

## AN OIRAT ETHNOGENETIC MYTH IN WRITTEN AND ORAL TRADITIONS

(A CASE OF OIRAT LEGITIMACY)

ÁGNES BIRTALAN\*  
(Budapest)

According to the oldest tradition of the Inner Asian steppe, the nomadic empires legitimised their rules by ethnogenetic myths, in which the zoomorphic phenomena played a determinative role. The Chinggisid Empire followed the traditional wolf–deer ancestorship as means for strengthening their power over the Inner-Asian nomads. At the time of the decline of the Eastern Mongolian (Chinggisid) empire the Western Mongolian tribal confederation came to power and tried to extend its power over the whole traditional Mongolian territory. The attempt to turn the political rule required a new mythical ideological background, which, in the case of the Oirats, also roots in an ancient Inner-Asian tradition. The motives of the myth of the *Čoros* (*Cors*), the Junghar ruling clan spread in the folklore as well and became a common Oirat ethnogenetic tradition.

The paper discusses different literary and lore variants of the myth and its main motives, indicating the possible political role of them.

*Key words:* Oirat (Western Mongol) mythology, legitimisation, literary and folklore tradition.

*Öwgön bagš*, *Li bagš*, as his Mongolian friends and admirers used to call Professor Ligeti, was not my professor during my university years (he retired earlier than I began my studies at the Department of Inner Asian Studies), but he had given me a lot of good advice, how to approach problems, questions, how to choose topics for studies. I would like to dedicate this article to the wise “master” of my professors.

Among the numerous articles, studies, books of Ligeti’s oeuvre, the transcription, and the richly annotated Hungarian translation of the Secret History of the Mongols occupies a prominent place. The Secret History of the Mongols starts with a short fragment of an ethnogenetic myth, which contains a phenomenon well known throughout Inner Asia, namely, the zoomorphic ancestorship. Starting from Scythian times there are numerous representations of tribal ancestors, for instance the fighting beast and deer, which show the violent unification of tribes. The two former hostile tribal leagues with the leadership of the clan of the wolf and the deer united peacefully

\* Ágnes Birtalan, Múzeum krt. 4/B, Budapest, Hungary, H-1088, birtalan@hotmail.com

through marriage according to the Secret History of the Mongols.<sup>1</sup> “There was a bluish wolf which was born having (his) destiny from heaven above. His spouse was a fallow doe. They came, passing over the Tenggis.” (Cleaves 1982, p. 1, § 1). As many authors had already expressed it, the zoomorphic ancestors belonged to the legitimacy of the Inner-Asian nomads.<sup>2</sup> Even a fragmentary myth of this type was of enough importance, and even at the time of the formation of the Mongolian Empire (13th century), the anonymous chronicler of the Secret History found it significant to mention it. Especially in the 1st–2nd “books” of the Secret History there are many more examples that testify to the legitimacy of the Chinggisid rule, such as the heavenly ancestor (golden man – yellow dog), the ornithoid and astral symbols of the holy charisma, etc.<sup>3</sup> Although the tradition of the zoomorphic ancestors was kept for centuries, and it found reflection in the mythology, in the ritual texts, and in the folklore of the Mongols (Köhalmi 1987, Birtalan 1995), the Buddhist historiography “palliated” the zoomorphic ancestors, turning them into human beings, bearing the original animal names.<sup>4</sup>

A new “political” take-over in the steppe attempted by any other, non-Chinggisid Mongolian tribe or tribal group would require a different mythological and ideological background, to try to make their rule legitimate. Such an attempt for obtaining governance in the steppe and to make their power legitimate was made soon by the Oirats in the 15th century.

### The Oirats<sup>5</sup>

The Oirats (known also as *Dörben* Oirats “the Four Oirats”) or the Western Mongols claimed to be the adversary of the Chinggisid descendants in the 15th century and later (in the 17th–18th centuries) and they represented the only independent Mongolian power against the expanding Manchu rule in the 17th century.<sup>6</sup>

The ethnonym Oirat (in written Mongolian and in written Oirat *Oyirad*, in spoken Oirat dialects *Örd*) covers several groups of Western Mongols, originally probably belonging to the tribal confederation of the *hoi-yin irgen* “forest people” who lived south and south-west of lake Baikal in South-Siberia until the 13th century. After Chinggis Khan’s eldest son *Ĵöči* attacked the forest people (in 1206–1207), the Oirat tribes moved to the steppe, to the Altai region and adopted the nomadic way of life. In the 15th century, the political power of the Oirat confederation began to gain strength. Under the rule of *Toγon* (1416?–1440) and his son *Esen* (1440–1455) the Oirats expanded their territory westwards from the Altai to the Ili valley and con-

<sup>1</sup> A new summary of the literature about the zoomorphic phenomena in the Mongolian folk culture is Birtalan (1995).

<sup>2</sup> Further references in Uray-Köhalmi (1987), Birtalan (1995).

<sup>3</sup> A detailed study about the Chinggisid charismatic power cf. Skrynnikova (1992–1993).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the fair Mongolian chronicle literature, among others the *Altan tobči* (Vietze – Lubsang 1992, p. 3).

<sup>5</sup> The ethnonyms, which have already “come to stay” more or less in the English literature will be given in the widespread versions, such as Oirat, Khalkha, etc.

<sup>6</sup> About the main problems of Oirat history cf. for instance: Pelliot (1960), Zlatkin (1983), Okada (1987), Miyawaki (1984), Miyawaki (1990), Birtalan – Rákos (2001).

trolled the legitimate Mongolian power of Chinggis' descendants. *Toyon's* attempt to seize political power is interesting from the ideological point of view as well. He claimed to be a Chinggisid descendant, but only on his mother's side! V. Veit analysing the story of his death<sup>7</sup> on that very day when he would proclaim himself the Khan, came to the conclusion that his mysterious death is clear evidence that only the male descendants could inherit the Chinggisid rule. The Oirats reached the height of their power under the rule of *Faldan bošoqtu* (1670–1697) and his successors *Cewangrabadan* (1697–1727) and *Faldanceren* (1727–1745), when the so-called Junghar (lit. “left-hand”) empire (a Khanate or pseudo-Khanate) was established. However similarly to Eastern and Southern Mongolian tribes, the expanding Manchu Empire in the middle of the 18th century also conquered the land of the Western Mongolian Oirats, the last independent Mongolian State.

Although the Oirats were able to obtain twice the governance over the traditional central territory of the Mongolian Empire, being of non-Chinggisid origin their power could never be admitted by other Mongolian populations. Even if some of their rulers received the title *qan* from the Dalai lamas, it was not passed down within a single ruling clan, but it was transferred from the Khoshuts to the Junghars, from the Junghars to the Torghuts.<sup>8</sup>

The ethnonym Oirat, used also as written Mongolian *Dörben Oyirad*, written Oirat *Dörbön Oyirad* “the four Oirats” covered different ethnic groups in different times. During the 17th–18th centuries, when the Eastern and Western Mongolian rivalry grew more intense, the following four (five) larger, originally tribal groups composed the Western Mongolian (Oirat) branch: 1. *Xošūd*, Mong. *Qosiyud* (the rulers of the tribe originate from Chinggis Khan's brother, *Qabutu Qasar*), 2. *Torγūd*, Mong. *Toryud* 3. *Zūn γar*, Mong. *Jegün γar* 4. *Dörböd* and *Xoyid*, Mong. *Dörbed*, *Qoyid* (Okada 1987). Each of these groups (originally tribes) had the sense of coherence with the other Oirat groups, but derived their own descent in different ways, from different ancestors. The very late (17th–18th-century) written sources and the even later records of oral tradition surely provide reliable evidence in comparison with an ancient mythological conception.

