

REMARKS ON THE *ČINGGIS QAYAN-U ALTAN TOBČI**

OLIVÉR KÁPOLNÁS

H-8353 Zalaszentő, Faképi utca, Hungary

e-mail: kaapolnaas@gmail.com

The *Golden History of Chinggis khan* (*Činggis Qayan-u Altan Tobči*) is an important Mongolian historical work. It was found in 1958, so its research history is not very long. This paper aims at pointing out the problems with its facsimile edition and attempts to define the date of writing of the only existing manuscript of this work. Finally, the author gives evidence that the original work must have been compiled in Qubilai's era with the purpose of showing his legitimacy.

Key words: Altan tobči, Chinggis khan, Mongolian historiography.

The *Golden History of Chinggis khan* (*Činggis Qayan-u Altan Tobči*, hereinafter CQAT) is an important Mongolian account. It recounts Chinggis khan's life based on legends, starting from the abduction of Hö'elün by Yisügei, to the khan's death and funeral. Most parts of this work can be found in other sources, such as the *Quriyangyui Altan Tobči* (hereinafter QAT), but it contains some unique legends as well, for example the *Abduction of Hö'elün*¹ that is told in a so far unknown way; or the *Legend of the Defeat of the 300 Tayichi'uds*² which latter can be found in Lubsandanзан's *Altan Tobči* (LuAT 1992, pp. 33–36), but the two versions are not the same.

* In the 2007/2008 academic year, I studied at the Inner Mongolia Normal University supported by the "Habilitas" scholarship of the Hungarian Development Bank. During that time I started to work on this manuscript the final result of which was my MA-thesis written under the supervision of Alice Sárközi and Katalin Uray-Kóhalmi. This paper is the extract of my thesis. I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors for their intellectual and to the Hungarian Development Bank for its financial support.

¹ CQAT (pp. 1b–6b). This episode is similar to the others in terms of the event and the characters, but this one is more detailed. The other seven versions of this event were collected in CQAT (2006, pp. 47–54).

² CQAT (pp. 7a–10a). Chinggis khan with his six paladins met the Tayichi'uds. After the khan's paladins had defeated the preponderant enemy, Chinggis praised them. It is supposed that it

The research of this unique source has started recently. The most significant related studies are as follows:

- Liu Jin Süwe gave a short description of the CQAT and he stated that it had been written at the end of the 16th century (basing his statement on its grammatical features), and that it had close relation to the *Secret History of the Mongols* (hereinafter SHM) (Liu 1979, pp. 181–184).
- Erdenitoγtatu (1983/1989³) wrote a short description of this work, citing some parts word by word. He presumed that it was a result of an oral tradition written down in around 1240 (Erdenitoγtatu 1989, p. 42).
- W. Heissig based his article on the *Legend of the Defeat of the 300 Tayichi'uds*. He supposed that the manuscript was written in the 16th century; his idea was based on the ductus (i.e style) of writing (Heissig 1987, pp. 208–210). The facsimiles of the last and the first two pages of the CQAT were attached to his article.
- According to Kesigtoγtatu (1998; CQAT 2006, pp. 7–15) the work was written at the beginning of Qubilai's era; he based this idea on only one sentence: *the boy Qubilai's words are different (= wise, not ordinary), follow those!*⁴
- Atwood assumed in his short article that in the middle of the 16th century, the CQAT put together the legends of Chinggis khan, which took shape during the late 14th and the 15th centuries (Atwood 2006, pp. 402–403).
- Buyanbayatur wrote a monograph on the QAT. In his book he devoted a chapter to the CQAT. He supposed that the CQAT was one of the main sources of the QAT. He summarised the earlier research and accepted Kesigtoγtaqu's idea about dating (Buyanbayatur 2007, pp. 228 sqq).
- Leland Liu Rogers published the transcription and the translation of the CQAT, together with a short introduction (CQAT 2009). He supposed that the manuscript of this work had been copied in the first half of the 17th century (he based his statement on the ductus) (CQAT 2009, p. 2). The compilation date of the original work was between 1570 and 1620 (CQAT 2009, p. 10), but several legends were composed in Dayan khan's era (CQAT 2009, p. 1). He did not use or reflect on previous research in his work. Three reviews were written on his work by Morris Rossabi (2010), László Károly (2010) and Dashdondog Bayarsaikhan (2011).
- Nasan-Ölzii published a brief paper on the CQAT. He supposed that this work had a connection with the *Eight White Tents*, and the time of compilation could not have been earlier than the 15th century (Nasan-Ölzii 2011, p. 201).

was based on a true event and everybody was a real person (Kesigtoγtaqu 1988, p. 369). This story was composed in the 13th century (Gaadamba 1990, p. 172; Damdinsüren 1957, pp. 78–80).

