



2012

# Six Pre-Chinggisid Genealogies in the Mongol Empire

Christopher P. Atwood

*University of Pennsylvania*, [catwood@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:catwood@sas.upenn.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/ealc>

 Part of the [East Asian Languages and Societies Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

Atwood, Christopher P., "Six Pre-Chinggisid Genealogies in the Mongol Empire" (2012). *Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations*. 23.

<https://repository.upenn.edu/ealc/23>

At the time of publication, author Christopher P. Atwood was affiliated with Indiana University. Currently, he is a faculty member in the East Asian Languages and Civilizations Department at the University of Pennsylvania.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/ealc/23>

For more information, please contact [repository@pobox.upenn.edu](mailto:repository@pobox.upenn.edu).

---

# Six Pre-Chinggisid Genealogies in the Mongol Empire

**Disciplines**

Arts and Humanities | East Asian Languages and Societies

**Comments**

At the time of publication, author Christopher P. Atwood was affiliated with Indiana University. Currently, he is a faculty member in the East Asian Languages and Civilizations Department at the University of Pennsylvania.

## SIX PRE-CHINGGISID GENEALOGIES IN THE MONGOL EMPIRE

CHRISTOPHER P. ATWOOD<sup>1</sup>

### INTRODUCTION

In the *Secret History of the Mongols* (hereafter *SHM*) §179, there is a brief statement about genealogy. Addressing Seche Beki and Tayichu, Chinggis Khan says “Of the elder generation, I thought of the sons of Bartan Ba’atur and said ‘Seche and Tayichu, you become rulers!’ but I failed in my aim.”<sup>2</sup> This passage is flagged as problematic in all the commentaries on the *SHM*. As reference to the *SHM*’s §§49 and 122 easily confirms, Seche Beki and Tayichu were the sons not of Bartan Ba’atur but of Qutuqtu/Sorghatu Yörki,<sup>3</sup> himself the son of Ökin Barqaq, the elder brother of Bartan Ba’atur. The commentators point out that this is a mistake, and blame the mistake on later editors who altered the text, since as Antoine Mostaert wrote to Francis Cleaves, “The author of the *Secret History* cannot have worded his text in this manner in which we read it at present. He knew very well that Sača and Taiču were the sons, not of Bartan Ba’atur, second son of Qabul Qan, but of Qutuqtu (~Sorghatu) Yörki, who was the son of Ökin Barqaq, eldest son of Qabul Qan. He had, in effect, written it in §49 and §122.”<sup>4</sup> De Rachewiltz goes a little farther to speak of a “tradition” “which is at variance with the statement with the statements in the SH;” in the end, therefore, it is a “mistake for the sons of Barqaq Ba’atur.”<sup>5</sup> But is it really just a mistake to call Seche and Tayichu the sons of Bartan

- 1 Christopher P. Atwood is Associate Professor of Mongolian studies and Chair of the Central Eurasian Studies Department at Indiana University. I would like to thank Elliot Sperling and Paul Losensky for their assistance with the Tibetan and Persian texts, respectively. A previous version of this paper was given at the conference “Mongolia in Anthropological Research: Recent Decades,” convened by the Department of Social Anthropology, National University of Mongolia, Ulaanbaatar, July 19, 2012. I am very grateful to D. Bum-Ochir and L. Munkh-Erdene for their invitation to the conference and to the participants for their fruitful comments and suggestions.
- 2 *SHM* §179 (EU, pp. 415-16): *de’ere-eche Bartan Ba’atur-un kö’ün Seche Tayichu qoyari ta qad boludqun ke’ejü yadaba je bi*. All translations from Mongolian are my own, unless otherwise noted.
- 3 This name is found with two readings, Jürki(n) and Yörki(n). Although the *SHM*’s Chinese transcription favored the first, all other sources favor the second, which I follow here.
- 4 Cited in Cleaves, pp. 107-08, n. 44.
- 5 De Rachewiltz, p. 645. Note that the name Barqaq Ba’atur is not actually attested, except as the result of the kind of editorial harmonization de Rachewiltz calls for here. Rather Barqaq always carries the prefixed epithet *ökin* “girl,” while Bartan always is called *ba’atur* “knight, hero.”

Ba'atur? And if so, why do later texts such as the Qubilai Qa'an era Veritable Records repeat that mistake?

I would like to begin this paper on genealogies in the Mongol empire by noting some salient features of modern scholarly assumptions in Mongolian studies as exemplified by the commentators on this passage in the *SHM*. Three assumptions stand out: 1. The genealogy of the pre-Chinggisid Mongols is fixed, such that divergences mean some sources are just wrong and other sources are right. 2. The truly authoritative source is in fact the *SHM*, especially in §§1-51. 3. Having been fixed early on, all differences from that fixed genealogy are simply errors made out of ignorance and have no further significance. When sources disagree with *SHM* §§1-51, it is the editor's job to call them on the carpet about their error and restore the correct form so as not to mislead the unwary. Underlying these three assumptions is a reflection theory of genealogy: that genealogies reflect a pre-existing reality and that the genealogists are important to that reflection only in being either clean and flat mirrors reflecting the reality without distortion or being dusty and warped mirrors distorting that reality. I will call this set of assumptions "Secret History fundamentalism."

Before I go further, let me give a few more examples of how "Secret History fundamentalism" works. As is well known there is a long genealogy from Börte Chino'a "the Blueish-Grey Wolf" to Dobun Mergen. A parallel to the *SHM*'s version is preserved in the Tibetan "Red Annals" (*Debter Marbó* or *Hulan Debter*)<sup>6</sup> where it is attributed to a Mongolian source, the *Yeke Tobchiyan* "Great History." Another citation comes from Rashīd al-Dīn's *Ghazanid History*. Now in the fourth generation from Börte Chino'a, these two sources have Khyi-ji Mer-mkhan in the Tibetan and Qījū Mergen in the Persian. Both spellings are quite stable in the mss and, taking into account transcriptional and Mongolian linguistic variation, are certainly identical. This identity has not been recognized, however, because every translation of Rashīd al-Dīn so far, and even the most recent Persian edition, has "corrected" the Qījū Markān of the actual manuscripts to the *SHM*'s Qorichar Mergen.<sup>7</sup> Meanwhile, Roerich's translation of the *Blue Annals*, which cites the *Debter Marbó* genealogy, likewise conforms the Tibetan to the *SHM*, putting Qorichar Mergen in brackets as the name intended. In the same way, in a later name in the genealogy, the Tibetan and Persian versions' consistent Qachu (Kha-chu~Qājū) was altered in all versions to conform to the *SHM*'s Qarchu.<sup>8</sup> So because everyone

6 For Tibetan names in the text, I adopt a transcription based on the Mongolian system, but with the vowels and initial ng- left unchanged. This result is relatively consistent with the reading in Amdo dialects. Where k, t, c, p, and ts have been changed to g, d, j, b, and dz, I add an acute accent (´) to the following vowel. Where z, and zh have been changed to s and sh, I have added a grave accent (`).

7 Smirnova, pp. 9, 10; Thackston, I, p. 114, 115; *Blue Annals*, p. 57. Rawshan and Mūsawī's Persian edition has Qurīchar Margān (vol. I, p. 218, l. 15, p. 219, l. 11), although the mss actually read Qījū Markān (see critical apparatus on vol. IV, pp. 1644).

8 Smirnova, p. 10; Thackston, I, p. 115; *Blue Annals*, p. 57. Again Rawshan and Mūsawī's Persian edition has Qārchū (vol. I, p. 219, l. 14; cf. apparatus on vol. IV, p. 1644), even

“knew” that there is *one* genealogy of the Mongols and it is reflected infallibly only in the *SHM*, the evidence of a consistent and consistently *different* genealogy had to be edited out of existence.

Another, older, example of such editorial alteration occurs in the *Record of the Campaigns of Chinggis Khan* (*Shengwu qinzheng lu* 聖武親征錄), written in the time of Qubilai Qa’an. That work has a parallel to the text as found in the *SHM* §179 cited above, with Seche Beki and Tayichu as sons of Bartan Ba’atur.<sup>9</sup> The *Record of the Campaigns of Chinggis Khan* is a later abridgment of the *Veritable Records* used as a source for the Basic Annals (*benji* 本紀) in the *Yuan shi* 元史 (hereafter *YS*), so this passage was also incorporated into the *Yuan shi* in 1370. But as the *YS* was being composed, an editor noticed that this contradicted the genealogy (to be discussed below) that the compilers were adding to the *YS*. Evidently disturbed by this inconsistency, the early Ming editors changed one character in the Chinese translation to make Bartan Ba’atur 八兒壇·拔都 into Barqaq Ba’atur 八兒合·拔都. “Barqaq Ba’atur,” however, is an entirely new name. Outside of this disputed passage, the sources always have Ökin Barqaq or Bartan Ba’atur, never Barqaq Ba’atur. Later still, as copies of the *Record of the Campaigns of Chinggis Khan* circulated in Ming manuscript, copyists noticed that making these two the sons of Bartan Ba’atur was “wrong,” so they followed the *YS* in making the name Barqaq Ba’atur. Only two mss survive giving, not the correct version, but a compromise version. Unable to decide between Bartan and Barqaq, they left it just as Bar-Ba’atur 八兒·拔都!<sup>10</sup>

As I hope these examples show, the variations in pre-Chinggisid genealogy are too complex to be captured by “Secret History fundamentalism.” In this paper I will show that over the history of the Mongol empire that at least six different written genealogies circulated and that none of them was accepted as the final authoritative word. I will proceed from the most recent one, the *Genealogical Record of the Ten*

though all the mss read Qālī Qājū or something clearly derived from it, e.g. Qālī Qājīr or Qālī Qāhū.

9 That the original was Bartan Ba’atur is demonstrated by the parallel in Rashīd al-Dīn which has Bartān Bahādūr (Smirnova, p. 130; Thackston, I, p. 189; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 391, l. 10).

10 This passage will be discussed in my forthcoming critical edition of the *Shengwu qinzheng lu*. The two manuscripts are the Zheng manuscript preserved in the National Library of China in Beijing under catalogue no. 6109/614; see Beijing tushuguan shanben bu 北京圖書館善本部, ed., *Beijing tushuguan shanben shumu* 北京圖書館善本書目, vol. 2, p. 30b; Beijing tushuguan 北京圖書館, ed., *Beijing tushuguan guji shanben shumu: Shi bu* 北京圖書館古籍善本書目·史部, p. 335. This was used by Jia Jingyan 賈敬顏 as his base text for his 1979 study of the *Shengwu qinzheng lu*; the passage on Bartan/Barqaq Ba’atur is in *SWQZL[J]*, vol. 2, p. 102b. The other manuscript is the one I call the Lu manuscript, preserved in the in the Seikadō Bunko 靜嘉堂文庫 library in Tokyo (no. 655-98); see Tetsuji Morohashi 諸橋轍次, *Seikadō Bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku* 靜嘉堂文庫漢籍分類目錄 (Tokyo: Seikadō Bunko, 1930), p. 250. *SWQZL[W]*, pp. 54a/113, had no access to these mss and simply repeated the later mss’ form of 八兒哈·拔都.

*Ancestors*, produced in the second quarter of the fourteenth century, back to what is the shortest one and likely to be the oldest, cited occasionally in Rashīd al-Dīn, but always rejected.

### THE “GENEALOGICAL RECORD OF THE TEN ANCESTORS”

Yuan era sources preserve two genealogies of the Mongol imperial house, one in chapter 107 of the *YS* and the other the “Genealogy of the Imperial House of the Great Yuan” (*Da Yuan zongshi shixi* 大元宗室世系) in the first chapter of the *Nancun chuogeng lu* 南村輟耕錄 (“Nancun’s Notes Upon Rest from the Plow”), Tao Zongyi’s 陶宗儀 1366 miscellany.<sup>11</sup> Alongside these two extant genealogies, there is also reference to the name of two other genealogies: 1) the “Imperial Genealogy” 帝系篇 (*Dixipian*) chapter in the 1329-1331 *Jingshi dadian* 經世大典 (“Great Statutes for the Administration of the Age”) encyclopedia<sup>12</sup>; and 2) the undated “Genealogical Record of the Ten Ancestors” (*Shizu shixi lu* 十祖世襲錄).<sup>13</sup> How are these different sources and titles related?

Let us consider the interrelations of the two extant Yuan texts first. As was already noticed by Pelliot, the *YS*’s chapter 107 obviously derives from a common source with the “Genealogy of the Imperial House of the Great Yuan” in Tao’s *Nancun chuogeng lu*.<sup>14</sup> The genealogies in both works cover the imperial family beginning with Tobun (=Dobun) Mergen and his widow Alan Gho’a’s supernatural conception up to the last emperor of the Yuan Toghan-Temür (Shundi 順帝, r. 1332-1370), his heir apparent Ayushiridara, and even Ayushiridara’s infant son. (Both omit the ten or so generations before Dobun Mergen given in both the *SHM* and the *Ghazanid History*, a point I will return to later.) The branches of Chinggis Qan’s brothers and sons appear to be included in as full fashion as information would permit, and the various lineages stemming from the rulers before Chinggis Qan’s father Yisükei are also briefly noted.

For the pre-Chinggisid period, the genealogies in the *YS* 107 and the “Genealogy of the Imperial House of the Great Yuan” are identical and use a unique set of often obscure Chinese characters, seemingly chosen for their mnemonic value and distinct from the set used by any other history or transcription project, such as the Qubilai Qa’an-era *Shengwu qinzheng lu* or even elsewhere in the genealogy.<sup>15</sup>

11 Tao Zongyi, a Yuan loyalist, was also the one who preserved the *Shengwu qinzheng lu* in his 70 fascicle (*juan*) *Shuofu* anthology.

12 See the introduction to the chapter in *YWL[SC]*, 40/6a-b; *YWL[CP]*, 40/530. As I will argue, the actual contents of the chapter are found in *YS* 107, beginning with the generation of Chinggis Qan or his father.

13 See *YS* 107/2729; cf. Louis Hambis, with notes by Paul Pelliot, *Le Chapitre CVII du Yuan che*. Supplement to *T’oung Pao*, vol. 38 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1945), p. 144.

14 Compare *NCCGL*, 1/1-8 to *YS* 107/2705-2729. See Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, pp. 1-2.

15 See Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 1.

Characteristic features of this new system include: the use of *miē* 咩 “bleat” for Mongolian *-me-*, 拏 *ná* “to grasp” for Mongolian *-no-*, 篤 *dǔ* “deep” for medial and final *-tu*, 直 *zhí* “straight” for Mongolian *chi-*, 急 *jí* “urgent” for Mongolian *-gi-*, 寒 *hán* “cold” for Mongolian *qan*, and 葛 *gě* (a Chinese surname) for Mongolian *qa-*. While this distinctive transcription system cannot be directly dated, it seems to fit with the trend after 1315 or so to use increasingly obscure Chinese characters to transcribe Mongolian names. This bookish new transcription system is found only in the pre-Chinggisid parts of the genealogy.

Strikingly this transcription system is also used in the pre-Chinggisid narratives found in pp. 1-3 of the first chapter (*juan*) of the *YS*.<sup>16</sup> The character transcriptions for all the names found in both the genealogies and in chapter 1 of the *YS* match. Moreover the name of Monulun 莫挈倫, absent from the genealogy in *YS* 107, is transcribed in chapter 1 with the same rare and distinctive character set as in the genealogies.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, both the genealogy and the *YS* chapter 1 stand out from other accounts of the pre-Chinggisid period by beginning not with Börte Chino’a, the Mongols’ mythical Blue Wolf ancestor, but with Tobun Mergen and Alan Gho’a. The genealogies also imply, and chapter 1 of the *YS* explicitly states, that Alan Gho’a had not five but three sons, of whom only one, Bodonchar, was born miraculously. (All other extant accounts of Alan Gho’a say she had two children by natural birth, and three supernatural sons.) And finally, unlike many other sources, both the *YS*’s pre-Chinggisid genealogy and its chapter 1 narrative make Monulun to be not the mother of Qaidu Qan, but his grandmother.<sup>18</sup> One must conclude therefore that the pre-Chinggisid narratives in the *YS* stem, at least in outline, from the same Chinese-language text that formed the source for the pre-Chinggisid genealogy in Tao Zongyi and the *YS* chapter 107. Moreover, if it was used as a source for the *YS* chapter 1, the further conclusion can be drawn that this genealogical source, undoubtedly translated from Mongolian into Chinese, must have had some fairly long narrative notes appended to the family tree.

One of the concluding notes appended to the *YS*’s chapter 107 gives the name of a genealogical source with narrative sections on the pre-Chinggisid period:

According the “Genealogical Record of the Ten Ancestors” (*Shizu shixi lu* 十祖世襲錄) it says: ‘When the Initial Ancestor (*Shizu* 始祖) Bodonchar 孛端叉兒 took over the civilian households of the Tünggilig Quru’u 統忽里·忽魯 clansmen, he also then got a pregnant wife named Chajirai 插只來

16 See Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 1.

17 Note the 挈, which should be an error for 挈 found in the transcriptions

18 The genealogy and the *Yuan shi* chapter 1 also share a tendency to very unusual readings of lineage names. In the *YS* 1/2-3, in the story of Monulun (Nomulun in the Secret History), the name Jalayir is transcribed *Yalayir* 押刺伊而 while the Veritable Record (as seen in the *SWQL*) and other Qubilai-era sources consistently use *Zhalar* 札刺兒 for the same clan name. There is a similar divergence in the spelling of Tayichi’ud: *Dachouwutu* 大丑秃 in the genealogy vs. *Taichiwu* 泰赤烏 or 太赤兀 elsewhere.

and took her in. Because his mother was named Chajirai, the child she gave to birth after his father's death from then on was counted a different race and was also called Tatar 達鞑.' At present, because he was not the Initial Ancestor's actual begotten son, he has therefore not been entered into this 'Genealogical Table,' but only added as a line here.<sup>19</sup>

This story of Chajirai as we have it here is a slightly altered version of the story told in *SHM* §§38 and 40, although here it is connected with the genealogy of the Tatars, not with the Jadaran family of Chinggis's rival, Jamuqa. What is the relationship of the "Genealogical Record of the Ten Ancestors" (hereafter *GRTA*) mentioned in this note to the textual tradition represented by the *YS* 1 and the *YS* 107-*NCCGL* genealogy? Certainly the character transcriptions are consistent with each other. Bodonchar and Tünggilig Quru'u are both transcribed in this note in the same way as in *YS* 1; the name Bodonchar, at least, when found elsewhere is transcribed in a slightly different form.<sup>20</sup> In the name Chajirai (transcribed *Chazhilai* 插只來) the reading of the name, which derives from the lineage name Jadaran~Jajirad, is highly unusual and uses a character for *cha* 插 which is used nowhere elsewhere for transcription.<sup>21</sup> Finally the characters "Dadan" used for Tatar is very rare in Yuan sources, although it had been traditional in Chinese usage before then.<sup>22</sup> Since we know that source of the *YS* 107-*NCCGL* genealogy's section on the pre-Chinggisids was a genealogical-narrative account with a bookish and eccentric transcription system, and we also know that the *GRTA* was a genealogical-narrative account with more or less the same bookish and eccentric transcription system, it seems probable that the two are in fact one source. We can thus provisionally designate as the *GRTA* the combined body of genealogical-narrative information on the pre-Chinggisid ancestors as found in the relevant parts of *YS* 1, 107 and *NCCGL* 1.

Yet while the *GRTA*, understood in this expanded sense, thus seems to be the *ultimate* source for the pre-Chinggisid material in the *YS* 107-*NCCGL* genealogy, it cannot be the *direct* source for the whole *YS* 107 and the *NCCGL* genealogies. This is evident because both the *YS* 107 and the *NCCGL* genealogy have been abridged

19 *YS*, 107/2729; cf. Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 144.

20 See the *SHM* §24, etc., and *YS* 119/2945, in the biography of Bo'orchu, which have the character *cha* 察 "observe" for *cha* 叉 "stab." The latter passage derives from the biography of Bo'orchu's descendant Ös-Temür (Örlüg Noyan) written by Yan Fu of Gaotang (1236-1312; see *YS* 160/3772-74). The work is abridged in Su Tianjue 蘇天爵, ed., *Yuanchao mingchen shilue* 元朝名臣史略, pp. 41-43, and found in full in *YWL[SC]*, 23/3b-9a.

21 The lineage name is transcribed in the *SWQZL* as *Zhadalan* 札荅蘭 and in the *SHM* as *Zhadaran* 札荅舌蘭 or *Zhazhiradai* 札只舌刺歹.

22 See e.g. Ouyang Xiu, ed. Xu Wudang, *Xin Wudai shi* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), 74/911ff. The characters and term "Dadan" for Mongol *Tatar* was in effect banned under Mongol rule, but only because the Mongols disliked being called Tatars. Using these disapproved characters for an illegitimate child who gave birth to Chinggis Qan's rival Jamuqa would not run afoul of this ban.

in the exact same way from the whole body of information found in the *GRTA* (as witnessed by the *YS*, chapter 1 material and the note in chapter 107), eliminating, for example, all mention of Chajirai, of Mother Monolun, and so on. Thus, although the *YS* editors had the *GRTA* in front of them in order to cite from it in the concluding note, they must have been satisfied with their intermediate source's abridgment, and apart from the final note cited above, considered that the intermediate source gave all the important information which they needed to transmit to posterity.