Among the diverse Oirat ethnogenetic myths, which date from different times of the Oirat and even pre-Oirat history, some of them preserved the oldest mythical layers and figures of North-Eurasia and Inner Asia, such as the water bird (swan) ancestress. While others claim to Buddhist historical and mythical persons, such as the

<sup>7</sup> Veit (1986, pp. 383–384). *Toyon* claimed to be the son of the Chinggisid descendant *Elbeg's* daughter, *Sütai*. When he went to the eight white yurts, to the Chinggis' reliquary, to proclaim himself the Khan, he behaved himself roughly and he was killed by an arrow of a Chinggis, kept in the yurts. Cf. for instance *Altan tobči* (Vietze–Lubsang 1992, p. 105).

<sup>8</sup> J. Miyawaki discussed the topic several times in her elaborate articles devoted to the history of the Oirat titles; she refuses the existence the so-called Junghar Khanate (Miyawaki 1990). Many of the Oirat rulers bore the title of *tayiji* “prince” or *qongtayiji* “vice-khan, second person after the khan”. Mong. *tayiša* “chief of a clan, tribe ...”, cf. Mong. *tayiji* (< Chin. t'ai-tzu) “a Mongolian noble class, a title inherited only by the descendants of Genghis Khan and his brothers” (Lessing 1982, p. 769). Mong. *qungtayiji*, or *qongtayiji* “an honorary title conferred on a taiji (Ch. huang-tai-tzu)” (Lessing 1982, p. 986).

early mythical *cakravartin*-kings, the Indian scholar Atīśa (982–1054), or the Dalai and Panchen lamas. The most commonly known and widespread Oirat myth is that of the origin of the Coros, Cors (Mong. Čoros), the ruling clan of the Junghars and the Dörböts. In the present article we would like to survey several variants of the Coros myth, while other Oirat tribal and clan myths transmitted in written and oral traditions will be discussed in another article. Analysing the Coros-myth variants we shall focus on the following problems: the mythological background and mythological figures of the Coros myths, the difference between the oral and literary traditions, the degree of the Buddhist influence on the mythical tradition, the supposed role of the Oirat myths in their legitimacy.

### Sources. I. Folklore material

Among the sources containing variants of the Coros myth, we find a very remarkable oral myth, recorded by B. Ja. Vladimircov at the beginning of the 20th century. Although this myth is fragmentary and in some parts incomplete, it comprises a wide scale of elements of common Inner Asian, Mongolian and Oirat mythology. It is particularly interesting because it was recorded when the mythology did not serve the Oirat political legitimacy anymore, especially not in the 19th–20th century.

B. Ja. Vladimircov published two different stories about the origin of the ruling clans of the Oirats in his valuable folklore collection, *Obrazcy mongol'skoj narodnoj slovesnosti. S.-Z. Mongolija* (Vladimircov 1926, pp. 151–152, 157–159). In his genre classification he suggested that the “The Dörböt princes” was a “rasskaz”, a folk narration, while the “The Khan of the Oirats” belongs to folktales (*ülgr*, Mong. *üliger*) of Buddhist origin.<sup>9</sup> However, because of their main motifs, such as the modellisation of the world similarly to myths (see below), and their ethiological character, we would like to suggest to range No. 19. *Dörwt noyt*<sup>10</sup> “The Dörböt princes” to the group of ethiological myths, and No. 22. *Oirdin xān* “The Khan of the Oirats” to the folktales with mythological motifs. Vladimircov translated myth No. 19. into Russian with some references in a short article (Vladimircov 1909).

#### No. 19. The Dörböt princes (further VI.19.)

Some nine people remained [alive] after a war. One [of them], the Black Master said:

- We do not have a prince, let us look for a prince.
- Where [should] we look for [him]? – the others asked.

<sup>9</sup> Vladimircov compared the motives of this folk tale with the tale entitled *Gō čikitü*, the 5th tale of the *Siditü kegür-ün üliger* “Tales of bewitched corpse”. Cf. Vladimircov (1926, pp. XVI–XVII.), and *Eljigen čiktü qayan-u qorin qoyaduyar bölüg* “The 27th chapter of the Khan with Donkey ear”.

<sup>10</sup> The Oirat fragments and the text in the Appendix follow Vladimircov’s transcription, but according to the peculiarity of the Oirat dialects, the overshortened vowels are omitted.

– Let us go southwards – said the Black Master. Well, there was an *obō*<sup>11</sup> and they arrived at it.

– Let us stick our staffs, and let us go in the four directions, and look for [the prince]. When we return, the staffs of the already deceased will shrivel up, while the staffs of those who are still alive, will bloom. Let us return on 15th of the midsummer month to the *obō* – said the Black Master.

Well, the Black Master left. There was a family with many cattle at the source of a large river. He [the Black Master] asked them:

– We look for a prince, there are nine of us. We remained after a war. We look for a prince; don't you know about a child, who could be our prince?

– We have learned [about such a child].

– Where is [he]?

– At the mouth of this river, there is a large golden lake, go there. There is a swan with four yellow heads.<sup>12</sup> There is a large golden fish. The swan with yellow head is the only son of the Heaven; the fish is the only Golden fairy, the daughter of the *Lūs* khan<sup>13</sup>. Next to them, there is a birch tree, and there is a baby in a cradle on it. I put some water in a bowl [for him]. The voice of an owlet<sup>14</sup> could be heard there. The baby listens to it. – Well, the Black Master praised and blessed the child, born from the Heavenly Son:

Having an owlet as your father,  
Having water as your drink,  
Born from the Golden fairy of the *Lūs*,  
And from the Heavenly Son,  
You had been in the sea  
Therefore you are the Sea-prince<sup>15</sup>,  
You are a prince with drink and food<sup>16</sup>,  
My name is “One who has food”,  
I make you [our] prince.

<sup>11</sup> Mong. *oboy-a*, Oir. Kalm. *owā* “stone cairn” altar for the protector spirits of the clan, tribe or the spirits of *genii loci* type. Cf. Birtalan (1996; 1998).

<sup>12</sup> Although in the variants there are more swans (three and five hundred), the Oirat expression *dörwn šar tolyat xun* suggests the translation “a swan with four heads”, because the attribute of quantity must precede the noun to which it pertains and not the attribute of quality. Vladimircov suggests a similar solution in his translation (Vladimircov 1909).

<sup>13</sup> Mong. *Lūs*, “anthropo- and zoomorphic (snake, dragon) chthonic spirits, lords of waters and earth, inhabiting the human world layer and the underworld” – their characteristics merged with the spirits of *genii loci*. Cf. Birtalan (2001, pp. 935–936, 1006–1007, 1033, 1055).

<sup>14</sup> Oirat *ūli*, *ūl'* Khal. *ūli*, Mong. *uyuli* “owlet [*Glaudicium noctuum*]”.

<sup>15</sup> *Dalād bāsārn* – *dalā tāš*; the Dörböt princes bore the title *dalā tāš* (Mong. *dalai tayisi*) which literally means “sea prince”, the myth suggests a possible explanation how this title originates.

<sup>16</sup> *Undtā badntā tāš*. *Min' ner Badntā* – the expression *badn* is connected in a hendiadion correspondence with the word *undtā* “having drink”, and could mean a certain type of food. However it is not clear why the master addressed also himself the same way. Another possible explanation is that the word corrupted from *bandh* “hölzernes Brett, Block, Bank” (Ramstedt 1976, p. 33), which could indicate the Throne of Coros. In this case the translation of the passage: “You are the prince with food and throne/My name is One who has a throne [for you].”

Now he returned to the former *obō*. One of the staffs shrivelled up.

