HARRASSOWITZ Verlag

THE MONGOL CAMPAIGNS IN KOREA AND THE DATING OF "THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS"
Author(s): GARI LEDYARD
Source: *Central Asiatic Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (March 1964), pp. 1-22
Published by: Harrassowitz Verlag
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41926597
Accessed: 19/10/2014 12:29

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Harrassowitz Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Central Asiatic Journal*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

THE MONGOL CAMPAIGNS IN KOREA AND THE DATING OF *THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS**

by

GARI LEDYARD

University of California

Naka Michiyo noticed many years ago that the Korean campaign mentioned in § 274 of *The Secret History of the Mongols* (*SH*) corresponded to events unambiguously described in the *Koryŏ sa* in connection with the year 1258.[1] The great Japanese scholar, who held unquestioningly to the traditional opinion that the Rat Year specified in *SH*'s colophon referred to 1240, thought that this passage had been added by a later hand. Arthur Waley recently drew attention to Naka's comments, but thought the possibility of the passage being a later addition rather unlikely; he interpreted it as evidence for the compilation of *SH* "well after the middle of the thirteenth century."[2] I agree with that conclusion, but feel that the evidence might be examined with greater detail than Waley's brief note allowed, and that some of the implications arising from the later dating should be considered.

* This paper grew from a footnote in my unpublished Master's Thesis, "Early Koryŏ-Mongol Relations, with Particular Reference to the Diplomatic Documents," University of California, Berkeley, 1963. — Please note the following abbreviations: *CCL* = *Ch'in cheng lu*, ed. Wang Kuo-wei, in *Hai-ning Wang Ching-an hsien-sheng i-shu*. *KS* = *Koryŏ sa*, Yŏnhi University edition, 3 vols., Seoul, 1955. A photolithographic reprint of the original printed edition of 1454. *KSC* = *Koryŏ sa chŏryo*, Gakushūin edition, Tokyo, 1960. A photolithographic reprint of the original movable type edition of 1453. *OMGH* = Shiratori Kurakichi's edition of *SH*, *Onyaku mōbun Genchō hishi*, Tokyo, 1942. *SH* = *Secret History of the Mongols*. *TYC* = *Tongguk Yi Sangguk Chip*, the collected works of Yi Kyubo (1168–1241). Photolithographic reprint of a 17th century printed edition, Seoul, 1958. *YK* = *Yuan Kao-li chi shih*, the monograph on Korea in the *Ching shih ta tien* (1332), preserved in the *Yung-lo ta tien*, and now found in *Kuang-ts'ang hsueh-ch'ün ts'ung-shu*. *YS* = *Yuan shih*, *Ssu pu pei yao* edition.

[1] *Chingisu kan jitsuroku zokuhen*, 62, 64 (in *Naka Michiyo isho*, Naka's posthumous works, Tokyo, 1915).

[2] Arthur Waley, "Notes on the *Yuan-ch'ao pi-shih*." *BSOAS* 23 (1960) 528 f. This article was pointed out to me by Mr. John Jamieson, whom I also have to thank for other suggestions in connection with this paper.

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

I

The sole appearance of the Koreans, or the Solangqas as they were known to the Mongols,[3] in the narrative of *SH*, occurs at the very end of § 274:

> [The Qa'an] had Yesüder-qorči campaign as a reinforcement for J̌alayirtai-qorči, who had earlier gone on a campaign among the Jürčed and the Solangqas. He made an edict saying that he [Yesüder] was to reside as Commander.[4, 5]

Since this brief notice occurs in that part of *SH* devoted to the career of Činggis's son, Ögödei (r. 1229-1241), commentators have generally sought to connect the events reported here with the Mongol campaigns in Korea during the 1230's. Before reviewing this idea, it will be well to summarize those campaigns briefly.

The Korean invasions of Ögödei's reign had been preceded by the invasion of 1218-1219, in which the object of Mongol wrath had not been the Koreans, but an army of Khitans, who, fleeing Mongol authority in Manchuria, had crossed the Yalu into Korea in 1216. The Mongols took advantage of this opportunity to force a tributary agreement on the Koreans, who thereafter were visited at least once annually (sometimes more frequently) by a tribute commissioner who always seemed to want more than the Koreans had to give. The mysterious death of one of these commissioners, in 1225, was used as a pretext by the Mongols for their campaign of 1231-1232, which was led by a man called Sarta-qorči.[6]

[3] For the name Solangqas, see the additional note at the end of this paper.

[4] *OMGH* C2.28a. Cf. Erich Haenisch, *Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, 2nd. ed. (Leipzig, 1948), 139; S. A. Kozin, *Sokrovennoe Skazanie* (Moscow, 1941), 194; Naka, *Chingisu kan jitsuroku* (Tokyo, 1907), 628 ff. Kozin interprets Jurčed as an adjective modifying Solangqas, a judgment on which he does not comment, but which we shall return to later.

[5] "Commander" stands for the *tama* of the text, considered by Haenisch, *Wörterbuch zu Mangḫol un niuca tobca'an*, (Leipzig, 1939), s.v., to be a short form of *tamači* "Statthalter". Since this conflicts with his definition of *daruḫacin*, I prefer "commander". This translation also fits better the use of the term in the *Yüan shih*, where it denotes the commanders of the private armies of the so-called *t'ou-hsia*, that is, the fourteen tribes which aided Činggis in his unification of the Mongol peoples. See the important study by Mori Masao, "Tambaseki buzoku kō josetsu", *Shigaku Zasshi* 55 (1944) 34–67, and the summary of it by H.F. Schurmann, *Economic Structure of the Yuan Dynasty* (Cambridge, Mass., 1956), 63, note. Mori does not comment on the appearance of the term in *SH*, where it certainly does connote "governor", as Haenisch has said. Possibly it refers to the commander of the army in a given campaign, and thus the Mongol agent plenipotentiary in that area. This definition, as we shall see, admirably fits Yesüder's activities in Korea. Much other bibliography on *tamači* could be cited; see the collection of references in Cleaves, "The Mongolian names and terms in *The History of the Nation of Archers*", *HJAS* 12 (1949) 439 ff.

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

After securing the submission of Koryŏ once more, the Mongols withdrew into Manchuria, leaving behind, according to Chinese sources, 72 military governors (daru'ači). In 1232 the Koreans revolted and moved their capital from Songdo (modern Kaesŏng) to the safety of Kanghwa Island; in this revolt attempts were made on the lives of several of the daru'ači. Sarta then re-opened the campaign, pushing his armies as far south as the district of modern Suwŏn, where he met his death at the hands of a sharp-eyed Korean archer. The Mongols then withdrew once more. In 1233, a Korean general, Hong Pogwŏn, defected to the Mongols, giving them control of the Korean "Western Capital" (P'yŏngyang) and the cities north of it. The following year, Hong was put in charge of all the Korean refugees, defectors or captives in Manchuria.[7]

This is a rough outline of events as presented by the Chinese sources. The *Koryŏ sa* allows us to fill in the picture on practically all points, gives much information that is entirely new, and helps us to resolve contradictions and correct errors in the Chinese sources.[8] Especially notable is its preservation of some of the diplomatic correspondence, including two letters from the Mongols and many more from the Korean side.[9]

[6] The name of this general is represented by a variety of transcriptions in Chinese and Korean sources. The most common form is Sa-li-t'a (*KS* 23. la and *passim*, *YS* 2.1b and 208.1b); other variants are Sa-li-ta (*YS* 120.8a, 154.1a), Sa-erh-t'ai (*YS* 149.3a), Sa-li-t'ai (*YS* 149.14b), Sa-li-t'a (*YK* 3a, *CCL* 81a), Sa-li-ta (*KS* 23.4a, 6a, *TYC* 28.7b), Sha-ta and a metathetical Sha-ta-li (*TYC* 28.12a and 18b respectively), and finally, Sa-erh-ta (*CCL* 83b). Some of these transcriptions would suppose, variously, *Sartai, *Sarda, and, on the analogy of the name of Batu's famous son, *Sartaq. The *Sarta used in this paper skirts rather than solves the problem, but seems to be the most likely form. The word underlying the name, originally meaning "merchant", "caravan", and later used generally to denote a representative of urban Muslim Central Asia, has a long and complex history. This and related words and usages have recently been thoroughly reviewed by Albert E. Dien. "The *sa-pao* problem re-examined", *JAOS* 82 (1962) 335–346; see especially pp. 337–338.

