; and
Choimaan 1997. The 'four steeds' are parallelled to the 'four hounds' (dörben noqas, see § 195), viz. Ġebe (see § 146), Qubīla (see § 120), Jelme (see § 97), and Sübe'eti (see § 120), the other four champions and army leaders. Cf. HCG, 340. For brief sketches of these personages, see ČÖK and, especially, TYÖ. According to Rašīd al-Dīn, the four sons of Cinggis Qan (Jōči, Ça'adai, Ögdīei and Tolui) were also known as the 'four küdūks.' See Successors, 159. Cf. SH, § 254, confirming Rašīd's statement. As for the symbolism of the number four, see Moses 1996, 80-81.

Hūlä' an Quit ('Red Cliffs') is a locality which, according to Perleē6, 5 ( = Perleē6, 96), corresponds to modern Ulaan Xus (the Ulaan Hus of our maps) in the Bayan Olğii Almang, at 49º N 89º E. Perleē's identification seems to be an arbitrary one. This place-name occurs again in § 177, in a longer and different form (Jorqal Qun-u Hula'anu ut Bolda'ut). Although Perleē could not identify this locality (HCG, 380), by a different argument it may be developed it can be definitely situated near the Selenga in the region of modern Kyakhta. See below, n. 177.

'Had been shot in the thigh by an arrow' (guya qaqqala). Qaqqal is the passive form of qa- 'to shoot (an arrow).' Cf. kalm. yu-č. See Öz, III, 294-295, n. 3.

'Those four steeds' arrived and saw him (āburāt), and they recovered ... for him (āburạt ūkber). Aburāt 'to save, rescue' is followed here (as in three other instances in this section) by the auxiliary verb ọk- ( = mo. ọt-) indicating that the action is performed in the interest of a person other than the subject (Cinggis Qan), i.e. for the benefit of Ong Qan and Senggüm. It is, therefore, not necessary to translate ọk- as 'to give, return, etc.' Cf. CI, 87.

'His good father' or 'his late father', as in § 73. Ong Qan is referring to the events described above, §§ 50-151.

'Who had been lost', lit. 'who had finished going' (odun baragaşan), i.e. 'gone to the last man,' 'utterly dispersed,' with bara- 'to finish' acting as the auxiliary of completed action. Cf. above, n. 149.

People', i.e. one's tribesmen, is rendered in this section with the expressions irge orgo (~ erga) and ulas, which are synonymous. Cf. § 177: odun baragaşan irge orgo.

The words 'now, once more, ... for me' have been rendered in my translation in conformity with the Chinese wording in the sectional summary (V2 § 35a-b) supported by AT1, 58a, which is slightly at variance with that of the SH. See CI, 87, n. 43, for a comparison of the three texts.

For the exact connotations of the last sentence, cf. Lettres, 83 and n. 252; and below, n. 172. Cleaves' translation 'Let the protection of Heaven and Earth know how I shall return the benefit' is incorrect insofar as the verb mede- 'to know', in the present context means 'to decide', as indeed shown in Lettres, loc. cit. Cf. also ibid., 47-48.

Regarding the events related in the last sections (§§ 160-163), it seems odd that Cinggis Qan should wish to assist Ong Qan and Senggüm in their predicament (after Ong Qan and Senggüm in their predicament described in § 159. For possible explanations of Cinggis' intentions, see CK, 54-56 (= CK1, 58-61).

§ 164. 'Gathered the lost people and returned them to me.' The verb guriya- 'to gather, assemble, bring together' implies also the action of 'conquering.' See below, n. 196.

'As for myself' (bi her). For this anaphoric-emphatic use of the particle her, see Street 1981, 147-148. Cf. Öz, III, 300, n. 2.

'To ascend to the heights' and the parallel expression 'to ascend to the cliffs' are metaphors for 'to die,' as already pointed out by Ligeti (Li, 159, n. 164). This no doubt originates from the ancient custom of burying the chief on the slopes of a (sacred) mountain, as we know was the case with Cinggis and several of his successors. For some references to burial places on elevated places, see Barthold & Rogers 1970, 210-211; Successors, 141. Cf. also Perleē 1956; Boyle 1974a; Tatar 1976, 4-7; and CI, 88, n. 44, for further references. Qubīla,
‘cliffs’, plural of qaladn, poses a problem. In § 103, ‘Qaldun’ stands for ‘Būrqa Qaldun’, the sacred mountain of the Mongols. In our passage, however, the Chinese interlinear gloss for qaladn is yai-mei 什里‘cliffs’, a meaning that may have been inferred by the Ming translators from the word úndit ‘heights’ of the preceding couplet, and from the fact that it occurs in the name of Mount Burqa Qaldun. But the explanation of the name Burqa Qaldun as ‘Buddha Mountain (or Heights, or Cliff)’ is by no means certain. See above, n. 1. Nevertheless, I too accept, albeit with some reservations, the Chinese gloss.

‘Lack force of character’ (ahwri úgeï)”an bai”, lit. ‘are without a good character.’ Cf. Cl. 88: ‘are without virtue,’ Abüri does, in fact, mean both ‘character, nature, disposition’, and ‘virtue’ (c.’good character’). See de Rachewiltz 1982, 53, n. 6; Cleaves 1982, 78-79, n. 20.

‘There is only Senggüm, my one son, but it is as if he did not exist’, lit. ‘My only son is as if I did not have him (úgeï úsī), and Senggüm is the only one’, i.e. Ong Qan’s only son, Senggüm, is a nonentity, a worthess man (in the father’s opinion), but, alas, he is the only one he has. This, in fact, was not true. As already pointed out by Cleaves, according to Ra’d al-Din Ong Qan had at least two sons. See Cl. 88, n. 47. Cf. HCG, 237. For the Persian text, see SL2, l12, 109 and n. 6, where the name of Ong Qan’s youngest son (Senggüm was the eldest) is given as ‘Eku’ (‘Ejû’ in Pelliot’s transcription). It would seem that here, again, the SH twists the facts to produce a dramatic effect; however, one cannot exclude the possibility that when Ong Qan made this statement the second son was already dead. For the use of úsī as ‘if, like’ (s. nom. méni), with and without úgeï, see Cleaves 1951, 89, n. 54; Öz, III, 313, n. 6. Cf. DO, 620a-b.

Ong Qan’s and Çinggis Qan’s mutual declaration in the Black Forest (Qara Tün) by (lit. ‘of’) the Tu’ula, i.e. the Tula River (see above, n. 96), was the formal oath sanctioning the father-son adoption established through the bond of andarship between Ong Qan and Yiśigüi Ba’atür, on which see §§ 96 and 124 and com.; Li, 149, n. 104. See also Vlad2, 76. What we have in the present section is the actual wording of the oath. Cf. § 177, where Çinggis reproaches Ong Qan for not having kept to it. The exact locality in the Black Forest area where the declaration was made is also specified in § 177, which says it was the ‘Hula’an’tu Bolda’u of Joraqul Qan’ i.e. the ‘Red Solitary Hills of Deer Cliff.’ See below, n. 177.

‘The reason why ... was because’, lit. ‘As for the reason for which ... it was by the reason that.’

‘Such was the reason’ (yusn teyínû). The yusn in l1, 116, is an oversight for yosn. Cf. Lettres, 70.

‘Out of jealousy’ (nayidûla), lit. ‘being jealous.’

‘We shall attack together as one ... We shall chase them together as one!’ ‘As one’ renders the Mongolian niken-e, lit. ‘in one.’ Cf. Cl. 89: ‘in one place (a literal but incorrect translation of the Chinese gloss l-chû ‘at, here = in’ together’); On. 72: ‘with one goal ... with one aim’ (cf. the 2001 ed., 135: ‘with a single [goal] ... with a single [aim]’). However, niken-e is inseparable from qamtû, forming the expression qamtû niken-e which means ‘together, jointly, simultaneously, unanimously’ (Les, 925a). Cf. Öz, III, 299.

‘Should a snake with venomous teeth ... Should a snake with venomous fangs’ — all familiar similes for a treacherous man who pretends to be a friend.

For södition: ‘to provoke or incite (discord, a quarrel) among each other’ and the parallel verb addar-a = (pno. addarta) ‘to slander, to sow discord through slander’, see Ligeti 1972, 2-3, n. 3. Cf. Öz, III, 304-365, nn. 9, 10.

For ara’a (s. nom. ara) ‘large tooth; molar,fang’, cf. TMEN, no. 474, Les., 474.

For the expressions ‘By talking only mouth to mouth (lit. “by teeth and mouth”)’ and ‘By explaining only face to face (lit. “by mouth and tongue”), cf. Mo, 210.

The entire poetic passage is translated in Mo, 172, n. 155. See also Céretsolom 1986, 71.
For the expression **nge buraldu** - to pledge one's word", see above, n. 123.

For the corresponding section in the SWCCCL, see HCG, 257, 262. For Raśīd al-Dīn's account, see SL, II, (110), 116, where the locality of Ong Qan and Cinggis Qan's meeting is given as the Sa'ari Steppe (Sa'ari Ke' er, see above, n. 123), i.e. the area west of the south-west corner of the great bend of the Kerulen and east of the great bend of the Tsala - an area therefore contiguous to the Black Forest and, indeed, occasionally identified with it. See above, n. 128. The different accounts are discussed in ČK, 55-56 (= ČK', 59-61).

§ 165. 'More affection', lit. 'double affection' (dabguur amar). Jöci is Cinggis' eldest son, mentioned here for the first time. For the name Jöci, read by some scholars as Jöci and almost certainly meaning 'guest', see above, n. 51. Cf. also Golden 2002. Jöci was born soon after the Merkit's defeat and Börte's rescue (§ 110), probably - at the latest - in 1184 (see above, n. 104). If so, he must have been about eighteen (according to the SH chronology) when these events took place, viz. in 1202. On him, see also below, n. 254. After the failure of the projected marriage with Čaur Beki as related in this section, Jöci married a daughter of Iaqa Gambu. He was the father of Buri, qan of the Golden Horde (r. 1227-55). He died probably in 1227 (or, possibly, earlier - the exact date is not known) and, according to Raśīd al-Dīn, was buried in a different burial ground from that of his father, i.e. not at Burqan Qaldun. There were always doubts about his paternity, since Börte had apparently conceived him while in captivity, but Cinggis recognized him as his son. However, he was not his favourite offspring. His personality is somewhat shadowy. He seems to have been mostly interested in hunting and shooting, and, generally, fighting; and he liked boasting (cf. SH, §§ 254, 255). On him and his descendants, see NMP, III (Index), 137a-b; NHIO, 10 et passim (see the Index, 255a); Chapitre CVIII, 3, 52-53; Successors, 358a (Index); Y Shi, 160; Auhin 1975, 470 and n. 19; Golden 2002.

For déyi 'younger sister', see above, n. 85.

For Senggum's younger sister Čaur Beki (and the name Čaur), see HCG, 58-59, 234, 235, 246. The word Čaur (= pnom. Ča'ur) means 'railed, plunder'; cf. HW, 26. It is often used as a proper name. Cf. Rybatzki [2003], s.v. For Beki (read begi)? - an honorific title given to both men and women - see the discussion in n. 49 above.

Qojin Beki (read QoOin Begi)? was the eldest of Cinggis' daughters and, indeed, of his children; he later married Buri or Botu (who had first married Buri or Botu who had first married Temitulun). See HCG, 50-51, 235. Cf. NMP, I, 303, and below, n. 202. Qojin Beki is called Fujin Begi by Raśīd al-Dīn (SL, I/2, 70; Successors, 97), Qo'alin Begi in the SWCCCL, 33b, and Qojin Begi in the YSH, 109, 2759. The MTPL, 6b, has Ahi Be' for Qo'alin Begi. See CG, 24, 30-31, n. 14. Her original name requires further investigation. Cf. Rybatzki [2003], s.v.

For Tusqa, Senggum's son, cf. HCG, 234, 235, 339; NMP, loc. cit.

'By the door' (ala'um-a). The Chinese interlinear gloss and sectional summary both take the word ala'um-a (w.l. *ala'um*) to mean 'the back of the door' (=hIku), so that ala'um-a is, literally, 'at the back of the door (of the tent). Unfortunately, ala'um-a is a hapax legomenon in Mongolian. The AT, 58b, has ala'um-a (= ala'um-a < *ala'um-a), which does not help, as alaum is also not attested elsewhere. The explanation given in TH, 91-92 (= JYT, 162) to the effect that ala'um corresponds to šag. alay 'fire' (< pers.) and adopted by On, 73 and n. 198 (and repeated in the 2001 ed., 136-137, no. 365), is in my view far-fetched and unconvincing. The word appears again in § 214, likewise glossed 'back of the door.' However, in the corresponding passage in AT, 68a, the word ala'um-a has been dropped by the copyist. I think we should accept the Chinese interpretation, particularly since it is repeated in another section of the work. Only' (e'nekke, mo. egoemo), for this word, which can also be rendered as 'exclusively' and 'constantly', cf. Cleaves 1949, 107-108, n. 65.
The back of the tent (qoyimir) is the place opposite the entrance and facing south; it is, therefore, the place of honour occupied by the master of the house, his wife, and his special guests. What Senqium means is that a girl from his clan marry into Cinggis' clan, she will have to sit near the door of the tent, i.e. she would be treated like a servant; if, on the other hand, a girl from Cinggis' clan should marry into SenggUM’s family, she would expect to sit in the back of the tent, facing the door, i.e. she would be treated like a lady. Hence Senqium’s refusal to give his daughter. For a different interpretation, see CW, 117; and Li, 160, n. 165. For the term qoyimir (= qoyimin), see Cleaves 1948a, 451, n. 9; Oz‘, III, 311, n. 4.

‘He spoke disparagingly of us.’ This statement is noteworthy, for by ‘us’ (bidan-i) is meant the family of Cinggis Qan, not the Mongols in general. The person who relates this incident must, therefore, be a member of that family. See Section Three of the Introduction, and above, n. 156.

In his heart (= in his mind), lit. ‘within himself’ (doto‘ran‘an). Cf. above, n. 156.

For Nilqa Senqium = Ilqa Senqium, see above, n. 162.

Lost affection’, lit. ‘the heart (= affection, love) remained behind’ (dura qo‘qor‘u‘a). For the expression dura qo‘qor (= qo‘qar) ‘to lose one’s affection (for someone)’, see Cleaves 1948a (where the relevant section of § 165 is also translated and annotated, ibid., 451-452); Letteris, 68-70.

As other scholars have pointed out, the purpose of the marriage proposed by Cinggis Qan—outwardly an expression of closer friendship—was motivated by a desire to increase his own prestige and power through a double alliance. Later Mongol historiography may have regarded this proposal and SenggUM’s rejection as somewhat demeaning for the ruling house and not fit for inclusion in the official account. Hence the omission of the episode in the SW/CCL and Rahid’s work. See Ratnerovsky 1976, 511; Hung 1956, 17, n. 5. Cf. CK, 62ff. (= ĂK, 67ff.), also for the echo of the story concerning Cinggis’ failure to establish a marriage alliance with Ong Qan in Marco Polo’s The Description of the World.

§ 166 After the events described in § 153 (s.a. 1202), Alatan, Qarqar and Daritai had turned against Cinggis Qan. We are now in the spring of the following year, the Year of the Pig, 1203. The names of the other personages listed present a problem, as it is not clear whether they are all proper names, or whether two or more of them (Qardaidai, Soge’eti, Ebegeljin and Noyakin) are ethnic designations (i.e. of the Qardakid, the Soge’en, the Ebegeljin and Noyakin tribes or clans). Therefore, we have different interpretations, resulting in the actual individuals named being from five to nine in number with Jamuaqa, Alatan and Qutar. Among the more recent translations, cf. Li, 166 (8): Mu, II, 98 and 105-106, n. 8 (6); Oz‘, III, 315 (5); Oz‘, I, 197 (5); Cl, 90 (8); On, 73 (9; but in the 2001 ed., 137, the ‘Qardakids, Ebegeljins, and Noyaksins have become ‘people‘). Ev-Pop, 120 (8). Of the earlier ones, Pe 170, lists seven, while Ha, 57, lists only six. There is a total lack of uniformity; however, we know that To’oril was a man of the Soge’en (w.f. Sogegen) tribe (on him and his tribe see HCG, 128-130, 255-257; cf. Beso 1988, 33-34), and that Qalilun (= Qalilun Beki was a Döreb). See § 141, and HCG, 402. Moreover, the ‘Qardaidai’ mentioned together with Ebegeljin and Noyakin is obviously related to the ‘Qarta‘at’ that appears, also with Ebegeljin and Noyakin (but after their names) later in this section. In AT, 59a, we find in the first instance ‘Kirdaqbai’ and in the second ‘Kirdaqai’, which Ligeti (ATL, 123) has equated to ‘Qardaidai’ and ‘Qartayat’ respectively on the basis of the SH readings. ‘Qardaidai’ is clearly an ethnic from ‘Qardakin. Cf. Qadagaidai ‘a Qadagin (tribesman)’ < Qadagin. See HCG, 394-395. Qarta‘at (w.f. Qartayat) is a plural of Qarta‘an (w.f. Qartayan) which is the name of a Mongol tribe. See St. 1, 71, 78, 183. ‘Qardaidai’ must then be a misreading for *Qarta’adai, probably because of a phonetic resemblance with Qadagidai. Ebegeljin and Noyakin were two Qarta‘an.
tribesmen. Later they are mentioned again with their tribal designation in apposition: ‘Ebiğejin and Noyakin – the two Qarta’at (pl. of Qarta’an).’ This interpretation would accord for the different designations of these two personages. For the incorrect form ‘Nobukin’ for ‘Noyakin’ in Y’ and Y’ (§ 40a), cf. Y’ 6, 11a: ‘Noyakin.’ See Cleaves 1948a, 422-453, n. 16. For Qarta’an, Qarta’ta, ‘Qarta’ada, cf. Borjigin, Borjigit, Borjigid, Borjigidad. See ETI, 33b. For Qač’un’s title of beki, unrelated to that of beki = begi of § 165, see HCG, 180, and TP 28:1931, 231.

Berke Elet (‘Difficult Sands’) was, according to Perleè’, 8 (cf. Perleè’, 97), a locality situated in the region of the southern Bayan Uul (= Bayan Ula, at 47° N 109° E), with which he identifies the Jeje’er Heights (Jeje’er Undur). Perleè’s suggestion is probably correct: Berke Elet was certainly in this general area, and Jeje’er must not be confused, as some investigators have done, with the Çekêer of § 61, etc., which was in eastern Mongolia (cf. HCG, 423). The identification in the CKA, 33b (cf. ibid., 32, A-5) of Berke Elet with ‘Berkhini kÖhündi’ (i.e. Berkini Xöndi) in the Argun Range area must be dismissed, since the Jeje’er Heights cannot be identified with the Argun Range. See below, n. 185. For the word berke in the combination Berke Elet, see Cleaves 1959, 86, n. 282.

‘Has messengers sent with secret communications’, lit. ‘has messengers with a tongue (keletir),’ i.e. with verbal communications (= secret information). Cf. above, n. 142, for the special usage of the term kele ‘tongue.’ See also Oz’, III, 317-318, n. 2.

Tayang Qan was one of the two leaders of the important Naiman tribe, first mentioned in § 141 in connection with Buyiruq Qan who had rallied to Jamiqatu. The name Tayang is in reality an epithet like Ong Qan, deriving from the Chinese title ta-wang XE: ‘great king (or prince).’ See HCG, 221; TMEM, no. 122; Fletcher 1986, 23. His real name was Tai Buqa. He was the brother, probably the younger one, of Buyiruq; their father was Inanič Bilge Qan, on whom see above, n. 151. As already mentioned (n. 158), the two brothers had quarrelled and

split, so that the Naiman tribe, or tribal complex, was now divided, with Buyiruq Qan and his followers occupying the mountain region of the Altai in the south down to the river Urungu, and Tayang Qan the territory of the Black Irysh and Bukhtarma rivers in the north-west. For Tayang Qan, besides HCG, 304-310, see also Gaandmaa 1968, 99-100.

For nende- ‘to make a surprise attack,’ see Oz’, III, 318, n. 4.

‘I will join you and attack his flank’ (köndelen-ée orsłaasu), lit. ‘I shall enter (= join) from the side.’

‘For you … For you …’: the action in favour of Senggüm is expressed by means of the verbal verb ek (= mo. iki) ‘to give.’ Cf. above, n. 163. Peliot’s translation (Pe, 181) ‘nous [te] donnerons … je vous le donnerai’ is, therefore, incorrect.

For the two Qarta’at, see above.

For kölde- ‘to seize the feet’ (köl kölde- id.), cf. DO, 426b.

The best plan is to go’ (argala ochu). For argala (proa argala, cf. AT, 59a) = argala, an ellipsis for arga-ča sayin ana ‘the best from among the schemes (or ways and means, methods, plans) at our disposal,’ see Mo, 23.

‘If his people are taken away from him’ (ulus-iyan abda állu), lit. ‘if he undertakes the taking of his people.’ For this passive construction, see Poppe 1964, 373-374.

‘Prince Nilga Senggüm’ (Nilga Senggüm köölün). Here köölün ‘son’ = ‘prince.’ See HW, 105. I follow Mu, II, 99, and others in taking köölün with this meaning, which is appropriate as Senggüm was the son of Ong Qan (his only son according to the SH, § 164), and there was no particular reason for Qač’un Beki to call him ‘son.’

‘Whatever you decide,’ lit. ‘whatever you think (or intend to do).’

‘To the farthest limit,’ lit. ‘To the extreme point of the long (length), rather than ‘to the top (of a tree),’ as understood by some translators on the basis of the sectional summary (Y’ 5, 42a). Cf. N’a’, 169; Pe, 181; Mu, loc. cit.; Wa, 263, etc. The Mongol couplet is obviously an ancient saying corresponding to
our expressions 'all the way', 'in fortune and misfortune', and the like. Cf. El-Ar, 482, n. 11. It occurs again in § 199 where, however, the word for 'bottom' (hidur) appears in the form hidur = mo. tayar id. For this word, see ibid.; Pelliot 1925, 217, no. 26; Poppe 1969, 268.

The beginning of § 166 up to 'set out and went' is translated and annotated in Cleaves 1948a, 452-453.

The present account represents the development of a situation which originates in § 160 with the rapprochement of Jamiqa to Ong Qan and Cinc岐s Qan (made, however, with ulterior motives according to the SH), and which will inexorably lead to the break-up between Ong Qan and his adopted son in the following sections. This interplay between Jamiqa, Senggum and Ong Qan which is described in the SH at the personal level, reflects the tribal struggle for supremacy in Mongolia between the three main rival groups, with shifting and ephemeral alliances, at a time when the Kereiy leadership was weakened by internal conflict and the problem of succession (see §§ 152, 164). On the special relationship between Ong Qan and Jamiqa, and on the latter's role in the present circumstances, cf. Buysaenderger 1989.

§ 167. Sayiqa Tode'en appears only once in the SH, but is mentioned in other works, including SL, i.2, 123, where he is referred to as an emir (= no. nusum) of Senggum. On the name Tode'en, see HCG, 126 and 467b (Index).

The demonstrative pronouns ede'er (= mo. edeger) 'these' and tede'er (= mo. useguh) 'those' appear here for the first time. For these forms of ede and tede (Walsh, in my opinion, have not been satisfactorily explained), cf. PLA, 70; IMCS, 228. See also HW, 41, s.v. 'ede', where ede'er is defined as 'attributive'; and Street 1981, 159-160. In my opinion ede'er and tede'er are slightly emphatic, with the ending -er (= -ger, -ber) corresponding to the Russian particle -to.

For turuq 'support' (CI, 91; 'prop'), a term that seems to occur only in the SH, cf. tu. turuq 'standing' (< tur- 'to stand'), and yak. turuk 'support.' Cf. TH, 266 (= JYT, 461). Ozawa reads taulug further on in the same § 167 (Y 5, 44a), and takes it to mean also 'support' (< mno. no. taul- 'to lean on, support + conn. vo. -ur + suff. -G [?]). See OZ, III, 324, n. 11; IV, 155-156, n. 12. His interpretation is shared by F, 91 and 340, n. 503, who equates SH taulug with mo. taula 'support.' However, the argument in favour of the reading turuq (= turuq) is stronger because this reading (with -ur-) occurs three times (§§ 167, 179, 207), whereas taulug occurs only once (i.e. the second occurrence in § 167), and on this occasion the correct reading is AT, § 159, is (tiruq), clearly confirming the form with -ur. The form turuq of § 167 is therefore due to the editor or scribe dropping the diacritical character ע, as is often the case in the SH. Moreover, the Yakut correspondence (for which I am indebted to N. Poppe) is perfect. I should add that the word taula 'pillar' is well attested in Preclassical and Middle Mongolian. See Cleaves 1951, 56 [32]; MA, 354a; Material 1, 193. Cf. also below, n. 245. In the SH, §§ 245 and 254, we find the word taula meaning 'the stone base of a pillar.' There is also a tula in § 272 meaning 'trout'; and a turuq (= mo. tururq) in §§ 201 and 207 meaning 'for a long time.' Finally, a word 'tula' appears once in AT, 103, line 4511, but this is an error for toloq 'a large felt rug or carpet.' See SH, § 189: toloq id.; DO, 666b, s.v. tuloq 'tapis de cérémonie en feutre blanc.' Cf. LDAT, 265. For im'ari (mo. imiyari = imiya-) 'by him,' see IMCS, 214. Turuq im'ari bolu is, literally, 'our support being by him.'

"We shall not be loved by Heaven." Here, again, we have a reference to Heaven withdrawing its love, i.e. protection, as a consequence of an evil intention. Cf. de Rachewiltz 1977, 27.

Jamiqa has a glib tongue,' lit. 'Jamiqa has a tongue that usually (or always) goes (= moves'), i.e. he indulges in wild, unreliable talk. Cf. the sectional summary (Y 5, 45a). The AT, § 59b, glosses yabdak with qudal okirian 'lie and gossip.'
For yabada, cf. also TMEN, no. 401 (the ‘410’ in TMEN, IV, 545a, is a misprint).

For the expression föhül-ü tab-u’u (AT), 59b: föhül-tab-u’u, lit. ‘rightly?; correct(ly)?’, cf. the expression môn-üu bisi-üu right or wrong? (Les., 547a). The idiom occurs again in § 168; and in § 275 the interrogative phrase föhül-tab-beli, lit. ‘to become right, correct’, is used to express uncertainty with regard to the outcome of an enterprise such as a military campaign. Cf. Oz’, III, 326-327, n. 2, 3.

‘When any man with a mouth and a tongue says these things’, lit. ‘Whereas (or while) a man who has a mouth and who has a tongue is speaking’, i.e. it is common, general knowledge, hence it must be true. The sectional summary (Y’5, 45a) says: ‘Now people who have mouths and tongues speak thus’, which Waley renders as ‘Every man that has a mouth and lips says the same’ (Wa, 263). See Pan’, 119, and Pan’, 57: ‘If every man who has mouth and tongue speaks thus.’ Cf., however, Onon’s translations: ‘In spite of the men (I send) with (eloquent) mouths and tongues’ (On, 74); and ‘[I send] you men with [winning] tongues’ (idem, 2001 ed., 138).


‘He went to him in person’, lit. ‘he went by himself in person’ (O’esin be engedün otçu). The expression be engedün, ‘in person’, occurs in Preclassical Mongolian texts written bengedun. See Cleaves 1950, 113, n. 76. In the past, this word has been split in two and read as be’en (= pmn. beyen) ‘person, body’ and gedün. Cf., e.g., H, 42; Ko, 249; L7, 119; R, 78, line 5133. However, Pelliot read correctly bœngadün (Pe, 51; note 6 should be deleted) following Y’5, 43a, which transcribes the word as a single unit. Burait has a verb beentred meaning ‘to strain or exert oneself’. See BRS, 130b. I have no doubt that this verb is the same as pmn. beynegdun- and mnno. bøengedün-. The Sî bengedün would, therefore, be its convertable mode in -n, lit. ‘straining (or exerting) oneself’, but used in an adverbial function with the meaning of ‘in person’. In the ‘Cãngis Qanun’ sêke ûçû’ edited by Damdinsire, we find the same form written bengedün (= bengedün). See MUL, 76a. On be engedün, bengedün, see Oz, III, 326, n. 4; TH, 147 (= NYT, 255); and Gaadam’s comments regarding the formation of the word in ga, 341, n. 505.

‘Even now, at a time when you are still so lively and well’, lit. ‘Even (bel) at the time of you being so much alive.’ For bel ‘even, also’ – a rare word – see ET, I, 73-74; TH, 147-148 (= NYT, 257); Oz’, III, 326-327, n. 5.

‘Temüü has not the slightest regard for us’, lit. ‘is not making us to be even a thing (= anything).’ Cf. Street 1981, 163.

‘Will there have reached the age when men! Choke on the white milk! And are stifled by the black meat’, lit. ‘Will choke on the “white” food/Will stifle on the “black” food.’ The ‘white’ (eçaq uan) foods comprise milk, milk products such as kumis, and liquid food in general; and the ‘black’ (qara) ones are meat and solid foods. See Mo, 76. Senggum intimates that once Ong Qan reaches old age – the age when one is liable to choke on any kind of food – Cinggis Qan will take advantage of the situation to seize his subjects. For a discussion of this passage, see ibid., 74-77; Li, 160, n. 167; Cl, 91, nn. 58 and 39. For a different interpretation of the ‘black’ (qara = qara ucuu ‘black water, water’), see Ja, 213, n. 2. Whereas there is no doubt about the meaning of the ‘white’, i.e. milk and milk products (see KJ, 351-360); cf. Ts. Sarangnerel in Anda 22:July 1996, 12-13, the meaning of the ‘black’ as meat and solid food is not as clear-cut and well attested. Mostaert’s interpretation may, indeed, have to be re-examined, although the meaning of the sentence is perfectly clear. Cf. Oz’, III, 328, n. 7.

For Quraqta Buyruq Qan, see above, n. 150.

‘In such great number’, lit. ‘so much’ (edizi). How will he let anyone govern it? (ken-e her yeän mede'illgî) – a rhetorical question which is, literally, ‘How will
he let govern it (= let it be governed) by anyone?" For a different interpretation of this sentence, see Mo, 77; Li, 62; Cl, 91; etc., who take ber as the conjunction 'and' following the Chinese interlinear gloss (yeh tc). But len-er ber must be taken together ('by anyone'), as correctly understood by Haensch (Ha, 58). Cf. Street 1981, 157. Therefore, renderings such as 'Who will he let them govern [i.e. the people -- J.R.]?' (On, 74; cf. the 1901 ed., 139: 'Who will he let rule them?'), and 'For whom will you manage it?' (LDAT, 140) miss the point.

Concerned about losing the affection.' For qayivala-'to be concerned (or feel sorry about)', cf. § 267.

'Who knows whether we shall be loved by Heaven after all?' The words 'Who knows whether ... after all?' render the single term maqa, on which see above, n. 31.

"You say, "How shall we do away with the son?" This sentence has been interpreted in several different ways, but I think that the above translation is the correct one. Cf. the sectional summary rendering (Y's § 5, 45a): 'How do you intend to forsake (= kill) the son?' See Cl, 92 and n. 63. The passage has been completely misunderstood by Pankratov (Pan', 119; Pan', 57).

For some relevant remarks on this section, chiefly concerning Ong Qan, Senggüm and the 'father-son' relationship between Ong Qan andČinggis Qan, see Gaadamba 1968, 120.

The events just described have their counterpart in the Y's 1, 9; SWCC1, 34a-35a; and SL1, 2/1, 123, s.a. 1202 (the SL2 gives 1202-1203). The differences between the three narratives (SH, YS and SWCC/LSL) are as interesting as their similarities, especially in the phrasology.

§ 168. 'Those same people requested!' (mät lä ... quy u bale). For mät lä, lit. 'the same, indeed', cf. Mo, 121; Street 1986a, 17-18. The rare emphatic particle lä (~ lu) appears here for the first time. The question of whether one should read lä or lu is still under discussion. See ibid., 9-10; cf. Oz', III, 333 (mäd lu); VI, 331 (Ogodei-lä). Mät is the plural of män (as mo. män); hence the reading mäd with the back u is incorrect. For quy u bale instead of quy u bale', cf. § 31: qonon a'fiu for qonon a'fiu, and § 84: qonon a'uladā for qonon a'uladā. The disappearance of the final n (suffix of the converb module) is simply due to the failure of the transcriber or copyist to note the small diacritic character ni at the end of the word to render the sound n at the end of the syllables yan and non.

For the Mongol traditional 'betrothal feast' (bu'ufar), see Mu, II, 114-115, n. 1; and Yao 1963, where the whole episode is critically discussed. The term bu'ufar (written bayalčur or bayuľfar in the corresponding passage in A', 105, 2) is glossed in the Y's § 1, 9, in the form pu-han ch'a-erh 勝罥篡 (bu'ulčur = *bu'ufar, see below) glossed as 'betrothal feast' (JY 28). Cf. Hung 1966, 16, n. 3. Mo. bayalčar, bayalčuur, bayalyur, and, more rarely, bayalčur, means 'throat'; in the Ujumchin dialect of Inner Mongolia, bayalyur(es)bayalyJur-as qurum (bayalyJur lurum) means 'betrothal feast (or banquet).' See TH, 154 (= JYT, 270). Da', 134 (cf. Da' 112-113), following Ja, 214, n. 1, explains the term bu'ufar as 'sheep's neck' -- the feast being so called because the meat from the sheep's neck was partaken of by the betrothed in the hope and expectation that the marriage would be as strong, i.e. durable, as a sheep's neck. See Yao 1963, 96-99; MCS, 83, 91, 93. Cf. On, 74, n. 201; Ev-Pop, 281, n. 70. (Daminšüreın's interpretation has been adopted by virtually all Mongolian scholars.) In the SH, bu'ufar is glossed 'betrothal banquet' (§ 38 髮揚), which Cleaves renders as 'betrothal feast' (Cl, 92), thereby translating the expression bu'ufar ide as 'to eat the betrothal meal.' There is no indication in the SH that bu'ufar means anything but 'betrothal feast or banquet.' Also, the word for 'throat' is not obvious for 'sheep's neck.' Furthermore, although we have descriptions of Mongolian wedding ceremonies going back several centuries, there is no record of an early 'sheep's neck' custom. Cf. Serruys 1945, 128-130; Yao 1963, 96-99. However, the main objection is the difficulty in reconciling SH bu'ufar, written bayuľfar, with mo. bayalčar (< bayalčur) since the intervocalic
velar consonant in buya is retained in all Mongolian languages and dialects (as γ, υ, or ϖ), whereas it had already disappeared in the word bu’ulcar of the SH. (In the written form buyulcar, the letter ϊ stands merely for the derivative) This problem was indeed noticed by Ozawa who expressed his reservations, without dismissing a relationship between the two words. See Oz’, III, 336-337, n. 2. Murakami (in Mu, II, 114, n. 1), hinted at a possible relationship between bu’ulcar and (mo.) bu’u - bu’u - ‘to tie; bond;’ but this runs into difficulties too because the transcriptions of SH by the two Writen Mongolian forms are actually incorrect: the verb in question is neither bu’u (as in Les., 111a-b), nor buya, but buyoo. See VGAS, 21, 123, 136, MKT, 469b-c (cf. 1999 ed., 469b). This verb occurs as hõ- in the modern Mongolian dialects. In the SH, § 240, we find a verb bo’o (w.f. bo) - ‘to obstruct (the way);’ which also occurs in the MA, 121a, with the meaning of ‘to strangle.’ Mo. bo-yo- and the dialect forms (hõ-) encompass these various related meanings as do their Turkic counterparts. Cf. tu. bo’- bo’- bu- bu- hû- etc. ‘to strangle, choke; to tie, obstruct.’ See VGAS, loc. cit.; ESTY, II, 164-167. However, a verb *bu’a- (bû-) must have existed in Ancient Mongolian since it is still present in the word buulga (kh. buulga, i.e. bulga) ‘yoke, (horse) collar’ which is evidently formed on *bu’u- ‘to fasten to the neck’ and the deverbal noun suffix -lyu (as in gatyul ‘gait’ < gatu- ‘to close’). At an early stage there were, therefore, two parallel forms, viz. boyo- (bû-) ‘to strangle, obstruct,’ and *bu’u- (bû-) ‘to fasten, tie,’ the latter converging later into boyo. Mutatis mutandis, a similar development occurred in Turkic. Being the case, Murakami’s suggestion (discarded in favour of Dambinsuren’s interpretation) must be reconsidered. A verb *bu’a- bû- must have had an intermediate form bo’u-. The SH bu’ulcar may be the evidence of such a development, provided we read bu’ulcar instead of bu’ulcar. The form bu’ulcar is supported by the YS, as we have already seen, and the A1 form can be read either buyulcar or buyulcar.

the letter  in the ms. being used for both c and f. Moreover, the confusion between the two affixes in the SH transcription is well attested, and we have a perfect example of this phenomenon in § 195, where the verb silemmelo- ‘to drive’ is transcribed as silemmelê- and silemmelê-. (Cf. also § 194: heﬃl et ‘paster’ for bêlí’er, §§ 134, 179; ja’at quri - çã’at qari, a title; §§ 128, 201: Joći Darmala - Çoji Darmala, pr. name, etc.) The confusion is always due to the ambivalence of the letter  in the Uighur-Mongol script – further evidence, incidentally, that the transcription of the SH used by the Ming translators was not written in this script and not in Pitγa-pa script, which distinguishes clearly between the two letters. Assuming, then, that bu’ulcar is the correct reading, this form can be explained as a deverbal noun in -r (see GWM, 49, § 178) of the co-operative in -cô (see ibid., 63, § 233) of bu’u (w.f. bu’u) ‘to fasten, to firmly tie or bind,’ i.e. ‘a firm mutual bond or tie (a union)’ – a most appropriate term for ‘betrothal.’ The meaning ‘betrothal feast’ would simply be an extension of it –> the betrothal [occasion = feast/banquet].’ Thus, bu’ulcar ide- would literally be ‘to eat the betrothal (feast)’ or, as Waley puts it (Wa, 264), ‘to eat the Feast of Betrothal.’ Cf. the expression quorim ide- ‘to eat (to attend) a banquet or feast’ (Les., 990b). If this interpretation is correct, it follows that the Ujumchin expression referred to above is based on folk etymology, i.e. the ancient expression bu’u’arbu’u’ulcar ide- was incorrectly interpreted as meaning bu’u’arbu’u ide-, and so the custom of eating the sheep’s neck was introduced. There are many examples of similar folk etymologies in Mongolian literature, beginning with the SH itself, where, e.g. the meanings of clan names are explained merely on the basis of phonetic affinities (Ch. 1). In my translation I have rendered the SH expression as ‘to dine at the betrothal feast’ without altering the meaning, whatever the etymology (still unresolved) of bu’u’arbu’u’ulcar.

For Father Mönglik, now again on Chinggis Qan’s side, see above, n. 130. The present passage concerning him and Chinggis (whom he calls ‘son’) is discussed in Hanbis 1975, 24-25, in the
light of the parallel passages in the SWCCL and SL. See also above, n. 68. Cf. Street 1986a, 18.

On the contrary ‘and contradicting themselves’ both translate the verb burnu’u-a, lit. ‘in the opposite direction.’ Cf. Oe’, III, 337, n. 4.

‘You must proceed with caution’, lit. ‘You must go understand-


‘Our herds are lean, and we must fatten our horses first.’ The word for ‘herds’ and ‘horses’ is the same (ada’ u’na). See above, n. 25.

‘Let us send a message giving as an excuse’, lit. ‘Let us send saying pretending (or in pretense; šilafa).’ For šilaf-, cf. Cleaves 1955, 35, 18.

§ 169. The Yeke Čeren mentioned in this section – the younger cousin (lit. ‘younger brother: de’i) of Altan – was the son of Qulan Ba’atur, as clearly stated in § 51. Cf. HCG, 125. According to a different tradition recorded in the SWCCL1, 35b, this personage was called Yeke Çaqaran (¼ Çaqaran). Cf. the form Jaqān (= Çärän) of the second element of this name in Raśld al-Dim’s work (SL’ 1/2, 124, n. 5), which may be taken as a contraction of Çaqaran. On the strength of the SWCCL and SL, Hambis has adopted the form ‘Yäkä-Tçaqaran’ in GK, 76. But the editors of SL’ have preferred to transcribe Raśld’s Jaqān as Çärän, i.e. Çeren, following the SH (SL’ 1/2, 124). However, it should be pointed out that the second element of the name in Ugir-Mongol script can be read Çeren as well as Çaran and therefore the name as found in AT’, 10a (= SH, § 51) and 60b (= SH, § 169), can be read Yeke Çeren or Yeke Çaran. The Migung editors of the SH, who were unacquainted with the real pronunciation of this name, may have transcribed it from the text in Ugir-Mongol script simply ‘by ear’, i.e. making the second element agree in vocalization with the first. Raśld’s informants, on the other hand, may have known the correct reading from Mongol oral sources. Thus, one cannot exclude that the true pronunciation of this name was Yeke Çaran or Çaran (¼ Çaqaran; cf. Raśld’s Jaqān). I think we can dismiss the interpretation of the name Yeke Čeren as ‘Grande-

Longévite’ in Ev-Pop, 48 and 122-123, which is based on the assumption that Čeren = late the word ‘grand âge, longévite’ (ibid., 260, n. 104), since this common Tibetan-Mongolian name, written Čeren in Cyrillic, is regularly written Cering (C’RYNK) in Ugir-Mongol script and not Čeren (C’R’N), as confirmed by the AT. There is, of course, no connection between our Yeke Čeren and the Tatar chief of the same name, on whom see above, §§ 154-156.

‘What sort of a reward might be expected by a person ...?’, lit. ‘Just (ele) what will a person ... be made to become?’, i.e. what kind of treatment (= reward) will there be for him? A rhetorical question. Cf. Poppe 1964, 371; Street 1986, 26.

Alaq, the name of Yeke Čeren’s wife, is a hybrid Mongol-

Turkic name meaning ‘Spotted Dog.’ Oe’, III, 339, 343, n. 3, amends this name to Alajyä; however, this would be a most unusual form for a personal name and unendorsed by any source. Moreover, the form Alaqot of AT’, 60b, is clearly a copyist’s error for Alaqid = Alaq Id = SH Alaq. The form Alaq Nidin of SL’ 1/2, 124, is a corruption of Alaq Id (with a prothetic n- and the genitive suffix -id incorporated in the name). On this name see also Rybatzki [2003], s.v. ‘Alaq.’

‘Some people. ’ By ‘people’ (haran) are meant the house-

hold staff, i.e. servants, grooms, etc.

Yeke Čeren’s herdmen Badai and Kălililiq were first mentioned in § 51, where they are referred to as darfur or ‘freemen’, thus anticipating the special status that Činggis Qan will confer on them in § 187 as a reward for the service they perform in the present episode.

‘Withdraw’, lit. ‘returned’ (gəriša).

The name Narin Ke’en (w.f. Kegen, see AT’, 60b) means ‘Fine Adornment.’ For his remarks deprecating his father’s careless words, see Mo, 79-82. Narin Ke’en says that it would have been better if they – the inclusive bida ‘we’ refers to his family – had had their tongues torn out so as to prevent them
making such imprudent, and irreparable, comments on the impending attack.

For hurí-i (=mo. üri) - to polish or sharpen (an arrow), see Pelliot 1925, 239, no. 74; the 'hunatu, hurfu' of HW, 79, must be amended to 'hurúgu.'

With regard to the two horses, the Chinese gloss indicates that Merkidei Çaqa'an ('The Merkit White') and Aman Çaqa'an Ke'er ('The Bay with a White Muzzle') were their respective names. On the other hand, the Chinese sectional takes these epithets as purely descriptive, except for 'Merkidei' which it ignores. See Y 5, 51a. Cf. § 87. I think Damindsayeu is in error in taking them as descriptive terms and not as proper names (see DaI, 113); therefore, I render 'Merkidei' (Merkitt - the suff. -dei, on which see Poppe 1975, 162-163) simply as 'Merkit.' This may refer to a particular type of horse or, more likely, to a horse seized from the Merkit. An unpublished note by A. Mostaert renders Merkidei Çaqa'an an 'Le blanc de chez les Merk.'

For huru-i (=mo. suya) - to tie, tether, see Pelliot 1925, 223, no. 46.

'Tonight, towards daybreak.' The expression sini erte is glossed ye-li tsao (置箋) 'in the night, early (in the morning)', while in the sectional it is rendered ming-jhih tsao (明晨) 'early tomorrow' or 'tomorrow early (in the morning). Since in the Chinese literature the two Mongolian words are glossed one after the other, i.e sini = ch. ye-li, and erte = ch. tsao, ye-li tsao must be understood as above and not as 'early in the night' (Cl, 93). Oz', III, 348-350, n. 7, discusses this expression at length, but his rendering ye-fè-kè (夜未) 'late at night' (cf. ibid., 344) is, in my view, not sufficiently precise. Sini erte means 'in the night just before dawn,' clearly referring to the following day. Cf. DaI, 113; sonood égòtò erti 'having spent the night, early in the morning.'

'I have checked what you said a short while ago,' lit. 'I have carefully examined (bolgà-a) your information (or news, message: kelen) of a moment ago.' For bolgà-a: (= bolgà:c; cf. § 246) 'to carefully examine, to check,' see Mo, 169.

'Travel-tent' renders qoš, a term borrowed from Turkic and meaning 'a conical pole-tent with felt cover.' See Rön-Tas 1963, 50. Cf. Poppe 1955, 40-41 (see also idem in ZDMG 99:1949, 278; Rassadin 1955, 114). At this time, qoš designated a small tent suitable for casual use by one or two individuals; however, later in the Yuan dynasty, the term qoš was apparently used for a felt-house on wheels, i.e a coach or tent-cart. See Mu, II, 119-120, n. 11; T. Kobayashi in TGYH, 32, 4:April 1950, 88; and MSR, 120, Khomonov 1970, 36-37; DO, 308a, s.v. 'qoš.' Cf. also the reference to this type of small tent in MP, 173. For the tent called qaśišiq (= qoš), see above, n. 80.

'From the back of his tent.' Badai and Khišii followed a strict rule that was evidently already observed at the time, and was formalized later, after the reorganization of the Guard (kešir), viz. that any man coming at night with an urgent message should not be let in, but should stand with the nightguards at the back, i.e. at the northern side, of the tent and communicate his message from there. See §§ 229 and 278. This was obviously a precautionary measure; and talking through the wall of the tent presented no problem.

'If Çinggis Qa'an favours us with his trust, he will not hesitate to act,' lit. 'If Çinggis Qa'an deigns, there is no hesitation (arrival ügei),' or, more freely, 'Please, Çinggis Qa'an, don't hesitate!' Most translators understand 'If Çinggis Qa'an favours us, we will not doubt (what we say).' Cf. 94, renders this sentence: 'If Çinggis Qa'an favours [us], [we assure him that] there is no doubt.' Cf. On, 76, and Ev-Pop, 123. However, in § 141 the verb ariju- definitely means 'to hesitate, waver, falter,' i.e. to be in doubt as to whether to do something or not; hence arrival ügei must mean 'without hesitation,' and it must refer to a course of action. Cf. TH, 95 (= JYT, 169); and Oz', III, 353, n. 15. As we shall see, Çinggis followed the two herdsmen's advice and later generously rewarded them.
As noted by Wei Kwei Sun, there is an apparent difficulty with distances in this section. Badai and Kilišiqi reached Çinggis Qan’t camp in the same night, while the references to the horses’ lassness in § 168 implies that Çinggis’ camp was situated much further from Senggüm’s camp. However, by then Senggüm had joined his father Ong Qan at his camp in the Black Forest on the Tula River. We know from § 164 that Ong Qan was in the Black Forest, and that he had a meeting with Çinggis whose camp in the Sar’i Stepe was not far removed from his. On the other hand, Senggüm’s own camp was at Berke Elet, north of the Ječen Heights in the southern Bayan Usul region, i.e. about 200 km (as the crow flies) east of Çinggis’ encampment (see § 166). Furthermore, from § 166 we learn that Senggüm went to his father’s camp to change Ong Qan’s mind about Çinggis and get his approval to trade the latter, in which endeavour he eventually succeeded. Thus, Senggüm’s plot was hatched in the Black Forest camp, and he himself stayed there to carry it out with his father and allies. It is clear from § 169 that the distance between them and Çinggis’ camp could be covered in a few hours’ ride, which in the light of the above makes perfect sense.

The accounts of the same events in the SWCCL, SL and YS are somewhat different. For example, the SWCCL’s, 36a, and YS’s, 9-10, state that Badai was Kilišiqi’s younger brother, whereas SL’s, 12, 124, says (like the SL) that they were nükis, i.e., companions – one of those rare instances in which Rašṭ al-Dīn is at variance with the SWCCL and agrees with the SL. Also, it is only from the SL that we learn that Yeke Čeren (or Çağaran) was Altan’s younger cousin: the SWCCL and SL call him simply a high official and retainer of Ong Qan’s. The YS account is much shorter. Cf. Hung 1956, 15, n. 1. There is also a discrepancy in Rašṭ al-Dīn’s work, which gives a different account in The History of the Tribes involving Kükü Teb Tenggerti (on whom see below, n. 244). See SL’s, D1, 133. Cf. CK’s, 34, n. 115 (= CK’s, 69).

For a critical discussion of § 169 from the literary point of view, cf. Gaedtner 1968, 100ff.

§ 170. The entire section from ‘On this intelligence’ to ‘he would have been caught unprepared’ has been translated and discussed in Mo, 82-90. The following are some additional remarks.

For the expression tešin ilügêdêla ‘On this intelligence’, lit. ‘being so told’, cf. Lettres, 82.

For the expression sôni bêt ‘that same night’, see above, n. 110.

‘The trusted men (lit. “the trustworthy ones”) who were at his side’ (dergedê an bišt am from [dat.]). For dergedê an ‘in the proximity of, by’, cf. Ligeti 1971, 147.

‘His baggage’, lit. ‘all his things (= effects, possessions).’ See ibid., 152; and above, n. 153.

‘Set out and fled in the night’, lit. ‘fleeing (being night =) that same night he moved on.’ For burunlu-s burunyula(s = mo burunya-la) ‘to flee, to run’, see VI, 17-20, s. 5. I think I have variously rendered the verb gidêli(s = mo külêli, külêli) ‘to move, depart’, as ‘to set out’, ‘to proceed’, ‘to move on’, and ‘to advance.’ Cf. Mo, 88.

The Ma’u (‘Evil’) Heights (Ma’u Ündir) refer to an as yet unidentified mountain near, and south of, the river Khalça (Qalça) in northeastern Mongolia which flows into the Buir Nôr. According to Perles², 11 (cf. Perles¹, 100), this mountain is situated near this river and the river Nömrêg (= Nömörge), i.e. the Numurgin Gol of our maps at 47° 18 N 119° 30 E. The text has ‘Mau’ throughout (cf. the form niça ‘secret’ for mûça in y² 1, 1a), but the reading ‘Ma’u’ is guaranteed by the ‘Maya’ of AT, 61a and 61b. For au = c’u, cf. Mo, n. 8 (however, Mostaert does not elaborate the point), and F.W. Cleaves in HIAS 13:1950, 232; for niça = mûça, see CI, xvii; and, especially, ‘Quelques problèmes’, 257-258, where Mostaert discusses ‘l’omission future de l’hiatus.’ For this common phenomenon in the Arabic-Persian sources, cf. the forms semdaan – semda-an (VMI, 71), basraan – basra-an (ibid., 18),
naar – na’ur (TMEN, no. 381; RH, 245, no. 2), sibauci and sabwani (= Sbwa’n) (RH, 137, no. 9; LH [1928], 60), etc.

Jelme Qo’a must not be confused with Jelme, the son of Jarudi idai, who was also an Uninggau (= Uninggau). See § 97. On this otherwise unknown Jelme Qo’a and his name, see HCG, 138.

"As its rearguard", lit. "as the rearguard of its rear" (qoyana’ an čagdita’ušun). For the military term čagdita’ušun (= pmo. čagdita’ušun) "rearguard", see Poppe 1967, 510-511; no. 4; Kalužnyk 1976, 131. And for garu’alus (= pmo. garu’alus) "eust (lit. "waterman"); see Visée 1990, 383-384.

The Qalajalit Sands (Qalajalt Elet) must have been a sandy plain somewhere further to the south of the Khalkha River. For Qalajalit Rašif-dIN writes Qalajit and Qaläljin. See SL 1, 1/2, 302b (Index); cf. HCG, 46, li, 160, n. 170, is of the opinion that Qaläljin is the correct form. A1, 61a, has "Qaläljín" or "Qaläljin" (i.e. Qalajjin; cf. ATL, 128). If Qalajalit is the correct reading, as I believe, it must be a scribal error for Qalajaljín (the letter I could easily have been dropped); such a name would normally develop into Qaläljin, plural: Qaläljí. This may explain Rašif-dIN’s Qaläljin and Qaläljí, but, according to Rašif, Qaläljin was the name of a river, which makes it unlikely that Qaläljin is the plural of Qaläljí. I think that the former is a scribal error for the latter (the AT has the -n ending). On the other hand, Perlee, 10 (cf. Perlee, 99), reads this name as Qara Qaljí and suggests that it refers to a place south of the confluence of the Nümrog and Khalkha rivers (at 47°49′55″ N 119°12′56″ E), where there are to this day various sandy areas such as Xuuedyn Els, Kuran Els, Udaat Els and Molit Els. Poppe 1956, 41, no. 11, deals with this locality. His conclusion is that "it must be somewhere near the Khalkha and Ullkhi rivers which are on the frontier of Outer Mongolia and Manchuria." The locality is also discussed in Schubert 1970, 524, n. 5, proposing another identification further to the west (which is most unlikely).

The Secret History

"To rest and eat" (üderi). The verb üderi—üderit is mo. üdele—'to rest at noon for a meal when travelling'. For this practice and the supposed identification of the site in question 32 km north-east of Delgerkan (Delgerkan) and 3 km southeast of the Tsenker (Ceneket) River (at 47°45′58″ N 109°11′0″ E), see Schubert 1970.

The names of Cigidei and Yadir, Aidid’s two horsehers, do not occur again in the SH. On Cingai’s nephew Aidid, see below, no. 241. "Lied their geldings to pasture, some here and some there, on the fresh grass. As they moved about ...", lit. "when they were going, feeding their geldings in groups (juyčel jüyčel) on the green (= grass), ..." Jüyče jüyčel has been variously translated as ‘while on the way’ (Nä, 178), ‘par groupes’ (Pe, 184), ‘jeber seines Weges’ (Ha, 61), ‘from place to place’ (Ko, 130), ‘echacun de son côté’ (Mo, 88), ‘one after the other’ (Li, 64), ‘each one’ (Mu, II, 123), ‘here and there’ (Oz, IV, 10; Ozi, 1, 219), ‘each his own way’ (Cl, 95), ‘to the spots’ (On, 76; left untranslated in the 2001 ed., 143), ‘all kinds of (grass)’ (Ce, 132), ‘diverses (herbes)’ (Ev, 127). For other renderings see Oz, IV, 24, n. 9. Pelliot’s translation ‘par groupes’ agrees with both the Chinese gloss (i-lu-lu = — & —, where lu means ‘group’) and the Mongolian text (juyče = pmo., mo. jüyčöl). The horses were scattered on the pasture, some here and some there, as is usually the case when feeding, hence my somewhat free rendering.

"Coming in pursuit", lit. ‘approaching from the rear (= after them).” Hula’an Burqat (Burqat in the text) means ‘Red Willows.’ For a discussion of this name, see Li, 160, n. 170. As stated in the text, it was a place on the south side of the Ma’u Heights. The full imagery of the dust raised by the enemy on this occasion is repeated in § 173.

For the impersonal (passive) construction with ke’ekde—’to be told’, cf. Mo, 108; Poppe 1964, 368.
animals and people, or forming another noun of the same meaning, as is evident from its usage in the SH where it is glossed simply as hei ‘black’. Cf. Poppe 1975, 164, 166.

The same applies to alaqgu ‘it is alay, pmo, mo. alay ‘multi-coloured, variegated, motley’ + qelin + ‘-ut’ ‘multi-coloured (pl.)’. Cf. § 124: alaqgu ‘qin-mi ‘pied sheep (acc.).’ The AT, 61b, confirms this by adding the glosses qara and alay to the two obsolete words qarayqild and alaqild of the SH. In view of this, my remarks in Material II, 39, where I discussed the expression alaqgu ugeti and stated that the suffix in question is -in, are incorrect. The relevant suffix is qelin (a mo. -qelin), on which see, provisionally, JS, 32-33, § 31; MÜTT, 265b-265a, no. 211. See also Oz’, IV, 31-34, n.17; and Vietze 1990, 384. Neither scholar can find a satisfactory answer to why a feminine suffix should be used for an object like a banner, however, as demonstrated by the example of alaqgu ugeti in the HDY (IIA, 146,4), this suffix has other functions which have not yet been properly investigated.

They are the people of whom we must be wary! (tide sereliten ingen bu).’ Cf. CI, 96: [They] are people against whom one should forewarn himself! Sereliten is the plural of serel bi ‘vigilant’ (see AT’, 53b), and both the Chinese transcription and translation of the word leave no doubt as to its meaning. See HW, 134; GHMBK, 533. However, On, 78, translates it as ‘inferior’, stating in note 207 on the same page that the word should be read sarulun ‘lower-class people’ (id. in the 2001 ed. 144 and n. 380). This interpretation is unacceptable, since it would not make sense in the context, the Uru’ut and the Mangqui being in fact outstanding warriors, whereas Janaq’s pertinent remarks.

The Jirgn, or Cirkin, tribe to which Qadaq belonged was a subtribe of the Kereyi. See HCC, 56, 398; Bose 1938, 24-25. At the time of John of Pian di Carpine’s visit to Giyuk (1246), there was at the Mongol court a Kereyi (?) chancellor by the same name who was a Nestorian Christian like his colleague, the famous Kereyi (?) Çingi. See Pelliot 1914, 628; ISK, 168.
COMMENTARY

109, 587; Buell 1994, 181-182. For Çingqai, see Section Three of the Introduction.

'Shall meet them', lit. 'shall oppose them.' For tuivaiadasi- to oppose one another', cf. Oz', IV, 34-35, n. 18; TMEN, no. 136.

'in support' (gejiwe), i.e. as reserve. For gejiwe 'reinforcement, reserve troops, auxiliaries', see TMEN, no. 357; Kahuzi- skye 1978, 131; Rōma-Tas 1986, 136. Further on in this section I render the term gejiwe as 'to support.' The original and primary meaning of the word is 'nape of the neck, occiput' (cf. RH, 206, no. 3; Lēs, 381a), and its usage as a military term is secondary and derivative.

On the Tümen Tübeqen and Olog Dongpoayit, see above, n. 150. For Ačiq Sirun, who is mentioned again in §§ 174 and 181, see also SLI, L/1, 128; L/2, 131 (where, however, Rašlid Ađin writes 'Ačiq and Sirun,' indicating two people rather than one).

For turqät (pl. of turquq) 'bodyguards' (later 'day guards'), see above, n. 79. Although I use the term 'bodyguard,' this term must be understood here sensu lato: Ong Qan's 'bodyguard' is an enlarged elite force (1,000 men: mingsq[n]), the pick of the cavalry, sent ahead of Ong Qan who leads the main body of the army (qol). For mingsq[n] = mingsq[n], m. mingsq[n] 'thousand,' cf. RH, 243, no. 14; id. See also TMEN, no. 1749; IMCS, 248. On the name Qori Silêmûn, see HCG, 62. For the title tæis-t, see above, n. 50.

'The main body of the army' renders yeke qol, lit. 'the great centre.' Qol by itself designates the main force. See Poppe 1967, 513-514, no. 7; cf. above, n. 142, and below, n. 247. For the importance of the military organization of the Kereyit under Ong Qan in relation to the future army organization of Çinggis Qan, see the relevant remarks in Li, 160-161, n. 170.

'The army', lit. 'went out being alone apart' (bre bôdqtwçiq Çaruq). For bre (< d'ere) bôdqtwç-, lit. 'to be alone (= set) apart,' see above, n. 156.

THE SECRET HISTORY

'Less capable', lit. 'on the other side (or beyond) me' (mûdaqa Çuruq), i.e. 'he cannot (even) reach me.'

'Not much of a companion, is he?' (çaqû nîkqûr buqqa), meaning that he is, in fact, a very mediocre, hence unreliable, friend. Çaqû is, literally, 'having a measure', Çaq (< m. Çay) having also the meaning of 'measure' besides that of 'time, season, etc.' Cf. Poppe 1967, 511. A person 'who has a measure' is measurable, hence not out of the ordinary (see Ci, 96, n. 3). The Chinese gloss gives cho-cheung fieldset 'muddling,' i.e. nothing remarkable, as the equivalent of Mongolian çaqû. For the expression cho-cheung, cf. 188-189, n. 200. In § 245, çaqû is rendered as 'common, mediocre' (p'ing-teng tê 158). I should point out, however, that çaqû can also mean 'having a (set) time, seasonal,' hence 'occasional, transitory.' Cf. Kow., 2105a: çay- an yâluq 'oies of date.' In other words, çaqû nîkqûr may also mean 'an occasional (or opportunistic) companion.' See Ra, VI, 46; On, 78; Ev-Pop, 128, and 283, n. 10. Cf. also T. Kobayashi's remarks in TYGH, 32, 4; April 1950, 88. In either case the meaning is essentially the same: a companion not worth having. Cf. Çe, 134: yâluq iige nîkqû 'a companion who is not of good quality' - one, therefore, that can be abandoned without compunction.

'To be on his guard,' lit. 'saying that the sworn friend must be on his guard.'

For secretely (dor'ên), cf. Ligeti 1971, 147.

'Sent the following message,' lit., 'sending a tongue (= a verbal communication, a secret message) ... sent saying.' Cf. above, n. 166.

The passage within brackets is missing in the SH, but is preserved in the AT, 62b. Cf. ATL, 130, l. 9.

'From this I realized,' lit. 'When (or if) I considered, I realized from this.'

§ 171. Jûrêdeqi, the chief of the Uru'ut, and his tribesmen had separated earlier from Jarmaqu and had joined Çinggis Qan. See
§ 130. See ibid. also for his designation of 'uncle' (ebin). For the clan and family grouping of military units (together with their dependants such as the bojat [= pmo boyod]) forming the vanguard (mangilulai), as in the case of Juričedė, see Vladić, 117 ff. Cf. also the important note 170 in Li, 160-161.

'Before Juričedė could utter a word,' lit. 'Before Juričedė[i] made a sound.' The final i of the name Juričedė has dropped once in this section and once in § 176; however, Juričedė may be a variant of Juričedė. Cf. Ögölę - Ögle, ilígüe - ilígüe, etc. See HCG, 129.

Quyldar of the Mangaut first appears in the SH, § 130, where he is called Quyldar (on this form, see HCG, 168). He had also defected from Janaqja, had received the appellation of Sečen ('the Wise') by Çinggis Qan, and the two had become andas, or sworn friends. See ibid., 167-168; Li, 160, n. 170; Mu, II, 139-140; and below, n. 175.

'I shall fight in front (emine) of my sworn friend!' The adverb emine (with the gen.) means 'in front of, before' and 'for, on behalf of.' Cf. Buck, 99-100, no. 31; 125, no. 31; and above n. 147. Cf. 97, and Ödö, IV, 47, have opted for the second interpretation ('I shall fight on behalf of ...'), which is grammatically correct. However, this interpretation does not make much sense because it is obvious that Quyldar, a sworn friend of Çinggis, would fight for him; the question here is in what capacity in the battle formation. Quyldar will go as vanguard before Çinggis Qan, thus taking the brunt of the attack and seriously endangering his life, hence the pointed remark about his 'orphanned children.' Cf. also the sectional summary (Yö 6, 10a: mien-chi len 面前 'before, in front'), and Pa, 88.

Naka had understood the text correctly (Na', 211).

For Önečiš kųś 'orphanned children', cf. Cleaves 2001b, 70-71, n. 37. For the whole sentence, see Lettres, 184.

In the description of the action, the attack verbs 'to attack' (doabul)-'to advance' (ayir)- and 'to overcome, defeat' (darar) are repeated several times. To avoid these monotonous repetitions in the translation, I have made use of synonymy ('to attack':'to charge', 'to rush (against)'; 'to advance':'to go forward'; 'to press ahead'; 'to overcome':'to crush', 'to defeat').

'Turned back and stood guard over Quyldar.' The expression de'ere esé'er, lit. 'to return over (someone)', is apparently a military expression meaning for soldiers to turn back and gather around, 'covering' as it were, a wounded comrade to protect him. The Chinese sectional summary paraphrases as follows (Yö 6, 10b): 'The Mangaut troops turned back and stood where Quyldar had fallen from the horse.' The same expression occurs a few lines further down with the verb bâyi: 'to stand, stay.'

'Without permission from Ong Qan', lit. 'without counsel (eye ügelü) from Ong Qan.' Cf. Cleaves 1953, 79-80, n. 12.

'Was shot by an arrow in one of his bright red cheeks (engegeq qatar). Although the interlinear gloss gives only 'red' (en) for enggeq (see HW, 44), mmo. enggeq = engege (in mno. enggeq) properly means 'rouge.' See MA, 161a; Lers, 318a. Both Pelliot and Ligeti are of the opinion that Sengüüm had applied rouge to his cheeks and have translated accordingly. See Pe, 166; Li, 66. For Oron, 'red cheek' simply means 'cheek' (Oñ, 79 and n. 210) cf. the 2001 ed., 146 and n. 285), following in this the Chinese sectional summary (Yö 6, 10b) which ignores the qualifier. I think that the expression 'rouge-cheek' means 'a cheek as red as if rouge had been applied to it,' i.e. a very red or bright red cheek. The qualifier is there because in all probability Sengüüm's complexion was unusually red even by current Mongolian standards. The arrow wound in Sengüüm's cheek is reported again in §§ 174 and 208, from which we also learn that it was caused by an aknäq-arrow.

See below, n. 174.

'Touched the hilltops,' lit. 'hit upon the hills.'

'Spent the night some distance from there', lit. 'spent the night separating themselves,' i.e. taking up a position distant from Ong Qan and the battlefield.

The narrator presents the engagement between the coalition led by Ong Qan (but without Janaqja and Çinggis Qan as a
medieval Mongols when they wanted to thank Heaven, or take Heaven as witness of an oath, a promise or a threat. See Lettres, 47-48. As noted by Ligeti, these words were accompanied by a ritual beating of the breast with the fist to establish communication with the supernatural powers (Li, 161, n. 172). On particular and solemn occasions other acts of submission to, and reverence for, Heaven were also performed. See § 103 and cop. 

The Christian expression Fiat voluntas Dei: in both a submission to the will of the Supreme Power is implied. The MTPL (17a) and the HTSL (11a) refer to the Mongol custom of invoking Heaven, and, in the latter source, P‘eng Ta-ya remarks that ‘with regard to things that have already been done by other persons, they (i.e. the Mongols) say, “Heaven knows.” There is not a single matter that they do not attribute to Heaven. P‘eng’s “Heaven knows” is a more literal than accurate rendering of the Mongolian tenggeri medetegi, since mede, in this case means ‘to decide’, not ‘to know.’’ Cf. CG, 141. It has e\anded scholars so far that the formula in question is also quoted by William of Rubruck in his Itinerarium, but in a different context. Rubruck (SF, 230) mentions the Buddhist formula On mani b\at\am (On mani padma žaw) stating that a priest from a temple in Qara Qorum translated it as ‘God, you know’ (MWR, 154). Clearly, the monk, who did not know the meaning of the invocation in Sanskrit (‘Omi, the jewel in the lotus, Ama’), assumed that it was the same as the familiar invocation in Mongolian. (For an example of the use of the verb ‘to decide’ applied to the supreme authority of the qan, cf. Successors, 148). As for the term m\ang\}= (p\=no. m\ang\)=) ‘eternal’, the usual epithet of Heaven which appears here for the first time, see TMEN, no. 1744. Cf. de Rachewiltz 1973, 28-29. For ċ\u=čl? ‘pause, intermission’, cf. Mo, 126. The pack-saddle’ (\=ingg\=ar\=c\=a). As noted by Cleaves, this term designates ‘a wooden saddle serving as pack-saddle for horses and oxen, without stirrups attached’ (Cl, 99, n. 11). Cf.
TMEN, no. 562; DO, 396b; Oz', IV, 60-61, n. 8; Khomonov 1970, 35.

Following the tracks left by our men when they withdrew from the battlefield, I went on, found them and here I am", lit.
"Following the trail (or path) that we i.e. our men went by withdrawing from the battlefield, I went on, found them, and have just come." Cf. CI, 99; LSHM, 25; Oz', IV, 61-62, n. 9. The verb miiki- 'to follow (the tracks/path), trail' is a variant of Sh miiçi- (m. miiçü-) id. See HW, 109; cf. Oz', IV, 62, n. 10; and IMCS, 113, for c's. § 173. "Then, a moment later, another man approached" (basba gozumut atala basa niken gii'ün ayúa). For this sentence, cf. VG, 70. Gozumut atala is, literally, 'while there is has a moment.' Cf. above, n. 31.

His feet dangling under him." As explained immediately after, Boroqul was riding the horse while holding the wounded Öködei (Ököde) in front of him. The 'dangling' (onflufla) feet were, of course, the latter's feet. Since the two were riding double (sundula), a frontal observer saw only one person riding with his feet hanging loose. For onflufla- 'to dangle' (rather than 'to hang', as in CI, 99), see DO, 735a; Oz', IV, 66, n. 1; sundula- 'to ride double' = mo. sundula- id. See Les., 737b.

When he came up and drew to a halt", lit. 'When he finished coming ... he arrived.'

'With blood trickling from the corners of his mouth', lit. 'Letting blood trickle with (or by) the corners of the mouth.'

'His heart was pained' (durun altaja). For the expression durun(a) altaja- '(for) the heart to be pained (or troubled)', cf. Cleaves 1950, 129, n. 309; and, especially, Letters, 69-70.

In this section we have another description of the Mongols' treatment of arrow wounds, which included cauterization. The procedure of sucking the blood and letting the wound bleed freely, so as to clean the wound and avoid blood clotting, was already described in § 145 (see above, n. 145). Cauterization of the wound is mentioned here for the first time. Cf. Kaszuba 1996, 64.

'Boroqul had sucked the wound-clogging blood, letting it trickle from the corners of the mouth: bad's how he came', lit. "Boroqul came, sucking it with his mouth and letting the clogging blood trickle from the corners of his mouth."

'The dust raised by the enemy ... direction." For these words of Boroqul, cf. the similar phrase employed in § 170. See also Mo, 90, n. 86.

'Had he come after us ... later!' This passage has been interpreted in several different ways, considerably altering the meaning of the original which must be understood in the context of the events just described. Cf. Pe, 187; Ha, 64; Ko, 174 (completely misunderstanding the text); Li, 67; CI, 99; Oz', IV, 65; Oz', I, 226 (somewhat different from the Oz' version); Ta, 86; Om, 173; Ce, 136; and Ev-Pop, 131. I am now of the opinion that my former rendering (Ra, VI, 32) is not correct. 'If we are now witnessing the enemy take flight' is, literally, 'if we are the object of the fleeing and moving away by the enemy.' For this passive construction, see Poppe 1964, 375. Činggis speaks of the enemy's flight in response to Boroqul's remarks about the enemy's horsemen raising dust whileretreating, and his (Činggis') earlier statement that, should the enemy come, he would fight them. Činggis' remarks or, rather, the remarks attributed to him by the SH, are tendentious insofar as they try to disguise the fact that Činggis himself was actually retreating with his badly mauled troops, and moving further to the southeast. Neither Ong Qan, whose son Senggum had been badly wounded, nor Janaqqa who was playing a very ambiguous role as Ong Qan's ally, were intent on pursuing Činggis at this stage (see § 174). Later on Činggis will admit that had Senggum not been wounded, 'what would have become of us?' (§ 208). As it was, Činggis prudently moved from the area of the Qalaqlit Sands south of the Khalkha River to Dalan Nembrig following the 'Ukqi Silügčit' (see above, n. 154) upstream, i.e. closer to the Khingan Mountains, to rest, take stock of the situation,
regroup his forces and plan the next move. This, as we shall see, will be one of the most brilliant products of his strategic genius, the so-called 'Lament of Cinggis Khan' (§ 177-181).

'He departed ... left ... moved' all three verbs render the Mongolian giidit-(=mo. ködel,-ködel-) which is consistently repeated in this passage.

§ 174. Qa'dan Dalduqan of the Tarquq was mentioned in § 120 among those who had joined Cinggis when he first parted company with Jamiqa. From this section it appears that he had subsequently joined Qog Quq.

'Then, from the rear, Qa'dan Dalduqan came up, leaving behind his wife and children', lit. 'Then, Qa'dan Dalduqan came from the rear separately (qaqas) from his wife and children (or child/son)'. For qaqas (= mo. qaqas) 'separately, half, respectively', see Lewicki 1939/49, 251-255; Mo, 146, 150. Cf. also above, nn. 50, 55. The expression eme kō-i-an may mean 'wife and child (or son)', 'wife and children (or sons)', or simply, 'wife'. Cf. above, nn. 104, 105, 146, and below, n. 185.

The učmum (= pno. učmum) was a particular type of arrow, almost certainly the 'three-pointed long arrow' (san-chien p'i-tzu 三射矢), i.e. a long arrow with a three-pointed head, of the CYI, 56a (this page should logically follow p. 54b), the Mongolian equivalent of which is given as es-tszo-ma 絃矢馬*tszou-ma*. Cf. Ligeti 1990, 267, no. 212, and Kara 1990, 330, s.v. 'učmum-taug' (where, however, the supposed conversion to yi-chang-ma 亦張命 should be discarded). During the Ch'ing dynasty, the p'i-tzu designated an arrow with a long shaft (99.2 cm) and with a thin and broad iron arrowhead 9.6 cm long. See DJK, XI, 40234. However, I think that here p'i-tzu designates only a long-shaft arrow. The term učmum probably derives from tu. nè-'to fly'. Cf. Tserensodnom 1993, 197-198; Rassadin 1995, 113.

The poetic passage beginning 'When it would have been better...' is translated and discussed in Mo, 90-92. Cf. Li, 161, n. 174; and Waley 1960, 527. For qa'dan asun (= pmo. qa'da-yasun), cf. TMEN, no. 1435.

'But, having arrived in time to save my son's life (ko-i-an a ani erisu)'. These words have been misunderstood by most modern translators. For erisu- 'to arrive in time', see Mo, 62-63, and n. 56. Cf. also mo. erisu- 'to forestall' (Les., 332b). Ani erisu may also be understood as 'profiting from the life', i.e. 'taking advantage of the fact that the life (of my son has been saved). Cf. Matrél II, 57 (21r, 2).

'Desist!', lit. 'let it be!'

'A son who was yet to come', lit. 'a son who was "at the back" ('ečine, i.e. out of sight, absent) in other words 'not yet born'. Cf. VG, 94.

'We made magic strips' (elbisen jalamja kih)[]. The words elbisen jalamja are not glossed in the Chinese interlinear version. However, as pointed out by Murakami (Mu, 111, n. 11), elbisen is undoubtly no. ihi (cf. ord. ihe, ihebe) 'magic strip the denominational suffix -in(=sen)'. Cf. bur. ñhičen 'magician, wizard'. See BRS, 763b; BSĐT, 103b-104a. On ihi, elbi, etc., see SG, 371; DO, 381b; Les., 402b-403a; Marazzi 1987, 835-836; de Rachewiltz 1989a, 60. As for jalamja, this term designated coloured ribbons attached to tree branches, to the mane of horses and the neck of other consecrated animals, and placed on graves and sacred places as part of the shamanistic ritual for the worship and invocation of spirits. See DO, 182a; Les., 1030a; BSĐ, 186; BSĐT, 52a; and the additional references in TH, 291-292 (= JYT, 306-507), and Oz', IV, 84, n. 10. Cf. also Oz', I, 249, n. 4.

The expression albu babui is also not glossed in the text. Li, 161, n. 174, referring to the Nestorianism of the Kereytis, is quite positive that these words are 'the distorted initial words of some Syriac prayer.' On the strength of Ligeti’s remarks, I suggested in 1977 that albu babui may be a corruption of the words apa b-šbu, apa meaning ‘father’ in Syriac, and šbu meaning ‘father’ in Turkish. This (I stated) was then to be an invocation to God the Father in both Syriac and Turkish – quite
plausible in view of the Nestorian-Turkic cultural background of the Kereyit. I also pointed out, like others had done before me, that, as evident from the SH, he Nestorian-Christian faith of the Kereyit ruling family was by the 13th century very much imbued with Shaministic elements—a fact confirmed by independent witnesses like William of Rubruck. See Ita, VI, 49, for further references. On the basis of TH, 88-89 (= JYT, 156), On, 81, n. 213, states that ‘The words they cried (abuit, babui) have various meanings, including “Pal! Mè!” (ie, the informal address of parents) and “dearest!” Here, on the assumption that they are addressed to the longed-for son, I have chosen the latter.’ (CF. the 2001 ed., 158, n. 390.) Since the words in question are obviously part of a prayer addressed to the protecting spirits or to a superior being, I doubt whether this interpretation is the correct one. Ev-Pop, 152, renders abuit babui as ‘les pères’, the supporting argument (expounded in note 14 on p. 283) being that kalim, abuit is the usual term of respect of a junior for his senior, while bauba may designate the father, the uncle, the mother, the paternal aunt, as well as the mythical ancestor of the Kalrucks. The expression aaba bauba is also used with the meaning of ‘father and grandfather.’ Ev-Pop continues: ‘On sait que les Mongols s’adressaient à leurs esprits sous les noms de père ou de mère: “Père [Baabaal] Seigneur Taureau”, etc. Guillaume de Rubrouck précise, dans sa relation de voyage, que certains des esprits protecteurs des Mongols s’appelaient “frère du maître de maison”.’ Ev-Pop’s interpretation, although much sounder than that of Eldengisti et al., remains, like mine, to a large degree hypothetical. Cf. 271a, compares the ‘prayer formula’ abuit babui to abracadabra; and Pan, 121, breaks the two words into four words: ‘A bai, ba bai’, which does not help much towards their understanding. Cf. Pan, 60.

’so at last your son Sengqim was born, let us take care of him!’, lit. ‘Let us take care of the son Sengqim who achieved (baraqsan, i.e. finally succeeded) to be born in such ways (edad, i.e. by such means).’ Cf. Oze, IV, 85, n. 12; Mo, 114, n. 106. For another instance in the SH of a birth by magic, see § 189.

‘On our side’, lit. ‘with us.’ ‘Who have but a horse as a mount/Who have but a tree as a shelter’, lit. ‘Who have as a riding animal a horse/Who have as a shelter a tree’, in other words, they are in a bad state of affairs and, therefore, incapacitated as adversaries—no doubt a reference to Cinggis’ predicament after the battle at the Qalaqaljf Sands. For nomsik ‘shelter’, cf. DO, 499b; Khomonev 1970, 23.

‘Like dry horse dung’ (morin-u jinda’ul meiû). The reference is to the dry dung collected for use as fuel (argal, argol). For the word jinda’ul (= pmo. jinda’ul, see AT, 64b: jū[n]dayl), cf. mo. jūnggay ‘dirt; excrement of a baby or young animal’ (Les., 1079b). Cf. also TH, 301-302 (= JYT, 524); Gantogtokh 1989, 121-122; Gantogtokh 1990, 125-126. This word is closely related to tu. jindaq ‘horse dung’, on which see ED, 947a. I think it is formed on jindaq > *jindaq > *jindaq + the rare denominal noun suffix -ul (= -ul), on which see above, n. 152. The term argal (= pmo., mo. argal) also occurs in the SH, but only in a place-name. See below, n. 183. ‘Correct! If this is so, I fear my son may be exhausted.’ For these words, see Cleaves 1949a, 527.

‘From the battlefield’, lit. ‘from where they had fought.’

§ 175. The river Qalaq of the SH is, of course, the Khalkha River (Xalkha Göl) in eastern Mongolia to which reference has been made in the previous notes, but which is mentioned by the SH for the first time in this section. On this important river, see Hambú 1974, 29-30.

‘And counted his forces’, lit. ‘counted the number (i.e. of his soldiers).’ With regard to Cinggis’ Qan’s forces after his encounter with Ong Qan at the Qalaqaljf Sands, which according to the sober account of the SH amounted to only 2,600 men, Raśd al-Dīn says that they were 6,600 (SL, 1/1,
discussed in Harayama 1974; see also idem 1972, 7, and Ratchnevsky 1968a, 127, concerning the hunting aspect of it. On Quylidar’s burial in relation to the Mongol burial practices, see also Tomka 1965, 166; Perleé 1956. The expression ‘to bury’, is, literally, ‘to place the bones’ (yasus talbi-’ul-’); cf. the expression yasa bari-’id., lit. ‘to take (in one’s hands) the bones (= the body of the deceased).’ See Cleaves 1951, 91-92, n. 99; TMEN, no. 405; Tomka 1965, 166, n. 30. For the burial on an elevated place, cf. above, n. 164, and below, mn. 201 and 241.

Keltgegi Qada. In the Chinese interlinear version keltgegi is glossed pan ‘‘half, one-sided’’ and qada as yai lü ‘cliff.’ Or Nu’u (one word in the Chinese transcription) is glossed sham ming li ‘name of a mountain.’ The sectional summary (Y² 6, 19b) says that Quylidar was buried ‘on the ‘half cliff’ of Mount Orgu’u of the Qalqa River. ‘By ‘half cliff’ is meant the ‘one-sided cliff,’ i.e. a cliff slanting on one side, i.e. at an angle, inclined (possibly overhanging), as correctly understood by Ma, II, 154, n. 17, and Ja, 227; not ‘half-way up the cliff’ as in Wa. 268. This is, indeed, what keltgegi qada means. See Les., 449: keltgegi ‘slanting, askew, inclined.’ My earlier rendering (Ra. VI, 33) ‘Jagged Cliff’ is not quite accurate. This particular cliff was situated at Or Nu’u, i.e. at the Or Bend. (For nu’u = nu < naya, lit. ‘corner,’ see above, n. 94.) The explanation given by On, 82, n. 214 (cf. the 2001 ed., 149, n. 392), that Or = or ‘the pit of the stomach: the heart’ on the basis of TH, 127 (= JY T. 222) is speculative. Cf. below, n. 280. The locality cannot be identified with certainty, but it was probably at one of the two main bends of the Khaikha River. In the corresponding section relating the same events in SL², mid. 126, Keltgegi Qada is given as the name of a place on the ‘Or River’ (Or Müren); and Keltgegi Qada is mentioned again (ibid., 147) in connection with the 1204 campaign against Tayanq Qan of the Naiman, as a place ‘in the valley of the Qalqa River’ (Qalqa ilkat.) A doubt a mistake for ‘Qalqa’). In the corresponding passages of the SWCCL (37a and 54a), Keltgegi is called a ‘mountain
riage’ (ゥヲゥ) of (or at, by) Or Nu‘u, and a ‘mountain’ by the Qaša River. Rašid’s ‘Er River’ is obviously a conflation of L(= Or) Nu‘u and the Qaša River. Both Kartegeq Qada and Or Nu‘u are mentioned again in the SH, § 191, in connection with the campaign against the Nairman. In the interlinear version and sectional summary they are referred to as ‘place-names’ (ニワガ) and ‘places’ (ヲガ) respectively, and from the context it is evident that they were not very far from Abšaqa Kötege (the Abšaqa Ködeger of § 187) which was near the shores of the Khalkha (see below, n. 187). Finally, in YS’1, 12, always with reference to the 1204 campaign, Kartegeq Qada is mentioned as ‘Mount Kentege’ (a perfect transcription of Kartegeq). In view of these numerous references in the SH, SL, SWCCl and YS, it is clear that Kartegeq Qada was a well-known place on the Khalkha River at the time of Cinggis Qan, and must not be interpreted literally, as several scholars have done following the misleading version of the Chinese sectional summary of § 175. Cf. Ož, IV, 90, and 93-94, n. 6, where Özwa puts forth the alternative rendering of kartegeq qada as ‘the steep cliff.’ Cf. Ož, I, 228.

§ 176 ‘Just where’, lit. ‘at the extremity’ (ゥハラホ). For the use of the term hə‘ur to designate the point where the river branches off (either at its source or at its estuary), cf. Ož, IV, 96-99, n. 2. It should be remembered that hə‘ur, mo. ḫayur, designating, as it does, ‘extreme point’ of something, can mean either its beginning or its end. Cf., e.g., MA, 184b, 368a.

For Lake Buyur, i.e., the Buir Nör, see above, n. 53. The Onggirat, or Onggirat, was the well-known tribe of eastern Mongolia to which Cinggis’ in-laws belonged. See above, n. 61. For this important tribe, besides HCG, 402ff., see also Li, 161-162, n. 176.

For the Onggirat chief Terge Emel (‘Amel’ in the text), see above, n. 141. Cf. CI, 10i: ‘the Unggirat [chief] Terge, Emel, and others’; Ož, IV, 95, 56: ‘the Unggirat tribe of Terge, Emel, and others’; On, 82: ‘Terge, Emel, and others of the Unggirat’ (the 2001 ed., 149, has ‘other members’ instead of ‘others’, but the word ‘members’ is not in the text).

Jāučedэ was the chief of the Uru‘ut, not of the Mangqut as stated in Cleave 1955a, 389. His name occurs once in this section without the final i. Cf. above, n. 171.

For the poetic passage in this section, cf. § 64. ‘Because he had been sent with this message’ renders the words ke‘el i‘itike, lit. ‘when he sent, saying.’ My rendering of this passage is somewhat free to make it more readable in English. For a literal translation and discussion of the whole § 176, see Mo, 92-95. Cf. also ibid., 182, 194, n. 178.

This section of the SH is the last one to have a regular counterpart in the AT, where the SH narrative resumes with § 208 in AT1, 65a. Cf. ATl, 136-138. Interestingly enough, the first personage to be mentioned in AT1, 65a, is the same Jāučedэ who appears in § 176. One wonders whether this is a coincidence. See Section Five of the Introduction.

§ 177. The Tüngge Stream (qorqan, but a little further on qorqollat) is an unidentified stream near the Onggirat camp close to the Buir Nör and the river Khalkha. Against the reading Ťunggel (of the sectional summary (YS’1, 6, 31b), the reading Tüngge of the Mongol text is confirmed by the SWCCl (38a); but the text should be revised following SWCCl, § XXVII; cf. SWCCl, 84b-85a), Rašid al-Din (SL, 17, 127), and the YS (YS’1, 10), although all these texts sign it as a lake, not as a stream. Since the SWCCl and SL mention the Tüngge Lake together with a Torqa Stream (Torqo Qorqan), it is possible that the Tüngge Qorqan of the SH is merely a conflation, due to a lacuna or corruption in the text, of Tüngge (Nü‘ur) and (Torqo) Qorqan, as in the case of Rašid al-Din’s ‘Er River’ (see above, n. 176). Cf. HCG, 386, and HHCG, § XXVII, n. 31. The ‘Ťunggel(ক)’ of the sectional summary is clearly an amendment of the Ming translator-transcriber who assimilated it to the other streams called Ťunggel in the SH. I think, therefore, that the ‘(sic)’ after ‘Ťungge’ in On, 62, should be
The couch on which they sat. According to their rank, renders Mongolian dīng aś’aiquī isen. The word dīng, which is not glossed in the interlinear version, is not clear. Albeit with some reservation I take it to be borrowing from Chinese tāng shān ‘grade, rank, kind’, this word being in fact transcribed as dīng in Preclassical Mongolian documents. See, e.g., Cleaves 1949, 108, n. 71: ‘Dīng = tāng shān’. From its position it is clearly an adverb qualifying aś’a ‘to sit’. Thus, dīng aś’a would mean ‘to sit by rank (i.e. according to one’s rank or dignity)’; however, other interpretations are possible, although some are rather forced. Cf. Pa, 188: ‘bas’; Ha, 65: ‘immer’ (difficult to justify); Mo, 97, n. 92: (tentative) ‘au même niveau; same rendering in Ir, 151; Li, 68: ‘high’ (see also ibid., 162 n. 177); Oz’, 122: ‘peacefully’ (same rendering in Oz’, IV, 1.6; Oz’, I, 229; On, 82, etc.; see TH, 282 (= YJ, 490); Čc, 396, n. 318: ‘for a long time’; Ev-Pop, 133: ‘at peine’ (difficult to justify); and so on.

The word for ‘smoke’ occurring twice in the AT in the passage corresponding to § 242 of the SH is ānī. See AT', 896 (where the reading kini of the first occurrence is an obvious clerical error for ūnī as shown by the second occurrence). This would lead us to believe that, since this word had an initial h in Middle Mongolian, we should read ūnī in the present section (as well as in § 242) instead of ānī, as has indeed been done in Pe, 58 (cf. also Pelliot 1925, 238, no. 69); L', 131 (and 208); and R, 86, line 5804 (and 139, lines 9511 and 9512), 235a. However, the correct reading is ānī; see my remarks in Ra, VI, 51, n. 177, and Oz’, IV, 122, n. 8. Cf. also DN, 99a. The ūnī of the AT can be explained by the fact that mo ūnī ‘mistr. hazé ~ ūnīyër (see Kow., 343b, 486a), with the same front-back vocalic alternation that we find in words like unūra ‘behind, north’ ~ umūnere. Činggis Qan is reproaching Ong Qan for wishing to destroy the respect that the members of his (i.e. Činggis’s) family command (figuratively, by bringing down the couch on which they sit), as well as to ruin their homes (by scattering the smoke of their tents) — in short, to punish them, without their being in no way responsible for anything wrong
that Činggis may have done in the eyes of Ong Qan. Cf. Li, loc. cit.

“Have you been stung ... Have you been stirred up ... ?”, i.e., “Did someone cause discord between you and me?” The idea of pricking, or needling, is associated in Mongolian with the manoeuvres of a person who sows discord between two friends. See Mo, 98, n. 93. Cf. the beginning of § 127 where the same idea is expressed; and § 201, repeating the same lines in inverse order. “Corming between us”, lit. “staying in the way (= crosswise)”, i.e. obstructing the path (between us).

The ‘Hulun’ainut Bolda’ut (w.f. Ulayan-nuyul Boldayud) of Jorqi Qan, or ‘Red (pl.)’ Hills of the Deer (?) Cliff” is the same place called Hula’an Qut (“Red Cliffs”) in § 163. The name is mentioned by Raskol-i-Din in the form Hulun Boldo’ut (= Hulan Bolda’ut), which is described as ‘a place by the river Qara’ and ‘near a mountain called Jorqi Qan’ in SL, I/2, 129. The corresponding passage in SWCCL, 41b, gives Qara in place of Raskol’s Qara; however, as shown by Pelliot (HCG, 267-279), these are scribal errors and misreadings: the original Mongolian source of Raskol’s-Din’s chronicle had Qaras, i.e. Qaras Muras, a locality west (i.e. north-west) of the Kerulen and near the Selenga, thus, broadly, in the region of Khakass. For the earlier agreement between Ong Qan and Činggis Qan, see, the wording in § 177 is slightly different, but the meaning is the same. See also Mo, 210.

For the words ‘Even if I and my followers are few in number, I gave you no cause’ (lit. “did not make you”) to seek for a more numerous group (lit. “for many”); even if I am bad, I gave you no cause to seek for someone better (lit. “for the good”),’ cf. Mo, 98-101, 275; Waley 1960, 252. For the use of the word do’em (= mo. do’em) ‘few’, cf. also Cleaves 1886, 195, n. 26.

For the events relating to Ong Qan’s earlier life which Činggis Qan is recalling in this section, cf. §§ 150-152.

Ong Qan’s younger brothers Tai Temir Taisi and Bega Temir are mentioned here for the first time. For Tai Temir

(“Colt-Iron”) Taishi (as usual this title is written incorrectly as Taisi, cf. above, n. 50), see HCG, 234f. N’mo. tai = tu. tuy “a one- or two-year-old foal, a colt” (ED, 566b); for temur “iron”, cf. TMTN, no. 1012; Rybatzki 2002, 113-116. For Buqa Temir (“Bull-Iron”), see HCG, 234f.; Cleaves 1943, n. 36. For Erge Qara, see above, n. 151. Inača Bilge Qan of the Naiman is the Inača Qan of § 151.

Because you had become the murderer of your younger brothers, your paternal uncle Gür Qan moved against you, lit. “Saying, ‘He (i.e. Ong Qan) has become the killer of his younger brothers’, your ... ’” Cf. § 150, where it is incorrectly stated that Ong Qan had killed the brothers of his uncle Onqalq, i.e. his uncles. See above, n. 150.

For Ong Qan’s daughter Hula’ur Ujin, i.e. Lady Huja’ur, see HCG, 266, 287; Rybatzki [2003], s.v. She became the mother of Toqo’a’s fifth son Cila’un, who is mentioned for the first time in § 157.

Gave ... to please him’ renders ni’urqan očču. The rare verb ni’urqa- (w.f. ni’urqa-) ‘to please to curry favour, establish cordial relations, etc.’ has caused much discussion among translators and commentators. See Ra, VI, 52; CL, 104, n. 33; Oe’, IV, 131-133, n. 23; Kara 1995a. Kara’s contribution has settled the problem of interpretation.

The Qunan mentioned in this section is a Taşči’ut and, therefore, a different person from the Qunan of the Geniges tribe first mentioned in § 122. Both he and Başqi are mentioned in the SWCCL, 38b, as Udur Unan (for Qunan) and Başqi; and in SL, I/2, 127, as Udur Qunan and Başqi. The word adur of uncertain meaning ("< tu. adur; cf. DYS, 606a) occurs in proper names. See, e.g., Udur Bayan in SL, I/2, 36, 30, 31; and Alias Udur in the SWCCL (see HCG, 430).

Qurban Telesėt ("The Three ?") is, according to Perleė, 8, to be identified probably with the present Curvan Teel on the Orkhon at 47° N 101° E (the ‘Garban Geel’ of Perleė, 99, is a misprint for ‘Garban Teel’). The locality is mentioned also in the corresponding passages in the SWCCL, 39b, and SL, I/2,
For the Bürgi Escarpment (Bürgi Ergi), see above, n. 96. It is evident from §§ 151 and 177 that this place was situated on the upper course of the Kerelen. Whereas § 151 speaks of 'the source of the Keleren River,’ our section merely says 'on the Keleren River.’ See above, n. 151, also for the problematic Lake Gise‘ur.

The campaign against Tqot'a of the Merkit, at the conclusion of which Ong Qan failed to share the plunder with Cinggis Qan, is mentioned in § 157, n. 1202, but only Ong Qan figures in it, as Cinggis was then fighting against the Talars (see § 153). This campaign was, however, preceded by a joint raid, in which Jamuqa also participated, against Tqot'a to rescue Cinggis' wife Bőne who had been captured by the Merkit, but this took place before Ong Qan's flight from Erke Qara and Cinggis' breakaway from Jamuqa (see § 104). The chronology of these events is confused and, as already pointed out by Pelliot, there may have been other campaigns against the Merkit that have been conflated into the two mentioned in the SH. See above, n. 157. As for the locality of the encounter Mūruqa Se‘ul (Mūruqa Se‘ul, ? Mūruqa Se‘ul) near the Qadiling (Qadiling) Ridge or Mountains (nira‘un), it must have been situated towards the Selenga and 'il peut s'agir d'une steppe touchant aux montagnes à l'Est de Khakha’ (HCG, 273). According to Perles, 10, this as yet unidentified place was south of the confluence of the Selenga and the Khizak (Xyolgo) River, on the left (west) side of the Selenga. Cf. Mu. II, 171, n. 10. For Qadiling = Qadiling (tu. Qadiling) 'Having Birch-leaves'), see HCG, 272.

'Their grainstores (tariyat ana). For tariya 'grain,' see TMEN, nos. 119, 886, RH, 256, n. 15. This is the first occurrence of the word 'grain(s)' in the SH; for its significance cf. Ratnasravy 1968a, 127, 132, n. 9; idem 1987, 66.

For Cinggis’ rescue of Ong Qan, the levying of taxes for him and asking him to his ‘circular camp’ (gare‘en), see also § 151 and com.
For the campaign against Bu'ayrur Qan ‘the Güçügüz’ (Guçügüzt’i Bu’ayrur Qan; on the ethnicon Guçügüzt’i, cf. HCG, 306), i.e. of the Güçügüz clan of the Naiman (on which see above, n. 141), see § 158 and con.

‘And, ... we finished him off’ (mugarga abu’in), rather than ‘et tous l’avons pris et en avons fus avec lui’ (Pe, 190), and ‘we caught up with him ... and destroyed him’ (Ra, VII, 37), since ab- is here an auxiliary verb. Mugarg- = mugarga.-  See HW, 110, 111; ‘Quelques problèmes’, 268-269. Cf. above, n. 153.

For the events at Baydaraq Bel‘ir and Ong Qan’s troop withdrawal under cover of night, see §§ 159-161. For the expression ides filda (§ 159: filda) ‘as evening fell’ (lit. ‘evening-late’), and manaqara erde (§ 159: manaqara) ‘early tomorrow’, cf. Mo, 172-173. See also above, n. 159; and below, n. 240.

For Kökse‘ü Sabraq’s attack on Senggüm and Çinggis Qan’s dispatch of the ‘four steeds’, see §§ 162-163.

For the Telegätü (or Tellettü [< Telegätü]) in § 136 Pass, cf. above, n. 136.

For the form Odu of the name of Togtö’a eldest son, see above, n. 141. In view of the uncertainty of the reading I have reproduced the forms of the name as found in the SH. The two envoys requested by Çinggis were Qubari Quri and Itürün. Qubari (Quri is a title, see above, n. 134) already appeared in § 152 among the nobles and brothers of Ong Qan who had conspired against him. On him, see HCG, 419-420. Itürün (= Itürün) appears again, and for the last time — he is executed by Qasar — in § 164. On him, see ibid., 379-380; Bese 1978, 368, no. 20.

The parallel versions of Çinggis Qan’s ‘lament’ in the SWCC’, 38a-43a and SL2, 12, 127-129 (cf. D’Ohsson, I, 73-77) are at variance with those of the YS’ 1, 10, and the SH. See Hambis 1975, 38-39, n. 59: Li, 162-163, n. 177.
§ 178. 'Oh! Sinful that I am!' renders Mongolian as soyolay. These two words are not glossed in the interlinear translation, but the sectional summary (Y': 6, 34a) translates the passage as 'Onq Qan, having heard these words, sighed and said . . . . 'Ai is an interjection expressing fear, sorrow, etc., but soyolay poses a problem, as this word is not attested elsewhere that I know of in Mongolian and was clearly a puzzle also for the Ming translators. Murakami relates it to mgo. süül- 'to be short of breath; to sniff, snuffle.' See Mu, II, 173, n. 13; cf. Les., 742a. TH, 240 (s JY, 414) quotes WVTD, IV, 229, where there is an entry for modern Matyri and Sagai saulй 'unfortunate, wretched.' Most of the recent translators have adopted this interpretation. See, e.g., Oz', IV, 138-139, n. 2; On, 85 (where the word 'poor' ['poor and stupid' in the 2001 ed.] 154) is applied to Cinggis Qan, not to Onq Qan (himself); El-Ar., 532. In my opinion, the modern Turcik meaning of the word is a development of the original Old Turkic meaning of soylay - soyolay 'sinful' (< ch. truiй 'sin, crime' + den. noun suff. -lay), on which see DTS, 513b, 553b; ED, 556a. In view of the Nestorian-Turcik background of the Kereyit chief, and the numerous borrowings from Ugur in the SH, the use of such a loan-word is perfectly plausible if not certain. In this case OnQ Qan's utterance can of course only be applied to himself vis-a-vis his 'son.'

'By abandoning my son . . . I parted from my duty.' A literal translation of the poetic passage would be: 'To abandon my son? So I did, and thereby I abandoned the norm. /To part from him? So I did, and thereby I parted from my duty (or obligations).' See Mo, 101; Cl., 106. Cf. Waley 1960, 227. The second couplet restates and strengthens the idea expressed in the first couplet.

For the expression dara afa 'pained in his heart', cf. above, n. 173.

'He pricked the ball (toli) of his little finger (jiqi quru-un).'

In an unpublished note by Pelliot on the word toli we read: 'tol
of Chinese manufacture was used by the Mongols, as evident from archaeological finds at Qara Qorum. See TMo, 99. Large blue chinaware (kh. suzan-tar) is still used today in Mongolia for kumis ready to be served.

On Altan and Quår in see above, n. 166. The passage ‘When you rejected me ... after you had consulted only among yourselves’ is translated and discussed in Mo, 101-102. Mostaert’s interpretation, which I follow here, is at variance with Pelliot’s rendering (Pe, 192) which is followed by Ligeti (Li, 71; 163, n. 179). ‘After you had consulted only among yourselves’, i.e. ‘by scheming against me in secret.’ Cf. El-Ar, 537, n. 9.

With regard to Çinggis’ claim that he had urged Altan and Quår to assume the leadership of the Mongols, we must remember that Nekši Taiš was an elder brother of Çinggis’ father Yisüget, and that Quår was, therefore, a senior cousin of Çinggis Qan. Altan was the son of Qutula Qan and was thus a cousin of Yisüget. That is why Çinggis calls him also ‘uncle Altan.’ See § 122 and com. When these reproaches were made, Taša and Taša had been dead for some time, their execution going back to 1196-1197 (see § 136 and com.). Here they are called ‘the sons of Batar Ba-atür’ which is a mistake for ‘the sons of Baraq Ba-atür.’ The same error occurs in SL, 172, 150, which indicates that in this particular instance both accounts follow the same tradition, which is at variance with the statements in the SH, §§ 49 and 122. Baraqq is, of course, Ökin Baraqq, who in § 140 is called simply Baraqq, but Baraqq(at) in the parallel account in SWCL, 145a, which confirms the erroneous form in our passage. Ökin Baraqq was the eldest son of Qubul Qan, and Taša and Taša were actually the grandsons of Ökin Baraqq, hence the word ‘sons’ (kōlin) must be taken here sensu lato as meaning ‘offspring’ (mnm. hachi tāk, bōn), as also in the SWCL, loc. cit., where they are called tāz (for sun bō ‘grandsons’). It should be noted that in the corresponding section of the YS (1, 11), Taša and Taša are called ‘the descendants (i bō) of the elder brother of my (i.e.
‘You grow easily tired of your friends’ (uyidängqa). Cf. §118, where the same expression is used by Börte with reference to Jamaq. In both cases, the meaning is that the loyalty of the person(s) in question cannot be counted upon. In the next sentence, Cinggis Qan refers to himself as the ca’ut qurî, a variant, and probably incorrect, reading of fa’ut qurî, the title that he had been given by Wan-yen Hsiang of Chin. See §134 and con. My interpretation of this passage which reads, literally, ‘Do not make one say, “It was only the support (turuaq) of the ca’ut qurî,” is based on the paraphrase in the sectional summary (Y’6, 38a; cf. Wa, 269) and on the parallel passage in SL,1, 12, 130, which is at variance with that in SWCCl, 45b. What Cinggis Qan means is that Altan and Kuçar must not, through their behaviour, confirm the rumour that their past achievements were due to the help of Cinggis Qan, on whom they entirely depended, and that without him they would be worthless fellows. Cf. CI, 109; Street 1986, 26. For the term turuaq ‘support’, see above, n. 107; and Oz’, IV, 155-156, n. 12. However, in the parallel accounts of the SWCCl (loc. cit.) and SL (loc. cit.), it is Ong Qan who is accused by Cinggis Qan of being ‘easily tired of his friends’, and ‘irritable and unsteady’, i.e. fickle. And, in the corresponding section of the YS,1, 11, Cinggis Qan refers to Ong Qan as ‘unstable by nature’, thus confirming the other two sources from which the report ultimately derives. In view of this, I wonder whether originally the uyidängqa of our passage could refer to Ong Qan, who has just been mentioned, rather than to Altan and Kuçar, who in the present text are indicated by the pronoun ta ‘you’ following be’ehde’ijet ‘I fear people might say’ (lit. ‘I fear it is said’) and thus joined to it by the connecting bracket (see Y’6, 37a, line 3). I think it is possible that ta ‘you’ is the subject of the following sentence, i.e. ta ca’ut qurî-yin ... ke’alâsikin, in which case the sentence with uyidängqa should read: ‘I fear he is said to grow easily tired of his friends.’ ‘Don’t let it be said ... ca’ut qurî’, i.e. ‘Don’t act in such a way that one says, “If they have
achieved something, they owe it to the support of the ĉa'ut qurt." [A.M.]

In spite of their differences, the SH, Rašīd al-Dīn and the SWCCl all contain the reference to the ĉa'ut qurt. It is not clear, however, why Ĉinggis Qan should refer to himself by this title on this particular occasion; Pelliot has nothing to say on the subject in HCG, nor in his notice in NMP, I, 291-295. The only explanation (admittedly not very satisfactory) is that, although this title in itself was rather insignificant, it may have meant much to Ĉinggis Qan, just as that of on gq nq (="wangu = qan") meant so much to To'oril that he had actually adopted it as an epithet-name and used it in preference to his real name. It is also possible that among the people who had not recognized his claim to leadership and his election as qan, Ĉinggis was generally known as 'the ĉa'ut (or ja'at) qurt', i.e. by the only title he had and one given to him by a foreign nation traditionally hostile to the Mongols. There is, perhaps, a subtle irony in his remark which would not have been lost on Altan and Quqar. Cf. On, 86, n. 221.

'Do not let anyone settle at the source of the Three Rivers!' — i.e. in the ancestral territory of the Mongols. This is a reminder to Altan and Quqar that, although they now sided with Qan Qan of the Kereyit, they were still Mongol tribesmen of royal lineage, duty-bound to protect and preserve the ancestral land in the region where the 'three rivers' (qurhan muret), viz. the Onon, the Tula and the Kerulen, have their source, the region in question being the Khentei area with Baxan Qudan/Khentei Khan as its centre. Cf. SH2, 1/2, 130; SWCCl1, 44a; and YS1, 1, 11.

§ 180. The To'oril (w.f. Toyoril; see above, n. 96) to whom Ĉinggis Qan addresses his reproaches is To'oril of the Söge'et-e tribe (Söge'et-e To'oril) of § 166. He was a descendant of domestic slaves of Ĉinggis' family, and, being born in the family, he had received the affectionate designation of 'younger brother' (de'g). Cf. Kalmykov, 1978, 124. These 'slaves' (bo'ol = òlguk — òłqgi bo'ol) were hereditary slaves whose status was rather that of vassals. See above, n. 137. Cf. HCG, 85-86; Li, 163, n. 180; and, for the passage in question, also Vlad2, 81.

On Tumbina and Ĉaraqai Lingqiu see §§ 47 and 48. Tumbina Seien was the father of Qabul Qan and, therefore, Ĉinggis' great-grandfather. As for Ĉaraqai Lingqiu, he was the second son of Qaidu and father of Ambaqai Qan. Ĉinggis must refer to a raid or campaign carried out jointly by his great-grandfather and Ĉaraqai Lingqiu in which Qoqa (w.f. Qyda), the ancestor of To'oril, was taken prisoner and whose descendants then became the hereditary slaves of Qabul Qan's descendants. Cf. Hambis 1975, 39, n. 61. Thus, both Qoqa and his son Söbegei are called bo'ol; however, this designation must be regarded as an epithet, and hence as part of their names, as indicated by Pelliot and Ligeti (Pe, 192-193; L1, 138 — but strangely not in Li, 721) — on the basis of Rašīd al-Dīn (SLT, 1/2, 130: Noqqa Bool pro Oqa Bool) and the SWCCl (SWCCl1, 105b: Noqqa = Qoqa; cf. HCG, 332-333). Besides being used as an epithet, Bo'ol (> Bo) was also used as a proper name by the Mongols, as in the case of Muqali's famous son. See ISK, 8-9. Cf. also Chapitre CVII, 54 (19), and Chapitre CVIII, 179a (Index). A name combination like Qoqa Bo'ol and Söbegei Bo'ol is comparable to combinations like Buqa Guregen ('Son-In-Law Buqa'), Temüge Olgigan ('Youngest Son Temüge'), Aliq Ba'uzi ('Steward Aliq'), Tooto Bo'ol ('Shaman Tooto'a'), etc., where the person is described by the position he or she occupies in the family or in society. Söbegei Bo'ol's son Kölkuhi Kiršan is mentioned only in § 150 of the SH, whereas the latter's son Yegei Qongoqaar's name appears in § 120 in the variant form Jegei Qongoqaar. In the SWCCl1, 44b, these two names appear in the forms Kölkuš Kiršan and Jegei Qongoqaar, whereas Rašīd al-Dīn (SLT, 1/2, 130) writes Kölkuš Kiršan and Yegei Qongoqaar (the form of the latter is rather corrupt in the ms.).
The threshold slave (bosozu-ya bo'ya) of my great-great-grandfather (borqai). The personal door slave (c'ud'en emcû bo'ya) of my great-grandfather (elincug).' Cf. §§ 137 and 211; and Li, 163, n. 180. For the obsolete term borqai (~ borqa, pl. borqan) 'great-great-grandfather', and for elincug (~ elincig; mo. elincig, elincig, elincêg) see OZ', IV, 161-162, n. 3; TEMEN, no. 29; Cleaves 1949, 104-105, n. 56; DO, 522.

Such is my message for you', lit. 'Such I send, saying.'

§ 181. 'A son born clothed ... a son born naked', i.e. an adopted son (when, who was adopted, was already wearing clothes), and a natural son. In this idiom, the first dörökûn (mo. törökûn) 'born', although literally incorrect, is used for parallelism. Cf. Ce, 399, n. 338.

'Because you were jealous that I might come between you and our father' (ja'ara orodqàqi-ya ... nayidaju = nayidaju). Ja'ara orodaqqi-aca means literally from (because of) if I might come in between, with the passive of the nomen futuri expressing necessity or, as here, strong probability. Cf. Poppe 1964, 375. The interlinear gloss has, in fact, | wore the character  in the character  is here a mere case indicator = -aca), where k'urq = k'urq-p'a denotes 'probably, perhaps' ~ a meaning confirmed by the sectional summary which renders these words as 'You thought that I would probably (fear) rise before (= take precedence over) you' (Y² 6, 43a). Cf. Wa, 270. However, the sectional summary's rendering of ja'ara oror = 'to rise before' (§§ ... 5b) is too free, for it disregards ja'ura 'between,' Cleaves' translation 'From the fact that thou [wast afraid that thou] mightest be supplanted [by me]' (CI, 109-110) is, strictly speaking, also not quite accurate for the same reason. In the passage under discussion, Senggûm is called 'sworn friend' (anda) by Cinggis Qan. This may mean that on the occasion when Ong Qan and Cinggis Qan had declared themselves father and son respectively (§ 164), Cinggis had also sworn an oath of anda-ship with Ong Qan's son Senggûm ~ an event which is, however, not recorded in the SH. In the parallel passage in SL', I/2, 131, and SWCC1', 46b, Senggûm is likewise called anda.

It should be noted in this connection that, according to Raifid al-Din, Cinggis Qan was also in an anda relationship with Ong Qan's younger brother Jaqa Gumbu. Cf. HCG, 236. This fact is equally ignored by the SH. However, from Senggûm's remarks a few lines down, it seems that Cinggis uses the term anda with regard to him for the first time in this message and is, therefore, behaving hypocritically. On nayidaju for nayidaju, cf. 0. Quelques problemes', 265-266.

'Always be of comfort to him', lit. 'go on comforting him' (odgir eji ja'aba). Cf. Mo, 237, n. 221.

Bilge Beki has already been mentioned in § 142. Todò'en's identity is uncertain: he does not seem to be related to any of the known personages by the same name, which was a fairly common one at the time. For its meaning, see above, n. 46. The Mongol text literally reads: 'Send the companions of Bilge Beki and Todò'en (Bilge Beki Todòen qoyar-un nokid-i ile), which is odd: who are the 'companions' of Bilge Beki and Todò'en? P. 193, renders this passage as follows: 'Ceci dit, anda Sënggûm, [envoie-moi] les deux, Bilgâ-bâki et Todòen [si tu n'envoies pas les deux], envoie [du moins] le second.' Note on the same page reads: 'Faire note sur correction.' Pelliot's emendation has no doubt been prompted by the parallel text of Raifid al-Din (SL', I/2, 131), and the SWCC1', 46a. The manuscript of the SH used by the Ming translators was almost certainly corrupt at this point and the word nakidî 'the second one' was misread by them as nokid-i. Cf. the identical phrase at the end of § 177, which, in my view, is conclusive (in the sectional summary Y² 6, 43a) our passage is not translated. I have, therefore, amended the passage in question in my translation. As Ligeti points out (Li, 163, n. 181), according to the rules of the exchange of envoy, Cinggis Qan sent his two envoy, Arqai Qasar and Sügegeï Je'un and expects in return two envoys from each of the people to whom he has sent his verbal message.
In this section Altan and Qiçar are mentioned for the last time as being alive. Concerning their fate, the SH, § 246, makes Činggis say to Monglik that had he known his (Monglik's) nature was like that, i.e. that he wanted to compete with Činggis Qan, he would have dealt with him as he had dealt with 'Jamua, Altan, Qiçar and the others' — implying, of course, that he would have killed him. Cf. also § 255. That Činggis eventually disposed of 'uncle' Altan is also confirmed by Raśid al-Din, who states that he was executed together with Dātarai and Qiçar after the defeat of Tayang of the Naiman in 1204. See SL1, I/1, 135; I/2, 47, 48. Cf. HCG, 68. However, the SH piously avoids any direct mention of Činggis' murder of his uncles and in § 242 says that Dātarai was actually pardoned. (Cf. the 'saasitized' version of Jamua's execution in § 201.) See Hambis 1975, 16, nn. 26, 27; 19, n. 34. Aćiq Sirun already appeared in § 170 as the leader of the Tümen Tübegen, and Qul'un is probably the Qul'un Beki of §§ 141 and 166, a chief of the Dörben. See HCG, 402.

'And he had these messages conveyed by word of mouth', lit. 'sent such words (= messages), making them deliver by voice.' 'When the messages', lit. 'when those words.'


For kidsu 'all (= mo. kidyaci) < kidu 'to kill' + dev. noun suffix -aci, man. -açi 'murderer, assassin', cf. Ligeti 1970, 303, 304 and n. 65; Mostaer apad Cleaves 1954a, 448-449, n. 23.

