Dumdadu Mongγol Ulus 'THE MIDDLE MONGOLIAN EMPIRE'

Dai Matsui

Introduction. There is a small fragment among the Mongolian texts brought back from East Turkestan by the German Turfan expeditions. It is housed now at the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences (Department Turfanforschung), under a signature U 5981[1]. In the present paper, I consider this fragment, particularly the unclear phrase reconstructed as *Dumdadu Mongγol Ulus* 'The Middle Mongolian Empire' and the related historical problems.

U 5981: Revised edition. L. Ligeti was the first scholar to provide an edition of the fragment[2]. He included the edition again in his corpus of the Pre-classical Mongolian monuments, without any further remarks[3]. In 1993, D. Cerensodnom and M. Taube published the philological edition of the Mongolian texts of the German Turfan collection with photographic reproductions and included also our fragment[4], basically following Ligeti's edition. So did Tumurtogoo in his recent corpus of the Uigur-Mongolian monuments[5]. Apart from these editions, no other scholar in the field of Mongolian philology or Mongolian history has paid attention to the fragment.

In 1997, I had the chance to examine the original fragment: it is 6.7 x 13.7 cm, a mediocre paper with rough *vergeé* (4 / cm) and colored beige clair. I present here a revised edition as the result of my examinations, even though it does not offer many new findings in addition to those of precedings scholars.

---

[1] It is now available in the "Digital Turfan Archiv" of the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy (http://www.bbaw.de/forschung/turfanforschung/dta/u/images/u5981seite1.jpg). Most of the Pre-classical Mongolian monuments of the German Turfan collection are now housed at the Berlin State Library Haus II (Potsdamer Straße), while our fragment is housed at the Academy (Jägerstraße) because it had been misunderstood as an Old Uigur manuscript as shown by the signature U(igur).

[2] Ligeti 1971, 150-153.

[3] Ligeti 1972, 251.

[4] BTT XVI, Nr. 79.

[5] Tumurtogoo 2006, 171.

[MISSING]

(1) [ ]
(2) [kü](č)ü (av)γ-a buu
(3) [kürgetügei](.) edüge bas-a
(4) [ ](e)düge an-e
(5) [ ]DWN yaγu ke
(6) [eyin] ke'gülüged burün
(7) [ ](.) kürged (q)arabas olm-a
(8) [ ](.) ba tanluγ-a
(9) [dum]dadu mongγo[l] u(l)us-un
(10) [temeče]ǰü buu qaltuγai ken-ü
(11) [ ](.) keleletügei ayin
(12) [ ](..)TWN ČWB'T kibesü
(13) [ke]men nišatu bičig
(14) [ögbei -W]N [e](ki) sar-a-in
(15) [büküi-d](ü)r bičibei

English translation. (1)…… (2-3)…… [They shall not use] violence. ……. (3)…… Even now (4)……... Now, this (5)……. anything (6)……. After (We) let announce [thus], (7)……. slave and jar (8)……. We together with you (9)……. of the Middle Mongolian Empire (10)…… [They shall] neither argue nor make demands. Whose (11)……. [they] shall tell. Thus (12)……. (???) If [they/you] torment(?), (13)……. (13-14)(Thus) saying, [We gave] (this) document with the stamp sealed. (14-15)[On the XXth day] of the first month of the [spring/autumn/winter of the year of XX], (15)when [We were at XX, We] wrote (this document).

Notes. (3) The beginning of the line may be restored as *kürgetügei* (< v. *kürge-* 'to cause to arrive; to send, deliver'). Cf. Cleaves and BTT XVI, Nrn. 68-70[6], for *kučü avγa kürge-* 'to bring might and strength; to use violence, behave violently'.

(6) We should follow Ligeti and restore *eyin* 'thus' before *ke'egülged* (~ *kemegülged* < v. *kemegül-*) 'let tell'[7]. Thus far *ke'egülged* has been read here as *kemegülged*, though the hook of -M- is not written. If it is not a simple error, it may reflect the contemporary colloquial pronunciation

[6] Cleaves 1953, 47; BTT XVI, Nrn. 68(11,13), 69(8-9), 70(14).
[7] Ligeti 1971, 152-153; BTT XVI, 185.

kēülü'ed as seen in the 'Phags-pa Mongolian inscriptions or the *Secret History*[8].