[7] The sources on the campaign of 1231–1232 are largely those cited in connection with Sarta's name in the previous note. For the campaign of 1218–1219, *KS* 22, *passim*. A general summary of Mongol relations with Korea, which has the merit of being based on Korean sources, may be found in Otto Franke, *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*, iv (Berlin, 1948), 269f. 302f. A complete account of these invasions by William Henthorn is now being printed in Leiden.

[8] The Chinese sources say that the Koreans killed all 72 daru'ači, but the *Koryŏ sa* permits us to qualify that statement; see my "The Establishment of Mongolian Military Governors in Korea in 1231", *Phi Theta Papers*, Vol. 6 (1961). The Chinese sources also say that that Hong Pogwŏn submitted in 1231; his *KS* biographers copied the statement, then contradicted it (with, I believe, the truth) by saying he went over to the Mongols in 1233 (*KS* 130.3b). The latter date better fits the facts.

[9] Thirty-three diplomatic documents are preserved in *TYC*, ch. 28. Most of them were copied also into the *Tongmun sŏn*, compiled in 1488 (Chōsen kosho kankō kai, Tokyo, 1914); see chs. 37, 39, 48 and 61. The more important ones are also to be found

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

The second Korean campaign of Ögödei's reign began in 1235, under the command of Tangγut-batur.[10] Information concerning it is very sparse in the Chinese sources, and even the Korean works give a spotty account,[11] probably because the court recorders on Kanghwa Island, being removed from the scene of events, were themselves not too well informed. In this campaign the Mongols stayed longer and destroyed more than they had in the previous one. The Koreans sat on their island and watched the armies go by, occasionally sending in guerilla bands to harass the steppe riders and to inspire the local population to resistance. But by 1238 the toll in both human and material resources had become so great that the Koreans were forced to negotiate a settlement. After more than two years of exchanging embassies and letters, peace was finally gained by the sending in of a hostage to Qaraqorum, in 1241. The hostage was Wang Chun, supposedly a son of the king, but actually one of his more distant cousins.[12] We shall come back to him again.

Most scholars have identified the J̌alayirtai-qorči of *SH* with the Sarta-qorči of all other sources. Among these we may mention Li Wen-t'ien, Wen T'ing-shih, Ting Ch'ien, Shen Tseng-chih, Wang Kuo-wei, T'u Chi and Yanai Watari.[13] In spite of this formidable array of authorities, there

---

in *KS*, 23.8b–26b. The two Mongol letters (*KS* 23.4a–7b) are translated in my "Two Mongol Documents from the *Koryŏ sa*", forthcoming in *JAOS*.

[10] The complete form of the name, T'ang-ku Pa-tu-erh, occurs only in *YS* 154.1b; other sources abbreviate it to T'ang-ku.

[11] Cf. *YK* 5b–6a, *YS* 2.3a, 154.1b, 208.2b, *KS* 29a–33a.

[12] The true identity of Wang Chun was kept hidden from the Mongols until 1254, but by that time he had so ingratiated himself with them that he did not suffer when the deception was discovered; in fact from that time on, he grew more powerful (*KSC* 17.16b–17a; this information is not to be found in *KS*, and shows the importance of *KSC*, which is generally a chronological re-arrangement of the information in *KS*, but which occasionally gives important new facts). That Wang went to Qaraqorum is not specifically stated in the sources; it is however implied in *YS* 120.8b, which says that he "came to pay court homage" (*lai-ch'ao*). Carpini says he saw a Korean prince there; it was probably Wang Chun (cf. Rockhill, *Journey of William of Rubruck*, London, 1900, 20, 23, 200–201).

[13] Li Wen-t'ien, *Yuan ch'ao pi shih chu* (*Ts'ung shu chi ch'eng* ed.), 14.336–337 (Wen T'ing-shih, in his "eyebrow" comments to Li's work, notes that the J̌alayirtai campaign should be mentioned earlier in *SH*'s order of events, which indicates he regarded it as a reference to Sarta's invasion); Ting Ch'ien, *Yuan pi shih ti li k'ao cheng* (1901), 14.5b–6a (*Che-chiang t'u-shu kuan ts'ung shu*); Shen Tseng-chih, *Ch'in cheng lu chiao chu*, 141 (incorporated in Naka's edition of *CCL* in his posthumous works, see *supra*, note 1); Wang Kuo-wei, *CCL* 81a–b; T'u Chi, *Meng-wu-erh shih chi* 3.19b, 4.4a, 38.1a, 134.1b, 2b (T'u gives four contradictory theories on the identification of J̌alayirtai, but is at least consistent in always regarding him as the leader of the 1231 campaign); Yanai Watari, "Sartai to Djalairtai", *Mansen chiri rekishi kenkyū hōkoku* 4 (1918).275–280

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

are several serious objections of the Sarta = J̌alayirtai theory. First, the identification is not self-evident on linguistic grounds, as most of these scholars have too readily assumed. Sarta's name is known in nine different transcriptions from Chinese and Korean sources;[14] in none of them is there a trace of the initial affricate of J̌alayirtai, nor does a single one of them give any evidence of the -yi- of the same name. Only three suggest a final -tai. The sheer weight of the variants is strong testimony against the identification of these two names. Second, *SH*'s notice of Korea is placed after the conquest of Chin, which was achieved in 1234. But Sarta was dead in the beginning of 1233 (or the end of 1232, by the lunar calendar).[15] Third, in spite of the abundant documentation of the campaign of 1231-1232 in the *Koryŏ sa*, there is not the slightest hint of the name Yesüder-qorči, nor of Sarta receiving any reinforcements (he hardly needed them). On the contrary, the *Koryŏ sa*, in naming Sarta's assistants, gives three completely different names.[16] These three facts weigh heavily against the supposed identification of Sarta with J̌alayirtai.

Erich Haenisch apparently saw these difficulties, and proposed to link the event reported in *SH* with Tangγut's campaign of 1235-1238.[17] This theory has the virtue of being in better accord with *SH*'s chronology, but is still subject to the other objections given above. In no source on that campaign do we see the name J̌alayirtai, much less that of Yesüder. Finally, it is significant that while the Chinese and Korean sources often present conflicting information on the Korean campaigns, ***in no single case*** do they differ on the names of their commanders (excepting, of course, variants in transcription).

