



East  
Asian  
History

NUMBERS 17/18 · JUNE/DECEMBER 1999

Institute of Advanced Studies  
Australian National University

Editor Geremie R. Barmé  
Assistant Editor Helen Lo  
Editorial Board Mark Elvin (Convenor)  
John Clark  
Andrew Fraser  
Helen Hardacre  
Colin Jeffcott  
W. J. F. Jenner  
Lo Hui-min  
Gavan McCormack  
David Marr  
Tessa Morris-Suzuki  
Michael Underdown

Design and Production Helen Lo  
Business Manager Marion Weeks  
Printed by Goanna Print, Fyshwick, ACT



This double issue of *East Asian History*, 17/18, was printed in February 2000.

Contributions to The Editor, *East Asian History*  
Division of Pacific and Asian History  
Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies  
Australian National University  
Canberra ACT 0200, Australia  
Phone +61 2 6249 3140 Fax +61 2 6249 5525  
email geremie@coombs.anu.edu.au

Subscription Enquiries to Subscriptions, *East Asian History*, at the above address  
Annual Subscription Australia A\$45 Overseas US\$45 (for two issues)



## CONTENTS

- 1** Whose Strange Stories? P'u Sung-ling (1640–1715), Herbert Giles (1845–1935), and the *Liao-chai chih-yi*  
*John Minford and Tong Man*
- 49** Nihonbashi: Edo's Contested Center  
*Marcia Yonemoto*
- 71** Was Töregene Qatun Ögödei's "Sixth Empress"?  
*I. de Rachewiltz*
- 77** Photography and Portraiture in Nineteenth-Century China  
*Régine Thiriez*
- 103** Sapajou  
*Richard Rigby*
- 131** Overcoming Risk: a Chinese Mining Company during the Nanjing Decade  
*Tim Wright*
- 169** Garden and Museum: Shadows of Memory at Peking University  
*Vera Schwarcz*

Cover calligraphy Yan Zhenqing 顏真卿, Tang calligrapher and statesman

Cover illustration Talisman—“Passport for wandering souls on the way to Hades,” from Henri Doré, *Researches into Chinese superstitions* (Shanghai: T'usewei Printing Press, 1914–38)

# WAS TÖREGENE QATUN ÖGÖDEI'S "SIXTH EMPRESS"?

史 I. de Rachewiltz

In 1955, Professor Ts'ai Mei-piao (Cai Meibiao) published for the first time, among other interesting documents of the Yüan period, the earliest known Sino-Mongolian inscription, dating from 1240.<sup>1</sup>

The Mongolian text, consisting of only three lines, is purely formulaic, validating, as it were, together with the imperial seal, the contents of the Chinese text, which is an edict in thirteenth-century vernacular.

This Sino-Mongolian inscription has been the subject of three articles, by F. W. Cleaves (1960–61), myself (1981) and Ts'ai Mei-piao (1989).<sup>2</sup> The edict in question is to the effect that: (1) Tu Feng 杜豐, Civil Administration Officer (*kuan-minkuan* 管民官) of Ch'in-chou 沁州 (Ch'in-hsien in Shan-hsi), be appointed Commissioner-in-charge to oversee the cutting of the printing blocks of the *Taoist Canon* (*Tao-tsang ching* 道藏經) and the construction of a building for this purpose; (2) Tu Feng's wife take over this charge, should Tu Feng lack the time to carry it out himself; and (3) no-one, regardless of whether it be the personnel of the apanage-holders' (*t'ou-hsia* 頭下 = 投下) administration or any other officials interfere with it. The edict ends with the formula "If one contravenes (this order), he shall be punished for his transgression. Respect this." This warning is repeated in the Mongolian text.<sup>3</sup>

The edict was jointly issued on the seventeenth day of the third month

/gologists held in Ulan Bator (14–21 September 1987). This summary, without Chinese characters, was published in Sh. Bira, ed., *Olon Ulsyn Mongolč Erdemtnii V Ix Xural. Fifth International Congress of Mongolists*, vol.3 (Ulan Bator, 1992), pp.265–7. In view of the fact that the latter contains also numerous typographic errors, I shall refer to the original "Summary" circulated by Prof. Ts'ai at the Congress.