The text literally says 'Shaman (bô'ê) Toqto'a goes on (yabuvus) attaching to himself the tail of a Sartuq sheep.' This must have been a popular saying or proverb, the meaning of which was no longer understood at the end of the 14th century, at least not by the Ming translators of the SH, as evident from the sectional summary which does not provide an explanation, merely saying: 'Old Master Toqto'a joining to himself the tail of a Hui-lui (= Central Asian) sheep' (Y 16, 6, 43a). The parallel passage in SL2, I/2, 131, is unfortunately also of no help. However, in SH, § 275, there is another reference to a tail being attached to a human being. There we read that Harqusum, the son of Eljigidei, speaking contemptuously of Batu, said, 'Let's attach a wooden tail to them!' (modun se'al jufčiça [= jufčiye] teden-i 'them' referring to the 'old women with beards' and the 'old women with quivers' to whom Batu had been compared. This was said in mockery. The words that Senegum puts into Činggis' mouth are probably along the same line, i.e. something laughable, to poke fun at, like a shaman wearing a large sheep's tail. 'Shaman Toqto'a' was in all likelihood a character in a popular story, possibly existing also as a toy or plaything for children. This interpretation is also supported by the corresponding passage in one of the manuscripts of the SWCCL (quoted by Wang Kuo-wei in SWCCL1, 47a; cf. SWCCL, 113a) which reads: 'He (i.e. Činggis Qan) regarded me merely as a toy (te-lê), viz., as something amusing, not serious, but the reference to a 'toy' may be significant. Cf. Öng Qan's words in § 164: 'There is only Senegum, my one son, but it is as if he did not exist', implying that he was a nonentity. Nevertheless, my interpretation remains speculative and other interpretations are indeed possible. See, e.g., Mu, II, 180, nn. 192-193, where the author provides an ingenious explanation of these derogatory words by relating them to the Uriangai custom described in SL2, I/1, 123. Cf. also Wa, 270; Ja, 240 (§ 181), n. 1; CL, 110, n. 51; Do', 165, n. 12; On, 87 and n. 225; Fa, 353-354, n. 39; Ev-Pop, 139, and 284, n. 46. (With regard to the latter, I doubt whether Toqto'a Bö'e can be identified with Toqto'a Beki, as there is no evidence to support the claim that the Merkit leader was a shaman.) For Pelliot (Pr, 193, n. 3), Senegum's words refer to a shamanistic ritual, but he does not elaborate; and his statement 'Je crois qu'il existe une dévotion plus loin à propos de Tüb-sangü' is incorrect. Pelliot was probably thinking of Eljigidei's words about Batu cited above. The term bôe (= mo. böye) 'shaman, sorcerer' appears here for the first time, and it occurs only five other times in the SH (in the plural bô-es, and all in § 272), i.e. very seldom considering the importance of these personages in Mongolian society. For this term and the role of the shaman, see TMEN.
no. 112 (also for further references to Mongolian and Turkish shamanism); IBČ, 198-200; CA, 142-143, 506; ASTI, 122-134; and G. Kara in Shuman 5:1997, 178. The ‘Sarta sheeph’ (sartaqin gyonin) refers to the fat-tailed domba of Uzbekistan and the Kirghiz steppe, whose young is the source of the astrakhan fur. For these sheep with spectacular tails, already mentioned by Marco Polo (see MP, I, 97, 100, n. 2; hence the specific name Oris Poli given to it), see also GPS, 75. For the fat-tailed sheep of Inner Mongolia and north China, cf. SSWI, 19 et passim; fig. 3 on p. 40. For sartaq ‘Muslim; any native of Central and Western Asia’, see above, n. 152. For the form Sartaqin (= paso. Sartaqin), i.e. Sartaq + the nominal noun suffix -in on which cf. HCG, 253, see ibid.; Cleaves 1949, 101, n. 33; MIIT, 2822b, no. 459; Poppe 1975, 164; and above, n. 152. For its later usage, see, e.g., TBGC, 39. See below, no. 182, for the form Sartaqai. The verb Jubeli ‘to attach, join, put on’ (§§ 171, 210, 275; cf. IW, 91) is obsolete. On it, cf. TH, 305 (at JYT, 530); OzI, IV, 171-172, n. 8. Yabu is merely an auxiliary verb of continuity. Cf. above, n. 15.

‘They are the words that precede a fight’, lit. ‘they are the first words of fighting.’

It is not clear which To’uril is the one with whom Sägegei’s family was staying at the time, To’uril Ong Qan (who in the SH is very seldom referred to simply as To’uril), or To’uril the former domestic slave of Çinggis Qan (see § 180), who was now with Ong Qan. Ci, 266b, is of the opinion that Ong Qan is meant here, but since both Sägegei Je’tun and To’uril the domestic slave are the sons of Ýegei Ongtaqar (= Ýegei Ongtaqar; see §§ 120, 180), it follows that our To’uril is indeed Çinggis domestic slave and ‘younger brother’ mentioned in the previous section. Cf. HCG, 129; Ev-Pop, 139.

‘Sägegei Je’tun did not have the courage to go with Arqai and stayed behind’, lit. ‘the heart (= courage) to go failing him', Sägegei Je’tin fell behind from Arqai.'
Çaq’an (> Çaqân), most probably the former. See above, n. 141.

Digit Quri = Tigit Quri. Tigit is the (honorific) plural of turgin (< prince), and quri is a title of unknown origin. See HCG, 205-206; NMP, I, 294-295. Cf. above, n. 134. For turgin – turgan (Sih digin, see § 239), cf. also TMEN, no. 922; CLC, 317; Rybatzki 2000, 215. Together they form the hybrid title borne by Alaqä’i (turgan = ‘montane bird’), the leader of the Öngütt. Cf. Cleaves 1949a, 527-528. On Alaqä’i see Pelliot 1914, 631; HCG, 378-379; Chapitre XVIII, 25, n. 8; Li, 165-166, n. 190; RCAC, 261-263; Chou CS 1979, 150-153. For v = d in the SH, see ’Quelques problèmes’, 243-244. The Öngütt, mentioned here for the first time, occupied a vast territory in and beyond the Ordos region of Inner Mongolia, along the present Great Wall and as far as Kalgan (Changchüa K’ou), and even further east. With regard to the extension of their territory, in 1890 a Nestorian cemetery was discovered at Shih-chü-shu-tiang Effe, some 60 km north of Kalgan. ‘Rough brown stone “columns” with lotuses and crosses roughly hewn, many also without crosses, were found there. The cemetery, which was never excavated, was undoubtedly from the Öngütt.’ (H.S.p.c.) See NDRC, 426 and pl. XV. They were a Turkish tribe that had been settled near the great bend of the Yellow River by the T’ang court in the 9th century. They had been converted to the Nestorian faith, but in the 13th century they were already very much sinicized. In 1204 Alaqä’i pledged his support to Chinggis Qan and sealed the alliance by giving his younger son Po-yao-ho 松要合 (*Booqaa) in marriage to Chinggis’ daughter Qurgut. This marriage alliance between the Mongol and Öngütt courts continued under subsequent reigns, the Öngütt ruler being thus regularly called ‘imperial son-in-law’ (ch. fu-ma 革馬 = mno. gürgen, mo. kürgen, see above, n. 66). See YS 118, 2923-2928; Pelliot 1914, 629ff; RCAC, 261-269; Dauvielle 1948, 303-305; CC, 93 et passim; NDRC, 423-427; WCAC, 319; Buell 1978; idem 1994, 168-169 and n. 2; ISK, 788 (Index); the quite important contribution Chou CS 1979 (cf. also CKMKSCK, 227-240); YSin, 107-108; Bese 1988, 31; and numerous other studies which have appeared in China since 1980, for which see the short notices in CKS/YTT and CKS/YTC (1980-). One must also take into account the interesting archaeologica discoveries made in the last decades in Inner Mongolia, the results of which have been published in Chinese archaeological journals such as XG, and other academic publications from Inner Mongolia. An analysis and evaluation of this great mass of information is now imperative.

The passage concerning the meeting of Asan with Chinggis Qan at Lake Bałjuna has been translated and discussed by Pelliot in HCG, 46-47. The Merchant Asan (= pers., arab. Hasan) ‘the Sartaaq’ (see below) was one of the many central and western Asian Muslims that engaged in trade along the ancient caravan routes of Inner Asia. See Pelliot 1927a, 264-268; Boyle 1956, 150; Hambis 1975, 7, n. 11, 18, n. 31; Serruys 1982a, 127; CEME, passim. For the name Hasan, cf. BT, II, 396. Barthold suggested that he is probably to be identified with the trader Hasan حسن mentioned by Juwaini, who became a trusted friend and follower of Chinggis Qan. He was slain by the inhabitants of Suqan or Siqan near Ujar (i.e. Uzbar, about 10 km north of Tumen-Aryk in Kazakhistan). See HWC, 86-87 and nn. 2, 3; TDM, 414. Cf. SL 1, I2, 199 and n. 5. Cleaves, on the other hand, identifies him with Ha-san-na 哈桑那, one of the nineteen participants in the Bağuna covenant, who has a biography in the YS 122, 301. See Cleaves 1955a, 399 and 401. However, the latter was a Kereyit and from his biography it is quite clear that he and Hasan حسن are two separate individuals. Cf. CEME, 41-42. Pelliot (1927a, 264-268) does not, in fact, relate the Ha-san-na of the YS with either the Asan of the SH, or with Juwaini’s Hasan حسن, suggesting as possible reconstructions of his original name *Qasana or *Qasanaq, *Hasana (*Asana) or *Hasanaq. I also think that we are dealing with two individuals, viz. the Muslim trader Asan (=Hasan) of the SH who may be identified with Hasan حسن, and
the Kereyt Ha-san-na who took part in the Baljuna covenant. The similarity of their names is purely coincidental. Our Asus met Çinggis for the first time at Lake Baljuna and it is most unlikely that he would have met him as one of their companions in drinking the muddy water of the lake to seal their friendship. The participants in the covenant, people like Sübe'eti, Çinggis, the Yeh-li brothers, Stige, etc., were all Çinggis' companions who had fought Ong Qin and who had shared his joys and sorrows, as we learn from their respective biographies (Cleaves 1955a, 397-402); this fact alone would automatically exclude the prosperous Muslim trader, who is probably mentioned at this juncture because he helped Çinggis and his followers by supplying them with food in the form of the sheep he had with him, thereby earning Çinggis' gratitude and eventual employment. As noted by Serruys (1982a, 127).

'(H)asan must have imported something from the Western Asian countries, but: one does not import sheep into Mongolia! Whatever Hassan had imported in the first place, he had already exchanged for sheep which he now wanted to trade for pelts. Furthermore one must also keep in mind that sheep cannot travel long distances without deteriorating fast. Hassan may well have imported a variety of manufactured goods including textiles, to be exchanged for Mongolia products, which by the time he reached the extreme northeastern corner of Mongolia, had been exchanged for sheep, to be bartered for pelts. Pelts are a product easy to transport, and one may guess, they constituted Hassan's final acquisition to be taken back to the west.' Cf. also CK1, 66 (= CK1, 72).

The form Sartaq (pmo. Sartayta) appears here for the first time. Like Sarta'ul and Sartaqin, it is formed on Sartaq. See above, nn. 152 and 181. For the denominal noun 'suffix d'apparence' -tau, see GWM, 44, § 138; Bese 1974, 92 (3.1.3: Qor.lar.tau); MIGT, 2766a, no. 385 (3). Cf. pmo. sillamta 'Christian' ('Trois documents', 459-460).

§ 183. Çinggis' brother Jöchi QSAR's eldest son was called Yekü, but Yegü in this section as well as in §§ 269, 280, because of the frequent passage of the voiceless velar stop -k to its voiced counterpart q in the SH, as in the case of jöchi怪在 says = Yegü in the text = Çinggis' attitude to the Chinese sources.

My reason for reading Yisingege rather than the usually accepted form Yësingege (cf. NMP, l, 309; Chapitre C VII, 178b [Index]; Pe, 62, 194; Ha, 71; Ko, 139; Da, 153 [Yisingege]; Mu, II, 194; Oe, IV, 178; Ir, 160; El-Ar, 574; Ta, 107; Çe, 148; Cl, 111; Ev-Pop, 345b; see also Rylatski 2000, 221) is not only because this name is formed on the word yisin 'mine', like Yisingege and Yisüü, but also because Yisingege is the reading found in the text in Urgur-Mongol script of the famous stele in his honour, the so-called 'Stone of Chingis.' See de Rachewiltz 1976, 489, 500, n. 24. The Chinese character yeh (like its homophone ë) in initial position can transcribe either mmo. ye or ye- (cf. HCG, 2; Chapitre C VII, 24-25, n. 1. I think we may be dealing also with some dialect variation (Yisingege - Yësingege), which then allows for either reading. The reading Yisingege has been adopted by Ligeti (L1, 73), Bese (in Bese 1974, 92, 93), and, more recently, Gaamba (J, 108). For Yisingege, besides de Rachewiltz 1976 and Chapitre C VII, loc. cit., see also HWC, 184 and n. 22; S1, I/2, 52, 231, 277; Successors, 372b (Index); Farquhar 1966, 362-368; and X. Nyambuu et al. in Mongolica 10 (31):2000, 197. He is mentioned again in § 269, where his name is incorrectly transcribed as Yisingege. For n > ng, cf. above, n. 1; for the denominal noun suffix -pe, cf. Poppel 1975, 167.

As for QSAR's third son Tuq, who appears only once in the SH and whose name alternates with Toqu in the Chinese sources, see S1, I/2, 52, 277; Chapitre C VII, 24, and 25, n. 4.

For the passage 'QSAR... Çinggis Qan', cf. Mo, 41-42 and 176. It should be noted that, in this passage, the names of
Qasar’s three sons are followed by the ‘enclitic’ -tan, on which see above, n. 72. In this particular case, -tan(-ten), just as its Chinese counterpart tseeng  tăng, usually meaning ‘and others, and the like, etcetera’, plays merely the role of the conjunction ‘and’, as evident from the context. One wonders whether mno. -tan(-ten) and ch. tseeng (tseeng) may originally be related – a question deserving further investigation. Cf. Ouz., III, 209, n. 1.

‘The ridges of Qara’un Jidun.’ In the early 13th century, Qara’un Jidun (‘Dark [or Black] Ridge’) designated a mountainous area at the easternmost limit of Mongolia, to be identified with the western ridges of the southern Great Khingan Range, possibly the western slopes of Mount Suyolji (Suyolži Ulul) at 46°31’ N 119°20’ E. It was definitely not further west in the Onon and Khentii area, as suggested by other investigators (e.g. Boyle 1973, 75). I have discussed the problem of the identification of Qara’un Jidun in considerable detail in Ra., VI, 60-63. It is not necessary, therefore, to repeat my argument here, except to mention that the above identification has also been adopted in the CKA, 24, 55a. For Mount Suyolji, cf. Franke W 1945, 11, n.35; idem 1949, 15. Our text says that, in his search for Cinggis, Qasar climbed ‘the ridges’ (miru’d) of Qara’un Jidun, a peculiarity similar to our ‘crossing the Gobi desert.’ We do not know which of the many ridges of the Khingan system east of the Buir Nor these were, and I think we should not take the reference too literally, as the author is dramatizing in this passage Qasar’s anxious search for his elder brother. In fact, according to Rafid al-Din, Qasar had been living separately from Cinggis Qan at Qara’un Jidun when Ong Qan carried out a raid there and seized his wife and children. Only then did Qasar leave Qara’un Jidun and go in search of his brother. See SLI, 12, 132. The parallel account in the SWCCCL, 48b, says that when Ong Qan captured Cinggis’s wife and children at Qara’un Jidun, Qasar managed to escape with his son Toqu (the Tuq of the SH); they had nothing to eat except birds’ eggs, and in this way they joined Cinggis Qan ‘on the bank of the river (i.e. the Ba’jiun).’ The YS I, 1, 11, gives a virtually identical account. Cf. Cleaves 1955a, 370-371. The problem of Qasar’s movements and his uneasy relationship with Cinggis is a very complex one and, with but a single exception (§ 244), is glossed over in the SH. See Hambis 1973, 8ff. (exp. nn. 13, 15), 27-28, n. 46; HCG, 172-173; Nasagdar 1958; and, by the same author, CXC 112-120.

For the ‘hides’ (raw skins) and ‘sinews’ (širš širı̄budu), cf. Khomonov 1970, 33-34. In view of the alliteration of these two words, we may assume that it is a cliché, not to be taken literally. Cf. the above-mentioned reference to ‘birds’ eggs’ in the SWCCCL and YS.

‘Cinggis Qa’an received Qasar’, lit. ‘Cinggis Qa’an let Qasar come.’ For Qali’udar and his clan, the Je’urêt (Je’urget) here written Je’urjet [C, 111; Je’urjet; cf. above, n. 44], see HCG, 147; Poppi 1975, 163. Caquirrelcan of the Uriangak is the same Çaquirrelcan of §§ 120, 122, and 124 and is called again Çaquirrelcan in §§ 184 and 185, and Çaquirrelcan in § 243. Çaquirrelcan = pmo. Çaquirrelcan ( Çaquirrelcan; cf. AT’, 31b: Çaquirrelcan; 33b: Çaquirrelcan; therefore, the form ‘Caquirrelcan’ in Cl, 111 et passim, is incorrect. He was the ‘younger brother’ (the cousin) of Jelme, and had earlier been appointed a special envoy/courier by Cinggis Qan. See § 124. Cf. HCG, 164.

‘I watched for my elder brother.’ In this passage, which is mostly in alliteration (hence presented here in poetic form) so that the messengers could commit it to memory more easily, the astute Cinggis Qan makes Qasar speak as if he, having failed to trace and join him (Cinggis Qan), has now decided to return to Ong Qan’s camp provided Ong Qan sends a trusted messenger to him to guarantee that no harm would be done to his person and to his family. For this passage, cf. A. Mastaert in TOQ, xv, 581, no. 436; and Carlsson 1980, 83-84. As shown by these scholars, Cinggis employs a familiar saying or proverb. Such use of familiar quotations is predominant in dramatic or quasi-dramatic situations, when important decisions must be taken.
'Gazing at the stars' (hot qaraqis). In L¹, 117, and L², 140, the word hot has been inadvertently left out. Hot (= hod, pmoo. od) is the plural of hod (-a) (= pmoo. oden) 'star.' Cf. mod, an ancient plural of modun 'tree.' See Street 1990, 360. For hodun, see also HCLWLYTT, 190-192, no. 54; Kara 1990, 299, s.v. 'hudo.'

For arbang 'a lump or clod of earth,' cf. mo. arbun 'hilllock, knoll' (Gol., l, 211c, le., 616b; cf. SMT, 21); bur. orbun 'a thick zone of a tree; a pointed stump projecting from the base of a tree.' Cf. the meanings of this word in other modern dialects as given in TH, 122 (= JYt, 214). See also CI, 111, n. 55; and Oz, IV, 182-183, n. 5. Poppe 1969, 274, renders it with 'knoll.' What is meant is the lump of earth at the base of a tree formed by the root. Cf. On, 88: 'a lump of earth (under a tree).' For dereti, lit. 'one having a pillow,' cf. Khomonov 1970, 33. The last two lines of the poetic passage are, literally, 'I lie, looking at the stars, being (sa) one having (= with) a pillow made of an earth-lump at the base of a tree.'

It is worth noting that in the present passage, Qasar calls Ong Qan 'my father the Qan,' using the same form of address employed by Cinngis Qan. Since Ong Qan had become Cinngis' adopted father, by the same token he had also become the adopted father of all the other children of Yisüaç. Cf. above, § 177 and com.

'If, hopefully, I get from you some one I can trust!' renders istegemi ere'en olus au, lit. 'If I find trust and hope.' Cf. CI, 111: 'If I obtain trust and expectation.' The Chinese sectional summary (Y¹ 6, 47b) correctly paraphrases: 'If you send someone trustworthy to me.' The formula used by Cinngis was no doubt a conventional one in cases in which a guarantee or hostage was required, as confirmed by Ong Qan's reply in § 184. Cf. EV-Pop, 285, n. 56.

'We shall follow close behind you,' lit. 'we shall move immediately after you.' Arqal (= mo. Aryal) Geği ('Dry Dung Hoolk') on the Kerulen River corresponds, according to Perleè, 7 (= Perleè, 91, but incomplete rendering?), to the present-day Aradult (Doloom) Xüüt, at the northwestern tip of the Bayan Uul (= Bayan Ula), at 45° N 109° E. From 1585 we learn that, at that time, Ong Qan's encampment was at Jer Qabüci Pass in the Jeje'er Heights (Jeje'er Ündir), which Perleè has identified with the southern Bayan Uul. See above, n. 166. Since Cinngis' forces were obviously in the same region and not far from the Kerulen (where the meeting with Qall'udar and Çaqurkan had been arranged), Perleè's identification of Arqal Geği with a place on the upper reaches of the Kerulen in the northwestern Bayan Uul would be plausible. However, as Perleè refers to 'the northwestern tip' of the Bayan Uul, the locality must be closer to 48° than 49° N. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the Baljuna episode and the events described in the previous sections took place in the region of the Buur Nór and the lower course of the Kerulen in eastern Mongolia, i.e. a long way from the Bayan Uul. Since the Jeje'er Heights were in the Bayan Uul region, what is stated at the end of § 183 about Cinngis setting out from Lake Baljuna cannot be implicitly accepted. There must have been a time-lag between the events at the Baljuna and Cinngis' return to his camping grounds further west which is not accounted for in the SH. In fact, the entire sequence of events is not clear. In the SLI, U2, 131, we read: 'In the autumn of this year (1203), moving from there (i.e. the Baljuna), he (i.e. Cinngis Qan) gathered his followers and subjects at the sources of the Onon River and set out on a campaign against Ong Qan.' The SWCC, 50b, writes: 'In the autumn there was a great assembly at the sources of the Onon River and he (= the Emperor, i.e. Cinngis Qan) set out to attack Ong Qan.' This is repeated in YS¹ 1, 11: 'The Emperor moved his army to the sources of the Onon River and made plans to attack Ong Qan.' Thus, according to these sources, prior to his attack on the Keretiit camp Cinngis Qan was by the Onon. According to the SH, he was near the Kerulen. This confusion is understandable, since it was in this very region between the two great rivers – the 'Onankertüle' of William of Rubruck, the 'Onan-Kelüren' of
woollen textile, flannel-like fabric', as well as 'the wooden grate of the walls of a felt tent' (Les., 806). Cf. Kow., 1774b: 'stamade, stamene, ettofe de laine', DO, 661a: 'tissu de laine, flanelle (de provenance tibétaine)', RL, 251, no. 10: 'tent'. Cf. HCG, 181; VWTD, III, 1080; KoW, 243; Róna-Tas 1963, 49-50; Khomonov 1970, 37; TMEN, no. 1340; Rassadin 1995, 114. On the golden fixtures of the royal tents in the 13th century, see the HTSL, 4a (cf. CG, 104, 106, n. 11); MM, 63; BDK, 11, 39 et passim; and, lately, CEME, 52, 75.

For getert (pl. of genet) 'not suspecting anything, unawares, "qui n’est pas sur ses gardes" [A.M.], etc.', see above, §§ 104 and 170, and Mo, 87-88. This whole passage is translated and discussed in Mo, 103-104.

'I shall give İrügen in trust', lit. 'I shall send İrügen in trust', i.e. as one that can be trusted and as guarantor of the accord. See above, n. 183.

'Seeing the signs of a multitude', or 'of a great display' (yeka baru'a: 'grand dépeçlement' [A.M.]) of people and tents, i.e. of a much larger camp than he expected, realizing that Çinggis Qan was assembling his forces in preparation for an attack on Ong Qan. For the connotations of the word baru'a'in, see below, n. 195 ad fin.

'Instead, going now in front of him, now behind him, he kept on obstructing his way', lit. 'as he went on cutting across the way before and behind him.'

'At an arrow's shot from the rear.' I have borrowed Cleaves' felicitous paraphrase of the Mongolian phrase govinata sumun-u gür-kai affu'ar-e, lit. 'from the extremity (= furthest point) an arrow would reach from behind.' See CI, 112, n. 58.

'He let İrügen's gold-saddled black gelding on the tip of its rump, so that it sat on its haunches (sa'utala).' This is how the Chinese sectional summary understands this phrase, and how Haenisch, Ligeti and Ozawa among others have also interpreted it. See Yü 6, 50a (cf. Pa, 97; Wa, 272). However, Naka, Pelliot and other translators take sa'utala, lit. 'till (or so that) it sat', as meaning 'until (or so that) it (= the arrow) sat (= lodged)', i.e. in

§ 184. 'Golden tent of thin woolen cloth' (aitan termes). For 'golden' = 'royal', see above, n. 21. The word termes is of Tibetan origin (= Tib. ther-ma) and properly designates a 'thin
the tip of the rump of the black gelding. I favour the first for the reason that is how the Ming translators of the SH understood it. See Hs, 72; Li, 74; Ozê, 2, 243; On, 89 (260 ed., 159: 'thutm bringing it down'); Na, 216-217; Pe, 195; Cl, 112; Ev-Pop, 141.

'Cut Türgen down and cast away his body there and then': cf. § 136 ad fin. This was harsh treatment for an official envoy (Türgen is called elcin in this very section) as well as a guarantor-hostage of his 'father the Qan', but it was all part of Cinggis' devious plan and his ruthless determination to dispose once and for all of all Ong Qan, hence his total disregard for the accepted rules of conduct concerning envoys. It should be noted that the account of Türgen's mission and capture is told differently in SL', 1/2, 133 (cf. SWCC'I, 51a-b), and the YS'I, 11. See D'Ohsson, 1, 81; CW, 137-138; CK', 72 (= CK', 79).

§ 185. 'Let us quickly move forward from here' renders ötirlen îgîlîgë. The word îgîlîgë is not glossed in the text, nor is it translated in the sectional summary (Y'I, 6, 53a); however, being preceded by ötirlen 'quickly, fast (lit. "fastening")', it must be a verb of action or movement. I think that Pelliot is correct in suggesting that this word, which is otherwise unattested in Mongolian, should be amended to neîélîlîf or neîélîlîf imperfect of neîélîlîf ('m. nom. neîlîlîf') 'to cause to move, to transmigrate'. See Y'I, 63, n. 1. The expression ötirlen neîlîlîf 'to move fast', is already found in § 101 of the SH. The factive form is used with reference to the men, i.e. the soldiers, who must also be made to travel through the night (sünit düül düîîlîlîf — again a conv. imp. of the fact.). It seems, then, that the manuscript of the SH used by the Ming translators had a corrupt form which they read as îgîlîgë, and which they left untranslated because they did not know what to make of it. (In the Uighur-Mongol script, a badly written word like negélîlîf could be easily read as îgîlîgë, for the regular confusion between i- and ni-, cf. HCG, 332-333.) Other interpretations suggested or adopted by modern translators are
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yegülîgë — 'to change (horses)' (Cc, 355; cf. On, 89); gînîlîgë — 'to cause to run or gallop' (Cc, 150; cf. Ev-Pop, 141); and *gîgîlî — (cf. YS'I) 'to assemble' (Ozê, IV, 198-200, n. 1, and Ozê, I, 243; but in his translation in Ozê, IV, 197, Orsawa adopted the rendering 'to move'), however, I regard them as less plausible. Jagchid's gîrîlîgë — 'to reconnitre' (Ja, 245 and n. 1), and Gaambab's yegülîgë — gînîlîgë, gînîlîgë — 'to cause to run or gallop' (Ta, 110, 356, n. 544) are untenable on any linguistic grounds.

The Jer Gorge (Jer Qabçiqa) pass (amasar) of the Jeje'er Heights has been identified by Perleć', 8, with the present-day Xàbêl Am (Amasar) at 47° N 109° E. This is apparently, the only passage leading into an area rich in camping grounds in the southern Bayan Ula region. Cf. Perleć', 8. See also above, n. 166, for the Jeje'er Heights. According to the CKA, 54a, the Jeje'er Heights corresponded to the Argun Nuruu (Argun Range), and Jer Qabçiqa Amasar to Xabgašaytn (Xabgašaytn) Am (cf. ibid., 32, A-5). This would place the latter at 50° N 119° E, which is too far to the north-east. In view of what has been said earlier concerning the respective itineraries of Ong Qan and Cinggis Qan after the encounter at Qogaljtû Sands, Perleć's identification of the Jeje'er Heights and of Jer Gorge appears to be the correct one (see above, n. 182). There is no doubt that we are dealing with a mountain pass (for amasar = 'pass', cf. above, n. 136); the very term qabçiqa = 'mount qabqûby', means 'gorge, ravine'. See TMEN, no. 265. Although the Jeje'er Heights are mentioned in the corresponding passage in SL', 1/2, 133, and the SWCC'I, 51b, as well as in YS'I, 11, these sources do not mention the Jer Gorge, and this locality does not reappear in the SH.

6. 'One who fought longer than the others', lit. 'This man who fought...'. Cf. Street 1990, 193.

Qadaq Ba'atur was the leader of the "brave Jirgin", the main crack unit of Ong Qan’s army. See § 170 and note.
For tebeki’- ‘to forsake, abandon’ → ‘to kill’, see above, n. 77. Here the meaning is ‘to abandon him and let him be killed.’ Cf. BGE, 166.

‘I will serve him’, lit. ‘I shall give him my strength.’ See above, n. 149. For the rallying of Qadaq Bah’at’ur, see the remarks in Vlad’ 2, 105.

‘Because Quyildar lost his life’, lit. ‘Because of the life of Quyildar’, i.e. the life he gave to Cinggis Qan. See § 175. The expression eme ku’ar, lit. ‘wife – child (or children)’, is ambiguous, like ch. e’r et’u:[e’r], it can mean ‘wife and children’, or simply ‘wife’. Cf. Mo, 41-42; and above, n. 104.

‘Must not betroth them’ (bu qudallatuq). For qudallu: ‘to betroth’ (c=quda, see above, n. 62), cf. BGE, 180.

For the expression ‘according to their own wishes’ (e’r’et’u dar’ar, mo, oliber bar darabar), cf. Cleaves 1953, 72, n. 9.

‘Must be servants and attend to’, lit. ‘let them serve in front and behind.’ For this expression, cf. Cleaves 1952, 101-102, n. 122.

It will be remembered that in § 171 it is related how Quyildar of the Mangqui had spoken before Uncle Juridze of the Uru’ut offering to fight in (i.e. as vanguard) of his anda Cinggis Qan. In the knowledge that this may cost him his life, he had entrusted his ‘orphanned children’ to the care of his anda. After his death (§ 175), Cinggis kept his word and rewarded Quyildar’s loyalty and sacrifice to the offspring of the offspring (uruq = uruq = uruq-a), i.e. in perpetuity. For ‘the bounty granted to orphans’ (Cl, 119: ‘grant of orphans’), cf. Aubin 1975, 562, n. 88.

Chapter Six of the SH ends, appropriately, with the end of the Kereyit ‘people’ (irge, see § 180) i.e. of their tribal unity, and the defeat at the battle of Jer Qabibqi of their leader, Ong Qan, the person who, more than anyone else, had helped Cinggis to achieve the prominence he attained in Mongolia. The organization of Ong Qan’s army served as the blueprint for that of Cinggis Qan’s formidable fighting force with which he overran China and Central Asia. Ong Qan’s heritage and memory continued in several ways largely through later legends which, by confusing him with the ruler of the Onqgu (who, like the Kereyit, were both of Turkish origin and Nestorian faith), related Ong Qan by marriage to Cinggis Qan’s family and identified him with the mythical Prester John. See MP, 375-376; MP, 22, MPA, 321-323; de Rachewiltz 1996a, 71. As Yügeci Baha’at’ur’s anda and Cinggis Qan’s adopted father, Ong Qan exerted great influence on the conqueror, more than he is usually credited with; this fact transpires from the pages of Rashid al-Din’s account, which tends to balance the more negatively biased account of the SH.

§ 186. A transcription in uyiyarin, i.e. in Uighur-Mongol script, of the entire Chapter Seven is found in MLJ, 15-19, followed by a translation in modern literary Mongolian, also in uyiyarin, taken from DA, 159-180. Cf. DA, 135-152.

For Taqi Baha’at’ur, see above, n. 120; Vlad’ 2, 124-125; and Cleaves 1959a, 400 and n. 261. For the Subudus, a former subrite of the Taqidi’ut, cf. above, n. 82; and, in particular, Li, 164, n. 86, also with regard to Taqi Baha’at’ur.

For the Jirgin, a subrite of the Kereyit, see above, n. 170.

‘Ordered as follows’ (farliq boluran). Cl, 114, leaves a lacuna immediately after, explaining in note 1, on the same page: ‘There seems to be a lacuna, because what follows is not the text of the decree. This passage is not found in the Altan tobeci (nov.). The words basa Cinggis qahan farliq boluran are not rendered in the continental Chinese translation (YCPS, 7. 2v4).’

I think that what follows is, in fact, the gist of Cinggis’ order with regard to Ong Qan’s daughters and Jaga Gambo. Cf. El- Ar, 561; O’z, IV, 210, Če, 152.

On Ibaqa Beki (? read Begi, cf. above, n. 49), see HCG, 236, 243; NMP, 1, 303-304; Rybarski (2003), s.v. Cinggis later gave Ibaqa Beki as wife to Juridze, the chief of the Uru’ut. As for Soriyanani Beki (w.f. Soriyanani Beki or Begi in? -1252), there is a vast literature on her, as she was the Christian (Nestorian) wife of Tolui and the mother of Mongke,
Qubilai, Hulegu and Ariq Boke. She played an important part in Mongol court politics, as well as in policies which affected China, and her name, in the form "Serocatan", became known in the West through John of Pian di Carpine’s *Historia Mongolorum*. On her see Successors, 165-171 et passim; SF, 66, 287, 288, 289; SDM, 266, 358, 446; MWI, 311a (Index); Pelleiot 1914, 628; idem 1932; NHHO, 33-34; NMP, 1, 342; RCAC, 66-67 (also for the date of her death, and concerning her sister Ibaqa Beki); Ratchevsky 1976, 510-511, 521-522; CK’, 21, 73, 115 (= CK, 22, 80, 128); KK, 11-14, 18-19, 108; Rossabhi 1979, 158-166; MJK, 27, 119; Szebr 1989, 374-375; and Rybaktsi [2003]. s.v. These are also several biographies of this famous princess in Chinese. See, in particular, YS’ 116, 1a-b (= YS, 116, 2897-2898); HYS, 104, 9a-b; MWE BC, 19, 66-7a.

Tolui, the fourth and youngest son of Cünggís Qan, is mentioned here for the first time. He was born between 1186 and 1190, and died in 1231 or 1232. He briefly held the regency of the empire between Cünggís’s death in 1227 and the enthronement of Ögedei in 1229, his posthumous Chinese appellation being Hui-tun-güông. His posthumous title among the Mongols was Ulyq Noyan, a Turco-Mongol hybrid meaning ‘The Great Chief.’ On him see HCG, 375-376, Chapitre CVIII, 88-98; Cleaves 1948, 318, n. 18; NHHO, 11, n. 2; NMP, 1, 232, 335, II, 785; Boyle 1956, 146-148; Szebr 1989. According to RC, 102, Tolui died in September-October 1232. Chou Liang-hsiao 仇良鉞 says in Yishi, 106, that Tolui died in 1233 at the age of over forty. The dates given for Tolui in On, 91, n. 731 (and 2010 ed., 163, n. 420), are 1193-1232. Cf. below, n. 272, for a further discussion on this point.

For the forms egoquem (e.g. ego + den. noun suff. -met) ‘elder sister’, and dysisym (di + den. noun suff. -met) ‘younger sister’, see LSHM, 54, § 4.1111; JJS, 35, § 37; GWM, 43, § 129a, 70, § 263. Cf. also Oz’, IV, 211-212, n. 2.

For qarquyan, plural of qariyaru ‘belonging to’, subject of (cf. dependant), see TMEN, no. 275.
occur only once in the SH. Mo. gürge is an alternative form of gürge ‘tresses of the neck’ (Kov., 2644a). There is also a word transcribed in Les., 392b, as gürge meaning ‘wicker-work’ (a nom. imp. of gürge ‘to braid, plait’; cf. Kov., 2645b, id.). According to Poppe, these words should be read as gürge and gürge. See TDB, 48 F38v, 13 (gürgeten). Cf. however, MXT, 791b; gürge; MBT, 1045b, id. Neither of these two terms fits the context. As is often the case in the SH, initial g = ʒ (thus ʒi’t in, küm, gürge = ʒo, kürge, etc.; see ‘Quelques problèmes’, 240). In this instance, too, gürge ñ = kürge, a term corresponding to šg. körde, ‘a container for wine’, er. cup, bowl’, cf. VWTD, II, 1251a [N.P. p.c.]; TH, 268, where the spoken Urad form ʒør dés designating a particular type of leather bag for kumis (aiţær) is also cited; cf. JYT, 361. In view of this, I think that the Chinese gloss must be understood as meaning ‘wine service’, i.e., all the objects (cups, bowls, etc.) pertaining to the serving and drinking of wine, чăл ‘drinking’ here ‘déposition des parties d’un tout, ensemble de circumstances’ (DCLC, 244b). Cf below, n. 213. On gürge, cf. also U. 140; Khonovom 1790, 31. For ęy aya (μ. ayg ) cup, bowl, beaker, vessel, cf. tu. aysy id. See TMEN, no. 628; RH, 279, no. 17; Khonovom, loc. cit. ‘Ongqoj Kereyit’ is explained by Pelliot as Ongqoj = *Ongqoj, plural of *Ongqoj, the ethnic of Ong Qan, hence ‘the Kereyit of Ong Qan’ (HCG, 128). These Ongqoj Kereyit would then be Ong Qan’s own slakhman. Keilig (μ. keilig) ‘bodyguards’ is a possessive noun formed on keiK ‘the bodyguard (or guard).’ See GWM, 44, § 139. For this important term, see below, n. 191. To carry quivers and participate in formal drinking (itored) were privileges not enjoyed by household serfs and guards like Baddi and Kiliq, but they became entitled to them when they were raised to the status of darqat (pl. of darqan) or freemen. See above, n. 51, and the interesting remarks on this question in Li, 164, n. 187. Cf also §§ 51, 169. For darqati= ‘to enjoy the privilege of being freeman’, cf. above, n. 121.

On the short alliterative passage (ignored as such in L1, 144), cf. the words spoken to Alan. Qara and Sada Beki in § 123, and in § 219 where the passage in question is repeated with almost identical words. Cf. also Ozawa 1972, 281ff.

‘When swiftly pursuing, lit. ‘when hastening after.’
‘What you get ...What you slaughter ...’, lit. ‘As much as you get ...As much as you slaughter ...’ (B, ‘quant a que ...’ [A.M.J].

Because of the vital service performed by Baddi and Kiliq, lit. ‘Because Baddi and Kiliq caused a service to arrive between my life and death’, i.e., ‘they performed a service that saved (or protected) my life.’

‘The high throne’, lit. ‘the place (seat) of height’ (iindjan eron). For this use of eron (‘place’ ‘throne’), cf. TMEN, no. 43. Cf also the expression yeko eron ‘great throne’. See Matériel II, 12 (2v, 1).

For alman alam ‘successively, one after the other’, cf. TMEN, no. 522; de Rachewiltz 1882, 73, n. 187; cf. Cohnas 1982, 85, n. 41. Although alam can mean ‘still farther, more and more’, the expression alman alam in the present context can only mean ‘successively’ (= alamfian). See Oz, IV, 225, n. 8. ‘Remember’ (uqatqat). Uqa means ‘to perceive, understand, think of, consider, keep in mind’, hence also ‘to remember’, but this extended meaning is usually not given in the dictionaries. ‘They distributed the Tūmen Tübe’en and they all took up until they had them plenty’, lit. ‘Distributing the Tūmen Tübe’en among themselves, they too joined them until they had finished distributing them.’ Tūmen Tübe’en = Tūmen Tülegen. See above, n. 150. For the expression tigetele, cf. above, n. 92.

For the Olan Dongqayit, see above, n. 150. For the expression eqqa (= no. ayq) adar-e ali giqen, lit. ‘without reaching a full day’, i.e., ‘in less than a day’, cf. ‘Trois documents’, 476.

The ‘brave’ (ba’ant) Jurgin were Ong Qan’s crack troops (see § 170); after a battle they had the right to strip the fallen enemies and take as trophies (and booty?) their blood-stained
clothing and possessions (čisutu tonog). According to a later source, the victors hung these gory trophies on the right side of their saddles, while at the same time leading the dead enemy’s horse on the left side. This symbolized also the victory over the honour of the horse. See Sagdarsuren 1970. Cf. MNTSZA, 60-70; Sambilendov 1977. Serruys 1982a, 126, writes: ‘Prof. I. de Rachewiltz makes the observation that the Mongols kept the clothes of vanquished enemies as trophies.’ Perhaps, this is so to a certain extent. But given the overwhelming evidence, as we shall see, of the need for textiles in general, I am rather inclined to think that most of the time clothes taken from the enemy were used again. The Mongols could not be too choosy, and certainly they did not share our modern squeamishness in this regard. Serruys is certainly right; however, the two considerations are not mutually exclusive. The enemy’s clothing would first be displayed as trophy and then, undoubtedly, used again. Cf. CEME, 21. As for tonog, cf. tu. ton ‘garment, clothing’ (ED, 512b); this term seems to have included also other personal possessions carried by a warrior on his person. The interlinear gloss renders it as pu-u-o ˌhɪn 'the stripping off' = ‘spoils.’

Tonog is, in fact, a deverbal noun in -o (mno- ˌg see GWWM, 45, § 146; JS, 41-42, § 54) from tono- ‘to strip off, rob, plunder.’ See above, n. 136. Tono ṭ now means ‘goods, utensils, harness, equipment, etc.’ (Les., 825a; DO, 668b; MMED, 500b). On these etymologies, cf. TMEN, no. 990; Ov, IV, 227-229, n. 11.

With regard to the reference in this section to the Jirgin taking ‘the blood-stained clothing,’ Cleaves (CL, 115, n. 7) writes: ‘Is this an allusion to the episode in § 136? If so, Jirgin is an error for Jürkin.’ Cf. also Cleaves 1955, 37, n. 25. Since the ethnic origin of the Jirgin is not clear, it is possible that they were related to the Êrijkin (Yürkin), which is certainly suggested by their names, although the former were apparently a subtribe of the Kereiyi, whereas the latter were Mongols proper. See HCG, 56-57, 398. It should be noted, however, that in our passage are given the epithet of ba’atui ‘brave (pl.),’ and in § 170 (twice), whereas this epithet is never applied to the Jürkin in the

SH. We are probably dealing with two separate subtribes. Cf. Vid., 74, 89 and n. 5, 117, n. 5.

‘They divided and apportioned them, but could not give some to everybody,’ i.e. ‘they split and apportioned them, but were unable to deliver them to each other (= for everybody),’ i.e. they were unable to divide them in such a way as to give everybody some.

Abjil’a (w.f. Abjilya) Ködège (~ Köteger, see § 191), or ~ Shurk Height (or Elevation), where Chinggis Qan spent the winter of 1203 after the destruction of the Kereiyi tribe, was a hilly place situated somewhere near the sources of the Khalkha River east-south-east of the Bur Nu. See HCG, 409; and Mu, II, 224-225, n. 7. Perleé, 4, gives its situation as ‘south-east of the city of Choibalsan.’ Cf. Boyle 1975a, 169. As noted by Pelliot, it was here too that the Omonat had their winter encampment. For Köteger ‘height, elevation,’ cf. TMEN, no. 338.

§ 188. ‘Went away, unwilling to submit to Chinggis Qaan’ (davijijia gocu odu-át). Cf. Mo, 177, n. 158: ‘s’échappant en révoltés et s’en étant allez . . . ;’ Cl, 115: ‘revoltant’ and going out, being departed.’ In note 9 on p. 115 Cleaves writes: ‘I.e. not wishing to submit themselves to Chinggis Qahan.’ The verb davijijia means ‘se révolter, abandonner le parti de quelqu’un’ (Mo, 45) and is, therefore, more or less synonymous with the expression bulqn boil. Cf. HW, 31 and 21. As is known, anyone who did not wish to submit was ipso facto regarded as rebel (d v. bulqat). Cf. ‘Truis documents,’ 493. The other interpretations of these words of the SH (including mine in R, VII, 45, and On, 92), are incorrect.

The ‘Nekun Usun of (= at, by) Didik Sagul’ has not been identified. Nekun Usun (‘Slave Water’) was the name of a spring or a watercourse. The first element of Didik Sagul is tu. tink ‘mud, clay’ (ED, 455b; DTS, 654a); the second is tu. and mo. saqul ‘beard’ (cf. Ligeti 1965, 276, no. 11), hence ‘Mud Beard’ – an unusual name for a locality. It is, thus, either a
Turkic or a hybrid Turko-Mongolian name, which is very much in accord with the Turko-Mongolian culture of the Naiman (see above, n. 141), this site being undoubtedly on the fringe of the Naiman territory in western Mongolia and just north of the Gobi (see below). I suspect that the word *saqal* 'beard' may have been used also as a topographical term, the meaning of which is lost. (Cf. the *gigi* 'book' of § 183.) However, one cannot exclude the possibility, suggested long ago by Pelliot, that Didik Saqal is the name of the (Naiman?) chief in whose territory Nekin Usun was situated, but I think this is unlikely because Nekin Usun occurs twice in this section, both times preceded by the qualifying expression "of Didik Saqal", as is very often the case with place-names in the SH. Cf. Pelliot 1920, 177-178; and Li, n. 165, n. 188 (where the corresponding passage in the SWCCCL and Raifāl-Al-Dīm's work is also discussed). Onon (On, 92, n. 232; 2001 ed., 164, n. 421), following TH, 283 (= JYT, 491), renders Didik Saqal as 'clump of sedge' - a speculatively and uninterpretable implication. It appears that after leaving the Bayan Ula region, both father and son had made their way to the south-west. Ong Qan was waylayed further west in search of water and fell victim to the Naiman chief Qori Sübeci who was then patrolling the area. Qori Sübeci is, indeed, called 'a high official who held command under Tayang Qan (of the Naiman) in § 194 - a fact confirmed by Raifāl-Al-Dīm (SL2, I/1, 132, 137; I/2, 132, 134) and the SWCCCL, 52a. (For further references to this chief, see ibid., 51a; SL2, I/2, 148; on him cf. also Bürnbrit 1991, 529-534.)

As for Senggım, he bypassed (lit. 'went outside') the area of Nekin Usun and, continuing his southward journey, crossed the Gobi (Čöl). For Čöl = the Gobi, see Pelliot, op. cit., 178-179. Both Pelliot and Laguta, loc. cit., have pointed out that in the SH this word is always glossed as "place-name" (Y7, 7, 5b; Sup. 2, 48b). I may add that it is likewise mentioned as a locality in the HIIY (IIB, 13a). See *Matériel I*, 28, 47; *Matériel II*, 90, 96. However, in the present context Čöl almost certainly designates the desert region between the Naiman territory and the Tangu'Qaiin (Hai Hnia) country. On the term 'name čöl ('desert?Gobi'), cf. also Pelliot 1930b, 19, n.1; Cleaves 1949, 115, n. 105; Poppe 1955, 38; de Rachewiltz 1985, 217, n. 29; and below, n. 279. Čöl is also glossed as 'desert' in MA, 136a; and as 'dry' and 'in' in IM, 453a.

'Plagued by gadflies' (hīša'atu). For hīša'atu- (w.f. ilāyatu-) 'to be plagued (or bitten) by gadflies', cf. mo. ilāyatu 'by, gadfly'; ord. ilā 'gadfly' (DO, 384a). Cf. also Pelliot 1925, 217, no. 28; Oz, IV, 239, n. 9.

Concerning the equerry Kököçi, Mostaert has already pointed out that he was not a simple groom, in which case his condition would have merely been that of a serf, but that he was a *commande* (nākūr) of Senggüm, which explains why he was given costly clothes and tasty dishes. Hence, 'equerry' is here a better rendering of *aqātā* than 'groom'. See Mo, 106. Cf. CEME, 52.

For a discussion and translation of the passage beginning 'His wife said', and ending 'let him at least draw water and drink', see Mo, 104-109. A still unresolved ambiguity is the subject of the two alliterative verses uttered by Kököçi's wife, viz. whether it was her husband or his master to wear "gold-embroidered clothes" and eat "tasty dishes" (lit. 'When wearing clothes having gold, When eating food having taste'). Translators are very much divided on this issue. Cf., e.g., Mo, 105-106; Li, 76, Mu, II, 226-227; Oz2, IV, 234 (cf. Oz1, II, 13-14); Cl, 116; Da, 137; Do, 172; Ce, 154; On, 92; Ev-Pop, 146, 1. I follow the interpretation of the Chinese sectional summary (Y7, 8a-b), also adopted by Mostaert and Cleaves, indicating that it was for Kököçi to wear those garments and eat that food (given to him by Senggüm). On these verses, cf. Cerénsodolin 1986, 80.

'Your lord Senggüm', lit. 'your qan Senggüm'. Cf. above, n. 149.

'You call me', lit. 'I am said' (ke'egdev), i.e. 'You apply to me the saying.' For the idiomatic expression "a woman (wife) with a dog's face (lit. 'has a dog's face')", i.e. a woman who
cannot blush, hence a shameless, unfaithful one, cf. Mo, 107-109. Onon’s interpretation (On, 92, n. 234): “They [i.e., women – I.R.] are two-faced; they may be both honest and dishonest” missed the point. The statement in the 2001 ed., 165, n. 423, that “This sentence means that women are loyal to their husbands, but men are not always loyal to their masters” is also inaccurate.

Jānta’s, the word for ‘cup’ in this passage, seems to be of Chinese origin like the term čung ‘cup’ of § 179; the second element is not clear (t’a < ch. t’ao ≠ 瓮 ‘a wrapper, container’?). Cf. the MKY, 9a: ya–tsa 㖢 (the text has incorrectly meng-tsa 酺) ‘large cup, basin’ = chun-tao (Yuan). Cf. bur. canton ‘iron bucket; tin teapot.’ See TH, 288-289 (= PT, 800); Ligeti 1990, 266, no. 181; Kara 1990, 309; Khronevov 1970, 31. For the particle her at least’, cf. Street 1981, 155.

‘Threw the golden cup back at him’, i.e. he threw the golden cup behind Senggüm. For oru at read ǒra at (< o’ora at), conversum perfect of ḍra (< o’ora; mo. ogor) ‘to throw, cast’ (R, 97, line 6511, and 282a, s.v. ‘orun’ at, must be amended accordingly).

‘From beginning to end’ renders rëgās ‘fully, completely.’ For this word, cf. TMEN, no. 916.

‘Cinggis Qan’ then ordered, ‘To his wife I shall show favour’ . . .’” Cf. 116, translates: ‘When Cinggis Qahan made a decree, favouring his wife, saying, ‘. . .’ O3’, IV, 235, understands the text in the same way. My rendering is the generally accepted one by western and Mongol translators alike. However, Clevae and Otawa may be right. The sectionwise summary (Y² 7, 5b) says, in fact, that Kōkōdō, after leaving Senggüm, went to Cinggis Qan together with his wife, something that is not stated in the Mongol text. As for Senggüm, his subsequent movements are not related in the SH, but we know them from RaJīl al-Dīn (SL², 122, 134), the SWCCJ (SWCCJ, 52a) and the YS (YS² 1, 12). He crossed the Gobi (Čöl), reaching the region of the Etsin Gol in the He Shá kingdom of north-west China. There he lived for a while as a marauder. Driven away by the local people, he fled to northeastern Tibet (or, more precisely, to the area of His-ning or Tsaidam), then to the region of Kucha in Lüghur territory, always engaging in banditry. He was eventually killed by a local emir. See Pelliot 1920, 180-185. As pointed out by Pelliot, the SH account is somewhat legendary in character, and there is no doubt that Senggüm was not alone when he left Mongolia, but must have had a band of followers with him.

‘And take him for a companion’ (nökide esh), lit. ‘when (or if) he becomes (or jums as) a companion.’ This is another example of the value Cinggis placed on the loyalty of a nökide and his dependants (such as his wife) towards the leader. Cf. above, § 149. See also Vlad., 114, 121; Ratchnevsky 1976, 530, n. 57.

‘He cut him down and cast away his body.’ Cf. § 184 ad fin. (terde qoγi sγahe). From the text it appears that Cinggis Qan himself carried out the execution – an unusual occurrence.

§ 189. Tayyān Qan, the ruler of the Naiman tribe, was briefly mentioned in § 166. He was the son of Inaqa Qan, i.e. Inaqa Bilga Bügü Qan (see above, no. 151) and, according to the SH, of Gürbesi (i.e. mo. gürbel ‘lizard’?), who in this section (189) is called Tayyān’s ‘mother’ (kke). However, there seems to be some confusion on this point, as Gürbesi, according to other sources, was actually Tayyān’s wife. She may indeed have been another younger wife of Tayyān’s father Inaqa Qan later (i.e. after Inaqa’s death) married by Tayyān Qan, in which case the epithet ‘mother’ of the SH must not be taken literally, but generically. See the discussion in HCG, 308-309. Eventually, she became Cinggis Qan’s concubine. Cf. ibid., 308; Hung 1956, 31-32, n. 7. On Gürbesi’s name, cf. Rybacki (2003), s.v. For a discussion of §§ 189-196 in which the SH account of the 1204 Mongol campaign against the Naiman is presented as a fictional narrative woven around a historical event, i.e. as an epic piece, see Kahn 1996.
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common phenomenon, and I think that this is exactly what happened in the case of Ong Qan’s head.

*He stamped on it and crushed it to pieces* renders kemkeria geckolege‘ai.

Bese 1969, 124, translated these two words as ‘rod [the skull] asunder’, which strictly speaking is accurate.

but fails to render the full force of the expression, since the verb geckole- implies a reiterative action with the foot or feet. Cf.

DO, 263a.

On the Naiman chief Kökše’u Sabaq sax, see §159 and corn.

*The next thing you do is to crush it to pieces*, lit. ‘it is you who, for the second time (milevl see “next”), crush it to pieces.’


This is not right’, lit. ‘How can it be proper?’ – a rhetorical question.

‘The sound of our dogs’ barking has turned nasty’, i.e. the dogs’ barking bodes ill after Tayang Qan’s sacrilegious act. For other historical references to dogs’ barking as an ill omen, see

Li, 165, n. 189. For the plural form noqan of noqai ‘dog’, see

Street 1990a, 361 (D) and n. 119.

*‘I begot only through magic (elbesi’er)*, i.e. by means of prayers, incantations and other shamanistic practices. Cf. above § 174 and corn. (on elbesi’an).

*‘Born a weakening* renders tortiq tīreksen (= mo. tortiq tōrgsen). Tortiq, not glossed in the text, corresponds to tu.

torIQ, tortiq ‘lean, emaciated.’ See GÖT, 3840; DTS, 857b; ED, 546b. Cf. tu. torIQ-ar, ‘to become’ weak or emaciated; to be exhausted; osm. tortIQ ‘a lazy, untrained horse, an unbroken colt.’ See GÖT, 384a; VEWT, 589b, 490b; ED, 530b. This is confirmed by the sectional summary which says, ‘My son Tayang is still weak (or soft)’ (Yü 7, 12b). The word tortiq (tōrgQ, torIQQ, etc.) still survives in Mongolian, usually in combination with modon ‘tree’, with the meaning of ‘twig, switch’, and as the name of a plant. See Les., 8260; DO, 671a.

MKT, 1066c; MKEF, 2391b; TH, 262 (= JYT, 454). This word has also been variously rendered as ‘a puppet (i.e. a nobody).’

The rite (or duties) of a daughter-in-law on this particular occasion are not known, and one can only speculate, as Onon (On, 93, n. 236) does when he writes that ‘perhaps in this instance they [i.e. the daughters-in-law – L.R.] offered filled pipes to the head of the Ong Qan.’ Cf. the 2001 ed., 166, n. 425.

For details of other domestic obligations involving the daughter-in-law, see Mu, II, 240-241, n. 5; Elżak 1974, 7-80. Cf. also Cleaves 1977, 69, concerning the role of the daughters and daughters-in-law in the old Uighur mourning regulations.

The ceremonial wine’, i.e. the formal ‘toasting’ or istak, on which see above, n. 154.

*The horse fiddle*, i.e. the Mongolian fiddle or quasar (= mo. quasar), the ancestor of our violin. Cf. TMEN, nis. 314, 1546; and the relevant entries in BM, 116; and MAM, 231f.

‘Laughed’ is the literal meaning of gojīnd ‘in leqelqi’u, w.f.

ingeqelqi‘ai); however, the author(s) perhaps meant that it grinned, as has been understood by some translators (e.g. Li, 77); others translate it as ‘smiled’ (e.g. On, 92; Bv-Pop, 147), which is not quite accurate. The ‘grinning’ effect after death is a

For tvari- ‘to offer a sacrifice; to worship’, cf. TMEN, no.

849; ‘Trois documents’, 453; Os, IV, 247-248. n. 1. The use of the head for the purpose of worship is, as pointed out by Ligeti, an example of pars pro toto, the head representing the whole being. Cf. in § 198 the case of Toqto’a’i’s head being severed by his sons. See Li, 165, n. 189.

*Placed it on a large white felt rug (caqi‘in tologo)*. This is the first reference in the SH to the white felt rug (tologo) which, since the remotest times, plays such an important part in Mongol entourage, marriage and, as here, funeral ceremonies. See ibid.; and de Rachewiltz 1960, 247-252, n. 1.6. Cf. also NF, 210ff. On the term tologo (= pmo. toloko), see ATl, 147b (ATi, 103, line 4511, reads ‘tuluy’); cf. DO, 660b; Os, IV, 248-249, n.

2; MKEF, 237a, s.w. ‘tolouk.’ The qualifier ‘large’ applied to the carpet in question comes from the Chinese gloss (Yü 7, 9a; cf. HW, 151).

The rites (or duties) of a daughter-in-law on this particular occasion are not known, and one can only speculate, as Onon (On, 93, n. 236) does when he writes that ‘perhaps in this instance they [i.e. the daughters-in-law – L.R.] offered filled pipes to the head of the Ong Qan.’ Cf. the 2001 ed., 166, n. 425.

For details of other domestic obligations involving the daughter-in-law, see Mu, II, 240-241, n. 5; Elżak 1974, 7-80. Cf. also Cleaves 1977, 69, concerning the role of the daughters and daughters-in-law in the old Uighur mourning regulations.

The ceremonial wine’, i.e. the formal ‘toasting’ or istak, on which see above, n. 154.

*The horse fiddle*, i.e. the Mongolian fiddle or quasar (= mo.

quasar), the ancestor of our violin. Cf. TMEN, nis. 314, 1546; and the relevant entries in BM, 116; and MAM, 231f.

‘Laughed’ is the literal meaning of gojīnd ‘in leqelqi’u, w.f.

ingeqelqi‘ai); however, the author(s) perhaps meant that it grinned, as has been understood by some translators (e.g. Li, 77); others translate it as ‘smiled’ (e.g. On, 92; Bv-Pop, 147), which is not quite accurate. The ‘grinning’ effect after death is a
Overtake; to fast approach.’ See HW, 80. Cf. above, nr. 145 and 146. This verb is not Mongolian but, like other words in this section, of Turkic origin: yit-yar- (yit-yar-) ‘to cause to arrive, to accomplish.’ See DTS, 260a; ED, 893a. It is not related to mo. idure- ugdere- (kh. idrec, ugdrec) ‘to have a relapse’, which occurs in the SH (§ 175) in the form hikdere-. Cf. Oz, IV, 253, n. 9. However, the general meaning here, is the paraphrase in the sectional summary (Y’7, 12b) indicates, is ‘to forestall an impending calamity’ — much as we would say ‘something (bad) is going to happen.’ There is also an element of haste implied in it, as evident in the use of the verb idire- in §§ 145 and 146.


For falconry, cf. above, no. 27 and 54 (esp. Katayama 1982).

‘I hear’, lit. ‘I am told (or it is said)’ (ke eddemi). With their quivers’, meaning, of course, the arrows contained in their quivers. For other references to quivers (rattling, moving) in a similar context, cf. §§ 105 and 230.

‘Causing him to desert his own companions’ renders dayyîl alâ. See above, no. 105. Cf. also above, no. 188.

‘Do they now want to be rulers themselves?’, lit. ‘Now are those same people going to say, “We shall be qan?”’ Cf. Street 1990, 191 (69).

‘Even if there are two shining lights, the sun and the moon, in the sky above — both sun and moon are indeed there — yet how can there be two rulers on earth?’, lit. ‘Saying, “Let there be two shining lights, the sun and the moon, in the sky above” is all right: both sun and moon are indeed there, yet ...’ Cf. the ancient Chinese saying ‘There are not two suns in the sky, nor two rulers on the land’ (天無二日，土無二主). See DIK, III, 583.1641. Whereas the version found in the Mongolian text of
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the SH is supported by the SWCCCL, 53a, and SL, l/2, 146, the
author of the sectional summary renders the Mongolian text as
follows: 'In the sky there is only one sun and one moon; how
can there be two masters on earth?' (Y 7, 13a). Cf. Wa, 274.
The same interpretation is found in YS 1, 12. This rendering,
however, does not correspond to the original. Ko, 142, has
likewise misunderstood the text and so, more recently, have
Bira and Khomonov by following him. See Bira 1974, 68;
Khomonov 1981, 61. Cf. Oz, IV, 253-256, n. 10. For the
historical and political implications of this passage, see Bira, op.
cit.; and Smith 1994, 208.

'Those few Mongols' (tedehek Mongol[i(s acc.)]). Several
translators have either rendered tedehek (pl. of tedehek) simply
as 'those' (see, e.g., Na, 228; Oz, IV, 247; Do, 175; On, 93;
Ev-Pop, 148), or have misunderstood its meaning (Ko, 142).
The word tedehek 'those few' must be contextually related to the
earlier 60'eket 'a few', as correctly seen by Hanisch, Ligeti and
others.

'Have ... worn grimy clothes', lit. 'have clothes that are
dark (baturan). For 'dark', i.e. more or less near black,
meaning 'grimy, dirty', cf. Poppe 1977, 121.

'At that ... our cows and sheep.' For this section, cf. Street
1986, 19-20 (33); Mo, 109-110 (for qar qot 'hands - feet' =
'hands', see ibid., 43, 167). For the form qonin for qon qhep,
see above, n. 118.

'What do they have for us to worry about?' (ya'utan aqun
tede). For this expression, cf. CI, 118, n. 22.

To take away somebody's quiver, i.e. arrows and bow,
bowing obviously meant to take out a successful raid. See also § 190.
Cf. the corresponding passage in YS 1, 12, where the
expression used is 'to snatch [his (i.e. the self-styled emperor's)
bow and arrows."

For maga 'perhaps, surely, etc.', see above, n. 31.

§ 190. 'How boastfully you speak! Or Torluq Qan, is this proper?
You had better stop talking!', lit. 'Oh! You speak big words!'
See RCAC, 275-276, n. 4. For the relevant passages, cf. SWCCL1, 53a; SL, I/2, 146; and YS1, 1, 12.

The area where, according to the SH, Činggis was hunting at the time is called Teme’en Ke’er, i.e. the Camel Steppé (or Plain), which corresponds to the Ternegei Valley (i.e.) of the SWCCL1, 52a and 53b, and the YS1, 1, 12; and to the Temeen (= Teme’en) Keber (= Ke’er) of SL1, I/2, 135 and 146. (For ee = e’e, and eee = e’e’e, cf. above, nn. 1 and 170.) This is the locality where, according to these sources, Činggis Qan had gone after the defeat of the Kerevit, either in the winter of 1202-1203 (SL), or in 1203 (YS). However, according to the SH, § 187, he had spent the winter of 1203 (following Ong Qan’s defeat) at Abţ’a Kodeger at the sources of the Khalkha River. These two localities — Abţ’a Kodeger and Teme’en Ke’er — were near each other, as is indeed confirmed in § 191. Perle’le, 11 (= Perle’le, 101), says that it was undoubtedly situated north-west of the Khalkha. The location of the Teme’en Steppé has been discussed by various scholars (in particular, Wang Kuo-wei and Yanai Watari), the consensus being that it was north-east of Dalai Nör (or Dar Nör; the Chinese Ta-li po or Ta-eri ho; see NMP, I, 355) at about 44° N 117° E. Their argument, based on other references to Teme’en Ke’er in the YS, is summarized in Mu, II, 246, n. 15. On the other hand, the Temeen Ke’er of the SH was beyond doubt near the Khalkha River. Does that mean then that there were two areas having the same name, as is often the case in Mongolia? In the present instance I do not think so. I believe it quite possible that the whole region extending for about 500 km south-westwards from the Buir Nör and Khalkha River to the Dalai Nör was loosely known in Činggis Qan’s time as the ‘Camel Steppé.’ Thus, the place where he was hunting in the spring of 1204 would have been the northern end of Teme’en Ke’er, whereas the Terntń Kté (= Teme’en Ke’er) of YS1, 118, 2919, where he was encamped in the year 1214, must have been the southern end of it. The term Ke’er ‘steppe, vast grass plain’ could, in fact, apply to a wide area, as was the case with the other famous steppe, the Sa’ari Ke’er west of the Kerulen (cf. HGC, 389). See Ra, VI, 65-66, and above, n. 128. Tükilin Ce’ul (= Tükilin Hills) was obviously a group of two or more hills in the same area. On this name see Mo, 260. On the basis of the transcription found in Rašid al-Din’s work, the name of this locality should be read Tukil or Tülik Ce’ul. Cf. SL1, I/2, 146 and n. 10; Pe, 666, n. 4. However, neither Tükil nor Tükil or Tülil yield a satisfactory meaning for the name of a hill or hills in Mongolian. Prof. H. Franke (p.c.) has suggested a possible relationship with the tülk ‘fox’ (‘place where foxes abound’) — in this case perhaps ‘Fox Hills’?

For qormor (nom. id.) ‘to encircle’, cf. TEMEN, no. 285.

For abtu ‘hunt’; lit. ‘a circular dance’, see above, n. 115. For the expression abu de’ere boqot, see Cleeves 1952, 104, n. 147 (but cf. Cl, 118, where boqot is rendered as ‘then’). For bôqot, cf. above, n. 110.

‘There is nothing we can do now’, lit. ‘what shall (= can) we do now!’ — a rhetorical question: the geldings being lean, they would be unfit for battle.

Otgelin Noyan is Činggis Qan’s younger brother Temüge Otgelin, already mentioned in §§ 60 and 79 as Temüge, and in § 99 as Temüge Otgelin. See above, n. 60. This is the first time in the SH that (Temüge) Otgelin is given the additional title of nuyan — a title often bestowed on the qan’s brothers and male offspring as high-ranking personages, in this case equivalent to ‘prince’ (kölön). Cf. HGC, 178; Vlad., 145 et passim; Boyle 1956, 153 (4). The same applies to Činggis’ half-brother Belgeütai, who in the same passage is referred to as Belgeütai Noyan (as also in § 112).

For the expressions yekin tsilagdagu ‘how can one make the excuse?’, lit. ‘how is one to use as pretence?’, and yekin taslaqda ‘how can we stay put?’, lit. ‘how is one to sit?’; see Poppe 1964, 371.

For a translation and discussion of Belgeütai’s words up to “difficult”, see Mo, 111-113. For ‘bones’ (yaran) = ‘body’, cf. above, n. 175. ‘Are boastful, bragging that ...’, lit. ‘saying ...
are speaking big words." For *olou 'numerous*, lit. 'having many', cf. DO, 511a. For certain grammatical features of this section, see also Cleaves 1953, 78, n. 7; and 'Trois documents', 466.

"Burdened with their palatal tents, won't they abandon them?" (ordo ger auv a'rej'i àlu- k'qoteru'ajin), lit. 'Carrying their palatal tents (ordo ger; see above, n. 123) on their backs, won't they (i.e. the palatal tents) stay behind?" The word *ë'rej'i*, conversely imperfect of *ë're-*, is not glossed in the text and is a hapax legomenon. The sectional summary paraphrases the whole sentence as 'their *boaters* (= tents) will be *left empty*' (Y' 7, 17b), hence the rendering 'Would their ordo tents, becoming empty, perhaps, not remain behind?' in CI, 119 (cf. Li, 78; Ev Pop, 149). Murakami (Mu, II, 247, n. 18) suggests that *ë're-* may correspond to mo. *egär-*, 'to stay always in the same place' (see Les., 302b; DO, 762b), hence the renderings 'be as usual' (SURE) and 'insect' in Del., 176, and On, 94, respectively. However, in principle *ë're-* should rather correspond to mo. *egär-* (kh. *ëret*) 'to carry on one's back.'

See Les., 301b; Cev., 629a; MED, 410a. Damdinsuren in fact translates: 'They cannot carry their palatal tents on their backs; surely they will abandon them and flee' (Da'l, 140; cf. Ja, 256; Ga, 117, and Ozl., IV, 264, 271, render this sentence as 'Will their palatal tents, being smashed, not be left behind?' on the basis of TH, 98-99 (= JYT, 174), which makes *ë're-*, corresponding to kh. *ëret*, *ëret* (= mo. *egär*; see Cev., 629a; 619a; Les., 431a), 'to break, crumble, etc.' I follow Damdinsuren's interpretation and take *ë're-* to mean 'to carry a burden, to be burdened with', but with some reservation in view of the fact that in the SH the verb 'to carry on one's back, to carry off' (mo. *egär-*, *egär*) appears in the forms *a'ur-*, *är-*. See HW, 165, 167. However, the alternation *e*- *u* does occur in the SH (see 'Quelques problèmes', 268) and, in any event, the verb in question occurs in Written Mongolian in both forms. Nevertheless, it seems that the Ming translator(s) also had some difficulty in understanding the word *ë'rej'i* since they left it untranslated. This problem deserves further investigation. What Belgei means is that, should the Mongols attack the Naiman by surprise, the Naiman would flee leaving behind all their possessions - horses and cattle, the chiefs' tents, etc.

In high places, i.e. in mountain forests. "Allow such people to keep boating in this way?" lit. 'Let the same speak such big words as these?"

§ 191. 'Returning from the hunt' (aba bā'ut). For the expression *aba bā'ut* (= pmo. *aba ba'ut*) 'to return from the hunt', lit. 'to come down from the batte', see 'Trois documents', 444, n. 31.

The Abjiça Köteger of § 191 is the same locality called Abji's Kideger in § 187, the reading Abjiça (= Abjiya > Abji'a) reflecting the written form - a further indication that the text used by the Ming transcribers was in Lighur-Mongol script. For *t- i* in Köteger - Kideger, see 'Quelques problèmes', 243-244.

For Keltegi Qads at the Or Dend of the river Khalkha, see above, n. 175.

Before the dramatic confrontation with the Naiman in May 1204, Chinggis begins the reorganization of the army that will be continued and completed in the Year of the Tiger 1206 (see § 202ff.). He starts by counting his forces (to *a'ban to oolatu*), lit. 'counting his number', cf. § 265) and dividing them into units of a thousand (mikqadln = mikqadln), sometimes referred to as chilariachs, a hundred (ja'um) and ten (harbun) men, appointing a leader or commander (noyutar) in charge of each unit. The system of decimal classification of military forces among the nomadic tribes of Inner Asia is very old; it existed in the Hsiung-nu empire well before our era. See Li, 166, n. 191.

On Chinggis Qan's introduction of this system, see 'Vlad.', 131-132; MJK, 43; and MEYD, 9-10. Further references are given below, no. 202 and 224. It should be noted that already the time of Chinggis' break with Jamiqa, Chinggis refers to his future organization of the army along these lines by saying to Qorgi: 'I will make you a commander of ten thousand (ta'umen-ū noyutar)'
Büçarkan Çerbi has been identified with another military commander mentioned in various Chinese sources and, possibly, by Raïd al-Din. See Mu, II, 253-254, n. 5. Since we know that Dödei, Dooqūq, Ögē (Ögöl, Ögöl), and Söykereti were made chamberlains at the time of Cinggis Qan’s election as tribal chief (see above, §§ 120, 124; for the dating of these events, see § 123), it seems that the ‘appointment’ of 1204 was merely a confirmation of these four persons in their position, with the addition of two more Çerbi as part of the reorganization. However, in view of the considerable lag of time between the original appointment and the later confirmation, it is possible (and, perhaps, more likely) that those four persons are called çerbi retrospectively in §§ 120 and 124, the appointment of 1204 being the original one.

‘He formed’, lit. ‘having finished forming.’ Cf. Cl. 119: ‘Making an end of dividing.’

The qan’s bodyguard or, simply, the Guard (keśik = pmo.堆积, Kesig), divided into dayguards (terqal’ut [pl. of terqaq = pmo. turqul]) and nightguards (keśih’ul = pmo. kešegül), was the most important military institution. On these terms, see CY, III, 57; NHHO, 116, n. 1; Chavannes, 1904, 429-432, n. 3; Pelliot 1905b, 27-31; Cleaves 1951a, 517-521; Mo, 244-249; Hamsch 1961, 144-149; LST, 175; Poppe 1967, 515-517, no. 10; idem 1975, 166; ED, 749b-750a; Blaiakkovics 1973, 195; MKSLT, II, 797; MTG, 159; MNTK, 56; Kylanov 1993; and especially TMEN, nos. 322, 331, 332, 333, 334, 382, 383, 3634. (For the interpretation, and misinterpretation, of the term terqaq, see Ra, IX, 140-141, n. 224.) On the organization of the Guard see, in particular, the important studies in MKS, 211-262; MEYD, 14 et passim; YTSHT, 59-111, as well as other numerous contributions by Chinese and Japanese scholars, such as Katayama 1977, and those cited in AA 24:1973, 114 (n.v. ‘Masugi’); Sugi 1979, 43-45; CKSCTC, 1984.8, 2; and YShī, 78-80. See also above, no. 70 and 170, and below, no. 192 and 224. The expression kesig kesig oree’al-means ‘to choose
and recruit men who serve on roster (i.e. the guards)." See Mo, 247.

For the recruitment of bodyguards from the sons of military leaders as well as of ordinary people, cf. § 224, where these instructions are repeated and expanded. The relevant passage in § 224 has been translated and discussed in Mo, 250-257, where expressions such as dári darú in § 191)-yin gi'un 'ordinary people', erdemnütjen 'who have talents, who are able', and il sayin ('as beyi il sayin of § 191) 'of good appearance (i.e. well-built)' are discussed. For dári-yin gi'un cf. also ÖMSÜ, 1989.1, 12; and MEYD, 36. These 'ordinary people', i.e. people of ordinary status, must be distinguished as a class of individuals from the qaracs, an term usually rendered as 'commoners' (fr. 'roturiers'; see Mo, 52), who were le menep people or plebs of Mongol society, just above the slaves and servants. However, the connotations of these terms varied in time with the internal changes of society and are not clearly definable. See Vlad, 99, 154 and n. 4. In the interlinear version, the word iil before darú-yin gi'un is glossed 'only that way, only as far as that' (î il). Cf. Huy, Ilb, 22b: il ('only'). See Matériel I, 109; Matériel II, 40 (14v, 1). The expression in question refers to ordinary tribemen who were not in the qan's service. Cf. CI, 119, n. 29; OZ, IV, 278-279, n. 5.

On Cinggis' trusted envoy Arqai Qasar, see above, n. 177. He is listed as a commander of a thousand in SL, 7/2, 268.

For the term ba'atū (pl. of ba'atū) 'brave (or valiant) man (w warriors)', see above, n. 50. Here this term is applied to the elite warriors especially selected by Arqai Qasar to form the thousand-man unit under him.

'To fight before me in time of battle', lit. 'On the day of battle, let them fight standing before me.'

Olon ildır literally means 'many (or most) days'; however, the sectional summary (Y, 7, 20a) renders this expression 'in peace time' (ye ye), no doubt because, as pointed out by N. Poppe (p.c.), 'most days' are not spent at war.

'Shaling in consultation with Qudus Qatan', lit. 'You be consulting with Qudus Qatan on the command!' (etvelidijii ataqt). The verb etvelidij, on which see above, n. 36, is employed here as a technical term meaning 'to share command, to command jointly', as evident from the sectional summary's rendering 'Ögoë Ceberi and Qudus Qatan shall together (-m = jointly) command the seventy dayguard' (ibid.). Cf. also §§ 209, 223. For the use of the auxiliary verbs at (ataqt, ataqt, etc.) in these sentences, see VG, 62, 63.

§ 192. For an annotated translation of the entire passage dealing with Cinggis Qan's order concerning the duties of the Guard, etc., cf. Cleaves 1951a, 520-521 (slightly different from that in CI, 120). For further translations and commentaries on difficult passages in this section, see Mo, 77, 139-141 and n. 140, 248 and n. 234, 235. This passage must be read in conjunction with the ordinance concerning the same guard duties recorded in § 229.

In the present section, the word kelik tout court appears for the first time. On it see above, n. 70 and 191. For a detailed description of service regulations for the quivebeers (gorq), stewards (ba'urq), guards, etc., as set out in 1206, see §§ 224-229. For the further development of these institutions in Ógoë's time, see § 278. The term for 'doorkeeper(o)' appears in this section in the two forms e'utenel and e'dečin. For t-d, cf. 'Quelques problèmes', 243-244, for e'utenel - e'dečin, cf. qoninči - qoninči, see above, n. 118. For the term itself, see TMEN, no 74, RH, 203, no. 6.

'Shall see that those of their men whose duty it is to lie all around Our tent do so', lit. 'shall make to lie those of their men who are to lie all around the tent.' Cf. CI, 121.

The following morning (manaqari). For manaqari - manaqari, see above, n. 159. The manaqari-in in OZ, IV, 280 (f.d. in V, 303) reflects the error in the Chinese transcription where the final i of manaqari is erroneously taken for the accusative suffix. See Mo, 17-18, n. 12. Cf. Lewicki 1938.
THE SECRET HISTORY

sacrificing to the standard (lit. "sprinkling the standard with kumis") has been mentioned before, in §106. See above, n. 106, for several references to this well-known practice. Cf. also Li, 166, n. 193; above, n. 63, and below, n. 202.

The Sa’ari Steppe (of the Barulas tribe) had been sent out together on previous missions. Cf. §153 and com.

For the Sa’ari Steppe see above, n. 128. It is possible that Qanggargan should be read Qanggar Qan, qan ‘lord’ being often used (but in more modern usage) as an honorific designation of a mountain. Cf. NMP, 1, 341; Li, loc. cit. It has been suggested that Qanggar is another name of the Kangqai, i.e. the Kanggai range (see Li, 166, n. 193); however, in my view, this is unlikely since this mountain range is mentioned at the very beginning of §194 in its regular form (Qangkai = Qangktai, see below). According to N. Poppe (p.c.), Qanggargan could also be a diminutive form in -an of qanggar (= qanggar, mo. qanggur), i.e. ‘rather large.’ The Sa’ari Steppe has been identified by Perleé, 7, with a mountain in the eastern Kangkai called Xanxar Uul at 47° N 101° E. Cf. Perleé, 90. This mountain is not marked on the maps available to us, but from its situation as given by Perleé it seems to be close to the Tunui River and the place where Tangyan Qan was encamping at the time (see below); this would place it too far west, as the Qanggargan was a mountain near enough to the Sa’ari Steppe to permit the Naiman scouts to watch the Mongol encampment. It is tempting to identify it with the Qanggargan mentioned in the Pei-cheng hou-lu (see NMP, I, 324), caled in Chinese San-hsia k’ou or ‘Three Defile Entrance (or Pass)’—probably identical with San-kuan k’ou (situated in the mountains to the north-west of the Sa’ari Steppe and which, I think, corresponds to the present-day Dasa’lin Ama south of Ulan Bator, but this is evidently too far to the north-east. The Sa’ari Steppe embraced a vast area (about 400 km) from the Kerulen in the east to the plain south and south-west of the Tul, probably as far as Xogtlin Tal at 47° N 103° E, the ‘classical’ portion being, as we know, between the southern bend of the

17ff. With regard to the ‘morning soup’ and the steward’s duties concerning it, cf. above, §124.

‘Their respective tasks’ (min min mör mör-dür-iven); cf. below, n. 229.

‘And take their appointed places’, lit. ‘let them sit upon their seats.’

Regarding Arqai Qasan, there is an apparent contradiction between §§191 and 192. In §191, Çinggis Qan orders Arqai Qasan to choose the ‘brave men’ (ba’atut, i.e. the elite warriors, himself, and appoints him their leader. In §192, on the other hand, we read that Çinggis Qan Arqai Qasan—ba’atut iliqg, a sentence which has usually been understood as ‘chose (lit. “choosing”) brave men for Arqai Qasan.’ Cf. Ha, 78; Ko, 144; Li, 79; Cl, 120; On, 95-96; Ev-Pop, 151. However, this sentence should be read Arqai Qasan—ba’atut iliqg (< iliqg a’u) ‘let (lit. “letting”) Arqai Qasan choose the brave men.’ Cf. Dandinsüren’s rephrasing: ‘Çinggis Qasan selected Arqai Qasan and made him the chief (darueg) of the brave men.’ (Da’l, 167); Jagchid’s rendering: ‘after causing Arqai Qasan to choose the brave men’ (Ja, 261); and Ozawa’s rendering ‘making Arqai Qasan choose the brave men’ (Oz’, IV, 282).

Unfortunately, the sectional summary of §192 omits the final passage concerning Arqai Qasan, but that of §191 confirms that Çinggis Qan ordered him to select the ba’atut. See Y’ 2, 20a and 22a. There is, therefore, no doubt that iliqg a iliqg (< iliqg a’u), convertum imperfecti of the factitive of iliqg (= mo. iliq) ‘to choose, select.’ Cf. SH ti-ge ‘to complete’, fact. ti-ge-e ‘to distribute, allot’ > ti-ge (MA, 358a: ti-ge-e) id. JS, 67, §110; HW, 153-154. For the forative-locative (instead of the accusative) of the person performing the act, see GWM, 170-171, §64.

§193. Here we have another precise date for the actual beginning of the campaign against the Naiman tribe led by Tayanq Qan, i.e. 17 May 1204, a day of the ‘Red Circle’ (hula’an tergel) and, therefore, an auspicious day. See above, n. 81. The custom of sacrificing to the standard (lit. ‘sprinkling the standard with kumis’) has been mentioned before, in §106. See above, n. 106, for several references to this well-known practice. Cf. also Li, 166, n. 193; above, n. 63, and below, n. 202.

Jebe and Qubilai (of the Barulas tribe) had been sent out together on previous missions. Cf. §153 and com.

For the Sa’ari Steppe see above, n. 128. It is possible that Qanggargan should be read Qanggar Qan, qan ‘lord’ being often used (but in more modern usage) as an honorific designation of a mountain. Cf. NMP, I, 341; Li, loc. cit. It has been suggested that Qanggar is another name of the Kangqai, i.e. the Kanggai range (see Li, 166, n. 193); however, in my view, this is unlikely since this mountain range is mentioned at the very beginning of §194 in its regular form (Qangkai = Qangktai, see below). According to N. Poppe (p.c.), Qanggargan could also be a diminutive form in -an of qanggar (= qanggar, mo. qanggur), i.e. ‘rather large.’ The Sa’ari Steppe has been identified by Perleé, 7, with a mountain in the eastern Kangkai called Xanxar Uul at 47° N 101° E. Cf. Perleé, 90. This mountain is not marked on the maps available to us, but from its situation as given by Perleé it seems to be close to the Tunui River and the place where Tayanq Qan was encamping at the time (see below); this would place it too far west, as the Qanggargan was a mountain near enough to the Sa’ari Steppe to permit the Naiman scouts to watch the Mongol encampment. It is tempting to identify it with the Qanggargan mentioned in the Pei-cheng hou-lu (see NMP, I, 324), caled in Chinese San-hsia k’ou or ‘Three Defile Entrance (or Pass)’—probably identical with San-kuan k’ou (situated in the mountains to the north-west of the Sa’ari Steppe and which, I think, corresponds to the present-day Dasa’lin Ama south of Ulan Bator, but this is evidently too far to the north-east. The Sa’ari Steppe embraced a vast area (about 400 km) from the Kerulen in the east to the plain south and south-west of the Tul, probably as far as Xogtlin Tal at 47° N 103° E, the ‘classical’ portion being, as we know, between the southern bend of the
Tūla and the southern bend of the Keneden. It seems that in 1204, Činggis Qan’s army was deployed in the western portion of the Sa’ar Steppe, in an area somewhere between the Tūla and the Doloon Uul. It may have been in the region between the Doloon Uul and the Orkton that the encounter with Tayang Qan took place (see § 195 and com.). In that case, Mount Qangarqan was probably in the northern part of the Doloon Uul. For terisi’in, lit. ‘head’, meaning ‘top of a mountain’, cf. Dogušiemen 1977, 184.

Our patrolmen and their: went in pursuit of one another (bisadu qara’ul-a- hā khádətələ)hə), lit. ‘a mutual chase by our patrolmen and their’ took place.‘ However, according to Mostaert, the dative-locative suffix ought not to be there [A.M.: ‘a fayfəf] Cf. Oj, IV, 291, n. 2.

The Naiman patrol seized one of (lit. “from”) our patrolmen who had a white horse with a rather poor (lit. “bad”) saddle.’ This sentence is rather ambiguous in the original, and several translators understood it to mean (as I myself did in 1978) that only the white horse with the bad saddle was seized by the Naiman scouts. Cf. Na’, 238; Ko, 144; Li, 79; Da’, 143; Ja, 262; Do’, 183; Ra, VII, 56; Oj, IV, 289; On, 96 (and the 2001 ed., 170). However, the correct rendering in Ha, 79, and Cl, 120-121, is supported by the Chinese-sectional summary. See YJ, 7, 25b. Cf. Wa, 275; Wi, 133.

For Dōde Čeri see above, n. 124. For duratqa: ‘to suggest, give advice’, cf. ‘Treat documents’, 472.

‘It is we who are few in number... exhausted.’ For this sentence, cf. Street 1986a, 16-17.

‘Each light fires in five different places’, lit. "light fires in five different places per man (=per head).’ As noted by Cleave and by Ligeti, Haenisch’s interpretation of this passage (in Ha, 79: 158, n. 193) is off the mark. See Cleeves 1949a, 528-529; Li, 166, n. 193. The verb ‘to frighten’ is oqtqa’ (w. f. oqtəqa), ‘to frighten’ of oqtat (w. f. oqtəd) ‘to be frightened’, cf. mo. oqmat, oqom (kh. ogcampo) ‘abrupt, sudden’, and oqomlat- ‘to be abrupt; to flare up.’ See below, n. 199.

‘While we keep them in doubt’ (hālirtirgu’i-tə). For the verb hālirtirgu’il- (fact. of hālirtirgu- w. f. hālirtirgu-) ‘to cause to be in doubt; to confuse’, cf. sh. gələtəx ‘to be absent-minded, to forget oneself.” See Pelliot 1925, 239, no. 76; Oj, IV, 293-294, n. 8. This verb is a hapax lemmomen.

‘When our geldings are satiated’, lit. ‘When we have satiated our geldings.’

‘Won’t we get the better of them?’, lit. ‘Will it not do (as succeed)?’ – a rhetorical question.

‘Činggis Qan gave the following order: “Things being so, let them light the fire!”’, and he proclaimed it as law (jasay) to the soldiers’, lit. ‘at the moment when Činggis Qan gave the order, saying, “...” he proclaimed the jasay to the soldiers.” As I stated in de Rachewiltz 1993, 97, ‘What Činggis did, then, was to issue the order and proclaim it as jasay, i.e. as if it were a law, or with the full force of the law, meaning that in view of the critical situation facing the Mongols, this order would be dealt with extrem severity as prescribed by the jasay. In my opinion, this passage has been misunderstood by previous translators, who have incorrectly assumed that jasay here means simply “order.”’ Now, the rather loose usage of the term yaxat when an order or decrees (birnike) is meant in the Islamic sources is well documented, but the Chinese and Mongol sources clearly distinguish between the two, as shown by the consistency of the Chinese renderings (famento shő-fu-tu [shöfə] for jasay and sheng-ch’i hăng-kwe for forlāt), and by their regular usage in all Mongol documents (epigraphs, edicts) of the Yüan in Uighur and Thang-pa scripts. In our passage, forlāt is also glossed as fa-tu “law” in the Chinese interlinear version (YJ, 7, 24b).’ Cf. Ratchevsky 1974, 472, 478. For the jasay (w. mo. jasay), cf. above, n. 153.

For the substitute of the stars, cf. Cl, 121, n. 34.

‘They seem to increase daily’, lit. ‘are they increasing by the day?’ (isdä-tär ururün așam-ə).‘ For the verb urer- ‘to rise, increase’, cf. Les, 876a. The reading ʔudir-[i]n in L, 152, and
According to Perleé, 7, Qarq Usun ('Mule Water [= River]') probably corresponds to the present-day Xoromgo Gorai, i.e., Xoromgo (= mo. Qurumorda) Stream (cf. Perleé, 70; the 'Khormorges' of Ra, VII, 70, n. 194, is a mistake for 'Khoromges') in the Khangai range at 47° N 102° E (Perleé's "112" is an obvious error for '102' carried over from Perleé - id. in Perleé, 90). This stream is not found on our maps, but the position given by Perleé seems to be correct. We know from § 195 that, when Teyang Qan left his camp at Qarq Usun, he went downstream along the Tamir River, i.e., the Urd (or Urda) Tamir Gol of our maps, and crossed the Oorqan. Therefore, his camp must have been in one of the valleys crossed by the tributary streams of the Tamir just south of Tsgetsirg, and Qarq Usun was almost certainly one of them. I doubt, however, whether one can identify Qarq Usun with a particular stream in that region. In the SWCC, 54b, the place in question is as 'the river Qarq Usun of the Qangqai mountains'. In his commentary to this passage, Wang Kuo-wei (loc. cit.) says that this is the present-day Ha-jui (= Ha River, i.e., the Hanuy (Xamul) Gol, or Khanuy River of our maps, between the Hoyt (Koil) Tamir and Chulut (Culoht) rivers, an identification proposed also by T'u Chi (MWESC 2, 28a) and recently adopted by Basharqir and Enkhbayar (CKA, 54b). Unfortunately, this identification is based on wrong phonetic grounds, i.e., the similarity in sound between Ha-jui and Ha-chih-erh (Qarq). In my view, it is also unacceptable because it would place the Naiman camp too far to the west. The parallel account by Rashid al-Din (SL, 1/2, 147) says that Teyang Qan was 'in the river valley of the Altai at the boundary of the territory of Kankai'. (For the Persian text see SL, 15 [1888], 4, line 4.) The name 'Altai' is puzzling. This passage seems to be corrupt; the original text of Rashid al-Din, or the source he used, probably said that Teyang 'had come from the Altai' and was then 'in a river valley in the Qangqai.' Cf. D'Ohsson, I, 86, and Grozset's remarks in EM, 160, n. 2. In the corresponding passage of the SWCC there is no mention of the Altai Mountains. N. Poppe (p.c.) indicated that the term 'Altai' does not always mean 'the Altai Mountains', but simply 'snow-covered mountains' (ger. Hocheberge); thus, it could refer to any mountain range. For qarq (or tu) 'mule', cf. Poppe 1955, 40. As for the Khangai range, mentioned in this section of the SH (and nowhere else in the work) in the form Qangqai (a Qangqai, cf. AT, 123a, 125b, id.), see Hambis, 36-38; cf. also MGYMC, 332-335, for numerous references to these mountains in the Chinese and Persian sources.

Güçüül (± Külülgülü) is the Turkish word Ašëlig 'strong' (cf. TMEN, no. 1676), used here as the name of the Naiman prince. On this name/epithet borne by members of the Naiman royal family, see HCG, 305. Güçüül had an adventurous life. After the defeat of his people by Cinggis in 1204, he fled to Central Asia and sought asylum in the Kara Kita capital Baššahan (see above, n. 151). In 1211 he succeeded in depositing the gür-qan of the Kara Kita and seized the throne for himself. However, he governed badly and alienated his subjects. In 1218, just before setting out on his campaign against Muhammad of Khwarazm, Cinggis sent Jehe to crush him and the Naiman prince was eventually killed by Mongol horsemen on the Pamir. On this personage, see HCSL, 70c, s.v. 'Chü'-chü-lü'; and below, n. 202 and 237.

For the passage 'The gendings of the Mongols are lean ... gushes forth', see Mostaert's discussion and translation in Mo, 113-115.

'To disengage ourselves', lit. 'to separate from one another.'

For the 'preverb' hirmes (h. hirm-, mo. irm-: 'to blink, wink') in the expression hirmes üli ki- 'not to blink', cf. Bese 1969, 126, n. 5.

'Is it advisable for us/To fight ... ?', lit. 'If we fight ... will it do?'
The southern slopes of the Altai ('Awaz-yin olkes). Olkes (pl. of olke) is glossed as shun-hsia lit. 'the foot of a mountain', and in § 196 (V 7, 42b) as shun-ch'ien (cfr. 'the front (side) of a mountain'), i.e. the southern side. Cf. mio. olke =samy side of a mountain (Lcs., 63b).

'Fighting a dog's fight' (noqai kerel kereji) is a technical expression for the well-known military tactics consisting of withdrawing one's soldiers, inducing the enemy to pursue them, suddenly turn back and attack the by then exhausted pursuers – hence the image of fighting, i.e. biting back, like a dog. See Li, 167, n. 194; WNTSZA, 83-85; Oz', IV, 305-306, n. 6; Kahn 1996, 101.

'When we had made their bellies slender', lit. 'making their bellies stretch up', i.e. reducing the volume of their bellies and, therefore, making them fitter for combat. Cf. Mo, 115.

'We shall turn back and smash into their faces' lit. 'we shall pour out our troops over their faces' – a rather graphic image. Cf. Mo, 115-116.

'Again that woman Tayang!' (anda ai-yin ene Tayang). For anda ai (= plm. anayai, mio. ana), cf. kh. andaai 'again (impatiently)' (MMED, 2b); Les., 42a. Ozawa reads anda £i yin, ene Tayang ... 'Once again like this. The woman (like) Tayang ...' (Oz', IV, 298, 302, 306-307, n. 8). This emendation is not warranted.

'Most Mongols' (Mongol-un olongkin). For olongkin, lit. 'who are the most numerous', i.e. 'the majority, most', cf. Cleaves 1950, 111, n. 58. It is worth noting that from this remark of Güelük it appears that a considerable number of Mongol clans, i.e. clans of the Mongol tribe, were still rallied around their elected gaa-qaan Januqa (cf. above, § 141). Januqa was last mentioned in § 181, when he was still with Ong Qan; when the latter was defeated, he escaped and joined Tayang Qun and the Naiman in their fight against Cinggis Qan.

'Who dares not walk further than/A pregnant woman goes to urinate', lit. 'Who has not yet gone to the urinating place (li ekii qaf-ar-a) of a pregnant woman', but qafar 'place', means also 'distance'; hence, qafar-a should be rendered here, as in § 4 above, as 'for all a distance', i.e. 'as far as, no further than'. In other words, Tayang Qan is so hesitant and weak-hearted that he does not dare go out of his tent and cover even the short distance a pregnant woman would go to urinate. The same idea is expressed in the next sentence (lit. 'Who does not even venture so far as a wheel-tied calf reaches for its feed') which, however, is understood differently by different translators. Gürdün-a tuqi is, literally, 'a wheel's calf'. This expression is understood by Haertisch to mean a calf as tall as a wheel (Ha, 80), by Korin as a calf that turns around because it is sick (Ko, 146), by Ligeti as a calf which is as round as a wheel (Li, 80), by Dambinsuren as a small calf (Du, 144), and by Murakami, Ozawa, Cleaves, Onon. Even and Pop, among others, as a calf tied or tethered to a cart wheel near the tent to prevent it from sucking its mother's milk, since she is milked every day (Mu, II, 262, 270, n. 13; Oz', IV, 302, 307-308, n. 11) cf. Oz', II, 24, 42, n. 4); Cl, 123 and n. 41; On, 97; Ev-Pop, 153, 287, n. 31), etc. It now believe that Murakami's interpretation (which is only a refinement on that in Na, 241) is the correct one. Güelük's insolent words in alterative form are no doubt an ancient saying. Cf. Cerenosdorn 1986, 72. For tuqi (= mi. tuju) 'calf less than a year old', cf. TMEN, no. 909; RH, 217, no. 20.

The high official, or great chief (yeke noyani), Qori Sübêli had already appeared in § 188.

'Never showed a man's back or a gelding's rump to an enemy that was his match' – almost certainly an ironical derogatory phrase. The meaning is, of course, that he would never flee when facing an adversary of equal or superior strength. For adikân 'companion' meaning also 'enemy', cf. above, n. 153.

For the construction of the sentence ëmi (ëmi) yin ... bo'esi, 'Had we known ...', cf. Lettres, 68-69.

'Even though she is only a woman' (qad(u) (= qutan) ber-gi (bo'esi), lit. 'even though she is but a lady person,' or 'lady person (= woman) that she is.'
What a pity, alas! (čima qayıran). For čima, an exclamation of pity and regret glossed as a 'sighing sound' (_excel), cf. Ov., IV, 310, n. 15.

On Kökse’s Subraga, an army leader of Tayang Qan last mentioned in § 190, see § 159 and com. This is the only reference to his advanced age.

'The discipline in our army' (çerig-iin bidan-u jasal). For jasal 'military' order, discipline', cf. tu. jasal 'army order' (MA, 408b; TMEN, no. 179).

'This is, surely, the favourable time and destiny of the Mongols decreed by Heaven and Earth' (Mongol-u čag jaya-iin bai le), i.e. the turn in favour of the Mongols as preordained by Heaven and Earth. Cf. § 248, where the same expression is used in its full form, i.e. with both Heaven and Earth specifically mentioned as the preordainers of the destiny (jaya-iin; see above, n. 1), and the favourable time (čag).

'We are finished!', lit. 'it has not become favourable for us' (eke bax). The interlinear gloss is pu chang long? 'it is of no avail (or it cannot be done, it's no good)', i.e. 'we are not going to succeed'. Cf. Ce, 163: bixišə iğel bolba 'it has become not feasible (or impossible)'; and Da, 145: Bid dildeč bolbo 'We shall be defeated.'

'It looks as if you are quite powerless', lit. 'you are just (ele) as though unable.', Cf. Street 1986, 25.

'Having struck on his quiver', no doubt to emphasize his decision to leave and abandon Tayang Qan to his fate—much a Chinese would have said 'having shaken his sleeve' (��袖). W, 277 ('after giving his horse a tap with his quiver'), has misunderstood the text of the sectional summary (Y 7, 31a).

Cf, Wel, 135.

'He trotted off and went his separate way' (barak-u qatarab), lit. 'he trotted off separately', i.e. he went his own way, abandoning Tayang Qan.

§ 195. 'A life means to die, a body means to suffer: it is the same destiny for all!' This conception of life is at the very root of the Weltanschaunng of the ancient Turkish and Mongolian people. Cf., e.g., the Kül Tigin inscription (AD 732), where we read, 'Human beings have all been created in order to die' (kist o'ylıq olğulı töranım). See GOT, 237, 271. Cf. MCPA, 43.

According to Grousset (CW, 151), 'Mount Naqu ... apparently corresponds to the Mount Namogo of our maps, or rather one of the neighbouring escarpments, north of Qaraqorum and Kosho-taydam', adding in a note 'Probably opposite the junction of the Tamir and the Orkhon. Cf. the map in Bouillane de Lacoste, Au pays sacré des anciens Turcs, p. 54.' Cf. EM, 163, 468. For Perleé, 5, 'Naku Güng' is the mountain now called Latu Bayan (Uul) at 47° N 104° E in the Dasčilen Sum of Bulgan Almag. (Cf. Perleé, 94, where '140° is a misprint for 104°'. In Map (Sheet NL 48), Dasčhingalin Suma is marked at 47° 51’ N 104° 03’ E (cf. GM, 628-63a), but Latu (Lahu) Bayan is not marked. Both the identifications of Grousset and Perleé are based on phonetic grounds. However, Grousset's 'Namogo' does not relate to Naqu, but to Nomanqan ('Peaceful'), one of the commonest names in Mongolian toponymy. Cf. GM, 165-166. Although Perleé's identification is probably correct, one would be inclined to identify the Naqu of the SH with the first mountainous area that Tayang Qan was likely to meet on his way from the Ordon to the Sa'ari Steppe, i.e. the mountains south-east of the Ügei (Çegel) Naur and north-west of the Doloön Uul at 47° 42’ N 103° 07’ E, among which rises the Yihe Berke Üula (Ix Berx Uul), the 'Great Steep Mountain.' If so, the site of Çakirma'ut should be looked for east or south-east of these mountains, possibly in the valley of the Gushunin Gol and Taranain Gol, just north of Doloön Uul. Perleé, 9, identifies Çakirma'ut with present-day Caşirmoors at 47° N 104° E (in GM, 220b, a Tsakhirin Khural is listed at 47° 38’ N 104° 25’ E), which is certainly in the same general area. As for the name Çakirma'ut, according to N. Popp (p.c.) it is a plural of *çakirmaya, a word corresponding to kir. čaşirmaq 'a 3-year-old deer.' See KIRS, II, 334a, s.v. 'çagymak 1.'
'The more numerous, the greater damage (i.e. the loss); the less numerous, the lesser damage.' Cleave translates differently: '[The issue] will be adversities [either which are] more than many or [which are] fewer than few', adding in a footnote, 'This seems to mean, "it is all or nothing", i.e., "We shall risk all."' See CL 124 and n. 48; and Cleave 1986, 196, n. 26. Cf., however, Oe', IV, 322, 325-326, n. 2; On, 98; Čč, 163; and Ev-Pop, 154. A contrast is clearly implied here between the large army of Tayang Qan and the less numerous forces of Cinggis Qan. See Dideči Cerbi's remarks on the subject in § 193: 'It is we who are few in number.... They say the Naiman people are numerous....' Cinggis indicates that by using the correct strategy in attacking the enemy, the smaller but more mobile army of the Mongols will be able to inflict substantial losses on the Naiman, who are hampered by their own size. The military tactics he employed on this occasion are mentioned immediately after.

Qaraqana, mo. qara'ayana, qarayana, kh. xarqana, is the Cagurana As. of which there are several species (C. arborescens, C. jubata, C. spinosa, etc.). See MOUNT 24, where 'Karagana' taut court is given as Cagurana Lam. Cf. LES., 933a; MED., 431a. Ours is, probably, the Cagurana arborescens, also known as the Siberian (false) acacia, the Siberian pea-tree, etc. Cf. TMEN, no. 275; UNT, 118-119, no. 15196a; GSE, IX, 429b. This plant is a shrub or small tree, common in Siberia and northern Mongolia. According to Cleave, the 'caragana marching-order' (qaraqana yortul) meant 'to march with the troops massed in close order in the manner of the qaraqana, a thorny shrub which grows in thick clumps on the steppe' (Cl, 124, n. 49). Onon, on the other hand, following Do', 193-195, says that it 'involved dividing the soldiers into many small groups which, although keeping contact with each other, maintained a low profile as they advanced' (On, 98, n. 244; 2001 ed., 173, n. 438). For Cleave (loc. cit.), the 'lake battle-formation' (na'ur bavild'a) meant 'to deploy with the troops widely scattered in the manner of the water of a lake which spreads over a large area', whereas Onon (loc. cit.) says that it entailed sending 'waves of men' to surround and attack the enemy on all sides. For Cleave (loc. cit.), to fight a 'chisel combat' (qaraqana qarqoqula) meant to attack the enemy thrusting straight into it like a chisel which is thrust into a piece of wood, whereas for Onon (2001 ed., ibid.), it entailed hand-to-hand combat by a line of soldiers charging straight through the middle of the enemy ranks. The word qaraqana 'chisel' corresponds to mo. čččč čččd. Cf. DO, 721a. For a further discussion of these tactics, cf. MNTSZA, 85-88; Nam 1994, 203. However, as pointed out by both Ligi and Ozawa, we can only speculate on the exact meaning of these technical expressions. See Li, 167, n. 195; Oe', IV, 329, n. 3. In fact, N. Poppe (p.c.) suggested that there may have been such battle-formations and that the text could be understood as follows: 'Moving (going, marching) through a caragana growth, fighting at the lake signpost (bavild'a, i.e. bavil = s Writ. Mong. buv) signpost, milestone' + dat.-loc. suffix -d'a, let us fight with spears (verbattum let us sting, prick) a chisel-like spearlight.' None of the other sources mention specifically the type of battle-formation and attack chosen by Cinggis Qan, but Rashid al-Din (SL', 12, 147-148), describing these events, records how al-Din (SL', 12, 147-148), describing these events, records how
this passage, cf. CLC, 114-115; Oz', IV, 327-328, n. 4; TMEN, nos. 324, 325 (on kotol, pl. kotô). Cf. above, n. 66.

As at that time Jamuqa had also set forth with his troops', lit. 'Then Jamuqa set forth with his troops for Sajek' morilu', cf. Cleaves 1996, 24, n. 162.

'Who are like wolves that come chasing a flock of sheep and pursuing them as far as the sheep-pen?', lit. 'Who are like wolves chasing many sheep and come, chasing them to the sheep-pen?' For Tayang Que's question to Jamuqa, and the wolf and sheep simile, cf. Poucha 1955, 166-168. With his question regarding the identity of Cinggis Qan's companions (nokot) we are introduced to the poetic passage that follows which describes in epic imagery the characteristics of the 'four hounds' (dörben noqas), viz. Jóbe (see § 146), Qubilai (see § 120), Jelme (see § 97), and Sübe'eti (see § 120 and below, n. 199). The question itself is couched in epic language, with the word hâlledî 'chasing, pursuing' repeated three times. Cf. Vla'd', 115-116.

This is the first occurrence of the expression dörben noqas (written noqas in the text), analogous to the dörben kilâl, al. ‘four steeds' (Bo'o'or, Muqali, Borouq, and Cil'âun) of § 163, the eight captains hand-picked by Cinggis Qan as his 'stallwars', as well as his chief lieutenants. On the symbolism of the number four, see above, n. 163. As in the case of the 'four steeds', the 'four hounds' became legendary figures in the later epic. See MNTSZA, 31-40. For the fusion of the two groups in the two subsequent groups of the legend, see HCG, 340-341. With the addition of Sigi Qutugi (see § 135), the eight heroes in time became nine (the 'symbolic' number par excellence), thus forming the elite group of Cinggis' companions celebrated in Mongolian literature as the jelen ertli or 'Nine Patriots' (for the term orlik, pl. orlil'â 'valiant, hero', etc., see § 201 and com.). Throughout § 195, the word noqas (pl. of noqai 'dog, hound') is transcribed in Chinese with a redundant -c- noqas.

Cf. § 209: dörben noqas. On these forms, see Street 1990a, 352, 23 (D), 373, 8.3. For the plural form in -c- v. that in -t (noqot, § 260), see Pope 1975, 167. Cf. the remarks in la, 364-365, n. 571.

For the poetic passage on the 'four hounds', see Mo, 11-12, 194-195. Siremian originally meant 'hardened ... coper', as indicated by the glosses of the SH (cf. IIW, 142) and the HIIY (cf. Materi l, 98). In Written Mongolian and the modern (cf. Materi l, 98). In Written Mongolian and the modern

languages and dialects it means 'cast (pig) iron'. Cf. e.g., Leš, 54a; Khomonov 1970, 37. The word 76b; DO, 62b; MED, 54b; Khomonov 1970, 37. The word 76b; DO, 62b; MED, 54b; Khomonov 1970, 37. The word

MNH, 46; and, more recently, Ryzhov 2002, 99-102. It is the NH, 46; and, more recently, Ryzhov 2002, 99-102. It is the

‘anachronisms' in the SH which have puzzled Reid 1992, 89.

Mina'at' 'having whips (pl.)': mina'a 'whip' = mo. minayu' id. For n > l, see IMCS, 164, § 104 (B). See also above, n. 76, and below, n. 255.

'They advance feeding on (lit. 'eating') deer (and) riding on the wind', i.e. they are supernatural beings. The image is reminiscent of the Chinese (Taotist) 'immortals' (hsien ,) and of the rabbit in the legend. It is rather incongruous when applied to bloodthirsty hounds, is certainly incongruous as their eating dog is concerned.

'On the day of the killing ... On the day of battle ...', lit. 'The day(s) when one slays one another ... (The) day(s) when one meets on the battlefield (w one fights one another) ... ' Cf. Pope 1969, 274.

'Which had surely restrained them!' renders the words ere'r buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a buagsa 'apar, lit. 'have (or had) they not been restrained?' - a
the verb and translated accordingly ('being angry'). See Oz, IV, 322, 329, n. 6. Cf. Ev-Pop, 155: 'la rage au cœur'. The context also supports the rendering of the Chinese glass.

For Chalcedonian 'slavering at the mouth, drooling', see Mo, 121; 'Trois documents', 459, n. 46; and above, n. 168. 'Let us then stay away from those vile creatures', lit. 'Just (ele) let us stay far from those vile (creatures)' for a discussion of the corroboration of the intensive particle ele and this passage, see Street 1986, 44-45; Oz, IV, 330-331, n. 7. In this instance, however, I prefer to render ele with 'then', since - as evident from the Chinese summary (Y τ, 40b: 嵐(嵐)), and from subsequent passages - ele implies also the conditional 'if this is so; this being the case' in addition to its corroborative function. Cf. Street 1990, 194.

'Took up position astride (lit. "straddling") the mountain (dala aisan basbha), i.e. with part of his troops on the plain and part on the mountain-side. Cf. Wa, 278; Cl, 125 ("straddling the mountain [and the plain]").

'Approaching from the rear', lit. 'Approaching from the back of that (te'ani gaqinaea ... vayiaqan), 'that being the people/situation just referred to, viz. the four hounds' released by Chungis Qan. For this use of the pronoun tere, cf. Street 1990, 176-178, § 1.3.

'Encircling them ... encircling us': the text says only toorqiyu and torqiqan, both converbs of tooriqan ('to surround, encircle'), preceding the verb avis- 'to approach', a facultative form of toori- (from toor- 'to turn, about, make circles.' In § 170, the Ura'ut and the Mangqut are already mentioned, also in a short poetic passage, in connection with their ability to carry out military manoeuvres which involved 'turning about' (toori-) and 'wheeling round' (derel-) without breaking ranks (see above, n. 170). In our passage, however, there is no question of using such a tactic, i.e. turning around and feigning retreat; the verb used (torqiqan) can only mean 'to surround, encircle.' The objects of this facultative verb are obviously Tuyang Qan and Janmaq, who, in the simile, are likened to the fool's mother. The translations of Cleave and Onon do not take this fact into account. See Cl, 125, and On, 2001 ed., 174 ('making circles'). The Chinese interlinear version renders the words ekhe-yu'en horuqan toorqan giyig yuqat metsi as 'like foals that run without restraint (disorderly) circling round their mother.' The word toorqan is the iterative or frequentative in -o- of torq-, a verb meaning in the modern Mongolian languages 'to run or bump into, to knock against, to stumble' (kh., bur.), 'to stick, to cling; to fall into or against, something' (kalm.). In Written Mongolian we find only tor- 'to get stuck' (Lcs, 825b) - corresponding to ord. tor- 'to be stopped, to become tangled up in something' - which also occurs in the SH (further on in the same § 195) with the meaning of 'to get stuck.' Clearly, Preclassical Mongolian had two distinct verbs, viz. tor- 'to move or act in a free, unrestrained way,' and tor- 'to get stuck,' which in some modern languages have coalesced into torq-, whereas in others and in Written Mongolian only tor- has survived.

For the 'blood-stained clothing,' see above, n. 187. For the verb tana- 'to strip off, remove the clothing,' see ibid. and n. 136, and for the expression aq tanaq (= tanaq), cf. DO, 668a. See also CEMC, 27 and n. 1.

For the poetic passage about the Ura'ut and the Mangqut, cf. Cleave 1955, 37, n. 25; Poppe 1969, 274; Ratchevsky 1966a, 183, n. 10. 'Retreating further up the mountain', lit. 'climbing (abairin) the mountain farther to the rear.'

'The one approaching from the rear', i.e. coming behind the Ura'ut and the Mangqut. Cf. above, and the sectional summary (Y τ, 40b: 嵐, 'following behind'). The interrogative pronoun 'who?' (ken) is in the singular.

On the poetic passage about Temujin, see Mo, 117-121. Cf. also Street 1986a, 22-24.

'My sworn friend Temujin is indeed (la) ... him?' For these words, and the use of the particle la, cf. ibid., and Mo, 102. For the interrogative particle -yu/w-yu/ ('is proo., -yu/yu/yu'), see
also Mo, 102. Cf. de Rachewiltz 1982, 52, n. 3; Cleeves 1982, 77, n. 13 (where, however, the reading uqamai[yu] proposed by Cleeves should, I think, be amended to uqamayul, i.e. uqamu + -yu, the præses imperfecti suffix -mu (v. -mu) being the only one attested in the Hsiao-ching. Cf. IyVAINT, I/2, 82 (s.v. ‘bol’), 87 (s.v. ‘èida’). Here lība ‘un’ bird’ (cf. § 111) = ‘falcon.’ See HW, 139.

“You would not leave them even the skin of a kid’s hoof.” Cf. § 277: ‘you haven’t yet acquired as booty even the hoof of a kid.’ The hoof of a kid is a worthless thing and the skin of a kid’s hoof even more so (if possible). What Jamua says is that the Naiman had boasted that in an encounter with the Mongols they would utterly despoil them, so great was their disregard, witness Tayang Qan’s and Gürbési’s earlier contemptuous remarks (§ 189; cf. also § 190). A different interpretation, based indirectly on the sectional summary of Jumua’s words, is found in the YS’ 1, 12-13. The sectional summary (Y’s 7, 41a) says: ‘You (Tayang Qan) said, “If I see a Ta-ta (= Mongol), it will be like (seeing) small ku-li (= goat) kids. Not even the skin of (their) hoofs will be left.” Now, have a look!’ The YS version runs as follows: ‘At that time, Jamua ... said, “When the Naiman first took up arms, they regarded the Mongolian army as if it was (made of) goat kids.” ’ The meaning was that they would not leave even (their) hoofs’ skins.’ Commenting on this passage, Hung 1956, 28, n. 5, writes: ‘Since pig’s feet, when thoroughly cleaned and well cooked, are a well-known delicacy in China, one naturally draws the inference that Jamua meant that the Naiman intended to despoil the Mongolian army, leaving no remnant at all.’ The (incorrect) interpretation is followed by Waley in translating the sectional summary passage (Wa, 278): ‘You people once said, “If we met the Mongols, we would gobble them down as one might the kid of a goat, not leaving so much as the skin of a hoof unsunned.”’ In the original text, however, there is no mention of gobbling down and swallowing. In the corresponding passages of the SWCCCL (see SWCCCL, 53b; but cf. SWCCCL, 139a-140a) and SL’1, I/2, 148, although the text of the former is corrupt, the meaning of Jamua’s words is that the Naiman used to say that they would despoil the Mongols to the extent of not leaving them even the skin of their oxen’s hoofs – evidently another variant of the skin of their oxen’s hoofs – the other variant of the skin of their oxen’s hoofs – evidently another variant of the skin of their oxen’s hoofs – evidently another variant of the skin of their oxen’s hoofs. In my view, the correct interpretation of the narrative text is the following: ‘The passage is the one given by Cleeves: “The goat (imsaari) is the first of all kinds of livestock (tabun qoqo marai), i.e., the horse (morin), the camel (temenge), the ox (atier), the sheep (gini), and the goat (focus)”, it is the last in order. Consequently, the skin from the (imsaari) is something which is almost less than nothing.”’ (Cl, 126-127, n. 51.)

‘This is simply dreadful!’ (ele amaari) is rendered as ‘e-chu (im)-ma ‘dreadful’ in both the interlinear meaning is, therefore, and the more accurate interpretation it is on the basis of modern Buriat ammgar as ‘foul’ is the rendering ‘awkward’ in On, 100, ‘implying something unplanned, a “gap in one’s strategy’, which Onon relates to amsar (ON) and amsar (EN) ‘to cause to try (or test).’ See ‘Nominalsuff’.’, 107, § 3; MÜÖT, 113b. Cf. eng. ‘trying’ = a word for testing the force of a particle ele preceding it, and the like. Only in this way ‘simply dreadful!’ ‘just awful!’ and the like. This ‘most awkward’, “as in Onon’s versions.

‘As if in a compact mass’ (jufu(-an-a), lit. ‘thickly (or massively).’ In the sectional summary (Y’s 7, 41a), jufu(-an-a) is (dat.-loc. of jufu(-a), mo. jufu(-an) ‘compact, massive’) is rendered as ‘a multitude of warriors’ (Gam 18). Pa, 107; We, 136; and Wa, 278, all understand this rendering in the sense of ‘leading’ or ‘with’ the large force coming next, as I did in Ra,
VII, 74, under the influence of the interlinear gloss of juča’un-a (§77) "thickly." However, I think that, in the present context, the dense mass or throng of warriors is simply an image referring to the physical appearance of Joči Qasgar which is so graphically described in the poetic passage, and does not mean that he was ‘together’ with other people; therefore, the sectional summary rendering cannot be taken literally (as Onon and others have done) when translating the Mongolian original. See the discussion in Oz’s, IV, 342-343, n. 16. Cf. Ev-Pop, 156: ‘đune telle ēpāissur’, which succinctly renders the idea. Da’i, 147, translates juča’un-a with nissor amtan ‘clumsy creature’, possibly under the influence of Ko, 148, who renders this sentence as: ‘And who is the one moving so heavily (γνώμα) behind him?’ Incidentally, I do not think that tere and qisimača should be taken together (‘behind him’ or ‘behind them’) as most translators do (cf., e.g., Li, 82; Cl, 127), and I agree with Oz’s, IV, 324, that tere refers to Qasgar, not to Temjit or the preceding warriors described by Junaq, in which case we would have te’ča’n-a (or teđen-a) qisimača.

‘Three-year-old cattle’ (qaginn bodo). The term bodo (mo. boda) designates large domestic animals, such as horses, oxen and camels, as opposed to small ones (sheep and goats). See Les., 101b; MKET, 100b, Cf. above, n. 155.