How far down the family tree from the "Initial Ancestor" Bodonchar did the *GRTA* go? The text's name, referring to the "ten ancestors" (*shizu* 十祖) indicates that it covered only the pre-Chinggisid period; Bodonchar was reckoned as Chinggis Qan's tenth-generation ancestor.<sup>23</sup> Thus the *GRTA* cannot have included material past Chinggis Qan. Since, however, the commonality of the *YS* 107-*NCCGL* genealogy extends far beyond Chinggis into many subsequent generations, they must depend for the later section on a different common source. Here the *Jingshi dadian* ("Great Statutes for the Administration of the Era"), comes into play. This encyclopedia of Yuan-era institutions was compiled by Yu Ji 虞集 and Zhao Shiyan 趙世延 from 1329 to 1331.<sup>24</sup> It contained a chapter on the "Imperial Genealogy" (*Dixipian* 帝系篇) as well as one on the "Annual Stipends for the Kinsmen and Affines" (*Zongqin suici* 宗親歲賜); since the annual stipends were paid to members of the imperial family, this chapter too was a storehouse of genealogical information. Unfortunately, only the prefaces for the two chapters are extant, as found in the *Yuan wen lei* 元文類, an anthology of Yuan literature.<sup>25</sup> However, the *Jingshi dadian* formed the basis for most of the "Treatises" in the *YS* (composed in 1369-1370), and since chapter 95, on "annual stipends" in the *YS* was indeed based on the *Jingshi dadian* one might assume that the chapter 107, which is a genealogy of the *YS* in table form, gives us an abridgment, at least, of the "Imperial Genealogy" chapter in the *Jingshi dadian*. Indeed a note to the *YS*'s chapter 107 shows that the compilers for that chapter did routinely check outside information they collected against the *Jingshi dadian*'s "Imperial Genealogy" and "Annual Stipends for the Kinsmen and Affines" chapters.<sup>26</sup>

There are, however, sufficient reasons to believe that the "Imperial Genealogy" chapter, like the *GRTA*, was incorporated into the *YS* 107 genealogy indirectly, not directly:

- 1) As we have seen, for the pre-Chinggisid genealogy a different source, the *GRTA*, was used. Since the *NCCGL* and *YS* 107 genealogies both link

23 *YS* 1/1.

24 The full text of all the *Jingshi dadian*'s chapter prefaces and of some of the chapters is given in *YWL[SC]*, *juàn* 40-42. The contents of the chapters are also preserved in the treatises (*zhi* 志) of the *Yuan shi* which in most cases are simply abridgements of the corresponding chapters in the *Jingshi dadian*.

25 *YWL[SC]*, 40/6a-b; *YWL[CP]*, 40/530; the preface to the record of the annual stipends of princes is in *YWL[SC]*, 40/23a-b; *YWL[CP]*, 40/541-42.

26 *YS* 107/2717; cf. Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 73.

the same two sources and in the same way, their identity should be the result of literary dependence. (It is unlikely that two persons would first chose the same two sources and then link them up in exactly the same way.)

2) The two genealogies both continue up to the very end of the Yuan dynasty, decades after the compilation of the *Jingshi dadian*. However, other chapters in the *YS* that were derived purely from the *Jingshi dadian*, not least the *YS*'s chapter 95 on annual stipends, show no sign of updating.<sup>27</sup>

3) In the *YS 107-NCCGL* genealogy the imperial list and other lines have been updated in almost exactly the same way through the reign of Toghan-Temür. This includes material on the Golden Horde, which can be dated precisely. Both source mention only Jani-Beg among Özbeg Qan's sons in the Golden Horde. This must be derive from information about his succession to the Golden Horde's throne, which took place in 1342, well after the compilation of the *Jingshi dadian*.<sup>28</sup> Updating of the *Jingshi dadian* material also occurred through dropping names; the Annual Stipends chapter includes Qubilaid princes not found in the *YS 107-NCCGL* genealogy: Qadan, Alughuichaq, and Qorchi.<sup>29</sup> One may assume that these were young princes who died early on and so were deleted from the genealogy.

4) The transcription system again gives useful information on the origin of the texts. The stipend list uses a number of transcriptions, which while lacking the particular obscure characters of the *GRTA* are different from those found elsewhere. Thus for Belgütei we have *Bolugudai* 孛魯古斛(~歹)<sup>30</sup> not the more usual *Bieligutai* 別里古台, for Temüge Odchigin we have *Wozhen Nayan* 斡真那顏, not *Tiemuge Wochijin* 鐵木哥斡赤斤, for Cha'adai, we have *Chahedai* 茶合斛(~歹), not *Chahetai* 察合台, and for

27 The chapter 95 was based on a series of lists of annual disbursements, the most complete of which was from 1319 (i.e. Yanyou, year 6; see e.g. *YS 95/2412* and *passim*). There are only a few notes from 1324-1326 (*YS 95/2417, 2419*) and from 1328 (*YS 95/2422, 2444*), and none from after that time. The basic form of the stipend list dating from the reign of Ayurbarwada Buyantu Qa'an (1311-1320) was left unchanged; Buyantu's Qa'an and his line is thus absent from this list of princes, while we do see related lines, e.g. those of Jingim's eldest son Gammala, and from Ayurbarwada's brother Amuga and nephew Qoshila (*YS 95/2420-21*).

28 On Jani-Beg (*Zhanibie* 札尼別), see *YS 107/2715* and *NCCGL, 1/3*. His succession to Özbeg is mentioned in *YS 117/2906*; this account of Jochi's house uses the same characters as that in *YS 107-NCCGL* and undoubtedly derives from the same source.

29 See *YS 95/2421-22*. That they are of the Qubilaid family is deduced from their placement in the genealogy, after Qoshila Qutuqtu/Mingzong and before Aradnashiri the Prince of Yu (Henan) who was a descendant of A'uruqchi, Qubilai's seventh son.

30 *Dai* in the simplified form 歹 alternates with the complex form 斛.

Kölgen we have *Kuoliejian* 闊列堅 not *Guoligan* 果里干. The forms in Tao Zongyi's text differ in all these cases from the stipend list, but the stipend list's forms for Belgütei, Odchigin Noyan, and Kölgen are added in as alternatives. The *YS* 107 genealogy adopts sometimes one and sometimes the other form.<sup>31</sup> These facts and especially the use of double forms indicate that Tao's genealogy was sewn together from two different sources with differing transcription systems. One is clearly that used in the *Jingshi dadian*, while the other is different. The two source overlapped only in the genealogy of Chinggis's brothers and sons (and possibly in Ögedei's son Qashi-Qashidai).

Together these arguments add up to a strong case that the common source for the *YS* 107-*NCCGL* genealogy was sewn together from two Chinese-language sources, one the *GRTA* material and the other the *Jingshi dadian* genealogy. The *GRTA* material extended from Bodonchar to Chinggis Qan and his brothers and sons. The *Jingshi dadian* source extended from Chinggis's father Yisükei to 1328. Sometime after 1342, an editor linked the two genealogical sources together, eliminated most of the narrative sections in the *GRTA*, corrected the transcriptions of a few well-known figures, and updated the *Jingshi dadian* material to reflect changes through middle of Toghhan-Temür Uqa'atu Qa'an's reign (1332-1370).

Could this compiler have been Tao Zongyi himself? It seems impossible. No matter how diligent a private scholar he might have been, it appears very unlikely that someone away from the court would have the knowledge to insert, for example, Jani-Beg as the successor of Özbek in the far away Golden Horde, a figure nowhere else mentioned anywhere in Yuan literature. Nor would a private compilation have had sufficient authority to be cited in the *YS*. Even though Tao's friend Song Lian 宋濂 headed the *YS* editorial committee, the *YS* compilers appear to have disregarded the abundant biographical information in the *Nancun chuogeng lu*, preferring to stick to official sources.<sup>32</sup> Certainly they would have had the same caution about using a private source for something as official as the imperial genealogy. Moreover, comparison of the *YS* 107 and *NCCGL* texts show some shared misprints, but many more cases in which the *NCCGL* text has unique corruptions and omissions. It thus seems hard to envision it as being the basis of the *YS* text.<sup>33</sup> Instead the basis

31 *NCCGL*, 1/4, 3; cf. *YS* 95/2413, 2415. In the *NCCGL*, the extant text has *Quebiejian* 缺別堅 as the alternative form. *Bie* 別 is easily and certainly emended to *lie* 列. In the case of Ögedei's son Qashi(dai) the *Yuan shi* editors adopted characters Heshi 合失 used in the *Jingshi dadian*'s stipend list, while Tao left a different transcription Hexidai 合昔歹; see *YS* 107/2718, 95/2416 and Tao, *Nancun chuogeng lu*, 1/5.

32 Mote, *T'ao Tsung-i*, p. 153.

33 Examples of shared corruptions are the transcription of Menen Tudun as *Miema dudun* 咩麻篤敦 (for *Mienian Dudun* 咩撚篤敦, probably via the *Mieli Dudun* 咩歷篤敦 of the Ming era Guozijian printing) and the descendants of Uru'ud lineage (descendants of Nachin) as *Wuchawu* 兀察兀 (for *Wuluwu* 兀魯兀); see the comments in Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 10. An example of additional misprints in the *NCCGL* text is the transcription of

was most likely a Chinese-language imperial genealogy dating to shortly after 1342, perhaps originally entitled with the name Tao Zongyi gave to his version of it: “Genealogy of the Imperial House of the Great Yuan” (*Da Yuan zongshi shixi* 大元宗室世系).

In summary, then, we find two pre-1342 Chinese-language genealogies in the Yuan dynasty. One, compiled as the “Imperial Genealogy” chapter of the *Jingshi dadian* in 1329-1331, covered the imperial family from Chinggis Qan’s father Yisükei to around 1328 at the latest, and was probably linked to a list of recipients of imperial stipends. Another, probably translated directly from Mongolian into Chinese and given the name “Genealogical Record of the Ten Ancestors” (*GRTA*), covered the Mongols from Bodonchar to Chinggis Qan and his sons. Both must have derived originally from Mongolian-language genealogies. The *GRTA* was translated by a learned eccentric, familiar with classical texts and with a predilection for showing off his knowledge of obscure characters. Its transcription system was certainly post-Qubilai, and probably from the mid-Yuan, c. 1310-1340.<sup>34</sup> Some-

the name of the Yörkin lineage (descended from Ökin Barqaq); it is transcribed correctly as the *Yuelijin* 岳里斤 in the *Yuan shi*, but incorrectly as *Yuesijin* 岳斯斤 in the *NCCGL*. In one case, an original misprint shared by both was compounded in the *NCCGL* printing. Ökin-Barqaq’s name must originally have been transcribed as *Wojin-Balahaha* 斡斤八剌哈哈, but the original *wō* 窩 was turned into *kē* 窠, making it *Kejin Balahaha* 窠斤八剌哈哈 in all extant copies of the *YS*; see Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 17. In the *NCCGL*, the name was further distorted when the *kē* 窠 character was disaggregated vertically into two characters, *dí* 笛 and *bù* 不, making the original *Wojin-Balahaha* into *Dibujin-Balahaha* 笛不斤八剌哈哈! The 1959 Zhonghua shuju edition of the *NCCGL* (reprinted 1997) which I have used is based on the *Wujin* 武進 edition of 1923, which in turn was based on the first 1366 edition; most if not all of the misprints thus must go back to the 1366 edition, which Frederick Mote described thus: “The characters are irregular in size and spacing and often unorthodox in form, the text is not accurate and the appearance leaves much to be desired” (Mote, *T’ao Tsung-i*, p. 115). On the editions of *NCCGL*, see Mote *T’ao Tsung-i*, pp. 114-22, and p. 1 of the preface to Zhonghua shuju edition.

The *YS* 107 genealogy is considerably more complete than the *NCCGL*. Sometimes this looks like updating; adding, for example, a fifth generation to the descendants of Jochi-Qasar, or a fourth generation to the descendants of Qachi’un. Elsewhere it seems whole chunks of genealogy were omitted from Tao’s collection; he includes, for example, only the two eldest of the eight sons of Temüge Odchigin listed in the *Yuan shi*. In other cases a generation has been lost; for example, in the line of Qashidai, the *NCCGL* jumps directly from Qaidu’s son Chabar to the Prince of Runing 汝寧 “Hulatai 忽刺台,” while the *Yuan shi* inserts a Prince of Runing 汝寧, Öljei-Temür in between. There is one case in which we find the *NCCGL* has preserved names lost in the *YS*, chapter 107. In the line of Qubilai’s fifth son Hükerchi, for example, *YS* 107/2725 preserves only the name of his son Esen-Temür, while *NCCGL* 1/7 also lists two sons of Esen-Temür.

34 Can we fix the latest possible date? Let us assume that the material common to *YS* 107 and Tao’s text derives from a single text. In that case, it should ante-date 1353, before a second son was born to the reigning emperor Toghan-Temür, since Tao Zongyi’s version gives only one son for Toghan-Temür (*NCCGL*, 1/7 and *YS* 107/2729). Tao Zongyi presumably simply copied the original text in 1366 without supplementing it and so listed

time after 1342, these two texts and other pieces of genealogical knowledge were merged into a single Chinese-language genealogical text. Copies of this text must have been rare, since the version used by both Tao Zongyi and the *YS* compilers already shared some textual corruptions. The *YS* compilers must have had access to both the new combined pre- and post-Chinggisid genealogy as well as its sources: the original *GRTA* and the *Jingshi dadian* genealogy. Finding virtually all the genealogical links of the *GRTA* incorporated into the larger genealogy, they mostly ignored the *GRTA*. Only in a single note did the editors reference a piece of narrative found in the *GRTA* but missing from the combined genealogy. The *YS* editors did use the *GRTA*'s narrative notes, however, to fill in the record of the pre-Chinggisid ancestors in the beginning of the *YS*. Several of the *GRTA*'s narrative notes were thus used to build up the narrative of the pre-Chinggisid period that begins chapter 1 of the *YS*.

A translation of the attested contents of the *GRTA*, the last imperial-period pre-Chinggisid genealogy, is presented in the appendix with notes on textual divergences.

### THE YEKE TOBCHIYAN

A second genealogy, probably dating from the earlier half of the reign of Temür Öljeitü Qa'an (1294-1307), is documented in the genealogy of the Mongol imperial lineage found in three Tibetan histories of the Yuan and post-Yuan period. These histories summarize the genealogy of the Mongol khans from the mythical ancestor Borte Chino'a up to the end of the Mongol dynasty. Unlike the *GRTA*, therefore, but like the *SHM*, these Tibetan histories have a "two stage" genealogical construct with an earlier phase from Borte Chino'a to Dobun (=Tobun) Mergen and then a later stage from Dobun Mergen's widow Alan Gho'a to Chinggis Khan. However, the actual genealogy of the "first stage" is rather different from that of the *SHM*, having only nine generations, not twelve, and different names at several points. The genealogy from Alan Gho'a to Chinggis Khan is reported very skeletally, and the names seem very close to the *SHM*, but with one possible difference.

The earliest of the three histories is the *Debter marbó* ("Red History"), written by Gúnga Dorje (1309-1364) of the Tsalbá monastic order.<sup>35</sup> Gúnga Dorje's genealogy is repeated with only a few changes and additions in the work popularly known as the *Ja-Bod yigtsang chenmo* ("Great Sino-Tibetan Archives") by Báljor-Sàngbó. Báljor-Sàngbó, writing in 1434, deletes many of the more intriguing passages of the *Debter marbó* but adds other pieces of information; it is difficult to say if his additional information, such as a full list of all twelve of Qubilai Qa'an's sons, for example, stems from fresh access to Gúnga Dorje's Mongolian source, or some other

only one son, while the *YS* editors further supplemented the source with information they had collected later.

35 See "*Ulaan dewter*," pp. 59-62; *Deb-ther dmar-po*, pp. 28-30. A Chinese translation is in Caiba Gongge Duojie/Chen and Zhou, pp. 23-25.

work.<sup>36</sup> The *Debter ngonbó* or “Blue History,” completed in 1478 by the translator Shònnubál (1392-1481) summarizes the information in the “Red History,” but without adding any new pieces of information.<sup>37</sup> In all three sources, the names have undergone significant corruption, and critical editions unfortunately do not exist as yet for any of them, although Demchigmaa’s valuable study assembles much of the documentation. Still, comparison of the published texts with each other and the known Mongolian equivalents makes the probable original forms fairly clear.<sup>38</sup>

Even without an explicit statement, one might guess that this information comes from a Mongolian source, but fortunately Gúnga Dorje actually names his source for us. After summarizing the genealogy up through the sons of Qubilai Qa’an and some of the grandsons of Cha’adai and Ögedei, he writes: “From the copy of the important lineage drawn from the *Ye-ga thob-cen*,” that is, the *Yeke tobchiyan* or “Great History.”<sup>39</sup> This note follows an account of Qubilai Qa’an’s reign with his sons and the length of the Zhongtong 中統 (1260-1263) and the Zhiyuan (1264-1294) reign periods. Whatever this *Yeke tobchiyan* was that he used, it covered the Mongol imperial genealogy through Qubilai’s time, and presumably dates from shortly after that reign, that is, during the time of his grandson Temür Öljeitü Qa’an.<sup>40</sup>

What can we say about the date, form, and coverage of this *Yeke tobchiyan*? That the note about the *Yeke tobchiyan* in the *Debter marbó* is placed after a reckoning of

36 *rGya-Bod yig-tshang*, pp. 254-256; cf. *Han-Zang shiji*, pp. 137-39.

37 *The Blue Annals*, pp. 57-58.

38 The most obvious form of corruption is the omission of syllables and/or the erroneous placement of the *shad* that is used to separate names in the genealogical lists. Thus Ba’i-shing-khor Dog-shing is divided by a *shad* into Ba’i-shing and Khor-dog-shing in the *Debter marbó*. In the *Ja-Bod yigtsang chenmo*, the first *shing* and following *shad* is omitted and it is one name, but with a syllable missing: *sBi’a-khor-dog-shing*. Another particularly characteristic corruption is the handling of the initial *B-* in Mongolian names. In the versions found in the published texts, this has three forms: *sB-*, *Bh-*, or *B’-*. It seems clear that these variants all go back to one form, which has been miscopied in various places. While the *Bh-* form is clearly secondary, it is hard to decide if the *sB-* or the *B’-* form is primary. The *a chung* (transcribed as ’) is used in later Tibetan transcriptions to represent long vowels in modern Mongolian, but Middle Mongolian does not have phonemic vowel length. Another possibility is that the *sB* is used to represent a voiced initial consonant, where *B-* alone would become aspirate. Other copyists’ errors in the list, such as *l-* for *a-* (*a-chen*), *p-* for *y-*, or *Ga’i-~Ga-si* for *Ga-bi-*, are fairly obvious.

39 *’Di-nams ye-ka thob-cen-nas gal-che rim bshus-pa-nas* in Demchigmaa, “Ulaan dewter,” p. 62; *Deb-ther dmar-po*, p. 30, gives *dpe-ka thob-chen* “Thob-chen pamphlet” for *ye-ka thob-cen* and *rigs* for *rim*; cf. Caiba Gongge Duoje/Chen and Zhou, p. 25. I would like to thank Elliot Sperling for his assistance in translating this sentence (email, February 20, 2007).

40 What follows this note in the *Debter marbó* is simply a list of the khans with their reign years, followed by a detailed account of the fall of the dynasty. Since these stories post-date Gúnga-Dorje’s death, a continuator must have added from the stories told by clerics returning from the Yuan capital of Daidu (modern Beijing).

the grandson of Chinggis Qan, and after Qubilai Qa'an's reign indicates that the history was written during his successor's reign, that of Temür Öljeitü Qa'an, and covered material up to that reign. In form, the material from the *Yeke tobchiyan* as we have it in the *Debter marbó* superficially most resembles the *Altan debter* of Rashīd al-Dīn (on which more later) and the late-Yuan *GRTA*: a genealogy of the Mongol imperial family, with brief narrative comments appended. Yet the Tibetan account has all the appearance of being only a very brief summary of a much longer work. If much narrative material had been stripped away, then the original *Yeke tobchiyan* would be more similar to the *SHM* in form: a history with genealogical material contained within it.