(7) Here the context is not clear. I suggest *kürged* (conv. < v. *kür-* 'to reach, arrive at') as another alternative to the reading *künesün* 'provision' as was done by earlier scholars. The next two words have not been studied enough so far. We may tentatively read the first one *(Q)'R'B'Z = (q)arabas* < Uig. *qarabaš* 'slave'. The next, which has been deciphered until now as *WLS-'*, might be *'WLM-' = olm-a* < Uig. *olma* 'jar, pitcher'[9].

(9) The expression *[dum]dadu mongγo[l] u(l)us* 'the Middle Mongolian Empire' and the problems related with it, will be analyzed below.

(10) For the sentence *temečejü buu qaltuγai* '[they] shall neither argue nor make demands', see Ligeti[10].

(12-13) The context of these lines seems to belong to the *Poenformel* section. Here we may expect a phrase such as *yosu ügei üiles üiledübesü ülü ayuqun ta/müd* 'If (you/they) commit unlawful behavior, don't you/they fear (the punishment)? [= you/they shall be punished]'[11]. For this reason *ČWB'T kibesü,* lit. 'if (you/they) make/do «*ČWB'T*»', should also be a kind of unlawful behavior, and in the beginning of line 13 we may restore *ülü ayuqun ta/müd.* Although the letters *ČWB'T* are rather clear, no word of this form is attested so far and earlier scholars did not explain it. Here I tentatively assume *ČWB'T = *ǰobad,* plural of **ǰoban,* a deverbal noun from v. *ǰoba-* 'to torment' with the converb *-n,*[12] and translate **ǰobad ki-* as 'to indulge in tormenting; to torment'. Yet the orthographical problem still remains as in the Classical Mongolian orthography, the initial *ǰ-* of the v. *ǰoba-* is always written with *Y-*. From the context it seems inappropriate to relate *ČWB'T* to *čuba* 'raincoat, short fur vest', *ǰoba ~ ǰobaγa* 'dangerous mountain trail, a narrow valley'[13] or Uig. *čupan* 'minor official; shepherd'[14].

(14) See Ligeti for the restoration of *ögbei* '[We] gave (the document)'[15]. This word should be followed by the designation of the date

---

[8] Junast 1991, 114, 120, 144; Matsukawa 1995, 43; *SH* 10:06:10, 06:37:04.
[9] ED 146.
[10] Ligeti 1971, 153.
[11] BTT XVI, 167; cf. Matsukawa 1995, 43-44.
[12] E.g., Cleaves 1954, 125: *naγadun čenggen-iyer* 'by playing and rejoicing' < v. *naγad-* 'to play; to enjoy oneself' and v. *čengge-* 'to exult, be happy or merry'; Poppe 1991, 49: *šinggen* 'fluid' < v. *šingge-* 'to be absorbed'.
[13] Lessing, 203, 1077; MKT 1283, 1361.
[14] ED 397-398
[15] Ligeti 1971, 153.

of issue, and in fact we can restore some more letters before *sar-a* 'month'. The word just before *sar-a*, on which a black stamp is sealed, might be *eki* 'first', since I could slightly identify the strokes *[ ]KY* while examining the original. In the damaged part preceding **eki*, we can see a stroke of a final *-N*, which apparently belongs to the genitive *-[u]n/-[ü]n*. This speaks for the fact that the name of the month was either *qabur* 'spring', *namur* 'autumn' or *übül* 'winter' all of them taking this genitive suffix, but not *ǰun* 'summer' which requires the genitive in *-u*.

Analysis. Although the fragment does not provide any dating information, we may safely regard it as issued under the domination of the Chaghatai Khanate during the fourteenth century, judging from the black round stamp (ø 2.6 cm), which is rarely seen on Yuan documents.

