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At the end of an edict of Ögedei of 1235, No XXI on page 307 of Ed. CHAVANNES' "Inscriptions et pièces de chancellerie chinoises de l'époque mongole (Seconde série)," we find the words 後有回同字号一行. These words are not rendered in CHAVANNES' translation on pages 308-309, but in note 1 on page 309 he remarked:

Après la date, l'inscription indique qu'il y avait encore une ligne en caractères houei-houei 回同字; ce devait être une ligne en écriture de Phags pa lama.

This, to the best of my knowledge, constitutes the first attempt to explain these intriguing words. That the explanation was not convincing, however, is apparent from the remarks of Paul PELLIOIT on pages 188-190 of his article "Les plus anciens monuments de l'écriture arabe en Chine." After citing the two lines of a Persian text in Arabic script which is found at the end of a Chinese inscription of 1307 in the temple of Yen-tzü 顔子 in Ch'ü-fu 曲阜, the native place of Confucius in the Shan-tung Province, he stated:

C'est encore au Chan-tong, mais dans un temple taoïque dépendant de Wei-hien, que M. Chavannes a recueilli une autre inscription où il semble bien s'agir de quelque chose d'analogue. Cette inscription (n° xxi) reproduit un court édit daté de 1235; Ögödâi y prescrit de désigner des religieux taoïstes pour résider dans le temple taoïque qu'il vient de fonder à Karakorum. Sur la stèle, le texte de l'édit est suivi de ces mots: 後有回同字号一行 «A la suite il y a une ligne en caractères houei-houei». M. Chavannes a supposé, là encore, qu'il s'agissait d'une ligne en écriture 'phags-pa; je ne le crois pas. Que supposerait en effet cette hypothèse? On sait que l'écriture 'phags-pa n'a été inventée qu'en 1269. Il faudrait donc admettre, de trois choses l'une: 

L'édit original de 1235, conservé par les destinataires, était uniquement rédigé en chinois; mais, postérieurement à 1269 et avant la date indéterminée où la stèle fut gravée, on ajouta sur ce manuscrit original de l'édit une ligne en 'phags-pa; les moines qui ont fait graver le manuscrit original ainsi complété n'ont pas vu qu'il s'agissait de caractères 'phags-pa et les ont qualifiés de houei-houei, «musulmans» (1). B. Ou bien l'original fut gravé immédiatement sur une stèle, à laquelle, après 1269, on aurait ajouté une ligne en 'phags-pa; la stèle actuelle ne serait qu'une reproduction faite, à une date indéterminée, de la stèle primitive ainsi accrus; mais ici encore les reproducteurs (189) auraient confondu les écritures 'phags-pa et arabe. γ. Le manuscrit original de l'édit, tout en chinois, n'aurait été gravé qu'après 1269, et c'est lors de cette gravure qu'on aurait ajouté, uniquement sur la stèle, une ligne en 'phags-pa qu'une gravure plus récente (celle qui nous est parvenue) n'a reconnue, ni reproduite.

Il me semble que ces trois hypothèses prétent à des objections plus ou moins graves, dont la principale, qui vaut dans les trois cas, est l'invraisemblance d'une confusion entre les caractères arabes et les caractères 'phags-pa. Je crois même que, si M. Chavannes eût reconnu, sur les deux stèles dont il a été question précédemment, la présence de lignes persanes, l'hypothèse d'une confusion semblable à propos de l'édit de 1235 ne lui fut pas venue à l'esprit. Nous admettrons donc qu'à l'édit de 1235 a été suivi, à un moment donné, d'une ligne en écriture arabe, mais là encore deux solutions peuvent être envisagées, et je ne vois pas encore de raison décisive pour choisir entre elles.

La première solution serait que l'édit original, tel qu'il fut expédié par la chancellerie d'Ogodăi, eût porté dès l'origine cette ligne, que les graveurs, peu au fait de cette écriture étrangère, n'ont mentionnée sans la reproduire. Dans la seconde hypothèse, l'édit était tout en chinois, mais la ligne en écriture arabe fut ajoutée lors de la gravure de l'édit sur une stèle dont la stèle actuelle ne serait qu'une réplique. Les documents dont nous disposons ne nous permettent pas de savoir quelles furent exactement les habitudes de la chancellerie mongole avant Khubilai. Une seule inscriptions est connue jusqu'ici qui remonte au temps même de Gengis-khan; c'est la «pierre de Gengis-khan» conservée au Musée asiatique de Saint-Pétersbourg (1). Elle est en écriture ouigoure et en langue mongole, (190) mais c'est une inscription de hasard, sans

(1) Cette pierre a été surtout étudiée par Schmidt et Banzarov, mais est encore assez mal expliquée; on trouvera un résumé des discussions dont elle (190) a fait l'objet dans A. Позднёвъ, Лекции по истоpии монгольской литературы, 1е livraison, Saint-Pétersbourg, 1896, p. 47-79.
caractère officiel et qui ne présuppose aucune habitude spéciale dans la rédaction des actes émanant vraiment du souverain. Nous savons par ailleurs que des Persans ont été employés dans les chancelleries de Gengis-khan et d’Ögödai; l’adjonction d’une ligne en persan à la fin de l’édit n’est donc pas inadmissible. Mais une réplique, comme l’explique la seconde hypothèse, est possible également. Le déchiffrement des lignes persanes sur les deux inscriptions de K’iu-feou est trop fragmentaire pour qu’on puisse se prononcer sur leur nature et leur origine véritables. Nous devons donc nous borner à constater l’existence d’une sorte d’épigraphie sino-persane au temps des Mongols, et à signaler l’intérêt qu’elle offre pour attester éventuellement, sous Ögödai et ses successeurs, des habitudes de chancellerie que rien ne nous faisait soupçonner jusqu’ici.

We must admit that it was not with great conviction that Pelliot proposed his own solution of the problem. A year later, however, he made an extremely interesting but undocumented statement on page 628 of his “Chrétiens d’Asie Centrale et d’Extrême-Orient.”  It reads as follows:

Nul édit ne put être promulgué dans la Chine du Nord sans que Cinqaï l’eut accompagné d’une ligne en écriture ouigoure; c’est là l’explication d’une mention jusqu’ici embarrassante qui concerne un édit d’Ögödai rendu en 1235.  

3 TP 15 (1914) 623-644 + 644*.
4 The complete text of Pelliot’s remarks on this great protonotarius is as follows (ibid., pp. 628-629):

“Des l’époque de Gengis-khan, bon nombre de chrétiens, particulièrement des Kerait, s’étaient fait un nom dans l’entourage de l’empereur mongol. Le plus connu d’entre eux est Cinqaï, dont les textes d’origine musulmane, par une confusion fréquente, font un Ouigour, mais qui était en réalité un Kerait. Fondateur en Mongolie d’une colonie militaire dont l’histoire se poursuit pendant un siècle et demi, Cinqaï fut chargé d’accompagner en 1221-1224 le taoïste K’ieou Tch’ou-ki qui, appelé par Gengis-khan, se rendit de la Chine orientale dans le bassin de l’Oxus; ce chrétien Cinqaï était auprès de Gengis-khan lorsque l’empereur mongol interrogea le taoïste sur les drogues d’immortalité. Aux côtés du Chinois (d’origine khitan) Ye-liu Tch’outs’ai, Cinqaï s’assura un rôle capital dans l’administration du jeune empire. Nul édit ne put être promulgué dans la Chine du Nord sans que Cinqaï l’eut accompagné d’une ligne en écriture ouigoure; c’est là l’explication d’une mention jusqu’ici embarrassante qui concerne un édit d’Ögödai rendu en 1235. Ministre pendant le règne d’Ögödai et de Kuyük, Cinqaï fut connu de Plan Carpin qui le qualifie de “protonotaire”, entendons “chancelier”. Il fut mis à mort, ainsi que son collègue le chrétien Qadaq (également nommé par Plan Carpin), lors des compétitions qui aboutirent à la proclamation de Mängü. Des descendants de Cinqaï ont été en charge pendant toute la dynastie mongole. Les [639] noms mèmes de ses trois fils confirment le christianisme attesté pour ce Kerait par les sources musulmanes; ces trois fils s’appelaient en effet Yao-sou-mou (Joseph), Po-kou-sseu (Bacchus) et K’ouo-li-ki-sseu (Georges).”

For additional remarks on “Cinqaï” see note 23 below.
Thus matters stood, without further discussion, until Arthur Waley published *The Travels of an Alchemist* in 1931. On page 34 of this work, Waley stated with reference to the chancellor of Ögedei:

Ögödäi, the successor of Chingiz, made him chief Secretary of State and gave him control over all business conducted (as were the affairs of Turkestan and the western countries) in higher writing, and no official documents of any kind were considered legal unless, next to the date, they bore a confirmation written in Uighur letters by Chinkai.

Although Waley did not specifically so state, it is obvious that the source of his statement published in 1931, like that of Pelliot published in 1914, is a text in the *Hei-Ta shih-lüeh* [Sketch of the Affairs of the Black Ta (i.e., Mongols)], because the *Hei-Ta shih-lüeh* is included in his list of “Sources” on pages 41-42 and is cited by title on page 36.

A year later, on pages 417-418 of his review of Waley’s book, Pelliot reformulated the problem in the following terms:

P. 34: Un passage du *Hei-Ta che-lio* de 1237 (éd. de Wang Kouo-wei, 7a) spécifie qu’un édit en chinois n’était valable que [418] lorsque Cinqai y avait

---

*The Travels of an Alchemist. The Journey of the Taoist Ch’ang-Ch’un from China to the Hindukush at the Summons of Chingiz Khan Recorded by His Disciple Li Chih-ch’ang* (George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., Broadway House, Carter Lane, London, 1931).

*In note 3 on page 234 of his *Sino-Iranica* (Chicago, 1919) [= Field Museum of Natural History: Publication 201: Anthropological Series: Vol. XV, No. 3] Berthold Laufer wrote: “This important work has not yet attracted the attention of our science. I hope to be able to publish a complete translation of it in the future.” It is regrettable that Laufer did not give us a translation. The manuscript of my own translation was lost in Japan during the last world war, but I have almost completed a new translation which includes not only the text proper but the commentary of the great master Wang Kuo-wei. (See note 10 below.)

From the colophon dated 27 April 1237 we learn that this precious account of the Mongols is the result of a collaboration of two people who had both participated in diplomatic missions from the Southern Sung to the Court of Ögedei. (See notes 8 and 9 below.) It is without question one of our most important primary sources for the early history of the Mongols.