The indubitably competent scholars who tried to put J̌alayirtai and Yesüder into the campaigns of Ögödei's reign did so on the assumption, in their day universally accepted, that *SH* had been written in 1240. If they noticed Naka's note, well hidden in his posthumous writtings,[18]

(this article is also included in Yanai's posthumous collection, *Mōko shi kenkyū*, Tokyo, 1930, 502–507). Most of these scholars thought the *SH* transcription to be the correct one and all those of the Chinese and Korean sources to be wrong. Yanai alone thought that *SH* was wrong. Naka Michiyo held the Sarta = J̌alayirtai theory for a time; see *Jitsuroku*, 629 ff.

[14] See *supra*, note 6.

[15] His actual death date was January 27, 1233 (1232.12.16); cf. *KS* 23.26a. The Chinese sources also note his death at this time, without however giving an exact date.

[16] *KS* 23.3b. A fourth assistant is named in *TYC* 28.9a; he is the recipient of one of Yi Kyubo's letters.

[17] Haenisch, *Geheime Geschichte*, 168. f

[18] Naka's observation came out quite casually in the course of a summary of the

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

they accepted his judgment that the J̌alayirtai reference was a later addition that did not impugn the rest of the text. The first to question the traditional date was René Grousset, who suspected a date of 1252 on quite subjective grounds, apparently unaware of any problem in connection with § 274.[19] Ten years later William Hung noticed an anachronistic place name which, together with some observations on Yüan historiography in the early years of Qubilai's reign, led him to suspect that *SH* had been written in 1264.[20] Waley went further than this, as we have

---

Mongol campaigns from 1247 to 1259. It is not at all expected, since just a few pages before (53–54) he had renounced the identification of his *Jitsuroku* (see *supra*, note 13, end) and proposed to link J̌alayirtai with Tas, the grandson of Muqali. Tas had an alternate name Ch'a-la-wen, in which Naka thought he could see J̌alayirtai. This identification led the great Japanese scholar of the *Secret History* to think that the campaign in question was that sent against the Eastern Jurčed leader, P'u-hsien Wan-nu, in 1234. Without renouncing this interpretation, Naka launched into a description of the later campaigns, in the course of which he made his third, and last, identification. Had Naka himself lived to edit these writings for publication, many of his remarks would probably have been deleted and others put in proper emphasis.

[19] Grousset, *L'Empire Mongol*, Paris, 1941, 230, 303; "Etat actuel des études sur l'histoire gengiskhanide", *Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Sciences* 12 (1941) 22; introduction to Carsow's French translation of Vladimirtsov, *Gengis-Khan* (Paris, 1948), pp. 1–2. Grousset observed that one of Činggis's speeches (in § 255, *OMGH* C1.28a–33b; cf. Haenisch, *Geheime Geschichte*, 126–128) seems to indicate retrospective knowledge of the transfer of the khanate from the house of Ögödei to that of Tolui, and that *SH*'s concluding paragraph (§ 281) sounds like a posthumous appraisal of Ögödei's career, even though the words are attributed to Ögödei himself. On the basis of these observations, he suspected that the Rat Year of *SH*'s colophon referred to 1252 and not 1240.

[20] William Hung, "The transmission of the book known as *The Secret History of the Mongols*", *HJAS* 14 (1951) 433-492. Hung (489–490) noted the appearance of the place name Hsüan-te-fu twice in the text (*OMGH* C1.1a–b), and concluded that since this form was not in use until September 7, 1263, the Rat Year of the colophon was 1264. He also noted the appeals of Wang O in 1262 and 1263 for the collection of historical materials on the earlier khans, and hinted that *SH* might have been one of the results (490–491).

[21] Waley, *op. cit.*, was of the opinion that the colophon did not testify to the compilation of *SH* in a Rat Year, but only to its having been copied in one. He cited the Chinese interlinear gloss for the word *biči-* "write", which was *hsieh*. The Chinese word does not mean "write" in the sense of "compose" or "compile", but only of "copy". There are, it seems to me, two strong objections to this interpretation. In the first place, the judgment should be made on the bases of the word *biči-*, not the Chinese translation of a century later, valuable as that translation is. Secondly, there is good evidence that the Chinese word *hsieh* was a formulaic gloss, used for *biči-* in whatever sense. In edicts of the 13th and 14th centuries for which both Chinese and Mongol texts survive, the *biči-* is translated *hsieh* in the final formula "written at such-and-such a time while staying at such-and-such a place". Compare the last lines of the Chinese texts published by Chavannes in *TP* 1904, 423, and *TP* 1908, 377 and 406, with those of the Mongol versions in Poppe-Krueger, *The Mongolian*

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

noted, simply putting the composition date well within the second half of the thirteenth century without trying to pin down the particular Rat Year.[21]

We now propose to outline in detail the proof for the identification of J̌alayirtai and Yesüder as leaders of the Korean campaigns in roughly the last half of the reign of Möngke Qa'an (Hsien-tsung, 1251-1259).

II

After Wang Chun had gone as a hostage to Qaraqorum, Mongol-Korean relations were cordial and peaceful for six years. But beginning in 1247 and lasting until 1259, the Mongols campaigned in Korea continuously. The first invasion, led by Amuqan,[22] reveals nothing that could throw light on the *SH* passage, nor does the second, carried out under the direction of Prince Yekü[23] in 1253. The third and fourth campaigns, however, attract our attention. The annals of Hsien-tsung report, under the year 1253, that a man named J̌alartai[24] was appointed commander of the campaigns in the east, apparently as a replacement for Yekü, who was feuding with another prince. In 1254 the "J̌alayir tribesman Qorči"[25] was sent to campaigns in Korea. In the following year a man named J̌alatai is mentioned in the same connection;[26] his name is repeated under 1258.[27] The *Koryŏ sa* mentions a Ch'aradae (Chinese, Ch'e-lo-ta) frequently between 1254 and 1259;[28] it is clear from these notices that he was the chief Mongol in Korea until 1258. The single Korean transcription proves that the three forms given in the Hsien-tsung annals are all variants of the same name. Now, either the first or the third of these variants is a tolerable transcription of J̌alayirtai, given the vagaries of transcription in the *Yüan-shih*, but the second is the most interesting. In Mongol, the suffix -tai indicates possession of or connection with something; thus J̌alayirtai means "of the J̌alayir [tribe]". Qorči is infrequent as a personal name, but

---

Monuments in ḥP'ags-pa Script, Wiesbaden, 1957, pages 49, 47 and 52 respectively. Are we to suppose that the dates given in these texts are not the dates of the writing (= composing) of the edicts, but only those on which someone copied them?

[22] A-mu-han in *YS* 154.1b, A-mu-k'an (K. Amogan) in *KS* 23.39b.

[23] For the various transcriptions of the name, see Hambis, *Le Chapitre CVII du Yuan Che* (Leiden, 1945), 24. To his list can be added the Yeh-k'u (K. Yagul) of *KS* 24.6a.

[24] Cha-tz'u[emend to -la]-erh-tai, *YS* 3.3a.

[25] Cha-la-i-erh *pu-jen* huo-erh-ch'ih, *ibid.*

[26] Cha-la-tai, *YS* 3.3b–4a.

[27] *YS* 3.5a

[28] *KS* 24.14a et seq.

