Monumenta Serica, 1965, vol. 24, p. 185-

SOME REMARKS ON THE DATING OF THE *SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS*

IGOR de RACHEWILTZ
The Australian National University, Canberra

The year in which the Mongolian text of the so-called *Secret History of the Mongols* was written is still a moot point. The colophon (§ 282) of the *Secret History*[1] reads as follows:

> *Yeke qurilta quriju, quluγana jil γuran sara-da, Kelüren-ü Köde'e-aral-un Dolo'an-boldaγ-a, Šilginčeg qoyar ja'ura, ordos ba'uju büküi-tür bičijü da'usba.* "[We] have finished writing at the time when the Great Diet was assembled and when, in the year of the Rat, in the month of the Roebuck, the imperial palaces (*ordos*) were established at Dolo'an-boldaγ of Köde'e-aral of the Kelüren, between the two [localities called] Šilginčeg and..."

As shown by the Reverend Antoine Mostaert, there is a lacuna in the text immediately after the word Šilginčeg which obliterates the name of the second place.[2] The month of the Roebuck (*γuran sara*) corresponds to the seventh month of the lunar calendar, but to which year of the Rat (*quluγana jil*) does the colophon refer? Various theories have been put forward at different times and the years proposed so far are 1228, 1240, 1252 and 1264. Let us briefly review these theories.

A. Year of the Rat 1228. This is the year after the death of Činggis Qan, when the court was assembled for the Great

Note: Unless otherwise specified, the editions used are *Po-na* for the standard histories, and *Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an* for literary texts.

1) *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* 元朝秘史 (hereafter *YCPS*), *Hsü-chi* 2,58a-b.

2) A. Mostaert, *Sur quelques passages de l'Histoire secrète des Mongols* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953 — rep. of articles published in *HJAS* 13, 14 and 15), 388-390. I an following Mostaert's transcription and translation of the colophon, *ibid.*, 388 and 392. Cf., however, L. Ligeti, *A mongolok titkos története* (Budapest, 1962), 139 and 189-190.

Diet which elected his successor, Ögödei Qaγan, a year later (13 September 1229).[3] Since the diet was held at Köde'e-aral of the Kelüren (=Kerülen) river,[4] Ting Ch'ien 丁謙 stated in 1901 that the *Secret History* was written on that occasion. Ting claimed that T'o-ch'a-an 脫察安, the presumed author of the *Secret History*, subsequently added some events of the reign of Ögödei to his narrative, but forgot to correct the date of the colophon.[5] Ting's theory, marred in part by the identification of the author with T'o-ch'a-an (a misinterpretation of the book's later Mongolian title), has found few supporters.[6]

B. Year of the Rat 1240. This is the year before Ögödei's death (11 December 1241).[7] Since the *Secret History* contains a brief account of Ögödei (§§ 269–281)[8] but does not mention his death, the assignment of 1240 as the year of the Rat of the colophon has found almost general acceptance among scholars in China, Japan and Europe since the second half of last century. They include Palladius, Li Wen-t'ien 李文田, Naka Michiyo 那珂通世, T'u Chi 屠寄, P. Pelliot, E. Haenisch, S.A. Kozin and, more recently, Professors Ts. Damdinsüren, P. Poucha, A. Temir and Iwamura Shinobu 岩村忍.[9]

3) On Ögödei's enthronement see *below*, n.39.

4) On the location of Köde'e-aral see *below*, n.39.

5) *Yüan pi-shih ti-li k'ao-ch'eng* 元秘史地理考證 (*Che-chiang t'u-shu-kuan ts'ung-shu* 浙江圖書館叢書 ed.) 15.4a; "*Yüan pi-shih* tso-che jen-ming k'ao 元秘史作者人名考" (appended to the above), 2a-b. Cf. W. Hung, "The Transmission of the Book Known as *The Secret History of the Mongols*," *HJAS* 14 (1951), 487, n.136.

6) The identification of the author of the *Secret History* with "T'o-ch'a-an" was first proposed by Ku Kuang-ch'i 顧廣圻 in 1805. See Hung, 439-440. Recently, Dr. Wei Kwei Sun adopted Ting's date in his work *The Secret History of the Mongol Dynasty* (*Yuan-Chao-Pi-Shi*) (Aligarh, 1957), 5 and 180, n.4. See also *below*, n. 25.

7) On Ögödei's death see the *Yüan-shih* 元史 2.7b-8a and 146.10a (Biography of Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai 耶律楚材). Cf. N.C. Munkuev, *Kitaĭskiĭ istočnik o pervykh mongol'skikh khanakh* (Moscow, 1965), 199-200.

8) *YCPS*, *Hsü-chi* 2.13b-58a.

9) See Li Wen-t'ien 李文田, *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih chu* 元朝秘史註 (1903 ed. of the Shang-hai Wen-jui-lou 上海文瑞樓) 15.50b; Naka Michiyo 那珂通世, *Chingisu kan jitsuroku* 成吉思汗實錄 (Tokyo, 1907), *Joron* 序論, 2-3; T'u Chi 屠寄, *Meng-wu-erh shih-chi* 蒙兀兒史記 (1934 ed.) 4.14b-15a; P. Pelliot, "Deux lacunes dans

Most of the investigators of the *Secret History* are of the opinion that the colophon applies to the whole book. Two notable exceptions are, however, Naka Michiyo[10] and Ishihama Juntarō 石濱純太郎.[11] These scholars claim that the original book, consisting of ten *chüan*, was composed in Činggis Qan's time (Naka) or, at any rate, before 1240 (Ishihama), and that the *Continuation* (*hsü-chi* 續集) in 2 *chüan* was added in 1240, the year to which — they both agree — the colophon refers.

