

TWO REMARKABLE WOMEN IN MONGOLIA:  
THE THIRD LADY ERKETÜ QATUN AND  
DAYIČING-BEYIJI

by HENRY SERRUYS, c.i.c.m.

ABBREVIATIONS

KPSTC	<i>K'ou-pei san-t'ing chih</i> 口北三廳志
<i>Manshühen</i>	<i>Mindai Manmó shiryó. Minjitsuroku-shó. Manshühen</i> 明代滿蒙史料。明實錄抄滿洲篇
<i>Mókohen</i>	<i>Mindai Manmó shiryó. Minjitsuroku-shó. Mókohen</i> 蒙古篇
MS	<i>Ming-shih</i> 明史
SL	<i>Shih-lu</i> 實錄
SYCTK	<i>San-Yün ch'ou-tsu k'ao</i> 三雲籌俎考
TP ed.	Taipei edition
WLWKL	<i>Wan-li wu-kung lu</i> 萬歷武功錄
WPC	<i>Wu-pei chih</i> 武備志

1 From 1570 to 1612 one person mentioned more often than any other in Chinese records dealing with Mongol affairs as wielding great power in Mongolia and using her influence in favour of co-operation and peaceful relations with China is the so-called Third Lady, or San-*niang-tzu* 三娘子. Chinese border officials considered her the best if not the only guarantee that the Mongol princes would remain faithful tributaries without reverting to the border raids so prevalent before 1570. Strong-willed women were not rare in Mongol society and quite a few appear in Mongol history, for example Činggis-qan's mother Högelün and his wife Börte, to mention only these two. The Third Lady seems to have captivated the imagination of Chinese officials and through their reports we happen to know quite a bit more about this lady than about any other Mongol woman in history.

True, the information is extremely fragmentary, peripheral, repetitive, in clichés, and very one-sided, and certainly not complete enough for a "life and times" story, yet interesting enough for the insights it provides into Mongol society of the latter part of the sixteenth century. If Chinese officials stationed along the northern borders paid attention to her only in the narrow framework of political contacts across the borders, even within these limits we are able to draw some conclusions regarding changing conditions in Mongolia.

Ch'ü Chiu-ssu 瞿九思, the author who treated Mongol affairs most extensively and systematically in the form of "biographies", makes numerous references to the Third Lady, but in an extremely disconnected way. In

Chapter Nine of his *Wan-li Wu-kung lu* 萬歷武功錄, he has a brief biography of her, but very incomplete.<sup>1</sup> This biographical note does not even state her personal name, who she was, or where she came from. Erketü Qatun "Powerful Lady" the name given to her here and in another passage<sup>2</sup> is not really a name, but rather a title, or an honorific, which must have been given to her later in life due to her position. The Chinese know her as *San-niang-tzu* "Third Lady" because of her rank as third wife of the Tümed chieftain Altan-qan. A Russian historian, V. G. Ščeben'kov says that the name "San-niang-tzu" was owing to the fact that she was married to three princes in succession.<sup>3</sup> But "San-niang-tzu" certainly does not mean that; and besides she married not three, but four princes, and she got her name after her first marriage.

Ch'ü Chiu-ssu's biographical note states that Altan-qan's first and second wives were known as *Ai-k'o-ha-t'un* and *I-k'o-ha-t'un* respectively; obviously both expressions are transcriptions of the same words: *yeke qatun* "Great, or First Lady". It is hardly possible that the two women bore the same title. Once the Chinese had started using different sets of characters, after a while they must have thought that they were writing two different names, or titles. And if the lady Erketü Qatun, the third wife, got her Chinese name from her rank, she did not remain third in power. Soon she was to outshine the qan's other wives.