Confirmation that this *Yeke tobchiyan* was indeed a Mongolian-language source and that it contained many more narratives than are given in the Tibetan summaries is given by what must be a reference to it in Rashīd al-Dīn's *Ghazanid History*. As I will discuss below, Rashīd al-Dīn's three main written genealogical sources were "one-stage" genealogies that began with Alan-Gho'a and did not include the pre-Alanid genealogy from Börte Chino'a. Yet he also has a brief account of the pre-Alanid period which he ascribes to Turco-Mongolian historians. He begins his account of the pre-Dobun Bayan-Alan Gho'a section thus:

Trustworthy historians of the Turks (*muvarrikhān-i atrāk-i šādiq al-qawl*) report that all the Mongol tribes are descended from the two persons who went into Arkūneh-Qūn. One of those who emerged from there was an important commander, a leader and chief of tribes, Būrteh-Chineh by name from whom Dübün Bāyān, Alān-Qū'a's husband, and several other clans were descended. He had many wives and sons. By his chief wife, Qūay-Marāl, he had a son, the most important of his sons, who attained rulership. His name was \*Batajī-Qā'an.<sup>41</sup> He had a son named Tamāj, who succeeded his father. This Tamāj had five sons, the eldest of whom was named Qījū<sup>42</sup> Markān, and who succeeded his father. It is related that the other four sons wanted to leave their place for other territories, but there was a branch of the river in the way. They gathered much dry dung and constructed a thing like a raft, which here [i.e. in Iran] they call *kalak* ["raft" in Persian], got on it, crossed the river, and entered other territories. They say that the Dürbān

41 His name is given a T?jī-Qān in the Tashkent ms and Yatajī-Qīān in the Istanbul ms. Qā'an should be correct, since the understanding of the suffix as meaning *Qa'an* or emperor, is the reason for Rashīd al-Dīn's comment that he "attained rulership." For the Persian transcription of Mongolian I use a fairly close transliteration.

42 This name is give as such in the Istanbul, Paris, and Oriental Institute Library mss and is not in doubt. (The version Qīhū found in the Tashkent, Saltykov-Shchedrin Library and London mss is the result simply of an omission of a diacritical dot.) As I mentioned, under the influence of "Secret History fundamentalism" it was unfortunately emended in all translations to Qorichar, thus obscuring the similarity to Khyi-ji Mer mkhan of the *Yeke Tobchiyan* citations.

tribe is descended from them because *dūrbān* means four, and they consist of four branches.<sup>43</sup>

Thereupon follows a genealogy decorated with a story, similar but not identical to that in the *SHM*, about how the Baya'ud came to be a "slave lineage" (*bandeh-i urugh*) of the imperial lineage, and a statement that the imperial lineage lived at the sources of the Onan (*Unān*), Kelüren (*Kilūrān*), and Tu'ula (*Tūghlā~Tūghleh*, from the Turkic version) rivers.<sup>44</sup>

The reference to the "trustworthy historians of the Turks" and "it is reported" indicate that we are dealing here with a single source, although whether oral or written is not stated. The material, both genealogical and narrative, is similar to that in the *SHM* but not identical. But the genealogy presented is identical to that of the *Yeke tobchiyan* (see the Table).<sup>45</sup> Since it is quite impossible that Rashīd al-Dīn directly used Tibetan sources or that Gūnga Dorje used Rashīd al-Dīn's history, one may assume the common information goes back to a common Mongolian source. The simplest explanation is that Rashīd al-Dīn here derived this account from the written *Yeke tobchiyan*, but not directly by reading a translation as with his other sources, but indirectly through having the information supplied to him by these "trustworthy historians of the Turks."

<i>SHM</i>	Tibetan translation of <i>Yeke Tobchiyan</i>	Rashīd al-Dīn's <i>GH</i>
Börte Chino'a	Bôr-ta-chi[-no]	Būrte-Chineh
Batachiqan	Bâ-dâ-chī-gan	T?jī-Qāān (A)~Yatajī-Qiān (S) < *Batajī-Qā'ān
Tamacha	Tham-chag	Tamāj

43 Thackston, I, p. 114-15; Smirnova, I.2, pp. 9-10; Rawshan and Mūsawī, pp. 218-19.

44 Thackston, I, p. 115; Smirnova, I.2, p. 10; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 219.

45 This similarity has been obscured by the tendency of editors and translators of both Rashīd al-Dīn and the Tibetan histories to distort the original forms to correspond to the Secret History ones. Thus the son of Tamacha is given in the manuscripts of Rashīd al-Dīn as *qījū* together with the Mongolian title *mergen* (the form *qīhū* is due simply to the omission of a dot). Smirnova and subsequent translators have compared this only to the *SHM*'s Qorichar Mergen (§2) and thus assumed *qījū* must somehow be a distortion for Qorichar (see Smirnova, p. 9; cf. Thackston, I, p. 114). The *Debter marbó*'s *Khyi-ji Mergan* nicely matches *qījū* (in Persian transcriptions of the Mongolian *j* and *ch* are not distinguished). Similarly with the son of Sem-Sa'uchi, the form *qālī qājū* in Rashīd al-Dīn and *Kha-chu~Kha-ju* in the Tibetan sources have been related only to Qarchu of the *SHM* (§§2-3), not to each other. Thus Smirnova in the Russian translation of the Persian, Thackston in the English translation of the Persian, and Roerich in the English translation of the Tibetan have all inserted a groundless *-r-* into Qachu~Qaju (see Smirnova, p. 10; cf. Thackston, I, p. 115; *The Blue Annals*, p. 57).

Qorichar Mergen	Khyi-ji Mer mkhan	Qījū (S, P, B) Markān
Aqujam Boro'ul	A'u-jam Bô-ro-'ol	Qūjam-Būghrūl (S, L, P, B)
Sali Qacha'u		
Yeke Nidūn	Yas-ka Ni-dun	Yikeh-Yīdūn (A) < Yikeh-*Nīdūn
Sem Sochi	Sems-za'o-ji	Sam-Sāūjī
Qarchu	Kha-chu	Qālī-Qājū
Borjigidai Mergen		
Torgholjin Bayan		
Dobun Mergen	Do-bun Mer-khan	Dūbūn Bāyān

**TABLE: THE PRE-ALAN GHO'A GENEALOGIES**

(Sigla for Rashīd al-Dīn's manuscripts is that of the Russian translation; see the brief list in the preface to Verkhovskii)

Linking this pre-Alanid section in Rashīd al-Dīn to the *Yeke tobchiyan* as a source adds several important pieces to our information on this source. First of all, it demonstrates that it cannot possibly date to after 1303, and probably well before then. Produced originally in East Asia, transportation of the work to Iran would have taken at least a year and it in use by 1304, when Rashīd al-Dīn completed his *Ghazanid History* before turning to the world history that would become the *Compendium of Chronicles*.

Moreover the opening section used by Rashīd al-Dīn has, as we have seen, several stories omitted from the Tibetan versions: the legend of the Mongols' ancestry in the cave of Ergūne-Qun, a etiological story of the origin of the Dörben, and the origin of the Baya'ud as a "slave lineage." With these stories included, the *Yeke tobchiyan* looks much more like the *SHM* in genre, despite the differences on specific names and episodes. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the *Yeke tobchiyan* is a *tobchiyan* "history" and not a *debter* "notebook." In the Mongolian language *tobchiyan* consistently designated narrative histories, while *debter* denoted notebooks or tables. (The use of *debter* to designate narrative sources is an unexplained peculiarity of Tibetan usage.) So the name too confirms that the *Yeke tobchiyan* was probably not a genealogical table, but a mixed genealogy and narrative history like the *SHM* in genre, although differing in the actual events.

Did Rashīd al-Dīn use this source only for the pre-Dobun material or more extensively? Such a question can only be answered by looking for parallels in accounts of later events. Since the Tibetan authors clearly added in statements of their own devising into the account summarizing the *Yeke tobchiyan*, it is important to identify only those statements which seem by their phrasing or content to have a

Mongolian original. Three statements stand out as being distinctive of this source (I have included only those ones found in both the *Debter marbó* and the *Ja-Bod yigtsang chenmo*):

- 1) After [Dobun Mergen] died, in the darkness (*nag-mo-la*) from Alan-Gho'a was born by the light of the sun and moon (*nyi-ma dang zla-ba'i zer*) Bodonchar Mungqag.<sup>46</sup>
- 2) On the 12<sup>th</sup> day of the seventh moon of the Fire Tiger year, in his sixty-first year, [Chinggis] ascended to heaven (*gnam-du gshegs-so*) in the Miñag Xia land.<sup>47</sup>
- 3) Because while the ruler [Chinggis] was still alive the two elder sons had presented letters (*yi-ge*) by which they would not struggle for the throne, they were made to administer lands on the right and left wing. Their younger brother Ögedei sat on the throne for six years . . . Because Tolui Noyan had not previously presented any letter, he struggled for the throne.<sup>48</sup>

Each one of these three statements has features that identify it as derived from a Mongolian language source (unlike some other comments which are clearly of Tibetan origin).

In all three cases, however, the parallels are closer with the *SHM* than with the *Ghazanid History*.

- 1) The reference to Alan Gho'a's birth by the light of the sun *and the moon* is found only the *SHM* §21: "by the beams of the sun and the moon" (*naran sara-yin kil-iyer*). By contrast Rashīd al-Dīn in the *Ghazanid History* does not refer to sun or moon at all, while in the *Shu'ab-i panjāneh*, the Mongolian heading for her page (presumably cited directly from the *Altan*

46 *De 'das rting, nag-mo-la a-lan khova-las nyi-ma dang zla-ba'i zer-las skyis-pa Bo-don-char mung-khag*; see "Ulaan dewter," p. 60; *Deb-ther dmar-po*, p. 29 (cf. Caiba Gongge Duojie/Chen and Zhou, p. 24); *rGya-Bod yig-tshang*, p. 254 (cf. *Han-Zang shiji*, p. 137).

47 *Me stag lo'i sngan-blo dang po'i tshes bcu-gnyis-la dgung-lo drug-cu-rtsa-gcig-ba Mi-nyag Gha-ru gnam-du gshegs*; see "Ulaan dewter," p. 60-61; *Deb-ther dmar-po*, p. 29 (cf. Caiba Gongge Duojie/Chen and Zhou, p. 24); *rGya-Bod yig-tshang*, p. 255 (cf. *Han-Zang shiji*, p. 138). The place of his death is variously given as *Mi-nyag-gha-ru* (Demchigmaa), *Mi-nyag-'ga'-ru* (*Deb-ther dmar-po*), and *Mi-nyag-gha'i-sa-char* (*rGya-Bod yig-tshang*).

48 *Rgyal-po rab-bshugs dus sras che-pa gnyis-kyis rgyal-sa mi rtsod-pa'i yi-ge byin-nas g.yas ru g.yon ru-la bskos. Nu-bo O-go-da'i rgyal-pos rgyal-sa lo-drug mdzad. . . To-lo no-yon-gyis sngar yi-ge mi byin-pas rgyal-sa-la brtsod-pa yod-cing*; see "Ulaan dewter," p. 61; *Deb-ther dmar-po*, p. 29 (cf. Caiba Gongge Duojie/Chen and Zhou, p. 24); *dPal-'byor bZang-po*, p. 255 (cf. *Han-Zang shiji*, p. 138).

*debter*) speaks of her as being born “from the beams of the sun” (*naran-u qili-dacha töregsed*), with no mention of the moon.<sup>49</sup>

2) The statement that Chinggis Qan “ascended to heaven” exactly parallels the *SHM* §268: “Chinggis Qa’an ascended to heaven” (*Chinggis Qa’an tenggeri-dür gharba*), but is not found in the *Ghazanid History*. A date is added along with a reference to the “Xia” (the Chinese name of the Tangut dynasty, which is Miñag in Tibetan), but the date differs from that in the *Ghazanid History*.<sup>50</sup>

3) Finally, the third passage is the only other source besides the *SHM* which explains the succession to Chinggis Qan as being due to irreconcilable conflicts of Jochi and Cha’adai, which left his third son Ögedei the throne, but with a later possibility of succession for his youngest son Tolui (see *SHM* §254-55). Despite citing a number of traditions, Rashīd al-Dīn generally follows the (quite absurd) argument initiated by Juvainī that the Mongols had a fixed rule of ultimogeniture, and that hence Tolui in some sense *should* have succeeded Chinggis Qan.<sup>51</sup>

Given that all three of these pieces of information are absent from the *Ghazanid History*, one can thus say fairly confidently that Rashīd al-Dīn did not use the *Yeke tobchiyan* extensively, but rather only for the pre-Alan Gho’a narrative.

Further information about the nature of this *Yeke tobchiyan*—and confirmation that Rashīd al-Dīn did not use it except for a small portion—may come from two passages in Chinese sources that refer to an unspecified *Tobchiyan*. The first is a

49 Zeki Velidi Togan, “The Composition of the History of the Mongols by Rashīd al-Dīn,” *Central Asiatic Journal*, vol. 7 (1962): p. 69, p. 70 n. 28.

50 As Elliot Sperling has pointed out to me (email, February 20, 2007), Tibetan sources regularly refer to the Miñag as Xia (spelled Gha, ‘Ga’, etc.) so this reference may or may not be derived from the Mongolian original. The exact death date for Chinggis Qan given here corresponds exactly with a passage—not derived from his Veritable Record—incorporated into the *Yuan shi*’s Basic Annals of Chinggis Qan and differs from Rashīd al-Dīn’s date of the 15th day of the seventh moon. See *YS* 1/25; Thackston, I, pp. 152, 263. The age follows the idea that Chinggis Qan was both born and died in a year of the pig, thus being sixty (Yang Weizhen) or seventy-two (Rashīd al-Dīn) at death. This appears to have been a notion of Qubilai’s (also born in the year of the pig) which was eliminated from official histories some time after his death.

51 See Verkhovskii, pp. 107-08 (cf. Smirnova, pp. 231, Verkhovskii, p. 8); Thackston, II, 384 (cf. pp. 261, 303-04); Rawshan and Mūsawī, pp. 784-85 (cf. pp. 537, 618-19); Juvaini/Boyle II, p. 549. The letter (*yi-ge*) here is the *möchelge* (Persian *mujilkā-mūjilkā*) frequently mentioned by Rashīd al-Dīn: a document given to the sovereign undertaking either general obedience to him and his line or else the accomplishment of some specific task. On the term, see *TMEN*, §370 (pp. 502-05), and for examples of its usage, see Thackston, II, pp. 408-09, 492, 545, 549, etc.; Verkhovskii, p. 138; Arends, pp. 39, 97, 100, etc.; Rawshan and Mūsawī, pp. 839, 1007, 1117, 1126, etc. See Subtelny on the “Binding Pledge.”

famous passage describing how two historians Yu Ji and Zhao Shiyan under the Yuan were denied access to several historical documents. Among them is said to have been a *Tobchiyan*, written in the “dynastic script” (*guoshu* 國書, i.e. the Pagbá or Square script) which incorporated “service records” (*shiji* 事蹟), or biographies, from “the Great Founder (i.e. Chinggis Qan) onwards” (*Taizu yilai* 太祖以來). This source contained “secret and privy matters” and was not to be circulated to the public.<sup>52</sup> This *Tobchiyan* could not have been the Veritable Records (*shilu* 實錄), which under the Yuan did not include biographical information, and had been open to Chinese historians. It might be the *SHM*, but it seems to have covered several reigns after Chinggis Qan, not just a brief continuation as in the *SHM*. Nor was the *SHM* written in the Square Script. The *Yeke tobchiyan* would fit perfectly this description, however. If so, this supplies us with the important information that it was written in the Tibetan-based Square Script, which may be why it was especially readable to Tibetan authors.

A second, likewise somewhat ambiguous, reference to a *Tobchiyan* occurs in a memorial inscription written by Xu Youren 許有壬 in honor of Chinqai (1169-1252), a leading scribe in the early Mongol empire. This inscription asserts directly that Chinqai’s name is mentioned in the “absolutely secret” (*zhimi* 至秘) *Tobchiyan* 脫必赤顏. It also implies that the *Tobchiyan* mentions the famous Baljuna Covenant, when Chinggis Qan promised to share future wealth with those who shared the muddy waters with him now, and that Chinqai drank the waters there:

[Chinqai’s] descendants teem in abundance; this stele has not recorded them all. There has been a saying for generations that to drink the waters of the black river [of Baljuna] is the highest honor; the deceased lord [Chinqai] indeed was present then. The dynastic history called the *Tobchiyan* is absolutely secret; if he had not had merit, his honor’s name would not be found therein.<sup>53</sup>

As William Hung points out, the *Tobchiyan* here cannot possibly be the extant text of the *SHM*, which mentions neither Chinqai nor the Baljuna Covenant, still less the two of them together. His contention that it refers to the Veritable Records is also not very probable, though. It is true that both the Baljuna covenant and Chinqai are mentioned, albeit separately, in the *SWQZL*, whose text is a slightly abridged ver-

52 Recounted in two parallel versions in *YS*, 35/784 and *YS* 181/4179. In the Yuan dynasty, *shiji* 事蹟 does not mean just historical records, but particularly official biographies of meritorious officials.

53 See Xu Youren’s memorial inscription “Yuan gu you chengxiang Qielie Gong shendao beaming 元故右丞相怯烈公神道碑銘,” in the Chenghua era blockprint, *GTXG/SY*, 10/7a. The *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 edition is better carved but adopted the distorted Qianlong-era transcription system; see *GTXG/SK*, vol. 1211, p. 658. Cf. William Hung, “Transmission of the Book Known as *The Secret History of the Mongols*,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 14 (1951): pp. 465, 484-85.

sion of the Veritable Records for Chinggis Khan and somewhat more abridged version of that for Ögedei Qa'an.<sup>54</sup> But the *SWQZL*'s references to both are extremely brief, and do not actually link Chinqai to the Baljuna Covenant, and again the Veritable Records can hardly be considered "absolutely secret." Thus, while this *Tobchiyan* reference might be stretched to fit the Veritable Records, the match is not very good. It is quite possible, however, that a continuation of the *SHM* revised under Qubilai, that is, the *Yeke tobchiyan*, written in the Square Script, might well have had a longer account of the Baljuna Covenant; certainly the episode is found in much of the originally Mongolian-language biographical literature on the Yuan era.<sup>55</sup>

In conclusion, we have in the *Yeke tobchiyan* a mid-Yuan-era work (c. 1295) which was used in a very limited fashion by Rashīd al-Dīn. The title, *Yeke tobchiyan* "Great History," indicates that it was a narrative history and a prestigious source produced under the highest auspices. Perhaps, the *Yeke tobchiyan* was a Mongolian-language revision and continuation of the *SHM* done at the court of Temür Öljeitü Qa'an, presumably in the Square Script. It was produced entirely independently from the Veritable Records and kept secret from non-Mongol officials. Thus while it was updated to include new data and fit the conclusions of new genealogical, chronological, and other historical research, this revised "Secret History" retained the sensitive material that had to be deleted from the Veritable Records to make them suitable for a broader official public. This source must have been brought to Tibet, perhaps by one of the high clerics which these histories cite as sources for their stories of the last days of the Mongol court.<sup>56</sup> Only after the fall of the Yuan could this top secret history be freely mined for information by non-Mongol historians in Tibet.

Another copy was brought to the Middle East by c. 1300. Rashīd al-Dīn was evidently not given access to a translation of the whole work, but "trustworthy historians of the Turks" (that is, learned Mongols at Ghazan Khan's court who could read the Square Script) gave him a *précis* of the information it contained on the pre-Dobun Mergen-Alan Gho'a period, a section of Mongol history on which he otherwise had no information. Because the information was related to him, and was not something he had seen personally—his "security clearance" was not, despite his avowals to the contrary, high enough—he did not mention the work itself, only the historians who assisted him.

The appendix presents all the textual evidence which can be attributed to this *Yeke tobchiyan*.

<sup>54</sup> See *SWQZL[W]*, pp. 59b/124 and 100a/205, and *SWQZL[J]*, pp. 114a and 230a.

<sup>55</sup> See Francis Woodman Cleaves, "The Historicity of the Baljuna Covenant," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 18 (1955): pp. 357-421.

<sup>56</sup> Gunga Dorje cites *Baqshi* Gunga-Rinchen of the Dágtasangbá as informant (*Deb-ther dmar-po*, p. 31; Caiba Gongge Duojie/Chen and Zhou, p. 26), while Báljor-Sāngbó only cites unspecified "Buddhist masters from Ui-Dzáng" or Central Tibet (*rGya-Bod yig-tshang*, p. 260; *Han-Zang shiji*, p. 141).

### THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS

The *SHM* is well-known enough to need no introduction. At the beginning of the text comes the word *Chinggis Qa'an-u huja'ur* "The Origin of Chinggis Khan" and what follows is what has been considered the canonical genealogy. Although the source is primarily narrative, the genealogy is carried through to the grandsons of Chinggis Khan, or at least the more important of them. I would like to make two points here. The first is implicit in what I have already explained, that although the *SHM* genealogy was in existence by the beginning of the reign of Qubilai Qa'an at the very latest, two later genealogies, the *GRTA* and the *Yeke tobchiyan*, were still composed with elements directly contradicting it. In the *GRTA* contradictory elements include: 1) beginning the lineage with Alan Gho'a (in the *SHM*, it begins with Börte Chino'a); 2) assigning of only three sons to Alan Gho'a, only one of whom is divinely born (in the *SHM*, she has five sons, three of whom are divinely born); 3) having the sons of Menen Tudun<sup>57</sup> be almost completely exterminated by the Jalayir (in the *SHM*, the Jalayir story is not told, his seven sons all survive and become the ancestors of many other lineages); 4) having Tumbina(i)<sup>58</sup> be the ancestor of a large number of Mongolian lineages (in the *SHM* this role is assigned to Menen Tudun). In the *Yeke tobchiyan* contradictory elements include: 1) having Börte Chino'a and Gho'a Maral come from within Ergüne Qun, not across the Tenggis Sea; 2) having only nine generations, not twelve, between him and Dobun Mergen; 3) assigning the divergence of the Dörben from the main line to the sons of Qiju Mergen, not to the sons of Du'a Soqor; 4) including material on Chinqai and the Baljuna Covenant; and 5) explaining the succession conflict between the Tolui family and the others as a matter of the Toluids not having given a *möchelge* or written guarantee of not striving for the throne. The changes show the *GRTA* is not simply an excerpt from the *SHM*, nor is the *Yeke tobchiyan* simply a continuation of it. Rather both are deliberate attempts to improve the *SHM*'s genealogy and narrative.