<sup>3</sup> See Cleaves, "Sino-Mongolian inscription," pp.65, 69; de Rachewiltz, "Some remarks," pp.40–2, 53–63. The short Mongolian text is also given in transcription in L. Ligeti, *Monuments préclassiques 1: XIIIe et XIVe siècles, Monumenta linguae Mongolicae collecta I* (Budapest, 1972), p.19. With regard to the Mongolian text, I should like to make the following remarks to complement and supplement those in my above-mentioned article. The first word of the first line, read *ene* by Cleaves, *ane* by Ligeti, and *ene* (written, however, *ane* = *ane*) by me, may well be *eyin* "thus," as indeed suggested by Cleaves, "Sino-Mongolian inscription," p.89, n.2. For the combination *yekeerke*, lit. "great power," of the first two words of the second line, cf. the expression *yeke erketü* "very powerful" of the *Erdeni-yin tobči*. See Sa'yang Secen, *Erdeni-yin tobci* ("Precious Summary"). *A Mongolian chronicle of 1662*. The Urga text transcribed and edited by M. G., I. de Rachewiltz, J. R. Krueger and B. Ulaan, *Faculty of Asian Studies Monographs*, new series, no.15 (Canberra, 1990), p.2 (2r,12). Concerning the connotations of the /OVER

<sup>1</sup> Ts'ai Mei-piao 蔡美彪, *Yüan-tai pai-hua pei cbi-lu* 元代白話碑集錄 (Peking, 1955), pl.II. The character *lu* 路 in line 4 of the inscription has been inadvertently left out in the printed text on p.7 of Ts'ai's edition (no. 6); and the character 騷 in line 4 of the printed text is a misprint for 搔.

<sup>2</sup> F. W. Cleaves, "The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1240," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 23 (1960–61): 62–72 + 2 pl.; I. de

/Rachewiltz, "Some remarks on Töregene's edict of 1240," *Papers on Far Eastern History* 23 (March 1981): 38–63, 1 pl. (p.38); Ts'ai Mei-piao, "T'o-lieh-ko-na hou shih-shih k'ao-pien" 脱列哥那后史事考辨 (An examination of several historical facts concerning Döregene-qatun), *Meng-ku shih yen-chiu* 蒙古史研究 (*Studia Historica Mongolica*) 3 (1989): 12–29. Ts'ai's article is an expanded version of his paper "Events relating to Töregene Khatun," read at the Fifth International Congress of Mon-

/expression *yeke erke* and the rest of the text of the inscription, the late Professor P. Ratchnevsky of Berlin wrote to me on 7 March 1982 as follows: “Of the proposed lectures *erke* seems to me the most satisfactory. The invocation of Heaven was not used in edicts until Qubilai’s time (*Code des Yuan*, II, 150, n.1). *Yeke erke* refers probably to the Good Fortune of the forefathers. The missing case-suffix after the word is certainly difficult to explain. But, as the word following *yeke* should be a noun, the problem is the same whatever sense is given to the word. I consider the sentence to be rhetorical as it is common in this kind of edict, the form *-sütü* does point to it, it expresses the possibility (Haenisch, *Wörterbuch [zu Manghöl un niuca tobca’an]*, p.142), the stem of the word being *alday-*, a variant form of *aldal-*. My tentative translation of the passage is as follows: ‘If someone contravene this my command (word), should (might) he not be punished (by) the great power (of the forefathers)?’.” I should also add the following comment by Prof. Murakami Masatsugu 村上正二 of Tokyo (in a letter dated 23 July 1981) on the expression *alday-situ* of the second line rendered by Cleaves and myself as “punishable”: “But concerning the term 按答奚, I would rather refer to the Mongol term *aldanggi* which appears very often in the late Mongol laws and codes such as the *Xalxa Jirum* and the Oirat laws and codes. In my opinion, *aldanggi* and *anju* have constituted the two main systems of the Mongol criminal punishments. As for the later term, as you are aware of, this term appears in the 黑鞑事略 in the form 斷案主 as the other term 按答奚. And these terms also appear in the 元典章 ... in the form 斷案主戶.” For these two terms in the *Hei-Ta shib-lüeb*, cf. *Meng-Ta pei-lu und Hei-Ta shib-lüeb. Chinesische Gesandtenberichte über die frühen Mongolen 1221 und 1237*. Nach Vorarbeiten von Erich Haenisch und Yao Ts’ung-wu übersetzt und kommentiert von Peter Olbricht und Elisabeth Pinks. Eingeleitet von Werner Banck, *Asiatische Forschungen* 56 (Wiesbaden, 1980), pp.162, 164.