If the Chinese called the Erketü Qatun "San-niang-tzu", the few Mongol sources to mention her at all use neither Mongol title nor Mongol name, but strangely enough refer to her as *Noyanču jünggin*.<sup>4</sup> Vladimirtsov, long ago identified *noyanču* as a transcription into Mongol of the Chinese *niang-tzu*.<sup>5</sup> However while stating that *niyanču* is the equivalent of *niang-tzu*, he also derives it from *noyan* "prince, ruler, officer, etc." + suff. *-ču*. *Noyanču* has really nothing to do with *noyan*, but the Mongols may well have thought that the two words were related. In old Mongol texts, *č* and *ǰ* are not always neatly distinguished. *Noyanču* could well have been pronounced *noyanǰu*. The second part of her "Mongol" title, *jünggin*, is also a Chinese loan word: *chung-kung* 中宮, lit. "inner quarters of the palace; the empress living in the inner quarters".<sup>6</sup>

2 How this Mongol girl later known as Erketü Qatun, *Noyanču jünggin*, and *San-niang-tzu*, came to be the third wife of Altan-qan is not related in

<sup>1</sup> *Wan-li wu-kung lu* (*Kuo-hsieh wen-k'u*, Vol. 34, Pei-p'ing, 1936), Ch. 9, pp. 3-12.

<sup>2</sup> WLWKL (*Kuo-hsieh wen-k'u*, Vol. 38), Ch. 8, p. 232.

<sup>3</sup> V. G. Ščeben'kov, *Russko-Kitaiskie Otnošeniya v 17 v.*, Moskva, 1960, p. 112.

<sup>4</sup> See note 200

<sup>5</sup> B. Y. Vladimirtsov, "Nadpisi na skalax Xalxaskago Tsoktu-taidži," *Izvestiya Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 1926 (1253-80), 1927 (215-40), p. 227.

<sup>6</sup> See my forthcoming paper, "Jünggen, a Title of Mongol princesses" in Karl H. Menges Festschrift.

her own biographical note, but in the long biography of the qan,<sup>7</sup> and also in other works. Here again the information is only sketchy and at times confusing and even contradictory, as the girl is mentioned only in so far as she unwittingly became the cause of a series of events which were to affect profoundly Sino-Mongol relations. Altan-qan had a grandson who remains practically unknown in Mongol sources, but is referred to in Chinese as *Pa-han-na-chi*, from the Mongol *Baya-ači* "Little Grandson". Again this is not a name in the strict sense of the word, but rather a sort of pet name, or nickname. The WLWKL<sup>8</sup> has a short note on him and here he is also known as *Pa-han-sun*, the last character being the Chinese term for "grandson": "Little Grandson". He is also regularly called *Ta-ch'eng t'ai-chi*: *Dayičing-tayiji*, and this, too, is a title rather than a name;<sup>9</sup> he was further known as *Pa-t'u t'ai-chi*: *Batu-tayiji*, and as *Ta-ch'eng-ai-chi t'ai-chi*: *Dayičing-efei tayiji*.<sup>10</sup> Some Mongol chronicles spell his name *Čuidayičing*, *čui* certainly being a corruption of *efei*.<sup>11</sup> *Baya-eci*~*Dayičing tayiji* was the son of Altan-qan's third son *Töbed tayiji*, *T'ieh-pai t'ai-chi*.<sup>12</sup> *Töbed-tayiji* died when *Baya-ači* was no more than three or four years old,<sup>13</sup> and the boy's mother died shortly afterwards, apparently killed by Altan-qan in a quarrel. Yet both the qan and his first wife, the Great Qatun, took a liking to the little orphan, who was raised thereafter in her own quarters.

When *Baya-ači* grew up, he married the daughter of one *Tai-shen* (another rendition of *dayičin*[g]?),<sup>14</sup> a son-in-law of the qan. This girl, a

<sup>7</sup> WLWKL, Ch. 8, p. 107.

<sup>8</sup> WLWKL, Ch. 9, pp. 13-15. *Pa-han* often occurs as the opposite of *i-k'o*: *yeke* "great", and there is little doubt that *pa-han* is *baya* "small". There is no final *-n* in the Mongol word. The Chinese *na-chi* is also an imperfect transcription of *ači* "grandson, descendant". There is no initial *n*.