³ The same article was published twice: *Mongyol Kele Bičig* 1983/2 and *Öbör Mongyol-un Baysi-yin Yeke Suryayuli-yin Erdem Sin-ilegen-ü Sedkül* 1989/1.

⁴ *Qubilai keüken-i üge öber-e bui .. [42/3] tegüni üge[-]ber yabuγdun ta* (CQAT pp. 42b–43a).

A brief description of the manuscript. Dorongya, a scholar of the Inner Mongolia Academy of Social Sciences found it in 1958, together with other texts⁵, in Inner Mongolia, not too far from Hohhot, near a shrine dedicated to Khasar (Buyanbayatur 2007, p. 229). It consists of 49 sheets, each 6 × 16 cm in size. The script shows that the writer was not highly experienced. The diacritical points are dotted randomly, *j* and *y* in the first syllable, *ĵ* and *č* in the middle of the words, and the *t* and *d* in the suffixes are not differentiated. The *q* and *γ* in initial position are written in the same way as in middle position.

The style of the work is almost the same as that of the SHM. Prose and verse parts alternately follow each other. From the 17th century, this style ceased to be used, all parts of the historical works being written in prose. In the accounts from the 17th century (for example QAT, *Asarayči Neretü-yin Teiuke* = ANT, *Erdeni-yin Tobči* = ET or the *Sira Tuγuji* = ST), the parts describing Chinggis khan's era were written in the prose-verse style, as the authors cited older sources, but the current period was always described in prose.

The manuscript has no other versions, the original is kept in the *Library of the Inner Mongolian Academy of Social Sciences*. The first facsimile was published in 1998 (CQAT 1998),⁶ and all of the later publications are based on that edition. The main problem is that this facsimile was modified, for example, the word *manggalam* was erased from the last page, it is absent in the facsimile. The text from the last two pages was merged into one page in the edition of 1998 (see Figures 1 and 2). The other main difference is the 18th sheet which is absent from the facsimile, nevertheless, it does exist.⁷

We are focusing on two questions, the first being whether the manuscript is an autograph or a copy; the second one is about the date of compilation.

Regarding the first question: typical errors that derive from copying can be found in the manuscript:

- Something is missing (it can be verified only by checking parallel texts). For example, on page 21b, the line *qun ɣalayun gegči bey-e minu bui* is missing. This verse (one poem from the *Legend of Arɣas-un qorči*) can be found in some other accounts and all of them include this line (QAT 2002, p. 47). The reason for this missing line is that the previous lines and this line have the same ending words (*minu bui*), and while copying the text, the scribe read a sentence and

⁵ One of them, the *Boɣda Činggis qayan-u takil-un sudur* was published by Elisabetta Chiodo (1989–1991), the facsimile: CQAT pp. 116–165.

⁶ This facsimile was published again in the CQAT (2006).

⁷ The transcription of the text from page 18: *ɣurɣultai ökin-i-yen solongɣos-un arin qayan-tür ögbei .. ejen boɣda-tu buriyad-un orosi güsi [=oro sigüsi] yeke bayıqal-ača način-i bariyad . ejen-tür kürgebei .. tere orosi güsi-tür [=oro sigüsi-dür] buriyad-i ejelegülbei .. tegün[-]ü qoyin[-]a ejen boɣda način sibayun-i olqu-yin ɣool-ača ola-yin ɣool [kürtel-e] örkin [=orkin] yabuqui-dur jürčid-ün vangjun qayan üjged buruɣudču . [18a/b] ese irebei .. ejen qurıɣaju qariyad čeriglebei .. ola-yin ɣool olom ügei ajuɣu .. tegün-dür qasar-un ači qatu sira qalɣaju čing tayıji . tümen aɣta-yin čayariɣ-i qolbaɣu giski(r)čü ɣarču . qota(-)yi anu qoriyaɣu bayıju tümen qariyačai mingyan miɣuri [=miɣui] alba ača geɣü abuba .. tümen qariya=čai-tür köbeng [=köbüng] oriyaɣu uyabai .. mingyan miɣuri- [=miɣui]*



Figure 1

The last page from the original manuscript, the term *manggalam* appears



Figure 2

The last page from the facsimile (CQAT 1998), the text from the last page of the original text was added to the end of the previous page without the word *manggalam*

wrote it down, memorising the last words, and then searched these words in the original text. If two or more sentences had the same ending, the scribe's eye could easily skip a line.

- Some parts are written twice, for example, on pages 34b and 35a one strophe⁸ was written two times. The reason is the same as above: the last words of the previous and this strophe were the same.
- Long words are written in two parts. Sometimes a long word does not fit at the end of a line, and the word continues at the beginning of the next line. However, if the scribe makes the copy automatically, he usually does not put the two parts of the word together. For example, on page 22b, the words *baysi layçi* appear in one line, it is supposed that originally it was the word *baysilayçi* written in two parts.