<sup>4</sup> See Ts’ai, *Yüan-tai pai-bua pei chi-lu*, p.7, n.2.

<sup>5</sup> See the biography of Yeh-lü Ch’u-ts’ai (1189–1243) in I. de Rachewiltz, H.-L. Chan, C.-C. Hsiao and P. W. Geier, eds, with the assistance

of the *keng-tzu* year. i.e. on 10 April 1240, by “The *Yeke Qadun*—Great Empress (*Ta Huang-bou* 大皇后)—who as before conducts the affairs of the Eastern Palace (*tung-kung* 東宮) by virtue of the Edict of the Emperor,” and by “the Imperial Concubine(s) (*fei-tzu* 妃子).”

The expression *Yeke Qadun* (= *Qatun*), lit. “Great Empress,” means of course “the Greater (or Senior) Empress,” i.e. the most senior among the emperor’s wives.

In 1955, Prof. Ts’ai identified this Great Empress with Töregene, the wife of Ögödei Qayan (r. 1229–41) who assumed the regency of the empire after his death (11 December 1241), and who held it until the great assembly (*quriltai*) of 1246 which elected her eldest son Güyüg (1246–48) as the new *qayan*.<sup>4</sup> It is known that in the latter part of his life Ögödei, because of alcoholism and ill-health, had lost interest in state affairs, and that Töregene had become increasingly involved in managing the business of government.<sup>5</sup>

Prof. Ts’ai’s identification was adopted by Cleaves and myself. Indeed, I took advantage of this identification to propose an explanation for the otherwise puzzling designation in the later Chinese *Yüan* sources of *Liu Huang-bou* 六皇后 or “Sixth Empress” applied to Töregene. In view of the fact that Töregene was not the sixth wife of Ögödei but officially the second, this appellation has remained unexplained. Since she is referred to as *Ta Huang-bou* 大皇后 in the edict of 1240, I suggested that the character *liu* 六 was originally a scribal error for *ta* 大, and that the mistake was repeated uncritically by later historians.<sup>6</sup>

In his 1987 and 1989 contributions, Prof. Ts’ai revised his earlier identification and, at the same time, tried to disprove my theory.

Ts’ai’s recent argument is that the *Yeke Qadun* who issued the edict is not Töregene, but Boraqčın who, as we know from both the *Yüan-shih* and Rašid al-Dīn, was Ögödei’s first wife.<sup>7</sup> Ts’ai claims that in 1240, when Ögödei was still alive, Töregene was his sixth wife, rather than the first one, also because the title “Sixth Empress” appears not only in the *Yüan-shih*, but also in other Chinese documents and inscriptions. Therefore, he claims, this cannot be a scribal error made by the compilers of the *Yüan-shih*. According to Ts’ai, Ögödei had six *qatuns*, most of whose deeds were properly recorded. They

/of M. Wang, *In the service of the Khan. Eminent personalities of the early Mongol-Yüan period*, *Asiatische Forschungen* 121 (Wiesbaden, 1993), pp.161–2.

<sup>6</sup> de Rachewiltz, “Some remarks,” pp.42–3.

<sup>7</sup> See *Yüan-shih* 元史, Po-na 百衲 ed. (various reprints) 106, 1b; *The successors of Genghis Khan*, translated from the Persian of Rašid al-Dīn by J. A. Boyle (New York, 1971) (hereafter referred to as *Successors*), p.18. The designation “Sixth Empress” (六皇后) occurs several times in the *Yüan-shih* (see Ts’ai, “T’o-

/lieh-ko-na,” pp.14–15), as well as in Ch’ien Ching 陳經, *T’ung-chien bsü-pien* 通鑑續編 (Preface of 1350; Sung Chiang 宋江 ed. of 1361 of the National Central Library, Taipei) 22, 18a–b. The other source cited by Ts’ai (ibid., p.15) is the *Wei Tai-p’u wen-chi* 危太樸文集 by Wei Su 危素 (1303–72). See the *Wei Tai-p’u Yün-lin chi* 危太樸雲林集 (Preface of 1337; Chia-yeh t’ang 嘉業堂 ed. of 1914), *bsü-chi* 2, 5b. As is evident, all these are fourteenth-century sources.

were (in his order and Latin transcription): (1) Boraqchin, (2) Onhui, (3) Kerih-huteni, (4) Mugai, (5) Jačin, and (6) Töregene.<sup>8</sup> On the basis of the Chinese and Persian transcriptions, we can re-transcribe these names as follows: (1) Boraqčin, (2) \*Algqui (= Ałyui), (3) \*Kirgisteneni, (4) Möge, (5) Jačin, and (6) Töregene.<sup>9</sup>

Although Prof. Ts'ai indicates that his (4), i.e. Möge Qatun, may be the third or fifth *qatun*, his list, as it stands, is largely an extrapolation from several sources and is not supported by the bulk of the evidence—it is, in other words, a personal interpretation.