---

*TP* 28 (1932).413-428.
ajouté, après la date, une ligne en caractères 回回 houei-houei. Houei-houei, au XIIIe siècle, peut signifier soit “ouigour”, soit “musulman” (cf. aussi M. W., p. 36); vu les origines de Çinquai et l’ensemble du Hei-Ta che-lio, on est normalement amené à le traduire ici par “ouigour”, et c’est ce que j’ai fait dans T’oung Pao, 1914, 628, comme M. W. le fait ici. Mais en 1913 (JA, II, 188-189), quand je ne connaissais pas encore le texte du Hei-Ta che-lio, j’avais été amené à formuler une autre hypothèse. Un édit en chinois, de 1235, a été publié par Chavannes (T’oung Pao, 1908, 308-309); sur la dalle qui le reproduit, le texte chinois est suivi de la mention qu’il y avait dans l’original, après la date, une ligne en caractères houei-houei. Chavannes avait songé au ’phags-pa, qui est exclu. Comme, dans les textes chinois d’époque mongole après le milieu du XIIIe siècle, l’écriture ouigoure est appelée wei-wou ou wei-wou-eul (= ｕｉｙｕｒ) et que houei-houei est alors réservé aux Musulmans, j’avais songé à l’écriture arabe, et ceci semblait d’autant plus justifié que deux édits en chinois gravés au Chantong, dont l’un est de 1307 et l’autre sensiblement de même date, sont chacun suivis d’une ligne en écriture arabe et en langue persane, au lieu que nous ne connaissions encore aucun édit effectivement suivi d’une ligne en écriture ouigoure. Devant le texte du Hei-Ta che-lio, contemporain de celui de l’édit de 1235, j’admetts que l’écriture houei-houei dont il est question à propos de celui-ci est l’écriture ouigoure, mais il reste à déterminer quand et sous quelles influences on a substitué au ouigour, dans la chancellerie mongole, une attestation en écriture arabe et en persan. Il paraît a priori vraisemblable que c’est lorsque des Musulmans, tel Aḥmed sous Khubilai, ont été des ministres presque tout puissants; on aimerait cependant à pouvoir l’affirmer.

The text in the Hei-Ta shih-lüeh to which PELLiOT made reference is a passage in an entry by Hsü T’ing 徐霆,8 which is appended to one by P‘ENG Ta-ya 彭大雅.9 Inasmuch as there exists no published translation of either of these entries, I shall present herewith an integral translation of each, together with a translation of the valuable comments by the late Wang Kuo-wei 王國維.10 For this purpose I have used the edition of the Hei-Ta shih-lüeh published in the Hai-ning Wang Ching-an hsien-shêng

---


i-shu 海寧王靜安先生遺書.11 The texts in question read as follows (8a10-9a4):

As for their affairs 其事,12 they write them with a wooden stick.13 [The writing] is like startled serpents and crooked earthworms; 14 it is like the fuchu "charm chuan-characters" of the ‘celestial books’ 天書;16

11 I have used this later edition of Wang’s collected works in preference to the Hai-ning Wang Chung-ko kung i-shu | | 忠頌公遺書 published under the editorship of Lo Chên-yü 羅振玉 and reviewed by Pelliot in TP 26 (1929).113-182 (see note 10 above)—the character 書 is misprinted 書 on page 114 of Pelliot’s review —because I regard it as a product of much more careful editing.

12 This is the twenty-fourth entry in the Hei-Ta shih-lüeh, each of which, with the exception of the first, is introduced by the word 其 (ch’i) ‘their.’

13 See note 38 below.

14 A very interesting parallel is found in the entry on Chan-ch’êng 古城 (Champa) in the Hsing-ch’a shêng-lan 星槎勝覽 by Féi Hsin 費信 whose preface is dated 1486. A translation of the entry may be found on pages 92-95 of the second part of W. W. Rockhill’s ‘Notes on the Relations and Trade of China with the Eastern Archipelago and the Coast of the Indian Ocean During the Fourteenth Century’ in TP 16 (1915).61-159. On page 95 of the translation we read:

‘They do not use writing brushes or paper, but they cover a thin piece of sheepskin wit [sic] soot and sharpen a small piece of bamboo for a style which they dip in lime (-water) to write their characters with; these are like wriggling earth-worms. The language is like the chirping of birds,2) interpreters have to translate it.”

2) The text reads 言詔 [sic] 燕鷗全憑 “The language is nothing but swallows’ and tailor-birds’ (chirping).”

Inasmuch as Rockhill’s translation contains a number of inaccuracies, I shall present herewith a new translation of the passage. In the Chi-lu hui-pien 纪録彙編 edition of the Hsing-ch’a shêng-lan 61 (tsê 12) 6b7-8, the original text reads: 其國無紙筆。以羊皮漆薄黑。削細竹為筆。蘸白灰書。字若蚯蚓委曲之狀。言語燕鷗。全憑通事傳譯。 ‘Their country does not have paper or brushes. Taking a sheepskin they pound it thin and smoke it black. They whittle a small [slip of] bamboo for a brush. They write by dipping it in white lime. The characters (i.e., script) have a wriggling (lit., ‘crooked and bent’) appearance like [that of] earthworms. As the language [resembles the twittering of] swallows and tailorbirds, one entirely relies upon an interpreter to translate it.”

15 For examples of the ‘charm chuan-characters’ cf. the Tao-tsang 道藏 3 (tsê 1).15b, 14a-b, 15a-b; 4 (tsê 1).12b, 18a-b, 14a; 5 (tsê 1).18b, 19a-b-21a-b.

16 For this term cf. Ts’ê-hai, 丑集, p. 266d.
it is like the *wu* 五, *fan* 反, *kung* 工, and *ch'ê* 尺 of the music scores.\(^\text{17}\) The Hui-hui (Ui-yur) characters 同同字 \(^\text{18}\) are probably brothers (i.e., akin).\(^\text{19}\)

\(^{17}\) These are four of the notes in the musical scale of the Sung period presented in a descending sequence of pitch. Although it would appear that P'êng intentionally or unintentionally omitted from this group the note 六 which falls between 五 and 反, it should be observed that precisely the same notes, in precisely the same sequence, are found in Liao shih 54 (ts'ê 10).10b5. It might, therefore, be assumed that the manner in which P'êng has referred to the notes of the Sung scale is, in effect, a conventional manner of reference.

Regrettably the article by J. A. van Aalst entitled “Chinese Music,” which was published in Shanghai in 1884 by order of the Inspector General of Customs [= China. Imperial Maritime Customs. II.—Special Series: No. 6], does not help us with the Sung scale. I am, therefore, greatly indebted to Mrs. Theodore Pian (née Chao Rulan) for bringing to my attention on 15 June 1951 the very important passage in the Mêng-hsi pi-t'an 夢溪筆談 of Shên Kua 沈括 and the fact that it was published in punctuated form on pages 7 to 8 of the section of the fifth chapter entitled “Kung-chê p'u” 工尺譜 (pp. 7-11) of the second ts'ê (下冊) of the Chung-kuo yin-yüeh shih 中國音樂史 [History of Chinese Music] by Wang Kuang-ch'i 王光祈 (Shanghai, 1934). I am also greatly indebted to Professor William Hung for working out with me a provisional translation of this text on a subject in which I possess not the slightest competence and to Mrs. Pian and Professor Yang Lien-shêng for several helpful suggestions.

Wang introduces the text by stating (page 7): "Among the old books of our country, as for those which speak of the kung-chê p'u ('music scores'), [the book by] Shên Kua of the Northern Sung seems to be the earliest."

In the Chin-tai pi-shu 津逮秘書 edition of the Mêng-hsi pi-t'an (ts'ê 179-182) the text proper reads (6[ts'ê 179].2b3-3a6):

"The twelve lü 律 ('tubes') together with the [four] ch'ing-kung 清宮 should have sixteen shêng 聲 ('notes'). As for the banquet (i.e., entertainment) music of the present day, there are only fifteen shêng ('notes'). It would appear that [the highest pitch of] the music of the present day is higher than [that of] the music of antiquity by slightly less than two lü ('tubes'). That is why there is no exact huang-chung 黃鍾 shêng ('note'). They only use the ho 合 character [= all holes closed up] to correspond to the ta-lü 大呂 [shêng ('note') of antiquity]. Still it is a bit too high. It should be between the ta-lü and the t'ai-ts'ou 太簇. The low ssû 下四 character approximates the t'ai-ts'ou. [The 之 after 太簇 and before 高 must be deleted.—F.W.C.] The high 高 ssû character approximates the chia-chung 夾鍾. [For an explanation of the latter term cf. ibid. 5 (ts'ê 179).5a5.] The low i 一 character approximates the ku-hsien 姑洗. The high i character approximates the chung-lü 中呂. The shang 上 character approximates the sui-pin 絲賓. The kou 勾 character approximates the lin-chung 林鐘. The ch'ê 尺 [13a] character approximates the i-tsê 夷則. The [low 下] kung 工 character approximates the nan-lü 南呂. The high kung character approximates the wu-i 無射. The liu 六 character approximates the ying-chung 應鍾. The low fan 反 character is the ch'ing 清 (= octave higher) of the huang-chung. The high fan character is the ch'ing of the ta-lü. The low
T'ing 錡 once investigated it (i.e., the writing). The Ta (Tatar) people 羌人 (i.e., Mongols) originally had no writing 字書. However, there are three kinds which they now use.

wu 五 character is the ch'ing of the t'ai-ts'ou. The high wu character is the ch'ing of the chia-chung. Although the method be like this, yet to conclude a shêng ('note') in [any of] the various melodies, one cannot completely match (lit., 'return to') the original lü ('scale') [to which one is trying to accommodate his instrument]. That is why there are categories such as p'ien-sha 偏殺 ('to conclude sideways'), ts'ê-sha 側 ('to conclude laterally'), chi-sha 寄 ('to conclude exactly'). Although it is not the same as the ancient method, [yet] if we calculate it, [we find that] it, too, is all reasonable. Those who know the sounds (i.e., music) can all explain it. Here, I shall not completely record [the explanation].

From this we may tentatively work out the scale of the Sung yen-yüeh "banquet (i.e., entertainment) music" as follows: 合,下四,高四,下一,高一,上,勾, 尺, [下]工,高工,六,下凡,高凡,下五,高五。

Although we must observe that this scale does not entirely coincide in the order of notes with that of most of the later scales, it does, nevertheless, afford us an idea of the musical scale of the Sung. All of this is meaningless, however, unless we understand that our author, P'êng, had in mind the so-called su-tsû p'u 俗字譜 "vulgar characters score," i.e., the score with the musical notes written in special cursive forms, which forms do, indeed, resemble and, in some cases, are identical with certain letters of the Uighur script. We may then understand why such a comparison is extremely reasonable.

Excellent examples of these notes in the cursive form may be found in the Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an edition of the Po-shih tao-jén shih-chi 白石道人詩集 of Chiang K'uei 姜夔 of Po-yang 鄱陽. Although neither his birth date nor his death date is known, it is known that he memorialized the throne in 1197. Cf. the "Po-shih tao-jén shih" 事 in the Po-shih tao-jén shih-chi (ts'ê 1).1a3. For the examples cf. Po-shih tao-jén shih-chi 2 (ts'ê 2).2b 7a, 7b, 8a; 3 (ts'ê 2).1b, 2a; 4 (ts'ê 2).1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b, 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b, 8a, 8b, 9a, 9b, 10a, 10b, 11a.