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

very common as a title, "Quiver-Bearer", signifying a member of the Qa'an's guard.[29] Thus it would seem that the form "J̌alayir tribesman" is half a transcription, half a translation, of J̌alayirtai, and that the following "Qorči" is to be interpreted in its usual sense as a title following a name. We thus have a phonetically perfect equivalent of the name given in *SH*.

The Hsien-tsung annals give the barest details of J̌alayirtai's activities in Korea; some of them are duplicated in the *Yüan Kao-li chi-shih* and in the *Yüan-shih* biography of Hong Pogwŏn (Hung Fu-yuan).[30] But the *Koryŏ sa* goes far beyond these sources, enabling us to follow J̌alayirtai very closely indeed. Some of the messages he sent the Kanghwa government are preserved; the envoys who carried them are named; the Korean replies are given.[31] We get a good idea of his power when we read the remarks of one of his envoys to Kanghwa: "Whether our armies go away or stay here lies within the disposition of J̌alayirtai."[32]

SH says that J̌alayirtai had gone on a campaign among the Jürčed and Solangqas. The Jürčed figure in the *Koryŏ sa* accounts. An intelligence report is entered in the annals under date of May 5, 1253 (1253.4. *chia-yin*), containing the information that the Mongols were sending a force of ten thousand men "to enter the eastern area [of Koryŏ] by way of the Eastern Jürčed country."[33] The man who reported this, a commoner who had escaped Mongol captivity, reported that this force would be led by the Emperor's younger brother, Sung-chu.[34] No prince of this name is known, but the date of this entry corresponds well with that of the first appointment of J̌alayirtai, which was in the first month of 1253 (January 31 to February 28). J̌alayirtai first appears in the *Koryŏ sa* under date of October 5, 1254 (1254.8. *jen- ch'en*);[35] this accords also with the data of Hong Pogwŏn's biography.[36] It is not at all unlikely that in the year and a half between his appointment as commander of the "eastern campaign"

[29] Cf. *TP* 5 (1905).431.

[30] *YK* 9b; *YS* 154.1b. There are also some details in the biography of Taču, J̌alayirtai's son (*YS* 133.1a). This biography says that J̌alayirtai served from the time of Činggis to that of Möngke, but gives details only for the latter period. It has been thought that this is evidence for linking J̌alayirtai with Sarta, but it is not; cf. Yanai, *op. cit.*, 276–277.

[31] For example, *KS* 24.15b, 20a, 23a, 25b, 26a, 29b, 30a.

[32] *KS* 24.29b.

[33] *KS* 24.6a.

[34] K. Songju. The list of Möngke's brothers does not indicate anyone by this name; cf. Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, 88, 108–109. Could he be one of the two listed on p. 88 whose names are unknown?

[35] *KS* 24.15b.

[36] *YS* 154.1b.

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

(note that the annals do not say "Korea") and his arrival in Korea, the Mongol general was busy among the Jürčed.[37]

It only remains to identify Yesüder and establish his presence in Korea to tie down *SH*'s reference to the campaigns of the 1250's. The Chinese sources do not mention any such person in connection with Korea, but the *Koryŏ sa* is not so deficient. Under the date of July 13, 1258 (1258.6. *chi-ch'ou*), it notes the arrival of a man whose name is transcribed Yü-ch'ou-ta.[38] At first sight this would not seem very close to Yesüder, but when the Korean pronunciations are taken into account, the phonetics of Yesüder are approached quite well: Yŏsudal. The syllable Yŏ- should cause no suspicion once it is realized that it is the historical equivalent of Chinese *-ie-* (or *-i̯ĕ-* or *-i̯ä-*).[39] The objectionable Chinese aspirate is removed: ch'ou = su. Finally, the terminal -l of the last syllable is a near perfect rendering of the final -r. In short, the *Koryŏ sa* form is an excellent transcription.[40]

SH says that Yesüder was sent to reinforce Jalayirtai, a statement that is confirmed in the *Koryŏ sa*, which informs us that he arrived with one thousand cavalry. The same book also suggests some good reasons why reinforcements were needed. Up until the beginning of 1257, the Koreans had been sending gift caravans to the Mongols, probably in the hope that the latter would consent to let the capital remain on Kanghwa. They were perfectly willing, it would seem, to accept a tributary status, just as they had with respect to all the continental powers in China since T'ang

[37] There may be an alternative explanation for the reference to Jurčed in *SH*. Rashīd-ad-Dīn listed "Churche and Solangqa" together as one of the twelve provinces of Yuan (see the additional note at the end of this paper). This corresponds to the province of Liao-yang in the *Yüan-shih*. It may be that people of that age referred to eastern Manchuria and northern Korea with the general term "Jurčed and Solangqas", and that such a reference need not be strictly interpreted. In this light, Kozin's reading is interesting; he treats Jurčed as an adjective, which yields something like "Jurčenian Solangqa", and more neatly marks the phrase as a single name (*Sokrovennoe Skazanie*, 194).

[38] *KS* 24.34b.

[39] Compare Ancient Chinese *kien* > Sino-Korean *kyŏn*; anc. *ki̯ĕng* > S.-K. *kyŏng*; anc. *.i̯äm* > S.-K. *yŏm*, etc.

[40] Although most of the transcriptions of Mongol names in the *Koryŏ sa* suppose a northern Chinese pronunciation of the characters (and hence indicate that those forms were brought with the Mongols and not devised by the Koreans), some of them are demonstrably Korean in origin. Shiratori, in an important study of some of these names and words, did not consider that fact, although some of his identifications are much more reasonable when the Korean reading is assumed. Cf. especially Nos. 8 and 31 in "Kōrai shi ni mietaru Mōkogo no kaishaku", *Tōyō gakuhō* 18 (1929) 149–244. Pelliot questioned both of these forms in his "Les mots mongols dans le *Korye să*", *JA* 217 (1930) 253–266 (substantially a review of Shiratori's work), again without thinking that the Korean readings might be relevant.

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

times. But they plainly wanted to send the tribute from Kanghwa. The probable reason for this policy (a hopeless one as it turned out) was that the Ch'oe family, in whose hands the king and royal family were helpless pawns, had no hope of maintaining their unique and exceedingly profitable position once the king was under direct Mongol control. In the beginning of 1257 however, it was realized that the Mongols were determined to press their campaign until the king left the island, and that sending in tribute was accomplishing nothing. It was therefore decided to stop the payments.[41] Direct Korean resistance to the Mongols increased, especially naval resistance.[42] It is not unlikely that it was in the light of these considerations that reinforcements were needed, and that a change in command was thought necessary.

Yesüder began carrying out his duties as "Commander" as soon as he reached Korea. His first message to Kanghwa was the following: "The emperor has entrusted Kao-li affairs to me and Jalayirtai. Do you know this? We will decide whether to go or stay on the basis of whether you surrender or not. Even if the king does not come out to meet us, so long as the Crown Prince surrenders to our army, we will turn our forces back that very day. If not, we will let the troops go into the southern zone." This extract and others in the *Koryŏ sa* annals[43] confirm quite conclusively the authority attributed to Yesüder in the *Secret History*.