– Oh, one of us died – said the Black Master. [Then] the Black Master acted as follows: he prepared a golden throne with thirty-two legs<sup>17</sup> and built a yurt [above it]. Then he said to the boy:

– If you are destined to be our prince, get three times on the throne with thirty-two legs and sit on it crossing your legs. If you shall not be our prince, get quickly on the ground. I will throw you three times through the smoke-hole of the yurt; I will throw you three times above the lintel of the yurt's [door]. – And the Black Master threw him [as he said]. Then [the boy] got three times<sup>18</sup> on the golden throne with thirty-two legs, and sat [on it] crossing his legs.

Therefore, the Dörböt princes are descendants of the son-in-law and the daughter of the Heaven and the *Lūstīn* Khan.

He has heavenly origin,  
He has metal navel,  
Born from the Heavenly Son,  
And from the Golden fairy,  
He was born so.

#### ***No. 19. The Khan of the Oirats (further VI.22.)***

There was a Khan who did not have a wife. There was boy in the yurt in front [of the Khan's place]. Later [the Khan] married. A son was born from her. [...] Both boys went away. It became very dark. They became hungry and arriving to the *yal burysn* world-tree<sup>19</sup> and set down. He [= the Khan's son] felt terribly badly.<sup>20</sup> When they looked above the liquid of the leaves dropped down, they both tasted it, and rejoiced over it. [...] The lama who reared up [the Khan's son] was the Dalai lama. The Khan sent for the lama, and they recognised each other immediately. They were the Panchen lama and the Khan of the Oirats.

### **Sources II. Folklore material.**

#### **Records of traveller scholars (Pallas, Potanin, Burdukov)**

P. S. Pallas published an oral version of the Coros clan-myth in his *Sammlungen* (Pallas 1776, pp. 33–36), but he seems to handle the mythical story very cautiously. He tried to find a real history behind the myths and explained it as if it were invented by the chief of the clan (*Bō xān*) for the legitimisation of his real descent.

<sup>17</sup> The throne with thirty-two legs refers to the Indo-Tibetan tale about King Vikramāditya (Vladimircov 1909, p. 37), further references see Bawden (1962).

<sup>18</sup> The text is incomplete, the Black Master should throw him six times, as it was stated by him above.

<sup>19</sup> See below, about the Concept of the world.

<sup>20</sup> The Mongolian text is vivid *elkm xatj mūdġ* “his liver dired up, he was so unwell”.

“Böh Chan hatte keine rechtmäßige Kinder und es war ein Meisterstück seiner Klugheit, daß er einen vermutlich natürlichen Sohn, unter dem Vorwand eines übernatürlichen und geheimnißvollen Ursprungs in dem Besitz seiner angefangenen Herrschaft, als Erben bestätigte. Dieses geschahe aber, nach den Kalmückischen Erzählungen, also. – Der Choitsche Held Joboghon Mergen<sup>21</sup> fand auf der Jagd ein schönes Mädchen, welches von einen, wegen kleiner Liebesschwachheiten, aus dem Himmel auf die Erde verbannten Engel (Tänggrin) ausgegeben wird. Diese nahm er zur Gattin, weil sie sich aber auch auf Erden nicht mit einem Mann begnügen konnte, so hegte sie, da Joboghon einstmals lange abwesend und vermutlich auf einem Kriegeszug war, mit Böhchan eine unerlaubte Vertraulichkeit. Noch ehe Joboghon zurück kam, gebahr sie einen Sohn, welchen sie bei vernommener Ankunft ihres Gatten unter einem Baum aufsetzte. Böh Chan ward, wie die Kalmücken glauben, durch seine Zauberkünste, oder besser durch eine Botschaft der Mutter von des Knaben Schicksal unterrichtet, suchte ihn auf und nahm ihn zu sich. Weil das Kind im Nebelwetter (Budun) war gefunden worden, und man eine kleine Ohreule (Ooli Schabun) um dasselbe flattern gesehen, so nannte er es Oolinda-budun und setzte es zu seinem Nachfolger ein. – Oolinda-budun Taidshi hatte als Kind, unter dem Baum, wo er von der Mutter ausgesetzt worden, einen abgestutzten krummen Ast über sich gehabt, aus welchem der Saft des Baums ihm in den Mund triefen und ihn also nothdürftig nähren konnte. Dieser Ast glich einer krummen Röhre, dergleichen sich die Kalmücken bey Abziehung ihres Milchbranntweins bedienen und Zorros nennen; daher werden alle Fürsten von seiner Nachkommenschaft und ihre Ulussen auch noch zuweilen Zorros zugehahmt. Einige setzen hinzu: Böh-Chan habe den Oolinda für ein von den Tängrien oder himmlischen Geistern auf die Erde gebrachtes Kind ausgegeben.

Unvollkommene Kalmückische Sagen setzen mit Unrecht diesen Oolinda-Budun Taischi nicht viel über den Anfang des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts hinaus und geben ihm unmittelbar die beyden Stamväter, der Songarschen und Derbetschen Fürstenhäuser, Ongozo und Ongorchoi zu Söhnen.”

G. N. Potanin collected three versions of the myths from Dörböt informants in 1879 (Potanin 1883, pp. 325–327, Notes 872–877).

**Potanin A.** It was written in the *Ganjur*<sup>22</sup>: When Ulbur-Šari was at war [with his enemies], twenty-one men [of his people] got married and hid themselves in a canyon of the river Narzi Mörn. One of them claimed to be elder. They prayed to *Xar Maxgal*<sup>23</sup> and when they brought offerings to him, they asked:

– We only have a chief [and no prince]. Show us a ruler in our dreams or any other way!

The chief dreamed that on top of the mountain where they lived there are three daughters of *Lūs*, being transformed into ducks. The Heavenly Son (*tengriin xüü*) de-

<sup>21</sup> Yabuγan mergen (Mong.) is an important progenitor of the Khoit tribe and figures in the mythology of Turcic ethnic groups as well (Taube 2001). A detailed study about the Khoits will follow in a further article about the Oirat ethnogenetic mythology.

<sup>22</sup> The well-known Mongolian or Oirat names and expressions are given in a reconstructed Oirat form and in italics.

<sup>23</sup> “Black *Mahākāla*”, cf. Skr. *Mahākāla*, Mong. *Yeke qara*.

scended to the middle [duck] and had relationship with her. She gave birth to a son. Next morning the chief asked the others:

– Who has dreamed something? – It seemed that none of them dreamed anything. Then he explained his dream and added:

– Now, we should find the son that was born.

– How could we look for him? – the others asked.

– As one looking for his horse – said the chief and everybody spread in the steppe. None [of them] could find anything. Then the chief started to divine, but without any result. Suddenly someone of them heard a child's cry from the upper flow of the river. They went there and found there a *zandn*<sup>24</sup> tree and an old man with an old woman sitting under it. The old woman cradled the child saying to him:

– Öl'güt, öl'güt.<sup>25</sup>

That is why the Dörböts are called *Öld*, as well.

**Potanin B.** One found a child in a cradle under a tree. A large twirled leaf was put into the child's mouth and the liquid of the tree flowed into it. There was also a bowl with water beside the child. The people who were looking for a ruler said:

– Surely, he should be our ruler. Thus, having a bowl beside him, he obtained the name *Cors*. There has been an *Ūli* bird<sup>26</sup> on the tree, where he has been found. That is why people say:

– *Urn modn ecgtää*,

*Ūli šuwuun ējtää*,

*Odun-Badin taiš*. That is:

“Having *Urn*<sup>27</sup> tree as his father,

Having *Ūli* bird as his mother

He is *Odun-Badin* prince.”

People took the child, brought him up, and made him their ruler. People married him and he had three sons: *Če*, *Toin*, *Cagaan*.<sup>28</sup>

**Potanin C.** The Dörböt's ancestor is called:

*Gurwn modn ējtää*,

*Ūli šuwuun ecegtää*,

*Odun-odun*.