⁸ *Qar-a terigütü kümün-tü ülü yartaqu / qadurayçi qar-a budung gegçi bile [bi] / qara terigütü kümün-tü yartaba bi / qara terigün qubiraqui-a bolbau.*

- Personal names written in the wrong way. For example the name *Jamuqa* appears as *Jabqan* on page 6b.

The theory of copying is also supported by page 23. It is a little thicker than the others. The page had already been written and it got an inkblot, therefore the scribe glued a new, thin paper on it, and copied this page again. However, he scribed one more line, thus he crossed out the first line by ink on page 24a (this line is missing from the facsimile edition). The glued paper can help to date the manuscript. Because the glued paper is a little separated from the first paper, its back side can be seen. It is a sheet printed by a modern printing machine (not xylograph!), consequently, it cannot be from an earlier period than the end of the 19th century.

According to the above-mentioned evidence, this is a copied text, so the following question arises: when was the original text composed? Most of the authors used older sources for their works. Thus, certain parts of the works can be traced back to older written sources or legends. Consequently, the question is not when it was written, but when it was compiled.

To decide the time of compilation, first of all it is necessary to know the reason why it was written. One sentence captures the reader's attention, it is one of Chinggis khan's last words: *the boy Qubilai's words are different* (= wise, not ordinary), *follow those!*⁹. It is out of question that these words were said by Chinggis khan, because when he died, Qubilai was only 12 years old. This sentence appears in almost all accounts that cite Chinggis khan's last words.¹⁰ Consequently, this sentence must have been added later, as Ögödei's legitimation was interpolated subsequently to the SHM (de Rachewiltz 2008, p. 151). Legitimizing an emperor based on Chinggis khan's words could not happen later than the 13th century (later nobody could say that Chinggis had chosen him for ruling). Taking a look at the circumstances of Qubilai's reign, we can state that the beginning of his rule was not peaceful, there was an internecine war. The two adversaries were Qubilai and his younger brother, Ariq-Böke. The fight was not only for power, it was two different perspectives that clashed. Ariq-Böke wanted to continue what Chinggis had started, his point of view of the ideal rule was a Great Mongol Empire, centred around the Mongolian territories, with the same elite as in Chinggis khan's era. In contrast, Qubilai wanted to build a new empire, with Chinese territories as its centre, where a new Mongolian "Chinese" dynasty could emerge (Kesigtoɣtaqu 1998, pp. 205–206; Rossabi 1988, pp. 51–62; MYT 2003, Дэд боть, pp. 191–196).

Qubilai had to show that he was the legitimate ruler, that is the reason why he supported the cult of Chinggis khan so strongly (for example, he built the ancestor's

⁹ *Qubilai keüken-i üge öber-e bui .. [42/3] tegüni üge[-]ber yabuɣtun ta* . CQAT (pp. 42b–43a).

¹⁰ QAT: *Qubilai kegüken-ü üge öber-e buyu . tegün-ü üge-ber yabuɣtun* QAT (2002, p. 58). ANT: *Qubilai keüken-ü üge öber-e bui . tegün-ü üge-ber yabuɣtun*. ANT (2002, p. 35). ST: *Qubilai keüken-ü üge öber bui . tegünü üge-ber yabuɣtun*. ST (1957, p. 39). ET: *Qubilai keüken-ü üge inu aɣıytai qarinam bülüge. qutalar tegün-ü üge-ber yabuɣtun*. ET (1959, p. 97). The only exception is the *Mongyol Boyda Činggis Qayan-u Tuɣuɣı*, it is kept in the Mongolian State Library, under the number: 1668/96 (Kápolnás 2014, pp. 70–71).

temple in Daidu – now Beijing) and he also erected the eight yurts for the cult. These yurts also appeared in the CQAT, and were erected after Chinggis khan's death¹¹. After Qubilai's era, all of the Mongolian khans were his descendants, so his legitimacy could not be questioned any more.