We have shown above that all the data of *SH* can be accounted for in the *Koryŏ sa* annals from 1254 to 1258. The inescapable conclusion is that that passage could not have been written before 1258. The first Rat Year after 1258 was 1264, the earliest possible date for the composition of the *Secret History*.[44]

III

This conclusion creates new questions that have not, so far as I know,

[41] *KS* 24.28b.
[42] *KS* 24.26b; cf. *KSC* 17.26a.
[43] *KS* 24.35b. Could the "southern zone" refer to Koryŏ proper as opposed to "Jürčed and Solangqa"? See *supra*, note 37, and additional note at the end of this paper. From this date on, all embassies to Kanghwa came from Yesüder. He is last noted in the *Koryŏ sa* during the 2nd month of 1260, *KS* 25.7a. Jalayirtai came to a mysterious end – the *Koryŏ sa* says "died violently". Three of his assistants were then arrested and taken away, presumably to Mongolia. See the report preserved in *KS* 24. 42b under date of May 26, 1259 (1259.5. *ping-wu*). Yesüder's authority is also indicated by his order to Kanghwa to see that post stations are established in Koryŏ; cf. *KS* 25.3a.
[44] With Hung, I rather favor the date of 1264, but the evidence presented in this paper does not exclude 1276 or even 1288.
[45] *HJAS* 15 (1952).394–395.

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

been answered: 1) Why is an event that occurred in the reign of Möngke Qa'an presented in *SH* as if it had taken place in the reign of Ögödei? 2) Why should *SH* report *only one* event from the end of Ögödei's reign to 1264? And why should that event be a relatively minor one in the whole context of Mongol history during that period? Why, to repeat Father Mostaert's criticism of Hung,[45] do we hear nothing in *SH* about the death of Ögödei, or about the many other important happenings in Mongol history from the end of 1241 to 1264? Let us take the second group of questions first.

Certainly, the writer of the *Secret History* fully intended to confine himself to the reigns of the first two rulers, Činggis and Ögödei.[46] The anachronistic reference to the Korean campaign of 1258 was a mistake; the other post-Ögödei events were not even considered by the compiler. What must be explained, however, is the writer's failure to report the death of Ögödei.

On this question, it may be instructive to consider *SH*'s treatment of the death of Činggis, on which the author is exasperatingly brief. We are told nothing about the circumstances in which Činggis died, or about the place of his burial, or even the date of death beyond the "Year of the Pig". The entire notice is as follows: "In the Year of the Pig, Činggis Qa'an went up to Heaven" (§ 268).[47] Since the author intended to continue his account with the reign of Ögödei, he had to say something about the death of his father. But why, in mentioning the passing of the founder of Mongol greatness, was he so brief? One suspects that the subject of Činggis's death was taboo, a suspicion that is strengthened when we consider the account of the *Ch'in cheng lu*, which is the Chinese translation of a Mongol chronicle. In the following, we translate the text as it was received by its first editor, Ho Ch'iu-t'ao:

In the Spring of *ping-hsü* (1226), he arrived in Hsi-hsia (Tangγut Land). In the space of one year, he completely overcame its cities. At that time, his Highness's age was sixty. In *ting-hai* (1227), he exterminated that state and thereupon returned home. After the Ascension of T'ai-tsu (Činggis), the Holy and Martial Emperor, the Emperor T'ai-tsung (Ögödei) acceded to the Great Station...[48]

[46] Cf. Waley, *op. cit.*, 529.

[47] *OMGH* C3.13a; cf. Haenisch, *Geheime Geschichte*, 136.

[48] *CCL* 79a. The text of Ho Ch'iu-t'ao (1824–1862) was one of those used by Wang Kuo-wei in his re-collation. Ho emended Činggis's age in 1226 to 65, basing himself on the *Yüan shih*, which puts his age at death at 66. But as Činggis's dates are a vexed question, I have left the figure at 60, as it was in the text that Ho received (cf. Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo*, Paris, 1959, 281ff. for a thorough discussion of these dates). Ho specifically noted the blank space after the word "returned home"; he said, "Below there is a missing text."

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

There are two curious things about this notice: the odd placing of Činggis's age, and the blank space that Ho Ch'iu-t'ao found after the word "returned home" (*huan*). In ordinary historiographical style, the age given is the age at death, which is placed immediately after the predication of that fact. Here that predication was not even made: we have a blank space instead. And instead of giving the age of Činggis at death, the author gives his age as of the year before his death. In view of these distinctly Mongol treatments of the passing of Činggis, it is perhaps not so surprising that *SH* says nothing of the death of Ögödei. Since the compiler was going to stop his account at the end of Ögödei's reign, there was no compelling reason for him to say that he died, as there had been in the case of his predecessor. But he did write that final paragraph (§ 281), which René Grousset felt had the air of a posthumous appraisal, even though the words were given as if spoken by Ögödei himself.[49]

IV

We may now return to the first question and attempt an explanation for the dating of J̌alayirtai's campaign in *SH*. We will consider this problem in connection with two other chronological puzzles concerning Korean affairs. One of them is in the *Yüan shih* biography of Hong Pogwŏn, and involves the date of the entry of Wang Chun as a hostage; the other is in the *J̌āmi-el-Tevārīkh* of Rashīd-ad-Dīn, and seems to be connected with the same event. Both problems appear to involve the year 1258, the same year in which Yesüder was sent to Korea.

Earlier, in summarizing the Korean campaigns of the 1230's, we had occasion to mention Wang Chun, the member of the Korean royal family who had gone to Qaraqorum as a hostage in 1241. That date is rather solidly established, not only in the *Koryŏ sa*, which should be particularly authoritative on the point, but in the annals of Ögödei and the account of Kao-li (Koryŏ) in the *Yüan shih*. The *Ch'in cheng lu* also records the event, without however naming Wang Chun.[50]

Nothing is known of Wang's activities in Qaraqorum,[51] but beginning in 1253 he became one of the chief figures in Mongol-Korean relations. He accompanied the Mongols on their campaign of 1253, serving as a

[49] Grousset. *L'Empire Mongol*, 303, note.

[50] The *Koryŏ sa* (23.35a) dates his departure in the 4th month of 1241 (May 13th to June 10th), while the *Yuan shih* (2.4b, 108.2b) puts his arrival in Qaraqorum in the autumn of the same year (August 9th to November 4th). The *Ch'in cheng lu*, 86b, sets his departure at about the same time the *Koryŏ sa* does, without mentioning his arrival.

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

go-between in their negotiations with Kanghwa. He had quite wholeheartedly adopted the Mongol cause, as his exhortations to Wang Ch'ŏl, the king, and Ch'oe Hang, the actual head of government, abundantly prove.[52] Wang's *Yüan shih* biography reports that the Koreans who submitted (or were captured) during these campaigns were put under his direct control, but it is doubtful that he had such power before 1258. Hong's Pogwŏn's biography assures us that it was Hong who was "the senior officer in charge of both the early and more recent defectors from among the Kao-li troops and commoners", a position given him in 1251,[53] although he had had the same powers since 1234. But it is clear that Wang was angling for some of Hong's power; the *Koryŏ sa* informs us that there had been a steadily growing rivalry between the two turncoats for some time.[54]

The *Yüan shih* reports the same intrigue in the questionable passage with which we are concerned: "In *wu-wu* (1258), Hong Pogwŏn sent his son, Ch'agu, to follow the army of J̌alayirtai and meet the Kao-li [royal] clan-son, Wang Chun, who was coming in as a hostage. Chun secretly wanted to share in the control of the people from his own country who had defected and accommodated themselves [to the Mongols]. He slandered Pogwŏn to the emperor, and Pogwŏn was then killed."[55] Hong would naturally have been concerned about any scheme to take away some of his power; thus it was that he sent his son to meet Wang, "the hostage". Some recorder undoubtedly garbled the account, and wrote that Wang was "coming in as a hostage". This error, supposedly, was then retained in some chronicle of the early Yüan period, and ended up in Hong's biography.