C. Year of the Rat 1252. In 1941 René Grousset questioned the validity of the B theory and suggested the year of the Rat one duodenary cycle later, i.e. 1252.[12] He contended that one passage in § 255 of the *Secret History*[13] hints at the succession to the khanship of the line of Tolui, an event which took place with the election of Möngke in 1251. He also pointed out that § 281[14] reads very much like a posthumous appraisal

le texte mongol actuel de *L'Histoire secrète des Mongols*," *Mélanges Asiatiques* 1 (1940-1941), 1-2, n.1; E. Haenisch, *Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, zweite verb. Auflage (Leipzig, 1948), 148; S.A. Kozin, *Sokrovennoe skazanie* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1941), 17-18 and 199; Ts. Damdinsüren, *Meng-ku pi-shih* 蒙古秘史, tr. into Chinese by Hsieh Tsai-shan 謝再善 (Peking, 1956), 12 and 276 (Damdinsüren's work is available to me only in this translation); cf., also, by the same author, *Mongolyn uran zoxiolyn toim* (Ulan-Bator, 1957), 53, and *Mongγol uran γokiγal-un degeǰi γaγun biliq orusibai*, Corpus Script. Mong. XIV (Ulan-Bator, 1959), 19; P. Poucha, *Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen als Geschichtsquelle und Literaturdenkmal* (Prag, 1956), 189; A. Temir, *Moğolların Gizli Tarihi* (Ankara, 1948), 205; Iwamura Shinobu 岩村忍, *Genchō hishi—Chingisu-han jitsuroku* 元朝秘史・チンギス-ハン實錄 (Tokyo, 1963), 201. In 1946 Professor Hattori Shirō 服部四郎 was also of the opinion that the *Secret History* was written in 1240. See his *Genchō hishi no mōkogo wo arawasu kanji no kenkyū* 元朝秘史の蒙古語を表わす漢字の研究 (Tokyo, 1946), 3.

10) *Chingisu kan jitsuroku*, *Joron*, 4.

11) Ishihama Juntarō 石濱純太郎, "*Genchō hishi kō* 元朝秘史考," *Ryūkoku shidan* 龍谷史壇 15 (1940), 1-9. This article is not available to me; my information derives from Hung, 466-468.

12) R. Grousset, *L'Empire Mongol* (1re phase) (Paris, 1941), 230, 303; "État actuel des études sur l'histoire gengiskhanide," in *Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Sciences*, 12 (1941). Cf. also his "Introduction historique" to Vladimirtsov's *Gengis-khan* tr. by M. Carsow (Paris, 1948), v-vi.

13) *YCPS*, *Hsü-chi* 1.31a-33b.

14) *Ibid.*, *Hsü-chi* 2.54b-58a.

of Ögödei. Pelliot was impressed but not convinced by Grousset's observations and held to the view that the year of the Rat refers to 1240. His counter-arguments were: a) The ambitions of Tolui's house must have been known before the death of Ögödei in 1241, and b) in the *Yüan-shih* no Great Diet at Köde'e-aral is recorded *s.a.* 1240 and 1252. The sketchy nature of the "Annals of T'ai-tsung 太宗" (Ögödei) in the *Yüan-shih* may account for the silence on a great diet held in 1240; however, from 1251 onward the imperial annals are more precise and such an important event as this in 1252 would have no doubt been mentioned.[15]

D. Year of the Rat 1264. In 1951 Professor William Hung published an important study on the transmission of the *Secret History*.[16] In it he discussed the theories of his predecessors and formulated new conclusions. Hung agrees with Grousset's views regarding §§ 255 and 281, but he feels that "the colophon might refer to a Rat year, a duodenary cycle still later than 1252."[17] His case rests chiefly on one puzzling geographical name occurring in § 247 of the *Secret History*.[18] In this paragraph, Hsüan-te fu 宣德府 is mentioned twice in this form. Hung points out that the area in question was called Hsüan-te chou 宣德州 in Chin times and continued to be known as such under the Mongols. On 7 September 1263 it was renamed Hsüan-te fu, hence a document referring to it by the new designation must be later than 7 September 1263. Hung suggests 1264 as the year in which the *Secret History* was written. He discards 1276, the next year of the Rat after 1264, on the ground that the author of the book, a man obviously well acquainted with Činggis Qan's early years, must have already been very old in 1264 and in all likelihood was no longer alive in 1276. Furthermore, if he referred in 1276 to Hsüan-te chou as Hsüan-te fu, he would have certainly referred to Chung-tu 中都 as Ta-tu 大都,

15) "Deux lacunes," 1-2, n.1.
16) See *above*, n.5.
17) Hung, 488.
18) *YCPS, Hsü-chi* 1.1a.

which is not the case.[19] In partial support of his theory, Hung adduces some external evidence; this, however, is very circumstantial and adds but little strength to the main argument.[20] Commenting in 1952 on Hung's interpretation, Mostaert pointed out that this leaves unanswered the question of why the author of the *Secret History*, writing in 1264, was silent on Ögödei's death and did not mention any of the many important events that took place between the end of Ögödei's reign and 1264.[21] Mostaert, therefore, does not regard the problem as having been solved satisfactorily. This is also the opinion of Professor B.I. Pankratov.[22]

In recent years, however, there have been new developments which tend to corroborate Hung's interpretation. I refer to two articles by Arthur Waley and Doctor Gari Ledyard, which appeared in 1960 and 1964 respectively.[23] In his article, Waley drew attention to some early remarks by Naka Michiyo to the effect that § 274 of the *Secret History*[24] describes events relating to the Mongol military activity in Korea in 1258. Naka regarded the passage in question as a later interpolation.[25] Waley, on the other

19) Hung, 489-490.

20) *Ibid.*, 490-491. Hung refers to Wang O's 王鶚 appeal to Qubilai in 1263 for the collection of historical material relating to Činggis Qan and intimates that the *Secret History* may have been compiled in response to this appeal. On Wang O cf. also *ibid.*, 478.

21) Mostaert, 394-395, n.254.

22) B.I. Pankratov, *Yuan'-čao bi-ši* (*Sekretnaya istoriya mongolov*) (Moscow, 1962), *Predislovie*, 5. A good critical review of the three main theories, with excerpts from the original texts, is found in Professor Kobayashi Takashirō's 小林高四郎 *Genchō hishi no kenkyū* 元朝秘史の研究 (Tokyo, 1950), 172-210.

23) A. Waley, "Notes on the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*," *BSOAS* 23 (1960), 523-529; G. Ledyard, "The Mongol Campaigns in Korea and the Dating of *The Secret History of the Mongols*," *CAJ* 9 (1964), 1-22.

24) *YCPS*, *Hsü-chi* 2.28a.