'Phags-pa lama wrote a book on Chen-chin/Jin-gim prince (Qubilai's son) in 1278 (Hoog 1983, pp. 1ff.). The description of the world from a 17th-century edition of this work: *In this world [Zambutib] there are sixteen great, and one thousand small countries/nations (ulus). There are three hundred sixty-one with different costumes, and seven hundred twenty-one with different languages.*¹² Almost the same description can be found in the CQAT: *great countries of the world [Zambutib] with three hundred sixty-one nations, and seven hundred twenty-one languages.*¹³ This sentence also appears in the QAT, but not with the exact same numbers as in the CQAT.¹⁴

In the *Čayan teüke*, which can be traced back to Qubilai's era,¹⁵ there is a brief paragraph that is in connection with the CQAT: *The elephant, called Archa-vardan, came with a golden jug, full of nectar. The nectar was splattered by the elephant on one of the nobles who was sitting in a queue with others, this meant that he would become a khan of virtue with an excellent fate.*¹⁶ This sentence might have a connection with the story of the *Legend about the Golden Jug Full of Nectar*. In this story, a golden jug full of nectar is given to Chinggis to show that he is a legitimate ruler. In this part a seal also appears, which, according to the CQAT, was given to Chinggis on Bud-dha's order (CQAT pp. 28a–30a). This might refer to the great seal of the khans that Qubilai had obtained.¹⁷

¹¹ *Qamuy-un möngke qatayasan nayiman čayan ger bosyabai* (CQAT p. 48b).

¹² *Ene čambutiib-tur arban jirγuyan yeke ulus mingyan öčüken ulus buyu .. busu busu yosutan γurban jayun jiran jüil irgen buyu .. öber-e öber-e keleten doloγan jayun qorin nigen buyu* (Uspensky 2006, p. 6). This part is missing from the Tibetan version, but there is also a short description of the world: *Beginning from the North he [= Chinggis] brought many countries of different languages and races under his power* (Hoog 1983, p. 42).

¹³ *Čambutib-un γurban jayun jiran nigen omoy(-)tan . doloγan jayun qorin nigen kele[-]ten . yeke ulus* (CQAT p. 10b).

¹⁴ *Čambutiib-un γurban jayun jiran nigen omuytan . doloγan jayun qorin keleten ulus* (QAT 2002, p. 41).

¹⁵ The debate on the dating of this work has not yet been closed. In some scholars' opinion, it was composed in the Yuan-era (Bayarsaihan 2006), others suppose that it comes from the reign of Altan khan (1540–1586) (Möngkebayar 2009), or that the first part was written at the time of Qubilai, and the second under the Altan khan's reign (Bira 2002, p. 50).

¹⁶ *Olan šakiy-a-liγ-ud-un jerge-len sayγusan-u dotor-a . arca-vardan neretü jayan altan qumq-a-yi rasiyan-u usun-iyar dügürge . oroi degereben iren ken-ü öber-ün deger-e inu. dusuyad rasiyan-u usun inu asaral ügegüy-e [=ög(e)küi-e] abubasu buyan-u degedü jayayatu qayan kemeyü* (CT 1967, p. 67).

¹⁷ There were at least two seals in Mongolian history, but probably there were several ones (Okada 1996). One of them was Güyük khan's seal (it was made by a Russian craftsman), according to the *Yuan shi*, Qubilai got the seal in 1260. The other was the seal of Qin Shi Huangdi (247–210 BC), it was the hand of the Yuan emperors from 1294 (Franke 1978, p. 43). According to a later Mongolian source, one seal is connected to Chinggis khan. This seal was found in a broken stone (ANT 2002, p. 13) or it was in the cradle of Chinggis as the CQAT stated. The seal was lost when Toghon Temür khan, the last emperor of the Yuan Dynasty escaped from Daidu (Beijing) in 1368

There is also a parallel between the CQAT and the *Yuan shi*. The compilation of *Yuan shi* was finished in 1370. The authors used some Mongolian accounts that had been lost since. In the middle of the 17th century, it was partly translated from the original Chinese into Manchu, then from Manchu into Mongolian. Qasar and Belgütei were talking that Chinggis khan could conquer the world with Qasar's shooting skills and Belgütei's force.¹⁸ This sentence appears in Belgütei's biography from the *Yuan shi* (Ulağan 2005, p. 67; QAT 1955, p. 131, 25/1, footnote). In the eulogy of the nine paladins, Chinggis says that Chu mergen could shoot without mistakes.¹⁹ It can be related to this event: *Two ducks were arriving by flying. Taizu Temüjin [= Chinggis khan] ordered Chu to shoot the duck. Chu asked which one, "The male" – answered the khan. Chu shot it down immediately.*²⁰ This part is important because it shows that the word *mergen* was used in the old meaning, as a 'good shooter'. Since the 14th century, the word *mergen* means 'wise'.²¹

Two objects from the CQAT are also connected to the 13th century. When Chinggis eulogised his paladins, he said that Boghorchu and Boghoral were axle keepers,²² that refers to the chariots that were used in the time of the Great Mongol Empire (Saad 2005, p. 13). In the story of the *Legend of the Defeat of the 300 Tayichi'uds*, saddles were used as shields,²³ it has only one parallel with Chinggis' biography from the *Yuan shi* (DYGSB 1828, p. 149).