We have gone into this detail in anticipation of the problematical passage from Rashīd-ad-Dīn, to which we now turn. In concluding his description of the conquest of Chin by Ögödei and his lieutenants, Rashid makes the following statement:

...This victory occurred in the *morin-il*, the Year of the Horse, [which began in] Jumada I, 631 (commencing 2 February 1234). In that year, they took out from

[51] Except that he may have been seen by Carpini, cf. *supra*, note 12.
[52] *KS* 129.48a-b, 24.25b.
[53] *YS* 154.1b; cf. 166.1a (Wang Chun's biog.).
[54] *KS* 130.4b.
[55] *YS* 154.1b. Hong's *Koryŏ sa* biography gives much interesting detail on the relations between Wang and Hong, and especially on the plot that led to the latter's death. Hong had a shaman make an effigy of Wang Chun. "Sometimes he would bind its hands, drive a nail in its head and bury it in the ground; sometimes he would sink it in a well and utter imprecations and curses." This and a supposed insult to Wang's wife (a Mongol woman of the Imperial clan) led to his death (*KS* 130.4b–5a).

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

the region of Solangqa innumerable *turqa'ut* and *kešikten* and sent them to his Majesty the Qa'an; at their head was a certain Ong Sun.[56]

The interpretation of the Mongol words *turqa'ut* (bodyguards, escorts) and *kešikten* (those belonging to a guard detachment) would be made easier if there were some trace of this event in Chinese or Korean sources, but there does not seem to be in either anything for the year 1234 that could throw any light on Rashīd's information.[57] But the name Ong Sun and the "Year of the Horse" draw our attention twenty-four years forward to *equus* 1258, and cause us to suspect that we have here an echo of the same error found in Hong Pogwŏn's biography. The Ong Sun mentioned would be none other than Wang Chun,[58] and the "innumerable *turqa'ut* and *kešikten*" would be a reference to those Koreans, probably defectors, who accompanied him.[59]

It is indeed curious that three separate errors, each involving Korean affairs in the year 1258, should have persisted in three widely divergent

[56] Blochet, *Histoire des Mongols* (E. J. Gibb Memorial Series, Vol. 18, part 2, London 1911), pages 26–27 of the Persian text; cf. Verkhovskii, *Sbornik Letopisei*, Vol. 2 (Moscow, 1960), p. 26. Verkhovskii renders the name of the individual as Ongsu without giving any variants. Blochet gives Ong Suna Mi in the text, but suggests in a note that Ong Sun Mi might also be a good reading. The syllable *mi*, however, can just as well be interpreted as part of the following verb, without affecting the meaning, in which case the name could be read as Ong Sun. I wish to gratefully acknowledge here the kind help of Professor Abbas Zaryab, who has explained to me the variant possibilities of the Persian text. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for the interpretation adopted.

[57] 1234 was the year in which Hong Pogwŏn first received control of the Korean defectors and captives acquired as a result of the campaigns of 1231–1232 and Hong's revolt in 1233. But Hong's name cannot be made to fit any of the variants in Rashīd.

[58] There is no problem in identifying "Ong" with "Wang", an alternation well attested on the pages of Mongol history (cf. Pelliot-Hambis, *Campagnes de Gengis Khan*, Leiden, 1951, 194, 211ff). Wang's personal name, Chun 緈, is written with a very rare character, for which all lexical authorities indicate the reading we have given (*chun* is the pronunciation both in Sino-Korean and in the Peking dialect). The dictionary *Chi yün* (1037), however, says that it is sometimes written for *ch'un* 淳, which is pronounced *sun* in Korean. Several Chinese dialects also have *sun* or shun . If it was the Korean form *sun* that was used, Rashīd's text is quite exact; if it was a Chinese form in *shun*, Rashīd's reading could be due to a missing diacritic in either the Uighur or Persian scripts.

[59] The *Koryŏ sa* does not give figures very frequently, but one can get a good idea of the numbers of Koreans put under Mongol control by the concluding statement in the annals for 1254, which reports that in that year more than 206,800 men and women had been captured, and that the dead were beyond counting (*KS* 24.20a–b). During the 5th month of 1258 (June 4th to July 2nd) an unstated number had rebelled and gone over to the Mongols in the region of the present Chŏngju (*KS* 24.34a–b); at the end of that year there were wholesale defections from the towns on the northeastern frontier (24.38b–39a). One wonders if some of these found their way into the special Korean guard detachment which is mentioned, unfortunately without any elaboration, in the *Yüan shih*, 99.5b, under the date of 1265.

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

sources – Mongol, Chinese and Persian. Since there is no question of these three works having influenced each other, there must have been a general error in some work which directly or indirectly served as a source for these later writers.

What follows is a conjectural explanation for this state of affairs. Needless to say, it is only one of several possible schemes which could explain the facts.

A) There was a chronicle or record in which events were dated only in terms of the 12-animal cycle. Among the entries for the "Horse Year" in Möngke's reign were 1) a notice of the order given to Yesüder, and 2) a reference (mistaken) to the arrival of Wang Chun as a hostage, with a large number of "*turqa'ut* and *kešikten*" as the Mongol text would have read. This work may have been a continuing chronicle in which events were noted as they occurred,[60] but in the form considered here, it dated to at least 1258. This work we will call "A".

B) There was a copy of "A" which may have existed as early as 1258 or it may have been made later. This we will call "B".

C) Sometime after 1258, there occurred in either "A" or "B" (we will arbitrarily say "A" to facilitate the discussion) a transposition of the two "Horse" events to the years of Ögödei's reign. This transposition may have been the result of an inadvertent misplacement of pages. On the other hand, it may have come about when someone noticed the item about Wang Chun, and knowing either from his own knowledge or some other source that Wang had actually come in as a hostage during Ögödei's reign, would have "corrected" the record by moving the note on Wang back two cycles. In doing so, he would have transposed the notice of the order given to Yesüder. This "corrected" version we will call "C".

The compiler of the Secret History probably used oral tradition as the main source of his work, as Arthur Waley has suggested.[61] But for some dates and campaigns he undoubtedly used a written source. I believe that this was "C" or a work based on it. In describing the events after the conquest of Chin, he would have noticed the transposed notice on

[60] This chronicle, at an earlier stage, may have been available to Juvainī's informant in 1252–1253. It is significant that both Juvaini and the *Secret History* date the quriltai at which Ögödei was elected in 1228, while all other sources put it in 1229 (see Boyle, *History of the World Conqueror*, Manchester, 1958, i, 187).

[61] Waley, *op. cit.*

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Yesüder, and tagged it on to his recital of the campaigns sent against the western countries, unaware of the anachronism he was thereby perpetuating.

Hong Pogwŏn's biographer based himself principally on the account of Kao-li in the *Ching shih ta tien*. Although this work is now lost, some fragments, including the Kao-li account (= our *YK*) survive. In comparing it with Hong's biography, we find identical treatments of the important events, but also enough differences to indicate that Hong's biographer had other sources. The Wang Chun affair is a case in point. *YK* has no entries for the period from the end of 1240 until the middle of 1247, and hence has no information on Wang Chun's coming in as a hostage. I believe that the mistaken date of 1258 in Hong's biography was derived from a source descended from "B".