25) *Chingisu kan jitsuroku zokuhen* 成吉思汗實錄續編, 62 and 64, in *Naka Michiyo isho* 那珂通世遺書 (Tokyo, 1915). More recently, Uemura Seiji 植村清二 claimed on the same evidence that the *Secret History* was not compiled at one time. According to him the year of the Rat of the colophon is, as for Ting Ch'ien, 1228; the colophon was probably copied into the book from an earlier text at the time of the final compilation. See Tōhōgaku 東方學 10 (April 1955), 108-113 and p. 6 of the English summary.

hand, thought this unlikely and suggested a date for the composition of the *Secret History* " well after the middle of the thirteenth century."[26] Ledyard pursued the investigation of the events described in § 274 in greater detail, showing conclusively, in my opinion, that the account in the *Secret History* could not have been written before 1258. For him too, 1264 is the earliest possible date for the composition of this work.[27] The transposition of events relating to the reign of Möngke to the reign Ögödei occurred, according to Ledyard, by mistake in a written source used by the compiler of the *Secret History*.[28]

Professor L. Ligeti's Hungarian translation of the *Secret History* appeared in 1962, i.e. after Waley's article but before Ledyard's study. Although Waley's paper was available to him, Ligeti seems to have missed the reference to Naka's remarks contained in it.[29] His position with regard to the dating of the *Secret History* is the following. He agrees with Mostaert's criticism of Hung and, on the strength that no diet is recorded *s.a.* 1264, rules out the year 1264 as the year of the Rat of the colophon. However, he maintains with Grousset that certain passages show an ex post facto knowledge of events, but regards these as later interpolations and additions. Ligeti believes that, in its present form, the *Secret History* dates from the time of Möngke's election ; he regards this work, however, as an enlargement of an earlier version containing the account of Činggis' life. Therefore, he concludes, if the colophon refers to the whole work, the year of the Rat must correspond to 1252 ; if, on the other hand, the colophon refers to the earlier version, it must correspond to the year 1228. The problem is still unsolved.[30] Since Ligeti

26) " Notes on the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*," 529.

27) " The Mongol Campaigns," 10. In n.44 on p. 10 Ledyard points out, however, that although he favours the date of 1264, the evidence presented in his paper does not exclude 1276 or even 1288.

28) *Ibid.*, 15-16. This is purely conjectural of course, since there is no evidence that the author, or authors, of the *Secret History* used anything but oral tradition.

29) See *A mongolok titkos története*, 210. However, Naka Michiyo's *Chingisu kan jitsuroku zokuhen* is listed in the bibliography, *ibid.*, 237.

30) *A mongolok*, 210-213 ; cf. also *ibid.*, 5 and 189-190. On pp. 212-213, Ligeti notes certain names and data in the *Secret History* which seem to indicate that the work was not completed in 1240. The most important evidence concerns the

ignored Naka's important discovery, his rejection of the year 1264 cannot be readily accepted. The fact remains that whoever wrote the passage on Korea in § 274 must have done so after 1258, and the next year of the Rat after this date is 1264. As matters stand at present, 1264 appears to be the only candidate for the year of the Rat of the colophon. Unfortunately, this solution still leaves several important questions unanswered. They are: 1) Why — to echo Mostaert's criticism of Hung's theory — does the *Secret History*, written in 1264, end without mentioning at least the death of Ögödei? 2) Why was this work entitled simply

references to Ögödei and Tolui which I shall discuss later. The other data are, in my view, not conclusive. It is certainly strange to find the name "Kerel" in §§ 262 (*YCPS*, *Hsü-chi* 1.49b gives the faulty reading "Raral") and 270 (*ibid.*, *Hsü-chi* 2.15b) applied to the Hungarians before 1240. But does it apply to them, as Ligeti claims, and is it to be related to Béla IV's royal title (*Kiraly*, "King")? Pelliot, who devoted a long notice to "Käräl~Kälär" in his *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or* (Paris, 1950), 115-162, stated with regard to the identity of this people: "la mention de ≪ Corola ≫ [of Plano Carpini — I.R.] parmi les peuples soumis par les Mongols me semble rendre possible qu'un peuple ait été designé par les Mongols sous le nom de Käräl, et c'est de ce peuple qu'il pourrait s'agir originairement dans le couple ≪ Käräl (~Kälär) et Bašγïrd ≫, appliqué ensuite aux Hongrois parce qu'on considérait que ceux-ci étaient identiques aux Bašγïrd et qu'en Hongrie il y avait un *käräl*, le *kiraly* ou roi." (*Ibid.*, 141.) The Bašγïrd are the Bajigit of the *Secret History* mentioned in the same passages with Kerel and also in §§ 239 and 274 (*YCPS* 10.15a and *Hsü-chi* 2.27b). As Pelliot, *op. cit.*, 141-142, points out, the Mongols under Joči had already before the Western Campaign of 1221-1225 come in contact with people like the Bašγïrd of the Urals (see the *Secret History*, § 239). Whether it was on this occasion that they also first came in contact with the "Kerel" people or learned about them it is impossible to say; they certainly did during the 1223 raid, when Jebe and Sübötei, having crossed the Volga, beat the Bulgars of the Kama and the Qanglï Turks (both these people are mentioned in §§ 262 and 270). Unfortunately, Pelliot did not elaborate on the identity of the original "Kerel" people. From his previous discussion he seems to relate them to the "Corola" (or "Korola," see R.A. Skelton, T.E. Marston and G. Painter, *The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation* [New Haven and London, 1965], 104, 105) of Plano Carpini. But, as he himself says, it is difficult to see in the Corola any other people than the Karelians. It is perhaps under Pelliot's influence that P. Poucha, *Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen* (Prag, 1956), 78, suggests that the "Kerel" of the *Secret History* may in fact be the Karelians. Clearly this problem calls for further research; however, we can safely assume that the Kerel, whatever their identity, together with the Bulgars and the Bašγïrd, were known to the Mongols in Činggis Qan's time and pose, therefore, no serious chronological problem. The other point raised by Ligeti is Činggis Qan's appoint-

Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur or *The Origin of Činggis Qahan*[31] — a title appropriate only to the first part of the book? 3) Why is the Great Diet at Köde'e-aral not recorded in the "Annals of Shih-tsu 世祖" (Qubilai) in the *Yüan-shih*, *s.a.* 1264?