In addition to all this philological evidence, there are two thought-provoking legends in the CQAT. These are the *Legend of the Bow Seller*²⁴ and the *Legend about*

(QAT 2002, p. 65). The seal reappeared at the end of 16th century and finally it went to the hands of the Manchus as a sign of their legitimization above the Mongols (Okada 1992).

¹⁸ *Qasar-un qabu . belgetei-yin böke-ber tabun öngge . dörben qari yeke ulus-i erke-tür-(i)-iyen oroyulbai* (CQAT p. 15b).

¹⁹ *Ülü aldan onon sigürün qarbuçi* (CQAT p. 10b).

²⁰ *Juwe niyehe deyeme jimbi .. taizu temujin . so o be niyehe gabta sere jakade . so o jabume . amila be gabta . so o uthai amila be gabtame tuhebuhe* (DYGSB 1828, p. 148).

²¹ For example in the Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti, one name of Manjusiri is *yeke mergen-iyer yeke aray-tu*, this name appeared also in the first translation between 1295–1312 (Särközi 1982, pp. 449, 454).

²² *Qusun tenggelig-i minu bariju / mösün teng[g]elig-(y)i bariju* (CQAT p. 9b).

²³ *Kölesü-tü [=kölösü-tü] toqom-iyar ejen-tü bambai bariju* (CQAT p. 8b).

²⁴ *Qasar and Belgetei said to each other: "This was an unreasonable thing for the Lord to say. By the skillful shooting of Qasar and the firm strength of Belgetei, we brought the great peoples of the Five Colours and Four Foreign Lands into our power." The Lord, having learned that they were saying this, said: "I will humble their pride." Becoming an insignificant poor old man, he took a long yellow bow, and went about enquiring and saying: "For sale!" Then Qasar and Belgetei asked: "Where do you come from, man such as has not been seen before?" That old man said: "I am a poor man, and I am going about selling a bow." Then those two mocked him, saying: "Do you say, 'Take this bow'?" Then old man said: "Bad as it may be, I should like to know about stringing it." Then Belgetei took it, but could not string it. That old man strung it and gave it to Qasar. Qasar could not stretch it. Then that old man became a grey-haired old man, mounted on a blue mule with a white blaze, and stretching his golden toyona on his long yellow bow, he shot through a rock, and reprimanded them, saying: "You are the younger brothers of the Holy Lord, called alert-shooter Qasar and strong Belgetei. It is said; 'Big words of boasting mean a big mouthful.'" Then those two younger brothers of his, in fear, said to each other: "This was the sign of the Lord." After that they abstained from such words. Translated by Charles Bawden from the QAT (1955, pp. 131–132).*

the Golden Jug Full of Nectar.²⁵ Both legends have the same idea: the younger brothers query the power of their brother and it becomes clear that the elder brother has total authority. These legends cannot originate from Chinggis khan's time as he depended on his younger brothers.²⁶ On the other hand, Qubilai was an autocratic ruler who wanted to show that he was the legitimate ruler, so it seems more probable that these legends originate from his time.

It is supposed that after Chinggis khan's death, at least two historical works were compiled. One of them was the SHM, which was written for the court; this was not well known. But at least one copy of the original Mongolian version survived until the 17th century, because Lubsandanzan used it for his *Altan Tobči* (Sharav 2002; Ligeti 1974, pp. 5ff.). The other work was compiled for a larger audience, it recounts Chinggis's life with legends.

According to all of the above-mentioned evidence, CQAT was compiled at the beginning of Qubilai's era to show that Qubilai was the legitimate ruler. The author used old legends and created some new ones. There was a considerable historiographical activity at Qubilai's court (de Rachewiltz 2006, p. XLIV). At that time, ancient works were rewritten and some were newly compiled (for example the *Sheng-wu Ch'in-cheng lu* (*Shengwu qinzheng lu*) was compiled during Chinggis's and Ögödei's reign, it was transmitted to us in Chinese language.²⁷ Presumably the CQAT was one of the achievements of this era.

²⁵ *After that, through the power of the virtue of former existences there was filled and bestowed upon the Holy Lord, from the mighty god Qormusda, in a precious jade cup, the drink rasâyana. Fearfully the Holy lord took it, and when he was about to drink it his four younger brothers said: "It is said, if there are ten to the eldest brother, there are four to the younger brothers. Oh my Lord, if you drink the greater part, deign to give us the lesser part, in pity. Deign, in your understanding, to consider this and make a decision." The Holy Lord said to his younger brothers: "Formerly, when I was born, in my right hand there happened to be, from the throne of the dragons and by the order of the mighty Buddha, the Qasbuu seal. Now the drink rasâyana has been filled and bestowed upon me in a precious jade cup, from the mighty god Qormusda. I think I am the Lord with a supreme destiny. Now, if you will drink go on!" So saying he gave it to them. When his four younger brothers took it and drank, it went in their mouths but did not go into their throats. Then his four younger brothers said to the Lord: "We, being without a destiny compared with you who have a destiny, have wrongly contended. We will be officials controlling the taxes of your villages." Saying: "Lord, drink," they presented it. The Lord took it and drank. The Lord, being warmed and excited by that rasâyana, said: "Formerly when I was born, there occurred, by order of the Buddha, the Qasbuu seal of the Dragon Kings. Now the mighty god Qormusda has filled and bestowed upon me in a precious jade cup the drink rasâyana. I am the Lord with a destiny from Heaven." Translated by Charles Bawden from the QAT (1955, pp. 136–137).*