That is: Having three trees as his mother,

Having *Ūli*-bird as his father,

*Odun-odun* [is his name].

A. V. Burdukov collected a variant of the myth among the Bayits.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>24</sup> “Santal tree”, Oir. *zandn*, Mong. *ḡandan*; the world tree also used to be called so.

<sup>25</sup> Probably it is a reference to the popular etymology of the word *öld*, trying to explain the word *ölgei* (Mong.), *ölgī* (Khal.), *ölgää* (Oir.) “cradle”. The woman used this expression for calming the infant.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Note 14.

<sup>27</sup> Corrupted from Oir. *ūr*, Mong. *ūr*, *modun ūr* “an excrescence on a tree” (Lessing 1982, p. 890).

<sup>28</sup> The story follows further with a long list of descendants.

<sup>29</sup> A. V. Burdukov: Predanie o proishozhdenii derbetskih knjazej kosti Coros. *Trudy Troicko-savsko-Kjatinского otdelenija RGO* 1911, t. XIV, vyp. 1–2, quoted and abridged by Cerel (1997, p. 76).



“Once upon a time the Oirat Dörböts were to pass a high mountain on their way of wandering. The top of that mountain was covered with clouds, and there was permanent fog and no one could see it. That time a young hunter chasing some game chanced upon the top of that mountain. There was a lake on the top of the mountain, and bush grew around the lake. To his surprise, he heard women’s voices suddenly, but he could not see anything. Thanks to its glimmering the lake pushed away the clouds, he was able to see that three heavenly fairies descended from Heaven, bathed in the lake and returned to the sky. The young man arrived next time with a lasso, hid himself in the bushy willow, and caught one of the fairies with his lasso. He made her stay with him and they fell in love. When they got appeased in love, the fairy returned to the Heaven, but because she became pregnant, she felt ashamed before the other heavenly beings, she came back to the top of the mountain, and gave birth to a son. She made a cradle out of the bark of the tree, hang the cradle on a branch of the tree. So that the child would not cry, she got a cooing bird to guard him, so that the child would not be hungry she put a wooden bowl with her milk and a pipe close to the child and put the pipe into his mouth. That time people living there had no nobleman and when these people, their fortune-tellers, wise men gathered together and conferred with each other how to find a ruler, they decided that on the top of the mountain beside the lake must be found a nobleman. Thus the found child originating from Heaven was made into a nobleman, and as a pipe had fed him, he obtained the name *corgo* ‘pipe’. Later a plural suffix *-s* was added to this word and became *Coros*. The noblemen of the Dörböts and Bajits are of heavenly origin.

Since the cradle was made of wood, thus his mother was a wooden bark and his father was a bird, [*Cors*] is called: “Having a wooden bark as mother, having a skilled bird as father, he has good birth, he is the son of the foggy *Xurmast*<sup>30</sup> god.”

### Oirat written records

I. *Dörbön oyiradiyin tūke* “The history of the Four Oirats” written by emči Габан Šarab in 1737 (Coloo 1967, Badmaev 1984, pp. 64–75) is the oldest chronicle about the “prekalmyk” history of the Oirats and that of the first century of Kalmyk history.<sup>31</sup> This valuable work contains not only historical facts, but also reflects the oral tradition, including the myth about the origin of the *Coros* clan. The chronicle follows the tradition, which claims that the Dörböts and the Junghars have a common ancestor. Both tribes originate from the Heavenly Son.

“It is said that the Dörböts and the Junghars originate from the Heaven. The reason is that a hunter discovered a small child on a *beamy* tree. The tree had a wart similar to a tube and that is why [the infant] was called *Coros*. The juice of that tree dropped into his mouth. [He] is said to be created by a tree with wart and an owlet.

<sup>30</sup> Mong. *Qormusda* (Birtalan 2001, p. 1026).

<sup>31</sup> Although the biography of the Oirat *Zaya* pandita (Coloo 1967) precedes Габан Šarab’s work, concerning its genre the *Dörbön oyiradiyin tūke* could be considered as the first historical chronicle.

Amini and Domonō were born [from him] Amini had ten sons, Domono [sic!] had four sons. The Dörböts and the Junghars originate from an infant who being at the roots of a tree was said to descend from the Heaven. That is the reason, that infant is said to be the grandson of the Heaven.”

II. *Dörbön oyiradiyin tūke* “The history of the Four Oirats” was written by one of the most learned Kalmyk chroniclers, by prince Xošūd noyon Bātur Ubaši Tümen in 1819.<sup>32</sup> The prince used for his chronicle the above-mentioned historical work written by Ғабан Ғараб, and collected numerous data from his vassals, from his subjects. He seemed to be extremely interested in the genealogical data; he describes thoroughly the lineage of each Oirat tribe. The descent of the Junghars contains the fragment of the Coros myth.

“[4b] The origin of the Junghar princes. *Yabuyn mergen* is the descendant of Chinggis Khan. His son is Erelbi. His son is Sayin Kā ... The origin of the Junghar princes. In early times, there lived two men: Aminai and Dömnönö on an uninhabited place. The ten sons of Aminai are the Junghar Khan’s subjects. The four sons of Dömnönö are the subjects called Dörböts. Each of them had 10 sons. They had numerous offspring. One of them, a hunter following a wild beast in an uninhabited forest found an infant at the roots of a tree. He reared [the child]. The tree had a shape similar to a pipe and thereafter got [the child] the name Coros. The liquid of the tree dropped into the mouth of the child, and became nourishment [for him]. In its shadows, there was an only owlet no other living being was there. Therefore, [Coros] was told: tree is his mother, owlet is his father. This Coros had such a faith, he has been considered as the grandson of the Heaven. The man who found [him] brought up [to become a *taiš*] and was made a prince.

“[5b] The origin of the Dörböt is similar to that of the Junghar princes. From a [man] called Bō axān originates Uduntai-Badan tayiši, from him originates Dalai tayiši.”

III. *Dörbön oyiradiyin tūke touji* (Luwsanbaldan 1976, pp. 331–377; Badmaev 1984, pp. 88–91). “History of the Four Oirats”, written by an anonymous chronicler, in Vladimircov’s opinion in all probability in the second half of the 19th century.<sup>33</sup> Two manuscripts of this chronicle are kept in the archive of the Institute of Language and Literature of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences and in the Mongolian State Library. Despite all its mistakes and sometimes ahistoric content, this chronicle is worthwhile to research and analyse, as it is a treasury of ethnogenetic and other myths and folk legends. Vladimircov simply labelled this chronicle “legends about Amursanā”; indeed this text seems to be a kind of “pamphlet” dedicated to the ill-reputed, however, outstanding Western Mongolian ruler (1755–57).

“[5b] The Nine tribes (*omoq*) of the Junghar [of] the Four Oirats are the followings: The Coros clan was created [through a relationship] of the Heaven and the *Klus*.”

<sup>32</sup> The whole title of the chronicle: *Xošūd noyon Bātur Ubaši Tümeni Tūrbiqsan Dörbön Oyiradiyin Tūke* “The history of the Four Oirats composed by the Khoshut prince, Bātur Ubaši Tümen”. Luwsanbaldan (1976, pp. 378–433), Badmaev (1984, pp. 75–82).

<sup>33</sup> Vladimircov added, that the possible author of the chronicle is a certain *Dambo tayiji* of Bayit origin (Badmaev 1984, p. 88).

IV. *Ögeled-ün noyad-un uy eki* (further ÖNE) “The lineage of the Ölöt princes”, two manuscripts about the origin of the Ölöt ruling clan are kept in the State Library in Ulanbator. Unfortunately, we had no access to these manuscripts, so they will be cited according to Heissig’s article (Heissig 1984, pp. 319–324).