In his article, Ledyard has dealt with the first question.[32] In reply to Mostaert's objections, Ledyard states that the author of the *Secret History* intended to confine himself only to the reigns of Činggis and Ögödei; since he was going to end his narrative with Ögödei's reign, there was no compelling reason for him to mention his death. Ledyard suggests an additional factor that may account for the author's silence on this point. There is a passage in the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* 聖武親征錄 where the mention of Činggis' death *s.a.* 1227 appears to have been deleted; only an indirect allusion to it is found in the entry on Ögödei's enthronement.[33] This seems to confirm that the subject of Činggis' death was taboo. Ledyard infers from it that Ögödei's death may have also been regarded as such, hence the lack of any re-

ment of Qunan as leader of ten-thousand (*tümen-ü noyan*) under Joči's command — an event recorded *s.a.* 1206 in §210 of the *Secret History* (*YCPS* 9.4b). This information is at variance with Rašīd al-Dīn's account, where (*Sbornik letopiseĭ*, I.2, tr. by L.A. Khetagurov and O.I. Smirnova [Moscow-Leningrad, 1952], 274) Qunan is listed as one of Joči's four leaders of thousand. Ligeti, 212 (cf. also *ibid.*, 172-173), contends that Qunan's appointment as leader of ten-thousand must have taken place after 1241 when, as Rašīd al-Dīn, *loc. cit.*, relates, the armies of these commanders incorporated Russian, Chircassian and other foreign troops. I agree with Ligeti that it is unlikely that Qunan received this office in 1206; however, the record of his appointment in §210 is also at variance with the account in §202 (*YCPS* 8.25a), where it is stated that on the same occasion — the Great Diet of 1206 — Qunan was appointed leader of thousand (*minγan-u noyan*). Moreover, Rašīd al-Dīn does not say that Qunan was at any time made leader of ten-thousand; this is only inferred by Ligeti on the strength that his army was later filled with various foreign troops. In view of Rašīd al-Dīn's statement and the internal contradiction of the *Secret History*, it seems likely that the *tümen-ü noyan* of §210 is simply a mistake for *minγan-u noyan*. Confusion between the two ranks occurs, not infrequently, in the sources of the period. Cf. B. Vladimirtsov, *Le régime social des Mongols: Le féodalisme nomade*, tr. by M. Carsow (Paris, 1948), 135, n.5.

31) On the original title of the *Secret History* see N. Poppe in *ZDMG* 99 (1950), 276-277; Hung, 466-467, 484-485; Mostaert, ix-xii.

32) "The Mongol Campaigns," 11-12.

33) *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* 聖武親征錄 (*Hai-ning Wang Ching-an hsien-sheng i-shu* 海寧王靜安先生遺書 ed.), 79a.

ference to it in the *Secret History*. I cannot accept Ledyard's argument. Činggis' death was undoubtedly taboo, this is why the *Secret History* (§ 268) uses the euphemism *tenggeri-tür yarba* "he ascended to Heaven."[34] If Ögödei's death were also taboo, as it almost certainly was, we would expect to find it mentioned in the same way and with the date prefixed to it as in the case of Činggis'. The fact that any reference to Ögödei's death is absent in the *Secret History* is even more puzzling, in my opinion, if we assume, as Ledyard does, that the author intended to close its narrative with an account of Ögödei's reign. The reference to the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* is not relevant.

The question of the inadequate title has so far been explained, rather unsatisfactorily, as the extension of the name of one section to the whole book.[35] While this may be so, it seems unlikely that the author would have stretched the word *huǰa'ur* "origin" to such an extent as to cover also the reign of Ögödei. To overcome this difficulty, Ishihama Juntarō put forth the ingenious theory that the title *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* covered only the original book in 10 *chüan* and did not apply to the *Continuation* in 2 *chüan* containing the account of Ögödei, which, according to him, was added later.[36] In his criticism of Ishihama, Hung correctly points out that the story of Činggis Qan extends well into the *Continuation*.[37] Clearly the division of the book into chapters and sections was the work of the Ming editors and has nothing to do with the form of the original text.[38] Ishihama's theory must be discarded, but the problem of the title remains.

The above two questions are important but not decisive; the third question, however, is. It is inconceivable, knowing what

34) *YCPS, Hsü-chi* 2.13a. In *Notes on Marco Polo*, I (Paris, 1959), 305, Pelliot points out that the *Secret History* and the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* do not mention the death of Činggis Qan certainly because of a taboo and not, as claimed by Wang Kuo-wei, because there is a lacuna in our mss.

35) Hung, 484. Mostaert, xii, says: "Vraisemblement, le chroniqueur mongol, au moment où il acheva sa chronique, n'a pas cru nécessaire de donner à son ouvrage un titre qui le couvrît en entier."

36) See Hung, 466-467, 468.

37) *Ibid.*, 468.

38) *Ibid.*, 483.

we know about Mongol customs in the thirteenth century, that a *Yeke Qurilta*, the convocation and business of which would have taken *at least* several months and required the participation of the emperor and the Mongolian elite, is not mentioned at all in the *Yüan-shih*, nor in any other source. This was, as we have seen, one of Pelliot's major objections to Grousset's thesis, as well as Ligeti's argument against Hung's. The objection becomes in fact overriding in the case of a Great Diet held in 1264, since the Annals of Qubilai are detailed and quite accurate. Moreover, we must not overlook the fact that the Great Diet of the year of the Rat was held at Köde'e-aral. This was the area where Činggis Qan had his principal *ordos* and where the Great Diet that elected his successor was convoked. Any other diet held at Köde'e-aral, a locality consecrated as it were by its special associations with Činggis Qan, would have no doubt been of a most solemn nature.[39] Not only are our sources completely silent on a Great Diet in 1264, they also indicate that Qubilai was in Shang-tu 上都, his summer residence, between 27 March and 22 September, i.e. during the very period when the diet is supposed to have been held.[40] Hung, who noted this fact, claimed that Qubilai may still have attended an "unrecorded conference" in the seventh month (25 July–22 August) and suggested a "reconciliation" meeting at Köde'e-aral between the emperor and his rebel brother Ariγ Böge.[41] This is, however, excluded since in the imperial edict