Tables of the su-tsû forms may be found in WANG, op. cit., pp. 128-133. These notations are also referred to as p'ang-p'u 旁譜 ("side scores"). Cf., e.g., Hsia Ch'êng-tao 夏承燾 "Pai-shih ko-chü p'ang-p'u pien" 白石歌曲旁譜 ("A Study of the Musical Notations of Chiang K'uei's songs"), YCHP 12 (1932) 2559-2594. For his tables of the p'ang-p'u cf. pp. 2579-2584. Cf. also the sixth chapter on "Notation" on pages 89-96 of John Hazedel Levis' Foundation of Chinese Musical Art (Peiping, 1936), pp. XIII + 233 and especially page 91 for the "Sung notation."

19 For a discussion of the term Hui-hui tsû which is encountered in Hsû's text below see the remarks by PELLIER cited on page 497 above. I presume that P'êng used the term in the same sense, but I am not absolutely certain. See note 19 immediately below.

19 From this statement it would appear that P'êng regarded the Hui-hui tsû as a script distinct from that used by the Mongols. One is, therefore, tempted to think that by Hui-hui tsû he meant the "Arabic script." On the other hand, as PELLIER has ably demonstrated, the term Hui-hui tsû in Hsû's text immediately below means "Uighur script." It is difficult to believe that P'êng and Hsû were using the same
As for that which circulates in the country proper of the Ta (Tatar) people, they only use small sticks three or four ts'un \(\text{ FETCH ME THE CHINESE CHARACTERS PINK-TINTED SANSKRT }\) long. They incise them [at] the four corners. Moreover, if they dispatch ten horses, then they incise [8b] ten incisions. In general, they only incise their number. Their customs are simple and their minds are concentrated [on them]. That is why [their] language does not err. [According to] their law, he who lies dies. That is why no one dares to falsify. Although they have no writing, by themselves they are able to establish a state. This small stick is [to be identified with] the wooden tally 木契 \(^{20}\) of antiquity [in China].

As for that which circulates among the Hui-hui 回回 \(^{21}\) (i.e., Mohammedans), one uses the Hui-hui (Uiyur) characters.\(^{22}\) Chên-hai 鎮海 \(^{23}\) is in charge of it. As for the Hui-hui characters, there are only twenty-one letters 字母. \(^{24}\) As for the balance, they only apply [it] to the sides to make up [the words].\(^{25}\)

As for that which circulates in the countries which have perished, such term in different senses in the same entry. I am, therefore, inclined to believe that they did not know that the writing of the Mongols at this time was, indeed, the Uighur script and not a kindred script.

\(^{20}\) For the use of wood for tallies cf. the texts cited in the Shuo-wên chieh-tzū ku-lin (ts'e 44).4567a.

\(^{21}\) As stated by Waley, op. cit., p. 36, “The term Hui-hui generally means Moslem, but is also used in the sense of ‘native of Turkestan.’”

\(^{22}\) See notes 18 and 19 above.

\(^{23}\) The biography of Chên-hai is found in Yüan shih 120 (ts'e 38).10a7-11a9. A source of this biography was the “Yüan ku yu-ch'êng-hsiang Ch'ieh-lieh kung shên-tao pei ming” 元故右丞相怯烈公神道碑銘 [“Epitaph on the Spirit-Way Stele of His Excellency Ch'ieh-lieh (Kereyid), the Late Yu-ch'êng-hsiang of the Yüan ”] (with a preface 并序) by Hsü Yu-jên 許有壬, which is found in his Kuei-t'ang hsiao-kao 圭塘小稿 in the San-i-t'ang ts'ung-shu 三怡堂叢書 10 (ts'e 22).5a5-8a1.

\(^{24}\) The term tsū-mu is used here in an accension which is extremely interesting in that it denotes the letters of a foreign script. In this accension the term is attested in the Hsi-t'ân tsū-chi 恒鳥字記. (For hsi-t'ân, the Sanskrit siddha[m] “accomplished, finished,” and hsi-t'ân chang 並 章, the Sanskrit “Siddhavastu, the first of twelve chapters of a syllabary attributed to Brahmana, originating the thirty-six letters of the alphabet, later said to be expanded to as many as fifty-two,” cf. William Edward Soothill and Lewis Hodous, A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms [London, 1937], p. 350a). This valuable work in one chüan was compiled in the T'ang period by a monk called Chih-kuang 智廣. It was published in facsimile in 1916 by Lo Chên-yü from a manuscript in Japan. For examples of tsū-mu designating the Sanskrit letters cf. 8a4, 10a7, 16b8. Again, in the Ching-yu T'ien-chu tsū-yüan 景祐天竺字源, a work, as indicated by the title, compiled in the years 1084-1087 and published in facsimile in 1916 by Lo Chên-yü from a manuscript copy, there are numerous examples of tsū-mu designating the Sanskrit letters. Cf., e.g., 1 (ts'e). [1a]5. 7, and 10.

\(^{25}\) I suppose that Hsü is referring to such elements of the writing as the point for the n, the two points for the \(\gamma\), the two points for the \(\delta\), etc.
as [those of] the [Northern] Chinese 漢人, the Ch'i-tan 契丹, and the Ju-chêns 女真.  

26 These three names frequently appear together, although not always in the same sequence, in literary and historical texts of the Yuan period. Cf. also YS 32 (ts'ê 27). 19b-3.

27 I.e., YEH-LÜ Ch'u-ts'ai 耶律 ン | | whose biography is found in the Yuan shih 146 (ts'ê 44).1a4-11a10. A source of this biography was the funerary inscription “Yüan ku ling-chung-shu-shêng YEH-LÜ kung shên-tao-pei” 元故領中書省耶律公神道碑 (“Spirit-Way Stele of His Excellency YEH-LÜ, the late Director of the Chung-shu-shêng of the Yuan”) by SUNG Tzû-chên 宋子貞 and found in the Kuo-ch'ao wên-lei 國朝文錄 57 (ts'ê 17).9b3-24a3. A biography by [Jean Pierre] Abel-RÉMUSAT entitled ‘Yeliu-thsou-thsai, Ministre tartare’ is found in Nouveaux mélanges asiatiques, ou recueil de morceaux de critique et de mémoires relatifs aux religions, aux sciences, aux coutumes, à l'histoire et à la géographie des nations orientales 2 (1829). 64-88.

In note 1 on page 175 of his article “L’édition collective des oeuvres de Wang Kuo-wei” in TP 26 (1929).113-182, Paul PELLIOT remarked:

“移剌 Yi-la est une autre forme du nom de famille Ye-liu; et c'est celle qui est employée par Ye-liu Tch'ou-ts'ai lui-même dans l'édition originale de son Si yeou lou. Quant à son ming, on l'écrit souvent avec 材 ts'ai; mais lui-même écrit bien 材 ts'ai dans son Si yeou lou, comme on l'a dans la présente suscription.”

Again, in the words of Paul PELLIOT on page 48 of his “Notes sur le “Turkestan” de M. W. Barthold” in TP 27 (1930).12-56, I-la is a “doublet bien connu de Ye-liu (Ye-liu Tch'ou-ts'ai écrivait lui-même son nom Yi-la Tch’ou-ts'ai).”

In note 2 on pages 47-48 of his article “Ordoisica” in Bulletin No. 9 of the Catholic University of Peking (1934).1-96, Antoine MOSTAERT made the following valuable observation:

“J'ignore dans quelle proportion les noms de clan ont survécu chez les autres Mongols de la Mongolie Intérieure. Chez les Kharatîn du bara-yun qo'riyun, j'ai noté le nom de clan  ula. [47] Les individus qui appartiennent à ce clan écrivent ce nom  ula et prétendent descendre de Ie-liu Tch'ou-ts'ai. C'est un fait connu que  ula (doublet de Ie-liu 耶律) était le nom de famille de Ie-liu Tchou-ts'ai qui lui-même était de la famille princière des K'î-tan. (Voir P. Pelliot, T'oung Pao, 1931, p. 118. Cf. aussi le Hei ta cheu leò 黑鞑事略, edit. T'oung fang hio houei f. 4, recto; 移剌楚材 I la Tchou ts'ai). Quant à la forme vivante  ula, la chute de a final ne doit pas nous surprendre, le dialecte Kharatîn réduisant fortement les voyelles des syllabes non accentuées et une voyelle finale brève tombant facilement.”

In Yuan shih 95 (ts'ê 32).29a2 we find still another orthography of this surname, namely I-la 移剌, in a text in which YEH-LÜ Ch'u-ts'ai is called I-la chung-shu Wu-t'u Sa-han-li 移剌中書兀顔撤罕里, i.e., Urtu Saqal (“Long Beard”), the chung-shu (“Chancellor”) I-la. For the name Urtu Saqal by which Činggis Qan called YEH-LÜ Ch'u-ts'ai, because of his magnificent beard, cf. Yuan shih 146 (ts'ê 44).1b6. The relationship between this word (ula) and that which occurs in the term 移剌馬 (i-la ma), i.e., an “ila horse” merits careful study. For examples of the latter cf. the Ta Yuan Ma-chêng chi 大元馬政記 (Kuo-hsüeh wên-k'u 國學
[of a document], Chén-hai personally writes Hui-hui (Uiyur) script reading: "Transmit to such-and-such a person." But again, the face of the document is made in the Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai. That is why one must make an attestation with Hui-hui script. If it does not have this, then it does not constitute a document. One probably wishes to cause it to pass through [the hands of] Chén-hai. [Thus] it also would afford a countercheck.30

女廬 edition, no. 49), pp. 13, 1. 7, 14, 1. 2, 17, 1. 1, etc. Cf. also the term 曳剌解子 (i-la chieh-tsü). For examples cf. Yüan shih 101 (ts'ê 34).2a7 and 2b5.

The dates of the birth and death of Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai were the subject of an article by Ch'ên Yüan 陳垣 in the YCYP 8 (1930) .1469-1472 entitled "Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai chih shên'g tsu nien" 耶律楚材之生卒年 ("The Dates of the Birth and Death of Yeh-lü-ch'ü-ts'ai"). His conclusion is that Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai was born in 1190 and died in 1244.

28 The text has 前 (ch'ien) "before," not 後 (hou) "after." This is also the reading in the text published by Hu Ssū-ching 胡思敬 in the Wên-ying lou yü-ti ts'ung-shu, ti-i chi 閔影樓僑地叢書，第一集 (ts'ê 1).4b5. It is the reading in the text published by Wang Kuo-wei in the Mêng-lu shih-liao ssü-chung chiao-chu 蒙古史料四種校注 (ts'ê 3).10a6, in the Hai-ning Wang Chung-k'o kung i-shu edition (ts'ê 30). 7a8, and the Kuo-hsiieh wen-k'u edition, no. 25. p. 68, l. 3.

