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UNTIL Ts'ai Mei-piao 蔡美彪 published his Yüan-tai pai-hua-pei chi-lu 元代白話碑集錄 [Collected Records of Yuan Dynasty Pai-hua Stelae] in 1955 the earliest known monuments of the Mongolian language were the so-called "Stone of Činggis Qan" of 1220–1225 and the impression of the seal of Güyüg affixed to a Persian document of 1246. With the publication of Ts'ai’s book we now have a monument which falls between those of 1220–1225 and 1246 respectively, namely the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1240.

Ts'ai, fortunately, included in his book a reproduction of the rubbing of the stele on which the Mongolian text is found. It is labelled: (二)一二四〇年濟源十方大紫微宮聖旨碑 "(2) Stele of the Edict of 1240 at the Shih-fang ta-tzu-wei kung in Chi-yüan." Although the

1 Although I have no biographical data on this scholar, it would appear that he is associated with the Chung-kuo k'o-hsiêh-yüan 中國科學院 [Chinese Academy of Sciences].
5 Cf. Plate 2 (herein reproduced as Plate 1).
6 In the entry on "Ssu-kuan" 寺觀 ("Temples") in the Ho-nan t'ung-chih 河南通志 50(ts'e 23).1r2–38r5 we read (13r10–13v1):

62
Chinese text is the translation of a Mongolian original of which only the terminal formulae, including the date, were cut on the same side of the stone, it is obvious that, unless the initial formulae and body of the Mongolian original were cut on the other side of the stone or on a separate stone, the major part of the Mongolian text was never so immortalized. This is the more regrettable in that, to judge by the word _alday-situ_ preserved in the second of the three extant lines of the Mongolian text, it probably contained vocabulary of the period which as yet has not been recovered through other sources. That we have even three lines of the text is owing to the fact that the Taoist monk, Ch‘ien Chih-t‘ung 錢志通, who traced and cut the Chinese text on the stone, also traced and cut the three lines of the Mongolian text, presumably, to lend a greater air of authority to the Chinese text of the Edict. This explains the fact that the letters of several Mongolian words are rather grotesquely—in fact, inaccurately—written. It also explains the reason for which the readings of two or three words in the text are still questionable.

Ts‘ai Mei-piao informs us that the stele is found in the Chi-yüan-hsien 濟源縣 in Ho-nan-sheng 河南省. During the Yuán the Chi-yüan-hsien was under the jurisdiction of the Huai-ch‘ing-lu 懐慶路. However, in the time of Ögedei (~ Ögödei) Qayan (1229–1241) the region was known as Huai-chou 慶州. Inasmuch as the Edict was issued to certain officials of the P‘ing-yang-fu 熹陽府路, including one in Ch‘in-chou 汶州, it is clear that the Chinese and Mon-

_The Tzu-wei-kung 紫微宮 is located at the foot of the Wang-wu-shan 王屋山, 100 li 里 northwest of the Chi-yüan-hsien 濟源縣. It is the place where Ssu-ma Ch‘eng-cheng 司馬承正 ( = 貞) of the T‘ang 唐 stayed overnight. It was founded at the beginning of [the] Shao-sheng 銘聖 [period] [1094–1098] of the Sung 宋. It was restored during [the] Ta-te 大德 [period] [1297–1307] of the Yuán 元. It was rebuilt in the 1st year of [the] T‘ien-shun 天順 [period] [1457–1464] of the Ming 明._

_7_ I have not found any reference to this monk elsewhere.

_8_ For Chi-yüan cf. Ting Wen-chiang 丁文江 et al., _Chung-hua min-huo hsin-t‘u_ 中華民國新地圖 (Shen-pao 申報), Shanghai, 1934, maps 22 and 23, 112° 32‘ E., 35° 08‘ N.

_9_ For Ho-nan-sheng cf. _op. cit._, maps 22 and 23, 28 and 29, and 30 and 31.

_10_ Cf. the _Yuán shih_ 58(_ts‘e 19)._176–1813.

_11_ Cf. the _Yuán shih_ 58(_ts‘e 19)._176–9.