39) On the 1227–1229 diet and the election of Ögödei see the *Secret History*, § 269 (*YCPS*, *Hsü-chi* 2.13b-14a); *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu*, 79b; *The History of the World-Conqueror by 'Ala-ad-Din 'Ata-Malik Juvaini*, tr. by J.A. Boyle (Manchester, 1958), 178–191; *Sbornik letopiseĭ*, II, tr. by Yu. P. Verkhovskiĭ (Moscow-Leningrad, 1960), 18; *Yüan-shih* 2.1a-b and 146.3a. Cf. Munkuev, 72 and 188. It is from Rašīd al-Dīn that we learn that the assembly was convened on the Kerülen at the place where Činggis had his main camp. The other diet held at Köde'e-aral was the famous one that elected Möngke in July 1251. See the *Yüan-shih* 3.2b; *L'Empire Mongol*, 308. Cf. Yanai Wataru 箭内亘, *Mōkoshi kenkyū* 蒙古史研究 (Tokyo, 1930), 391–392, 408–416, 672. According to Yanai, 594, and Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo*, I, 322, Köde'e-aral ("Barren Island") was situated at the confluence of the Senggür and the Kerülen. The Senggür (Senkur, Cenkir or Tsenkhir Gol) originates in the Kentei range and flows from north to south into the great bend of the Kerülen; it is now lost in sands and swamps.

40) *Yüan-shih* 5.18b-22b.

41) Hung, 491–492.

of 7 September 1264, issued a fortnight after the return and submission of Ariγ Böge and his followers, Qubilai specifically refers to the reconciliation meeting as having taken place in Shang-tu.[42]

These three unsolved problems are together sufficient to cast serious doubts on the validity of the theories so far proposed, including the latest interpretations by Hung and Ledyard. On the basis of what precedes and after a further analysis of the available evidence, I have come to the following conclusions: a) no Great Diet is recorded in the *Yüan-shih s.a.* 1240, 1252 and 1264 simply because none was held in these years; b) the Great Diet at Köde'e-aral in the year of the Rat is the well-known diet that elected Ögödei, hence the date of the colophon must be, as Ting Ch'ien stated long ago, the 7th month of 1228; c) the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur*, to which the colophon belonged, covered only the ancestry and life of Činggis Qan, and ended with his "ascension to Heaven" in the year of the Pig 1227 (i.e. with § 268 of the *Secret History*); d) the remaining portion of the book, consisting of a short account of Ögödei's life (§§ 269–281), was written after 1258 and was added to the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* in the early Ming period; e) the colophon was transposed on that occasion from the end of the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* to the end of the complete book (§ 282).

A question that will be immediately raised by the reader is: if the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur*, i.e. §§ 1–268 of the present text of the *Secret History*, was written in 1228, how is it that two passages in it indicate, as shown by Grousset and Hung, a much later date for its composition? The question is very pertinent, since all the theories that favour a post-1228 year of the Rat are based on material and information found in the portion of the *Secret History* concerning Ögödei and, in two instances only (§§ 247 and 255), on data found in the part of the book dealing with Činggis Qan.[43] Since we assume that the part concerning Ögödei

42) *Yüan-shih* 5.22a. Cf. *Meng-wu-erh shih-chi* 7.14a.

43) In a few instances in the section of the *Secret History* preceding Ögödei's enthronement, his name is followed by the titles *qan* (§ 255; *YCPS, Hsü-chi* 1.29a) or *qahan* (§ 198; *YCPS* 8.1a). Elsewhere in this section it is given correctly without epithets. As in the case of Činggis' name, these epithets were added after

is of a later date — certainly post-1258 — we must still dispose of §§ 247 and 255. If we subject the information contained in these two paragraphs to close scrutiny, we shall see, however, that they pose no problem.

The case of the occurrence of Hsüan-te fu in § 247, on which Hung's argument is based, is not conclusive. There is definite evidence showing that the area in question was popularly known as Hsüan-te fu already in the early 1230's, although its official elevation to this rank did not take place till much later. The name Hsüan-te fu occurs in fact in P'eng Ta-ya's 彭大雅 account in the *Hei-Ta shih-lüeh* 黑韃事略.[44] Now P'eng's mission to Mongol-occupied North China took place in 1232, but the present text of the *Hei-Ta shih-lüeh*, which includes also Hsü T'ing's 徐霆 account, was completed in 1237.[45] Since there was no reason for Hsü T'ing to amend P'eng's text on this point, we can safely assume that Hsüan-te fu was a current name of this area in 1232.

As for § 255, to which Grousset drew attention, I agree that, while it records Činggis' choice of Ögödei as his successor, it hints at the same time at the aspirations to leadership of the other sons' lineages. However, as Pelliot pointed out, it is not necessary to see in this an ex post facto knowledge of events. As a matter of fact, Tolu's ambitions to the throne were manifest already during the Great Diet of 1227–29. From both the Chinese and Persian sources we learn that at the time there was disagreement in the assembly, a section of which supported the

---

the compilation and must, in all likelihood, be ascribed to later copyists. See *Notes on Marco Polo*, I, 302. Cf. also L. Hambis in *Mélanges publiés par l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises*, II (Paris, 1960), 149.

44) *Hei-Ta shih-lüeh* 黑韃事略 (*Hai-ning Wang Ching-an hsien-sheng i-shu* ed.), 23a; cf. *ibid.* (*Ts'ung-shu chi-ch'eng* 叢書集成 ed.), 16. The "Hsüan-te chou 宣德州" in Wang Kuo-wei's commentary to the *Hsi-yu chi* 西遊記 (*Hai-ning Wang Ching-an hsien-sheng i-shu* ed.), A, 10a9–10, is therefore an error for "Hsüan-te fu 宣德府." I think that Hsüan-te chou was called Hsüan-te fu as early as 1228 because it was then the administrative headquarters (*fu*) of Yeh-lü T'u-hua's 耶律禿花 army. See *Meng-wu-erh shih-chi* 49.2b-3a. This point, however, requires further investigation.