PELLIOT, as we have seen (see page 496 above), stated that "Un passage du Hei-Ta che-lio de 1237 (éd. de Wang Kouo-wei, 7a) spécifie qu'un édit en chinois n'était valable que [418] lorsque Çinçai y avait ajouté, après la date, une ligne en caractères 同回 houei-houei." In view of the fact that all the texts have 前 (ch'ien), not 後, the words "après la date" appear, therefore, to be an inadvertance for "avant la date." It is possible that PELLIOT was misled by the fact that Wang Kuo-wei, in citing this passage in his commentary on 2a12-2b12 in the Hai-ning Wang Chung-k'o kung i-shu edition which PELLIOT used, did, indeed, erroneously cite it as: 又於後面日月之後. (The same error is found in the edition from which I have made the present translation and in the others to which I have referred above, with the exception, of course, of that published by Hu Ssū-ching.)

29 The term 後面 (hou-mien) may mean either the "end" or the "back." From the context it would appear, in this instance, to mean the "end," if we assume that the date was placed immediately after the text on the obverse of the document.

30 In the margin of the Wên-ying-lou edition of the text (4b) there is a note which reads: 桉字似撮之誤。蓋傳鈔多省筆。作手旁耳字。展轉叢成此。或括字之誤。亦未可定。要總非桉字。 "The character ni seems to be an error for shê ('to control'). It would appear that, in copying, one often economized on strokes. [Thus] one made the êrh ('ear') character with a shou ('hand') side (i.e., radical). [Then] it evolved into this. Perhaps, this is an error for the character k'uo. [However,] it cannot be determined either. [But,] in any case, it must not be the character ni."

In his "Chiao-k'an chi" (1a12-1b1), Hu Ssū-ching remarked: 十八行互相檢桉。桉即防止之義。見周易。眉批謂是撮字或括字之誤。非也。 "[The words] hu-hsiang chien-ni in column 18: Ni is [used in] the sense of fang-chih ('to check'). See the Chou I. The marginal (lit., 'eyebrow') note states that this is an
The schools in the Yen-ching municipality 燕京学, in most cases, teach the Hui-hui (Uiyur) script as well as [how] to translate the language of the Ta (Tatar) people. As soon as one is able to translate the language, then he becomes a t'ung-shih 通事 ("translator"). Then, in the suite of the Ta (Tatar) people, he goes the rounds 行打 and intimidates people without restraint 态作威福. He demands and gets sa-hua 撒花 (saw-yα). He demands and gets things to eat.

Although the Ch'i-tαn and the Ju-chên originally had their own script, neither uses it [any longer].

Chien-yen i-lai ch'ao-yeh tsa-chi 建炎以来朝野雜記, I chi 乙集, 19: "Nor do the Ta-tan 髭靼 (Tatar) have writing. Whenever they conscript troops and horses, forthwith they twist grass (i.e., straw) into knots and have men transmit [it]. [These men] are swifter than a comet. Sometimes they break [pieces of] wood as tallies. On the surface they incise a number of strokes. Each receives his half. When it happens that they dispatch an army, they use the coincidence of the wooden tallies as evidence."

Ch'ang-ch'un chên-jen Hsi-yu-chi 長春真人西遊記： "The Mén[9a]-ku 蒙古 (Mongγol) commonly have no writing. In some cases, they error for the character shē or [1b] the character k'uо. It is wrong." For the word ni in the Chou I cf. Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series, Supplement No. 10, A Concordance to Yi Ching (Peiping, 1935), p. 190a.


32 Lit., "recklessly makes awe and felicity."


The passage which Wang cites may be found in the edition of the Chien-yen i-lai ch'ao-yeh tsa-chi published in the Shih-yuăn ts'ung-shu 南園叢書 (ts'ê 68-75), 乙集, 19 (ts'ê 75).10b5-7.

The name Ta-tan was interpolated by Wang and 軍馬 (ch'ûn ma) was changed to 兵 | (ping ma).

35 The system of twisting grass (i.e., straw) into knots is probably comparable to that of incising wooden tallies in that the knots on any two given pieces of straw would be identical in number and relative spacing so that they could effectively serve as tallies.

36 For a discussion of this extremely important work cf. the introduction to Waley's The Travels of an Alchemist. (See note 5 above.) Cf. also Pelliot's review of Waley's translation in TP 28 (1932).413-428. (See note 7 above.) For Pelliot's remarks on the edition of the text published in the Hai-nìng Wang Chung-k'ō kung i-shu cf. "L'édition collective . . .," TP 26 (1929).113-182 (pp. 172-175).
make contracts (lit., ‘knot it’) with words (i.e., oral language); in some cases, they incise [pieces of] wood as tallies.” 37

As for [the term] mu chang 木杖 (“wooden stick”), Li shih-lang 李侍郎 58 emended [it] to mu-pan 木板 (“wooden board”). Shên I-an 沈乙庵 59 hsien-shêng said: “[According to] the Chung-t'ang shih-ch'i 中堂事紀, 40 ‘Hui-hui (Moslem) interpreter [. . .]” 41 Mai-chu-ting 麥

37 This text may be found in Wang’s edition of the Ch’ang-ch’un chên-jên Hsi-yu-chi, 上, 18b11, in the Hai-ning Wang Ching-an hsien-shêng i-shu (ts’e 39). First of all, it should be observed that the word 蒙古 (Méng-kú) is not part of the original text which begins with the word 俗 (su) (“commonly”).

Arthur Waley’s translation (see note 5 above) (p. 67) of this text reads as follows: “They have no writing. Contracts are either verbal or recorded by tokens carved out of wood.” In this translation, the words “recorded by tokens carved out of wood” do not render the sense of the original which says: “In some cases, they incise [pieces of] wood to make tallies.” As a matter of fact, Waley, in this instance, might have profitably have followed the Archimandrite Palladil who, on page 289 of his translation entitled Си ю цзии, или описание путешествия на запад (“Si yu czi, or Description of the Journey to the West”) in the Труды членовъ Россійской Духовной Миссіи въ Пекинѣ [Works of the Members of the Russian Religious Mission in Peking] 14 (1866).259-434, rendered the passage as follows: НАРДЪ ЭТОТЪ НЕ ЗНАЕТЪ ПИСЬМЕННОСТИ; ДОГОВАРИВАЮТСЯ ТОЛЬКО НА СЛОВАХЪ И ЗАКЛЮЧАЮТЪ КОНТРАКТЫ НАРЬЗЫВАНИЕМЪ МЪТКОЪ НА ДЕРЕВЬ 212). (“This people does not know writing; they reach agreement only on (the basis of) words and conclude contracts by the notching of marks on wood 213).” Note 212, which appears on page 401, reads: ПИСЬМЕННОСТЬ УЙГУРСКИМИ БУКВАМИ БЫЛА ТОЛЬКО ЧТО ВВЕДЕНА ЧИНГИШХАНЪ. (“Writing with Uïgur letters had just been introduced by Çingishkhan.”) The significance of this note by Palladil has, I think, generally been overlooked.

58 I.e., the great scholar Li Wên-t’ien 李文田 (1834 - 6 December 1895). Cf. the entry by Hiromu Momose in Arthur W. Hummel’s Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing Period (1644-1912) 1 (A-O) (1943).494a-495b, where, however, there is no reference to Li’s notes on the Hei-Ta shih-liüeh. Although it is true that the Wên-ying-lou edition of the Hei-Ta shih-liüeh has 木板 (mu pan) (4a11), it is by no means certain that this is the result of an emendation by Li. On the contrary, we have more reason to believe that this is a reading which was already in the manuscript when Li acquired it or a misprint in the Wên-ying-lou text. Neither in the marginal notes of Li nor in the textual notes of Hu is there any mention of this term.

39 As stated by Paul Pelliot, “L’édition collective . . .,” TP 26 (1929).169, “Un certain nombre de notes utilisées par W. sont dues à 沈乙庵 Chen Yi-ngan, c’est-à-dire a 沈曾植 Chen Ts’eng-tehe (1863-1922).”

40 The “Chung-t’ang shih-ch'i” 中堂事記 (“Mémoires de l’Affaires of the Chung-t'ang (i.e., Chung shu-shêng)”) by Wang Hui 王恽 of the Yuan dynasty is found in the Ssu-pu te‘ung-k’an reproduction of his collected works entitled Ch‘iu-chien hsien-shêng ta-ch’üan wên-chi 秋潤先生大全文集 80-82 (ts’e 20).

41 It is not clear from the citation, as Wang presents it, that the words 一人 (“one man”) of the original text have been omitted, and also that, at this point in the
As for the records which he translates, he pounds and works square and thick foot-paper into leaves. With a wooden brush (i.e., stylus) he digs and writes P'u-su-man letters. This being so, then the Hui-hui (Uighur) characters are written on.
paper with a wooden brush (i.e., stylus).\textsuperscript{46} [Hence,] to write [the character] 枇 (chang) is right.

From the interesting text by Hsü T'ing we gather that the words written by Chên-hai were in the nature of an attestation without which a document was invalid. Whether the Mongolian equivalent of the words 付與某人 (fu-yü mou-jên) ("Transmit to such-and-such a person") constituted the entire text in the hand of Chên-hai is, at the present time, impossible to say. It is possible, however, to offer in evidence of what I call "a chancellery practice of the Mongols in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries" three hitherto unpublished Mongolian texts which, although from another part of the Mongolian world, confirm the statement of our Chinese source.

The publication by Professor Erich Haenisch of his study entitled "Zu den Briefen der mongolischen Il-khane Arğun und Öljêtü an den König Philipp den Schönen von Frankreich (1289 u. 1305)"\textsuperscript{47} is the most recent of a long series of studies devoted to these precious letters, starting with the \textit{mémoire} of Jean Pierre Abel-Rémusat entitled "Relations diplomatiques des Princes chrétiens avec les Rois de Perse de la race de Tchinggis, depuis Houlagou, jusqu’au règne d’Abousaid."\textsuperscript{48} Although the study by Professor Haenisch does, in several respects, advance our understanding of these letters, particularly because of his commendable use of the \textit{Secret History of the Mongols},\textsuperscript{49} it also leaves certain problems unsolved and, in a few instances, presents us with interpretations which are not acceptable.

Aside from these considerations, however, I wish to devote this article to another matter. In his study Professor Haenisch has

\textsuperscript{46}This was probably a sort of \textit{calamus}.

\textsuperscript{47}Oriens 2 (1949).216-235.


presented reproductions of the obverse of the letters, that of Arýun (1289) constituting “Tafel I” between pages 220-221 and that of Öljeytu (1305) constituting “Tafel IIa” and “Tafel IIb” between pages 230-231.

While in Paris on the occasion of the XXI\textsuperscript{e} Congrès International des Orientalistes, in July of 1948, I was accorded the privilege of examining the original letters at the Archives Nationales. It was, then, with great surprise that I discovered that on the reverse of the letter of Öljeytu there were, in addition to the Italian text which Abel-Rémusat had published, a line in Persian and two lines in Mongolian which no one had ever published and, indeed, to which no one had ever made reference. These lines, therefore, are reproduced for the first time in Plate I of this article.