‘He is pulled along in his cart by three bulls’, lit. ‘He approaches, causing three bulls to drag his cart.’ Several translators understand this line to mean that Qasgar was so big and heavy that he needed three bulls to pull him — an interpretation that cannot be discounted. For the repetition of the number ‘three’ (fathoms, years of age of the animal and number of bulls) in these passages, see below.

‘It does not fill his stomach’, lit. ‘It does not satisfy his heart (đore).’ Cf. On, 100: ‘It does not satisfy his desire (“craving” in the 2001 ed., 175).’ However, in this case đore (mo. đor) does not mean ‘heart’ or ‘desire’, but ‘pit of the stomach.’ See Oz’s, IV, 344, n. 18. Cf. above, n. 137.

THE SECRET HISTORY

A forked-tip arrow (qayin-a suma) ... A long-range thin arrow (qisima čuma). The qayin-a and qisimača arrows are two types of arrows used by the Mongols and, as pointed out by Ligeti, they must have been long-distance arrows of great strength. See Li, 167, n. 195. Qayin-a corresponds to mo. qayin, the name of a two-pointed arrow. See Les., 43b. Cf. TH, 87 (= JYT, 154); Oz’s, IV, 346, n. 20. As for qisimača, described in Les., 444b, as ‘A kind of arrow used for long distance’, it was of the ‘boring’ javelin-type, hence long and thin. Its name survives in ma. keju ‘Durchbohren, Name einer Pfeilart’ (HM, 579), as also noted by Ligeti, loc. cit. See CMEL, 173b: ‘the name of an arrow used for shooting tigers, bears, and buck deer.’ Cf. also Oz’s, IV, 345, n. 20. Some additional data on the qisimača arrows can be gleaned from the Mongol glosses to the MA published by A.K. Borovkov, informing us that they were ‘arrows with a long and broad head’ (Borovkov 1964, 145, no. 9). The keju arrow also had a broad head, as we learn from the WTCWC, I, 1054a. A qisimača arrow is mentioned by Sayang Sečen (see ET’s, 5402; cf. GOM, 151), from whom we further learn that it had an ‘iron (head).’ See ET’s, 5409. Written Mongolian has qayin-muγar, qayimār, which designates an arrow with a small head and a slender shaft used for shooting at distant targets. It corresponds to ma. kuliγī. See Les., 913a; CMEL, 170b. Ev-Pop, 137, 283, n. 35, following Če, 168, 422-423, n. 416, identifies our qisimača with qayin-muγar and renders the expression qisimača sum as ‘flèche de fer destinée à tirer loin.’ This interpretation goes back (via Če) to Koww., 710b-711a, where qayimur = qayimur is glossed as ‘espèce de flèches avec le fer tuangulaire.’ Kowalewski’s source is QNTT, 292b, where qayin-muγar is described as ‘a long-range arrow with a rather small, thin iron shaft.’ There is evidently a confusion in the glossary descriptions between the head and the shaft of the qayimur arrow; thus, the identification of the latter with the qisimača of the SH remains speculative. For a further, and even more speculative, discussion on the subject, see Ga’s, 367a-b, n.
have to be reduced to 'one' and '300' aldas respectively in order to be realistic, i.e. to 1.55 - 1.60 m. in stature, and to about 470 m. for the long shot. We know from Rasid al-Din that Qasar was, indeed, famous for his physical strength, not for his stature (see SL, II/2, 51), and that he was a superb archer, a fact that earned him the appellation of Qabuta ('Skilful Archer') in the later Mongol tradition. Cf. HCG, 173-174. His son Ysünge was, possibly, an even better archer, having won an archery contest in Central Asia in 1225 at which he shot an arrow at the distance of 335 aldas (c. 350 m.), i.e. 35 aldas above the 300 which Qasar could achieve drawing his bow at full strength (if we reduce the hyperbole as suggested). Although the '500' of our poem is obviously not an ideal triple hyperbole, the poetic requirements, with the alliteration tatan ... tabun (fat'at), However, as I stated in my paper on the 'Steile of Ysünge', (ibid., 503, n. 36), we are dealing here with an epic passage and cannot therefore expect strict consistency or, indeed, accuracy. To the literature on arrow-shooting in Mongol times one must add the interesting article by Hok-lam Chan, 'Sitting by Bowshot: A Mongolian Custom and Its Sociopolitical and Cultural Implication' in AM (Third Series) 4:2:1991, 53-78.

'He covers nine hundred fathoms ... He covers five hundred fathoms', lit. 'He shoots a distance of five hundred fathoms.' 'He was born a coiling dragon-snake', lit. 'a coiling mangus' (gürülgü mangus). In Ra, VII, 75-77, I have discussed at length the possible interpretations of the expression a mangus gürülgü which in my earlier translation I rendered 'a coiling dragon' (ibid., 55). I gave my reasons for taking gürülgü to mean 'coiling', i.e. writhing or twisting as a snake, on the basis of Ordos, as against the identification of this word with the Gürülgi (= Gürülgi) Mountains of the SH (on which see above, n. 89). See Mu, II, 279, 294, n. 21; Oz, II, 29. I should add that the Ming translators and transcribers of the SH were well acquainted with the geographic name Gürülgi; however, in the
under Buddhist influence into the man-eating ogre and demon
(skr. rajāku) of the later Mongol tradition (see Lönnroth 1970),
this already mythical animal was regarded as a monstrous snake
dragon-like creature capable of swallowing its prey alive. Cf.
§ 78, where the prey is not specified, however, and our poetic
passage which speaks of the gurūlgi mangusq' Qasar
swallowing a man complete with quiver who 'does not get stuck
in his throat.' To explain the presence of this myth in ancient
pre-Buddhist Mongolian folklore, Gaadamba put forth the
theory that gurūlgi mangusq' = mo. guēbel manjūs 'lizard-
mangus', i.e. a lizard-like monster whose existence may have
been inferred by the ancient Mongols from the discovery of
dinosaur remains. Although speculative, this theory is ingenious
and has found favour among some contemporary translators.
See Gaadamba 1972, 95-100; On. 101 and n. 249 (however,
in the 2001 ed., 176, the 'lizard-like monster' has become a
true monster', following DO. 190-200, n. 14); Ev-Pop. 157. While
Gaadareba's interpretation cannot be discounted, it is certain
from the scanty literary evidence we possess that the mangusq'
was regarded by the Mongols in Činggis Qan's times as a large
animal with dragon- and/or snake-like physical characteristics
which cannot be exactly determined. (Similarly we find in the
ancient Chinese dragon-like instances of hybrid dragon/snake
creatures like the mand-lang 萬龍 and she-lang 萬鶻; and in later
Buddhist texts, a 'Mangus, king of the dragons', see BTD, 239,
no. 3248.) For this reason it is the present translation I have
adopted for manjūs Ligei's compromise rendering 'dragon-
snake' which reflects the ambiguity of the original. As for the
origin of the word manjūs ( = manjus), I suspect that it is an
early borrowing from ch. mang ( = manjūs) + the connec-
tive vowel - + the plural suffix -s. Cf. mo. luus 'Dragon, the
Dragon King, the God of Water ( = skr. rāhu), plural of luus 'dragon'
- in the. HCS, 50; BTD, 327, no. 3217.
I would, therefore, illustrate the semantic development of mo.
mangus as follows: ch. mang 'a (very) large snake (that is

interlinear version they did not gloss gurūlgi as 'name of a mountain'
(120; see 1Y 2, 27a et passim, cf. GHMBKZ, 368a, 375a) as they would have done in that case, but glossed it as
mang ming 檜名 'name of a large snake (such as a python). The
sectional summary (op. cit. 7, 41b) renders the expression
‘gurūlgi mangusq' as 'a kind of large mang' ( = māng), thus
confirming the interlinear gloss. While I do not share Murakaa-
mi's and Ozawa's opinion that the gurūlgi of our passage is the
mountains' name, I think that both words are, in fact, identical,
i.e. the name of the mountains and the attribute of the mangus
in § 195 are the nomen futuri of gurūlgi - gurūlgi - 'to twist
continuously', the iterative form in - (see GWM, 64, § 236 of
gurūlgi - gurūlgi ( = mo. guēbel, guēbel - guēbel) - 'to twist, braid,
weave'. Cf. ord. gurūlqi-gurūlzi ( = gurūlqi-gurūlzi) 'se mouvoir en faisant des
replis (serpent)' (DO, 275a). In the case of the Gurelgii
Mountains, the verbal noun is the descriptive attribute of the
mountain range, i.e. 'The Twisting Mountains', in contrast to a
'straight' range of mountains. As for mangusq, mo. mangus,' we
encountered this term in the famous 'Hol'sān's Lament' in § 78,
where in both the interlinear version and the sectional
summary it is rendered as mang-shē 'manjūs-snake' = 'a very
large snake' (Y 2, 11b, 12b). There are good reasons for rendering
manjūs with 'dragon' on the basis of a medieval
Persian text definition, as I have shown in my earlier discussion.
Cf. also Senyæ 1982, 480, n. 35. The difference between a
monstrous super-snake and a dragon is, indeed, blurred, hence
the variations we find in the modern translations, e.g. Pe. 126 (§
78: 'boa'); Ha. 14, § 78: 'boa constrictor'), 83 (§ 195: 'Guēbel
Snake'); Ko. 91 (§ 78: 'demon-snake'); Li, 22 (§ 78: 'snake'),
83 (§ 195: 'dragon-snake'); Lönnroth 1971, 57, n. 17 ('dragon');
CW, 153 ('dragon'); Mo, 111, n. 105 ('python'); CI, 23, 128
('python'); OZ, 1, 62 ('a large snake'). As already noted,
neither 'boa nor 'python' are suitable definitions since the boa
is an American snake, and the python is found only in tropical
Asia and Australia. Clearly, before the mangusq developed
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at times associated with a dragon) > mnm. manguus (the pmn. mangus) 'a man-eating dragon-snake' > mo. mangus 'a man-

eating ogre or demon, a ridiculous > modern Mongolian languages and dialects 'a man-eating monster, an ogre.' For

further investigation of this subject, cf. TDB, 86 (F11v, 11-12); Lörincz 1970; Serruys 1982, idem 1982b; MQ, 41, n. 96, as well as

P. Dambепjилж in OPTS, 1988-3, 78-91; and Buyankhesig, ibid., 1989-4, 62-68. A comprehensive study, which must be both historic and comparative, on the mangus in Mongolian literature and folklore is still lacking, although much of the material (chronicles, written and oral epics and stories, etc.) is now available in translation thanks to the efforts of A. Mostuen, N. Poppe, W. Heissig and many others.

"Ocitgin, the Easy-going (Ocitgin heliqetii) -- a reference to Temüge Öcitgin's pleasant disposition which, as noted by Pelliot, made him get along well with his elder brother Cungsig Qan. See HCG, 178; cf. HWC, 201ff.; Successors, 76. The term heliqetii, lit. 'having liver,' is not obvious, but it has some of the connotations of our 'philocratic' (cf. Ha, 83). Other translators have variously rendered this term as 'courageous,' 'lady,' 'spoil child,' 'sluggard,' 'friendly,' 'kind-hearted' and 'unconcerned.' The Chinese sectional summary (Yv 7, 41b) says: 'His name is Öcitgin, he is lazy (or indolent) by nature.' I think that ch. 19 "lazy, indolent," must be understood here as meaning someone who takes life in a leisurely and carefree way. Cf. Kh. eleqeti 'good-natured,' and mo. elixeg 'amiable,' both also deriving from (fielqetii) 'liver.' Cf. Ov, IV, 347-348, n. 24. In this section, Temüge Öcitgin is called Öcitgin and Öcitgin Noyan, as is the case in other sections of the SH as well as in other texts. Cf. HCG, 175-178.

"He does not lag behind ... in position," lit. 'Even (ele) he does not lag behind the great display (baru'ain) Even he does not lag behind the position (bayjilii)." We have already encountered the term baru'ain (yo. barau'ain) in the sense of 'darkness' (§ 91), and 'multitude' (§ 184), with the connotation of 'a large display of people.' Cf. ord. baru so-'se

laissier voir de loin en grand nombre pour faire peur à l'ennemi' (DO, 508). In view of the second line of the couplet and the

usage of barau'ain in a military context, I think that the word does not refer simply to a 'multitude' (as CL, 128, and Ov, IV, 325 have it, but see Ov, II, 29), but to the full army array. This is confirmed by the sectional summary, which reads: 'Yet, he is not far behind from among the multitude of the mounted troops' (Yv 7, 41b). I have tried to express the force of the particle ele by using a proposed 'yet' rather than repeating the particle ele by using a proposed 'yet' rather than

even in two already long lines. Cf. Street 1981, 154, § 14. For the word baru'ain occurs again in § 255 in the form baru'a (<

"happens to be on one's own'), see also above, n. 156.

"And he said,' lit. 'he sent saying':

For a translation in alliterative form, see Mo, 121-124; Gaadamba to Çinggis in allusive discussion of Jamuqa's verbal message

(§ 170), where a similar situation occurs (boldeyin)." Cf. § 170, where a similar situation alone (boldeyin)." Cf. § 170, where a similar situation

ocurred with Jamuqa and Ong Qan. For the verb boldeyin 'to

be alone (< on one's own), see also above, n. 156.

Cf. Coste 1951, 75; n. 23; VG, 92.

"Late in the day," lit. 'the sun becoming late (= evening)."

Cf. Poppe 1964, 777; and above, n. 177.

"They tried to escape," lit. 'were about (or intended) to escape.'

They pined on top of each other (deere deere-en quatsi-
laldujia). The word quatsialdujia, which is not glossed in the
text, is the converser imperfect of qutaqalada-, the reciprocal form of qutaqala-, a hupas legomenon. I think that Kozi is right in equating it to mo. qutaqala- 'to pile up, heap up' (Ko, 555). Cf. Cl, 129, n. 65; Oz', IV, 356, n. 5. The sectional summary (Y' 7, 47b) says: 'Those who died pressing (i.e. crushing) each other were many.' Also, qutaqala- cannot correspond to mo. qutaqala- 'to mix, mingle', as suggested by some scholars (see Mu, II, 296, n. 25), because this verb occurs in the SH as qutaqala-. See HW, 73.

'They fell breaking their bones', lit. 'their bones falling asunder (kenkeri, i.e. to pieces). Cf. Bese 1969, 124-125. For yassu bussi, a 'not-couple' ('bone - hair') = 'bones'), see Mo, 43, DO, 398b, 396b.

'Rotten logs' renders the word hunjli'i which means 'dead tree, rotten wood.' See above, n. 27, where I have discussed this puzzling word. The expression hunjli'i bayatiia, which occurs again in §§ 247, 251 and 272, means literally 'until they stood (= piled up; cf. the gloss in § 251) like rotten logs.'

'Činggis Qa'an finished off Tayang Qan' (Tayang Qan-i muqataqaju abubai). For muqataqaju abubai, cf. the muqataqaju ab'au'i of § 177 and corn. However, this does not necessarily mean that Tayang Qan was killed outright, even though that is what is stated in so many words in the SWCCL, 55h. The corresponding passage in SL', 1/2, 148, gives a much fuller account of Tayang Qan's end, indicating that he was mortally wounded when he was captured, and he may well have died of his wound(s) as, indeed, another source expressly states (see Wei, 136, n. 23). The sectional summary (Y' 7, 44b) merely says that Tayang Qan was captured, without any mention of his death. Cf D'Ossios, I, 88-89; CW, 41. On the other hand, the YS' 1, 12-13, which gives a full account of the battle, says: 'This day, the Emperor (Činggis Qa'an) fought a great battle with the Naiman army. By sun-down, he had captured and killed Tayang Qan.' At the beginning of § 154 the verb muqataqaju (which I rendered in English as 'to destroy') is used with reference to the defeated Tatars; however, it is clear from what follows that most of the Tartar tribesmen were still alive, albeit not for long. Whatever the sequence of events, Tayang Qan lost the battle at Nuuq Cliff and perished.

'Moved from there with a few men', lit. 'moved being only a few persons.' Cf. above, n. 177, and below, n. 197.

'A circular camp' (gare en), i.e. a fortified camp, given the circumstances. See above, n. 90.

On the Tamir River see above, n. 194. 'Činggis Qa'an utterly defeated and conquered (lit. "gathered") the people of the Naiman tribe on the southern slopes of the Altai (Altai-vin ٨١٥٥-d). The sectional summary (Y' 7, 44b) says: 'cia Činggis) attack became more as far as the southern side of the Altai Mountains. The situation attacked more and more desperate and, all his people were captured.' From the context, the object of Činggis' attack seems to be Guçilik, and this people the latter's people. This is, in fact, how the passage has been understood by Palladî (Pa, 108), Waley (Wa, 279-280) and Wei Kwei Sun (Ye, 137). However, we know that Guçilik was virtually alone when he fled, and the summary is at variance with the Mongol text, which refers to 'the people of the Naiman tribe.' It would thus appear that Činggis Qa'an pursued the Naiman remnants to their territory south of the Altai; then, in the autumn (1204), he fought with Togo'ta Beki at the Qaradal Source (§ 197).

After defeating Togo'ta, he pursued him, Qudu and Cülan and, again, crossed the Altai (§ 198). I doubt that Činggis crossed the Altai twice and wonder whether the text in § 196 is corrupt (the differing version in the sectional summary seems to indicate this); and, if so, whether the author of this section meant that the Naiman inhabited the southern Altai region were defeated and conquered by Činggis Qa'an together with their subjects and allies. This is to distinguish them from the Nairan who inhabited the region north of the Altai, the Naiman tribe being distributed over both sides of the great mountain range. As Péronne pointed out, the Naiman south of the Altai reached as far as the Urungu; those north of the Altai (north-west of Kobod) reached as far as
our passage, the latter meaning is confirmed by the sectional summary, hence in the present instance the rendering "essent-
ialized in Cl. 129, is not quite correct.
For the use of k't (= mno. Aved) and others", cf. above, nn.
130, 150.
"took her as wife." The text simply says that Cinggis 'took
her' (ašulük); however, although she is not listed among his
wives in the table of VS 106 2693-2697, we know from Ballt
wives that she was one of his principal secondary
wife (SL 1, l/2, 72) that she was married in accordance with the Mongol
wives and that he married her in accordance with the Persian historian, Gürbêst had been custom.
According to the Persian historian, Gürbêst had been custom.
This section closes the account of Cinggis Qan's
campaign against Tayang Qan and the important Naiman tribe
which had begun on 17 May 1204 (see § 193). According to the
which had begun on 17 May 1204 (see § 193). This is the
same year (29 July-24 October 1204). As noted by Ligei (Li
n 167, n. 196), with the defeat of this tribe Cinggis had removed
the last great nomadic people from his path of conquest. The
the last great nomadic people from his path of conquest. The
Naiman was first mentioned in the SH in § 141, s.a. 1201, i.e.
Naiman was first mentioned in the SH in § 141, s.a. 1201, i.e.
the SH chronology quite late in the story, but, as stated earlier, the SH chronology
quite late in the story, but, as stated earlier, the SH chronology
The identification of the Qaradal Source (Qaradal Huja'tur)
poses serious problems. In the SWCCL 56a, this locality is
called the "Thei-ere'-e 29b River source Pu-la-na-ai-hu 田
Thei-ere'-e 29b River source Pu-la-na-ai-hu 田
Thei-ere'-e 29b River source Pu-la-na-ai-hu 田
Tar (or Ter) Muren." The c of Thei-ere'-e is undoubtedly a
tography (double erh 29b since the character  is never used
in these transcriptions. We are left, therefore, with Tisch-eth = *Der or *Ter (the alternation d – t is quite common; cf., e.g., Døregêne = Tøregene, Dørût = Tørsút). Since the passages in the SWCCL and SL are parallel ones, the SWCCL reading *Der* = SL Tar/Ter, i.e. the Der/Dar or Ter/Tar River. Dar or Tar may perhaps correspond to the second element of Qaradâl, i.e. Dal, in which case the name Qaradâl should be read Qara Dal or ‘Black Dal’ (it is quite common for a river in Mongolia to have the epithet Qara ‘Black’); alternatively, we may have two rivers called respectively Qara and Dal, but the reference in SL seems to preclude that. Perlee, 7 (= Perlee’, 91), claims that the river in question is the Xar Tal (= Kara Tal), an affluent of the Selenga, at 49° N 101° E. He quotes as his authority Radlov, Sibirskie drevnosti, vol. I, ch. 3, p. 80. This can only be AS. I cannot find the reference to the Kara Tal on page 80 of vol. I, but the river is mentioned in vol. II, pp. 9 and 116 as Karat. However, this is the well-known Kara-Tal in east Kazakhstan which has its sources in the Dzungarian Ala-tau Mountains and empties into Lake Balkhash — too far to the south-west for our account. I cannot find any other river of the same name along the Selenga and I think that Perlee’s statement is incorrect. In On, 102, n. 250, we read: “Although the use of the word “source” (huj'a)ur in this name would usually imply a river source, in fact Qaradâl is qara dar (or ta)l which means ‘Black Steppе’, a steppe that is located to the south-west of the city of Khovd (Qoimb) in the MPR. See B. 171.” Cf. the 2001 ed., 177, n. 446, to the same effect. The reference for this identification is TH, 171 (= JYT, 298-299) and, ultimately, the MKYMC. See MKYMC, 154. This area — a plain, not a river is, according to the latter source, on the Köke Usu, in the westernmost region of Mongolia. Since, immediately after the confrontation with Chînges’ army at Qaradâl Hàu’ur, Togo’s Beki was chased by the Mongols to the Sa’ari Steppе, where he was totally defeated, it seems that a localization as that proposed in TH is also too far to the west. Moreover, our text, as well as the SWCCL and SL, describe the place as a spring or water-
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course, rot a plain. Unfortunately, the Pu-la-na-ai-ulu of the SWCCL is, likewise, an unknown locality. I believe that a possible solution to the problem that would satisfy both the linguistic and geographical aspects of the identification is the following. If we read Tes instead of Ter (i.e. M. I. 185) we have the name of a well-known river in northwestern Mongolia, the Tes or Teshin Gol that originates in the Bolnai Mountains at 49° N 90° E. ‘Ter’ and ‘Tes’ can easily be confused in the Arabic-Fersian script. The puzzling Pu-la-na-ai-ulu of the SWCCL is, probably, a corruption of the name of these mountains (<Bulnai Quln>, i.e. the ‘Bulnai Cliff or Mountain’; for ku = quln, cf. HCG, 380; for qun = ‘mountain’, see ibid., and above, n. 177, the reference to Qorgal Qun in SL). The area itself is near the Selenga and much closer to the Sa’ari Steppе than the region of Kobdo. This identification is, I think, more satisfactory than the ones proposed so far; I think, therefore, regard Qaradâl as the locality on the northern side of the Bolnai Mountains where the Tes takes its source. The text says that on that occasion Çinggis Qun dislodged Togo’o from his position and eventually crushed him in the Sa’ari Steppе further west. This must have happened soon after the first encounter. From § 162 we know that in 1202 Togo’o and his sons had retreated to the relative safety of their own territory in the lower Selenga, which they must have followed upstream in the summer-autumn of 1204 in order to reach Qaradâl Hàu’ur. Togo’o was still with his sons at the time. They were Qutu (written here Qudu, but to be read as Qutu or Qodu; see above, n. 141) and Chil’a’un and, probably, also another son whose name is uncertain (Qul?) and who is mentioned in § 198.

For the passage ‘Togo’o with his sons ... got away by flight’, cf. Mo, 177, n. 158, where çë en qul’un beyes-livn is rendered ‘ct[e]l un petit nombre de gens.’ The literal meaning is rendered ‘[e]t un petit nombre de gens.’ The passages in §§ 109, 136, 183, 188 and 198 also translated by Mostert (Mo, 176-177).

Deyt Usun of the ‘Qo’as’ Merkit is first mentioned in the SH, § 102, where the name of his tribe is correctly given as U’as
Markit. This is the regular spelling throughout (see §§ 105, 109, 111, 117). Ligeti says that the form ‘Qo’as’ for Uwás (read U’a’s) cannot exclusively be traced back to the peculiarity of the Uighur script (Li, 167, n. 197). Cf. HCG, 137-138, 275.

However, in my opinion the aberrant form Qo’as (the ‘Ho’as’ of HCG, Cl. 130, and Oez’, IV. 360, 366, n. 1, is a purely mechanical transcription of the Chinese transcription ‘Hao’). ‘Ho’as pro ぬl 아바 ‘Qo’as’ is to be explained simply by the fact that in the early Uighur-Mongol script, the word U’a’s, written Uyas, is virtually identical with Qo’s, written Qoyas, as can also be observed in the AT, 24b, where the first word of line 19, Uyas, can be read Qoyas. There are other cases where this confusion has occurred in proper names. See HCG, 138.

‘To offer her’, lit. ‘to show (or present) her’, but in this case ḥe‘i’il is actually rendered as ‘to offer’ (hisien-yü 賦散, hisien 使) in both the interleaver version and the sectional summary (Y. 7, 45b, 49a).

For the episode of Dayir Usan’s offer of his daughter Qulan, see also HCG, 275. For the name Qulan, see above, n. 48. She is called qutan (written qutan and qatan in this section) in view of her future rank as one of the principal wives of Çinggis Qan. She is, in fact, listed as the first wife of the first rank of those belonging to the second ordo or ‘Palace’ in YS 156, 2694. The later Mongol tradition made Qulan Qatan a Korean princess. See HCG, 275-276. She bore Çinggis Qan a son, Kölgen, who died in Russia. There are many references to both Qulan and her son in the Persian and Chinese sources, including Yüan literary, legal and administrative texts (see, e.g., RPN, I, 567; TCTK 2, 28a), which deserve study.

Naya’a Noyan of the Ba’arin (Ba’ardai) has his name variously transcribed in this section as Naya’a and Naya’y (< Naya’a), the written form being Naya’y. The younger (?) son of Old Şiré’er of the Nide głut Ba’arin, he was mentioned in § 149 in connection with the seizure of Tarquita Kirilif of the Taguï’ut. There his name appears only in the form Naya’a. For the sake of uniformity, I have transcribed his name as Naya’a throughout this section. Çinggis Qan was angry with him because he thought that Naya’a had sexually used Qulan during the three days he delayed her progress – a most serious crime according to Mongol customary law, for Qulan as daughter of a chief and on her way to be given to Çinggis, was already the quen’s property and should have been conveyed to him immediately. It was, therefore, a case of lèse majesté. Cf. Vernadsky 1928, 350-351; Ratchevsky 1987, 68; and below, nn. 208, 220, 257, concerning the expressions yeke tür (¼ tör) and yeke yasqan.

‘Detained ... held’: the verb is the same in Mongolian (türüge = mo. türüke ‘to cease to hold, obstruct’). I have used (türüge = mo. türüke ‘to cease to hold, obstruct’). I have used two different words in English to avoid repeating the same verb three times.

‘Rigorously and minutely questioned’, lit. ‘questioning observing carefully (or looking inquisitively) in a harsh manner’ (qatangqu-që mari’ an assaq). The use of harsh methods of interrogation, i.e. torture, is implied in the expression qatangqu-që mari’ an assaq ‘in detail. Mari’an is the verb form of mar(a)-carefully. Mari’ an is the verb form of mar(a)-carefully. Mari’ an is the verb form of mar(a)-carefully. Mari’ an is the verb form of mar(a)-carefully. Mari’ an is the verb form of mar(a)-carefully. Mari’ an is the verb form of mar(a)-carefully.

‘made this case a matter of law’, lit. ‘to make into a fasqa’, i.e. into a normative law or, in Cleaves’ words ‘a precedent which shall serve as law for the future’ (Cl. 130, n. 69). See de Rachewiltz 1990-97, 97-98.

‘No doubt we would have been intercepted and would have got into difficulties’, lit. ‘would we have not ...’ – a rhetorical question.

‘Perhaps ...’, (qui ...). For gai, a word expressing doubt (perhaps, who knows?), cf. Viete 1990, 384.

‘To inspect my body’, lit. ‘to question the flesh (mariyan)’. For mariyan (> mar(a) ‘a flesh, body’, i.e. to test her virginity. For mariyan (> mar(a) ‘a flesh, body’, i.e. to test her virginity. For mariyan (> mar(a) ‘a flesh, body’, i.e. to test her virginity. For mariyan (> mar(a) ‘a flesh, body’, i.e. to test her virginity. For mariyan (> mar(a) ‘a flesh, body’, i.e. to test her virginity.
account of Benedict the Pole, ibid., 82); SDM, 390, 393. She died probably soon after the election. There are many references to her in the works of the Persian historians and in the Chinese sources. On her see MPa, 193-195; HCG, 90. She is known in the West as Turakina, and in China as Na-ra-chen 娜拉切恩 (‘Naimaljin, ‘The Naiman’) and Liu huang-hou 刘皇后 or ‘The Sixth Empress.’ The latter designation has not been satisfactorily explained, since both the Persian and Chinese sources list her as the second, not sixth, wife of Ogüdeî, belonging to the emperor’s principal ord (his first wife was Borâqîn). See Successors, 18, YS 106, 2693-4. I have discussed this problem at length in de Rachewiltz 1981 and de Rachewiltz 1999a, where new source material is presented to support my earlier tentative explanation of this puzzling question. For the name Döregene/Töregene, cf. Rybatzki [2003], s.v. For the form qudun instead of qutan ‘ladies (of rank), wives (of a chief or nobleman); see above, n. 118; Mo, 109; Matériel II, 47 (17v, 5).

As pointed out in Li, 167, n. 198, Ogüdeî is called Qa’an in anticipation of his future status, just as in the preceding section (§ 197) Dayûr Usun’s daughter is called Qulan Qogû. Ogüdeî’s title must have been added to the original text of the SH (which undoubtedly had Ogüdeî tout court) much later, presumably at the same time when Çînggis’s title of qan was changed to qa’un. See Section Four of the Introduction.

The Taqûq stronghold (Taqûq qorqta) presents some problems. The word taqûq is glossed in the interlinear version as ‘mountain top’ (shan-ting 腾) and qorqta as ‘stockade, stronghold, fortress’ (chi-tzu 墻;F however, the sectional summary (YS 8, 5a) calls this place ‘the Taqûq mountain stronghold’, with taqûq transcribed as a proper name. Cf. CL, 132, n. 1). That Taqûq was a place-name is confirmed by Raalî al-Din (SL 1, 12, 149; Dağöl qorqan), the SWCCCL (56b; the Taqûq [= Taqûq] stronghold), and the YS 1 (1, 13: id.). The interlinear

Most of them fell into the river and drowned', lit. 'sinking into it caused the majority to perish in the water.' The verb 'to fall to the bottom, sink.' 縛浮 corresponds to mo. ichtum- 'to fall to the bottom, sink.' "\n
Regarding the country of the Uit and Qarluq Turks in Central Asia, see above n. 151. Here, as in § 235, the name Qarluq occurs in the plural Qalru'ut (cf. Qarluq). The preceding word, Uurut, is the ethnonym of 1975, 166. The preceding word, Uurut, is the ethnonym of the Uighurs and Uur, but since it can hardly modify Qalru'ut (the Uighurs and the Qarluq being clearly distinguished in the SH as well as in other sources), it must be taken as the equivalent of Uur or other names. The preceding word, Uur, is the ethnonym of the Uighurs and Qarluq with the interlinear gloss which renders Uurut and Qarluq with the glosses 'people' in each case. E.g., the Chinese gloss lao-chien is designating them in the SH, and of which 'stray arrow' is only an approximate translation, is a technical term registered in the WTCWC, loc. cit., corresponding to mo. siba ni jebe and ma. sorha sidran 'arrows shot wildly', i.e. randomly. Hence my present rendering of this term. Middle Mongolian siba has survived in Modern Mongolian in the denominal verb sibada-, kh. səvdə, 'to pierce; to incite, urge' (Les., 693); cf. kh. šav 'shooting target', but siba 'shot.' More could be said on this interesting and much-travelled word, but it would take us too far afield. "

'His sons could not take in their hands (= bury) his bones (= body). ' On the expression yasu bari - 'to bury', see above, n. 175. The practice of severing the head of a dead person (pars pro toto) has already been encountered in § 189. Cf. also Ratchnevsky 1987, 81-82.
passim. On the Qangli and Qipçaq see also MR, I, 301-304; II, 68-72; Nöeff, I, 402; HTAC, 88-91; Li, 168, n. 198; CC5, 189, nn. 51, 53; Kumekov 1987, TIKCA, 178; and especially the important contributions by O. Pritsker. Cf. SMEH, Index, 11a; and Allsen 1983a, 6. See further CHEIA, 506 (Index, s.v. 'Kipçaq'), and CHCAR, 836b (Index). They are frequently mentioned in the Chinese and Persian sources, but have not yet been made the object of a comprehensive investigation. For n = b, see 'Quelques problèmes', 270.

The passage 'Toqto'a was struck ... Kimča'ut' is translated somewhat differently in Buell 1992, 7-8.

'Settled in his base camp' renders a'urun ut-tur ba'uba. For the term a'urun (pl. a'urun-ut), see above, n. 136. Cf. the expression ordos tur-ba'uba, lit. 'to settle down at the Palace', i.e. at the qan's encampment (§ 264). See Mo, 261 and n. 249. The use of the plural form for the base camp may be compared to the use of the term ordos (pl. of ordo) in that expression, the qan's encampment consisting of his residence and those of his wives, retainers, etc., altogether a large number of tents. However, it is possible that the plural in such instances may be also one of respect, a sort of honorific plural, on which cf. Letters, 65, 79.

For Aššurzin 'servants, attendants', see Ozu, V, 19-20, n. 1; Miller 2000, 212-216. Cf. above, n. 66.

'He had the Merkit distributed here and there down to the last one', lit. 'he apportioned the Merkit in all directions until they were utterly finished.' Cf. Cl, 133: 'He made one to part the Merkid, [distributing them] unto every quarter, to the point that he extinguished them as an entire tribe.'

Whereas the SH records the battle on the Irtysh and Toqto'a's death in the spring of the Year of the Ox, i.e. in 1205, the same event is placed a.a. 1208 in the Chinese and Persian sources. Cf. YS1 1, 14; SL1, I2, 151-152; SWCC1, 58. See also EM, 172-173, 196-197; Čk1, 79, 92 (= Čk2, 86, 102). A comparison of the sources within the framework of Cinggis' movements in the years 1207/1208 and 1217/1218 shows that the chronology of the YS and Ra'id al-Din is, as usual, more reliable than that of the SH. See Appendix One, and below, n. 199. However, Grouset and Hambis follow the chronology of the SH in their respective works. See CW, 160, Gk, 89.

§ 129. 'In that same Year of the Ox' must refer to 1205; see the fourth paragraph of § 198. However, we have here a mistake of a full twelve-year cycle, as Sūbe'et'in's expedition against Toqto'a's sons took place in 1217, also a Year of the Ox. This event must have been either erroneously or purposely transposed in the text. Cf. Pelliot 1920, 163-164; EM, 197-198, 579; and below, n. 236. Sūbe'et'in is the famous lieutenant of Cinggis below, n. 236. Sūbe'et'in is the famous lieutenant of Cinggis in §§ 120, 121 and one of the 'four hounds', already mentioned in §§ 120, 124, 195. His name is also mentioned in the SH in the forms Sūbe'et'in (= pmo. Sūbeget'in) and Sūbedet (= Sūbe'et'in). In other sources we find Sūbedet - Sūbedet (= Sūbedet - Sūbedet = Sūbe'et'in Sūbe'et'in). Cf. Cleaves 1955a, 598, n. 259. For this great chief, see the biographical essay by Paul D. Buell in ISK, 13-26 (with a comprehensive bibliography on page 26), 797a (Index); and Buell 1992. Buell's views on the sequence of events differ from mine. Sūbe'et'in is usually referred to as Sūbe'et'in Ba'atar (cf. above, n. 120). In view of the capital role he played in the creation of the Mongol empire, a full-length study of his life and activities in 1205, the same event is placed a.a. 1208 in the Mongol empire would be highly desirable. With regard to the campaign question, the 'iron cart' (temir telege) with which he was equipped for his long and arduous journey (Odu and the Merkit equipped for his long and arduous journey (Odu and the Merkit remained on foot to the west and sought shelter in Qipçaq territory under the protection of a local chief) must have been the iron-covered wheels. The cart reinforced with an iron frame and with iron wheels. The SWCC1, 72a, specifically states that it had iron-covered wheels. On these carts see Ras 1992, 90; Nam 1994, 200; cf. also TH, 259 (= JYT, 448); Ozu, V, 28-29, n. 2. For its possible use in connection with Sūbe'et'in in particular, i.e. as a suitable vehicle for a very corpulent man, cf. Ha, 118, n. 199; Li, 168, n.
199. In our text, temür telegelli is in apposition to Sübe-etei: 'Sübe-etei – he is an iron cart.' As pointed out by N. Poppe (p. c.), this is an interesting and unusual construction. The name of Togo's second son is Qul (Qui in §198) which, as stated earlier, is the correct form.

'Left in fright and haste, then turned back, exchanged shots with us and went off like lassoed wild asses or stags with arrows in their bodies' (odun ogiatu qarin qarbuççu uşqutan qulan samatu buqti bolbu otahu). The expression odun ogiatu qarin qarbuççu is idiomatic (note the alliteration) and it seems to apply to the well-known tactic of feigning retreat, then turning back and shooting arrows at the enemy (cf., e.g., MM, 36-37; CG, 191; and see above, nn. 194 and 195), used here by the Merkit forces which were numerically at a great disadvantage vis-à-vis the Mongols. This tactic was evidently quite effective, since the Merkit were thus able to make good their escape even if, as the narrator vividly describes, they were then like wild asses (or horses. qulan, see above, n. 48) with the loop of the kiyu (mimo, uşqara = pmo. and mo. uşyru, kh. urgu 'a long wooden pole with a loop on the end used to catch horses' [Lesa, 881a]) over their necks, or like stags with arrows in their flesh, i.e. wounded and impaired. For the entire sentence see the important remarks in Oz., V, 29-31, nn. 3, 4, which rectify previous interpretations; however, with regard to the verb ogiatu (w.f. ogat) – 'to be frightened (alarmed or startled)'. Ozawa's interpretation must be reconciled with Oz., IV, 292-293, n. 6, dealing with the same verb occurring in §193. Ogati is a denominal verb in -< a -< ogu (cf. j. ogu, ogga, uşgu quick, sudden, unexpected, fearful) (Cev., 408a; see TH, 115 = JY, 204); MUJT, 338b-339a). Clearly, as noted by Ozawa, the verb carries the meaning both of 'to be in fear' and 'to be pressed or haste', hence my rendering.

This whole section is in 'semi-epic' style, i.e. it combines poetic imagery with realistic advice. Some or most of it could indeed be rendered poetically, as Even and Poppe have done (Ev, Pop, 164-166); however, I have refrained from doing so because of its 'bittry' character. Cf. Cerensdörom 1986, 70; Poucha 1955, 168-170 (for a remarkable parallel in Herodotus); Khomonov 1981, 55-56. For some interesting remarks and further references, and for other ancient popular sayings in this section, see Li, 168, n. 199.

Fot tarbaqan (= mo. tarbaunli) 'marmot', see above, n. 89; cf. also MED, 332b. 'If they ... plunge', lit. 'If they ... enter' (oro.asa).

'Tenggis Sea' (Tenggis Dalai): see the discussion on Tenggis in n. 1 above. The word dalai 'sea, ocean, great lake,' appears here for the first time, glossed hai iš id. On dalai etc. see above, n. 32; see TMEN, no. 196; de Rachewiltz 1983, 274-276, 280, n. 32; Sinor 1972. Judging by the context which was numerically with the general meaning of 'the Ocean', rather than specifically, as in §1, with the meaning of Tenggis/Baikal, but there is disagreement between the interlinear gloss (Y 8, ?); the latter supporting the generic designation (hai sea, ocean) tout court). See Wa, 43, 282. Cf. Oz., V, 26; Oz., II, 53 (lakes and seas)'.

Gölmi and qubčur (mo. yubčiyr) designate two types of fishing nets; according to the Chinese gloss, the former is a casting net and the latter a dragnet (qubčur already appears in § 75). For gölmi, cf. RH, 70, no. 25 and n. 1. Interestingly enough, both gölmi (gölme, gölůme, gölim) and yubčiyr (qubčur, qubčur) mean also 'saddle cloth, shabrack.' For these terms and their semantic development, see Oz., V, 31-32, n. 6, 7; Pelliot 1944c, 159ff; TMEN, no. 266 (s.v. qubčur); Uyum, Kühn, 1984, 730-733. ‘Mindful of the long distance you have to cover, lit.' thinking of the distance of the territory. Cf. above, n. 194. ‘The army mounts' (čerig-un aša). For aša (ašo) (re)mount, post or relay horse', a loan-word from tu. ulaynli) a 'technical term for a horse used for riding, more particularly for a horse used for hire and a post horse' (ED, see TMEN, no. 521; Mo, 254; Arakawa 1994, €eaves 136a-b); see TMEN, no. 521; Mo, 254; Arakawa 1994, 136a-b; and 1988, 157-158, n. 17; MHKS, 88, n. 20; Oz., V, 32, n. 6; and
SH, §§ 279-281 and com. Regulations concerning the use of post horses (ulu'a) and provisions, i.e. rations (si'is), figure prominently in the official documents of the Yuan period. Cf. MMHS, 46-47 et passim. In our text, the term for 'provisions' is ganaesi (cf. §§ 93, 175), but si'is is also found in the SH (§ 280). See below, n. 280

'If a gelding is already completely exhausted it will be of no use (lit. "it will not do") to spare it then.' For this sentence see Mo, 107.

'If your provisions have already completely run out, how can you save them then? (lit. "to save them will not do").' For this sentence see ibid., 197.

'Thinking ahead', lit. 'thinking beyond' (i.e. of what is beyond). Cf., however, Oz', V, 26, 34-35, n. 11; Oz', II, 54; Ev-Pop, 165. I do not think that ulu'a = "distance" in this case, since the caution about the distance had been given only a few lines before.

'Do not allow your soldiers...to make circular battalions (bu abalatqa) without limit.' This provision of the fasaq on limited or controlled hunting is worth noting, also for its economic implications. See MCS, 33-34. Cf. also above, nn. 115, 190, for the verb abala- 'to hunt by making a circular hunt or battle.'

'In order to give (lit. "saying, 'Let there be'") additional provisions (nema is'is in ganaesi-yen). The verb ingegeo, glossed tieng-i in § 282, 'to increase', corresponds to ma. ingegi- 'to increase (in price).' See Kow., 497a. Cf. Ko, 556.

'To fix the crupper to the saddle', lit. 'to crupper the crupper of the saddle.' For gudaqa (ma. gudara) 'crupper', cf. TMEN, no. 1494; RH, 289, no. 20.

'With their mouths free' (ulu'salaq), i.e. without putting in the bit. The verb sudabi- 'to remove the bit from the horse's mouth' is still preserved in Dagur (sodobi- id.). Cf. ma. sudaminim 'to remove the bit, to take out the bit (of livestock)' (CMEL, 250a). See TH, 242-243 (= JYT, 419).
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(to dissipate, diminish) one's natural virtue (= sedour) and seek-then agaspos = 'to lose heart', lit. 'to be neglectful of one's thoughts (or heart)'. Cf. HW, 5. For the usage of agaspos in preclassical texts, cf. also Cleaves 1954, 76 [4-159a] and 78 [4-160a]. The Ming translators were undoubtedly acquainted with the various meanings of this word, and took the expression agasposa da ta of our passage to mean 'you will separate (or divide) yourselves' (tairi). I believe, however, that they were not acquainted with the, by then, obsolete Tungus word miese, but since the expression agasposa da ta corresponded to the expression misedokwin da ta in the first half of the poetic passage, they assumed that the latter likewise meant 'to separate oneself' (tairi) and translated accordingly ('Beyond the rivers/You will perhaps separate yourselves ...'). Had they assumed that agasposa meant, in this context, 'to lose heart' instead of 'to separate oneself', they would have been correct in their rendering of miese too, but this was not the case. I should add that the sectional summary is of little help in the present instance (see below). The nomen futuri in -qani-kin (pl. of -qak-
-kin) indicates here a particular situation, hence my insertion of 'perhaps.' For this use of the nomen futuri, also in conjunction with the same verb agasposa, cf. the expression agasposa sedikti anu 'their thoughts which could be distracted' (Cleaves 1954, 78 [4-160a]; Mostaert: 'leur pensées qui pourraient être distraites'), ibid., 104, n. 156.

But think of nothing else apart (lit. "apart and separately") from your mission, i.e. in spite of all the difficulties of the long journey in pursuit of Togto's son which may dampen their spirits, Sibek'etei's troops are urged to press on regardless, single-mindedly. The sectional summary says simply 'You must be attentive' (V 8, 11b). For a different interpretation of Cinggis's words, see Mo, 125, n. 118; cf. Cl, 135, n. 14.

'If Eternal Heaven grants you further strength and power', lit. 'If strength and power are increased by Eternal Heaven.' (At the end of this section Cinggis refers also to the protection of
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Heaven Above.) For this terminology, see above, n. 113, and below, nn. 201, 208. For the 'mot-couple' gu'yu awa (= mo-
kiiu't[si] awa - awa kiiu't) 'strength-power', cf. Cleaves 1996, 10-11, n. 56 where, however, for 'a'yu' read 'awa'.

'You capture', lit. 'you cause to enter into your hands.'

'There is no need for you to bring them back', lit. 'why go so far as bringing them?'

The episode of Cinggis, then Temujin, chased ('to be frightened' in the old Mongol language often implying being pursued and fleeing for one's life) by the Merkit chieftains ('Three Merkit' (here the Udyuy Merkit is singled out because Togto'a was its chief) - the one related in § 102, an ordeal that had clearly left an indelible impression on Cinggis.

'Swearing oaths', lit. 'letting loose the mouth and tongue' (amun kelen alda'ai), an idiomatic expression still used in Mongolian.

'You shall reach', lit. 'let him (i.e you - Sibe'etei) reach together (= meet, i.e. with the enemy).

'To the utmost limit, etc.' For this expression, see § 166 ad fin. and com. Cinggis means that he, through Sibe'etei, will go to any lengths to punish them.

'He had an iron cart made', lit. 'he had an iron cart beaten out', i.e. with the iron reinforcements hammered on to the cart. See above.

'To pursue them to the very end', lit. 'making him (Sibe'etei) pursue them, going to the extremity (a'ul'ul'en). For a'ul'ul'en (= prono. ilgig'ile) - to go to (or reach) the end (limit; extremity), cf. Cleaves 1950, 115, n. 95; idem 1994, 19, n. 31.

'With these final instructions, lit. 'He ordered, saying...

For the final passage, 'If you constantly (lit. 'go on') think', etc.; see Cleaves 1951, 83, n. 54; Letters, 60; Ligeti 1971, 156 etc.; see Cleaves 1951, 83, n. 54; Letters, 60; Ligeti 1971, 156 (for a different interpretation; but cf. Li, 87 and 168, n. 199).

Cf. also Street 1981, 152, where yahba asu is correctly taken as an auxiliary of continuity ('if you keep thinking'). See Mo, 195, 'We' and Aalto 1973, 36, versus Letters, 60, and Cl, 135. The 'We' (bidani, acc.) is a pluralis majestatis, not employed in Cinggis
previous words to Sübe’etei. Cf. the sectional summary (Y’8, 11b), where the same pronoun wo ‘t is used in both passages. One wonders whether the pluralis majestatis, which is used so inconsistently in the SH (cf., e.g., § 224), was found in the original recension or is due to later editorial changes, like Činggis Qan → Činggis Qalan → Qan. In any event, such inconsistency in the usage of the first person singular and plural should not surprise us since it is well attested in the documents of the Mongol period (see, e.g., MPa, 16-21, and the important remarks in ‘Trois documents’, 454), as indeed in classical works, the Koran among them. See The Koran, 9, n. 2. Fot ba ‘we = ‘t’, cf. below, n. 201. Concerning the pronouns (ba and bide) of the first person plural, cf. Lettres, 66. The expression elone ba bösii ile meti, qolo ba bösii oyrva meti setki ‘to think that even out of sight it is like being visible, even being far it is like being near’ is, as rightly put by Ligeti (Ligeti 1971, 156), a ‘famous sentence of ancients Mongolia’—a phrase frequently used by them to overcome the feeling of separation and distance, and still now expressed in similar forms in proverbs and popular sayings. See, e.g., MCCID, I, 101; II, 51, s.v. ‘xol.’

§ 211. In §§ 200-201 the final confrontation between Činggis Qan and Jamuqa, and the latter’s demise, are recounted in epic form—one of the highlights of the SH from both the dramatic and literary points of view.

The Tanglu (< Tangnu) is the present-day Tangnu Range, i.e. the Tangnu Ola (Ula, Uul), Tannu Ola or Tagan Nurun of our maps, in the southern Tuvin Republic. Tangla (T’anglu) is also the form we find in Y’63, 1575. Cf. Hambis 1856, 291 and 299, n. 44; Pérée, 9. We are not told in which part of the Tangnu Range Jamuqa and his companions had taken shelter. The wild sheep they killed was a male wild mountain sheep or argali (uqafo, mo. uraфа, uwaфо), i.e. Ovis ammon, on which see Colmón 2002, 166.

‘Whose sons, etc.’ As already pointed out by Mostaert, Jamuqa is saying to his companions: ‘Who (lit. "the sons of whom") is so lucky today to eat wild sheep’s meat?’, or in other words, ‘You owe it to me if your lot is better than that of many other people.’ See Mo, 126; Li, 168-169, n. 200. However, Jamuqa’s remark can be understood differently. Instead of being a rhetorical question (requiring the answer ‘Very few indeed!’), these words could have been uttered in a self-mocking, sarcastic manner, the ‘sons’ being, in fact, Jamuqa himself and his five companions, once powerful leaders and now destitute fugitives. In English, the sentence would then end with an exclamation, rather than a question mark. For this interpretation, cf. Na’, 263; Ku, 154; Mu, II, 527, 336, n. 3; Do’, 211, 215-216, n. 2; O’z, Y, 48, 54, n. 2; On, 106 and n. 258 (cf. the 2001 ed. – 185, n. 461). Whatever the meaning of Jamuqa’s remark, his companions, evidently tired of their leader and of their not so enviable life as outcasts (o’ortqi, see above, n. 156), decided to hand him over to Činggis Qan.

The meaning of the alliterative message conveyed by Jamuqa to his anda is that the latter should not be mistaken about the treacherous act of Jamuqa’s former companions and condone it. The imagery used is the same as that found in Čiger Bokö’s ‘lament’ in § 111, to which the reader is referred. Common tribesmen (qaraqo, which I have rendered as ‘black skins’ to retain the colour component of the image), slaves (bo’ol) and servants (nekisin, see below) who dare lay hands on their lord and master (qan, qanen; cf. above, § 149) are compared to vile and predatory birds like black crows and grey buzzards catching noble fowls like the mandarin and wild ducks (qaramboi nogosu and borcin sono). My rendering of the names of these fowls is tentative since we do not know precisely what kind of ducks they designate. Qaramboi nogosu, or qaramboi duck, may correspond to mo qaramboi nogosu, ma. irgece niyhe ‘one name for the mandarin duck’, i.e. the Aix galericulata. See WTCWC, III, 4154.3; CMEL, 150a; O’z, Y, 54-55, n. 3. Cf. also Ra, VIII, 38-39, n. 200; Vietze 1990, 384. For the
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enigmatic borčin sono (almost certainly a borrowing from Turkic), I have followed Ligeti who renders it with "canard savage." See his detailed discussion in Ligeti 1951, 354-355, n. 25. Cf. HCG, 120; Mo, 128, n. 124. Ozawa, following Murakami, renders it as 'falcated teal' (yōshūtamago 羽毛宿), i.e. Anas falcata, but Murakami's identification is largely speculative.

See Mu, II, 337, n. 5; Oz', V, 56-57, n. 6; Oz', II, 56.

'Have gone so far! As to ...', or 'Have come (or reached) the point of ...'. For this construction, which is also found in the above-mentioned poetic passage in § 111, see Mo, 192ff.

In § 111, 'to lay one's hands on' is expressed in Mongolian with the verb gal- (on which see Mo, 52); and in § 149, 'to lay one's hands on (one's lord, lit. qan). gal-' is expressed with the single verb qarda- (mo. qardo-), whereas in § 200 we find both qarda- and the expression qaŋ-gaŋ (mo. qaŋ-kurγe), lit. 'to cause the hands to reach', which I render with 'to raise one's hands against.'

'How can you be mistaken?', i.e. 'How can you be deceived (by that)?' For these words, cf. Lettres, 61.

Nekkin is one of several terms used by the ancient Mongols to designate domestics (see Vlad, 154 and n. 7) and is glossed chiiʃan 'household servant.' Ozawa identifies nekin with the term nekkin 'to neke inql! (neke inql! to nekkin [nekin]).' See Oz', V, 57-59, n. 7. This is not likely, since in the 15th-16th centuries nekkin did not mean 'servant,' but 'a member of the retinue, a "follower," lit. 'a pursuer' (from neke- 'to pursue' + der. noun suff. -gal, on which see GWM, 46, § 153). Cf. TMEN, no. 392. It would, therefore, correspond to chiiʃan-jen (EIA or ts long- chei, not to chiiʃan. Furthermore, in the language of the SH, nekkin would have resulted in neke inql! to nekkin. Cf. degiŋa = de ʔu, nekkin = nekkin, etc. In the word nekkin 'servant' appears in this form not only in the SH (also as a proper and geographical name), but also in LH (1928), 72, in the compound nekkin bol 'female slave.' Cf. HCG, 49, for further references.
On the principle of loyalty to one's chief, see the comment in n. 149 above.

'If we become each of us like one of the two shafts of a cart, would (lit. "do will") you think of separating yourself from me and being on your own?' – a rhetorical question, which is however rendered as a statement in Cl, 137 (cf. Mo, 182, id.): 'As we are together becoming, thou thinkest of separating thyself.' See also Do, 212; Çe, 179; Es-Pop, 167. The sectional summary (Y' 8, 16a) understands differently: 'Formerly, I made you one shaft of a cart when I was the other, but you separated yourself from me.' Cf. Wa, 283. Nevertheless, in view of the presence of the converbum conditionale (bololjegoj) in the living language. See Ed, 306b. (In the case of ch. pen, we have a reverse semantic development: 'root, original') to 'proper, one's own.') On the other hand, one cannot exclude the possibility that there existed only one word, i.e. bidin = bidin (cf. tu. bita = bidin), meaning '1) one's own, proper' (?) and 2) 'whole, complete' (?), as proposed in TH, 161 (cf. JYT, 282-283).

For the verb baso- 'to encircle, surround; to obstruct', cf. Mo, 163; Oz, 60-61, n. 9.

For the epithet bopda (= bopdo) 'wise, enlightened', see above, n. 121. This is the first time it is applied to Çinggis Qan. I have followed the Chinese gloss in translating it as 'wise' instead of 'holy (or saintly)', which influences the influence of Buddhism will later become the common epithet of the conqueror.

The entire poetic passage is translated and discussed in Mo, 126-129, 193. Cf. also Lettres, 61; Li, 168-169, n. 200.
themseves swore friends and loved each other ..., and at night they slept together.' See also §§ 255 and 272.

'Although you separated from me/And went a different way', lit. 'Although you separated and went elsewhere.'

For the expression ìljetta quattq 'lucky and blessed', cf. the words spoken by Cinggis to his faithful Bo'orcú or Jeime in § 125: 'When Heaven and Earth increased my strength and took me into their protection, you, the senior ones, who for my sake came over from sworn friend Jamiqa wishing to become companions, will you not be my lucky companions (ìljeten nikót)?' It implies the sharing with sworn friends (andas) and companions (nokót) of the good fortune accorded to Cinggis by Heaven and Earth. For the connotations of the word quattq, which I render here as 'blessed', i.e. enjoying Heaven's favour (cf. eng. 'blessed' with = 'fortunate in the possession of'), see above, nn. 105 and 111. Cf. Cleaves 1950, 126, n. 247.

'When was that?', lit. 'If you say, 'When?'

On the battle at the Qalaqjit Sands and Jamiqa's action to which Cinggis Qan refers, see § 170.

The passage from 'Then', to the end of § 200 is translated and discussed in Mo, 121-124. On the second service (nasa) rendered by Jamiqa to Cinggis Qan, see §§ 195-196. For the refrain 'Slaying them with your words, Killing them with your mouth', see § 196, where these words are used by Jamiqa in relation to Tayyug Qan of the Naman. Cf. also Čerėsnodnom 1986, 70, 77, for this saying.

§ 201. For the Qorqonqaj Valley (Qorqonqaj Jubar), see §§ 57 and 104 and cor. The event in question, i.e. the declaration of andaship between Temdžin and Jamiqa, had taken place in the Qorqonqaj Valley when Temdžin was eleven (= ten) years old, as recalled in § 116, at the time when the pledge or oath of friendship was renewed after the raid against the Uduyt Merkit.

For the 'indigestible food' and 'unforgettable words', see below.
memory’ (Cl. 138) appears to be the correct one. Cinggis has a ‘long’ sessel, which here is not the ‘mind’ in the sense of ‘heart’ (hence ‘generosity, magnanimity’), but the faculty to think and remember. As in the case of ch. hisiang 甘 in the SH, see HW, 134 means both ‘to think’ and ‘to recall’. sessel has therefore also the meaning of ‘recollection, memory’. Cf. mo. sedel tigerti - to lose one’s memory; for the mind to wonder.’ See Cleaves 1949, 67 [48], 91 [48]; MA, 321b. Renderings like ‘far-sighted’, ‘generous’ and ‘patient’ are, I believe, off the mark. Útra sesselti means ‘having an extended recollection’, i.e. a good memory, which certainly applies to Cinggis in the present instance. Ta, 134, is of the same opinion.

‘All our people’, lit. ‘the people all around us’ (tògògègè elus), i.e. the Mongol tribes – in contrast to ‘all other (lit. “foreign”) people’ (qari nautum), i.e. all the other tribes. At this time one cannot yet speak of ‘nations’ and ‘realms’ (Cl. 139). Cf. Oz, V, 74 (and Oz, II, 58); On, 109. For the word tògògègè, cf. DO, 673a; for qari, see above, n. 123.

‘Now that the world is at your disposal’, lit. ‘Now that the world is ready for you.’ For these words as an expression of the political ideology of the Mongols, see Sagaster 1973, 223 ff. Cf. also Cleaves 1949, 62 [3], 83 [4]. For delege (= deleke) ‘the earth, the world’, cf. RH, 246, no. 8; MIMHS, 111, Note 117.

‘I would intrude into’, lit. ‘I shall enter.’ ‘The inner lapel of your coat’ renders Mongolian fahing-un elinu. For fahing ‘inner lapel of a coat’, cf. bur. zuin ‘pocket’ (DRS, 245b, s.v. ‘zuin II’); ysl. fævø ‘1) sides; 2) wedge, a side inset is the shape of a fold in a dress’ (SYY, 775). In other Mongolian dialects we find the word fævin ‘fahing’ meaning ‘a partition board’, ‘a square frame or door panel’, etc. (see TV, 290 [a JYT, 503-504]; cf. On, 109 and n. 261; Oz, V, 75; and 82-83, n. 8) – all meanings, however, totally unrelated to that of the Chinese gloss in the SH (ti-chin 促心 [=PI] ‘inner lapel of a coat’) which I follow since it is also confirmed by the Yakut form. The transcription fahing is undoubtedly faulty; the original form must have been fævin. In all probability, the display here the role of intercalary hiatus. fahing = faeing. Cf. qæhan = qu on (see above, n. 1). For -væ- → -æ-, see below, nn. 202, 204. However, this problem deserves further study.

‘I had many paternal grandmothers.’ As pointed out by Mostaert (apud CI, 139, n. 36), the reference is to the wives of Jamaq’s grandfather who brought him up after the early death of his parents (mentioned a little later). Jamaq wants to stress the fact that as a young boy he was surrounded by old women, emege meaning both ‘paternal grandmother’ and ‘old woman’ – hence Even and Pop’s rendering ‘j’ai été entoue de vieilles femmes’ (Ev-Pop, 169). For other interpretations of Jamaq’s words, cf. In, 285 and 286-287, n. 2; On, 109 and n. 262.

‘When I became disloyal to my sworn friend’, lit. ‘Thinking (or Feeling: sesselti) beyond (= away from) the sworn friend.’ For these words cf., however, Mo, 174; On, 139; and Ev-Pop, 289, n. 16.

‘In this life – that of the sworn friend and me’ - , lit. ‘in this life – that of the sworn friend and us’ (= one tògògègè kír anda ba qooy-an ...). In the SH, the pronoun of the first person plural ba plays, in certain circumstances such as a construction with the word qooy ‘two’ = ‘and’, the role of ‘I’ without being a pluralis majestatis. See § 255 (ivvve). Cf. mo. anda bida pluralis majestatis. See § 255 (ivvve). Cf. mo. anda bida qooy-un (Bo, 193; Du, 172; Ma, 246; Ce, 183), and anda bi qooy-un (Al, 123).

‘My fame has passed (lit. reached)” from sunrise to sunset” What Jamaq implies, of course, is that his fame has now declined. I prefer this interpretation to that of ’1 (or We) have acquired fame from east to west’ (Ha, 90; Ko, 156-157, Li, 89; Mu, II, 332; Oz, V, 75; and others), since in the following sentences Jamaq gives the reasons for his decline vis-à-vis Cinggis Qan.

‘You were born a hero’, lit. ‘You were born a hero by birth’ (tòrælki kó élík tòrælki). Tòrælki ‘birth’ = tòrælki. For tòræ- = tòræ-
‘Whose destiny was ordained by Heaven.’ For the expression tengseri-ets jaya'atu, see above, n. 1.

‘Let me die swiftly … let them kill me without shedding blood.’ It is a well-known fact that in the case of executions the Mongol regarded a bloodless death as preferable to the one in which blood was shed (see below). It was, in fact, the privilege of the qan’s close relatives and enemies of noble birth to undergo a bloodless death. However, this right originated from the ancient religious beliefs of the Turks and the Mongols, and their conception of a soul residing in the blood, was not strictly observed. Cf., e.g., § 136 and corn. Jamuga, being a tribal leader, a relative of Cinggis Qan, and his aunts, was entitled to this privilege, hence his request. In the epic account of the SH, the game is played according to the rules until the final act, but, as we shall see, this may not reflect the true course of events.

‘My bones’, lit. ‘my dead bones’ (ooluk yasun minus), i.e. ‘my corpse.’ For this expression, cf. Tomen 1965, n. 161 and n. 7; and above, n. 175. For the word ooluk (p. pno. ool) ‘dead, deceased,’ a borrowing from Turkish, see Poppe 1955, 40; TMEN, no. 621; Rassadin 1995, 113. The integrity of the skeleton, which was also the seat of a soul, and hence the preservation of bones, was essential for the spiritual survival of the individual after death. See Roux 1976, 557ff.; Even 1999, 176.

‘High place’ renders Mongolian iindur etigen, lit. ‘high earth.’ Apparently, the term etigen (= aigjen; cf. § 255) ‘Earth’ (as the counterpart of tengsere ‘Heaven’) is used here as an honorific designation for a site on earth. The Chinese gloss is ti hsr ‘earth place.’ For the custom of burying chiefs and personages of rank on elevated places such as cliffs and mountain slopes, cf. above, nn. 164, 175, and below, n. 268.

For soldur, rendered here (as in § 63) with the expression ‘the august spirit’, cf. above, n. 63. It is clear from our text that the soul of an enemy of noble birth could exert a beneficial influence over the entire family line of his conqueror. The
Mongols, like other Altaic people, believed that a defeated enemy was bound to his victor-master not only in his lifetime but also after his death. The nobler and stronger the enemy had been in his lifetime and, therefore, the greater his ‘virtue’, the more powerful was his influence in the afterlife. In order to retain his power and turn it to beneficial use it was essential that his blood, the seat or vehicle of one of his souls (the integrity of which ensured spiritual survival), should not be dispersed in the ground. However, the concept of a relation between the ‘soul’ (or ‘souls’) and the ‘virtue’ of the individual is not very clear. See MP", II, 343, 344, n. 1, 414 (cf. MP", 105, 117); MCPA, 75-81 et passim; Turan 1955, 82; Barthold & Rogers 1970, 213; Boyle 1963a, 204. On the ‘soul(s)’ and the afterlife conception of the ancient Turks and Mongols, see also Baskakov 1973; KHIV, 149ff.; Even 1999, 166-176. On the theme of bloodless killing and revenge in relation to Jampa and other personages, and in the wider context of Mongolian and East Asian cultures, see Uray-Kohalmi 1970 (esp. pp 261-262); Hambis 1975, 15 and n. 25; Heissig 1985, 142; Rauhnevsky 1987, 81. ‘Repeat them among yourselves’, lit. ‘speak them to one another.’ ‘Now do away with me quickly!’, lit. ‘Now let my sworn friend dispatch me!’ For the verb ötöle—ötöle ‘to do something immediately’, here ‘to dispatch’, see above, n. 133. Cf. Mo, 244, 228. ‘Has been railing against Us’, lit. ‘has been speaking a full mouth at (= against) Us’. For the expression aman da’uren (= da’ureng) kelele ‘(or avgöl) ‘to speak with anger; to abuse, rail’, cf. § 276 (R, 166, lines 11432 and 11503-4). ‘He is a man who should learn from experience, but is not willing to’, lit. ‘He is a man who should (or could) learn, but as for him (main), it will not do (i.e. he refuses)’, in other words, he is an obstinate, obdurate man who will not change his ways. I follow both the Chinese interlinear version and the sectional summary, taking into consideration Waley’s pertinent remarks.
history for ideological reasons. The more sober and reliable account of the Mongol chronicle utilized by Rashid al-Din informs us on the different fate of Cinggis' anda. According to the Persian historian, Jamaqa was delivered to Cinggis Qan by sixty of his followers, whereasupon Cinggis had thirty of them, i.e., the ringleaders, executed for the betrayal of their chief. Since Cinggis could not himself kill his anda, he gave him, together with the remaining rikor and all his possessions, to Eljigei Noyan (i.e., Eljigei Noyan, the son of Qa'ilun and nephew of Cinggis Qan) who, soon after and undoubtedly as part of his assent — as indeed confirmed by Rashid in another passage — had him cruelly executed by hacking him to pieces. The only possible "embellishment" in this account is the almost enthusiastic acceptance of his fate on the part of Jamaqa, who apparently encouraged the executioner in his gruesome task by saying that he would have done the same with his enemies if he had captured them. See SL1, I/1, 191-192, II/2, 277 (the "227" in CK), 245, n. 195, is a misprint); D'Oehsson, I, 91-92, EM, 178-179. Cf. Li, 169, n. 201. Rashid's account is obviously more reliable insofar as it supplies the information regarding Eljigei Noyan and the fact that Jamaqa's companions, who eventually betrayed him, were not five but (more realistically) six, with tents and possessions. A point worth noting is that in both accounts it is stated that Cinggis could not himself kill his sworn friend. The solution presented by the second account is more in conformity with what we may expect from Cinggis Qan in the circumstances. No date is given for this event, but since it occurred soon after the defeat of the Naiman and Merkit tribes and just before the 1206 qurultai, it must be placed sometime in 1205. Unfortunately, it is not mentioned either in the SWCCL or in the YS.

For an evaluation of Jamaqa's death as seen from different historical perspectives, cf. Lattimore 1978, 135-138; CK, 80-81 (= CK', 87-88, 245, nn. 191-196); CQT, I, 301-304, CXC, 90-104.
The people of the felt-walled tents' (sisegi to’urqatu ulus), i.e. all the nomadic and semi-nomadic pastoral people of Mongolia who lived in yurts (ger), to distinguish them from the forest hunting tribes of the north and the north-west, the so-called People of the Forest (hoiyn irgen), on which see below. For the special reference to ‘tug’ (sisegi, cf. above, n. 124), see CEME, 51-52. For the term wa’at ‘people/tribe’ → ‘patrimony’ → ‘domain, dominion, nation/state, empire’, see above, nn. 53, 64, 121; Vladă, 124 et passim; TQUEMC, 36ff; Buell 1980, 44ff; MEYD, 9-11; Bira 1966a, 131.

When ... had been brought to allegiance’, lit. ‘Making straight (= right, i.e. loyal)’ (sidurqatuq). For the verb sidur-qatuq (= m. sidurqatuq) → ‘to cause to be straight (= loyal)’, i.e. ‘to bring under submission’, cf. the sectional summary (Y’ 8, 27a), ‘having submitted (or subdued)’ (§ 8 ... § 9f).

The great assembly (quriltu) of the Year of the Tiger 1206 is one of the most important events in the life of Cinggis Qan. The place chosen for this momentous occasion was ground consecrated by tradition — holy ground, as it were — for it was at the very sources of the great river Onon, on Mount Burqan Qaldun, that the mythical blue-grey wolf (börte čini) and fallow doe (qal’i murad) had settled after crossing the Tenggis/Baikal, thus beginning the line from which originated all the Mongol clans as told in § 1 of the SH. Later, in Cinggis’ own lifetime, Burqan Qaldun continued to play an important role in protecting him (see §§ 100-103), and it was on its slopes that he was eventually buried by his express will (see below, n. 268). The exact area where the quriltu was held cannot be positively identified, but in view of the great number of people that must have gathered there on this and subsequent occasions with all their tents, carts, etc., it must be a valley in the proximity and east of Khenete Khan in the Great Khentei Range, possibly in the same area of the locality called Botouqan Bo orji in §§ 106 and 108. The Chinese sources confirm that the place in question was ‘at the sources of the Onon River.’ See YS’ 1, 13; SWCC’ 1, 57a.

It should be noted that our text does not refer to the gathering of 1206 as a quriltu, a term that appears only once (in § 282). However, Rašid al-Dīn employs the term quriltu (a variant of quriltu) for this occasion. See SL’ 1/2, 150. The same Chinese sources use the expression na-hai xing ‘to hold a great assembly’ which corresponds to Mongolian yeke quriltu. – For the term quriltu and for this important institution, see below, n. 282.

The white standard with nine tails’ (visin kìtši čqo’an tug). The tails or streamers, lit. ‘feet’ (kolu), were either yak- or horse-tails, and the fact that there were nine has a symbolic meaning (see above, n. 60). This was the standard of Cinggis Qan and the paramount symbol of his power. Cf. above, nn. 65, 73 and 193. See also CEME, 39. (Incidentally, the Mongol standard — given, however, as blue in colour instead of white — provided the title for Léon Cahun’s famous novel La bannière bleue: aventures d’un musulman, d’un chrétien et d’un pâion à l’époque des croisades et de la conquête mongole, Paris, 1877. This book was one of the first, if not the first, books of the kind to be translated from a European language into Mongolian. The translation was made by the leading Burait scholar C.Z. Zamcarman [1880-1937] who published it under the title of Köke Mongol-ün köke tug [The Blue Standard of the Blue Mongols]. See R.A. Rupen in HJAS 19:1956, 142, no. 23. Cf. Haining See MP’, 1, i, 222-223. Cf. also the SH, §§ 186, 219, 239, 245 and 267. They gave Cinggis Qan’s the title of qan.’ As stated earlier (see the discussion in n. 123 above), it seems that the great assembly of 1206 sanctioned Cinggis Qan’s leadership as qan of the all ‘the people of the felt-walled tents’, conferring on him at the same time the epithet of Cinggis, meaning ‘Fierce’, which the titles of qa’an and qan in became in effect his name. (For the titles of qa’an and qan in the context of the 1206 assembly, cf. Kalmykische 1978, 128, but
state, and that the Mongols adopted it after 1210 as they adopted several other titles and designations of Chinese origin from the Jurchen. *Ta Meng-kul Yeke Mongol* would then be formed in the same way as *Ta Chin kuo*, and designating the Jurchen nation and dynasty, as well as its people. This is, indeed, specifically stated in the HTSL. See ‘Trois documents’, 487; CG, 87. Cf. CG, 17, for an earlier statement to the same effect in the MTPL. For other relevant comments on the 1206 *qarita*, and on the origin and creation of the Mongolian state, see FTC, 20-22; Khazanov 1980; Kitagawa 1984; Särkkä 1993, 217; Dmitriev 1994; Bira 1996; and, especially, CK, 82-87 (= CK, 89-96). For the (supposed) key role played by the so-called shaman Kökökül Teb Tengeri (on whom see § 244-246) in both the election of Çändig Qan and the confirmation of his title, see above, n. 123; EM, 181, 204; CK, 38, 88-89 (= CK, 41, 96ff.); Kitagawa 1984, 48ff., 66-67. It should be emphasized that the SH totally ignores Kökökül’s role in either the election or the confirmation of the title. The year 1206 is, therefore, recognized by later historiography as the year of the enthronement of Çändig Qan, an event which has been variously interpreted by historians from the Yuan dynasty and on to modern and contemporary times, in China, Mongolia and in the West. Besides H. Friske’s fundamental study (FCT), see Khan 1993; de Rachewiltz 1996; and Haining 1999. For the title or, rather, epithet and name ‘Çändig Qan’, see above, n. 123.

‘Then they also (gü) gave the title of gui ong to Muqali.’ For the particle gi meaning ‘also’, see above, n. 117. *Gui ong* is the Mongolian transcription of the well-known Chinese title *kuo-wang* or Prince of State. On this title and its transcription, see DOTIC, 300, n. GC1I3R, 18; Mostaert 1935, 332-333; HCG, 363; Cleaves 1949, 96, n. 13; THHEN, nos. 355 and 625 (ong); and above, n. 96. We know from reliable sources that the title of gui ong was conferred on Muqali (one of the ‘four steeds’, see above, n. 117) in 1217 (between 3 September and 2 October 1217 according to YS’ 1, 19, or between 30

*qi’an should not be taken into account since the original text of the SH had *gun* instead.) It was, therefore, a solemn consecration of a dignity that had been conferred on him several years before but which now, for the first time, was recognized by all the Mongolian and Turco-Mongolian tribes that ‘had been brought to allegiance’, i.e. that had been conquered and brought into submission. It is reasonable to assume that from this time on the new consecration was known as *Yoke Mongol Ulus*, or *The Great Mongol Nation* (or *The Nation of the Great Mongols* according to other investigators), although no statement to this effect is found in the SH. We know that when Çändig later came in contact with north China, the Chinese called his tribal confederation *Ta Meng-ku kuo* 大興國 or *The Great Mongol Nation* (or *The Nation of the Great Mongols*), shortened to *Ta Meng-ku* ‘The Great Mongols’ (cf. ‘The Great Mogul(s)’), which is unquestionably the Chinese counterpart of the Mongolian *Yoke Mongol*, which is itself extrapolated from *Yoke Mongol Ulus*; in other words, the members of the rulling ethnic group, the Mongols, became known as ‘The Great Mongols.’ Cf. ‘Trois documents’, 486-487; de Rachewiltz 1993, 94, n. 20; idem 1994, 374ff.; CEME, 18-19; and above, n. 52, also for further references. For the other early Chinese designation of the Mongol ‘state’ (employed by defectors from north China at the Mongol court, and also found on some coins), viz. *Ta Ch’ao shih*, or ‘The Great Court’, cf. Hsiao CC 1985, and Whaley 2001. Another possible explanation for the genesis of the designation *Yoke Mongol Ulus* for the nation, then empire, established by Çändig Qan, and one which I tend to favour at present, is the following. In view of the fact that there is no evidence that Çändig named his confederation *Yeke Mongol Ulus* is merely a calque of ch. *Ta Chin kuo* 大金, ‘The Great Chin Nation’, the regular name of the Jurchen/Chin
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January and 28 February 1218 according to SL, l/2, 178; also in 1218 according to SWCCL, 72b, i.e. exactly one twelve-year cycle after the 1206 qurita. This type of error is a very common one - both 1206 and 1218 are years of the Tiger (burs il) - and it was in 1206 that Činggis restructured the army and made many new appointments. It may also have been an intentional mistake in order to anticipate the confrment of this honour and make it coincide with the year of the great qurita, but since this item of information is followed by the entry on Jebe's mission against Gūlūlik which likewise took place in 1218, the error must be a genuine one. As suggested by Pelliot (HCG, 362), the exalted title of gui ongko-o-wang, officially conferred on Muqa'li on his return to Mongolia after several years' campaigning in China, may have reflected the designation of Vicery (薩滿) which had been given to him by the people of north China, or by which he was already known there - a fact confirmed by a contemporary Chinese source (the MTPL). What Činggis Qan did in 1217/18 was then to formalize the dignity and make it hereditary. Cf. below, n. 206.

'Jebe was sent on a war mission.' For the verb ca'ara: 'to go on a campaign', cf. Mo. 181. For Jebe's campaign against Gūlūlik of the Naiman, last met in § 198, and the latter's end, see § 237 and com.

'Having thus completed the task of setting the Mongol people in order', lit. 'Having finished setting in order (bijive- [= biji-e'], i.e. pacifying) the Mongol people (Monggoljin ulan). For the form Monggoljin (= pmo. Monggoljin) 'Mongol', which is comparatively rare as a synonym for Mongol (= pmo., mno. Mongol), see the important remarks in 'Trois documents', 462 and n. 49, as well as Cleaves 1954, 122, n. 314; YSLC, 420 and n. 1; DO, 467a. For -y- -y-, cf. below, n. 204.

'I shall express my appreciation', lit. 'I shall speak words of favour' (tuyragul ike iğilisi). For the various connotations of the term tuyragul, see above, n. 147.

The redistribution and reorganisation of the Mongol population for military purposes into ninety-five units, each capable of supplying in wartime a force of approximately one thousand men (mungur = mungqat) led by a commander of a thousand (mungu-un [= mungqun-un] novan), is the first major change decreed by Činggis at the qurita. For a significant restructuring of the army prior to the final confrontation with the Naiman in 1204, see above §§ 191-192. The establishment of the ninety-five units of a thousand in 1206 is a continuation and extension of military reforms undertaken at various times by Činggis Qan, which include the creation of the three units of ten thousand (qurban tümen) formed by his thirteen camps (dorgon qurban giret) described in § 129, and even earlier (gerel giret) described in § 104 and 121). Cf. changes in the military organization (see §§ 104 and 121). Above, nn. 129 and 191. The SH lists the ninety-five units with the names of their eighty-eight leaders. The commanders of a thousand are not ninety-five because Álì Giişegen was in charge of three Onggirat units (nos. 86, 87, 88), butu Giişegen of two Ikire units (nos. 89, 90), and Aliqud Digi Quri of five Onggir units (nos. 91, 92, 93, 94, 95). Thus, the statement at the end of § 202 that the leaders appointed by Činggis were ninety-five is incorrect. The importance of these military units calls for a detailed investigation. See, provisionally, the valuable contributions of M. Honda in MKJ, 17-52 (cf. THG 4, 6; 1952, 1-12; Sz 62, 8-Aug. 1953, 1-26; RK, 9, 7-July 1961, 10-18; and PICO XXIII, 255-256); YCS, 1, 83-87; YSPC 9; 1985, 24-30; Munkuev 1977, 394; MEYD, 9-11; Fitcher 1986, 29-30. The units of a thousand as listed by Rañid al-Din are found in SL, l/2, 266-274. Cf. TDU, 446-455; and, for comparative purposes (SH and SL), the tabulation in MJK, 34-40.

Regarding the commanders of a thousand listed in this section, many, as we would expect, are Činggis' famous ñukül which we already met, such as .filePath, Muqa'li, Boroqul, Jelme, Qubilai (of the Barulas), etc.; all the others are also known from the Chinese and Persian sources. Important biographical and miscellaneous notes on them can be found in Na; 272-285, and Mu, II, 348-352. The following are additional remarks on some of the individuals leaders and their names: (1) Father Monglik
honours for the use of their illustrious posterity. See Li, 170, n. 202. Cf. also below, n. 224.

§ 203. 'Together with the sons-in-law', i.e. including the sons-in-law. Clearly, Činggis wants not only to emphasize the participation of his own sons-in-law in the leadership of the military units, but also the fact that these ninety-five units were made up with the inclusion of the sons-in-law, several of whom commanded more than one unit. See above, n. 202. The rendering 'un jour qu'il était avec ses gendres' in EV 171, is incorrect. Cf. the Chinese sectional summary (Y 8, 32a): "Činggis said, "These sons-in-law, together with the ninety-five commanders of a thousand, ....." See also Cleaves 1953, 87, n. 32 (where, however, 'ninety-five thousand chilarchs' should read 'captains of the ninety-five thousands'). Cf. Mo, 184.

'And he said (lit. "when he said") that the commanders having at their head Bo'oru and Muqūl should come', i.e. they should enter Činggis Qan's tent.

Sigī Qutuq is the sixteenth commander listed in § 202. In §§ 135 and 138 it is related how he was found as a little boy in the pillaged Tata (not Merkit as in RV, VIII, 45, n. 203) camp and how he was adopted by Mother Ho'elün - a recurring "adoption theme" in the SH. There he is called Siğikên (= Siğikên) Qutuq (= Qutuq), Siğikên being the diminutive and endearment form of Sigī. See above, n. 135. He rose to be one of the highest officials in the Mongol government and the one who supervised the census of nom China in 1234-1236 in his capacity of (veke) Jarqatî (= mo, Jarqatî), i.e. grand or supreme judge. See ibid., and below; de Rachewiltz 1960, 376-380, n. 215; KIPMX, 77-78, 193.

'Have Bo'oru and Muqūl been of greater assistance than others?', lit. 'Have Bo'oru and Muqūl been of greater assistance than whom?'

'If you want to give rewards ... lesser service?', lit. 'As to be given favours (= rewards), in does not matter what (ya'um), I was not lacking in giving assistance, in does not matter what, I
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was not lacking in giving service." Here yuva 'what?' = 'en n'importe quoi' [A.M.]. The verbal forms in -is·ali·le·e (bol·sa·a, ög·šle·e) indicate certainty, hence my insertion of the word 'surely.'

'At your noble threshold', lit. 'at your high (iändür) threshold.'

'Until this beard sprouted on my chin', lit. 'Until this much (ediš) beard as I now have grew on my chin.'

'From the time I had a piss-pot at my crotch', i.e. from infancy, but Onon's interpretation (On, 112 and n. 269 [cf. the 2001 ed., 192], following TH, 246) as 'incertitude at the crotch' is not justified. Cf. CL 143, n. 59.

'At your royal threshold', lit. 'at your golden (altan) threshold.' For altan 'golden' = 'royal', see above, n. 21. Both the 'high threshold' and the 'golden threshold' are a synecdoche for the qan's tent. See above, n. 137.

'And brought me up as her own son' (kö·ščil·jen öšgehe). For kö·ščil·je·n (a mo. kögeščil·jen) 'to treat or adopt as a son', cf. DO, 441a.

'And brought me up as the younger brother of her children.' Cf. § 135: 'The Mother ... brought him up as the younger brother of her five children and as her sixth child.' CL 143; On, 112; and Ozr, V, 110 (cf. Ozr, II, 63) understand instead 'as your younger brother.'

'Sixth younger brother.' Ćinggis Qan had three brothers (Qasar, Qaš'lin and Tenmüge), one sister (Temülin), and two half-brothers (Bekter and Belgütei), the eldest of whom, Bekter, had been killed by Ćinggis and Qasar while still a boy (§§ 60, 77). Thus, Ćinggis had altogether five brothers, all younger than himself.

'To you, my late-born younger brother' (oroq·u de·š·en čimadu). The term oroq·u, although disappeared from the later literary language, has survived in the dialects. Cf. ord. oroq·u 'në après le temps normal, tardillon (bétail)' (DO, 522a). To render oroq·u de·š as 'Adoptivsohn' as in Ratchnevsky 1987, 74, is not correct.

---

With regard to Ćinggis Qan's position vis-à-vis Sigī Qutuqa, a different tradition is recorded by Rašid al-Dîn who, in his work (SL, 11, 107; E2, 269) says that Sigī Qutuqa was adopted on Ćinggis Qan's order by Börte, who at that time had no children. Therefore, Sigī Qutuqa used to call Ćinggis Qan 'father' (ečige) and Börte 'first mother' (tereš·en eke); Ćinggis called him his 'fifth son' and Ögdöe his 'senior brother.' Cf. Ratchnevsky 1963, 89-92; ISK, 75-76. Ratchnevsky is of the opinion that Rašid al-Dîn's version is more reliable than the $H$ account (as is often the case).

'You shall be allotted the same share as (lit. "of") the younger brothers' (de·š·er·en qubi·yjar qubilašdu), i.e. in the division of the war booty and distribution of the conquered people. The sentence ending with an imperative of the second person singular (qubilašdu 'share with each other!' is rather awkward in Mongolian, and the text has therefore been variously amended: CL, 143, n. 61, suggests qubilašdun yah 'let one part'; Ozr, V, 106, writes qubilašdun 'share!' (see ibid., 114, n. 9); Į, 120, writes qubilašdu 'let me share'; etc. I think the imperative form qubilašdu can be retained. Cf. Ir, 192; El-Ar, 675, and 678-679, n. 15: Ba, II, 949. For the important term qubi 'share, part, allotment', and its usage at the time, see the literature cited above, n. 22.

'You shall not be punished for up to nine crimes' (visini aldat-sar bu aldatuq). Lit. 'you shall not (be)come culpable (or punishable) for nine crimes (i.e. breaches of the jasaq).' The basic meaning of the verb alda is 'to miss, fail, omit, lose' → 'to commit a fault, error or transgression, i.e. a crime', hence 'to become culpable' and therefore also 'to become punishable.' In legal terminology, the verbal noun aldat 'omission' means 'punishable act, crime'; the adjectives aldatsiai, aldatlan 'guilty, culpable', hence 'punishable'; and the factitive verb aldat·i·les (mo. alday·i·les), lit. 'to cause to lose; to remove' (cf. § 145) = 'to punish.' See CY, 1, 20, n. 2, 21, n. 1; the discussion in Rb, VIII, 48-49; and de Rachewiltz 1981, 56-60. Cf. also below, the remarks on the expression aldatlan boluq. To be exempted
from punishment for up to nine transgressions of the jasaq was at that time a privilege enjoyed by a small number of men, such as the daruq (pl. of daruq) or ‘freemen’, who had performed outstanding services, usually in protecting or saving the life of Çinggis Qan. See above, n. 51. For ‘nine’ as a symbolic number, see above, n. 60. Cf. Bese 1987, 47.

‘When, protected by Eternal Heaven, I am engaged in bringing the entire people under my sway’, lit. ‘When, being protected by Eternal Heaven, I am reciting (i.e. conquering) the entire people.’ Cf. § 187: ‘Under the protection of Eternal Heaven, I crushed the Kereiyit people and, indeed, gained the high throne’; and § 201: ‘You have pacified all our people; You have unified all other peoples, and the qan’s throne has been assigned to you. . . Because of this I was exalted by my sworn friend, whose destiny was ordained by Heaven.’ As already noted, the theme of protection from Eternal Heaven, or Heaven Above, runs through the fabric of the SH. Cf. also §§ 250 and 265; and de Rachewiltz 1973. The verb jükte (= mo. jügile, ‘to head for, strive after’), rendered here as ‘to bring order’, is glossed in Chinese as cheng 作 ‘to regulate, rectify’, and is interpreted as ting 作 ‘to fix, settle’ in the sectional summary (Y’ 8, 32b). The real meaning is ‘to conquer, subject.’ See Cl., 143, n. 62. Cf. the verbs śihrānqwa ‘to make straight (= right),’ i.e. ‘to bring under submission’, and ifi/bi-e, ifi/biy-e ‘to set in order’, i.e. ‘to pacify,’ in § 202, etc. (HW, 139, 89).

To be ‘Eyes to see with, Ears to hear with’ is, as noted earlier (n. 138), a set phrase or idiom describing a person who performs important services and delicate missions, and one, therefore, appropriate for a trustworthy personal assistant. This idiom is applied again to Śigi Qutuq in § 252.

‘According to the name of the people’, i.e. the grant or reward (soyarqal) would consist of apportioning (qubi qubiha-) the subject people (ırgi) among Çinggis’s family by dividing them according to their importance (here ‘name’ = ‘fame, renown’) and suitability as nomadic tribes or settled populations, as evident from the next sentence, so that the most important groups (from the point of view of exploitation) would be allotted to the more exalted members of the ruling family.

‘Splitting up those that live in felt-walled tents/ Separating those that live in dwellings with wooden doors’, i.e. the nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes living in yurts (see § 202), as well as the sedentary people living in houses with doors, lit. ‘having wood-board doors’ (qabdasun e ‘beden). For qabdasun ~ qabtasun ‘wooden board’, cf. above, n. 112. The verb iriçe ‘lå-, ‘to cause to separate, break up’, is the factitive of iriçe- ~ hirîçe- ~ hirîçê- ‘to part, separate (from)’. See above, n. 123.

‘Let no one disobey your word!’ (ken ber cêna uge buši bu bolqatqal), lit. ‘Let not anyone cause your word (= order) to be otherwise!’ For this and similar formulaic warnings against transgressing a court order or decree, cf. Cleaves 1955, 79, n. 10; ‘Trois documents’, 464. See also below the remarks on the expression aidaltan bolqatqal.

‘He entrusted Śigi Qutuq with the power of judgement over all’ (qur de ‘ere-yin jarqü tatibê), i.e. he appointed him as judge or arbitrator, in Mongolian jarqü (‘mo. jarqü’, a den. noun in -çê from jarq ‘mo. jarqü’ ‘judgement, arbitration’), later elevated to yeke jarqü, i.e. grand judge. For the term jarqü and the title and office of jarqü, cf. TMEN, no. 1784; MksLT, I, 233-263; YSLC, 129-137; Ratchevsky 1965, 105, 109-109 and n. 96; ČK, 87, ČY, I, vii, et passim (see ibid., index, 131); Ratchevsky 1987, 101ff., ISK, 777a-b (Indo-Turks). The first jarqü was Çinggis’s half-brother Belgeçï, whose appointment ‘to judge litigations and those who are guilty of theft and falsehood (lit. ‘who have committed theft and deceitful deeds’)’ (kere-ar-i qalqal qalqal avileni-i jarqü-) is recorded in § 154. See above, n. 154 (jarqün ‘= mo. jarqüla-’) ‘to judge, arbitrate’ is a den. verb in -la from jarqü. The crimes of robbery and lying are again specified in the present appointment of Śigi Qutuq: Curing theft/Discouraging falsehood (qulqulqal- ‘saq ala- for kese-e ‘= mo. kesege-) ‘to
proved. On the käke deberter and the use of blue ink in certain documents, see Pelliot 1930b, 38-42, where the relevant passage in the SH is also discussed (p. 40). In my translation I have followed his interpretation. See also Liu MS 1947; Rachnevsky 1965; 97 and nn. 37; 38; idem 1974, 479 and n. 42; ČK, 87 (= ČK, 95); TQUEMC, 39-40; ISK, 79, 80, 94, 154-155; MNTS, 220-235. In this section of the SH there is a mention of ‘script, writing’ (bičik, mo. bičel), and in the colophon (§ 282) of ‘to write’ (bölə), but just as there is no occurrence of the word farqel ‘judge’, so there is no reference to a scribe (bičeti < bičelgeč), although individuals with a knowledge of writing, i.e. of the Uighur script, such as the famous Çingis, the Uighur T'a-t'a Tung-a and the Kereyt Şira Oqlu were already with Çingis Qan in 1206. Şigi Qutanu too was apparently literate, but we do not know where and in what circumstances he learned to write. Çingis Qan was well aware of the importance of literacy in administering the new state, hence the establishment of recruitment of scholar-officials from north China (especially people of Sincid Qitan and Jurchen background) after 1210, and, of course, of educated Central Asians, but also the appointment of a tutor for his own son Úghedė for the special purpose of teaching him the script. These early scribe-secretaries played a capital role in the formation and administration of the Mongol empire and much has been written about them. See de Rachewiltz 1960, passim; idem 1966, 100f; MKSST, I, 365-463; YSLC, 137-141; ISK, 759b (Index, s.v. 'bičeti'). Cf. also TQUEMC, 34 et passim; N. Katayama in MK 17/1966, 51-66; and T. Sakamoto cited in N. Katayama 1973, 114 (On Çingis, T'a-t'a Tung-a and Şigi Qutanu, cf. also Section Three of the Introduction; for Şira Oqlu (= Orul), cf. de Rachewiltz 1966, 101 and n. 2). It is therefore possible and indeed likely, in my opinion, that the actual writing in the 'blue registers' was done for Sigi Qutunu by bičetel under his supervision. It has been suggested, and it is reasonable to assume, that the registers in question may also have been used to record Çingis Qan's fasaq if these laws were set down in writing.
however, this cannot be established since it is not clear what exactly is meant by the "decisions about judicial matters" (jarqu faraqalqasan), and some scholars are of the opinion that they may have had nothing to do with the janaj. See de Rachewiltz 1993, 98-99. Cf. EBCIZ, 7. For the term biqiq "script, writing" ( cf. tu. biqiq id.), and other terms related to writing, see TMEN, no. 717; Röna-Tas 1965, 126ff; Cleaves 1988, 161, no. 37; and RH, 309, no. 6 (where, however, biqik should be rendered as "writing" rather than "book").

"Anyone (lit. "the people") who alters it shall be guilty and liable to punishment" (ye-sukeken haran aldatan biqisqa). Similarly worded formulas (e.g. with "who transgresses [the order]" instead of "who alters it"; cf. § 224) are regularly found at the end of ordinances and decrees issued by the Mongol authorities in the 13th and 14th centuries in Mongolian (in Uighur and "Phags-pa scripts"), in the Chinese versions of the original Mongol documents, and in other languages. In the words aldatan botaqiq, lit. "they shall be ones having committed a crime (= being guilty)," it is implied that "to be guilty" is "to be punishable," and that, within the strict regime of the janaj, the guilty party shall incur capital punishment for such an offence. See Mo, 147-148, no. 144; Ligeti 1971, 148; MMHS, 102, Note 70; Cleaves 1961, 65, 67, no. 25, 69-73. Cf. also MMHS, 98-99, Note 62 (with regard to the use of the word haran); and above, what has been said about the verb aldat-

"If the Qa'an wants to reward me, let him decide in favour of granting me the people from the towns that have walls of pounded earth," lit. "If the Qa'an favours (= rewards me), let his favour decide on giving me from the towns with walls of pounded earth." That it is actually the people from the towns that are meant is clearly stated in the sectional summary (Y 8, 33a), a fact which cannot be ignored. "The towns that have walls of pounded earth" renders širo'˜ai yqoqorqat balaqasun, širo'˜ai = *sīroa, sīroya, sīroyal, sīroi = "earth." Cf. RH, 248, no. 17: Sīroa "dust." For yqoqorq = "earth" or mud-wall," cf. HIY yqoqorq (= pmo. yipunya = "wall." See Maistrel 2, 110; Cleaves

1949, 112, n. 95; and TMEN, no. 409. The word balaqasun (= pmo. balayasan) "city, town" occurs in § 151 in the plural form balajt. See above, n. 151. Cf. also §§ 248 and 265 for other references to cities with pounded-earth walls. On, 112, n. 270, suggests that Sigi Qutaq was probably referring to the towns of the Naiman in western Mongolia, but this is rather speculative. Cf. Ozl V, 117-118, n. 16. In the allocation of booty and anapages for Činggis Qan's family, of which Sigi Qutaq was a member as one of 120 Öün's adoptive sons, Sigi claims for himself, and is accorded a share of the inhabitants of the towns subject to the Mongols. Although Sigi Qutaq will, indeed, play an important role in the future distribution of the anapages, there is no doubt that, as noted by Ratchnevsky, his role in determining the share of members of Činggis' immediate family is grossly exaggerated by the author(s) of the SH, a fact that supports the theory that he may have played a part in its composition. Such distribution of shares within the family was, in fact, determined by Činggis himself and no other. See ISK, 80. Cf. Vlad., 124-125; Jackson 1999, 18.

§ 204. Činggis now recalls the services which he received from Father Mönglik, in particular the event described in § 168, when Mönglik prevented Činggis from falling into the trap set by Senggüm to capture him. He also recalls their growing up together, using the same phraseology when he addresses Jelme soon after (see § 211). Father Mönglik's merits will be taken into account when Činggis spares him after the Teb Tengeri "affair" (§§ 245-246). It is worth noting that Mönglik is among the first commanders of a thousand to be rewarded by Činggis and, indeed, the first listed in § 202, clearly showing the high esteem in which he was held at the time. See Hambis 1975, 56; Li, 171, n. 204.

"Who at birth were born together with me/When growing, grew up together with me," lit. "Who with being born . . .ÒWith growing . . ."
'How many times have you helped and protected me?'; lit. 'How many indeed have your services and protection been?'

Answer: very. See the sectional summary, Y' 8, 34b.

'Into whirling waters/Into a blazing fire', lit. 'Into water that is whirlring/Into fire that is red' — an idiomatic expression: going into a whirlpool or a blazing fire means mortal danger.

'The seat at the very beginning of this side in my tent.' This statement has caused a good deal of controversy owing to a misunderstanding of the word nu' in the expression ene nu' hala' ur-a, variously rendered as 'here in this corner' (Ll 92; cf. Ha, 92: 'hier an dieser Ecke'); 'at the base of this corner' (Mu II, 400; Cl, 145); 'of this corner-base' (Ra, VIII, 28); 'this honoured seat (Da)', 'at this corner (Do)', 'on the corner at the end of this seat' (On, 113 and n. 271, mentioning hala' ur ur yin'in tip, extremity', the 2001 ed., 194, has simply 'on the corner of this seat'); 'at this extreme point of this seat as seen from above' (Oz', p. 121; cf. Ev-Pop, 173), and 'on the first place of this side' (Oz', II, 66); 'at the principal (honourable) side', i.e. on the first seat at the right-hand (west) side of the qan (Ta 377, n. 604; Ce, 190, 441, n. 480). Ta, Ce and Oz' provide the correct interpretation. The word nu' nu' ur ur (nu') in the 13th and 14th centuries had three meanings: 1) 'corner'; 2) (geogr.) 'a plain in the winding of a river' (cf. §§ 94, 220); and 3) 'direction, quarter, side', as in dörben naka (pl.) 'the four directions or quarters of the world', corresponding exactly to tu. tört halun. See Chev 1959, 70, n. 75; TH, 139 (= JYT, 242); ED, 543b. Cf. ch. 5, 'corner, side' (CEDMU, 555c); fr. coin 'corner, spot'; etc. As for hala' ur 'origin, beginning', cf. above, n. 1. The seat 'at the very beginning of this (my) side' in Çinggis' tent was the seat next to him, in the back (= north side) of the tent. We know, in fact, from Raşid al-Din, that Möngïk's regular seat was always immediately on the right of Çinggis Qan and above other officers. See Hambis, loc. cit. Raşid's testimony settles the issue. For the elevated position in relation to status, cf. below, n. 205.

THE SECRET HISTORY

'Yearly and monthly I shall consult with you' (hon-tur sarur sarul selul), i.e. 'I shall consult with you (or seek advice from you) at all times.' There has been some speculation as to the meaning of the verb sata-, glossed lun ja and i-lun lun as 'to discuss; to consult (with) deliberate' (§ 7, 34a-b), and attempts have been made to read it as his. The verb sata- means, bestowal; alms', see MA, 314; WVD, TD, IV, 384 'to bestow alms, present offerings.' See TH, 235-236 (= JYT, 405-406); Oz', V, 123, n. 4, On, 113 and n. 272. However, the verb sata- occurs again in § 216 also glossed i-lun. Although sata- is a hapax legomenon in Mongolian, the SH glosses cannot be discounted twice. For another (in my opinion unlikely) interpretation of this word, see Ev-Pop, 291, n. 68, and the discussion below, n. 216. My own interpretation of this form is the following: There is in Mongolian a verb sedi- 'to think (out), devise, plan' (Les., 68b), which in the ET (see ET, 78b-26) and in some modern languages has the meaning 'forma, formula, sere'. Cf. e.g. kh. sedex, kalm. sef' e. See L. Ligeti in AOH 38:1984, 334, for further examples. Now, 1) in Middle and Preclassical Mongolian there are several instances of normally back-vocalic words written as front-vocalic words and vice versa (anggir - enggir, dorom - doröem, sinore - uma, ineggi - inegi, illidüüce - illidüüc, naiyum - naiyım, etc.), cf. SG, 131-133, § 68; de Rachewiltz 1982, 20; and below, n. 207; and 2) the alternation i - a is very common, see 'Quelques problèmes', 243-244. My opinion is that SH sata-' is sao. sedi-... My interpretation is supported by the AT, where the passage parallel of the SH, § 216 (AT, 69a), we find the relevant word written sidefa (cf. ATL, 150) pro sedelü. Semantically, 'to consult, discuss, deliberate' is not very far from 'to devise, plan, etc.' Such an interpretation would also explain why a word that occurs twice in the SH has apparently 'disappeared' from the literary language and all other living languages and dialects without leaving a trace. Cf also Chev 2001c, 103, n. 137.
‘I shall give you gifts and favours’ (öldże sooyarqal čimada ókis). For öldże (m) øłłgøł ‘gift’, see TMEN, no. 23, 33-84, n. 56. As for bürük, this verb corresponds to mo. bërk-t ‘to cover, cover up, envelop, obscure’ (Les., 150a). Da’ 42, confines mo. buyn ‘with mo. boyn- (kh. boox) ‘to bind, tie, bundle, wrap, envelop’ (Les., 111a), and in § 205 renders bürük as ørëxt ‘casting away, abandoning’ (Da’ 168).

‘Before we reached the circular camp with the stolen light-bay geldings’, lit. ‘when we reached the circular camp (giître en) that had stolen the light-bay geldings.’

‘Because of your brave heart’, lit. ‘by the courage (kúlik) of your mind (ê xert: xërki).’ Kúlik (m) xël, besides its usual meanings of ‘fine, steed’ and ‘commander, chieftain, hero’ (see above, n. 3, 163), means also ‘courage, bravery’, i.e. the quality that makes one a chieftain, as in the case at hand. For this passage, see Sarközi 1978, 148.

“When I sent you Belgeti to ask you to join me again as a companion,” lit. “when I, sending Belgeti, said, ‘Let us be companions!’” Cf. Mo, 195. ‘And came to join me’, lit. ‘When you came to be a companion (jëñpëng on your chernnit horse...the Three Merkit came, etc.’ Cf. Cl, 146. For Belgeti’s mission, see § 95. For ørëme (àrmìr ‘woollen cloak’, see above, n. 95.

The episode of young Temüjin being pursued three times around Mount Burqan Qaldun by the Three Merkit is described in § 102 (and referred to again in §§ 111, 145 wöd 199), but there is no mention there of Bo’orôt circling the mountain with him. For Bo’orôt’s role at the time, see the beginning of § 103.

‘Throughout the night’, lit. ‘until the night finished.’

‘One of your feet’, lit. ‘one of your two feet.’

In the brief description of the famous battle of Dolan Nemürges in § 153 there is no reference to Bo’orôt’s role in protecting Önggis from the night rain. However, in Bo’orôt’s biography in YS 119, 2946, as well as in Musaï’s biography in
all other officials. The explanation is found in John of Pian di Carpine’s description of the Mongol princely court: ‘He [Batu – I.R.] even sits raised up as if on a throne with one of his wives; the others, however, both his brothers and sons and others less noble, sit lower down on a bench in the middle, as for the rest they sit beyond them on the ground, the men on the right and the women on the left’ (MM, 57). See also ibid., 64-65. Cf. SF, 110; SDM, 386; as well as MF, I, 381. The seat or position occupied by Bo’or’u’u obviously was to the right of the qan on the raised platform, ‘above the rest of the officials who sat on the ground (the same arrangement applies to Muqali, see § 206). The term de’re has special ‘vertical’ connotations, the model being Heaven Above (de’re tengerti), under which come the qan on his raised throne, his family and the rest of the officials sitting at different levels according to their rank. Physical elevation was for the Mongols (as for most other people) a status symbol, hence also the predilection of chiefs for burials on mountains that we have already discussed, and the lifting of the qan on the white felt carpet when he was elected, the symbolism compounded with three or nine prostrations, etc. See JWC, 187-188, 252, n. 16, 568, n. 50; cf. D’Ohsson, II, 10, 199, 254; de Rachewiltz 1960, 247-250, n. 116. Within a given level, status was indicated by positioning according to orientation, both along east-west and south-north directions. For the word sa’uri – sa’urin (= m. sa’urin)[r] ‘seat, station’, cf. Cleaves 1988, 158, n. 18; and above, n. 142.

The SH informs us that, on the same occasion, Bo’or’u’u was also put in charge of the ten thousand men or myriarchy (tamen) of the right or west wing (lit. ‘hand’) (b Zu’u’an qan) of the Mongol army. This wing included the Xiongnu tribes inhabiting the region extending westwards to the Altai Mountains or, as the SH says, ‘using the Altai as a pillow’ (Altai deregelten). For the interpretation of this expression I follow the Chinese sectional summary. See 7/8, 39a. CI, 147, n. 76, understanding ‘which live in front of the Altai Mountain’; cf. Oz’, II, 68: ‘depending on (as adjoining, by) the Altai Mountain(s)’; Ev-
COMMENTARY

ISK, 12 (Editorial Note). The promise made by Chinggis Qan was, of course, to reward him in the way described should his prophecy come true.

'The shall henceforth seat on a seat [above all others].’ The text merely says sa ura de ere sa uqaa ‘sitting on a seat,’ but from the sectional summary (Y2 § 405b) it appears that the original text had (as in § 205) birin-ü de ere sa uqaa, hence the restoration of the missing words in my translation.

With regard to the title gai oong, we have already seen that the references to it in § 202, as in the present one and also in § 220, are anachronistic. See above, n. 202. Like Bo’orbu, Muqali was appointed commander of a thousand (see § 202, no. 3), as well as of ten thousand. The first unit of a thousand was the left wing of the army (Minqaq) of the left wing composed of his own tribesmen, the Guliun U’a, 18-20, 22-23; Jalayir, belonged to him. Cf. SL, l2, 270; MJK, 18, 171, n. 206. As tumen-ü noyan, he was entrusted with the supreme command of the left or east wing (je’ün qar) of the army whose effective were drawn from tribes inhabiting the eastern Mongolia up to the Qara’ün Jadun Mountains in the southern Great Khingan Range (see above, n. 183). North China was regarded as a natural extension of this region and, therefore, it also fell under Muqali’s control. His future leadership of the campaign in north China against the Jurchen/Chin state is a logical consequence of this appointment.

‘Which extends eastwards up to the Qara’ün Jadun Mountains,’ lit. ‘using the Qara’ün Jadun as a pillow.’ Cf. above, n. 205 ad fin.

§ 207. On Qorui’s prophetic words, see § 121. Cf. Vlad’i, 137.

For the alliterative saying ‘When it was wet, you suffered with the wet with me; When it was cold, you suffered the cold with me,’ which occurs again, but in a different context in § 213, see Cerenosdnon 1966, 47. Cf. Gsambd, 1968, 111, 125. For nobbi ‘to be wet,’ cf. DO, 495a: nobbi ‘être mouillé jusqu’aux os.’ For the connotations of both nobbi and kohbi ‘to be cold.’

'Indeed, you have constantly been' (bohita yatubba fe ci). As in many other instances, yatu- functions here as an auxiliary verb of continuity. See above, n. 15 et passim.

'Benevolent spirit' renders the Mongolian nendi qutug – a puzzling expression, the exact connotations of which escape us. In the interlinear translation it is glossed as fes-then igit 'a spirit (deity, god) that brings good fortune (or happiness), a benevolent spirit.' The same expression occurs in § 231 in the form nendii'ut (pl.) qutug, where only the word qutug is glossed as fes-then. In §§ 105 and 109, fes-then renders also qutug = qiduq (= qutug). See FHW, 73, 70. In the sectional summary of § 207 the expression is not translated, while in that of § 231 it is likewise rendered as fes-then ('Y' 10, 44). It may be that the very element of the two-word compound was no longer understood by the Ming translators in the second half of the 14th century, the whole expression was taken as meaning 'benevolent spirit(s)' ('divinities bienfaisantes' [A.M.]). The passage corresponding to § 231 in the AT', 75b, has erred qutug-tan, undoubtedly a copyist's error for nendii'at qutug-tan. Cf. ATL, 164; LDAT, 164. On the evidence of its plural form nendii'ut, Pelliot suggested an original (sing.) nendii. See PE, 80, n. 3: 'hindiq'; and 'nendii 207, nendii'ut 231; suppose nindi[u]k' (nun.). Cf. RA, VIII, 30, 53-54. In the SH a word ending in a vowel can also have a plural in -ut, -at. Cf., e.g., aqaqii'ut (pl. of aqaqii 'pied, multicoloured') in §§ 124 and 170. See FHW, 4, Street 1900a, 368 (6.8) and n. 166. There has been much speculation as to the meaning of nendi, but in my view most of the more recent interpretations are unconvincing. See OZ, V, 143 (followed by On, 114 and n. 275): nendi = nendi 'peaceful' (On: 'strong'; cf. the 2001 ed., 196 and n. 486); cf. OZ, II, 69: 'tutelary spirit' rendering nendi qutug; G, 739, n. 609: nendi = nendi 'peaceful'; furthermore, 'even more', hence 'eminent, superior' (? following Ko, 559); Mä, 253: nendi = erkin degedi 'highest, most distinguished' (nendi qutug = 'the greatest blessing'). Cf. Do', 175, n. 3. Earlier scholars suggested that nendi qutug may have been the name of a kind of tutelary spirit or god in the religious (shamanistic) system of the 13th century Mongols. Cf. FH, 73, s.v. 'huni', GMGL, 176, and Yao-la, II, 256; § 207, n. 1. Cf. Ja, 312, n. 2. I was also of this opinion and in Ra, VIII, 54, put forth the idea that by nendi'ut qutug were perhaps meant the tutelary spirits and household gods later known as onggod, the felt images ('dolls') of which are described by 13th century travellers. See SF, 36, 174, MM, 9, 95-96; BCA, 17-18; RTEM, 354 et passim. Subsequently, however, a note in El-Ar referring to the expression in § 231, not to that in § 207, has prompted a new interpretation. El-Ar, 760, n. 5, equates nendi'ut with arjyn nandii 'sacred' (lit. 'pure/sacred-noble/sacred), but without giving any supporting evidence. See C, 192 and 443, n. 459, where nendi qutug is explained as arjyn (or sayin) qutug 'sacred (or good) spirit.' I think that El-Ar may have unwittingly hit the nail on the head by introducing mo. nandii. This word has an interesting history: it goes back to Sanskrit, where we find nanda ( < nand to 'rejoice') 'joy, prosperity, happiness; name of one of the Naga-king:s'; nandi 'the happy one'; and nandra 'rejoicing, gladness.' See SED, 526c-527b.

Nanda occurs also in the form nando in compound proper names. Cf. MV, 164, no. 3239; BHSD, 290a; BTD, 239, no. 3241. With the adoption of Buddhism by the Mongols, sk. nando, nandi and nandii passed into classical Mongolian in the form Nandi as a proper name (cf. ET', 515; AT', 13b), and into classical Mongolian and the modern literary language as nando (nandi) with the meanings of 'joy, happiness; precious, noble, venerable, sacred.' See Kow, 602b, L., 564b; MKT, 337c; MED, 231a. I think it possible that, at an earlier stage, also the Sanskrit form nando (~ nanda) passed into Mongolian (possibly via Uighur?), where it became *nando ~ nandii. Cf. mo. Balbo ~ Balbo ( < tiub Balpo) 'Nepal.' In the language of the 13th and 14th centuries, the passage of a word from the front- to the back-vocalic class and vice versa is well attested. Cf., e.g.,
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and 2; NCHK. 1, 5, 9, 60, n. 55, 120, n. 55; Cleaves 1956a, 395 and n. 21; Ligeti 1966, 124; Hambur 1957, 32-34; idem 1970a, 175-178. They were two of the People of the Forest (bái-yín yingen) and they are mentioned again, as Tó’èles and, incorrectly, as ‘Tenlek’, in § 239. The People of the Forest, first mentioned in § 202, were tribes of forest-dwelling inhabitants the vast region extending from the upper reaches of the Irysh, the Erdii of the SH, to the Yenisei and Angara rivers, and covering the former Uryankhai Territory, i.e. Tanuu-Tava (Tuva AO, now the Tuvin Republic in the RF). As is evident from their designation, the other Mongols regarded them as being different and somewhat beyond the pale, largely because of their remoteness and mode of life, but possibly also because of their more pronounced ‘Turkish’ component. On them, see SL 2, 1, 4; 5, 4; 2, 47, 49, 84, 120. Cf. Vlad. 2, 98ff.; HCG, 184, 185; Ratchevsky 1908a, 127, 132, n. 6.

With regard to the two commanders Taqqi and Asiaq mentioned together with Qorq, the former must be the Taqqi of § 202 (no. 24), i.e. Taqqi Ba’arur of the Sudus, on whom see above, n. 151. The latter is almost certainly the Asiaq Güregen of § 202 (no. 83). For the expressions ‘this way or that’ (ejin tevin), and ‘without agreement (= permission’) (eye ije-ii-dëgela), see above, nn. 102 and 171.

‘He should not hesitate to kill them’, lit. ‘why should he hesitate?’ As if the question in pronouncements of this kind in Mongolian, the rhetorical question invariably implies the enforcement of capital punishment. Cf. CL, 148, n. 82.

§ 208. Jurcdédi of the Uru’ut (Urit) tribe, the hero of the battle of Qalaqalj Sands, is the sixth commander of a thousand in the list of § 202. The momentous events recalled by Činggis Qhat in the beginning of this section are related in § 171 of the SH, where Jurčédi is referred to as ʿUncle Jurčédi (Jurečedi Ebin). See above, nn. 130 and 171. For sworn friend (anda) Quyldar’s

ámare-arana ‘north’, dívíne-darona ‘east’, anggan-engken ‘the most...’, ‘the very...’, soyna-soyna ‘to instruct’. See above, n. 204. I think, therefore, that *nando * nandu could easily have become nendu (nendō) is phonetically impossible in Mongolian, with the basic meaning of ‘prosperity, happiness’ (as in Sanskrit), which, in combination with qandu, would yield the very rendering of the Chinese gloss (es). This is to a large extent speculative, but it could provide a satisfactory explanation of both the problem of the Chinese gloss(es), and of the fact that the word in question has apparently (but only apparently) disappeared from Mongolian without a trace after the 13th century.

‘If the prophecy comes true (jib bolu’sas).’ For the expression jib bol ‘to become right’, i.e. ‘to be fulfilled’, cf. Cleaves 1948, 319-320.

For Qorq’s request of thirty women as a reward for the fulfilment of his prophecy, and on the subsequent (and not trouble-free) realization of his wish, see §§ 121 and 241.

Qorq was a Ba’arin (Blarin) and one of the commanders of a thousand appointed by Činggis Qan in 1206 (§ 202, no. 4). The 3,000 Ba’arín troops already belonged to him, hence the words ‘on top of’ (de’ero). ‘Make up a full ten thousand’ is, literally, ‘filling ten thousand’ (ámare d’arća). The unit of ten thousand of which Činggis had thus put him in charge together with the two other commanders Taqqi and Asiaq (on whom see below) consisted of troops from the Činös, Tő’ölös and Tèlengit tribes. The text speaks of the Činös of the Adarkin.’ On the Adarkin tribe, see HCG, 57-58, 60, 300. As remarked by Pelliot, op. cit., 135 and 300, the association of the Adarkin with the Činös (on whom see ibid., 131-137) is not clear. Cf. SL 2, 226; and LI, 172, no. 207. Ne’ 295, says that the Činös had been dispersed—presumably after their defeat at Dalän Baljut (see SH, § 129)—and had become the subjects of the Adarkin, which would then explain their designation in this passage of the SH. On the Tő’ölös (Tó’èles > Tölös > Tölö) and the Tèlengit (pl. of Téleng), see IOD, 146, n. 21; HCG, 308; NHHSO, 142 and nn. 1
troops) along the eastern bank of the river. See § 175. For Jürçedei’s contemporaneous mission to the Onggirat chiefs (Terge Emel and others) of Lake Buyur, i.e. the Buur Nórig, see § 176.

For Činggis’ arrival at Lake Batun, Jürçedei’s reconnoitring and the Kereyt’s defeat, see §§ 182-183 and 185. Jürçedei was with Činggis and the other companions of Lake Batun. On all these events, cf again Cleaves 1955a, 367ff.

‘With our strength increased by Heaven and Earth.’ For this expression, cf §§ 113, 121, 125, and above, n. 113.