Let us start with the main Chinese source, viz. the “Tables of Empresses and Imperial Concubines” (*Hou fei piao* 后妃表) in the *Yüan-shih*. Under Ögödei (T'ai-tsung 太宗) five empresses and one concubine are listed as follows: (1) Empress Boraqčin of the Main *Ordo* (正官); (2) the Sixth Empress Töregene, who, in an editorial note appended to her name, is also designated as Naimajin, the feminine ethnicon of Naiman, meaning “the Naiman (= from the Naiman tribe)”; (3) the Second Empress \*Ałyui; (4) the Third Empress \*Kirgisteneni; (5) the Sixth Empress \*Tunagina; and (6) the Imperial Concubine \*Erkine.<sup>10</sup>

Now, (5) can be eliminated from the list because it is simply a faulty transcription for Töregene, already entered as (2); and (6) is a concubine. Therefore, the revised *Yüan-shih* listing should be: (1) Boraqčin, (2) Töregene *alias* Naimajin, (3) \*Ałyui, and (4) \*Kirgisteneni. However, \*Ałyui is also called the Second Empress; \*Kirgisteneni, the Third Empress; and Töregene, the Sixth Empress. The name \*Kirgisteneni (< Pers. Qyrqytāni) is, like Naimajin, an ethnicon meaning “the Kirghiz.”

ǰuvainī does not mention Boraqčin, \*Ałyui and \*Kirgisteneni, but he mentions Möge as Ögödei's favourite wife, i.e. the one he loved most, and has much to say about Töregene as the *qayan's* able and forceful wife who assumed the regency after Ögödei's death. ǰuvainī ascribes her authority over Möge Qatun to two reasons: the fact that she was the mother of Ögödei's eldest son, and that she was shrewder and more sagacious than Möge.<sup>11</sup>

Rašid al-Din lists four principal wives of Ögödei in the appropriate section of his work. They are: (1) Boraqčin, whom he calls *xātün avval* “the first *qatun*” and *buzurgtar*, lit. “the greater” = “the eldest”<sup>12</sup>; (2) Töregene; (3) Möge<sup>13</sup>; and (4) Jačin.<sup>14</sup> However, later on in the same work on the successors of Činggis Qan, he refers to Töregene as “the senior” (*mibtar*), and as “the eldest” (*buzurgtar*) of his wives, thus apparently contradicting himself.<sup>15</sup>

Finally, the *Mu'izz al-Ansāb*, a precious genealogical source first used by Blochet and later, to great advantage, by Pelliot,<sup>16</sup> but which has not been utilized so far with regard to Ögödei's wives, informs us that (1) Boraqčin was the eldest of Ögödei's wives; (2) Töregene was his second wife; (3) Čučai ~

/pp.38–40. For \*Algqui = Ałyui, cf. L. Hambis, *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan che. Les généalogies impériales mongoles dans l'histoire chinoise officielle de la dynastie mongole. Avec des notes supplémentaires* par P. Pelliot (Leiden, 1945), p.161 (Index). The Ch'i-li-chi-hu-t'ieh-ni 乞里吉忽帖尼 of the *Yüan-shih* is an obvious error for Ch'i-li-chi-ssu, 思-t'ieh-ni. She is ignored by the Persian sources. For Möge, see 'Ata-Malik Juvaini, *The history of the world-conqueror*, translated by J. A. Boyle (Manchester, 1958) (hereafter *History*), pp.211 *et passim*; *Successors*, pp.81, 176. Möge is totally ignored by the Chinese sources, and so is Jačin. Töregene is called Döregene in the *Secret History of the Mongols*. See *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* 元朝秘史 (Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an 四部叢刊 ed.) 8, 1a (§198): To-lieh (= rieh)-ko-nieh 朵剌格揲. However, the *Yüan-shih* and the Persian sources support the reading Töregene. See P. Pelliot, *Les Mongols et la Papauté* (Extrait de la *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*) (Paris, 1923), p.193, n.1.