My analysis shall concentrate on the phrase *[dum]dadu mongγo[l] u(l)us* 'the Middle Mongolian Empire' in line 9 of the text. While the last two words *mongγo[l] u(l)us* can be read undoubtedly, the anterior half of the first word is severely damaged, and *[dum]dadu* is only a hypothetical restoration proposed by Ligeti; however, in his later edition he did not mention it again[16]. Cerensodnom and Taube also followed his later reading, and refered to his proposal of *[dum]dadu* only in a footnote to the text[17]; Tumurtogoo did not make any remark concerning the expression[18]. However, I would raise again Ligeti's proposal, because some Western sources attest appellations such as 'the Middle Empire' for the Chaghatai Khanate, corresponding to *Dumdadu Mongγol Ulus* in our fragment.

First to be noted are appellations *Imperium Medium* 'the Middle Empire' and the like in Latin sources. They were first collected by H. Yule and later remarked on by P. Pelliot as follows: Guillaume Adam describes the empire of «Doa or Caydo», i.e., Du'a or Qaidu, with the appellation *Medium Imperium* 'the Middle Empire' between 1314 and 1328. By this period Qaidu, the Ögödeid leader of the anti-Yuan Mongols in Central Asia, had already passed away (d. 1301), consequently this 'Middle Empire' clearly stands for the Chaghatai Khanate in Central Asia ruled by the descendents of Du'a[19]; *Imperium Medium* 'the Middle Empire' as seen in a letter from Pope Benedict XII of 1338 and in the report by the Franciscan friar John of Marignolli, who brought the Pope's letter to the

[16] Ligeti 1971, 151-152; 1972, 251.
[17] BTT XVI, 184.
[18] Tumurtogoo 2006, 171.
[19] Pelliot 1959, 129.

Yuan[20]; *Imp. de Medio* 'the Empire in the Middle' as seen in Andrea Bianco's atlas of 1436[21].

Besides these, we also have Latin appellations for the Chaghatai Khanate such as *Imperium Medie* 'the Empire of Media' by the Franciscan friar Pascal of Vittoria or on the Catalan Map, as well as *Imperium Medorum* 'the Empire of Medes' in the *Portulano Mediceo* in the Laurentian Library. They are apparently misnomers of *Imperium Medium* or *Imperium de Medio* mentioned above[22].

Concerning these Latin attestations, noteworthy is also the narrative of the famous Muslim traveler Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. In his *Riḥlat*, he introduces the Chaghatai Khanate under the reign of Ṭarmāšīrīn (< Mong. Darmaširi(n) < Skt. Dharmaśrī, r. 1326-34) as follows: *bilāduhu mutawassiṭatun baina 'arba'atin min al-dunyā al-kibāri wa hum maliku al-ṣīni wa maliku al-hindi wa mailk al-'irāqi wa al-maliku ūzbaku* 'His (= Ṭarmāšīrīn's) [ruling] country [is in] the middle between the four of the powerful kings on the earth, i.e., King of China, King of India, King of Iraq and King Özbeg'[23]. Here *bilāduhu mutawassiṭatun* 'his country [is in] the middle' is not completely parallel with the phrase *Dumdadu Mongγol Ulus* or *Imperium Medium*, yet it seems not an accident that he uses the word *mutawassiṭ* 'middle' for the Chagahtai Khanate[24].

Yule explained the reason of the use of *Imperium Medium* and the like for the Chaghatai Khanate with the fact that it lies "between Cathay and Persia"[25]. However, I would suppose that the Latin appellations should be originated from the Mongolian expression *Dumdadu Mongγol Ulus* to be reconstructed in our fragment, which must have been adopted by the Chaghatai Khanate as their official state name.

The appanage in Central Asia given by Činggis-qan to his second son Čaγatai was the origin of the Chaghatai Khanate. However, it was not

---

[20] Yule 1916, 212; Pelliot 1959, 55.

[21] Yule 1916, 85.

[22] Yule 1916, 85, 87, 88; Pelliot 1959, 55.