The Mongol sources used by Rashīd-ad-Dīn have not yet been identified with certainty, and their filation with books known to have existed under the Mongols in China is still a vexed question.[62] All that will be said here is that the source used by him was influenced partly by "C", the "corrected" record.

It is necessary to repeat that the scheme suggested above is only a conjecture which accounts for a limited set of facts. Further research, especially on the sources of Rashīd, may permit the revision of this theory or possibly disprove it altogether. But I do believe it is possible to say with some assurance that the writer of the *Secret History* made some use of written records, that these records also influenced other works now surviving, and that the *Secret History* was written, at the earliest, in 1264.

[62] For two theories on the filation of Rashid's Mongol sources, see Pelliot-Hambis, *op. cit.*, xiii-xv, and Hung, *op. cit.*, 472–481. A. Zeki Velidi Togan, "The composition of the History of the Mongols by Rashīd-al-Dīn", *CAJ* 7 (1962). 60–72, a more recent discussion of the problem, gives a rather confused picture of the facts from the Far Eastern side. It is not easy to tell, for instance, if the author is sure of the date of K'o Shao-min's *Hsin Yüan shih* (1922). On p. 67 he reports that K'o utilized Rashid, which is well known, but both on this page and on the preceding one, he argues that K'o and Rashid must have had a common source for their description of the Mongol tribes, "perhaps the Altan-debter." It can be stated with assurance that K'o never saw this book, which is not known to have survived beyond the fourteenth century. Prof. Togan says on p. 66 that the Chinese knew the *Altan-debter* as the "Tung-kien", and cites as his authority Otto Franke, *Geschichte*, v, 9. Franke not only makes no such statement, but on the next page identifies the "in mongolisch-uigurischer Schrift abgefasste *T'ung-kien*" as the *Tzu-chih T'ung-chien* of Ssu-ma Kuang, which indeed is the only book the Chinese compilers of the *Yüan shih* could have had in mind when they wrote the words "*T'ung-chien*". In the *YS* passage Franke was translating, it was a question of the "Abschnitte des *T'ung-kien* in mongolischer Übersetzung", designed for language instruction.

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Additional note on "Solangqas"

Solangqas is the plural form of the name Solangqa, "Korean", "Korea". References to Solangqa (variously spelled Solangai, Sulangka, Solange, Solanga, Su-liang-ho) are scattered throughout many works, and it may be useful to bring them together in one place, along with some opinions on the etymology of the name.

The name Solangqa is widely attested in medieval sources. The first appearances are probably in Carpini and Rubruck (cf. Rockhill, 20, 23, 152ff); the latter also mentions "Caule" (= Kao-li/Koryŏ), without however identifying it with Solangqa (*ibid.*, 201). It is found in Juvaini (Boyle, i, 190, 196, 256; ii, 596) and Rashid (Blochet, 27, 485; cf. Verkhovskii, 21, 26, 180). It is in the *Yüan-shih* (114.7a, 196.4a-b) and, of course, in the *Secret History* (§ 274).

The identification of Solangqa with Korea has long been known; the earliest authority is the interlinear gloss to the *Secret History* and the intersectional Chinese translation, both of which give "Kao-li" (*OMGH* C2.28a-b). Kowalewski defined Solangqa as "Coréens septentrionaux" (*Dict. Mongol-russe-français*, 1401a), a definition that holds true especially for the Yüan period, as we shall see. Rubruck's mention of both Solangqa and Caule suggests that the two were not identical, however, and Rashīd's notice proves it. The Persian historian lists "Churche and Solangqa" as the second of the twelve provinces of the Yüan empire, and "Koli and Kokoli" as the third. (Koli = Kao-li; Kokoli seems to be a survival of the old name Kao-chü-li/Koguryŏ, as has already been suggested by Blochet, 486; Verkhovskii, 181, did not hazard a guess, leaving the name in Persian script.) Shiratori Kurakichi tried to explain this passage in Rashīd by saying that Solangqa was the earlier name for Korea and Koli/Caule a later usage, and that Rashīd's sources date from a period when both names were in use together ("Shiragi no kokugō ni tsuite," *Rekishi chiri* 8 [1906] 376 ff). Palladius has however given a more reasonable explanation, that Solangqa referred to that area of north Korea and Manchuria under the direct control of Yüan, while Kao-li referred to the southern three quarters of the peninsula ruled directly by the Korean king, at that time a Mongol vassal. ("Elucidations of Marco Polo's travels ...", *JNCBRAS* n.s. 10 [1876].32). D'Ohsson says that Solangqa was probably the cultivated part of the Jürčed country, the part containing cities and villages. (*Histoire des Mongols*, 1834, ii, 478). In that judgment he was undoubtedly correct. We know from the *Koryŏ sa* that during the Mongol invasions of 1231-1259, innumerable Koreans were taken north-

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

ward into Liao-tung and forced to cultivate abandoned land. Besides refugees and captives, the Mongols expected the Koreans to send them farmers on request (*KS* 23.11a-b; on this point see also the summary of a paper read before the Oriental Society of Tokyo in 1958 by Okada Hidehiro, *Tōyō gakuhō* 52 [1959].04-06).

The first attempt at an etymology of the name Solangqa was made by Shiratori in 1906 (*op. cit.*, 374ff). He considered it to be the Mongol form of the Jürčen So-ko (cf. Grube, *Die Sprache und Schrift der Jučen*, 1896, 18), probably related to the Manchu Solho. Shiratori thought that the So-/Sol- went back to an Ancient Korean **sore* "iron", "metal", which itself was the word underlying the name of one of the ancient Korean three kingdoms, Silla (Japanese Shiragi), and the word implied in the name of Silla's first capital, Chin-ch'eng "metal city" (cf. *Samguk sagi* 1.2, under "21st year", corresponding in the traditional chronology to 37 B.C.). This etymology is attractive, but Shiratori's linguistics leave doubts in my mind; there are questionable identifications every step of the way.

More recently, Pavel Poucha (*Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, = *Archiv Orientální Supplementa*, No. 4, Prague, 1956, 68) has reported the opinion of G. N. Potanin (*Tangutsko-tibetskaia okraina Kitaia*, new. ed., Moscow, 1952, 122), who says the name Solangqa designated for the Mongols an enemy tribe; from this it aquired the meaning "foreigner", whence it came to be applied to the Koreans. Just why it came to denote Koreans, of all foreigners, is not explained. Poucha himself thought that some form of the word was present in the name Solon, belonging to a Tungusic tribe living on the upper Amur. This supposed connection had been made before him by Rockhill (*op. cit.*, 153). The connection was doubted by Naka, who considered the resemblance of sounds fortuitous (*Chingisu Kan jitsuroku*, 629).

Finally, Yi Pyŏngdo (*Hanguk sa*, i [Seoul, 1959], 228-9, and also in his article "Koguryŏ kukho ko", *Sŏul Taehakkyo Nonmun Chip*, Humanities and Social Sciences section, Vol. 3 [April, 1956], 1-14) has seen in "Solangqa" the old Korean name for Koguryŏ (the northernmost of the ancient three kingdoms, 37 B.C.-668 A.D.). Prof. Yi interprets "Koguryŏ" as half a translation, half a transcription of ancient Korean **solkkol* or **surikkol*, "high city", "mountain capital". In countering Shiratori's "Silla" etymology, he argues plausibly that the Jürčen and Mongol name for Korea is much more likely to have descended from a name for Koguryŏ, which was in direct contact with the peoples of Manchuria for centuries, and whose people formed the dominant element in the state of Po-hai, which existed in north Korea and eastern Manchuria until it

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

was destroyed by the Khitan in 926. The evidence brought forward from Chinese and Korean sources for this reading of "Koguryŏ" is indeed impressive, although much of it depends on textual emendations and fancied ancient pronunciations of Chinese characters. One could wish that the materials grouped by Prof. Yi had received more critical philological treatment.