<sup>10</sup> *Yüan-shih* 106, 1b.

<sup>11</sup> See *History*, p.240.

<sup>12</sup> *Successors*, p.18; I. P. Petruševskii, ed., *Rašid al-Din, Sbornik letopisei*, T. II, translated by Yu. P. Verkhovskii, annotated by Yu. P. Verkhovskii and B. I. Pankratov (Moscow & Leningrad, 1960) (hereafter *Sbornik*), pp.8–9. Cf. E. Blochet, ed., *Djami el-Tévarikh, Histoire générale du monde par Fadl Allah Rashid ed-Din. Tarikh-i moubarek-i Ghazani*, E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series 18 (Leyden & London, 1911), p.3; A. A. Ali-zade, ed., *Fazlallākh Rašid al-Din, Džāmi'at-tavārikh*, T. 2/1 (Moscow, 1980), p.7.

<sup>13</sup> Omitted in *Successors*, p.19, but given in *Sbornik*, p.9, where her name is transcribed as “Muka.” Cf. Ali-zade, *Fazlallākh Rašid al-Din*, p.8 (*in fine*).

<sup>14</sup> Omitted in *Successors*, p.19, but given in *Sbornik*, p.9. Cf. Ali-zade, *Fazlallākh Rašid al-Din*, p.8.

<sup>15</sup> *Successors*, pp.120, 175; *Sbornik*, pp.80, 114. Cf. Blochet, *Djami el-Tévarikh*, pp.134, 228.

<sup>16</sup> See Blochet, *Djami el-Tévarikh*, pp.5, n.1 *et passim*; Hambis, *Le Chapitre CVII du Yuan che*, pp.x *et passim*.

<sup>8</sup> Ts'ai, “Summary,” pp.2–3; “T'o-lieh-ko-na,” pp.15–16.

<sup>9</sup> For the name Boraqčin, see P. Pelliot, *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or* (Paris, 1949),

<sup>17</sup> *Mu'izz al-Ansāb*, Aligarh MS. A, 77 (corr. 78) and 78 (corr. 79); MS. B, 77 (corr. 75) and 78 (corr. 76). For these two MSS, *which are not identical*, see A. A. Rizvi, *Catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the Maulana Azad Library Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh*, revised and edited by M. Ahmad, Aligarh, p.49, nos.195–6: *Mu'izz ul-Ansāb fī shajarat il-Ansāb*.

<sup>18</sup> Whereas the London (British Museum) MS. of the *Mu'izz* lists (39) Töregene as the second wife of Ögödei, the Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale) MS. (39) lists Möge as the second *qatun* and misplaces Töregene as the eighth *qatun*; however, it corrects itself by explicitly stating that Töregene was the *second* wife of Ögödei Qan. I am much obliged to Mr Shimo Hirotohi 志茂碩敏 of the Tōyō Bunko 東洋文庫 (The Oriental Library), Tokyo, for kindly supplying the photostats of the relevant folios of the Paris and London MSS of the *Mu'izz*, and for providing also a typed transcription of the former.

<sup>19</sup> “Chung-shu-ling Yeh-lü Kung shen-tao-pei 中書令耶律公神道碑” in Su T'ien-chüeh 蘇天爵, *Kuo-ch'ao wen-lei 國朝文類* (Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an ed.) 57, 20b (*buang-bou, bou*), 21a (*bou* [twice]), 21b (*buang-bou, bou*); *Yüan(Kuo國)-ch'ao ming-ch'en shih-lüeh* (Ch'in-yu-shu-t'ang 勤有書堂 ed. of 1335; repr. by Chung-hua shu-chü 中華書局 (Peking, 1962) 5, 8b–9a. It is quite clear from the context, in particular from the references to her regency, that the *bou* and *buang-bou* in question is one and the same person, viz. Töregene. Cf. N. C. Munkuev, *Kitaiskii istočnik o perykh mongol'skikh kbanax. Nadgrobnaya nadpis' na mogile Elyui Ču-caya* (Moscow, 1965), pp.85–6. Although Töregene is usually referred to as *buang-bou* or *bou*—and *never* as *Liu buang-bou* or *Naimajin*—in the contemporary Chinese sources, we also find her occasionally called *t'ai-bou* 太后 “Grand Empress” (= the Emperor's Mother). Cf., e.g., the *Yüan-ch'ao ming-ch'en shih-lüeh* 5, 10b (Biography of Yang Wei-chung 楊惟中 [1206–60]).