My transcription and translation of the lines are as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\item [Persian]
\begin{center}
S(u)ltan (-i-) \textit{F(a)r(a)m} \footnote{I wish to express my gratitude to M. Ali Bey Toptchibachy who very graciously accompanied me on my second visit to the Archives Nationales and deciphered for me this line of Persian.} \\
King of France.
\end{center}

\item [Mongolian]
\begin{center}
\textit{Tačm-a bičibe} \\
\textit{üjig inu Qutluy Š-a Čuban Sewinč} \\
Tačm-a has written [this]. \\
Its \textit{üjig}. Qutluy Š-a, Čuban, [and] Sewinč.
\end{center}
\end{itemize}

This very important Mongolian text not only confirms the accuracy of what Hsü T'ing reported, but it contains the names of three people of historical prominence. At the same time, the text raises new problems for which satisfactory solutions are not immediately apparent. Let us subject it to a detailed analysis.

In the first line, the name which I read Tačm-a may also be read Dačm-a or Tečm-e/Dečm-e or Taʃm-a/Daʃm-a or Teʃm-e/Deʃm-e. I have not succeeded in establishing an identification. It is obviously the name of the scribe who wrote the text of the
The word bičiibe is, of course, the praeteritum perfecti in -be of the verb biči- “to write.”

The second line consists of two elements: üjig inu and Qutluy Ŝ-a Čuban Sewinč. The words üjig inu must be taken as constituting an absolute construction which has no grammatical connection either with what precedes or what follows. It appears to be an abbreviated chancellery formula of which the unexpressed words could be supplied mentally. To the best of my knowledge, the word üjig is not registered in our dictionaries. I have not the slightest doubt, however, that it is the early Mongolian form of the word which is registered in Joseph Etienne KOWALEWSKI’s Dictionnaire mongol-russe-francais 1 (1844) 549b with the two orthographies üjüg and üsüg and with the definition “lettre, caractère de l’alphabet, type; 2plume de roseau.”

In the orthography üsüg the word is, indeed, attested as early as 1362 in lines 2 and 10 of the Mongolian text of the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362, where, in the first instance, the term manglai-yin üsüg means “the [seal] characters (lit., ‘letters’) of the cap (lit., ‘forehead’)” and, in the second, the term manglai-yin yeke üsüg means “the large (i.e., seal) characters (lit., ‘letters’) of the cap.” In both cases, the terms refer to the chuan ("seal") characters of the cap of the Chinese text of the inscription.

Thus we have attested in Mongolian three forms of the same word: üjig-üjüg-üsüg. As a matter of fact, the word üjig is Turkish, not Mongolian, in origin. On page 348b of the “Glossar” in A. von GABAIN’s Alttürkische Grammatik (Leipzig, 1941) we find the following entry: “uzik, uzik, uzak, uzak, < chin. тзу < archaisch *dz’ég (B. KARLGREN, Shi King Researches, Bull. Mus. Far-Eastern Antiq., Stockholm 1932 S. 160 unter Zeichen 11) Buchstabe, Silbe | harf, hece.” Cf. also the entries: “uzak s. užik” (p. 348a) and “uzik s. užik” (p. 348b).


On page 383a-b of N. N. POREP’s Монгольский словарь Мукад-
димат ал-Адаб (Часть I-II) [The Mongolian Dictionary Mukad-dimat al-Adab (Part I-II)] we find: “үүзүү қалам құл перо (калам) 184 623 | | ..” 51 In this instance, үүзүү, strictly speaking, is a Turkish, not a Mongolian, form of the word.

From these references, both Mongolian and Turkish, it is clear that the word үүж (әүүж-әүүг) was used to designate first a “letter (of the Uighur script)” and then a “character (of the Chinese script).” If the etymology of the word found in A. von GABAIN’s “Glossar” is correct, in Turkish it designated a “character (of the Chinese script)” before it designated a “letter (of the Uighur script).” It is, however, difficult to admit that either of these meanings is applicable in the present text. At first glance, the problem appears somewhat complicated by the fact that on the right-hand side of the word үүж there is a tamгa 52 or “seal” of which the first word (upside-down) is probably the last. I read it биёж “writing.” 53 Furthermore, on the right-hand side of the word үүж in the second text which is cited below (see page 516) there is a tamгa which, in effect, is a Chinese character. That the word үүж does not refer to the tamгa, however, is clear from the fact that there is no trace of a tamгa beside the word үүж in the text on the reverse of the edict of Busayid (Abū Saʿīd) Bayatur Qan of 1320, which is cited on page 523.

51 Cf. also the entries үүзүү гёкин (ид. а), үүзүкле барфи. (ид. б), and үүзүтү (ид. б).


In note 5 on page 359 of his “Inscriptions et pièces de chancellerie chinoises de l’époque mongole” (see note 64 below) CHAVANNES remarked with reference to document “Nо XXXVII”:

“Au-dessous de la date, on voit un signe bizarre qui tient lieu de signature 押, cf. les N° XXXVII, XXXIX. Ces signes sont assez analogues, semble-t-il, à la tamga qui figure sur les inscriptions turques de l’Orkhon.”

Although I do not propose to discuss the tamгa in connection with the subject of this paper, I think that it might profitably constitute the subject of an independent study, because there is an abundance of source material and there are several excellent specimens of tamгa on Mongolian documents of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

53 See Plate I.
below. This same conclusion was reached independently by the Reverend Antoine MOSTAERT whose remarks are cited below, on this and the following page.

It is also tempting to think that the word üjig may have meant "signature," a very natural semantic derivative (particularly in Chinese) of the meaning of "letter" or "character." However, this meaning is practically excluded for the following reason: the word üjig is followed by the pronoun inu, the genitivus of *i, the archaic pronoun of the third person singular. Since we recognize three distinct names in the second part of the line, it is obvious that inu is not used with reference to these names. If such a reference were intended, the text would have anu, the genitivus of *a, the archaic pronoun of the third person plural. The word inu, as remarked by the Reverend Antoine MOSTAERT in the passage of his letter which I have cited below, unquestionably refers to the document itself. Hence üjig inu means "Its üjig."

In considering the function of the word üjig, we must not forget the words of Hsü T‘ing: "That is why one must make an attestation with Hui-hui script." In his text the word which I render "attestation" is 驗 (yen). It might also be rendered "verification" or "certification." Since the names which follow the word üjig are placed on the document by way of "attestation," "verification," or "certification," it might be assumed that the word üjig, in this usage, has the meaning of "attestation," "verification," or "certification."

In a letter to me dated 12 October 1951 the Reverend Antoine MOSTAERT wrote as follows:

A propos de üjig inu. Ce texte au revers de l’édit de Busayid baγatur qan est extrêmement intéressant. Puisque le revers de ce document porte les mots üjig inu bien qu’on n’y voie aucune empreinte de cachet, j’incline à croire que, dans ces divers documents où nous lisons cette formule, le pronom inu ne se rapporte pas à une personne mais à la pièce elle-même et que le mot üjig ne désigne pas le tamγa mais l’inscription. Je pense qu’on pourrait traduire üjig inu par "sa marque de légalisation" parce qu’il semble que l’apposition du nom de certains dignitaires (accompagnée ou non de celle d’un tamγa) était précisément ce qui rendait la pièce valable.

Jusqu’ici nous ne possédons que trois documents portant une inscription sur le revers. Une fois qu’on en aura découvert un plus grand nombre—et tout
Such an interpretation of the words üjig inu is extremely convincing. However, in a letter to me dated 15 October 1951 the Reverend Antoine Mostaert proposed a new solution in the following terms:

Dans ma derni ère lettre j'ai parlé aussi de la formule üjig. J'avais d'abord pensé, comme vous, à "signature", puis j'ai traduit par "sa marque de légalisation", parce que de fait c'était cette inscription qui donnait force légale à la pièce. Mais, à présent, je vois qu'il faut traduire üjig par "contreseing". Le üjig est vraiment l'équivalent du contreseing en usage au moyen âge dans les chancelleries européennes. Ce qui tient lieu de signature de l'ılkhan c'est le grand sceau apposé à la pièce, mais ce qui authentique et rend valables le sceau et la pièce c'est le üjig. Les dignitaires dont nous lisons les noms sur le revers de ces documents ont contreSIGNé la pièce; on peut donc dire que cette inscription ou plutôt souscription: les noms des dignitaires—avec ou sans le sceau que nous voyons sur deux des trois documents—constitue le contreseing. Il y a toutefois une différence entre ces contreseings de Perse et ceux des chancelleries européennes, en ce sens qu'en Europe, je le suppose du moins, on contreSIGNait personnellement, tandis que dans la chancellerie des ilkhan on se contentait de faire écrire les noms par un scribe...

The meaning of "countersign" which is proposed by the Reverend Antoine Mostaert seems to be satisfactory in every way.

Reference has already been made to the pronoun inu (see page 511 above) and, as we have seen, the Reverend Antoine Mostaert has stated that "le pronom inu ne se rapporte pas à une personne mais à la pièce elle-même."

As I have already stated above, the names Qutlugyu Ş-a, Čuban, and Sevinč are those of three people of historical prominence. On page 535 of Sir Henry H. Howorth's History of the Mongols From the 9th to the 19th Century, Part III, the Mongols of Persia (London, 1888), we read with reference to the coronation of Öljeitü:

The princes Kütluğ Shah, Choban, Pulad, Sevinj, and İsen Kütluğ stood on the right of the throne, with their girdles bound round them, while the princesses stood on the left, and in front were the amirs.

---

54 See notes 56, 58, and 59 below.
55 This was extracted from HAMMER-PURGSTALL, Geschichte der Ichanen das ist der
These names are easily identifiable as Qutluγ Š-a, Čuban, Bolad, Sewinč, and Esen Qutluγ.

Qutluγ Š-a is a hybrid name consisting of two elements: the Turkish qutluγ, which Brockelmann, op. cit., p. 167, defines as “glücklich,” and the Persian šāh, which F. Steingass, A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary (London, Third Impression 1947), p. 726a, registers as “شاه shāh, A king, sovereign, emperor, monarch, prince; the king at chess; a check to the king (in chess); a bridegroom; a son-in-law; a title assumed by fakirs; . . .” In note 31 on page 95 of the Histoire des campagnes de Gengis Khan (Leiden, 1951) by Paul Pelliot and Louis Hambis we read: “Rien n’établit que le Tuši-Bahlawān surnommé Qutluγ-Šāh qui était à la tête de la cavalerie essentiellement Bayawut du souverain du Khwārezm était lui-même un Bayawut. Son surnom turco-persan de Qutluγ-Šāh, “Prince Fortuné”, a été porté pas [sic] de nombreux Turcs.” Thus we see that the name of Qutluγ Š-a was not an uncommon one. It is also attested in the Chinese sources as Hu-tu-lu Sha 忽都魯沙 (Qudluγ) [= Qutluγ Ša). Cf., e.g., the funerary inscription in memory of Ma-ha-ma Sha 马合馬沙 (Maqma[d] ša) by Ou-yang Hsüan 歐陽玄 in his Kuei-chai wén-chi 圭齋文集 9 (ts’ê 2).49b3-53a3 (49b8 and 50a1).