### Historical evidences of the Coros myth

The most frequently figuring names in the mythology, like Bō xan, Ulintai-Badantai appear in the Chinese historical documents. The Ming chronicles recorded the probably historical persons, who became significant in the 16th–17th century legitimacy endeavour of the Oirats (Pelliot 1960, pp. 8–9). The mentioned progenitors of the Coros clan occur in different genealogies and literary sources, too.<sup>34</sup>

Analysing the background of the Coros myth, Okada reached the conclusion that the Coros myth roots in an ancient Inner-Asian tradition of the Uighurs and other Inner-Asian people (Okada 1987, pp. 197–203). The Uighur ethnogenetic tradition (sources, such as the Persian Juvaini, and the Chinese Kuo ch’ao wen lei) is based on a genesis from a single or more trees. The story has elements similar to the myth of Oirat tradition, such as<sup>35</sup>:

Motive	Uighur	Oirat
place of the birth	between two rivers	along the (world)river
the motive of descent	heavenly ray	heavenly female being
the tree	with lump	with wart
the destiny of the child(ren)	they will be brought up by local people	he will be reared up by the nobleman seeking group of people

The identification of the Oirat progenitor Bō xan with the Uighur Bōgū qayan is a noteworthy theory, which must be proved later, but the similarities in the mythology could be considered as a continuous tradition in Inner Asia.

### The mythological background of the Oirat legitimisation

Since the Chinggisid rulers weakened and the chiefs of the Western Mongolian tribal league came to power, the Western Mongols needed mythological and legendary background to make their rule legitimate.<sup>36</sup>

The basic myth of the Coros, the ruling clan of the Junghars, consists of the following motifs:

<sup>34</sup> The *Činggis qayan-u yeke öčig* “Great Prayer of Chinggis Khan” also mentions the Uyiyu-dai Badang (cf. Ulintai Badantai) quoted by Okada (1987, p 198).

<sup>35</sup> Besides of the similar motifs there are different ones, too, but because of the limited size of the paper, this will not be discussed here.

<sup>36</sup> The story of the Coros clan attracted the attention of W. Heissig as well, he has been trying to seek for a shaman myth in the ethnogenetic mythology (Heissig 1984, pp. 319–324).

- (a) a group of people (a clan?) looks for a ruler;
- (b) the chief of the group is a prominent person (shaman, a diviner, or a master);
- (c) the ruler will be an abandoned child;
- (d) the child originates from other world layers by his mother's side;
- (e) the child's parents represent the upper world and the underworld;
- (f) the child is found on the top of the world mountain, at the foot of the world-tree;
- (g) the tree feeds the child (var.: people put water for him in a bowl on the tree, his mother puts her milk in a bowl on the tree);
- (h) the child is guarded by a bird (owlet), a protector against the harmful spirits, or a totemic (?) animal of shamans, or an envoy of shamans;
- (i) the prominent person (former chief, or hunter) will rear the child.

Although most of the listed motifs are well known in world mythology, it would go beyond the limits of this paper to cite every possible parallel motif, therefore we shall confine ourselves to the ones of the Mongolian mythology and some close analogies from neighbouring people (Kazak, Chinese, Tuvian). In this article we concentrated on the following problems:

- (1) the world conception of the myth (the three-layered world, world tree, world river) and its role in the legitimisation,
- (2) the problem of Chieftainship (chiefless group of people, prince of external origin),
- (3) the ornitoid phenomena (swan, owlet) as important elements of the legitimisation.

### The problem of chieftainship

Several variants of the story mentioned that the group of people<sup>37</sup> that survived after a war had a chief (but not a ruler, not a prince), a shaman (*bō*) or a master (*bagš*). In his article, W. Heissig analysed this motive, comprehending it as significant for a shaman myth. Some versions (ÖNE, Pallas, VI.19, Potanin A) confirm that the chief of that group of people is an extraordinary person with peculiar abilities, and two of the texts even attach to him the name *Bō* "shaman". In the later folk tradition (VI.19) the chief lost his "shaman" title, became "black master" (*xar bagš*), but preserved the shamanic abilities. He knows how to find the prince, he is able to find him, and he is able to divine (VI.19). Remarkable is the way of divination, how the chief ascertains whether the boy would really be their prince. He throws the child three times through the smoke-hole of the yurt, and three times above its lintel. Both the smoke-hole and the gap above the lintel are considered as the way of spirits in a Mongolian yurt. The smoke-hole played an important role in the ethnogenetic myth of Chinggis Khan as well (the golden man – yellow dog motive: Cleaves 1982, p. 4, § 20). It is well known that the Mongols close the smoke-hole only when there is a deceased in the yurt or

<sup>37</sup> In the genealogy of the Torghts there is a similar motive to the VI.19 variant, where also nine persons (progenitors of the clan) figure: the On tayisi (= Ong qan) escaped with his nine followers to his uncle on maternal side. (Geleg – Čoytan 1991, pp. 20–21).

for peculiar magic activities (e. g. healing) (Sárközi 1996, pp. 91–118). Otherwise, a Mongolian family adhering to tradition never closes the cover over the smoke-hole of the yurt. Although it is prohibited for common people to throw something through the smoke-hole, it is a part of shamanic rituals and everyday ceremonies to sprinkle milk libation through the smoke-hole for the spirits. The gap above the lintel could serve as a way for the harmful spirits, that is why a rope of the yurt, called 'khalkha' *čagtag* and used as a demon catcher, is fastened close to the lintel in a traditional Mongolian yurt.<sup>38</sup> During the New Year ceremony, the Mongols put white pebbles, snow, and thorny boughs over the lintel, to make the way of benevolent spirits easier with the white colour, and the way of harmful spirits difficult with the thorns (Dulam 1992, p. 19). Throwing the child through these significant places of the Mongolian yurt refers to his non-earthly origin, to his origin from another, non-human world layer (cf. below the elements of the mythical world concept). In the corrupted variant of the myth collected by Potanin the chief of the group of people lost almost all his peculiar abilities, he was not able even to divine where the prince could be found (another man of his community heard the child's cry).

The motive of the group of chiefless people is well known from other Mongolian traditions as well. E. G. Borte Činu-a, the ancestor of the Borjigid was elected as chief of the people called Bede (Schmidt 1829, pp. 56–57).

The chief of external origin is considered as a legitimate ruler, because he could be enveloped in the mythical aura, as in the case of Coros. Even if he is endowed with supernatural power, being a member of his clan the original leader of the group (shaman or master) cannot meet the requirements of a chief, because of the lack of the mythical background.

### **The conception of the world<sup>39</sup>**

The mythological background of the Coros story concerning the world conception contains elements of pre-buddhist and Buddhist notions. The most important components of the traditional world conception are the followings: the three-layered world (upperworld, underworld, middle – human – world), the world tree, the world mountain, and the world river. The Vladimircov text enumerates the greatest number of the mentioned components. In the conception of Coros the whole universe appears: his mother (golden fish) represents the underworld and the water element, and his father is the son of the Heaven. It is also remarkable that the male principle appears as a swan, in the usual form of the female principle (see below in the chapter about the ornitoid phenomena). Besides the above-mentioned representatives of the non-human world layers the tree and the owl also appear.

The place where the infant is found, and where the group of people (the Junghars and the Dörböts) settle down is the centre of the world, where the world

<sup>38</sup> From the materials of the Hungarian–Mongolian Joint Expedition.