<sup>20</sup> See *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* 8, 1a. Cf. F. W. Cleaves, tr., *The Secret History of the Mongols for the first time done into English out of the original tongue and provided with an exegetical commentary*, vol.1 (Translation) (Cambridge, Mass. & London, 1982), p.132

ǰujai was the third wife; and (4) ǰač'in was the fourth wife.<sup>17</sup> The *Mu'izz* lists twelve wives, and the extant MSS do not always agree. Nevertheless, there is agreement about Borač'in being the eldest, and Töregene the second of Ögödei's wives.<sup>18</sup> Thus,

(1) Both the Chinese and Persian sources list Borač'in as the eldest *qatun* of Ögödei;

(2) Both the Chinese and Persian sources call Töregene Ögödei's second *qatun*;

(3) Rašid al-Dīn on two separate occasions states that Töregene was “the eldest” of Ögödei's wives;

(4) Only the late Yüan sources refer to Töregene as “the Sixth Empress,” and as *Naimajin* (“the Naiman”). The contemporary Chinese sources (first half of the thirteenth century) refer to her only as “the Empress” (*buang-bou, bou*), witness the inscription on the “spirit-way stele” (*shen-tao pei* 神道碑) for Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai 耶律楚材 (1189–1243) by Sung Tzu-chen 宋子貞 (1187–1267) composed in 1267, and the *Yüan-ch'ao ming-ch'en shih-lüeh* 元朝名臣事略 by Su T'ien-chüeh 蘇天爵 (1294–1352), which although dating from 1329, quotes verbatim many early biographical sources.<sup>19</sup> We can, therefore, assume that *for the contemporary Chinese* T'ai-tsung's (i.e. Ögödei's) “Empress” was Töregene.

As for Töregene's epithet *Naimajin*, we know from the *Secret History of the Mongols* and, independently, from the Persian sources (including the *Mu'izz*), that she was not a Naiman, but a Merkid lady.<sup>20</sup> We shall return to Töregene's puzzling appellations later.

In our inscription, we read that the Great or Senior Empress, who issued the edict together with the Imperial Concubine(s) (unfortunately unidentified), was conducting the affairs of the Eastern Palace (*tung-kung*), “as before, by virtue of the Edict of the Emperor.” We do not know either the contents of this edict. About the term *tung-kung*, Cleaves noted that although this term is normally used with reference to the Crown Prince, “it is clear that, in this instance, it refers to the *ordo* or “palace” in which Töregene resided.”<sup>21</sup> For his part, Prof. Ts'ai is of the opinion that the *ordo* in question is the Great *Ordo* (*ta-kung* 大宮), i.e. the First or Principal *Ordo* (*ti-i kung* 第一宮, *cheng-kung* 正宮), to which Borač'in belonged.<sup>22</sup> There is, however, no documentary evidence that here *tung-kung* = *ta-kung* or *cheng-kung*. By the same token, it is also not obvious that, as Cleaves states, the *tung-kung* was Töregene's *ordo*, his inference being based entirely on the assumption that the Great Empress was Töregene, an inference on which Prof. Ts'ai has subsequently cast serious doubt.

In my view, the term *tung-kung* should be understood in the way it was regularly used in China, and of which many examples are found in the Yüan

(§198); *History*, pp.239–40, n.1; *Successors*, pp.18–19.

<sup>21</sup> Cleaves, “Sino-Mongolian inscription,” p.66, n.4.



sources, i.e. as a synonym for the Heir Apparent.<sup>23</sup> This is the meaning that would have been obvious to the readers of the edict at the time. Had the translator of the edict meant the Great or Principal *Ordo* (Mong. *yeke ordo*), he would have used terms like *ta-kung* or *cheng-kung*. If the Heir Apparent is meant, this could be either Širemün, the son of Ögödei's third son Köçü (d.1236), who was Ögödei's own choice as his successor<sup>24</sup>; or the *qayan*'s eldest son Güyüg, who was eventually elected in 1246 because of his seniority over the other offspring of Töregene.<sup>25</sup> In 1240 Güyüg was absent, fighting in the West, and Širemün was still a boy and living in Ögödei's own *ordo*, as we learn from Rašid al-Dīn, so it could have been either of them whose "affairs" were being conducted by the Great Empress at the *qayan*'s behest.<sup>26</sup> But which empress was the *Yeke Qadun* of the edict? I think we can exclude the "eldest" *qatun*, Boraqčīn, because, as stated earlier, she is not even mentioned by Juvainī, and Rašid al-Dīn refers to her only once.<sup>27</sup> She had no children from Ögödei and may have been dead by then. Töregene is the best candidate because she was the mother of Güyüg, whom she strongly supported, and the grandmother of Širemün; she was also very influential at court, and her position at the time was so strong that when Ögödei died the following year, Rašid speaking of her calls *her* twice the "eldest" *qatun*.<sup>28</sup> This seems to confirm that Boraqčīn was no more; and we know from Juvainī that, at the time, the power of his favourite wife Möge was purely nominal, effective authority being already in Töregene's hands.<sup>29</sup>