[23] Defrémery & Sanguinetti (Baṭṭūṭa/DS 31) and Gibb (Baṭṭūṭa/G 556) did not directly translate the original Arabic *mutawassiṭ* as 'middle', while Hikoichi Yajima did so, translating correctly into Japanese as 'mannaka' (Baṭṭūṭa/Y:IV, 172). I would express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Masaki Mukai (Osaka University) and Dr. Yōichi Yajima (Kyoto University) for their kind help in reading the Arabic text.

[24] Baṭṭūṭa/DS is the only Arabic text of *Riḥlat* available to me. As far as H. Yajima confirmed, there exists 29 manuscripts of *Riḥlat* (Baṭṭūṭa/Y:I, 390-398), among which we may also expect an attestation of **bilād al-mutawassiṭat* 'the Middle country' or the like for the Chaghatai Khanate.

[25] Yule 1916, 85.

directly and smoothly inherited by Čaγatai's descendents as they were severely suppressed by the fourth Emperor Möngke, and after the temporary prosperity under Alγu (r. 1260-65/66) and Baraq (r. 1266-71) they were headed by Du'a under the supremacy of the Ögödeid prince Qaidu for nearly thirty years. Only after Qaidu's death (1301), Du'a could re-establish the Chaghatai Khanate in alliance with the Yuan Dynasty to sweep away the Ögödeids in Central Asia[26].

In order to settle his new regime in the Central Asia, Du'a must have had to show off the independence from the Qaidu-Ögödeid domination in various ways. The *Chaghatai-Zeichen*, a double-leaves-like emblem ( ) used frequently in the official stamps sealed on the Mongol and Uigur documents as well as in the coins and mints issued under the Chaghatai Khanate, might be one of the expression: it is never used on the materials before Du'a's reign[27]. Still more, some Chinese sources call the Chaghataid rulers Esen-Buqa (r. 1310-18) and Elǰigidei (r. 1327-30) not by their own names, but 諸王察阿臺 *zhu-wang Cha-a-tai* 'Prince Čaγatai'[28]. This may point to the fact that after Du'a the Yuan dynasty recognized the khanate in Central Asia as specifically "Chaghataid"[29].

Although it is true that no appellation kindred with 'the Middle Mongolian Empire' has been attested in the Persian and Chinese historical sources, it seems probable that Du'a or his descendants took the brand-new official state name *Dumdadu Mongγol Ulus* 'the Middle Mongolian Empire' in order to affirm that their polity was renewed, as did the emperor Qubilai, who in 1271 adopted the official state name *Dai Ön Yeke Mongγol Ulus* 'the Dai-Ön Great Mongolian Empire' [30], adding *Da-yuan* 大元 (> Mong. *Dai-Ön*) to the former state name *Yeke Mongγol Ulus* (>

[26] Barthold 1927, 813; Barthold 1956, 128-131; Kato 1977; Sugiyama 1987 = Sugiyama 2004, 356-359; Jackson 1992, 345; Biran 1997, 69-77

[27] Oliver 1891, 8-9; Franke 1962, 406-407; Matsui 1998, 8-11.

[28] *YS*, chap. 31:694, 695, 696; Liu 2006, 398-399.

[29] Du'a himself and the Yuan emperor Temür had the similar concept that Turkestan was to belong to the Chaghataids (TU/H 33; TU/P 40-41).

[30] For *Dai Ön Yeke Mongγol Ulus* as attested in the Sino-Mongolian bilingual inscriptions, see Cleaves 1949, 62; Cleaves 1951, 53. Also noteworthy is that the official state name *Dai-Ön* was widespread among the Mongols, as indicated by the Mongolian edict of 1389 from the first Ming Emperor Hongwu to Aǰaširi, in which the former Yuan emperor (Chin. 元君 *Yuan-jun*) is designated as *Dai-Ön Mongγol qaγan* (Haenisch 1952, 1 & pl. II; Mostaert & Rachewiltz 1977, 1-2; HYYY, 2:03a4; Miya 2006, 15-16).