²⁶ Chinggis was helped by his siblings very much. As the CQAT states *Chinggis khan could conquer the world with Kasar's shooting skill and Belgütei's force* (CQAT p. 15b). Or Jamuka's words can be cited from the SHM to the importance of the brothers: *You [= Chinggis], sworn friend, had a wise mother. You were born a hero, and as you had younger brothers, valiant companions and seventy-three geldings, you, my sworn friend, excelled me. As for me, I lost my parents when I was small and had no younger brothers* (Translated by de Rachewiltz 2006, p. 131, § 201).

²⁷ *Sheng-wu Ch'in-cheng lu*. The latest description: de Rachewiltz (2004). This work stated that before Ögedei ascended to the throne, Chinggis had honoured Qubilai's father, Tolui (BBBDT 1985, p. 53). This sentence must be an interpolation from Qubilai's reign.

The manuscripts of the Mongolian chronicles did not exist earlier than the 17th century, so the question is whether a text from the 13th century could have survived the centuries (having been copied from time to time). The answer is definitely affirmative, for example, as was mentioned above, Lubsandanзан used an original Mongolian copy of the SHM for his historical work (Sharav 2002; Ligeti 1974, pp. 5ff). Over recent years, several fragments from the 16th–17th centuries have been identified, related to the SHM (Mongyolküü 2006; Saranyou-a 2013). Some Buddhist texts could also survive, for example the *Pañcarakṣā* from the 14th century still exists today (Monhsaihan 2011, p. 22).

All in all, the CQAT proved to be an important Mongolian account that was presumably compiled at the beginning of Qubilai's era when he had to prove his legitimacy. Although there is no direct evidence, both philological (for example parallel texts) and historical evidence support this hypothesis. The original manuscript does not exist, there is only one extant manuscript from the 19th century. This text must be republished since the only facsimile (CQAT 1998) is not satisfactory.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- ANT (2002): *Byamba-yin Asarayči neretü(-yin) teüke* [*Asarayči Neretü-yin Teüke* by Byamba, a Mongolian historical work from the 17th century]. (Эхбичгийн судлагаа.) Галиглаж, үгийн хэлхээг үйлдэн хэвлэлд бэлтгэсэн: Цэвэлийн Шагдарсүрэн, И Сөн Гю. Улаанбаатар.
- BBBDT (1985): *Boyda Bayatur-un Bey-e-ber Dayılayısan Temdeglel* [Chinggis Khan's campaigns, the Mongolian translation of the Sheng Wu Qin Zheng Lu]. Öbör Mongyol-un Soyul-un Keblel-ün Qoriy-a.
- CQAT: *Činggis Qayan-u Altan Tobči* [Golden history of Chinggis Khan]. Manuscript held in the Library of the Inner Mongolian Academy of Sciences.
- CQAT (1998): Činggis qayan-u Altan Tobči, *Činggis qayan-u takil-un sudur orosiba*, ed. Dorongy-a [Offering text to Chinggis Khan]. Öbör Mongyol-un Arad-un Keblel-un Qoriy-a, pp. 21–115.
- CQAT (2006): *Чингис хааны алтан тобч нэртүйн цэдиү* [Golden history of Chinggis Khan]. Ed. С. Дашдэжид. Улаанбаатар (Transcribed to modern Mongolian. With facsimile from the CQAT 1998. The introduction is by Kesigtoıytaqu 1998).
- CQAT (2009): *The Golden Summary of Činggis Qayan: Činggis Qayan-u Altan Tobči* by Leland Liu Rogers. Translation and transcription with a brief introduction. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag.
- CT (1967): Čayan Teüke. Ligeti, Lajos (ed.): *Jüan- es Ming-kori szövegek klasszikus átírásban* [Texts from the Yüan and Ming periods in classical transcription]. Budapest, ELTE Belső-ázsiai Intézet (Mongol nyelvelméltár V., Preklasszikus emlékek 3).
- DYGSB (1828): *Dai Yuwan gurun i suduri bithe* (*Historie de l'origine de l'Empire Mongol et de son premier fondateur Tchinghis-khan, jusqu'en 1211 de J. C. Tirée de l'histoire de la dynastie Mongole, qui a regné en Chine, publié à Peking en 1646*). *Chrestomathie Mandchou, ou Recueil de Textes Mandchou*. Ed. J. Klaproth, pp. 121–194.
- ET (1959): *Der Kienlung-Druck des mongolischen Geschichtswerks Erdeni-yin tobci von Sagang Secen*. Herausgegeben von Erich Hauer. Wiesbaden.