In view of all this, I think that by 1240–1241 Töregene had actually become the senior wife, or *Yeke Qatun*, moving in rank from No.2 to No.1 (which would also explain why in the *Yüan-shih* table quoted above, the third empress \*Alyui is called "the Second Empress," and the fourth empress \*Kırgısteni is called "the Third Empress": as the second empress Töregene had moved from second to first place, the next two also moved up one grade from third to second, and from fourth to third respectively), thus justifying Rašid's designation of *mihtar* and *buzurgtar*.<sup>30</sup>

In support of the identification of the "Great Empress" of the inscription with Töregene Qatun, I should also invoke the very contents of the 1240 edict. This, as we have seen, is concerned with the printing of the *Tao-tsang* or *Taoist Canon*. Now, we know from Li Tao-ch'ien 李道謙 (1219–ca. 1288) that in 1234, under T'ai-tung (Ögödei), the "Empress" (*Huang-hou*) donated a complete set of Taoist scriptures (*Tao-ching* 道經) to Yin Chih-p'ing 尹志平 (1169–1251), the successor of Ch'iu Ch'u-chi 丘處機 (1148–1227), *alias* Ch'ang-ch'un 長春, as head of the Ch'üan-chen 全真 sect in north China.<sup>31</sup> There is no doubt in my mind that the Mongol empress who made this donation to the Taoists was also the one responsible for the edict of 1240. Li Tao-ch'ien's source is the stele inscription for Yin Chih-p'ing composed by I Kou 弋穀 (i.e. I T'ang-tso 弋唐佐) soon after Yin's death in 1251. As we have seen, the designation of "Empress" in this period was applied *only* to Töregene among Ögödei's wives.

As I have shown, Töregene was officially, for most of the time, the second

<sup>22</sup> Ts'ai, "T'o-lieh-ko-na," pp.16–17.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. the occurrences of this term (and its usage) in the *Yüan-shih* as listed in Tamura Jitsuzō 田村實造, *Genshi goi shūsei* 元史語彙集成 (Kyoto, 1961–63), vol.2, pp.1187b–1188a.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *History*, p.251 and n.14; *Successors*, pp.19, 120, 121, 170, 180.

<sup>25</sup> See *History*, p.240: "Chaghatai and the other princes sent representatives to say that Töregene Khatun was the mother of the princes who had a right to the Khanate"; p.251: "But of all the sons of Qa'an [i.e. Ögödei—I.R.] Güyük was most renowned for his might ...; he was the eldest of the brothers ..."; *Successors*, p.120: "But Töregene Khatun and some of the emirs objected, saying that Güyük Khan was older [than Širemün—I.R.]" The emphasis is mine. Clearly, in the case of Güyüg *versus* Širemün, seniority was the overriding factor.

<sup>26</sup> See *History*, p.240; *Successors*, p.180.

<sup>27</sup> In *Successors*, p.18. Neither her tribe nor her parentage are known.

<sup>28</sup> See above, n.15.

<sup>29</sup> *History*, p.240. Furthermore, from Sung Tzu-chen's "spirit-waystele" of Yeh-lü Ch'u-t's'ai (see above, n.19), 20b, we learn that in March–April 1241, when Ögödei fell seriously ill, it was Töregene who "summoned" (召) Ch'u-t's'ai and asked for advice.

<sup>30</sup> It is, therefore, not surprising that C. D'Ohsson should write, with regard to Ögödei's wives, that "la première de ses femmes en rang était Tourakina." See his *Histoire des Mongols, depuis Tchinguizkhan jusqu'à Timour Bey ou Tamerlan*, vol.2 (La Haye & Amsterdam, 1834; repr. Tientsin, 1940), p.99.