<sup>39</sup> In this article, we are not going to give a detailed analysis of this phenomenon with all its parallels.

tree grows, on the world mountain, close to the world river. The tree and the river symbolise fertility, the drops of the tree (cf. VI.19.) can be considered as the drops of life water. Although there are texts in which the celestial being is the real mother of Coros, parallel with this the tree is also comprehended as the female participant of the conception. The motif of the feeding tree (and its female spirit) is well known in several mythologies (from Egypt to India and further) and appears in the Siberian mythology as the birthplace of the first man (Harva 1938, pp. 72–74). The world tree (Mong. *Galburγasun*, *Jambu*, *Ĵaq-a-yin γayca modun*) belongs to the most important ancient phenomena of the dawn of the world (Pallas 1801, p. 36; Potanin 1883, p. 223; Birtalan 2001, pp. 947–948, etc.). In some variants of the myth the motif of the feeding tree transformed, and the tree does not feed the infant (var.: he is fed by mother milk, or by water, which is provided by a herdsman). Such a motif modification is a mutation of the original notion. The cult of fertility trees throughout Mongolia is a living tradition of sacred trees.<sup>40</sup>

The world river (Pallas 1776, p. 37) also belongs to the important elements of the world concept; it also shows the way to get to the tree in some variants. People who direct the person seeking a prince to the tree also live by the river, and as it is common in the epic tradition they live on the lower part of the river (cf. SH, the Bodončar episode: Cleaves 1982, pp. 6–7, § 27–35).

### The ornitoid phenomena

Two ornitoid phenomena, the swan (swan girl, swan prince, in var.: duck), the ancestor and the owlet (owl), the quasi-ancestor (see below) or the guardian figure in the myth, but while the owlet appears in each text, in both the literary and the oral traditions, the swan figures only in a few variants (VI.19, ÖNE, Potanin A). The swan as a kind of “totemic ancestor” is a well-known phenomenon throughout Eurasia. Although we would not discuss them here in detail, it is necessary to touch upon some unusual motifs, which are not common in other myths and tales about the swan. The VI.19. says that the swan should have four heads, which could be considered as a corruption of the text in the oral tradition. Another strange motif is the elimination of the 499 birds by Bō Khan (ÖNE). Killing sacred animals is one of the greatest sins in Mongolian mythology and folk belief<sup>41</sup>. He left alive only one bird with a red head. The red-headed swan is unknown in other myths and other traditions. Although Bō Khan was punished in the story, he met his fate not because of his unforgivable sin, but rather for being unfaithful to his wife who cursed him (Heissig 1984, pp. 319–324).

<sup>40</sup> The Hungarian–Mongolian Joint Expedition recorded materials about fertility trees in Arkhangai, Bulgan, Seleng and Khövsgöl provinces in 1998, 1999.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. the myth about the origin of the constellation *Furban maral* ‘Orion’, a myth in which a hunter (in most variants *Xüxedei mergen*) chased three maral deers – var.: three hinds with their calves – and all the chasing and the chased turned into a constellation for an eternal memory about this sin. Birtalan (2001, *Furban maral* pp. 990, *Xüxedei mergen* pp. 995–996).

The owlet is a less popular phenomenon in the Mongolian mythology and folk belief. Other ornitoid phenomena, like eagle (Birtalan 2001, *Bürgeḍ*, pp. 955–956) and swan (Birtalan 2001, *Qun sibayun*, pp. 1026–1027, Schwanenjungfrau, 1037) appear frequently as ancestors; the bird of prey symbolises the *sülde*, the holy charisma, among others that of Chinggis Khan. The raven (Birtalan 2001, *Keriye* pp. 1003–1004) is also important in the shamanic belief system, it is the symbol of the upper world and the power of the shamans; the raven is considered to be very wise and respected. Although they are more rare, there are traces of owl worship in literary sources and oral tradition. In his elaborate study an Inner-Mongolian researcher, Kürelša collected numerous data about the appearance of owl in the Mongolian tradition.<sup>42</sup> Here we would like to define the role of the owl in Mongolian mythology and to determine its possible origin. The owl and the she-owlet appear in aetiological myths, explaining the origin of the owlet or one or more of its unfavourable features. In all stories it appears as an anti-hero, according to the best known one a jealous, greedy maid who grudged the wedding food from others, turned into an owlet, which was held up to ridicule by a child as well (Cerensodnom 1989, p. 123). Another aetiological story explains the origin of the owl's eyes, which became huge and yellow, because the owl ate the grease prepared for an offering to Buddha (Cerensodnom 1989, p. 131). In a Buriat tale the she-owl (*šara šubūn*) used to be the fiancé of the bird-king (Bur. *Xan xeregde šubūn*), but because the owl hooted every night, the bird-king abandoned her (Hangalov 1960, p. 29). The motif of transformation reminds us of the Chinese transformation stories (like that of the fox).

Heissig indicated that the owl is an ill omen in the Mongolian epic (Heissig 1984, pp. 319–324), and Kürelša suggested that this feature is not an original Mongolian one, but it appeared with the spread of Buddhism. In fact, there are a few records of the Mongolian owl-worship from the times when Buddhism was not significant among the Mongols. One dates back to Ricolto da Montecroce's work about the traditional worldview of the Mongols: a fragment in which God sends the owl and the hare as his messengers to them (Boyle 1972, pp. 65–66). Even more detailed is the aetiological myth about the custom of the Mongols wearing owl-feather on their hats. Hayton and Strahlenberg quoted the story referring probably to an earlier Mongolian (?) source. The owl saved the life of Chinggis Khan, taking his perch on the bush, where Chinggis hid himself from his enemies. Thereafter the Mongols started to wear owl-feather on their hats (Boyle 1972, pp. 67–69). Similar story, concerning the saving role of the owl, has been preserved in a late Mongolian chronicle, in *Bolur erike*, in which the life of one of Chinggis Khan's adopted sons was saved by the shrieking of an owl, trying to warn him of a poisonous snake in his boots (Heissig 1946, p. 53). The two aetiological stories explain the origin of the worship of the owl among the Mongols, the first one providing an explanation for the beginning of the Mongols wearing owl-feather on their hats. As far as we know,

<sup>42</sup> Kürelša, *Uyuli sibayun sitülge kiged uysayatan-u domoy* "The worship of owlet and the ethnogenetic myths". In his study which we received in manuscript (17 pages), Kürelša also collected the literary sources, chronicles in which the owlet figures, however he did not touch upon the folklore material. We do not have any information about publication of this article.

there is no similar contemporary custom among the Mongols (except for shamans, see below), but it is well known among the Turkic-speaking people of Central-Asia. Wearing owl-feather on their hats is a living tradition among the Kazaks, who consider the owl as a protector of new-born children and young girls. Girls wear hats with a branch of owl-feather, what is especially important during the wedding ceremony. The Kazaks use for protective purposes not only the feathers of the owl, but also the claws, the wings, the bill (they hang them above the door in their flats). Owl-feather will be attached on the head of the winner horse as well.<sup>43</sup> The Kazaks put the stripped skin of an owl above the cradle of infants, to protect them this way from harmful forces.<sup>44</sup>

In almost all variants of the myth, the owlet is considered as the male principle of the conception of the child. Even if a human or celestial hero is the father of the infant, the owl always appears at least in an alliterating rhyme called as the father of Coros (*ūli šuwūn ecgtāā*). Either the owlet guards the new-born or he is par excellence the father, he is (one of) the male principle(s) of the world concept. Why is the owlet considered as the father of the hero? In all alliterating fragments about the origin of *Čoros* the tree is attributed as his mother, and the owlet as his father. Actually there is not a single text which would mention the owlet in the role of his ancestor, only in the alliterating pairs of lines (*Ūli šuwūn ecgtā ...*). The role of the owlet is rather to draw people's attention to the child and pacify the crying infant. The owlet figures in the Mongolian myth – similarly as in the recent Kazak belief system – as the protector, the guarding spirit of the new-born child, saving him from the harmful spirits. The possible owl-ancestorship phenomenon could not be neglected entirely, but in all probability if there had existed such a mythologem among the Mongols, it belongs to an ancient, already forgotten layer of the mythology (in the same way as the shamans consider the owl as one of their animal-shaped ancestors). In the shamanic concept the owl is considered as one of the envoys of the shaman, the shamans send or call an owl as a helping spirit, wear a headgear made of owl-feather, as we also learned it from a Darkhat shamaness, called Baljir, who explained to us that her main helping spirit are the owl and the lynx. Starting her invocations she imitates animal sounds, among others the owl's.<sup>45</sup>

In the case of the known text variants of the myth the owlet appears as a male protector (spirit) and we should consider the influence of the neighbouring Turkic-speaking peoples' tradition on this.