The second point concerns the dating of the *SHM*. I have recently engaged in a debate with Igor de Rachewiltz on this question. In this debate I upheld the substantial unity of the text which I dated to 1252, while Igor de Rachewiltz defended his view that the core was written in 1228 and then it was substantially rewritten and added to over a long period of time.<sup>59</sup> This is not the place to address this issue, but

57 In Rashīd al-Dīn the name is Dutum Menen. Obviously the reading of Dutu-~Tudu- varies in the sources. The alternation of *-m~-n* may be related to a similar alternation of *-m~Ø* in the title *lingqu(m)* and of *-n* and *-m* in the titles *Senggün (SWQZL, Rashīd al-Dīn)~Senggüm (SHM)*.

58 With Tumbina(i) and Charaqa(i), the sources show alternation of forms in *-a* and *-ai*. This alternation is quite common in Middle Mongolian names.

59 Christopher P. Atwood, "The Date of the 'Secret History of the Mongols' Reconsidered," *Journal of Song and Yuan Studies* 37 (2007), 1-48; Igor de Rachewiltz, "The Dating of the *Secret History of the Mongols*—A Re-interpretation," *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher*, new series, 22 (2008), pp. 150-84.

the issue of dating should be kept in mind in the discussion of Rashīd al-Dīn's three written genealogical sources discussed below. As I will argue, at least one of these sources is linked to a separate written source used by the *SHM*, while one or more of them also present genealogies of the Yörkin lineage which the *SHM* seems at pains to refute in §§49-50, 139-40. On a dating of the *SHM* to 1252, this would leave just about five decades between then and the beginning of the Mongol empire in which to gather and write numerous genealogical traditions. On a dating of its core, in which the genealogy is included by Igor de Rachewiltz, this would leave about half that time between the beginning of the empire and the creation of the *SHM*. The reader may decide if that time is enough.

### RASHĪD AL-DĪN'S THREE WRITTEN GENEALOGIES

Scholars on Rashīd al-Dīn frequently point to one or another work or informant as the Mongol source for his *Ghazanid History*. Bolod Chingsang, Ghazan Khan, the *Altan debter*: all of these have been touted at one time or another by scholars as the source for the bulk of his work.<sup>60</sup> Yet Rashīd al-Dīn lays emphasis not on the existence of a single systematic Mongolian source or oral informant, but on the wide variety of written materials “unorganized and disarranged” and “scattered in treasuries” from which he could build his own history only after “ascertaining which were true and sifting and poring over them.”<sup>61</sup>

This is the picture of his genealogical information as well. As I will show, Rashīd al-Dīn discusses at considerable length three different written genealogies of the pre-Chinggisid period. At first he relied on one of them, but later on in his work, he came to consider a different one more authoritative. Finally near the end of his composition, he was informed about the contents of the *Yeke tobchiyan* and added in a brief section derived from that work, without integrating it into the rest of his previously written work. Rashīd al-Dīn's pre-Chinggisid genealogical system thus has distinctive strata which can be separated out by paying attention to his specific statements about this or that genealogical issue. In so doing, we are given an example of how the multiplicity of genealogical sources presented a picture not of a single unanimous history, but rather one of inconclusive debate.

In the introduction to his history of Chinggis Khan, Rashīd al-Dīn sets out two genealogies, differing only in one link, as alternatives:

Chīnggīz Khān's descent is as follows: his father (in Mongolian, *“tjkeh”*) was Yīsūkāy Bahādur; his grandfather (in Mongolian, *“abūkeh”*) was Bartān Bahādur; his great-grandfather (*“ālīnjīk”*) was Qabul Khān; his great-great-

60 See for example, Zeki Velidi Togan, “The Composition of the History of the Mongols by Rashīd al-Dīn,” and Satoko SHIMO, “Ghāzān Khan and the Ta'rifk-i Ghāzānī: Concerning Its Relationship to the ‘Mongol History’ of the Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh.”

61 Khetagurov, p. 67; Thackston, I, p. 18.

grandfather (*būdūtū*) was Tūmbineh Qā'ān; his ancestor in the fifth degree (*\*būdeh-<sup>a</sup>ūkūr'*) was Bāy-Sinkqūr; his ancestor in the sixth degree (*būrqa*) was Qāydū Khān; his ancestor in the seventh degree (*dūtāqūn*) was Dūtūm Manan; and his ancestor in the eighth degree was Būdunjār. There is no term for ancestors above the seventh degree: they are called *<sup>a</sup>ṭjktīn-ābūkan* in the aggregate. The ancestress of them all was Alān-Qū'ā.

According to one report Alān-Qū'ā was his ancestress in the tenth degree because Būdunjār is said to have had two sons, Būqā and Nājīn, and Būqā's son was Dūtūm Mānān. Inasmuch as this differs from the preceding report it has been given here as a variant lest anything be omitted.<sup>62</sup>

The key difference between the two versions lies in placing Buqa between Bodonchar and Dutum Menen (who in the *SHM*, *YT*, and *GRTA* is called Menen Tudun). Bodonchar is thus not the eighth-generation ancestor of Chinggis but his ninth-generation ancestor. This slightly longer genealogy (I call it the Nine-Ancestor Genealogy, as opposed to the Eight-Ancestor Genealogy)<sup>63</sup> was, at the time Rashīd al-Dīn composed this section, only a "report," perhaps passed on to him orally the way a small part of the *Yeke tobchiyan* was to be later resumed for him. The long sequence of extremely obscure Mongolian generational terms he uses for his preferred genealogy indicates that the Eight-Ancestor Genealogy was available to him in written form, a hypothesis that will be directly confirmed later.

That Rashīd al-Dīn considered this Eight-Ancestor Genealogy authoritative when he first began his book is additionally documented by the fact it was that scheme which he followed in composing the table of contents to his history.<sup>64</sup> The table of contents lists the names of Chinggis Khan's ancestors as follows:

Gen.	Name of Ancestor(s)
10.	Dübün-Bāyān and Ālān Qū'ā
9.	Ālān Qū'ā and her three sons
8.	Būdunjār Qā'ān
7.	Dūtūm Manan

62 Smirnova, pp. 63-64; Thackston, I, p. 143; Rawshan and Mūsawī, pp. 292-93. On the generational terms, I follow Doerfer's reconstructions: 1st: *aṭjkeh* (*TMEN* §63, pp. 187-88); 2nd: *ābūkeh* (*TMEN*, §5, pp. 110-11); 3rd: *ālṭjīk* (*TMEN* §29, pp. 147-48); 4th: *būdūtū* (*TMEN*, vol. I, §97, pp. 217-18); 5th: *\*būdeh-āūkūr'* (§99, pp. 218-19); 6th: *\*būrqa* (§103, pp. 225-26); 7th: *dūtāqūn* (§202, p. 329); 8th and above: *<sup>a</sup>ṭjktīn ābūkan* (§63, pp. 187-88, and §4, pp. 109-10).

63 In a previous version of this paper, I designated the genealogies by the generation of Alan-Gho'a. But since in the case of the *GRTA*, the count from Bodonchar was incorporated into the title, I have decided it would be less confusing to classify and designate the genealogies with reference to him rather than Alan Gho's.

64 Khetagurov, p. 54; Thackston, I, p. 10; Romashkevich, p. 31; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 16.

6.	Qāydū Khān
5.	Bāy-Sinkqūr
4.	Tūmbineh Khān
3.	Qābūl Khān
2.	Bartān Bahādur
1.	Yisūkay Bahādur
	Jnkkīz Khān

**TABLE: ANCESTORS OF CHINGGIS KHAN IN THE EIGHT-ANCESTOR SOURCE**

This list is clearly the same Eight-Ancestor scheme as found in the preface to the history of Chinggis Khan. (It is eight ancestors according to my count from Bodonchar, although Rashīd al-Dīn preferred to think of it as “ten stories in all,” counting all the way to Dobun Bayan).<sup>65</sup> This version adds a few more elements to the characterization of the Eight-Ancestor genealogy text. 1) The title *qa’an* (Persian *qā’an*, as opposed to *khān*) appears with regard to Būdunjār Qā’an in his descriptive table of contents, and the Tūmbineh Qā’an in his preface to his history of Chinggis Khan. Since Rashīd al-Dīn elsewhere uses the title *khan*, not *qā’an*, for them in the body of his text, this usage is best attributed directly to his source. Thus this genealogy appears to have originally had the title *qa’an* (not *qan*). 2) This genealogy attributes to the ancestors different titles from those found elsewhere. Compared to the *SHM*, the *GRTA*, and *YT*, Dobun is given the title *bayan* “rich,” not *mergen* “sharpshooter,” Bodonchar is given the title *qa’an* not *mungqaq* “fool,” and Tumbina(i) is given the title *qa’an*, not *sechen* “wise.” Also he who is Menen Dutun in the *SHM*, *GRTA*, and *YT* is Dutum Menen in this genealogy. These peculiarities of usage are standard in Rashīd al-Dīn; these two lists confirm that he derived them from his Eight-Ancestor genealogy.

When Rashīd al-Dīn composed his history of the pre-Chinggisid khans, however, his evaluation of the sources had changed. In the text he now wrote: “As has been mentioned, Būdunjār had two sons, Būqā and Būqatay. Būqā’s son was Dūtūm Manan, the progenitor of Chīnggīz Khān’s line.”<sup>66</sup> So now what had previously been only an alternative report, mentioned for the sake of completeness, was the preferred version. This change of opinion appears to have been connected to Rashīd al-Dīn’s getting access to a manuscript of the Nine-Ancestor version. In the chart setting out the links of Bodonchar, Buqa, Buqatai, and Dutum Menen, Rashīd al-Dīn actually follows the Eight-Ancestor scheme, making Buqa, Buqatai, and Dutum Menen to be three brothers, all alike sons of Bodonchar. Evidently his chart reflected an earlier recension and was not as easy to change as the text. But to the chart, below the name of Dutum Menen, he added the following note: “Chīnggīz Khān’s *dūtaqun* or ancestor in the seventh degree. Another version says that Dūtūm Manan

65 Rashīd al-Dīn’s count as “ten stories in all” is found in the title to his account of the pre-Chinggisid khans. See Smirnova, p. 7; Thackston, I, p. 113; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 215.

66 Smirnova, p. 17; Thackston, I, p. 118; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 228

was the son of Būdunjār, but they are correct who make him a son of Būqā, for that is also what has been found in the old manuscript (*chih dar nuskhah-yi qadīm nīz chunīn yāftah'and*).<sup>67</sup> This demonstrates conclusively that Rashīd al-Dīn now had access to a Nine-Ancestor manuscript, one which differed both from his other Eight-Ancestor Genealogy, and from the *SHM*, *YT*, and *GRTA*, all of which had ten generations between Bodonchar and Chinggis Khan. Having secured this manuscript he was now treating it as his authoritative source and revising his genealogies accordingly.

But Rashīd al-Dīn had access to more than just two genealogical manuscripts. In the generation below Qayidu Khan, he records another divergence, over the presence or absence of Bai-Shingqor. In all the genealogies considered so far, Qayidu begets Bai-Shingqor, who begets Tumbinai, who begets Qabul, who begets Bartan, who begets Yisūkei, Chinggis's father.<sup>68</sup> In those genealogies whose collateral lines are attested (*SHM*, *GRTA*, and Rashīd al-Dīn's genealogy based on the Eight- and Nine-Genealogy schemes), Bai-Shingqor has two brothers, Cha'ujin and Charaqa(i),<sup>69</sup> who become ancestors of collateral lineages such as the Chinos ("Wolves") and Tayichi'ud. But in giving this mainstream scheme in his genealogy, Rashīd al-Dīn discusses the presence of an alternative written version. In the chart with Bai-Shingqor he writes:

In some manuscripts (*dar ba'zī nusakh*) Bāy-Sinkqūr's name and that of [Jāujīn]-Hūkar<sup>70</sup> do not occur, and they say that Tūmbineh Khān was the

67 Smirnova, p. 17; Thackston, I, p. 118; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 229. Note that only Smirnova's translation, based on older manuscripts, preserves the contradiction between the text and the chart. Thackston's translation was based on mss which smoothed out the contradiction by making the chart correspond to the text.

68 In most of these names, the attached titles vary considerably from source to source (for example, Tumbinai Sechen, Tumbina Khan, Tumbina Qa'an, etc.). To avoid confusion I have tried to use only the invariant core.

69 With Charaqa(i) and Tumbina(i), the sources show alternation of forms in *-a* and *-ai*. This alternation is quite common in Middle Mongolian names. Likewise, Charaqa's title Lingqu(m) shows alternation between forms with *-m* and without, a phenomenon related to the alternation of *-n* and *-m* seen in the titles Senggün (*SWQZL*, Rashīd al-Dīn)~Senggüm (*SHM*), and Tudun (*SHM*, *YT*, *GRTA*)~Dutum (Rashīd al-Dīn).

70 Cha'ujin is the usual form in Rashīd al-Dīn, without the second element Örtegei. In the notes to Rashīd al-Dīn's chart of Qayidu's sons, however, a second element appears, although it is hardly reconcilable with Örtegei: *hūkr* in Tashkent ms., and Rawshan and Mūsawī's mss read *jāujīn hūrkūz* (ms X) and *jāurjīn hūrkūr* (ms Q) (Rawshan and Mūsawī, pp. 238 and 1649, l. 9). In the next place in that note, the Tashkent ms appears to have *jāujīn hūkr* (judging from Smirnova's reading as "Chaodzhin Khukur"); Rawshan and Mūsawī's mss read *jāurjīn* (mss Q, Y), *jāwūrčīn* (ms BY), *jāurjīn* (ms D), *jāurjīn hūrkūz* (ms X), *jāurjīn hrkz* (ms Q), . . . *mūrkz* (ms Y) (Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 238, l. 11). In the next it is *jāujīn hūrkūz* (ms X) and *jāurjīn hūrkz* (mss Q, S, D, Y) (Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 238, l. 14); Berezin there reads "Chaudzhin *hūkūz*." The only plausible reconstruction of this as an attested Mongolian word would be based on the Tashkent ms's *hūkr*, viz. Mongolian *hūker* "bovine, ox, cow," but this does not offer any

son of Qāydū. But in some old manuscripts (*dar ba'zī nusakh qadīmī*) I see as follows: that Bāy-Sinqūr and Jāūjīn-Hūkar were sons of Qāydū, and Tūmbineh was the son of Bāy-Sinqūr and that is more correct, so we have included Bāy-Sinqūr here.<sup>71</sup>

Since Rashīd al-Dīn included Bai-Shingqor in both his Eight-Ancestor genealogy and implicitly in his Nine-Ancestor genealogy (otherwise Alan Gho'a would not be Chinggis Khan's tenth generation ancestor if Qayidu directly begat Tumbinai) it is confirmed that both of these sources were indeed manuscript sources, that Rashīd al-Dīn considered to be "old." But this passage also confirms that at least one manuscript has an even shorter scheme than the Eight-Ancestor one, one which we could call a Seven-Ancestor genealogy.<sup>72</sup> (Rashīd al-Dīn says "some manuscripts" have this shorter scheme but since his data allows reconstruction of only one genealogy without Bai-Shingqor, I prefer to posit only one Seven-Ancestor genealogy. Perhaps it was found in multiple copies.)

The other question on which these genealogies differed (or at least in which Rashīd al-Dīn discusses the difference) was in the position of Nachin. Rashīd al-Dīn has several discussions over the genealogical placement of this figure, one who plays a crucial role in the story of the Jalayir (found in the *GRTA* and also in the genealogies used by Rashīd al-Dīn, but absent from the *SHM*). In the introduction to his history of Chinggis Khan, when the Nine-Ancestor Genealogy was just a report that he did not wish to follow, he said that Nachin was one of Bodonchar's sons and a brother of Buqa. In his account of the sons of Bodonchar, however, after he adopted the Nine-Ancestor scheme, he revised this idea to make Nachin the son of Buqtai (Buqa's brother). In fact as he admits, "[Nachin's] branch is not known for certain."<sup>73</sup> Or as he writes twice, his preferred source actually says nothing about Nachin's ancestry or descendants, just that he was a marriage-ally of the Mongols and rescued Qayidu from the Jalayir (a version of the story found in slightly altered form in the *GRTA*). In these same passages he actually names his preferred source, calling it the *Altān daftar* (Mongolian *Altan debter*), "which is always kept in the khan's treasury by great emirs."<sup>74</sup> As a result, the Nine-Ancestor genealogy, which

connection with the *SHM*'s Öртекеi. Judging from his reading as Hör[tä]gäi, Thackston implicitly emended the text to hūr[t]ky in order to conform it to the *SHM*. This is possible, but seems suspiciously easy. In light of this situation, I have simply followed the Tashkent ms reading, without advancing any solution.

71 Smirnova, chart opposite p. 26; Thackston, I, p. 122; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 238. Thackston's translation does not mention the manuscript being "ancient," but it is found in the Persian (*dar ba'zī nusakh qadīmī*; Russian translation: *v nekotorykh starykh spiskakh*).

72 I am assuming here for simplicity's sake that in this short scheme the generations above Qayidu also follow the shorter Eight-Generation scheme, rather than the longer Nine-Ancestor scheme.

73 Smirnova, p. 17; Thackston, I, p. 118; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 2.

74 Khetagurov, p. 180; Smirnova, pp. 16-17; Thackston, I, pp. 99, 118; Rawshan and Mūsawī, pp. 186, 227.

Rashīd al-Dīn had at first only heard about, but which he later was given access to and made his major source is in fact the famous “Golden Register.”<sup>75</sup>

In the *Altan debter*, then, Nachin appears not as a branch of the pre-Chinggisid family tree, but rather as a son-in-law, whose assisted the Mongols. What did Rashīd al-Dīn’s Eight- and Seven-Ancestor genealogies say about Nachin? Rashīd al-Dīn writes that “In some manuscripts of Mongolian history (*naskhah’hā-yi tāvārīkh-i Mughulān*) it is recorded that the Tāyjiūt clan stems from the second son of Dūtūm Manan, Nājīn.”<sup>76</sup> He also writes that “As for Jaraqeh Līnqūm, it is stated in some manuscripts that he was the son of Nājīn.” Putting these together, we get the following genealogy: Dutum Menen begat Nachin, who begat Charaqa(i) who begat the Tayichi’ud.

Does this scheme apply to the Seven-Ancestor genealogy, the Eight-Ancestor genealogy or both? Although the proof is somewhat indirect, Rashīd al-Dīn’s arguments imply that it applies to both. One could even argue that since he says “some manuscripts” have the alternate genealogy he rejects that it *must* apply to both. But it would be risky to rely on his plural here, since he might just be referring to plural manuscripts of one genealogy. But stronger evidence is available. With regard to the Seven-Ancestor genealogy, recall that Rashīd al-Dīn defined it as a genealogy which among the three, Bai-Shingqor, Cha’ujin, and Charaqa, did not have Bai-Shingqor or Cha’ujin. The implication is that it did have Charaqa. Yet Rashīd al-Dīn does not state or imply that Charaqa is a son of Qayidu in the Seven-Ancestor genealogy. Thus Charaqa is there in the genealogy but in a different place—this would fit perfect with him being the son of Nachin, the son of Dutum Menen. With regard to the Eight-Ancestor genealogy, in talking about the position of Bai-Shingqor, Cha’ujin, and Charaqa in the genealogies, Rashīd al-Dīn mentions that the other, older (and hence more reliable) manuscripts (that is, the Eight- and Nine-Ancestor genealogies) make Bai-Shingqor and Cha’ujin to be the sons of Qayidu. There is an implication that they do not both make Charaqa a son of Qayidu. Since the Nine-Ancestor *Altan debter* does, the implication is that the Eight-Ancestor genealogy does not.