‘Being cut off’ renders Mongolian өңгөлдөлдөл following the Chinese gloss. See Cl. 144; id. This is an obsolete word, the verb өңгөлдөл- having disappeared from the literary language and the dialects. The verb is a denominative one in -t from *өңгөл ‘blade, axe.’ Cf. bur. өңүүд (BRS, 470a). See Oz’, V, 155, n. 4.

‘Lost heart’ renders өңүүдү жоопурукту, lit. ‘their minm was broken.’ For this use of өңүүд ‘minm, countenance, appearance’ = ‘daring, will to fight’, see above, n. 196. Cf. Cl. 149, n. 37.

Ong Qan’s younger brother Jaqa Gambu had two daughters, one of whom was taken by Činggis Qan and the other was given to Tolui. Because of this relationship, Jaqa Gambu was allowed to retain control of his own subjects after the defeat and disintegration of the Kereyt tribes. There is, however, no previous reference in the SH to Jaqa Gambu’s subsequent (‘second’) rebellion and of Jürçedei’s role in capturing and executing him. Baaqa Beki was Jaqa Gambu’s eldest daughter whom Činggis had taken for himself. See § 186.

‘He disguised his life,’ lit. ‘He deployed (or exposed) his life’. For öрөр, cf. mo. өрөр ‘to set in order, arrange’ (Les. 643b). Olamol- ‘to fight to the death’ is a denominal verb formed on t. ölөм ‘death’. It has the secondary meanings of ‘to press on (regardless)’ and ‘to strive fiercely’ which are found elsewhere in the SH (§§ 254, 281), and in later texts. See below, n. 254. Cf. HW, 124; TH, 126 (= JYT, 221). It is with the latter accretation that Oz’, V, 153 (cf. Oz’, II, 71), On, 116 (cf.
rendering of the verb *setki* in this section to avoid a monotonous repetition.) The 'great principle' (*yeke törö*) is mentioned again in § 220 as such, and in § 252 as *yeke yuva* 'the great power.' Although in neither case the meaning of the expression is spelled out, it is clear from the individual contexts that it referred to one of the cardinal principles, if not the very cornerstone, of the *fanay*, viz. the principle of mutual obligations between lord and subject governing all relations between the two: from below loyalty and obedience to the *quen,* and from above protection and due reward for good services to the retainer. Cf. the case of Qulan and Naya'n in § 197, and the ones in §§ 220 and 252. For *yeke törö,* cf. also *Materiel I,* 10 (6t, 1), 26, where reference is made to the same principle. His 'brought together the people/Who had become divided/Him united the people/Who had scattered.' Cf. the poetic passages in §§ 56 and 104 where the same phraseology is used. The unification of the tribes by Cinggis Qan is a recurrent theme in the SH, underlining what was undoubtedly regarded as his greatest achievement by his contemporaries. For the expression 'they should not disobey my words,' see above, n. 204.

'They are not to abolish Ibaqa's rightful place among my wives.' Cinggis Qan means that, in spite of the fact that Ibaqa Beki was given to Jürchedi, she should continue to be regarded as holding the status she had earlier held as a *quen's* wife, i.e. she would not lose the (hereditary) privileges associated with her former rank by marrying Jürchedi, evidently an exceptional favour in the circumstances. 'Gave you two hundred servants as dowry (ingtes).' The *ingtes,* pl. of *ingte* (= *ing*; cf. § 43; but see below), were the servants and maids who, as part of the bride's dowry, followed her to her new household to which they remained attached, their status not being dissimilar, apparently, from that of domestic slaves. See *Les.,* 411b, s.v. 'ingts.' A good deal has been written on this early Mongol institution. See *Vlad.* 70, 82, 85, 127, n. 6; *Cleaves* 1950, 54-55, n. 184; *ESYD,* 3, 82.
n. 8, Ebisawa 1969, 57-61; Mu, I, 48, n. 4; MSDK, 133 et passim; MTSK, Index, 21a; Aubin 1975, 547 and n. 52; Shirawa 1988; TH, 109-100 (= JYT, 194-195). Cf. also Rachewsky 1976, 511-512; idem 1987, 72; Pinin 1988, 770; Sertuys 1945, 130. For the term infi (‘ingle’s), see TMEN, no. 670 (where, however, the terms infi and emfi [see above, n. 137] have been erroneously related); for its Chinese counterparts, see Cleaves, loc. cit. It should be noted that in the corresponding passage of the AT, the text has infis, not ingiles (AT, 66a); this was almost certainly the original form in the SH.

The SH Uru’tut (Uru’étut) was Jürçede’i’s own tribe. See above.

‘To remember you’, lit. ‘as your souvenir’ (geyertes-iyen). On the term gertyes (‘ger’eti’es’) ‘souvenir, keepsake’, see Cleaves 1949, 110-111, n. 82. For the stearwes (ba ur’ilin), see above, n. 124. On the name Aliqiq (of Turkic origin), cf. Bese 1978, 356, no. 4. Aliq (= Aliy) Temit is, likewise, a Turkic name, meaning ‘Useful Iron.’

‘As to your four thousand Uru’utu, you will be in charge of them, won’t you?’, lit. ‘Will you not be in charge, you, of your four thousand Uru’utu?‘ — a rhetorical question. Cf. ‘Trois documents’, 465. The four thousand men under the command of Jürçede’i formed the unit assigned to him by Ççagis (no. 6 in § 202). As pointed out by Ligett (Li, 172, n. 209), in Radif al-Dīn’s work (where Jürçede’i is confused with his son Keteli throughout) the account of how Ibaqa Beki was given to Jürçede’i is quite different from the one told in the SH. See SLI, I/1, 186; I/2, 271. Cf. also HCC, 7, 236-237; Vldl, 85. There is a biography of Jürçede’i in YSII 120, 2962-2953. More than three fourths of § 208 are found in the AT version (ATI, 65a-66a; cf. ATL, 138-141; EDAT, 147-149).

§ 209. Chapter Nine of the SH has been translated in full, with annotations and a glossary, by Kuo-yi Pao in 1965. (Kuo-yi Pao is the Chinese name of Professor Unneschin of the Khorchin Borjigin clan.) See Pao, and the reviews of this work by H. Sertuys in MS 24:1965, 477-480; N. Poppe in CAJ 11:1966, 234-235; and Hashimoto Masaru in TYGH 52:1969, 85-95.

The Qubilai mentioned in this section is Qubilai of the Barulas, one of the so-called ‘four hounds’ (dörben noqal). See above, n. 195; Li, 172, n. 209. His appointment as head of all military affairs is, however, immediately qualified by Cinggis Qan’s statement to the effect that he would share command of a miqqan with Bedu’in of the Dörben. He is the eighth commander of a thousand listed in § 202.

‘You, Qubilai, Jelm, Jebe and Sibete’eti — these “four hounds” of mine’, lit. ‘These, Qubilai, Jelm, Jebe and Sibete’eti, you my “four hounds.”’ Sibetegeti is the written form of Sibete’eti (= Sibet). See above, n. 199.

‘Directing you to the place I had in mind’ (sekkxen-sur jori’ilal), or ‘directing you to what I aimed’, i.e. ‘towards that which I had in view’ (CL, 151, n. 1). Cf. Mo, 44. However, specific reference to the ‘place’ (q’ilar) where Cinggis had directed his ‘four hounds’ is made after the next poetic passage.

For the phraseology and imagery of the poetic passage, cf. §§ 72 and 147; Bese 1969, 130; Ceresondom 1986, 77. Cf. also Vlad, 115. For qii‘: ‘to attack’, cf. above, n. 147. As for nitul: ‘to kill, butcher, slaughter’, in the presenct context it has the meaning of ‘to cut off, cleave’, not registered in Lës., 566b, but found in Kow., 658b, s.v. ‘nitula’ (‘copper’). Cf. Gol., II, 26c; MGDD, I, 504c.

In this section of the SH, the author, writing with an eye to posterity, enumerates the members of the select group of Cinggis’ paladins in whom he had complete trust, viz. the ‘four hounds’ (Qubilai, Jelm, Jebe and Sibete’eti), the ‘four steeds’ (Bo’orq, Muqalq, Borolq and Cila’un, called here Cila’un Ba’atar as in §§ 163 and 177), as well as Jürçede’i of the Uru’utu (just mentioned in § 208) and Qiyildar of the Mangaut (whose death is described in § 175). Bedu’in (pmo. Bedu’ün; cf. AT, 31b, 66b) is the Moli Bedu’ün (‘Bedu’ün the Carpenter’) of § 120, a chief of the Dörben. In our passage, Bedu’ün is criticised by Cinggis Qan.
on account of his mofiricy (AT, 66b; mofiricy), a term rendered in the Chinese sectional summary as ‘stubborn(ness)’ (geb), but left untranslated in the interlinear version. This is a denominative noun in -raqi(r)-ke; mo. -raqi(r)-ke), designating an abundance of something (see GWM, 43, § 134), from mofirj, a word unattested in Mongolian. In view of the Chinese rendering, mofiricy must be related to mo. mofir,j, mofirj: ‘to have a squinting eye’, which in Khalkha has retained also the meaning of ‘to behave obstinately.’ See Les., 554b; Cev., 348b, s.v. ‘mofir.j’ and ‘mofiricy’. Hence it must also be related (as suggested by Pao, 47, n. 18) to mo. mofiricy ‘squinting, slanting’ (Les., 554b), and, presumably, also ‘obstinate’, a meaning that has, however, not survived in the literary language and the dialects. The nearest approximation is bur. mofiricy ‘awkward, clumsy, stupid’ (BRB, 298b). See TH, 228 (= JYT, 392-393); Oz’, V, 167, n. 3. For o – u (mofir, – mofirj), cf. ‘Quelques problemes’, 268-269. Although the term mofiricy may well have been used in relation to Bedu’iun because of its similarity in sound to his sobriquet Moch, it is clear from the above that there is no semantic relationship between mofirj (< *mo[h] ‘tree, wood’) ‘carpenter’ and mofirj ‘stubborn(ness)’; therefore, to interpret the name Mochi Bedu’iun as ‘Bedu’iun the Stubborn’ (Doj, 256, n. 3) is unwarranted. We do not know in what way Bedu’iun had manifested his stubbornness vis-à-vis Cinggis Qan so as to incur his displeasure, and there is no further mention of this personage in the SH. For the expression ‘I was displeased with him’ (bi ma’ali nu’u yoful), cf. Mo, 195; ‘Trois documents’, 466; and Aalto 1973, 36.

‘And he added’, lit. ‘Further, he said.’

§ 210. On Qunan of the Geniges, the seventh commander of a thousand in the list in § 202, see § 122. Although our text says that Cinggis Qan spoke to Qunan, the actual order is directed to the other commanders, i.e. the commanders of a thousand Bo’oruc and Muqali, and the chamberlains (cerbin; see above, n. 120) Dode, Dowquilu and others, in favour of Qunan, hence
that they were always honest and sincere, and completely trustworthy. This whole section (§ 210) gives the impression that it has been introduced for the express purpose of illustrating and extolling such qualities. For gabfr (to conceal), cf. TMEN, no. 1372; Sizon 1996. As pointed out by H. Serruys (p.c.), the final sentence in CI, 152 (‘These are the four’), is not a separate sentence; these words are in apposition to the subjects (Qunan, etc.).

§ 211. On Jelmé of the Uriangqai (Urtiangqai), one of the ‘four hounds’, and his fatter (Old) Jarčiʿudai the smith, see § 97, where the events to which Çinggis Qan refers are related. For these episodes, cf. also Vadiʿ, 112.

For the form yưreg (yưreg-e = kûlûrg) (‘smith’s’ bellows), see above, n. 97.

For the refrain ‘Who at birth ..., When growing …’, and the designation ‘frontmate and blessed’ (ilfeini qatqana), cf. § 204. See above, nn. 200 and 204.

‘Has its origin in the sable swaddling-clothes’, lit. ‘has as its origin the sable swaddling-clothes.’

Jelmé is the ninth commander of a thousand listed in § 202; however, his name is missing in Rašid al-Din’s list of these military leaders. As pointed out by Ligeti, this was probably due to his advanced age. Instead of him, his son Yisî Buqa Tašî is listed as the commander of the second unit of a thousand of the left wing. See Li, 173, n. 211. Cf. SL, 2, 270-271.

§ 212. On the appointment of Tolun of the Qongqoton as chamberlain (čerbi), see § 191 and com. He is listed (no. 12) as ‘Tolon’ among the commanders of a thousand in § 202 (for Tolun instead of Tolun, cf. below the name Turqan, which in the Chinese sectional summary [Y'9, 7b] is transcribed Torqan – a common confusion since in Uighur-Mongol script the letters o and u are identical). According to Rašid al-Din, Tolun was a son of Father Mônglik. See SL, 2, 176, 268. The same source (p. 268) lists him among the commanders of a thousand of the right wing. We are not informed, however, as to the role of his
father and of Turuq (Toroq) to which our text refers. Cf. Li, 173, n. 212. Pao, 51, n. 36, makes Turuq a brother of Tolun, which is speculative. See Na', 305.

'Being one of the two wings of (lit. "from" = "belonging to") your father', i.e. assisting him in the task at hand, namely the 'gathering' (â conquering) of the tribes. Cf. the sectional summary (Yâ 9, 7b): 'Because you helped your father in gathering the people, I thereby gave you the title (or status) of čerbi.'

'You strove together' (jikidâljû). In the SH, mo. jikidâ- 'to pull; to endeavor, strive, exert oneself' (Les., 1049a), occurs in the forms jikidâ- (§ 121), jikidir- (§ 177), fitgir- (§ 195), and jikidî- (§§ 205, 212). Cf. 'Quelques problèmes', 271. Pao's comments on this word (Pao, 50, n. 35) are not pertinent.

'That you have acquired yourself and constituted as your own patrimony' (êrênin olujan jôfêkên). For jôfê- (mo. jôge-) 'to amass; to gradually constitute as one's own patrimony' in association with ol- 'to find', see Mo, 254-255. Cf. §§ 221, 222; above, n. 92; and, especially, below, n. 224.

§ 213. On the steward (bâ urêl) Önggür of the Baya'ut, see § 120, where he is mentioned for the first time together with 'the three Toqaraun brothers', i.e. Qa'dan Toqaraun, Qaraqai Toqaraun and Qaraqal Taqaraun of the Jaliy tribe, and 'the five Taqar', i.e. Qa'dan Daulurqan and his four brothers. Önggür and the other sons of Monggeti Kiyän led both the Baya'ut and the Cângâl'ut. (For Monggeti Kiyän, see above, n. 80; Önggür, being his son, was Çinggis Qan's first cousin.) Önggür and Boru'ut (Boro'oz, see above, n. 157) were both put in charge of vahtals - an important office. Cf. Ratchevsky 1970, 420, n. 21. Önggür is the thirteenth commander of a thousand listed in § 202. In SL, 2/2, 272, he is mentioned as a commander of a thousand of the left wing and the person in charge of food preparation. See Pelliot's long note on Önggür, the Baya'ut and the Cângâl'ut in HCG, 79-112. Cf. also Li, 173, n. 213. On the relationship between Monggeti Kiyän and Önggür, see W.K. Park in MH 2:1994, 48-62. In the present section, the name Toqaraun (§ 120) is in the plural form Toqara'ut, cf. Poppe 1975, 166.

'You ... have formed one camp for me', lit. 'You ... became one camp for me', i.e. they together made up one circular camp (gûre'en) when they came to submit to Çinggis Qan, then Temûljin, as related in § 120 (see, ad fin., the reference to Qarûl and others who 'also came as one camp').

'In the fight' renders Mongolian bulya-tur (= pmo. bulya-tur) which would normally be translated as 'in the rebellion'; it is in fact glossed thus in the SH (9, 8a: bulja), and is consequently rendered as 'in the revolt' in CL, 154. However, the meaning of 'fight, battle' of bulja is well attested (see 'Trois documents', 492-493, n. 85) and it does certainly apply here.

For the words 'When it was wet ... with me' in the poetic passage, cf. above, § 207.

As on previous occasions, I render the word sovurqal, which occurs frequently in these sections, as "favour" as well as 'reward.'

'Scattered about' renders bura tara, an expression of the 'pêle-mêle' or 'harum-scarum' type which is quite common in Mongolian. The second element is undoubtedly tara- 'to disperse, scatter' (Les., 779b); the first element (bura) is, I think, chiefly phonetic. This expression is attested in one of the Mongolian documents in the Turfan collection in Berlin (Toûay's rescript of 1352). See MPt, 220 (line 6); MBT, 174 (70b), where it is rendered 'in alle Richtungen.' Cf. eng. 'hither and thither.' It has also passed into Manchu. See Ligeti 1960, 236-237. Cf. Or., V, 187, n. 4.

For the 'reconstitution' of the Baya'ut tribal grouping whose other leaders - Önggür's 'brothers' (aqa de'a) - had evidently been dispersed as a result of the political and military events prior to Çinggis Qan's enthronement, and the formation of a Baya'ut contingent which also comprised Cângâl'ut tribesmen, all under Önggür's command, cf. Vlad., 65 (where the 'Wanguur in line 7 is a misprint for 'Önggür'); and HCG, 80-82.
Thereupon, Cinggis Qaan ordered, "Yes, be it so!" [...]. When he (= Onggir) spoke (ke'e'sai), Cinggis Qaan said, "Yes, thus! (je teyin)."); For the expression je teyin, cf. the expression je teli (deli). "Yes, be it so!", lit. "Yes, that!" = "Enough of it!" in § 246. See Mo, 173.

"Bring together your Baya'ut brothers and you take command — a thousand!" i.e. with your and their men form a unit of a thousand!" The syntax of the original is awkward: Baya'ut aqa de-a-yen ci'ulajfu ci mede minqan, instead of ci minqan mede. For the expression minqa(n) mede- to be in charge of a unit of a thousand", cf. § 225 (R, 129, line 8802). However, as suggested by Mostaert (u.n.), the word minqan in our sentence must be taken in isolation: it follows the command for emphasis. Therefore, there is no need to amend the text, as some have done, particularly since the corresponding passage in the AT confirms the reading of the SH. See AT, 67b: ci'ulajfu ci mede: kemehe: (the copyist's side 'correction' of kemehe to mede is unwarranted the kemehe of the AT simply stands for the ke'en of the SH). Cf. also I'a, 149: ci'ulajfu ci ede. minqan.

For the poetic passage beginning 'Do not let it fall short' (ala dawa' ulan), see 'Trois documents', 463. 'My throat (lit. 'gullet': qo'odai) will not choke', i.e. 'I will not choke with sorrow thinking of those who have not received their share of food' See Mo, 205.

'He large kumis pitchers' renders the expression yeke tiisarge 'large tiisarge'. The original meaning of the Chinese gloss and the context of the earlier occurrence of this word in § 130, I take it to mean a 'pitcher' or 'jug' used to pour kumis - 'cruche' in Mostaert's translation (ibid.). The idea of pouring is implicit since tiisarge is a deverbal noun in -atep -napq-e of tiisarc -to pour.' Cf. the modern literary meaning of tiisarc 'watering can' (Les., 857b). Cf. kh. tårøg id. The yeke tiisarge were the large pitchers or vats containing kumis ready to be served; they were placed on the bench near the entrance of the tent, and are known to us through medieval travellers' accounts. See H.
and Tayčči‘ut (Kököçü, § 119), where they had been abandoned after the fight.

`She placed you close to (lit. “in, by”) her legs (or feet): kölf’, i.e. to her body, for warmth, under the blanket. See Ev-Pop, 292, n. 7, for the Mongol custom of keeping children and old people warm in bed. Cleaves translates ‘in her legs’, i.e. between her legs, and explains in a footnote: ‘In order to wash you, dress you, comb your hair, etc.’ (CI, 155, and n. 20). Cf. Ra, IX, 114, 132 (‘between her legs’, i.e. in her lap), following most of the earlier translators. The expression kölf-dürijen düržifä is indeed rather ambiguous and the Chinese sectional summary is of no help; hence the diverging interpretations that we still have today. Cf. Li, 98: Ozi’, II, 94; Ce, 201; On, 119. My present rendering is given with some reservations: my earlier rendering or Cleaves’ interpretation may still be the correct one.

`She stretched your necks’, lit. ‘She pulled you by your necks.’ ‘She stretched your shoulders’, lit. ‘She pulled you by your collar-bone (or shoulder-blade: egem).’ ‘And made you into adults... into men’, lit. ‘She made you equal with (= to) a man (ga³lär)/...She made you equal with (= to) a male (ere).’

‘In order to make you the companions for us her sons’, where ‘companions’ renders the Mongolian expression nöök se³ler, lit. ‘company-shadow’, a ‘mot-couple’ about which cf. Mo, 43, 152 (the ‘XLV’ on p. 272a, 1st line, is a misprint for ‘XIV’), Cleaves 1964/65, 65-66, n. 63. For the association of the shadow with companionship, cf. e.g., the saying ‘We have no friend (= companion: nöök) but our shadow, etc.’ in §§ 77, 78.

For the words ‘Who knows how many favours...’, cf. Mo, 159; ‘Trois documents’, 463-464; Cleaves 1964/65, 60, n. 69.

‘When we made swift sorties’ (qurduŋ ayaŋ-tur), lit. ‘in swift expeditions (= raids).’

‘Full of hatred and resentment.’ Cf. above, § 136, and n. 149.
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‘We were taking revenge. We were requiting the wrong.’ Cf. above, §§ 58, 154.


‘I am a beggar’, lit. ‘I am a seeker of good things’ (sayi erti‘ülün buya). For this expression, see Mo, 86. Iserti, here meaning ‘bench’ rather than ‘bed’ as in Pao, 34. §§ 86, 169, 177. See also Matarël 1, 64.

‘Near the inside of the door’, lit. ‘at the door-back’ (ala‘un-a), i.e. in the least honourable place in the tent. Cf. § 165 and com.

The passage ‘Tolui, who was five years old...the eastern side of my mother’s tent’ is translated and discussed in Mo, 129-131. Cf. also Moarter 1927, 152-153.

‘Under his arm’, lit. ‘in his armpit.’

On the name Alani (‘Crimson’), see Cleaves 1949b, 410-411. Besides the important contributions by Pelliot and Cleaves (see ibid.) to the explanation of the name Alani (= Eleni; cf. Amal – Emel), one may add the possibility that this name is the feminine in -i (cf. the name Yisû < yisû[en] ‘nine’ + fem. suffix -i; see above, n. 155) of the well attested male name Alian (‘Gold’; cf. SH, § 51 et passim), in which case its meaning would be ‘Goldy’ rather than ‘Crimson’. Cf. also Rybatzki [2003], s.v.; and below, concerning the name of Borouq’s wife and the historicity of the entire episode.

‘On the eastern side of my mother’s tent’, i.e. on the side reserved for women. See Moarter 1927, 153, n. 4.

On the plaits or pigtails (sibülgør – sibülgør) worn by Mongol men, see above, § 56 and com.

On the expression ger-ün amere ‘north of the tent’, see Cleaves 1952, 101-102, n. 122.

Jetei of the Mangqut, the brother of Duguqqu Cerbi, is the twenty-third commander of a thousand listed in § 202; he first appears in the SH in § 120.

For müqarur ‘horseless (ox)’, cf. above, n. 121.
For the obsolete term *jemlen* 'provisions, food', cf. tu. *jemlen*- 'to feed.' On this word, see Hattori 1957; Ozl, V, 210-211, n. 17.

'The word *fjdl*a or, rather, *fjdl*a (see below), glossed as 'chief merit' (Shiz), is also no longer productive in Mongolian. Some scholars regard it as a variant reading of the word *fjdl*a i.e. the chosen portion of a slaughtered animal (comprising head, trachea, lungs and heart), that we encountered in § 13. See above, n. 13. They point out that *fjdl*a = *fjdl*a also had the related meaning of 'central, most important; best achievement' and the like. See Do2, 171, n. 1; TH, 304-305 (= YJT, 528-530); Ozl, V, 211-212, n. 19; El-Arz, 721, n. 17; On, 120, n. 280; Ev-Pop, 292, n. 9. The readings found in the corresponding passages of the AT are ambiguous: *fjuls* (-i for *fjdl*a) in § 13 (AT2, 5b), and *fjdl*a or *fjdl*a in § 214 (AT6, 68b: the 'juldu' of ATL, 148, is an error for 'fjdl*'); however, they tend to support the above argument. With regard to the vocalization of this word in § 214, P, Ko, L1, R, Daš, S1, as well as Shi and Mu, read *fjul*a, whereas Pao, TH, Ozl, BA, IA, El-Arz, CE, On and Ev-Pop read *fjul*a. Cleave's 1953b (484, n. 3) is uncertain: *fjul*a (? *fjdl*a). The word occurs also in Turkish. Cf. Teg. *čulu* (DTS, 298; VWT, III, 2178b) to be read *fjuldu* (N.P. c.) or *fjuldu* (TMEN, no. 162) 'reward, compensate; present, prize.' However, in Turkish this word does not carry the primary meaning of 'a slaughtered animal's praecordia' as the word *fjuldu* does in Mongolian. Although the question of the identity of *fjuldu* and *fjdl*a (*fjulda*) remains open, the evidence is on the whole in favour of reading the word with front vowels and regarding it as a variant of *fjdl*a.

For the words 'Qargil Sira would have harmed the life of the child', see Cleave's 1950, 129, n. 304. 'The chief merit went, by general consent, to Altan', lit. 'the chief merit was Altan's.' Cf. Cleave's, 1953b, 484, n. 3.
§ 215. This, the shortest paragraph of the SH, is in all likelihood all that is left of a set of ordinances and injunctions concerning grants and rewards to Činggis Qan’s daughters and granddaughters. Cf. Ratchevsky 1976, 518. It is more than probable that they were purposely excised from the original text as a result of political events and internal disputes between the rival branches of Činggis’ family – a further indication of later interference with the original text of the SH. The full text is also missing in the AT.

‘Let Us reward’, lit. ‘Let Us give favour(s)’. Cf. below, n. 224.

Ökin uranq (= mo. uranx) means, literally, ‘daughter’s kin (or descendants)’, i.e. Činggis Qan’s female offspring. Cf. above, n. 214.

§ 216. On Old Üüsün, Qunan, Kükü Cos and Degei, and their observance of the principle of ‘not hiding or concealing’, see § 210 and com.

‘What they thought and comprehended.’ In the text, these two verbs are in inverse order. By ‘what they thought’ (saxkisen) is meant also ‘how they felt about something’, the verb sakisi (= mo. saksı) meaning not only ‘to think’, but also ‘to feel, be inspired, etc.’ Cf. Lettres, 93; Lese, 680b.

In the Mongol tradition it is customary for a high ranking personage to become a beki’, lit. ‘As for the Mongol tradition (üte), it is the custom (yuoxan) that a chief’s position (yuoxen sum) becomes that of beki’. For mēr, ‘path, way, course’, is meaning also ‘official duty or task; position, status, rank’, cf. HW, 110; Cleaves 1903, 36, n. 42. For the title beki, see above, n. 49; and Ev-Pop, 293, n. 12. Cf. the sectional summary (Y9, 20b): ‘Now, in (according to the Ta-ta (=Mongol) system, the office of beki is important.’ Strictly speaking, no one was designated a military leader, a commander or chief, hence an ‘officer’; however, this term was used broadly to designate also a high dignitary, a person in authority, a ‘seigneur’, i.e. a member of the ruling clan(s), irrespective of whether he had actual
command of troops (e.g., because of his age). See Vlad, 88, 93, 111. Cf. above, n. 8. It appears that Old Usün, a senior kinman of Cünggis Qan, held no military office. Cf. Li, 174, n. 216. What Cünggis Qan says is that Usün, by virtue of his being a senior kinman loyal to him (which was not the case with other senior kinmen, like, for instance, Dātār Otchigin), should be duly rewarded with the honorary title of bekī. ‘Elder Brother the Bat’arin’ (Bat’arin apa) was Ba’ar’idai (ethnic of Ba’ar’in), the eponymous ancestor of the Ba’ar’in (Batin) tribe. See § 41. As explained by Mostaert, this Ba’ar’idai was the son of Cünggis’ ancestor Bodonçar Munqaq, but whereas Cünggis was descended from him through Bodonçar’s principal wife, Ba’ar’idai was born from the Jack’ut woman captured by Bodonçar in a raid (§ 38). Ba’ar’idai must have been born before Qabqiçi Ba’atar, hence the respectful designation of apa ‘elder brother’ employed here by Cünggis Qan. See Cl, 157-158, n. 29; Cleaves 1963, 69. Cf. also Vlad, 60-61.

‘Who are from among us and senior to Us’, lit. ‘being from among and above Us’, i.e. being from the same family or kin (uraj) as Cünggis, but ‘higher’, i.e. senior to him in age. The sectional summary merely says: ‘Usün, you are a senior descendant of the Bat’arin.’ See Y 9, 20b. This passage has been understood in various ways by different scholars and, unfortunately, it is not one of those discussed by Mostaert. Cf. Li, 100; Cl, 157-158; Oz, V, 219; On, 121 (cf. the 200 ed., 207)

To wear a white dress, ride a white gelding and sit in an elevated position were marks of high status. For the significance of the colour white for the Mongols, see above, nn. 63, 111, 202. Riding a white gelding was also a special privilege. See Cl, 158, n. 30; and on month) to be suitable (lit. ‘good’), times or occasions (lit. ‘year and month’) to be determined (lit. ‘choosing’), thus stating in effect: what Cünggis had said also to Father Mönglik in § 204. See Cleaves’ rendering ‘again, with his considering the year and the month’, let it so be.’ (Cl, 158.) Note 31 on the same page reads: ‘To determine what
action it might be appropriate to take.' Cf. his translation of the relevant words in § 204: 'consulting [heu] in [each] year or in [each] moon' (Cl, 145). The corresponding passage in AT, 69a, is unfortunately so corrupt as to be of no use whatsoever. The ambiguity of the sectional summary has led most translators astray, including Pao. See Pao 35 and 58, n. 68. Cf. also Heissig 1984, 319. § 217. This section merely repeats Çinggis' decree concerning the grant made to Quyildar's children and descendants mentioned at the end of § 185. For other references to Quyildar's services, see §§ 171 and 175. As stated by Ligeti, the decree has probably been repeated here for the sake of comprehensiveness. See Li, 174, n. 217. § 218. The death of Çaqan Qo'a (-Çaqan U'a) of the Neguis (-Ne'ü) is mentioned in § 129, which relates how he was killed by Janmuq at Dalanc Baljut and his head dragged about attached to the tail of Jamuq's horse.

On Narin To'ortil (-pino. Tooryil. cf. above, n. 96), see HCG, 417, 421-422; Vlad', 136; Li, 174, n. 218; Bese 1974, 94. 'Was fighting zealously', lit. 'was fighting exerting himself (kičč-ej’. For the verb kičč-e (-kičč-e) 'to exert oneself, to apply oneself with zeal', cf. HW, 101; TMEN, no. 350; Quelques problèmes', 258 (4); and above, n. 202. For Narin To'ortil's request to gather his scattered tribesmen, and for his hereditary appointment as their leader, cf. the same request by Qanggir in § 213, where almost identical language is used. 'To this', lit. 'being told so.' In this, as in earlier sections (cf. §§ 208, 212), negative rhetorical questions are used in place of the imperative. Cf. §§ 203, 213: ši međe.

§ 219. The famous episode that Çinggis re-echoes is the one narrated in §§ 85-87. For the Tayiš'ut 'kinsmen' (apa deś), see § 76 and corn. This is the first time that a reason, viz. jealousy, is given for the Tayiš'ut's hostility towards Çinggis Qan, then Temüjin. This 'jealousy' was due (as stated earlier) to the threat posed by Yügeti Ba'atur's son to the chief of the Suldus later joined Jamuq's above, n. 71. Sorqan Siru of the Suldus later joined Jamuq's camp, but eventually rallied to Çinggis, as related in § 146, and Çinggis accepted his explanation for his belated allegiance. However, he does not miss the opportunity of reminding him of this fact when he rewards him now for his services. Sorqan Siru in § 202, is the twenty-seventh commander of a thousand listed in § 202, but his sons, strangely enough, are not listed among them, and were probably not appointed (Rašl al-Din does not mention any of them, not even Sorqan Siru, among the army commanders), even though Cīla'ūn was one of the 'four steeds.' See Li, 174, n. 219. CF. HCG, 153, 157. As rightly noted by Cleaves, the story as told in § 219 is somewhat at variance with the account in § 85, where it is stated that only Cīmbai and Cīla'ūn, displeased with their father's words, made their younger sister Qada'ān look after Temüjin. See Cl, 159, n. 35.

The verb darqala- 'to be (= enjoy the privilege of being a darqan' ("freeman") combined with nuntiu (= tu. yurt), i.e. the territory reserved for transmigration or 'terrain de transhumance' (Vl'ai, 52, n. 1, 70 et passim; cf. TMEN, no. 1914), or with nuntuqa- 'to set up a camp, to settle in a (particular) grazing ground', means 'to freely establish a camp or to encamp as a freeman', i.e. to settle on, and make use of, a particular territory for grazing and hunting purposes without paying any of the dues to the ruler - the darqan being 'free' by definition from those obligations. For the special grant to Sorqan Siru and his sons, cf. Vlad', 87; and Rachnevsky 1987, 106. On the institution of darqan and the freeman's privileges, see above, n. 51.

'The territory of the Merkit on the Selenge River', lit. 'the Selenge - the territory (or country) of the Merkit.'
For the conferment of the hereditary privilege to carry a quiver and drink the ceremonial wine (dōik), see § 187 and corr. concerning Badzi and Kisiiliq.

‘The words that you, Cila’un and Chinbai, once spoke’, i.e. the very words reported in § 85 that saved Cinggis Qan’s life.

‘How will you be satisfied?’ (ker qandaq)qsa, i.e. ‘what can I do to satisfy (= recompense) you?’ This simple question has caused much debate and controversy on account of the word qandaq (the ‘handaq’ of Pe, 86, is an incorrect transcription; cf. ibid., n. 1), tomen futur of the verb qandaq which has been variously rendered as 1) ‘to forget’ (Na’, Ha, Ko, Da’l, Li, Cl and others); 2) ‘to ignore’ (Mi, Pao, Ra, Ta); 3) ‘to treat (= recompense)’ (Do’, Ma); 4) ‘to be satisfied’ (TH, Oz, El-Ar, En); 5) ‘to face (= address)’ (Cee, Ev-Pop). The first interpretation is based on the free rendering of the sentence in question in the sectional summary (Y’9, 27a): ‘How could I forget them?’ (周知手勢), but see below my comments on the meaning of this sentence. The second, on SH qandaq = mo. qandu (cf. kh. and bur. xandaq) ‘to turn away (from something)’, i.e. to pretend not to know, to ignore. Cf. Kow., 725a: ‘détourner (les yeux), se détourner; prendre une autre direction.’ The third interpretation is based on another meaning of qandaq (xandaq) in the living languages, viz. ‘to treat.’ See, e.g., MED, 427a (2). The fourth, on the assumption that SH qandaq is the passive form in -sed of mo. qan (qanq-, qandaq-) ‘to be satisfied.’ See Oz, V, 238-239, n. 8; and On, 123 and n. 285. Finally, the fifth is likewise based on SH qandaq = qandaq-taken, however, in the sense of ‘to face’ = ‘to address.’ Cf. Les, 928a; MKT, 539b; MED, 427a (1). It should be noted that the Chinese gloss is rather puzzling, qandaq being rendered with the expression man li ti (是的), lit. ‘which stands full.’ In Ra (IX, 137), I expressed the opinion that the character man (是) is an error for fan (是) to close the eyes, conceal the truth, deceive’, so that this expression should be understood as ‘that stands closing the eyes’, i.e. purposely disregarding or ignoring. On the other hand, Ozawa and Ono regard li (是) as an error for tsu (是), the second element in the common compound man-tsu ‘to be satisfied.’ The AT', 70a, has the corrupt form ayaqqa fur qandaq (see ATL, 152), thus confirming the SH reading. Now, mo. qan- ‘to be satisfied’ occurs three times in the SH, twice in the intransitive form qandaq (mo. qandaq) (§§ 145, 177), and once in the form qandu (§ 272), i.e. always as qanq-, not qandu. See HW, 59, and 101, and s.v. ‘kibhund’ (キブンクン) ‘kib qandaq’. Furthermore, the interpretation ‘to be satisfied’ is unsupported by the sectional summary. One can point out that ch. wang (忘) ‘to forget’ is also used in the sense of ‘to neglect, be unmindful of’, and that this may well be the way it should be understood in the sectional summary (‘how can I neglect [= ignore] them [i.e. your words?]’). Cf. DCLC, 309a; CED, 1043b, no. 7056. Other arguments can be put forth in favour or against any of the above interpretations. Indeed, A. Mostaert (u.n.) has even hypothesized ‘qandaq for handaq’ (cf. Pe, 861 – L.R.) = xandaq = entdeg. ‘laisser échapper à son attention’; cf. lettre d’Oljeitu, I 11. Cf. aussi § 200 entdegii, xandaq – entdegii? However, after having again reviewed all the published material, and on the grounds that 1) an emendation (是的) is definitely better than (是的), and 2) one of the meanings of kaln. xandaq, previously unknown to me, is ‘to be satisfied’ (see KarS, 575a [3]), I have now adopted, albeit with some reservations, the interpretation proposed by ThL and Oz. This being so, the expression in Mongolian must be read ker qandaq ta instead of ker qandaq, i.e. with the pronoun ‘you’ belonging to qandaq, not to the following sentence, as correctly punctuated in Pe, Ibid, but not in St, 110, line 9250.

‘What you have in mind’, lit. ‘your thoughts’, i.e. ‘your wishes.’

‘An intermediary’, lit. ‘a between-person (= middle-man)’ (ja’ura gi’tu’).
"You in person," lit. "You, by (= with) your own bodies (= persons)" (d'erin beyes over ... tan). For d' eisit ("yourselves, personally") cf. DO, 541b.

For the poetic passage in this section, cf. the almost identical words of § 187. See above, n. 187.

For haran 'retainer', cf. the expression haran tutgar 'subject people and servants' in § 39.

On Yeke ('Big') Ceren, see §§ 51, 169; he is not to be confused with the homonymous Tatar chief of §§ 154-156.

"With my support" rather than 'you be my support', as understood by other translators (see, e.g., Če, 206, and Ev-Pop, 152), in view of the sectional summary paraphrase (Y² 9, 27a): "Now, relying on me (= with my support), live happily!" (不如去 前 所 說 說) For turtai 'prop, support', cf. above, n. 167. Do!, 244, 246, n. 7, renders turtai as 'right-hand men' (tortu) — an unwarranted extrapolation.

§ 220 Old Şirgüţ (a contracted form of Şirgü'eti; see below) of the Niçoğlu Ba'arin (Bärin), with his two sons Alaq ('Mortlaid') and Naya'a (i.e. the Naya Noyan of § 197), had been responsible for the capture and subsequent release of their former chief Tariqüll KatilÜz, a leader of the Taili'ut tribe. The event, which is recalled here by Çinggaş Çan, is described in detail in § 149. Çinggaş at one point calls Şirgüţ's second son Naya'a Bil'i'ur, i.e. Naya'a the Lark (for the meaning of bil'i'ur ~ bilda'ur, see above, n. 160). The origin of this sobriquet is obscure, but it may have something to do with the episode of Qulun Qatar's 'abduction' described in § 177. See Pelliot's remarks in HCG, 162. The reference to the locality Qutuqul Bendi (Qutuqul Nu'U), which is also mentioned in the original account in § 149, has been inadvertently left out in CI, 259b (Index).

The 'great principle' (yeke tu'd) is not spelled out in the text, as is also the case in § 208 (and with yeke yenu 'the great norm' in § 252), because its meaning was obvious to Çinggaş' contemporaries. It is clear from the context that it refers always to the cardinal principle of the jasay governing the relationship and mutual obligations of lord (qan) and subject, and, specifically (in the present instance), to the loyalty due to one's chief. See above, n. 208. Cf. Ratchnevsky 1974 473 and n. 10.

'I shall entrust him with an important task.' This statement is recorded in § 197 ad fin. There the text has yeke ûyle (ê ûile), lit. 'a great matter', the reference being to his appointment as commander of the ten thousand of the centre, which is formally conferred on him in the present pronouncement.

However, in our passage we have niken ûyle 'a task' instead of yeke ûyle. I think that the word niken is almost certainly an early scribal error (which has passed also into the text of the AT, see AT, 71a) for yeke, the two words bearing a very close resemblance to each other. In their written form, yeke and niken[n] are virtually indistinguishable.

With regard to his career, Naya'a is listed as the thirty-second commander of a thousand in § 282 (Alaq is the twenty-sixth). Furthermore, according to the SL, he was appointed to one of the highest positions in the army, that of commander of the division or myriarchy of the centre (tib-in tümên) — one, and the most important, of the three divisions of the Mongol army, the others being the myriarchy of the left or east wing (je-in qar-un tümên) and the myriarchy of the right or west wing (bara'un qar-un tümên). For tib (= mo. tôb) 'centre, middle' as a military term, cf. TMEN, no. 995. Naya'a's appointment, however, is not recorded by Râfi'd al-Din, who mentions Naya'a only as one of the commanders of a thousand of the left wing and as a deputy of Muqâli, whom he replaced as commander of the left wing after Muqâli's death in 1271. See SL², U2, 272. On the appointment of Dî'çuq and Muqâli, see §§ 205 and 206.

Old Şirgüţ or Şirgë'eti was the great-grandfather of the famous general Bayan of the Bärin. See Cleaves 1956, 194 and 202-203, n. 3, also on the various forms of Şirgüţ's name. For the name Alaq, cf. Rybachki [2003], s.v.
§ 221. Jebe and Sübe-etei, two of the ‘four hounds’ of Çinggis Qan and prominent military leaders, are naturally included in the list of § 202 (nos. 48 and 52). This section deals mainly with Çinggis’ order concerning the composition of their two units to the effect that these should be formed with men of their own tribes (Bésüt and Urańqai) of whom they were already in charge or, as the SH puts it, whom they themselves had ‘acquired (or assembled) and constituted as their own patri-mony.’ For this expression, see above, n. 212, and below, n. 224. As noted in Li, 175, n. 221, Rašld al-Dīn lists Sübe-etei among the commanders of a thousand of the left wing, but not Jebe. See SU, 1/2, 272.

§ 222. The ‘shepherd’ (on this epithet see below) Degei was a Bésüt like Jebe, and first appears in § 120 as the brother of Kūdūgüür and one of the early allies of Çinggis Qan after the latter’s separation from Jamuqa. See also above, n. 210. He is the eleventh commander in the list in § 202.

‘Unregistered households’ renders bākde-ul (= pm. būigungī, cf. AT, 71a. būigungī < bāigungī), a term that occurs only once in the SH, where it is glossed maï-mo (or ‘concealed’) (the ñ in 21, 21, is a misprint), and the term is explained as ‘unregistered people’ (explainis). In the sectional summary (Y, 9, 30a). Bākde-ul is a deverbal noun in ‘-l (Ul); see JS, 53-54, 9; 80; GWM, 46, § 153) from bākde- ‘to be hidden.’ For bāk (pm. bāg) ‘to hide, conceal; to lie in ambush’; see HW, 21. It corresponds to mo. biği (or. see Les., 145a) and kib. biği. id. Thus bākde-ul literally means ‘the concealed people’ as a category or class of individuals. They included, no doubt, many vagrant tribesmen or ‘outcasts’ (o’ravtq - o’ravtq) mentioned in the SH (§§ 156, 200, 214), that had become homeless as a result of the breaking-up of their tribes by Çinggis Qan. Cf. ML, 117 and n. 3; ISK, 149ff.; Vlad, 1, 141; and above, n. 214.

§ 223. The ‘carpenter’ Gūdūgüür is none other than Degei’s brother Kūdūgüür mentioned with Degei in § 120. See above, n. 120, and n. 141 about his name. In § 124 he pledged to serve Çinggis as manager of the tent-carts, hence his epithet of ‘carpenter’ (moći). Cf. the use of moći as a sobriquet prefixed to the name in the case of Moći Bedi’ün in § 120. Cf. also above, n. 209. Çinggis’ order is to the effect that a unit of a thousand was to be constituted for Kūdūgüür, who had just been appointed a commander of a thousand (see § 202, no. 34), by levying a sufficient number of men from other commanders who had plenty (lit. ‘from here and there’), the idea of gathering them in this way being regarded as equivalent to an exacting or levy, a meaning which is implicit in the verb gubč- used in this passage. A discussion and translation of the entire § 223, see Mo., 131-135. Cf. also ibid., 256, for Mostaert’s further remarks on the meaning of gubč-.

Mulqalqū of the Jadaran was also mentioned in § 124 among those appointed to supervize the horseherds, but no separate military unit was assigned to him in 1206. He is now going to share the command of one with Kūdūgüür (Gūdūgüür). For other examples of joint leadership, see §§ 191, 209, 212, 225. Cf. Vlad, 1, 141. Mulqalqū is commended by Çinggis for having been a ‘perfect’ (lāk-iyer) companion to him. For the expression lāk-iyer (= pm. łāk-iyer or, more accurately, lāk-iyer), lit. ‘in a befitting manner’, see Cleaves 1949, 101, n. 34; idem 1950, 108, n. 25; and ‘Trois documents’, 466.

§ 224. This, with §§ 191-192, is the most important section dealing with the early military system of Çinggis Qan and the restructuring of the Guard (ke’il). See above, n. 191, and the references given in n. 202 on the establishment of the one-thousand-man units. Further references will be given below.
The subject of the first long sentence in the text (Ulas buyululüçuqati ... bolüja) is Cinggis Qan, who is mentioned immediately after as the subject of the next sentence (Cinggis Qan var jariq boluq...). For stylistic reasons, in my translation I have transposed the subject to the beginning of the first sentence and divided the single sentence into several.

The formation of decimal units up to one thousand (minqar), following the model of the Kereyit army, is mentioned in § 191; one new development in the 1296 reorganization is the formal establishment of the three units of ten thousand or myrtarchies (tümên), with their specific territorial control, and the appointment of their leaders. On the earlier tümên, see the remarks above, n. 104. Such comprehensive reorganization was determined also by the pressing need of breaking up the old clan ties and loyalties, as rightly pointed out by R. Hamayon (Hamayon 1979, 119 and n. 8). Cf. Vladi, 139 and 156-158. The massive restructuring of the army is likewise intimately related to the rewards and commendations given by Cinggis to his loyal followers which began in Chapter Eight and continue in the present piece. I translate soyyulul jariq bol-, lit. 'to order favour', as 'to commend.' For soyyulul 'favour, grace' → 'gracious deed, reward, privilege', see Murukami 1961, 311ff; and above, n. 147.

With regard to the earlier recruitment of eighty nightguards (kebeleli) and seventy dayguards (taraqt), to serve as bodyguards on roster (kesigeti), see § 191 and cor. for numerous references to the present literature on the subject. In view of Cinggis' exalted position now as supreme leader of all the tribes, i.e. of all the people of Mongalla, a much stronger contingent of picked warriors is called for to serve as bodyguards, attendants and service personnel. The rules and regulations governing the appointment of these elite guards form the substance of the present section, most of which has been translated by Cleave (before the publication of Cl) in Cleave 1953, 46, n. 7; idem 1952, 108, n. 168; and by Mastaer in Mo, 256-257. For an important discussion of various technical terms and expressions in this section, see the references given above, n. 191, and especially Mo, 250-257. For an excellent outline of the system in the early period, see YTSHT, 63-71, as well as MEYD, 36-38. Cf. also Vladi, 156-158; and YRS, 78-80.

Cinggis claims that now, by the strength (or might) of Eternal Heaven (môngke tenggeri-yin güülün-tür), his own power has been increased by Heaven and Earth (tenggeri egder-a güül nuqa nemegele), and so he has brought the entire people to allegiance, causing them to come under the rule (gur ulu-ı lideri qayqaq quraqa futile-a durulun ˇuro-iliqat). We encounter here, for the first time, the well-known 'initiative' – i.e. the one often occurring at the beginning of Mongol decrees and official documents in the 13th century – môngke tenggeri-yin güülün-tür (= pmo. môngke tayri-yin kükün-dür [or kükün-tür]), about which much has been written. See 'fais documents', 485-486; Lette, 18-20; Hamilton 1972, 160-162; Cleaves 1979, 68; Mautner, 19-20, 90-93. See also below, n. 275. I think that Hamilton, loc. cit., has convincingly shown that 1) the expression kükün-dür (SH güülün-tür) is a literal rendering of tu kükün 'thanks to (or by reason of) the strength' → 'from, through, because of, by,' cf. DTS, 323b; 2) the Chinese translation of kükün-dür, chülii R.Ts.R, lit. 'in the strength', is a mere calque of the Mongolian expression and cannot, therefore, be understood in its literal sense; ergo 3) kükün-dür can only mean 'by' (inst. = "thanks to, relying on, by means of") 'the strength', and not 'in (dat.-loc.) the strength.' We may add that, irrespective of the calque in the instance, the use of the daative-locative for the instrumental, although rare in the ancient language, it is by no means unknown. See above, n. 152, for an example of this usage in the SH. And, with regard to the Chinese mechanical rendering of the Mongolian daative-locative with li, it is worth noting that in the case of the dative-locative actors in passive constructions – grammatically indistinguishable from an instrumentalis actoris – the Chinese version also regularly employs li. A good example of the convergence of the
dative-locative with the instrumental case (which, incidentally, is also reflected in English) is found in the HIIY, IIA, 19v, 2: qahan (‘in qān’) anu qattema durrasu ‘When...their emperor was harmed (= was killed) at the hands of (= by a common official’) glossed in Chinese as 純臣所犯的下人臣的干葛爾該訖。Cf. Matériel I, 6, 21. No one would dispute that the idiomatic expression ‘at (dat.: ḫ) the hands of’ is ‘through (instr.) the action or agency of.’ For the role of Heaven and Earth in supporting Cinggis’ actions and ‘increasing his strength’, cf. §§ 113, 121, 125, 201, 208, 254, 260, 281. For the ‘mot-couple’ gilči aqeq, lit. ‘strength – power’ = ‘power’, see above, n. 199. For the expression ‘to cause them (i.e. the entire people) to come under my sole rule’ (qaqita filu-u duruyan orul-), lit. ‘to cause them to enter into my only reins (= control, rule)’, cf. § 208 and com. See Cleaves 1952, 108, n. 168. For an earlier reference to this expression in the bringing to allegiance of the people, i.e. of the various tribes of Mongolia, and the establishment of a unified nation in connection with the new military appointments, see § 202. Cf. also Jamagu’s words in § 201.

The entire passage from ‘Further, Cinggis Qa’an proclaimed the following order to the various thousands’ to ‘as well as to the sons of ordinary people.’ So he ordered,’ has been translated and discussed in Mo, 250-257. The following are some additional comments on this passage. ‘The various thousands’, lit. ‘the thousands and thousands.’ ‘To serve by Our side’, i.e. to personally attend to Cinggis Qa’an’s needs and safeguard his person. The ‘ordinary people’ (duruyan gilči) are the people of ordinary status already mentioned in § 191. See above, n. 191. For the particle gilči, used again here with the meaning of ‘also, likewise’, see above, n. 117. For the ‘mot-couple’ aśa’a (see above, n. 199) gilči ‘mount, a riding horse requisitioned for such use’, cf. Mo, 43, 254. ‘They have personally acquired and constituted as their own patrimony’ (inus beye qad-īyar ọluṣan fọ́ ẹsẹn): for the understanding of this

sentence, and the expression beye qat (‘in pro. beye quad’) ‘body, person’, see Cleaves 1949, 126-127, n. 222; idem 1953, 78, n. 7; Mo, 242 and n. 224, 257, n. 244; and above, n. 21. Independently of (lit. “apart from”) their personal share of goods’ (inus emu qabil-a ọluṣa nígíjí). For these words, see Cleaves 1953, 78, n. 7; Mo, 246, n. 232, 257, n. 244. Cf. also Haenisch 1961, 146.

‘The numerous ordinary people’ (olon gilči) are the duruyan gilči mentioned earlier.

‘Who have received this order of Ours’, lit. ‘having caused one to deliver this Our order to them.’

‘Anyone who transgresses it shall be guilty and liable to punishment.’ See above, n. 203.

For the sentence ‘As to the people ... out of Our sight’, see Mo, 242-244, n. 228. Cf., however, the somewhat different interpretations of this sentence in Pao, 38-39; Oz, V, 269-271, n. 12; On, 125; Ce, 209; and Ev-Pop, 190. See also Waley 1960, 528. ‘To send a person to a distant place out of sight’ (nidiin-a eće gołi qaffar-a ile-) is a paraphrase for ‘to banish.’

‘In order to earn’, lit. ‘saying that they would learn.’

§ 225. This section is a continuation of the ordinance on the appointment of the dayguards, the nightguards and their commanders. For the earlier appointment of the eighty nightguards (kebe‘i a), see §§ 191 and 192.

‘He brought their number up to’, lit. ‘he made them into.’

‘Make up a full thousand’, lit. ‘fill a thousand’, i.e. to form a unit of a thousand (mínigá). Cf. §§ 207, 224.

Yeke Ne‘irin (Ati), 72b: Yeke Négirin, the officer appointed as commander of the thousand nightguards, appears here for the first and only time in the SH. He is not mentioned by Radīl al-Dīn.

Whereas the earlier appointment of the eighty nightguards is recorded in the SH, there is no previous mention of the four hundred quiverbearers; however, their duties are set out in § 192. Yisín Tö’e is the same personage as Yisín Tö’e of § 278.
The Secret History

This name means ‘Nine Spanis’ (yisín ‘nine’; te’e < tū ‘span’). This son of Jeime reappears in §§ 230 and 234. He is mentioned in both the Chinese and Persian sources. See YS 3, 45, SL 1/2, 267, 269; Successors, 138, 139, 180, 204, 213. He was executed in Mönge’s post-election purge in 1251. Tüge, the Tüinge of § 137 and Tüge of § 262 (no. 2 in the list of commanders of a thousand), was the eldest son of Cila’an Quyièi, himself the second son of Teleger Bayan of the Jalayir and uncle of Muqalli. See above, n. 137. Thus, Tüge or Tüinge was Muqalli’s first cousin. On the variants of Tüge’s name, see ibid. For Bügidei (Būkidei), see also §§ 230, 234 and 278.

‘The various companies’, lit. ‘companies and companies’ (keliš keliš). Cf. CL, 164: ‘the diverse companies’; On, 125: ‘shift (by) shift’. For keliš ‘company’ or, more precisely, ‘section ou compagnie alternatives de la garde’, i.e. a ‘watch’, see Mo, 247.

Horqudaq, the leader of the third quiverbearers company, is also mentioned with Yisín Tü’e, Būkidei and Labalaq (Labalaq) in § 278. Neither Horqudaq nor Labalaq is mentioned by Râfi‘ al-Din.

‘These four shall make their quiverbearers join the various companies, etc.’ This difficult passage is rendered differently by most translators. See Pao, 67–68, n. 95; CL, 164; On, 125–126; Oz‘, II, 107; Če, 209; Ev-Pop, 190. To understand what the author means, we must take into account the similar passage in § 278, which runs as follows: Bâuqa qorqin-i Yisín Tü’e Būkidei Horqudaq Labalaq dîrben keliš keliš bolun qor aqsaqqa-a turqa‘ud-an dîrben keliš keliš-tir qorqin-iyan xasaqqa orlanduqayi ke‘en fariq bolha. ‘Further, he (Qoqhâi Qa‘an) ordered, “As to the quiverbearers, Yisín Tü’e, Būkidei, Horqudaq and Labalaq (Labalaq), forming four separate companies and marshalling (xasaqqa) their quiverbearers of the bodyguards (âlûq), they shall respectively join (orlanduqayi) the four separate companies of the bodyguards to carry quivers (gor aqsaqqa-a).” The meaning of the passage is that the four companies (keliš) of quiverbearers led by Yisín Tü’e, etc. —
COMMENTARY

1251. See YS 3, 45; HWC, 580, 583; Successors, 60, 89, 211, 224, 264. His name is sometimes written Eljedie or Eljedj, owing to the ambiguity of the Chinese and Persian transcripts, and because there were several personages by this name. There is much confusion about these names, which makes identification difficult. See Li, 175, n. 227; Chapitre CVII, 29-30, n. 1. On him, cf. also MPB, 171-172, n. 3; NMP, II, 642; and below, n. 255.

Dödei Čerbi and Doloqolu Čerbi were last mentioned in § 210. For the order in which these chamberlains appear in the SH, cf. Hambis 1975, 43, n. 64. For the erroneous statement concerning Doloqolu Čerbi's family in SL, I/2, 272, see HCG, 353; Li, 175-176, n. 227.

Aqhat (AT, 73s: Ayatasi) is mentioned again in § 234. On him, cf. MWESC 23, 5b; and Cleaves's remarks in Cleaves 1951, 23, n. 118.

Alei is probably Alēi Noyan, De Sečen's eldest son and brother of Bōte, but his identification with the Alēi mentioned in §§ 202 (no. 71) and 253 is not certain, since Alēi Noyan may well be the same person called Alēi Gürgen in § 202 (nos. 86, 87, 88), as suggested in Naiani 1928, 168-170; see Pelliot 1935, 908-917, esp. pp. 909, 916-917; and FP 21:1912, 67. Cf. Cleaves 1951, 15 and 23, n. 118.

As for the last commander of the dayguards, Arqai Qasar, in 1203-1204 he had already been appointed leader of an elite thousand-man corps which on the battlefield was to fight before Činggis Qan, and in time of peace was to serve as dayguards. See § 191. On 'the many days of peace', see above, n. 191.

"Attached to Us", lit. 'in the presence of Us' (bidanu dą'a'da), since they were regarded as 'personal guards' (emti kektim), as clearly stated in § 231. For the word dą'a'da (= pro. ču'ud; cf. AT, 73s, and ATL, 158), see de Rachewiltz 1997:98.

For the term yeke qol 'the main body of the army', cf. above, nn. 142, 170, and below, n. 247. With the establishment of the eight units of a thousand of the dayguards and the appointment of their commanders, an eight-thousand-man force was formed which, with the 'enrolment' of the two thousand nightguards and quiverbearers (1000 + 1000; see § 225), constituted the ten-thousand-man division, or münşäch, known as qol or yeke qol. In this way, the Guard (kełş), as the yeke qol, became the main nucleus or central core of the whole Mongol army (čerbi). This was a major innovation. See MEYD, 37ff.

§ 227. In this section we have the ordinance concerning the appointment of senior officers, called tögel, lit. 'elders', in charge of the four two-thousand-man strong companies of guards (kełş) who were to serve on a three days' roster. As we have seen (§ 225), they were assisted by the four two-hundred-and-fifty-man strong companies of quiverbearers. The four 'elders' were the above-mentioned Buqa, Alēi Qan, Dödei Čerbi and Doloqolu Čerbi, chosen from the commanders of the eight units of dayguards. See § 226.

"After spending three days and nights with them" (qurban goñolda'la). This statement has been incorrectly understood as meaning simply 'three nights' by the authors of the sectional summary (YS 9, 44a), as well as by Haenisch (Ha 106), followed by several other scholars (Po, 168; Li, 104; Ch, 165; On, 126; and LDAT, 160) including all the Japanese and Chinese translators. The meaning is 'three full days', even though, strictly speaking, goño- is 'to spend the night.' See above, n. 80. However, most Western translators, beginning with Kozin, have understood the text correctly. See Ko, 170; Te, 152; Ka, 145; Ta, 159; Fe, 143; Ev-Pop, 192. Indeed, given the context, no other interpretation is possible.

"A member of the Guard", lit. 'a man of the Guard' (kełštii gii' an). For this expression, see Mo, 247.
That has so failed', lit. 'has failed to take his turn of duty.'

'Shall be disciplined', lit. 'let one teach him', as in 'to teach a lesson.'

The passage 'If a member of the Guard ... out of Your sight', has been translated and discussed in Mo, 241-249. For the expression 'to send someone to a distant place, out of sight', i.e. to banish him, see above, n. 224.

The second ordinance in this section, regarding punishment (from beatings to banishment) for those who fail in their guard duty, is quoted almost verbatim in § 278. See Mo, 239-241.

'Every third turn of duty' (iqqa'ar qatta'ar), i.e. every third shift, each shift (as just indicated in the ordinance) remaining on duty for three days. Cf. M 24:1965, 479 (reviewing Paolo's translation). In § 278 it is further specified that the proclamation of the order takes place when the guards are relieved.

'Who have enrolled as guards equal (saxa'a) to you', i.e. who, in their status as members of the Guard (kešten), are equal to their chiefs, the company elders. This point is missed if one translates saxa'a (saxa'ar) merely as 'equal in rank' (Ha, 107; Li, 104), since the elders were obviously superior in rank to the ordinary guards. Cf. Mu, III, 37.

'Merely on the ground of seniority', lit. 'only (ele) saying that (= because) they are enrolled by you in seniority (command)', i.e. 'only because you are their seniors (or superiors in rank; see below.)' Cf. Cleaves 1953, 80, n. 12. For the use of ele 'only, simply' twice in this section, cf. Street 1986, 21-22 (36). Cf. also Pelliot 1949, 674, n. 76. As for the obsolete verb honāti (onjī- in § 278) 'to reprimand', cf. Pelliot 1925, 221, n. 43; Or, V, 298, n. 10.

'If any of them breaks the law (fasaq) künde'esi', i.e. if they transgress any of the principles and rules of the fasaq with regard to their duties. For the expression fasaq künde'-, cf. Cleaves 2001a, 48-49, n. 79. See also on this issue, PerLe 1962, 29-31; Ratchnevsky 1974, 475, n. 8; idem 1987, 106; de Rachewiltz 1993, 98-100. As evident from the text of the SH and the above discussions, a breach of the ordinances concerning the Guard constituted a violation of the fasaq, which was to be expected since the safety and protection of the qan depended entirely on the loyalty and reliability of his Guard. Cf. the same regulations to this effect repeated in § 278.

'Those liable to execution', lit. 'those whom it is proper (i.e. according to the fasaq) to execute.' For miskir 'it, to execute, cut down', cf. above, n. 149.

'If you yourself, ... lay hands ... and strike', lit. 'If, causing your own hands - feet (= hands) to reach ... you strike.' For the 'mot-couple' qar kol 'hands', see above, n. 189.

'You shall be repaid with strokes of the rod ... with fists', i.e. with an equal number of strokes and with an equal number of blows. For the final passage of this section, cf. Mo, 110.

§ 278. By the outside (quadnadas) commanders of a thousand (hundred, ten) are meant the commanders of the units of a thousand (hundred, ten) who did not belong to the Guard, i.e. the commanders of the two wings of the Mongol army who did not enjoy the privileged status of the members of the Guard. Cf. Vla, 157-158.

The attendants (kôte'et) were the retainers of the guards. Since the latter had an exalted position vis-à-vis the regular army men, their personal attendants also enjoyed a proportionately high status.

In this section, the commanders of a thousand (mintaq-an noyan), lit. 'commanders of thousands', are also referred to as mintaq'at, which I render as 'leaders of a thousand.' Mintaq'at is the plural of mintaqil (mintaqy, mintaqy), a denominative noun in -liq (= -lit) from mintaq 'a unit of a thousand men', sometimes referred to as a chilarchy (see above, nn. 170, 191). The medieval Mongols had several related terms designating the same military functions and ranks. Another name for a commander of a thousand not found in the SH, but occurring in the HiIY, was minyanta (= minyanta). See Material II, 109.
regarded as suspicious. ’Palace’ is the rather imperfect rendering of ordo (calqued on ch. hung ภ, id., the usual rendering of this term in the SH; cf. HW, 125), a term designating here the complex of tents and other structures forming the living quarters of the qan and his dependants – a forbidden precinct in the middle of the encampment (often on a slight elevation) guarded day and night by the kesigten, and several descriptions of which are given in medieval travellers’ accounts. See, e.g., MM, 60, 126, 150-151, 175-180. For this early period I prefer to avoid the rendering ‘imperial camp or (encampment)’ used by other translators (e.g. Ev-Pop, 193 et passim) for obvious historical reasons: ‘royal encampment’ (as in NMP, 1, 309) would be better. Other translators, like Cleave, prefer to leave this well-known term untranslated. For this term, see above, n. 123. By ger ‘tent’, occurring later in this section, is meant the ordo ger, i.e. the ‘Palace tent’ of Çinggis Qan. See ibid.

For the night, lit. ‘passing the night.’ For manaqari – manaqar ‘the following morning’, see above, nn. 159 and 192.

‘Shall question him,’ lit. ‘shall ask his words,’ i.e. of explanation.

When the company is relieved (kešik ye’ṭeškidirin) ... when relieved (ye’ṭešqi),’ lit. ‘At the moment when the company changes place with the relief company ... changing place with the relief company.’ Cf. Mo, 247.

‘Their passes’ (belge anu), i.e. their tokens of identification. For belge, see above, n. 66.

On the nightguards ‘lying down all around the Palace’ (ordo horin gebe), and those ‘standing at the door’ (e’iten-sur horin), i.e. protecting the qan’s residence and guarding the entrance, see also § 192. ‘Who stand guarding the door:’ is literally, ‘who stand securing (= barring) the door’ (e’iten darușu baygat). Cf. § 246.

‘Shall hack any person entering at night until their heads are split open and their shoulders fall apart,’ lit. ‘hacking (or cutting) people who shall enter at night until their heads are split (dalbaru) and their shoulders fall.’ For the adverb
dalbar ‘split open along a vertical line’, formed on dolba ‘split open’ (adv.) + the suffix of direction -ru (on which see GWM, 59, § 215; Mo, 17, n, 11, 47), see Text 1609, 123. Cf. mo. dalbharra ‘to split open’, and darbayer ‘wide open, gaping, split up’ (MKT, 1134a; Les., 232a). Cf. mo. dalbaram ‘along the side’ (CMEL, 53a), and ju. dalbara (mo. dalba) ‘sake’ (S5I, 99b). In the SH, the Mig translators have rendered the expression dalbarčabět- once as ‘to cut breaking (apart)’ (§ 229: ffr...), and twice as ‘to cut (split) open’ (§ 255, 278: ŽJu). See HW, 31. In the sectional summary of § 229 (Y9, 49b), it is rendered less accurately as ‘to break (or smash)’ (fjR). This has misled several translators, including myself in Ra. IX, 126. The same expression is used in the poetic passage in § 255. As for those ‘entering at night’, the reference is to persons who try to enter without due authorization in the form of a token or mark of identification (bılge), or a verbal permission (kele, lit. ‘word’; see below).

For the ordinance concerning the delivery of urgent messages, cf. § 169 and com. ‘No one is to sit in a place above the nightguards’, lit. ‘No one is to sit in a seat above (de’ere) the nightguards’, i.e. no one is allowed to stop and stay anywhere beyonder and behind the sentries, in other words, past the limit between these and the...’

‘Without permission’, lit. ‘without ward’ (keleyn ikey), i.e. without the nightguards’ authorization.

‘No one is to walk up beyond (degɛ’in) the nightguards’: just as one was not allowed to stop and set in the area between the sentries and the tent, so.one is also not allowed to walk in that same area. For degɛ’in ‘on the upper side, above, higher than’ = ‘beyond’, cf. Ligeti 1971, 146-147; Otz’, V, 310-313, n. 7. This entire sentence is omitted in Pao’s translation (p. 41).

‘One must not walk between (jaqa’un) the nightguards.’ For jaqa’un ‘between’, cf. Ligeti 1971, 147; Otz’, V, 313-314, n. 7.

THE SECRET HISTORY

For the removal of the gear and clothing of enemies (and culprits in general), cf. Sertuys 1982a, 126. Some translators understand this passage to mean that not only the gear and clothing of the transgressor shall be seized by the nightguards, but he will also be arrested. See Cl, 167; 128, Street 1999, 175; Otz, I, 113. However, the sectional summary (Y9, 49b) specifically omits the transgressor, as rightly noted by Haenisch and Ligeti (Ha, 108; Li, 105), and he is also not included in the seizure in most other translations. Cf., e.g., Do1, 255; Ta, 161; Ev-Pop, 194.

Some of the above regulations, as well as the reference to Eljigeedie’s misadventure – about which nothing else is known – are quoted by Ogödei in § 278. For these regulations, cf. also Perlé 1962, 31-32. Eljigeedi (- Eljigeedi, meaning ‘Donkey’) reappears in § 275 as the father of Harqaun. They are both well-known personages. See below, nn. 275 and 278. The Western travellers to the Mongol court in the 13th century bear witness to the strict observance of those regulations and the harsh treatment meted out to those who unwittingly infringed them. See, e.g., MM, 61-62.

‘Was he not arrested?’, lit. ‘how was he arrested...?’ § 239. This section is almost entirely taken up with Chinggis’ words of praise for his faithful nightguards.

‘Lying down around’, lit. ‘Lying down surrounding’ (e’eren kebehej). Cf. §§ 192 and 229, and a few lines below in the present section, where horcė ‘(all) around’, is used instead of e’eren. For kebeh-‘gehe’, see ‘Quelques problèmes’, 241.

‘Vented tent’, lit. ‘tent having a smoke-hole (örıgete).’ For örige ‘ëriège’ (HW, 46, 128) ‘smoke-hoek on top of the yurt’, cf. mo. orük – örık id. See also RH, 70, no. 29; SG, 152; Do, 538b; ‘Quelques problèmes’, 266; and above, n. 21.

‘Ensured that I slept’, lit. ‘Let (or make, caused) me to sleep.’ ‘In quiet and peace’ (örük nata). Örük (w.f. örük) is a borrowing from uig. örük ‘quiet, rest.’ See FB, 222b; DTS, 390b.
Cf. Mo, 145; and below, n. 255. Nata in Written Mongolian and the living languages (cf. kh. nüü) means ‘firm, strong.’ See Les., 596b; Cev., 390a. This meaning is clearly related to the ancient meaning of ‘(at) peace, (at) rest,’ from which derives ‘not movable,’ hence ‘firm.’

For the ‘Palace tent’ (ordo ger), see above, n. 229.

‘Ensured that I was without fear,’ lit. ‘You have not made me afraid’ (see ogilagtiagan), i.e. ‘you have caused me not to be afraid.’ For the verb ogilagti, ‘to frighten,’ see above, n. 193.

‘In the swirling snowstorm/In shivering cold, in pouring rain,’ lit. ‘in the snowstorm that is moving (i.e. changing position)/In the cold that makes one shiver, in rain that is pouring.’ For ji’en ‘cold,’ cf. Cleave 1996, 40, n. 333. For šilgišik, facultative of šilgiš = (mo. šilgiš) ‘to tremble, shiver,’ see Les., 706b. Cf. Mostaert 1939, 329; Cleave 1991, 140, n. 47; Oz., VI, 10, 12, n. 6.

‘Taking no rest’ (širin ali kin), lit. ‘not making širin.’ The word širin, glossed as ‘a short rest’ (舒松), is apparently unattested elsewhere in Mongolian. As pointed out by N. Poppe (p.c.), Kanaam has a word čirin meaning ‘slumber.’ See VWTD, III, 2126b. C. TH, 300-301 (as JYT, 522-523); Oz., VI, 13, n. 8. Čirin is actually the form found in ATI’, 75a. See ATL, 162. Poppe has suggested a possible relationship with ord. čirin, ‘regarder en ferment à motoir les yeux’ (DO, 2026b) < širin-sti = mo. širmevi ‘to squint’ (Gol., III, 369c). Thus, there are two possibilities: 1) ‘not making slumber’ = ‘without even slumbering;’ and 2) ‘not blinking’ = ‘without even blinking’ – both of them fitting the context. In view of the fact that the expression ‘not blinking an eye’ occurs a few lines below, I have rendered širin ali kin as ‘taking no rest.’

‘Latticed tent’ (šütsetil gen), i.e. with a lattice frame (šütset, mo. sütseti) ‘splint or strips of bamboo,’ is the traditional tents are made. See Les., 743a. The entry on sütseti is misplaced in MKT, 2146b.
§ 232. ‘Female attendants’, lit. ‘ćerbi-maids’ (ćerbi őkit; AT, 75b; Ćerbi őkit). These were young women who served in various capacities as servants and ‘stewardsess’es in the ordo, but their degree of servitude is not known. For the designation ordo-yn ćerbi őkit, cf. Hambis 1975, 43, n. 64; cf. also Kaźużyński 1978, 125, n. 4. Ćerbi is an ancient plural of ćerbi. See GWM, 72, § 272. As for the ‘sons of the household’, lit. ‘sons of the tent’ (ger-ün ćo’uś), in this period they were almost certainly young domestic slaves. That they were domestics is confirmed by the interlinear gloss (Y’ 10, 4b). The expression ger-ün ćo’uś, its Chinese transcription in the later Yüan texts (chei-hieh k’ou, 亁庬), and its Turkic equivalent in the Persian texts (ge-khus, 兀赫), have been the subject of investigation by various scholars. See, in particular, Cleaves 1950, 51-52, n. 170 (where earlier literature on the subject is discussed) TMEN, nos. 675, 676; Ebuswa 1969, Mu, III, 72-73, n. 8; Murakami 1973; MTSK, 16, 136, 149, 303; and ÇEME, 32. The term ćo’uś (pl. ćo’uś), lit. ‘son’ (mo. košiğan), in this context means ‘servant, slave.’ See Vlad, 213, 214; Kaźużyński, loc. cit. Also, from the context in which these categories of service personnel are mentioned, i.e. together with carrel-keepers and cowherds, it would appear that their functions in Ćinggis Qan’s time were rather menial. It is interesting that in Ordos the term ćo’uś designated an ‘esclave du dernier rang’ rather than a servant—a usage that may have an early origin. See DO, 433b. For other interpretations and renderings of ordo-yn ćerbi őkit and ger-ün ćo’uś, cf. On, 130, and Čd-Pop, 198. Whereas Önön’s definition of ‘house-boys’ for ger-ün ćo’uś is acceptable (cf. TMEN, no 675), I find Even and Pope’s ‘servantes des chambellans’ for ćerbi őkit grammatically incorrect; it is also contradicted by both the interlinear gloss and the sectional summary (Y’ 10, 6a). It will be remembered that in § 124, Dõdei Ćerbi was put in charge of ‘domestics and servants in the tent’ (ger dota ćerbi țiqar), i.e. in Ćinggis Qan’s yurt. Dõdei was subsequently (1299) appointed as one of the ‘elders’
(dığiș) of the (four) companies of dayguards (§ 227). The functions of all these different classes of servants are unfortunately not described in any of our sources.

For the term hıkeći (c. hıke ‘cow’; pl. hıkeçin) ‘cowherd, ox-driver’, cf. Cleaves 1953, 103, n. 3.

For the 'tent-carts' (ger tergen), see above, n. 121.

‘The standards and drums, and the spears arranged beneath them’ (tug giürge doro jida). Cf. § 278, where this ordinance is quoted again, with the ‘bowls and vessels’ mentioned immediately after the spears (jida). Cl. 169-170, translated the entire sentence thus: ‘Let the nightguards collect the spears at the foot of the standards and drums.’ In note 6 on p. 169, he writes: ‘This interpretation of doro [i.e. doro – IR.] as a postposition was suggested by the Reverend Antoine Mostaert in an oral communication of 8 September 1953.’ While I prefer to render asara- with ‘to take care of (or to be responsible for) instead of ‘to collect’, I think that Mostaert and Cleaves are undoubtedly correct in their interpretation of doro; indeed, a similar, if not identical, interpretation had been adopted by Haenisch. See Ha, 110, where doro is rendered with ‘daronet.’ (If we exclude Palladisi’s unpublished translation [see Section Seven of the Introduction], the first correct rendering is actually found in Čendu Giing’s version. See Ce, 501.) However, N. Poppe (p.c.) is inclined to see in the four words in question four or three direct objects, ‘doro’ being in his view either a weapon or an attribute of jida, following in this Kuzcu’s doubtful interpretation. See Ko, 173: ‘banners, drums and pickets.’ Cf. also ibid., 564 and 608, where doro jida is listed as a compound meaning ‘pickets (؟).’ Several other scholars take doro, which they variously read dörige (kh. dörîso), dörô, dörî, as meaning ‘stirrups’ (Da, 227; Da, 193; cf., however, Da, 230, where dörige is left untranslated; Mu, III, 65; Ia, 164; ‘halberds’ (Oz, VI, 29, 32-34, n. 4), ‘pikes’ (On, 130, and n. 292), and ‘lances at crochet’ (Ev-Pop, 232, with a note [6] on p. 295 reading ‘Doro (؟) jida.’ Peut-être faut-il y voir les ‘lances arrêtées d’un croc à la douille, pour pouvoir éventuellement désarçonner leur homme’, que mentionne Jean de Plan Carpin (p. 77).’ Cf. also Do, 232; El-Ar, 760; Ce, 216; and others following the same or similar interpretations (a convenient listing is given in Ia, 387, n. 620). However, mo. dörü (dörü) means ‘iron or rope nose-ring, or wood pin (for cattle); lead rope (for cattle); basket; handle or cross-bar to lift a basket; splint; cotter pin’ (Les., 269a; cf. Kow., 1941b; TH, 285 [= JYT, 404-495]); a word related to it, döreći (= döre [+ dörü] + den. noun suff. -ći) ‘(nose) ring’, occurs in § 135. See above, n. 135. To see in the word dörü a ‘pike’, ‘pickstaff’ or ‘halberd’ is stretching the ring too far. Furthermore, in the SH, dörü (= dörü, mo. doora) is regularly glossed hisa 7 ‘under, below’ (see HW, 37), as is the case in §§ 232 and 278. Iričin (Iriçinen) is virtually alone among the contemporary Mongolian scholars in correctly transcribing dörü as doora. See Ir, 200. It would therefore seem that, at the time in the tent(s) or cart(s) where this equipment remained, the spears were placed ‘under’, i.e. arranged on the ground (or floor) at the foot of the standards and drums. The nightguards were also responsible for the custody of the qan’s precious bowls and vessels (ayapu saba) which were apparently also kept beneath the standards and drums. It is not clear from the text whether we are dealing here with several standards and drums, or with the white standard with nine tails (see § 202) and the great war drum (cf. § 106), the two paramount symbols of the qan’s power, hence sacred objects. If so, the translation should be amended accordingly. For giürge (= köürge) ‘drum’ and its variants in the SH, cf. Oz, VI, 31-32, n. 3; and above, n. 106.

‘Uncut meat and food as well’, lit. ‘thick meat and food as well’ (otken bir niqan iden), i.e. the meat and foodstuff before being cut and prepared for cooking by the ba’aricin. The words in question are understood differently by various scholars, who render them as ‘meat for the sacrificial offerings’ (Da, 227, and Da, 193, after Ko, 173; Mu, III, 65 and 73, n. 10; El-Ar, 761, n. 5); ‘clear (= plain – I.R.) meat’ (Li, 107); ‘thick meatfood (= thick meat soup)’ (Oz, VI, 29, 34-36, n. 5; Oz, II,
128, 150-151, n. 2 – after Do’, 260; cf. also Ja, 348; ‘pièces de viande’ (Ev-Pop, 198, note 7 on p. 295 reads: ‘Odgos-bet miqan idegen: probablemente la viande coupée en morceaux aux articulations, par opposition à la viande entier en petits morceaux ou hachée dans la composition d’un plat’). However, as shown by the parallel passage in § 278, ökken miqan(n) forms a single compound without ide ‘en; the latter must therefore be considered a separate noun. Thus the nightguards also had to supervise both the supply of raw foodstuffs and the preparation of the same. This sentence is related to the next one, which implies that the nightguards would be held responsible for any scarcity (qor qomsa) of food. Regarding the expression qor qomsa, lit. ‘little (quantity) – scanty’ = ‘lacking, wanting; scarcity’; cf. DO, 357b; Vietze 1990, 386 (where, however, the word qor has been inadvertently dropped from the sentence). ‘We shall seek them from the nightguards who have been entrusted with their supervision’, i.e. ‘we shall seek and obtain them from the nightguards …’. For this sentence, cf. Poppe 1964, 367.

‘Shall stand right next to the tent.’ For these words, see Lettres, 77.

‘Shall … oversee the large kunis pitchers’, lit. ‘shall … be holding in hand’ = controlling the large kunis pitchers (yekê tîvîrê). For these pitchers, see above, n. 213.

The ‘campmasters’ (nuntu‘aîî), i.e. the officers in charge of laying out the camp and setting up the qan’s tents. The term nuntu‘aîî (see nuntu‘âîî, plural of nuntu‘aîî (see nuntu‘âîî)), occurs again in §§ 278 and 279; also (§ 279) in the form nuntu$tîcan (< nuntu‘aîîcû < nuntu‘aîîcû). For this term, cf. HCWLYTT, 99-104, no. 22; Oz’, VI, 37-38, n. 8. For the plural suffix -tan-tan, cf. Mo, 30.

‘Exactly one half of them shall stay at the carts’, lit. ‘measuring (= counting) their half (farimud-iyen), they shall place it at the carts.’ In other words, exactly one half of the nightguards must remain to guard the tent-carts, while the other half goes hunting with the qan. Jarînut (pl. of jarîn – with reference to the nightguards) means ‘half’, not ‘some (in number)’ (naniqash) as in Oz’, VI, 30. See HW, 86; the sectional summary (Y² 10, 6b); Matêriel I, 65; MA, 201b. The error has been corrected in Oz’, II, 129. Several of the above ordinances, including the present one, will be reconfirmed by Ögôdî (§ 278).

§ 233. This section is the continuation of the ordinance (farîq) concerning the duties of the nightguards. The injunction against going to fight without the qan’s participation is repeated in § 278. The entire § 233 is translated and discussed in Mo, 142-153. The following are additional comments and elucidations.

For the words ‘If We Ourselves (is in person) do not go on a military campaign’ (hidînas beyê čerîk ese qara‘asu), cf. Mo, 184.

‘After being thus instructed by Us’, lit. ‘having let themselves be told (is ordered) in this way’ (eyin ke e‘llî dit), or ‘après qu’ils se sont laissé donner un ordre congé de tels termes’ (A.M.). For this expression, cf. also Cleaves 1953, 48-49, n. 17; Ligeti 1971, 152.

The chamberlains (čerîbîn, pl.) in charge of troops. Besides their duties as chamberlains and stewards in the ordo, the čerîbis were also military chiefs as the occasion demanded. See § 234. Cf. Hambis 1975, 43, n. 64.

‘My golden life’ (minu ałan amin). For ałan ‘gold(en)’ = ‘royal’, see above, n. 21. This sentence is emphasized by the particle liî. See Street 1986a, 14-15.

‘Whether this is moving or stationery (orîk-türî), i.e. when the qan is travelling or when he has pitched camp. Orîk-türî is, literally, ‘at rest.’ Cf. Cleaves 1957, 441, n. 44; and above, n. 230.

The main base camp’, lit. ‘the great a‘rûqî (yekê a‘rûqî). This was the base or ‘rear’ camp belonging to the qan’s ordo. Cf. above, n. 136. The epithet yekê ‘great’ also indicates, as usual, that the establishment in question pertains to the qan.
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The reason why We say ... duties', lit. 'Saying to Ourselves that the nightguards have such double (dabqur, i.e. manifold) and quite distinct (qaqsu qaqs) tasks (yabudatan, i.e. duties), the reason why We say, "Let them not go on a military campaign apart and separately from Us" is such (= this).') For qaqsu qaqs (mo. qaqsu qaqs), besides Mo, 146-151, cf. also Besz 1969, 126-127, n. 5. For Orazwa, the expression (-a) aqqida o'overe, lit. 'apart and separately (from)', or 'apart (from) and separately', which occurs also in §§ 199 and 278, is a compound meaning only 'separately' or 'apart (from)'. See Oz', VI, 56-57, n. 7.

§ 234. 'Some of the nightguards shall decide on judicial matters together with Sigq Qutqutu', lit. 'As to judicial matters (jäqiq) with Sigq Qutqutu, from among the nightguards some shall hear judicial matters with him', i.e. certain officers chosen from among the nightguards were to be appointed to assist Sigq Qutqutu in hearing legal cases and passing judgements. As we have already seen (§ 203 and com.), Sigq Qutqutu had earlier been appointed grand judge (jäqiq).)

'Quivers, bows, breastplates and weapons (febe). The word *febe* has two meanings: 1) a particular type of arrow (see § 147 and com.), and 2) 'weapons' in general, including arrows. Cf. TMEN, no. 156; and Khomonov 1970, 39 (also for remarks on *qoyq* 'breastplate, armour'). Although there is some ambiguity in the Chinese sectional summary (Y² 10, 10a) which speaks of 'arrows and weapons', I follow the interlinear gloss and render *febe* as 'weapons' as most of the translators have done.

'The hunting nets' (bo'ulim = mo. *digesim*, not listed in Pelliot 1925) were nets, or snares, used for catching birds and other animals. Cf. Ma, 316-317, n. 6; TH, 198 (= JYT, 343). The 'a-qaq' of HW, 8 (see also H, 78, § 234) is an incorrect reading due to a faulty transcription of the original Mongol word.

'A'arasan 'satin' corresponds to mo. *a'arasan* 'chattels, belongings, possessions' (Les., 18a). Cf. mo. *a'arasanui* 'having possessions, rich' (ibid., 1197a). For this word, which occurs but seldom in ancient texts, cf. Khomonov 1970, 40; TH, 85 (= JYT, 150); CEME, 27. For its later usage, cf. ETI, 6a. The distribution of satin, a valuable commodity, was as a reward or in payment for services to officials, a practice that continued until modern times.

'To take up duty' is, literally, 'to go' (yubu-), i.e. 'to undertake, perform, to serve.' Cf. Cleaves 1950, 96 [14]; DO, 399b.

On the commanders of the quiverbearers and the dayguards, and on Arqat's 'brave warriors' (ba'at) mentioned in this section, see §§ 225-227, 230. The ordinance regarding the stationing of the nightguards near the ordo, on the left (eastern side), has been inadvertently omitted in L², 203, first line. Cf. R, 135, lines 9229-9230; St, 117, lines X095-X097.

'The tent-carts of the Palace' (ordo ger tergen). Some scholars (e.g. Li, 108; Cleaves 1955, 37, n. 26), separate ordo from ger tergen and translate 'the palace (ordo) and the tent-carts.' However, ordo ger tergen = ordo-yin ger tergen, as is clearly shown by the examples quoted by Cleaves (loc. cit.), and by his own translation of the passage in § 278 (ibid.). The translation has, in fact, been rectified in C, 171.

'Constantly' (darun). On this term, a fossilized convenvum module of darun- 'to press' used adverbially, see Cleaves 1953a, 245.

'Scraps of leftovers' renders Mongolian qog (= mo. qoy). The literal meaning of the Chinese interlinear gloss is 'cuttings of grass' (犁), but the actual meaning is 'sweepings, scraps, remnants of food, garbage', which we find in the living languages and dialects as well as in the literary language. This word is a borrowing from uig. qoy- 'dust, dirt, ashes'. See DTS, 452b, 457a; ED, 609a. The word for 'dried dung' (used for fuel) is here qomaal', which alliterates with qog. Qomaal' corresponds to mo. qomoyal, qoomool, qoomal (= qomul) id. (mainly used with reference to horse, donkey and mule dung).
See Kow., 936a; Les., 961a; MKT, 659a-b. Cf. also Vietze 1990, 386; DO, 351a.

The ordinances in this section provide for the security of the qan’s ordo by distributing the reorganized detachments of nightguards, chamberlains, quiverbearers and dayguards around it. This enables us to get a much clearer picture of the topography of the Mongol camp. The right or western side of the ordo – the entrance of which faced south – was jointly guarded by the quiverbearers of Yisit Te’e and Büküder (see §§ 225, 230), and by the dayguards under the command of Alícüz, Ağolü and Aqtau (see §§ 226, 227, 230). The left or eastern side was guarded by the dayguards led by Buqa, Dödele Çerbi, Doqolqu Çerbi and Çanai (see §§ 226, 227). In front of the ordo, i.e. on the southern side, were deployed the élite guards of Arqai Qaspar (see §§ 226, 230). Moreover, Dödele Çerbi was appointed to control all the dayguards on duty, as well as the numerous auxiliary personnel attached to the ordo, an office that obviously carried great responsibility and constant vigilance – hence the ‘poetic’ image of a busy official who, as Onon says (On, 131, n. 294; cf. the ed. 220, n. 517) ‘will have no time to look after himself properly’ and will have to make do with scraps of food and self-gathered fuel while he is at his station at the rear of Çinggis’ tent. As seen earlier (§§ 169, 229), the back of the tent was the place used for conveying confidential and urgent verbal messages to the qan. Further details on the organization of the Mongol camp can be gleaned from the HTSL and from the Western travellers’ accounts. See CG, 185-186; and SF, 624b-625a, s.v. ‘curia’. Cf. also Li, 176, n. 234.

§ 235. The Qarluq Turks were mentioned in § 198 in connection with the flight to Central Asia of Güçülük, the Naiman prince, son of Tayang Qan. For bibliographical references to that important person, see above, n. 151. Cf. also YTWHTLC, 4-6, for the episode described in this section. Their chief was Arslan (‘Lion’) Qan, but this was probably a royal title rather than his name. He ruled in the Qarluq capital Qayaliq (or Qayali) in the lower Ili valley, identified with the site of Dunguq, 18 km south-west of Taldy-Kurgan in southeastern Kazakhstan. Arslan Qan was wise enough to submit peacefully to Qubilai Noyan – the commander of a thousand of the Barulans (on whom see §§ 202 [no. 8], 209) – thus becoming a subordinate ally of the Mongols. Çinggis gave him one of his daughters in marriage, sealing in this way their alliance: by making him a royal son-in-law (guregen). He did the same with the rulers of the Uighur and Öngüüt Turks, who had also not ‘rebelled’ (bulqabo), i.e. who had not offered resistance. See § 235, and above, n. 182. For the term bulqabo and its implications, see above, n. 150. Upon Arslan’s submission, Çinggis renamed him Arslan Sartaqta, i.e. ‘Arslan the Sartaq’. See SL, II/1, 151. For the designation ‘Sartaqta’, see above, nn. 152 and 182. For the background of Arslan’s submission, see HWC, 74-77. According to the Chinese sources (SL, II/163), the submission took place in the spring of the Year of the Sheep (hsin-wel 24), i.e. 1211. See Na, 337; FSHCA, 33.

As for the identity of Çinggis’ daughter, it is noteworthy that her name is not given in any of the sources, whereas the princesses given to the rulers of the Uighurs (§ 238) and the Öngüüt (§ 239) are named. A Mongol princess called Töre is mentioned in YS 109, 276d, as being the wife of Yesü Buqa. Çinggis is not known to have had a daughter by that name; it is difficult to say, therefore, whether she was the daughter who went to Yesü Buqa after Arslan Qan’s death. See MWESC 151, 5b-6a.

In Da, 229-230 (cf. Da, 194-195), there follows a poetic passage taken from AT, 858-86a. For the Russian translation of the same, see LDAT, 182. However, this passage is a later son interpretation: it confines Töre with Alaqa Bek, the princess given in marriage to the Öngüüt ruler. See § 239; LDAT, 353, n. 2.
§ 236. P. 199 relates how in the Year of the Ox, i.e. in 1205, Činggis sent Sūbe'etei in pursuit of Tsoq'ta's sons Qodu (~ Qutu, or beiser, Qodu; see above, n. 141), Qal and Citla'un, providing him with "an iron cart." See above, n. 199. As I explained in my note, the date is wrong as this event must be placed c.a. 1217. For a detailed chronology of these events, which is at variance with that presented in Buell 1992, see Appendix One. For the Čui, i.e. the Chu River in Kazakhstan, see §§ 152, 177 and 198, and above, n. 152.

'Destroyed them and came back' (muqtgata irthe). For muqtgata (~ muqtgata) -'to destroy, finish off', see above, n. 153. As shown above, it was as a Mongol army, led by Čoți and Sūbe'etei and sent against the Merkit remnants, first defeated Qodu at the Chu and, finally, at a place that the Chinese sources call Yu-û-yû (~ Yu-û-yû) in the Qıpçaq territory whither Qodu and his followers had fled. Cf. TDMD, 369-371. According to Buell 1992, 12, the destruction of the last Merkit occurred in the spring of 1209.

§ 237. As with the event recorded in the preceding section, this episode is also misplaced. Jebe's expedition against Gūčilük of the Naiman, already briefly referred to in § 202, actually took place in 1218. Again we have here an error of a full twelve-year cycle (1206 for 1218). See Appendix One. For the various accounts of Gūčilük's death, see HWC, 66-68, SL1, 1/2, 183-184; TDMD, 400-403; EM, 224-225; ES, 294-296; HCSL, 653-654; and Buell 1992, 27-28.

In the SH, the place where Gūčilük met his death is called Sariq Qun, a Turkic-Mongol hybrid name meaning 'Yellow Cliff' (sarıq = tu. sarı 'yellow', cf. TMEN, no. 1207; qun = pmo. qun) means 'cliff, steep bank, slope', cf. above, n. 25. As already noted in Pelliot 1930b, 55, the name of the place found in the Persian sources as well as in the corresponding passage of the AT (AT1, 86a; cf. ATL, 167: 'Sarji-yuul', the first element of which is incorrectly read 'Khiras' in LDAT, 183) is Sariq Qol (= Sariq Fool), i.e. 'Yellow River.' This, in turn, may be an error for Sarji Köl (or Sar-i Köl), the 'Yellow Lake'; i.e. Lake Victoria or Zor Kül (Zorkul) in the Pamir, on the Tajikistan-Afghanistan border, in that same region (~ the Panj River valley - where Gūčilük is supposed to have been captured by local hunters and delivered to Jebe's horsemen). On the other hand, the Sarikol Range at the eastern edge of the Pamir cannot be excluded, even though this location seems too far to the east. The identification remains uncertain. For a discussion of the problem, see Boyle in HWC, 67-68, n. 18; and YAO TL 1981, Sūbe'etei's and Jebe's expeditions in Central Asia in 1216/17 and 1218 respectively put the Mongols directly in contact with the Kūhşarazan empire (the 'Sar-ta'ul people' - Sar-ta'ul land - of the SH) and were a prelude to the great Western Campaign launched by Činggis Qan soon after their return to Mongolia, following the so-called 'Otrar incident.' However, the first clash between the troops of Muhammad Sâh of Kūhšaraz and the Mongols led by Čoți and Sūbe'etei apparently took place in 1216/17 in the course of the Mongol campaign against Qodu in Qıpçaq country, between the rivers Qülit and Qaimisch (~ Irizq and Turghai). See HWC, 69-70, 370-373; TDMD, 371; FSHCA, 36. Cf. below, n. 254, and Appendix One. For the name Kūhšaraz (Xvার)zam), see above, n. 152. For Otrar (Otrar, see below, n. 257.

§ 238. Idu'at was the title of the Uighur ruler. The written Mongolian form of the word was iduyat (~ idyat'), a form confirmed by the AT, 86a (see ATL, 167, where 'iduqat' = 'iduyat'), which corresponds to uig. idüqat, in other preclassical texts we find the lecto plena iduy qat (see, e.g., Cleave 1949, 73b, corresponding to uig. idüq qat (~ iduqat), meaning the 'sacred favour of (Heaven)', or 'grace or fortune envoyed or oествой [sic] (par le Ciel)' (Geng & Hamilton 1981, 49b), i.e. 'divine majesty.' On this title and its various connotations, see TMEN, nos. 238, 1936; DTS, 27b; ED, 46c; CLL, 316-317 (see also Han Ju-lin in ICS 1:1940/41, 53-76); Cleave
As in previous occurrences of this name, 'Uighurs' is written Uirut, the plural of Uir or Usqur (= Uljur). See above, n. 151. The ruler of the Uighurs who in 1209 submitted voluntarily to Chinggis Qan was Barçaq Arı Tegin (tegin being his princely title; cf. above, n. 182). On his name, see Cleaves 1949, n. 29, 100, n. 28; Geng & Hamilton 1981, 486. See also Chapitre CVIII, 133, n. 9; Rybatzki 2000, 253. His capital was Beś Balaq ('Five Cities'), Beś Baly and Beś Baly in Mongolian, known as Peč-hing (the ‘Northern Court’ in Chinese, situated in the area of modern Jimaś/Janšar north-east of Urumchi in Sinkiang. See de Rachewiltz 1962, 48, n. 56; YShi, 10. That this, and not the 'southern capital' Qara Qoqo (Qara Qoqo, Qara Bala, east of Turfan) was his residence is clearly stated by Juvariant. See HWC, 47. For Qara Qoqo, see NMP, III, 220a, 221a-b [Index]. Barçaq’s submission to, and subsequent relations with, Chinggis Qan are related in HWC, 44-48; SL, 1/1, 147-149; 1/2, 152-154, as well as in the Chinese sources. For a discussion of these relations, see the important contribution of Th. T. Ålsen in CAE (Ålsen 1983); and Tang PH 1998. However, our sources do not agree on the names of the envelopes sent by Barçaq to Chinggis. In the SH their names are given as Ajikraq and Darbā. Pelliot suggested a possible emendation of the former into 'At-buñag' (Pe, 93, n. 1), but gives no reason. At1, 86a, gives the correct form 'Ahibra' (ATL, 167; [= Adkārây]). Adkārây is undoubtedly the correct written form, corresponding to the 'Adkārây 'a young stallion.' See ED, 49a. Cf. Bese 1978, 356, no. 5. The discrepancies between the SH and the Persian sources are discussed by Boyle in HWC, 45, 9. Cf. also Li, 176-177, n. 28; Mu, III, 85-86, n. 8; Buell 1992, 10-11, n. 28. The confusion is largely due to the fact that there was an exchange of envelopes from both sides on more than one occasion.

'Mother Sun' (eke naran poetic), because of the alliteration, for naran eke. For the epithet eke 'mother', given to deities that are personifications of nature, such as the Earth, see Mostaert 1957a, 99, 101, n. 8; idem 1962, 201, 218, n. 21. 'Came upon', lit. 'found.' For the 'wife-couple' nere aldar name = fame = 'fame', cf. Lettres, 31.

'If I were to obtain/But a ring from your golden belt/But a thread from your crimson coat,' lit. 'If I obtained/but one from the rings (qargul-adu) of the golden belt/but one from the threads (härtesin-cu) of the crimson robes.' (qargul, plural of qargul (= mnu. yrskul) 'ring or hook of a belt, buckle, clasp,' cf. Oe, VI, 85-86, n. 3; Les., 361b. However, these rings decorating the leather belt must not be confused with the metal buckle (as in Ev-Pop, 200). Cf. Pelliot 1929a, 141, 144ff. In view of the plural form qargul-adu of AT1, 86a, Pelliot's 'qargul-adu' (read 'qargul-ada') is correct (Pe, 93), hence the reading 'qargul-ada' of H, 78 ('qargul-ada'); and H, 9310; L2, 204; Daš, line 3408 ('qargul-ada'); and St, line X126, must be amended. Härtesin = mnu. uitéši(n), uitéši(n) 'scrap, shred, rag, etc.' See Les., 1011b; Khomonov 1970, 34. For the symbolism of Barçaq's request, see CEME, 49-50, 64-65.

In Mongolian medieval terminology (as also in Chinese traditional usage), 'to become a son' (kašun bok)' meant 'to become a subject or vassal,' and it is in this sense that Barçaq employs this expression. See Mo, 209.

For susb (= mnu. subūd) 'small or smaller pearl,' see Matériel I, 96; MA, 498a, s.v.; RH, 303, no. 11; Kara 1950, 325. Cf. Clauson 1966, 33-34; Huang SC 1984, 210. For tana (pl. tana) 'big pearl,' see above, n. 133. For nacit (gold) brocade(s), see Pelliot 1927a, 269-271; CEME, 2-4, 29-29 and passim; Cleaves 1991a, 125; Moriya 1994, 88-89. This gold brocade - the medieval 'Tartar cloth' par excellence - was a cloth of gold and silk, i.e. a brocade with ornamental threads made of gold; however, in its restricted meaning it designated gilded cloth or brocade and, in several sources, it is often paired.
with the term nakh (i.e. pers. nax, mno. naq; see below, n. 274), also referring to cloth woven of silk and gold. Although nacit (w.t. nacič), a word originally borrowed from pers. nasy and, ultimately, ultimately, amb. nasy, is already a plural (of *nacis or *nacitims), we find its double plural form nacitid (w.t. nacitidūd) in § 274. Being obsolete in the 17th-18th centuries, this word is substitut-
ted with nacīn ‘falcon(s)’ in AT, 86b (cf. ALT, 168; for
nacīn, see TMEN, no. 1728). For double plurals in Mongolian, see GW, 73, § 277. For dardas ‘damask(s), a plural of dardā,
cf. mno. dardā, ’a kind of flowered Chinese silk (ch. chuang-tien ēbei)’ (Les., 133a). On this word, see CEME, 28, Morīyusu
1904, 84-91, no. 11. For torq’ar ‘silk(s), a plural of torqan, see
above, n. 131. A further stem, satānis (a l’arasn), is included among the ‘gifts’ brought by Baruq to Činggis Qan. For
a’rasan, see above, n. 234. These were only some of the regular
articles supplied by tributary nations. Cf., e.g., MR, II,
124-125; MP, 138. See also § 274. Other gifts, such as white
gerfalcon, white geldings and black sables, are mentioned in
the next section (§ 239). Cf. also §§ 248, 249, 250, 252, 260,
264, 265, 266. The items varied, but they were always the most
precious things that a subject people could offer (besides the
people themselves, as slaves), and the ones which were especially
valued by the court at the time.

The daughter of Činggis Qan who was given in marriage to
Baruq is called Al Altun in the SH, a reading only partly
confirmed by the AT, 86b, which gives ilqalun (read ilaltum) Beki (or Begi), added to Al-altun-beki in ATL, 168. A compara-
tion of the various forms of the name in the Persian and
Chinese sources indicates that her name was probably Altun
(‘Gold’) in Mongolian and Altun (‘Gold’) or El (~ Al) Altun
(‘Peace-Gold’) in Turkic; for the title of begi or princess, see
above, n. 49. Cf. RCAC, 128 ed. Bn.; Boyle’s remarks in IW, 47,
n. 17; Li, 176, n. 238. See also Huang WP 1964, 34 and
[40], line 11. On the common Turkic name Altun (used in this
form also by the Mongols), see OuECD, 145-146, no. 2; Pelliot
1944a, 175; Chou pI with 
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The name Al Altun of the SH appears to be a mongolized form
(el ~ al) of her Turkic name. However, L. Bese (p.c.) is of the
opinion that the name Al Altun must be interpreted as ‘Flame-
scarlet Gold’, which may well be the case. For ta ‘scarlet,
vermilion’ > mo. al id.; cf. Poppe 1955, 38; TMEN, no. 517;
Rybatzki [2003], s.v. ‘Al.’ According to Rashid al-Dīn (SL, I2,
70), she was the fifth and favourite daughter of Činggis Qan.
Cf. YS, 109, 2760a. For her marriage vicissitudes owing to
Baruq’s premature death, see RKAC, 128. Cf. Li, 176, n. 238;
Mu, III, 87, n. 10.

§ 239. This section has been translated in full and richly anno-
tated by Paul Pelliot in NCHIK, 1,5, 55-56. See also his NHHO,
141-142; Li, 177, n. 239; and Mu, III, 92-104. As pointed out
by Pelliot, the SH account of the expedition against the so-called
People of the Forest (hui-yin ingen) and other tribes inhabiting
the region of the Irtysh, Angara and Yenisei (Kern) rivers is in
reality a conflation of two separate events which occurred in
1207/08 and 1218/19 respectively.

The voluntary submission of Quduqa Bexi of the Oiyyat and
his tribe, the Tümen (‘Ten Thousand’) Oiyyat, belongs to
the former date, whereas Čiźi’s expedition – with Bexa’s participa-
ton against the rebellious forest tribes belongs to the latter
date. Quduqa Bexi had previously allied himself with Jamiqa,
the Nairan and the Merkit (see §§ 141-144). His territory was
the region along the Ṣligid (Shahbid) Göl (the ‘Singes’ of § 144
and the ‘Siqin’ of our § 239; see below), just west of Lake
Khabugul (Xöwügul Nur) and flowing into the Dǒd (Qoqor
Nur); however, it must have extended considerably to the
south-west. When the army led by Činggis Qan, Čiźi and others
moved in 1200 against the Nairan and Merkit forces assem-
bled in northwestern Mongolia, its vanguard (possibly led by Čiźi)
reached Quduqa’s territory, whereupon Quduqa not only sub-
mitted without resistance, but also agreed to guide the Mongol
army to the place where his former allies had in the meantime
gathered, i.e. the area of the Irtysh and Bukhtarma rivers about
that these events have been purposely anticipated, or brought forward, in the SH. See Appendix One. According to Pelliot, op. cit., 57, n. 30, Šiqšīt — the place where the O'yirat's submission took place — may refer to either campaign; but in my opinion it can only refer to the 1208 submission of Quduqa Beki prior to the expedition to the Irysh. In the Chinese interlinear version Šigšig is glossed as ‘a place-name’, and in the sectional summary (N° 10, 17a) it is referred to as ‘a territory’ (tūfen). However, as stated in Hambis 1926, 286-287, and Parlec', 10, this is undoubtedly the Šigšīd Gol, already mentioned as ‘Šigši’ in §144 in connection with Quduqa Beki’s movements. Šiqšī (≡ Šiqšī) is a metathetical form of Šiqšī (≡ Šiqšī). For final d - s, see IMCS, 109. The AT, 42a, 87a, has the corrupt forms Šiqšiš and Singsing. For this river see also above, n. 144.

In the sentence ‘Quduqa Beki ... made them submit at the Šiqšī River’, the Mongolian for ‘to make submit’ is oro'-ul (≡ mo. oro'-ul), lit. ‘to make enter (as subjects).’ Cf. Cleaves 1951, 88, n. 82. Following the Chinese sectional summery, Pelliot (NCHK I, 5) translated: ‘Qudugh-a-bik… le fit arrive à Šiqšīt.’ ‘Oz,’ VI, 93-95 (cf. Oz., II, 134), Do, 269, and Ev-Pop, 201, also take oro'-ul literally in the sense of ‘to make enter, penetrate, etc.’; on the assumption that Šiqšīt was a region, territory or valley. However, the Ming translators were not aware that Šiqšīt was in fact a river, hence their misinterpretation of oro'-ul, a verb that occurs immediately after with the meaning of ‘to cause to submit, bring under submission’, and simply as oro'-' to submit’ immediately before. If taken literally, Šiqšī-tur oro'-ulha would mean ‘he made them enter into the Šiqšī River’, which was certainly not the case here.

According to § 207, Qorqī was given authority over the People of the Forest from his base on the Irysh, and was ordered to bring these people under control — obviously not an easy task judging by later developments, Mongol authority over the whole region between the Irysh, the Yenisei, the Angara and the Selenga being still rather loose. The Tölöö and Telengüt people were also to form part of Qorqī’s new
myriarchy. Qoči is mentioned again in § 241, but only in connection with the submission of the Qoči Tumut.

We do not know which Buqa is the one mentioned as Joci’s guide. Some scholars, such as Wang Kuo-wei and Liegi, believe that Muqil’s younger brother is meant; others claim that he is to be identified with Buqa Gürgen (no. 81 in the list in § 202). See Pelliot’s comments, op. cit., 56, n. 37; Li, 218, s.v. ‘Buka.’ Subsequently Pelliot took the view that this Buqa was ‘probably’ Muqil’s brother. See HCG, 370. For the verb qajarcela (= mo. yajarcela) ‘to accompany someone to show him the way’, see Cleaves 1956a, 394, n. 17. Qudua Beki, the chief of the Tümen Qiyarin, is known also as the father of a son who married a daughter of Činger Qtn (see below), and of a daughter called Orq (w.f. Oyr) Qimish – not to be confused with the homonymous wife of Gürük – who married Mönke Qan. Qudua eventually became one of the commanders of a thousand of the right wing in Činggis’ army – his unit, recruited from Qiyarin tribesmen, actually numbering four thousand men. See SL, 12, 269.

As noted by Pelliot, op. cit., 56, n. 38, tūmen ‘ten thousand’ is merely an epithet prefixed to names of tribes; cf. Tümen Tübehgen (‘The Ten Thousand Tübehgen’), Oloń Dongqiyit (‘The Many Dongqiyit’), etc. See above, n. 150. The Tümen are the historical Orat ancestors of the Kalmucks, and the Buriat the ancestors of the modern Buriats. The former had first been mentioned in § 141 also in connection with Qudua Beki; the latter’s name appears here for the first and only time. Cf. Beso 1908, 21-22. The Barqun (the plural form Barqut is the one used by Rāḏif al-Dīn) are to be identified with the ancestors of the present-day Barguzin Buriats and the Bargut(?) of NW Manchuria. See above, n. 8. The Uraut (Rāḏif al-Dīn’s Urekī) lived apparently next to the Kurgizh and the Qabqanas, whose territory was at the very sources of the Yenisei. Cf. Liegi 1966, 124; Hambis 1957, 25-30. For the Qabqanas ~ Qamqanas, see also Cleaves 1956a; Hambis 1957, 30-31, and idem 1970a. The Qungqas, about whom nothing is known, are omitted from the corresponding passage in AT, 87, as also, inadvertently, in H, 79, and Ra, X, 44. The Tūban are the ancestors of the modern Tuba, the so-called Black Forest Tatars, of the Altai Republic (Respublika Aqtal, RF). Cf. IAL, 41. The Tümen (‘Ten Thousand’) Kurgas (tu. Qiniz) are the ‘true’ Kurgizh, not those sometimes referred to as Kurgizh who are in reality Kazakh. Cf. Čeveng 2000, 81-82. Their territory at the time was ‘five post stations’ from that of the Oiyarin, beyond the Yenisei. See NCHK, I, 58-59, n. 45. For this people and their name, see also CLC, 335-382; ČMKMCSK, 286-293; Poppe 1955, 39-40; BT, II, 344; Pullenymbank 1990 (with a useful bibliography on pp. 107-108). Yedi Inal and Aldi Er’s mission is mentioned in the VS, i, 14, s.a. 1207; cf. also the SWCCIL, 57b-58a. The names Yedi Inal (‘Seven’ + the tribal chief’s title ina’il), Aldi Er (‘Six Men’) and Örêbek Dîgin (‘Prince Örêbek’) are all Turkic. On Aldi Er, cf. Rybtzki [2003], s.v. ‘Al’. For the title din (pl. dinät = tigin, tīgit), see above, n. 182; for that of ina’il, see TMEN, no. 1900; Ieze 1978, 72-73, 79. Cf. also BT, II, 139. The Sibür are the Sibir (Rāḏif al-Dīn’s ‘Bib Sibir’) beyond the Kīrgūz and further north in northwestern Siberia. Cf. also Pritsak 1989. The Kesdim are the Kestimi or Kestimi of Rāḏif al-Dīn. Cf. Liget, 1966, 124-128; CLC, 332-334. ‘Tenlek’ is a mistake for Teleng (pl. Telengüt; cf. § 207), the modern Telengüt in the Altai Republic. The Töle’els (≈ Tölöös; cf. § 207) are the Tölöš, another Turkic tribe of the Altai. Cf. above, n. 207, for these two tribes. The Bajği̇t correspond to the Bajgi̇t, i.e. the modern Bashkir. Cf. P.B. Golden in AEMA 1:1975, 34-35. The other names listed in § 239 cannot be easily identified. However, pace Pelliot (HCG, 87-89; NCHK, I, 60, n. 52), the Bayit may well be related to the modern Bayat or Bait (on which see Čeveng 1996, 112-113, 118), cf. Beso 1988, 19; the puzzling ‘Tuqas’ may correspond to either the Kazakh Toghas clan, or the Ordos Býgas clan; and there is another Kazakh clan called Tas, as noted by Aristov. See NCHK, I, 60, nn. 53, 56; Hambis 1970a. For the above identifications and further literature on the subject besides NCHK, I, 57-59, nn. 40-57, and NHKO, 141-
younger son Törolı. The YS supports the latter’s version. See YS II 109, 2762. According to the YS and other Chinese sources, Princess Qohlt (Qohltiqan) is the diminutive and endearment form, a granddaughter of Čingis, was married to one Qada. The disagreement between the various sources has been discussed by Pelliot (NCHK, I, 61-62, n. 59). The name Qolultiqan is written “Hолосун” in the SH and this orthographically incorrect form has been adopted in Cl, 173, and Or, VI, 89; however, the correct form with initial q (Qohltiquan) is confirmed by AT* 87a. The name Inalci is Turkic and may represent an original Inalq, or even Inan, both names deriving from official titles. See HCG, 102; ED, 1846, 1878; TIMEN, nos. 669, N34=1979. Cf. also EM, 486. As for Ceceyigeq (= Čečeken), Poucha claims that this name is a diminutive form of čeqeq ‘flower.’ See GGMGL, 83. Cf. Rybakov [2003]; s.v. In Poucha’s opinion, the intermediate -i- is an hypocoristic suffix used in conjunction with ‘-qeq’, i.e. -ken. There are several problems with Poucha’s interpretation, tempting as it may be and earlier adopted in Ri, X, 68, following a personal communication from N. Poppe who referred to Vladimirzov 1923a, where it is stated that the suffix -qeqken functions not only as a diminutive suffix, but also as a feminine ending. Cf. GWM, 42, § 124. Poupe gave as an example of this usage the name of Dayan Qayan’s wife Jimisken (‘fruit’) Qutan in the inscription of Cayan Buškin. See IB, 31, line 6. However, as pointed out by L. Bese (p.c.; cf. Bese 1978, 365, no. 15), the suffix in question is essentially a diminutive suffix, since there are plenty of masculine names also ending in -qeqken. Furthermore, it is morphologically unusual in both Turkic and Mongolian for the final -eqeq (čeqčeqeqeqeqeq) to disappear before suffixes; and the -i-ken of Čečeken is a Turkic, not a Mongolian, double suffix (cf. tat., kaz. Urazaitai, Urazaqan, from uraza ‘gift’). We are, therefore, in the presence of an original name Čee – Seče (cf. AT*, 87a: Čeečeken). This is confirmed by Rašid al-Din and Juvinji, who give the form Čečeken throughout. See SL, I, 119, II, 70 (‘Čeečeqeqeqeqeqeq’).
Chou CS 181. Princess Alaqa, or Alaqi, married the Önggüt prince Jingu, the earlier mentioned nephew of Alaqlí Dígít Qūr (see §§ 182, 190, and above, n. 202), ca. 1211. Alaqi(s) was then about twenty years old. Cf. also the important notice on ‘Alaqlí-bag’ in Chou CS 191, 164-168, n. 16. For the name Alaqi(s), ‘Siberian marmot’, see Bese 1978, 355-356, no. 3; Rybatzki [2003], s.v.

‘You, eldest of my sons ... the fortunate People of the Forest.’ This passage has been translated and discussed in Cleaves 1949, 106-107, n. 64; cf. also Cleaves 1949a, 530-531; and Lettres, 31: ‘Who only now for the first time have left home (lit. “the tent”), i.e. to go to war, indicating that Joci had thus reached manhood. Cf. Ögödel’s words addressed to Gavúk in § 277. At the time (1207/08), Joci must have been twenty-three years old, but this was his first important campaign, and one in which he played a leading role. ‘You have had a good “way” (mūr).’ For mūr ‘way’ = ‘luck’, see A. Mostaert apud Cleaves 1949, 107, n. 64. For the expression ere aqa (also pno. ere aya) ‘man oriand gelding’, cf. Cleaves 1949, 106-107, n. 64; idem 1952, 108, n. 168; TMEN, no. 638. The use of the term ‘fortunate’ (iljewa) with reference to the People of the Forest may sound strange, but it is appropriate because, by submitting as they did, they were not only spared death and destruction, but their chiefs also became closely related to the Mongol ruling family through marriage. No greater fortune could befall a subject of Çinggis Qan than to become his son-in-law (gūræqen). For Çinggis’ granting of the People of the Forest as patrimony to his eldest son Joci – a sort of ‘investiture’ – see Vlad., 130. Cf. also Jackson 1999, 18-19.