<sup>31</sup> See Li Tao-ch'ien, *Kan-shui hsien yüan-liu* 甘水仙源流 (Preface of 1288; Tao-tsang ed., case 69, vol.611: 息上) 3, 5b. Cf. Ch'en Kuo-fu 陳國符, *Tao-tsang yüan-liu k'ao* 道藏源流考, 2nd ed. (Peking, 1963), pp.159–60; de Rachewiltz, "Some remarks," p.45 and n.22.

<sup>32</sup> *Mu'izz al-Ansāb*, Aligarh MS. A and B (see above, n.18).

<sup>33</sup> See de Rachewiltz et al., *In the service of the Khan*, p.308.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. W. Hung, "The transmission of the book known as *The Secret History of the Mongols*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 14 (1951): 473–4.

<sup>35</sup> We know, for instance, that the famous widow of Tolui, Princess Sorqaytani, was also called Berüde. See I. de Rachewiltz, "*The Secret History of the Mongols*: Chapter XII." Translation and commentary, *Papers on Far Eastern History* 31 (March 1985): 65, n.272.

<sup>36</sup> I suspect that the \*Kirgisten of the *Yüan-shih* may, in fact, be the epithet (like Naimajin) of the third *qatun* Čučai ~ Jujai of the *Mu'izz*.

<sup>37</sup> The paper as presented here is a slightly modified version of the one I read at the Seventh International Congress of Mongolists held in Ulan Bator, 11–15 August 1997.

*qatun*, not the sixth. Therefore, the designation of "Sixth Empress" is incorrect and so is her epithet of Naimajin. My earlier theory of a misreading of the character *ta* "great" as *liu* "sixth" was formulated before I had access to the *Mu'izz al-Ansāb*. I wish to propose now a new interpretation of the source material which may explain the origin of both the incorrect designations of Töregene in the Chinese documents.

The *Mu'izz* lists Küçülder Qatun as the sixth wife of Ögödei, and specifies that this lady was a Naiman, daughter of a Naiman chief called Temür Buqa Tegin.<sup>32</sup> Here we have Ögödei's sixth *qatun* who is also a "Naimajin"—a fact which is too striking to be dismissed simply as a coincidence. What happened, I now believe, is that decades later, when the officials of the Department of National (= Mongol) History (*Kuo-shih yüan* 國史院) were gathering material on the early Mongol rulers,<sup>33</sup> much of the archival sources had already been lost as the result of the transfer of the court from Qara Qorum to Ta-tu (Peking) and the subsequent conflict between Qubilai and Ariq Böke. Thus, the early court events at Qara Qorum were poorly documented, a fact which is reflected in the inferior quality of the official records of the reigns of Ögödei, Güyüg and Möngke in the "Basic Annals" (*pen-chi* 本紀) of the *Yüan-shih*. Somehow or other, there must have occurred at the time (i.e. in the latter part of Qubilai's reign) a confusion in the records concerning Ögödei's wives which accounts for the errors already noted in the genealogical table of the *Yüan-shih*, as well as for a contamination of Töregene with Küçülder, so that the former, while still listed as the second empress, was additionally (and incorrectly) designated also as both "the Sixth Empress" and "the Naiman" (Naimajin)—appellations which pertained only to Küçülder. Ultimately, the confusion *may* have arisen from a Chinese document in which the character *ta* "great" was incorrectly written (or read) as *liu* "six," as I suggested in my 1981 paper, but this is only one possibility. There is no doubt, however, that this mistake must have occurred in the latter part of Qubilai's reign or during that of his successor Temür Öljeitü (Ch'eng-tsung 成宗, 1295–1307).<sup>34</sup> Such a confusion may also have been facilitated by the fact that Mongolian ladies could have more than one name,<sup>35</sup> and that it was quite common to bear a name which was originally an ethnicon.<sup>36</sup>

In conclusion, I wish to say that I could not have written this paper without having had access to the Aligarh MSS of the *Mu'izz al-Ansāb* which both complement and supplement the Paris and London MSS, and for this I am very grateful to my late friend Dr Athar Abbas Rizvi who first catalogued them and brought them to my attention. It is my fervent hope that a thorough study of the various MSS of the *Mu'izz al-Ansāb* be undertaken by scholars interested in Mongolian history.<sup>37</sup>

#### I. de Rachewiltz

Division of Pacific and Asian History  
Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies  
Australian National University  
Canberra ACT 0200  
igor@coombs.anu.edu.au