Chin. 大蒙古國 *Da Meng-gu guo*)[31] to cap a series of his "new deals" after his victory against his youngest brother Ariγ-Böke, such as changing the era name into 至元 *Zhi-yuan* (1264), constructing the new capital *Da-du* 大都 > Mong. *Daidu* ~ Pers. *Dāydū* (1267), campaigning against the Southern Song dynasty (1268), and inventing the 'Phags-pa script (1269). The designation *dumdadu* 'middle' could have been chosen because the Chaghatai Khanate was situated "in the middle" between Yuan, India, the Ilkhanid and the Golden Horde, as explained by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa.

From the mid-fourteenth century onwards, the Chaghatai Khanate was divided into Eastern and Western parts. The latter, which had been undergoing Islamization and Turkicization, became the dominion of the Timurid dynasty, while the Eastern part became the so-called Moghul Khanate, with the self-designation *Moġūl ulus* or *ulus-i Moġūl*. Their dominion — covering the northern steppe and southern oases of the Tianshan mountains with Bišbalïq and Ili valley as their main bases — was called *Moġūlistān*[32]. The name *Moġūl* (< Pers. *Muġūl* 'Mongol') attached to them acknowleged their attachment to the nomadic tradition[33]. They even considered themselves as the legitimate rulers of the whole territories formerly under the control of the Chaghatai Khanate and the Timurids as usurpers[34]. Here we may suppose that the designation *Moġūl ulus* was directly derived from *Dumdadu Mongγol Ulus* 'the Middle Mongolian Empire' which had been first adopted by their ancestors in the Chaghatai Khanate.

Bibliography and Abbreviations

Barthold, W. W. 1927. 'Čaghatāi-Khān'. *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* II, 811-815.

— 1956-58. *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia*, I-II. Tr. by V. & T. Minorsky. Leiden.

Biran, M. 1997. *Qaidu and the Rise of the Independent Mongol State in Central Asia.* Richmond.

Baṭṭūṭa/DS: Defrémery, C. & B. R. Sanguinetti (eds & trs) 1877. *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, Vol. III. Paris.

Baṭṭūṭa/G: Gibb, H. A. R. (tr.) 1993. *The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa A.D. 1325-1354*, Vol. III. Rep. New Delhi.

---

[31] *Yeke Mongγol Ulus* is attested in the inscription of the stamp sealed on the Persian letter of 1246 from Güyüg to Pope Innocent IV (Rachewiltz 1983, 274 & pl. I). Its Chinese translation *Da Meng-gu guo* is frequently attested: e.g., the notorious diplomatic correspondence of 1266 from Qubilai to Japan (*YS*, chap. 208, 4625).

[32] Barthold 1956, 137-139; Barthold 1958, 10-11; Mano 2001, 264-274 291-313.

[33] Kim 1999, 316-318.

[34] *MTS*, chap. 66, 929; Kim 1999, 314.

Baṭṭūṭa/Y: Yajima, H. (tr.) 1996-2002. *Dairyokouki*. Japanese Translation of the *Riḥlat ibn Baṭṭūṭa* I-VIII. Tokyo.

BTT XVI: Cerensodnom, D. & M. Taube 1993. *Die Mongolica der Berliner Turfansammlung*. Berlin.

Cleaves, F. W. 1949. 'The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1362 in Memory of Prince Hindu'. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 12, 1-133 + 27 pls.

— 1951: 'The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1338 in Memory of J̌igüntei'. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 14, 1-104 + 32 pls.

— 1952. 'The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1346'. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 15, 1-123 + pls I-XII.

— 1953. 'The Mongolian Documents in the Musée de Téhéran'. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 16, 1-107.

— 1954. 'The *Bodistw-a Čari-a Awatar-un Tayilbur* of 1312 by Čosgi Odsir'. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 17, 1-129 + pls I-XXIV.

de Rachewiltz, I. 1983. '*Qan, qa'an* and the Seal of Güyüg'. In: K. Sagaster & M. Weiers (eds), *Documenta Barbarorum.* Wiesbaden, 272-281 + 3 pls.