§ 240. The Tumut or Qori Tumut (the Qori being one of their main subtribes) were mentioned at the beginning of the SH (§§ 8 and 9) in connection with their chief Qorlāltai Mergen, the husband of Barçqin Qo’a and father of Çinggis Qan’s ancestors Alan Qo’a. They lived in northern Mongolia, chiefly on the southwestern shore of Lake Baikal and in the forest region.
between this lake and Lake Khubsugul. Raśid al-Dīn places them in the Barūqin Tūgīm, i.e. the Barūqin Lowland farthest east, between the Selenga and Barguzin rivers. See SL7, III, 122. The association of the Tumat with the Barūqin territory is confirmed, in ter alia, by the very name of Qortlanui Morgen's wife. We must, therefore, assume that this forest tribe was scattered over a wide area at the time.

The campaign against the Tumat and the death of Boroqul (Boro’ul) must be placed s.a. 1217. See SL7, VII, 178, 235-256; SWCC1, 72b; and YS8, 1, 20, where the account of these events is at variance with the SH version. Cf. HCG, 375; Li, 177, n. 240; Čleaves 1956a, 394-396 and n. 12; and Appendix One. In this section, Boroqul's name appears in both forms (Boroqul and Boro’ul). Cf. §§ 213 and 214.

Daidaqul Soqor and Botokus Tarqun mean Daidaqul the Blind and Botokus the Fat respectively; however, the two epithets 'blind (or "one-eyed")' and 'fat' are not necessarily disparaging attributes given by the Mongols to the Tumat chief and his wife, as I previously stated (Ra, X, 69, n. 240), but they were probably an integral part of their names. Cf. the name Da'ura Soqor in § 3. See also Bese 1988, 34-35. For the name Botokus, cf. Rybatzki 2003, s.vv. 'Botokui' and 'Terek'.

'Upon reaching their territory, Boroqul Noyan with two others – three men altogether – set out from the main army to proceed ahead of it', lit. 'When Boroqul Noyan arrived, three men set out from the great army to go before it' (Boroqul Noyan gurçu qurban haran yeke ērığ-e ārda yabarə ətə). This sentence has been misunderstood by most translators (beginning with Na', 404), who took it to mean either that Eroqul or one of the three men set out, or that Boroqul set out leading three other men – in both cases forming a four-man advance party. Cf., e.g., Ha, 113; Ko, 175; Dā, 231 (see also Da', 196); LDAT, 185; Po, 178; Ka, 152; El-Ar, 773 and 774, n. 3 (quoting Ko); Ja, 359; Ma, 306; Oz', VI, 102 (see also Oz', II, 135); Ev-Pop, 202. Ozawa also renders haran with 'retainers' (əʃə), i.e., 'Boroqul Noyan, together with three retainers, ...' See his discussion in Oz', VI, 103-106. The Chinese sectional summary appears to support such an interpretation, insofar as it renders the Mongolian text as follows: 'When Boroqul arrived, he ordered (ŋ) three men to go in front of the great army' (Y', 10, 20). See Pa, 132; Wēi, 157; Wa, 287. However, Ligeti (Li, 110) and Murakami (Mu, III, 89) have understood the text correctly, whereas Čleaves' translation is ambiguous ('When Boroqul Noyan arrived, three men departing from the great army to go in front'). See Cl, 174. If we examine the original, we notice that it has no word for 'and', 'together with', or 'ordered, sent,' etc.; it is a simple case of apposition, quite common in Mongolian: 'Boroqul Noyan – three persons ...'. Boroqul Noyan being one of the three persons. There is no need to render the word haran as 'retainers', since 'person' or 'man' is its most likely meaning here; cf. the interlinear gloss and the sectional summary [əʃə], and for the primary meaning of haran as 'person, individual'; cf. now also the RJ, 263, no. 9.) For this type of apposition, see, e.g., Mo, 29-30 (§ 90). Unfortunately, the sectional summary version misled Haensch and many after him who have misunderstood the Chinese text. The word ling ŋ 'to order' stands here, as it often does, for ling ŋ 'to lead, be at the head of'; so that the text must be rendered 'When Boroqul arrived, he, leading three men (i.e. a three-man party [consisting of himself and two others]), went in front (at head of the great army).' For qurban, see DKU, I, 387.1 (2). On the basis of information contained in § 241, Murakami (loc. cit.) identifies the other two members of the party as Quduaq Beki and Qeći, but this is by no means certain in view of the conflicting accounts. See below, n. 241.

In the evening (tide filda). For the expression tide filda = filda 'evening', see, Mo, 172-173. Cf. above, n. 177.

In the dense forest', lit. 'in the difficult (berke) forest.'

'And were off guard', lit. 'without realizing (or unaware)' (uqamsar). Uqamsar < uqa- 'to realize, perceive, understand' + dev. noun suff: -msar (a cong. 'less'). For this expression and
the 'suffix privativ', see Oz', VI, 106-8, n. 2; and above, n. 56.

'And prepared to move.' For the verb *tuʿurehi* (= mo. *tuwrehi*) 'to prepare oneself, to get ready (to do something)', see 'Trois documents', 474-475.

Pleased with him', lit. 'persuaded (or advised) Šinggis Qa'an.'

Dörbej Noyan of the Dörbej tribe, known also as Dörbej Dogjin ('the Fierce'), reappears in § 261. On him, see Pelliot's remarks in BCG, 402; and below, nn. 257 and 261. The notice of his appointment as leader of the punitive mission against the Qorq Timat is followed by certain data of a military and ritual nature which are worth noting. First comes the injunction of marshalling the troops 'in strict order' (lit. 'with severity'), the expression used being *qatangqai-a fasaja*, which implies the enforcement of the *fisaqa* in cases of breach of discipline. This, in fact, confirmed by the disciplinary measures that Dörbej introduced 'by ordinance' (*fisaqa*) when the army made its way into the forest area. See Ratchnevsky 1974, 476. Secondly, the injunction to pray to Eternal Heaven before starting the campaign in order to obtain its protection and increase Dörbej's strength and power. Cf. § 199. This is the first and only time that the SH uses the word *jalbari* 'to pray' at the beginning of a military expedition, but we know from other sources that prayer was a regular feature of their worship of Heaven, *pace* John of Pian di Carpine. See MTPL, 17a; HTSL, 21a (cf. CG, 77, 140, 141, 187); MM, 9. Cf. also Letters, 29; and above, n. 172.

Thirdly, the strategy used on this occasion to confuse the enemy. The expression *houtorqai erbeggele*i- designates the well-known tactic of moving troops to foil an attack from a certain direction, while the main army makes a detour and attacks from the direction where the enemy least expects it. Its meaning is 'to make a false (i.e. simulated) troop movement', lit. 'falseh *houtorqai* to cause troops to move (*erbeggele*i-)', i.e. to make a decoy movement or manoeuvre. I have discussed this technical expression in detail in Ra, X, 69-70, n. 240. Cf. Oz', VI, 110-114, n. 7. See also HTSL, 22b (cf. CG, 191); MM, 36; and above, n. 195, for other military tactics. It should be mentioned, however, that for 'Cleaves the expression in question meant 'to spread false rumors abroad.' See Cl, 174 and n. 27. For the deployment of patro/men or scouts (*qara*i*) in a typical situation as described here, see HTSL, 20a-b. Cf. CG, 183.

'To advance', lit. 'to go (or proceed) *yabuqie*' by paths trodden by the red bull' (*hula*i* *buraq* *yabaqan mör-ûyer*). These words occur again a few lines further down and all between is parenthetical. However, for stylistic purposes I have had to break the long passage into separate sentences. The interpretation of the expression *hula*i* *buraq*, lit. 'red bull (or ox)' presents some difficulties. It is certainly not a place-name, as Pa, 132 and Wei, 157, have assumed it to be owing to a misinterpretation of the Chinese sectional summary. See Y 10, 20b. The reference is undoubtedly to a particular animal, as both the interlinear gloss and the sectional summary clearly indicate. It was the tracks made by these animals in the mountain forest that the Mongol soldiers followed, enlarging them as they went by felling trees, etc., so as to allow the army to get through and reach the top of the mountain in order to fall upon the Timat encamped on the other side of the range. To identify the animal with a wild ox or buffalo, as some have done (e.g. Na', 350; Ha, 113; Ko, 175; Li, 110; Mu, III, 90; Yao-Ja, III, 359) is a mistake, because this animal did not inhabit that part of northern Mongolia. Since these events took place in the mountain taiga and forest region of the Baikal, the animal in question was almost certainly one of the large species of deer that still inhabit the area. In my view there are only two possibilities: the Manchurian red deer (*Cervus elaphus santohipyy*) and the larger elk (*Alces alces*), both common in the Barguzin district, a fact recorded even by Marco Polo. See MP', 88. *Hula*i* (= mo. *ulaqan*) 'red' may also designate various shades of brown. See Poppe 1977, 125-
126. Cf. MA, 363a: *ulaq gürkeni* 'deer', lit. 'red wild animal', and bur. *ulaq güröhen* 'winter or red doe-deer' (BRS, 466b).
Carry ten rods', lit. 'carry ten rods on the back.'

For some interesting remarks on the words uqalī 'adze', šī'-šēl 'chisel' and jér jēbēk 'weapons', see Khomonov 1970, 37, 38. Cf. also RH, 283, nos. 10 (koli = uqalī) and 11 (kirî = kirî-). For jér jēbēk = mṣ, jēr jēbēk, see Cleaves 1966, 41-42, n. 348. Cf. also TMEN, no. 170.

'They took them by surprise', lit. 'unprepared (genet). On genet, a plural of genet, 'unprepared (for something unexpected)', see above, nn. 104 and 170.

As noted by Litigè (Li, 177, n. 240), the SH account of the second campaign against the Tumat has a strong epic flavour.

§ 241. § 207 relates how Qorqî, in reward for his services, obtained permission from Cinggis Qan to take thirty beautiful women from among the people who had submitted to the Mongols. In the same section Qorqî had also been entrusted by Cinggis with the creation of a myriarchy drawn from various forest tribes. Neither his capture by the Tumat, nor the capture of Quduqa Bēki by the same people, were mentioned before. The narrative of these events is somewhat fragmentary and, as we have seen, chronologically out of order. Since this is also the case with the AT text of the SH, the 'disarrangement' of the material must have occurred at an early date. See AT, 86a-86b (ATL, 170-171); LDAT, 185-186. Cf. Appendix One. It will be remembered that in § 121 Qorqî had asked Cinggis Qan to allow him 'to take freely beautiful and fine girls from among the people', and to let him have thirty as wives in reward for his correct prophecy of Cinggis' becoming 'lord of all'. In the present passage, the sentence Tumat īrge-e-ū qāt qo-a 'astroqın qinān emnes abruqil has been rendered in different ways. Cf. HA, 114; Ko, 175; Li, 110; Ra, X, 46; CI, 175; Oz', VI, 122; Ev-Pop, 203. I now follow Mostaert (un.) in translating qo-a 'astan (pl. in -s of qo-a 'beautiful' [cf. § 121] + -tan) as 'sont belles', an interpretation supported by the sectional summary (Y2 10, 22a: 'Qorqî, knowing that the Tumat women were very beautiful, wanted to take thirty as wives'). For qo-a 'astan qīt [sic!], cf.

Rassadin 1995, 114. For the words Tumat īrge-n-ū qāt qub 'en qaṭa bulaq, see the remarks in Aalto 1973, 35. The nomen futuri (-qa) followed by bol- indicates intention, purpose or future action (= ch. yao ḫ). See Y2, loc. cit. In Cleaves' translation, the word 'people' after 'of the Tumat' is missing. See CI, 175. On Qorqî's reward, cf. also Rachnevsky 1976, 514, 527, n. 32.

'Because of the death', lit. 'because of the bones.' Cf. the expressions 'my dead bones' and 'to take the bones (= body)' in § 201, and 'to place the bones', i.e. 'to bury' in § 175, where the word 'bones' (yastan) is used to designate the body of the deceased and, by extension (as in the present instance), his death. This way of referring to the death of a person is rooted in the shamanistic beliefs of the medieval Mongols and in the tendency to avoid direct references to death. Also, as stated earlier (n. 201 above), the skeleton was regarded as the seat of a soul and had, therefore, numerous connotations. Borouqî's death is related in § 240.

For the granting of slaves to the family of a fallen hero, cf. the case of Quyildar, to whose widow and children Cinggis Qan had also granted one hundred people taken from the Jirgin tribe (§ 185).

§ 242. Gathering the people' (a̱kṣa kuriya-an), i.e. rallying the clansmen and subjects who had become disaffected after the death of Yisēgē. See § 73. However, I think that Cinggis may also allude here to the support and advice he received from his mother during the arduous years when he strove to establish his authority over all the tribes of Mongolia. Cf. Rachnevsky 1976, 523.

The distribution of subjects among members of his family is mentioned by Rašūd al-Dīn, but Rašūd's figures are at variance with those given by the SH and at times the difference is quite considerable. Chinese sources such as the YS provide additional information. The SH figures appear to be inflated. They have been compared and discussed in Li, 177-178, n. 242; Mu,
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III. 108ff.; and in great detail in Sugiyama 1978. Ötögin’s, i.e. Temüüge Ötögin’s share (qubii) is put together with that of Möhe Hōčentín (10,000 people according to the SH; 5,000 and 3,000 respectively according to Rašid) because Ötögin, being the youngest son, was the one who ‘stayed home’ and who by tradition inherited the heir. See Vld., 60, 67, 126, 130; and above, n. 48. (In this section and in §§ 743 and 245, Ötögin is written Ötögin.) It is noteworthy that Joči, as Činggis’ eldest son, is among the first three members of his family to receive a share.

‘The mother was dissatisfied’ (eko čimāću). Cf. 175, translates: ‘although considering the number too few’, but čimāću (mo. čimāću) implies dissatisfaction, resentment and, indeed, blame. Cf. Hw, 27, Lės., 1844; MKeT, 2780b.

‘Did not complain’, lit. ‘did not utter a sound.’

Joči received 9,000 people (Rašid: 4,000); Tačii 8,000 (Rašid: 4,000); Qaqad 5,000 (Rašid: 4,000); Tolū 5,000 (Rašid: not given); Qasar, i.e. Joči Qasar, 4,000 (Rašid: 1,000 to Qasar’s three sons); Alčidii 2,000 (Rašid: 3,000). Cf. SL, 1/2, 274-277.

While Joči has been mentioned in the SH several times before (§§ 165, 210, 239), Činggis Qan’s second son Tačii is mentioned for the first time in this passage. He was born ca. 1184 (see above, n. 104) and died in 1242, a year after Qogödei (see, however, Successors, 149 and n. 37). Compared with the wealth of information in the eastern sources, there is little on him in western languages; on the other hand, there is a vast literature on his ulus, i.e. the so-called Chaghatai Khânate of Central Asia which lasted until the middle of the 14th century. See EINE, II, 2a-4a; GSE, VIII, 540a; FSHCA, 172b (Index); and HTAC, 145ff. Cf. also NMP, I, 254. On particular issues concerning Tačii himself and his name, cf. Chapitre CIII, 57-64; NMP, I, 250-254, 287; NNHIO, 63-64; HCG, 189, 265, 410; BT, II, 310; Cleeves 1949b, 417-418; Boyle 1975a, 36-37; MNT, I, 108; and YSHI, 13-14. It is generally assumed that his name derives from *ca’ān (mo. ča’ān) ‘white’ + the deno- minal noun suffix -dai (on which see ‘Trois documents’, 473-474; Poppe 1975, 162, § 2A), thus meaning ‘the White.’ However, mmo. ‘white’ is regularly transcribed as ča’ān or ča’ān (* ča’ān) (mo. ča’ān) > mo. ča’ān). See, e.g., R, 206a; Matériel I, 45; MA, 464b; VMI, 23; RH, 257, no. 26. Cf. IMCS, 27, 61; MXTXII, 4, 84-85. Bese 1978, 362-365, no. 13, was of the opinion that Tačii derives from tu. ča’al ča’u (tak., kaz., urkm.) ‘child’ + the (tu.) denotinal noun suffix -dai-tai. Since in the SH we find forms like Ca’a’n (* 153), Čahan (ca’ān) (ibid), and Ca’alun (§ 157), a derivation from ca’ān ‘white’ (+ -dai) is likely. See above, n. 153. Cf. HCG, 283. The irregular form ca’ān (v. ča’in) is possibly due to popular or dialect pronunciation. In view of their still doubtful etymology, the names Ca’alun and Ca’adii are transcribed as such instead of Ca’alun and Ca’adii which, in my view, is the correct reading. The Written Mongolian form of SH Ca’adii is Čyaitai (Ča’aitai) < mo. Ča’adai (Ča’aitai). Cf. Cleeves 1949b, 417-418.

The Alčidii mentioned in this passage was Činggis Qan’s nephew, the son of his younger brother Qogödei, not to be confused with the military leader Alčidii of the Jazair, closely related to the commander of a thousand iljüei (no. 5 in the list in § 202), on whom see above, n. 226 (also for the confusion and alternative readings of their name). On Činggis’ nephew, and his name, cf. Chapitre CIII, 29-30, n. 1; Li, 178, n. 242; Poppe 1975, 162.

Belgutei, Činggis’ half-brother, received 1,500 people (Rašid: not given).

Dārūtai, the ‘disloyal’ uncle of Činggis Qan, was last mentioned in §§ 153-154, where it is related how he fell soul of Činggis for having disobeyed his order concerning the plundering of the defeated Tatars. From Rašid al-Dīn (SL, 1/2, 48) we learn that soon after this incident Dārūtai left the Mongol camp and went over to the Tayši’, then to the Kereti
('Gereit' in our passage, see above, n. 134) and, eventually, to the Naim and Dorb.

' I shall wipe him from my sight (lit. 'eyes')' - a euphemism for 'I shall get rid of him', i.e., 'I shall kill him', as evident from the three nökör's question 'How can you do away with him?' (ker tebciygä) Their argument is that to kill Därtaï, the youngest son of Bartun's lamar and guardian of the hearth, would be like destroying Çingis' own hearth; furthermore, since Därtaï was the only surviving brother of Yisügü, it would also mean severing the last remaining link (lit. 'reminder') with his late father - both powerful arguments. For Çingis' attitude towards the alienated kinsmen, cf. Ratchnevsky 1987, 102-103. For the word gers lieu - gruiwert 'souvenir, remembrance, etc.', cf. above, n. 208. For sayin 'good' = 'late, deceased', see above, n. 73.

'He acted without thinking, so spare him', lit. 'In (= because of) his not considering (i.e. because he acted without realizing the consequences of his action), let him be!'

'Allow the youngest brother (nilqa) of your good father ...'; here the word nilqa has the same meaning as the nilqa applied to Temeq Öçigìn at the beginning of this section. Cf. above, n. 142. However, the phrase has been understood differently by Ozawa, ultimately following Ko, 176. Cf. Oz', VI, 132-135, n. 6; On, 135. But see 'Trois documents', 455, for the correct interpretation.

'To let the smoke of their camp swirl up', i.e. so that he and his family and kinsmen could go on living as before. See ibid.

'They reasoned with him', lit. 'they argued clearly (or reasonably) with him.' See Mo, 147, 130.

'Until he was so moved that he sniffled, as if he had smoke in his nose', i.e. until he was so moved by his nökör's plea that he began sniffing as if he were affected by smoke in his nose. The expression gahar-ça his hani qangsi, lit. 'to sniff out smoke from the nose' = 'to become deeply moved', must be an ancient idiom (the equivalence is supported by the sectional summary [Y² 10, 25a] which says, 'Thereupon, T'ai-tsu [i.e. Çingis Qan] was deeply moved.') The whole sentence has been rendered in different ways by other translators, the problem centering around the puzzling word qangstalba, con- versum terminale of qangsi. I have discussed this problem in Ra, X, 73-74, n. 242; the following are additional comments and clarifications. Written Mongolian has a verb qangsi - 'to yelp, howl (of dogs)', cf. kh. qangsi - 'to whine, whimper'; and yangsi (kh. qangsi, qangsi) - 'to speak through the nose.' See Lc., 349b. Cf. Vietze 1990, 380. According to Lc., 299b, the latter appears also in the form qangsi. Although this form is doubtful, Yakut has a verb xangsi - 'to speak through the nose, sniffle', which S. Kaluzynski (MEs, 109) has related to the SH qangsi-, and which obviously cannot be separated from mo. yangsi. Indeed, the unusual transcription of qangstalba in the SH (with initial k rather than q) may point to a word beginning with the voiced velar stop y. Cf. Y² 12, 5b; L², 208. Thus it is un-certain whether the verb in question began with qa or qa. Since in Mongolian a considerable number of words with front vocalism occur also with back vocalism and vice versa (cf. above, n. 204), it has been suggested that SH qangsi- (? yangsi-) = mo. kengsi - 'to have a dry cough.' See Oz', VI, 137-136, n. 7. It has further been suggested that SH qangsi- = kh. san xile 'to emit a strong odour.' See TH, 164 (a JÝT, 286). While I do not share this last interpretation, one cannot exclude that qangsi - kengsi, if the verb in question had initial qa, particularly since the meaning 'to cough' is supported by the incisural gloss which has ch'ang ph' 'to robb, plunder', an obvious error for ch'ang to 'to cough, choke.' Cf. Do', 273, 275, n. 4. Although the precise translation of the SH idiom is still subject to discussion, its meaning is perfectly clear.

'Right!' renders the Mongolian je deli (es telii), lit. 'So that!' = 'Let that be so!', 'Enough of that!', etc. On this expression, by which the subject indicates that he has finally made up his mind, see Mo, 173 add. n. 156 (where the entire sentence is translated). Cf. §§ 242, 246, 256, 265, 277.
For Šighi Qutuq’s role in this episode, see Ratchnevsky 1965, 97-98; cf. ISK, 80.

§ 243. In this section Chinggis Qan designates the chieftains in charge of the people distributed among his family. The list given by the SH complements and, at the same time, supplements the information found in Rašíd al-Dīn’s work, on which see Li, 178, n. 243. All the chieftains are mentioned among the commanders of a thousand listed in § 202: Guźū (no. 17), Kōkōzū (no. 18), Jungzi (= Junglou, no. 33) and Qorqašun (= Qorqoosun, no. 19; on this see Bese 1974, 92); Qunan (no. 7); Mongke’sr (= Monggūsür, no. 40) and Kete (no. 51); Qaračār (no. 29); Mungke (= Mungko Qalja, no. 53) and Iqдаqда (Iduqda, no. 66; on this see Poppe 1975, 162, and Bese 1978, 367, no. 18); Khūt-Cos (= Kûh Hamos, no. 30); Hüge (= Iliigei, no. 5; on this see ibid., 367-368, no. 19) and Degei (no. 11); Jedei (= Jetei, no. 23) and Bala (no. 35); Jebke (no. 45); Ča’urqi (no. 59).

‘Ča’adai is hardheaded and is, by nature, punctilious’ is, I believe, a more accurate rendering of the Mongolian Ča’adai keč’e ᥑ buńa narın abartı buňa than my previous translation (‘Ča’adai is obstinate and petty-minded’). See Ra, X, 47. For the words keč’e (= mno. kečegi) ‘hard, headstrong’, and narın ‘meticulous, punctilious’, cf. TMEN, nos. 327, 380; and Mo, 187, n. 169. The Persian sources confirm that Ča’adai was headstrong and severe, and excessively preoccupied with the proper observance of the rules of etiquette and the enforcement of the Mongol customary law. Cf. HWG, 271ff.; Successors, 137-138, 147-148. Cf. also Heissig 1976a, 278, 287, nn. 10, 11; Vlad, 2, 139; and the SH; §§ 270-271. Because of his difficult and unbending character, Chinggis wanted him to have constantly at his side a reasonable and level-headed man like Khūt-Cos, whose skill in ‘thinking’, i.e. in sound advice, is well illustrated in § 254.

It is not certain whether the Ča’urqi mentioned in this section and in § 202 is the same person as Ča’urqi, the elder brother of Sūbe’e’eti, on whom see §§ 120, 124 and 127; as well as §§ 183, 184 and 185, where he is called Cašurqi (= pmo. ḑurqan) > Ča’urqi, see above, n. 183. Murakami, following Naka, assumes that he was. See Naka, 278; Mu, I, 228-229, n. 11; II, 380, 65. Pelliot is inclined to take the same view (HCG, 164); and, although Cleave’s lists Ča’urqi and Ča’urqi as separate personages in CI, 236b (Index), I am personally convinced that they are one and the same person. See above, no. 120 and 183.

§ 244. Mönglik Eč’e (= Ełige), or Fatker Mönglik, was last mentioned in § 204. Some of his sons are well known: Tolun Čerbi and Süyükétü (= Süyüketa) Čerbi are mentioned several times in the SH, and these and the other offspring are mentioned in other Chinese sources. See Hambis 1975, 40-45 (where, however, the author, by wrongly identifying Süyükétü Čerbi with Sūtu [? Sūtu], i.e. Rašíd al-Dīn’s Sūtu Noyan [see SL, I/2, 272; cf. Li, 179, n. 244] in his genealogical table on page 45, reduces the number of Mönglik’s sons from seven to six). Mönglik’s most famous, or rather notorious, offspring was doubtless his fourth son Kōközū, who had gained immense prestige among the Mongols on the strength of his supernatural powers. Relying on his authority and influence over Chinggis Qan, in whose enrolment in 1206 he had apparently played an important role (see above, no. 123, 202), Kōközū overran himself and went as far as challenging Chinggis’ leadership, but failed and was destroyed, explicitly narrated in the sequel to the present section of the SH. For the Persian accounts, see HWC, 39; SL, I/1, 167-168; I/2, 150 and n. 4. Cf. D’Ohsson, I, 99-100; Hambis 1975, 8f. Although Kōközū is generally referred to as a shaman (also, more recently, in ČK, 38 et passim; Koyta 1984, 67; CQ, 652; ČXC, 120), W. Heissig and E. Endicott have pointed out that this is a later assumption made on the strength of his designation as a ‘magician/shaman’ (Ηβ. Νάι) in the Chinese summary of the present section of the SH (Y7 10, 31b), with the interlinear
gloss explaining the appellation Teb Tenggeri as a ‘magician/ shaman’s title’ (wul-ming 吾命). See Heissig 1984, 319; Endicott-West 1999, 224 and n. 3. Raïd al-Dîn (SL, 15 [1888], 112; SL, 3, 122, 253) describes Kôkôchû as a wonder- worker and a man endowed (or believed to be endowed) with prophetic powers, but neither the SH nor the Persian authors ever refer to him as a real shaman (mbo boe; pers. hûvâ [read boe’]; see TMEN, no. 112). His prophetic skill may be com- pared to that of Qorî (see §§ 121, 207), who was certainly not a bo’e’. Nevertheless, Kôkôchû bore an appellation or epithet which beyond doubt reflected his unusual qualities and powers but the exact meaning of which is still a subject of controversy. Pelliot and Ghirshman consider it as the opinion that Teb Tenggeri means ‘the Very (Most) Celestial (or Divine).’ See Pelliot 1944d, 182-184 (refuting Vladimiricz’s previous interpretations); CW, 176; CK, 88 (where the reference to the Turkeic term, not surprising in the context of the title, is made). The note 27 is incorrect; the correc correct; the reference being to Pelliot 1944d cited above. The error has passed into CK, 248, n. 30). For a review of all the interpretations proposed before 1967, see Cleaves 1967, 248ff. Cf. also Heissig, loc. cit., where Teb Tenggeri is translated as ‘the fully heavenly.’ In FTC, 21, H. Franke renders it ‘Arch-Heaven.’ The section on Kôkôchû in Humphrey 1994, 202-203, is an assemblage of errors and misinterpretations. Pelliot’s interpretation has been challenged by Cleaves who, in his learned article (pp. 259-260), reached the conclusion that Kôkôchû’s epithet actually means ‘Lord Cun- ning.’ I expressed my reservations on Cleaves’ argument in Ra, X, 75-76, and concluded my discussion as follows (p. 76): ‘Thus, in spite of certain difficulties, which I think can be solved, Pelliot’s interpretation in my view still holds true. Even though it is not grammatically correct in Mongolian to strength- en a substantive – as opposed to an adjective or colour-name – by means of a reduplicative prefix like teb (before a word beginning with the syllable te), Teb-Tenggeri may well be an aho expression, i.e. coined, as it were, in order to express a certain idea for a special purpose. “The Very Divine” is, indeed, a most appropriate designation for such an eminent personality as Kôkôchû undoubtably was. Furthermore, as already pointed out by other scholars (see Cleaves 1967, 169), so understood, finds a correspondence in the shaman’s real name Kôkôchû, which derives from kôkô “blue.”’ The major difficulty to which I remarked, i.e. the ‘improper’ use of the reduplicative prefix in the exalted Teb-Tenggeri, is no longer insurmountable, since we find in Preclassical Mongolian expressions like jib jiiqjiyir ‘in the most befitting manner’, with the prefix jib reinforcing the following noun jiiq ‘manner’, which by itself is not an adverb. See Cleaves 1949, 101, n. 34. Cf. also Ghirshman, 1969, 169. Furthermore, as noted in Pelliot 1944d, 182-184, the Mongolian expression apparently has its exact counterpart in Uighur, which, if correct, shows that the Mongolian expression is merely a calque of the Turkeic, not surprising in the circumstances of the Turkeic title (The word nûqgûn of Cinggis Qan, the title according to Raïd al-Dîn was chosen for Temülîn by Teb Tenggeri, is also a Turkeic, not a Mongolian, word; see above, n. 123.) The other serious problem raised by Cleaves is the use of Teb instead of Teb Tenggeri twice in § 246: if Teb is a prefix, it obviously cannot stand alone. See Cleaves 1967, 257. However, as clearly shown by the sectional summary (Y’ 10, 45a) and the corresponding passage in AT’, 98a, 98b, it is simply due to a scribal error that on two occasions the word nûqgûn has been changed from Teb to the so-called “the Very Divine” or, perhaps better, “the All-Divine,” I have now a different interpretation to propose that combines, as it were, those of Pelliot and Cleaves. The latter, extrapolating from Pelliot 1944d, is of the opinion that the word nûqgûn must be taken here with the meaning not of ‘Heaven’, but of ‘Lord’, an opinion which I share. But I still take teb as the reduplicative
problems with the qualities of the consonants). I should add that a possible derivation of *teb from skt. deva had also been proposed by G. Clausen in JRA, 1956, 76. Cf. Cleaves 1967, 252.

‘Ganged up’ (əmeryėli): cf. above, n. 78. Qasar is Joči Qasar, Cinggis’ younger brother, famous for his physical strength and skill in archery, on whom see above, n. 60 and § 195; Hambis 1975, 8-9, n. 13 et passim.

‘While Qasar was still talking, Cinggis Q’an in his anger said to him’, lit. ‘While he was talking, Cinggis Q’an in his anger said to Qasar.’

‘At this’, lit. ‘being so told’ (ke’egdašqi). Cf. Poppe 1964, 368.

‘Concerning the ruler (qan).’ Here qan (~ qa) does not refer to Cinggis Q’an, but to the ruler (ship), i.e. governance, of the Mongol nation (ulus). For this use of qan, see de Rachewiltz 1963, 273 (e). Cf. above, n. 57, and below, n. 249. For H. Franke (FTC, 21), the words mӨngkө tenggeri-yin farltiq qan form a meaningful unit which he renders as ‘order-king of eternal Heaven’, but mӨngkө tenggeri-yin farltiq is a standard formula of which the Chinese counterpart is 長生天皇帝. See Y¹ 10, 32a. Cf., e.g., YTHPCL, 21, no. 21 (opening line).

‘Has been foretold by heavenly signs’, lit. ‘heavenly signs foretell.’ Cf. §§ 121, 206. In § 206, ʃa’arin ‘sign, portent’ is actually preceded by tenggeri-yin ‘heavenly’ (see below).

‘Once they say that ... once that (lit. “they say that”) ...’. Teb Tenggeti’s words forecasting either Cinggis Q’an’s hold on the supreme power, or Qasar’s assumption of that power, have been discussed both in the context of the Mongol perception of Heaven’s role with regard to Cinggis’ political designs, and of his own enunciation of a world-conquest program sanctioned by Heaven. Cf. de Rachewiltz 1973, 27; Smith 1994, 207, 212, n. 8 (Smith’s criticism of my rendering of the word ulus with ‘emprise’ as anarchonistic is well justified). However, I think that the chief value of the SH account lies in the fact that it highlights an existing rivalry between Cinggis and his younger
brother for which there is supporting evidence also from other sources. See above, n. 183.

"If you don't strike at Qasar by surprise" (Qasari-i eze nende-eza). For nende: 'to attack by surprise', see above, n. 166.

With regard to Güçü and Kököcz (of the Besitit), we know from the previous section (§ 243) that they had been appointed with Jungsi and Qensan as commanders in charge of the subjects assigned to Hō-elîn and Tentese-Oţiçin.

"When the mother heard this", lit. 'The mother having learned this.'

"At sunrise", lit. 'with the sun rising.'

To remove one's hat and belt was an act of abdication of power and of total submission. Cf. §§ 103 and com., 117; CEME, 48. In the present instance, Cinggis was humiliating his brother to an extreme degree, for he had also tied up the opening of his sleeves, so as to immobilize him—a very powerful man during the interrogation, which was no doubt a brutal one. To interrogate", lit., 'to question one's words(s) (ıge asag-)

"By the mother descending upon him", lit. 'being reached by the mother.'

"Qasar's sleeves, the opening of which had been tied up" (Qasari-un huyasatı qanlı). For these words, see Mo, 184.

"Laid them over her knees", lit. 'made them extend over and beyond the two knees' (qāvar ehidük dege'un bisari-ulja). For dege'un 'over', cf. Ligeti 1971, 146-147. For bisari- — bisari— 'to overflow, run over', cf. Mostaert 1939, 328; de Ravehental 1982, 60-61, n. 60; Cleaves 1991, 132, n. 18, 133, n. 24. Bisari-ulja is the nomen imperfect of the factitive of bisari— in the corresponding passage of the AT, we find bis-<ṣar>-yari-ulja. See AT, 95a.

"They are the breasts that suckled you", lit. 'The breast that you have sucked is this.'

After "tise" (eder) — referring to Cinggis Qan and Qasar — there follow the two puzzling words qadalan da'un, which are not glossed in the interlinear translation and are also not rendered in the sectional summary. I have discussed them in Ra, X, 79, and tentatively rendered them (following suggestions made by Pelliot [Pe, 96, n. 5] and N. Poppe [p.c.]) as 'she stressed quoting ancient words' (ibid., 48). Other interpretations have since been proposed (Do1, 276, 280-281, n. 6 [cf. Do2, 180 and n. 7]; El-Ar, 784, 787, n. 16; Ozu1, VI, 152, 161-162, n. 12; Ozu2, 224, 462, n. 552), none of them satisfactory in my opinion. Cf. 177, has widely refrained from translating them. The corre- sponding passage in AT, 95a, has yadawun qarbhise: Yadawun = mino. qadawun 'outside.' Cf. SH, § 124: qadawul id; see HW, 56. Qadawun qarbhise, 'outside afterbirth,' is something of a tautology, but quite acceptable insofar as it designates the placenta after it has been released outside. It is possible, I think, that the AT has retained the original correct reading, and that this has subsequently been corrupted through scribal error. But this would not explain the presence of the word da'un in the SH. By some stretch of the imagination one could take da'un (= mo- dawun) as a mere digraphy, viz. the repetition by a careless copyist of the last two syllables of yadawun, and ignore it. This is a remote possibility, whereas the change of yadawun to qadawun may have been made under the influence of the text in § 78 where the poetic image of the fierce qasar dog 'snapping at its own afterbirth' first occurs, and where the very word qadalan 'citing' is also found, applied to Hō-elîn. Otherwise it could be a simple orthographic fault due to the addition of an upper hook for l. Whatever the case, the Ming translators encountered two words spelled (in Uighur script) Q'T-LWN TQWN which they transcribed qadalan 'aun and, not knowing what to make of them, left them untranslated. I am now in favour of reading the two words as qadawun ta'un, qadawun (= Q'TQWN, i.e. yadawun) meaning 'outside' as explained above, and ta'un (TQWN, i.e. taun) meaning 'rushing', lit. 'driving (or pursuing),' convenubim module of ta-ur (= mo. taw-) 'to drive, chase, pursue', the resulting compound thus meaning 'rushing out', i.e. out of the womb. (Cf. ch. II 8—and the standard gloss of ta-ur — taun— meaning both 'to rush' and 'to drive.' See HW,
145; MKT, 993c). The same idea is expressed at the very beginning of ‘Hö’elân’s Lament’ in § 78: qala un-ââla mina qaat qarurin. ‘From the warmth of my womb.’ When he broke forth fiercely. The Qasar episode treated here and Mother Hö’elân’s second ‘lament’ which, through poetic imagery, relates to it the first – the reference to the qasar dog biting its own afterbirth and Joci Qasar is, again, not a fortuitous one – has been analysed and discussed from various angles. Cf. Rachnevsky 1976, 520; idem 1987, 102, 105; Särközi 1978, 151.

‘Bath cord’, lit. ‘navel’ (ââla). Hö’elân means: you are bent on destroying your own flesh and blood – the same message conveyed in § 78. See the sectional summary (Y² 10, 32a-b), cf. Wa, 288. In translating this passage, Hambis 1975, 11, has followed the sectional summary, not the Mongol text.

Qaš’uin and (Temüjin) Öçïgin were Hö’elân’s two younger sons (see § 60), and what the mother means is that they were not as voracious, i.e. fierce, as Temüjin and Qasar. ‘Between them’, lit. ‘the two of them together.’

‘Until my bosom relaxed’, lit. ‘until my bosom (ce’elî) became wide (â’u bolala).’ For â’u, â’ui (= mo. aqun, aqun) ‘wide, broad’, cf. Materiêl I, 37.

‘Has skill of mind (ce’elî)’, lit. ‘Has skill of bosom’: there is a word-play here, ce’elî (= mo. ce’egi) meaning both ‘chest, breast, bosom’ and ‘mind, intellect.’ See MKT, 2733, (1) and (3). Cf. our ‘heart’ = ‘mind.’

‘Has skill in archery/And might?’ (qaba guçâ erdemî). Qaba ‘arrow-shooting’ and guçû ‘might’, here as ‘physical strength’, are two separate nouns as clearly shown by the sectional summary (Y² 10, 32b), not a compound meaning ‘good archery’ as understood in Öz², VI, 153 (cf. also Öz², II, 142), and Ev-Pop, 205. Qaba (= mo. qaba), qaba ‘skilful in handling, handling a bow, etc.’; see Les., 909a) is incorrectly transcribed ‘barbe’ in H, 81, and ‘barbuli’ in HW, 61, and correctly as ‘habu’ in HW, 55. Pelliot has commented: ‘Geuenicht a lu qabtu et qarbul (gloss), mais cf. le mot kitan pour “tirer à l’arc.”'

[P.P.- C.R.A.C.]. For the Kitan word to which Pelliot refers, see F.W. Cleaves in HIAS 13-1950, 231. For qaba, cf. also TMEN, no. 257. For a previous poetic description of Qasar’s feats with the bow and his prodigious strength, see § 195. For the word hontaci: ‘to shoot arrows at a long distance’, which occurs again in § 254, see de Rachewitz 1976, 490, 500-501, nn. 25-28 (with regard to n. 28, the correct reading in AT, 95a, is ontuçu, as stated on p. 490).

‘Those on the run’, lit. ‘those who went out.’ ‘To go out’ (qar, m. yar) is the opposite of ‘to go in’ (oro = to submit, join.’ Thus, ‘those who went out (or escaped)’ were rebel or fugitive tribesmen (balqâ tîregi), i.e. enemies (daïsun [ = daïsun] gigû), whom Temüjin was in the process of bringing under control. Hö’elân (or, rather, the anonymous author of this piece) wishes to emphasize here the capital role that Qasar, the redoubtable champion archer and great warrior, had played in the ‘rallying of the tribes’ by his brother, the future Çinggis Qan, with an implicit criticism of the latter. For the last two lines of the poetic passage, cf. Poppe 1969, 274.

‘But now, saying that you have destroyed the enemy people, you can no longer bear the sight of Qasar’, lit. ‘Now, saying, “I have destroyed the enemy people”, you cannot behold Qasar.’

‘He stealthily (ceêne uyin) took away.’ For ceêne uyin (= mo. cëînegi) ‘by stealth, secretly’, see Ligeri 1971, 146-147.

‘Let Qasar have’, lit. ‘gave to Qasar.’ As stated earlier in the SH (§ 242), Qasar had originally been granted 4,000 people, but after the ugly incident related in this section, Çinggis, obviously not appeased by his mother’s entreaties, dispossessed him of about two-thirds of this force in order to weaken him and, in this way, remove the threat he allegedly posed. However, as pointed out by Hambis (op. cit., 13), Qasar was subsequently appointed one of the leaders in the war against Chin, in the course of which he apparently died. The circumstances of his death are obscure, but not necessarily suspicious. His three sons were treated without favour by Çinggis, who appointed them
only as commanders of a thousand. See HCG, 172-173. Cf. EM, 206 and n. 3.

‘The thought of it made her go quickly into decline’, lit. ‘by that thought she went quickly straightaway into old age’, i.e. she aged quickly and died before long. Jelbe of the Jelbatir tribe, who belonged to Qasar’s apogee or yurt, was one of the commanders of Qasar’s people appointed by Çinggis. See §§ 177, 243.

§ 245. In this section we reach the inevitable climax of the confrontation between Kököö Tıeb Tenggeri and Çinggis Qan, resulting in the latter’s downfall and death. It is clear from the beginning of the section that Tıeb Tenggeri and his clan – the Qongqatan – were enticing entire groups of tribesmen belonging to Çinggis and his family to leave their masters and join them. Among the people thus enticed were also some from those residing in Qinggis’ ‘horse station’ (kiri‘e; see above, n. 229) and from Temügame Öçigün’s subjects. Who the defectors were is not clear (perhaps deliberately so): the text refers to them cumulatively as the ‘people of nine tongues’, lit. ‘people having nine tongues (= languages)’ (yösin keleten ögör), an expression that occurs only (and twice) in this very section of the SH. Since the word ‘nine’ (yüsin), having the connotation of completeness, also has the meaning of ‘many, various, all’ (cf. above, n. 60), it has been generally assumed that the expression in question designates various groups of tribesmen within the Mongol confederation speaking different languages or dialects, in other words ‘all sorts of people.’ See Pa, 238, n. 519; Wa, 289; Ha, 162, n. 245; Da, 201; Mu, III, 116; Oz, VI, 180, n. 1; Ïa, 393, n. 645. Cf. Ratzevovszky 1968a, 127, 132, n. 2; CK, 82, n. 1 (where, however, Ratzevovszky’s suggestion that the nine ‘tails’ of the great white standard [nüq, see above, n. 73] represented the nine subdivisions or tribes of the Mongol people is, in my view, anachronistic and unwarranted since it is related to the later tradition of the Çayun teike, see WG, 304ff.); Fletcher 1986, 13. The number ‘nine’ is also often associated with particular ethnic groups or confederations of tribes in both Turkic- and Mongol-speaking Central Asia, such as the Nine Oras (Terqız Orusu), identified with the Nine-clan Turks (Chu- kihsin T‘u-ch‘ieh 九姓联隊), and the Nine-clan Tatars (Chiu- hsing Ta-ta 九姓聯隊) of the Chinese sources. See Pelliot 1929a, 125-126 and n. 1; Sinor 1985, 116. ‘Nine’ also the latter Nine Great People (Yösin Yeke Ulus) of the Çayun teike. See WG, 304-317. As for tribes or people possessing various kinds of tongues, in the AT (anon.) of the late Ming we find those referred to as ‘having dark-brown tongues’ (bârûd keleti), ‘having many tongues’ (olun keleti) and ‘having good tongues’ (suyin keleti). See ÏCQ, 115; MCAT, 189. The ones characterized as ‘having many tongues’ are the Kereyit, no doubt belonging to their multi-ethno-linguistic components. In view of the fact that 1) the SH text seems to refer to a specific group, which included the personnel of Çinggis Qan’s horse station and Temügage Öçigün’s subjects, and 2) the Kereyit as a distinct tribal grouping no longer existed by then (they are not mentioned as such after §§ 186-187), I wonder whether the expression yösin keleten ögör of the SH may not be an oblique reference to a particular group of clans which were formerly part of the Kereyit tribal confederation and which, taking advantage of Tıeb Tenggeri’s rise to power, decided to leave Çinggis Qan and join Tıeb Tenggeri’s camp. We know from §§ 186-187 that after Qan Qan’s defeat, Çinggis Qan distributed the Kereyit people on all sides’ and ‘among each other so that nobody went short’, and that Täquisi B‘atu of the Suldun received one hundred Jirgin in reward for his services. It is worth noting, in this connection, that Tıeb Tenggeri’s wife was herself a Jirgin, i.e. she belonged to one of the major subtribes of the Kereyit (see above, n. 170), as clearly stated by Râşid al-Din, a fact that would further strengthen the interpretation just proposed. See SL, 1/1, 132 (where ‘Kirhun’, i.e. İlhiün, must be read Jirgin). Cf. CK, 64, n. 118 (= CK2, 69); SC, 1/1, 217. For Jirgin – Jirgin, cf. HCG, 56-57, 399. To conclude, it should be mentioned that several later Mongol chronicles and epics, such as the ET, the
Gezer Qan and Khalkha epics, also mention people speaking a variety of tongues, a subject that requires further study. Cf. ET', 68r01-02, GOM, 201 ('three tongues'); TBGC, 11 ('different tongues'); KMGE, 103, and HEKM, 146 ('nine tongues'). For a further reference to 'a different tongue', cf. also Cleaves 1986, 192, n. 8.

In this section, Temüüge Otöün is called Otöün as well as Otöün Nayan. Cf. above, § 195.

'Gathered under', lit. 'gathered at (Teb Tenggeri's) camp', i.e. they went over to him.

'To request' (qoyor). For qoyor (= mo. yuwar) - to ask, request, cf. BGEG, 167-168, § 5.

'I am grateful to both Otöün and you' renders Otöün ti fırın elčeten (read ačıtan) bol'fa ul. The emendation ačıtan 'deserving gratitude' (lit. 'having benefit') has been suggested by A. Mostaert on the basis of the AT reading ačıtan (AT, 96b; the 'elčeten' of ATL, 175, is an arbitrary and misleading emendation), also because the text as it stands does not make much sense. See Rs, X, 81; CI, 179, n. 53. The expression ačıtan bol'fa ul corresponds to modern ačıtan bolada 'I am very grateful', 'thank you'. See Les, 8b, DO, 35b. Teb Tenggeri sarcastically thanks Temüüge Otöün and Soqor for the ‘gift’ of the horse which he has just seized from the latter. I have no doubt that Mostaert’s interpretation is the correct one, but there is by no means agreement among modern scholars, some of whom prefer to read elčeten, and (in the case of Liğeti and Bese) understand the sentence in question as ‘You have sent two envoys, Otöün.’ See Li, 112, Bese 1987, 48-51. Bese, op. cit., 50-51, claims that its point of Teb Tenggeri’s remark concerns ‘the diplomatic customs’ of the nomadic peoples which required ‘sending two envoys on the basis of mutual agreement.’ In the present instance, Temüüge Otöün ‘violated this rule by sending only one envoy to Teb Tenggeri, who took revenge by humiliating the envoy.’ Against Bese’s argument one can point out that in § 181 of the SH there is a clear indication that a single messenger can be sent instead of two on a diplomatic mission.

and other examples can be adduced. The word fırın ‘two, both’ is also understood differently by other scholars. Cf. On, 137 and n. 309 (cf. the 2001 ed., 228, n. 539), where the opinion is expressed that since fırın is usually employed in the feminine (cf. above, n. 70), Teb Tenggeri is deliberately insulting Temüüge and Soqor by calling them ‘ladies’, thus also implying that they have an exaggerated idea of their own importance.” However, the word fırın is also used as a masculine or neutral form. See SH, § 278 (R, 169, lines 11637, 11701); ET, 25r01-02, 59r01, 87v04, 100r19. For further discussions on the interpretation of Teb Tenggeri’s words, cf. Do', 281, n. 8; Oz', VI, 180-183, n. 2; Oz', II, 157, n. 2.

As noted by Liğeti, to make a horseman carry the saddle on his back and send him home on foot is a humiliation; even more so is to force someone to apologize kneeling behind one’s back, as Temüüge Otöün was subsequently compelled to do. See Li, 179, n. 245.

‘From all sides’, lit. “from here and from there” (enđeče enđeče).

‘You were right to send them... I was wrong to send’, lit. ‘Your sending... is right... My sending... is wrong.’

‘Sat up in bed’, lit. ‘raised herself and sat.’ Onđeđeyi ‘to raise oneself’ corresponds to mo. onđeđeyi-ıd.

‘She herself shed tears’, lit. ‘she let tears fall.’

‘What are those Qongqotan doing?’ lit. ‘They are Qongqotan doing what, those?’

‘What kind of behaviour is this?’, lit. ‘What sort of manner (yosun) is it?’

They covertly injure (oyıslaladımlar) even (bel) these younger brothers of yours.’ For the verb oyıslala – oyıslat-a ‘to secretly harm’, see above, n. 68.

For the passage ‘And truly... view all this’, see Mo. 155-159. The following are a few additional remarks. ‘Like a great old tree’: both the ideas of ‘great’ and ‘old’ are implicit in the word ne’ıle (= mo. negie[le]), hence my rendering. Cf. Mo, 156. ‘Like the stone base of a pillar’ renders tulu meti. The
word tuku, glossed in the Chinese interlinear version as chu-chüeh "base of a pillar", is used metaphorically here for 'the mainstay (of the nation)'. This is an image which the Mongols almost certainly borrowed from the Chinese, since pillars and bases of pillars are alien features in a nomadic culture. Just as we would speak of a great man being 'a pillar of the state', the Chinese, using the same metaphor, would refer to him as either 'a pillar of the state' (kuo-chüeh 珂旗) or 'a pillar-base' (chu-shih 翟石), literally 'pillar-stone', because the supporting strength of the (wooden) pillar resided in its stone base. The expression chu-shih corresponds to the chu-chüeh of the SH gloss. It should be noted that in the Öötõ Kalmuck dialect, tul actually means 'supporting beam; pillar.' See KW, 409b. It is therefore possible that, in spite of the Chinese gloss, this was also the original meaning of tuku. The reading tuku is confirmed by the corrupt form tol of AT 97a. The regular word for 'pillar, column' in Preclassical and Middle Mongolian is tulya (= mno. tulqa). See above, n. 167. Cf. also MKAT, 21; and bur. tulqa, id. The poetic passage in this section is repeated in slightly modified wording in § 254. By comparing the subject people to tanged hemp and a flock of birds, Börte indicates that they are troublesome and difficult to rule. Cf. the words of Inanač Bilge Qan of the Naiman in § 189: 'Will he (i.e. Tayang) be able to care for (and control) my numerous, base and unruly people?'

For the words 'By whom will they let govern your people ...', see also Mo, 186, n. 167.

'How will people ... ever allow', lit. 'People ... how will those (tede) allow'. The pronoun "those (tu 'they') is expressed following yu tu međe-talkan, but Cl, 180, joins this tede to the next sentence, which already has one. Cf. the preceding kon-t mede-talkan tede. See Mostaert opud Cleaves 1949, 133, n. 266, also for ki'iš (= mno. kišiš) "insatirator."

'Llittle "naughty ones"' (ülget maw') is a term of endearment for one's sons. See Mo, 158. Cf. above, n. 177; and Street 1990, 193, n. 29.
of tərə́n-i. To take this expression as referring to the back or north side of the fireplace (Or, 138; Li-Pop, 208) would imply that Tëmkè Oltçiqin and Tëb Tengeri were wrestling at the back of the tent, which is not the case since, as the SH informs us, they were then near the door, i.e. in the south side of the tent, with Father Mønglik sitting next to the wine table, also in the south side. Thus, as we knew from earlier references in the SH and Rašid al-Dîn, was not Mønglik’s usual place (see above, n. 208), but it may have been an exceptional circumstance and, in any event, if we are dealing with a semifectional account (as is probably the case), we cannot expect strict accuracy. Thus, as correctly stated in Ei-Al, 800, n. 34, and Oz’, VI, 191-192, n. 14, tərə́n-i can only mean èniæ-i ‘in front.’ The losing of the hat on the part of Tëb Tengeri is clearly a bad omen, the hat as covering symbolizing protection, as well as – together with one’s belt – power and authority. See above, nn. 103, 244. As A. Sárközi says, Father Mønglik ‘knew his son had met his fate’ (Sárközi 1978, 148). To enhance the pathos of the scene we have an additional touch with Mønglik’s smelling of the hat, a personal garment, also a symbolic act of remembrance and love, and one we have already encountered in § 55, in the famous episode of Yeke Çïledï and Hïlïn’s shirt.

‘Match each other’s strength and might’, lit. ‘compete with each other for the strong man’s might.’ ‘At the threshold of the door.’ The text has ‘between (fa’ara) the threshold of the door’, which is not clear. The author probably means ‘within the threshold’, i.e. in the area immediately adjacent to the threshold, hence just outside the door of the tent. At any rate, this is how the Ming translators of the SH seem to have understood the phrase. See Y’1 10, 42a. Cf. Wet, 160.

On the two lines of carts placed to the right (= west) and left (= east) sides of the tent, see Mo, 163.

For the correct meaning of arqala`ı ‘pretending, making the excuse that (as a reason for refusing a request)’, see Walcy 1960, 527.

‘Not much of a companion, is he!’ (çathqatu nukør aʃa)’; cf. above, § 170 and com. Tëmkè Oltçiqin’s sarcastic remark is to the effect that he expected a better performance from a person like Tëb Tengeri who now, instead of fighting, lies on the ground pretending that he cannot get up. Tëmkè is adding insult to injury by implying that his opponent is behaving like a coward. It should be noted that, as in the case of Ímaqa, the other great friend of Cinggis Qan turned enemy, the SH makes Cinggis liquidate the opponent by somebody else and without the shedding of blood. Cf. Uray-Ôxalmai 1970, 257-262; Clark 1978, 54, n. 42.

For the section from ‘Father Mønglik understood’ to the end of § 245, see Mo, 160-164. The following are a few additional remarks on the text. The alliterative passage (in da) has also been discussed in Çerênsodîn 1986, 74-75. For the expression da`avî etxan ‘brown earth’, besides Mo, 162, 191, cf. Cleaves 1949a, 501, 531-532; and Mostaert 1962, 202. ‘Since the brown earth, etc.’, i.e. from the very beginning. The term for the ‘funeral tent’ of Tëb Tengeri is qəlîqiq (L’ 214: qəlîqiq, but the correct reading is qəlîqiq = pmo. qəlîqîq, as confirmed by AT1, 98a; cf. AT1, 178), a word already encountered in § 89; in § 169 we find the related form qal ‘travel-tent.’ See above, nn. 80, 169; and AT1, 237b. For the custom of laying the dead in a conical felt tent, cf. CG, 105, n. 3; Li, 179, n. 245. However, as indicated by statements in § 245, the qəlîqiq in question had a regular smoke-hole (erîqe). The reason for moving camp after the slaying of Tëb Tengeri (and the subsequent disappearance of his body) is no doubt to be found in the ancient Mongols’ taboo on the site of a death – particularly relevant in this case, since the violent death of a powerful man had taken place just outside Cinggis’ tent. Cf. MM, 185; MCPA, 64-67; and below, n. 246. It may also have been a prudent move, I think, in view of a possible retaliation on the part of Tëb Tengeri’s numerous followers. The ‘disappearance’ of the body, i.e. the removal and obliteration of the corpus delicti mast, I am sure,
also be explained in this light. However, since the entire episo-
dede as described in the SH is of doubtful historicity and
uncertain chronology, one can only speculate. For a brief but
perceptive summary of the whole affair, see ZCTZ, II, 45-47.
The word *timilaym* in Mo, 162, second line from bottom, is a
misspelling for *similaym*.

§ 246. This entire section has been translated and discussed in
Mo, 164-175. The following are a few additional remarks.

'At dusk,' lit. 'when the brightness of day was yellow.' 'Bodily,' lit.
'together with his body' (beye selte). It is debatable whether the text
implies that his 'soul' left the tent through the smoke-hole, as in the
classic shaman's ascent or 'flight,' but in this case together with the body, as suggested in
Humphrey 1994, 204. Cf. IBs, 245. I think the text merely says
that Tenggeri left the tent with his body, i.e. physically,
although supernaturally since he was dead; this happened 'three
days' after his death, and at the moment when the light of
day 'was yellow.' All these elements are symbolic and introduced in
the story to point at Heaven's direct involvement in the affair.
Cf. §§ 21, 80. In other words, Heaven was so displeased with
Teb Tenggeri that it not only caused his demise, but also bodily
removed him from the scene so that nothing of him was left
behind. Cf. Cinggis' words 'he was no longer loved by Heaven,
and his life (ami-yam), together with his body (beye selte), has been
taken away.' The 'taking away' of his life clearly occurred before
that of his body, since the covering of the smoke-hole, the
blocking of the door and the placing of 'people' (hara =
harat) to guard the tent are all procedures connected with
the taboo on sickness and the site of death. Cf. MM, 12, 14,
183; MP, 181; Ratchevsky 1987, 76; and above, n. 245.
18zun 1975, 133 (following Kc, 179), reinterpretsthe text and
makes Cinggis Qan say that Heaven was so displeased with Teb
Tenggeri that 'it took away not only his soul but his very body!'
*For amirun* 'life' is 'soul,' cf. also Pyurbee 2000. All in all,
within its legendary framework, the SH account is as conse-
quential as that of Jamuaq's end. For the words amirun beye
selte ..., cf. also Cleaves 1953, 37, n. 29. For the notion of
Heaven's favour and the dire consequences that follow, cf. §§
143, 167. See also de Rachewiltz 1973, 27. 'In that part of
the tent,' lit. 'in that place of it (= the tent). For the verb *jingi*
(jingi- in § 160) 'to slander,' see also Ligeti 1972, 2-3, n. 3.
'You have paid for this with Teb Tenggeri's life,' lit. 'you have
come to pay with Teb Tenggeri's head.' Cf. the same usage
('head' = 'life') in English and other languages. 'You would
have been dealt with like Jamuaq, Altan, Qućar and the others,'
i.e. they (Mönglik and his other sons) would have been
executed. For the fate of Altan and Qućar of Qutul's
Qan and Nekin Taši respectively - about which this passage of
the SH leaves no doubt, see § 181. 'If one retracts,' lit. 'If one
demolishes (orundo).' The words for 'morning' in the idiom
quoted by Cinggis Qan (and about which cf. Cersosimo
1986, 72; and Street 1986, 46-47 [92]) are manaqaran
and manaqar, the former being merely a variant of the latter,
as noted by Mostaer (Mo, 17-18), and not a faulty reading
as indicated by Ligeti (L, 215). For these two words, see above,
n. 159. Regarding the 'earlier pledge' of Cinggis Qan to Möng-
lik, see § 204. 'Enough of this matter!' (te lili). For this ex-
pression, cf. § 242, where it is rendered as 'Right!' because of
the context. See above, n. 242. For a different interpretation of
Cinggis' words 'Had you restrained...', see Li, 114, 170, n.
246. Ligeti understands: 'If you had restrained their (i.e. your
sons') unbridled nature, who could have competed with Father
Mönglik's clan?' This is indeed the rendering favoured by most
translators before and after Ligeti, from Naka to Even and Pop,
with the notable exceptions of Mostaer and Cleaves. The
reason why I rejected this otherwise plausible interpretation
is (as, I think, correctly surmised by Mostaer) that such
a statement on Cinggis' part would have acknowledged the
superiority of the Qongqutan clan over all the other clans
- including Cinggis Qan's own clan - which is most unlikely in
the circumstances. Moreover — and I regard this as conclusive — Cinggis’ statement is logically related to the one in the previous paragraph, viz. ‘By not restraining your sons’ nature, you and your sons begin thinking that you were equal to me.’ In both instances it is the Qongoten daring to challenge Cinggis Qan’s authority because of their ambitious nature. ‘The proud air’, lit. ‘the meien’ (tietai). Cf. above, nn. 196 and 208.

For another French translation of, and interesting notes and remarks on, § 246, see Hambis 1975, 15, 19, 33, 37.

§ 247. With this section — the first of Chapter Eleven (= Sup. 1: 業業章一) — begins the account of Cinggis’ campaign in north China against the Jurchens who, since 1115, had established themselves there as rulers of the Chin 吉刺 state, replacing the Kitan/Liao 老 (907-1115) and enlarging their kingdom at the expense of the Southern Sung 南宋 (1127-1279). The account in the SH covers the period 1211-1215 (§§ 247-253). This is followed by Cinggis’ Western Campaign, i.e. the expedition against Muhammad Sîh of Khwârezm in Central and Western Asia of 1218/19-1225 (§§ 254-264), and by his final war against the Tangut state of Hsi Hsia 西夏 in 1226-1227 (§§ 265-268) ending with the conqueror’s death in 1227. These three phases are treated very superficially in the SH, which is principally concerned with domestic matters and internal developments within Mongolia itself, and they contain also many historical and geographical inaccuracies. See Section Six of the Introduction. The chief value of the SH narrative lies not in its historical reliability, but in providing us with an insight into these momentous events straight from the Mongol camp, as it were, and in enlivening them with numerous human elements, personal touches and important details which are lacking in the Chinese sources. These, together with the rich Persian sources, are much more accurate and complete as records of political and military events for this period, certainly one of the most confused in the history of Asia. Cf. Ligeti’s pertinent remarks in Li, 180, n. 247. Insofar as the war with Chin is concerned, the fullest account in any western language is still Martin which, owing to the fact that the author did not know Chinese, must be used with great care (even though H.D. Martin had two competent Chinese scholars to assist him in translating most of the sources, the reconstruction of proper names from the Chinese transcriptions is often unreliable). For the events under discussion, see especially pp. 130-180. A good survey of the campaign in north China is found in CCHC, 249-309. See also the important historical and geographical commentary by Naka in ‘Na’, 369ff; the detailed notes to the relevant sections in Mu, III, 138ff; as well as specialised studies such as Franke H 1978; Uray-Kühlmarsh 1984a; and Jagchib 1982. For the Mongol invasion of Chin, cf. also YTS, 137-145; LIC, 257a (Index); JTCC, 90, 96, 105, 109, 115; and ISK, 765a, 777b (Index). For general studies of the period and issues concerning Chin governance, economy, etc., also in relation to the Mongol conquest, see the works of Japanese scholars like Mikami Tsugio 三上宗男 and Ikuchi Inaue 井上井村 cited in the excellent bibliographies in LIC, 230-248; JTCC, 177-206; and FIC, 156-165. Numerous studies on various aspects of Jurchen culture and history have also appeared in China in recent decades, in publications like YSLT, CKMSKCK, CMKKS, and as monographs, the titles and/or summaries of which are found in the relevant issues of CKSCYT, CKSSTG, and in the JYSS.

In the SH, the inhabitants of north China belonging to the Jurchen/Chin state are always called ‘Kitai’ or ‘the Kitai people’ (Kitat 伊朗). See § 53, where these terms occur for the first time; cf. n. 53 above, and NMP, I, 386-387. They included both Jurchen and Chinese people as well as sinicised Khitans who had been living in the northern provinces since the beginning of the tenth century. Further on in this section we encounter for the first time the designation ‘Jürçet’ (pl. of ‘Jürçen’). On this name, see CLC, 466; SIR, vii-viii, n. 1. On its use by the Mongols, see below.

Vulji, i.e. Fu-chou 福州, was the northernmost outpost of Chin and therefore the first to take the brunt of the advancing
Mongol army in 1211. The site of Fu-chou has been identified in Chang-pei hsien 章浦縣, in the former province of Chahar, now the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region. Its ruins are in present-day Hsing-ho ch'eng 萍湖城, known also by its Mongol name of Qara Bayasun or 'Black Town', some 50 km north of Chang-chia k'ou 長粲口 (formerly Kalagan). See GMCDC, 244-245. Cf. Serruys 1990/91, 219, no. 8.

Hüenge Daba'an (= moo. Ünegen Dabyan), i.e. 'Fox Ridge', is the Mongolian translation of Chinese Yeh-hu ling 耶呼嶺 ('Wild Fox Ridge'), the defile about 15 km north-west of Chang-chia k'ou and 20 km north-east of Wan-ch'ian 万全, known in Yuan times as E-hu ling 耶呼嶺. See YC 13, 1b-3a; YCPC 13, 1a; YSCK 10, 40a; and YTL 13, 1b. Passage through the Yeh-hu ling was by the strategic Ts-sheng k'ou 和順口, the pass known in the Yuan as Huan-erh-tsui 賴爾嘴 ('Badger's Snout'). This was one of the main gateways to China from Mongolia and a regular route for invaders.

Sändiru, i.e. Hsian-te fu 沙丁府, is the present-day Hsian-hua hsien 漢化縣, on the road from Chang-chia k'ou to Peking. The name Hsian-te fu is apparently archaismic since this place was then officially known as Hsian-te chou (漢代), the name being changed to Hsian-te fu only in 1263. The change in the text would seem to have occurred after this date. See Hung 1951, 489-490; LI, 180, n. 247. For some evidence to the contrary see de Rachewiltz 1965, 196. The reconstructed Middle Mongolian forms in the transcriptions of the two towns of Fu-chou and Hsian-te fu are variously given as Vu-ju and Sun-dâ-ju (Pe, 99); Vu-ju and Sândiru (L', 216; but Fudzsiu [cf. Fudzsiu] and Sôndefu [cf. Sôndefu] in Li, 115; Wuju and Sändiru (CI, 183); Viju and Sôndeyvu (ST, 126, lines Y012, and Y013); Viju and Sündiru (Ir, 230); Fuju and Sondofu (Oz, VI, 215); Fuju and Suen-de-fu (EI-AR, 808); and Bu-liu and Sündefu (Ta, 179). The AT', 110a, has Vuju and Snojdu (for Sündiru) respectively (ATL, 181, must be amended accordingly). The forms 'fujuyu' and 'sündefu' in H, 83, are out of consideration. Cleaves' transcriptions Wuju and Sündiru are based on the Mongol transcriptions of the Chinese characters of those names which occur in the inscriptions in Uighur-Mongol script of the 14th century and are therefore reliable. I follow them, except that for w I write v. On the capture of Hsiantuán, see Martin, 142.

The officer sent ahead with Jehe to Chi-yung kuan is called Güyîgûnêk Ba'atur. He is mentioned only once in the SH and is probably to be identified with the K'uei-chu-nieh (*Küüü-nek) 鈕其乃 of YS' 115, 2886, a.a. 1213, as noted by Murakami (Mu, III, 141, n. 5), this name is Turkic: k'ağânak → kiağânak 'a mouse-catching hawk, a bustard.' See VWTD, II, 1418, 1419.

Čâbiyál and Čâbiyál Daba'an ('Čâbiyál Pass') designate Chi-yung kuan 檀陽關, the well-known pass in the Chi-yung defile north-west of Chi'ang-p'ing hsien 慈祥平 in Hopei, the southern end of which (Nan-k'ou 南口) is about 53 km from Snout. For a long time it was the most strategic post north of Peking on the route between this city and Hsiantuán. This long (18 km) and narrow valley separating the plain of Peking from the Chang-chia k'ou plateau was called by the Mongols Čâbiyál, a word meaning in fact 'steep, steep ravine, gully.' See Les., 134b. Its present name in Mongolian is Čâbiyál Boyontu (kh. Čavzaal Böömch), also meaning Čâbiyál Pass. In Middle Mongolian, the form Čâbiyál already alternated with Čâba'al. See MMOH, 121b, s.v. 'čaheč'al.' Cf. TMEN, no. 183. On this pass, see GMCDC, 48-51; and, especially, KYK, 327-330. The latter work is chiefly devoted to the famous arch or gate at Chi-yung kuan which is 10 km north-west of Nan-k'ou, i.e. halfway between Nan-k'ou and Pa-ta ling 牛場嶺, the walls of which contain Buddhist inscriptions (dharanis and hymns) in six languages and scripts dating back to 1345. On these inscriptions in Mongolian, see IMIEC, 37-72; MMOH, 60-66, 103-117; MEP, 83-98; Psptwh, 15-179; Cleaves 1975, and the references contained in these publications, especially in
Therefore, 'Qara Kitat' is, properly, 'Qara Kitat' (= mno. Qara Kitad). For the Jüyin auxiliaries, see above, p. 33. According to the SH, §§ 247 and 248, the Jüyin troops (Jüyin-a čeri'at) sent against the advancing Mongols were the elite 'Qara Kitad' and 'Jüčet' detachments supporting the regular Chinese army, here referred to simply as 'the Kitat.' They were defeated by the main Mongol army led by Činggis. The Chinese sectional summary says (Y 5 Sup. 1, 3b): 'He (Činggis) defeated all the important (i.e. leading) Ch'i-tan (= Kitan), Ju-chen (= Jüčet) and other troops of the Chin state.' As stated earlier (n. 53 above), in the Mongolian text the general term 'Kitat' designates the Chin state of north China and its mixed population – Jüchen and Chinese; the term used for the ethnic Kitans (both the subjects of the Chin living in north China and the Qara Kitad/Hai Liao of Central Asia) was 'Qara Kitat' ('Black Kitan'), qara, lit. 'black', here merely indicating that these were the 'true' Kitans. On this particular use of the term qara, see Poppe 1977, 121, §§ 12 and 14; Khbatagaeva 2001, 95, § 2.14.7.) The double value of Qara Kitat (in Persian Qarā Xītā) is reflected also in Rašīd al-Dīn's work. The 'Jüčet' of the SH are, therefore, not the Jürchens of China, also called Kitan, but the 'true' (= tribal) Jürchens of southeastern Manchuria. See NMP, I, 227, 387. The Kitan and Jürchen Jüyin corps were obviously among the best and most loyal troops of the Chin ruler, witness Činggis' remarks in § 266; however, already during the reign of the Chin emperor Chang-tsung Ÿūé (1190-1208), some Jüyin troops had rebelled against their Jüyin masters and gone over to the Mongols. The role of the Jüyin in the Mongol conquest of north China has been virtually ignored by western historians and we are indebted to P.D. Buell for having drawn attention to it. See, in particular, TQUEMC, 23, 44, 50-54, 61, 88; and Buell 1978 (esp. pp. 64-68). On the Jüyin see also the fundamental studies in KTCL 16, 2b-16b; and MSK, 69-125; as well as Pelliot 1929a, 128-129; HGC, 9; HCSL, 137, n. 20, 395, n. 100; MEYD, 174, n. 52 (also for further literature on the subject); CG, 16, 17-18, n. 1, 36, 44, n. 22, 60, 62, n. 9; and Ts'ai MP...

‘Until they were like heaps of rotten logs.’ For this image, cf. §§ 196, 251, 272.

For ‘the gate of Cabiyal’, see above, and for the passes in question, see GMDCD, 47-48.

Sira Degtür (‘Yellow Terrace’) corresponds to Lung-hu t’ai in Lung-hu, a locality south-east of Chi-yung kuan, about halfway between Nan-k’ou and Ch’ang-p’ing hsiien and some 40 km north-west of Peking. Degtür (degtür = mno. degtürge ‘step, tier, terrace on the side of a mountain.’ See Mostaert’s and Cleaves’ remarks on this term in Cleaves 1953, 88, n. 20. For this sentence, cf. also Lettres, 66.

Jungdu, i.e. Chung-tu 中都 (‘Central Capital’), was the main Chin capital. It occupied, by and large, the southern half of the modern city of Peking, which was built in the early 15th century. On it, see NMP, I, 142, 256; II, 844; Hung 1951, 428; MEYD, 192, n. 244; RAHP, 20f; Bouillard 1929, 53-54 and Map 2, and, especially, YTT, 11-23. While in the interlinear translation Chung-tu (Jungdu) is glossed Ta-tu 太極, in the sectional summary (Y Sup. 1, 3b) it is rendered as Pei-p’ing 佩平, i.e. with the Yüan and Ming names respectively. See Hung 1951, 458-459. The actual attack on Chung-tu did not take place until the beginning of 1214 (see below, n. 248), hence later than the events described in this section, which are of 1211-1212. What the SH means is that Cenggis, on his way to conquer the Chin capital, sent his armies to seize the main enemy strongholds in order to secure the success of the operation. These strongholds, referred to as qoqot qoqot balataq ‘the various towns and cities’, are enumerated in the YS and in other sources. See Na, 377-378; cf. Martin, 144-147. For the expression qoqot balataq (qoqot qoqot balataq, cf. Cleaves 1949, 64 [21].

As noted by previous investigators, Dongchäng, i.e. Tung-ch'ing 東清, or Liao-yang 迎陽, present-day Liao-yang hsiien in Liaoning. This correction is supported by the parallel accounts in the YS’ 1, 16, and SWCCL, 62a, as well as by Raifid al-Din (SL, 12, 165, where ‘Tun-kit’ is Tung-ching). See Hung 1951, 488-489; Li, 180, n. 247. However, according to other accounts found also in the YS, Tung-ching was captured by Muqali in 1215. See Na, 379; Mu, III, 145-146, n. 10. Conflicting reports on the dates of capture of towns and the identity of the military leaders are all too common in the later sources dealing with these early campaigns. It seems that in the case of Tung-ching both accounts are correct: the city was first captured by Jebe early in 1212, then reoccupied by the Chin, and later recaptured by Muqali’s army. See CHHC, 267-275 (esp. pp. 268-271); Martin, 145ff; and the detailed discussion in Qu DF 1998. The AT’, 110b, has the corrupt form ‘Düngül’, which is of no help.

‘As far as the distance of a six days’ (firgo ‘an onegog, lit. “six days and nights”) march from there.’ Qafar, lit. ‘place’ = ‘distance’; cf. § 4. According to the SWCCL, 62a (s.a. 1211), the distance covered by Jebe’s soldiers was 500 li (= ca. 270 km), which makes an average of 45 km a day. Hs, 120, erroneously has ‘drei Tagesmirschen’ (left uncorrected in HH, 144), but the correct rendering had already been given in HW, 57, s.v. ‘bajar.’

Although the SH is silent on the motivation of Cenggis Qan’s expedition against Chin, other sources – Chinese and Persian – throw light on the various and complex reasons that prompted the Mongol qan to embark on such a risky enterprise, the ultimate purpose of which was to combine the removal of a possible future threat with substantial spoils and loot, and other booty and tribute, the latter incentive being well illustrated by the various references to Mongol ‘gains’ in §§ 248, 249 and 250. The best outline of the diverse factors playing a role in Cenggis’ momentous decision is found in CK, 95-98 (= CK’, 105-109), Cf. also Marques 1988, 91; Kharasov 1989, and NOW, 336, as well as Bira 1991, 37-38, for further insights into the problem of
"Even Çäçïyalu Pass, on which we were relying, they have wrested from us," lit. 'Even (her) the reliable (isegelu) Çäçïyalu ...' For the use of her 'even', cf Strick 1981, 155.

They will have no doubt (qala'a) scatter and return to their various cities (balaqat balaqat-der-iyan), i.e. the scattered remnants of the defeated armies will not regroup, but will flake back to the safety of their respective garrisons. The word qala'a (= mo. qala'ar) occurs only once in the SH, in the present passage, where it is glossed as pi-jan &k; 'certainly, without fail.' It occurs several times in the HIY with the same meaning. See Materiel I, 87; Materiel II, 11 (2r, 2). The Written Mongolian form is not registered in Kow., but it occurs, for example, in the colophon of the ET. Cf ET', 100r02, 100r,27. See ibid., 212; Krieger 1963a, 122 and 123, stanza 47, line 4. See also Alf., 1214a, where it is rendered as "verily, surely.""

'And if we rally them against their will, they will turn against us and will no longer be our friends', lit. "Furthermore (jìfi), if they are subject to being gathered by us, not willing, becoming enemies (= hostile) to us, they will not be friends.'

'For the present' renders the Mongolian edö'i-tür, an expression which occurs only once in the SH, but twice in the HIY, where it alternates with edö'i-tür (= mo. edüge-dür) 'at present, now.' See Materiel I, 52; Materiel II, 40-41 (14v, 5).

"If the Mongols agree to withdraw," lit. 'If, entering into (= acceding to) the proposal (or agreement), the Mongols withdraw.'

"After their withdrawal," lit. 'after we have caused them to withdraw.'

"Find our country unsustainble (he'lisüejü) and fall victim to epidemics (kölkürgemü)." On the verb he'lisüejü (= pmo. egisüije-) 'to find disagreeable, intolerable', see Polliot 1925, 216, no. 23; Cleaves 1950, 114-115, n. 84. For kölkürgü: 'to fall victim to epidemics', see Polliot, loc. cit. Cf also Oz', VI, 234-236, n. 6.
'Princess' (öki), lit. 'daughter, girl', is here, as in § 280, used as a counterpart of k̲u 'son, boy' = 'prince'; however, whereas in the case of the latter the SH glosses make the meaning clear (see HW, 105), in the case of the former they do not, and the word is rendered literally throughout, which is misleading (especially in § 280).

For et (= pno. and mo. ed) and, further on, et tabar (= pno. ed tabar; mo. ed tuvar), 'goods, possessions', a borrowing from Turkic, see Claeves 1954, 88-89. n. 7; idem 1991, 129, n. 10; Poppe 1955, 39; Kemonon 1970, 34.

"In abundance", lit. 'heavily (= substantially) (kándú-t-e)'.

"Who knows whether they will or will not agree to our proposal?" – a rhetorical question implying that they would surely agree, as they in fact did.

'When Onggi Cingsang had given his advice, the Altan Qan approved these words of his', lit. 'When he (Onggi Cingsang) had advised (daráqi-su), the Altan Qan approved these words of Onggi Cingsang.'

Gungli is not the personal name of a princess, but the Chinese title kung-chu 公祖 'princess' phonetically transcribed into Mongolian. Unfortunately, we do not know the original SH reading in Uighur-Mongol script, but the word in the corresponding passage in AT, 110b, is Gungli, an obvious scribal error for Gungli (final -uí-i and i are easily confused in that script). In the later literary language and in Written Mongolian, the regular form is also gungli, which I think accounts for the AT reading. (As a Mongolian borrowing from Chinese, gungli 'princess' conforms to the rules of vowel harmony.) See ETI, 82a; Kow., 257b. Scholars are divided as to the correct reading in the SH. Cf. e.g., Pe, 100: Gungli; Shi, Sup. 1, 6a: Gungli; Da', 244: Gungli (cf. Da', 208: gungli); L̲2, 217: gungli (but Gungdzüö = [Gungli] in Li, 116); Mu, III, 148, n. 13: Gungli; Cl, 184: Gungli; Ir, 239: Gungli; On, 143: Gungli (but Gungli in the 2001 ed., 236); Ts, 179: Gungli; Da, 183: gungli; Cé, 231: Gungli; Ev-Pop, 214: Gungli. I discussed the problem of transcription at length in Ra, XI, 111-

112, and decided then (1984) in favour of Gungli, i.e. Gungli, albeit with reservations. The character kung is regularly transcribed as gung in Mongolian, and gung is a term for both kung and gung-li (lingual inscriptions). See Cleeves 1949, 73a; idem 1950, 83a. As for ch, chu, its value in the SH and HIIY transcriptions is ju as well as jü. Cf. GHMIBK, 448-449: Maetriel I, 69. The reading gungli is also supported by the Turkic forms which are all with back vocalism. See TME, no. 1585; Olmez 1999, 59-60; Battuul 2000, 148ff. I have, therefore, adopted the form Gungli in the present work but, again, with some reservations, since neither gungli nor gungli can be definitely rejected. As noted by other commentators, the princess in question was not the daughter of Hsuian-tsung, but of his predecessor Wei-shao Wang 萬壽王, alias Yang-chi 陽聖 (r. 1209-13; see RC, 101 (GI)), and her personal name was Chi'-k'uo 水國. See YS' 1, 17; Martin, 170-171. However, in the CS 14, 304, her name appears also as Kung-chu kuang-hou 公祖皇后 or, as the Kung-chu ('Princess') Empress. Cf. also SL' 2, 71, 171, 255: Gungli Qatun. The Taoist patriarch Ch'ang-ch'ung 長沖, i.e. Ch'i' Ch'ü-ch'i 丘成機 (1148-1227), and his party met her in Mongolia in July 1221. See the HYC, A, 21b, 22b-22a; TOA, 71, 73 (where, however, the word 'Tangat' in note 2 is a mistake for 'Chinese'). Cf. ISK, 213. According to a (? popular) tradition preserved in the ET, the name of the Jurchen princess was Jalaqi. See ET, 30v16-17 (where 'Jalaqi' should almost certainly be read 'Jalaqi'). However, she is erroneously described as the daughter of Chang-tsung (r. 1190-1208). Jalaqi ('Crafty') is perhaps a nickname given to her by the Mongols at the time, or later. Cf. MKLYC, 203, n. 72.

"As much as, in their judgement, their strength and that of their horses could carry", lit. 'letting them decide (mëdeš'ilën) by the strength (gücün-e) as much as one could carry (da'aqii-əčii)." For da'a' (= mo. daayę) 'to be able to carry, bear or lift', see Les., 216a. For the ablative of the nomen futuri
saw Cinggis out of the pass before returning to Ch'ung-tu. The lacunose YS account does not say how far out of Ch'ü-yung kuan he actually went with the imperial suite before turning back, but other early sources do. The SWCCCL, 67a (s.a. 1214) says that he accompanied Cinggis Qan ‘as far as Yeh-ma chi’i’h 野馬之尉和’ and returned.’ In the corresponding passage of SL2, U2, 171, it is stated that he ‘came before Cingiz-khan, passed through Camial (= Cádëiyal, i.e. Chü-yung kuan), and accompanying [him] went as far as the place called Mači (= Mačë); in the text: Mâji, and from there turned back.’ Cf. SL1,15 (1888), 23. In the TCHP 20, 6b-7a, the same account is found, and the locality in question is called Ma-chih 野馬. There is no doubt, in my opinion, that the Mači/Mâji of Rashid al-Din and the (Yeh-)Ma-chih of the Chinese sources are one and the same place. I agree with other commentators that the ‘Mo-chou (Motju)’ of the SH is probably an error for ‘Ma-chih (Mači),’ but with reservations. See Hung 1951, 488. It remains to identify this locality which to my knowledge is not mentioned in other Yuan or later works, at least not in this form and not in this region. Since in the SH ‘Mo-chou’ is mentioned in connection with Fu-chou, we may assume that it was in the same general area. This makes sense, as the locality would then be on the way from the Chü-yung Pass to the Dal Nëir by the usual route – the one also followed by Ch'ang-ch’un (see TOA, 56-64). The obvious ‘point of return’ for an envoy like Onggir Cingsang would have been one of the last Chin outposts, such as Fu-chou. Therefore, the ‘spurs’ (golûn) to which the SH refers can only be those of the northern face of the Maniit Mountains (馬尼山). According to Ting Ch'i'en, Yeh-ma chih corresponds to a locality called I-ma-t'u 野馬圖 situated 90 li north and slightly to the east of Chang-chia K'ou (Kalgan). See STL, 38a. This identification is worth considering. I-ma-t'u, also and better known as Yeh-ma-ts'u 野馬圖, is about 30 km east-southeast of Chang-pei/Fu-chou, 30 km north-east of Chang-chia k'ou and 20 km north-west of Ch'ung-lung-li'ei-p'ing chang, at 41°03 N
account of the 1209 campaign, see YS¹ 1, 14; SWCCL², 60b-61a; SL², f.2/2, 153; Martin, 115-120; OITG, 298-301; HHSK, 123ff., 334; CHCAR, 207-208 (and Map 13 on p. 209). There are some discrepancies as to the year of the campaign, some sources giving 1210 and even 1211 for it, but the overall evidence points to 1209, and this is also the year given by the TCHP 19, 31a. Cf. Na², 384-385; Mu, III, 151-152; Kyčenský 1977, 49; CHCAR, 207; YShi, 161. For the state of Hsi Hsia and the names Qaṣin (< ch. Ho-hsi 'West of the [Yellow] River') and Tang 'ut (< Tangqūt = Tangqūd), a Turkic-Mongolian designation of Hsi Hsia, see above, nn. 150 and 151.

The 'Qaṣin people' (Qaṣin irden), i.e. the inhabitants of Hsi Hsia, are here referred to as the 'Tang 'ut people' (Tang 'ut irden), and their ruler, who at the time of these events was Hsiang-tseng-sheng, alias Li An-ch'ien-su (cf. 1206-11), is called Burqan Qan, lit. 'Buddha (= Divine) Ruler.' This apparently was the religious and popular designation of the Tangut rulers originating from their deep Buddhist faith. Another designation of the Hsi Hsia sovereign, found in § 250, was Iliuq Burqan or 'Victorious Buddha.' Iliuq = ili'uq < iliyyuq, the nomen futurum of the verb iliyyuq- 'to conquer, overcome.' It corresponds to mo. ilaayuun, ilaayuyi, all of them rendering skr. jina 'conqueror, victorious', a standard epithet of the Buddha. See L., 1171a; BTD, nos. 12, 13b, 3605. On Hsiang-tseng, cf. RC, 83 (l).

'Becoming your right (= west) wing (lit. 'hand').' Cinggis's army was invading China from the north; its weak flank was the western flank which was under constant threat from the Hsi Hsia forts along the border, hence the various probing and reconnaissance raids into Tangut territory and the present campaign immediately preceding the actual launching of the expedition against China. Burqan Qan is now pledging his support and, to remove Cinggis Qan's fears, offers to become the Mongol army's 'western wing', meaning that Cinggis would be secure on his western flank from any Hsi Hsia attack.
'I shall serve you', lit. 'I shall give you my strength' (guët uguë); see above, n. 149. To seal his allegiance Burqan Qan gives his daughter Caqa to Cinggis. The identification of Caqa with Ch'a-erh 萨儿 (*Čār), listed in the YS 106, 2695a, as the fifth empress belonging to the third ordo — identification proposed by Li Wen-t’ien (YC 13, 10a) and Naka (Nař, 383) is acceptable only if it can be shown that the two names are related; unfortunately, this cannot be done on purely phonetic grounds. Caqa appears to be the Mongolian counterpart or version of the princess' name, just as Iluqu Burqan is the Mongolian version of her father's title. The AT, 111b, gives the reading 'Čaqa' instead of 'Caqa.' ATL, 183, reads 'Čayśmo', while ATL, 79, has 'Čayın', and LDAT, 219, 'Čakhan' (= Čaqa). However, čaqa means 'child' in Mongolian, and is plausibly a name or nickname. See HW, 25, Lsa, 166b. Cf Rybarkz’s [2003], s.v. ćar means 'layer of frost on the surface of the snow; hard crust on snow' (Lsa, 165a), but ċar or a similar sounding word may well be the Chinese transcription of the original Tungt name of the princess. Further research on this problem by Tungt specialists is clearly necessary. In any event, Murakami’s objection (in Mu, III, 152, n. 2) to Naqa’s and, ultimately, Li Wen-t’ien’s identification (adopted also in Do, 297, n. 3), based on the assumption that Ch’a-erh and Ča’alun, the ‘daughter’—actually the wife of Toqto’a of the Merkit (see § 157 and corr.) are one and the same person, is hardly defensible on phonetic grounds. Incidentally, the Tungt princess, too, was met by Ch’ang-ch’un and his disciples in Mongolia in July 1221. See the HYC, A, 21b; TOA, 71. Cf above, n. 248.

'Your august person' (sildertsi beye čino), lit. 'your person possessing an august spirit (or majesty; sildert)'. For sildert, see above, n. 69.

“You have come to us’, lit. ‘undergoing the coming by you’ (irteküčit). Cf Poppe 1964, 377.

“We are the ones who live in permanent camps,” We are the ones who have towns with buried-earth walls”, lit. ‘We are the ones who have immovable (nuñi) camps. We are the ones who have poundeds (nûdûksen) towns’, i.e. a settled population and, consequently, untrained and unsuitable for the type of warfare waged by the Mongols. Cf § 203: ‘Splitting up those that live in felt-walled tents. Separating those that live in dwellings with wooden doors.’ Cf also § 265, where the same phraseology of § 249 is employed. Nuñi, glossed as pü-tung-ti 不得的 ‘immovable (= stable)’, came to mean ‘tardy, slow (or late) growing; weak, frail, having poor sight or hearing’ in the later literary language. Cf Kow., 676b; Les., 596a; MKT, 395a. As for the ‘pounded towns’ (nûdûksen balaquas), i.e. towns with walls of pounded earth, Cleave renders the line in question somewhat differently: ‘[We] are ones which have pounded city walls’ (Cl, 185), thereby taking the word balaquas (n) (= pmo. balaquas) to mean ‘city wall’ on the strength of the Chinese gloss ch’aqeng 取 which means both ‘walled town/city’ and ‘city wall(s).’ However, balaquas (n) designates only a ‘walled-town/city.’ The reading nûdûksen in Oe, VI., 239, 241-242, n. 3, does not represent the Chinese transcription which is unquestionably nûdûgsen (郎都克). Qurdu aya aylayu ‘to wage a swift campaign’ is, literally, ‘to campaign a swift campaign.’ On the expression aya aylayu, see Cleave 1949, 101, n. 32. ‘To fight a deadly combat’ renders qurdu bulaqa bulagaldu (pmo. bulya bulgaldu), lit. ‘to fight a sharp fight.’ See ‘Trois documents’, 493, n. 85.

“We shall bring forth many camels/Read in the shelter of the tall feather-grass”, lit. ‘Rearing those in the shelter of the tall deserañ. We shall bring forth many camels.” For deserañ ‘feather-grass, broom grass’ = Lasiorigrosia splendens (Trin.) Kunth., etc., see MOUNT, 57; UN'T, 85, no. 15019; Les., 253b; MBE, 146b; and, especially, Sermey 1985 (where the reference to the SH is on p. 70). See also C.R. Bawden’s remarks in BSOAS 45:1982, 205. The correct scientific name is Lasiorigrosis, not Lasiorigrosia. Cf above, n. 150.
"We shall turn them into (lit. "cause to become") government property (qap)." For qa, which is an alternative form of qa 'ruler' as 'ruderush, government', hence 'pertaining to the government, government property', see Cleaves 1952, 97-98, n. 90; and de Rachewiltz 1983, 273 (e). Cf. above, nn. 57, 244. Burqan Qan means that the camels will be levied (zubārī), see below) from his subjects in order to be delivered to Činggis Qan. On the Mongols' requirements of camels, see also § 274. On their need of textiles, see Serruyas 1982a; CEME, 11ff; and above, nn. 136 and 187. As Serruyas points out (op. cit., 126), the Mongols had wool and used it to make felt for their tents, but they did not weave.

'Training falcons to fly loose at game', lit. 'teaching (surqūf) birds (ṣibāʿun, here = falcons) that one lets loose (orqa).' ʿṢibāʿun (m. ʿṣibāyun) 'bird' has the secondary meaning of 'falcon', as in § 195. On falconry, cf. above, n. 239.

'The best ones', lit. 'the fine ones (ṣuqūd-i) of (amogst) them (ṇu).' For ṣuqūd = āṣu, cf. Mo, 95.

'He kept to his word', lit. 'he reached (ṣuqūd) up to his word.' For this expression, see Letteres, 31. For qubī, 'to levy', see above, n. 223.

In this section, as in the next one, emphasis is placed on Burqan Qan's submission and his promise to provide military assistance to Činggis Qan. The royal act of submission was formalized by the dispatch of a princess to the Mongol court together with a substantial tribute in camels, satin, etc. It was the subsequent failure to provide military assistance to the Mongols prior to the launching of the Western Campaign in 1218-19 that will give Činggis Qan the 'legitimate' pretext to invade and, ultimately, destroy the Hsi Hisa state in 1226. See below, n. 256.

§ 250. This section contains a brief recapitulation of the results of Činggis' two expeditions against Chin and Hsi Hisa described in the previous sections, viz. the acquisition of a large amount of booty on the part of the Mongols. The year given for the two campaigns is the Year of the Sheep, i.e. 1211. As shown in the previous notes, the chronology of the SH concerning these events is unreliable. The year 1211, already 'ruderush, government', hence 'pertaining to the government, government property', see Cleaves 1952, 97-98, n. 90; and de Rachewiltz 1983, 273 (e). Cf. above, nn. 57, 244. Burqan Qan means that the camels will be levied (zubārī), see below) from his subjects in order to be delivered to Činggis Qan. On the Mongols' requirements of camels, see also § 274. On their need of textiles, see Serruyas 1982a; CEME, 11ff; and above, nn. 136 and 187. As Serruyas points out (op. cit., 126), the Mongols had wool and used it to make felt for their tents, but they did not weave.

'Training falcons to fly loose at game', lit. 'teaching (surqūf) birds (ṣibāʿun, here = falcons) that one lets loose (orqa).' ʿṢibāʿun (m. ʿṣibāyun) 'bird' has the secondary meaning of 'falcon', as in § 195. On falconry, cf. above, n. 239.

'The best ones', lit. 'the fine ones (ṣuqūd-i) of (amogst) them (ṇu).' For ṣuqūd = āṣu, cf. Mo, 95.

'He kept to his word', lit. 'he reached (ṣuqūd) up to his word.' For this expression, see Letteres, 31. For qubī, 'to levy', see above, n. 223.

In this section, as in the next one, emphasis is placed on Burqan Qan's submission and his promise to provide military assistance to Činggis Qan. The royal act of submission was formalized by the dispatch of a princess to the Mongol court together with a substantial tribute in camels, satin, etc. It was the subsequent failure to provide military assistance to the Mongols prior to the launching of the Western Campaign in 1218-19 that will give Činggis Qan the 'legitimate' pretext to invade and, ultimately, destroy the Hsi Hisa state in 1226. See below, n. 256.

§ 250. This section contains a brief recapitulation of the results of Činggis' two expeditions against Chin and Hsi Hisa described in the previous sections, viz. the acquisition of a large amount of booty on the part of the Mongols. The year given for the two
and 4, 3a (s.a. 1229: mission of Wan-yan Nu-shen 王延奴申). Personally, I favour the first explanation, viz. that the Jurchen name Nguda, pronounced by the Mongols Aquta or Ayuta/Ayudai, although properly belonging to the founder of the dynasty, was also mistakenly applied by them to his descendents, much as we would say ‘the Agudadd.’ The Mongol practice of giving names to other peoples is an interesting subject in itself and deserves investigation.

For Iluqu Burkan, see above, n. 249. For the Sa’ari Ke’er, or Sa’ari Shiepe, see above, n. 128. The SH statement that Cinggis Qun 超金昆 returned to his camping grounds in northern Mongolia is correct only insofar as the completion of the 1209 campaign against Hsi Hsia is concerned. After this the Mongols were following their first campaign against China, concluded in 1214, Cinggis withdrew his army only as far as the Yü-čh po, i.e. the Dal Nor, in southeastern Mongolia to avoid the summer heat, as already shown above (n. 248).

For the use of the verb ba’ur (= mo. bayur) ‘to pitch camp’, lit. ‘to dispose’, with the accusative, see Cleaves 1953, 105, n. 5; and Lettres, 29. For this section, cf. also Street 1990, 190 (66).

§ 251. This section deals with the resumption of hostilities with China. The SH is again in error as to the sequence of events by placing the Alan Qan’s flight from Chung-tu after the resumption of hostilities, whereas all other sources agree that Cinggis’ renewed attack was triggered off by the Chin ruler’s hasty transfer of his court to the relative safety of the Southern Capital Pien-liang 潘署, i.e. K’ai-feng 柏陵, in Honan in June 1214. See below, and Martin, 171ff. There are also other inconsistencies that will be discussed later. The reason given in the SH for this, the ‘second’ campaign, is the Chin government’s interference with the ‘hindered’ the envoy sent by Cinggis to the Sung court in the south. These various envos, among whom was Jubaqan (see below), were seeking an alliance with Sung against the Jurchens, which explains why they were
detained by the latter. On the other hand, envoys were regarded as inviolable by the Mongols, and hindering their mission or harming them automatically provided the Mongol court with a legitimate casus belli (cf. below, n. 254). The then reigning Sung emperor, Ning-tsung 靖宗 (r. 1195-1224; see RC, 89 [M]), is called Jau Gon, which was the Mongol pronunciation of Chao Kuan 超觀, lit. ‘Chao Person-in-office’, Chao being the family name (hsing) of the Sung rulers. This unusual appellation must have been a popular designation of the Southern Sung emperors in northern Chín-ruled China. Kuan 超 is used here for ‘emperor’, also a meaning of this character. See DKJ, III, 7107 (3). Cf. also the expressions kuan-chia 官家 and kuan-li 官里 id. (ibid., 7107.29 and 7107.357; CEDMU, 925a; SYTTYT, 578a).

For the surname of a person followed by his title or designation, cf. pmo. Eau Qolang = ch. Chi’o Ho-shiang 齊吾何象, lit. ‘Monk Ch’ao’, in Cleaves 1951, 56 [31], 71. As for the transcription Jau Gon of 超用 adopted by Cleaves (Cl, 186) and others, Ligeti gives again different readings in his works: Jeou- gun in the text edition (L², 220) and Osmonogon (= Jasaon) in his translation (Li, 117); whereas Ozawa prefers the reading ‘Jögon’ (Oz’, VI, 246). The reading Jeou for 超用, which I also adopted in Ra, XI, 85, 120, is indeed supported by the 13th-14th century transcriptions in Phags-pa script (see, e.g., MKTY, 1190 [= B, 15a]), but these reflect the state of Old Mandarin, whereas here we are dealing with a Middle Mandarin pronunciation. See KQJ, 243, no. 55 (s.v. 超). As for 超等 = gon, cf. Cleaves 1949, 73a (Index). The AT, 112a, has the corrupt forms Čedóin and Čudóin (amended to ‘Čeouin’ and ‘Čeouin’ respectively in ATL, 185). CF. ATI, 79.

For the emendation of the SH ‘Chao Kuan’ into ‘Chao K’o’ou 超觀 (K’ou being the personal name of Ning-tsung) proposed by Wang Kuo-wei, see KTCL 16, 26b. Cf. Pelliot 1929, 130; Cl, 186, n. 21. This emendation is doubtful on phonetic grounds.

Jubagan, the chief envoy of Cinggis Qun to the Sung, is a
known personage, mentioned in the MTPL, 2a-b (see the important note on him by Wang Kuo-wei, loc. cit.), the YSP 2, 31 (s.a. 1231), and other Sung and Yuan sources, where his name is transcribed in slightly different ways (Su-pu-han, Shuo-pu-han, etc.). See MBDL, 44-48, 101-102, n. 38; CG, 3, 8-9, n. 11; Na, 386-387; Mu, III, 156-158, n. 2; Abramowsky 1976, 126, 140, n. 35 (where, however, Shuo-pu-han is not identified). The various transcriptions of his name reflect Sub(u)qan ~ Chub(u)qan (~ Jubaq(u)qan) ~ Chub(u)qan. The AT, 172a, gives Cab Qan (~ Cabqan) ~ incorrectly read as 'Cau-qan' by Sastina (LDAT, 220) and ATL, 79 ~ which has been amended by Ligeti to 'Cubqan' in his text edition (ATL, 185). Murakami, loc. cit., suggests a possible derivation from cubagun (~ Mo. 'Cibaganqan, 'Cubqan') 'jubge'. Cf. tu. cubagan id. See Material I, 46; Les, 174a, 175a; DTS, 156a.

Although this etymology is very plausible, I would like to suggest a possible, even if less likely, alternative, viz. *cubagan ~ *cubqan 'intelligent, eloquent'. Cf. ord. t'owá, t'owlán 'very intelligent, lively, eloquent' (DO, 714b-a); šl. t'sowá 'witty' (registered in KW, 431a). See IMCS, 70-71. This could have been the nickname the Mongols gave to this personage on account of his skill as an ambassador. We now that he was a Chinese-speaking Onggut, apparently serving under Muqali in north China, who was entrusted with several missions to the Sung, including one about 1221. He was eventually killed in Shensi by a Chin official in the course of a mission to the Sung on behalf of Tolui in 1231, i.e. after Ögedei's full-scale resumption of the war against China. One may well wonder whether the reference to Jubqan in the passage of the SH under discussion is not a later interpolation, or a textual contamination, in view of the fact that Jubqan was indeed prevented from carrying out a Mongol diplomatic mission to the Sung, losing his life into the bargain, about seventeen years later.

For the construction 0lon eli'tin-yen ~ jetgik'dajq, see Poppe 1964, 374.
peasants, displaced people and outlaws, known as the 'Red Coats' (ch. Hung-wo '红卫'). The Chin government made determined efforts to suppress them in 1214-1215, but without much success, and the Red Coats continued to harass the authorities and the local population for many years. In its fight against these rebels, the Chin government made use of civil volunteers known as the 'Multicoloured Caps Army' (ch. Hua-mao chün 花帽軍); these troops were also used in support of the regular army when the Mongol forces led by Samaqua attacked the T'ung-kuan stronghold in 1216. Some scholars have suggested that the Hula'an Degeren (Hula-an Degeren 呼拉安得勒恩) of the Multicoloured Caps Army; others maintain that they were the latter, but comprising also units of the Red Coats who had changed sides and rallied to the government. Cf. the various arguments in Yao TW 1960; and Mu, III, 160-161, n. 7. As pointed out by Murakami (loc. cit., p. 108), the Red Coats and the Multicoloured Caps Army may later have become blurred because of the incorporation of the former into the latter. On the Red Coats and their leaders, see MWHYW, 11-48 (esp. p. 22ff.); F. Aubin's biography of the Chin Ch'ien-kuo (ch. 靑賊); Pei, 1213 in SB, 542-546; NTS, 119ff.: Oshima 1974. In any event, all authors agree that the battle of T'ung-kuan described in this section of the SH is that of 1216. It should be pointed out, however, that Ra'id al-Din, in describing the military operations in north China just prior to Tolui's great victory at 'T'unggan Qahalaq' (read 'T'unggan Qaqlaqa'), i.e. the T'ung-kuan Pass, in 1231/32, says that Ogödei, who was personally in charge of the operations, 'himself proceeded on the right (i.e. westwards -- I.R.) in the direction of a province of Khati (or north China -- I.R.), the people of which are called Hulan-Delegen, that is, the people who wear red coats.' (Successors, 34; cf. ibid., p. 166; and TMEN, no. 200.) Then follows a description of Tolui's arrival at T'ung-kuan and the ensuing battle against the Chin troops led by *Qeda Sengum and *Höbegdär in the course, 35-38; cf. HWC, 192-195) mentioned earlier. In my view, the SH account is a conflation of events that took place in the North.
China campaigns of 1214-1216 and 1231-1232, the confusion being due in all probability to a later editor who meddled with the text of the SH and, in particular, with the sections dealing with Tolui. Therefore, I think that the reference to the Red Coats in our passage must be re-examined in the light of the account of the final battle for T’ung-kuan and the cryptic remark by Rashid al-Din concerning the people by that name. Cf. also Liu TY, 1998, 25-26. The name itself presents no problem: ‘Hülan-Delegeten’ is Hülan (< Hulun as) Delegeten, lit. ‘Those who have (= west) red coats’, a designation formed on Hulun Degen + the possessive suffix -ten.

‘With the army blocking the passage’ (čerkä böklei), the passage being the Tunggan Pass. The exact meaning of bökle- (= mo. bögë-) is ‘to fill (i.e. to block, obstruct) an opening.’ Cf. § 80: amasar bökle- ‘to block the opening.’ Renderings such as ‘selected the (best) soldiers’ (On, 144; cf. the 2001 ed., 238), and ‘reinforcing (or strengthening, making a full contingent of) the troops’ (Oz., 210; Oz., VI, 249, 250, n. 3, 309; Oz., II, 167-168; CE, 233; Ev-Pop, 216, 301, n. 23) go against both the text and the Chinese gloss (吾屯).

‘In haste’, lit. ‘hastening’ (qardulun). The verb qardula- (= mo. qurdula-) ‘to hasten’ (from qurdun ‘haste, quick’; cf. HW, 72) occurs only once in the SH.

‘The Kitat troops came to intercept him, saying, “Our soil!”’ By ‘Our soil!’ is meant ‘Let us defend our soil!’ See Mo, 175-178. For somewhat different interpretations of this passage, see Oz., VI, 249, 253, n. 6, 381; On, 144, CE, 234, Ev-Pop, 216. The two Mongol leaders mentioned in § 251 are Tolui and Cüjü. Cüjü Gürgen, i.e. Cügi Gürgen (Son-in-law Cügi) – the latter having been mentioned in § 202 as the commander of one of the three Urgirat thousands (mirkat). Cügi is the correct form of the name. The son of Aśči Nojan and grandson of Dei Sečen, Cügi married Cüngis’s youngest daughter Tünamän, hence the epithet gürgen. On him, see Na’, 281; Mu, II, 391-393, n. 92 (with genealogical notes); Pelliot 1935, 913-916: Chapître CVIII, 49; n. 2, 160 (?), n. 2. On gürgen – gürgeen, see ‘Töös documents’, 474; and above, n. 66. Cügi took part in the first North China campaign and is mentioned in YS’ 1, 16, in connection with Tolui and the attack on Te-hsing fu in 1213, as well as in Rashid al-Din’s work, always in connection with this early campaign and with Tolui. See Successors, 164. His participation in Ögedei’s campaign against Chin in the early 1230s can only be inferred from the participation of his father, who led the left (= east) wing of the Mongol army, and from the handsome reward he received for his services from Ögedei in 1236. See YS’ 2, 35; MWESC 4, 58; Abramovski 1976, 132.

‘Charging at their flanks!’ (kündelen-cë debuti), lit. ‘assaulting from the side(s).’

‘Slew the Kitat until they were like heaps of rotten logs.’ For this expression, see above, n. 247.

‘Fled out of Jungdu’, lit. ‘going out fled from Jungdu.’ ‘The city of Nangming’ (Namming bulagus) is Nan-ching 紅, or Southern Capital, of the Chin, which was then Pien-liang, i.e. K’ai-feng, in Honan. The city was besieged and eventually captured by Sühe’eti in May-June 1233. As stated at the outset, Chung-tu was abandoned by Hria’ns-tsung before Cüngis’s resumption of hostilities in the second half of 1214. Hšían-tüng left Chung-tu on 27 June 1214 and arrived in Pien-liang/Nan-caing on 19 August. See SS 39, 760; CS 14, 305. Cf. YS’ 1, 17. By the time he reached Pien-liang, Chung-tu was being surrounded by the Mongol army and put under siege. The siege lasted over ten months and the city finally surrendered on 31 May 1215. See CS 14, 309; YS’ 1, 18. The famine became acute in the last two months and references to cases of cannibalism are indeed found in the Chinese sources. See SWCC1, 68b; MWESC 3, 16a. Cf. SL, 1/2, 174; Martin, 177; ISK, 18, 101, 300, 416, 621. As noted by Ligeti (Li, 181, n. 251), a distorted version of this story – the one in which the besieging Mongols resort to cannibalism – is found even in John of Pian di Carpine’s Historia Mongolorum. See MM, 16; SDM, 349. As for the rending Namming, the ATN, 112b, has Nannging (with the side gloss ‘Nan-jing’); however, the 13th-
14th century reading of nan 纳 was narn, as shown by Marco Polo’s ‘Nanchin/Namghin.’ See NMP, I, 127 (regrettably Pelliot never completed his entry on ‘Nanchin’); MP., 199, 399. Cf. also Cleaves 1949, 76a (Index). For this city in Chin times, see ISK, 789a (Index); FJC, 175a (Index). Cf. also Hung 1951, 478.

§ 252. Qosiṿu = Ho-hsi-wu 到 JW, just north-east of Wu-ch‘ing hsien 武城縣 in Hopei, at 39° 38 N 116° 58 E. This is not a place where Cinggis Qan would have halted during the second campaign against Chin, since he was moving towards Chung-tu (Peking) from the north (Yü-ehh Po/Dal Nor) and Ho-hsi-wu is situated south-east of Peking. The erroneous mention of Hoo-hsi-wu in the present context may be a later interpolation in one of the SH manuscripts, as it is not found in the sectional summary which begins as follows (V Sup. 1, 17b) ‘When Cinggis reached the territory of Sira Ke‘er of Pei-p'ing 北平 (= Chung-tu/Peking), Jeebe had already taken Ch‘i-yang kuan ... ’ It is, however, found in the AT, 112b: ‘Qoi-siva.’ Alternately, as in the case of Mojou 美洲 in § 248, another locality is meant.

‘Set up camp at Qosivu, then in the Sira Ke‘er of Jungdu, lit. ‘Having set up camp at Qosivu (Qosivu-yi ba‘u‘at), he set up camp in the Sira Ke‘er (Sira Ke‘er ba‘uwa) of Jungdu.’ Here we have an example of the use of the verb ba‘u (i.e. mo. ba‘u-) ‘to pitch camp’ with and without the accusative. Cf. above, n. 250 ad fin. The Sira Ke‘er, or Yellow Plain (ke‘er means both ‘plain’ and ‘steppe, steppeland’; see above, n. 56), is the open country north of Peking, ‘yellow’ no doubt referring to the characteristic colour of the soil (loess). Cinggis’ setting up camp in the neighbourhood of Chung-tu and Jeebe’s capture of Cabiyal, i.e. of Ch‘i-yang kuan, are events belonging to the earlier campaign: the capture of the pass is recorded in the YS‘ 1, 16, s.a. 1213, in the seventh month (20 July-17 August), and Cinggis’ halt ‘in the open country north of Chung-tu’ in the third month (12 April-10 May) of 1214. See ibid., 17. Cf. the
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SWCC‘, 64b (s.a. 1213) and 66b (s.a. 1214). However, according to both the YS and SWCC‘, 64b, after the capture of Ch‘i-yang kuan Jeebe’s army joined the troops of the Mongol generals Ketei and Bolā, not the main army led by Cinggis. Cf. Martin, 160. The sentence ‘Jebe Cahcyv-Bold na ga‘lpa ... neyileba (= neyilebe)’ is discussed in Mo, 179-180. For ga‘lpa q aq’alaqa (i.e. mo. goyra‘a) ‘gate’, cf. TMEN, no. 1514. Mostaert’s ‘qel’ajala’ (Mo, 179) is, therefore, unwarranted. Cf. also IMCS, 58, 61.

Regarding the appointment of Qada as liditi, i.e. ch. linshou 临守, lit. ‘official left behind to guard the capital’; hence vicegerent (HCCL, 747b [Index]), protector (GUCMR, 97, 122, n. 183), regent (DOTT, 323a, no. 3813), or governor (ISK, 703), nothing is known from other Chinese sources with the exception of the SWCC‘, 69a, where it is stated that Ha-ta 額端 (Qada) and Kuo-ho 周和, who were liu-shou at the time, i.e. when Chung-tu was captured by the Mongols, made obeisance and offered gifts of gold and silk to the three Mongol commanders Qadoqua Noyan (i.e. Ghi Qutqqi), Onggir Baurüi (i.e. Ba‘urei) and Arqai Qasbar who had been sent by Cinggis, then encamped at Huan-chou 廣州 (present day To-lun hsien 多倫縣, Inner Mongolia), to make the inventory of Chin treasures in Chung-tu. This follows an account of the story related in the present section of the SH, always s.a. 1214. In the corresponding passage of Rashd al-Din’s work (SL 1/2, 174), Qada and Kuo-ho are called Qada (or Qadai) liu-an (read liu-an) and Got (? Qui), and the same story is recounted (ibid., 174-175). Cf. Ratchevsky 1965, 100-101; ISK, 80-81; Li, 181, n. 252. The vicegerent originally appointed by Hisan-tsung when he left the capital was the heir apparent Shou-chung 祉承 (assisted by Chancellor Wan-yen Fu-hsing 蘇承 (the Onggir Cängsgang of § 248) and the Associate Director of Political Affairs (ts‘ii-yii-chung 參政) Mo-juan Chin-chung 稲然忠. During the siege of Chung-tu, the heir apparent escaped and the above two officials were left in charge of the city. Fu-hsing committed suicide before
"Stealing them ... behind his back (éc-ûn én)". For éc-ûn 'secretly, stealthily', see above, n. 24.

'The great norm' (ye-yen you), like 'the great principle' (ye-yen törö - törö) of §§ 208, 220, designates the fundamental principle of the fasaq governing the relationship and mutual obligations of lord and subject. In the present context, the principle/norm invoked is the one whereby all captured property, war booty, etc., belongs to the clan, who has the sole right of distribution and reward. Cf. the case of Qulan and Naya's (§ 197 and com.) -- a classic example of the enforcement of this principle.

"You shall be ...", lit. 'Will you not be ...?' -- a rhetorical question.

'Eye's for me to see with/Ears for me to hear with.' Cf. above, § 203, where the same words were applied to Šiğ Qutuq, but without the possessive pronoun mina.

The story involving Onggur, Arqai Qasar and Šiğ Qutuq must have been well known among the Mongols, furnishing, as it were, a fine example of the breach of, and compliance with, the fasaq. It is told in the SWCC1, 69a-b, s.a. 1214, and in SL1, 1/2, 174-175, s.a. 1213 (see above). In Činggis Qan's annals in YS1 11, the dispatch of 'Šiğ Qutuq and others to make an inventory of the money depositories in Chung-tu' is correctly entered s.a. 1215 (the fifth month: 30 May-28 June), but the full story is not told. For a comparison of the various accounts, and valuable comments on them, see Ratchnevsky 1965, 98-103; ISK, 80-82. Cf. also Ratchnevsky 1974, 473.

§ 253. As in the previous sections, here too several events are related in the wrong chronological order. There is also a muddling up of the personages involved. The submission of the Altan Qan, his offer of a royal princess and substantial tribute to Činggis Qan, the latter's withdrawal to the north (via Cha-yung kuan), and the Altan Qan's move to Nanning, i.e. to Pei-liang/K'ai-feng, were related in §§ 248, 250 and 251. All these events, as we have seen, took place in the first half of 1214. In the present section, the events described span the period 1214-
COMMENTARY

1216, then they move back to 1213. The reference to a son of the Altan Qan called Tenggeri, who was sent to serve in the Guard, i.e. as a hostage, together with a hundred companions, is incorrect and due to a confusion with the next entry on Vuqanan. Vuqanan, i.e. P'us-hisen Wan-nu 魏騃築衛 (d. 1233), was the Chin commander in Liaoning who, at the beginning of 1215, after the transfer of the court to Pien-liang, decided to rebel and established for himself an independent kingdom in Manchuria. However, before long (end of 1216) he followed the example of the famous Kitan defector Yeh-ilu Liu-ko 車裡可鉞 (1165-1226) and submitted to the Mongols by sending his own son T'ihe-kho 伊海可好 to Tenggeri of the SH – to Cinggis as hostage (‘Tenggeri’ is obviously a corruption of ‘T'ieh-kho’). My interpretation is at variance with that of Naka and other scholars, who prefer to relate the SH account to events that occurred during Ögedei’s campaign in north China in 1232. See Na', 395-398; Mu, III, 167, n. 5. On P'us-hisen Wan-nu, see YS² L. 19; MWESC 31, 4b-5a; Martin, 180, 200, 216; Mu, III, 167-168, n. 4 (for further references). Cf. SWCCL', 67b-68a, and the parallel account in SL² L.12-173-172. Various historical and geographical problems relating to this section have been discussed in Uray-Kóhalmi 1984a and idem 1985. See also below. Sent... to serve as dayguard and hostage', lit. 'sent... saying,...Let him be a turqas.' On turqas 'dayguard' = 'hostage', see MEYD, 41; Alissen 1987/191, 31. Most translations fail to point out that, in the present context, turqas is synonymous with 'hostage.' Cf. above, n. 191.