Mongolen in Persien 2 (Darmstadt, 1843).180-181, where the original text reads as follows: “Kotloghsah Nujan wurde des ersten Amtes [181] des Heeres und des Hofes, nämlich als Beglerbeg, d.i. Fürst der Fürsten, würdig erachtet, und seine Ferti-
gung in rother Tinte allen Befehlen beigesetzt; die Nujane Dschoban, Pulad, Husein, Sewindsch und Inskeotlogh waren demselben als Diener untergeben; . . .”

This valiant man, who served under Tāsan and Öljeitü, died a warrior’s death in Gilan in 1906. The highlights of his active career may be gleaned from Tome quatrième of the Baron C. d’Ouisson’s Histoire des Mongols, depuis Téchingiz-Khan jusqu’à Timour Bey ou Tamerlan, where references are found on pages 94, 95, 124-125, 139, 150, 158, 169, 177-178, 187-188, 189, 190, 192, 197, 198, 229, 236, 258, 259, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 334, 338, 479, 482, 490, 491-492, 494, 496, and 497-498. On page 482 it is stated: “Après avoir fait revêtir de robes d’honneur les officiers, il [i.e., Œuldjaitou—F.W.C.] confia le département de la guerre aux généraux Cout-
loucschah et Tchoban nouyan, qui furent les chefs de l’Olaus mongol, . . .” Cf. also the “Register” of “Personen” on page 518a of Bertold Spuler’s Die Mongolen in Iran (Leipzig, 1939).

For still other examples of this name cf. Louis Hambis, Le chapitre cvii du Yüan che (Leiden, 1945), p. 173b (“Index des noms propres ”).
The name Čuban is the Turkish (Persian) čupan, which BROCKELMANN, op. cit., p. 59, registers as “čupan (s. V. Thomsen, Det Kgl. Danske Vid. Selsk. phil. hist. Med. I, 1, 15 ff) Gehilfe des Dorfverstehers I, 337, 6.” STEINGASS, op. cit., p. 402a, registers the word as “چپان chopan, A shepherd.”

On page 882a of The Encyclopaedia of Islam, Volume I (A-D) (1913), the entry on Čupan by W. BARTOLD reads as follows:

ČÚPÁN, ČOPAN (Čaghatái) or ČOBAN (Othmanli and Krim-tatar), a Perso-Turki word for “herdsman”; it is applied particularly to shepherds and cowherds in opposition to horseherds (Pers. kalabân). The Čupán is considered the type of the lowest class of the people in a contemptuous sense, when the rude and uncultured people are contrasted with the classes chosen to rule (cf. the sayings ascribed to Čingiz-Khán in Rashid al-Dín, ed. Berezin, Trudi vost. otd. arkh obshč., xv. 179), as well as in epic tales in which the representative of the inherent strength of the people appears as the faithful ally and rescuer of his selfish and ungrateful master (e.g. in the Kitāb-i Dada Korkud, Zap. vost. etc. xii. 038 et seq.). The word “Čupán” is also found as the name even of persons of the highest rank (cf. for example, Emīr Čupán, regent of Persia under Ābū Sa’īd 1316-1327 A.D. and founder of a dynasty).

The name Sewinč is the Turkish Sāwinč. A. VON GABAIN, op. cit., p. 333b has “sāwinč, s(ā) winč Freude, Dank || sevinč, teşekkür.” BROCKELMANN, op. cit., p. 177, also has “sāwinč Freude.”

This name is also well attested in Chinese sources. In note 44 on page 182 of his fascinating article, “Mots de civilisation de Haute Asie en transcription chinoise,” in Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae (Budapest, 1950).141-185 (with a Russian résumé on pp. 185-188), Louis LIGETI cites the name


59 For references to Sewinč, a loyal retainer of Oljeitū, who reared the young Busayid and, with Čuban, placed him on the throne in April of 1317 and who died near Baghdad in January of the following year, cf. d’Ohsson, op. cit., 480, 494, 565, 566, 600-605, and 609.

Hsiao-yün-shih from the Yüan shih, “ch. 34, f. 5a,” “qui supposerait un nom également turc *Sävinč” and Hsiao-yün shih Hai-ya 小雲石海涯 (here the character涯 must be read ya, not yai) from “ch. 143” of the Yüan shih and reconstructs “*Sävinč qaya?.” The reconstruction is absolutely certain and the question mark is not necessary.

The first example is found in Yüan shih 34 (ts‘e 11) .5a7 in a passage reading: 命中尚卿小云失以兵討雲南. “[The Emperor] ordered the chung-shang-ch‘ing Hsiao-yün-shih (Sewinc) to lead a punitive expedition against Yiin-nan.” The second is the name of the well-known Sewinc Qaya, whose biography is found in Yüan shih 143 (ts‘e 43) .12b2-14a7. This Sewinc Qaya was the subject of an interesting article by YANG Tsung-han 楊宗翰 (himself of Mongolian antecedents) entitled “Hsiao-yün-shih Khaya 小雲石海涯 (1286-1324)” and published in Monumenta Serica 9 (1944). 92-100. As stated by Professor YANG at the very outset of his article, “The available primary source for the life of Hsiao-yün-shih khaya 小雲石海涯 is the biography written of him by his personal friend Ou-yang Hsüan 歐陽玄.” In a future publication, I shall have occasion to examine in more detail the sources for the life of Sewinc Qaya.

I should like to conclude my remarks on this text with the citation of a pertinent passage from HOWORTH, who, describing the three days of feasting following the coronation of Öljeitü, states (ibid., pp. 535-536):

Kutlugh Shah was appointed commander-in-chief of the army and given the first position at Court as Beglerbeg, [536] and his tamgha or mark in red was attached to all orders. The noyans Choban, Pulad, Husein, Sevinj, and Inskutluk were put under him.

On 17 July 1948, on the occasion of a visit to Rome and the Città del Vaticano, through the gracious courtesy of His Eminence Eugène the Cardinal Tisserant and His Highness Monsignor Angelo Mercati, Prefetto della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, I was accorded the privilege of seeing in the Archivio Segreto the

---

60 I refer to my forthcoming study on the Mongolian translation of the Hsiao ching done during the Yüan dynasty.
61 This was extracted from d'Ohsson, op. cit., pp. 481-483.
precious documents from the Mongolian rulers of Iran to the Papacy.\textsuperscript{62}

Again I was surprised to find on the reverse of the letter of Ραςαν of 1302,\textsuperscript{63} earlier by three years than that of Öljeitū, a line in the Uighur script, but in the Mongolian language, which I transcribe and translate as follows:

\texttt{üśg inu Üredüń kesiğün ekin ödür Qutluy Š-a Erisidküle. Iramadan.}

Its \texttt{üśg}. First day of the \texttt{kesiğ} of Üred. Qutluy Ša, Erisidküle, [and] Iramadan.’’

Here again we have a text which confirms the accuracy of what Hsü T'īng reported. It is reproduced for the first time in Plate II of this article. Let us subject it to a detailed analysis.

Unlike the text on the reverse of the letter of Öljeitū, this one does not have a line similar to that of \texttt{Tačm-a bičibe}. Furthermore, the single line which constitutes the text in question consists of three, not two, elements.

With the first of these, \texttt{üśg inu}, we are already familiar. Here again, I take it to mean “Its countersign.” It, too, is placed beside a \texttt{tam-ya} which, as I am informed by my friend and colleague Professor \textsc{Yang} Lien-sheng, is the Chinese 宝 (pao), an abbreviated form of 寶 (pao) “seal.”

As for the second element, \texttt{Üredüń kesiğün ekin ödür (“The first day of the \texttt{kesiğ} of Üred”)}, it is one which we have not encountered in the previous text. As a matter of fact, it is extremely important, for, to the best of my knowledge, it is the only attested example in the Mongolian language of a formula which is found many times in Chinese sources of the Yüan period.

In “N° XI” of Ed. \textsc{Chavannes’ “Inscriptions et pièces de chancellerie chinoises de l’époque mongole”} \textsuperscript{64} we read (page 429):

\texttt{5 (Tümen yurban-iyar) to 14 (-dür bičibe)} of this precious letter may be found on page 439 of Harold \textsc{Lamb’s The Crusades: The Flame of Islam} (New York, 1931).

\textsuperscript{62} These documents, as Paul Pelliot indicated, e. g., on page [3] of “Les Mongols et la Papauté,” \textit{Extrait de la Revue de l’Orient chrétien 3\textsuperscript{e} Série}, T. III (XXIII) N\textsuperscript{e} 1 et 2 (1922-23), pp. 3-30, are the letter of Arγun of 1290, the safe-conduct of Arγun of 1291, and the letter of Ραςαν of 1302. They will be published in a forthcoming issue of the \textit{HJAS} by the Reverend Antoine Mostaert and myself.

\textsuperscript{63} A reproduction of lines 5 (Tümen yurban-iyar) to 14 (-dür bičibe) of this precious letter may be found on page 439 of Harold \textsc{Lamb’s The Crusades: The Flame of Islam} (New York, 1931).

\textsuperscript{64} \textit{TP} 5 (1904). 357-447
Ensuite d’un édit de l’empereur, le hing-siuan-tcheng-yuan a reçu du sinan[sic]-tcheng-yuan \(^2\) une dépêche ainsi conçue:

La deuxième année yuan-t’ong (1334), le vingt-sixième jour du premier mois, le deuxième jour du k’ie-sie (kechik) de Tou-lien t’ie-mou-eul (timour) \(^3\) . . .

This is a translation of the following passage: 

This is a translation of the following passage: 皇帝聖旨裏行宣政院。准宣政院咨。元統二年正月二十六日。篤連帖木兒怯薛第二日。\(^{65}\)

Note 2 refers the reader to note 5 on pages 428-429 for an explanation of the term hsüan-chêng-yüan, “siuan-tcheng-yuan” in Chavannes’ transcription and misprinted “sinan-tcheng-yuan” on page 429.

At the beginning of note 3 on pages 429-432, Chavannes stated (p. 429):

篤連帖木兒怯薛第二日。Cette indication dans la date est digne de remarque. On en retrouve la présence ailleurs; ainsi, dans la pièce N° XV: 元統三年五月初七日阿察赤怯薛第二日。«La troisième année yuan-t’ong (1335), le septième jour du cinquième mois, le deuxième jour du k’ie-sie (kechik) d’A-tch’a-tch’e». En voici un autre exemple où cependant l’indication du jour du kechik ne suit pas immédiatement l’indication du jour du mois: 於至大元年十月十一日到隴福宮。今上皇帝潛龍時分。月海怯薛一日。親捧進宮賞賜。 (Trip., éd. Jap., vol. XXXII, fasc. 11, p. 51 r°) «La première année tche-ta (1308), le onzième jour du dixième mois, ils (des religieux) arrivèrent au palais Long-fou. L’empereur actuel, qui était à cette époque héritier présomptif, le premier jour du k’ie-sie (kechik) de Yue-hai, reçut en personne (l’ouvrage intitulé) Lien tsong pao kien».