_12_ Cf. the _Yuán shih_ 58(_ts‘e 19)._35r10–35v3 and 36r6.

_13_ Cf. the _Yuán shih_ 58(_ts‘e 19)._38r1–4.
golian texts on the stele at the Shih-fang ta-tzu-wei kung in the Chi-
yüan-hsien are far removed from the area to which they were directed.
It is evident that they are not applicable to the Shih-fang ta-tzu-wei
kung as such. Therefore, the reasons for which they were cut on stone
at that temple is a matter of speculation.

The singular importance of the Chinese text of the inscription lies
in the fact that it is an additional primary source for the story of the
printing of the Taoist Canon at the beginning of the Yüan—a story of
which only the most meagre details have been transmitted.

As to the Mongolian text, it consists of only three lines, presumably,
the last three of a Bičig which probably did not consist of more than a
dozen lines in all. Even the three lines which have been preserved
seem not to be complete, for the text terminates with the words qula-
yana[jil]“rat year,” rather than the usual formula which includes the day
and the month of the year as well as the name of the place where the
Bičig was written. Such a concluding formula would itself terminate
with the words . . . bükii-dür bičibei “. . . [We] have written [it (=the
Bičig)], at the moment when [We] were [in] . . . .” At least two words
in the text present difficult problems in reading, for they are so im-
perfectly written that it is virtually impossible to be certain of the ex-
actitude of the readings which I have proposed. Despite the disap-
pointing features of the three lines in Mongolian, the existence of the
word aldaj-situ alone lends to the text an importance which com-
mends it to our attention.

I have included in this article the following reproductions:
(1) "Plate I" (Ts‘ai‘i’s reproduction of a rubbing of the stele).
(2) "Plate II" (Ts‘ai‘i’s transcription of the Chinese text together
with his annotations).

To both Dr. William Hung (洪煥逵) and the Reverend Antoine
Mostaert I wish to express my grateful indebtedness for the material
assistance which they have given me in the study and solution of
problems in the Chinese and Mongolian texts respectively.

In making these acknowledgments, I do not, in any manner, dis-
claim responsibility for the imperfections of my work.
Translation of the Chinese Text

The Edict (懿旨) of the Yeh-k’o Ho-tun 也可合敦 (Yeke Qadun), Ta Huang-hou 大皇后, who, as hitherto, conducts the affairs of the Eastern Palace (東宮) in [virtue of] the Edict (聖旨) of the Emperor, as well as the Edict (懿旨) of the Concubines (妃子), saying to the ta-lu-hua-ch’ih 達魯花赤 (daruyati) and the kuan-min-kuan 管民官 of the P’ing-yang-fu 平陽府路.

"Whereas [you,] Tu Feng 杜豐, kuan-min-kuan of Ch’iin-chou 沁州, may serve as the t’i-ling ta-shih 提領大使 to manage (勾當) such matters as the cutting [of the blocks] (雕造) of the Tao-tsang-ching 道藏經 as well as the building (修蓋) of an edifice, if you do not have the time, let your wife (娘子) be in charge of the management [thereof]. Moreover, regardless of whatsoever t’ou-hsia 頭下 official personnel (官員) and others it may be, they shall not disturb [the work]. If [anyone] violate [this], let him be punished for his transgression. Respect this."

SEAL OF

The 17th day of the 3rd moon of the year keng-tzu 庚子 [10 April 1240].

THE EMPEROR

A tao-shih 道士 of this kung 宮, Ch’ien Chih-t’ung 錢志通 has traced and cut (摹勒) [the texts] on stone.

Notes to the Translation of the Chinese Text


2 In Yeke Qadun "Great Empress" we have the Mongolian term for the principal wife of the emperor. As to Qadun, it is an alternate form of Qatan. For the -d- ~ -t- in Middle Mongolian, cf., e.g., Marian Lewicki, La Langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIVe siècle. Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389, Wroclaw, 1949, p. 107 §1.
Ts'ai Mei-piao is undoubtedly right in stating (op. cit., p. 7, n. 2) that Yeqe Qadun here refers to the Empress Töregene. In the "Hou-fei piao 后妃表” ["Table of Empresses and Concubines"] in the Yuan shih 106(ts'e 36).114-5v we read (1v) under the rubric "Ts'ai-tsung 太宗":

"T'o-lieh-ko-na 脫列哥那 (Töregene): Sixth Empress. Née Nai-ma-chen 乃馬真 (Naima'in). When the cyclical year was jen-yin 禁寅 [1242], Ts'ai-tsung died. The Empress was regent (攝政)—four years in all. In the 2nd year of Chih-yüan [1265] she was posthumously canonized Chao-ts'u huang-hou 昭慈皇后."  

5 In Ts Huang-hou "Great Empress" we have the Chinese translation of the Mongolian Yeqe Qadun (~ Qatun).

4 Although the term tung-kung "Eastern Palace" is usually used in reference to the Huang-t'ai-tzu 皇帝子 "Crown Prince"—cf., e.g., the entry in the Yuan shih 92(ts'e 31).5v5-6r—it is clear that, in this instance, it refers to the ordo or "palace" in which Töregene resided. In the "Hou-fei piao" (see note 2 above) we read (1r7-8):

"This being so, [as to] their habitations, then, there was the division of [them by] wo-erh-to 幹耳朵 (ordo). When they died, in turn, there were regulations [in respect] of the perpetual upkeep of the palace [in question]."

6 For this term cf. Chavannes, op. cit., p. 368, n. 3: "un édit de l'empereur" and Ratchnevsky, op. cit., p. 28, n. 1: "l'édit ... rendu par l'Empereur."

6 I.e., Ögedei (~ Ögedei) Qayan who was born in 1186, ascended the throne on 13 September 1229, and died on 11 December 1241. Cf. A. C. Moule, "A Table of the Emperors of the Yuan Dynasty," Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society 45 (1914).124 + "Table."

7 To the definitions of this term given in note 1 above there should also be added that of "Edict of a Concubine."

8 It is virtually impossible to determine to which concubines reference is made.

9 For the expression 道與 (t'ai yü) translating a Mongolian -da/-de ~ -ta/-te or -dur/-dör ~ -tur/-tür ... kemen "saying to . . .," cf. Chavannes, op. cit., p. 368, n. 4, p. 388, n. 3, p. 396, n. 1, and p. 406, n. 4.


11 I.e., "Officials who govern the people." Cf. e.g., Ratchnevsky, op. cit., p. 32, n. 4.

12 For P'ing-yang-fu lu, i.e., the P'ing-yang-fu Circuit, cf. the Yuan shih 58(ts'e 19).3510-3533, where we read (3510-3511): "At the beginning of the Yuan it (i.e., P'ing-yang-fu) became P'ing-yang-lu. In the 9th year of T'ai[sic]-te 太 [sic] 德 [1305], because of an earthquake, it was changed to Chin-ning-lu 晉寧路." Cf. also Ratchnevsky, op. cit., p. 261, n. 1.

13 I have not succeeded in identifying this person.

14 For Ch'in-chou cf. the Yuan shih 58(ts'e 19).38r1-2.

15 I.e., "Commissioner-in-Charge." Strictly speaking, the words t'i-ling ta-shih do not constitute an established title, although both elements, t'i-ling and ta-shih, are used independently to designate specific functions. Cf., e.g., Ratchnevsky, op. cit., p. 254, n. 1.

16 The words kou-tang are frequently encountered in texts of the Yuan period. Used


In an Imperial Rescript (皇帝聖旨) of the 20th day of the 10th month of the 18th year of Chih-yüan 至元, that is, 1 January 1282, in the Pien-wei lu 貓鷄録 by the monk Hsiang-mai 祥遇 of the Yüan in the Taishō shinshū Daizōyō 大正新脩大藏經 52, No. 2116, pp. 751–781 (pp. 764–765), we read (p. 764b): "Moreover, in the Wang tzu-shih 王祖師 cloisters [of] places such as Pao-ting 保安, Chen-ting 真定, T'ai-yüan 太原, P'ing-yang 平陽, and Ho-chung-fu 河中府 and in Kuan-hsi 關西 there are blocks of the Tao-t'ang-ch'ing 道藏经." From this it is clear that the blocks of this edition of the Taoist Canon were still in existence in the year 1282.

19 The words hsin-hai, although very general in sense, presumably here refer to the construction of an edifice where the work may be undertaken.

20 On 2 December 1955 Professor Lien-sheng Yang informed me that the words時節 (shih-chieh) had a conditional force.

21 I have not succeeded in identifying who, to judge by the context, was qualified to assume the responsibility which such matters entailed.

22 The words 不以 (pu i) are equivalent to 不論 (pu lun).

23 In t'ou-hsia 頭下 we have a variant of the more usual t'ou-hsiu 投下. For this term of which the Mongolian original was ayima. Cf. Francis Woodman Cleaves, "The Historicity of the Baljuna Covenant," Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Volume 18, December, 1955, Numbers 3 and 4, pp. 357–421 (p. 365, n. 26).

24 I.e., "functionaries of diverse categories."

25 In the words 要罪過者 (yao tsui-kuo che) we have a formula which is also attested in an edict published by Erich Haenisch, Steuergerechtsame der chinesischen Klöster unter der Mongolenherrschaft, Leipzig, 1940, p. 59, l. 9, with the Mongolian original "ere'ute'n boltu'hai." Haenisch, op. cit., p. 63, l. 24, translated the formula as "sollen strafbar sein." It is further attested, with the addition of two words, in an edict published by Chavannes, op. cit., p. 403, as 一體要罪過者 (i-t'ei yao tsui-kuo che) which Chavannes translated "ils seront punis de la même peine." In his discussion of this and similar formulae Chavannes, op. cit., p. 379, n. 1, suggested: "Le mot 要過 paraît impliquer le sens de "se produire", "tel est le fait qui se produit ou qui arrive." This is not correct. The words tsui-kuo 罪過 constitute a compound "offense-transgression." Cf. Herbert A. Giles, A Chinese-English Dictionary, Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged, 1912, p. 1472, no. 11,910: "罪過 or 罪戾 or 罪責 or 罪愆 crime; sin; wrong."

As Ögedei (~ Ögödei) Qaγan died on 11 December 1241, it is clear that he was still alive when this edict was issued and that Töregene was not yet regent.

The seal characters are to be read as follows: 皇帝之寶 (*Huang-ti chih pao*).

I.e., Taoist priest.

Lit., “palace.” However, in Taoist terminology the term is used in the sense of “temple.”

I have not succeeded in identifying this person.

Although I have translated this line here with the Chinese text of the inscription, it is found at the very end of the inscription after the Mongolian text.
THE SINO-MONGOLIAN INSCRIPTION OF 1240

TRANSCRIPTION OF THE MONGOLIAN TEXT

[1] ene minu üge busi bolyγay-san kümün
[3] bičig qulayana jil

TRANSLATION OF THE MONGOLIAN TEXT

[1] The person who shall have contravened1 this2 my word,3
[2] let him be held greatly . . ? . .4 punishable.5 This
[3] Writ.6 The year of the rat.7

NOTES TO THE TRANSLATION OF THE MONGOLIAN TEXT


2 My reading of this word is tentative. When compared with the word at the end of the second line, which is indubitably ene, it would seem rather to be ejin “thus.” As it is written, however, it also suggests -gine, the second half of *Töregine ~ Töregene. If such a reading were correct, the first half of the name—Töre—would have appeared at the end of the preceding line. However, it seems highly unlikely that the name of the person from whom the Bičig emanated would have been fractured in this manner. One would expect to find the name of the Empress elevated to the beginning of the line—the first as the text has been transmitted—so that we would have Töregine minu üge.

3 At first glance, it would appear that in minu üge we have a variation of the more usual üge manu in which manu is an appositive of the name which immediately precedes (cf., e.g., Arγun üge manu). However, unless we are to read -gine minu üge, “Word of me, [Töre]gine,” we must understand the words minu üge as I have translated them. From the use of üge in this text, it is clear that, despite the occurrence of the term 諡旨 (i-chih) in the Chinese text, the practice whereby an edict emanating from an Empress came to be designated in Mongolian by the same Chinese term (cf. Mostaert et Cleaves, op. cit., p. 435, n. 15) did not yet obtain.

4 The word which follows yeke is written in such a manner that it is difficult to propose a reading which is convincing. As it stands, the word would appear to be nenge or nenke,
ange or anke, or possibly nege or neke. Together with yeke it would appear to form a "mot-
couple," but, as none of the suggested readings yields anything which is recognizable
either independently or in conjunction with yeke, it is futile to speculate as to what the
word itself or the "mot-couple," if it be such, might signify. For this reason I have pre-
ferred to leave the word untranscribed and untranslated.

5 For the reading of the word aldəγ-situ I am indebted to the Reverend Antoine Mos-
taert, who remarked in a letter of 14 December 1955:

"Je lis le mot qui suit aldəγ-situ, que j'explique comme étant un adjectif en -tu formé
sur aldəγ-si, qui serait synonyme de aldal. Aldəγ-situ boltyai serait donc l'équivalent de
aldaltai boltyai. Aldasi est un mot attesté. Si aldəγ-situ est correctement lu, il faut en
conclure qu'à côté de aldə- ce verbe a eu une forme aldəγ-. Pour cette dernière particu-
larité, l'on ne peut dire a priori que aldəγ- soit impossible, parce que, p. ex. Hist. secr.
ilay- 'vaincre' existe à côté de Hist. secr. et mo. ila- idem."

Aldasi, as the Reverend Antoine Mostaert has indicated, is an attested word. Cf. Mr.
Matthew Haltdt, Mr. D. Wangchindorji, Mrs. Geshigtogdaho Fu, Miss Vera McGillivray
and S. J. Gunzel, Mongol-English Practical Dictionary with English Word Reference List,
The Evangelical Alliance Mission, 1949–1953, p. 20b: "Fault, error, mistake." Cf. also
Folke Boberg, Mongolian-English Dictionary, 1, A-Chagchihgo tarani, Stockholm, 1954,
p. 51b: "Failure." The word is not registered in Joseph Étienne Kowalewski, Diction-
naire mongol-russe-français, Tome premier, Kasan, 1844. Cf., however, the word aldas,
op. cit., p. 88b: "une petite faute, défaut." It is more than probable that aldas is, in fact,
a misprint for aldasi. (For the synonym aldal cf. also Kowalewski, op. cit., p. 88b: "faute,
erreur, manquement, omission; péché." For the Ordos form of aldasi cf. Antoine Mo-
staert, Dictionnaire ordos, Tome premier (λ-ν), The Catholic University—Peking, 1941,
p. 14b: "aldaši pertę; diminution de biens, de profits. Cf. alda-." Cf. also, op. cit., p. 14b,
for the adjective "aldaši tərə' aying une pertę | aldaši tərə' məmə commerce dans lequel on
perd."

Although the form aldəγ-si has not been encountered as such in any Mongolian source,
it is possible that it is the form of the word on which the Chinese transcriptions of the
term were based in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. As examples of the term
abound in Chinese sources of the period, I shall confine myself to but a few which are
typical of all others.

In the entry by P'eng Ta-ya 彭大雅, under the rubric "Ch'i shang fa" 其賞罰
["Their Rewards and Punishments"], in the Hei-Ta shih-liuch 黑鞑事略 [Sketch of the
Affairs of the Black Ta (Ta[tar]) in the Hai-niing Wang Ching-an hsien-sheng i-shu 海寧
王靜安先生選書 edition we read (15v):

"When they capture a city, then they permit them to plunder women and goods (lit.,
'permit their [=soldiers'] plundering women and jade and silk'). Priority in plundering
depends upon the difference of their merit (lit., 'As to ) the before or after of plunder-
ing, they regard the equality or inequality of their merit'). If those who are before stick
arrows on the gate [of the city], then those who are after do not dare to enter. If there be
[any who commits an act of ] transgression, then they kill him. This is known as (lit.,
'they call it') an-ta-hsi 按打黑 (alda[γ]si)."

In the Ta-Yüan ma-cheng chi 大元馬政記 [Record of the Horse Administration of the
Great Yuan] in the Kuang-ts'ang hsüeh-chüen ts'ung-shu 廣倉學堂叢書,甲類,第一
集, there is a text (33v7–33v1) which reads as follows:
"Imperial Directive of the 24th day of the 6th moon of jen-ch'ên 壬辰, the 4th year [13 July 1232] of T'ai-tsung Huang-ti 太宗皇帝 (Ögedei Ṭ Öögedei Qaɣan): . . . . "[As for] troughs for watering horses (飲馬槽) . . . , the households—in all—according to verification, presently under the jurisdiction of the said lu (i.e., Hsi-ch'ing lu 西京路) shall provide one trough per household, five ch'ih 尺 in length, one ch'ih, four ts'ün 丈 in width, the common Mongolian type (蒙古中様). [Those in charge of] each place shall furnish draught oxen (車牛) to convey [them] to the wo-lu-te 幹魯朵 (ordo) for delivery not later than the 10th day of the 7th moon [29 July 1232]. No delay shall be permitted (lit., "It shall not be permitted to delay"). Any disobedience shall be adjudged an an-ta-hsi 按笞忒 (alta[γ]si) offense (lit., "If they disobey, they shall be adjudged an-ta-hsi (alta[γ]si) offenders");"

In the "Chan-ch'iî" 站赤 ("Jamšî") in the Yung-lo ta-tien 永樂大典 there are several examples of the term. Cf., e.g., 19,416:

(1) [72–5] "A Rescript of the 15th day of the 11th moon of chi-ch'ou 己丑, the 1st year [2 December 1229] of T'ai-tsung Huang-ti (Ögedei Ṭ Öögedei Qaɣan):

"The sundry ox stations and horse chan 站 (jam) ("stations") are enjoined [as follows]."

"The gist is as follows:

"If there are those who demand (起要) relay station horses, upon verification, if they do not have p'ai-mien 牌面 and written authorization (文字), the relay station officials who first furnished [them] horses shall be sentenced to servitude (徒) for two years and shall be given 70 blows of the rod (杖). The originally commissioned officials shall be adjudged an-ta-hsi 按笞忒 (alta[γ]si) offenders (罪). . . . One po-hu 百戸 ("centurion") shall be specially ordered to use draught oxen to send [the rice] to persons who sojourn (作客) [there] while trading. They shall not ride relay station horses. Violators shall be adjudged an-ta-hsi (alta[γ]si) offenders . . . ."

(2) [778–774] "This month [18 November–17 December 1229] . . . The Emperor promulgated the following items:

"One: Messengers who come and go without using the relay routes shall be adjudged an-ta-hsi 按笞忒 (alta[γ]si) offenders (罪). Those who come and go without p'ai-tzu 碑子, but with written authorization shall also be adjudged an-ta-hsi (alta[γ]si) offenders . . . . Thus those who come to complain by memorial, the officials shall also be adjudged an-ta-hsi (alta[γ]si) offenders. Those who are commissioned and dispatched by the Court to go on a mission and have p'ai-tzu and written authorization, if [there are] persons who do not listen to [them], they shall also be adjudged an-ta-hsi (alta[γ]si) offenders. Moreover, they shall be put to death.

"One: Messengers and others shall be furnished daily one chin 尺 of meat, one sheng 升 of flour, and one p'ing 瓶 of wine per day per person . . . . They shall not request additional amounts. Moreover, they shall not demand and take [any] forcibly. If [there be] violators, they shall be adjudged an-ta-hsi (alta[γ]si) offenders . . . ."

(3) [774–6] "Rescript of the 25th day of the 5th moon of jen-ch'ên, the 4th year [15 June 1234]:

"The officials as well as chan-ch'iî (Jamšî) personnel and others of the several lu are [hereby] instructed:

"If a messenger does not have a p'ai-tzu and written authorization, the relay station official who first furnished [him] horses shall be sentenced to servitude for two years and
given 70 blows of the rod. The originally commissioned official shall be adjudged an an-ta-hsi (alda[γ]si) offender . . . .’”

(4) [7v8–8r3] “Rescript of the 5th day of the 2nd moon of kuei-ssu 昆已, the 5th year [17 March 1233]:

‘If there is the furnishing of 1 sheng of rice per day per person, if there are persons who as before demand wine, meat, rice, and flour in a disorderly manner, they shall all be adjudged an-ta-hsi (alda[γ]si) offenders . . . .”

(5) [8r5–7] “Rescript of the 17th day of the 6th moon [25 July 1233]:

‘. . . Moreover, [in the case of] the places through which they pass, then those who furnish relay animals (頭口) shall not procrustinate. If, because of other matters, they demand animals, they shall be adjudged an-ta-hsi (alda[γ]si) offenders.’”

(6) [8r8–8v5] “Directive received on the 21st day [29 July 1233]:

‘A messenger from the headquarters of the army of K’uo-ch’u T’ai-tzu 蘇出太子 (Kōči T’ai-tzu) has come [to inform us that] the relay stations along the route have been interrupted. . . .

‘The above-mentioned chan (詹姆) ("station") horses are to be branded with a distinctive brand. Only the messengers from the headquarters of the army of K’uo-ch’u T’ai-tzu (Kōči T’ai-tzu) shall be allowed to ride [them]. Others shall not be furnished [such horses]. If there are other messengers who wish to ride them, those who furnish [them] and those who receive them shall all be adjudged an-ta-hsi (alda[γ]si) death offenders. [For] each station there shall be appointed a careful, capable official to take charge of [its] business and to care for [the horses] adequately. [The horses] shall not be reduced by death. In case of death, immediately, the number shall be made up. If [any of] the above-mentioned officials die, the officials present (見在) under the name of the respective person shall attend to (準上) the business. If there be [any] delay, they shall all be adjudged an-ta-hsi (alda[γ]si) offenders. Messengers who come from the headquarters of the army, if they encounter any trading Hui-hui 回回 and other whosoever (lit., "not selecting it is what do trading Hui-hui and others"), may seize their horses to ride between relay stations. Those who do not give [them to them] shall also be adjudged an-ta-hsi (alda[γ]si) offenders.’”

Under the rubric “Chin tsai lieh hsing-fa jih” 禁宰獵刑罰日 ["Days on which it is Forbidden to Slaughter, Hunt, and Administer Punishment"] in the Yüan tien chang 元典章 57(ts’e 31).272–5 there is a Rescript of Mönge Qayan which reads as follows:

“Rescript (聖旨) promulgated by Meng-ko Huang-ti 蒙哥皇帝 (Möngge ~ Mönge Qayan):

‘Beginning with this ting-ssu 丁巳 year [1257] (lit., “This ting-ssu year making the head”), on the 1st day, the 8th day, the 15th day, and the 23rd day—these four days—of each moon (按月), whatsoever it be (lit., "not selecting it is what"), so long as it is alive (lit., "only if it is that which has life"), persons who secretly kill [lit], if they are not adjudged an-ta-hsi 按笞奚 (alda[γ]si), what is that? (lit., "that (謂) [is] what 於甚麼")?’."

“Rescript of Us. [We] have written [it] in the Tien-chih-erh 典只兒 (Delišir) field (田地) on the 11th day of the 7th moon in the snake year (29 August 1257).’”

For the Ancient Chinese pronunciation of the character 奚 (hsi), cf. B. Karlsgren, Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese, 1923, no. 126: すei. For the Ancient

As observed by the Reverend Antoine Mostaert in a letter dated 12 December 1961, the use of the character 窝 (ki) in these transcriptions is difficult to explain:

"Le problème est: Comment le caractère 窝, qui à cette époque se prononçait xi, peut-il servir à rendre la syllabe mongole ści? Autrement dit comment le mot 按打窝 peut-il correspondre à un mot mongol aldayši ou aldasi? Je ne puis pas résoudre ce problème.

"Autre problème. Si le caractère 窝 peut transcrire ści dans le mot aldayši ~ aldaši, pourquoi rend-il la syllabe ki dans le nom 学蘭窩 à lire Boralki (Inscr. de 1335, 1. 38)?"

6 The usual formula in such documents is Bičig manu, "Writ of Us." Cf., e.g., Mostaert et Cleaves, op. cit., p. 433, l. 13; p. 451, l. 32; and p. 470, ll. 11–12. Furthermore, the formula in question, standing in an absolute relationship, is regularly followed by the date in full, by the words bukiš-dür, "at the moment when [we] were," with an indication of the locality, and finally by the verb bičbei "[we] have written [it]," the "[it]" referring to its antecedent, "Writ of Us." It is evident from the use of the words ene bičig alone that the document is incomplete.

7 Nicholas Poppe, "Remarks on the Vocalism of the Second Syllable in Mongolian," Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Volume 14, June, 1951, Numbers 1 and 2, pp. 189–207, observed (p. 197) with reference to the assimilation of the vowel *a of the second syllable by the vowel *u of the first syllable: "As an example we may take Mo. qulaγana 'mouse,' which is etymologically connected with qula 'brown' (with the suffix -γana as in altαγana, name of a plant, or qaraγana, also a plant, derived from altan 'gold' and qara 'black' respectively), and consequently is a development of an older form *qulaγana." The present inscription is the only text in which the older form qulaγana has been encountered.

As the date of such documents is usually given in full, i.e., day, moon, and season, in addition to the year (cf., e.g., Mostaert et Cleaves, op. cit., p. 433, 11. 14–15; p. 451; 11. 32–33; and p. 470, 11. 12–13), it is also evident from the use of the words qulaγana jil alone that the document is incomplete.
PLATE I

The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1240
(6) 一二四〇年濟源十方大紫微宮聖旨碑

漢字正書 末附蒙古畏兀字 三行 在河南省濟源縣

皇帝聖旨宜依舊行東宮事也合記□□□大皇后懿旨井妃子懿旨□□□，道與平陽府
達魯花赤管民官；

據沁州管民官杜義虬進道藏經暨修蓋等事，可充提領大使勾當者。 你不得
功夫時節，你的娘子充提領勾當者。兼不以何頭下□□官員人等，無得騷擾。如
違，要罪過者。准此。

庚子年三月十七日□□

本宮道士錢志通纂勒上石。

---

1) 本碑年月日後勒有蒙古畏兀字三行。今按徐鼒疏略改譯云：“行於選人契丹女即為亡國者，叛
川叛字，移刻壁柱主之。欲以後兩年月之前，續御書回字，云付某人，此蓋尊防楚材，故
必以回字為義，無此則不成文書。欲使之經由齊孟，亦可互相傳達也。” 這裏所謂回字就是
蒙古畏兀字。這是一種利用蒙古畏兀字母書寫蒙古文的字，是現代蒙古文的前身。 一二
四〇四年成吉思汗滅滅木，得三監汗傳塔統給，‘遂命教太子諸王以畏兀字書諺言’（元史卷一
二四塔統傳同頒），是為這種蒙古畏兀字的源起。

2) “也可合敦” 爲蒙古語的音譯。“也可” 意為“大”，“合敦” 即“皇后”。畏兀，亦為各民族
中多有此稱。這裏譯作“也可合敦大皇后”，是同義蒙古文的音譯。這種例子在元代翻譯作
品中時常見到。此“也可合敦” 對照元曲諸宮大皇后乃馬氏，時向未稱制。

3) 庚人把皇后妃子的命令稱作“懿旨”，以與皇帝聖旨及諸王太子令旨相區別。

4) “殺下” 或寫作“按下”，但非蒙古語的譯音。遼、金兩代均有此制。遼代分封蒙古諸王及
以采地，稱為頂下，其內部的生產關係基本上仍是地主與佃農的關係。

5) 此庚子年為一二四〇年，蒙古太宗廟號合十二年。廟合合於次年十一月，此時尚在。

---

Plate II

Ts'ai's Transcription and Annotation