Franke, H. 1962. 'Zur Datierung der mongolischen Schreiben aus Turfan'. *Oriens* 15, 399-410.

Haenisch, E. 1952. *Sinomongolische Documente vom Ende des 14. Jahrhundert*. Berlin.

HYYY: Kuribayashi, H. (ed.) 2003. *Word- and Suffix-Index to Hua-yi Yi-yü*. Sendai.

Jackson, P. 1992. 'Chaghatayid Dynasty'. *Encyclopaedia Iranica* V, 343-347.

Junast 1991. *The 'Phags-pa Script and Mongolian Texts* II: Collected Materials. Tokyo.

Kato, K. 1978. 'The Establishment of the Chaghatay Khanate'. In: The Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan (ed.), *Oriental and Indological Studies Dedicated to Dr. Atsuuji Ashikaga on His Seventy-seventh Birthday*. Tokyo, 143-160.

Kim, H. 1999. 'The Early History of the Moghul Nomads. The Legacy of the Chaghatai Khanate'. In: R. Amitai-Preiss & D. Morgan (eds.), *The Mongol Empire and Its Legacy*. Leiden · Boston · Köln, 290-318.

Lessing, F. D. 1960. *Mongolian-English Dictionary*. Berkeley · Los Angels.

Ligeti, L. 1971. 'Fragments mongols de Berlin'. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 24, 139-164.

— 1972. *Monuments préclassiques* 1, XIII-XIV siècles. Budapest.

Mano, E. 2001. *Bābur and His Times.* Kyoto.

Matsui, D. 1998. 'Uigur Administrative Orders Bearing «Qutluγ-seals»'. *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 13, 1-62 + 15 pls.

Matsukawa, T. 1995. 'On the Daiyuan-Ulus Style in the Mongolian Edicts of the 13th and 14th Centuries'. *Machikaneyama Ronsō* 30, 25-52.

Miya, N. 2006: *The Culture of Publication in the Mongol Period*. Nagoya.

MKT: 蒙漢詞典 *Meng-han ci-dian* [Mongγol Kitad toli]. Kökeqota 1999.

Mostaert, A. & I. de Rachewiltz 1977. *Le matériel mongol du Houa-i-i-iu* 華夷譯語 *de Houng-ou (1389)* I. Bruxelles.

MTS: 明太宗實録 *Ming Taizong shilu* (Institute of History and Philology of Academia Sinica ed.). Taipei (no date).

Oliver, B. 1891. 'The Coins of Chaghatai Mughals'. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 60, 8-16 + m. pls.

Pelliot, P. 1959. *Notes on Marco Polo*, Vol. I. Paris.

Poppe, N. 1991. *Grammer of Written Mongolian*. 4th ed. Wiesbaden.

SH: Kuribayashi, H. & Choijinjab (eds.) 2001. *Word- and Suffix-Index to the Secret History of the Mongols*. Sendai.

Sugiyama, M. 1987. 'Where Were the Western Borderlands of the Dai-Ön Ulus around 1314 AD?'. *Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies* 27. *Kyoto*, 24-56.

— 2004: *The Mongol Empire and Dai-Ön Ulus*. Kyoto.

TU/H: Abū al-Qasim 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Qāšānī, *Tārīẖ-i Ūlğāytū*. Ed. by M. Hambalī. Tehrān 1969.

TU/P: Parvisi-Berger, M. (ed. & tr.) 1968. *Die Chronik des Qāšānī über den Ilchan Öljāytü (1304-1316)*. Göttingen.

Tumurtogoo, D. 2006. *Mongolian Monuments in Uighur-Mongolian Script (XIII-XVI Centuries)*. Taipei.

YS: 元史 *Yuanshi*. Zhonghua shuju (ed.). Beijing 1976.

Yule, H. 1916: *Cathay and the Way Thither*, Vol. III. New ed. by H. Cordier. London. (Rep. New Delhi 1998)