**Conclusion.** The Coros story being actually the ethnogenetic myth of the Junghars and the Dörböts, i.e. their ruling clan, became a common myth of origin among other Oirat tribes, such as the Ölöts, Bayits.<sup>46</sup> Some of the elements of the myth, such as

<sup>43</sup> From the personal collection of Dr. Omar Dilmurat (Xinjiang).

<sup>44</sup> The author of present lines could observe a stripped-off owl-skin in the flat of a Kazak family in Ulaanbaatar.

<sup>45</sup> From the data of the Hungarian–Mongolian Joint Expedition, collected in 1992 and 1993 in Khöwsgöl district.

<sup>46</sup> The story could be even more common among other Oirat tribes, but there are no more records available.



the probable identity of Bō Khan with the Uighur Bōgū qayan, the prominent role of the tree, could be based on an early Inner-Asian mythological tradition. The story of the myth – especially that of the oral variants – offers a very rich scale of mythological elements. This plenty of mitologems framed the mythological background of the Oirat legitimisation when the Junghars came to power. In the legitimising process Buddhist mythological and historical elements also penetrated the original Inner-Asian tradition, such as the allusion on the Kanjur, praying to the Black Mahāklā (Potanin A), the theory of rebirth (identification of the progenitors of the Oirats with the Panchen lama and the Dalai lama).

The Inner-Asian common mythological and religious tradition rooting in the Coros myth have been transmitted from the Oirats to Iranian ethnic groups and found another written tradition in the Čurasnāme.

## Appendix

### *Folklore I. VI.19. Dörwt noyt*

*neg yisn kümn dā'nā üldksn. neg Xar Bakš – “bid noy-ugō, noy xā'y” geḡ. nātkn uls – “xār xā'nā” geḡ surḡ. – “ömār yowwy” geḡ Xar Bakš genā. jā, neg obō bi, tündār irwā. – “bid tayḡan luk xatxy, tegāt dörwn üzkt yowwy, xā'y. xār' irk cakt, manā üksnā tayk xubxrx; ämdīn taykt ceck garx. zunā dund sarān arwn tawnd obō dērn luk iry” geḡ Xar Bakš kellā.*

*jā, Xar Bakš yowwā. neg ik golīn eknd ik ükrtā ā'l bā'nā, ter – “bid noy xā'y yomnā, dā'nā üldksn yisn kūn bid. noy xā'yat, noy bolm köwūn medkdnū?” geḡ surnā. – “medkdnā”. – “xā bā'nā?” – “en golīn adkt ik tögrk altn nūr bā'nā; terūnār yow. dörwn šar tolyāt xun – teḡgrīn gacxn köwūn, ter zayšn – lustīn xānā gacxn altn dagn. terūnā o'r xusn modn bi; tünd ölgātā nilx köwūn bi; āyd us keḡ taw'sn bi; ūl' šowūn dū garč bi. tūnā dund köwūn sūyāt bā'nā”. jā, tegāt Xar Bakš teḡgrīn köwūnās garsn köwūg maktāt yöröl tāwāt amnā: – “ūl' šowūn ecgtā, usn undtā, teḡgrīn köwūn, lūstīn altn dagn xoyrās garsn čī xun tāš; dalād bā'sārīn – dalā tāš; undtā badntā tāš. min' ner Badntā; čamār bi noy kenā” geḡ awāt yownā.*

*odāk urdk obō dērn lug irnā. tūnās gacxn tayk xubxrnā. – “ā, manā negn ükj” genā, Xar Bakš tēgnā. gučn xoyr költā altn tawzn širā beldnā, ger bar'j. odāk köwūg – “manā noy bolwl, en gučn xoyr költā altn tawzn širā dēr gurw zāmlj tus. mand noy bolxugō bolwl gazrt türgūr tus. čamāg örkār gurw xā'nā, totxār gurw xā'nā” gegāt Xar Bakš xā'nā. tegāt, gurw altn tawzn gučn xoyr költā širā dēr zāmlāt tusnā.*

*tegāt teḡgrīn xān lūstīn xān xoyrīn kürgn kūkn xoyrīn ugsgā dörwt noyn. teḡgrīn uzḡürtā, tömr kīstā, teḡgrīn köwūn altn dagn xoyrās garsn bolāt, tīm garsn.*

### **Folklore II. VI.22. Oirdin xān**

*kezēnā neg xatn-ugō xān bāj. urd gerin köwün bāj. xō'n neg xat jalj. tūnā neg köwün garč [...] xoyūln yowāt bāj. bür xarḡyu xarḡyulāt, ölsāt gal burysn modnā dergd irj sūj. bür elkm xatj mūdj. ōd xalāxlā, namč šūsñ dusč, terūg amsāt, ceḡgj xoyūln [...] ürd asrksn lam dalā-lam sanj. xān lamīg zalj lug neg negān tan'nā. ter urd dur'dān Ban'č'n Erdn o'rdin xān bolāt sūnā.*

### **Written sources I. Faban ses rab**

*dörböd zöün yariyin ugi tenggeri-ēce salaqsan geküi : učirni bökün modundu bičixan küüken bayıqsayıgi angıuuči kümün olji abuqsan modoni keb corıo kebtayın tula : coros geqsun : tere modoni dusul amaduni dusuqsan : ur modun uuli şobuunāsa bütübe gedeq : aminiyigi domonō geqčēse salaqsan : amini arban küböütē : domono dörbön küböütē : dörbön zöün yariyin uq bičixan küüken modoni izuurtu bayıqsārni tenggeri-ēce bolbo gedeq : učirni tere :: kübüüni tenggeriyin zē gedeq : raşı gümanggiyin yunzād aldar kabču tere küböün almasai biyiza gebe : zöün yar dörböd xoyoriyin teriüni xorin nigen üyēse xoyidkiyini zöün yariyin bičiqtü bii*

### **Written sources II. Xoşuud noyon batur ubaşı tümeni tuurbiqsan dörbön oyiradiyin tüüke**

*[4b] [...] zöün yariyin noyoduudiyn uq : erte nigen caqtu aminai dömönō gedeq xoyor küün eze ügei yazart nutuqlaqsan [5a] bui : aminayın arban köbüün zöün yariyin xāni albatu : dömönō dürbün köbüün dörbüd geqči albatu edeni ken keni inu arbayād köbüütei : edenēsü inu ulum öči olon bolji : edenēsü nigen görösüči kümün ezē ügei oi-du görösü keteji yabād modoni yozuurtu kebtEQü nige balčir köbüü olji abād ösgöqsen : tere köbüüni bayıqsan modoni keb inu corıo metü töüge[=ē]r coros kemēkü nere xadaqsan : modoni şüüsün balčir köbüüni amandu du[s]çi : tejl bolji : şidartuni uuli şubuunāsu talār amitan ülü učıraqsār uur modon eketei uuli şubuun ecegetei geqdeqsen bui : zayān učirlani iyimiyn tölō corosiyigi tenggeriyin c[=z]ē mün gēd tere olji abuqsan ulusiyini tayişi öskölēni noyon geqsan [...]*