In the same note (pp. 430-432) Chavannes presented an integral translation of the notice in Yüan shih 99 (ts’ê 33) 1b8-3b2 on the “Ssü ch‘ieh-hsieh” 四怯薛 (“Four Keseq”).\(^{66}\) In this notice we read: 怯薛者猶言直宿衛也。凡宿衛每三日而一[2a]更。

\(^{65}\) Cf. plate “N° XI.”

\(^{66}\) The Chinese transcription ch‘ieh-hsieh is based on a Mongolian kese[g], a variant form of the word written kesig (\(\overset{\circ}{k}\)esig) in our text. As stated by Paul Pelliot on pages 27-28 of his “Notes sur le “Turkestán” de M. W. Barthold” (see note 52 above), “La description de la “garde” de Gengis-khan et de ses successeurs méritera un travail spécial; en attendant, on peut [28] joindre aux informations de M. B. la longue note de Chavannes dans T’oung Pao, 1904, 429-432, et aussi Yule-Cordier, Marco Polo\(^3\), I, 379-381, Notes and Addenda, 69.” The valuable remarks by Pelliot himself (op. cit., pp. 27-31) must be added to these references which he furnished. We must not forget, however, the important study by Yanai Wataru 箭内亀 “Genchō keshikukō” 元朝怯薛考 (“Study of the Ch‘ieh-hsieh of the Yüan Dynasty”) which may be found in his Mōkoshi kenkyū 蒙古史研究 [Studies in Mongolian History] (Tōkyō, 1937), pp. 211-262.
FRANCIS WOODMAN CLEAVES

CHAVANNES rendered these words (p. 430):

*K'ie-sie* signifie les gardes qui sont de service à tour de rôle. D'une manière générale, ces gardes alternent une fois tous les trois jours.\(^67\)

At the end of his translation CHAVANNES remarked (p. 432):

Dans les expressions que nous avons citées au début de cette note: kechik de Tou-lien T'ie-mou-erh, kechik d'A-tch'a-tch'e, kechik de Yue-hai, il est vraisemblable que Tou-lien, T'ie-mou-erh, A-tch'a-tch'e et Yue-hai sont les noms des chefs respectifs des kechik mentionnés.

It is not only likely, as CHAVANNES suggests, but a fact that the proper names are "les noms des chefs respectifs des kechik mentionnés." In the case of the name Tu-lien T'ieh-mu-erh, CHAVANNES reconstructed only the second part. His reconstruction "timour" is, however, not quite exact. We must reconstruct Temür ("Iron").\(^68\) Tu-lien is a transcription of the Mongolian Dûren < Diü'uren < Dügüren "Full." Hence the name Dûren Temür means "Full Iron." Cf. also the name Sengge Temür Dügüreng Qayan in the Altan toböi (Peking ed.), p. 6, l. 8.

As for A-ch'a-ch'ih, for which CHAVANNES did not present a reconstruction, it is probably the Mongolian Ača'či < *Ača'aci < *Ači'aci < *Ačiyači < *Ačiyači "Pack Man." The word ačan < *ač'a'an < *ač'i'an < *ačiyan < ačiyan. It means "pack" and the suffix -či is used to designate the agent of an action or the person who is charged with a specific function, in this case the man who is in charge of packs.

Finally, Yüeh-hai seems to be the transcription of a name, *Yoqaı̇, but I have not encountered it elsewhere.\(^69\)

Turning to the "Seconde série" of CHAVANNES' "Inscriptions et pièces de chancellerie chinoises de l'époque mongole"\(^70\) we find still other examples. Thus in "N° XXXI" we read (p. 334):

\(^67\) Cf. Yuan shih 99 (tsʻê 33).1b10-2a1.

\(^68\) CHAVANNES himself corrected "timour" to "temour" in TP 9 (1908).334. See the text which is cited on page 519 below.


\(^70\) See note 1 above.
La deuxième année yuan-t'ong (1334), le premier mois, le vingt-sixième jour qui était le second jour du k'ie-sie (kechik) 2) de Tou-ling t'ie-mou-eul (Toureng temour) 3), . . .

2) Sur les kechik, voyez la longue note publiée dans le T'oung pao de 1904, p. 429-432.

3) 筐伶帖木兒. Le second caractère est écrit 連 lien dans la pièce n° XI (T'oung pao, 1904, p. 429). Ce personnage est celui qui est mentionné par le Yuan che (chap. XXXIII, p. 3v°, année 1329) sous le nom de 筐聮帖木兒 et (chap. XXXVI, p. 2v°, année 1332) de 筐聮帖木兒. Le K'in ting Yuan che yu kiai 欽定元史語解 (chap. XVI, p. 7v°) nous indique que ce nom correspond au mongol Toureng temour.

This is a translation of the following text: 元統二年正月二十六日。糴伶帖木兒怯薛第二日。(Planche 8, No. XXXI, ll. 1-2).

Again in “N° LX” we read (pp. 421-424):

Le siuan-tcheng-yuan, agissant en vertu d’un auguste édit de l’Empereur, la vingt-troisième année tche-tcheng (1363), le dixième, [424] mois 3), le treizième jour qui était le second jour du k’ie-sie (kechik) Ho-la tchang4), . . .

1) Quoique la date soit en grande partie effacée, on peut la rétablir grâce au texte gravé sur l’avers de la stèle où se trouve rappelée cette délibération.

2) Le dixième mois de l’année 1365, ce Ho-la-tchang reçut le titre de tche kiu mi yuan che 知樞密院事 (Yuan che, chap. XLVI, p. 7 v°).

This translates the Chinese 宣政院至正廿三年十月十三日。哈剌章怯薛第二日。（p. 422, N° LX, l. 1).

Finally in “N° LXI” we read (p. 426):

Le siuan-tcheng yuan agissant en vertu d’un édit impérial, la vingt-sixième année tche-tcheng (1336), le dix-septième jour du deuxième mois, premier jour du kechik Wan-tchô t’ie-mou-eul (Euldjaï temour) 2), . . .


This translates the Chinese 宣政院至正廿六年二月十七日。完者帖木兒怯薛第一日。（p. 427, N° LXI, ll. 1 and 2).

In spite of the Ch’in-ting Yüan shih yü-chieh, the name which is written Tu-ling T’ieh-mu-érh in “N° XXXI”, Tu-lien (連) T’ieh-mu-érh in “N° XI” (see above), Tu-lin (麟) T’ieh-mu-érh in Yuan shih 33, and Tu-lin (麟) T’ieh-mu-érh in Yuan shih 36 is not “Toureng temour,” as CHAVANNES stated. The various
transcriptions are all based on an original Düren-Düreng < Dü'uren-Dü'ureng < Dügüren-Dügüreng Temür, as I have demonstrated above.

In the case of Ha-la Chang, it is the Mongolian Qara Ñang “Black Ñang,” the counterpart of Çayan Ñang “White Ñang.” These were the Mongolian designations for certain aborigines in the Yün-nan region. Both of these designations came to be used as personal names.\textsuperscript{71}

Finally the name which Chavannes reconstructed as “Euldjaï temour” is Õljëi Temür “Happiness Iron.”

Although these examples from the texts published by Cha-vannes are adequate to illustrate the Mongolian practice of dating official documents by the day of the kesig of a given officer, I should make it clear that they could be multiplied many times by examples drawn from numerous sources of the Yüan period.

From all of this it is evident that the formula in question was: ——— -u/ -ü (or -un/ -ün, or -yin) kesigün ——— ödür. At the beginning of the formula it, presumably, was customary to supply the name of the officer in command and before the word ödür, it also, presumably, was customary to supply the number of the day in question—the first, second, or third.

As Cha-vannes stated (see above), “D’une manière générale, ces gardes alternent une fois tous les trois jours.”

The system of rotating the kesig every three days was established by Činggis Qan himself. The order by which this practice came into force is found in §192 of the Secret History of the Mongols, where we read (YCP 7.20a5-21b2):

\begin{quote}
\textit{basa Činggis qahan jarliy bolurun qorčin turya'ud [20b] kešigten ba'urči e'ütençi aytchi üdür kešig oroju naran šinggegü-yin urida kebte'ül-e jayilažu aytas-tur-iyen yarun qonotu-yai. kebte'ül sōni ger horčin kebtegiin-iyen kebte'iüljü e'üten-tür bayyqan-iyen kešiglen bayi'ultu-yai. qorčin turya'ud [21a] manayari inu bidan-i šulen ide'esü kebte'ül-tür kelelejü qorčin turya'ud ba'určin e'üdecin miin mün mürdür-iyen yabutu-yai. sa'urin-dur-iyen sa'utu-yai. yurban sōni yurban üdür kešig üdür-iyen da'usču mün gi yosu'ar yurban sōni qonolduju [21b] ye'üdgeldiüjü sōni kebte'ül atu-yai. horčin kebtejü qonotu-yai ke'ên jarliy bolba.}
\end{quote}

“Again when Činggis Qahan ordered, he ordered saying, 'Let the quiver-bearers (qorćin), [20b] the turya'ud kešgten (i.e., the kešgten who are day-guards), the stewards (ba'ürći), the doorkeepers (e'ütenci), and the gelding-keepers (aytaci) go (lit., “enter”) [on] duty (kešig) [in] the day[-time] and, before the sun sets, retire for the night-guards (kebte'ül) and, going out to their geldings, pass the night. Let the night-guards, at night, have lie their [men] who shall lie around the tent and have stand in rotation their [men] who shall stand at the door.” 72 Let the quiver-bearers and the day-guards, [31a] tell [it] unto the night-guards the next day, when We take (lit., “eat”) broth, and let the quiver-bearers, day-guards, stewards, and doorkeepers act in accordance with their respective duties. Let them sit upon their seats. Let them (i.e., my kešgten), completing their days of duty of three nights and three days and passing the three nights in the very same (i.e., above-mentioned) manner 73 [21b], changing [places with their relief], be night-guards the night [which follows the relief]. Let them pass the night lying [all] around.” 74

The name Üred in our formula presents a problem. If my reading is correct, it would appear to be a plural in -d of üre which KOWALEWSKI (1.577b) defines: “fruit, graine; 2 descendant, les descendants, la postérité; ³ produit, effet, conséquence; ⁴ profit, avantage, utilité, récompense, rémunération, rétribution; ⁵ en Chine, mou, un mou de terre, un arpent de terre.” Such a plural form for this word is, to say the least, extraordinary, because this word regularly has a plural in -s, i.e., üres. 75

The third element of this text, like the second of the comparable text on the reverse of the letter of Öljeitü, consists of three names, the first of which is that of Qutluy Ş-a, the same Qutluy Ş-a whom we have already encountered.