But a stronger implication is made just below. Rashīd al-Dīn adduces as proof that Charaqa must be Qayidu’s son and not Nachin’s son the following fact:

It is more correct to say that he was a son of Qāydū Khān because it has been entered in their family tree (*sabab ānkih dar shajarah-yi tshān dar āmadah’ast*) that Jaraqeh married his *bīrkān*, the wife of Bāy-Sinkqūr, and by her had two sons. . . . Consequently he must have been slightly junior to Bāy-Sinkqūr, because if he had been Nājīn’s son, he would have been [Bāy-Sinkqūr’s] cousin and Bāy-Sinkqūr’s wife would have been Jaraqeh’s

75 On *Āltān daftar*, see also *TMEN*, vol. I, §26, p. 142.

76 Khetagurov, p. 180; Thackston, I, p. 99; Romashkevich, p. 480; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 186.

cousin's wife, and by Mongolian custom it would have been inappropriate for him to marry her.<sup>77</sup>

Rashīd al-Dīn's argument here is that his favored source, the "family tree," which must be the Nine-Ancestor *Altan debter*, says Charaqa married Bai-Shingqor's wife in a levirate marriage. Indeed a statement of the same fact is found in the *GRTA*.<sup>78</sup> Such levirate marriages were conducted between brothers or fathers and sons, and always involved the junior man taking the wife of a deceased senior.<sup>79</sup> Now one of the invariable motifs in the stories is that after the Jalayir attack, Nachin was the older protector of infant Qayidu (sometimes Nachin is an uncle of Qayidu, sometimes an older brother, sometimes a brother-in-law, but he is always older). But if both Nachin and Qayidu were sons of Dutum Menen, as they would be according to the alternative genealogy, then Charaqa as the son of Nachin would be senior to Bai-Shingqor the son of Qayidu. Thus a levirate marriage between Charaqa and Bai-Shingqor's widow would be unacceptable. But the whole point of the argument is to argue that Charaqa could not possibly have married Bai-Shingqor's widow; it would have no force against a genealogy that simply denied the existence of Bai-Shingqor at all, as the Seven-Ancestor genealogy did. Evidently Rashīd al-Dīn's argument was intended as a reason for rejecting the Dutum Menen > Nachin > Charaqa > Tayichi'ud filiation in a genealogy that did have both Charaqa and Bai-Shingqor—and that can only be the Eight-Ancestor genealogy.

Finally there is the fact that in discussing the Nachin question, Rashīd al-Dīn is always unusually specific about his source for rejecting any connection of Nachin with Charaqa and the Tayichi'ud. Twice he refers to the authority of the *Altan debter* by name, and once he refers to the "family tree." Such a specificity of source makes more sense if the *Altan debter* was the only source arguing for his new position on Nachin. Rashīd al-Dīn had once set up the genealogy differently, and was now coming around to the other point of view based on access to a new source. Since the genealogy Rashīd al-Dīn preferred before getting access to the Nine-Ancestor *Altan debter* was the Eight-Ancestor genealogy, that genealogy at least, and even better both it and the Seven-Ancestor one, ought to have been supporting the now rejected view of Nachin's genealogical position. In short, assuming that both the Seven- and the Eight-Ancestor genealogies had the Dutum Menen > Nachin > Charaqa > Tayichi'ud filiation and that only the Nine-Ancestor *Altan debter*, also referred to as the "old manuscript" and the "family tree" (note the singular form of both), spoke against that filiation is overall the most natural way to read Rashīd al-Dīn's arguments about his sources.

77 Smirnova, chart opposite p. 26; Thackston, I, pp. 122-23; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 239.

78 *YS* 107/2709; cf. Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 12 n.3; *NCCGL*, 1/2.

79 Relations between senior men and wives of junior men (sons or younger brothers) were strictly limited by traditional taboos. Violation of this taboo forms a key motif in the legends of the start of the Mongol-Oirat wars for example.

As a result of these considerations, Rashīd al-Dīn's three genealogical manuscripts can be compared in the following form (since the generations from Tumbinai to Chinggis appear to be the same in all three they have not been added):

Generation above Chinggis Khan	1. Seven-Ancestor Genealogy (never preferred)	2. Eight-Ancestor Genealogy (preferred in Rashīd al-Dīn's biography of Chinggis Khan)			3. Nine-Ancestor Genealogy, <i>Altan debter</i> (preferred in Rashīd al-Dīn's biographies of the pre-Chinggisid rulers)			
10 <sup>th</sup>					Ālān-Qū'a			
9 <sup>th</sup>			Ālān-Qū'a		Būdujār			
8 <sup>th</sup>			Būdujār		Būqā	Būqatay		
7 <sup>th</sup>	[Būdujār?]		Dütüm Manan		Dütüm Manan			
6 <sup>th</sup>	Dütüm Manan		Nājīm	Qāydū		Qāydū		
5 <sup>th</sup>	Nājīm	Qāydū	Jaraqeh	Bāy-Sinkqūr	Jaūjīm	Bay-Sinkqūr	Jaūjīm	Jaraqeh
4 <sup>th</sup>	Jaraqeh	Tūmbineh	to Tāyjūt	Tūmbineh		Tūmbineh		to Tāyjūt
	to Tāyjūt	to Jīnkkiz Khān		to Jīnkkiz Khān		to Jīnkkiz Khān		

TABLE OF THE THREE WRITTEN GENEALOGIES USED BY RASHĪD AL-DĪN

In speaking of these three sources as genealogies, I have been speaking somewhat ambiguously. Of the three genealogies not used by Rashīd al-Dīn, we know that one (the *SHM*) is primarily a narrative history with extensive genealogical data in it, that another (the *GRTA*) is described as a genealogy with narrative notes attached to it, and that the third (the *YT*) is probably a narrative history with genealogical data. Thus genealogical data can be found in works that are primarily narrative and narrative data can be found in works that are primarily genealogical. What can we say of the genre of Rashīd al-Dīn three sources? Strikingly, Rashīd al-Dīn refers to the "family tree" in a context in which only his preferred Nine-Ancestor genealogy, the *Altan debter*, can be meant.<sup>80</sup> Thus the famous *Altan debter* must actually be not a narrative history, but a family tree. Indeed the absence of references to the *Altan debter* in the genealogical section post-dating Chinggis Khan indicate that its genre and coverage was very similar to the *GRTA*: a genealogy with narrative notes cover-

80 Smirnova, chart opposite p. 26; Thackston, I, p. 122; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 129. Persian (*sabab ānkih dar shajarah-yi īshān dar āmadah'ast*) and in Russian translation, "v ikh rodoslovnoe drevo."

ing the period from Alan Gho'a to the sons of Chinggis Khan.<sup>81</sup> By contrast, at least one of the Seven- and/or Eight-Ancestor genealogies appears to be embedded in a narrative history. This is implied by Rashīd al-Dīn's statement that idea of the Tayichi'ud being descended from Nachin is found "in some manuscripts of Mongolian history (*dar ba'zī naskhah'hā-yi tāvārikh-i Mughūlān*)" (again Rashīd al-Dīn's plurals may or may not be meant literally).<sup>82</sup>

Yet the Eight-Ancestor genealogy appears to be a genealogy. I say this because in the passage at the beginning of the biography of Chinggis Khan in which he summarizes its contents, he assigns to each generation a specific Mongolian term (*dūtaqūn* for seventh generation ancestor, etc.). These terms also reappear consistently in the charts Rashīd al-Dīn appends to his genealogy. Along with the term *qu'dūd*, marking those of equal generations, as found for example in phrases like "[he] was the *qu'dūd* of Chīnggīz Khān's sons," this creates a consistent grid of generational affiliation.<sup>83</sup> The same idea can be seen the *GRTA*, both in its title itself, "Genealogical Record of the Ten Ancestors" and in the statement that appear to begin it, identifying Bodonchar specifically as Chinggis Khan's tenth-generation ancestor.<sup>84</sup> This explicit generational grid seems particularly fitting for a genealogy and does not appear in narrative sources. Given that it is explicitly associated with the Eight-Ancestor scheme, which was the source of the first draft of Rashīd al-

81 As I demonstrate in my forthcoming study of the *Shengwu qinzheng lu*, the *Altan debter* is not, *pace* Pelliot, the name of the Mongolian work which served as the common source for the *SWQZL* and Rashīd al-Dīn's history of Chinggis Khan. All references to it are related to the pre-Chinggisid genealogy, except one: where he refers to it as a source for his listing of the commanders of a thousand. If the *Altan debter* was a pre-Chinggisid genealogy, why did Rashīd al-Dīn claim it as a source for his list of the commanders of a thousand? I see three possibilities: 1) the *Altan debter*, like the *Shu'ab-i panjganeh* concluded its pre-Chinggisid genealogy with a listing of the commanders of a thousand; 2) Rashīd al-Dīn only used the *Altan debter* for details about a few commanders, such as the ancestry of Geūgi Noyan (Kūkī Nāyān) and Mōgetū Ba'adur (Mūkatū Bahādur), who were from a collateral line related to Chinggis Khan and appear in Rashīd al-Dīn's pre-Chinggisid genealogical tables (Smirnova, pp. 46, 49, 270; Thackston, I, p. 132, II, p. 275; Rawshan and Mūsawī, pp. 268, 598); 3) the *Altan debter* concluded its list of Chinggis Khan's sons with a list of the commanders assigned to them. Of these three options, Kim Hodong's forthcoming study of the list of commanders makes it unlikely to be derived from a single source, thus casting doubt on the first possibility. The last possibility would seem to be more directly implied by Rashīd al-Dīn's text, but I have a feeling the second possibility is more likely to be true. Certainly, Rashīd al-Dīn felt very proud of having been given access to the *Altan debter* and would not be above inflating its importance to his work.

82 Khetagurov, p. 180; Thackston, I, p. 99; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 186.

83 See for example in the statements on the descendants of Tumbinai's collateral lines (Smirnova, pp. 29-30; Thackston, I, pp. 124-25; Rawshan and Mūsawī, pp. 245-46). I have not found any reference in *TMEN* to the term *qu'dūd*, meaning someone of the same generation.

84 *YS* 1/1 and 107/2729.

Dīn's genealogical charts, this would indicate that the Eight-Ancestor scheme was genealogical, leaving the Seven-Ancestor genealogy as primarily historical.

### ALAN GHO'A'S SONS

How does this recognition of multiple genealogical traditions change our approach to the pre-Chinggisid genealogies? To illustrate this different approach, I will use two examples of genealogical controversies which can be traced in the sources. One is the question of Alan Gho'a's sons: how many were they, and how many were of divine ancestry? I will follow that discussion with a discussion of the question of the genealogy of the Yörkin with which I began this paper.

The *SHM* and main text of Rashīd al-Dīn both record the same number and distribution between divine and ordinary: five sons, with Belgünütei and Bügünütei born by ordinary generation from Alan Gho'a and Dobun (titled Mergen or Bayan), and three sons born by divine generation after Dobun's death: Buqu Qatagi, Buqatu Salji, and Bodonchar Mungqaq "the fool" who becomes ancestor of the Chinggisid lineage. This we can call the 2+3 scheme for Alan Gho'a's sons. In the *GRTA*, however, there is a different and narratively more economical version: Alan Gho'a has three sons, of whom Buqan Qadaqī and Boqatu Salgi were born by ordinary generation and only Bodonchar Mungqaq was divine. Call this the 2+1 scheme.

The *GRTA* is the last of the documented genealogical texts. Is the 2+1 scheme simply a late rationalization? I would say not, due to certain clues found within both the *SHM* and Rashīd al-Dīn's account, that both were built on previous accounts in which Alan Gho'a had only three sons in all. In the *SHM*, it is peculiar that while Belgünütei and Bügünütei accuse all three of the divine sons of being illegitimate (§18), when it comes to dividing the property, they exclude only Bodonchar as a fool, not mentioning the other two (§23). One would normally expect exclusion from inheritance to track accusations of illegitimacy. And in §§30-36, when his elder brother regrets driving out Bodonchar and goes to find him, the elder brother is Buqu Qatagi, not the elders Belgünütei and Bügünütei. Throughout the subsequent narrative, Buqu acts as the head and spokesman of the brothers and Belgünütei and Bügünütei are nowhere to be found. Finally, although all five of the brothers are said to be ancestors of lineages in §42, only the descendants of Buqu Qatagi, Buqatu Salji, and Bodonchar are attested elsewhere. The Belgünüd and Bügünüd descendants appear nowhere else. Nor do the Qatagin or Salji'ud, who are descendants of the similarly divine Buqu Qatagi and Buqatu Salji, appear in the narratives to have any closer association with the Borjigid descendants of Bodonchar than any other lineage. In other words, as a genealogy, the 2+3 scheme appears to preserve two useless names and to give misleading information about the relation of the Qatagin, Salji'ud, and Borjigid. Judging from these signals, I would guess that the *SHM* was preceded by at least one version with the 2+1 scheme later repeated in the *GRTA*.

In Rashīd al-Dīn, there are signals pointing to a somewhat different “three sons” scheme. First of all, Rashīd al-Dīn records a dispute about whether Būgūnūtei and Belgūnūtei were divinely destined or not:

Dūbūn Bāyān had an extremely chaste wife, Ālān-Qū’ā by name, of the Qūrūlās tribe (*qawm*). By her he had two sons, one of whom was named Bilkūnūt and the other Būkūnūt.<sup>85</sup> Two Mongol tribes (*qawm*) are descended from them. Some reckon them of the *nīrūn* tribe (*qawm*) because their mother was Ālān-Qū’ā, but others consider them *durlukīn* because they reckon the *nīrūn* only to be from the three sons to whom Ālān-Qū’ā gave birth after the death of her husband. There is much dispute in this regard, but the better known version—which is also analogically closer to the truth—is the latter. There is no one from the descendants of these two in this realm—aside from one person who is in a *hazāreh* (thousand). Even in Mongolia (*Mughūlistān*) they are said to be few.<sup>86</sup>

Rashīd al-Dīn thus implies that the dispute is not about genealogical facts (who was born from whom and by what process) but about their interpretation. But is it plausible that a son of Dobun and Alan would be truly seen as belonging to the divinely-destined *nīrūn* lineage? Moreover there is another unusual feature in Rashīd al-Dīn’s story of Alan Gho’a. In the *SHM* and *GRTA* it is Alan Gho’a’s common-born sons who question her chastity and the paternity of the divinely-born sons. In the *Ghazanid History*, however, it is “her husbands’ brothers and relatives” who perform this function.<sup>87</sup> As a result, the theme of fraternal strife and exclusion of Bodonchar as a “fool” is completely absent in Rashīd al-Dīn’s version. Indeed as I have already noted, the Eight-Ancestor Genealogy does not use this title (“fool” *mungqaq*) for Bodonchar at all, calling him *qa’an* instead. The implication is that Alan Gho’a’s sons get along, presumably because they all share the same paternity—divine ancestry.

The final discordant signal in Rashīd al-Dīn is the strange similarity of names between Bodonchar’s two divine brothers and two of his sons. Buqa and Buqatai are found in both the Eight Ancestor Genealogy and the Nine Ancestor *Altan debter* as two of Bodonchar’s sons. (Where the two genealogies differ is in whether Dutum Menen is another son of Bodonchar or Buqa’s son.) What is striking is that this Buqa and Buqatay are otherwise completely unknown, and in both genealogies one or both of them seem strangely nugatory.<sup>88</sup> Where did they come from? In light of

85 I base these readings on the “Belgunut” and “Bugunut” of Smirnova, and the ms readings in Rawshan and Musawi, p. 1644, under p. 220, ll. 5 and 6.

86 Smirnova, pp. 10-11; Thackston, I, p. 115; Rawshan and Musawi, p. 220.

87 Smirnova, p. 14; Thackston, I, p. 116; Rawshan and Musawi, p. 224.

88 As I mentioned, Rashīd al-Dīn’s statement that Nachin is the son of Buqatai is actually denied elsewhere, and seems to be a way to attach Nachin to the *Altan debter* genealogy after rejecting his role as ancestor of the Tayichi’ud found in other genealogies. Yet elsewhere he specifically says that Nachin’s ancestry is *not* given in the *Altan debter*, and

the close similarity of the names, I regard the only plausible answer to this question to be that they are in fact simply doublets of Buqu Qataqi and Buqatu Salji. Already in the sources, there is an alternation between *buqu* “deer” and *buqa* “bovine, ox, cow” in the names of the Qatagin and Salji’ud ancestors (e.g. Buqu Qatagi in *SHM*, Boqan Qadaqi in *GRTA*) and alternations between *-tu* and *-tai* are common in Mongolian.<sup>89</sup> In context in Rashīd al-Dīn, the duplication of two *Buqu~Buqa* brothers in successive generations has every appearance of the kind of doublet or conflated reading produced when an editor is synthesizing two documents. Since as I have already noted, the chart in Rashīd al-Dīn giving the latter pair of Buqu~Buqa(tai) brothers definitely originated from the Eight Ancestor Genealogy, and had Dutum Menen as a third brother, this indicates that in the Eight Ancestor Genealogy, the Buqu~Buqa(tai) brothers were not Bodonchar’s brothers, but his sons.

Taking into account all of these indications, I propose that at least one genealogy in the background of Rashīd al-Dīn’s account had a 0+3 scheme for Alan Gho’a’s sons, that is, one in which she had no sons by Dobun Bayan, but instead only three sons by divine birth. Thus the divine birth could not be criticized by her common sons (she had none), but only by her husband’s relatives. These three sons were Belgünüd and Bügünüd<sup>90</sup> and Bodonchar Qa’an. In this scheme, Bodonchar became the ruler without apparent incident and had three sons himself: Buqa~Buqu, ancestor of the Qatagin, Buqatu~Buqatay, ancestor of the Salji’ud, and Bodonchar, ancestor of the Borjigid.

The origin of the 2+3 scheme in the *SHM* and in Rashīd al-Dīn’s composite scheme can thus be seen to lie in a conflation of the 2+1 scheme attested in the *GRTA* and the 0+3 scheme attested in the *Ghazanid History*. Confronted by two accounts, one in which Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai were Alan Gho’a’s “other” sons (alongside the Chinggisid ancestor Bodonchar) and another one in which Belgünüd(ei) and Bügünüd(ei) were her “other” sons, it would be easy to simply make all four her sons. At the same time, a version in which Belgünüd(ei) and Bügünüd(ei) were brothers of Bodonchar and Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai were his sons still established a hierarchy in which Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai were closer to the imperial line than Belgünüd(ei) and Bügünüd(ei). How to reproduce that hierarchy when all four were brothers? The easy answer would be to make Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai sons of divine ancestry, while Belgünüd(ei) and Bügünüd(ei) were merely common children. This simple solution would thus remove Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai from the generation of Bodonchar’s sons entirely. Since only the 2+1 scheme had the motif of fraternal conflict and exclusion of Bodonchar, Bel-

in another summary of the Ten-Ancestor scheme, he has Nachin be a brother of Buqa, not a nephew. In reality, his source did not record Nachin’s name and Rashīd al-Dīn was actually just guessing where Nachin would fit, and guessed differently at different times.

89 There is variation even in the mss of Rashīd al-Dīn: *būqūn qa?aqī* (< \**būqūn qataqī*) in the Tashkent ms, *tūqūm qataqī* (< \**būqūn qataqī*) in the Oriental Institute ms, and *būqān qayaqī* (< \**būqān qataqī*) in the Istanbul and London mss.

90 Note the difference in form from that in the *SHM*, which presumably reflects the Eight-Ancestor Genealogy’s form.

günüd(ei) and Bügünüd(ei) who were derived from the 0+3 scheme would tend to be absent from that motif, which is indeed what we find. But if a source with such a simple 2+3 scheme in which Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai were put in Bodonchar's generation was re-crossed with one in which they were present as sons of Bodonchar, the result would be a doublet, exactly as we see in both Rashīd al-Dīn's composite account.

It would be tempting to assume that one of Rashīd al-Dīn's sources was a simple 2+3 scheme like the *SHM* and another was a 0+3 scheme with Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai as sons of Bodonchar. But I think the process of conflating the written versions and forming the doublet must have already occurred in at least one of Rashīd al-Dīn's sources. It is certain that both the Eight-Ancestor Genealogy and the Nine Ancestor *Altan debter* gave Bodonchar sons named Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai. Since Rashīd al-Dīn's final version followed the *Altan debter* and he made the Buqu and Buqatu who were Bodonchar's brothers ancestors of the Qatagin and Salji'ud respectively, that should also be the genealogy followed in the *Altan debter*. Thus the *Altan debter* already had the doublet of two generations of Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai. It is possible, however, that Rashīd al-Dīn's original main source, the Eight Ancestor Genealogy, actually had a pure 0+3 scheme in which Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai were found only in the generation below Bodonchar. If so, it is somewhat remarkable that Rashīd al-Dīn left so little trace of that alternative in his discussions. The other possibility is that the Eight-Ancestor Genealogy was already similar to the *Altan debter* in having the Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai doublet. But either way, it seems that both of his main sources preserved the narrative spirit of the 0+3 narrative structure in which the sons of Alan Gho'a remain united and her in-laws are the skeptics.

As this analysis shows, then, Rashīd al-Dīn's *Altan debter*, far from being the oldest source implied by his reference to it as an "old manuscript," was actually the result of two successive instances of conflation, one that multiplied Alan Gho'a's sons from three to five, and another that created a doublet with two generations of brothers named Buqu~Buqa and Buqatu~Buqatai. The *SHM*'s genealogical scheme was also the product of such a conflation, but the narrative use made of the shared source materials was very different. Even if they changed the exact scheme, Rashīd al-Dīn's sources preserved the 0+3 narrative logic in which fraternal unity was emphasized, while the *SHM*, even after assimilating Belgünütei and Bügünütei, preserved the motifs of fraternal disunity and exclusion that were the narrative leitmotifs of the 2+1 scheme.