- LuAT (1992): *Altan Tobči: Eine mongolische Chronik des XVII. Jahrhunderts von Blo bzan bstan 'jin*. Text und Index by Hans-Peter Vietze, Gendeng Lubsang. Tokyo, Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- QAT (1955): *The Mongol Chronicle Altan Tobči*. Translated and edited by C. R. Bawden. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.
- QAT (2002): *Qad-un ündüsün quriyangyui altan tobči (Textological Study)*. Transcription and index by Sharav Choimaa. Ulaanbaatar.
- ST (1957): *Шара Туджи – Монгольская летопись XVII века*. Сводный текст, перевод, введение и примечания Н. П. Шастиной. Москва–Ленинград.

Secondary Literature

- Atwood, Christopher P. (2006): How the Mongols Rejected the Secret History. *Mongolica* Vol. 18 (39), pp. 389–410.
- Bayarsaihan, Batsuhiin (2006) Батсүхийн Баярсайхан: *Арван буянт номын цагаан туух* [ᠠᠷᠠᠨ Төүкэ]. Улаанбаатар.
- Bayarsaikhan, Dashdondog (2011): Review in *JAH* Vol. 45, Nos 1–2, pp. 198–199.
- Bira, Shagdaryn (2002): *Mongolian Historical Writing from 1200 to 1700*. Translated from the original Russian by John R. Krueger and revised and updated by the author, second edition. Belingham, WA, Center for East Asian Studies, Western Washington University.
- Buyanbayatur (2007): “*Quriyangyui Altan Tobči*”-yin eke bičig-un sudulul. *Öbör Mongyol-un Arad-un Keblel-ün Qoriy-a*.
- Chiodo, Elisabetta (1989–1991): “The Book of the Offerings to the Holy Cinggis Qayan”. A Mongolian Ritual Text. *ZAS* Vol. 22, pp. 190–220.
- Damdinsüren, C. (1957) Ц. Дамдинсүрэн: *Монголын уран зохиолын тойм. Нэгдүгээр дэвэр. XIII-XIV зууны үе* [Mongolian literature from the 13th–14th centuries]. Улаанбаатар, Улсын хэвлэлийн газар.
- Erdenitoytatu (1989): “Cinggis qayan-u altan tobci neretü cedig”-un tuqai [On the Golden summary of Chinggis Khan]. *Öbör Mongyol-un bayši-yin yeke surγayuli-yin erdem sinjilegen-ü sedkül* No. 1, pp. 34–43.
- Franke, Herbert (1978): *From Tribal Chieftain to Universal Emperor and God: The Legitimation of the Yüan Dynasty*. München, Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Gaadamba, Sh. (1990) Гадамба, Ш.: *Монголын Нууц Товчооны судлалын зарим асуудал* [Questions on the Secret History of the Mongols]. Улаанбаатар, Улсын хэвлэлийн газар.
- Heissig, Walther (1987): A New Version of the “Battle with the Tayicighut”. *CAJ* Vol. 31, Nos 3–4, pp. 209–223.
- Hoog, Constance (1983): *Prince Ji-Gim's Textbook of Tibetan Buddhism*. Leiden, Brill.
- Kápolnás, Olivér (2014): An Unpublished Manuscript – Mongyol Boyda Cinggis Qayan-u Tuyuji. *Культурное наследие монголов: рукописные и архивные собрания Санкт-Петербурга и Улан-батыра*, pp. 69–74.
- Károly, László (2010): Review of Leland Liu Rogers, The Golden Summary of Činggis Qayan. *Činggis Qayan-u Altan Tobči. Turkic Languages* Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 294–297.
- Kesigtoγtaqu (1998): “Činggis Qayan-u Altan Tobci Neretü Čedig”-ün jokiyaysan Čay Üy-e-yin Tuqai [On the compilation time of Golden Summary of Chinggis Khan]. In: *Mongyol-un erten-ü utq-a jokiyal-un sudulul*. *Öbör Mongyol-un Arad-un Keblel-ün Qoriy-a*, pp. 199–208.
- Ligeti, Louis (1974): *Histoire Secrète des Mongols: Texte en Ecriture Ouigoure Incorporé dans la Chronique Altan Tobci de Blo-Bzan Bstan-'jin*. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