45) See Wang Kuo-wei's 王國維 colophon to the *Hei-Ta shih-lüeh*. Cf. Pelliot in *TP* 26 (1929), 167.

candidature of Tolui (then regent of the empire) against Ögödei's.[46] This is not surprising, since the Mongol law of succession favoured, at least in principle, the youngest son.[47] Tolui, as we know, was not elected, but his family re-asserted its claim after the death of Güyüg and won the succession.[48]

In view of this, the data in §§ 247 and 255 can no longer be used to support the theory that the *Secret History* was composed in 1252 or later. However, the removal of this obstacle does not, of course, prove automatically that in §§ 1–268 of the *Secret History* we have the original *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur*. Is there any positive evidence to this effect? I think there is. It is a well-known fact that the *Altan tobči* of bLo-bzaṅ bsTan-'jin incorporates a large portion of the *Secret History*. We do not know how this text reached bLo-bzaṅ bsTan-'jin, but evidently a copy of it (or of another work embodying it) still circulated in Mongolia in the second half of the seventeenth century. bLo-bzaṅ bsTan-'jin used it extensively in compiling his chronicle: 233 of the 282 paragraphs of the *Secret History* are found in it.[49] How-

46) *Yüan-shih* 146.3a; *The History of the World-Conqueror*, 186-187; *Sbornik letopisei*, II, 19. Cf. C. D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, II (La Haye et Amsterdam, 1834), 9-10.

47) See Ögödei's remarks as reported by J̌uwainī (*The History of the World-Conqueror*, 186). Cf. also Fang Chaoying *apud* H.F. Schurmann, "Mongolian Tributary Practices of the Thirteenth Century," *HJAS* 19 (1956), 316-317, n.12.

48) Ligeti, 212, thinks that the section dealing with the problem of succession, which occupies most of § 254 and all of § 255 (*YCPS*, *Hsü-chi* 1.20b-34b), is a later interpolation to justify the rise of the Tolui branch. He points out that a) this section is out of context; b) it is not found in the corresponding part of Rašīd al-Dīn's work; and c) it is missing altogether from the text of the *Secret History* preserved in the *Altan tobči* of bLo-bzaṅ bsTan-'jin. Ligeti is probably right. Assuming, however, that this section is not an interpolation, its contents are still plausible within the context of the 1228 Diet. Ligeti's further remarks that the *Secret History*'s exaltation of Tolui and its portrayal of Ögödei as a weak personality, subordinated to Čaǰatai and indulging in a self-criticism unbecoming to a Great Khan, could hardly have been tolerated during Ögödei's lifetime, are irrefutable. This not only confirms that the section dealing with Ögödei's reign is a post-1241 production, but also that both parts of the work issue from the pro-Tolui faction of the court.

49) See bLo-bzaṅ bsTan-'jin, *Altan tobči: A Brief History of the Mongols*. Scripta Mongolica I (Cambridge, Mass., 1952), xviii-xx; W. Heissig, *Die Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Mongolen I: 16.-18. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden,

ever, they are all from the portion of the book dealing with Činggis' ancestry and life ; not a single paragraph from the *Secret History* account of Ögödei is quoted in the *Altan tobči*. The last paragraph of the *Secret History* quoted in it is § 268.[50] Had the account of Ögödei's reign been available to bLo-bzaṅ bsTan-'jin, he would no doubt have made use of it in the section of his chronicle devoted to Ögödei. Since he did not, we must conclude that the text used by him ended with the death of Činggis Qan. This fact was noticed by C. Ž. Žamcarano who, in 1934, felt "compelled to assume that in Mongolia there was in circulation the complete text of the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*, but possibly without the account of Ögödei's reign".[51] We cannot discount the possibility that the text of the *Secret History* available to bLo-bzaṅ bsTan-'jin was a fragmentary one. The fact, however, that the section on Ögödei is missing *in toto* makes this unlikely. The more obvious explanation is that the work he used was a chronicle complete in itself, beginning with Činggis Qan's ancestry and ending with his "ascension to Heaven," in other words the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur*.

Assuming this to be correct, I would propose the following reconstruction of events. I am well aware that this reconstruction is partly conjectural. However, I think that the relatively few well-documented facts at our disposal warrant a new interpretation along the lines suggested below.

1959), 57-60, 70-71 ; C. Ž. Žamcarano, *The Mongol Chronicles of the Seventeenth Century*, tr. by R. Loewenthal (Wiesbaden, 1955), 57-88 (see, however, *below*, n.51); N. Poppe, "Stand und Aufgabe der Mongolistik", *ZDMG* 100 (1950), 69. For the transcription of the text of the *Secret History* found in the *Altan tobči* see Kozin, 321-397.

50) In the table of parallel passages on p. 70 of Professor Heissig's work, the passage in *Altan tobči*, II, 77.9 (read 77.10) — 78.6, is listed as an adaptation of § 273 of the *Secret History*. This is a *lapsus*, since the two passages are on entirely different topics. See Mostaert in *Altan tobči*, xvii-xviii.

51) *The Mongol Chronicles*, 88. Žamcarano, however, held the erroneous view that the text of the *Secret History* in the *Altan tobči* originated from a thirteenth century copy in Uighur script of the original text in the Chinese transcription. This theory has been criticized by Heissig, 57-58, and Ligeti, 197. Kozin's theory (*Sokrovennoe skazanie*, 17-29), which is basically identical with Žamcarano's, that the *Altan tobči* text of the *Secret History* was reconstructed in the seventeenth century in Uighur script from the Chinese transcription, must likewise be dismissed. See Pelliot, "Deux lacunes," 4 ff.; Ligeti, 197-198.

The *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* was composed exactly one year after the death of Činggis Qan, in the seventh month (2 to 31 August) of the year of the Rat 1228, while all the Mongol princes and nobles were gathered at his former *ordos* to elect his successor. This would have been a most fitting occasion to evoke and record for posterity the dead khan's noble origins, his spectacular rise and magnificent achievements. At the Great Diet were present, of course, all the surviving companions and early followers of Činggis Qan : men intimately acquainted with him, who could be consulted on the minutest details concerning his family and career. Reciting and recording[52] the imperial saga on such a momentous occasion must have been a solemn affair ; and, once completed, the work could not fail to be regarded with awe and reverence, for therein were contained, together with the imperial genealogy and the record of Činggis' life, also many of his pronouncements and binding instructions.[53] The story of Činggis Qan, as recorded in 1228, would begin with an account of the origins of his family and tribe, hence the words *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* prefixed to it. Upon completion of the work no new and comprehensive title was, apparently, considered necessary. Although by 1228 the Mongols had a script and, no doubt, some written records, this was a recent development. As they lacked a literary tradition, the concept of a suitable title for a book must have still been alien to them ; therefore, to retain *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* as a label covering both the origin *and* life of Činggis Qan may not have struck them as inappropriate or inadequate.[54] It is not even certain whether they actually referred

52) The epic was no doubt recited and sung before being committed to writing, and the numerous passages in alliterative, rhythmic prose (the oldest specimens of Mongolian "poetry") bear witness to this. Cf. Ligeti, 204, 209 and 213. It is, of course, hardly credible that, as Hung, 487, states, the writing of the book "might have taken only a few days."