Qasar’s, i.e. Jöchi Qasar’s, progress eastwards along the coast of Po Hai – the ‘daalai’ ('sea') of the SH – took place in the autumn of 1213 and the winter of 1213-1214. According to the Chinese sources, the left wing of the army was led by Qasar, with Aláx Noyan, Jóircéed and Böca as commanders. They conquered various cities and commanderies west of the Liao River before reopening the Mongol forces concentrated at Ta-K’ou 大口, just south-west of Chung-tu. See YS² L. 17 (a.s. 1213); SWCCL', 65b. Cf. Pelliot 1935, 907ff. In the SH account, Böca is replaced by Tóulun Çerbí (last mentioned in \1 213. Beiging = Pei-ching 並京, the Northern Capital of the Chin and former Central Capital (Chung-ching 中京) of the Liao, was the ancient city of Ta-t'ing (fu) 太貞府, renamed Ta-ning 太宁 in the Yüan and Ming periods. It corresponds to modern Tai-ching 太興 (Mongol name: Çayan Subburin) in Liaoning, on the left (west) bank of the Liao-ha. See DHGM, 484, 737, 831-832, 836 (where 太明 is an error for 大明). Following Pelliot and Ligeti (Pe, 102; L², 222), I have adopted the reading Beiging, which is supported by the AT¹, 113b, reading Biing (= Beiging; cf. ATL, 187). However, the reading Biing adopted by Cloeves is also possible. See Ci, 189. During the Yüan, the character pei 佩 was pronounced pui 和 (pe), and these two pronunciations are reflected in the 13th-14th Mongolian transcriptions pui and bei of T. Cf. Cloeves 1952, 72b (Index); Hattori 1973, 40. The Mongol term for 'along' is gijin. Further on we find this term again (Ula Na'a muvet gijin), as well as its related form gijur (gijur beladát). Gijin is glossed as yen 亜 (en él) 'to follow a course; along (this) frontier (or coast)', and gijur as pien 並 'border; frontier; edge, bank.' See SH, 50. The former corresponds to mo kija ‘border, edging, hem (of a garment)', and the latter to mo kia'al 'border, frontier' (< kija). See Læ., 474b; cf. below, n. 257. 'If Vuqanan intends to offer resistance (lit. "thinks of rebellion")... border towns.' For this passage, see Mo, 95. The rivers Ula (a word meaning 'river' in the Jurchen language) and Na' of the SH correspond to the present-day Sungari (Sung-hua chihang) and its chief tributary the Norni (Nen-chiang). See DHGM, 698 and 656. As for the Ta'ur, it is the T'ao-erh ho or "T'ao-ho (Tor, Taor, Toror Golu), a right-hand affluent of the Norni. See ibid., 848; Na', 395-396; Li, 182, n. 253; and, especially, Uray-Kóhalmi 1984a and idem 1985.
Thus, according to the SH, Qasar and his horsemen were supposed to cross the territory of Liaotung held by P'uh-hisien Wan-nu, then ride northwards across the region of the upper Sungari, Nonni and T'a-o-erh rivers and, following the course of the latter upstream (in this way approaching the river Khalkha), gain Cinggis' main base camp, the 'great adar', the location of which is not specified in the text. However, we know that Cinggis Qan did not return to Mongolia until the end of 1215-
beginning of 1216, and that Qasar's campaign of 1213-1214 was a limited raid ending with his return to north China, not to Mongolia (see above). Clearly, we have here a conflation of two campaigns, that of Qasar of 1213-1214 and a subsequent one, of 1214-1215, which consisted of two separate expeditions in Manchuria, one led again by Qasar, and the other by Muqali. On completion of his campaign, Qasar did indeed return to Mongolia as stated in the SH; but the siege and capture of Pei-
ching/Ta-ning was actually carried out by Muqali's army in 1215. Muqali himself did not return to Mongolia until September 1217. The submission of Vuqana, i.e. P'uh-hisien Wan-nu, to the Mongols took place in the latter part of 1216 and falls within the context of Muqali's completion of the military operations in western and southern Manchuria. Therefore, the SH statements that Qasar 'brought the city of Beiping into subjection' and 'forced Vuqana of the Jürçet to submit' are incorrect and probably tendentious, insofar as they add undeserved glory to Cinggis' brother. See Na', 397-398; MWESC 3, 14b-15b; Martin, 203f.

§ 254. With this section begins the narrative of Cinggis Qan's so-
called Western Campaign (from ch. hsi-cheng BEE id.; cf. the HYC, A, 296, 39b) against Muhammad of Khvärzam. It is preceded by an interesting introduction in which, after recalling the murder of the members of the Mongol embassy – the famous 'Otrar incident' of 1218 – that was the immediate cause of the war, the SH records a dramatic dialogue between Cinggis, his wife Yisül Qaran and his sons on the subject of the succession to
the throne in the event of the conqueror's death. The dialogue, couched in epic language, is almost certainly a later interpola-
tion reflecting the views of that section of the Mongol court and nobility which was opposed to the claims of the lines of Jochi and Ça'adaï – the two elder sons of Cinggis. The episode continues, with definite political overtones, in the following section (§ 255), in which Ögedei's claim to succession is upheld, but in such a way as to foreshadow the eventual replacement of his line by that of Tolui, as indeed happened (see below, n. 255 ad fin.). This would indicate that the spurious section must date after Möngke's accession to the throne in 1251. It is worth noting that the entire episode is missing from the AT version; therefore the issue also has a bearing on the date of composition of the SH. See Section Two of the Introduction.

The SH statement that Cinggis' envoys led by the Mongol (?) Uqana ('Bilgi-Goat'; on his name, see ch. 33 leave 256-30) were one hundred in number agrees with Yeh-li Ch'ü-tsa'ai's account and is at variance with the figure of 450 given by Juvaini and, after him, by Rashid al-Din. See de Rachewiltz 1962, 62, 55, n. 89; HWC, 79: SL, 1/2, 188. In view of the fact that the SH account is confirmed by a contemporary and independent witness to these events like Yeh-li Ch'ü-tsa'ai, who in 1218 was already serving as scribe-secretary (mnno. bid蜇 < bidigli) at the Mongol court, the figure of one hundred is more reliable than that of Juvaini which has been adopted by the CHI, 304, and TM, 68. The 'envoys' sent by Cinggis were actually merchants in charge of a caravan whose leader or leaders, bearing credentials from the Mongol court, held (from the Mongol point of view) the status of official envoys or ambassadors (čilin). It was indeed their special status as čilin that made their murder an inevitable causa belli. (On the invalidity of official envoys, see MP', 109, cf. Reserve 1992a.) On the composition of the caravan and the controversial account of the massacre of its members by order of Ilačiç (or Ilačiç), the Muslim governor of Otrar (Urṭar ~ ọtrara, the former Fārāb, the ruins of which are on the right bank of the Syr
On Yisüi Qutan (Qadun in the text), see §§ 155-156. For the alternative qutan – qadin, see above, n. 54.

'Respectfully gave the following advice', lit. 'advising (or making a suggestion, petitioning) informed' (durataq ədəviyə). On durataq – (m. duratqa), see above, n. 192.

'The entire passage from 'The Quan' to 'Your order (= word) shall decide!' has been translated and discussed in Mo, 180-185. The whole section and its implications with regard to the succession and inheritance issue, and the role played, once again, by a female member of Cinggis' family, have been discussed by various scholars from different angles. Cf. Yao TW 1964, 18ff; Hsi ao KC 1981, 52ff; Aubin 1975, 551-553; Ratchnovsky 1976, 520; YSLC, 42-43. See also L.L. Vixtcrova in OUMÉIX, VI, 155. The following are a few additional remarks.


'Still, living beings who are but (eles) born to this world are not eternal.' For these words, see Street 1986, 13 (20).

'When your body … like a flock of birds'. Cf. the almost identical refrain in § 245; and Mo, 156-157.

'Of your four sons, the heroes you have begotten, which one will you designate as your successor?', lit. 'Of your four heroes sons (kala'ta ko'li, i.e. "sons who are heroes") that are born of you, which of them (kən-wi isu) will you name?' For kala'ta 'heroes', see above, n. 163. On the pronoun isu used for isu, see Mo, 182, 257, n. 244. See also above, n. 249.

'I have given you this advice, etc.', lit. 'I have advised what, when we consider it, has been understood by the sons, the younger brothers, the many common people and also by Ut "the bad one" (= myself). Let your order decide!' In other words, Yisüi Qutan is suggesting something about a matter of state that has been of serious concern to Cinggis' immediate family and
the people at large, and which requires a prompt decision by Çinggis himself. In view of her privileged standing among Çinggis’ wives, Yūrū Çinggis speaks with authority (note the use of the pluralis majestatis), but at the same time she employs the self-deprecatory epithet ma’un, lit., ‘the bad one’, which has, however, also endurance and familiarity connotations. See above, nn. 177 and 245. For the expression jarlij (= mo. jarlij) medetiger ‘let the order (= your word) decide!’ i.e. ‘You decide!’ see Mo, 233.

The passage ‘I forgot/As if I would not follow the forefathers (i.e. ‘As if I would not die’) I slept/As if I would not be caught by death.’ is not regarded as a poetic one in Či, 190. Cf., however, L’., 244; Če, 237; Oz’, VI, 271.

‘The eldest of my sons’ (k’ö’id-in minu eqqa): cf. §§ 239, 242. For eqqa = eldest, see Cleaves, 1963, 70.

‘This bastard offspring of the Merkit’ renders the Mongolian ene Merkitde čul uišar (read čul ofšar). I understand the expression čul ofšar, which is not glossed in the interlinear version nor rendered in the sectional summary, as meaning literally ‘desert acquisition’, i.e. ‘something seized or captured in a deserted place, the origin of which is unknown; goods or possessions of uncertain origin.’ By extension, and as an idiom, ‘a bastard child or offspring.’ I have discussed this expression at length in de Rachewiltz 1985. I should like to add that the form čul (čü’l, ču’il, čü’) ‘desert, steppe’ occurs in several Turkic languages. Mogul has čü’l and Buriat söl (in the expression söl gazar id.). See Ligitu 1964a, 29. Cf. also Pettit 1930b, 19, n. 1. However, my rendering is only tentative and several different interpretations have been proposed by other translators. Among the more recent ones, cf. Oz’, VI, 290-294, n. 9; Oz’, II, 173; Os, 147 and n. 236 (and the somewhat different rendering in the 2001 ed., p. 242); Če, 237, 472-473, n. 601; and Ev-Pop, 219, 303, n. 3. This obviously insulting remark of Ca’adai is an unequivocal allusion to Joči’s doubtful paternal origin. It will be recalled, in fact, that Çinggis’ wife Börte had been abducted by Toqto’a Beki and other Merkit chiefs in a raid and had been given to Čiger Bökö, younger brother of that Yeke Čiited whose wife Hė’olün had earlier been abducted by Çinggis’ father Yisigüe. (Toqto’a Beki, who had led the avenging party, was himself the elder brother of Yeke Čiited and Čiger Bökö.) Eventually, Çinggis – then still Ternjîn – rescued Börte with the help of Ta’oril Ong Qen and Jampaq. See the SH, §§ 101, 104-111. Börte was pregnant at the time of her rescue and soon after gave birth to Joči. Çinggis always accepted Joči as his own son, but doubts about his paternity remained and Ca’adai did not miss this opportunity of raising them in order to discredit his elder brother, whom he then regarded as his major rival to the throne. On this whole question, see NNHO, 23-25, and above, n. 104.

‘At these words’, lit. ‘With his saying.’
‘Grabbing Ca’adai by the collar’, lit. ‘laying hold of Ca’adai’s collar.’

With regard to Ca’adai’s stubbornness and unbending character, cf. above § 243 and com.; and Heissig 1976a, 287, nn. 10, 11. For this remark of Joči’s, cf. Street 1986, 26-27 (46). For hentewa ‘to shoot arrows at a long distance’, see above, n. 244. For this passage, see Mo, 123. The entire section from ‘as Joči and Ca’adai’ to the end of § 254 has been translated and discussed in Mo, 187-208. The following are additional remarks and elucidations.

‘With Bo’orcu pulling Joči by the arm and Muqali pulling Ca’adai by the arm’, lit. ‘When Bo’orcu was pulling from (= at) Joči’s arm and Muqali was pulling from (= at) Ca’adai’s arm.’ The Kökö Ços who intervenes at this point is the Kökö Ços of the Ba’arin of §§ 202, 210 and 216, who had been appointed by Çinggis as adviser to Ca’adai (§ 243).

For the phrase qan edgel ömu k’ö’id-in dotora qimadaqa ereču bûle’e, lit. ‘among the sons, it was for you that your father the Qan had conceived hopes’, see also Lettres, 75.

‘The stary sky was turning upon itself, … The crusty earth was turning and turning’, i.e. even heaven and earth were upset,
so great and general was the state of confusion in the world before Činggis' birth. For the concept of heaven and earth being in disorder, cf. the phraseology of the Orkhon inscriptions, which often offers interesting parallels with that of the SH. See GOT, 244, 276. Cf. also CLC, 162-163.

'Crusty earth', lit. 'earth with epidermis' (körösëtei eitgen). For this expression, cf. Mastaert 1957a, 101, n. 7; and idem 1962, 202.

'It was not her wish', lit. 'she was surely not desiring it' (giseši ese yabuha fe). As an auxiliary verb, see Mo, 237, n. 221; and above, n. 181. The passage refers to Börte's abduction by the Merkit, so vividly described in the SH, § 101.

'When men met', lit. 'When one man met the other man' — in combat.

'You speak so as to harden, etc.', lit. 'You speak so as to harden the butter-affection, so as to sour the milk-heart of your mother, the autumn make (= Qatun).' For boqaša (~ boqtaša) 'boqtaša: august, blessed,' as above, n. 121.

For the strong graphic imagery of birth in the poetic passage that follows, cf. § 78 and also § 244.

For the word qaunaq (w.f. qaunuren), lit. 'placenta', here rendered as 'womb', cf. Vietze 1990, 383, where it is incorrectly translated as 'Hönsenack'. For fekur (= mo. fiškere) 'to grow cold', cf. DO, 1969.

Kókò Čos, after having stressed the fact that both Jöči and Ča'adai were born from the same mother, warns the latter not to incur the displeasure of his mother by offending her, as he had done indirectly with his insulting words.

'It will be of no avail', lit. 'It will not do', i.e. Börte will be so angry with him that he will not be able to soothe her and regain her affection. For the poetic imagery of these verses, cf. Khomonoç 1981, 59. Kókò Čos then recalls how difficult life had been for Ča'adai's parents and how much Börte had done for her children.

'His black head was bound to the saddle. His black blood was poured into a large leather bucket.' Kókò Čos means that Činggis was then constantly in action and so busy that he never got off his horse; so precarious was his life in those conditions that he could lose his head or spill his blood at any moment — as if his head had been attached to his saddle and his blood poured into a bucket (also attached to the saddle). He never rested or slept in a proper bed, and usually went hungry. For the verb qaunushala (~ mo. qaunUSHala) 'to attach to the saddle', cf. also Vietze 1990, 380. The reading qaunushala in Cërësöndöm 1986, 71 (cf. Ce, 240, 475, n. 608) is incorrect. See Mo, 1988-199. The 'large leather bucket' (nambuqa (~ plno. nambuha, mo. namusha), from which the verb nambushala (~ mo. nambushala) 'to pour into a nambuqa' was the bucket containing mare's milk or water normally carried by the Mongol horsemen. See § 87 and com.

'The flesh between his teeth' (fığı), i.e. his own gums — in parallel with 'his own saliva.' See Mo, 200.

'He strove fiercely' (alünten). The verb alünten- originally means 'to fight to the death' (see above, n. 208); from this primary meaning derive the secondary meanings of 'to fight (or strive) fiercely; to labour', especially in relation to a person's duty to, or in the service of, his master. Cf. what is said in § 281 about Döödpü (Čerbi). This verb was still used in the 17th century. For the word ula 'sole of the foot' (mo. id.), cf. also HCLWYYT, 164-167, no. 48.

'It was the time when', lit. 'At the time when.'

'Pulling firmly her tail hat, etc.:', cf. § 74 for the same verses, which apply there to Mother Ho'ötün. The same imagery used in both cases indicates that this was a standard characterization of the dutiful mother in strained circumstances. For the verb boqtaša: 'to put on the boqtaša', i.e. the Mongol traditional headdress worn by ladies of rank, see above, n. 74. For this poetic section, cf. Cërësöndöm 1986, 78.

'She gave you half of it', lit. 'she gave you her half.' For the expression qoløl qoløq, lit. 'to choke at the throat', cf. § 213 ad fin. 'She gave you all of it', lit. 'she gave you her all.'

'She herself went hungry', lit. 'she went empty.'
‘Cleaning your whole body’ renders the Mongolian buyi tanu ariqtalya (‘to mo. ariqtalya’). The word buyi is not glossed in the interlinear translation and is otherwise unknown. Mo. 206, 208, left it untranslated, and so did CL 194, and I’a, 187 (cf. also Li, 122, where the entire line is ignored). Other scholars have variously interpreted this term as follows: ‘gums’ (I’a, 126); ‘body’ (Ko, 185); ‘body’ (Ko, 185); ‘body’ (Da, 216; Mu, III, 177); ‘skin socks’ (Ja, 390); ‘baby wraps or diapers’ (mutsuki: Oz, II, 177; cf., however, Oz, VI, 280, 306-308, n. 22, where, as in Če, 476, n. 613, the expression buyi ariqtalya is understood to mean ‘to care for, rear [a child]’). As pointed out in TH, 156 (= JYT, 276), buyi is to be ‘bœi’, i.e. buy – bœi (bœi) ‘body; the (whole) figure, stature, length’ (VWTD, IV, 1639-1640, 1800; cf. ESTY, II, 176). However, this meaning was not adopted in Do, 307, where the sentence in question is rendered ‘she removed your clumsy walk’ (she mo. e jeotge), i.e. ‘she taught you how to walk’ – a totally unacceptable interpretation notwithstanding the explanations in note 19 on p. 315, and in Do, 193, n. 4. The meaning of ‘body’ for buyi has likewise been adopted by On, 149 (cf. the 2001 ed., 245); Ta, 187; and Ev-Pop, 221 (see also 303, n. 43). ‘And even now, does she not wish to see the happiness of you, her sons?’, lit. ‘And now does she not think, saying, “I shall see the good of you, my sons”?’

As already noted by Mostaert (Mo, 191), this section contains one of the most beautiful passages of the SH, viz. Kôkô Csô’s eloquent and moving speech – an excellent example of the early Mongolian epic genre preserved in the SH. L. Moses has pointed out that the ‘Quarrelling Sons’ motif in the SH, of which four examples are illustrated in Moses 1987, is ‘part of a folk tale tradition common to the peoples of the Mongol steppe in the 13th century.’ As for the poetic mother/wife love theme which is also prominent in this section (as in § 74), cf. Sârkôzi 1978, 150-151. It is likewise important to point out that the entire section dealing with Yisüi’s question and the succession issue is missing in the AT. See AT, 186. For the relevance of this omission, see below, n. 255, and Section Five of the Introduction.

Finally, I should add that here, as elsewhere in the SH, Khvârâzm is never mentioned by this name, but as ‘the Sarta’ul people’ (Sarta’ul irgen). Cf. §§ 177, 198: Sarda’ul (= Sarta’ul: un qâfan ‘the country of the Sarda’ul (= Sarta’ul). For the name Sarda’ul (w.f. Sartayul, pl. of Sady), see above, n. 152. There is also no mention here of Muḥammad ibn Khvârâzm, who will make his appearance only in § 259. As for the inconsistent use of the titles qan and qâfan in this section, see also below, n. 255.

§ 255. Continuation of the preceding section, also missing in its entirety in the AT. See AT, 188, and the comments below.

Note the form Ćinggis Qan’ in place of Ćinggis Qan’ – an obvious oversight by later editors. Cf. above, n. 1 and 250, and below.

For the words ‘How can you speak thus … like that!’ cf. Mo, 208, n. 193. Cf. also Cleaves 1963, 70:

‘I shall not dispute Joči’s strength, nor shall I reply to his claims of skill’, lit. ‘Not speaking of Joči’s strength and of a reply of (= to) his supposed skill.’ The alliterative saying or proverb quoted by Ča’adai is a reply to Joči’s words in the preceding section (§ 254), which Ča’adai takes as an empty boast. For translations of, and comments on, this passage, see Mo, 123, 194-195, n. 178; CL, 195, n. 56; and Cerênšodôn 1986, 79 (where, however, the words tige-tite šikšatšakan are incorrectly transcribed as šeker esšašetšakan).

‘Joči and I and, further on, Ča’adai and I’, lit. ‘Joči and we’, ‘Ča’adai and we’, where ‘we’ (bac: excl.) = ‘I’. Instead of ‘The eldest sons are Joči and I’, Bese 1969, 123, translates ‘Joči and we, we are the elder brothers of the boys’, which is incorrect. Cf. the sectional summary (Y’Sup. 1, 34a; Wc, 165-166).

‘We shall, in cooperation with each other, serve our father the Qan’, lit. ‘We shall, associating ourselves, give our strength to our father the Qan.’ Cf. further on where, instead of ‘our
father the Qan’ (qan ejege), which occurs again a few lines later, we find ‘our father the Qa’an’ (qan e’el and q’an ejege). The alternative qan – q’an is also present in § 254, where Yisü refers to Çinggis Qan as ‘the Qa’an’, whereas Joči and Kokö Ços call him ‘the Qan’. This is a further indication of editorial inconsistency: the original text had ‘the Qan’ throughout. Cf. below, n. 281.

‘Shall have his head split open’, lit. ‘We shall split open his head’ (bildaru ĝabulidušu) – a ‘vertical’ action, in poetic contrast to the cutting of the heads across (kingguru ĝabulidaušu), a ‘horizontal’ action. Kingguru ĝabulidaušu is, literally, ‘We shall cut his heads across’, i.e. ‘We shall hamstring him.’ Cf. Bese 1969, 124, 126. Although in the present sentence the head is not specifically mentioned, it is in §§ 229 and 278.

‘But it is Ögödei among us who is steady and reliable’ renders the Mongolian Ögödei li örik bii. For the use of the emphatic/limitative particle li, cf. Street 1986a, 15-16 (2). The meaning ‘steady and reliable’ of the word örik (cf. tu. öriq) is an extension of its primary meaning of ‘quict, at rest; calm, unruffled’ (cf. §§ 230 and com., 233), glossed here tuh-tuh giq, lit. ‘firm and thick (= solid), i.e. ‘steady and reliable.’ See also Street 1986a, 15, n. 11. For Ögödei’s qualities of firmness and dignity, cf. Successors, 17. For other aspects of Ögödei’s character, see D’Ollson, II, 87-99; and the SH, § 281 and com.

‘Close to’, lit. ‘at the side of, next to’ (ljerde), of Çinggis Qan’s sons, Ögödei may have been the one who spent more time in the company of his father and who was therefore closer to him, but according to the words put into Ögödei’s mouth by Juvani, it was Tolui who ‘was ever in attendance on Chingiz-Khan day and night, morning and evening, and has seen, and heard, and learnt all his yasas and customs.’ (HWC, 186.)

‘The great array of the “teachings of the hat”‘, lit. ‘the teachings of the hat whose array (baru’a) is great (= imposing).’ The expression ‘teachings of the hat’ (maqalatu –iin bauliya) deserves comment. For bauliya ‘training, teaching, instruction, precept’, a deverbal noun in -ya (on which see JS, 43-44, § 57)
Činggis also warns his two sons against making empty promises, such as serving him, for if they broke them, as Altan and Šāqār did (see §§ 123 and 157), they would become the laughing-stock of the people. For the expression ije baraldutu-'to pledge one's word,' see above, n. 123.

For the words ker kikda’alaiti yambur bolqaqadulaiti, lit. 'How were they done by? In what way were they caused to become what they were?' see Popp 1964, 374.

'Seeing them, how can you be remiss in your duties?' i.e. 'seeing them will remind you of Altan and Šāqār and their unhappy fate, and this will make you keep your word.' When my father the Qa’an, favouring me, tells me to speak,' lit. 'When father ečču = edcču the Qa’an, favouring, I am told, 'Speak!' Ligetí, in his text edition (L2, 229), reads qanak-ečču instead of qanak-ečču, which is incorrect. For ije > īje, see IMC, 65.

Mona qoyina (= mona qoyinu) 'later, in future, a long time from now.' See above, n. 93. For mona — mona, cf. 'Quelques pro-bêbles', 207 (3).

'Perchance' renders Mongoljan maqta, a term expressing doubt or possibility. See above, n. 31.

'Even if one wrapped them in fresh grass, etc.' This is an old saying, still living in the dialects, describing something — a person or thing — so inept, worthless and lacking character that even if 'dressed' in fresh grass or in fat it would be rejected by oxen and dogs. See Mo, 168, n. 154. To the corresponding saying in modern usage registered by Oyunbilib and Nasundalai and cited by Moserst, loc. cit., one can add the following, which is no. 2901 in MCUD, 1, 62; ovdöö ovord uril idegxiigii/oxoxord ovord nooral iisixiguii "Although one wraps it in grass, the ox does not eat it; although one wraps it in fat, the dog does not sniff at it." Cfr. Čerćensödrom 1986, 77, 80; Khodonov 1981, 58. For a discussion of these words in relation to the issue of succession, see below. For the word ołçen 'fresh grass,' a borrowing from Turkic, cf. TMEN, no. 620; DO, 531b;Lexer, 633b. For eļčiiqi (= mo. ɑgykən, ɑgykän), cf. DO, 530a.

THE SECRET HISTORY

This word occurs again in the identical passage at the end of the section in the form ołčiïki. Cf. Mo, 168.

'To miss the elk broadlywise just as the rat lengthwise' is another saying applied to an unskilled hunter who, when shooting arrows, would miss a large animal like an elk showing its side to him, hence a very easy target, just as he would miss a difficult target like a 'rat lengthwise', i.e. a rat showing only its head and back to him. Šogōdi expresses concern about the possibility that some of his offspring and descendants who will rule the empire after him may be incompetent and unfit to govern. For different interpretations of this simile, see Oz’, VI, 317; Ev-Pop, 223, 303, n. 47. Cf., however, Cl, 196, and n. 68.

'I'll say as much as that,' lit. 'I say this much of mine.'

'I shall remind him of what he has forgotten; I shall wake him up when he has fallen asleep.' Cf. the same words used by Činggis Qan with regard to Jamgu in § 200. The second line is, literally, 'Waking up him who has fallen asleep.'

'I shall become a friend of the world "yes" ...Not being remiss in my "yes".Not being absent from the ranks,' i.e. 'I shall keep my oath (of loyalty and obedience to Šogōdī) and perform my duty in the army.' For the use of the word yesi (je) to seal and formalize a promise or oath, see above, n. 108.

'And the whip (mina’ä) of his chestnut horse (jeérde), i.e. 'I shall force him to go ahead by acting as the whip of his steed,' possibly an oblique reference to Šogōdī’s "relaxed" temperament, requiring some stimulus to action. For jeérde (= mo. jeerde) 'red, chestnut' (here = jeérde mor[r]n ‘chestnut horse’), cf. TMEN, no. 158. For mina’ä ‘whip’, above, n. 195; and Kantogox 1900, 122. However, jeérde (jeérde ‘Chestnut’) may actually have been the name of Šogōdī’s horse. Cf. § 3.

'Descendants of ... appoint one of you to govern,' lit. 'Descendants (urug: see Mo, 168) of ... make one of you to govern.' In his final and most important pronouncement, Činggis states — or, rather, is made to state by the anonymous author(s) of this passage — the principle of succession to be
observed by the cadet branches of his family, viz. that Činggis’ line has priority over the lines of his brothers Qasar (= Teji Qasar), Qa‘ilun (now deceased, hence the mention of Qa‘ilun’s son Alaidai; see above, n. 242), Oltigin (= Temüüge Oltigin) and Belgutai. What Činggis says is that each of the cadet branches may indeed choose a member of its own branch as successor if the line of Činggis fails. However, even if the descendants of Ogödei, who has now been appointed successor by Činggis’ will, prove unfit to rule (as foreshadowed by Ogödei himself), it is unlikely that there will not be found among all Činggis Qan’s descendants, i.e. the descendents of his other three sons, one who will make a good ruler. Činggis’ will (lit. ‘decrees’ or ‘orders’: jarlig) must not be disobeyed and rescinded (the verb employed in the text is hatutar- to destroy), for this would be a serious and punishable crime. ‘To err (endev) and to be at fault (alday)’ actually signify ‘to commit a criminal act or offence entailing retabling’. Cf. above, nn. 203 and 224 ad fin. As stated earlier (n. 254), Činggis’ pronouncement would have given legal sanction to the replacement of the line of Ogödei by that of Tolui. However, as already pointed out by Barthold (TDMI 478-479), Alad-Din records a different tradition. According to the Persian historian, under Ogödei and Giyūk there was an understanding (among the princes and the nobles) that the imperial succession would remain in the line of Ogödei: ‘So long as there exists a piece of flesh from the children of Ogödei Qa’an, and even if you roll it in grass and the grass the cow won’t eat, and if you roll it in fat and this fat the dog won’t look at, yet we shall elect him to the khanate and nobody else will sit on the throne.’ Thus Ėlidai of the Jalayir (i.e. the Alaidai of the SH, § 226, etc.), the younger brother or cousin of İliygi (see above, n. 226), reminds the princes when Mongke was elected on in 1251. See SL 2, 1, 95. Moreover, Giyūk had apparently accepted the imperial dignity only on condition that the khanate would be settled in his family. This was agreed by the princes and nobles at the qurita (in 1246); they unanimously pledged that they would not give the khanate to anybody else ‘as long as there remains of thy (i.e. Giyūk’s – I.R.) race a piece of flesh such as an ox or dog would not accept wrapped in fat or grass.’ See Successors, 181-182 and n. 18. Cf. also Vlad, 130; Li, 182, n. 255; Ratchevsky 1965, 117 (where the relevant quotations from § 255 are also given); ISK, 89; Ratchevsky 1974, 480; MK, 63-64; CK, 113-115 (= CK’s, 125-128); and, more recently, Teghchian 1996. According to Ratchevsky, the whole section is spurious, a conclusion with which I concur, especially since it is entirely absent from the AT, whereas the proceeding portion of § 254 and the entire § 256 are included. This is no mere lapse in the text, for the omission can only be explained by the fact that the passage in question was not there in the first place. It should also be emphasized that all the sources – Chinese, Persian and Mongol – agree that Ogödei was the son formally designated by Činggis as his successor, and that they refer to a ‘ decrees’ or ‘will’ to that effect. See HWC, 185; Successors, 30; YCMCSL 5, 3a (cf. de Rачewitz 1960, 243ff., n. 114); and the SH, § 269. Cf. Sections Two and Five of the Introduction.

§ 256. This section resumes the account of the campaign against Khydrāźm which had been interrupted at the beginning of § 254 with the interpolation of the narrative concerning the issue of succession. The present section is important insofar as it supplies the specific reason for the later Mongol campaign against, and destruction of, the Hsi Hsia kingdom, viz. the refusal of the Tangut king, here called simply Durqan (see below), to join forces with Činggis in the war against Mahammad of Khydrāźm. The initial passage concerning Činggis’ dispatch of envoys to the Hsi Hsia ruler to remind him of the earlier promise and exact the auxiliary troops which were meant to form, or rather strengthen, the right or west wing of the Mongol army (see above, n. 249) has been translated in full and discussed in Mo, 208-214. For additional references to words and expressions found in this section, cf. Cleaves 1953, 96, n. 19; Lettres, 35; and Poppe 1964, 374. The Hsi Hsia ruler in
question, designated by his epithet of (Iluq) Burqan (on which see above, n. 249), was Li Tsum-hsi 李廷相. I.e. Shen-tsung 沈宗 (r. 1211-23), on whom see RC, 83 (1). On these events, see OITG, 306-107. For the “breaking of the ‘golden haller’,” see above, n. 254.

Aka Gambu is a Tangut name like Jaqa Gambu, the second element of which, gambu, means ‘commander of an army.’ See above, n. 107. The original Aka (< tib. ‘A-ra’) – a T'u-yü-hun dynastic name – occurs also in Turkic-Mongolian nomenclature. Cf. HCG, 102, 226-227; Mu, III, 202-203. n. 2; and, especially, Renkhi 1961, 43-44. See also CHEIA, 373. This personage was obviously a high official of the Hsi Hsia court, but is not otherwise known. On him, see also §§ 265, 266.

‘Forstalling him said’, lit. ‘first ... said.’

‘Incapable of subjugating others’, i.e. by themselves, without other peoples’ military assistance.

‘With haughty words’, lit. ‘saying big words.’

‘Here be he at ‘at once’ as in § 190 ad fin.

By detouring in their direction’, lit. ‘moving in their direction round about kelbes’. Kelbes is a word not found in Written Mongolian; however, it has survived in the modern languages and dialects. See, e.g., ord. kelbes ge- ‘pencher up one on the côte’ (DO, 411a). Cf. also MKT, 609c: kelbes kelbes ‘snagging, faltering.’ In Written Mongolian we have the related form kelberir ‘crooked, not straight’ (Les., 447a). Cinggis means that his army, now ready to proceed westwards against Khwâramz, should instead change direction ‘(lean on the side),’ i.e. it should turn south and attack the Tangut kingdom. While this would not be difficult in itself, it was not convenient at that juncture, hence Cinggis’ pledge to punish the Tanguts after his victorious completion of the Western Campaign. For je teli ‘enough of this matter, let it pass, let it be, etc.’, and teli ‘this (or that) affair (or matter),’ see Mo, 176; and above, nn. 242, 246.

If I am protected by Eternal Heaven (môngke tenggeri),’

Cf. § 199 ad fin.: ‘You will also be protected by Heaven Above (deere tenggeri),’ and § 203: ‘Eternal Heaven.’ See de Rachewiltz 1973, 27; and above, n. 203.

‘To pull in the reins’ (jîlo’a tala) means ‘to halt the campaign, to return home (after a successful military expedition).’ For this expression, see Cleaves 1996, 20, n. 140. Cf. also Li, 183, n. 256. ‘Golden’, as usual, is the title of things pertaining to the sovereign. See above, nn. 21, 254.

Haenisch 1933, 512-527, contains a translation of §§ 256-268 of the SH. Although this translation is superseded by Ha, 128-136 (cf. IH, 155-163), it is still a useful contribution because it brings together material from different sources on Cinggis’ last campaign and death. For the AT account of the campaign against Hsi Hsia, see below, n. 265.

§ 257. According to the Chinese sources, Cinggis Qan left his ordo of the Sa’ari Steppe (Sa’ari Ke; see above, n. 128) in the fourth month (16 May-13 June) of 1219 and by the fifth month (14 June-12 July) he was on the Eder. Thence the army proceeded across the Altai to the Black Irysh (Kara Irysh), where Cinggis pitched his summer camp. He did not leave the Irysh until autumn, probably not before October. Cf. TDMD, 392c., 403; de Rachewiltz 1962, 46-47, nn. 49, 50. The Alai (‘Arai in the text, but correctly ‘Aai in AT), 115a) seems to be the same locality – apparently a pass on the Altai – as mentioned in § 198, but the identification remains doubtful. It seems certain, however, that it was a mountain pass on the way from the Eder to the Irysh; thus, one may assume, an important pass on the Altai such as the Ulaan Dasaa, as suggested by Perle. See above, n. 198.

On Qulan Qatan, one of the favourite wives of Cinggis Qan, see § 197 and com. It is interesting that, as noted by Ligeti (Li, 183, n. 257), Qulan Qatan was chosen in preference to Yisî Qatan, who had acquired merit by expressing her concern on the
issue of succession (§ 254) – possibly a reinforcing argument for the spuriousness of the whole episode.

Temüüge Öztigim is called here Öztigim Noyan, as in §§ 190, 195, 245, 269 and 280. Being the youngest brother and, therefore, "keeper of the hearth", he remained behind to guard the home patrimony and main base camp in Mongolia, which comprised the great ordo of Cinggis Qan in the Sa'a ri Steppe. When the T'aiot patriarch Ch'ang-ch'ung (see above, n. 248) crossed Mongolia on his way to Central Asia, he reached Temüüge Öztigim's camp (on 24 April, 1221), then situated four to five days' ride south-east of the Kœilöö at the point where this river flows into the Hulan Nor. See the HYC, A, 16b; TOA, 64-65; ISK, 213. This was Temüüge Öztigim's own family domain or apanage. See HCG, 178.

For gelge 'in support', i.e. in the rearguard, see above, no. 170.

Regarding the expedition of Jebe, Sübe'etei and Toqučar, see TDMI, 419-420. Toqučar is mentioned here for the first time and his name reappears in § 280 as one of the officials entrusted by Ögdöö with the post stations' administration. He is mentioned by both Juuinji and Raśid al-Dîn. According to the former, the first time, 'Toghaachar Kürgegn (who was the son-in-law of Chingiz-Khan) fell in the attack on Nishapur (Nîshābûr) in November 1220. See HWC, 174-175. According to Raśid, Toqučar (also called Dalan Tuqaq Toqučar, Toqučar Baydur and Toqučar Noyan) was a Qonngirat, i.e. an Onggirat (see above, n. 61). When Cinggis sent him, with Jebe and Sübe'etei, against Muhammad ibn Khûwârqân, he disobeyed Cinggis' order not to plunder the territory of the governor of Herat (Herāt) Malik Xan Amin al-Malik (the 'Qan Melîk' of the SH; see below) and was subsequently killed in an encounter with some mountain people in Ghur. See see 1, l/2, 217-222; SWCCl, 72a, 77a. Clearly, this personage cannot be the Toqučar mentioned in § 280 of the SH. For these conflicting reports and the problem of identification, see TDMI, 423-424; HWC, 174-175, n. 11; and Mu, III, 204-205, n. 5. For the name Toqučar, see

THE SECRET HISTORY

Poppe 1975, 161. The title sultan (i.e. pers. sulâtan) appears in the SH only once in this form; at all other times, alone or in combination, it is written soltan. Cf. Lettres, 58; Poppe 1955, 41. The sultan in question is 'the Soltan of the Sarâ'ul people' of § 260, who in the SH is apparently identified not with Muhammad, as one would expect, but with his son Jalâl al-Dîn, who became sultan of Khâwarûzam upon his father's death at the end of 1220. As is known, the Mongols never made contact with Muhammad and eventually lost track of him. Barhold comments on this point: 'On the Mongol invasion he played such a pitiful role that the Mongols themselves completely forgot him. Even the Mongol account of the thirteenth century (i.e. the Secret History of the Mongols – I.R.) omits all mention of Muhammad, and speaks only of Jalâl ad-Dîn, merging both persons in one, as is apparent from the narrative of the operations of Jebe, Sûbaday and Toqchar.' (TDMI, 426.) On the other hand, in the three instances in the SH when the title sultan – soltan occurs alone, it may well refer to Muhammad rather than to his son, who throughout these sections is regularly referred to as Jalâlîn Soltan. On this name, cf. MMHS, 116, Note 152. See also below. It should again be emphasized that the entire SH narrative concerning the Western Campaign is fragmentary, i.e. incomplete, confused and inaccurate as to the sequence of events, indication of localities, etc., partly, no doubt, owing to the work of later editors who, for various reasons, interfered with the original text, but, essentially, because the SH is chiefly concerned with domestic matters and the Mongolian scene, with scant attention being paid to events, situations and people far removed from 'home.' See Sections Three and Six of the Introduction.

'Attack him from your side' (qunsatauyu): Jebe, Sübe'etei and Toqučar were to go around the sultan's territory and attack him from the back, while Cinggis, with the main body of the Mongol army, attacked him from the front. On the important military term quns-, see above, n. 133.
For the apposition Jebe tere, lit. ‘Jebe – that one –’, in which tere only has the function of drawing attention to the preceding word, see Mo, 89, n. 84. Cf. also Cleaves 1959, 91, n. 364. ‘Qan Melik’ (in this section the form ‘Melik’; alternates with ‘Melig’) is the ‘Aml Melik’ of Juvaini (HWC, 732) and the ‘Khân-melik’ (Xan Melik) of Rashid (SL1, U2, 220-223), i.e. Amlin al-Mulik, the governor of Herat in Khorasan (Xurastân), on whom see TDMI, 423, 439-443. Cf. also Poppe 1955, 40.

‘Border towns’ (kif’ar ar balagur). Towards the end of the present section the first word is written kifa’ar, and in § 253 we find the form gify’ar. In the SH the form kifa’ar (cf. ‘ph. kif’âr, mo. kif’ar), alternates with kif’ar and gify’ar. See above, n. 253.

For tarîjîn (mo. tarija’[l]) ‘peasant, farmer’, see TMEN, no. 886. (The capital ‘T’ in L1, 232, is a printing error.) For jîn ~ ‘din, cf. HCG, 151, 253.

‘Because his towns had been attacked’, lit. ‘Speaking, “My towns have been attacked”.

With regard to the name Jalal al-Din, in the SH it is transcribed phonetically as Jalâlîn, which is to be read Jalâlîn, the final -g of the Chinese transcription being unavoidable but redundant. (arb. > pers. din can only be transcribed in Chinese as ting). Cf. the AT transcription ‘Jhâlîn’ for Jalâjîn.’ See AT, 115b (ATL, 189-190, incorrectly reads ‘Jalâjîn’; cf. LDAT, 225: ‘Dâjânîn (= Jalâjîn)’). In this section the form qa’an, usually transcribed as qa-han (qahan; see above, n. 1), alternates with the latter, confirming that the -h- of the Chinese transcription represents a hiatus. The famous defeat of Sîgî Qutugh near Parwan (Parvân) in the spring of 1221 – the most serious reverse suffered by the Mongols during the whole campaign – is described in detail in SL, U2, 221-222. Cf. the earlier account by Juvaini in HWC, 406-407. See TDMI, 441-445, 448. Ratchnevsky 1965, 103-107, has translated and discussed the relevant Persian and Chinese sources on these events. Cf. ISK, 83-85.
the following months in 'mopping up' operations and the de-
struction of mountain forts in the territory of Gihar and Koh-
Pýlah, i.e. in the region immediately north of the Kabul River,
between Parwan in the west and the Swat Valley in the east.
See TN, 1043ff. Railid says that after Jalal al-Din's escape across the
Indus, in the spring of 1223, Çinggis 'went up the river Sind, and sent Ugedel down the river to subdue these districts. ... That summer Çinggis Khan agreed to stop in the
steppe (or plain) which the Mongols call Pervan, waiting for
Bala-nolin (i.e. Bala Noyan, whom he had previously sent with
Dörbe Noyan in pursuit of Jalal al-Din); [all] the districts which
were within those boundaries (i.e. in that region) he captured and
plundered.' (SL, I, 225; the parenthetical comments are
mine.) The SWCCCL 77b, 78a, says: 'In the spring of the (year)
kuei-wei (1223), the Emperor's (= Çinggis Qan's) troops
followed the Hsin-mu-lien 左目勒 (Sin Müren, i.e. the Sin
[Indus] River) upstream (i.e. northward); he ordered the third
prince (i.e. Ogiden) to follow the river downstream (i.e. south-
wards). ... In the summer, the Emperor escaped the heat in the
Pa-lu-wan 並路寒 (Parvan) Valley.' 'Fled upstream along it', lit
'fled upstream along the Sin River.' The year 1223 given in the
above sources is an error for 1222. Cf. below, n. 259.

For Çinggis' immediate movements after the battle on
the Indus, see also HWC, 135-138; and CHI, 321. The account in
GK, 121, is confused and contradictory. In view of all this, the
SH statement that Çinggis 'went to plunder Bakteen' must be
sensus latissimo. 'Bakteen' (AT, 116a: Bacheen-gwen) is a
corruption of an original reading 'Badagšān (= Badastān), i.e.
Badakhshan in northeastern Afghanistan.

The Eke ('Mother') and the Ge'n ('Mare') streams of the
SH are the Mongol names of two small rivers (qoreqan),
almost certainly tributaries of the Kabul River, which cannot be
identified with any degree of certainty. The plain or valley of
Baru'an (Baru'an Ke'er; cf. AT, 116a: Barayan? [Barayan]
Kegere), i.e. Parwan, lies just north of Kabul, and it is there,
on pasture land at the foothills of the Hindu Kush, that by all
accounts Çinggis spent the summer of 1222 before returning to
the north on his homeward journey. Cf. also the statement by Li
Chih-ch'ang 李志常 in HYC, A, 44a (see TOA, 98-99) that in
March 1222 the imperial encampment was three days' ride south
of the Hindu Kush. On the other hand, Boyle has suggested that
perhaps 'Baghlan' and not 'Parvan' is meant by the 'plain of
Baran' of the SH, and the 'Parvan' (= Parvan) of SL (see
above, but for Boyle's 'Parvan' read 'Pervan'), the SWCCCL (see
above) and the YS (see YS I, 22, s.a. 1223). See HWC, 139, n.
1. Cf. de Rachewiltz 1962, 67-68, n. 159. This is, however,
unlikely: the problem is one of chronology, not of nomenclature.

On Bala's and Dörbe Noyan's expedition in pursuit of Jalal
al-Din across the Indus and their attack on Multan (Multan), see
the above-mentioned sources and, in particular, HWC, 141-142
and n. 4; SL, I, 225; D'Ollisson, I, 309-310. See also Boyle
1954, 406-410. The Dörbe Noyan question is the same
personage called Dörbe Dogen in §§ 240, 261. On Bala, i.e.
Bala Noyan, of the Jalayir tribe, see §§ 120, 202 (no. 35),
and 243. He will appear again in §§ 259 and 264. Instead of
'Jalayirtai' – the reading found in AT, 116a – the SH has the
(metaethical) form 'Jalayirtai', almost certainly a scribal error
since 'Jalaiyr' for 'Jalayir' does not appear anywhere else in the
text.

For Jebe's allegiance to Çinggis and the origin of his name,
or rather nickname (designating a particular type of arrow), see
§ 147 and com.

On Tsoqar and the contradictory accounts about him in our
sources, see above.

For the expression o'erion dara'ar, lit. 'by his own will (or
desire)', see above, n. 185.

'Making this a matter of law' (fasaq bolqas). Çinggis is
again invoking the fasaq as a normative law or principle in such
an instance, just as in § 197. Cf. Ratkevichky 1974, 473, n. 9;
de Rachewiltz 1993, 98.

'Severely', lit. 'exceedingly' (mali).
For a general overview of Činggis' movements during the Western Campaign and the role of his generals, cf. ČK, 114-120 (»ČK«, 129-134).

§ 258. Continuation of the account of the Western Campaign. In this section the chronology of events and the nomenclature are particularly faulty. 'Barula' is an error for 'Baru'an', i.e. Parwan. See above, n. 257.

The Amnu Mūren, or Arsui River, is the Amnu Darya (Amnu Darya, i.e. the Oxus). The term found in AT, 116a, is 'Amnu Mūren'—clearly a scribal error for 'Amnu Mūren', tacitly corrected in ATL, 191, and DAT, 226. The form Amnu itself is probably due to a graphic error (final yod for waw). The original correct form must have been Amnu, corresponding to Persian Amīn. Alternatively Amnu is simply a variant form of Amnu. Cf., e.g., mno. a'dai - e'duu (>+ a'di) 'vast'.

Öröngegel (Oröngegi in § 260) = Urgegel, the name employed by the Mongols for Gurgan (Gurgān), the capital of Khwarazm, situated then on both banks of the Amnu Darya. See TDML, 457 and n. 3; Mu, III, 224-225, n. 3; de Rachewiltz 1962, 60, n. 117; and Cleaves 1953a, 243, n. 29. On the operations of Jūči, Ca'adāi and Ogōrdī, and the siege and capture of Gurgan on 1220-4 April (1221), see TDML, 433-437.

Irū = Herāt, and isiβur = Nilabīr, i.e. Nishapur in Khurasan. Contrary to Boyle's opinion (see Boyle 1954, 403ff.), I think that phonetically 'irū' can only represent 'Herāt', the identification earlier proposed by Haenisch and adopted also by Ligeti (Ha, 179; Li, 183, n. 158). The identification of Irū with Merv, first proposed by K. Grünbein (see Boyle, op. cit., 410, n. 35), is unlikely in view of the fact that Merv is mentioned further on (§ 261) as 'Marū'. The term 'isīburur' for 'Nīshābar' is probably due to the ambiguity of the Uighur-Mongol script, as pointed out by Ligeti, loc. cit.; cf. Pelliot 1920b, 23. On the other hand, 'Nīshābar = *Iβabūr is also possible. For nero = zero, cf. HCG, 332-333. Herat was conquered by Tolui after Merv and Nishapur (see TDML, 446-449; Boyle, op. cit., 404), but as noted earlier this entire section is chronologically unreliable. Udīr = Ūtrār, i.e. Otrar. Cf. above, n. 257. In this and the following section there is an anachronistic reference to Činggis' advance on, and capture of Otrar. See below, § 259.

On the expression age'eler yahu = 'to act according to the words (of s.), to obey the command (of s.),' see 'Trois documents', 475; and Cleaves 1953, 78-79, n. 8.

'Sent a message to them ordering that they should act according to the words of Ogōrdī', lit. 'when he ordered, he sent saying, 'Act according to the words of your brother Ogōrdī.' In the SWCLL, 75b-76a, it is stated that in the autumn of 1221 Činggis sent Jōči and Ogōrdī (there is no mention of Ca'adāi) as leaders of the right wing to conquer Uruk Čenig, i.e. Gurgan, and that after the army had assembled he ordered that it should be under Ogōrdī's command. According to SL, 1/2, 216, the reason for this action was the discord between Jōči and Ca'adāi.

§ 259. As we have seen (n. 257), Otrar (Udīr = Ūdarār = Udīr = Ūtrār) was besieged by Činggis at the very beginning of the Western Campaign, almost certainly in November 1219, Bukhara and Samarqand were taken in February and March of the following year. In the second mention of Otrar in this section, the name of this city is incorrectly written 'Uduber' in both Yi and Yi', but correctly as 'Udubur' in Yi'. Bala is Bala Noyan of the Jalayir, already mentioned in § 257 in connection with the pursuit of Jalāl al-Dīn beyond the Indus in 1221-1222. While Bala Noyan and Dūrbe Dū基督徒 were busy in pursuit, Činggis was in the Baru'an (Parwan) plain, or valley, north of Kabul. Therefore one would assume that it was here, in the foothills of the Hindu Kush, that the summer quarters or residence (jusar) of the 'Soltan' must have been situated, this being the place, too, where Činggis spent the summer of 1222. (Here 'Soltan' refers no doubt to Jūči. On the other hand, Nīshābar = *Iβabūr is also possible. For nero = zero, cf. HCG, 332-333. Herat was conquered by Tolui after Merv and Nishapur (see TDML, 446-449; Boyle, op. cit., 404), but as noted earlier this entire section is chronologically unreliable. Udīr = Ūtrār, i.e. Otrar. Cf. above, n. 257. In this and the following section there is an anachronistic reference to Činggis' advance on, and capture of Otrar. See below, § 259.

On the expression age'eler yahu = 'to act according to the words (of s.), to obey the command (of s.),' see 'Trois documents', 475; and Cleaves 1953, 78-79, n. 8.

'Sent a message to them ordering that they should act according to the words of Ogōrdī', lit. 'when he ordered, he sent saying, 'Act according to the words of your brother Ogōrdī.' In the SWCLL, 75b-76a, it is stated that in the autumn of 1221 Činggis sent Jōči and Ogōrdī (there is no mention of Ca'adāi) as leaders of the right wing to conquer Uruk Čenig, i.e. Gurgan, and that after the army had assembled he ordered that it should be under Ogōrdī's command. According to SL, 1/2, 216, the reason for this action was the discord between Jōči and Ca'adāi.

§ 259. As we have seen (n. 257), Otrar (Udīr = Ūdarār = Udīr = Ūtrār) was besieged by Činggis at the very beginning of the Western Campaign, almost certainly in November 1219, Bukhara and Samarqand were taken in February and March of the following year. In the second mention of Otrar in this section, the name of this city is incorrectly written 'Uduber' in both Yi' and Yi', but correctly as 'Udubur' in Yi'. Bala is Bala Noyan of the Jalayir, already mentioned in § 257 in connection with the pursuit of Jalāl al-Dīn beyond the Indus in 1221-1222. While Bala Noyan and Dūrbe Dū基督徒 were busy in pursuit, Činggis was in the Baru'an (Parwan) plain, or valley, north of Kabul. Therefore one would assume that it was here, in the foothills of the Hindu Kush, that the summer quarters or residence (jusar) of the 'Soltan' must have been situated, this being the place, too, where Činggis spent the summer of 1222. (Here 'Soltan' refers no doubt to Jūči. On the other hand, Nīshābar = *Iβabūr is also possible. For nero = zero, cf. HCG, 332-333. Herat was conquered by Tolui after Merv and Nishapur (see TDML, 446-449; Boyle, op. cit., 404), but as noted earlier this entire section is chronologically unreliable. Udīr = Ūtrār, i.e. Otrar. Cf. above, n. 257. In this and the following section there is an anachronistic reference to Činggis' advance on, and capture of Otrar. See below, § 259.

On the expression age'eler yahu = 'to act according to the words (of s.), to obey the command (of s.),' see 'Trois documents', 475; and Cleaves 1953, 78-79, n. 8.

'Sent a message to them ordering that they should act according to the words of Ogōrdī', lit. 'when he ordered, he sent saying, 'Act according to the words of your brother Ogōrdī.' In the SWCLL, 75b-76a, it is stated that in the autumn of 1221 Činggis sent Jōči and Ogōrdī (there is no mention of Ca'adāi) as leaders of the right wing to conquer Uruk Čenig, i.e. Gurgan, and that after the army had assembled he ordered that it should be under Ogōdī's command. According to SL, 1/2, 216, the reason for this action was the discord between Jōči and Ca'adāi.
Merv’, on the Murgab River), Yeh-k’o Ma-lu (Yeke Maru = Merv the Great), His-ia-sau (Sirafqal, i.e. Sarakhs in Khorasan) and other cities. He made his army advance further. Always according to this source (76b-77a), in the spring of 1222, Tolui again conquered Tus (Tash), Nishapur and other cities, but ‘since the heat was then about to reach its peak, the Emperor (i.e. Cinggis Qan) sent a messenger to instruct the fourth prince (i.e. Tolui) to return in haste. On the way through the country the Mu-la-his (*Mulâq[q]d] = Mulâh, lit. “heretics, infidels” [< arab.], i.e. the Ismailians: this must refer to Qushman; cf. MR, I, 115, 133; NMP II, 785-787; and Ligeot, loc. cit.)avaged it and, crossing the Cho-cho-lan (*Jo[j]aran) River, he conquered Yeh-li (Herat) and other cities. At that time, the Emperor was attacking the fortress of T’a-li-han (Taliqân). After the audience (with Tolui) was over, the (two) Emperors together captured it (i.e. Taliqân). ... That summer (the Emperor) escaped the heat in the plain of the fortress of T’a-li-han (Taliqân). With regard to Tolui’s movements, the chronology of the YS (YS2 I, 21-22) account agrees with that of the SWCCl, and we also find in it a reference to the crossing of the Cho-cho-lan River and the capture of Herat in the spring of 1222. Juvainî has an entire chapter devoted to Tolui’s conquests in Khorasan in the spring of 1221; among the many cities and towns mentioned are Merv, Herat and Nishapur, as well as ‘the country of Sijsistan’, i.e. Sistan, meaning the eastern section of the SH. See HWC, 151-152. There is no mention, however, of the ridge of Altan Qorqan and of Coqaran. As we have seen, the latter is a river and the SH is at fault in referring to it as a city (balâqasa). I agree with Ligeot, lover, this is a straightforward error and not to be understood, like Boyle does, as ‘the town of Coxârân’ or ‘the Coxârân town’ (= the town on the Coxârân River) meaning Herat, since Herat has just been mentioned. See Boyle 1954, 405. As for the ridge of Altan Qorqan and the place where Muhammad of Khorazm used to spend the summer, its location is also not clear because ridge (nîr’în) of Altan Qorqan (‘Golden [= Yellow] Creek’), where Muhammad’s palace was situated, cannot be identified. On the term nîr’în(n)-nîr’în, cf. above, int. 147, 177. ‘The weather has become warm’, lit. ‘the year has become warm (or hot).’ 

For itu = Herat, see above, n. 258. Sistian (a faulty transcription for Sistan = Sistan (Sîstân), the province of which Zaragn, near the modern town of Zabel, was the capital.

Cuqîrân (an erroneous transcription for CoqÎran) = Coxârân, another name of the river Herinard (Harînis) just south of Herat. See Boyle 1954, 404-405; and Ligeot 1950, 179, n. 37. This river is actually mentioned by Râsid al-Dîn in connection with Tolui’s capture of Herat in 1221. The relevant section reads as follows: ‘He (i.e. Tolui) subjugated all this region and captured Merv. By the end of spring of the above-mentioned year (1221) he had already subjugated all these cities and districts. [Then] Cinggis-khan sent a message from Talikan [to Tolui] to the effect that (his) son Tolui should return before the coming of the (summer) heat. In accordance with the order he (Tolui) came back. On the way he made a raid in the province of Kuhistan, crossed the river Çûçarân and captured the city of Kherat and its districts, and from there he joined [the army] of Cinggis-khan. ... After that, Cinggis-khan together with [his] sons and armies spent the summer at the foothills of Talikan.’ See SL I/2, 219-220. (The additions in parentheses are mine.) In the SWCCl, 75b-76b, it is recorded that in 1221 Cinggis and Tolui attacked and captured Bukhara, Samarkand and other cities. In the summer, Cinggis ‘escaped the heat in the place where the sultan of the Western Regions used to escape the heat.’ In the autumn, he ‘ordered Tolui to attack Yeh-li (Eri = Herât), Ni-sha-wu-erh (Nishapur = Nîshapur) and other cities.’ Cinggis himself took the cities of Timriz and Baîk (the Termez and Bâîkî of our maps), then besieged the fortress of Taliqân. In the winter Tolui ‘also conquered Mu-lu-ch’-a-yeh (read -k’o, i.e. Martûqâ, or ‘Little
of the confused chronology of events. Tolui's conquest of Khorasan, including the crossing of the Coqaran/Heridan River, took place in 1221, not 1222 as incorrectly stated by the SWCCCL and the YS. (For this one-year discrepancy, see Wang Kuo-wei, Yeh-liu Wen-cheng Kung nien-p'yu’ 鄭 Türkiye 正邵錫教授 in KWK, ts'1, 32, 'yi-chi 風提', 5b; cf. also above, n. 257.) The fortress of Tālīqān besieged and conquered by Činggis in 1221 was apparently the citadel of Naṣrūd Dār between Balkh and Marv-ar-Rūd in Khorasan, whereas the place also called Tālīqān, in the neighbourhood of which - i.e. in the northern foothills of the Hindu Kush - both Činggis and Tolui spent the summer of the same year, was a town in Badakhshan still known by that name. It corresponds to the 'Taican' of Marco Polo. See TDMI, 430 and n. 3; TL, 1/2, 1/2, 219 and n. 1; de Rachewiltz 1962, 67-68, n. 159. (The above place-name is variously written Tālīqān, Tālīqān and Tālīqān. There existed also a homonymous district near Qazvin in Iran.) It was in all probability here, and not in the plain of Panaw on the other side of the Hindu Kush, that Muhammand's summer residence and the unidentified Altan Qorqan ridge must have been situated. In the SH the confusion is compounded by the reference to Činggis' waiting for Sela before the mention of Tolui joining his father. Cf. SWCCCL, 77b-78a, where (s.a. 1223?) it is stated that, after having followed the Indus River upstream in the spring, Činggis ordered Ögedei to go downstream, but because of the approaching summer told him not to seize the city of Sistan and sent another general to conquer it. Činggis himself set up his headquarters in the Panaw Valley waiting for Bala Noyan.

§ 260. This section deals with a particular incident following the capture of Gurganj (Gurganj U'gen) in April 1221 which, to my knowledge, is not recorded elsewhere. Örunggēi = Örunggēi. Initial s and š are identical in Ughur-Mongol script, hence the confusion. medial t and d are also identical, thus we have Sigi Quduoq instead of Sigi Qutuoq. All these discrepancies in proper names are purely orthographical in nature. See above, n. 138.

'Who had refused to submit' renders očin melen' aquat, lit. 'who had refused to petition Činggis Qa'an (i.e. to be ranked as a superior)', in other words, 'who had refused to acknowledge themselves as subjects.' For melen' 'to dispute, deny, repudiate, etc.', see Les., 535a.

The verb doroytšu' (fact of doroytša' to decline) meaning 'to cause to lower (i.e. to force to come down from a higher position); to degrade, abase', corresponds to mo. doroyttaṣ̌. See ibid., 263a. This verb appears again in the same passage in the form doroytšu' in, in which the -d is either redundant (cf. Or', VI, 357), or, since it occurs also in Yč' (13, 208), possibly due to -g genitive ending. Cf. § 245: iyiyeld ūčču. See above, n. 245. I think that balaqat irgen anu refers to the cities and peoples of the sultan, thus anu 'their' = inu 'his.' Cf. the Hsiao-ching in Mongolian (Yuan), where the same usage is found. See de Rachewiltz 1982, 20 (847, where, however, kändedel should read känddel), 43, and Or., 5b, see below, n. 273. For the inverse case, see Mo, 95, 182, 257, n. 244; Material II, 6 (1r, 5). Cf. Lettres, 31; Cl, 201; and Ev-Pop, 226. It should be noted that the plural form anu (a sort of hon. plural) is used in both the Hsiao-ching and the present passage with reference to the sovereign.

'All belong to Činggis Qa'an', lit. 'are all of Činggis Qa'an.'

'Now that ... we have caused the Sarta'ul people to abase themselves like this,' lit. 'At the moment when we have caused ... ' On the 'increase of strength (or might: güčču') by Heaven and Earth, see above, nn. 113, 201 and 208.

'We - the men of your entire army -', lit. 'We - your many men and geldings -.' Like eme koćč', the expression ere uqqa 'men and geldings' can be taken literally (as in §§ 239 and 248), or as a 'mot-couple' meaning 'the army.' Cf. ch. Jen ma ḡačču.
id. See above, n. 239. Given the context, the latter meaning applies here.

"Are rejoicing and are content with ourselves‘ is a tentative interpretation of the expression bayašiça maqaji amui. Bayašiça, converb imperficti of bayai, means ‘rejoicing‘; maqaji, the converb imperficti of maqai, a verb not attested elsewhere to my knowledge, is not glossed in the Chinese inliner linear translation. The sectional summary merely says: ‘We the people are all happy‘ (俄羅斯人數萬), rendering the general meaning of the Mongolian. In H, 122, n. 260 (5), Haenisch wrote: ‘Das Wort μαθαίνει wie einen Ausruf des Frohlockens bedeutet: ‘mahi‘ rufen‘. In FW, 106, he rendered this verb as ‘frohlocken‘. Finally, in his Ha, 130-131, he translated the sentence as ‘Daruber sind wir, dein ganzes Heer, voll Freude und Frohlocken‘. Kozin (Ko, 571, 669) was the first to refer to mo. maqajiça- ‘to play at knucklebones‘ and to suggest for it a (7 secondary) meaning of ‘to make merry‘ – an interpretation he adopted in his translation (ibid., 188: ‘we rejoice and exult‘). In this he was followed by Dambörsed, Yoon, and Jagchid, Ligeti and others. See Da", 220; Yoo-Ja, III, 382; Li, 125; Ja, 403, 405, n. 3; Ta, 193; Ce, 248. For Doronathi, maqai = (7) bayaš ‘soothing with activity‘ (see De, 336 and 338, n. 3), whereas Mu, III, 218, translates maqaiça as ‘neighing (with joy)‘. THI, 222 (= JYT, 382-383, on the basis of the Ejino dialect, interprets maqai as meaning ‘to exert oneself, to do all one can sparing no effort‘. Cf. Oz, VI, 36 i; ‘emboldened‘; and On, 153: ‘bustling happily‘ (in the 2003 ed., p. 251, bayašiça maqai amui is rendered as ‘are busily rejoicing‘). Cf. 201, leaves the verb untranslated. It is true that in Written Mongolian there is a verb maqaiça- which Kowalewski renders as ‘jeter l‘osselet, frapper sur l‘osselet‘. See Kow., 191a; cf. MIFP., 490b: ‘to play a game with knuckle bones‘. More specifically, as explained in Gol, III, 205c, this verb means ‘after hitting and Dislodging the first knucklebone, to hit another knucklebone from a further distance‘, i.e. to earn a second throw after ‘knock ing out‘ the first knucklebone, a meaning retained in Khalkha Mongolian. See Cev., 352b, s.v. ‘maqaiça‘. Maqaiça- is the cooperative form in -ça- (on which see ‘Verbaux‘, 29-30, §§ 34-35) of maqai-. In the old language, this verb may also have had the meaning of ‘to make merry‘; however, this is unlikely because such a meaning would undoubtedly have been known to the Ming translators. (Incidentally, in the SH, § 116, the term for ‘to play together with knucklebones‘ is laqalga, corresponding to mo. sinjalga-.) It is more likely, in my view, that the text was corrupt at this point, as one can also infer from AT, 117a, which in the corresponding passage gives bayašer allia instead of bayašiça maqai (or maqaiça). From the context it is clear that the corrupt word must have had a meaning similar to bayaš-, i.e. ‘to be happy, merry, etc.‘. The only possible candidate is maqaiça-‘to smile happily, to have a contented air, to be self-satisfied or content‘. See MKT, 808c-809a; Cev., 352b; and MED, 206b, s.v. ‘maqaiça‘. I think that the original text had bayašiça maqaiça amui ‘are rejoicing and self-satisfied (i.e. content with ourselves‘), and that in the manuscript used by the Ming translators the letters s and a (α-α- ) of maqaiça were somehow damaged and obliterated with the result that the translators could only make out a meaningless word maqai- (α ματς maqai̱- maqai, cf. bayai - bai-, etc., see ‘Quelques problèmes‘, 265-266) which they transcribed and left untranslated. I find this interpretation more satisfactory than those of Haenisch, Kozin and their followers.

‘Let this be a lesson for their future conduct‘, lit. ‘Let them learn their future conduct from this!‘

‘We fear lest the sons‘ natural ardour may be discouraged as a result of this‘, lit. ‘We fear lest the sons may be neglectful of their natural virtue (daten yan olqai ujijai), by which is meant that Öggins‘ excessive severity may have a demoralizing effect on his sons by weakening their innate qualities of courage and boldness. Cf. A. Mastaert apud CI, 201, n. 106: ‘The sense
is: "We fear that, if you treat them so harshly, the princes may be discouraged and lose the zeal to fulfil their duty of which they have given evidence since the present." For the verb aqasa: 'to be remiss (discouraged, confused), etc.' cf. above, n. 199. See also below.

'Will you not ... ?', lit. 'Will it do if you ... ?', Or Jalira: 'to become appeased, to calm down', see Mo, 231.

'Quotating ancient words/Citing old sayings.' For these verses, see § 78 and com.; Gaadamb 1968, 81-82; Čerňadnomin 1986, 77. Cf. also § 244 and com.

For the poetic passage 'To the point ... their brow', see Mo, 214-216; Serruys 1959a, 219, and Ozes remarks (Oz., VI, 365-366, n. 6) concerning Mostaens comments in Mo, 215, regarding the word baṣta (baṣte) in the expression baṣta alaṣt 'almost sink, to be on the point of sinking.'

'Just as he was addressing them with reprimands and admonitions' renders čimil'tar sūyār d'ulaqon bukqis-tar, lit. 'at the moment when he was causing them to hear reprimands and admonitions.' For du'ulaq- (= mo. duqulaq-) 'to let know, inform,' see 'Trois documents', 461. As to sūyār (= pmo. stringer), cf. §§ 22 and 277 where we find the expression sūyār aqge 'words' of admonition.' See Mo, 243, n. 227; Cleaves 1949, 115, n. 122. Čimil'tar (w.t. čimil'tar) is, like sūyār, a deverbal noun in -aqer (mo. -a'eri, cf. GWM, 46, § 150; JI, 40, § 80) from čimil: 'to find fault with, to resent.' See § 281: čimilqiqi aqge 'resentful words.' Cf. mo. čimal-uq, 'to be dissatisfied' (Les., 1844); and Cleaves 1848, 80, n. 25. Contrary to Haensch (HW, 27, s.v. 'cimar'), Ligeti (L', 235), de Rachewiltz (R, 10724, 209a, s.v. 'cimar-tar'; and Ra, XI, 152, n. 260), Cleaves (Cl, 202), Street (St, line Y463), and others, the word čimil'tar must not be read čimar-l'ar, the instrumental of čimar 'reproach, rebuke' (see HW, 27), and must not be understood as 'by (= by means of) rebuke.' Nor can sūyār be regarded as a noun in the instrumental case.

Qongqi Qorqi of the Adargin (on which see HCG, 57-58) is not otherwise known as is the case with Qongtaqar Qorqi of the Dolonggar (a subtribe of the Juyt; see 264-266, 255-256, and Poppe 1975, 162). Čormaqan Qorqi, on the other hand, is well known. At the end of § 260 he is called Oregedii Čormaqan, i.e. Čormaqan of the Otegen tribe. However, Pelliot has suggested that 'Oregedii' is an error for 'Otegendi', the ethnonym derived from the term otegendi bo'ol 'ancestral slave' which, according to Rašid al-Din, had eventually become a tribal name. See HCG, 86; cf. Bese 1988, 31-32. Čormaqan was, in fact, a Sūnū. He belonged to a Christian Nestorian family which played an important role in Iran under Šogdu. He became the commander-in-chief in western Asia in 1231 and, following an incapacitating illness, was replaced by Baiḫa Noyan in 1242. In the Persian sources he is usually called Čormayan Noyan. He is repeatedly mentioned by Rašid al-Din, anc in the Armenian and Persian medieval sources. On him, see HCG, 46 (and the references to NPs contained therein); Cleaves 1848b, 419-420; MWE, Index, 2, s.v. For the Sūnū clan, see the SH, § 47.

'That have just begun training,' lit. 'that are just to enter into training.' For baṣiuy 'training', see above, n. 255. The Mongol expression for 'to train birds (= falcons, for hunting) occurring in § 249 in iba'an surqa (= mo. iba'an surqa)-.

The sons are barely learning how to wage a military campaign', lit. 'The sons are learning to wage a military campaign just as much as this.' 'At such a time,' lit. 'at the moment when.' 'Piling abuse on them,' lit. 'abusing the sons as if in heaps (mene medals). For the expression mene medals, see above, n. 41.

'We fear lest the sons, being afraid, will lose heart.' For the words Askili-iyan aqqa'aq'i, cf. the words avariyan aqqa aqqa'i' above. See also n. 199.

For the expression narnar šeŋgelge'i-eč uruqqu-da şurtele, lit. 'from the sun setting as far as its rising', see Lettres, 72-73; Cleaves 1952, 11, n. 205.
'Tibetan dogs' (tobdud nag). Tobdud is the plural of tshob (= mo. tshed) 'Tibetan.' Cf. ord. litov 'Tibetan' (DO, 676a). On the origin of the name Tibet and the Turkic and Mongolian forms of the name, see Bazin & Hamilton 1991. The large Tibetan manriding (tsh. 'brag-khyu; cf. TED, 402b) were known for their fierceness and were therefore highly prized (and, indeed, feared) by the Mongols, who used them for hunting and as watchdogs. They are mentioned by Marco Polo, who brought one back to Venice, and by modern travellers like Peter Goullart. See MP!, 271-272; cf. ibid., 228-228; MP!, II, 45, 49, 52, 5, 5: 400-401, and 401-402, n. 1; 483, n. 3; FK, 132. For this breed of dogs, see GPS, 77. See also Yissigier's words on the subject of fierce dogs in § 66, as well as the other references to hounds, in the SH. Indeed, the dog-lure of the Mongols deserves special study. See, provisionally, Z. Lendvai (Lendvai) in CMJS 4:1995, 421-428. For a different interpretation of the word tobdud which, however, is at variance with the SH gloss, see Oz!, VI, 369-370, n. 10; On, 154, n. 344. For the plural nag = (mo. nog) cf. AF!, 117u, noog/oj [rather than 'oogu or 'odan] pro nag-oj] — an unusual form — see Pope 1975, 167; and Street 1990a, 361 and n. 119.

Tabar 'goods, possessions' is a synonym of et (= mo. ed), with which it is often combined. See above, § 248 and con. In § 252 we find the words attaus moomggin et arterasun yu ke 'gold, silver, goods, satins and other things.'

Irgen orog — (irge orag; cf. above, n. 150) means 'people' in general; here, however, the 'subject people' are meant.

'Here in the west,' lit. 'This here west,' = 'In this western region.' Cf. Street 1990, 173.

Qalibai Sultan = Xiafa Sulain, i.e. 'Sultan Caliph' — two titles used here as the ruler's name. Cf. Poppe 1955, 40. Bagdat = Baghdad. 'The Abbasid caliph of Baghdad at the time was al-Nasir (575-622/1180-1225); however, his grandson and second successor al-Mustansir (623-640/1226-1242) is clearly the caliph in question, since Qormaqan's expedition against Jalal-al-Din in western Asia took place in 1230/31, and it was not
Caucasia, see Allsen, op. cit., 17-28. As pointed out by Ligeti (Li, 186, n. 270), some of these names, viz. those referring to the Hungarians, could only have come the Mongols' way during the campaign of 1237.

'Northwards' is an error for 'eastwards.'

The names of the countries (qanin) and peoples (irgen) of the eleven 'tribes' (aytimu) listed in this section have been discussed and identified by Pelliot in his NHA, pp. 115-162 (cf. pp. 128-130). Cf. also Li, 184, n. 262; Cl. 203, nn. 117-130. For the sense in question, cf. Street 1990, 185. They are the following: 1) Qangrin = the Qangul of Turgai, see above, n. 198; 2) Kibda'ut, pl. of Kibda'a, called Kimk'as'ut (for b = m, see 'Quelques problemes', 270) in § 198 = the Qipaq, on whom also n. 198; 3) Baligih, pl. of *Baliger = the Bulayid, i.e. the Bashkirs, of the Uralis; 4) Orusut, pl. of Orus = the Rus, or Russians; 5) Majarat, pl. of Majar = the Magyars, or Hungarians; 6) Asut, pl. of As, i.e. the Alans or Ossetes of the Caucasus; 7) Satut, pl. of Sas (in §§ 270 and 274 this name appears in the form Sestut, pl. of Sas), either the Saxons of Transylvania or the Saq'lin of the lower Volga, but almost certainly the former; 8) Serkesut, pl. of Serkes = Cerkes, i.e. the Circassians; 9) Kesmir = Kasmir (see below); 10) Dolor (in § 270 erroneously written Bugar) = Bolgar, i.e. the Volga Bulgars; 11) Kerel (erroneously written Baral), another name for the Hungarians, from hung. kir'ly = 'king.' Most of these names appear also in Râdîf al-Dîn's account of Ógâdîr's western expedition and in his chapter on the princes of the Qipaq Steppe. See Sucorstorn, 55, 69-70. These and other relevant passages in Râdîf's and Juvâni's works have also been discussed by Pelliot, op. cit., 122-128. It should be noted that the Hungarians are mentioned twice in the above list, once as Majarat and once as Kerel; it is possible, however, that the name Kerel in the SH may not refer to the Hungarians, but to another people, the identity of which cannot at present be established with certainty. See Pelliot, op. cit., 141-142; de Rachewiltz 1965, 191, n. 30; and the important discussion in Aalto 1982.
According to K. Juhn, the ‘Keler and Balýnd’ mentioned by Rašid in his version of the Oycz nāma definitely refer to the Hungarians. See GORD, 22, n 1. For the Kerel, cf also TMEN, nos. 1447, 1641; D Sinor in BASOS 30:1697, 429-431; and, for the Majjar, Vášary 1975; BT, I, 184.

On the name Crost, with prothetico a, cf. Lettres, 23. On the Oraus/Rus, see NHIO, 262b, s.v.; SMEH, Index, 11a: OR, 906b, s.v.; NNRs, Index, 1a-b. On the Asut (Alans), see NMP, I, 16-25 (esp. p. 173); CKSYC77T, 1984, 8; SMEH, Index, 2a.

On the Serkes (Circuitans), see Hung 1956, 30, 5 (for the word serkes); Allsen 1987, 18 and n 40; and below, n 264.

The name Kešmir, i.e. Kâšmir, is misplaced here, as it refers to a separate expedition launched soon after against northern India and Kashmir under the command of Qoottur (or Hoqatúr). See Successors, 55 and n 216; and below, n 270.

For the Bolar (Boljar, Bulgars), cf. TMEN, no. 766; SMEH, Index, 3b; NNRs, Index, 3b; and, for the first Mongol raid against the Volga-Bulgars, see Zimonyi 1985.

In the present context, ayinay ‘a group of related families (ayid)’ is used in its more evolved meaning of ‘tribal or ethnic group.’ Cf. above, n. 156. See also MSR, 30.

As for the geographical names in the present section, the Ildi (§ 270: Adil; § 274: Elij; all from Turkic Etil – Ili) is the Volga; the Jayaq is the river Ural; and Kiwa Menkermen is Kiev. See Pelliot, op. cit., 129 and n 4, 114, n 1, 227; NMP, I, 299. Kiwa Menkermen (the second element, Men-kîrman, was the Turkic name of this city) is called Menkermen Keyibe in § 270 and M. Kiwa in § 274. Keyibe is another form of Kiwa (< *Kiwa < *Kiyewa < *Kiyewa > Keyibe). Cf. TMEN, no. N 151 = 2096; NHIO, 114. Kiwa, as the name of the city, appears also in the Josippon, a Hebrew book whose first version was written in the tenth century. See D. Flusser, ed., The Josippon (Josipus Geronidus), Jerusalem, 1978, § 1, line 18 and n 1. (In Hebrew, I owe this reference to Prof. M. Fridel of Göttingen.) In the AT, 117b, in the section corresponding to § 262 of the SNET, the same names appear in forms more or less corrupt. Unfortunately, in ATL, 194, various readings have been arbitrarily altered and omitted. Thus, e.g., the river Ildi of the SH is written Aži (in Ajl; cf. the Ejl of § 274) in AT, not Ilij, as given in ATL as well as in AT, II, 84, and LDLAT, 228. In this as in other instances, Šastina clearly follows ATI instead of AT, which makes one doubt whether she had been able to make full use of the photocopy of AT in the possession of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences (see Section Five of the Introduction). The correct reading is found in Kozić’s edition (Ko, 396).

§ 263. This historically important section has been translated in full and annotated in Cleaves 1953a, 241-244; however, the words Orungeće botaqasun-aču have inadvertently been left untranslated. Cf. CI, 203-204.

Darjuščin and daruqa are the plurals of daruqači (= pmo. daruqači) and daruqa (= pmo. daruqa), respectively, both terms meaning ‘chief local administrator or controller, resident commissioner (in a city or district), governor, overseer, chief, (of an office).’ Both derive from daru ‘to press (down)’ = ‘to hold under (in subjection); to control.’ Thus, the two terms literally mean ‘one who presses down’, hence ‘one who holds people in subjection’, ‘one who controls subject people.’ Cf. Cleaves 1950, 103 [50], 128, n 293; and Mostaert apud Cleaves 1954a, 448-449, n 23. ‘Oppressor’ would be a fair rendering, semantically as well as in terms of the official’s actual role, his principal functions being tax-collection and the recruitment of people for service and corvée. Most scholars, however, are of the opinion that the two terms mean ‘the one pressing the seal’ = ‘the (local) official in authority’ A detailed discussion by Cleaves of both daruqa and daruqas is found in Cleaves 1953a, 237-255. There is a vast literature on the daruqas (‘daruqua’). See D. Flusser, ed. The Josippon (Josephus Geronidus), and their role in the Mongol Empire. To the books and articles cited by Cleaves in the above-mentioned article, and those given in Ra, XI, 157-158, n. 263, one must add the following: TMEN,
no. 193; RH, 202, no. 29; MKSLT, I, 465-631; H. Harayama in Shisō 29:1963, 32-46; and the numerous references to primary and secondary sources in MRC, 178-191. The most up-to-date study on the subject is, in fact, MRC (which now supersedes RLGYC), an indispensable work for the understanding of this early administrative office. The genesis of the institution as described in §263 of the SH is discussed by E. Endicott on p. 17H, where she also deals with the interpretation of the terms danygul and darya. On this controversial issue, cf. also TMEN, no. 193 (p. 323), and Róna-Tas 1986, 136. ‘In the various cities’, lit. ‘in the cities’ (balaqat balaqat-tur). Cf. §247: qotot qotot balaqat-tur ‘to various towns and cities.’ See above, n. 247. For the expression the resident commissioners (darygulın, daryaças) in (or of) the various cities’, cf. ‘Three documents’, 436.

A basic bibliography on Yalavachi, i.e. the famous administrator, originally a merchant, Mažymid Yalavach (tu. ‘the Envoy’) (d. ca. 1254), is found in R., XI, 158, n. 263. Allsen’s essay on him and his son Mavcut, i.e. Mavcut Beg (d. 1289), is now available in SK, 122-129, where the Chinese and Persian sources are listed on pp. 134-153. See also Cleaves 1977, 80-85, n. 53; YSLT 2:1983, 225-251; and CCME, 5, 198. For the term yalavach, yalavach ‘envoy’, cf. NHP, 149; Poppe 1955, 42; TMEN, no. 1807. The SH says that they were Sarta’il of the Qurumidi clan (Qurumidi obuqtan Sarta’il), i.e., Muslims of Khwarazmian stock. In the Persian sources Mažymid Yalavach is in fact called Mažymid (Yalavach) Xvdraxmi, i.e. the Khwarazmian, and the SH specifically mentions that both parents came from Urgench (Gurgan). On Qurumidi (for Qurumimi = Xvdraxmi, the ethnic name of Xvdraxmi, see Pelio 1993, 150; Cleaves 1949b, 433-435; idem 1953a, 242, n. 20. ‘Father and son’, lit. ‘father and sons’ (eciçe kö̲l̲ut qovar) – the plural here being a ‘plural by attraction.’ See Cleaves 1953a, 242, n. 21. Further on we also have once ‘his sons’ = ‘his son’; this would simply be a repetition of the previous form.

AT, 117b, has kö̲b̲e̲g̲i̲n (sing.) in both instances. See below for a different interpretation.

Sartagat gil’in-neче, lit. ‘From the Sartagat (= Sartaq) people.’ For Sartagat and Sartaq (= Sarta’ul), cf. above, n. 182; Cleaves, op. cit., 241-242, n. 19.

The laws and customs of the cities’, lit. ‘the customs and laws (yosu doño) of the cities.’ Cf. tö̲r̲o̲ yosan idi. further down. Cf. 203, inadvertently gives ‘of the city.’ For tö̲r̲o̲ – doño, cf. ‘Quelques problèmes’, 243-244.

‘Being adequately informed as to these customs’, lit. ‘being told so as to know (as being informed) in a way similar to the actual customs (i.e. how the customs [concerning the government of the cities] really are).’ For this rather awkward sentence, cf. Cleaves 1964/65, 57, n. 35.

With regard to the cities enumerated in this section, the first three are Bukhara, Samarkand and Gurgan, already mentioned in the previous sections (§§257, 258). Udan for Odan (= Odon – Udun = tu.) = Khutan in southwestern Sinkiang. Cf. NMP, I, 408-425; Cleaves 1953a, 243, n. 30; and Li, 184, n. 263. Kishar is an erroneous reading for Kishar = Kishar < *Qishar < tu. Kishar, Qishar), i.e. Kashgar in western Sinkiang. AT, 118a, has *Siegel’ for *Kišar’ (the ‘Kišar’ of AT, 194, is an incorrect reading). Cf. Cleaves, op. cit., 243, n. 31. Uriyang is also an erroneous reading for *Yarqand or *Yarkend (to tu. Yarkand), i.e. Yarkand in southwestern Sinkiang. Cf. ibid., n. 72, CI, 204, n. 137; Güsen Daril. Güsen = Kö̲s̲en = Kü̲s̲en, i.e. Kucha in western central Sinkiang; Daril = Darim = Tarim, i.e. the Tarim River of Sinkiang. This rather puzzling compound place-name seems to be a general designation of the region of Kucha and the Tarim. Cf. Cleaves 1953a, 243-244, n. 33; and the reference in CKYCTT, 1985.5, 4. With regard to these localities, Khutan, Kashgar, Yarkand and Kucha were all towns formerly in the Qara Kaitu kingdom usurped by the Naiman prince Kū́lu̲g̲ – the Gǘčù̲lik of the SH, last mentioned in §237. The whole area became subject to the Mongols after his death in 1271. See HMRC, 68.
He brought back with him', lit. 'bringing ... he brought' (abčərəbən ... abčərəbən).

The city of Jingdu of the Kitai is Chung-tu, i.e. Peking. See above, n. 247. It is worth noting that Mahmud Yalavac's appointment as chief administrator of North China is completely anachronistic; he was first appointed to this position in 1241, and there is no evidence that his son Mas'tud was ever associated with him in the government of China. Mas'tud began his career as an assistant of his father in Central Asia sometime after 1229, and in 1232, he took up the governor-generalship of Turkestan. After a period of exile in the West during Türege's regency, he returned to power and was confirmed in office by Möngke in 1251, becoming 'the de facto head of the government of both Eastern and Western Turkestan, answerable only to the qan in Mongolia'. (MSR, 128.) He was, indeed, a virtual viceroy in Central Asia. According to A. Mostert (u.), the plural in -t of k'o'li' sun' applied twice to Mas'tud in the SH is due to his being a "vice-roi", i.e. the plural form is a plural of respect, often used in Mongolian (as in the words sayil, dègedes, etc.). Cf. Lettres, 79. If so, we have further confirmation that this section is a later (editorial) interpolation in the original text. See below, n. 274.

§ 264. 'Spent seven years' (dolo'an hom yabul), lit. 'going seven years.' The years in question are 1219-1225. Cf. the beginning of § 257 where it is stated that Çingsig set out against the Sarta'ul people in the Year of the Hare (1219). In the present section the narrative goes back to the time when Bala Noyan of the Jalayir, having crossed the Indus (Sin) River, unsuccessfully pursued Jalal al-Din (1221-22). The SH account does not mention Döbrei Noyan in conjunction with Bala, and erroneously includes Qan Melik, i.e. Amün al-Mulk. See above, § 257 and com. For the hom hom years' for kar, above, cf. n. 118 and 198, and below, n. 272 and 280, regarding the word qonist for qonist, etc.

'As far as the middle of the country of the Hindus', i.e. as far as the middle of northern India — a statement to be taken figuratively, since the Mongols did not go much further than Multan and Peshawar (Peshawar) before turning back. See TDMS, 445-446; Boyle 1954, 406-409 (esp. pp. 408-409 with regard to § 264 of the SH). For the gilded billy-goats (seriemes), cf. Hung 1956, 30, n. 5. In § 262, this word (in the plural) is used as the designation of the Circassians.

In Juvinai's work there is a chapter devoted to Çingsig's homeward journey (HJC, Ch. XXIII, 138-141); cf. also SL', II, 229-230. Çingsig had begun withdrawing his army from Afghanistan in the latter part of 1222, and the entire Mongol army, i.e. including Jebe and Sübe'ttin's forces, gradually withdrew from Central Asia in 1223-1224. Çingsig was again on the Irrish in the summer of 1224, almost certainly in the same area where he had encamped in 1219. All our sources, except the SH, agree that he was back at his base in the area of the Quara Qan (Black Forest) on the Tula in the spring of the following year (1225). Therefore, the word namar 'wandering' in the present section must be a clerical error for qabhar 'spring', these two words being easily confused in Uighur-Mongol script. Cf de Rachewiltz 1962, 63-64, n. 138. Çingsig's 'Palaces (orodos) in the Black Forest by the Tula' must be his principal encampment in the Sa'ari valley, the so-called Sa'ari Steppe (Sa'ari Ke'er), in the basin of the upper Kerulen, between this river and the Tula — a vast wooded area known as the Black Forest extending east of the great bend of the Tula. See HCC, 260; and above, n. 96 and 128. In NMFP, I, 309, Pelliot refers to these orodos, stating that they were 'probably outside the south-eastern bend of that river (i.e. of the Tula — I.R.).' Cf. also below, n. 271. For the expression ordor sara'as 's'instiller (m. à m. : "descendre") dans les palais,' see Mo, 261 and n. 249.

§ 265. Chapter Twelve (= Sup. 2 3a-5a) of the SH begins with the account of Çingsig's last campaign against the Tangut state of Hai Hsia. As described earlier (§§ 249, 250, 256), the Tangut court had at first submitted to the Mongols, but later, at the time
of the confrontation with Khwārzm (1218-19), the minister Ala Gambu had persuaded the Hsi Hsia ruler Shen-tsung ('Bunqan') not to comply with Činggis' request for Tangut troops in the forthcoming campaign. Činggis did not take any punitive action then but pledged to deal with the matter on his return from Central Asia. He now proceeds to do so after a brief halt in Mongolia to plan the campaign and mobilize the troops. With regard to the date of the start of the expedition against Hsi Hsia, the sources are not in full agreement. See de Rachewiltz 1962, 64, n. 140. However, it can be established that the mobilization of troops began in the latter part of 1225, and that the actual attack on Hsi Hsia was launched in the spring of the following year. The SH is one year late in describing the sequence of these events. On this question, see NMP, I, 316. The best account of the Hsi Hsia campaign in English is found in Martin, 283-308. See also Martin 1942; OITG, 306-315; CHCAR, 210-214; and CIHC, 490ff.

'He counted his troops anew,' lit. 'He newly counted his number (i.e. the number of effective in his army).'

On Yisū Kutun (Qadun in the text), see § 254.

The many wild asses of Arbaqa. Arbaqa was obviously an area rich in wild asses (qulan = Equus hemionus), the entire region being famous for its abundance of these quadrupeds, as confirmed by Marco Polo. See MP1, 75. CF. MP2, I, 224, 225, n. 3. Although Arbaqa has not been identified, several scholars, including Grousset (see CW, 278) and, more recently, Perlès, 10, have situated it in the Alashan Desert in southeastern Ninghsia. This localization goes back to Shen Shih-ch'ien who, in YSCK 12, 478-48a, attempted to identify Arbaqa and Čo'orqat – the place where Činggis halted after the fall from his horse – with two localities having similar names in the Oros. In this he was rather uncritically followed by other Chinese scholars like Ting Ch'ien and Kao Pao-ch'üan. CF. also N. Baturčičyj in MNTS, 460-486. However, these identifications are arbitrary and unconvincing not only on linguistic and geographical grounds (see NMP, I, 316-317), but also for chronological reasons. If the accident occurred in the winter of 1225 and the invasion of Hsi Hsia took place in the spring of the following year, it is unlikely that Činggis was already far south as the Alashan, i.e. in Tangut territory, in the winter as assumed by the above authors. On the other hand, the SH narrative definitely indicates that Činggis was 'on the way' to Hsi Hsia when he fell from his horse. I think, therefore, that Martin, 289, following F. Grenard (GKG, 173-174), is probably correct in stating that the accident occurred when the Mongol army had left the Tūla on the first stage of the expedition and had temporarily halted on the Onin, almost certainly in November, to hunt the wild asses at Arbaqa. (Martin says 'November' following Tu Chi, this being the most likely month.) Thus, Činggis was at the time still in Mongolia, albeit well on his way to Hsi Hsia in the south and, no doubt on account of his serious injury, or injuries, the military operations were deferred to the spring while a diplomatic settlement with the Hsi Hsia ruler was sought to avert the hostilities without loss of face. The details of this embassy and of the Tanguts' negative response are found only in the SH.

Josotsu Boru ('Reddish-Grey') was the name of Činggis' horse which bolted when the wild asses rushed past.

For ko'ula (pl. of ko'ula) 'son; prince') 'princes', see Kahyžyki 1978, 124-125.

'His body', lit. 'his flesh' (mariya-ban). In this section we find mariya ~ mara'-a. Cf. Cleaves 1982, 84, n. 46; DO, 465a; 'Quelques problèmes', 258 (4); and above, n. 197.

'Čo'orqat, a plural of ko'orqan (= noon. kopocyn), means 'The Loch.' Peliot (NMP, I, 317), says: 'it may have applied figuratively to some strong position, and may actually refer to the same place as the *Qunči mountain of the YS.*' According to Martin, 291, n. 17, the Hun-ch'ui Ms. 西南 of YS 1, 23, are most probably the Ch's-iien Ms. 西南 south of Su-chou ill in Kansu, whereas R. Dunnell is of the opinion that
former—a mountain rather than mountains—was perhaps located north of Huxi (縣) between Edzina and Wulahai (see below and n. 267—1 R.), rather than in the Qilian Mountains of southern Gansu (Dunzali 1992, 226). (For Qunçu as a proper name, see Battaluga 2000: 148-149.) In any event, the Hun-ch'u Mts. of the YS seem to correspond to the Casatu ('Snowy') of the SH, §§ 266, 267, where Çinggis 'escaped the summer heat' in 1226.

Tolun Çerbi of the Öngqotan was last mentioned in § 253 in connection with the Mongol operations in north-east China in 1213-1214. The Tanguts had already been referred to as a settled population living in permanent towns and thus unable to move. See above, § 249. Cf. also Belgutui Noyan's words in § 190 about the Naiman people being burdened with palatial tents and having to leave them behind when they fled.

For the words 'The Tangut people ... that would be fine', see Mo, 217-220, where the passage is discussed in detail. Cf. also Cleaves 1964/65, 54, n. 26; and CI, 205, with regard to the reading ebe'eri-i 'the illness (acc.)' instead of the *el'eri-i* 'the envies (acc.)' of the text. 'Right here at Cho'orqat', is, literally, 'at this very Cho'orqat (мнён энэ Cho'orqat-tai). Cf. Street 1990, 183. The passage is understood differently by Ozawa (Oz., VI, 397-398, n. 6: Oz., II, 217, 241, n. 3). Cf. also On, 157. 'He sent envoys to carry the following message', lit. 'Letting his voice (del'u, i.e. his verbal message) be carried by the envoys, he sent saying,'

In the past.' For this usage of the word ňidona, see Mo, 41-42, n. 40; and Lettres, 24-25. Cf. above, n. 104. For the Hsi Hsia ruler's earlier promise to form with his troops the right wing of the Mongol army, see above, § 249. (When Çinggis advanced southwards from Mongolia against the Jurchen kings, the Tanguts, being in the west, would naturally supply forces to his west, or right wing.)

For the words 'because the Sarta'u people had not agreed to my proposal', see Mo, 209; Poppe 1964, 375. The 'proposal (eye) in question was the request for reparations sent by Çinggis

Qan to Muhammad of Khwârazm after the Otrar incident in 1218. See TDMI, 399-400.

'came out with mocking words', lit. 'came mocking with words.' See above, § 256, where the words in question—spoken by Asa Gambu not by Burqan—are reported.

'I brought them duly under submission', lit. 'I caused them to enter ( = forced them) into the right (or into righteousness)', i.e. 'I overcame them and subjected them to Mongol rule'—this rule being the 'right' (jijk) order of things sanctioned by Eternal Heaven, to which reference is made in the same passage.

'Now I have come to call Burqan to account for his words', lit. 'Now I have come to Burqan to verify his word (i.e. to demand an explanation: üge oluća). Cf. Cleaves 1953, 96, n. 19.

'As for now', renders edö' e ber bö'esi. On this idiom see ibid., 73, n. 13.

'For I', lit. 'as for me' (bi bürün). For bürün 'as for', cf. above, n. 196.

In the interlinear version, Alasai is glossed as 'name of the Ho-lan Mountains.' The Hsien Mts. (i.e. the Holanshan or Helanshan 贺蘭山 of our maps) are the Alashan Mts., viz. the mountain range extending parallel to the Huang-ho due west of Ning-hsia, now Yin-ch'uan 肥川, then the capital of the Hsi Hsia state (its Chinese name at the time was actually Chung-hsing fu 中京府; the native Tangut name was Irqai or Iryai, from which derives the Mongolian form Erviya [енэ Эрвийя]; see above, nn. 150, 249, and below). Pelliot, following Palladie, is of the opinion that the 'encampment in the Alasai' (Alasai usual) of our passage corresponds to the 'Calacian' of Marco Polo, which can probably be identified with the 'temporary residence' built by Li Yuan-hao 李元昊 (Ching-tsung 景宗, r. 1038-48) at 1047 at the foot of the Ho-lan Mts., 60 li (= ca. 33.5 km) west of Ning-hsia. See NMF, 1, 133, and the whole discussion, ibid., 132-137. On Ching-tsung see RC, 80 (C).
I have tents of thin woolen cloth’ renders the Mongolian term geerti, lit. ‘having tentee tents.’ For the term term ‘thin woolen cloth’ see above, n. 184.

‘Camels laden with goods,’ lit. ‘camels loads.’ For the passage ‘If you need ... Erje’u,’ et al. see 1955, 29, n. 9. ‘Erjaya and Erje’u’ the two principal and richest cities of His hia. As stated earlier, Erjaya was the capital of the state (since ca. 1020) and corresponds to present-day Yin-ch’uan hia. It is the ‘Erigia’ of Marco Polo. On it, see the important note by Pelliot in NMP, II, 641-642; Cleaves 1967a, 96-99, n. 4.; and, especially, Dunnell 1989 (also with regard to its Tangut name). Erje’u is the Mongolian form of Erji’u or Erji, the Tangut name of His-hiang, present-day Wu-wei hia (武威縣 in Kansu). It is the ‘Erjiu’ of Marco Polo, on which see, NMP, II, 646-647; OTTG, 348a (Index). ‘This is enough!’ (Je tei). On this expression see above, nn. 242, 246.

‘Let us take their boasts!’ lit. ‘let us go and press against their big words!’

‘You be the judge,’ lit. ‘You decide who is right!’

‘Until they were blown to the winds like hearth-ashes’: cf. § 112 for the same image, a recurrent one in the SH.

‘The common Tangut’s, lit. ‘such and such (or this kind and that kind) of Tang’uts (acc.)’ (seijina seiyman Tang’utsudai). Cf. the Chinese sectional summary (Y’ Sup. 2, 7a): ‘the rest of the (Tangut) people.’ For somewhat differing interpretations of Chinggis Qan’s order, cf. Li, 128; Cleaves 1952, 119, n. 206; Qe’i, VI, 392, and Oe’i, II, 214; On, 158; CI, 207. For an earlier example of the use of the verbs ol’ to get booty (ol’fa) and ab’ to take, seize (for oneself), cf. § 187.

Chinggis’ dronician order had far-reaching consequences, as it was responsible for the large-scale slaughter of the Tangut population before and after his own death. With regard to the movements of the Mongol army, it should be noted that from the encampment on the Onqin, where Chinggis presumably spent the winter of 1225-1226, the army moved across the western Gobi in the first (lunar) month (30 January-27 February) of
caused them to plunder as planned until they utterly destroyed the ‘Tang’ut’....’ ‘Were offering resistance’, lit. ‘had revolted.’

‘As planned’ (onqïq‘ar, conv. abt. of onq- ‘to reckon, consider’), lit. ‘by the reckoning.’ I think that Ozawa’s argument (Oz’, VI, 410-412, n. 1), following El-Ar, 887, n. 3 (and before that Do’, 203, n. 61), against Mostaert’s interpretation adopted by Cleaves (CI, 207; cf. n. 15), myself (Ra, XII, 24), and others, is valid. Mostaert’s rendering ‘totally’ or ‘entirely’ is too strong and would be in conflict with the use of the verb toyqala- ~ toyqala- ‘to count, calculate, reckon’ in the ET (see ET2, 32:69 and 67v22), regarding which Mostaert writes (u.n.): ‘toyqala (toyqala- = toyqala; cette dernière forme est celle que donnent mes mss.), m. à m. “comptant” = “l’un après l’autre, chacun.” Unfortunately, the sectional summary (Y¹ Sup. 2, 9a) is of no help since the word in question is left untranslated.

‘As much booty as in their judgement their strength could carry’, lit. ‘until they judge by their strength (how much they can take and carry away with them).’ Cf. above, § 248.

‘The Juyn of the Kitat people’ and, later, ‘the Qara Kitat Juyn people’ were the Kitan and other auxiliary forces in the service of the Jurchen. See above, n. 247.

‘Make their fine sons follow you... Bring up their fine daughters and make them arrange (or fix, repair) the hems of your wives’ skirts’, in other words, ‘take possession of them and turn them into your servants.’

‘Trusted friends’ renders irtëlêm in'aat (pl. of in'aat). The word in'aat (m. in'aat) means ‘bosom friend, favourite, personal attendant.’ See HW, 82; Les, 409b; TMEN, no. 668; Poppe 1955, 39; idem 1975, 166.

‘Who have destroyed the ancestors of the Mongols’ – a reference to the capture of Ambaqi Qin by the Tatar Juyn, who then delivered him to the Ailán Qin of the Kitat, i.e. to the Jurchen sovereign, as narrated in the SH, § 53. Note, however, that in § 53 the ‘Juyn people’ in question are of Tatar, not Kitan, stock. In the present instance I have rendered ebûges eçîqes, lit. ‘forefathers and fathers’, as ‘ancestors’ in view of the fact that the ‘Mongols’ (Mogolqı), i.e. the Mongol tribe is mentioned. Cf. Oz’, VI, 413, n. 5; and above, n. 133.

§ 267. Uraqi (ch. Wu-la-hai – Wu-lang-hai – Wo-lo-hai [兀良海-兀良海-斡羅海], i.e. Uraqi – Urgaqi – Orogai; for Uraqi – Urgaqi, cf. Çinqui – Çingai, but I think that the form in -qa is simply due to a phonetic resemblance to Uriyangqai), was a town in Inner Mongolia, north of the Huang-ho. It had been captured twice by the Mongols (in the raids of 1207 and 1209) and by all accounts it was one of the northernmost, if not the most northern, Tangut strongholds. See YS¹, 14, and SWCCL, 57b (r.a. 1207). However, until recently scholars were at odds as to its exact location. For their differing opinions and discussions of the problem, cf. MWESC 3, 7a; NMP, 1, 315; Martin, 359; Mu, III, 269, n. 12; Dunning 1992, 223-224. Cf. also Cleaves 1954b, 440-441, n. 67; and Ra, XII, 49, n. 267. According to R. Dunning, Uraqi ‘was situated near the Yellow River bank, probably along the outer loop of its northwestern bend, since there is no mention elsewhere of crossing a river to reach it.’ (Dunning 1992, 228.) For her supporting argument, based in part on research by Chinese scholars, see ibid., 224-228, and the map, ibid., 220-221. From Uraqi Çinggis proceeded to Dörmêgi (the Mongol name of Ling-chou 瀛州), present-day Ling-wu hae ën (蓮頤, in Ninghsia), which fell in early December 1226. On its way to the south, the Mongol army would have followed the course of the Huang-ho upstream, as one would expect. We know that after the capture of the towns in the Erbin Oel-khan-chou region (Hei-shui ch‘eng, Su-chou, etc.) in the spring and early summer of 1226, Çinggis spent some time ‘escaping the heat’ on Ĉasåtu before springing at Uraqi, and thence resumed the campaign moving southwards to Ling-chou (Dörmêgi), which he besieged in late November.

If Uraqi was north-west of the great bend of the Huang-ho and, as Dunning supposes, Ĉasåtu (presumed to be the same as the Hun-ch‘u Mi [魴]) was between Hei-shui ch‘eng/Qara Qoto
and Uraqi, one may well ask why Ćinggis Qan, who was in ill health, would undertake such a long and painful journey (over 500 km) to the north-east to rest, unless he also had to subdue that to this day the Ch'i-lien Mts. are still called by that name. A summer halt somewhere in these mountains before moving towards Ling-chou would make perfect sense both chronologically and geographically. We may have to re-examine the entire problem concerning the location of Uraqi in relation to Ćinggis' attack on Ling-chou, and seriously consider the possibility that Ćinggis attacked Uraqi after conquering Dörmegeri; this event would then have taken place in December 1226 or early the following year. Cf. MWESC 3, 30b; Martin, 295-296.

The 'Iluqa Buqan' who, according to the SH account, submitted to Ćinggis when Ling-chou was about to capitulate, was the newly enthroned Tangut ruler Li Hsien 於謙 (1226-27), on whom see RC, 83 (1). However, the SH account of the time and place of Li Hsien's submission is contradicted by the Chinese and Persian accounts of this event. See NMP, I, 310ff. Li Hsien almost certainly surrendered when his capital, Chinghsing (see above, n. 265), was under Mongol siege and about to capitulate. This occurred in the summer of 1227, when the now fatally ill conqueror was again 'escaping the heat' south of Liu-p'an shan 六盤山. Thus, the last Hsia ruler (and his family) may have been executed either shortly before, or very soon after Ćinggis' death, which occurred towards the end, or in the second half, of August. In either case, the execution was carried out in accordance with his final instructions. I am convinced that the execution of the Tangut royal family, as well as the large-scale massacre of the civilian population that followed, excessive even by Mongol standards, was not to provide Ćinggis with a suitable escort in the afterlife (see below). On the (doubtful) etymology of the name Dörmegeri, see NMP, II, 642. Cf. Mo, 222.

The passage 'The city of Dörmegeri ... outside the tent' has been translated and discussed in Mo, 220-225. The following are a few additional remarks.
With regard to the word *siṃe* meaning 'image, figure, statue (of Buddha)', cf. also Kara 1990, 323, s.v. *siṃe*; Khomonov 1970, 37. ‘Nine of each’ (yissan yissit), lit. ‘nine and nine (or nine).’ As noted earlier (see above, nn. 60, 99), the number nine had a symbolic value. On the subject, see also Li, 185, n. 267. To leave a guest bringing gifts outside the closed door and refuse to see him was, of course, the ultimate rejection.

‘Felt revulsion within his heart’, lit. ‘the inside feelings revolted.’

Prior to having him executed by Tolun Čerbi, Činggis Qan gave the Tangut ruler the name or appellation of Sidurqu (= mao. Sidurϕu), the usual meaning of which is ‘straight, honest, upright, sincere, loyal’ (see Les., 699a; cf. DO, 632b). However, the verb sidurϕuqte- (= mao. sidurϕudpata-) ‘to make right (or straight)’ is used in the SHI, §§ 202, 224, with the meaning of ‘to bring to allegiance, subdue.’ Cf. ch. p.197 ff., lit. ‘to make even, to pacify’ = ‘to subdue, subjugate.’ Cf. also § 265 above, where ‘to force into righteousness’ (jiuk-tür oru'tu) = ‘to force into submission.’ Ligeti has inferred that the word sidurϕu means here ‘the one who has surrendered’ (or ‘the one who has been brought to allegiance’). See Li, 129; and Mostaert (u.n.). ‘Sidurϕu (= celui qui est maintenant) Droit (= subjugé) (tout en ne l’étant pas jusqu’ici).’ Haenisch (Ha, 166, n. 267) has pointed out that this epithet characterizes the defeated enemy as the actual servant of the victor; and that it was given to the Tangut ruler in place of ‘Burqan’ (= Buddha). Haenisch claims that it would have been disrespectful to retain the latter, i.e. a name holy to Buddhists as well as to the Mongols (who used it as an attribute of their sacred mountain Burqan Qaidan), for an enemy about to be executed. This consideration may certainly have played a part; however, I think that the main reason for giving this name to the condemned sovereign has to do with the medieval Mongol’s conception of the afterlife. According to their beliefs, the ‘virtue’ of an enemy of noble birth could, after his death, exercise a beneficial influence on the victor and his descendants. The former enemy, in other words, would become a protective spirit or genius. See above, n. 201; cf. also n. 59. It is, I believe, to propitiate this spirit and invest it, as it were, with a rare-quality of loyalty to his master that an appropriate designation was called for. The concept of ‘surrender’ is implicit in a, since the operation of the enemy’s ‘viritue’ is based upon the continuous subservience to the victor after the enemy’s death. For the sake of completeness, I should add that according to Pelliot [P.P.-M.G.], sidurqu in the present context does not mean ‘upright’, but ‘superb.’ For this appellation, cf. also CLC, 4607.

For Tolun Čerbi’s role at Ču’oqat after Činggis’ fall and injury, see § 265.

‘Seize and execute him with his own hands’, lit. ‘lay hands on him and cause him to die.’ It is worth noting that in general, and by all accounts, Činggis Qan was unwilling to execute an enemy by his own hand and left this task to one of his lieutenants.

‘When Tolun Čerbi reported that he had seized liqqu and killed him (büte eho).’ For büte= ‘to kill’, see above, n. 136.

The poisoned words of an enemy’, lit. ‘at the poison words’ of a ‘companion-person’ (nikker gül’un).’ For ‘companion’ (nikkor) = ‘enemy’, see above, n. 153. Cleaves’ rendering (in Cleaves 1983, 42, n. 15) of the expression nikkor gül’un in this section as ‘comrade’ is, therefore, inaccurate.

‘Gave him into Our hands’, lit. ‘caused him to enter into Our hands.’

The ‘movable palace’ (ne’lgq̱ qarit) refers to Li Hisen’s royal pavilion. For qariti ‘(royal) palace’ (< tu), see TMEN, no. 1486; Poppe 1955, 40; ED, 664a.

For a notable event connected with the capture and sacking of Ling-chou, and involving Yeh-lu Ch’u-ta’s 瑪雅度達, who was with the Mongol army at the time, see KIPMX, 71-72, 102, nn. 74-76; de Rachewiltz 1960, 232-233, n. 104; ISK, 146-147. § 268. ‘After he had extinguished ... manoeuvring’, lit. ‘Casting the mothers and fathers of the Tang’ut people reaching
COMMENTARY

to the offspring of the offspring to disappear muqal muqal.' The two words muqal muqal are puzzling. They clearly form a bisome of the suffix oc't'ill (§ 103) and bura tara (§ 213) type (cf. eng. 'naming and shaming'), the meaning of which was no longer understood by the translators of the SH, who left a blank in both places where this expression occurs in the present section. The author(s) of the sectional summary rendered only the general meaning of the sentences in question (Y² Sup. 2, 13a: mic¥uk 'obliterated', and chin chech-le 聞聞'completely extinguished'). The AT is of no help as it merely distorts muqal muqal into muqal mskaili without providing any interlinear gloss (the value of which would, in any case, have been questionable). See AT, 125a; cf. LDAT, 238, 371, n. 79. There is little doubt, however, that these words are descriptive of the way in which the Tanguts were destroyed, as pointed out in CI, 209, n. 21. Several conflicting interpretations have been put forth; I have discussed them at length in Ra, XII, 51-53, and expressed the view, which I still hold, that Damdinsüren's interpretation of the two words appears to be the most likely one, i.e. that muqal is related (as a den. noun in -li; cf. GWM, 47, § 162) to *muqal (= mo. mqo) 'to be blunt or dull; to be exhausted or powerless, to come to the end of one's resources, etc.' Cf. Les., 344a; MED, 215b; and SH muqtaq 'to destroy, bring to an end' (fact. of muqal 'to be finished, come to an end'; see HW, 111; for *muqal- 'muqal', cf. SH jepisile- jepisile-, üdüsü- üdüsü-, see HW, 130, 158). Cf. also Boodberg 1939, 231-232, for some interesting asides. As for muqal, Damdinsüren makes it derive (also as a den. noun in -li) from *muqal- (= mo. muki, muku') 'to turn, twist; to coerce, put pressure on; to hold down, subdue.' Cf. Les., 552a; MED, 221b; and yak. mskal 'to turn, twist; to break, distort, wear out, etc.' (SYY, 1641; YRS, 246a). See Da¹, 265; Da², 227. Cf. also Oz¹, VI, 427-428, n. 2; Ev-Pop, 308, n. 15. Thus, the expression muqal muqal would mean 'blunting and coering', i.e. 'maiming and coercing'. To retain some of the homophonic quality of the original, I have rendered it with 'maiming and taming' and 'maimed and tamed.' 'For the second time', the first time being, according to the SH account of events, the one described in § 249 — in actual fact the 1209 campaign. See above n. 249. 'Chinggis Qan came back and, in the Year of the Pig (1227), ascended to Heaven.' As is known Chinggis Qan did not return to Mongolia, but died at Liu-p'an shan in Ninghsia some time in the latter part of August 1227, possibly as a result of the internal injuries caused by the fall from his horse and the strain of the military operations. His body was taken to Mongolia and buried on Mount Bürqan Qadun, at the sources of the Onon and Kerulen rivers (see below). The mention in the SH of his return (trefi) was, presumably, to enhance his figure by making him return home as a victor, for we know that the war against Hisa was finished before the end of his life. However, Pelliot (NMP, I, 326) links trefi with niki'dete and understands that 'Chingisz "came" for a "second" campaign against Tangut.' Pelliot's interpretation, adopted also by Ligeti (Li, 129), is contradicted by 1) the Chinese sectional summary which says (Y² Sup. 2, 13a) 選已("thereupon he returned home", and 2) by the verb muqatq'a, lit. 'destroying', which precedes trefi i.e. Chinggis Qan 'campaigning a second time ... destroying ... coming back ... ascended to Heaven.' See CI, 209. His return home is immediately followed by the mention of his death, which is referred to as ascending to Heaven (törggers-tür qarbo). Pelliot, op. cit., 305, has suggested that this may be due to the subject of his death being regarded as taboo by the Mongols. This is not necessarily so. As J.-P. Roux has pointed out, among the ancient Turks there was a belief that the souls or, at any rate, one of the souls of their heroic chiefs flew to Heaven at death. In the Orikhon inscriptions, the expressions 'to go flying' and 'fly' — i.e. to Heaven — mean 'to pass away' when used with reference to the death of a qayan or a prince of the blood. See MCPA, 99ff.; Tryjarski 1981, 157; GOTT, 266. (For qar= [mo. var] 'to ascend', see Cleaves 1996, 8, n. 45).
belief, like many others, was shared by the ancient and medieval Mongols, and it would especially have applied to an exalted personage like Činggis Qan. The author(s) of the SH would then have employed the expression ‘be ascended to Heaven’ much in the same way as, mutatis mutandis, a Christian medieval author like Paul the Deacon would say ‘ad regna caelestia migravit.’ In other words, it was a eumphemistic conventional expression. In the SH we find that the death of Činggis Qan is referred to both indirectly, i.e., metaphorically, and directly. See Yüsü Qutan’s words in § 254: ‘When your body, like a great old tree, will fall down... When your body, like the stone base of a pillar, will collapse...’ and Činggis’ own words in the same section: ‘I forgot/As if I would not follow the forefathers/ I slept/As if I would not be caught by death (śūleśa).’ On these issues see also Rachchentsky 1970, 422 and n. 266; IBŠ, 245; Pūrečan and Bāasanbām 1996, 157-158; and Kaszuba 1996.

The cause - direct or indirect - of Činggis’ death, viz. the fall from his horse, is inferred solely from the SH, §§ 265 and 267, for the Chinese and Persian sources speak only in general terms of a ‘disease’ which, according to Ju ventai, arose from the insanity of the climate (HWC, 180). Other sources give different causes (a fever, an arrow in the knee), and colourful folklore motifs (such as an unusual sexual injury caused by the Tangut queen) are found in the later epic accounts. See Wright 1997, 428-432. Modern scholars, like Hsien, have suggested typhus (see below, n. 272), but the real cause of Činggis’ death is unknown, and was certainly unknown also to most people at the time (except, of course, to the qan’s ‘inner circle’, judging by the conflicting reports of our sources. On the subject, see Haensch 1933, 548; NMP, I, 328-329; CK, 126-127 (= CK’, 141-142). According to Pelliot (op. cit., 329), ‘The most likely cause of the death of Chinggis Khan is the one given thirteen years (the present author would say “one year” [LR] later by the Secret History, a serious fall from his horse Jōso-tubo.’

On the complex question of the date and place of his death, and of the location of his grave, see the fundamental discussion by Pelliot, op. cit., 305-363. Although the exact day of Činggis’ demise cannot be determined with certainty, it occurred beyond doubt in the second half of August 1227.

On the place of death there is little doubt. Činggis died in the camp that he had pitched at Liup’-pan shan 六盤山 (‘Liup’-pan Mountain’), the Liuban Qan (= Mountain) of AT, 125a, in southern Ninghsia, where he had moved in June-July 1227 ‘to escape the (summer) heat’, and which had become his military headquarters. The remains of a ‘palace’ dating from the Yuan period were found in 1993 by Chinese archaeologists at K’u-šč’-éng 額旗 (35° 50’ N 106° 14’ E) just south of Ku-yüán山 窟山, in the area of the Ch’ing-shui River 清水河 where we know Činggis’ temporary residence was situated. The archaeologists unearthed a large number of glazed porcelain vases, including vases, bowls and dishes; ceremonial bronze, as well as construction materials such as roof- and other tiles. This may well be the site in question. See the report and map of the area on page 6 of the Kuang-ming jih-pao 光明日报 of 1 August 1993.

In his meticulous study, Pelliot (op. cit., 329-353) has shown that Činggis was not buried in north China, but that his body was carried to his native land and buried on Mount Burkan Qaldun, i.e. on Khentei Khan (Xentii Xan; see above, n. 1), where several of his successors were also subsequently interred.