- Liu, Jin Suo (1979): *Arban Gurba – Arban Doloduyar Jayun-u Mongγol-ün Teiuke Bičilge* [Mongolian historical writing from the 13th to the 17th century]. Öbör Mongγol-un Arad-un Keblel-ün Qoriy-a.
- Mongγolküü (2006): *Olan Süm-e-yin Mongγol Bicig-ün Oldaburi-nuyud daki Qoyar Tamtuy-i Totulaqu ni* [Study on two fragments from *Olan Süm-e*]. *Questiones Mongolorum Disputatae* No. 2. pp. 142–153.
- Monhsaihan, S. (2011) Мөнхсайхан, С.: “Банзарагч”-ийн төгсгөлийн үг [The colophone of *Pañ-carakṣā*]. Улаанбаатар.
- Möngkebayar, M. (2009): “*Čayan Teiuke*”-yin Jokiyaγci-yin Tuqai [On the author of *Čayan Teiuke*]. In: Möngkedalai, M. – Qorcabilig, N. (eds): *Qutuytai Sečen Sudulul-un Silimel Ögüel*. Öbör Mongγol-un Arad-un Keblel-ün Qoriy-a.
- MYT (2003): Чулууны Далай – Цогт-Очирын Ишдорж: *Монгол улсын түүх* [History of Mongolia]. Улаанбаатар.
- Nasan-Ölzii (2011) Насан-Өлзий: “*Чингис хааны алтан товч*”-ийн зохигдсон түүхэн цаг үеийн асуудалд [On the compilation time of *Golden Summary of Chinggis Khan*]. In: Дашдаваа, Чулууны – Чингэлт – Хироки, Ока (eds): *Монголын түүх судлал ба сурвалж*. Сэндай, Тохоку Их Сургууль (CNEAS Report 2), pp. 196–204.
- Okada, Hidehiro (1992): The Yüan Imperial Seal in the Manchu Hands: the Source of the Ch’ing Legitimacy. In: Bethlenfalvy, Géza et al. (eds): *Altaic Religious Beliefs and Practices. Proceedings of the 33rd Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference, Budapest, June 24–29, 1990*. Budapest, Research Group for Altaic Studies of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and Department of Inner Asiatic Studies Eötvös Loránd University, pp. 267–270.
- Okada, Hidehiro (1996): The Imperial Seal in the Mongol and Chinese Tradition. In: Stary, Giovanni (ed.): *Proceedings of the 38th Permanent International Altaistic Conference (PIAC) Kawasaki, Japan, August 7–12, 1995*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, pp. 273–280.
- de Rachewiltz, I. (2004): On the Sheng-wu Ch’in-cheng lu. *East Asian History* Vol. 28, December, pp. 35–52.
- de Rachewiltz, I. (2006): *The Secret History of the Mongols. A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century*. Translated with a Historical and Philological Commentary by Igor de Rachewiltz. Leiden, Brill.
- de Rachewiltz, I. (2008): The Dating of the Secret History of the Mongols – A Re-interpretation. *UJb* Vol. 22, pp. 150–184.
- Rossabi, M. (1988): *Qubilai Khan. His Life and Times*. Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- Rossabi, M. (2010): The Golden Summary of Činggis Qayan: Činggis Qayan-u Altan Tobci by Lealand Liu Rogers (review). *Asian Ethnology* Vol. 69, No. 1, pp. 208–209.
- Saad, Rana (ed.) (2005): *William of Rubruck’s Account of the Mongols*. Maryland.
- Saranyou-a (2013): 萨仁高娃, 西藏阿里地区发现蒙古文散叶研究, 国家图书馆出版社 *Xizang ali diqu faxian menggu wen san ye yanjiu* [A Mongolian manuscript from Ngari Prefecture]. Guojia tushu guan chuban she.
- Sárközi, A. (1982): A 17th Century Mongol Manjusrināmasaṃgiti with Commentary. *AOH* Vol. 36, Nos 1–3, pp. 449–468.
- Sharav, Choimaa (2002): The Comparative Study of Texts “The Secret History of the Mongols” & “Altan Tobci” by Lubsangdanjin. Ulaanbaatar, NUM.
- Ulayan (2005): “*Erdeni-yin Tobči*”-yin *Sudulul* [Study on the *Erdeni-yin Tobči*]. Liyooning-un Ündüsüten-ü Keblel-ün Qoriy-a.
- Uspensky, V. (2006): “*Explanation of the Knowable*” by ‘Phags-pa bla-ma Blo-gros rgyal-mtshan (1235–1280). *Facsimile of the Mongolian Translation with Transliteration and Notes*. Tokyo (Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series).