53) For example, the detailed regulations concerning army organization and the duties of the Guard (§§ 202 ff.); and the instructions regarding warfare, hunting, rewards and punishments, and mutual responsibilities scattered throughout the work.

54) See the important remarks in Ligeti, 209. On the development of Mongolian literary culture in relation to writing see A. Róna-Tas' interesting article "Some Notes on the Terminology of Mongolian Writing" in *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 18 (1965), 119 ff.

to the book by this title. The sacred chronicle of the Mongols kept in the treasury of the Il-khans was known as the *Altan debter* or *Golden (=Imperial) Book.*[55] The imperial chronicles in Mongolian compiled during the first half of the Yüan dynasty were called simply the *Tobčiyan* or *History.* The title *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* is not attested anywhere, except as the first line of our chronicle.

As far as we can ascertain, no more chronicles in Mongolian were written during the reigns of Ögödei, Güyüg and Möngke (1229–1259). The Mongol generals were busy with military campaigns in Europe and Asia, while the court at Qara-qorum was torn by internal dissension and bitter rivalries. The house of Ögödei was disgraced and the leadership was transferred to the line of Tolui. A native chronicler writing in this troubled period would have found his task beset with difficulties of all kinds. It is only with the accession of Qubilai and his establishment in China that conditions became favourable for the resumption of historiographical activity. Credit for this must go to a large extent to Qubilai's Chinese advisers who, from the very beginning of his reign, urged him to collect historical data on his illustrious predecessors.[56] Qubilai would have had in his possession a copy of the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur*, but this chronicle, as we have seen, did not go beyond 1227. From the *Yüan-shih* we infer that he gave instructions that veritable records of the reigns of Tolui, Ögödei, Güyüg and Möngke be compiled. The presentation to the Throne of these records by Sarman is registered *s.a.* 1288 and 1290.[57] It is worth noting that neither of these references men-

55) On the *Altan debter* see Hung, 471 and n.86. Cf. Ligeti, 202, 203. Although the *Altan debter* was in all likelihood a series of historical compilations similar to the *Tobčiyan* of the Yüan emperors (on which see Hung, 465 ff.), we cannot exclude the possibility that this title was first given to the chronicle of Činggis Qan and his ancestors, i.e. to the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur*, a copy of which was certainly in the possession of the Il-khans. That this "sacred" text concerned Činggis Qan is explicitly stated in the *Mu'izz al-Ansāb*, where it is referred to as "the *Golden Book* of Čingiz-khān." See W. Barthold, *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion* (London, 1928), 44-45.

56) See Hung, 478-479, 490-491.

57) *Yüan-shih* 15.3a; 16.7a-b, 11a-b. Cf. Hung, 473-474.

tions the veritable records of Činggis Qan. Since the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* would already have been available, there would, of course, be no need to ask Sarman and his colleagues to compile new records on him. These chronicles in Mongolian, including parts of the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur*, were also translated and revised by the Bureau of Dynastic History (Kuo-shih yüan 國史院) and used for the compilation of the *Wu-ch'ao shih-lu* 五朝實錄, the veritable records of the first five reigns in Chinese, which were completed and presented to Temür Qa;an (Ch'eng-tsung 成宗; r. 1295–1307) on 5 December 1303.[58]

Historiographical activity continued under the following emperors. By the middle of the fourteenth century a considerable body of historical records on the Mongol dynasty existed in both languages. It is to be assumed that more than one copy of the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* in Uighur script were kept in the palace archives, and that they were placed in that section of the archives, which was accessible only to members of the imperial family and a few high-ranking Mongol officials.[59] The *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* was no doubt included in the historical records collectively known as the *Tobčiyan*, and these, we know, were regarded as "extremely secret" documents.[60]

When the dynasty was overthrown and the Mongols expelled from China, the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* was, presumably, among

58) *Yüan-shih* 21.11a; Hung, *ibid.* We do not know when the Bureau of Dynastic History began the compilation of the veritable records in Chinese. However, this work must have progressed *pari passu* with the compilation of the Mongolian historical records. In the *Yüan-shih* 14.11b, under the date 11 January 1287, we find recorded the emperor's approval to Sarman's request that the veritable records from T'ai-tsu 太祖 (Činggis Qan) down, which were being compiled by the Bureau of Dynastic History, should be translated into Mongolian in the Uighur script, and that they should be put into final from only after the emperor had read them. See Hung, 470. I believe that this measure was designed to enable Qubilai, who could not read Chinese, to check that the veritable records in Chinese did not contain information which the court was unwilling to divulge.

59) See Pankratov, 11.

60) Cf. Hung, 465–466, 484–485. References to the *Tobčiyan* in the *Yüan-shih* state unambiguously that this work contained historical accounts "from T'ai-tsu down". See W. Fuchs, "Analecta zur mongolischen Übersetzungsliteratur der Yüan-Zeit", *MS* 11 (1946), 59, 60.

the treasured possessions carried away by the fleeing court. This is only a conjecture, but it provides a reasonable clue to the existence and preservation of this text in Mongolia. Unfortunately, the vicissitudes of the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* in Mongolia are not known. One thing we know for certain: it survived several centuries of political and social turmoil, and thanks to the learned bLo-bzaṅ bsTan-'jin it has eventually come down to us. At least one manuscript copy of the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* was, however, left behind. The circumstances in which this copy came to light in the early Ming period are also not known. Pankratov has advanced the interesting theory that it was found by the officials who were processing the documents recovered from the palace archives, and that they may have registered it under the random title *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*, or *Secret History of the Yüan Dynasty*, since it was discovered in the "closed" section of these archives.[61] I think that Pankratov is correct about the provenance, but, in my opinion, what the officials found in the Mongol archives was actually a copy of the *Tobčiyan*. The Chinese officials knew well that the *Tobčiyan* was a secret history of the Yüan, hence the appropriate title under which they registered it. The work may or may not have been a complete one; it certainly included the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* and at least the record of Ögödei's reign. However, from the words "*Yüan-ch'ao*" of the title we can infer that the copy that the officials examined probably covered several reigns.