### THE GENEALOGY OF THE YÖRKIN

As a second example of multiple genealogical traditions, I would like to return to the question with which I opened this paper: the genealogy of Seche Beki and Tayichu, the leaders of the Yörkin rivals of Chinggis Khan. As I mentioned, one passage in the *SHM* makes Seche Beki a son of Bartan Ba'atur, while the *SHM*'s formal

genealogy make him and his confederate Tayichu the sons of Sorqatu (or Qutuqtu) Yörki,<sup>91</sup> in turn the son of Ökin Barqaq, the elder brother of Bartan Ba'atur. Along with the cousins Altan and Quchar, Seche Beki and Tayichu were the four most important members of Chinggis Qan's extended family during his early rise. One would expect their ancestry thus to be clear, but the genealogical information about them varies significantly in the source, as commentators have noticed. But as I will show the variation is not a matter of mistakes, but of coherent, alternative genealogies which can be linked with those found in the genealogical sources here analyzed.

I will begin not with the *SHM* genealogy, but that exceptional, "mistaken" one found in *SHM* §179. The reason is that the genealogy set out in §179 appears to *predate* that of the *SHM*. As I argued in a paper given in Tokyo, that section of the *SHM* is part of a text which Yoshida Jun'ichi called "The Indictment of Ong Qan" and which I call the "Apologia of Chinggis Khan." This "Apologia" text is cited almost verbatim in the "Record of the Campaigns of Chinggis Khan" (*SWQZL*) §24, and also, albeit with rather more rearrangement and alteration, in *SHM* §177-181. Brief citations from it also appear elsewhere in those two works. Among the ways it differs from other texts include not just the genealogy of Seche and Tayichu, but also in giving Yisükei the title Qa'an, not Ba'atur, and giving Tayichu the title *qiru*, and Altan the Turkic title *je'in* "younger brother," and highlighting the role of persons elsewhere hardly mentioned, such as Sö'ekedei To'oril (To'oril of the Sö'eken, not to be confused with To'oril Ong Qa'an). Since this text was a source for the finished *SHM*, it must predate it, and hence its genealogy, with Seche Beki and Tayichu Qiru as the sons of Bartan Ba'atur, and hence uncles of, and not cousins, of Chinggis is not a *later* mistake but the *earliest* genealogy of Seche Beki and Altan attested in writing.

While this source's genealogy is incomplete, it does give six clear bits of information: 1) Seche and Tayichu were sons of Bartan Ba'atur (*SHM* §179; *SWQZL* §24.8); 2) they were one generation above Chinggis Khan and (it is implied) Altan and Quchar (*SHM* §179; *SWQZL* §24.8); 3) Seche was genealogically senior to Chinggis Khan's line and Tayichu genealogically junior (*SWQZL* §24.2); 4) Quchar was the son of Nekün Tayishi (*SHM* §179; *SWQZL* §24.8); 5) Altan was the son of Qutula Qa'an (*SHM* §179; *SWQZL* §24.8); 6) Tumbinai and Charaqai were in the same generation (*SHM* §180; *SWQZL* §24.9). This last piece of information is crucial. Only in the Seven-Ancestor genealogical scheme do Tumbina(i) and Charaqai(i) occupy the same generation. One can therefore associate the genealogy of the "Apologia" with that of the Seven-Ancestor scheme. Putting them together with

91 The explanation of this alternation is that Sorqatu means "having smallpox scars." This type of avoidance name—presumably given so that the child would be treated by the spirits spreading smallpox as already marked and so would be passed over—was rather common in pre-Chinggisid Mongolia, but was frequently also subject to the taboo on mentioning smallpox and so replaced by a euphemism.

assumptions about Nekün Tayishi and Yisükei Ba'atur, one could come up with the genealogy given in the Table.<sup>92</sup>

Menen Tudun					
Nachin	Qayidu				
<i>Charaqai</i>	<i>Tumbinai</i>				
	Qabul Qa'an				
	<i>Bartan Ba'atur</i>				?
	<i>Seche Beki</i>	<i>Nekün Tay-ishi</i>	<i>Yisükei Qa'an</i>	<i>Tayichu</i>	<i>Qutula Qa'an</i>
		<i>Quchar</i>	<i>Temüjin</i>		<i>Altan</i>

**TABLE OF THE OF THE YÖRKIN GENEALOGY IN THE "APOLOGIA"**  
(links documented in the "Apologia" in italics; those from the Seven-Ancestor genealogy in Rashīd al-Dīn in plain type)

A second genealogy is the one attested in Rashīd al-Dīn. As I have shown, Rashīd al-Dīn had in front of him at least three genealogical documents. His final genealogy seems to have been originally based on the Eight-Ancestor genealogy, but then re-edited according to the *Altan debter*, a Nine-Ancestor scheme. Since the reediting was not complete (as I have shown), it seems impossible to exclude the possibility of distinctive Eight-Ancestor data remaining in the material, while on the hand, any given piece of data might possibly derive from the *Altan debter*. Thus the exact

Bai-Shingqor				Charaqa
Tumbina Qan				
Qabul Qa'an				
Sorqatu Yörki	Bartan Ba'atur		Qutuqtu-Möngner	Qutula Qa'an
Seche Beki	Nekün Tayishi	Yisükei Ba'atur	Tayichu	Altan
	Quchar	Temüjin		

**TABLE OF THE OF THE YÖRKIN GENEALOGY IN RASHĪD AL-DĪN'S CONFLATED EIGHT-ANCESTOR AND ALTAN DEBTER GENEALOGY**

affiliation of Rashīd al-Dīn's information cannot be completely ascertained and his information should be seen as a composite of the Eight-Ancestor and *Altan debter* genealogies. According to this record (see Table 3), Seche Beki was indeed the son of Sorghatu Yörki and was thus, as his name indicates the *beki* (genealogical senior) of the family. Tayichu, however, is no longer a brother of Seche Beki, but the overall genealogical position of the two Yörkin leaders remains straddling the line of Yisükei Ba'atur, with Seche being senior and Tayichu being junior, now the son of

92 The only undocumented part is the exact linkage of Qutula Qa'an to Yisükei Ba'atur; brother or cousin?

Bartan Ba'atur's younger brother Qutuqtu Möngner.<sup>93</sup> Meanwhile generational placements of Altan and Charaqa(i) have shifted.

In this context, the *SHM*'s comments on Yörkin genealogy become much more understandable as a new solution to an old set of problems (see Table).

Bai-Shingqor				Charaqa
Tumbina Qan				
Qabul Qa'an				
Sorqatu Yörki	Bartan Ba'atur		Qutuqtu-Möngner	Qutula Qa'an
Seche Beki and Tayichu	Nekün Tayishi	Yisükei Ba'atur	Böri Böke	Altan
	Quchar	Temüjin		

TABLE OF THE OF THE YÖRKIN GENEALOGY IN *SHM* IN §§49-50, 122, AND 139-40

The *SHM* does not just introduce Yörkin genealogy in context, but actually returns to it again in §139-40, with special reference to the genealogy of Böri Böke. The tone of the Secret Historian's comments is not one of someone expounding an accepted, mainstream position, but rather one of someone advancing a new and different point of view. So what was the problem for the Secret Historian, and what was new about his solution? The problem, relevant for all three genealogies, was evidently the question of how the Yörkin could be one group when its leaders were not genealogically unified. In §§50 and 140, the Secret Historian emphasizes how Böri Böke, even though being the son of Qutuqtu Möngner, "went past the sons of Bartan Ba'atur and became a companion of the proud sons of Barqaq."<sup>94</sup> Attached to this is a description of how the Yörkin were formed in §139, in which Qabul Qa'an, the admitted grandfather of the Yörkin patriarch in all the genealogies, gives strong men from all the lineages to the Yörkin founder (whether Sorqatu Yörki or Seche Beki). Both explanations deal with the problem, found in all three genealogies, that Yörkin leaders are found on both sides, senior and junior, of the specifically Chinggisid ancestor (whether Bartan Ba'atur or Yisükei Ba'atur).

Another problem seems to have been whether Seche Beki and Tayichu were brothers or not. Given their extremely close association in all the stories, making them brothers would seem to be a natural move. In the Seven-Ancessor genealogy, they were, albeit on different sides of Chinggis's father, Yisükei. But in Rashīd al-Dīn's genealogy, they retain the straddling position on both sides of the Chinggisid ancestor, Bartan Ba'atur, necessitated by the stories of the Yörkin rise, but at the cost of these two closely associated figures no longer being brothers. The Secret

93 Smirnova, pp. 33, 34; Thackston, I, pp. 126, 127; Rawshan and Mūsawī, pp. 248, 249.

94 *SHM* §140 (EU, p. 264): *Bartan Ba'atur-un kö'ün-eche alus Barqaq-un omoqsad kö'üt-tür nököchejü bolun*

Historian was evidently looking for a different solution and found it in the figure Böri Böke.

The big innovation in the *SHM*'s genealogy is that the Yörkin leader on the junior side of Bartan Ba'atur is not Tayichu, but Böri Böke. In other sources, Böri Böke is not even a member of Chinggis Khan's Borjigid lineage at all; Rashīd al-Dīn in all his sources evidently had no data on his ancestry.<sup>95</sup> A listing of Chinggis Khan's thirteen corrals (*küre'en*) gives the son of Qutuqtu-Möngner not as the *SHM*'s Böri Böke, nor as Tayichu, but as the otherwise unknown Möngge-Kejiger.<sup>96</sup> The other genealogies kept the idea of Seche Beki and Tayichu being on different sides of Bartan Ba'atur, but the *SHM* account put them both on the senior side. Hence to retain the sense of the Yörkin being on both sides of Bartan Ba'atur, a new junior Yörkin leader was needed. Böri Böke appeared in the stories as a Yörkin follower and was recruited by the Secret Historian to fill the position that Tayichu held in Rashīd al-Dīn's genealogy. The genealogy of Böri Böke appears to be a particularly speculative link for the Secret Historian: he mentions it in §50, links it up to the story he will tell later, and having told the story, repeats the genealogy in §140, together with an additional gloss stating that Böri had passed over Bartan Ba'atur to ally with the Yörkin. Why was this gloss necessary? Presumably because this was a speculative new genealogical solution with which his readers might be unfamiliar. In any case, the *SHM* clearly treats its own genealogy of the Yörkin as a challenge to conventional wisdom.

This analysis suggests the following preliminary conclusions: 1) The *SHM* is by no means the first genealogy, but certainly postdates the Seven-Ancestor genealogy. Rashīd al-Dīn's genealogical composite of the Eight-Ancestor genealogy and the *Altan debter* appears to be a set of parallel solutions, perhaps earlier than, or of similar age to the *SHM*, but in any case certainly independent of and unaware of the *SHM*.<sup>97</sup> 2) The driving force of genealogical explanation and debate appears to be the need to reconcile certain narrative motifs which were potentially contradictory. For example, the Yörkin genealogy had three fixed narrative motifs:

1. Seche Beki and Tayichu were leaders of the Yörkin;
2. Seche Beki and Tayichu were brothers (or as close as brothers);
3. The Yörkin were both senior and junior to "our" (i.e. the Chinggisid) line.

95 See Smirnova, p. 92; Thackston, I, p. 164, Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 336 in which Böri "was allied with" Seche and was a "emir of the Tājjiūt" (which seems to be Rashīd al-Dīn's catch-all receptacle for any leader whose genealogical affiliation he is uncertain of).

96 *SWQZL* §3.3; this could be an indication that the genealogical data in this important list is more compatible with the Seven-Ancestor genealogy than any other. But the presence of Sorqatu Yürki in Rashīd al-Dīn's parallel text version of it would seem to speak against such a conclusion (see Smirnova, p. 87; Thackston, I, p. 161; Rawshan and Mūsawī, p. 329).

97 The preliminary analysis of the Alan Gho'a legends given above suggests this same point with regard to that complex of motifs as well.

The potential contradiction is that if Seche Beki and Tayichu are put on the two sides of the Chinggisid line, they might not actually be brothers. Given these three fixed points, differing, more or less satisfactory, solutions were possible, and the three genealogies outline some of the possibilities. Finally, as the reference to Chinggisid shows, this genealogical investigation was always carried out from the standpoint of Chinggis Khan's lineage as the focal point from which all assessments of generational sequence and seniority were viewed.

### CONCLUSION

The following tables summarize the conclusions I have drawn about these six genealogies. The first simply presents the names of the lineal ancestors of Chinggis Khan for each source. The second presents the contrasts between the genealogies in terms of distinctive genre, attendant narratives, collateral links, and so on. The existence of these six genealogies shows that genealogy remained a major site of intellectual disputation and production throughout the Mongol empire period. No genealogy was treated as above criticism, but all of them represented a bundle of solutions to various problems created by the existence of narrative motifs and traditions preserved in the story of the rise of Chinggis Khan. Analysis from this point of view, rather than from the elevation of any one account, such as the *SHM*, as the one canonical story, will be both more revealing and more faithful to the way genealogies were actually created and revised in the Mongol empire.

Seven-Ancestor Genealogy	Eight-Ancestor Genealogy	<i>Altan debter</i>	<i>SHM</i>	<i>YT</i>	<i>GRTA</i>
			XII. Börte Chino'a	IX. Börte Chino'a	
			XI. Batachiqan	VIII. Batachi Qa'an	
			X. Tamacha	VII. Tamach	
			IX. Qorichar Mergen	VI. Qiju Mergen	
			VIII. A'ujam Boro'ul	V. A'ujam Boro'ul	
			VII. Sali Qacha'u		
			VI. Yeke Nidün	IV. Yeke Nidün	
			V. Sam Sochi	III. Sam Sa'uchi	
			IV. Qarchu	II. Sali Qachu	
			III. Borjigidai Mergen		
			II. Toroqoljin Bayan		

	Dobun Bayan and Alan Gho'a	Dobun Bayan and Alan Gho'a	I. Dobun Mergen; Alan Gho'a	I. Dobun Mergen; Alan Gho'a	Tobun Mergen; Alan Gho'o
7. [Bodonchar]	8. Bodonchar	9. Bodonchar	10. Bodonchar	9. Bodonchar Mungqaq	10. Bodonchar
		8. Buqa	9. Barim Siqiratu Qabichi	8. Qabichi Berim Siqir (?)	9. Barim Siqiratu Qabichi
6. Dutum Manan	7. Dutum Menen	7. Dutum Menen	8. Menen Tudun	7. Menen Todon	8. Menen Tudun
			7. Qachi Külüq		7. Ginadur Qan
5. Qayidu	6. Qayidu	6. Qayidu	6. Qayidu	6. Qayidu Qa'an	6. Qayidu
	7. Bai-Shingqor	5. Bai-Shingqor	5. Bai-Shingqor Doqshin	5. Bai-Shingqor Doqshin	5. Bai-Shingqor
4. Tumbina Qan	8. Tumbina Qan	4. Tumbina Qan	4. Tumbinai Sechen	4. Dumbinai Qan	4. Tumbinai
3. Qabul Qa'an	9. Qabul Qa'an	3. Qabul Qa'an	3. Qabul Qa'an	3. Qabula Qa'an	3. Qabul Qa'an
2. Bartan Ba'atur	10. Bartan Ba'atur	2. Bartan Ba'atur	2. Bartan Ba'atur	2. Bartan Ba'atur	2. Bardan
1. Yisükei Ba'atur	11. Yisükei Ba'atur	1. Yisükei Ba'atur	1. Yisükei Ba'atur	1. Yisükei Ba'atur	1. Yisükei
Chinggis Qan	Chinggis Qan	Chinggis Qan	Chinggis Qan	Chinggis Qan	Chinggis Qan

TABLE: CONSPECTUS OF THE SIX GENEALOGICAL SOURCES

	Seven-Ancestor Genealogy	Eight-Ancestor Genealogy	<i>Altan debter</i>	<i>SHM</i>	<i>YT</i>	<i>GRTA</i>
main genre	history	genealogy	genealogy	history	history	genealogy
no. of stages	1	1	1	2	2	1
sons of Alan Gho'a			5	5	5	3
Bodonchar's generation	7	8	9	10	9	10
Jalayir story?	yes	yes	yes	no	?	yes
Nachin's father	Tudum Menen	Tudum Menen	none	Menen Tudun	?	Ginadur Qan
Nachin's descendants	Tayichi'ud	Tayichi'ud	none	Uru'ud, Mangghud	?	Uru'ud

TABLE OF THE MAIN CONTRADICTIONS BETWEEN THE SIX GENEALOGICAL SOURCES

## APPENDICES

I. The *Genealogical Record of the Ten Ancestors*. In this section I include all the material from *YS* 1 and 107 and *NCCGL* 1 that derives directly or indirectly from the *GRTA*. The tabular format of the *YS* has been adopted to present the genealogical data. Narrative information has been added to the appropriate boxes. To assist in navigating the table, which originally may have been on very large format paper, the generations above Chinggis Khan have been numbered. Material drawn from the genealogy in *YS* 107 and *NCCGL* is in large and small type; material drawn from *YS* 1 is in medium-size type.

The wife of Tobun Mergen 脫奔咩哩健, Empress Alan Gho'o 阿蘭果火后 <sup>98</sup> [Chinggis Khan's] ancestor in the tenth generation was Bodonchar, whose mother was called Alan Gho'o. She married Tobun Mergen, and gave birth to two sons, the eldest of whom was named Boqan Qadaqi and the second of whom was named Boqatu Salgi. Then, when her husband died and Alan lived as a widow, at night in her sleeping tent, a visionary white ray entered in through the skylight, and changed into a golden-colored spirit-man, who came in and immediately laid down upon the bed. Alan awoke in astonishment and consequently became pregnant, giving birth to one son, who was Bodonchar.		
Boqan Qadaqi 博寒葛答 黑 <sup>99</sup>	Boqatu Salgi 博合觀撒里 吉	10. Initial Founder ( <i>Shizu</i> 始祖) Bodonchar 李端叉兒 <small>one son</small> Bodonchar's appearance was strange, and his words few; those in the family called him an idiot. Only Alan said to people, "This boy is not an idiot; the sons and grandsons descended from him will certainly be held in honor." After Alan passed away, the brothers divided up the family estate and did not give him any. Bodonchar said, "To be poor and despised or else to be rich and honored, that is fate; as for property and goods, what is worth saying about them?" and rode alone on a blueish-white horse to the place, Baltun-Aral 八里屯阿懶, where he stayed. He had no way to get food or drink, when just then there was an grey falcon catching a wild animal for food, and Bodonchar used a fishing-line to set a device to catch it, and the falcon became tame and friendly. Thus, the tamed falcon hunted rabbits and fowls for him to eat, and even when something was lacking, still he survived, as if Heaven was friendly to him. He had been living thus for several months, when a few score families of commoners had migrated in from the Tüנגgilig Quru'u 統急里忽魯 fields, following the water and grass, and Bodonchar built a cottage to live with them and they helped each other out in receipts and expenditures, so that from then on his life and health became somewhat adequate. One day, his second older brother suddenly thought about him, and said, "Bodonchar left alone and has no refuge; I wonder if he starved or froze to death recently?" Then he came from there to find him, and invited him to return home with him. Bodonchar in the middle of the road turned to speak to his brother: "The commoners of Tüנגgilig-Quru'u are subject to no one; if we were to go back there for an attack, they could be made to serve us." His elder brother also thought that way. When they got to their family, they selected brave men, commanded Bodonchar to

98 后: found in *NCCGL*.

99 Both *YS* 107 and *NCCGL* omit 答黑, which has been added from *YS* 1.

		lead their forward advance, and as a result the commoners all surrendered to them.
--	--	--

10. Initial Founder Bodonchar	
9. Barim Siqiratu Qabichu 八林昔黑 刺秃哈必畜 one son Bodonchar died, and his son Barim-Shigiratu-Qabichi succeeded him, giving birth himself to a son Menen-Dudun.	When the Initial Founder Bodonchar took over the civilian households of the Tüנגgilig Quru'u clansmen, he also then got a pregnant wife named Chajirai 插只來 and took her in. Because his mother was named Chajirai, the child she gave to birth after his father's death from then on was counted a different race and was also called Tatar 達鞏. <sup>100</sup>
8. Menen Dudun 咩撚 <sup>101</sup> 篤敦 seven sons	

## 8. Menen Dudun

Menen-Dudun's wife was called Monolun 莫拏倫, who gave birth to seven children before being widowed. Monolun's character was tough and enterprising. At the time, the Yalayir 押刺伊而<sup>102</sup> tribe had a gang of young boys who dug up the grass roots in the fields for food, and when Monolun got into her cart and went out, she just then saw them. Angrily saying, "This field is just the place where my sons exercise their horses, yet this gang of boys dares to do the evil of ruining it," she urged on her cart and left straightaway, running over and wounding several boys, some of whom even died. The Yalayir were furious, and drove away all of Monolun's horse herds. When Monolun's sons heard this, they went to pursue them, without stopping to put on armor. Monolun worried to herself about them, saying, "My boys left without putting on armor, and I fear they will not be able to gain victory over the enemy." She commanded the women and children to carry armor to her sons, but they were already out of reach. Thus, the result was that they were defeated, and the six of the sons there all died. The Yalayir took advantage of the victory to kill Monolun and destroy her family. Only with one, the oldest grandson Qayidu 海都, who was still a baby, did his nurse hide him among the firewood, and so he was able to escape.