As for the second, Erisidküle, of which my transcription is provisional, I have no satisfactory explanation. I have not en-

72 Cf. note 140 on pages 389-391 of Antoine MOSTAERT’s article “Sur quelques passages de l'Histoire secrète des Mongols (Suite)” in this issue of the HJAS (pp. 329-403) for his translation of the words kebte'ül söni ger horčin . . . kešiglen baya'ultuvay. I have followed his translation.

73 I.e., the manner whereby the turya'ud go out to their geldings to pass the night and the kebte'ül take over the duties of sleeping around the tent and standing guard at the door.

74 Cf. note 140 on pages 389-391 of Antoine MOSTAERT’s article (see note 72 above) for his translation of the words yurban söni yurban üdür . . . qonotuvay. I have followed his translation.

75 Cf., e.g., the example in line 15 on page 30 of the chronicle of Sayang Sečen (Isaac Jacob SCHMIDT, Geschichte der Ost-Mongolen und ihres Fürstenhauses [St. Petersburg, 1829]).
countered such a name elsewhere. It is possible that it consists of two elements: Erisid and Küle. Erisid might be the Mongolian form of the Persian (⟨Arabic⟩) Rašid with a prothetic e vowel comparable to the prothetic i vowel which is found in the name Iramadān which I shall discuss below. If so, it would indicate that the vowel in the first syllable of the name Rašid was fronted to the point that it became i in Mongolian. The word Rašid itself is defined by Steingass (op. cit., 578b) as follows: “A ṭa’sḥid, A director, conductor, guide; orthodox; brave, courageous (m.c.); one of the names of God.” I confess, however, that it is not with any particular conviction that I propose this identification.

As for Kūle, I do not know what it is.

The third name is the Mongolian form of the Persian (⟨Arabic⟩) Ramadān. Cf. Steingass, op. cit., p. 587a: “A ṭa’māzan, The ninth month of the Muhammadan year; the fast observed during that month.”

In his entry on Ramadān on page 1111a-b of The Encyclopaedia of Islam, Volume III (L-R) (1936), M. Plessner stated (p. 1111a):

RAMADĀN (A.), name of the ninth month of the Muḥammadan calendar. The name from the root r-m-d refers to the heat of summer and therefore shows in what season the month fell when the ancient Arabs still endeavoured to equate their year with the solar year by intercalary months [see nāsi’].

The initial i of the Mongolian form is a prothetic vowel which regularly appears in words of foreign origin with an initial r-. Cf., e. g., Irad Barans “Roi de France” in line 4 of the letter of Aryun to Philippe le Bel, Iriduwarans “Roi de France” in line 2 of the letter of Öljaitü to Philippe le Bel, iraiyad ⟨Persian ⟨⟨Arabic⟩⟩ ra‘iyat “subject” in line 4 of “Document III” (Fig. 29) and line 2 of “Document III” (Fig. 31) (page 42) of Paul Pelliot’s article “Les documents mongols du Musée de Téheran” in Athār-e-Īrān 1 (1936) .37-44, and irayis_ud, plural in -ud of irayis ⟨Persian ⟨⟨Arabic⟩⟩ ra‘īs “chief” in line 2 of “Document III” (Fig. 31) (page 42) of “Les documents mongols . . .”

Although it may seem strange to find the name of the ninth month of the Mohammedan year used as a personal name, such usage is well attested in Chinese sources of Yuan history. Cf.,
e. g., *Yüan shih* 29 (ts‘ē 10).26a7, where the name is written 亦剌馬丹 (*I-la-ma-tan* [= *Iramadan*]) . Cf. also *Yüan shih* 32 (ts‘ē 11).14a6-7. Because of the initial, prothetic *i*- , it is evident that the Chinese transcription of the name is based on a Mongolian, not a Persian, form of the name.

On the occasion of my recent visit to Teheran to inspect the Mongolian documents in the Musée de Téhéran, the late Mehdi Bahrami, Curator of Islamic Art at the museum, very kindly permitted me to examine on 13 September of the present year, two texts which are found on the reverse of the edict of Busayid Bayatur Qan of 1320 and to which he had first called my attention in 1950.

The first of these texts is found at the top of the document. It consists of a single line in the Uighur script, but in the Mongolian language. The second is found at the bottom of the document. It consists of three lines in the Uighur script, but in the Mongolian language. The third of the three lines is slightly elevated, because it begins with the word *jral* ("edict") which requires the honorific lift. I transcribe and translate these texts as follows:

(1)


(2)

\[ [1] śiy Şaqid-un Qayas-a wayb-i \]
\[ [2] köbegün inu medetügei. kemegsen \]
\[ [3] jraḻ Birus bičibe \]

(1)


(2)

An edict in which one has said, "Let his (i. e., *śiy Şaqid's*) son administer the Qayas-a *wayb* of *śiy Şaqid." Birus has written [this].

Thus for the third time we have a text which confirms the accuracy of what Hsü T'ing reported. I regret that it was impossible for me to have the texts photographed in the short time at
my disposal, but I hope to be able to include a reproduction of the texts in my forthcoming article on “The Mongolian Documents in the Musée de Téhéran.” Let us, then, also subject these texts to a detailed analysis.

In the first of these two texts we find two elements, both of which are exactly parallel with those in the second text on the reverse of the letter of Öljéitü. Unlike that on the reverse of the letter of Ṯasan, this one lacks the date. On the other hand, in the second of the two texts we find, first of all, a new element, namely a résumé of the contents of the edict, and then the words *Birus bičibe* which are exactly parallel with the words *Tačm-a bičibe* in the first of the two texts on the reverse of the letter of Öljéitü.

The words *üjig inu* which constitute the first element of the first text are now attested for the third time, leaving us not the slightest doubt as to their frequency in this formula. It is strange, however, that in this instance there is not the slightest trace of a *tamya* beside these words.

The second element of this text appears to consist of two names of which the first appears to consist of three words. I have, however, succeeded in deciphering only the word *Dawlaš-a* which is the second of the three.

The name *Dawlaš-a* is composed of *Dawla* + *Š-a*. *Dawla* suggests the Persian *daula*. Cf. Steingass, op. cit., p. 546b: “*šala* daula, A whirlwind, hurricane; a cup; a circle; a ringlet; . . .” For *š-a*, the Persian *šāh*, see page 513 above. There seems to be no evidence, however, that *Daula Šāh* is an attested name in Persian. If the text had *Dawladš-a*, it would be the Persian name *Daulat Šāh*. For *daulat* cf. Steingass, op. cit., p. 546b: “A *šala* daulat (v. n. of *šala*), Going round each other in combat; good turn of fortune; felicity, wealth, victory; power, dominion, empire; a state, reign, dynasty; . . .” (For examples of the name *Daulat Šāh* cf. Spuler, op. cit., “Register” of “Personen,” p. 507b.) It is tempting to regard *Dawlaš-a* as a variant transcription of *Dawladš-a*, with the assimilation of the *-d* (Persian *-t*) of *Dawlad* to the *š*- (Persian *š*) of *š-a*. In the Chinese sources for Yüan history we find the name *Tao-la Sha* 倒剌沙. Cf., e.g., Yüan-shih 29 (ts‘é 10).12b1, 13a3, etc. This name might be re-
constructed as either Daula Šāh or Daulat Šāh. In this case, however, the latter reconstruction is almost certainly preferable.


As I have already observed, the second of these two texts introduces a new element, namely a résumé of the content of the document. Since the document itself will be studied in the forthcoming publication to which I have made reference above, I shall not attempt a discussion of it in this paper.

The word šīy is the Persian (<Arabic) šaiḥ. Cf. Steingass, op. cit., p. 772a: “A شیخ shaikh, A venerable old man; a man of fifty and upwards; a man of authority, a chief, prelate, prior, abbot, superior of the dervīshes or Muhammadan monks; doctor learned in religion and law; preacher; a sheik; . . .”

Šaqid is the Persian (<Arabic) šahīd. Cf. Steingass, op. cit., p. 771a: “A شهد shahid, shihid, A witness; a martyr; . . .”

Reference to the šīy šaqid is made in line 1 of the first fragment of “Document III” in “Fig. 30” on page 41 of Paul Pelliot’s article “Les documents mongols du Musée de Ţehrān” in Atharé-Īrān 1 (1936) 37-44.

The word waqf is the Persian (<Arabic) waqf. Cf. Steingass, op. cit., p. 1477a: “A وقف waqf (v.n.), Standing, stopping, staying, halting, waiting; . . . bequeathing for pious uses (as habitations for the poor, and books for the use of learned men); such bequest or legacy; . . .”


Qayas-a is a place name which I have not identified. It is found in line 7 of the fragment of "Document III" in "Fig. 30" of Pelliot's article and in line 2 of the first fragment of "Document III" in "Fig. 30" on page 41 of the article. In the latter instance the text has Qayas-a-yin w[ay]b "wayb of Qayas-a."

The words Birus bičibe are, as I have already stated, parallel with those of Tačm-a bičibe on the reverse of the letter of Öljëtitü.

The name Birus is the Persian Pîrûz. Cf. Steingass, op. cit., p. 265a: "پروز, Victorious; prosperous, favoured by fortune and opportunity; a champion of Irân."

From these four important sources—the statement by Hsü T‘ing, the text on the reverse of the letter of Qasan, those on the reverse of the letter of Öljëtitü, and those on the reverse of the edict of Busayid Bayâatur Qan, to place them in their proper chronological sequence—it is evident that it was a chancellery practice of the Mongols in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to validate official documents in the manner which has been discussed above. That this practice, like certain other chancellery practices of the Mongols, was of Uighur origin is, I think, demonstrable, but I shall not attempt to discuss that aspect of the question in this paper.

Before concluding, I should like to draw the reader's attention to an important text from which we learn that no ordinance of the il qan Arûyn was valid without the seal of his minister Buqa. Although no mention is made of a line in Uighur script, it might be assumed that such a line constituted an element of the validating process. The text which I have in mind is found on pages 13-14 of Tome quatrième of d'Oïsson's Histoire des Mongols, where it is related:

Il [i.e., Argoun—F.W.C.] investit Boucaï, par un décret royal, d'une autorité presque sans bornes, et statua que tant qu'il [14] n'aurait pas commis neuf délits graves, il ne pourrait être interrogé que par le souverain lui-même; que les ordonnances de l'Ikhân ne seraient exécutoires qu'autant qu'elles auraient été munies du sceau (altamgha) de Boucaï, dont les ordres, pour être respectés, n'avaient pas besoin de la sanction royale. Boucaï se distinguait entre les Mongols par ses connaissances en fait d'administration. Il avait de la capacité; il voulait l'ordre et la justice. Sa sévérité réprimait les désordres; mais son pouvoir, si étendu qu'il ne lui manquait du souverain que le titre, lui attira des envieux, qui n'osant l'attaquer de front, à cause de la faveur dont il jouissait, épièrent l'occasion de le perdre.
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