For the research carried out on the identification of the imperial burial ground since the publication of Pelliot’s investigation (1959) and J. Schubert’s RBC in 1963 (the relevant section is on pp. 84-99, see ÇXEBN; and de Rachewiltz 1998. On the basis of all available evidence and personal inspection, I think one can reasonably assume that the burial ground is situated on the southern and southeastern shoulder of Khentei Khan, and that it is so far untouched; this can only be ascertained, however, by a scientific investigation in situ. (Unfortunately, the ruins of what was almost certainly the temple built by Kammala at the foot of the mountain [see Pelliot, op. cit., 338] have been
abusively and seriously tampered with in the late 1990s and early 2000s according to the latest (July 2002) travellers’ reports. For further literature on the subject in Chinese, see CHLYCWC; and CYW, 825-878, 909-910. (In July-August 2001, a joint Mongolian-American expedition led by Dr. D. Bazargur of the Institute of Geography of the Academy of Sciences of Mongolia, and Mr. M. Kravitz of Chicago, which had carried out an archaeological investigation in Xentif Aimag in 2000 and 2001, claimed to have located the burial ground of the Mongolian royalty and nobility at Ölgii Öcöl Xereim near Mount Binder [Bindes Uul at 48°35' 35°11' 36 E], which may have also included Činggis Qan’s grave. See the ‘Mongolia On Line’ [www.mol.mn] News of 31 July and 14 August 2001. The site is well known — it was first described in 1926 — and suggestions that Činggis Qan’s tomb may be situated there were already put forth in 1994. See MNDSJD, 182; GG, II, 29. However, all indications point to a pre-13th-century, possibly Liao, site. Cf. GG, II, 8. In any event, the joint expedition came to an abrupt end in August 2002 without having announced any significant discovery. See The Daily News Daily News, No. 177 [1506] of Wednesday 11 September 2002 for further details, and above, n. 70, for the site of the investigation.) As for Činggis Qan’s mausoleum (the so-called ‘Eight White Tents’; Naiman Cyan Gen) at Ejlen Qarqin in the Ordos, there is a vast literature in various languages. Besides Polliut’s remarks (op. cit., 343ff) and the articles cited in the above two Chinese collections, see de Rachewiltz 1994, 363-364, Chiodo 1997/98; idem 1999/2000 (and the literature cited therein); Andrews 1999; CLYE; and, especially, ČSNČO and ČNČOBO. However, both the history of the sanctuary and the cult of Činggis Qan connected with it (and with other sanctuaries in Inner Mongolia) are beyond the scope of the present investigation. As to Činggis’ age at the time, if he was born in 1162, as seems probable (see above, n. 104), he must have been sixty-five. His age in YS¹, 25, is given as sixty-six, Chinese

reckoning. Cf. the SWCCCL¹, 79a, where s.a. 1226, his age is given as sixty-five, thus essentially agreeing with that of the YS. In the AT¹, 125a-b, a fairly long poetic piece is declaimed by Činggis Qan just before he died. See LADAT, 238-240. This epic passage, a later addition to the Činggis Qan saga which also occurs (with some variants) in other chronicles, has been arbitrarily inserted in Da¹, 266-269 (cf. Da¹, 227-229). The passage in question has been the subject of a detailed philological and comparative study by S. Ozawa. See Oz¹, V, 487-537. (For other epic motifs associated with Činggis’ campaign against Hsi Hsia, see Heissig 1985.) In sharp contrast to the greatly elaborated accounts of Činggis’ death we find in the later Mongol sources, the news of his passing in the present section of the SH is recorded without any embellishment and, indeed quite abruptly, within the context of a rather disappointing narrative concerning the war against Hsi Hsia. In Li, 185, n. 268, Ligeti draws attention to the substantial discrepancy between the SH account of Činggis’ last campaign and the other sources, especially Râfid al-Dân’s work. It should again be emphasized that the SH gives only a very brief sketch of the campaign, totally ignoring most of the military operations carried out by Činggis Qan and the Mongol army in 1226-1227. This is due either to later editorial work, or, as I am more inclined to believe, to the author(s) of the SH, who preferred to cut a narrative that would have otherwise inevitably led him (or them) to mention the conqueror’s demise in the course of the campaign — an event which he (or they) evidently wanted to gloss over, not (in my opinion) because the subject was taboo, but because it may indicate that Heaven’s ‘protection’ (ihe’el) had been withdrawn, at least as far as the life of Činggis Qan was concerned. ‘A great part of the Tang’ut people was given (lit. “one gave”) to Yisii Qatun (Qadun in the text), i.e. as slaves. Yisii was the wife Činggis had taken with him on his last campaign and the one who looked after him in his final illness. Her reward was commensurate to the favour she had been shown by
were in the west (the Qipcha Steppe and Central Asia); that is why they are called here 'the princes of the right (= west) hand', the 'right hand' corresponding to the west wing of the army in the military organization of the Mongols. Öülin Noyan, i.e. Tevüge Öülin (Cinggis' younger brother), had his domain in northeastern Mongolia, near the border with Manchuria (see HC, 178, and above, n. 257; and also in the north-east, in the basin of the Argun, was the anapage of Joqi Qasar. See de Rachewiltz 1976, 491 ff. (cf. above, n. 183). Hence the definition of 'princes of the left (= east) hand' applied to Öülin Noyan, Yegi and Yisëinge. (For 'kar 'princes', see above, n. 265.) Tolui, being the youngest son and 'keeper of the hearth', retained the Mongolian homeland, and was therefore a 'prince of the centre' — the 'centre' (qol) corresponding in military terms to the main body of the army (see below). Cf. TMEN, no. 307; TQIJMEC, 2/1, 36.

'All assembled in full force', lit. 'assembled in their entirety, being (= as) a whole.'

Fos Kõde'i Aral (written Kõdo'e Aral in § 136 and Kõde'e Aral in § 282), see above, n. 136. 'On the Kélliren', lit. 'of the Kélliren.' In the SWCC1, 79b, there is an entry to the effect that, in the autumn of the year wus-tan (1228), emperor T'ai-sung (Ōguj) returned from Hu-pa τοπ/Α, i.e. from his ulus/domain on the Qobaq (Qobaq) and Emil (Imit) rivers in Central Asia (see below), and held an assembly — the qurilu — at the great ordo (Xii') of the former emperor T'ai-sun (Cinggis Qan), i.e. at Kõde'e Aral's Kerulen. In 1227, autumn began on 12 August and ended on 7 November. The CS 115, 2523, confirms Öguj's presence on the Kerulen at the time, for an embassy from the Chin court was sent to him there in October and did not return to China until December 1228-January 1229. Cf. de Rachewiltz 1993, 4.

'They installed Öguj Q'a'an as gan.' The term used for 'installed (= elected)' is, literally, 'raised, lifted up' (erguñer), which derives from the ancient Akaic custom of enorning the elected gan by actually lifting him up on a felt carpet. See

With regard to the two titles qan and qa'an assumed by Ögdöei, cf. the statement of Juvaini (HWC, 187) that at the enthronement ceremony, 'Ulugh-Noyan', i.e. Tolui, took a cup and all those present 'uttered prayers, saying, 'May the kingdom prosper by his being Khan!'... And they named him Qa'an.' Raïsî al-Dîn follows Juvaini almost verbatim. See Successors, 31. Ögdöei 1) was elected qan, i.e. ruler of all the Mongols, and 2) was given at the same time, according to Juvaini, the name (or epitet) Qa’an, which is actually the old Turkic title of the supreme ruler. Juvaini was writing a generation later, when Ögdöei was normally referred to as 'the Qa’an', i.e. the Qa’an par excellence, Ögdöei having been the first Mongol qan to use this title. Cf. NMP, I, 302; and de Rachewiltz in RSO 64:1990, 428. In my opinion, 'the Qa’an' had almost certainly become the current appellation of Ögdöei during his lifetime. Cf. the use of the single epithet in § 272. The additional Turkic title of qa’an (but not qa’an, qan, or mina) was probably conferred on Ögdöei in 1229 because the Mongol tribal chief or leader (qan) was now the supreme ruler of a vast empire besides Mongolia – an empire in which the elite was largely, if not predominantly, Turkic-speaking. Turkic was also the language of the Nestorian Christians and of the Uighur advisers and dignitaries at court; indeed, it was the lingua franca in Inner Asia at the time, more so than Persian which superseded it during the Yuan period. See Huang S 1986. It is no surprise therefore that the Mongols, having adopted by then (ca. 1230) many cultural elements from the Turks (especially the Uighurs), including their script, they adopted their royal title, this title now being more appropriate to the ruler of a world-empire than the essentially tribal title of qan borne by Chinggis. On the whole question, see de Rachewiltz 1983, 272-277; and idem 1983a, 292, 306, n. 76 where, however, my statement concerning the Persian language must be revised in the light of Huang Shijian's contribution). Although some scholars still claim that the title qa’an was only given posthumously to the early Mongol qa’an (cf. Boyle 1956, 152; SMM, 474-475, n. 4), their claim is contradicted by the overwhelming evidence from legends on coins and other inscriptions. See de Rachewiltz 1983, 278, n. 8; CCME, 18-19; and the 1257 inscription in honour of Möngke (r. 1251-59), where the emperor's name is followed by the title qa’an, showing beyond doubt that Möngke was called qa’an, i.e. qa’an, in his lifetime. See Poppe 1961, 147 (1).

'Precious life', lit. 'golden life' (altun amin). The attribute 'golden' as usual applies to the person of the qa’an.

'The ten thousand guards who had been in close attendance on (lit. "who had been acting [= performing their duties] close to") the person of my father the Qa’an.' This sentence is very puzzling because of the words "of my family", the Qa’an (qa’an echtige-yin mina), instead of which one would expect 'of their (i.e. Châ’dâ’s and Tolui’s) father the Qa’an' (qa’an echtige-yin ana), or 'of his (i.e. Ögdöei’s) father the Qa’an' (qa’an echtige-yin ana). In view of the closeness in sound between mina and mina, it is possible that the latter is simply a scribal error. Cleaves is of this opinion. See Cl, 209, n. 24. On the other hand, Ratchnevsky may be right in supposing that mina is the correct original reading (especially in view of the fact that the interlinear gloss renders it as "my"), and that the word betrays the hand of the author of the SH. It is indeed true that Ögdöei is being more appropriate to the ruler of a world-empire than the essentially tribal title of qan borne by Chinggis. On the whole question, see de Rachewiltz 1983, 272-277; and idem 1983a, 292, 306, n. 76 (where, however, my statement concerning the Persian language must be revised in the light of Huang Shijian's
and n. 362; Ev-Pop, 235. See also Section Three of the Introduction.

‘The domain of the centre’ (qol-ün ulus), i.e. the people and territory belonging to the central portion of the empire, this being the native territory in Mongolia proper. In terms of Mongol military organization, this corresponded to the ‘army of the centre’ (qol čerīl), i.e. to the main army. As we have seen, the heart of this domain was traditionally situated in the region of the Onon and Kerulen (in the SH: Onan and Keliren) rivers, where Ćinggis had his principal encampments or ordos, but already in Ćinggis’ time the center of gravity had begun to shift to the region of the Orkhon (Qorqon) basin further west, in the former Naain territory, where a new important encampment was established which, under Ćogodei, became the capital of the Mongol empire. It is likely, as Pelliot has suggested, that Ćinggis had first made Qara Qorum his qurtn (SH: a’uraj; see above, n. 136); i.e. his main base camp, at the time of the Western Campaign, ca. 1220. This became increasingly important until it was walled in 1235 by Ćogodei and turned into a permanent settlement and imperial residence, with palaces, temples, etc. See NMP, I, 166–167, and below, n. 273. It seems that Qara Qorum acquired importance for the Mongols only after 1218, for there is indirect evidence that the large encampment where Yeh-liu Ch’u-ts’ai first met Ćinggis Qan in 1218, and which could only have been Ćinggis’ ordo, was the one in the Sa’ari Steppe, not the one in Qara Qorum. See de Rachewiltz 1962, 45–46, n. 47. Ćogodei’s ulus was not in Mongolia proper, but in the region of the Emel and Qobuk rivers, and in the basin of the upper Irtish (see TDMI, 393) – hence the ‘hanging over’ to him of the central ulus at the time of his enthronement. Regarding the hanging over to Ćogodei of Ćinggis’ bodyguard, see T. Allen in CHCAR, 367 and n. 55.

§ 270. ‘The transfer of ... to himself’, lit. ‘making ... to be for himself.’

The expedition of Qututur and Mōnggerūtur at the head of the auxiliary forces of Čormaan Qoči’s army is the one that took place in 1236, and not immediately after Ćogodei’s enthronement in 1229 as the SH leads one to believe. According to the Persian sources, Mōnggerūtur (not ‘Mōnggerūtur’ as in Boyle 1963, 242) was put in charge of two mynyarchies (timur) in the Baghlan-Kunduz-Badakshan area on the frontiers of India; then, on his death, the command passed to Qotur (called Hoqatur [? Hoqotur] by Raštāl-dīn). See Boyle, loc. cit.; Successors, 55 and n. 216; Aubin J 1969, 71–72, 79; and above, n. 262. On Čormaan himself and his expedition to the West in 1230/31, see above, n. 260, and below, n. 274. On the Qalbiī Soltan, i.e. the sultan (= caliph) of Baghdad, see also n. 260. The SH account has confused the earlier expedition of Čormaan against Jālāl al-Dīn with the later (1238) attack on Baghdad (on which see § 274) and the Mongol expedition against northern India, which took place at about the same time.

‘A people not dealt with by his father Ćinggis Qa’an’, lit. ‘of a people left unfinished (dorqut) of (= by) his father Ćinggis Qa’an.’ The word dorqut is a plural of dorqan (= mo. dorqan) ‘lacking, incomplete, insufficient.’ See Les., 2026.

The beginning of the account of Ćogodei’s campaign against western Asia and Europe (1236–42) is somewhat ambiguous. The Mongol princes (Batu, Būri, Gīyūk and Mōŋgke) are sent, according to the SH, ‘in support of the army of Sūbe’et’ei Ba’at’ar who, earlier on (arida) had run into difficulties during his campaign in the West. In § 262, the SH has mentioned Sūbe’et’ei’s campaign against the eleven tribes (Qanglin, Kībā’ut’etc.) in the north, his crossing of the rivers Idil (Volga) and Jayaq (Ural) ‘rich in water’ (wsutan), and his reaching the city of Mënkermen (Kiev). The same places and phraseology are repeated, with regard to Sūbe’et’ei’s campaign, in the present section, showing that the ‘earlier on’ to which the latter refers is clearly the campaign mentioned in § 262. As already noted, § 262 refers to the great Mongol raid of 1221–1222/23 (the one led by Jebe and Sūbe’et’ei), which is however confused in the
SH with the great expedition of 1236-1242, as some of the place-names indicate. When Ogodei’s Western Campaign was launched in the spring of 1236 (on this date, see Pelliot 1920, 166-167), Sibe’eti was indeed the senior commander of the Mongol army. The SH statement that he had been put in a difficult situation (berkeldekelbei) earlier on may well refer to the few reverses and the human loss suffered by the Mongols, during the 1221-1222 raid, in their engagements with the Georgians, with the coalition of the Lezhgians, Circassians, Alans and Qipchaqs, and, lastly, with the Volga Bulgars on their way back. See Dulaurier 1858/60, 200, 203 (1858), 278-279 (1860); HNA, 295; EM, 517; KR, 238; Zimonyi 1985. On the other hand, it is more likely that the memory of these earlier reverses colored with that of the rebellion of the Qipchaq leaders Bayan and Cheq in 1237, the dispatch of Sibe’eti to subdue them and the subsequent manoeuvre of the Mongol princes culminating in the capture of Ba’can. In Rafid’s account of these operations in ‘the country of As (i.e. Alans – I.R.) and the region of Bulgar’, it is specifically mentioned that Sibe’eti was sent there ‘for the second time’ (Successors, 57; cf. HWC, 269). On Ogodei’s accession, a major problem confronting the Mongol court was the fact that after the early daring but ephemeral raid of Jebe and Sibe’eti, the various populations inhabiting the vast area forming the ulus of Jochi (and, later, of his son Batu) had failed to submit to Mongol suzerainty, relying on their distance from Mongolia and the size of their territory. It was chiefly this political consideration that prompted the expedition of 1236, as we indeed learn from Juvarri. See HWC, 199; and Alison 1983a, 14-20. The section in § 270 dealing with the names of the peoples against whom Sibe’eti had been campaigning (cf. §§ 262 and 274) has been discussed by Pelliot in NHHO, 128ff. The name Meget (Meget in §§ 274 and 275) appears here for the first time. Pelliot, op. cit., 129, n. 6, reversing an earlier correct assumption, stated that ‘le contexte suggère qu’il s’agisse de Moscou.’ However, V. Minorsky has conclusively shown, in my opinion, that it must be the Alan capital Magas in the Caucasus, destroyed by the Mongols in 1239. See Minorsky 1952; Allsen 1987/91, 19-20. Cf. Pelliot’s reservations in NMP, I, 19, and the long discussion by T. Kobayashi (GHK, 178-187) in which the problem of the identification of Meget is examined in relation to the date of composition of the SH. For the identification of Menkermen Keyibe (i.e. Kiwa Menkermen; in our passage Meget is erroneously joined to the Men of Menkermen), Adil (for Sali or Idil) and Jayaq, see above, n. 262. In our passage we also find Asut, as in §§ 262, 274; Sesit, as in § 274 (§ 262: Sasut); Mafar, in the singular (instead of Mafarat, as in § 262); Sesgesit (§ 262: Sesgesit); and Bajar, an orthographic error for Bolar. For all these names, see also above, n. 262, and below, n. 274. Cf. also Li, 186, n. 270.

With regard to the princes who were sent into the field, the SH mentions Batu, the second son of Jochi; Buri, the eldest son of Mörëttken, second son of Ca’adai; Gliyik, the eldest son of Ogodei; and Môngge (i.e. Môngke), the eldest son of Tolu. Of these four, Batu was not the eldest son (Orda was Jochi’s eldest son); however, being Jochi’s heir and successor, Batu was regarded as the senior of all Chingis Qian’s grandsons after the latter’s death (see Successors, 107), hence his appointment as leader of all the princes participating in the campaign according to the SH. Cf. DGH, 16. On Orda, see Pelliot’s remarks in NHHO, 29-34. As to Buri, a grandson of Ca’adai, see below. Gliyik and Môngke are mentioned here for the first time. On Gliyik (1206-48), the third Mongol emperor (r. 1246-48), see Chapitre CVII, 85-89; NMP, I, 570. On Môngge (1208-59), the fourth emperor (r. 1251-59), see Chapitre CVII, 107-110; Cleaves 1949b, 423. Cf. RC, 102 (D) and 103 (E); YShi, 66-67. On the roles of these princes during the campaign, see Successors, 559.

’Any commoners, whoever they might be’, lit. ‘and the many common people, whoever they may be’ (olon gil’an ken ber ba’esi). This sentence is somewhat ambiguous and could be interpreted differently. See Mostert’s remarks apud CL, 210, n. 33; Oz’s, VI, 441-443, n. 5.

This principle (yosun) … originates from elder brother Ça‘ada1, lit. ‘This principle … is from elder brother Ça‘ada1’. For yosun ‘principle, norm’ v. fasıy ‘law’, cf. Ratchnevsky 1974, 473.

’Büri, the eldest of my sons’, is, strictly speaking, an incor- rect statement, for Büri was the eldest grandson of Ça‘ada1. However, the term kō’ai is must be understood here sensu lato.

Looking superior and mighty (cări).’

‘Swords’ (mesel[2]).’ Mese (pl. mese) can mean any (edged) weapon and ’sword’. See Kow, 2006b; Les., 53b; DO, 463b. I prefer the latter meaning in the present context. Cf. Oz’s, VI, 438, and Oz’s, II, 219.

The pronouncement of Ça‘ada1 is a good illustration (and probably meant to be so) of the ‘zeal and strength’, i.e. of the legalistic approach and forcefulness to which Çinggis’ second son largely owed his reputation. It is to be noted that Ögödei accepted his decisions as final and binding. Cf. also § 271.

§ 271. Introduction to the launching of the final campaign against Chin, indicating that it was again Ça‘ada1 who sanctioned Ögödei’s proposal to proceed with it, a fact which is not mentioned in the Chinese and Persian sources.

’I have sat on the throne made ready by my father Çinggis Qa’an’, i.e. ’By assuming the imperial dignity, I have inherited a ready-made situation (belen) which . owe to my father and not to my own ability.’ See ’Trois documents’, 457, n. 43; Lettres, 63-64; ‘Cleave’ 1953, 66, n. 5.

’Will people not say of me?’, lit. ’Will it be said of me?’ See Mo, 238, n. 221.
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The Oldaug Qoril of the SH is no doubt the same person called ’Oldaug Noyan’ (Oldagir Noytan) in Successors, 312. According to Rashi he was a Jalayir. Elsewhere, Rashi calls him Aldür (~ Cildür) Qoril and refers to him as the commander of the four (great) ordos. See SL1, 226; cf. also SL1, 15 (1888), 133. In view of this statement, it would appear that the term a‘uraj (see above, nn. 136, 269), as employed here by Ça‘ada1, refers to the four great ordos established by Çinggis Qan, i.e. his main encampment and those of his wives situated in the Safati Steppe and the Onon-Kerulen region that were inherited by Ögödei and to which the latter repaired at the beginning of 1233. See NMP, 328, 350. The names of the ordos and çi Çinggis’ wives in charge of them are given in AT1, 129a. See LDAJ, 244. (For the Ora Qorum a‘uraj, cf. Pelliot, op. cit., 166-167; and above, n. 269.) This is the only reference in the SH to the ‘great ordos’ (yekes ordos) as such. On Ögödei’s return to Mongolia in 1232-1233, see below, nn. 272 and 273. The last sentence of § 271 properly belongs to § 272.

§ 272. Ögödei decided to launch the final campaign against the Chin kingdom immediately after his enthronement in the autumn of 1229. After the failure of diplomatic moves on the part of the Chin court, Mongol military operations in north China began in earnest the following year. For the various accounts of this campaign, see YS2, 29-33 (cf. Abramowski 976, 124-130); CS 17, 382, 18, 403; MWESC 4, 3a-9b; SWCLC, 790-84b; Successors, 33-42; ZUZR, 1-26; ES, 321-322. As already noted, the SH confines the first invasion of Chin (1211) with the final campaign. In the present section the opening paragraph is nothing but a rephrasing of the beginning of § 247 and is totally anachronistic. (The words ’Having put Oldagir Qoril in charge of the Great Palaces’ at the end of § 271 are misplaced in the text as they are the actual beginning of § 272.) The date (Year of the Hare = 1231), which, incidentally, is the only one given in
The interesting episode of Ögedei's illness and Tolui's sacrifice is a story with strong epic overtones which had obviously gained wide acceptance, for it is also recorded, albeit with some variations, in the Persian and Chinese sources. Furthermore, Rashid al-Din himself says that "this story is well known." See Successors, 38-39, 167-168; YS II 115, 2887. Cf. D'Ohsson, II, 58 and n.1. According to Juvaina, no doubt a more reliable authority on this point, Tolui died of alcoholism. See his HWC, 549. For the version of Tolui's death in the AT III 114b (after the passage corresponding to the SH, § 253), see LDAT, 223-224. Cf. Li, 186-187, n. 272. See also below, at the end of the present note.

For the entire section from 'There Ögedei Qa'an fell ill' to 'Now your order shall decide!', see the translation and commentary in Mo, 226-233. The following are a few additional remarks and clarifications.

For the expression heshtht gierte, lit. 'to receive (= be attained by illness)', see Cleaves 1949, 110, n. 80. 'When he lost his speech and was in great distress', lit. 'When he was distressed losing mouth and tongue (= speech)'. Cf. Poppo 1964, 372. 'Various shamans and soothsayers were ordered to divine the cause of the illness', lit. 'When one caused to divine by all kinds of shamans (bô ev bô es) and soothsayers (tölgeć). Whereas the term bôe (= mo. bogo) is the standard designation of the Mongolian shaman, tölgeći (= tolge 'one of Odin divination' + den. noun suff. -ći) seems to have been a general term for diviners practising different forms of prognostication involving 'signs', such as marks on burnt shoulder blades (scapulimancy), flights of birds (augury), dreams (omnromancy), etc. See Pelliot 1944, 93, n. 1; Mo, 227-228 (with some important remarks on the term abdita- 'to divine by inspecting the entrails of an animal', and on this practice among the medieval Mongols; cf. Ev-Pop, 310, n. 30; Bawden 1958/59, 11F; J.P. Roux in Anthropos 53-1958, 135ff; CCMF, 203ff; and, especially, Rosa-Tas 1972, 232ff, (also powerful nature deities in the Altaic (shamanistic) conception of the world; and here, in particular, the indwelling spirits of natural features of the areas in north China affected by the Mongol invasion. As stated in the passage in question, the cause of their violent rage was the destruction and concomitant deaths of the polluted eagle - caused by Ögedei's armies. It should be remembered that only three years before (March 1227), in the course of the campaign against Hsi Hsia, i.e. always in north China, the Mongol army was struck by a severe epidemic, possibly of typhus as Haensch has suggested (Haensch 1933, 548), and almost certainly caused by the wholesale slaughter of the civilian population. See KIPMX, 72, 102, n. 76, 187; de Rachewiltz 1960, 232-233, n. 104 (for the correct dating of the event). Chinggis Qan died the following August and Haensch (loc. cit.) suggested typhus as a possible cause, although this is unlikely in view of the time elapsed between the Mongol invasion and his death. However, it is not surprising that when Ögedei resumed the hostilities in north China and suddenly fell ill, the soothsayers would relate his illness to the renewed slaughter of the population. With regard to the expression qajar uasan (= mo. yajar uas) 'land and rivers' (lit. 'renewed homestead'), the same expression in Ordos designates a place considered from the point of view of its good or bad influence when building a house. See DO, 285b. Cf. ch. feng-shui 謂勘, 'geomancy', lit. 'wind and water'. Cf. also Cleaves 1959, 69, n. 55. For the cult of water among the
Mongols, cf. IBŠ, 154-156. On the form qanl = qat, see Mo, 109, 230; Maériel II, 38 (13r, 3); Poppe 1975, 167; Street 1990a, 358 and n. 90; and above, n. 118. For the use of qan in this connection, see de Rachewiltz 1983, 273; Kaluzhynski 1978, 129, n. 17. On the verbal talbiru- ‘to relax’—‘(for an illness to abate), besides the remark in Mo, 231-232, cf. TAJ, 358, n. 387. ‘Could a person from the Qa’an’s family serve as a substitute?’, iv. ‘Will one from the persons of the family do?’ Cf. Mo, 238, r. 221. On the influence of local genii, their connection with sickness and death, and the concept of a substitute offering, see Bawden 1963, 155-157; and for the ritual theme of the brother offering himself in place of the king-victim, cf. WIP, 17, n. 1. ‘The Qa’an, opening his eyes’: note the use of the single epithet ‘the Qa’an’ for ‘Ogodii Qa’an’ in this and the following sections. Cf. above, n. 269. ‘What has happened?’ (yaa’un bolih). On this expression, see Mo, 193 and n. 177. ‘Our fortunate father Cinggis Qa’an.’ On the expression susu ‘endowed with good fortune’, i.e. with the fortune conferred by Heaven, cf. above, no. 74, 111; Letters, 22.

‘Feeling you as one would feel a wetter’, i.e. as one would feel a wetter to make sure that it is fat. See CII, 212, n. 39. ‘The great throne’; see above, no. 248.

‘If... dies’, lit. ‘if... becomes not active’. On the expression joob ese boi = ‘to die’, see Cleaves 1948, 311-320 (esp. pp. 317-318, where the present passage is translated and discussed).

For the expression ‘the numerous Mongol people’, cf. Cleaves 1949a, 532-533; and, especially, idem 1986, 190-191, n. 4. However, I do not share Cleaves’ interpretation of olon Mongol ulus as ‘The people (or nation) consisting of the Many Mongol’, i.e. taking olon Mongol as Olon Mongol, a designation of the Mongol people. Rather than considering ‘Olon Mongol ulus’ as being the syntactic equivalent of ‘Yeke Mongol ulus’ as Cleaves does, I consider the word olon Mongol of our passage as the exact equivalent of qanqul Mongol ‘all the Mongols’ of § 52. See above, no. 52 and 202.

‘Would rejoice at their good fortune’ renders Mongolian khbqamqyp. Although written as one word, this expression is actually made up of two words, i.e. khb and qamqyp. Mostaert apud Cleaves 1948, 311, n. 14, has suggested that qamqyp is the verb qamb-—qang- (before a suffix with an initial velar consonant) ‘to be satisfied’, and that the expression khb qamqyp corresponds to ord. t’awak qamb ‘to rejoice at somebody’s misfortune’ (= mo. tabala-). I am of the opinion that khb < qamb < uig. giv ‘good fortune, luck.’ See DTS, 449a; ED, 579a-b. This correspondence was first suggested by B. Vladimirov in SG, 272. The expression khb qang would then mean ‘to rejoice at one’s own good fortune.’ Cf. above, n. 219. ‘I shall take the place of’; lit ‘I shall be in the place of’, i.e. ‘I shall substitute.’

Tuls is the Siberian salmon (Salmo taimen), according to Les., 841b. The Ching hengquleng (WTWC, III, 4461.1) renders tuls with ma. jelu, which J. Norman (CMEL, 1576a) translates as ‘salmon trout (Huchu taimen).’ Cf. HM, 528: ‘Lachsforelle.’ Actually, tuls is the taimen, a fish of the genus Huchu. See BRS, 434b; MED, 356a. The incorrect definition ‘salmon trout’ for the Huchu taimen is simply due to the fact that in Russia the salmon trout (Salmo trutta) is also referred to as taimen (both the salmon trout and the Huchu belong to the family Salmonidae). However, in my translation I have employed the word ‘trout’ (like Haensch and Ligeti) for the sake of poetry. Kileme = mo. kileme ‘sturgeon’ (Acipenser sturio). Cf. Uray-Köhalmi 1984, 731-732.

The verbs tabbal- and kinggul- according to the Chinese gloss mean ‘to split, cut in half’ (开裂) and ‘to break through, cut across’ (破) respectively. For the latter term, cf. kinggul- ‘to cut off’ in § 124 (HW, 102). Tabbal- is possibly related to tabbas ‘overturning’, on which see Mo, 156-157. For the ‘cleaving’ and ‘renting’ in the poetic fish imagery, see below.

‘I have conquered those in the litre (lit. “the visible”); I have pierced (= killed) those afar (lit. “the outside”)’ (je-ya bi
ilaphulqada-yi bi qatuba), i.e. 'I have defeated and killed the enemies who came forward and were near as well as those who stayed back and out of sight.' However, according to Do\textsuperscript{1}, 369, 379-380, n. 7 (cf. Do\textsuperscript{2}, 207 and nn. 6, 7), the words ileaf and qada are the names (Ile and Qada) of the two Jurchen commanders defeated by Tolui. See § 251. Translators are still divided on the issue; cf. O\textsuperscript{2}, VI, 457; O\textsuperscript{3}, II, 222, 247, nn. 6, 7; On, 163 and n. 366 (cf. the 2001 ed., 266, n. 663); Ce, 259; ev-Pop, 237. I am of the opinion that the poetic passage is couched in general terms and does not specifically refer to individuals. This is the view of the author(s) of the Chinese interlinear glosses (Y\textsuperscript{2} Sup, 2, 4a), which is also followed by CL 213, and the same can be inferred from Ra\textsuperscript{2}al-d\textsuperscript{2}In's account (see below). However, the proof that Doronati\textsuperscript{b} argument is untenable is supplied by the Chinese gloss itself, which renders qada with tsai-wai RowIndex['outside'], as in §§ 156 and 169 (see HW, 55). Qada 'outside' = qada < qada' a, w.f. yada (mo. id.). It is evident that the word the translator glossed as tsai-wai must have been yada (not qada). The gloss does indeed settle the matter.

'Tall of stature,' lit. 'long of spine.'

'Cast your spells and make your incantations!' renders the Mongolian arbatgun jagerk\textsubscript{a}k. Arba- is glossed in Chinese as chow 'to make incantations or magic formulas.'

This term is a direct borrowing from tu. arba- 'to charm, bewitch, cast a spell over; to conjure, exorcize, invoke.' See ESTY, 1, 168-169. Cf R.A. Miller in JAOS 118:1998, 268. For jager\textsubscript{2}-, glossed sis 'to curse, imprecate; to invoke the spirits,' cf. the noun jager\textsubscript{2}, meaning 'the sacrifice in which meat is hung on a pole and offered to Heaven,' in §§ 43, 44. See above, n. 43. In Kow., 2424a, we find jik\textsubscript{2}li 'mouton suspendu au bout d'une perche par les chamans: 'des paroles obsc\`enes, des jurements, impr\`ecations\textquoteright, which corresponds to SH j\{"\}ger\textsubscript{2}, and clearly derives from jik\textsubscript{2}li \textasciitilde{} jik\textsubscript{2}e 'dire des obsc\`en\textquotesingle s, mauvais, injurieux' (Kow., loc.cit.). Cf Las., 1084b; kh. z\kern-.5em/z\textasciitilde{}x\textasciitilde{}l 'curse, malediction.' Mo. jik\textsubscript{2}e \textasciitilde{} jik\textsubscript{2}a corresponds to SH jager\textsubscript{2}. For


'The magic water', lit. 'the water of incantation.'

This entire passage needs explaining. As noted by Ligeti (Li, 186-187, n. 272), in Ra\textsuperscript{2}al-d\textsuperscript{2}In's work (Successors, 38-39, 167) Tolui is made to declare that if Og\textsuperscript{2}dei's sickness is due to having sinned, his own sins are even greater because, in all the lands, he himself slayed more men in battle, carrying off their wives and children and enslaving their mothers and fathers. If, on the other hand, Heaven wants Og\textsuperscript{2}dei because of his fairness of face, elegance of stature and many accomplishments, Tolui is equally as handsome and accomplished, indeed more fitting and suitable. So Tolui earnestly begs Heaven to take him instead of his elder brother. In our passage, the truth, or, better, the taenim (see above) and the stuperose are poetic images of Tolui's helpless victims; the rest is clear in the light of Ra\textsuperscript{2}al-d\textsuperscript{2}In's text.

'I have become drunk' (sok\textsubscript{2}ba). For sok\textsubscript{2}a (a m. sok\textsubscript{2}a, sok\textsubscript{2}o) 'to become drunk', cf. HCWLYTT, 256-257, no. 85. This reference to drunkenness is most significant. We know from Ju\textsuperscript{2}vaint, a contemporary of these events, that Tolui was 'excessively addicted to the circulating of cups of wine from morn till eve, and a malady overt\textsuperscript{2}w his head such that two of these days did not pass before he died' (HWC, 549). I think that Boyle (ibid., n. 5) is correct in stating that the true cause of Tolui's death has been 'curiously idealized' in the Mongolian version of his demise. Tolui, who had a very close relationship with Og\textsuperscript{2}dei (affection beyond the bounds of fatherhood), says Ju\textsuperscript{2}vaint, op.cit., 549), is made to sacrifice his own life to save his brother, just as in § 201 Jan\textsuperscript{2}qua is made to ask to be executed by Ch\textsuperscript{2}g\textsuperscript{2}g\textsuperscript{2}s who unwillingly obliges him. But, even though the present account of Tolui's death is an idealized and, therefore, falsified version of the event, the author of the account has managed to introduce, not once but twice, a reference to Tolui's state of drunkenness, even if in this case such a state is caused
mention also the locality where Tolui is supposed to have died, seems to be the most reliable as far as this event is concerned. On the problem of Tolui's name after his death, see the perceptive remarks in Boyle 1956, 146-154. Also see NHHO, 11, n. 2. For further references on Tolui and his relationship with his brothers, cf. MNT, I, 125-131; Szemb 1989, 370ff.; L.L. Viktorova in OUMEIX, VII, 155-157; and A. Sürkhü in RLSWA, 314-323.

§ 273. The end of the Altan Qan, i.e. of the last Chin emperor Ai-tsung 阿里木 (r. 1224-34), came in February 1234, with the fall of Ts'ai-chou 粵州, his last refuge in Honan. The name Seûse (ch. tsai-su-su 小蘇 "Little Slave") was in all probability given to Ai-tsung by Ögedei before the former's demise in 1234. This name is also mentioned by Iraïd al-Dîn in the forms 'Shose' (Successors, 34), 'Suse' (SL., II, 21), or 'Sawsa' the reading proposed by Ligeti (Ligeti 1959, 243), as the actual name of the Altan Qan. We know in fact that the Chinese personal name of the Chin sovereign was Shou-huì 守惠 (CS 17, 373; cf. RC, 101 (I)), which accounts for Iraïd's statement. The renaming by Ögedei is, in my view, nothing but a re-interpretation of the Chin emperor's original name based on the phonetic resemblance between it and the Sino-Mongolian term seûse. On the origin and use of this interesting term, see Ligeti, loc. cit. and n. 11; Serruyas 1974, 319-325. Contrary to what is stated in the present section of the SH, Ögedei had by then (1224) left north China after entrusting his generals with the continuation and completion of the campaign against Chin. He himself had already begun his return journey to Mongolia in 1232. See above, n. 272, and below. (One may justifiably assume that this sudden withdrawal from the field was actually prompted by Ögedei's illness and his fears that the powerful and hostile spirits of the 'land of the Kitai' would eventually destroy him.) The appellation Seûse, like that of Sidurçu given by Čingis Qan to the Hsi Hsia ruler, had religious significance. It meant
that, in the afterlife, the spirit of the former Chin sovereign would serve Ögedei as a slave. Cf. above, n. 267.

‘He despoiled him of his ... ’, lit. ‘He plundered their ... ’ However, in the present instance anu ‘their’ is apparently used in place of nia ‘his’, as it is occasionally the case in the ancient language. See above, n. 260. Alternatively, it may refer to ‘the Kitat people.’

‘Piebald horses’ renders alatas (pl. of alata), which the interlinear gloss translates as Hui-ma 胡馬 ‘Hui horse(s).’ This term is puzzling, and both W. Hung (apud CI, 214, n. 46) and TH (p. 94; cf. JYT, 166) rightly suggest that in the present instance the gloss must be wrong. The previous renderings (‘Alashas horses’ [Ha]; ‘horses’ [Ko, Oe]; ‘geldings’ [Da]; etc.), or the mere adoption of the gloss (Yao-Ja) are not satisfactory. Unfortunately, the sectional summary is of no help, since it states that the alatas in general terms as ‘domestic animals’ ( 家畜). See Y 2 Sup, 2. 26a. Alata is a Turkic word. Although most in Turkic languages it means now is ‘gelding; horse’, originally it meant ‘moley, speckled.’ See NMP, I, 135-136; ESTY, I, 136-137. In 13th century Kuman (cœm) alata (＞alata) still meant ‘speckled.’ See KoW, 34. This affords the clue to the mysterious Hui-ma of the SH. The character 习 is almost certainly a scribal error for chu 习 ‘piebald horse.’ For the expression chu-ma 习馬, cf. PWYF, III, 204a. Alata is clearly a Turkic loanword and, in my view, it designated a particular type of piebald horse, possibly a small one. Cf. Ligeti’s ‘multicoloured horses’ (Li, 132). On the term alata, cf. also Poppe 1955, 38; Mu, III, 325, n. 12; the important entry on alata in TMEN, n. N20=1965; and SSTMY, I, 30a (where, however, the reference to ‘n’ which usually means VGAS is used incorrectly – p.c. from Prof. R.A. Miller).

‘Garrison troops’ renders tammaci, a special term designating an important institution going back to pre-Mongol times. It is made up of tam (＜ch. t'am-ma 胡馬 ‘scout horse’) + name of agent suff. -ci. Tammaci were thus ‘mounted scouts’ or ‘vanguard troops’, i.e. a specially selected corps of an advancing army. However, in the early Mongol period this term was used to designate ‘garrisoning troops’ because, as military outposts, they too performed a ‘watching’ or ‘snooping’ function similar to that of scouts reconnoitering enemy territory. Tammaci troops were deployed in border areas and in newly conquered territories. With progressive feudalization and the parcelling of the country subject to Mongol rule, the term tammaci during the Yuan period came to be employed for the private armies – often used by the court as auxiliary troops – belonging to the Mongol prince-holders and leaders of entrusted territories (cf. 沃里_NULL; mmo. csimaq), which were largely composed of members of their clans and their dependants and subjects. In this way it gradually acquired both ethnic and territorial connotations, the understanding of which is still imperfect and controversial. On top of that there is a comparatively vast literature. See the references in MEYD, 137, n. 119; 310-311; TMEN, no. 130; Buell 1850; and Murakami 1983, 101. See also TMAE, 377E; WHBC, 283-295; YSLC, 200f; Oba Shōchi 大貫一 in MK 15:1984, 2-14; Higawara Junpei (井川隆平 in YSK 36,2:1977, 79-105; Chia Chung-yen 賈敬典 in YST 2:1983, 23-42; Yang Chih-chiu 楊智秋 in CKMKSCK, 371-379, and in MKSYCLWC, 116-133 (see also YSSL, 27-66); RRT, 4; YShi, 104. On the ‘wo-hsi, with which the tammaci are intimately related, see in particular MEYD, 16, 132-133, n. 69, 137, n. 119; Ratchevsky 1966a; Chung CF 1987; Schurmann 1951, 304-305; ESYD, 63, n. 46; Fletcher 1986, 39; and MRC, 211a (Index), s.v. ‘Appanages.’

Nanging and Jungdu are 莫克'ai-feng and Chung-tu/ Peking respectively. See above, no. 251 and 247. In Chung-tu a resident commissioner (daruŋacht, see above, n. 263) was appointed by the Mongols as early as 1215. See de Rachewiltz 1966, 114, n. 5, 116, 135, n. 3.

For Ögedei’s return to Mongolia, see above, n. 272. See also YS’7 2, 32, where it is stated that he returned to the imperial
COMMENTARY

Činggis Qan launched his Western Campaign, he apparently made Qara Qorum a base camp (a'tarun), and possibly designated the site as his future capital at about this time, for the Chinese sources claim that he "established his capital" there in 1220. See NMP, I, 167; Cheeves 1952, 29, 35-36, n. 5. It is not surprising then that Ögdöö set up his main camp there after his accession, eventually surrounding it with a protective wall. This happened in 1235. His palace (ordo), known in Chinese as "Wan-an kung" (萬安宮), is traditionally identified with the "Palace of the Myriad Tranquillities" (piao. "tümün amantluaq"?), was built in the spring of the same year. Yeh-liu Ch'ü-ning, who probably gave the Chinese name Wan-an kung to the palace and who witnessed its construction, wrote a short but elegant granite plaque on the occasion of "the setting up of the beams", which is found in his Collected Works. See de Rachewiltz 1997a, 42 and nn. 20, 21. Qara Qorum remained the official capital until Qubilai's arbitrary elevation as qan in 1260, his subsequent transfer of the seat of power to north China and the rupture with his younger brother Arik Bökö (d. 1266) who retained Qara Qorum as his base. After Arik Bökö's defeat and death, Qara Qorum fell into the orbit of Qubilai's rebel nephew Toq Temür (d. ca. 1279), and ultimately into that of his hostile cousin Qaidu (d. 1301). In between rebellions, the former capital, which consisted largely of tents with only a few solid structures and edifices like the palace complex and some temples, was neglected and fell into disrepair despite occasional economic help from the south. See KK, 113-114. Repair work, such as the restoration of a Buddhist shrine, was still carried out in 1342-1346, as we learn from a Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1346. Little is known about the condition of the site after the fall of the Yuan until 1586, when the famous temple complex of Erdeni Zu (Erdeni Zuu, Erdeni Dzu) was built alongside it by Abai Qan of the Qalpas. Following the construction of Erdeni Zuu, the fairly rich documentation that we possess, consisting of chronicles, travel accounts and epigraphies, concerns the lamasery itself, which continued to exert its influence, with numerous additions and
mien 光緯地 in CYFY P.4:1935, 461-463; Yi Kae-Seok in MH 4, 27-41 (in Korean with an English abstract); Mu, III, 326-327; Mo, 27, n. 2e; TMEN, no. 1476; YShi, 41-42; *SPFCX* 3:1978, 5-7; RBC, 158; CEME, 13. As for the native sources on Erenji Jua, see *IED* – a valuable contribution with a rich bibliography (pp. 162-166). On it, cf. A. Sárközi in AOH 53:2000, 273-274. For a pun on the name Qara Qorum in ET (see *ET*, 52300), cf. Zámé, 18; Zámé, 11, where the old capital is referred to as ‘a city called “Móomont” (Qorumqan), i.e. as an ephemeral town in the historical context of the early 15th century (1415), when the city as such had become only a memory of the past.

§ 274. For Čormaqan Qorut’s campaign against the ‘Baqtat people’, i.e. the people of Baghadad, see § 200, where it is first mentioned, albeit anachronistically. Čormaqan’s expedition was originally (1230/5) directed against Jalal al-Din. After the latter’s death (1231), Čormaqan remained in western Asia as commander-in-chief of the Mongol forces. The Mongols’ unsuccessful attack on Baghadad took place in 1238. See above, nn. 260 and 270. On *tamma*, see above, n. 273. Here *tamma* = *tammaci*.

*Naq-fabrics* renders Mongolian naqut, plural of *naq* (< pers. *naq*), a word designating a kind of gold brocade, also known in Europe in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance under various names related to *naq* (*nacchi*). See MR, II, 124-125; Pellet 1927a, 269-271, n. 1; idem 1930a, 200; RCAC, 161; SI, 495-496; CEME, 134a (Index); Poppe 1955, 40; MSKLT, II, 683. For *naqdat* ‘(gold) broacades’, see above, n. 238. As stated earlier, *naq* (*naq*) and *naqti* (*naqti*) are often paired and virtually synonymous. Cf. CEME, 3.

With gilded thread* renders the Mongolian *širamal altatun*. This expression is glossed in the interlinear translation as *huang-chin yu-tu* 紅金inline4 having ‘yellow gold’, the Ming translator(s) evidently having taken *širamal* as a synonym of *žira* ‘yellow.’ The expression *žira* altun occurs in fact immediately before, and this must have misled them. *Širamal* is a deverbal noun in -mal
(see GWM, 48, § 168) from šita 'to roast to gild.' See Les., 714b. Cf. ord. taramal al'ta 'dorure' (DO, 609a). 'Brocades and damasks with gilded thread' refers to brocades and damasks embroidered with gilded silver thread. On the 'brocades (nacīdat), 'damasks' (darās), 'small pearls' (ṣubrūt) and 'big pearls' (tamas), cf. also above, § 230; and Mu, III, 331-333, n. 4-7.

Toćōča uti is the plural of toćīcāt (< tu. toćīcāt) 'a fine horse from the West.' In the MA, 350a, toćīcq morīn is glossed 'Arab horse.' For many references to this term, see Poppe 1967, 515, no. 9; TMEN, no. 949.

Gārdān əl'-tīt and waṣi əkīdūt according to the Chinese interlinear gloss are designations of different kinds of camels. Gārdān must correspond to mo. kūrēng (= kārēn) 'dark brown.' See Les., 505a. The words əl'-tīt (pl. of əl'-tīr) and əkīdūt (a double pl. of əkīr) cannot at present be identified with any degree of certainty. For əkīr (tumeghe) as an Aralash dialect term for a camel with an inconspicuous and soft hump, cf. TH, 216 (3 Jyt, 373). Da'wīt (or ta'wīt), the written form of which was ətayyṣi or, better, ətayyṣi, is almost certainly derived from ch. ə-t-su ətay ətay ətay 'humpback.' Cf. lauwa (mo. luwa, laywa) < ch. lu-tu ətay 'male.' For the rendering of ch. ət-tu ətay with the Mongol syllable si, see HCG, 150; for the rendering with the syllable su (so), cf. ch. ə-t-su ətay ətay 'braid, ribbon.' Mo. nuwa. I think that the 'dark brown əl'-tīt' are Bactrian camels, i.e. the one-humped Camelus bactrianus, the stallion of which is usually known as ba'wra (mo. ba'wra, ba'wra - a borrowing from Turkish), and the 'humpback əkīdūt' are the Arabian camels, i.e. the one-humped Camelus dromedarius. Cf. Mu, III, 333-334, n. 9. For other references to the camel in the SH, see above, nn. 65 and 152. For the camel in Mongolia, see R.L. Reserv in ESY 65:1993, 169-170. For the camel in China in the Mongol period, see Schafer 1950, 190-192. Cf. also MR, I, 156-151, n. 404.

THE SECRET HISTORY

Quladūt and lausīt are also double plurals of qači (< tu.) and lausa (< ch.) 'mule' respectively. See Pelliot 1927, 271, n. 1; TMEN, no. 1395; and above, n. 194. Mostaert (apud CI, 214, 215, n. 55) is of the opinion that the term lausa 'indicated especially the mules to be mounted.'

The campaign of Batu, Buri, Gıyık and Möngke had been mentioned in § 270 in connection with Sübê'eti Ba'atūr's expedition, and all the names of peoples and places in the present section are repetitions of those found in §§ 262 and 270. As stated earlier, we are dealing here with the great expedition against the West (1236-1242). See above, nn. 262, 270. The word keṭiļji 'they crossed' after the names of the two rivers 'Ejlį and Jayaļq' has been inadvertently omitted from the text (see NHQ, 129-130; 130, n. 1), and 'Ejlį' is another form of the name of the Volga (Idil in §§ 262 and Adil in § 270). Cf. the form 'Ajlį of AT, 117b. See above, n. 262. For Meget (same reading in § 275; Meket in § 270) = Magus, see above, n. 270. 'Utterly crushed,' lit. 'utterly finished' (idilte). As noted by Pelliot (NHQ, 130, n. 2) and Ligeti (Li, 187, n. 274), Asut, Seili and Bolar are not names of towns (they are properly referred to as 'tribes' and 'peoples' in §§ 262 and 270). For the mention of the Asut in the present context, see Allsen 1987:91, 31. Mankerman = Menkermen of §§ 262 and 270. The text actually has 'Bolarman Menkerman,' an obvious error for 'Bolar Menkermen'; cf. 'Meketmen Menkermen' for 'Meket Menkermen' in § 270. See above, n. 270.

From the list of peoples mentioned in this section four names are missing: Majar, Kerel, Sergest and Kelsimir - probably by accident, as suggested by Ligeti (Li, 187, n. 275, where however '274' is an error for '274'). For the establishment of resident commissioners (dauragāq) and garrisons (tanmaqāq) in the occupied territories, see Allsen 1987:91, 32.

The SH notice on the campaign against the Jürțet (see below) and the Solangqas, i.e. the Kertans, is totally anachronistic, as these events occurred much later, during the reign of Möngke (1251-59). In 1253, Jalayirră Qorri was appointed
commander of the Mongol expeditionary forces against Koryŏ and was active in Korea until his death in 1258/59. Yiśider Qeré was sent 'in support' of Jalayiratir, i.e. as reinforcement, in 1258. Details of the activity of these two commanders are found in the Korean and Chinese sources, and have been discussed by various scholars, in particular T. Kobayashi, G. Ledyard and W. Henthorn. See GHK, 187-190; Ledyard 1964, 1-10; KMI, 137-151, 153. Cf. also Mu, III, 336-339; Dalai 2000, 75. Serov 1977 is inadequate. (The work by Ko Pyŏng-in in Sino-Korean relations in the thirteenth century is unfortunately not available to me.) For the name Yiśider, see Besse 1974, 92-93; Poppe 1975, 163. Commenting on the relevant passage of the SH, Cleaves (Cl, 215, n. 63) writes: 'This is a reference to the expedition of 1218, not previously mentioned in the Secret History. Cf. the Yuan shih, s. l. 1 (t'ae 1), 20r1-3.3.' However, the 'Mongol' commander mentioned in the YS s. a. 1218 is not Jalayiratir, but Jal. See YS 1, 20. The reading Jal is confirmed not only by other passages in the YS (YS 208, 4607, 4609, where it is written Jal instead of Jal), but also by the Sino-Korean sources. See MSXB, 210a (Index, s.v. Jal). Cf. MWESC 3, 19b, where the same confusion occurs. In Y 115, 2886, Jalal appears as the name of a Jurchen commander; and if Jal = Jalal Jal, Jal, Jal, we know that a Kitam official bore this name too. See HCG, 65. In any event, the passage of the SH in question can in no way be related to the entry in the YS insofar as the former specifically refers to 'the Jurchet and the Solanggas.' The name 'Jurchet' associated with 'Solanggas' in our text has nothing to do with the defunct Chin dynasty or the Jurchens of north China. It refers to the so-called 'Eastern Jurchens' of Manchuria, of the region north of the Koryŏ Long Wall (corresponding to the northeastern part of present-day North Korea), whose territory the Mongol forces had to cross in order to penetrate into eastern Koryŏ, and whose sudden raids were a constant source of harassment for the invaders. See KMI, 6 et passim. In the Mongol period, owing to the close proximity of the Eastern Jurchens and Koryŏ, the expression 'Jurchet and Solanggas' became a general designation for the whole area of southeastern Manchuria and northern Korea. See Ledyard 1964, 9 and n. 37; Successors, 35, 261 and n. 149. For the still controversial etymology of the name Solanggas Solanggas (= Solanggas − Solanggas), plural of Solangga − Solangga − Solanggo, applied to the Koreans, see Ledyard, op. cit., 17-19; HCG, 276, 361-362; RCAC, 130-131. Cf. also DO, 582b. On the reason for the inclusion of such a late item in the Mongol chronicle, and the bearing that it has on the date of composition of the YS, see Waley 1960, 229-229; Ledyard, op. cit., 10-15; de Rachewiltz 1965, 189ff.; idem 1963/64, 6-7; and Section Two of the Introduction.

§ 275. 'From the Kibdaq campaign' (Kibaq, ayao de'ere), lit. 'From on the Kibac (military) campaign.' For the expression ayao de'ere, see Cleaves 1952, 104, n. 147. The suffix -en of Kibdaq is used to form nouns designating ethnic origin. Cf. the noun Sartaqen in § 181. See Poppe 1975, 164. "The expression 'ayao de'ere' is to send saying (= reporting to, petitioning a superior), see Letters, 26-27.

'By the strength of Eternal Heaven and the good fortune of my uncle the Q'an (mongsae tenggeri-it'in guilun-tur Q'an an abaga-it'in su-ur). For this standard formula, and the notations of the words giiitu (= kiiitu) and su, see above, §§ 74 and 224. Cf. also Cleaves 1953, 40, n. 1; Letters, 20-22 (with regard to it); Cleaves 1979, 66ff.; MD, 20ff. In this connection it may be interesting to mention the following identical expression used by Pizarro's secretary Francisco Xeres in his report to the King of Spain (Charles V) of 1534: 'By reason of his (i.e. the King's [R.] great power and good fortune.' See RDP, 1.

The 'eleven countries and peoples' are those listed in §§ 262 and 270; in § 274 they are mentioned again (minus four names). See above, n. 274.

For the expression 'turned back' (lit. "withdrawing ourselves"), pulling in the golden reins (altan fiIna tI in tatata), i.e. reining in the qan's war-horse, hence, figuratively, bringing
the campaign to an end, cf. § 256 and com.; Cleaves 1996, 20, n. 140.

'A large tent' renders yekê čačir. Čačir = mo. čačir, on which see Les., 155a. For this term, cf. TMEN, no. 1042; RH, 250, no. 7; Poppe 1955, 39; MSR, 120-121; HCHLYTT, 193, no. 55; and, especially, Serruys 1984.

'The ceremonial wine' (jöök): see above, n. 154. As ex-emplified in other incidents of this kind, all too frequent at Mongol feasts, the ceremonial on these formal occasions placed extreme importance on questions of status and precedence when serving wine and making formal toasts. See above, §§ 130, 154 and com. Cf. also Pelliot's remarks on the subject in NHMO, 133, n. 1.

'Refused to join the feast', lit. 'without feasting the feast.' The angry and scathing remarks of Bürü, Güyük and Harqasun call for comment. Bürü first raises the point that Batu is not superior in rank to them and should not have drunk first. Secondly, he emphasizes that Batu is actually inferior to them as a man, and is more like a woman, even though he has a beard, and carries a quiver (adds Güyük). Bürü goes on saying, contemptuously, that the way to treat such 'women' is to kick them and tread on them. Güyük goes even further in vitupera- tion and says that they should be whipped or hit with burning sticks - a form of punishment inflicted by the medieval Mongols on female criminals, implying thereby that Batu not only lacks manliness but is also evil. Harqasun joins Bürü and Güyük in their tirade and suggests that they should attach a tail to Batu - as a jibe - thus adding insult to injury. As we have already seen (§ 181), the tail of an animal, especially a heavy and cumbersome tail, was an object of ridicule. To attach a wooden tail to someone, either for fun or, more likely, for punishment, was clearly meant to mock and humiliate the person concerned. Cf. also Moestaert's remarks in CI, 216, n. 66; and ibid., 110, n. 51. Cf. above, n. 181. As for Güyük's suggestion, Ligeti has pointed out (Li, 188, n. 275) that this form of punishment is mentioned by William of Rubruck in his Itinerarium. See SF.

304; cf. MM, 200: 'and he (Mangu Chan - I.R.) ordered her (i.e. the woman who had murdered the girl - I.R.) to be eaten with burning brands.' I think that this is what is actually meant by jorqalda-, a verb glossed in the Chinese interlinear version as 'to beat with firewood' (cf. CF). Jorqalda- is undoubtedly jor-, the reciprocal form of jor-, a factitive of jor-, meaning in Written Mongolian 'to shave off, pare off, scratch, carve (wood).'

See Les., 1070b. In my opinion, the meaning 'to beat with a burning brand' is a secondary and derivative one from that of 'to scratch, carve.' The reciprocal form is used here for the co-operative, as is often the case in the SH. See Hanisch 1950, 20. For a better understanding of this passage I am greatly indebted to Street 1984, 142-143 (cf. also idem 1990, 189). My translation is, therefore, at variance with that of CI, 216; Oez', VI, 485; and other translators, but it agrees with the interlinear Chinese version.

Harqasun, who is mentioned here for the first time, was the son of Eljigeide (- Eljigeide) of §§ 229 and 278. On him, see below, n. 278. He was executed by order of Möngke in 1251. See HWC, 587 and n. 117; Successors, 204, 212. Cf. MPa, 201-202. On Eljigeide see below, n. 278.

'Of a different race', lit. 'having a different liver.' In Mongolian, the word 'liver' (pmo. helige; mo. elege) has various meanings, one of which is 'blood or close relative.' See Les., 396b; Gol., I, 86a; MGDJ, I, 166b. 'To be with (= to have) a different liver' (baga heligen) is 'to be unrelated' -- 'to belong to a different group (= cf. ethnie).'

For the expression bulga irgen 'rebellious people', see Cleaves 1949, 111, n. 89; 'Trois documents', 492; and above, n. 150.

'Asking ourselves whether we had been successful', lit. 'saying,' "Has it become right? correct?", i.e. being still in doubt as to the outcome of the operation that has just been completed. Cf. above, n. 167.

'Bürü and Güyük spoke to us in this way', lit. 'Having been so told by Bürü and Güyük.' Cf. Poppe 1964, 374. With regard
to § 275, Ligeri (Li, 188, n. 275), has rightly drawn attention to the fact that this section (§ 275), together with §§ 254 and 255 (and some other sections), is almost certainly a later interpolation designed to discredit Ögödei’s line of succession. According to Ligeri, the interpolation was introduced into the text of the SH when Ögödei’s line had already been removed from the succession, or when this was about to happen (Güyük died in 1248).

§ 276. ‘Following whose counsel (lit. “words”)’ renders the Mongolian ken-i uges-tür dölüs-gii. The verb dölüs-gi is not attested elsewhere. In § 177 there is a verb dölüse ‘to disperse’, used with reference to smoke and possibly related to mo. dölše ‘to crack, become disjointed’ (Les., 257b); however, it does not seem to be the same verb as dölüs-gi. The latter is glossed in the interlinear translation as chr’en-hung 43:69 (= p. 25). This is an old pai-hua expression literally meaning ‘to take advantage (and participate in) commotion (or bustle)’ and, by extension, ‘to join somebody else’s doings; to take advantage of and exploit a situation of confusion for one’s own purposes.’ Thus, uges-tür dölüs-gi would mean something like ‘to follow (or adopt) somebody else’s words for one’s own purposes.’ The idea of ‘following, imitating’ is paralleled in Ögödei’s words addressed to Harqasun further on. Cf. the sectional summary (V Sup. 2, 33a): ‘Listening to whose words ...’ (喀喇沁御帳).

‘Does ... fill his mouth with talk against a person to him?’, lit. ‘Does ... speak, the mouth full, against an elder brother or person?’ Here ‘elder brother’ (aqai = ‘senior, elder.’ CF. MA, 26th, where aqa (aqai) is glossed in Chaghatai as wohri ‘elder.’ For aqa gia, cf. the expression qan giia ‘a person who is a ruler’ in § 155. CF. Matteri I, 17 and n. 12; Matteri II, 27 (9r,1). Batu was Güyük’s first cousin and they must have been about the same age. However, Batu, as we have seen, was regarded as the senior one among all the princes, i.e. the grandsons of Chinggis Qan. See above, n. 270.

‘May he and he alone rot like an egg!’, lit. ‘May the single egg rot!’ Ögödei apparently means that Güyük alone among his sons should be rejected just as one casts away a bad egg. See Cl, 216, n. 69.

‘He has turned against the bosom’, lit. ‘he is rebelling to (or at) the breast.’

‘We shall place him in the vanguard (altinii).’ For altinii ‘scout, spy, vanguard’, cf. above, n. 37; Kahuzi, 131 (where, however, 279 is a misprint for 276).

‘Until the nails of his ten fingers are worn away... Until the nails of his five fingers are ground down.’ For this idiom, cf. § 53. For the words ‘... the town walls/Which are made of hard-pounded earth’, cf. § 249: ‘... towns with pounded-earth walls.’ (For the faulty reading ha’utala in place of ha’utala = ha’utala, see Mo, 8.)

‘You, wretched’ (či bêter) is a tentative translation. The word bêter, not glossed in the text, has not survived in the later literary language; however, in the Ordos dialect we find the expression bader batar k’un ‘personne à esprit borné, personne grossière, rustre, qui ne sait pas se tirer d’affaire’ (DO, 101b). According to TH, 149 (= JY, 260), in Qorqin and Qorqin bêter means ‘depressed, sorrowful, in tears.’ In Persian bádáar means ‘worse, more villainous.’ See PED, 162a. This word has passed also into modern Turkish (Osmanlı) as bêter id. See VWTD, IV, 1618; TEL, 339a.

‘In imitation of whom’, lit. ‘imitating whom’ (ken-i engelgiiyii). For this verb, cf. enggeisge ‘to imitate’ in the Preclassical Mongolian version of the Hisiao-ching. See de Rachewiltiz 1982, 34 (21a, 2). Cf. EMVHC, 87, 105, n. 155. (In view of the Hisiao-ching reading, the question mark in line 11503 on p. 166 of R should be deleted.)

‘Have you filled your mouth with such boastful talk ...?’, lit. ‘have you spoken big words, the mouth full ...? ’

‘You would then say that We showed partiality – a surprising statement in view of the offense that Harqasun had committed, which amounted to a crime of lese majeste on the
part of a commoner. Öğüdi obviously wants to appear over-careful and magnuminos vis-à-vis his subjects. Thus, Harqasun is to be banished to a far-away place and suffer hardship together with Güyük. Bürön, on the other hand, has to be sent for judgment to his grandfather Ça'ali, who appointed him in the first place and to whom he must answer for his behaviour in the field. In the end, Öğüdi's decision with regard to Güyük and Harqasun turns out to be wrong in terms of Çinggiside law (fayaq), as shown in § 277. See the important remarks by Motaert in Cl, 217, n. 76. On aqqağhlâda, lit. 'I was partial (or biased)', see Cleaves 1950, 129, n. 299.

As for Bürön', lit. 'If one says, "As for Bürön"'

§ 277. Continuation of the episode related in § 276.
Möngke = Möngge (§§ 270, 274) = Möngke, Tolui's son and future qa'an (r. 1251-59). The Alcidâi in question is the one mentioned in §§ 226, 227 and 234, and later in §§ 277, 278, viz. the younger brother (or cousin ?) of Iligli, a commander of a thousand of the Jalayîr tribe (see § 202, no. 5). He was executed in 1251. He is the Alcidâi (= Alcidâi) of the Chinese sources, and the Elcidâi (= El'diê) Noyan of the Persian sources. On him, see HWC, 580, 583; SL², I/1, 95; Successors, 66, 89, 211, 224, 264; NMP, II, p. 642; and above, nn. 226, 242. The name Qongqortai is mentioned twice in the present section in this form, and once as Qongqortaq in § 278, also in association with Alcidâi. We are no doubt dealing with one and the same person. Qongqortaq, then, is to be read Qongqortay, from which we have *Qongqortai 'Qongqortai (= Qongqortai). A Mongol chief by this name (Qongqortaq Noyan, read Qongqortaq Noyan) is mentioned by Juvaini and by Rashid al-Din, following Juvaini. See HWC, 557; Successors, 200. This independent authority confirms the correctness of the unusual form Qongqortaqi of our text. It is likely that the person mentioned by Juvaini is the same as that of the SH. Another Qongqortai, almost certainly unrelated to the above, is also mentioned in § 278 as a juat'ul, i.e. 'supervisor.' See below, n. 278. On these questions, see NHHO, 90-91, n. 2. Janggi is known from the Chinese and Persian sources. See HWC, 580-583, and n. 88. See also HCG, 278. Pelliot [P.P.-C.R.A.C.] writes: 'Janggi: cf. Geği [§] 202 et cf. T'ou Ki (= MWESC - I.R.) 153, 60a.' Cf. above, n. 202. Like Alcidâi, he was executed by order of Möngke after the latter's enthronement in 1251. As for Möngge - Möngge (-e-zuero), cf. SG, 298, § 159, 'Quelques problemes', 266-267 (1).

'Field matters' (ke' er'an iyile), lit. 'affaire(s) of the steppe.' On the use of the emphatic gi-gi in the decree (jarliq) of Çinggis Qan, see Street 1992, 624.

'Will the Q'an not show favour and send Güyük to Batu, entrusting him with the decision?', lit. 'If the Q'an shows favour ... and sends Güyük to Batu entrusting him with it, will it not do?', the words 'the Q'an is angry with Güyük' and 'This is a field matter' being in between as parenthetical matter. See Cl, 218. For the same type of rhetorical question, see § 260, where it is also a question of the 'Q'an' (here Çinggis Qan) being angry at his sons.

In the course of it' (ja'ura), i.e. during the campaign; however, ja'ura may also mean 'on the way, en route.' Either meaning can apply here, even though the interlinear gloss gives 'on the way' (§§ 200). Cf. HW, 87; Buck, 102-103, no. 45.

'You did not leave unflushed the buttocks', lit. 'His buttocks did not remain unflushed', i.e. could not escape being whipped. Cf. Cl, 218, n. 78.

'You crushed the spirit', lit. 'You broke the misn.' By 'mien' (dérw) is meant the proud spirit or air, i.e. the morale and self-confidence of the troops (as shown through one's countenance), as we have seen in previous sections (§§ 196, 208, 246). Here ot- (= mo. od-) 'to go' is an auxiliary verb of completed action. Cf. Mo, 156; and above, nn. 66, 80. Öğüdi reproaches Güyük for the harsh treatment of his own troops in the field which had led to demoralization and loss of confidence.
"Do you imagine (lit. "make out") ... of yours?" For this sentence, cf. Poppe 1964, 372; Street 1990, 177. For the Orousut (pl.) people, i.e. 'the Rus people', see above, n. 262.

"With pride in your heart", lit. 'holding a proud heart (or mind)."

"In the pronouncements" (jarlig-tur). Here jarlig does not mean 'decree, ordinance', but rather 'utterance, authoritative statement.' See Kow., 2306b.

The multitude of people make one afraid/The depth of water makes one die (i.e. by drowning)" is obviously a proverb stressing the power of numbers: a large number of people, i.e. of enemies, frightens one, just as the depth (= large amount) of water drowns one. Ögdée means that the people of Rus did not submit to the Mongols because they were overawed by Gýyük's angry and violent character, but because they were frightened by the size and might of the Mongol army.

"You pretend that you have accomplished it alone", lit. 'As if you had accomplished it alone.'

Bøjek, one of the army leaders in the campaign against Qip-çaq and Rus, was a younger son (the seventh or eighth) of Tolui and brother of Mörge and Qubilai. See Successors, 352a, Index, s.v. 'Bøjek.' Cf. also HWC, 735b, 1d. His name is variously transcribed in the Mongol, Chinese and Persian sources as Bøjek, Böhek, Böhek/Bøjek or Böhek/Bøjek. See HCC, 277-278, NHIOO, 153. On him, see also Chapitre CVII, 88-89 and n. 6, 100-103.

"You haven't yet acquired as booty (olu'ai jö'e?i) even the hoof of a kid.

For ol. - jö'e- (mo. jö'e-), see above, n. 212. For the expression 'not even the hoof of a kid', cf. § 195: 'not ... even the skin of a kid's hoof.' See above, n. 195. Both expressions are descriptive of a worthless thing.

"Having left home but once." Cf. § 739 n. 6.

For the indefinite expression ya'u ber, see Street 1981, 156-158. Here ya'u ber = 'whatever, no matter what', hence 'anything, everything.' Cf. above, n. 157.

'The Secret History' 1019

'Come out with such abusive and provocative language' is my tentative rendering of the Mongolian üge da'u ulisü irelj. For the 'mot-couple' üge da'u (= mo. dayin[e]), lit. 'words - sounds' = 'words' (in such compounds it is the first word that counts for the meaning), see Mo, 43. The verb ulisü is glossed as jo tai 聊驟 'to provoke and involve (someone in a quarrel)', so that the expression üge da'u ulisü would mean, literally, 'provoking words', i.e. 'uttering words that stir up or provoke (a quarrel). Cf. the sectional summary (Y² Sup. 2, 36b): 'You have left home for the first time and have already provoked a quarrel' ( 絕違則便甚是). Although the verb ulisü 'to provoke' has not survived in such, Written Mongolian and the modern languages and dialects have ali- 'to howl!' (Lex., 873a), which in Burut also means 'to swear, abuse' (IBRS, 468b). I think that the expression üge da'u ulisü, lit. 'to howl' (= swear) words and sounds (= words') may have meant something like 'to use abusive and provocative language, to heap abuse', an interpretation that agrees with both the interlinear gloss and the sectional summary. For a fuller discussion, see Ra, XII, 76-77.

'Have restrained ... Have calmed ... ', lit. 'Causing to restrain ... (Being subject to the calming ... (by Möngge, etc.).'

For this alliterative passage, see Poppe 1964, 374; Khomonov 1981, 60. For the word žinâq (= mo. žinâq) 'ladle', a borrowing from Turkic, see TMEN, no. 1125; Khomonov 1970, 31. Cf. RH, 279, no. 12.

For the words 'Right! This ... Harqasun', see Mo, 173, n. 156.

For an analysis of the 'legal' aspect of Ögdée's decision in the matter concerning Gýyük, Bürü and Harqasun, see Ratchevsky 1987, 89-90.

§ 278. This long section contains Ögdée's regulations concerning the organization and duties of the Guard (kėlēk). It is closely related to §§ 222-233; most of the regulations are, in fact, verbatim or almost verbatim repetitions of the ones enunciated in §§ 227, 228, 229 and 232, to which the reader is referred. As
noted by Ligeti (Li, 188, n. 278), these regulations substantially confirm those issued by Cinggis Qan, the main difference being in the appointment of the new commanders. In view of the substantial identity of the old and new ordinances, the Chinese sectional summary does not repeat them, but merely states that Ögedei Qa’an reproclaimed Cinggis’ regulations concerning the duties of the dayguards and of the officers in conformity with the previous ones. See Y’ Sup. 2, 46b. The entire section has been omitted in Wei, 178.

‘Which announces anew’ (tungguan du’ulagqa). For tunggu (= mo. tungige) ‘to renew, do again’, see Mo, 58.

‘Who have served’, lit. ‘who have gone with’ (yabuqsat). On yabu ‘to be in someone’s service, to serve’, cf. Cleaves 1950, 124, n. 205.

‘In whatever capacity’, lit. ‘however’. ‘In the same capacity’, lit. ‘in the same manner.’

‘In accordance with the previous order.’ See § 229 for the ordinance (quu) in question.


‘The nightguards shall seize anyone’, lit. ‘the nightguards shall seize the people.’

‘They shall split their heads open.’ See also § 229; cf. above, n. 255. For this passage, cf. Bese 1969, 123.

On the office of fasa’ul (mo. fasa’ul), a dev. noun from fasa- ‘to manage, be in charge’, see Vlad, 181; Successors, 312-313 and n. 207; and, especially, TMEN, no. 1863.

The Qongqortai mentioned here is undoubtedly a different person from the Qongqortai of § 277 and the Qongqortai mentioned further on in this section, these last two being one and the same person. See above, n. 277, and below. Siraxan does not seem to be mentioned elsewhere. It is impossible to say whether the Qongqortai of § 278 is also a contraction of the name Qongqortai (= Qongqortai); however, most scholars are of the opinion that it is not. Cf. Da’, 274; Fa’, 210; Oz’, VI, 714; Ir, 277; Çe, 264.

On the incident involving Elligidei (on whom see below), see § 229 ad fin., and above, n. 229. Cf. also Ligeti 1971, 147.

For the expression farilgin buqa ili buqqa- ‘not to contravene the order(s)’, cf. Cleaves 1953, 79, n. 10.

‘One must not walk beyond (lit. ‘on the upper side of’) the nightguards’ post (lit. ‘seat’).’ By ‘seat’ (sa’utin) is meant the whole area where the guards around the Palace (ordo) were stationed. Cf. the slightly differently phrased passage in § 229.

‘Who walk beyond or between them’, lit. ‘who walk beyond and who walk between the nightguards.’

‘Who shall have asked their number’, lit. ‘who shall have asked the number of the nightguards.’

‘No one is to sit above the place (lit. ‘seat’) of the nightguards.’ Cf. the slightly different passage in § 229. For the adverbs dege’an ‘on the upper side, above (= beyond)’, and jaq’ut ‘between’, see Ligeti 1971, 146-147. For qubasun ‘clothes’ = qubctan (§ 136), see above, n. 136.

‘The nightguards shall take care of the standards and drums, and of the spears, bows and vessels arranged beneath them.’ See the corresponding passage in § 232 and 233.

The nightguards shall supervise drink and food – the uncut (lit. ‘thick’) meat.’ Cf. § 232 and 233.

Regarding the movements of the nightguards during a military campaign and the shifting of the encampment at the time of the great hunts, cf. the corresponding passages in §§ 232 and 233. See also Cleaves 1955, 37, n. 26.

Qada’an, the new commander of the nightguards, was one of the commanders of a thousand listed in § 202 (no. 63). According to Na’, 279, followed by Li, 224; Mu, i, 225, n. 4; II, 382, n. 79; and Cx. 255a (Index), our Qada’an is the same person as the Qada’an Duldunjan mentioned in §§ 120, 124 and 174. However, this is unlikely, since the latter was a Tarqat (see § 120), whereas the former was, at least according to Ra’id al-Dīn (SL2, 1/2, 270), a Sōst. The name Qada’an (> Qadān) was fairly
common. See HCG, 475b, s.v. On the other hand, nothing further is known of Buqlaqa ( = Buqladār), except for a later mention (§ 279) in connection with the post-relay system under Ogūdēi. In the present passage his name is written Buqlaqadār. On his name see Poppe 1975, 163. Regarding the appointment of the new officers in charge of the nightguards' companies, cf. the terminology used in § 227, which deals with Cinggis Qan's appointment of commanders of the dayguards. For qasqaq 'separately', here rendered as 'respectively', see Ms. 146, 150; cf. also above, n. 174.

We lack information concerning Amlal and Canar. In § 176 an Onggirat chief called Amlal (= Emel) is mentioned, but this is beyond doubt only the second element of the name Terge Emel (cf. the Dergek Emel of § 141). See above, nn. 141 and 176. A Qadicī Gūrēgēn, son-in-law of Cinggis Qan, is also listed in § 202 (no. 84). Naš, 565 (following Ho Ch'i-t'ieh-fai 柯惕斯), identifies the Qadicī with Amlal. Pelliott thinks that this identification is probably correct, and that the Qadicī of the SH is actually the same person as the Qatai (Noyan) of the Qonggirat (= Onggirat) mentioned by Raśīd al-Dīn in connection with the Mongol campaign in north China in 1211-1212, and the Qatai (喀台) of the SWCCL, 64b (s.a. 1213). See SL, II, 168-169; Pelliott 1935, 924-925, n. 4. He may also be identified with the person named Qatai and Qatai Noyan, a cousin of Cinggis' wife Borte and, likewise, an Onggirat, who is mentioned in SL, I/1, 162, 163, and II/2, 271, among the commanders of a thousand of the left wing. For another Qatai, also an Onggirat, who may be considered, see Pelliott, op. cit., 925 and 930, n. 20. With regard to Qadiqī Gūrēgēn, see Murakami's remarks in Mu, II, 391, n. 91.

Qori Qāqār, Yalbaq and Qara 'udar do not seem to be known other than through this section of the SH. In the passage dealing with the last two commanders, the word baran 'right (= west) is missing, almost certainly through scribal inadvertence. For the name Qara 'udar, see Bese 1974, 92-93; Poppe 1975, 163.

'The secret history: They shall stand around the palace... and they shall lie down guarding the door.' This is an incorrect rephrasing of the corresponding regulation in § 229, which says that the nightguards lie down around the palace and stand guarding the door. It is interesting to note that the commanders of the nightguards' companies, eight in all (four on the right side and four on the left side of the ordo-Palace), are new appointments: Qada'an, Amlal, Qadah and Yalbaq on the right or western side, and Buqladār, Canar, Qori Qāqār and Qara 'udar on the left or eastern side. Li, 188, n. 278, has confused the sides. For the qwiwerbearers Yūsin Tō'c (= Yūsin Te'c), Būkidi (= Būgidei), Horqadaq and Labalqa (= Lablaq), and their duties as set by Cinggis Qan, see § 225. For the relevant passage in the present section, see above n. 225, where the same passage is discussed. Thus, the commanders of the four companies of qwiwerbearers are the same four commanders previously appointed by Cinggis and confirmed in office by Ogūdēi. For aqi (pl. of aqi) 'bodyguards', see Poppe 1967, 507-508, no. 1; Oz', VI, 523-524, n. 5. Cf. Street 1990a, 363 (D).

On the 'elders' (ūgūgūs), i.e. the senior officers in charge of the dayguards' companies, see § 227 and com.

Ažīdī (Elźidei, Elźidei) is the only member of the 'old guard' who retained command in Ogūdēi's reshuffle. On him see §§ 226-227, 277 and com. Qongqartaqī in the Qongqarta of § 277, mentioned there also in association with Ažīdī; see above, n. 277. (The 'Qongqartaqī' in L, 254, and Ra, XII, 37, is an error for 'Qongqartaqī'.) Temüder, Jegū and Mangqatuī are all new appointments. In Cinggis' reorganization of the Guard, Buqa, Alźidī, Dōdei Cebē and Dōqeqeq Cebē were appointed 'elders' (ūgūgūs) of the four two-thousand-man strong companies of dayguards, each with two thousand men. Now we have Ažīdī and Qongqartaqī jointly in charge of one company, Temüder and Jegū jointly in charge of one company, and Mangqatuī in charge of the reserve (gefgele'el, lit. 'the supporters' =
COMMENTARY

§ 279. This important section contains the regulations concerning taxes and the post-relay service.

“We shall not cause suffering to the nation that our father Čingis Qa’an established with so much toil.” For this sentence, cf. Cleave 1952, 94, n. 65, 100-101, n. 118.

“We shall make the people rejoice, causing them to rest (lit. “put down”)/Their feet upon the ground/Their hands upon the earth.” This is a popular Mongol saying describing a state of rest: both hands and feet on the ground, i.e. no motion, no work or toil. Cf. MCUD. I, 22, no. 908: Gar gazar, Xol xöösör, with identical meaning. Cf. also the various equivalents given in Cl, 223-224, n. 103; and in W5, 112, n. 10. To these we must add the passage in the ‘Holy Čingis Qayan’s Precepts to His Younger Brothers and Sons’, in which Ögödei uses the same figures of speech, thus ultimately echoing the words of the SH. See MX, 57, lines 6-7; Korvić 1923, 95. Cf. also Ceresndorn 1986, 76.

“Sitting now on the throne made ready by Our father the Qa’an’, i.e. by Čingis Qan. See § 271 and com. for this expression.

“For our soup” (šilén-e). On the term šilén, see above, n. 124, and the discussion in Smith 1970, 68. ‘Here the “soup” (as sustenance, support) of the Qa’an is meant, i.e. the contribution that each owner of a flock of sheep was under obligation to give to the emperor, hence its placing as the first item of taxation. This new levy of one sheep (a year) out of every flock (of one hundred sheep) must have been a lighter burden compared to previous exactions of which we have no record. Next comes the contribution – also one sheep out of a hundred – to the poor ‘belonging to the unit on which the owners of these sheep depend’ (Mostaert apud Cl, 224, n. 104).

“Poor and needy” (ße’n daša’ ur). For this expression, see Ligeti 1971, 145. On the early Mongol taxation system, see ESJD, 65ff.; Schurmann 1951; idem 1956; Smith 1970; MSKK, 116ff.; CEME, 56 and n. 44; and above, n. 151. The new tributes and levies imposed on the Mongols themselves in the
For the Col (lit. 'Desert') = the Gobi, see above, § 188 and com. Here the term is perhaps used in a more general sense ('the desert country'), as the word qajar following it seems to indicate. Some scholars have opted for the latter interpretation, which is however at variance with the interfering gloss. See Do', 416; Oz', VI, 530; Ev-Pop, 245.

Cana of the Urut'ut was last mentioned in § 234. On him, see § 226 and com. U'urut (w.f. Uyurut), i.e. 'the Uighur', was the son of Qutulq Buqa and grandson of Korguz (a George), the commander of Khorasan. He came from a Christian (Nestorian) Uighur family. See Successors, 26, 141, and 339b, s.v. 'Korguz.' For his name cf. also above, n. 198.

For people to live in this rather vast area (irgen-e aqiu-a suqa), lit. 'for people, rather widely.' For suq ('mo. suqud') 'a little, somewhat', cf. DO, 633b. The interpretation of this sentence is based on the paraphrase in the Chinese sectional summary (see Y Sup. 2, 51a; Pa, 158; Wei, 179; cf. Oz', VI, 530, and Oz', II, 235), but the text is not very clear and can be interpreted in other ways. See, for example, Li, 137 ('in order to give somewhat wider possibilities to the inhabitants').

For qudq (in mo. qudur.) 'well', see TMEN, no. 272; RH, 245, no. 3.

The second half of § 279 and part of § 280 are devoted to the Mongol post-relay service (jam), on which see the rather unsatisfactory work by P. Rugglesi on the subject (GEZ), a subject of extreme interest and importance, and far from being exhausted (Olbrich's work must be regarded merely as an introduction to it). For the relevant sections, see PCUM, 40-42, 60: 78. Cf. also Rugglesi, 32ff.; Ch'en Ka-hua, 蔡華 in YLS 1:2183, 1255ff; and YSH, 151-153. On the term jam (tu. yam) < ch. chan in 'post-relay station', see TMEN, no. 1812; HCLWYT, 20-26, no. 5.

For ha'ul. 'to ride in haste', see above, n. 54.

'Moving freely among the population' renders the Mongolian ulus birl'ûn, lit. 'making them roam about the
people', i.e. riding freely through populated areas. The abuses by the 'messengers' (elčin), i.e. by the couriers and envoys on official business to which the local population was constantly subjected under the Mongols was well known, and Ogödei's new regulations outlined in this section, issued immediately after his enthronement in 1229 (see SWCCU, 80a; YS² 2, 29; PCUM, 40), were in fact designed to check such abuses.

'The pace', lit. 'the going' (yabudal).

For the expression ogo'ata orolč'ul- 'to settle matters once and for all', see 'Trois documents', 476.

'By providing', lit. 'bringing forth.' jamučin and ula'adc in are the plurals of jamuči (= m. jamųči) and ula'adc (= m. ulayč[n], ulayč[n]) respectively. On the term jamuči 'person in charge of a post-relay station', see ibid., 438; TMEN, no. 1814; HWCYLT, 20-26, no. 5; Cleaves 1953, 83, n. 19, Lettres, 40. For ula'adc 'person in charge of post horses' (from ula'a 'post horse'; see above, n. 199), see TMEN, no. 617; 'Trois documents', 440-441; Ligen 1958, 222, n. 17; HWCYLT, 50-57, no. 13; Ting Kuo-fan 1976 in YSLT 1:1982, 179-199.

'At every stage', lit. 'at stopping-places and stopping-places' (sa'urits sa'urits). In § 280, the word sa'urits (pl. of sa'urits[n], m. sa'urits[n]) occurs in the form saœurits. Cf. the forms honti, qontit, qadat for hot, qontit, qadat (= qadat), etc. See above, nn. 118, 198, 264. Cf Poppe 1975, 167.

'Unless on urgent business', lit. 'without importance' (qadaqa [= prn. qadaqa] 'ager), i.e. without having important (a urgent) matters. For this expression, cf. KW, 158b.

If We do this, it will surely be an appropriate measure', lit. 'If, providing... will it not do?'

Bolgadjar is the same person called Buqadjar in § 278.

'Ve considered that they were indeed right', lit. 'We thought, saying to ourselves, "Are they not right?"' — a rhetorical question.

'These measures under discussion', lit. 'the acts which are spoken of.'

'You have asked me in your message', lit. 'you have sent asking.'

'Thus, act accordingly!', lit. 'And so do!' For this passage, cf. Street 1986, 8; V9, 90.

'I shall have post stations connecting with (lit. "facing") yours.' For the expression jamuč barildučul- (= prn. jamuč barildučul-) 'to connect post stations', see Lettres, 74.

Úgičči ire', lit. 'to come speaking', describes the action of the speaker, whether the action is carried out in person ('he came and spoke') or, as here, through someone else ('his message or word came').

§ 280. For the princes of the right hand (= west), the left hand (= east), and of the centre (gol), see above, § 269 and com.

'Have all together approved the following: "If...", lit. 'have all together (buri-yer) approved. At the moment when they approved, when they said, "if..."' For buri-yer (prn. buriyer, m. buriyer) 'all together', cf. Lettres, 76-77. Further on, I render buri-yer as more emphatically as 'unanimously.' Cf. Street 1986, 17 (28).

The Universal Ruler.' The text has dalai-yin qa'an, where qa'an is a later editorial change, the original text reading dalaiyin gaun, as in the legend of Gǔyẹk's seal. Dalai-yin gaun means 'ruler of all within the seas', i.e. 'ruler of the whole world' (= ger. Weltherrscher). For a critical discussion of this designation of the Mongol emperors, see de Rachewiltz 1983, 247ff. Cf. also CK, 82-83, n. 2; and M. Weiers in MS 3:1984-85, 683.

'It won't be a burden at all', lit. 'what is it?', i.e. nothing at all. 'Ce n’est rien du tout!' (A.M.J.) For the levy in question and the subsequent measures mentioned in this section, see above, § 279 and com. Cf. Ratchnevsky 1987, 68-69.

'One-year-old sheep' (jašaq). The term jašaq (= m. jašaq) in written Mongolian means 'between two and three years old (of female sheep, goat or deer)' (Les., 1080b). Cf. DO, 221a.
For the rare word *ilūte* (adv. 'advantage, convenience') den. noun suff. *-te* 'convenient', see de Rachewiltz 1982, 52, n. 4. Cf. Cleaves 1982, 78, n. 19. (It should be pointed out, however, that the reading *ilūteken* of the Hsiao-ching adopted by both authors should be amended, the correct reading almost certainly being *ilūteken* (pmn. *ilūtegen*). For the den. noun suff. *yan*-gen, cf. 'Trois documents', 452-453.)

Herders of milch mares were *also* assigned, lit. 'they made herders of milch mares sit over them.' Cf. ch. ts'o 〠 'to sit; to assign.'

'The distance between each stage', lit. 'the distance (qaftar, see § 4 and com.) of stage after stage.'

Aračan (阿蘭增): Pelliot has *Arajan* and *Aračan?* (Pe, 119 and n. 3); Haensch (Ha, 146): *Aratsen*; Olbricht (PCUM, 41 and n. 86): *Aračin*; Ligeti (Li, 138): *Araćan* (='Araćan'), but *Arajan* in the text edition (L', 258); Cleaves (Cl, 226): *Arazen*; Ozawa (Oe, VI, 543): *Aračan*; Onon (On [2001 ed.], 276), and Even and Pop (Ev-Pop, 312, n. 71): *Arajan*; etc. (see Ir, 284-285, n. 1). These differences are essentially due to a certain confusion arising from the value of the character 増 of the Chinese transcription. This character is ambivalent and can be read ch'i'en (< ts'e'an) and ch'ien (< ts'ian). Cf. Ba, III, *Chu-yin tsu-tien* (shi yun shu), 160. The original form of this name in the manuscript of the SH in Uighur-Mongol script was in all probability Aračan/Aračan – the letters c and j being identically written in such a position. The Ming transcribers, to whom this name did not mean anything, could not decide which way to read the final syllable: c'an or j'an. In my opinion, they chose for the purpose a Chinese character presenting the same ambiguity, viz. 註, which I believe occurs only in this instance in the SH. (It is not even included in the 'exhaustive' list in Hattori 1973.)

May, in fact, be used to render both Mongolian c'an and j'an in a back-vocalic word as is the case here, and c'en and j'en in a front-vocalic one (cf. the character yen 艮 = yan y'en). It is difficult to determine whether the original name was Aračan or Arajan, hence my reading Aračan is given with reservations; in any case, I would definitely exclude Aratsen, Aračin and Arasen from consideration. Some scholars have tried to identify Aračan or Arajan with the A-li-hsiun (阿理紛) of the HYC, A, 11a-b et passim. See TOA, 59, n. 2, 161a (Index); Mu, III, 371-372, n. 13. However, as pointed out by Pelliot in his review of Walesy's book, there is no real justification for it. See TP 28:1931, 419. A-li-hsiun is apparently the transcription of a Tangut name. As noted by Ligeti (Li, 189, n. 280), Aračan's colleague Toquchar is not the homonymous grandson of Ogođi, but the Toquchar of § 257, on whom see above, n. 257. The appointment of these two officials as functionaries in charge of the post-relay system under Ogođi, and the changes to the system introduced by the latter, must be placed s.a. 1234, as correctly surmised by Olbricht (PCUM, 40-41). It should be noted in this connection that the credit for the important measures designed to curb the abuses of government couriers is ascribed to Yeh-lü Ch'ü-t'u-ai, s.a. 1237, by Sung Tzu-chen: 〠 (1187-1267) in his inscrip[ional] shen-tao pai (神詔牌) for Yeh-lü. See KIPMX, 81. I have discussed these measures in de Rachewiltz 1960, 428-432, n. 271.

For the items listed in Ogođi's ordinance (goldings, sheep, milch mares, etc.), see Letter, 441; and Mo, 223, n. 209.

From the amount fixed', lit. 'from the limit measured' (kemlekšen kem-eč). For ši-yusun (= mo. sigšan) 'provisions', cf. above, n. 199. On this term, see TMEN, nos. 238, 239; and HCWLYTT, 293-298, n. 103.

The poetic passage presents serious difficulties of interpretation. I have followed the one proposed by Mostaert (Xo, 146-149, n. 144), except that I regard *orqat* = *ergit* 'top', and the gloss nāo hisuāng 脫延 as a mistake for nāo ting 脫延 'top of the head.' Both these suggestions I have adopted myself, ibid., 147, 147. 'A piece of string', lit. 'a short cord.' For bugi 'rope, cord', cf. Mo, 37. As for the puzzling word *orqat*,
Onon (On, 172, and n. 378; cf. the 2001 ed., 277 and n. 682), following TH, 127 (= JYT, 222), renders it as ‘right down the centre’ by splitting orpol into two distinct words: or ‘pit of the stomach; heart; and qol ‘central, centre.’ Cf. Oe’, VI, 543, 545. This, however, cannot be reconciled with the Chinese gloss whether one reads niao hsiaot or niao ting. For galbulqa (= mo. gallbusha, gallbura) ‘spoon’, see TMEN, no. 1393; RH, 279, no. 13. In his translation of this passage (Cl, 226-227), Cleaves follows Mostaert’s interpretation, while Lifiet (Li, 138) follows Haenisch’s (Ha, 146-147), which see Mo, 147-148. I think that Mostaert is correct in seeing in the two parallel Mongol sentences a figure of speech expressing the idea of halving the possessions of the offender, one half going to the government as penalty for the offence, the other half being retained by the offender himself. As pointed out by Mostaert, the sectional summary clearly states (V² Sup. 2, 54b) that the penalty was the confiscation, by the government, of half the culprit’s patrimony.

§ 281. Conclusion of the section on Ögödei with a sort of apology and self-criticism of the Qa’an which marks a pernicious interruption and has, therefore, a bearing also on the date of compilation of the SH. For this question, see below, n. 282. The term Japut has been discussed by Pelliot in NMP, 1, 228-229. Cf. Li, 189, n. 281; Oe’, VI, 545-554, n. 1; Nakamura & Matsuura 1993, 66-67; Ev-Pop, 312-313, n. 73. In spite of Pelliot’s explanation, and of other interpretations, its etymology remains doubtful; but it is most likely that, as Pelliot claims, this term is a borrowing from Kitan. There is not much doubt, however, as to its meaning. The Chinese gloss is Chin jen ‘in the Chin people’, i.e. the ‘Jurchen people’ of north China, or sensu lato ‘the people of Chin’, i.e. the inhabitants of the (fóssé) Chin kingdom, including the northern Chinese. Elsewhere in the SH, the Jurchen people of China and the Chin dynasty are called ‘the Kitan (people),’ and the Chin ruler ‘the Altan (Golden) Chin Qin of the Kitan people.’ See Cl, 230a-b, 247a (Index). We also find the name Jürcket, plural of Jürčen (§§ 247, 248, 253, 274). The term Kitat, plural of Kitat, could only apply to the people and region of north China formerly ruled by the Kitai/Liao and later by the Jurchen/Chin, and would therefore not apply, for instance, to the Tungar/Hsi Hsia. On the other hand, the term Japut (‘a plural of Jaqut),’ even though it is glossed Chin jen in the SH, was actually an inclusive one designating all the people and regions of north China. This is confirmed by Rash’d al-Din, who says (Succes- sors, 225): ‘The Jaqut (the Jaqut of the SH – I.R.) consist of (in the region of) Khita (i.e. the northern Chinese – I.R.), Tungar, Jurchi (= Jürčen – I.R.), and Solangga (i.e. the Koreans – I.R.), which regions are called Jaqut by the Mongols.’ ‘And I destroyed them,’ lit. ‘and I destroyed the Jaqut people.’

‘All necessities,’ lit. ‘needs and necessities’ (éreék forág). For Ögödei’s ordinance concerning the digging of wells in the Cöl, see above, § 279 and con. For the establishment of scouts (aldogün) and garrison troops (tammacin) in the conquered cities, see § 279.

‘Causing them to rest/Their feet upon the ground, etc.’: cf. § 279.

‘Being placed on the great throne by my father the Qa’an and being made to take upon myself (lit. ‘to carry on my back’): aleda otóla the burden of his many peoples.’ Cf. Tolu’s words to the sick Ögödei in § 272. For the expression aleda otóla (= mo. odaša), cf. H, 124, n. 281 (5), and Poppe 1964, 370 (where ‘218’ is a printing error for ‘281’). However, in view of the above-mentioned passage in § 272, I wonder whether otóla is not a mistake for odaša, even though the Chinese gloss does not support the amendment as it does in § 272.

‘By wine,’ lit. ‘by grape wine’ (bor dormosan-a). There is ample evidence that Ögödei was inordinately fond of wine, eventually dying of alcoholism at the age of fifty-five in 1241. For the Chinese sources, see KIPMX, 83, 121, n. 197, 124, n. 206, 193-194, 198. For the Persian sources, see HWC, 197-200,
actually delivered up to them. Tidings hereof spread from mouth to mouth and reached the ear of the Emperor. He appointed a group of emirs to go there and investigate the matter. When the truth of the report had been established, he gave orders that all girls over seven years old should be gathered together and that all who had been given that year to the khans taken back from them. Four thousand starlike maidens ... were thus assembled. ... And first he ordered those who were the daughters of emirs to be separated from the rest; and all who were present were commanded to have intercourse with them. And two moonlike damsels from amongst them expired. As for the remaining chaste ones, he had them drawn up in rows in front of the orda, and such as were worthy thereof were dispatched to the harem, while some were given to the keepers of the eunuchs and wild beasts and others to the various attendants at the Court, and others again were sent to the brothel and the hostel of the envoys to wait upon travellers. As for those that still remained it was decreed that all present, whether Mongols or Muslims, might carry them off. And their fathers, brothers, relatives, kinsmen and husbands looked on and were unable to breathe or move their tongues. And this is an absolute proof of his rigid enforcement of his orders and of the obedience of his army.’ In note 66 on p. 235 we read: ‘There is a blank in A and B. D has ‘the Orat’, which does not make sense in the context, though according to Rashid-ad-Din’s version of the anecdote (Blocchet, 44) the tribe in question were in fact the Orat.’ For Rashid’s version, see Successors, 93-94. There is no doubt, I think, that the YS entry refers to the same event related by Juvaini. The YS notice records also that the event took place among the tribes of the left wing, and we know that Temüge Ödzigin’s ulus was situated in the northeastern corner of Mongolia and was thus comprised in the left (= eastern) wing group of tribes. Naka is probably right in relating the events recorded in these sources; however, to connect this episode with the one in Yeh-lü Chi’u-t’ai’s biography (YS 146, 346) concerning an
order for the requisition of women for Ögödei’s harem is in, my opinion, unwarranted.

Regarding the third ‘fault’, we have no other evidence to go by. As noted by Ligei (Li, 189, n. 281), while Rašid al-Din mentions the military activity of Doqolqū, i.e. Doqolqū Čerbi of the Mangqut tribe (on whom see the SH, § 120 et passim), during the reign of Ögödei, there is no mention of his having been executed by order of Ögödei. See Successors, 36, 38, 167. Nevertheless, this seems to have been the case if we rely on the statement that he was ‘secretly harmed’, i.e. killed. There is no doubt that ‘harmed’ is synonymous with ‘killed’. See above, §§ 67 and 68, from which we learn that the surreptitious harm was caused by poison. Since the same expression is used in connection with Doqolqū, we may assume (but only assume) that the same method was employed to dispose of him. In the interlinear version, the verb ēksesē- is glossed ēyisulat- ëi hāi, lit. ‘to secretly harm’, and is rendered ‘to secretly harm because of a personal grudge’ (strongly considered) in the sectional summary (YŽ Sup. 2, 58a). In § 67 we find the noun kegesē, meaning ‘enmity, grievance’, in connection with the poisoning of Temūjin’s father Yūsīgēi by the Tatars. See above, nn. 67, 68. In § 67 we also find the verb ēyisulat- glossed an-hāi, lit. ‘to harbour secret thoughts (of hate, revenge).’ The same verb in the passive voice ēyisulaqda- occurs in § 68 glossed pei yin-hāi Ḳaža ‘to be secretly harmed.’ However, ēyisulaqda- presupposes ēyisula- not ēyisulat-. In § 245 we again find ēyisulat- glossed ‘to secretly harm’, and in the present section the form ēyisulat- occurs with the same meaning. The verbs ēyisula-, ēyisulat- (w.f. ēyisulatd.), ēyisilet- (w.f. ēyisiletēd.) are not found in our dictionaries (cf. Mo, 157), and kegesē- is registered only with the meaning of ‘to furnish with or make spokes’ (Les., 443a). Thus, in § 281 both ēksesē- and ēyisilet- are glossed yin-hāi, and must therefore be regarded as synonyms. However, in view of the fact that the text uses two different words with the same meaning, I have rendered ēksesē- (the ‘kesesē’- of 1.2, 259, is a printing error) with ‘to secretly injure’, and ēyisilet- with ‘to secretly harm.’ As stated in nn. 67 and 68 above, the latter verb is ultimately derived from āl ‘hate, revenge.’ Cf. mo. āl, ālar, ālā- ālyele- (Les., 645a), and SH ālar ‘to avenge’ (H28, 128, w.v. ārūga). In view of such combinations like ālā doqulā kisalā kisalā ‘taking revenge and requiring the wrong’ (§§ 58, 154) and ālā kiś ‘hatred and resentment’ in ošen kišten (§ 136), one may postulate a similar relationship between ēyisilet- and ēyisèle- with semantic roots in the concept of ‘hated, revenge’ from which the meaning of ‘to harm, injure’ has subsequently evolved. This problem requires further investigation.

‘And why was it a fault?’, lit. ‘if one says, ‘Why a fault?’’
‘Who strove (or fought) fiercely.’ Cf. above, n. 254.
‘My father the Qan.’ The later editor(s) who methodically went through the SH changing qan into qal ‘an missed this occurrence, almost certainly because it comes at the end of the work and close to another occurrence. See de Rachewiltz 1983, 276; and above, n. 255. Cf. Ratchnevsky 1965, 120, n. 149 ad fin.
On Ögödei’s ‘fault and mistake’ of having Doqolqū killed, see idem 1987, 102.

There is also no direct additional evidence concerning Ögödei’s fourth ‘fault’, i.e. the fencing in of his hunting grounds to prevent game from straying into his brothers’ territory. Here the wild animals are also referred to as ‘having a destiny ordained by Heaven and Earth’ – their destiny being, no doubt, to serve as quarry for the emperor’s battues. On the extended concept of the destiny (juyt-), present in the Western World and Earth, cf. above, n. 1. Cf. also Mo, xiv, for the present passage. Ögödei is made to say that he did that out of greed (paran). This is strange in view of the reputation he had, and which is so amply recorded, of generosity and liberality unequaled by any other Mongol ruler. On the other hand, we also know that the animals reserved for the great winter hunt were almost sacred, and that severe penalties were meted out to anyone breaking the rules. See, e.g., HWC, 27-28. Juvainī also mentions the construction by Ögödei of a wall of wood and clay between
north China and his winter quarters, with gates set into it 'so that much game might enter it from a great distance', and how Chaghatai (= Ca'adai) constructed similar hunting grounds in the valley of the Ilı. This piece of information may perhaps be related to the problem of boundaries and the issue concerning Ögödei's fourth 'fault.' See ibid., 29. For the words qurala yo'uroq nudi'i'lı, lit. 'making one building fences (qurala; no. qoraq, see Kow., 963b) and walls of pounded earth (yo'uroq, see above, n. 203)', cf. Cleaves 1949, 112, n. 95.

"Confirming them", lit. 'hindering (or blocking) them' (jet-su). "Resentful words" (cimili'lı uıge). See above, n. 260. On the location of Ögödei's winter quarters, see Boyle 1974, 148-150. On Ögödei's character, see HWC, 198, 201-236; Successors, 76-93; D'Ollashon, II, 87-99, and above, n. 255.

This section ends the short portion of the SH devoted to Ögödei. There is no mention of his death, but (as stated earlier) the description of his positive accomplishments and of his major 'faults' seems to be a posthumous assessment. The work thus comes to an abrupt and rather unsatisfactory conclusion. See Section Two of the Introduction.

§ 282. The short colophon of the SH is more problem-ridden than any other passage of this work, confirming the old saying that the tail is the most difficult part of the animal to skin. To which Great Assembly (yeke qulila) does the text refer? Which Year of the Rat? Does bičilı da'asba mean the end of the writing = composition, or the end of the writing = copying? And who did the writing? Does the indication of the locality in the text contain a lacuna? Indeed, more has been written on the colophon of the SH than on any other section of the work.

With regard to the year of 'writing' and the authorship of the SH, see Sections Two and Three of the Introduction. I have restated (and updated) there my earlier argument that the colophon applies to the main body of the work (§§ 1-268) – the remaining portion of the SH about Ögödei's reign (§§ 269-281) being a later addition – and that the Year of the Rat (qulagana jıl) must consequently be 1228. The Great Assembly was, in my view, that which eventually elected Ögödei in 1229, i.e. the one mentioned in § 269 of the SH when all the princes and military leaders "assembled in full force at Kødė'ı Aral of (= on) the Selçuk River." The 'month of the Roebuck' (qurun sara) is the seventh month (see Mo, 262, n. 252), thus the date of the colophon would correspond to 2-31 August 1228, exactly one year after Činggis' death. (For qurun sara and the Mongol calendar, see also Clark 1998, 46H; MSR, 177-179; for the names of the months in Middle Mongolian, cf. V. Rybatzki's study in the Add. & Corr.) The great or general assembly (yeke qulila) is the natural development of the earlier great council (yeke eye) mentioned in § 154. The assembly that elected Činggis Qan in 1206 was undoubtedly also a (yeke) qurila. For this fundamental institution, see MSK, 361-449; Endicott-West 1986; Fletcher 1986, 26; Haider 1994. The term qurila is a deverbal noun (in -iti/te) from quri- 'to gather, assemble.' See GWM, 47, § 163; MÜIT, 2687a-b, no. 260. It alternates with qurila (for qurilat = qurilat, cf. SG, 295-299, § 159). The same phenomenon is observed in the Turkic languages where this word is a borrowing from Mongolian. See TMEN, no. 305. The form in -i, current in the western Mongol empire, gained predominance in Persian and Turkic and is the one generally used in the West, whereas in the later Mongol literary language and dialects qurilat, as well as qurila, have disappeared, being replaced by qural (=' qura- 'to gather, assemble' = prn. quri-) + dev. noun suff. -ı; see GWM, 47, § 159). Cf. Oz'I, VI, 560-562, n. 1. In our passage I have used 'convened' instead of 'was assembled' to avoid a phonetic clash with 'Assembly.'

With regard to the place where the ordo ("Palaces"), i.e. the imperial encampment, was pitched in the seventh month of the Year of the Rat and where the work was completed, Naka (Na', 586) and Haenisch (Ha', 148), disregarding the fact that the name Dolo'an Boldsq is in the dative-locative case (Dolo'an Boldaq-
a), understood the passage as meaning that the place in question was situated between the two (goyar ju'ura) localities called Dolo'an Boldaq and Šilgineč. Kozin, for his part, rendered Dolo'an Boldaq-a correctly, but in order to retain the 'two' localities of which the text speaks, he split Šilgineč into 'Šil'gun' (a printing error for 'Šil'gin') and 'Ček' (Ko, 199). Mostaert (Mo, 258-261), in his brilliant analysis of the colophon, demonstrated the inaccuracy of both Haenisch's and Kozin's interpretations, and showed at the same time that there must be a lacuna in the text immediately after 'Šilgineč', the name of the second locality having dropped out in the course of transmission of the Chinese text. Ligeti did not accept Mostaert's argument and followed Haenisch's interpretation, claiming that the misunderstanding derives from the fact that 'boldag (boldaqa) is a simple scribal error for 'boldak' (= beldag), since in Uighur script it is a common mistake for a scribe to add or leave out a 'tooth', i.e. the little horizontal stroke representing the letters a, e, u, etc. See Ls, 189, n. 282. In the present instance, however, it is not a question of an additional 'tooth' turning beldag into boldaqa. As pointed out by Mostaert, the Ming translators noted the dative-locative suffix -a, which they duly rendered with tsoing tsi; the word in Uighur-Mongol script must, therefore, have been written as boldaqa, i.e. with the final -a separated from the body of the word, and not as boldaqa. Moreover, they were familiar with the word boldaq (= bolo boldag), which they regularly glossed ko-shan (Eli): 'solitary (= isolated) hill' in the interlinear version, as they had already done before (see, for instance, de Hiest Secr. s 61 à une faute du scribe qui avait copié le ms. qu'utilisèrent plus tard les transcrivants des Ming, et que ces mêmes transcrivants, non seulement n'auraient pas remarqué la faute, mais auraient encore pris cette forme fautive pour un locatif'). Haenisch's interpretation has been followed (among others) by Dandinsüren, Murakami, Yao and Jächid, and, more recently, Doronatib, Eldengtci and Ardajar, Mansang, Gadaamba, and CereenNomdun. Ke, as well as Taube, Even and Pop, Street, and I have followed Mostaert's interpretation. Orawa at first adopted also the latter with reservations (Oz, VI, 560, 563-564, n. 3), but subsequently modified it following an earlier (1994) interpretation by the Inner Mongolian scholar Bürbinubu who sees in the word 'Šilgineč' two place-names (as Kozin did), being Šilgin' and 'Čekčeg' (Oz, II, 239-240, 254-255, n. 2). In similar fashion, Onon, after adopting Mostaert's interpretation (On, 173), revised it in his later version (2001 ed., 278), where he rendered the words Šilgineč goyar ju'ura as 'between two [places called] Šilgineč', in note 688 on the same page, Onon writes: 'Šilgineč, here used (by way of exception) as a place-name, meant a high, narrow hill. For the explanation "between two Šilginečs", see the article by Bürbinubu in the Academic Journal of the University of Inner Mongolia, no. 4 (1994), pp. 66-70.' (For the meaning of Šilgineč see below.)

The writing of the SH was then completed and, presumably, also carried out at Dolo'an Boldaq, which is the same locality mentioned in § 136 in the plural form Dolo'an Boldaqtut ('Seven Solitary Hills'), at Köde'e Aral (the Köde'i Aral of § 136 and Ködéu Aral of § 269) or 'Barren Island' — one of the great historic sites of Mongolia. Köde'e Aral and the seven hills which have given the same to the place have been positively identified; see above n 136. Mostaert (op. cit., 260) regards Šilgineč as a Mongolian compound name Šilgin-čeg meaning 'la colline où il croît de la rue des montagnes', i.e. 'Mountain Rue Hill.' This is an ingenious interpretation indirectly supported by the name Tülkin čeq-tut = Tülkin Ćeq-tut, plural of *Tülkin Ćeq, which appears in § 190. However, in the MA, 407a, we find the Turki: word silkinec meaning 'neck amulet', and this may well be the same word written šilgineč in the SH.
Other interpretations are possible (for instance on the basis of Kalmück), but whatever the meaning of this word, it would appear from the context that Šilginček or Šilgin Ček was the name of one of the seven hills, and that the lacuna in the text contained the name of another locality in the same area: it was between these two places that the ordos were established at the time. Having personally inspected this area in August 1997, I am no longer of the opinion that the missing name must be that of another of the seven hills, as I somewhat rashly stated in Ra, XII, 92, n. 282. The situation of these hills is, in fact, such as to preclude the possibility of establishing a large enclosure ‘between’ them. See the map in Dandinsuren 1974, 107; and my report in de Rachewiltz 1998, 251-254. Starting from the (wrong) premise that the ordos were between Dolo’an Boldaq and Šilginček, Perleé, and J. Schubert after him, situated the latter place in the present-day Zamgaltai Nuur, in the plain behind, i.e. north of, the seven hills, bordering on the Avargyn Gol. See Perleé, 7 (= Perleé, 92); RBC, 110; and Schubert 1966, 55-56. But why would the author of the colophon, who, like most of his contemporaries was undoubtedly well acquainted with this area, feel the need to specify more in detail where the camp was established when Dolo’an Boldaq would have been sufficient, given the reference to Kōde’e Ariöl? As I wrote in my report (p. 253), the only reason I can give for this additional localization is that Kōde’e Ariöl comprised a much larger area than generally supposed, and that its present limits must be pushed much further to the west and to the north, thus encompassing the entire steppe plain (kōde’e) between the Bayan Uul, the Xerön (Kerulen) and Chenxer (Senggilir) rivers. See above, n. 136. It is only when placed in this much broader geographical context that the author of the colophon would have felt the need to be more specific as to the exact spot where the ordos were at that particular time during the long assembly. As we know, it was the custom of the qans and their entourage to move camp frequently because of pasture requirements. In August of that year, i.e. at the height of summer, the encampment had been pitched somewhere between Šilginček and another locality, probably somewhere further east. This was the conclusion I reached in 1998. I would only add that, in my present view, the ordos set up in 1228-1229 at Kōde’e Ariöl were almost certainly east of Šilginček, i.e. of Dolo’an Boldaq, and that the localization proposed by Perleé could still be valid if pushed somewhat further to the south, i.e. to the area between the seven hills and the Avargyn Gol.

As to the question of whether the last two words of the colophon (bicīlī da’usba) mean that the text of the SH was ‘written’ or ‘copied’, Waley’s objection (in Waley 1960, 529) that the Chinese sectional summary (Y2 Sup. 2, 58b) by using the verb kseik 譴 indicates that the text was not composed, but merely ‘copied’ in the year of the Rat, does not stand. The verb kseik was used by the Ming translators simply to render Mongolian bicī- ‘to write’; the question of original composition or copying of the text does not come into the picture at all, as this was, in any case, something that the translators would certainly not have been able to judge. Cf. Li, 190, n. 282. I agree with Mostaert (op. cit., 263-264) that in the present context bicī-can only mean ‘to compose’. On the other hand, since we do not know whether this was the work of a single author or of several, I now think that it is better to make the verb impersonal in English – as it is in the original and in the sectional summary – rather than translate bicīlī da’usba ‘[Nous avons achevé d’écrire]’, as Mostaert does.

A radically different interpretation of the colophon has been put forward by S. Bira who translates it as follows: ‘Having finished the record as a result of (by reason of) the convocation of the Grand Assembly, in the month of the Doe [the seventh month] of the Mouse Year, upon location of the court at Dolo’an-Boldaq at Kōdege Island in the Kerulen River, namely between (there) and Šilginček.’ (MIFW, 20) Bira is thus of the opinion that the yeke qurila was directly involved in the compilation of the SH; indeed, it was convened for the express purpose of recording for posterity the history of the ‘Golden
Clan (altaan uruu), i.e. the qan's lineage, by the actual representatives of the clan headed by the qan himself, with the participation of the surviving companions of Chinggis Qan and aided by court records, story-tellers and oral tradition. See ibid., 20-21; cf. Miš, 41-42.

There are, in my view, two major objections to Bira's interpretation: 1) while a great assembly may have been convoked for such a purpose in later times (see Haider 1994), it is most unlikely that it would have been held in the first half of the 13th century, whether in 1228 or 1240. In this early period, a yeke qurilte was convoked only to deliberate on the most important state affairs, like the election of a new qan, the succession issue, military campaigns and family/clan disputes, as the Persian and Chinese sources inform us (the reading of the jasaq and of Chinggis' pronouncements in the course of the qurilte was done within the context of these deliberations); 2) Bira's rendering of the colophon is at variance with the abridged translation provided by the Ming translators, who were well acquainted with the language of the SH. The Chinese version clearly says, 'The writing of this Book was completed when the Great Assembly was convened, in the seventh month of the Year of the Rat, at the time when (the Palaces) were established in the region of Kode's Kolur River' (Y Sup. 2, 58b; cf. Mo, 263). I see no reason to question the correctness of this interpretation.

APPENDIX ONE
CHINGGIS QAN'S CAMPAIGNS IN MONGOLIA, SIBERIA AND CENTRAL ASIA 1204-1219

A chronological summary of events

The chronology of Chinggis Qan's campaigns is still a subject of controversy among historians of the Mongol period because of the often conflicting reports found in the SH, the accounts of the Persian authors (Juvaini and Rashid al-Din in particular) and the Chinese sources, notably the YS. For Chinggis' early military exploits, the most important contribution is undoubtedly that of P. Pelliot in HCG, his data are incorporated in G (1973). Unfortunately, Pelliot's meticulous investigation, left unfinished by his premature death, ends with section XXI (out of 80 sections) of the SWCCL, corresponding to AD 1202. For the subsequent campaigns within and beyond Mongolia, one can make profitable use of Martin (1950), G (1973), TDML (4th ed., 1977), CC (1983), and the specialized articles by Th. T. Allsen (Allsen 1983 and Allsen 1987/91) and P.D. Buell (1992) and his contribution in ISK, 14-18 (1993).