7. Ginadur Qan 既拏 都篤罕 one son	some-one	some-one	some-one	some-one	some-one	Nachin 納真. Today's Uru'ud 兀魯兀 <sup>103</sup> are his descendants. Previously, Monolun's seventh son Nachin, was living among the Barghu 八刺忽 commoner households as a son-in-law, and therefore was not harmed. When he heard that his family had suffered disaster, he came to see them, and found a little more than ten sickly old women with Qayidu still there, so that there was no plan he could make. Fortunately, when the horses had been driven away, the elder brothers' yellow horse thrice broke the lariat, fled away, and later returned. Nachin was able to catch
----------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	---

100 This paragraph is quoted in *YS* 107/2797 as a direct citation from the *GRTA*.

101 *YS* 107 and *NCCGL* have 麻; the correct reading is from *YS* 1.

102 This Yalayir is the same as the clan elsewhere attested as Jalayir. It is found elsewhere in *YS* as Jalar (Chinese *Zhalar* 札刺兒).

103 Following the emendation suggested in Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 10, n. 9.

					<p>up to him and ride him. Then pretending to be a horse herder, he went to the Yalayir. On the way, he met a father and son riding one behind the other, hunting with a tame falcon. Nachin recognized the falcon and thought, "This is one my elder brothers used to hold." He hastened up and fooled the younger of them, saying, "There was a red horse, leading a herd of horses east, have you seen them?" "No," was the reply. The son then asked him, "Along the way you passed, did you see any wild ducks or geese?" "Yes," was the reply. "Could you go in front of me to guide me to them?" "I can," he said, and so the two went on together. After turning a bend in the river, and looking back to see the distance growing between him and the rear rider, Nachin stabbed him to death. He took the bridle of the horse and the falcon, and hastened back to the other rider, where he fooled him as before. The rear rider asked him, "That one in front shooting wild ducks and geese is my son. Why is he taking so long to rest and not getting up?" Nachin responded that it was a bloody nose. Just as the rider got angry, Nachin took the opportunity and stabbed him to death. Again going on to the foot of a mountain, there were several hundred horses, of which the herdsmen were only a few boys, who just then were hitting hipbones and stones as sport. Nachin looked carefully at the horses, and that too was the property of his elder brothers' household. He deceptively asked the boys about it, and indeed so it was. Thereupon, he ascended the mountain and looked in all four directions, and so, seeing everything was quiet with no one approaching, he killed all the boys, and, driving the horses before him and holding the falcon, he returned home, where he gathered up Qayidu together with the sickly old women, and returned to the land of Barghu, where he stayed.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

6. Qayidu 海都 one son <sup>104</sup>					
---	--	--	--	--	--

6. Qayidu 海都 When Qayidu grew somewhat older, Nachin led the Barghu and Ke[se]güd 怯谷 <sup>105</sup> commoners together to make Qayidu their lord. When Qayidu was thus established, he attacked the Yalayir with troops, making them servitors and subjects, so that his situation became increasingly grand. He arranged his camp of tents in a line on Barqaq 八刺合黑 River, straddling the river with a bridge, to increase the convenience of coming and going. From this time on, the neighboring tribes and clans in all directions coming under his allegiance steadily increased.		
5. Bai-Shingqor 拜姓 <sup>106</sup> 忽兒 one son Qayidu died and his son Bai-Shingqor succeeded him.	Charaqa Lingqun 察刺哈寧昆 received his elder brother Bai-Shingqor's wife; begat one son	Cha'ujin-Ûrdege 擦忽真兀兒迭葛 <sup>107</sup> Today's Siji'ud 昔只兀剔 <sup>108</sup> are his descendants
4. Dumbinai 敦必乃 six sons Bai-Shingqor died and his son Tumbinai succeeded him.	Chinas 直孛斯 Today's Tayichi'ud 太丑禿 <sup>109</sup> are his descendants	

4. Dumbinai 敦必乃					
Qachuqu 葛 朮虎. Today's Noyakin 那 are his descendants	Qaqla Girten 葛忽刺急哩 担. Today's Great Barulas 大八魯刺斯 are his descendants	Qachan 合產. Today's Little Barulas 小八 魯刺斯 are his descendants	Qaraladai 哈刺喇 歹. Today's Boda'ad 博苔 <sup>110</sup> 阿 替 are his descendants	Qachiqun 葛 赤渾. Today's Adarki 阿答 里急 are his descendants	3. Qabul Qan 葛不 律寒 seven sons. Dumbinai died and his son Qabul Qan succeeded him.

104 In fact according to the genealogy presented, Qayidu had three sons. Is this just a slip? Or does it represent a remnant of the Seven-Ancestor genealogical scheme according to which Qayidu had one son, Tumbinai?

105 *YS* 1 text: Qie-gu 怯谷 (<Kê-gu). This must correspond to Rashid al-Din's *knbut-ksüt*, rendered by translators as Kanbaut or Känbä'üt.

106 *YS* 107 and *NCCGL* both read 住; *YS* 1 has the correct reading.

107 Following Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 12, n.3, I emend *YS*107 and *NCCGL*'s 獠 to 擦 and 禿 to 兒.

108 I emend *YS* 107 and *NCCGL*'s 刺 to 剔. Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 12, n.3, considers an emendation to 禿 but believes it less probable. *NCCGL* has 卽 for 只.

109 Following Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 13, n. 5, I emend *YS* 107's 大 to 太 and 兀禿 to 禿; *NCCGL* has 大 and 兀兀.

110 I emend *YS* 107 and *NCCGL*'s 歹 to 苔.

3. Qabul Qan 葛不律寒						
Ökin Barqaq 窩 111斤八刺 哈哈 Today's Yörkin 岳 里斤 are his descendants	2. Bardan 八哩丹 four sons Qabul Qan died and his son Bartan succeeded him.	Qutuqtu Megner <sup>112</sup> 忽 都都 <sup>113</sup> 咩轟 兒	Qutula Qan 忽 都刺罕	Qadan Ba'atur 合丹八 都兒	Dödö'en Odchigin 掇端斡赤 斤	Qulan Ba'atur 忽闌八都兒 the son of a concubine

2. Bardan			
Mönggetü Qiyān 蒙 哥睹黑顏	Nekün Tayishi 轟昆 太 <sup>114</sup> 司	1. Ardent Founder ( <i>Liezu</i> 烈祖), the Supernaturally Primal Emperor ( <i>Shenyuan huangdi</i> 神元皇帝) Personal name Yisükei 也 速該, surname Qiya'un 奇渥溫. <sup>115</sup> Bartan died, and his son Yisügei succeeded him, at which time he also swallowed up the tribes, so that his power became even more magnificent.	Daritai Ochir 答里 台斡 <sup>116</sup> 真
		Five sons <sup>117</sup>	Tayinal Yeye 太 <sup>118</sup> 納耶耶

1. Ardent Founder 烈祖, the Supernaturally Prime 神元 Emperor				
The Great Founder and Emperor ( <i>Taizu huangdi</i> 太祖皇帝) six sons	Chochi Qasar 捌只哈撒兒	Qachi'un 哈赤溫	Temüge Odchigin 鐵木哥斡 赤斤	Belgütei 別 里古台
1) Crown Prince Jochi 朮赤太子 <sup>119</sup> 2) Crown Prince Chaghadai 察合台太子 3) The Great Ancestor and Emperor ( <i>Taizong huangdi</i> 太宗皇帝) 4) The Sagacious Ancestor and				

111 Following Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 17, n. 12, I emend YS 107's 窠 to 窩; NCCGL has the yet more corrupt 笛不.

112 For Qutuqtu-Mngner, correctly read as Qutuqtu-Mengner.

113 Following Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 17, n. 14, I emend YS 107 and NCCGL's 魯 to 都.

114 I emend YS 107 and NCCGL's 大 to 太.

115 This note, taken from NCCGL, supplies the transcription for Qiyad (again slightly unusual), which is also found in YS 1/1. The reading of wò 渥 is 'yaw in Pagbá Chinese (Coblin, *A Handbook of 'Phags-pa Chinese*, §543, p. 153).

116 Following Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, pp. 19-20, n. 22, I emend YS 107 and NCCGL by adding 台斡.

117 From this generation on, I have assumed that all names with the title *wang* 王 or *dawang* 大王 derive from the *Jingshi dadian* stipend list and eliminated them.

118 Following Hambis, *Chapitre CVII*, p. 20 n.1, I emend YS 107 and NCCGL's 大 to 太.

119 Crown Prince (*taizi* 太子), preserved in the NCCGL, is the term used by the GRTA genealogy, while the *Jingshi dadian* stipend list uses *dawang* 大王.

Emperor ( <i>Ruizong huangdi</i> 睿宗皇帝)				
5) Crown Prince Uruchi 兀魯赤太子				
6) Crown Prince Kölgen 果里干太子				

II. The *Yeke tobchiyan*. In this section I include the material from the *Debter marbó* and Rashīd al-Dīn that derives from the *Yeke tobchiyan*. Material from the *Debter marbó* is in plain type and that from Rashīd al-Dīn in italics. The notes present the textual variants in the Tibetan transcriptions as well as excluded material or possibly material to be added.<sup>120</sup>

According to the genealogy (*rgyal-rabs*) of the Mongols, in the beginning was the son of heaven Börte Chi[no'a] (*sBor-ta-che*).<sup>121</sup> *Trustworthy historians of the Turks report that all the Mongol tribes are descended from the two persons who went into Arkūneh-Qūn. One of those who emerged from there was an important commander, a leader and chief of tribes, Būrteh-Chineh by name from whom Dübūn Bayān, Alān-Qū'ā's husband, and several other clans were descended. He had many wives and sons.*

His son was Batachi-Qa'an (\**Ba'a-da'a-chi-ga'an*).<sup>122</sup> *By his chief wife, Qūay-Marāl, [Börte-Chino's] had a son, the most important of his sons, who attained rulership. His name was \*Batajī-Qā'ān.*<sup>123</sup>

His son was Tamchaq (*Tham-chag*).<sup>124</sup> *He had a son named Tamāj who succeeded his father.*

His son was Qiju Mergen (\**Khyi-ju Mer-khan*)<sup>125</sup>.<sup>126</sup> *This Tamāj had five sons, the eldest of whom was named Qījū<sup>127</sup> Markān and who succeeded his father. It is*

120 Sigla are as follows: DMD: *Debter marbó*, Demchigmaa edition (pp. 59-62); DMB: *Debter marbó*, Beijing edition (pp. 28-30); DMS: *Debter marbó*, Sikkim edition (pp. 27-28/14a-b); JB: *Ja-Bod yigtsang* (pp. 254-56); DN: *Debter ngonbó* (pp. 57-58).

121 DMD: *sBor-tha-che*; DMB: *sBor-ta-che*; DMS: *sBor-tha-che*; JB: *sBor-ta-che*; DN: *sBor-ta-che*.

122 DMD: *Pa-da-chi-gan*; DMB: *Ba'a-da'a-chi'a-gan*; DMS: *Ba-da-chi-gan*; JB: *Bha-ta-che-gan*; DN: *Ba-da-chi-gan*.

123 His name is given a T?jī-Qāān in the Tashkent ms and Yatajī-Qīān in the Istanbul ms.

124 DMD: *Tham-chag*; DMB: *Tham-chag*; DMS: *Thams-cad-chag*; JB: *Thams-cad-cha'i*; DN: *Tham-chag*.

125 DMD: *Khyi-ji mer-mkhan*; DMB: *Khyi-ji mer-khan*; DMS: *Byi-ji mer-mkhan*; JB: *Chi-ge Ma-regs-gan*; DN: *Chi-ji mer-gan*. I guess here, as elsewhere, two different vowels in the original were assimilated to become one. This is visible elsewhere, for example with the name of Hö'elün, but here must have taken place very early in the textual tradition.

126 Here the *Debter marbó* adds this note: "Now they say that he is the Badma-Jungnai famous as the one who shut the mouths of demons (*lha-srin-po*)." The combination of "now" (*da*) and "they say" (*zer*) flags this as material added by the Tibetan translator adapting the Mongolian genealogy to a Tibetan context.

related that the other four sons wanted to leave their place for other territories, but there was a branch of the river in the way. They gathered much dry dung and constructed a thing like a raft, which here [i.e. in Iran] they call kalak ["raft" in Persian], got on it, crossed the river, and entered other territories. They say that the Dūrbān tribe is descended from them because dūrbān means four, and they consist of four branches.

One day one of the offspring of the youngest son, Qūlūn Saqal by name, had killed a mountain ox (gaw-i kūhī), and someone from the Bāyāūt tribe, Bāyālīq by name, brought his son, and he sold him some of the ox flesh. Since he was a relative of Alān Qū'ā's husband, he gave the boy to Alān Qū'ā, and most of the Bāyāūt, who are servants and urugh (bandeh-i urugh) to Chīnggīz Khān, are descended from that boy.

His son was A'ujam-Boro'ul (\*A'u-jam sBo-ro-'ol).<sup>128</sup> Qījū Markān had a son who succeeded him, Qūjam-Būghrūl by name.

His son was Yeke-Nidūn (\*Ye-ka Ni-dun).<sup>129</sup> He had a son who succeeded him named Yikeh-\*Nīdūn.

His son was Sam-Sa'uchi (Sems-za'u-ji).<sup>130</sup> He had a son named Sam-Sāūjī who succeeded to his father's position.

His son was Kha-chu.<sup>131</sup> He had a son named Qālī-Qājū [error for Sālī-Qājū],<sup>132</sup> who succeeded his father.

His son was Dobun Mergen (Do-bun Mer-khan).<sup>133</sup> To him was born Dūbūn Bāyān. Their yurt was the area of the "Unān, Kilūrān, and Tūghleh, three rivers that arise from Burqān Qāldūn mountain.

After he died, in the darkness (nag-mo-la) from Alan-Gho'a (A-lan Khwo)<sup>134</sup> was born by the light of the sun and moon (nyi-ma dang zla-ba'i zer) Bodonchar Mungqaq (\*sBo-don-char Mung-khag).<sup>135</sup>

127 This name is given as such in the Istanbul, Paris, and Oriental Institute Library mss and is not in doubt. (The version Qīhū found in the Tashkent, Saltykov-Shchedrin Library and London mss is the result simply of an omission of a diacritical dot.)

128 DMD: La'ur-byang sPo-ro'ol; DMB: La'u-byang sBo-ro'ol; DMS: La'u-jang sBe-re'ol; JB: A'u-jam Po-re-wol; DN: La'u-jang Bhe-re'ol.

129 DMD: Pas-ka Ni-dun; DMB: Pas-ka Ni-dun; DMS: Pas-ka-Ni-dun; JB: Ye-gra No-dun; DN: Pas-ka Ni-dun.

130 DMD: Sems Za-'o-ji; DMB: Sems Za-'u-ji; DMS: Sems Dza'o-ji; JB: Sems Za'o-che'i; DN: Sems Dza'o-ji.

131 DMD: Kha-chu; DMB: Kha-chu; DMS: Kha-chu; JB: Gra-chung; DN: Kha-ju.

132 Qālī-Qājū. Qālī here is actually a misreading of the Mongolian Sali; qa- and sa- are sufficiently alike that they are often confused; see Choimaa, "Comparative Analysis."

133 DMD: Do-bun Mer-khan; DMB: Do-bun Mer-khan; DMS: Do-bun Mer-khan; JB: Tho-bun Mer-gan; DN: Du-ban mer-gan.

His son was Qabichi (*\*Ga-bi-chi*)<sup>136</sup><; his son was> Be[rim-Si]qür (*sBe-khir*)<sup>137,138</sup>

His son was Menen Todon (*Ma-nan Tho-don*)<sup>139</sup>;

His son was Qayidu Qa'an (*\*Ga'i-du gan*)<sup>140</sup>;

His son was Bai Shing (*Ba'i-shing*)<sup>141</sup><; his son was> Qor Doqshin (*khör Dog-shing*)<sup>142,143</sup>

His son was Dumbinai-Qan (*Dum-bi-na'i Khan*)<sup>144</sup>;

His son was Qabula-Qa'an (*Ga-bu-la Gan*)<sup>145</sup>;

His son was Bartan Ba'atur (*Bar-than Ba-dur*)<sup>146</sup>;

His son was Yistüke Ba'atur (*\*Ye-su-ga Ba-dur*)<sup>147</sup>. The son of him and his empress (*bdzun-mo*) Hö'elün (*Ho-lun*)<sup>148</sup>, Emperor Taizu Jinggi (*Tha'i-dzu Jing-gi*)<sup>149</sup> was born in the Water Tiger year. There were five brothers.

134 DMD: *A-lan Khwo*; DMB: *A-lan Kho*; DMS: *A-lan Khwo*; JB: *A-nan Khro*; DN: *A-lan Kho*.

135 DMD: *Bo-don-char Mung-khag*; DMB: *Bo-don-char Mung-khan*; DMS: *Bo-don-char Mung-khag*; JB: *sBo-thon-char Mung-khan*; DN: *Bo-don-char Mu-gan*.

136 DMD: *Ga'i-chi*; DMB: *Ga'i-chi*; DMS: *Ga'm-chi*; JB: *Ga-si-chi*; DN: *Ga'i-chi*.

137 DMD: *sBi-khir*; DMB: *sBe-khir*; DMS: *sBe-kher*; JB: *sBi-khor*; DN: *sBi-khir*.

138 Although the case is not as clear-cut as with Bai Shingqor Doqshin below, it appears that what was a single name in the Mongolian was inadvertently split in two in the *Debter Marbó* summary. The *SHM* and the *GRTA* both have between Bodonchar Mungqaq and Menen Tudun a person name Barim Siqiratu Qabichi. The text here would seem to have these two name in reverse order and with the Barim Siqiratu abbreviated and read differently as Berim Siqir or Berim Siqiratu. It is possible, however, that some totally different name is meant.

139 DMD: *Ma-nan Tho-don*; DMB: *Ma-nan To-don*; DMS: *Ma-nan To-don*; JB: *Ma-nan*; DN: *Ma-nan Tho-don*.

140 DMD: *Ga'i-thu gan*; DMB: *Ga'i-thu gan*; DMS: *Ga'm-thu-gan*; JB: *Kha'i-du gan*; DN: *Ga'i-thu gan*.

141 DMD: *Ba'i-shing*; DMB: *Ba'i-shing*; DMS: *Ba'i-shing*; JB: *sBa'i*; DN: *Ba'i-shing*.

142 DMD: *Khör Thog-shing*; DMB: *Khör Dog-shing*; DMS: *Khör Thog-shing*; JB: *Khör Dog-shing*; DN: *Khör Thog-shing*.

143 Here what was a single name in the Mongolian was inadvertently split in two in the *Debter Marbó* summary. *Ba'i-shing-khör Dog-shing* represents Mongolian Bai-Shingqor Doqshin.

144 DMD: *Dum-ba'i-na'i Khan*; DMB: *Dum-bi'i-na'i Khan*; DMS: *Dum-bi-ha'i Khan*; JB: *na'i Khan*; DN: *Dum-bi-ha'i Khan*.

145 DMD: *Ga-bu-la gan*; DMB: *Ga-bu-la khan*; DMS: *Ga-bu-la gan*; JB: *Ga-bu khan*; DN: *Ka-bu-la gan*.

146 DMD: *Bar-than ba-dur*; DMB: *bar-than ba-dur*; DMS: *Bar-than Ba-dur*; JB: *Bha-dan Bha-dur*; DN: *Bar-than Ba-dur*.

Emperor Jinggi brought the realm under his power and ruled on the throne for 23 years. On the 12<sup>th</sup> day of the seventh moon of the Fire Tiger year, in his sixty-first year, he ascended to heaven (*gnam-du gshegs-so*) in the Mi-nyag Xia (*Gha*)<sup>150</sup> land.

He had nine son, such as Jochi (*'Jo-chi*),<sup>151</sup> Chaghadai (*Cha-ga-da'i*),<sup>152</sup> Ögedei (*O-ga-da'i*),<sup>153</sup> and Tolui Noyan (*Tho-lo No-yon*).<sup>154</sup> Because while the ruler [Chinggis] was still alive the two elder sons had presented letters (*yi-ge*) by which they would not struggle for the throne, they were made to administer lands on the right and left wing.

Their younger brother Ögedei sat on the throne for six years. Jochi had eight sons. Chaghadai had nine sons, such as Du'a (*Du-ba*).<sup>155</sup>

Emperor Ögedei's eldest son was Küyüg (*Go-yug*).<sup>156</sup> He ruled on the imperial throne for six months. His younger brothers were Kötén (*Go-dan*)<sup>157</sup> and Qashi (*Ga-shi*)<sup>158</sup>; there were six younger brothers besides Kötén (*Go-dan*).

Because Tolui Noyan had not previously presented any letter, he struggled for the throne. He had eleven sons, such as the son of Sayin Eke Soroqtai (*Za-yin E-ka So-rog-da'i*),<sup>159</sup> Mōngke Qa'an (*\*Mong-go Gan*)<sup>160</sup> who was nine years on the throne, his fourth son, Qubila Shizu Sechen Qa'an (*Go-be-la Shi-dzu Se-chen Gan*)<sup>161</sup> who was born in the wood pig year, his sixth son Hüle'ü (*Hu-la-hu*),<sup>162</sup> and his seventh son Ari-Böke (*A-ri sBo-ga*)<sup>163, 164</sup>.