*[5b] [...] dörbödiyn noyoduudiyn uq : zöün yariyin noyodudiyn uqlai nigen bui : bō axān kemēbēsü salaqsan uduntai badan tayişi : edenēsü salaqsan dalai tayişi [...]*

### **Written sources III. Dörbön oyir[a]diyn tüükei tuuşi keme[=ē]n oroşibo**

*[5b] [...] züün yar dörbön oyirad yesün omoqgin [= omogiyin] iljol anu coros yasugi tengger klus xabsuruqse[=a]n bui :*

## References

- Badmaev, A. (1984): *Kalmyckaja dorevoljucionnaja literatura*. Elista.
- Bawden, C. R. (1962): Vikramāditya Tales from Mongolia. In: *Mongol Pitaka* Vol. 6. New Delhi.
- Birtalan, Á. (1995): Some Animal Representations in Mongolian Shaman Invocations and Folklore. *Shaman* V.2., pp. 99–111.
- Birtalan, Á. (1998): Typology of the Stone Cairns *Obos* and their Symbolical Meaning (Preliminary Report, based on Mongolian Fieldwork Material collected in 1991–1995). In: Blondeau, A.-M. (ed.): *Tibetan Mountain Deities. Their Cults and Representations. Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies 1995*. Wien, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Graz, pp. 199–210.
- Birtalan Á. (1996): Obó hagyományok a mai Mongóliában [The Cult of Obo in contemporary Mongolia]. In: Birtalan Á. (ed.): *Őseink nyomán Belső-Ázsiában. Tanulmányok a mongol népi hiedelemvilágból*. I. Budapest, Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, pp. 4–19.
- Birtalan, Á. (2001): Die Mythologie der mongolischen Volksreligion. In: Schmalzriedt, E. – Hausig, H. W.: *Wörterbuch der Mythologie I. Abteilung. Die alten Kulturvölker*. 34. Lieferung. Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta, pp. 879–1097.
- Birtalan, Á. – Rákos, A. (2001): *Kalmükek. Egy európai mongol nép* [The Kalmyks. A European Mongolian nation]. Budapest, Terebess Collection.
- Boyle, J. A. (1972): The Owl and the Hare in the Popular Beliefs of the Medieval Mongols. pp. 65–71.
- Cerel, B. (1997): *Dörwön oirad ba oiradīn xolbōnd bagtax ündesten yastnūdīn ugsā tūxīn jarim asūdal* [Some problems of the history of the origin of the four Oirats and other nationalities, clans, belonging to them]. Uws Ulānbātar.
- Cerensodnom, D. (1989): *Mongol ardīn domog ülger* [Mongolian Folk Myths]. Ulānbātar, Šinǰlex Uxānī Akademīn Xel Joxiolīn Xürēlen, Ulsīn Xewlelīn Gajar.
- Cleaves, F. W. (1982): *The Secret History of the Mongols*. Harvard University Press Cambridge etc.
- Coloo, Ĵ. (1967): Biography of Caya Pandita in Oirat Characters. In: *Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum* V. Ulānbātar.
- Dulam, S. (1992): *Cagaan sariin belegdel* [Symbols of the White Month]. Ulaanbaatar.
- Geleg – Čoytan (1991): *Sin-e qayučin torjuud-un qayad noyad-un uy ündüsün-ü iledkel bičig*. Kökeqota.
- Hangalov, M. N. (1960): *Sobranie sočinenij*. III. Ulan-Ude.
- Heissig, W. (1946): *Bolur Erike: „Eine Kette aus Bergkristallen“, eine mongolische Chronik der Kienlung-Zeit, von Rasipungsuy (1774–75) literaturhistorisch untersucht*. Peking
- Heissig, W. (1984): Shaman Myth and Clan-Epic. In: Hoppál, M. (ed.): *Shamanism in Eurasia*. Part 2. Göttingen, pp. 319–324.
- Kürelša, *Uyuli sibayun sitülge kiged uysayatan-u domoy* “The worship of owlet and the ethnogenetic myths” (a manuscript)
- Lessing, F. (1982): *Mongolian–English Dictionary*. Bloomington, Indiana.
- Luwsanbaldan, X. (1976): *Tod üsgiin dursgalūd* [Monuments of the Clear Script]. Ulaanbaatar, Šinǰlex Uxānī Akademīn Xewlel (Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum T. XIX. Fasc. 14).
- Okada, H. (1987): Origin of Dörben Oyirad. *UJb* Vol. 7, pp. 181–211.
- Miyawaki, J. (1984): The Qalqa Mongols and the Oyirad in the seventeenth century. *JAH* Vol. 18/2. pp. 136–173.
- Miyawaki, J. (1990): On the Oyirad Khanship. In: Sinor, D. (ed.): *Aspects of Altaic Civilisation*. Vol. III. Indiana University, pp. 142–153.

- Pallas, P. S. (1776, 1801): *Sammlungen historischer Nachrichten über die mongolischen Völkerschaften*. I–II. St. Petersburg, Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Pelliot, P. (1960): *Notes critiques d'histoire kalmouke*. Paris (Oeuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot VI).
- Poppe, N. (1981): *Die Schwannengfrauen in der eischen Dichtung der Mongolen: Fragen der mongolische Heldendichtung I*. Hrsg. W. Heissig. (Asiatische Forschungen 72.) Wiesbaden, O. Harrassowitz, S. 101–108.
- Potanin, G. N. (1883): *Očerki Severo-Zapadnoj Mongolii. Rezul'taty putešestvija, ispolnennago v 1879 godu po poručeniju Imperatorskago Russkago Geografičeskago Obščestva*. IV. S. Petersburg.
- Ramstedt, G. J. (1976): *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Helsinki.
- Sárközi A. (1996): Halottkultusz és őstisztelet. In: Birtalan Á. (ed.): *Őseink nyomán Belső-Ázsiában. Tanulmányok a mongol népi hiedelemvilágból*. Budapest, pp. 91–118.
- Schmidt, I. J. (1829): *Geschichte der Ost-Mongolen und ihres Fürstenhauses*, verfasst von Ssanang Ssetsen Chungtaidschi der Ordus. St. Petersburg, gedruckt bei N. Gretsche 1829. (Photomechanic reprint 1961. Europe Printing, The Hague, Holland.)
- Skrynnikova, T. D. (1992–1993): *Sülde – the Basic Idea of the Chingis-Khan Cult*. *AOH* Vol. XLVI, pp. 51–59.
- Taube, E. (2001): Eine mytisch-sagenhafte Überlieferung der Altaituwiner und ihre fuyü-kirgisische Parallele. *Turkic Languages* Vol. 4, pp. 114–128.
- Uray-Kóhalmi, K. (1987): *Synkretismus im Staatskult der frühen Dschingisiden. Synkretismus in den Religionen Zentralasiens*. Hrsg. von W. Heissig und H. J. Klimkeit. (Studies in Oriental Religions 13.) Wiesbaden, pp. 136–158.
- Veit, V. (1986): Die mongolischen Völkerschaften vom 15. Jahrhundert bis 1961. *Die Mongolen. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und Kultur*. Herausgegeben von M. Weiers unter Mitwirkung von V. Veit und W. Heissig. Darmstadt.
- Vietze, H.-P. – Lubsang, G. (1992): *Altan tobči. Eine mongolische Chronik des XVII. Jahrhunderts von Blo-bzañ bstan-'jin. Text und Index*. Tokyo.
- Vladimircov, B. Ja. (1909): Legenda o proišhoždenii derbetskih knjazej. *Živaja Starina* Vol. XVIII, pp. 35–38.
- Vladimircov, B. Ja. (1926): *Obrazcy mongol'skoj narodnoj slovesnosti. S.-Z. Mongolija*. Lenin-grad.
- Zlatkin, I. Ja. (1983): *Istorija džungarskogo gosudarstva 1635–1758*. Nauka, Moskva.