The commission presided over by Sung Lien 宋濂, which hastily compiled the *Yüan-shih* in 1369, did not consult any of the historical documents in Mongolian rescued from the archives, with the exception perhaps of those concerning the reign of the last emperor Toγon Temür (Shun-ti 順帝; r. 1333–1367). These precious records were scattered, destroyed or otherwise lost in the few decades after the founding of the Ming. Only one or two escaped obliteration thanks to a lucky chance. After the national restoration the Ming court had still to cope with the Mongol menace on its northern borders. In order to deal more effective-

61) Pankratov, 11. See *below*, n.64.

ly with the troublesome Mongols, the government, early in the Hung-wu 洪武 period, felt the need of training a number of Chinese in their manners and customs, as well as in their language. Since no practical manual for the study of Mongolian was available (during the Yüan the Chinese were expressly forbidden to learn this language), a team of scholars of the College of Literature (Han-lin yüan 翰林院) was entrusted with the task of compiling one. While working on a Sino-Mongolian vocabulary (the *Hua-i i-yü* 華夷譯語) they looked for suitable texts to use as readers.[62] Among the Mongolian books available to them was the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*. Unfortunately, by this time (early 1380's) the manuscript had apparently suffered some damage. The extent of the damage cannot be ascertained since we do not know in what state it was originally found in the palace archives; it seems, however, that all that was left now of the former *Tobčiyan* consisted of A: the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur*, parts of which were missing or out of order,[63] and B: the incomplete record of Ögödei's reign. These two texts, nevertheless, formed a fairly continuous narrative; they contained a good deal of background material on Mongol history and customs, and were, above all, an extremely rich and valuable source from the linguistic point of view. The compilers of the College of Literature presumably decided, therefore, to piece them together into one book. There was, however, an obstacle: the colophon of A which, if retained in its place, obviously would have broken the continuity of the book. The idea of removing it altogether — the easiest way out — may have been repugnant to them; perhaps, not knowing to which year of the Rat it referred to, they thought that it could apply also to B. Whatever the case, they chose to retain it, but since it was a colophon, they had to transpose it from the end of A to the

62) Cf. Hung, 448 ff.; Pankratov, 11-12; M. Lewicki, *La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIVe siècle: Le Houa-yi yi-yu du 1389* (Wroclaw, 1949), "Introduction"; E. Haenisch, *Sino-Mongolische Dokumente vom Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1952), "Einleitung."

63) Cf. Hung, 483. As is known, the *Altan tobči* text of the *Secret History* (see *above*, n.49) gives often a more extensive version of the same event related in the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*. It seems likely that at least part of this additional material was in the original *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur*. See Heissig, 57, and Ligeti, 196, 199 ff.

end of the book. For the latter they kept the title *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*, which they probably took to be the Chinese translation of the lost Mongolian title. They then prepared a free and summarized translation of the whole work into vernacular Chinese.[64] They presumably also had one or more copies made of the Mongolian text (A+B) in Uighur script. In the following years the Mongolian text was transcribed with Chinese characters and provided with interlinear glosses. The team of transcribers and translators did not at this stage work on A and B but on the copy or copies of the unified text. There is definite evidence that the manuscript they used differed in a few instances — no doubt through copyists' faults — from that used by the authors of the early summarized translation.[65] The other textbook which was being compiled by the College of Literature, the *Hua-i i-yü*, consisting of a Sino-Mongolian glossary and twelve official documents to serve as reader, was completed and published first (1389).[66] The *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*, a long and difficult text, kept transcribers and translators occupied for several more years. In the course of their work, these scholars developed a more sophisticated system of transcription than the one used in the *Hua-i i-yü*. We owe to Professor Ch'en Yüan 陳垣 a detailed description of these innovations in technique.[67] They also divided the book, rather arbitrarily, into chapters and sections, adding at the end of each section the corresponding passages from the summarized translation. Furthermore, they rendered the title *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* into Mongolian (in Chinese transcription), thus unwittingly causing several later generations of scholars to believe that the original Mongolian title of the work was *Mongγol-un ni'uča*

64) Hung, 485, and Mostaert, xi, are of the opinion that the title *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* may have been given to the book by these early translators. Although I prefer Pankratov's theory, both interpretations are equally possible.

65) See Pelliot, "Deux lacunes," 6-7; Mostaert, viii-ix, n.4., xi. Although the differences between the summarized version and the text in transcription discussed by these scholars can be explained as omissions and mistakes due to scribes, a detailed comparison of the two texts still remains to be done. Cf. Ligeti, 196.

66) See Hung, 449; H. Serruys, "The Dates of the Mongolian Documents in the *Hua-i i-yü*," *HJAS* 17 (1954), 419-427.

67) Ch'en Yüan 陳垣, *Yüan pi-shih i-yin yung tzu k'ao* 元秘史譯音用字考 (Peking, 1934). Cf. Hung, 454-457.

tobča'an.[68] While all the Mongolian manuscripts were lost, either through negligence or destroyed because no longer needed, the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* transcribed and translated into Chinese survived owing to its inclusion in the *Yung-lo ta-tien* 永樂大典. The subsequent history of the text is well known thanks to the painstaking work of Professor Hung, and we need not dwell on it.[69]

One point which I have not taken up in my investigation is the problem of the stylistic unity of the *Secret History*. If this work is, as I maintain, composed of two distinct texts written by different authors and separated by a time gap of at least thirty years, there might be noticeable differences in language and literary style between the two parts, i.e. between § 1–268 and 269–281. This is a problem that can be tackled only by a competent Mongolist, which I cannot claim to be. An investigation of this kind may yield interesting results, but I doubt whether it will be conclusive one way or the other. There is always the possibility, not to say the likelihood, that each text was the outcome of a joint effort (this may explain why no author is mentioned in the colophon),[70] and that its style reflects an ancient folk narrative tradition which was crystallized for the first time in writing with the *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur*. This text may have then served as a model for later historical compilations, including of course the account of Ögödei. In this case even if stylistic differences were detected, it would be an extremely hazardous task to draw conclusions from them.

68) Hung, 483-485.

69) *Ibid.*, 433 ff. Cf. Pankratov, 7 ff.

70) Pankratov, 6, has already suggested that the composition of the *Secret History* may be the work of several people. On the question of authorship see Ligeti, 206-209.