147 DMD: *Ye-sun-ka Pa-thur*; DMB: *Ye-sur-ga Ba-dur*; DMS: *Ye-phur-gang Pa-thur*; JB: *Ye-su-ga dur*; DN: *Ye-phur-ga Ba-dur*.

148 DMD: *Hu-lun*; DMB: *Ho-lun*; DMS: *Hu-lun*; JB: *Hu-lun*; DN: *Hu-lun*.

149 DMD: *Tha'i-ju Jing-gi*; DMB: *Tha'i-dzu Jing-gi*; DMS: *Tha'i-dzung Jing-gi*; JB: *Tha'i-dzung Jing-gir*; DN: *Tha'i-dzung Jing-gin*.

150 DMD: *Gha*; DMB: *'Ga'*; DMS: *Ga*; JB: *Gha*; DN: *Gha*.

151 DMD: *'Jo-chi*; DMB: *'Jo-chi*; DMS: *Jo-chi*; JB: *rDzo-chi*.

152 DMD: *Cha-ga-da'i*; DMB: *Cha-ga-ta'i*; DMS: *Cha-ga-ta'i*; JB: *Cha-ga-ta'i*.

153 DMD: *O-ga-da'i*; DMB: *O-go-ta'i*; DMS: *O-go-ta'i*; JB: *O-ko-ta'i*; DN: *O-ga-ta*.

154 DMD: *Tho-lo No-yon*; DMB: *Tho-lo No-yon*; DMS: *Tho-lo no-yon*; JB: *Tho-lo No-yon*.

155 DMD: *Du-ba*; DMB: *Du-ba*; DMS: *Du-ba*.

156 DMD: *Go-yug*; DMB: *Go-yug*; DMS: *Go-yug*; JB: *Go-yug*; DN: *Go-lug*.

157 DMD: *Go-dan*; DMB: *Go-dan*; DMS: *Go-dan*; JB: *Go-dan*.

158 DMD: *Ga-shi*; DMB: *Go-shi*; DMS: *Ga-shi*. DMB later has *Kha-shi*.

159 DMD: *Za-yin E-ga So-rog-da'i*; DMB: *Za-yin E-ka So-rog-ta'i*; DMS: *Za-yin E-ka Zo-rog-ta'i*; JB: *Za-yin E-ga Zo-rog-ta'i*.

160 DMD: *Mo gan*; DMB: *Mong-gol gan*; DMS: *Mo-go gan*; JB: *Mong-gor gan*; DN: *Mong-gol gan*.

161 DMD: *Go-be-la Shi-ju Se-chen Gan*; DMB: *Go-be-la Shi-dzu Se-chen Gan*; DMS: *Go-bo-la Shi-dzu Se-chen gan*; JB: *Go-be-la shi-dzung Se-chen gan*; DN: *Se-chen Gan*.

162 DMD: *Hu-la-hu*; DMB: *Hu-la-hu*; DMS: *Hu-la-hu*; JB: *Hu-la-hu*.

163 DMD: *A-ri sBo-kha*; DMB: *A-ri sBo-ga*; DMS: *A-ri sBo-ga*; JB: *A-ri Bho-ga*.

164 The *Ja-Bod yigtsang chenmo* preserves a different sequence and number of Tolui's sons: 1) Mōngke Qa'an; 2) *E-chen Ga-dan*; 3) Qubila Sechen Qa'an; 4) Ari-Böke; 5):

Emperor Sechen with Chabui (*Cha-bu*)<sup>165</sup> had four sons rDo-rje, Jingim (*\*Jing-gim*),<sup>166</sup> Mañghala,<sup>167</sup> Nomoqan (*No-mo-gan*)<sup>168</sup>; with concubines (*zhwa-gon-ma*)<sup>169</sup> his sons were six for a total of ten<sup>170</sup>; Nambui (*Nam-bu*)<sup>171</sup> gave birth to one son and died. From the Iron Monkey year, Emperor Sechen ruled on the throne for five Zhongtong (*\*Jong-thung*)<sup>172</sup> years and thirty Zhiyuan (*Ci-dben*)<sup>173</sup> years for a total of thirty-five years. He died in the Wood Horse year. Köten had three sons, such as Jibiq-Temür (*Ji-big The-mur*).<sup>174</sup> Qashi's son was Qayidu (*Ga-du*)<sup>175</sup>; it is not known how many others there were.

These things are from the copy of the important lineage drawn from the *Ye-ka thob-can*.<sup>176</sup>

### ABBREVIATIONS FOR SOURCES

*Debter marbó*. Consulted in the following editions and translations:

Caiba Gongge Duoji/Chen and Zhou: Caiba Gongge Duoji 蔡巴 貢噶多吉 [Tshal-pa Kun-dga' rDo-rje], trans. Chen Qingying 陳慶英 and Zhou Runnian 周潤年, ed. Dongga Luosang-Chilie. *Hong shi* 紅史. Lhasa: Tibetan People's Press, 2002.

*DMB: Deb-ther dmar-po*: Tshal-pa Kun-dga' rDo-rje. *Deb-ther dmar-po*. Beijing: Nationalities Press, 1981.

Hüle'ü. For each of them the monastery with which they formed a priest-patron relationship is given. *E-chen Ga-dan* should correspond to the Qutuqtu listed as Tului's third son in Rashīd al-Dīn. Qutuqtu ("Blessed") is likely a taboo avoidance name. Given the different order it seems that this information derives from a different source than the *Yeke Tobchiyan*.

165 DMD: *Cha'u*; DMB: *Cha-bu*; DMS: *Cha'u*; JB: *Cha-bu*.

166 DMD: *Jing-gim*; DMB: *Jing-gim*; DMS: *Jing-gim*; JB: *Jim-gin*.

167 DMD: *Mañghala*; DMB: *Mañghala*; DMS: *Mamghala*; JB: *Mangghalañ*.

168 DMD: *No-mo-gan*; DMB: *Na-mo-gan*; DMS: *No-mo-gan*; JB: *No-mo-gan*.

169 DMD: *Zhwa-gon-ma*; DMB: *Zhwa-gon-ma*; DMS: *Zhwa-gon-ma*; JB: *Zhwa-gon-ma*.

170 The *Ja-Bod yigtsang chenmo* says Qubila had twelve sons in all and list the names of those born from concubines as follows: 1): *Hu-kar-cha* [i.e. *\*Hu-ker-chi*] for Hükechi; 2): *A-rog-che* [i.e. *\*A-rog-chi*] for A'uruqchi; 4): *Go-lug Thi-mur* for Qutlugh-Temür; 5): *E-sen sBo-ga* for Esen-Buqa; 6): *Tho-gan* for Togho'an; 7): *Go-go-chu* for Kökechü; 8): *rDo-lo*. (The third son by a concubine is missing.) Given the different total number it seems that this information may derive from a different source than the *Yeke Tobchiyan*.

171 DMD: *Nam-bu*; DMB: *Nam-bu*; DMS: *Nam-bu*.

172 DMD: *Jo-thung*; DMB: *Jo-thung*; DMS: *Jo-thung*.

173 DMD: *Ci-dben*; DMB: *Ci-dben*; DMS: *Ci-dben*.

174 DMD: *Ji-big Thi-mur*; DMB: *Ji-big Thi-mur*; DMS: *Ji-big The-mur*.

175 DMD: *Kha-thu*; DMB: *Ga-du*; DMS: *Kha-du*.

176 DMD: *Yi-ga thob-can*; DMB: *dBe-ka Thob-chen*; DMS: *Ye-ka Thob-can*.

*DMS: Deb-ther dmar-po (The Red Annals)*, vol. 1: Kun-dga' rDo-rje. Gangtok, Sikkim: Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, 1961.

*DMD: "Ulaan dewter": Demchigmaa, Oyuunkhandyn. "Ulaan dewter"-iin negen Töwd bichmel ekhiin orchuulga, ekh bichgiin sudalga.* Ulaanbaatar: Mongolian National University, 2002.

*DN: Debter Ngonbó. Consulted in the following translation:*

Roerich, George, trans. *The Blue Annals*. 1949; rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1976.

*JB: Ja-Bod yigtsang. Consulted in the following editions and translations::*

*Han Zang shiji*: Dacang Zongba Banjue Sangbu 達倉宗巴班覺桑部 [sTag-tshang rDzong-pa dPal-'byor bZang-po], trans. Chen Qingying 陳慶英, *Han Zang shiji—xianzhe xile Shanbuzhou mingjian* 漢藏史集—賢者喜樂贍部洲明鑒. Lhasa: Tibet People's Press, 1986.

dPal-'byor bZang-po. *rGya-Bod yig-tshang*. Chengdu: Sichuan Nationalities Press, 1983.

Juvaini/Boyle:

Juvaini, 'Ala-ad-Din 'Ata-Malik, trans. John Andrew Boyle. *The History of the World Conqueror*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

*NCCGL:*

Tao, Zongyi 陶宗儀. *Nancun chuogenglu* 南村輟耕錄. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1997.

Rashīd al-Dīn: Rashīd al-Dīn's *Compendium of Chronicles*. Consulted in the following editions and translations:

Arends: Rashid ad-Din, trans. A.K. Arends, ed. A.A. Romashkevich, Ye. E. Bertel's, and A. Yu. Yakubovskii. *Sbornik letopisei*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Academy of Sciences Press, 1946.

Khetagurov: Rashid ad-Din, trans. L.A. Khetagurov, ed. A.A. Semenov. *Sbornik letopisei*. Vol. I, part 1. Moscow: Academy of Sciences Press, 1952.

Rawshan and Mūsawī: Rashīd al-Dīn Faẓlāllāh Hamadānī, ed. Muḥammad Rawshan and Muṣṭafī Mūsawī, ed. *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*. 4 vols. Tehran: Nashr-i Alburz, 1383/1994.

Romashkevich: Rashīd ad-Dīn, Faẓlallākh, ed. A.A. Romashkevich, A.A. Khetagurov, A.A. Ali-Zade. *Dzhāmi' at-Tavārīkh*, vol. 1, part 1, *Kriticheskii text*. Moskva: "Nauka," 1968.

Smirnova: Rashid ad-Din, trans. O.I. Smirnova, notes by B.I. Pankratov and O.I. Smirnova, ed. A.A. Semenov. *Sbornik letopisei*. Vol. I, part 2. Moscow: Academy of Sciences Press, 1952.

Thackston: Rashiduddin Fazlullah, trans. and ed. W.M. Thackston. *Jami'u't-Tawarikh: Compendium of Chronicles: A History of the Mongols*. 3 vols. with continuous pagination. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998-1999.

Verkhovskii: Rashid ad-Din, trans. Yu. P. Verkhovskii, notes by Yu. P. Verkhovskii and B.I. Pankratov. *Sbornik letopisei*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Academy of Sciences Press, 1960.

*SHM: Secret History of the Mongols*. Consulted in the following editions, concordances, and translations:

Cleaves: Cleaves, Francis Woodman. *The Secret History of the Mongols*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

De Rachewiltz: Rachewiltz, Igor de, trans. and ed. *Secret History of the Mongols: A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century*. 2 vols. with continuous pagination. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004.

EU: E'rdengtai 额尔登泰 and Wuyundalai 乌云达賚, ed. *Menggu mishu jiaokan ben* 蒙古秘史校勘本. Höhhot: Nei Menggu renmin chubanshe, 1980.

*SWQZL:*

*SWQZL[J]*: Jia, Jingyan 賈敬顏. *Shengwu qinzheng lu jiaoben* 聖武親征錄校本. Beijing: Minzu University mimeograph, 1979.

*SWQZL[W]*: Wang, Guowei 王國維. "Shengwu qinzheng lu jiaozhu 聖武親征錄校注." in *Menggu shiliao sizhong* 蒙古史料四種, pp. 1-220 (1a-107b). 1926: rpt. Taipei: Cheng-chung Press, 1962. *TMEN:*

Doerfer, Gerhard. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente in Neupersischen*. 3 vols. with continuous pagination. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1963, 1965, and 1967.

Xu Youren 許有壬, *Guitang xiaogao* 圭塘小藁, consulted in the following editions:

*GTGX[SY]*: Xu, Youren 許有壬, ed. Zhang Fengtai 張鳳臺. *Guitang xiaogao* 圭塘小藁. In *Sanyi Tang congshu* 三怡堂叢書, juàn 19-24. Chenghua 成化 era blockprint; rpt. 1922; rpt. Beijing: Zhongguo shudian, 1990.

*GTGX[SK]*: Xu, Youren 許有壬, with additions by Xu Youfu 許有孚 and continuation by Xu Yong 許顯. *Guitang xiaogao* 圭塘小藁. In *Ying yin Wenyan ge Siku quanshu* 景印文淵閣四庫全書, vol. 1211, pp. 579-728. Rpt. Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press, 1983.

*YS: Yuan shi* 元史, consulted in the following edition:

Song, Lian 宋濂, ed. *Yuan shi* 元史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976.

*YWL: Yuan Wen lei* 元文類 "Anthology of the Yuan Dynasty," consulted in the following editions:

*YWL[CP]*: Su, Tianjue 蘇天爵, ed., punctuated. *Yuan wen lei* 元文類. Guoxue jiben congshu 國學基本叢書 series. 1936; rpt. Beijing: Commercial Press, 1958.

*YWL[SC]*: Su, Tianjue 蘇天爵, ed. *Yuan wen lei* 元文類. 1342; rpt., Taipei: Shih-chieh shu-chü, 1962.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beijing tushuguan 北京圖書館, ed. *Beijing tushuguan guji shanben shumu* 北京圖書館古籍善本書目. 5 vols. Beijing: Shumu wenxian Publishing House, 1987.
- Caiba Gongge Duoji 蔡巴 貢噶多吉 [Tshal-pa Kun-dga' rDo-rje], trans. Chen Qingying 陳慶英 and Zhou Runnian 周潤年, ed. Dongga Luosang-Chilie. *Hong shi* 紅史. Lhasa: Tibetan People's Press, 2002.
- Choimaa, Sharav. "Comparative Analysis of Original Texts on One Verse Composition in the Secret History of the Mongols." In *The Early Mongols: Language, Culture and History*, ed. Volker Rybatzki, Alessandra Pozzi, Peter W. Geier, and John Krueger. Bloomington: Indiana University, 2009, pp. 47-52.
- Cleaves, Francis Woodman. "On the Historicity of the Baljuna Covenant," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 18 (1955): pp. 357-421.
- Cleaves, Francis Woodman. *The Secret History of the Mongols*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Dacang Zongba Banjue Sangbu 達倉宗巴 班覺桑部 [sTag-tshang rDzong-pa dPal-'byor bZang-po], trans. Chen Qingying 陳慶英, *Han Zang shiji—xianzhe xile Shanbuzhou mingjian* 漢藏史集—賢者喜樂贍部洲明鑒. Lhasa: Tibet People's Press, 1986.
- Demchigmaa, Oyuunkhandyn. "Ulaan dewter"—iin negen Töwd bichmel ekhiin orchuulga, ekh bichgiin sudalga. Ulaanbaatar: Mongolian National University, 2002.
- Doerfer, Gerhard. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente in Neupersischen*. 3 vols. with continuous pagination. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1963, 1965, and 1967. dPal-'byor bZang-po. *rGya-Bod yig-tshang*. Chengdu: Sichuan Nationalities Press, 1983.
- E'rdengtai 额尔登泰 and Wuyundalai 乌云达賚, ed. *Menggu mishi jiaokan ben* 蒙古秘史校勘本. Hohhot: Nei Menggu renmin chubanshe, 1980.
- Hambis, Louis, with notes by Paul Pelliot. *Le Chapitre CVII du Yuan che*. Supplement to *T'oung Pao*, vol. 38. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1945.
- Hung, William. "Transmission of the Book Known as *The Secret History of the Mongols*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 14 (1951): pp. 433-92.
- Jia, Jingyan 賈敬顏. *Shengwu qinzheng lu jiaoben* 聖武親征錄校本. Beijing: Minzu University mimeograph, 1979.
- Juvaini, 'Ala-ad-Din 'Ata-Malik, trans. John Andrew Boyle. *The History of the World Conqueror*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Kim, Hodong. "A Re-examination of the 'Register of Thousands (*hazāra*)' in the *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh*." In *Rashīd al-Dīn as an Agent and Mediator of Cultural Exchanges in Ilkhanid Iran*, ed. Anna Akasoy, Ronit Yoeli-Tlalim, and Charles Burnett. London: Wartburg Institute, in press.
- Morohashi, Tetsuji 諸橋轍次, ed. *Seikadō Bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku* 靜嘉堂文庫漢籍分類目錄. Tokyo: Seikadō Bunko, 1930.

- Mote, Frederick W. *T'ao Tsung-i and His Cho Keng Lu*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1954.
- Ouyang, Xiu 歐陽修. *Xin Wudai shi* 新五代史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974.
- Rachewiltz, Igor de, trans. and ed. *Secret History of the Mongols: A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century*. 2 vols. with continuous pagination. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004.
- Rashīd ad-Dīn, Fazlallākh, ed. A.A. Romashkevich, A.A. Khetagurov, A.A. Ali-Zade. *Dzhāmi' at-Tawārīkh*, vol. 1, part 1, *Kriticheskii text*. Moskva: "Nauka," 1968.
- Rashīd ad-Dīn, trans. A.K. Arends, ed. A.A. Romaskevich, Ye. E. Bertel's, and A. Yu. Yakubovskii. *Sbornik letopisei*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Academy of Sciences Press, 1946.
- Rashīd ad-Dīn, trans. L.A. Khetagurov, ed. A.A. Semenov. *Sbornik letopisei*. Vol. I, part 1. Moscow: Academy of Sciences Press, 1952.
- Rashīd ad-Dīn, trans. O.I. Smirnova, notes by B.I. Pankratov and O.I. Smirnova, ed. A.A. Semenov. *Sbornik letopisei*. Vol. I, part 2. Moscow: Academy of Sciences Press, 1952.
- Rashīd ad-Dīn, trans. Yu. P. Verkhovskii, notes by Yu. P. Verkhovskii and B.I. Pankratov. *Sbornik letopisei*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Academy of Sciences Press, 1960.
- Rashīd al-Dīn Fazlallāh Hamadānī, ed. Muḥammad Rawshan and Muṣṭafī Mūsawī, ed. *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*. 4 vols. Tehran: Nashr-i Alburz, 1383/1994.
- Rashiduddin Fazlullah, trans. and ed. W.M. Thackston. *Jami'u't-Tawarikh: Compendium of Chronicles: A History of the Mongols*. 3 vols. with continuous pagination. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998-1999.
- Roerich, George, trans. *The Blue Annals*. 1949; rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1976.
- Shimo, Satoko 志茂智子. "Ghāzān Khan and the Ta'rīkh-i Ghāzānī: Concerning Its Relationship to the "Mongol History" of the Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh." *Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko* 54 (1996): pp. 93-110.
- Song, Lian 宋濂, ed. *Yuan shi* 元史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976.
- Su, Tianjue 蘇天爵, ed. Yao Jing'an 姚景安, ed. *Yuanchao mingchen shilue* 元朝名臣事略. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1996.
- Su, Tianjue 蘇天爵, ed. *Yuan wen lei* 元文類. 1342; rpt., Taipei: Shih-chieh shu-chū, 1962.
- Su, Tianjue 蘇天爵, ed., punctuated. *Yuan wen lei* 元文類. Guoxue jiben congshu 國學基本叢書 series. 1936; rpt. Beijing: Commercial Press, 1958.
- Su, Tianjue 蘇天爵. *Yuanchao mingchen shilue* 元朝名臣事略. 1335; rpt. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962.
- Subtelny, Maria E. "The Binding Pledge (Möchālgä): A Chinggisid Practice and Its Survival in Safavid Iran." In *New Perspectives on Safavid Iran: Empire and Society*, ed. Colin P. Mitchell. Abingdon: Routledge, 2011: pp. 9-29.
- Tao, Zongyi 陶宗儀. *Nancun chuogenglu* 南村輟耕錄. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1997.
- Togan, Zeki Velidi. "The Composition of the History of the Mongols by Rashīd al-Dīn." *Central Asiatic Journal*, vol. 7 (1962): pp. 68-71.

- Tshal-pa Kun-dga' rDo-rje. *Deb-ther dmar-po*. Beijing: Nationalities Press, 1981.
- Wang, Guowei 王國維. "Shengwu qinzheng lu jiaozhu 聖武親征錄校注." in *Menggu shiliao sizhong* 蒙古史料四種, pp. 1-220 (1a-107b). 1926: rpt. Taipei: Cheng-chung Press, 1962.
- Xu, Youren 許有壬, ed. Zhang Fengtai 張鳳臺. *Guitang xiaogao* 圭塘小藁. In *Sanyi Tang congshu* 三怡堂叢書, juàn 19-24. Chenghua 成化 era blockprint; rpt. 1922; rpt. Beijing: Zhongguo shudian, 1990.
- Xu, Youren 許有壬, with additions by Xu Youfu 許有孚 and continuation by Xu Yong 許顥. *Guitang xiaogao* 圭塘小藁. In *Ying yin Wenyuan ge Siku quanshu* 景印文淵閣四庫全書, vol. 1211, pp. 579-728. Rpt. Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press, 1983.