These varying explanations of the name "Solangqa" show that the question is far from settled. Of the three, I feel that the case is best for Prof. Yi's theory, in spite of some details still to be ironed out.

In Khalkha, as Poucha has noted, the word *solonga* means, in addition to "rainbow", also "weasel". But a check of the standard dictionaries reveals considerably more zoological complexity or perhaps, unsureness. Kowalewski (1401a) gives "le putois, la martre de Siberie (khoryok, kolonok)" for *solongγa*. Lessing (*Mongolian-English Dictionary*, 1960, s.v.) gives "Siberian marten; weasel" for *solungɛ-a*. In Folke Boberg, *Mongolian-English Dictionary*, 1954, 1479b-1480a, we find "The polecat, the fitchew" for *solongγo*, and "The chipmunk" for *solonga*. Haenisch (*Wörterbuch zu Manghol un niuca tobca'an*, 1939, 135) has "Wiesel" for *solangḫa*, but he translates "Iltis" (polecat) in his *Geheime Geschichte*, 23. Finally, Kozin glosses the word as "krot" (mole) in *Sokrovennoe skazanie*, 601.

Whatever the identity of the animal, it is not impossible that its name could be bound up with that used by the Mongols for Korea. If we accept **solkkol* as the basis for Jürčen So-ko (in view of the Manchu form, perhaps going back to **Sol-ko*), we still must explain how So-ko or **Sol-ko* could end up as Mongol Solangqa. This might be done, we suggest, by supposing on the part of the Mongols a confusion or popular etymology of the name of the country with that of the animal. Koreans were famous as trappers in the Far East; indeed the annals of early Koryŏ-Mongol relations contain frequent references to the skin trade, particularly otter skins (*KS* 22.20a-b, 25a, 27a, 23.6b, 12a-b) but also products of weasel fur (*Tongmun sŏn*, 61.370f). The Mongols might well have arrived at "the weasels" as a name for the Koreans, through a pun on the old name for Koguryŏ as passed on to them by the Jürčen, if indeed the same pun had not already been made by the Jürčen themselves (cf. Jürč. *so-lo-hi*, glossed as *huang-shu* "weasel" [Grube, *op. cit.*]). But before final judgment, we must hear from Korean linguists on the merits of **solkkol*, and from Mongolists more precise information on the identity of the elusive animal known as the *solangqa* (or variants as above).

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

CHINESE CHARACTERS

A. *Persons*

Amuqan:
A-mu-han 阿母罕
A-mu-k'an 阿母侃
Ch'a-la-wen 查剌溫
Ch'oe Hang 崔沆
Hung Ch'a-ch'iu / Hong Ch'agu 洪茶丘
Hung Fu-yuan / Hong Pogwŏn 洪福源
Jalayirtai:
Cha-la-i-erh *pu-jen* huo-erh-ch'ih 札剌亦兒部人火兒赤
Cha-la-tai 劄剌鼐
Cha-tz'u [em. -la]-erh-tai 札剌 [em. 剌] 兒帶
Ch'e-lo-ta / Ch'aradae 車羅大
Sarta:
Sa-erh-ta 撒兒荅
Sa-erh-t'ai | | 台
Sa-li-ta | 里答
Sa-li-ta* | | 打
Sa-li-t'a 撒禮塔
Sa-li-t'a* | 里 |
Sa-li-t'ai | | 吾
Sha -ta 沙扎
Sha-ta-li (sic) | | 里
Sung-chu / Songju 松柱
Taču: T'a-ch'u 塔出
Tas: T'a-ssu 塔思
Tangγut Batur: T'ang-ku Pa-tu-erh 唐古拔都兒
Wang Ch'ŏl 王暶敬
Wang Chun 王耘
Wang O 王鶚
Yekü:
Yeh-k'u / Yagul 也窟

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Yesüder:
Yü-ch'ou-ta, Yŏsudal } 余愁達

B. *Books and Authors*

Che-chiang t'u-shu-kuan ts'ung-shu 浙江圖書館叢書
Ch'in cheng lu 親征錄 (ed. Wang Kuo-wei 王國維)
Ch'in cheng lu chiao-chu 校注 (Ho Ch'iu-t'ao 河秋濤)
Ching shih ta tien 經世大典 (Yu Chi 虞集)
Chingisu kan jitsuroku 成吉思汗實錄 (Naka Michiyo 那珂通世)
Chingisu kan jitsuroku zokuhen 續編 (Naka Michiyo)
Hanguk sa 韓國史 (古代篇) (Yi Pyŏngdo 李丙燾)
Hsin Yüan shih 新元史 (K'o Shao-min 柯劭忞)
Hai-ning Wang Ching-an hsien-sheng i-shu 海寧王靜安先生遺書
Koryŏ sa 高麗史 (Chŏng Inji 鄭麟趾)
Koryŏ sa chŏryo 節要 (Kim Chongsŏ 金宗瑞)
Kuang-ts'ang hsueh-ch'ün ts'ung-shu 廣倉學窘叢書
Mansen chiri rekishi kenkyū hōkoku 滿鮮地理歷史研究報告
Meng-wu-erh shih chi 蒙兀兒史記 (T'u Chi 屠寄)
Mōko shi kenkyū 蒙古史研究 (Yanai Watari 箭內亙)
Naka Michiyo isho 那珂通世遺書
Onyaku mōbun Genchō hishi 音譯蒙文元朝祕史 (Shiratori Kurakichi 白鳥庫吉)
Sŏul Taehakkyo Nonmun Chip, "Koguryŏ kukho ko" (서울大學校論文集, "高句麗國號考") (Yi Pyŏngdo)
Tongguk Yi Sangguk Chip 東國李相國集 (Yi Kyubo 李奎報)
Tongmun sŏn 東文選 (Sŏ Kŏjŏng 徐居正)
Ts'ung shu chi ch'eng 叢書集成
Tzu-chih t'ung-chien 資治通鑑 (Ssu-ma Kuang 司馬光)
Yuan ch'ao pi shih chu 元朝祕史注 (Li Wen-t'ien 李文田)
Yuan Kao-li chi shih 元高麗紀事
Yuan pi shih ti li k'ao cheng 元祕史地理考證 (Ting Ch'ien 丁謙)
Yuan shih 元史 (Sung Lien 宋濂)
Yung-lo ta tien 永樂大典

C. *Miscellaneous*

Hsuan-te-fu 宣德府

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Huang-shu 黃鼠
Kanghwa 江華
Koguryŏ 高句麗
kien/kyŏn 見
kiĕng/kyŏng 敬
lai-ch'ao 來朝
Po-hai 渤海
Silla 新羅
Songdo 松都
t'ou-hsia 投下
.iam/yŏm 吠

This content downloaded from 86.3.248.227 on Sun, 19 Oct 2014 12:29:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions