

Harvard-Yenching Institute

The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1240

Author(s): Francis Woodman Cleaves

Source: *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, Vol. 23 (1960 - 1961), pp. 62-75

Published by: Harvard-Yenching Institute

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2718568>

Accessed: 28/02/2009 06:41

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=hyi>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard-Yenching Institute is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE SINO-MONGOLIAN INSCRIPTION OF 1240

FRANCIS WOODMAN CLEAVES

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

UNTIL Ts'ai Mei-piao 蔡美彪¹ published his *Yüan-tai pai-hua-pei chi-lu* 元代白話碑集錄² [*Collected Records of Yüan Dynasty Pai-hua Stelae*] in 1955 the earliest known monuments of the Mongolian language were the so-called "Stone of Činggis Qan"³ of 1220–1225 and the impression of the seal of Güyüg affixed to a Persian document of 1246.⁴ 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.⁵ 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*⁶ 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-hsüeh-yüan 中國科學院 [Chinese Academy of Sciences].

² Chung-kuo k'o-hsüeh-yüan yü-yen yen-chiu-so 中國科學院語言研究所 [Institute of Linguistics and Philology of the Chinese Academy of Sciences], Pei-ching 北京, 1955. Pp. 4 + 133 (+ pl. 1–4). For a review of this work cf. Iriya Yoshitaka 入矢義高, "Sai Mihō shi hen [Gendai hakuwa-hi shūroku] wo yomu" 蔡美彪氏編「元代白話碑集錄」を讀む ["Reading the [Gendai hakuwa-hi shūroku] Compiled by Mr. Sai Mihō"], *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方學報, Vol. 26, 1956, pp. 186–228.

³ For the most recent study of this text cf. Louis Hambis, "A propos de la «Pierre de Gengis-khan»,» *Mélanges publiés par l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises*, Tome second, *Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises*, Volume XIV, Paris, 1960, pp. 141–157.

⁴ For the most recent study of this text cf. Antoine Mostaert et Francis Woodman Cleaves, "Trois Documents Mongols des Archives Secrètes Vaticanes," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, Volume 15, Numbers 3 and 4, December, 1952, pp. 419–506 (+ pl. I–VIII) (pp. 485–495).

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):

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 *aldar-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,⁷ 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⁸ in Ho-nan-sheng 河南省.⁹ During the Yüan the Chi-yüan-hsien was under the jurisdiction of the Huai-ch'ing-lu 懷慶路.¹⁰ However, in the time of Ögedei (~ Ögödei) Qaγan (1229–1241) the region was known as Huai-chou 懷州.¹¹ Inasmuch as the Edict was issued to certain officials of the P'ing-yang-fu lu 平陽府路,¹² including one in Ch'in-chou 沁州,¹³ it is clear that the Chinese and Mon-

⁷ 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¹ stayed overnight. It was founded at the beginning of [the] Shao-sheng 紹聖 [period] [1094–1098] of the Sung 宋. It was restored during [the] Ta-te 大德 [period] [1297–1307] of the Yüan 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-kuo hsin-ti-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 *Yüan shih* 58(*ts'e* 19).17v6–18r3.

¹¹ Cf. the *Yüan shih* 58(*ts'e* 19).17v6–9.

¹² Cf. the *Yüan shih* 58(*ts'e* 19).35r10–35v3 and 36r6.

¹³ Cf. the *Yüan 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-γana 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 . . . *büküi-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 imperfectly written that it is virtually impossible to be certain of the exactitude of the readings which I have proposed. Despite the disappointing features of the three lines in Mongolian, the existence of the word *alda-γ-situ* alone lends to the text an importance which commends it to our attention.

I have included in this article the following reproductions:

- (1) “Plate I” (Ts’ai’s reproduction of a rubbing of the stele).
- (2) “Plate II” (Ts’ai’s transcription of the Chinese text together with his annotations).

To both Dr. William Hung (洪煨蓮) 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, disclaim responsibility for the imperfections of my work.

TRANSLATION OF THE CHINESE TEXT

The Edict (懿旨)¹ of the *Yeh-k'o Ho-tun* 也可合敦 (*Yeke Qadun*),² *Ta Huang-hou* 大皇后,³ who, as hitherto, conducts the affairs of the Eastern Palace (東宮)⁴ in [virtue of] the Edict (聖旨)⁵ of the Emperor,⁶ as well as the Edict (懿旨)⁷ of the Concubines (妃子),⁸ saying to⁹ the *ta-lu-hua-ch'ih* 達魯花赤 (*daruyachi*)¹⁰ and the *kuan-min-kuan* 管民官¹¹ of the P'ing-yang-fu lu 平陽府路:¹²

"Whereas [you,] Tu Feng 杜豐,¹³ *kuan-min-kuan* of Ch'in-chou 沁州,¹⁴ may serve as the *t'i-ling ta-shih* 提領大使¹⁵ to manage (勾當)¹⁶ such matters as the cutting [of the blocks] (雕造)¹⁷ of the *Tao-tsang-ching* 道藏經¹⁸ as well as the building (修蓋)¹⁹ [of an edifice], if²⁰ you do not have the time, let your wife (娘子)²¹ be in charge of the management [thereof]. Moreover, regardless of²² whatsoever *t'ou-hsia* 頭下²³ official personnel (官員人)²⁴ and others it may be, they shall not disturb [the work]. If [anyone] violate [this], let him be punished for his transgression."²⁵

Respect this.²⁶

SEAL OF

The 17th day of the 3rd moon of the year *keng-tzu* 庚子²⁷ [10 April 1240].

THE EMPEROR²⁸

A *tao-shih* 道士²⁹ of this *kung* 宮,³⁰ Ch'ien Chih-t'ung 錢志通,³¹ has traced and cut (摹勒) [the texts] on stone.³²

NOTES TO THE TRANSLATION OF THE CHINESE TEXT

¹ For this term cf. Ed. Chavannes, "Inscriptions et pièces de chancellerie chinoises de l'époque mongole," *T'oung pao*, Série II, Vol. v, 1904, pp. 357-447 (p. 368, n. 3): "un édit de l'impératrice-douarière" and Chavannes, *op. cit.*, p. 434, n. 3: "un décret émanant de l'impératrice." It is the latter definition which is applicable here. Cf. also Paul Ratchnevsky, *Un Code des Yuan*, Paris, 1937, p. 28, n. 1: "l'édit . . . rendu par l'Impératrice."

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 *Qatun*. For the *-d- ~ -t-* in Middle Mongolian, cf., e.g., Marian Lewicki, *La Langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIV^e siècle. Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389*, Wrocław, 1949, p. 107§1.

Ts'ai Mei-piao is undoubtedly right in stating (*op. cit.*, p. 7, n. 2) that *Yeke Qadun* here refers to the Empress Töregene. In the "Hou-fei piao 后妃表" ["Table of Empresses and Concubines"] in the *Yüan shih* 106(*ts'è* 36).1r4-5v we read (1v) under the rubric "T'ai-tsung 太宗":

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

³ In *Ta Huang-hou* "Great Empress" we have the Chinese translation of the Mongolian *Yeke Qadun* (~ *Qatun*).

⁴ Although the term *tung-kung* "Eastern Palace" is usually used in reference to the *Huang-t'ai-tzu* 皇太子 "Crown Prince"—cf., e.g., the entry in the *Yüan shih* 92(*ts'è* 31).5v5-6r2—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* 斡耳朵 (*ordo*). When they died, in turn, there were regulations [in respect] of the perpetual upkeep of the palace [in question.]"

⁵ 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 (~ Ögödei) Qaγan 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 Yüan 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 道典 (*tao yü*) translating a Mongolian *-da/-de ~ -ta/-te* or *-dur/-dür ~ -tur/-tüer . . . kemei* "saying to . . .," cf. Chavannes, *op. cit.*, p. 368, n. 4, p. 388, n. 3, p. 396, n. 1, and p. 406, n. 4.

¹⁰ For this term cf. Chavannes, *op. cit.*, p. 389, n. 1, Ratchnevsky, *op. cit.*, p. 32, n. 3, and Francis Woodman Cleaves, "The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1362 in Memory of Prince Hindu," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, Volume 12, June, 1949, Numbers 1 and 2, p. 57, n. 178, and p. 124, n. 198.

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 *Yüan shih* 58(*ts'è* 19).35r10-35v3, where we read (35r10-35v1): "At the beginning of the Yüan 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 *Yüan shih* 58(*ts'è* 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 Yüan period. Used

substantively they correspond to the Mongolian *üile* "matter," "affair." Cf. Erich Haenisch, *Wörterbuch zu Manghol un Niuca Tobca'an (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi)*, *Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, Leipzig, 1939, p. 161. For an example of their substantive use cf. Ratchnevsky, *op. cit.*, p. 293, n. 1. (This is not registered in Françoise Aubin, "Index de «Un Code des Yuan» de P. Ratchnevsky," *Mélanges publiés par l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises*, Tome second, Paris, 1960, pp. 423-515.)

¹⁷ For the words *tiao-tiao* cf. Paul Pelliot, *Les Débuts de l'imprimerie en Chine, Oeuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot*, Paris, 1953, p. 124, n. 3.

¹⁸ For this edition of the *Taoist Canon* cf. Pelliot, *op. cit.*, p. 93: "Sous les Yuan, un *Canon taoïque*, comprenant „plus de 7.800 liasses,, fut gravé à P'ing-yang-fou du Chan-si par les soins du 披雲子 P'i-yun-tseu." For additional details cf. Paul Pelliot, "Compte rendu" of Dr. L. Wieger, s.j., *Taoïsme*, Tome 1, in *Journal asiatique*, Dixième série, Tome xx, N° 1, Juillet-Août 1912, pp. 141-156 (pp. 144-145).

In an Imperial Rescript (皇帝聖旨) of the 20th day of the 10th moon of the 18th year of Chih-yüan 至元, that is, 1 January 1282, in the *Pien-wei lu* 辯僞錄 by the monk Hsiang-mai 祥邁 of the Yüan in the *Taishō shinsū Daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經 52, No. 2116, pp. 751-781 (pp. 764-765), we read (p. 764b): "Moreover, in the Wang *tsu-shih* 王祖師 cloisters [of] places such as Pao-ting 保定, 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-tsang-ching* 道藏經." 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 *hsiu-kai*, 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*) have a conditional force.

²¹ I have not succeeded in identifying this person 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-hsia* 投下. For this term of which the Mongolian original was *ayimaγ* 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, *Steuergerechsamkeit der chinesischen Klöster unter der Mongolenherrschaft*, Leipzig, 1940, p. 59, l. 9, with the Mongolian original "ere'uten boltuhayi." 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'i 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 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."

²⁶ For the formula 准此 (*chun tz'u*) cf. Chavannes, *op. cit.*, p. 371, n. 1, p. 390, n. 2, and p. 403, n. 2.

²⁷ 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.

²⁸ The seal characters are to be read as follows: 皇帝之寶 (*Huang-ti chih pao*).

²⁹ I.e., Taoist priest.

³⁰ Lit., "palace." However, in Taoist terminology the term is used in the sense of "temple."

³¹ I have not succeeded in identifying this person.

³² 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.

TRANSCRIPTION OF THE MONGOLIAN TEXT

- [1] ene minu üge busi bolγaγ-san kümün
 [2] yeke . . ? . . aldaγ-situ boltuγai[.] ene
 [3] bičig qulaγana 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

¹ The words *busi bolγaγ-san kümün* "the person who shall have contravened" may be compared with the words *busi bolγaγun aran* "people who shall contravene" attested in the Teheran documents. Cf. Francis Woodman Cleaves, "The Mongolian Documents in the Musée de Téhéran," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 16(1953).1-107+Plates I-II (p. 26, "Document III," 1. 6; p. 32, "Document III," 1. 14; and p. 49, n. 18 and n. 19).

The expression *busi bolγa-* "to contravene" (lit., "to cause to be other") is well attested in numerous early Mongolian texts. Cf., e.g., Antoine Mostaert et Francis Woodman Cleaves, "Trois documents mongols des Archives secrètes vaticanes," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 15(1952).419-516 + "Planches" I-VIII (p. 464, "Lignes 22-25").

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 *eyin* "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 懿旨 (*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 preferred to leave the word untranscribed and untranslated.

⁵ For the reading of the word *alda γ -situ* I am indebted to the Reverend Antoine Mostaert, who remarked in a letter of 14 December 1955:

"Je lis le mot qui suit *alda γ -situ*, que j'explique comme étant un adjectif en *-tu* formé sur *alda γ si*, qui serait synonyme de *aldal*. *Alda γ situ boltu γ ai* serait donc l'équivalent de *aldaltai boltu γ ai*. *Aldasi* est un mot attesté. Si *alda γ situ* est correctement lu, il faut en conclure qu'à côté de *alda-* ce verbe a eu une forme *alda γ -*. Pour cette dernière particularité, l'on ne peut dire a priori que *alda γ -* soit impossible, parce que, p. ex. *Hist. secr. ila γ -* '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 Haltod, 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-Ghachigho tarani, Stockholm, 1954, p. 51b: "Failure." The word is not registered in Joseph Étienne Kowalewski, *Dictionnaire 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 Mostaert, *Dictionnaire ordos*, Tome premier (A-1), The Catholic University—Peking, 1941, p. 14b: "*al δ aši* perte; diminution de biens, de profits. Cf. *al δ a-*." Cf. also, *op. cit.*, p. 14a, for the adjective "*al δ aši \prime t \prime ā* ayant une perte | *al δ aši \prime t \prime ā māmā* commerce dans lequel on perd."

Although the form *alda γ 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-lüeh* 黑鞑事略 [*Sketch of the Affairs of the Black Ta (Ta[tar])*] in the *Hai-ning Wang Ching-an hsien-sheng i-shu* 海寧王靜安先生遺書 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 plundering, 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* 按打奚 (*alda γ si*)."

In the *Ta-Yüan ma-cheng chi* 大元馬政記 [*Record of the Horse Administration of the Great Yüan*] in the *Kuang-ts'ang hsüeh-ch'ün ts'ung-shu* 廣倉學宥叢書, 甲類, 第一集, there is a text (33r7-33v1) which reads as follows:

"Imperial Directive of the 24th day of the 6th moon of *jen-ch'en* 壬辰, the 4th year [13 July 1232] of T'ai-tsung Huang-ti 太宗皇帝 (Ögedei ~ Ögödei Qaγan): . . .

"[As for] troughs for watering horses (飲馬槽) . . . , the households—1,627 households in all—according to verification, presently under the jurisdiction of the said *lu* (i.e., Hsi-ching lu 西京路) shall provide one trough per household, five *ch'ih* 尺 in length, one *ch'ih*, four *ts'un* 寸 in width, the common Mongolian type (蒙古中樣). [Those in charge of] each place shall furnish draught oxen (車牛) to convey [them] to the *wo-lu-to* 斡魯朶 (*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* 按答奚 (*alda*[γ]si) offense (lit., "If they disobey, they shall be adjudged *an-ta-hsi* (*alda*[γ]si) offenders")."

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

(1) [7r2-5] "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 ~ Ögödei Qaγan):

"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* 按答奚 (*alda*[γ]si) offenders (罪) . . . One *po-hu* 百戶 ("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* (*alda*[γ]si) offenders . . ."

(2) [7r8-7v4] "This moon [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* 按答奚 (*alda*[γ]si) offenders (罪戾). Those who come and go without *p'ai-tzu* 牌子, but with written authorization shall also be adjudged *an-ta-hsi* (*alda*[γ]si) offenders . . . Thus those who come to complain by memorial, the officials shall also be adjudged *an-ta-hsi* (*alda*[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* (*alda*[γ]si) offenders. Moreover, they shall be put to death.

"One: Messengers and others shall be furnished daily one *chin* 斤 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* (*alda*[γ]si) offenders . . ."

(3) [7v4-6] "Rescript of the 25th day of the 5th moon of *jen-ch'en*, the 4th year [15 June 1232]:

"The officials as well as *chan-ch'ih* (*jamči*) 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* 癸巳, 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 procrastinate. 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* 瀾出太子 (Köçü *T’ai-tzu*) has come [to inform us that] the relay stations along the route have been interrupted. . . .

“The above-mentioned *chan* (*jam*) (“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* (Köçü *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’ ϵ* 21).27r2-5 there is a Rescript of Möngke Qayan which reads as follows:

“Rescript (聖旨) promulgated by Meng-ko Huang-ti 蒙哥皇帝 (Möngge ~ Möngke 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 [it], if they are not adjudged *an-ta-hsi* 按答奚 (*alda*[γ]*si*), what is that? (lit., “that (卽) [is] what 甚麼?”).

“Rescript of Us. [We] have written [it] in the Tien-chih-erh 典只兒 (?Deljir) field (田地) on the 11th day of the 7th moon in the snake year (22 August 1257).”

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

Mandarin pronunciation of the same character cf. A. Dragunov, "The *hPhags-pa* Script and Ancient Mandarin," Известия Академии Наук СССР (*Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS*), Отделение Гуманитарных Наук (Classe des Humanités), 1930, pp. 627-647; 775-797 (p. 784), no. 163: *xi*.

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

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

"Autre problème. Si le caractère 奚 peut transcrire *ši* dans le mot *aldaγsi* ~ *aldaši*, pourquoi rend-il la syllabe *hi* dans le nom 孛蘭奚 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 *buküi-dür*, "at the moment when [we] were," with an indication of the locality, and finally by the verb *bičibei* "[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. *quluγana* 'mouse,' which is etymologically connected with *qula* 'brown' (with the suffix *-γana* as in *altaγana*, 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, ll. 14-15; p. 451; ll. 32-33; and p. 470, ll. 12-13), it is also evident from the use of the words *qulaγana jil* alone that the document is incomplete.

(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¹⁾ 三行 在河南省濟源縣

皇帝聖旨裏依舊行東宮事也可合敦²⁾大皇后懿旨并妃子懿旨³⁾，道與平陽府達魯花赤管民官：

據沁州管民官杜豐雕造道藏經并修蓋等事，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。兼不以是何頭下⁴⁾官員人等，無得騷擾。如違，要罪過者。准此。

庚子年三月十七日⁵⁾。

本宮道士錢志通摹勒上石。

- 1) 本碑年月日後勒有蒙古畏兀字三行。今案徐燾黑韃事略疏證：“行於漢人契丹女真諸亡國者，祇用漢字，移刺楚材主之。卻又於後年年月之前，鎮海寫回回字，云付與某人，此蓋專防楚材，故必以回回字爲驗，無此則不成文書。欲使之經由鎮海，亦可互相檢柅也。”這裏所謂回回字就是蒙古畏兀字。這是一種利用古代畏兀字母來拼寫蒙古語的文字，是現代蒙古文字的前身。一二〇四年成吉思汗滅乃蠻，得太斡汗博塔塔統阿，“遂命教太子諸王以畏兀字書國言”（元史卷一二四博塔塔統阿傳），是爲這種蒙古畏兀字的源起。
- 2) “也可合敦”爲蒙古語的音譯。“也可”意爲“大”，“合敦”卽“皇后”。蒙古、突厥各民族中多有此稱。這裏譯文作“也可合敦大皇后”，是同義蒙漢文的蒸譯。這種例子在元代翻譯作品中時常見到。此“也可合敦”當卽脫列哥那六皇后乃馬真氏，時尙未稱制。
- 3) 元人把皇后妃子的命令都稱作“懿旨”，以與皇帝聖旨及諸王太子令旨相區別。
- 4) “頭下”或寫作“投下”，但非蒙古語的譯音。遼、金兩代均有此制。元代分封蒙古諸王貴族以采地，稱爲頭下。其內部的生產關係基本上仍是地主與佃農的關係。
- 5) 此庚子年爲一二四〇年，蒙古太宗窩闊台十二年。窩闊台死於是年十一月，此時尙在。

PLATE II

Ts'ai's Transcription and Annotation