The most contentious dates concern the events following the Mongols' campaigns against the Naiman and the Merkits, and the flight of Tayan Qan's son Guchiluk Qan and of Toqto'a Beki's sons with the remnants of their forces to Central Asia, prompting the expeditions led by Jebe and Sibet etc.; the 'first' encounter of the Mongol expeditionary forces with those of the Sild Muhammad of Khwarazm; the movements of the Mongol army in central and northern Asia, and the submission of the so-called 'People of the Forest' (rano, hojurg irgen), also in relation to the final campaign against Guchiluk and the expedition against Khwarazm, i.e. the 'Western Campaign' (ch. hsi-cheng [西征]), after the so-called 'Otrar Incident' of 1218.
The chronology of events as presented below is based on an interpretation of the data found chiefly in the SH, HWC, SL, SWCC1, the Basic Annals (pen-chi 基紀) of T'ai-tsu 太祖, i.e. Chinggis Qan, in YS1, 1-28, the two biographies of Sühe'te'i in YS1 121, 2975-2978 and 122, 3008-3009, and the short notice on him in Wang Yün's 王孕's inscription for Sühe'te'i's son Uryingquqai (1201-72) in CCWC 50, 2a-3a. It will be noticed that my chronology broadly agrees with the dates accepted by Barthold, Ratchevsky and Allsen, but is at variance with the 'shorter' chronology proposed by Duell. I shall discuss the discrepancies in detail in a forthcoming article.

The first date, the Year of the Rat 1204, is the undisputed date for the defeat and death of the Naiman leader Tayan Qan, and for Chinggis Qan's victory over Toqto'a Beki of the Merkit. The events that follow are dominated by the pursuit and final destruction of the Naiman and Merkit remnants whose principal leaders were Buyuiruq Qan and Guçülük Qan (of the Naiman), and after Toqto'a Beki's death in 1208, his sons Qudu, Çila'un and Qal.

1204 (Rat) Summer: Defeat of Tayan Qan of the Naiman at Naq Cliff. Death of Tayan and flight of his son Guçülük to Tayan's brother Buyuiruq Qan in western Mongolia (Kobdo-Altaï region).

Autumn/Winter: Defeat of Toqto'a Beki of the Merkit at the Qaradal Source. He and his sons Qudu, Çila'un and Qal also flee to Buyuiruq Qan. Surrender of Dayir Usun of the U'a Merkit. His subsequent rebellion with a sizable Merkit force in the area of the Qarun Gorge on the Selenga River (north of Kyakhta). Expedition of Boroqul Noyan, Çila'un Ba'atur and Cimbai to the Selenga to quell the rebellion.

1204/1205 (Rat/Ox) Defeat of Dayir Usun at the Taqilq stronghold.

1205 (Ox) Chinggis' first limited campaign against Hsi Hsia, with destruction of fortresses and pillage, the motivation being mainly the acquisition of booty (camels, cattle).
Sinkiang). Barluq has the envoys killed, then drives off Qudu and his Merkit, defeating them at the Cham/Chen River (the exact name and identification of this river have not been established; it could be the present-day Ch'ang-chi Ho, the Manas Ho, or one of the rivers disappearing into the southern fringes of the Dzungarian desert north of Jimsar). Autumn: After having informed him of the battle, Barluq offers his submission to Çinggis Qan. Qudu moves to Qara Kitai where he joins Gü cuda and lends him support in his rise to power. Çinggis leads the first major expedition against Hsi Hsia.

1210 (Horse) The Hsi Hsia ruler (Li An-ch'üan 李安遠) asks for peace. Çinggis returns to Mongolia and begins preparations for the war against "the Kitai people," i.e. the Jurchen Chin.

1211 (Sheep) Spring: Expedition of Qubilai Noyan against the Qaraïuq (in the area of Qayaqiu, i.e. modern Taldy-Kurgan in SE Kazakhstan). Voluntary submission of their ruler Arslan Qan. The Mongols extend their control as far as the Ili. Gü cuda deposes the Qara Kitai ruler (Chih-ju-kü 曹著古) and assumes the title of gür qan himself. Qudu moves from Qara Kitai to the Qangli-Qipčaq territory (Upper Chu and Sary Su rivers). Visit of the Uighur ïldai õqo to Çinggis' ordo on the Kerulen. His adoption as Çinggis' "fifth son." Çinggis Qan invades Chin with Jebe and Sübe'etcëi, and with Muqali as commander of the left wing; and with Jochi, Ça'ada and Ögedei in charge of the right wing.

1211-1215 (Sheep-Fig) Campaign against Chin in north China. The capital Chung-tu (Peking) is captured at the end of May 1215 after a ten-month siege. The city is sacked and burned. Çinggis returns to his ordo on the Kerulen leaving his generals to continue the southern offensive. The reason for his departure is the planning of the final campaigns against Qudu and Gü cuda and their supporters in Central Asia.

The Secret History

Hostilities between Muhammad of Khwarazm and Gü cuda for the control of the former Qara Kitai territory.

1216 (Rat) Expedition of Jochi to ask Sultan Sübe'etcëi (especially equipped with "iron carts") against Qudu and his Merkit. Jebe is sent to attack Gü cuda. Expedition of Muhammad against the Qipčaq.

1216/1217 (Rat/Ox) Defeat of Qudu, first on the Chu River and, finally, at Yü-yü (玉勒 = YÜ YÜ) in Qipčaq country. Collision of the Khwarazmian troops with the Mongols, apparently in the area between the rivers Qali and Qalmich (? Ergiz and Turghat). Yeh-li Hsich-chü's rescue of Jochi and the "first use of the Mongols must also be referred to this occasion. The Mongols withdraw without fighting. Embassy from Muhammed to Çinggis.

1217 (Ox) Revolt of the Qori Tumat, another People of the Forest of the Angara-Yeneset region, and their capture of Qi Regi Noyan and Qutuqa Beki. Expedition of Boroqi and Döbere against the Qori Tumat. Death of Boroqi. Muqali is made gui ong (= kuo-wung 觀同) by Çinggis Qan and is appointed commander-in-chief of the operations in north China. Further exchanges (envoys, trading caravans) between Çinggis Qan and Muhammed. Çinggis offers a peace treaty to Muhammed, placing him however on a level with his "son" (i.e. implying that Muhammad should be regarded as Çinggis' vassal). Muhammed agrees to the peace treaty, but is resentful and feels threatened by the Mongols' "expansion" in Central Asia.

1218 (Tiger) the "Otrar Incident" (see SH § 254): one hundred merchants and their leader bearing official credentials as Çinggis Qan's envoys are arrested and killed by Janšiq, the governor of the frontier town of Otrar (= Ýtrār, the former Frāhr on the Syr Darya near present-day Kok-Saraj), apparently with Muhammed's connivance. Expedition of Jebe
against Güülük in the Chu-i-li region. Barçuq lends military support to the Mongols. Güülük flees south, is eventually hunted down, and killed by Ismail, the former Qara Kitai governor of Kastan and ally of the Mongols, at Sari Qui in the Pamirs, near the border of India.

The Kirghiz of the Yenići refuse to assist the Mongols against the Qori Tumut. General revolt of the People of the Forest against the Mongols.

1218/1219 (Tiger/Hare) Çingis sends envoys to Muhammad to protest and demand the surrender of Inalqiq. Muhammad has the envoys killed. This act of defiance makes Çingis' punitive expedition unavoidable.

Joći's campaign against the rebellious People of the Forest. Joći crosses the frozen Selenga and Yenisei rivers. Mubâlî's brother Bura acts as vanguard.

1219 (Hare) Spring: The Kirghiz, Qori Tumut and other People of the Forest are brought into submission.

In May, Çingis Qan leaves his army on the Karulen and sets out on his Western Campaign against Muhammad of Khwârezm. Jabe and Sübe'teqi (who are still in the field after the destruction of Güülük) lead the vanguard.

Summer: After a brief halt on the Edor River, Çingis crosses the Altai and spends the height of summer on the banks of the Irysh. He then moves towards Otrar by way of Qâylq; in that plain he is joined by the Uighur and Qarluq leaders with their forces, the joint army consisting of 150,000 men.

In September/October the Mongols and their allies reach Otrar, where Çingis divides his forces prior to laying siege to the town. The invasion of Khwârezm has begun.

---

APPENDIX TWO
SECRET HISTORY PASSAGES IN THE ALTAN TOBČI (1990: AT')

Finding List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SH</th>
<th>AT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5b-6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6b-7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>7b-8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>8a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>9a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9b-10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>10a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>10b-11a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>11a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX THREE

ALTAN TOJamaha passages cited in C. DAMDINSUREN’S
MONGOLIN NUUC TOVCOO (1976: Da2)

Finding List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SH</th>
<th>Da2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 56</td>
<td>p. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 60</td>
<td>p. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 69</td>
<td>pp. 35-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 74</td>
<td>p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 86</td>
<td>p. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 91</td>
<td>p. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 92</td>
<td>p. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 94</td>
<td>p. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 100</td>
<td>p. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 103</td>
<td>p. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 118</td>
<td>p. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 132</td>
<td>p. 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 139</td>
<td>p. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 141</td>
<td>p. 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 149</td>
<td>pp. 89-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 176</td>
<td>p. 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 208</td>
<td>p. 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 235</td>
<td>pp. 194-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 238</td>
<td>p. 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 245</td>
<td>p. 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 268</td>
<td>pp. 227-229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX FOUR

A. MOSTAERT: SUR QUELQUES PASSAGES DE L'HISTOIRE SECRÈTE DES MONGOLS (1953: Mo)

#### A Paragraph-Page Reference List

(The + sign following the page number indicates that there is more than one reference on that page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SH</th>
<th>Mo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 1</td>
<td>p. xii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2</td>
<td>p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 3</td>
<td>p. xvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 5</td>
<td>pp. 228, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 6</td>
<td>p. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 7</td>
<td>p. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 8</td>
<td>p. 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 9</td>
<td>p. 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 10</td>
<td>pp. 49, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 11</td>
<td>p. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 12</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 13</td>
<td>p. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 14</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 15</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 16</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 17</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 18</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 19</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 20</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 21</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 22</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 23</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 24</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 25</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 26</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 27</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 28</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 29</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 30</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 31</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 32</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 33</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 34</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 35</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 36</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 37</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 38</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 39</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 40</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 41</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 42</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 43</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 44</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 45</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 46</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 47</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 48</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 49</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 50</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 52</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 53</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 54</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 55</td>
<td>p. 71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### THE SECRET HISTORY

| § 103 | pp. 27, 35, 147 |
| § 104 | pp. 40, 51, 84, 87, 110, 151, 152 |
| § 105 | pp. 43, 260 |
| § 106 | pp. 46, 48, 123, 176, 173 |
| § 111 | pp. 39, 50, 62, 91, 167, 183, 225 |
| § 112 | p. 62 |
| § 117 | p. 53 |
| § 118 | p. 80 |
| § 119 | p. 240 |
| § 121 | pp. xvi, 11, 57+ |
| § 122 | p. 134 |
| § 124 | pp. 109, 134 |
| § 125 | p. 178 |
| § 127 | p. 98 |
| § 129 | p. 103 |
| § 130 | p. 39 |
| § 131 | p. 71 |
| § 132 | p. 231 |
| § 136 | pp. 177, 178, 258, 263 |
| § 137 | pp. 8, 182 |
| § 141 | p. 94 |
| § 142 | p. 80 |
| § 145 | p. 26, 61 |
| § 146 | p. 63 |
| § 147 | pp. 52, 65 |
| § 149 | pp. 64, 67, 114, 236, 242 |
| § 152 | p. 116 |
| § 154 | p. 68 |

---

| § 155 | pp. xvi, 70, 73, 90, 236 |
| § 156 | p. 169 |
| § 157 | p. 19 |
| § 158 | p. 231 |
| § 164 | pp. 97, 171, 210 |
| § 166 | p. 23 |
| § 167 | p. 74 |
| § 168 | p. 121 |
| § 169 | pp. 79, 169 |
| § 170 | pp. 82, 89, 90, 104, 108 |
| § 172 | pp. 96, 120 |
| § 173 | p. 90 |
| § 174 | pp. 52, 62, 90, 146, 150 |
| § 175 | p. 41 (pro § 204) |
| § 176 | pp. 92, 94, 182, 194 |
| § 177 | pp. 19, 25, 58, 95, 98, 100, 171, 213, 210 |
| § 178 | pp. 90, 101, 238 |
| § 179 | pp. 101, 168 |
| § 181 | p. 174 |
| § 183 | pp. 30, 41, 90, 176, 178 |
| § 184 | pp. 87, 103 |
| § 185 | p. 87 |
| § 188 | pp. 104, 133, 177, 178+, 197 |
| § 189 | pp. 43, 109, 151, 167, 230, 238 |
| § 190 | pp. 111, 260 |
| § 191 | pp. 139, 253, 254 |
| § 192 | pp. 77, 139+, 248 |
| § 194 | pp. 113, 115, 194 |
| § 195 | pp. 11+, 102, 111, 117, 121, 147, 194 |
APPENDIX FIVE

F.W. CLEAVES, tr.: THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS
(1962: Cl)

Additions and Corrections
(The lines are those of the Translation. f.b. = from bottom)

p. xxv 1. 10 for “Ta-tan” read “Ta-ta”
p. xlvii the last line of this page should be the last line of the text
p. 3 l. 4 read uncle Dobun Mergen
p. 10 ll. 10, 16 read Çağin
p. 18 l. 6 read they had formerly been
p. 26 l. 15 read he lay on his back
p. 26 l. 16 for canique read buya’s
p. 28 n. 35 for note 13 read note 14
p. 28 n. 35 delete 88
p. 30 n. 42 for 13 read 14
p. 3 5 last line read three days and three nights
p. 32 l. 4 read [36v]
p. 35 l. 22 for within, read within
p. 37 l. 9 read [Mount] Burqan Qaldün.
p. 42 n. 14 for 13 read 14
p. 52 a note similar to n. 47 should be inserted with regard to Jelme and Ça’quiran and Sibe’eti
Ballatar, these last two being the cousins, not the brothers, of Jelme
p. 55 l. 18 read Daçolu Çerbi
p. 57 l. 2 read geldings.”
p. 57 l. 10 read [boshuat].”
p. 71 l. 29 read Mine eyes
p. 73 l. 14 f.b. for buya’s read jariyl
p. 79 ll. 8-9 the ten thousand Tübegen and the many Dongqayid (in §§ 176 and 177 the same people

are called Tümen Tübegen and Oton
Dongqayid, as in fact stated in n. 13, but then why the different designations?)

for Cahan read Çaqan
for Eter read Eder
read Who will govern all [my] people?
read the crafty wild beasts,
read [44r] At
read [12r] Having
read is [here] with
read bad daughters in law [21v] to
read saying.
read [35r] When
read [35v] When
for Sügegi read Sügegi
for Çaqurqan read Çaqurqan
ll. 7-8, 10 the Tümen Tübe’en the many Dongqayid (see above, p. 79)
read spake: “The head
read [10r] break
read for Arqui Qasar,
read Qubli [34v]
read “Nay,” why
read [47v] Peradventure
read mother [48r] did
for 197 read 199
read Sarda’ul
read Subtei
read Now
read speak Read
read [67v & 68 for 13 read 14
read decide [what they might be].”
read There were two thousand nightguards
with quiverbearers
read [into
read [is the subject of “telling”]
p. 248b s.v. Menggetü Kiyan add; v. Menggetü Kiyan,
Müşgetü Kiyan
p. 250a s.v. Menggetü Kiyan-u ko’ u add; v. Menggetü
Kiyan, Münggetü Kiyan
p. 250b s.v. Münggetü Kiyan add; v. Menggetü Kiyan,
Müşgetü Kiyan
p. 252a transfer the enquirer Odagin Abaya and Odagin
Noyan after Odagin-nu uruy
p. 253b l. 15 for Talqul read Talqun
p. 253b l. 28 after 144 add , 239
p. 253b l. 34 for Ögelan read Ögelen
p. 253b l. 36–37 delete entry on Ögelan Čerbi
p. 254a l. 8 for Ögelan read Ögelen
p. 254a insert entry Ögelen Čerbi 120
p. 254a insert entry Onqgök 239
p. 255a s.v. Qada’an (of the Taryud) 202, 278 (2);
Qada’an Daldurqan (the Qada’an of §§ 202 and
278 may not be a Taryud to be identified with
Qada’an Daldurqan)

p. 255a insert entry Qalqa-yin Buyur Na‘ ur-tur 176
p. 256b l. 9 delete entry Qara Kedad 152 ...

p. 257a l. 17 insert 124,

p. 259b s.v. Qutaqul Na‘u add , 220
p. 267b l. 2 f.b. add , 264
p. 269a last line read Uruangajın
p. 270a l. 4 before 210 insert 120,

p. 270b l. 12 f.b. for 183 read 269

p. 270b l. 11 f.b. for 269 read 183

p. 274a insert an explanatory entry on the word Jarbiyal
in § 146

p. 274b s.v. naqd italicize *naq, n(s)x
p. 276b l. 3 f.b. add 189
p. 277a l. 6 add 189
I. DE RACHEWILTZ: INDEX TO THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS (1972 R)

Additions and Corrections

For baw vál-read bawal-throughout. See, however, below, N.B.
For ílæ-read ílæ-throughout
p. 3 l. 1.6 for brackets, read brackets.

p. 9 after note 19 insert note 19a to read as follows:

p. 13 l. 502 for bóte-cinó read bóte cinó
for qo’ai-maral read qo’a maral
for sőyű-’er read sőyű’er
p. 16 l. 726 for for qonog read qonog
p. 18 l. 825 for qonog read qonog
p. 19 l. 910 for bodonar read bodonar
p. 20 l. 932 for jewûredei read jewûredei
l. 933 for jewûredei read jewûredei
l. 934 for jewûredei read jewûredei
l. 936 for jewûredei read jewûredei
p. 22 l. 1107 for qonog read qonog
l. 1122 for buraqui-lu’a read bureqüqi-lu’a
p. 23 l. 1210 for olqo read olqo
p. 24 l. 1227 for qonqun read qonqun
p. 29 l. 1630 for keqüen read keqüen
l. 1633 for bilji’ur read bilji’ur
p. 30 l. 1710 for qonqun read qonqun
p. 33 l. 1907 for qonqun read qonqun

p. 34 l. 2004 for singgeksen-nú read singgeksen-nú
p. 45 l. 2732 for cîfûur read cîfûur
p. 47 l. 2912 for orqan read orqan
p. 54 l. 3427 for rîiûd read rîiûd
p. 55 l. 3505 for onan-nú read onan-nú
p. 56 l. 3516 for cîfûur read cîfûur
p. 57 II. 3525-6 for jîlûd read jîlûd
p. 57 l. 3628 for qanah-nú read qanah-nú
p. 58 l. 3632 for cîngis-nú read cîngis-nú
p. 58 l. 3711 for cîngis-nú read cîngis-nú
p. 59 l. 3714 for cîngis-nú read cîngis-nú
p. 60 l. 3716 for onan-nú read onan-nú
p. 60 l. 3820 for qonqun-nú read qonqun
p. 61 l. 3915 for dörben-nú read dörben-nú
p. 68 l. 4512 for cîngis-nú read cîngis-nú
p. 70 l. 4607 for ong-an read ong-an
l. 4621 for cûi-mûren-e read cûi-mûren-e
p. 71 l. 4628 for ong-an read ong-an
p. 75 l. 4921 for ong-an read ong-an
p. 75 l. 4923 for bîlû’ur read bîlû’ur
p. 75 l. 4929 for edc ci read edc-ci
p. 76 l. 5005 for kûn-necce’-en read kûn-necce’-en
p. 76 l. 5116 for itteqși-’û read itteqși-’û
p. 76 l. 5133 for be’-en read be’-ingenë
p. 79 l. 5211 for qonqun-nú read qonqun
p. 80 l. 5302 for qonqun-nú read qonqun
p. 82 l. 5426 for tûbegen-nú read tûbegen-nú
l. 5427 for ong-an read ong-an
p. 86 l. 5721 for cîngis-nú read cîngis-nú
l. 5804 for hûi read hûi
p. 92 l. 6209 for cîngis-nú read cîngis-nú
for jidan-un read jidan-un
for jezwreedi read jezwreedi
for cinggis-qahan-a read cinggis-qahan-na
for qan-iyan read qan-iyan
for cinggis-qahan-a read cinggis-qahan-na
for oru'at read oru'at
for ese-gu read ese-gu
for undur-pin read undurun
for ileju'i read ireju'i
for uru'u read uru'u
for gilb'en read gilb'en
for arai-yar read arai?-iyar
for arai-yar read arai?-iyar
for teleget'u read telegettu-yi
for bilsaq'a read bilsaq'a
for unqatala read angatala
for delbileg'i read delbeg'i
for jidan-u read jidan-i
for nendu read nendu(k?)
for cinos read cinos
for dorqatun read dorqatala
for maquqaj'a read maquqaj'a
for buraqan-i read buraqan-i
for noyas read noyas
for onggin read onggin
for soyurq'aj'uor read soyurq'asi
for julu read julu
for juldu read jildu
for biliq'i read biliq'ur
for jirin(?) read jirin
for at-read at
for sele (?)
p. 196b  for biljû'ir read biljû'ur
s.v. bodoncar delete the entry 910.
s.v. bodoncar-i add . 910
p. 198a  for bolqâqda 9816 read bolqâqda 9816
p. 198b  for bolqû'su as 3221, 9816 read bolqû'su 3221
bolqû'su 9816
p. 199b  for boro read boro' and delete 512,
insert the entry boro' pr. name 512
for boro-yi read boro'-yi
p. 200a  after bûrte insert 502,
delete the entry bûrte-rins 502
p. 203b  delete the entry buraqsan-i 8106
p. 204b  for buruqiu-i'û'a read burûqiu-lu'a
p. 208a  s.v. ci delete 4929,
s.v. ci insert 4929
p. 208b  for cîlbûr read cîlbûr
insert the entry cîmbalûr 10724
p. 209a  delete the entry cimari-'ar 10724
p. 209b  for cînggis-qahan-a read cinggis-qahan
p. 209b-210a  delete the entry cinggis-qahan-a
p. 210a  s.v. cinggis-qahan-nu insert 3627, 3632, 3714,
4512, 4518, 5721, 6209, 6314, 6326, 6806,
10914, 10931, 11024
s.v. cinggis-qahan-nu insert 3711, 11117
delete the entry cinggis-qahan-u 3711, 11117
p. 210a  the entries cinsû and cînûs-un should read
cinsû and cînûs-un
p. 211a  after cülke add (wîjloke)
for çorçan read çorçan
p. 211b  for -da read -da'
s.v. cui-müren-e delete 4621,
insert the entry cui-müren-ne 4621
for -da read -da'
s.v. -da' delete 620
p. 212a  for dâbâ-ir read -da'
p. 212a. insert the entry -da' 620
s.v. -daça delete 9310, and , 10903
p. 213a. the entry darun 1712...9608 to read now as follows:
  darun¹ 1712, 3834, 4707, 9608
  darun² 9232, 9233
p. 214a. for dayir¹ 512, 9805, read dayir² 9805
after dayir² pr. name insert 512,
  delete the entry de'-u-yeyen 1630
insert the entry de'-u-yeyen 1630
for dörben²-u 3915 read dörben²-ni 3915
p. 219a. s.v. -e delete 4621,
s.v. -ee-'en insert 5005,
s.v. edc-ci insert 4929,
s.v. delete the entry elcin-nu-u 10230
insert the entry elcin-u-en 10230
p. 224a. delete erbegeje-ulü i v. erbegeje-ulü
after erbegeje-ulü delete [erbegeje-ulü]? s.v. erdiš delete , 10831
insert the entry erdiš-i 10831
s.v. erikin last figure to read 11007
delete the entry eri-je'-u-yi 10930
insert the entry eri-qaya 10930
p. 225b. s.v. ese-gü delete 6819
insert the entry ese-gü 6819
delete gedän 5133
s.v. -gü delete 6819,
p. 229a. insert the entry haqu'un 1227, 1710
p. 235a. for bűn read bůn
p. 238a. for ijiš-išken read ijiš-dukcan
s.v. ikejü'-u delete 6908, 11825, 11829
p. 239a. insert the entry ilėsü 11224
s.v. ilė'sü delete 11224
p. 240b. s.v. ikejü'-u insert 6908, 11825, 11829

p. 242a. for itegeju'-u read itegeju'-u
s.v. -yan delete 6323,
p. 243b. for jabajin-iyar read jabajin-iyar
s.v. -i at delete 10724
p. 246a. insert jaugon-tur 10105, 10108
p. 248a. delete the entry je'i-ü-yi 10930
the entries jeiredei, jeiredei should read jeiredei,
jeiredei
delete jaugon-tur 10105, 10108
p. 248b. for jidin-i read jidin-i
for jidin-i read jidin-u
for jirin v. jirin read jirin 9106
p. 250b. delete the entry jirin'[=jirim] 9106
p. 257a. for juldü read juldü
p. 257a. the entry ke'er 1202...10126 to read now as follows:
  ke'er¹ 1202, 4931, 7109, 10126
  ke'er² 5301, 5305, 5307, 5311
for ke'er-e read ke'er-e
for ke'er-e-gü read ke'er-e-gü
for ke'er-ece read ke'er-ece
for ke'er-i read ke'er-i
p. 257b. for ke'er-i read ke'er-e
insert the entry kib 11317
p. 258a. delete the entry kib 11317
p. 259a. insert the entry kiri'tes-eece v. kiri'tes-eece
  after kiri'tes-eece insert [:kiri'tes-eece]
s.v. kitat insert 10107,
delete the entry kitat-irgen-tur 10107
p. 261a. s.v. ko'in-cece'en insert 5005,
delete the entry ko'in-neece'en 5005
delete the entry maquraqaju 8101
p. 263a. s.v. muquraqaju insert 8101,
s.v. muren-e delete 4621,
for oru'at read oru'at
s.v. otçgın-a delete 9627,
insert the entry otçgın-na 9627
insert the entry otçgın-nu 10516
delete the entry otçgın-u 9714, 10516
s.v. otçgın-u insert 9714,
s.v. o'oruca delete , 9802
after qa' insert cf. qa'
after qa' insert cf. qa'
insert the entry qadad-aca v. qadund-aca
delete the entry qadund-daca 10903
insert the entry qadund-aca [eqadud-aca] 10903
delete the entry qahan-a
s.v. qahan-na insert 3628, 3632, 3714, 4512,
4518, 5721, 6209, 6314, 6326, 6806, 10914,
10931, 11024, 11414,
s.v. qahan-nu insert 3717, 10912, 11118, 11902,
delete the entry qahan-u
s.v. qan-a delete 4607, 4628, 4921,
s.v. qan-iyana delete 6323,
s.v. qan-na add , 4607, 4628, 4921
s.v. qan-niyan insert 6323,
s.v. qan-nu insert 4933, 4934, 5427,
s.v. qan-u delete 4933, 4934, 5427
insert the entry qangqun 11317
for qara'un-jidän-i read qara'un-jidän-i
for qara'un-jidän-u read qara'un-jidän-u
delete the entry qatqun 1227, 1710
s.v. qaya delete , 10930
s.v. qongortai delete 11508, 11525
insert the entry qongqontî 11508, 11525
insert the entry qonqon 825, 1907
s.v. qonqon delete 825,
delete the entry qonq a'ululati
for qorgi-daca read qorgid-aca
after qorguqin insert cf. qorguqin

s.v. müren-ne add , 4621
s.v. -na insert 3628, 3632, 3714, 4512, 4518,
4607, 4628, 4921, 5721, 6209, 6314, 6326,
6806, 9627, 10914, 10931, 11024, 11414
s.v. -ne insert 4621,
delete the entry -ne 'en 9005
for rendu read nendu [≡nendük']
insert the entry nendük v. nendu
s.v. -niyan insert 6323,
after noqas-iyana 8203 add , 8206
delete the entry noyas-iyana 8206
for -nu read -nu-nu
s.v. -nu-nu insert 2004, 3505, 3711, 3716,
3915, 4933, 4934, 5427,
s.v. -nu-nu insert 10516, 10912, 11118, 11902
insert the entry numulcitian-i 11807
delete the entry numuqicitian-i 11807
insert the entry -nün 10230
for olja-'u v. olja'-u 'read olja-'u v. olja'-ū
s.v. onan-nu insert 3505, 3716,
s.v. onan-u delete 3505, 3716,
delete the entry ong-qua 4607, 4628, 4921
s.v. ong-qua-nu add , 4607, 4628, 4921
s.v. ong-qua-nu insert 4933, 4934, 5427,
delete the entry ong-qua 4933, 4934, 5427
delete the entry ounq 8315
for oru'a insert 8315,
after ara'a insert [əorə'a]
insert the entry oru'a 9802
the entry oron 933, 1731, 2725, 6003, 6428, 9624, 10324
oron'ı 904, 9706, 9713
after oro'a insert cf. oru'a, ura'a
for qo'ar-maraj read qo'ii
for qan read qan
insert the entry qun in v. qun in, qun, qun-tur, qun-tu
for qun reads qun
for qun-tu read qun-tu
for qun-tur read qun-tur
for qun-u read qun-u
after quroqun insert [=quroqun]
for quyu read quyu
insert the entry quyu in v. quyu
delete the entry sa'ar qui-n-ti v. sa'ar qui-n-ti
s.v. sa'ar qui-n-ti delete [=sa'ar qui-n-ti]
insert the entry si-ngekeen-ii 2004
s.v. si-ngekeen-ii delete 2004,
for qeşö-yi ter 726, 10724, 11514
insert the entry so-yar-sun 8031
s.v. so-yar-sun delete 8031,
insert the entry so-yar-sun 726, 10724, 11514
s.v. telegetii delete 7402,
insert the entry telegetii-yi 7402
for temii-octig-in read temii-octig-in-na
for terge 5725, 9216, 9229 read terge 9216, 9229
terge pr. name 5725
after türümisi insert [=türümisi]
insert the entry türümisi v. türümisi
for tızęq read toqçuq
for tub'ı delete (tub'ı) delete
s.v. us'ı delete 2004, 3505, 3711, 3716, 3919, 4933, 4934, 5427, 10516, 10912, 11118, 11902,
for uqı read uqi
s.v. uqi delete 1223,
insert the entry uqi 1223
for uge ı-ye ıen read üge ı-ye ıen, üge ı-ye ıen, üge ı-ye ıen, üge ı-ye ıen, üge ı-ye ıen, üge ı-ye ıen, üge ı-ye ıen, üge ı-ye ıen
insert the entry üge ı-ye ıen 10432
s.v. üge ı-ye ıen delete 1227,
insert the entry üge ı-ye ıen 1227
for üge ı-ye ıen read üge ı-ye ıen
s.v. üge ı-ye ıen add, 10432
for üge ı-ye ıen delete 6822
insert undurun 6822
for üge ı-ye ıen delete 3902
after usan 3014, 3019, add 3902,
for üge ı-ye ıen insert [=ero']
for üge ı-ye ıen delete 7813,
s.v. undurun delete 7813
for üge ı-ye ıen delete 7813,
s.v. üge ı-ye ıen delete 7813,
s.v. üge ı-ye ıen delete 10230,
s.v. üge ı-ye ıen delete 1630
s.v. üge ı-ye ıen insert 7402,
s.v. üge ı-ye ıen insert 1630,
s.v. üge ı-ye ıen delete 726, 10724, 11514
s.v. üge ı-ye ıen insert 5116,
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>pao</td>
<td>pao</td>
<td>shan</td>
<td>shan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>p'ao</td>
<td>p'ao</td>
<td>shang</td>
<td>shang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nai</td>
<td>nai</td>
<td>pei</td>
<td>pei</td>
<td>shao</td>
<td>shao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nan</td>
<td>nan</td>
<td>pei</td>
<td>pei</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nang</td>
<td>nang</td>
<td>pen</td>
<td>pen</td>
<td>shei</td>
<td>shei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nao</td>
<td>nao</td>
<td>sheng</td>
<td>sheng</td>
<td>sheng</td>
<td>sheng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>peng</td>
<td>peng</td>
<td>shib</td>
<td>shib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nei</td>
<td>nei</td>
<td>peng</td>
<td>peng</td>
<td>shou</td>
<td>shou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nen</td>
<td>nen</td>
<td>pi</td>
<td>pi</td>
<td>shou</td>
<td>shou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

APPENDIX SEVEN
BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

(In the alphabetical order, letters with diacritics always follow those without them: c, ç, ê, è, j, ñ, etc. However, in Japanese surnames お = o)

1. Periodicals, Collections and Reference Works

AAWG = Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse
ACS = Area and Culture Studies (東京外国語大学関東)
ADAW = Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst
AEMA = Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi
AF = Asiatische Forschungen
AFS = Asian Folklore Studies (Nagoya)
AH = Altaic Hakpo. Journal of the Altaic Society of Korea
AJP = American Journal of Philology
Altuica (Moscow)
AM = Asia Major
AMO = Acta Mongolica
AO = Acta Orientalia (Helsinki)
AOH = Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
AOr = Archiv Orientalní
ASAW = Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Klasse der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
BAVA = Beiträge zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Archäologie
BCUP = Bulletin of the Catholic University of Peking
BEFEO = Bulletin de l’École Française d’Été du Proche-Orient
BIAMS = The IAMS News Information on Mongol Studies Bulletin (Ulan Bator)
BIHEC = Bibliothèque de l’Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises
BMFEA = Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities
BOH = Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica
S0 = Studia Orientalia (Helsinki)
SOr = Studi Orientali
SOLL = Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures (Harvard University)
SPTK = 西班牙
SS = Studia Serica
SSM = Studia Serica Monographs
SSN = Sang Studies Newsletter (later BSYS and JSYS)
ST = Studia Tibetica
SU = Studia Uralo-Altaica
ŠZ = 收集整理
ŠU = Šťastný xuan. Naouka
TBI = Trudy Buryatskogo Instituta Občestvennykh Nauk BF SO
AN SSSR (Ulan-Ude)
TBBK = 東洋文化研究所紀要
TBR = 東洋文論叢
TCDMP = Trudy Členov Rossisskoj Dukhovnoj Missii v Peke
(T. Petersburg)
TD = Türkoloji Dergisi (Ankara)
TDA = Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları
TDAYB = Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yılıntı-Belleten
TGDR = 東京外国語大学講義
THG = 東方学
THGH = 東方学報
TLTC = 大陸論叢
TP = T'oung Pao
TSCC = 境界集
TSCIA = Toronto Studies in Central and Inner Asia
TVORAO = Trudy Vostočnogo Odnelentija Imperatorskogo Russ-
skago Arkheologiceskogo Občestva (St. Petersburg)
TYGH = 東洋学報
TYSH = 東洋史研究
TYSR = 東洋史論集
UB = Ural-Altaische Bibliothek
UAJ = Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher
AM = J.G. Hangin, U. Onon, eds, Aranalytica Mongolica Dedicated to the Seventieth Birthday of Professor Owen Latimore, MSOP 8, Bloomington, Ind., 1972
Andrews 1999 = P.A. Andrews, 'The Shrine Temples of Činggis Qan at Ejen Qorqqa', in AMMS, I-3-30
ASK = 諮問部, アルタイ諸語群の研究: 諮問部研究論集 I-II, 東京, 1966-87
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AT = Altan tobči by Lubsangdajin; see AT1, AT2, AT3, AT4, ATL, and Section Five of the Introduction
AT1 = Blo-bzan bstan-'jin (Lubsangdajin), Altan tobči. Also called Altan tobči nova. Full title: Erten-ii qad-un ṣündülsegesen törö yosun-u joklyal-i tobtčil qurğişan altan tobči kemekü orosibai, 1655. The Ulam Bator ms. described by C. Žamcarino in Žamč., 79-120 (cf. Žamč., 55-88). All references are to the folios of this ms. which has been reproduced in a facsimile edition entitled Ermitt xačiyn andeslieven törö yosun-ii ṣündül tovčlon suruṣaṣan altan tovč semeعكس orıvıl "The Golden Summary Which Relates Briefly the Deeds of Civil Governing Established by Ancient Emperors" (The Mongol chronicle of the 17th century), ed., with an Introduction by S. Bira, Ulam Bator, 1990. Cf. AT2, AT3, AT4, ATL, and ATL
AT2 = Blo-bzan bstan-'jin (Lubsangdajin), Altan tobči. Full title: Erten-ii qad-un ṣündülsegesen törö yosun-u joklyal-i tobtčil qurğişan altan tobči kemekü orosibai, Ms. copy made by Jamyan Güng, ca. 1927, formerly belonging to P. Pelliot, now in the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris
AT3 = Cojičii, ed., Altan tobči, Hohhot, 1983
AT (anon.) = Altan tobči anon., sie brevier (end of the Ming dynasty). See MCAT


Isosöörg 1939 = P.A. Bodberg, 'Marginalia to the Histories of the Northern Dynasties', HIAS 4:1939, 230-283.

Borbovok 1964 = A. Borbovok, 'Mongol'skije gospos v bukhanskom spise "Mukhadmat at alab"', NAA, 1964, 1, 140-145.


Boyle 1954 = J.A. Boyle, 'Iru and Maru in the Secret History of the Mongols', HIAS 17:1954, 403-410; repr. in MWE (I).

— 1965 = J.A. Boyle, 'A Form of Horse Sacrifice Amongst The 13th- and 14th-Century Mongols', CAJ 10:1965, 145-150; repr. in MWE (XX).
— 1972a = J.A. Boyle, 'Turkish and Mongol Shamanism in the Middle Ages', Folklore 83:1972, 177-193.
— 1973 = J.A. Boyle, 'Sites and Localities Connected with the History of the Mongol Empire', in OUMEIX, V/2, 75-79; repr. in MWE (XVI).
Bö = Bőkesegis, tr., Mongol-un nüyûna taagli (Nigen deberi), [K'aiat], 1941
BRS = K.M. Ceremino, Birjatsko-naskii slovar’, Moscow, 1973
BSYS = ‘Bibliographies of Chinese Periodical Literature on Sung and Related Periods and Recent Japanese Scholarship on Sung and Related Periods’ in JSYS 1:May 1970
BSDT = I.A. Manžitev, Birjatsko samаниически и досаманическii terminy, Moscow, 1978
BT = G. Moravcik, Byzantiontudomány, I. Die byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvolker, II. Sprachreste der Türkvolker in den byzantinischen Quellen, Zweite durchgearbeitete Auflage, Berlin, 1958
BTD = A. Särköz, ed, A Buddhist Terminological Dictionary, in collab. with J. Szerb, Budapest, 1993
Buck = F.H. Buck, Comparative Study of Postpositions in Mongolian Dialects and the Written Language, Cambridge, Mass., 1955
CA = R. Harnoy, La chasse à l’mme. Exquiss de une théorie du chamanisme sibérien, Nanterre, 1990
CC = A.C. Moule, Christians in China Before the Year 1550, London, 1930; repr. Taipei, 1972
CCCCC = Combined Concordances to the Ch’u-n Ch’iu, Kung-yang, Ku-luang and Tso-chuan, 1-IV, ed. by W. Hung et al., HYSS, Sup. No. 11, Peking, 1973; repr. Taipei, 1966
CCHEIA = M. Gervers, W. Schlepp, eds, Cultural Contact, History and Ethnicity in Inner Asia, TSCIA 2, Toronto, 1996
CCME = Th.T. Allsen, Culture and Conflict in Mongol Eurasia, Cambridge, 2001
CCTSKTS = 丁卯, 浙江省图书馆, 1915
CEDMU = Lin Yutang, Chinese-English Dictionary of Modern Usage, Hong Kong, 1972
Ce = Cendin Chandsuren, ed., Cend Gun ba Mongolyn Nuuc Tovchoo, Ulan Bator, 1997
Cérensodin: see also Tserensoin
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Čev. = Ya. Čevel, Mongol selhit tov aišilik 1959, Ulan Bator, 1966
Čevel 1959 = Ya. Čevel, Mongolcaudyn erxmedeg öngö, SE, VI, 1959
Chapitre CVII = L. Hambis, tr., Le Chapitre CVII du Yuan che, avec des notes supplémentaires par P. Pelliot, Leiden, 1945
Chapitre CVIII = L. Hambis, tr., Le Chapitre CVIII du Yuan che, I, Leiden, 1954
CHHC = 李济洲, 反清惩恶新编, 香港, 1960


CKCCTWC = 伍書所編, 中國經濟類志, 淺水魚類, 北京, 1979

CKŻH = 蓋爾托, 俄及吉汗實錄編, in NMI [1-152]

CKKTWC = 中国队所屬植物圖譜, Iconographia Cymophyorum Sinicum, I-V, 中國科學院北京植物研究所, 北京, 1972-76

CKTFSYC = 波及, 中國古代植物研究, 香港, 1981

CKLS STC = 布恩斯羅, 中國歷史地圖集, IV, 米達貴, V, 元起, 上海, 1982, 1975

CMKK = 中國蒙古史學會論文集, 中國蒙古史學會編 (1980), 喻和浩, 1981

CMKMSCK = 中國蒙古史學會成立大會紀念集, 中國蒙古史學會編, 喻和浩, 1979

CKTS = 蔡適, 蒙古史, 北京, 1983


--- 1998 = L. Clark, ‘The Month Name kõiget in the Mongol Natural Calendar’, in BO, 45-48


--- 1959 = G. Clauson, the hP’ags-pa Alphabet’, BSOAS 22:1959, 300-323
DBS = Дорж Банзаров, Sobranie sochestvennik, Moscow, 1955
— 1982a = I. de Rachewiltz, 'Two Recently Published P'ai-tzu Discovered in China', AOI 36:1982, 413-417
— 1982b = I. de Rachewiltz, 'On a Recently Discovered Ms. of Chunggis-Qan's Precepts to His Younger Brothers and Sons', in IBS, 427-439
— 1983 = I. de Rachewiltz, 'Qan, Qa'un and the Seal of Guyüg', in DB, 272-281
— 1983a = I. de Rachewiltz, 'Turks in China under the Mongols: A Preliminary Investigation of Turco-Mongol Relations in the 13th and 4th Centuries', in CAE, 281-310
— 1989 = I. de Rachewiltz, 'The Title Chunggis Qan/Quanyan Re-examined', in GJW, 281-298
— 1989a = I. de Rachewiltz, 'Dante's Aleppa: A Tartar Word in Tartarus?', in PIAC XXXVIII, 57-71
— 1990 = I. de Rachewiltz, 'The Expression Qajarun Inerin in Paragraph 70 of The Secret History of the Mongols', in IST, 283-290
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— 1995 = I. de Rachewiltz, 'Some Puzzling Words in The Secret History of the Mongols', OUMEILX, V/2, 278-283
— 1999 = I. de Rachewiltz, 'Some Reflections on So-Called Written Mongolian', in STM, 255-246
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ETY = Erdeni-yin töbi by Sayang Sechen; see ET¹, ET², ET³, ET, and GOM
ET¹ = E. Haenisch, Eine Urga-Handschrift des mongolischen Geschichtswerks von Sechen Sagang (alias Sanang Sechen), Berlin, 1955
ETML = A. Macdonald, ed., Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou, Paris, 1971
ETNS = Erdeni tenumal neretí sudur orosnibai, Mongol tuyoń bizig-än cultural, Peking, 1984
EHUCL = B.A. Nazarov, D. Sinor, eds, with D. DeWeese (tech. ed.), Essays on Uzbek History, Culture and Language, Bloomington, Indiana, 1993
EBČIZ = Ezen borg Cangtian ‘ix zuoxi’, ed. by MÜUS Xuul’ Züün Deed SurgaUi’, Ulan Bator, 1995
Fe = A. Fedotov, tr., Tainata istoriya na mongolite, Sofia, 1991
Fedotov 1996a = A. Fedotov, ‘Motif of Miraculous Birth in Mongolian and Korean Myths and Epic (Comparative Study)’, UJAS 1:1996, 201-224
FJC = Hok-lam Chan, The Fall of the Jurchen Chin. Wang E’s Memoir on Ts’ai-chou under the Mongol Siege (1233-1234), Stuttgart, 1993
FK = P. Guillaud, Forgotten Kingdom, London, 1955
FKM = W. Heissig, Die Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Mongolen, I 16-18. Jahrhundert, AF 5, Wiesenbaden,1959
FMH = W. Heissig, ed., Fragen der mongolischen Helden-
dichtung. III. Vorträge des 4. Epenythosimposium des Sonder-
forschungsbereichs 12, Bonn 1983, AF 91, Wiesbaden, 1985
FO = A. Mostaert, Folklore ordo (Traduction des Textes oraux
ordon), MSM 11, Pēpping, 1947
Franke H 1975 = H. Franke, 'Chinesische Texte zur Jurchen. A
Translation of the Jurchen Monograph in the San-ch’ao pei-
meng hai-pien', ZAS 9:1975, 119-186
— 1978 = H. Franke, Nordchina am Vorabend der Mongo-
lischen Eroberung: Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft unter der
Chin-Dynastie (1115-1234), Rhenish-Westfälische Akad. d.
Wissenschafts. Vorträge G 228, Düsseldorf, 1978
— 1979 = H. Franke, 'Some Folkloristic Data in the Dynastic
History of the Chin (1115-1234)', in LLRC, 135-153
— 2002 = H. Franke, 'Seitenwechsel zum Feind. Tanguten im
Dienst der mongolischen Eroberer', Saeculum 55.2002, 226-
268
Franke W 1945 = W. Franke, 'Yunglo’s Mongolei-Feldzüge', SR
3:1945, 1-54
FSHICA = V.V. Barthold, Four Studies on the History of Central
Asia, I. tr. by V. and T. Minorsky, Leiden, 1956
FSYTIM = L. Manlazov, Fonotogicheskaya sistema yazyka 'Talbot
istorii mongolov', Uljan Bator, 1973
FTC = H. Franke, From Tribal Chieftain to Universal Emperor
and God: The Legitimation of the Yuan Dynasty, Munich,
1978
Fukushima 1985 = 福島伸介, '12-13 世紀のモンゴル社会における
urug について — 現代構造論としての外縁集団の分析 —', MK
16:1985, 31-47
FYSSOS = B.G. Gafurov, Y.V. Gankovsky, eds, Fifty Years of
Soviet Oriental Studies (Brief Reviews), Moscow, 1967
Gaadbampa, M.: see also Sh. and S. Gaadbampa
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Gaadbamba 1968 = M. Gaadbamba, 'Nekotorye khudozhestvennye
osobennosti "Sokrovennogo skazaniya"', MStS 6, 27:1966, 62-
126 (19-69)
— 1969 = M. Gaadbamba, 'Zur ccaen úgilg züü'len anilugs
ausudal', SF 7, 5:1969, 165-189
— 1969a = M. Gaadbamba, '"Sokrovennoe skazanie mongolov"
как литературны памятник', ZXS 7:1969, 115-141
— 1970 = M. Gaadbamba, '"Mongolyn nuuc tövöönyy" zarim
— 1972 = Sh. Gaadbamba, 'The Problem of Interrelation Be-
 tween the "Secret History of the Mongols" and Mongolian
Folklore', in OUMEX, 11, 95-100
— 1981 = S. Gaadbamba, 'Sokrovennoe skazanie' in problem:
literaturnykh svyazey, in LSM, 76-83
— 1984 = S. Gaadbamba, 'Mongol ardyn ülger', SF 14, 1-
10:1984 [1987], 15-156
— 1993 = S. Gaadbamba, 'Mongolyn nuuc tövöönyy xatat
ügilin galik ex ba mongolyn üsig büzilin üsél garyn
ausudal', MJ 1:1993, 151-170
GALCT = S. Rimskey-Korsakoff Dye, Grammatical Analysis of
the Lao Ch’tia, with an English Translation of the Chinese
Text, Canberra, 1983
Gantogtogtokh 1989 = G. Gantogtogtokh, 'Rol buryatskikh dialektnykh
leksiko-grammatičeskikh edinie i form i izolirovani neko-
torykh slov i vyraženii "Sokrovennogo skazaniya"', in IGBY, 116-
125
Gantogtogtokh 1990 = G. Gantogtogtokh, 'Mongolyn nuuc tövöönyy zarim
ğig xellogiğ nügilin ayaliunas survaälisän i"', Mongolica 1
(22):1990, 125-128
— 1994 = G. Gantogtogtokh, 'Mongolyn nuuc tövöönd gardag bög
morgoliun gurvan nér tom’iyo', MJ 2:1994, 144-152
GCR = O. Franke, Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches, I-V,
Berlin, Leipzig, 1930-52
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GMS = I. Kalzinska-Stawarz, Games of Mongolian Shepherds, Warsaw, 1991


GORD = K. Jahn, Die Geschichte der Oguzen des Rašid al-Dīn, Vienna, 1969


GPYM = N.N. Poppe, Grammatika pis’menno-mongol’skogo yazika, Moscow-Leningrad, 1937


GQT = Geser Qeçen-a tanqi, I-ii, ed. by Y. Cimedderji, Hohhot, 1985

GR = Guillaume de Rubrouck, Envoyé de saint Louis, Voyage dans l’Empire Mongol (1253-1255), tr. and comm. by C. and R. Kappler, Paris, 1985
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GEZ = 別青, 京師佛教志, 東京, 1930

GFT = J. Laude-Cirtautas, Der Gebrauch der Farbbezeichnungen in den Türkdialekte, Wienshadten, 1961


GGG = 現代蒙古語, 服部四郎先生年近忌念論文集編纂委員会, 三省堂, 東京, 1972

GGMGL = P. Foucault, Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen als Geschichtsquelle und Literaturkanal. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Erklärung, Prague, 1956

GGS = 田邁賢, 元史論集, I-II, 京都, 1961-63

GHI = 荒木重男, 元朝秘史, 東京, 1994

GHK = 小林裕四郎, 元朝秘史の研究, 東京, 1954

GHMAK = 服部四郎, 元朝秘史の翻訳者を表す漢字の研究, 東京, 1946

GHMBK = 小澤重男, 元朝秘史蒙古語法講義, 東京, 1993

GHMBKZ = 小澤重男, 元朝秘史蒙古語法講義補遗, 東京, 2000


GKBM = 山根幸夫, 代物名字編, 元代史研究文集, 東京, 1971

GKG = F. Grenard, Gengis-Khan, Paris, 1935

GKV = B. Vladimirov, Gengis-khan, tr. by M. Carsow, Paris, 1948

GLME = L. Hambis, Grammaire de la langue mongole écrite (première partie), Paris, 1945

GLT = J. Deny, Grammaire de la langue turque (dialecte osmanli), Paris, 1921

Haenisch 1933 = E. Haenisch, 'Die letzten Feldzüge Cinggis Han's und sein Tod nach der ostasiatischen Überlieferung', AM 9:1933, 503-551

—– 1944 = 'Der Stand der Yüan-ch'ao-pi-shi Forschung', ZDMG 98:1944, 109-120

—– 1950 = E. Haenisch, 'Grammatische Besonderheiten in der Sprache des Manghol un Niucua Tobcaun', SO 14, 3:1950, 3-26

—– 1956 = E. Haenisch, 'Weiterer Beitrag zum Text der Geheimen Geschichte der Mongolen', ZDMG 111:1961, 139-149

—– 1975 = E. Haenisch, 'Sinomongolische Späne', UAJ 47:1975, 72-84

Haider 1994 = M. Haider, 'The Kurultai in Medieval Central Asian Sources', in OUMEIX, VII, 220-234 (bibliography missing)


—– 1999 = T.N. Haining, 'The Vicissitudes of the Mongol Historiography in the Twentieth Century', in MEL, 332-346


—– 1986 = R. Hamayon, 'Mérite de l’offensé vengeur, plaisir du rival vainqueur. Le mouvement ascendant des échanges
Harayama 1974 = 原山喜, 'クイルドゥの呪詛' ("Kuylidar's Bural'"), Shirin 57:1974, 384-403
Hashimoto 1976 = 枝本朝, tr., "M. Gaandamba, Mongolyn nuuc tövööny" nüg uran xiltligiin učir", OGGD 37:1976, 11-17
— 1984 = M. Hashimoto, "On a Negative Expression in the Language of the Secret History of the Mongols", CISHAAN XXXI, 1, 330
— 1992 = M. Hashimoto, Mongolyn Nuuc Tövööon deer garax tegmi- gesen xelberin tuval", in OUMEIX, V/2, 14-16; cf. also OMTS, 1988, 37-90
Hat-Du = 韓田四郎, 麗華麗華, 奏文考古秘史, 卷一, 東京, 1939
Hattori 1957 = S. Hattori, "哈達在 Yuan-ch'ao Mi-shih", in SA, 69-70
— 1973 = S. Hattori, 'The Chinese Dialect on which the Transcription of the Yuan-ch'ao Mi-shih was Based', AA 24:1973, 35-44

HIC = Text of the Preclassical Mongolian version of the Hsiiaoching 質齢 in ZAS 12:1978, 162-235
Heissig 1943 = W. Heissig, ‘Mongolische Neudrucke und Neuerscheinungen’, MS 8:1943, 260-279
— 1985 = W. Heissig, ‘On Some Epic Motifs in the Altan Tochči’, in NB, 137-143
HEM = D. Pokotilov, History of the Eastern Mongols During the Ming Dynasty from 1368 to 1634, Part I, tr. by R. Loewenthal, LSM, Ser. A, No. 1, 1947
HEMAC = D. Pokotilov, History of the Eastern Mongols During the Ming Dynasty from 1368 to 1634. Part II: Addenda and Corrigenda by W. Franke, SSM, Ser. A, No. 3, 1949
HHC = L. Hambis, Histoire des campagnes de Gengis Khan, II (§§ XXII-LXXX). Chinese text collated by P. Pelliot; translation and commentary by L. Hambis (unpublished manuscript)
HHSK = 吴天墀, 西夏史话, 成都, 1980
HHSLWC = 白积儒, 西夏史论文集, 宁夏人民出版社, 西安, 1984
HHYCLC = 李向文, 西夏研究论文集, 宁夏人民出版社, 西安, 1983
HII = 高丽逸史 (1389), 韩体高, 汉译, 1918
HIE = B. Árpád, ed., Historic and Linguistic Interaction between Inner-Asia and Europe, with the ed. assistance of E. Horváth, PIAC 39, Szeged, 1997
HMKSYC = 杜荣坤, 白翠琴, 西夏蒙古史研究, 吐鲁番, 1986
HMFR = Y.M. Zhukov, B. Shirendyv et al., eds, History of the Mongolian People’s Republic, Moscow, 1973 (English version of BMNR)
IPCLM = L. Punskaya, Introduction to Palladio’s Chinese Literature of the Muslims, in collab. with D.D. Leslie, Canberra, 1977
Ir = Yekeminegradar Irintkin (Y. Irintchen), Mongol-ul nii uča tobdynan, Buhhot, 1987. Previously published in installments in ÖMY, 1984-87
ISMC = Chang Chün-i 楊振川, ed., International Symposium on Mongolian Culture, [Taipei], 1993
ISMH = W. Franke, An Introduction to the Sources of Ming History, Singapore, 1968
--- 1983 = F. Isono, ‘More About the Anda Relationship’, JAMS 8, 1, 2-Dec. 1983, 36-47
ISSMR = D.B. Ulymževev, Izuchenie “Sokrovenskogo skazaniya mongolov” v Rossii i SSSR. Täinaya istoriya mongolov, Novosibirsk, 1995
Ižamč 1974 = N. Ižamč, ‘Kultura mongolov XIII-XIV vv.’, SH 9, 1974, 75-97
JAT = 李哲宏 (S. Jagchid), 蒙古史思想史論集, 北京, 1979
JK = 小林成二, シンディスラム, 東京, 1969 (several reprints): Chinese translation: 戦吉成訳, 『 CONVERTUS, 』, 東北, 1985
JÝT = Eldengei, Oyundalai, Arshul, 'Mongol-un niyuča tobočyń-jarim üges-ün taylbari', tr. by Ardjab and Selenggoba, Peking, 1991 (Mongolian version of TR)
Ka = S. Kalužný, tr., Tajna historia Mongolów. Anonimowa kronika mongolska z XIII w., Warsaw, 1970
--- 1977 = S. Kalužný, 'O značení slov igen i obog v "Sokrovennom skazáni"', in OUMÉIX, III/2, 79-85
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KOSUG = D.I. Tikhonov, Khoyzaitstvo i obichustvennyy strot ulugurskogo gosudarstva X-XIV vv., Moscow-Leningrad, 1966
Košič 1923 = V. Košič (W. Kotwicz), 'Iz poučených Cingis-khana', Vostok 3:1923, 94-96
--- 1934 = W. Kotwicz, 'Formules initiales des documents mongols aux XIIIe et XIVe ss.', RO 10:1934, 131-157
--- 1936 = W. Kotwicz, 'Contributions aux études altaiques', IV-V, RO 12:1936, 122-142
--- 1939/40 = W. Kotwicz, 'Contributions à l'histoire de l'Asie Centrale', RO 15:1939-40, 159-195
KoW = K. Granbech, Komisches Worterbuch. Tütscher Wortindex zur Codex Cumanicus, Vienna, 1942
Kow = J.E. Kowaleski, Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français, I-III, Kazan, 1844-49, several reprints
Korelja 1989 = Korelja, ‘Videti čitaju jada-yi jügilük ni’ (‘Regarding the Magic ‘Stone’”), ÖMY, 1989 i, 64-76
KR = G. Varnadsky, Klevan Rossiia, New Haven, 1948
Kradin 1995 = N.N. Kradin, ‘The Transformation of Political Systems from Chieftain to State: Mongolian Example, 1180(-1206)’, in APTES, 136-143
KSK = East Asian Institute, 1964
KTCL = National Library of China, 1961

KIPMX = N.C. Munkvэ, Kitakšílai istóriq o peryvkh mongol’skikh khanakh. Nadzorubnaya nadpis’ na mogile Elyum Cůcęya. Perevod i issledovanie, Moscow, 1965
See also CAJ 36:1992, 72-83
KMG = N. Poppe, Khakha-MongolskajaGrammatika, mit Bibliographie, Sprachproben und Glossar, Wiesbaden, 1951
KMGE = N.N. Poppe, Khakha-mongol’skijgeročesčeskijepos, Moscow-Leningrad, 1937. See KHER
KMI = W.E. Henthorn, Korea. The Mongol Invasion, Leiden, 1963
Kob = 小林南雲翻譯, 蒙古史. 東京, 1941
KoR = T. Kobayashi’s review of H in ‘YGGI 32, 4:April, 1950, 77-99
Lauer 1907 = B. Lauer, ‘Skizze der mongolischen Literatur’, KS 8:1907, 165-261. See OML
LCSTMKK = 史氏民謡錄, 麟寳史記蒙古考, 内蒙古文萃書, 内蒙古自治区文史研究課, 1994
LDAT = Lubsan Danzan, Altan tobi ili (Zolotoe skazanie), tr. by N.P. Šastina, Moscow, 1973
Ligeti 1972 = L. Ligeti, 'Une ancienne interpolation dans l’Alban Tubu', AOH 26:1972, 1-10

LIML = A.M. Podznevek, Lekcii po istorii mongol’skoi literatury, I-I, St. Petersburg 1896, 1897; II, Vladivostok, 1908

Liu MS 1947 = 劉士義, '清代之口語情報' (The Census Blue Book of the Yuan Dynasty). CKWHCH 7:1947, IC1-106


LLSL = 諾瑪森塞 (1610), in TBS, 113-145; originally published in MG 2:Jan. 1937, 119-144


LPYYYC = 麥塔.Byeals, 赖火头, Mongol. 語言研究. 開封, 1991
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LRCP = G.C. Cibikov, Lan-tin čen-po (Stepeni puti k blážnostu), soč. Czechtšaya v mong. i rus. per., I/1 (Mongol text), Vladivostok, 1910; I/2 (Russian translation), Vladivostok, 1913
LRP = E.G. Pulleyblank, Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin, UBC Press, Vancouver, 1991
LSHM = J.C. Street, The Language of the Secret History of the Mongols, New Haven, 1957
LSM = P.A. Grinker et al., eds., Literature of the Mongoli, Moscow, 1981
LST = A.K. Borovkov, Leksika sredneaziatskogo tefsara XIII-XIII vv., Moscow, 1963
LUKQ = A. von Gabain, Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qocho (850-1250), I-II, Wiesbaden, 1973
LYTIS = 席位文献, 聖經聖訓, 1848
Ma = Mansung, Sine-her orifígyul taylurbanlosan Mongol-an nivča tóbčyan, Hohhot, 1985
MA = N.N. Poppe, Mongolśkót slovar’ Mukaddimat al-Adab, I-III, Moscow-Leningrad, 1938-39; repr. in one volume by Gregg Internat Public Ltd., Westmead, 1971
MAAZDB = S. Gaddamba, D. Cerensdnom, Mongol ordoj aman zoxiyon deet bíeq, Ulran Bator, 1977; Inner Mongolian edition in two volumes, Hohhot, 1984 (references are to the former)
Mag = S. Magauya, tr., Mongolid kuptya šežeriši, Oliγi, 1979
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MAM = H.G. Schwarz, Mongolia and the Mongols. Holdings at Western Washington University, Western Washington, Bellingham, 1992
Map2 = Map of Mongolia, 1:4,000,000, Geo. Sect. Gen. Staff, No. 2957, publ. by the War Office, 1931 (3rd ed., 1939), Sheet 22
Matériel I = A. Mostaert, Le matériel mongol du Hunou iu in 蒙古語 de Hong-ou (1389), I, ed. par I. de Rachewiltz avec l’assistance de A. Schönbaum, Bruxelles, 1977
Matériel II = A. Mostaert, I. de Rachewiltz, Le matériel mongol du Hunou iu de Hong-ou (1389), II, Commentaire, Bruxelles, 1995
MB = Babel (Zahir-Ed-Din-Mohammed), Mémoires de Baber..., I-II, tr. by A. Pavet de Courteille, Paris, 1871
MBIKG = M. Weißen, ed., Die Mongolen, Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und Kultur, Darmstadt, 1986
MBMTTS = L. Qurtabayatur, Ç. Ülümę, Mongol-an börge mörgböl-an tayluya takțiya-yin soyol, Hulunbuir, 1991
MBOT = Mongol-an Borjigit obur-an teixke by Lomi. See MBOT* and MBOT
MEP = L. Ligeti, Monuments en écriture 'phags-pa. Pièces de chancellerie en transcription chinoise, MLMC 3, Budapest, 1972


MEPI = L. Ligeti, Monuments en écriture 'phags-pa. Pièces de chancellerie en transcription chinoise, IVLMMT 3, Budapest, 1973


— 1993 = R.I. Meserve, 'The Latin Sources for Khwarezm', in EÜHCL, 79-93


MF = L. Olschki, The Myth of Felt, Berkeley, 1949

MFC = Mélange offerts au R.P. Ferdinand Cavallera, Université des Sciences Sociales de Toulouse, Toulouse, 1948

MGDJ = [編集者] 大地茂太郎, 大矢正夫, 高橋威明, 1933; repr. 1971

MGK = 森川哲夫, 萬古公, "Erdeni-yin toborb-a" の校訂, 補闕, 1996

MGVM = A.D. Rudnev, Materiały po govoram vostochnol Mongoli, St. Petersbourg, 1911

MGYMČ = P.S. Popov, tr., Mongol'skii kočev'yaš, St. Petersbourg, 1895

MIIHWY = 孫克宏, 萬古公與溝通文化研究, 臺北, 1958
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MIA = P.K. Kozlov, *Mongoliya i Amdo i meryt gol korha Khato*, Moscow-Petrograd, 1923; repr. Moscow, 1948


MIHH = 森安孝夫, *オタニ編集, モンゴル現存文献, 研究試案研究報告*, 大阪, 1999

Miller 2000 = R.A. Miller, *Two Middle Mongolian Titles in Early Korean*, in *SSE*, 205-218


MIM = A.M. Pozdneev, *Mongoliya i Mongoly*, I, St. Petersburg, 1896; II, St. Petersburg, 1898


MJD = *Mélanges offerts à Jean Duviucci, Université des Sciences Sociales de Toulouse*, Toulouse, 1979

MKJ = 本間賢, *モンゴル時代史研究, 東京, 1961

MJHT = Mongol jöb bícige-yin tol, *蒙古文正字法詞典*, I-II, Hobhot, 1999


MKet = *Mongol kelen-ü tol, 察坦雅西文*, Hobhot, 1997

MKKHCSc = 札合合氏譯著, *蒙古記史文譯集*, 北京, 1979


MKLY = *蒙古語彙*, SLKC, ed. of 1330-32. See CTVT, Ligeti 1990 and Kara 1990

MKK = 王慶厯, 蒙古考, in *WK*, *s* 6; repr. in KTCL 15, 687-712, and LCST, 22-31


MKVM VI = VI Meždunarodnyj Kongress Mongolovedov (Ulan Bator, avgust 1992 g.), I-II, Moscow, 1992


MKSH = 马佩坤, 蒙古史, 北京, 1979
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MKSLT = 蒙古史通, 北京, 1979
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Mostaert 1957 = A. Mostaert, ‘Sur le culte de Sayang Sezen et de son biaital Qutuytai Sezen chez les Ordos’, HIAS 20:1957, 534-566
— 1957a = A. Mostaert, ‘Le mot Natigay/Nacigay chez Marco Polo’, in OP, 95-101

MOUNT = Mongol orny ursgalyn ner ton'tsoo, UNTKM 59-60, Ulam Bator, 1965

MP = Marco Polo, see MP1, MP2, MP3

MP1 = A.C. Moule, P. Pelliot, Marco Polo. The Description of the World, I-II, London, 1938


MP3 = Marco Polo, La description du monde, texte intégral en français moderne avec introduction et notes par L. Hambis, Paris, 1955

MP4 = The Travels of Marco Polo, translated and with an introduction by R. Latham, Penguin Books, 1958; several reprint

MPA = L. Olchoki, Marco Polo’s Asia. An Introduction to his ‘Description of the World called “Il Milione”’, tr. by J.R. Scott, Univ. of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960


MPr = L. Ligeti, ed., Monuments préclassiques, I. XIIIe et XIVe siècles, MLMC 2, Budapest, 1972

MPrI = L. Ligeti, Monuments préclassiques, I. XIIIe et XIVe siècles, Premiere partie, IVL45MF1, Budapest, 1970
MTSTBS, III = Š. Bira, Mongolyn tuua, soyol, tuux biciigii sudaalgaa, ed. by C. Badorz and X. Purevjavag, Ulan Bator, 2001


Mu = 村上正二, モンゴル部族, ナダマン・カン残巻, I-III, 東京, 1970-76

Mu’iz = Mu’izz al-Ansāb fi ṣaḥārat al-Ansāb, comp. by order of Sultan Säth Rakh in alt 830/1426-1427, Mss. of the Maulania Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Nos. 195 and 196

MUJ = Č. Dámszüssér, Mongol uran tokial-un degyjil jayun billy ongos, CSM XIV, Ulan Bator, 1959


OECD = J.R. Krueger, Materials for an Oirat-Mongolian to English Citation Dictionary, I-III, Bloomington, Ind., 1978-84
OSUDNK = Ａ.Ｓ. Kadybaev, Очерки истири срежекевокых улугов, дзагаев, нануок и кыркытов, Alma-Ata, 1993
OTIG = E.I. Kychanov, Очерки истории татарского государства, Moscow, 1968
Okladnikov 1958 = A.P. Okladnikov, ”Jë-Burxan” na Khalkhin-gol (z goloykh znamet arheologii), in FINN, 214-218
OLTMKSLC = 馬汝珩, 馬大正, 赫思特蒙古史論集, 青海, 1984

OZ = 小矢原男, 元朝秘史今解, I = 上; II = 中; III = 下; IV = 繕訂版; V = 繕訂版, 東京, 1984-89

OZ = 小矢原男, 元朝秘史, I-II, 東京, 1997


—— 1972 = 小矢原男, ‘元朝秘史蒙古語の“斡捏阿阿戈戈邪翁古”について’，GGG, 579-586


—— 1977a = 小矢原男, ‘元朝秘史蒙古語與現代蒙古語’，in ENKJKK, 491-508

—— 1979 = 小矢原男, 中世蒙古語語彙研究, 東京, 1979


Pa = Arch. Palladit (P.I. Kafarov), ‘Starinnoe mongol’skoe skazanie o Çinigiskhanke’, TCRDM 4:1866, 3-258: 2nd ed., 1910, 1-124 (references are to the 1866 ed.)

PAC = M.J. Hashimoto, Phonology of Ancient Chinese, I-II, SELCAMS 10, 11, 1984

Paj-la-ta-ko-ch'i 1979 = 白拉拉格其, ‘弘治翻譯與辭典’, ir CKMK, 270-278


Pelliot 1929 = P. Pelliot, 'Neuf notes sur des questions d’Asie Centrale', TP 26:1929, 201-266

1929a = P. Pelliot, 'L’édition collective des oeuvres de Wang Kouo-wel', TP 26:1929, 113-182

1930 = P. Pelliot, 'Les mots mongols dans le Koyre só', JA 217:1930, 253-266


1930b = P. Pelliot, 'Notes sur le "Turkestan" de M.W. Barthold', TP 27:1930, 12-56

1930c = P. Pelliot, 'Sur la légende d’Uyuz-khan en écriture ouigoure', TP 27:1930, 247-358


1932 = P. Pelliot, 'Le vrai nom de “Seroctan”', TP 29:1932, 43-54


1936 = P. Pelliot, review of H (1935), TP 32:1936, 355-357

1938 = P. Pelliot, 'Le nom de Xwārizm dans les textes chinois', TP 34:1938, 146-152

1940/41 = P. Pelliot, 'Deux lacunes dans le texte mongol actuel de l’Histoire secrète des Mongols', JA 232:1940-41, 1-16

1944 = P. Pelliot, 'Les formes avec et sans q- (k) initial en turc et en mongol', TP 37:1944, 73-101

1944a = P. Pelliot, ‘Široya = širaya’, TP 37:1944, 102-113

1944b = P. Pelliot, 'Une tribu méconnue des Naiman: les Bārākān', TP 37:1944, 35-72

Pao = Kuo-yi Pao, Studies on the Secret History of the Mongols, UAS 58, Bloomington-The Hague, 1965

PB = B.R. Zonkuev, Príbaščal’ě v serdene VI-načale XVII veka, Ulan-Ude, 1997

PC = M. Granet, La pensée chinoise, Paris, 1950

PCA = L. Krader, Peoples of Central Asia, UAS 26, Bloomington, 1963


Pe = P. Pelliot, Histoire secrète des Mongols, restitution du texte mongol et traduction française des chapitres I à VI, Paris, 1949


PEKG = I. de Rachewiltz, Papal Envoy to the Great Khans, London, 1971

Pelliot 1914 = P. Pelliot, 'Chrétiens d’Asie Centrale et d’Extrême-Orient', TP 15:1914, 623-644

1914a = P. Pelliot, 'Le nom turc du vin dans Odoric de Pordenone', TP 15:1914, 428-435

1920 = P. Pelliot, 'A propos des Comans', JA 15, 2:1920, 125-185

1925 = P. Pelliot, 'Les noms à ḥ ḥ initiale, aujourd’hui amusée dans le mongol des XIII et XIV siècles', JA 206:1925, 193-263

1927 = P. Pelliot, 'Le prétendu vocabulaire mongol des Kaitak du Daghestan', JA 210:1927, 279-294

1927a = P. Pelliot, 'Une ville musulmane dans la Chine du Nord sous les Mongols', JA 211:1927, 261-279
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— 1954a = MAJAR(AT), MAX(ASARI, MATZAP(1 Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung der Geheimen Geschichte der Mongolen), AOI 4:1954, 171-174
PR = N. Pope, Reminiscences, ed. by H.G. Schwarz, Bellingham, 1983
Pritsak 1988 = O. Pritsak, The Distinctive Features of the “Pax Nomadica”, separ. from Settmane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull' alto medievo XXXV. Popoli delle steppe:
Qu DF 1998 = Qu Da-feng, 'A Study of Jie's Expedition to Tung Ch'eng', AOH 51:1998, 171-177

Qu DF 1999 = Qu Da-feng, 'Regional Cultures of the Inner Asian World', in AMMS, I, 225-271

Ra = L. de Rachewiltz, *Index to the Secret History of the Mongols*, UAS 121, Bloomington, 1972
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RIM = W. Rozycki, *A Reverse Index of Manchu*, with the assistance of R. Dwyer, UAS 140, Bloomington, Ind., 1981

Rintchen 1950 = Rintchen, *L’explication du nom Burqan Qaldun*, AOI 1:1950, 189-190

RKN = Rolf ročenkovych narodů v civilizací Central'noj Azii (Role of Nomadic Peoples in the Civilization of Central Asia), International UNESCO Symposium, publ. by the Mongolian National Commission for Central Asian Civilization, Acad. of Sciences of the MPR, Ulán Bator, 1974


— 1986 = A. Rona-Tas, *Yazıkvoev vilijane mongol skol imperi*, in UMEIX, IV/3, 133-138; cf. also UMEIX, IV/2, 547-555

Rossabi 1979 = M. Rossabi, *Khubilai Khan and the Women in His Family*, in SSM, 153-180


SH = The Secret History of the Mongols. Text in transcription in R, Part One. See Appendix Six

Shagdarsüren: see also Ságardsüren


Shastina: see Šástina


SHS = C. Humphrey, N. Thomas, eds, Shamanism, History and the States, Ann Arbor, 1994

Shu CP 1979 = 蘇綱輝, 成吉思汗傳按語考, in COKMKSCK, 108-122

SL = B. Lasfer, Sino-Iranica. Chinese Contributions to the History of Civilization in Ancient Iran, With Special Reference to the History of Cultivated Plants and Products, Chicago, 1919; repr. Taipei, 1967


SIK = L.N. Gumilev, Searches for an Imaginary Kingdom. The Legend of the Kingdom of Prester John, tr. by R.E.F. Smith, Cambridge, 1987

Sinor 1939 = D. Sinor, ‘A propos de la biographie ouigouire de Huian-tsang’, JA 23:1939, 543-590; repr. in IACME (VI)

1972 = D. Sinor, ‘The Mysterious “Talu Sea” in Öjeti’s Letter to Philip the Fair of France’, in AM, 115-121; repr. in IACME (XIV)

1975 = D. Sinor, ‘On Mongol Strategy’, in PEAAC, V, 238-249; repr. in IACME (XVI)


1985 = D. Sinor, ‘Some Components of the Civilization of the Turks (6th to 8th century A.D.)’, in ASI, 145-159

1986 = D. Sinor, ‘Takšta on Oosgh over a Dog Cut in Two’, in ARDP, 301-307; repr. in SMA (XVII)


1996 = D. Sinor, ‘Some Altaic Terms for Containers’, in PIAC XXXVIII, 345-357
SLKC = 彭國Crud, 文書考訂, in the following editions: 1) 楊守齋, 西夏書院, of 1339-52; 2) Jap. ed. of Genroku 元禄 15 (= 1699) reprodn. the Yuan ed. of 1325
SMCU = N.P. Sastina, The Study of Mongolian Chronicles in the USSR, Papers Presented by the USSR Delegation, XXVI International Congress of Orientalists, Moscow, 1963 (panphlet)
SMG = E. Haenisch, Sinomongolische Glossare, I. Das Hua-I In-yi, ADAW 1956, 5, Berlin, 1957
SMA = D. Sincr, Studies in Medieval Inner Asia, Variorum, Aldershot, 1997
SMRM = H. Serruy, Sino-Mongol Relations During the Ming, I. The Mongols in China During the Hung-wa Period (1368-1398), Bruxelles, 1959, II. The tribute System and Diplomatic Missions (1400-1600), Bruxelles, 1967; III. Trade Relations: The Horse Fairs (1400-1600), Bruxelles, 1975
SMT = V.A. Kazakevich, Sovremennaya mongol’skaya toponimika, Leningrad, 1934


TNP == G. Tucci, Tibetan Painted Scrolls, I-II, Rome, 1949


'Three documents mongols des Archives secrète vaticaines', BJAS 15:1952, 419-506


Tsai’ic 1980 = 葛志明, ‘蒙古族的年號’; MTYC, 1980.3, 57-61


Tsien CM 1935 = 錢仲鈞, ‘蒙古史紀年’; CYYF 5:1935, 461-496


TJK = 和田清, 東亞史研究 (蒙古史) (Studies in the History of Far East [Mongolia]), Tokyo, 1954

TTK = 端田清, 傳誦解, in WKW, i:6

TTKHY = 傳誦解語解, in TBS, 147-205


TTKTT = 傳誦解譯解, ed. by E. Haenisch in SMG. For the TTKTT Supplements see OJUTB

TTY = 傳誦語 (ca. 1600), in LIML, III, b-39


TYH = G. Molé, The T’a-ya-hun from the Northern Wei to the Time of the Five Dynasties, Rome, 1970

TYO = B. Bayana, tr., Temüjin-a yisin irlag, Hailar, 1984


UGPM = M. Weiers, Untersuchungen zu einer historischen Grammatik des präklassischen Schriftmongolischen, AF 28, Wiesbaden, 1969


UNT = Mongol-oros-latin-tüviy-sytad xelger saxsaran urgamlyn ner toom tsoo, UNTKM 89-90, Ulán Bator, 1973


- 1984a = K. Uray-Köhalmi, ‘Berichte der Geheimen Geschichte der Mongolen und des Altan Toböl über Cinggis Qan’s
Politik gegenüber den östlichen Jurden, "AOH 38:1984, 289-302

šuray-Kóhmí 1985 = K. šuray-Kóhmí, O žnejčenii odnogo gidronima v "Sokrovanom skazanii mongolov", in OUMEIX, IV/2, 154-159


— 1994 = K. šuray-Kóhmí, "Von Sippenkult bis zum Staatskult", in BZ, 317-323


UUY = E. Haennisch, Untersuchungen über das Yuan-ch'uo pi-ch'i. Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen, ASAW 41, 4, Leipzig, 1931

UD = Uliger-ün dali, tr. by Siiregetti Guosi Cojüi, ed. and ann. by Erkinbajar, Peking, 1986

ÜÜT = Üereti urumutun jiraxtu tol, Ööör Mongol-un Surjal Künnişün-in Khebel-in Qenıya, Holhot, 1977

Väsky 1975 = I. Väskylä, "The Hungarians or Možars and the Mešeris/Mıserı of the Middle Volga Region", AEMA 1:1975, 237-275

Verstambl = G.J. Ramstedt, Zur Verbstammbildungslehre der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachen, JSEFoU 28:1912, 1-83


VG = T. Pagba, Vppomogatel'nye, ili služebnye, glagoly v sovremennom mongol'skom literaturnom yaz'ke, SM 4, Ulan Bator, 1961

VGAS = N. Poppe, Vergleichende Grammatik der altaiischen Sprachen, I, Vergleichende Lautlehre, Wiesbaden, 1960

Vicze 1990 = H.-P. Vicze, "Haapsudemia auf γ- und q- in der "Geheimen Geschichte der Mongolen", in OA, 379-389

— 1993 = H.-P. Vicze, "The Ulán Bator Editions of the Altan Tobö", in ISMC, 237-244

— 1993a = H.-P. Vicze, "Bló Bzan Bstan 'Jin Gùšši's Rhymes", in PIAC XXXV, 469-476


— 1995a = H.-P. Vicze, "Bló Bzan Bstan 'Jin Gùšši's Errors", in OUMEIX, VI/2, 302-360

Vicze & Lubsang 1993 = H.-P. Vicze, G. Lubsang, "Das Altan Tobö im Computer", in AB, 299-305

Viktorova 1978 = L. L. Viktorova, "Rol' stereotipa kul'tury v étnogenese mongolov', in AEM, 5-15


VKV = L.A. Aganina et al., eds, III Vestychnaya Kongresiya Vostokovedov. Vzaimodejstvie i vzaimovlyanie civilizacii kul'tur na vostoče (Dushanbe, 16-18 maya 1988), I, Moscow, 1988

Vlad. 1 = B. Ya. Vladimirov, Óšćěštvěnný strl mongolov. Mongol'skij kočevot' jeadatim, Leningrad, 1934


Vladimirov 1911 = B. Ya. Vladimirov, "Tureckče elemynti v mongol'skom yaz'ke", ZVORAO 20:1911, 153-184


— — 1925a = B. Ya. Vladimirovic, ‘Sledy grammatičeskogo roda v mongol’skom yazike’, DAV, 1925, 31-34


VMI = L. Ligeti, ‘Un vocabulaire mongol d’Istanboul’, AOH 14:1962, 3-99


VWTD = W. Radloff, Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialekte, I-IV, St. Petersburg, 1893-1911; repr. Moscow, 1963


WAJ = J. Hamunen, V. Rybatzki, eds, Writing in the Asian World, Helsinki, 1999

WCAC = Ch’en Yuan, Western and Central Asians in China. Their Transformation into Chinese, tr. by Ch’en Hsing-hai and L.C. Goodrich, MSM 15, Los Angeles, 1966

Wei = Wei Kwei San, tr., The Secret History of the Mongol Dynasty (Yuan-Chao-Pi-Shi), Aligarh, 1957


WHHC = 瑞安, 瑞安史學論著選編, II, 北京, 1986


WKW = 王鳳書, 通史諸家所著編, 上海, 1940

WMA = A. Mohdår, Weather-Magic in Inner Asia, UAS 158, Bloomington, 1994

WPC = 王元管理, 勁草志, 1621. See ISMH, 209 (7.7)

Wright 1997 = D.C. Wright, ‘The Death of Chinggis Khan in Mongolian, Chinese, Persian, and European Sources’, in HLIIE, 425-433


WTCWC = 王連清文集, III, 北京, 1957

WTY = W. Heissig, Wort aus tausend Jahren, Wiesbaden, n.d.

Wu C 1986 = Chaolu Wu (Chalouli Üjiedin), ‘Tree Worship in Early Mongolia’, in CCHEIA, 80-95

WWETSL = 西安鮮卑學, 西安鮮卑學研究, 4, 北京, 1981

Y = 元朝秘史; see Y1, Y2, Y3, Y4, Y5, and Section Four of the Introduction

Y1 = 元朝秘史, 萊氏 (萊德理) 設記 изд., 1988; repr. in YSC, 311-619

Y2 = 元朝秘史, SFTK ed., 1936; repr. in YSC, 2-308

Y3 = 元朝秘史, 十五卷本 (Palladius ms), in Yuan-Chao bi-shi (Sekretanaya istoriya mongolov) 15 cizyaniem, I, tekst, ed. by B.L. Pankratov, Moscow, 1962; repr. in /SC, 623-771
The secret history
INDEX NAME

259; on story of Dobon Menben and the Miao Baya’u ma: 259; on succession to Ogodei; 936; on succession to Qubilai Khan; 299; 315; on Subu, 405; in Sugi Qotai; xxvii, xl. 479, 769; on Taqal stronghold; 729; on taking of girls by Ogidens from Temige; 1059; on Tarqar Kirtiku, 547; on the Tayu’u; 286, 299; on thirteen camps of Cinggis Qan; 473-5; on title fa’ut qurqa’ul utuq, 492, 493; on Tobon, 797; on Touqar; 940; on tribes that submitted after battle at Naqi Cliff; 722; on the Tumat; 858; on Tugane Stream; 635; and Ur River; 633, 634, 635; on Urgumb Turas; 257; on Wai-yun Fuhing; 901; on Yedj Cheng; 610, 614; in Yusi Buqa Tai; 797; on Yisigai’s campaign against Tatars; 319; on Yisigai’s wives; 313-4; on Yisigai and Yisigai, 579-80; Ratchnevsky, P. (pr.: on date of composition of SH, xxxii; on SH as history, IX; on Sugi Qotai as author of SH, xxxvii, xxxvi, xxxi; on Shub, William (pr.: see William of Rubruck); Rus (pr.: 959, 1018; see also Orusit, Russians; Russians (pr.: 959); see also Orusit, Rus; Sair Ke (see Sair Stope); Sair Stope (pr.: 180, 161, 177, 195a, 197b, 205, 210, 241, 257, 268, 465, 467, 695, 856-69, 703; battle at (see under battles in Subject Index); campaign base on; 161, 177, 193, 250, 416, 645, 695, 939, 940, 965, 986, 993; Salla (pr.: 136, 137, 179; see also Sala Beki); Salla Beki (pr.: 122, 123, 304, 313, 136, 249, 255, 412, 425, 511, and election of Cinggis Qan as qan; 123, 453, 455, 460, 645, 646, execution of; 136, 137, 503, 546, 655; and Fitth Camp, 474; see also Sala; Sedie (pr.: on Sedie’s tale; and Erdeni Gedik on, xvi, xxxv, xlvii)

729); on taking of girls by Ogidens from Temige; 1059; on Tarqar Kirtiku, 547; on the Tayu’u; 286, 299; on thirteen camps of Cinggis Qan; 473-5; on title fa’ut qurqa’ul utuq, 492, 493; on Tobon, 797; on Touqar; 940; on tribes that submitted after battle at Naqi Cliff; 722; on the Tumat; 858; on Tugane Stream; 635; and Ur River; 633, 634, 635; on Urgumb Turas; 257; on Wai-yun Fuhing; 901; on Yedj Cheng; 610, 614; in Yusi Buqa Tai; 797; on Yisigai’s campaign against Tatars; 319; on Yisigai’s wives; 313-4; on Yisigai and Yisigai, 579-80; Ratchnevsky, P. (pr.: on date of composition of SH, xxxii; on SH as history, IX; on Sugi Qotai as author of SH, xxxvii, xxxvi, xxxi; on Shub, William (pr.: see William of Rubruck); Rus (pr.: 959, 1018; see also Orusit, Russians; Russians (pr.: 959); see also Orusit, Rus; Sair Ke(see Sair Stope); Sair Stope (pr.: 180, 161, 177, 195a, 197b, 205, 210, 241, 257, 268, 465, 467, 695, 856-69, 703; battle at (see under battles in Subject Index); campaign base on; 161, 177, 193, 250, 416, 645, 695, 939, 940, 965, 986, 993; Salla (pr.: 136, 137, 179; see also Sala Beki); Salla Beki (pr.: 122, 123, 304, 313, 136, 249, 255, 412, 425, 511, and election of Cinggis Qan as qan; 123, 453, 455, 460, 645, 646, execution of; 136, 137, 503, 546, 655; and Fitth Camp, 474; see also Sala; Sedie (pr.: on Sedie’s tale; and Erdeni Gedik on, xvi, xxxv, xlvii)
rivers of the Kiiat, 272, 995; of Mother Hōsin. 244; of Qoqio at Gyokan. Hanggwan and Bii, 276, 277; see also Jurō. arangling, 76; see also fishing. animals and birds, 78; in Mongolian and Turkish mythology, 224. animism and taboo against explicit references to killing, death and spillling of blood, 368; see also spirit. anessination (xian deshui); examination. ammendations and commentaries to translation of. correspondence. 25.orraine of anonymu of compiler of Shī, xxxv. ante, 244. ante-quin, 515, 585; see also Jampa in Nime Index. antipapoi, 1903; distribution of, 775. of Qōzār, 878, 985; of Tenshū, 940; of Yūnjin, 984; see also domestic paternity (‘jure). appointments by Qōqio: Qōqio serves, 204, 216, 219, 221, 268, 808; of Belgians and Qoqio Taqara’an as equipers, 124, 483; of Belgians as judge, 154, 572, 771; of Bōsor and Jāsna as commanders of all, 125, 467; chamberlains, 124, 191, 212, 441. 462, 901, 977, commander of all, 125, 407; commander of ten thousand, 795; commander of ten thousand of the left wing, 206; commander of ten thousand of the right wing, 265, 792; of commanders of a hundred, 191, 224, commanders of a thousand, 120, 191, 262, 269, 213, 211, 233, 234, 225, 763.5-766, 775, commanders of a thousand of daysguard, 26; commanders of a thousand of quiverbeakers, 225, commanders of quiverbeakers, 225, commanders of quiverbeakers, 225, 822-3, 1023; commanders of subjects peoples given to Qōqio Qōqio’s master, children and children, 868, 874; commanders of ten, 191, 224, commanders of ten thousand, 205, 206, 207, 210, 220, 224, 728, 915; commanders of ten thousand of the center, 228, 728, 815; Comitah to command right wing against Merkit rebels, 198, 730; envoys of companies of daysguards, 227, 825, 1022, 1027; envoys, 124, 465, 636, 661; three heralds, 124; judges: Belgians, 151, 572, 771; Gūp Qinao, 803, 721; of Rīs (Kōro) Ciy as adviser to Ciy, 243; management of tent-carts, 124; Mās at in charge of various cities, along with resident commissaries, 263; sheep terrains, 124, 465; stelards, 124, 462; 124; Yawār and Mās at, along with resident commissaries, in charge of the Khan, 260, 914; in charge of Junglo, 260 appointments by Qōqio: of Batu in command of princes in support of Sube dei, 270, 991; commanders of companies of nightsguard, 278, 1022, 1027; commanders of companies of quiverbeakers, 278, 1027; of Qānum as commander of garrison in Buzan, 274; clerks of companies of daysguards, 278, 1032; of Eklehak in command of the Guard, 278, 1024; of functionaries in charge of post-relay system, 280, 1011; of Qōbe in Dailgakan in charge of nightsguard, 278, 1027; resident commissaries, 273; of Yiddar Qoqio as commander of garrison, 274 appointments by the Altai Qoqio (Itendan-tsū). Qoqio as Itai, 282, 917; approval of: (Subai as) other princes and commanders for levies and post-station system, 280. Arabian-Persian transcription, 223, 291 archaeological investigations of burial place of Qoqio, 981-2 archaeological remains at: Kodō-e Aral, 502; at Qoqio Qoqio, 445, 1006. archery, 715; practice. 116; Qia at and, 715, 873, 877, skill in, 139, 224; Yiqing and, 715; see also arrows, bows. arches are imperial archives; secret archives. ‘aristocracy of the steppe’ are ruling class, 996; three layers, 195; see also brezgates. army, 260; of Bīnqī, 240; of Qōqio Qōqio, 183, 195, 247, 248, of Dobrī, 240; enslavement to of eldest son, 270; punishment, 276; great, of Qōqio Qōqio, 146; the Guard and, 226, 825; of Qōqo, 133, 141, 170, 171; provisioning of, 199; of Tuyan Qōqio, 194; of Yingsi, 190; see also companies; flaskis; Guard (Yidlik); left wing; military administration; organization; patrol/patrolmen; right wing; soldiers; troops, units of a hundred, a units of ten; units of ten thousand; vanguard army mounts, 737-8; care of, 195, 739; supplied to recruits to guards, 224; see also reserve forces. armies of Qōqio Qōqio, 163, 177, 195; Qōqio Qōqio and Qōqio, 159; Qōqio Qōqio and Qōqio, 198; Qōke’s U’aq’ab, 159, 177; of Qōqio, 179; Yingsi, 177; see also battle cry: arrest for breaches of restrictions on movement in the vicinity of Palace and nightsguards, 229, 278, 300, 301; of Qōqio’s younger brothers and chiefs, 152 arrangement to be permitted, 124, 465; of Buri Bōko, 511, 512, 513, 514; see also pride: arrow-throwing knife, 178 arrow-shafts, 262; Altai Qoqio’s parade of, 19, 22, 262-3 arrow-sharpening knife, 80. arrow-shaped javelins, 116, 657; 618. arrows, 77, 39, 87, 91, 106, 147, 163, 171, 172, 173, 177, 198, 199, 214, 219, 246, 416, 604; falcon-flying, 124, 465, 656, 657; see also envoys, forking-tip, 719, 713, 14; samb, 147, 154, 157, 160, see also golden halter. army of the steppe, 1023, 1024, 1026, 1070; of Altai, 204, 246 of the Gaoxu, 204, 207, 210; see also golden halter. army of the steppe, 1023, 1024, 1026, 1070; of Altai, 204, 246 of the Gaoxu, 204, 207, 210; see also golden halter. army of the steppe, 1023, 1024, 1026, 1070; of Altai, 204, 246 of the Gaoxu, 204, 207, 210; see also golden halter. army of the steppe, 1023, 1024, 1026, 1070; of Altai, 204, 246 of the Gaoxu, 204, 207, 210; see also golden halter. army of the steppe, 1023, 1024, 1026, 1070; of Altai, 204, 246 of the Gaoxu, 204, 207, 210; see also golden halter. army of the steppe, 1023, 1024, 1026, 1070; of Altai, 204, 246 of the Gaoxu, 204, 207, 210; see also golden halter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 1264</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ORDER OF ODGO QU AN**

- **Appointment as Commander of a Command in Support of the Battalion of 270**
- **Appointment as Assistant Commissioner as Commander of a garrison in Bajit, 274**
- **Appointment as Eligible to be in command of a battalion of 278**
- **Appointment as Guyluk to be in command of troops from the centre in support of Suhe, 270**
- **Appointment as Quda a Daldalq to be in charge of a garrison, 278**
- **Appointment as Yawdar Quayil as commander of garrison, 274**

**ORDERS OF ODGO QU AN**

- **Appointment of a Commander in Support of 270**
- **Appointment of a Commander of a Command in Support of the Battalion of 270**

**ORDERS OF ODGO QU AN**

- **Appointment of a Commander in Support of 270**
- **Appointment of a Commander of a Command in Support of the Battalion of 270**
on Tzu-tan, 240, of Tuan on Brooqui, 240
surrender: of Dayak Usun, 1046; of the
Kerevy, 185; of Quaq Ba’we, 185
surveillance, 240
swallowing: of Qatu, 97, 211
swim, 111
sweat: of bow, 234, 260; of feet, 254
swords: 50, 131, 170, 195, 250; awarded
to Qohele, Qilgits, Qaqai Yiquan and
Qasir, 124, 464-5; execution by,
136, 703; masked, 106, 415
sworn friends: 117, 395-6; Cinagis Qan
and Jamui, 165, 168, 112, 136,
17, 118, 112, 127, 167, 166, 170, 179,
181, 195, 196, 200, 201, 409, 436, 438,
747-8, 748, 749, 753, 756; Cinagis Qan
and quaka Jami, 651, Cinagis Qan and
Qoyqiz, 171, 208, 217, 632, 668,
787; Cinagis Qan and Senggiang, 181,
285, 550-1; and exchange of gifts, 438,
438-9; background of, 438-9; origins of,
116-17, 196; Yosigo and Qan
96, 104, 150, 151, 164, 177, 394,
408, 550, 703, 769; see also friendship;
and Sen, Qan; Index: symbolism of, 353, 809, 437, 874, 884; of birth of conqueror with
blood on his hands, 321; of collars (see under collar); of colours (see under black;
golden, white; yellow); of Dci Senin, dreams of, 323; of door of life, and frame, 263, 415; of fallen stars, 450; of gendrani,
328; of golden/yellow colour, 263, 264-
5, 506; of great war drum, 837, of
hagini, 924, of hat, 407, 847, 874, 933,
of heartless ox, 450; of images of fish,
999; of numbers, 325 (see under
turquoise; four, nine, three); of shaft of cut (see under shaft); of smoke hole, 276,
343 of tall hat, 503; of tall and tent
shaft, 450; of trachea, lungs and heart,
258; of white with standard with nine
tails, 837, of wolf, 264
syntagm of preclausal (see, of: of Qan, 213
Syrian prayer, 679; see also Al-Ahbabu prayer
wa-sung (title) see GII, Index: table see wine table, labours to abstract explicit references
to killing, death and spilling of blood, 506
(see also preclausal); on site of death,
885, 886
series see manuscript/techniques
sha-gi, 816
traits: attached to humains, 652-3; of
horse, 24, 26, 76, 77, 79, 90, 117, 129,
152, 177, 268-9; nine, of standard, 302,
350, 759; of Sumag aipr, 181, 652,
wooden, 275, 1012
traits and asli see GII, Index: series
Tamm, immeret (see garrison troops
Tangbleng Huia kingdom see Huia
Tawin immortals, 707
Tarit patriarch, 899, 940
tarot cloth, 847
taxation: of Bajiki people, 274; early
system of, 1025; rating of to provide
for Qan, 141, 151, 177, 238, 559,
reform by of Oggodi, 279, 1024, 1025;
see also land tax; letiers, tribute
sum (title) see GII, Index: taxation
strict instruction be decided in, 277, domestic and
servants in, 124, vacant seat, 214, 803,
of Fathar Mingeli, 160, 204; for feast,
275, 560; gun, 230, 833; felt-walled,
202, 202, 230, 759, 771; golden (see
golden tent); great council in single,
134, grey, 245; guardini of Cinagis
Qan’s, 192; hierarchy of places within,
16, of Ho Shit, 138, 214, 803; in
instead, 302, 832, of Naqui Shait, 93,
205; of Ogg, 152; palatial (see
palatial tent); pulled by, 131, 450; rock the score of, 80, 374; seeing in (see
seat order and elevation); serving inside, 224 (see also guards); of the
Yangi, 266, 265, of Taiyin Qan, 193,
of thin wooden cloth, 268, 265, of
Taiyin’s, of Toyo’s Beki, 109,
ventured, 230, 831; of Yeke Yeren,
169; see also back of the tent; center
of the tent; deer; frame; smoke-hole; travel-
tents
temples: between the Alakan Qan (Huihuai)
and Cinagis Qan, 248
testimony: of Qulan Qan on behalf of
Nawa’s, 197
thali, 110, 131
test of SH see textual history of SH
textile are cloth
textile evidence: for Sigit Oqotou as
author of SH, xxvii
theft see robbery
thug: Senggiang’s horse shot in, 163, 177
thieves, 246; farm, wounded, 149
themes: in inner land of nest, 201; in
mouth, 77, 367
thoughtful: Cinagis Qan, 149
theurgia: see manuscript/techniques
thousand: see commands of a thousand: units of a thousand
thread, 137
three: symbolism of, 241, 325, 374, 388,
408
threading: 254, 406, 488, golden, 137,
506, 768; royal, 203, 768; slaves of,
137, 210, 311, 506
thread, 149; and tokhing, 213
thread, 64, 201, 205, 280, 231, 271, 279,
281; grass, 248, 272, 281; high,
187; nightguards and, 303, 731
see also enthronement
thunder and shivering arrows, 139, 254
Tibetan culture and SH, xxv, lv
Tibetan dogs, 956, used figuratively, 260
tiger, 78, see also Year of the Tiger
title of SH, xxv, xxl, 221; in
Chinese version, 221-2
tribute Chinese, 236, 553, 589, 590, 600,
given posthumously to imperial
ancestors, of Shu, Xunian, 493;
Kerevy, 512; Kitan, 492-3; Turke,
236, 263, 495, 553, 956; used in;
and as proper names, 222, 236, 260,
283, 286, 288, 291, 249, 419, 509;
variations regarding in allied tent
rest of SH, 8ix; see also under
title of SH, lady, mother; old; uncle;
young brothers; see also local
titles; terms of respect; and individual
extraction in GII
tress: meaning objective rules on rank
and seniority and, 481, 1012; formal, 680;
see also drinking
Tubganyan xili, xili, xivi, composition of,
Xili, xili, xivi, and Cinagis Qan’s a
allegorist, Cinagis Qan’s a
allegorist, and, and; Odigui section of
xili, xiliv, translation of,
155, 215, 216; gift of, 167; people of the
to, 245, 878-80; tales see impliment
of Mongol camp, 442
tongue: used in questioning,
terrestrial access in
mongol mythology, 224, 231, 332,
towns, 272, 258, barrier, 253; of Qan
Melin, 27, Kitan, 272; subjurgated,
53 with walls of wood, 269, 249,
274, 75-5, see also cities; cities and
towns, tracking, 56, 88, 90, 101, 173, 182, 173;
red bull, 248, 861
unregarded households, 222, Rikos, 202, of left wing, 783; and levy of mule’s milk, 279; and levy of sheep for support of the axe and the poor, 280, levy to form, 817; and levy to support post-secretary station, 280, Mosko, 202, of nightgowns, 226. Orogen, 202; post-secretary masters and post-secretary keepers from, 279, of quiverbearers, 225, 226, of ring-wing, 797; selection of camponasters from, 279; and see also commanders of a thousand, monego in G&I Index. Units of ten of, 459; see also commanders of ten.

units of ten thousand, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 129, 269, 417, 417, 415, 815; of the centre, 220, 815, 818; of the left wing, 206, 220, 783, 818, 818 of nightgivers, quiverbearers and dayguards, 224, of Qoq, 207, 786; of the right wing, 205, 220, 781, 815, 818, 229 and the thirteen camps, 229, 475, 763; see also commanders of ten thousand, leader of ten thousand, names of in G&I Index

unity and solidarity: Alan Qoq a’an, 19, 22, 262

universal Ruler, 280, 308, 102; see also qes; qes are unregarded households, 222, urgent messengers, 222 and library of Pallic, 226, 613, 842

Uturn of SH, kaal, kaal, kaal, authorisation of, kaal, meaning of, kaal, reconstruction of, kaal see also Chungq Qoq a’an-âqay, Chungq Qoq a’uqay

valleys, 56, 247, 311

vanguard, 123, 179, 276, 276, 522, 622, C Gregg Qin a’in, 189, Chungq Qin’s, 142, Janqui’s, 142, 523, jet, and Oxygyn, Bu’tar a’un, 207, Jene a, 257, 272, Jerga as Qoq Qin’s, 176, 171, Kiit, 251, Qoq Qin’s, 121, ‘our’, 142, Qvilladai and the Mangaptai and the Una’a as Chungq Qin’s, 171, 667, 667

Qungq as, 257; see also reconnoitering, scores, variant readings in: alhun topi text of SH, livvi, in A and B texts of SH, li, in D. Liv Hui-yian and Palladius miss., hui vassals, 847, rulers of subject peoples as, 924; see also subjects

venom, neck, 145, 173

vendetta see revenge revenge versions of SH and see translations of SH

vessels: golden, of Qoq Qin, 187, 671-2, golden and silver, 267, nightguards and, 222, 238, 876; Swardars and, 222; see also bowls

victuals: towards and distribution of, 796; see also food

vexation: none of, 197, 177

vexes: and aesthetic sense, 329; of enemies, 754, 755, 797-6; and soul, 754

victory (Roman); and augural spirit, 633 vocabulary of SH, livvi, livvi

wastage: gold-stitched and lined with sable, 135, 495, 496

walls, bricks, 279, felt, 202, 203; of pounded earth, 203, 249, 265, 276, 281, town, 276, G&I Index

water: war and warfare: for disinfecting commands, 122, see also batteux; campaigns; weapons; war drum see great war drum war mission of: Jero to pursue Guulzki Qoq, 202, of Sibei to pursue Tse’po’s sons, 199

warnings of Ambaqua about dangers of accompanying daughter-in-law to person in her husband’s home, 53, 391; Baidai and Kilingq warn Cingq Qin’s, 169, 170, 655; Baidai warns Cingq Qin about rupture with the Jorkin, 131, 132, 465; Ilme warns Cingq Qin, 245, Cidsiq and Yidai warn Cingq Qin, 170, Father Mongisk warns Cingq Qin, 168, 775; from Heaven, 60, 374, Jamaati warns Cingq Qin, 170, 200

warriors: brave, of Arqui Qoq (see elite guards of Arqui Qoq), of Debris Doolin, 240, elder brave, 230; see also soldiers, troops

washing, hands, 189

watches see companions

water, 272, cult of, 951, - depth of and death, 277, mixed with cart, 145; provision of by digging of wells, 279, 281, river, 283, searching for, 188

watering, 183, 208; wetters, 182

weakness of Tusaq Qin, 199, 193, 199, 681-2; of young Taayi’s man guarding Cingq Qin’s, 81, 377

weapons, 234, 250, 254, 279, 719, 840, 861; see arrows; bows; spears; swords woven; 183

weather conditions, 259; see also blizzard; cold; fog; rain; storm; snowstorm; wet

wearing, 249, 906

wedding gifts for father/ mother of betrothals, 96, 593, 596, 398

wedding see marriage

weft, 279, see also reed; wells; digging of, 279, 281

west see right hand; right wing

Western Campaign see under campaign Western Liao (Hi Siao) empire, 521, 555; see also Lin-maryan; Qes Kiru in Name Index, 207, 208, 327; see also rain

wetters, 124, 272, 272, 280

wheeling: manoeuvre of 179, 618, 708 wheels: sold to trif 194, 701; of cart, 177, 771, 771, 772, 159, 255, 255, 364

wheeling arrow see under arrow

wheel: symbol of, 265, 328, 374, 427, 759, 808, 854

whose power grasper of judicial decisions in book with, 283

while standard with nine tails see under standards

widowed elder sister-in-law used figuratively, 360, 360

widows of: Ambaqua, 70, 71; Ilme alimin a’uqay, 74; of Tolu, 272, 1000; see also widowed elder sister-in-law

winds to be of: Cingq Qin’s, 66 of Yeke Cidiki, 54; see also break

wild animals hunt, 109

wild ass, 199, 279

wild asses, 188, 199, 265, 269, 288, 296, 960

wild bees, 123, 164, 179, 187

wild ducks, 703, 744

wild geese, 215, 215; see also game wild game, 357

wild geese, 27

wild goats, 249

wild hares, see wild asses

wild ducks, 70, 360

wildlife, 378, 8, bullocks, 247

wild onions, 74, 75, 357

wild sheep, 206, 742

wild fowl, 123, 437

will: of Cingq Qin in relation to his successor, 984; of Qebul Qin in relation to his successor, 984

willows, 133, quivers made from wood of, 239

wind, 191

windbreak: of folk, 124

wine: Ogddi and, 281, 1033-4; see also cerimonial wine; drink; drinking

wine table, 801

wings of army see left wing; right wing

wings of army and decision of Alty’s Kodegree, 675, 685, 686, of Qes Kiru at Qe Qva Qva. 148, 151, 153, 177, 339, 595, 566; Cingq Qin at Jero’s teens, 668; Cingq Qin in Black Forest by the Tu in River, 265, Cingq Qin of from the South of the Altai, 198, 730, the Qnggeq at Alty’s Kodegree, 675

winter quarters of Ogddi, 1038

wisdom of Cingq Qin’s, 746

wisdom of Qes Kiru from Kitqin Kodegree, 288, 253

wivers of: Ambaqua Qoq’s, 70; attitude towards, 185, of Baran Bbi ak, 200, 313; of blue-grey wolf, I. of Bodonuk, 43, 120, 80, 374, 9, of Borenluk, 214, 205, 803, 806, of
Bo-ou and Maqiu, 266: confiscation for defying commandments of the qin in war, 129: confiscation of the violation of counsel of the qin in peace, 123: Cairei Lingsu, 47: of Czings Qin, 96, 104, 105, 186, 196, 208, 257, 577, 723, 726, 728, 79, 790, 791, 993; of Didaugui Xipes, 249; of Dei Sedon, 94; of Dobun Mengm, 9: gaining of by abduction, 313; (see also abduction of women: Bozha Diai Qin, 189; of Jamo, 201; of Jutowe, 208, 789, 791, 992; of Xipo, 188, 678, 8; many: of Colou Boku, 45; of the Mertic, made concubines and slaves, 112; of Ymulin Han, 46: order of precedence of, 537; principal, 155, 577, 808; of Qerei, 241; of Qinlunu Mengm, 8; of Quin, 198; secondary, 130, 481; of Seningm, 162, 163, 177, 191, firmly: of Quaxun Qin, 81, 121, 207, 451, 786, 802, without principle, 281, 1034; young, 306; slave: also under capture, conception, daughters, female attendants of the Palace, girls, marriage, queen, slaves, wife, wife's: barking of stick, 275, 1032; tail of made of, 275; woodblock making of signature of, silk wooden tail, 275, 1032; wood, 56, 102, 149, 155, 711; see also sira: women, wife, wife's: (see also ye-sen); of Alan and Quei, 127, 265, 934; by Ban Qin to Czings Qin, 249, 268, by Joci and Caadda, 255, 934; by Satai Boku and Taadu, 126, 503, pledged (see also compact, oath, pledge); by Alan, Queran and Sato Boku, 123; by Czings Qin and Maqiu, 260, by Cizings Qin and Ong Qin, 264, 794; by Czings Qin to Faner Mongol, 246; by Seningm and others to seize Czings Qin, 169, pavement, 267; remnant in one, 188, 255; of a woman without principle, 281; see also agreements; promise: word- and suffix titles of: 511, (see word-order of Alan, (see of, 141, 431), Laxen words: ancient (see proverb sayings/old saying/ancient words), masking, 265, 268; see to be forgotten, 201, 749, wonderful: standing gurum over, 171, 172, 174, 263. worthless: blood clogging, 529, 626-7, Czings Qin's, 145; Ong Qin's, 173: cenzured (Ong Qns) in, 173, 626-7, check of Seningm, 171, 214, 268, 627, death of Qoylandar from, 175, 632, neck words: of Czings Qin, 146, of Ong Qin, 173, 214, hacking wood into, 528-9, 627-9, Czings Qin's, 146, Ong Qin's, 173; sewage, 275, 279, 513, Belgians and, 131; Belgians and Bori Boku, 140, Tensile and Kekleb Boku Tegeg, 245, 284; writings: blue (see blue-script register) Writings Mongol, 115; writers: sources: 333, and, xxi, xxiv; Todzhe and, slin, wrong: squandering (sayings about), 89, 154, 214, 243, see also right and wrong wrongness: sewing needing, 196; Wu cin xin shih xia, xxi, Xuxam Mongol Lin, 296, 342, xvi, 100, 262, 216: xvi, 100, 262, 216, 225, 226: Year of the Dog, 122, 123, 137, 566, 1224, 325, 1226, 265: Year of the Pig, 203, 166, 693, 1224, 1084, 227, 268, 1225, xxii; Year of the Rat, 123, 1034, 193, 197, 1240, 1216, 1222, 255, xxii, xxiii, xxiv, 269, 1239, 1240, 1222, xxiii, xxiv, xxv, 269, 1225, xxiii; and comparison of Sali, xvi, xxii, 282: Year of the Ox, 120, 199, 199, 253, 353, 1046, 2177, 2395, 1229, 255, 1047: Year of the Tiger, 216, 202, 788, 1047, 1218, 762, 1270, 1218, 763, 1270: Year of the Horse, 1220, 1047, 1219, 257, 606, 1050, 1221, 259, 593, 5: Year of the Dragon, 202, 1047, Year of the Snake, 1209, 1047-8, 1235, 1000: Year of the Horse, 1210, 1048: Year of the Sheep, 211, 247, 280, 843, 907, 1048 yellow: symbology of, 265, 264-5 yellow dog, 21, 263, 264 yellow man: and birth of Alan Osa man, 24, 260, 266-5: yellow facebook of, the word, 255, 935, remiss in one's, 108, 430; see also yellow words, keeping of yielding place: Yiquen Qin to Yiqu Qin, yield to: also rules on rank and succession, younger brothers: 166, behaviour towards elder brothers, 76 of Bori Qqatu, 30, of children of Hsui elin, 135 of commanders of a hundred, 191 of commanders of a thousand, 11 of Czale, 209, of Coleo, 111 of Czings Qin, 76, 79, 83, 85, 97, 101, 203, 231, 242, 245, 250, 255, Dogen of, 124 of Du's Ssper, 5, 6 of Hsui elin's children, 203 Jamo, 105, Jamo without, 201, 230; making up, 4, 497 of Ong Qin, 497, 109, 153, 154, 177, 186, of ordinary people, 191 of Qozqan Bajuyn Qin, 150, reason for calling on, 188, 640, of soldiers, 110 of Tampiai Kinty, 194; term used figuratively, 68, 340 title of Jamo, 105, 148, 170 title of Tongdi, 186, of Tsoo, 272, of Yiqu Qin elin, 111 of Yiquen Bo, 54, 126; see also kinmen, younger; younger brothers: (see also: Huu, younger); younger brothers (nephews), younger brothers (a cousin), 351, 446 of Ong Qin, 272, 446, 120, 124, 144, of Jione, 272; younger brothers (nephews): of Ong Qin, 272, 446, younger cousins of: Alan, 169 younger cousins of: Alan Qin, 24, 169, 166 younger sister in-law of: Ong Qin, 272 younger sisters of: Czumai and Qinlin elin, 85 of Sengem, 272 younger brothers of: Yiquen Bo, 242 younger son: Bori, 86, 11use and domastic possession ("yni"); 278, 288, 864, 946, 985. Yuan archives are imperial archives, secret archives Year of the Ox = year plus, xxi; see also: 221-2; see also Secret History of the Mongols
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ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

(The publications listed below appeared, were received, or came to my notice too late for inclusion in the Introduction, the Commentary and the Bibliography; and some of the references were inadvertently omitted at the time of writing)

p. Lxxii, ll. 2-3: a new transcription of the text of the SH by Songgor was published in Hohhot in 2002 under the title Mongvol-un niyača töbliyan-a serγüelet (p.c. of Dr. Chio-do).

p. xc. n. 114: with regard to the HIIY of 1389, a new Word- and Suffix-Index to the Hua-yi Yi-yü based on the Romanized Chinese of L. Ligeti by Hitoshi Kuribayashi (CNEAS) was published by The Center for Northeast Asian Studies (CNEAS) of Tohoku University, Sendai, 2003. This work includes an excellent photo-reproduction of the Chinese text.

p. civ. n. 297, civii. n. 338: a second edition of Li is in preparation in Hungary. It will be issued, under the original title, by the publishing house Osiris, with an Afterword, a revised chronology and bibliography by G. Kara (p.c. of Prof. Kara).

p. cx. n. 356: to the recent studies on Middle Mongolian one must now add Yoshio Saiito’s Uradshin book (轉數的字) and Uradshin (Script and Sound in Middle Mongolian), Kyoto, 2003; and V. Rybatzki’s contribution ‘Middle Mongol’, in J. Janhunen, ed., The Mongolic Languages, London & New York, 2003, 57-82.

p. 223, l. 5 f.b.: on the intervocalic hiatus and Y. Saiito’s contribution, see above.

p. 224, l. 3: for the reading čiúč v. čiño, see below, under p. 479.

p. 234, l. 9 f.b.: after Ch’en Te-chih add 習得芝.


p. 443, l. 6 f.b: for the pronoun bidan'ui, see below under p. 569.

p. 479, 3rd para.: concerning the reading činî v. čino (see above, p. 224) and činîs v. činos, the argument in favour of čino ( > > as propounded here must be subject to some caution, since the long vowel of the second syllable is apparently not present in any modern Mongolian language or dialect.

p. 551, ll. 5-6: for the Arabic-Mongolian document of 1272, see A. Temir, Kireghur Emiri Caka Oglu Nur el-Dîn in 1272 tavori Arapça-Mogolca târîŷes, Ankara, 1959, 160 (ll. 27), 164 (ll. 27), 197, Cf. MP, 271 (l. 27). The following is a tentative translation of the relevant portion (ll. 1-61): ‘On the second qaadî of the first month of summer of the year of the Monkey (= 20 May 1272), when Nuradin (= Nür al-Dîn), the son of Čağa (ča), was at Lâdd Kermen Sarai, he relinquished his own possessions, all of them, making them an ugb ( = ar. waqf) for the sake of Heaven. He had (the deed) entered in this document: “After me, no one, whether (they be) my brothers, my sons, my daughters or my sons-in-law, my grandchildren or great-grandchildren, shall make changes to this ugb (and include) people other than the persons recorded in this document. If (someone) contravenes, he shall be culpable (and liable to punishment) by Eternal Heaven!” Being told to accomplish (this) and carry it out in accordance with what has been written in this document, we, together with all (our) companions – these officials (nayâd) have acted as witnesses, being (the following): Samaryâ, Bâinal, Darîr, Kukečâ, T(e)mür, Čiğin ( > Čirîn), Quta Buqa, Burâaçar, Borând’s commanders (nayâd) Olğolin (and) Çamuto, the commander of a hundred Samduay, the equestries Cob, Nebeg, Mayu, Çaça (? Caya), Nâbî’s intendent Torçova, Atsun, Çaora, Toyân, Turumtai, Audai (? Ečedî), Uriangovdâ’s son Qidzada, Nâbî’s campmaster Qangildai, Talbar, Keremin; further, the companions of
THE SECRET HISTORY

rightly points out, 'Il est impossible de dire, sans un examen minutieux de tous les textes, quels sont ceux qui se rapportent à Atlighidâ, fils de Qâsun, et ceux qui concernent des homonymes ou quasi-homonymes.' (Chapitre CVII, 29-30, n.1) Even then, I doubt whether some of the individuals bearing these names can be positively identified.


p. 938, l. 11: for the name Afa (of Afa Gambu), cf. also H. Franke, 'Zur chinesisch-siHughischen Inschrift von 1361' (see above, under p. 419), 149-150.


p. 1101, l. 5: a new edition of Cev., revised and enlarged by C. Šagdaršüren, was published in Hohhot in 2012 under the double title Mongol uul uul tovč taibar toli. "Mongol kelen-ü tobči taibari toli."

p. 1182, l. 12 f.b.: a new unaltered edition of Šagja (1937), with the same title but different pagination, was prepared by Š. Čojima and published in Ulan Bator and Hohhot in 1996/97.
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