<sup>9</sup> According to Fang K'ung-chao 方孔炤 (1591-1655), *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi* 全邊略記 (Peking, 1930) 2. 47b, *Baya-ači* was put in charge of Bayising (see Appendix) and on that account he was called *Dayičing*. *Dayičin*(g), from *ta(i)-ch'en* 大臣 is a loan word. From being a title, the word became a personal name; there are dozens of Mongols bearing this name but the Chinese transcriptions are far from uniform and identification is often impossible.

<sup>10</sup> He is mentioned under this name in the *Erdeni-yin Tobči*: I. J. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Ost-Mongolen*, Leipzig, 1829, pp. 262: 11, 263.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. W. Heissig (ed.), *Altan kürdün mingyan kegesütü bičig* (1739), Kopenhagen, 1958, p. 60 (IV: 8v: lacking in my copy); Ant. Mostaert (ed.), *Bolor Erike. Scripta Mongolica III*, Cambridge, Mass., 1959, Part V, p. 343 (Kalgan ed., p. 686).

<sup>12</sup> According to the *Erdeni-yin Tobči* (Schmidt, *Geschichte*, pp. 248: 17, 249), *Töbed tayiji*'s mother was one *Molon qatun* (*Maudgalyâyana*), a concubine of *Alaγ-jinong*, who had been "inherited" by Altan-qan, just as the Third Lady was going to be "inherited" by his son and grandson. *T'ieh-pai t'ai-chi* is also known as *Hei t'ai-chi* "Swarthy tayiji". The WLWKL, Ch. 9, p. 6, says that *Baya-ači*'s grandmother was the *I-k'o ha-t'un*, while *Sengge*'s mother (8, p. 193) was the *Ai-k'o ha-t'un*. This must be a mistake. *Baya-ači*'s grandmother definitely was not the first lady; *Sengge*'s mother was.

<sup>13</sup> WLWKL 7, p. 23: "three years", 8, p. 13: "four years".

<sup>14</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 117, mentions one *Tai-ch'en* (*Dayičin*) *tabunang*. *Tabunang* means "son in law of a noble". He could well be *Baya-beyiji*'s father.

daughter's daughter of the qan, became known as *beyiji*, or *Baya-beyiji*, or *Dayicing-beyiji*, after her husband. *Beyiji* may be roughly translated as "princess".<sup>15</sup> Six years later Baya-ači made arrangements to take a second wife, namely the daughter of one T'u-ch'e-chin.<sup>16</sup> Apparently he never

<sup>15</sup> *Beyiji* is a Chinese loan word: *fei-tzu* 妃子. In the SYCTK (author: Wang Shih-ch'i 王士琦: 1551-1618) 2.24a, the word *pi-chi* is explained as "the wife of a tayiji, like the consort of (a member of) the imperial family". Some scholars have tried to associate *pi-chi* with *bigi*, *begi*. L. Ligeti, "Deux tablettes de T'ai-tsong des Ts'ing", *Acta Orient. Hung.* 8, 3, 1958, p. 227, renders the two Chinese characters as "*pi-ki: bigi*". I myself have considered *beyiji*~*begiji* as a derivation from *begi*+*ji* (feminine suffix). H. Serruys "Four Documents relating to the Sino-Mongol Peace of 1570-1571", *Monumenta Serica* 19, 1960, p. 5. It is true, of course, that character (*pi*-) *chi* 嬖 was originally <sup>°</sup>*ki*; but so was character 吉 *chi*, always used to transcribe the Mongol term *tayiji* 合音 (*t'ai-chi* < *t'ai-tzu* 太子). But *beyiji* is also transcribed *pi-chih* 嬖只 where no <sup>°</sup>*k* is involved (e.g. in WLWKL 13, p. 108; Tamura Jitsuzō, *Mōkohen* 8, pp. 641, 642-3; Ch'en Jen-hsi 陳仁錫 (1579-1624?), *Huang-Ming shih-fa lu* 皇明世法錄 57. 33b; *Lu-lung sai-lieh* 盧龍塞略, Isida Mikinosuke, "Roryū sairyaku ni miataru kammō tai yakugoi ni tsuite," in *Mōkogaku* 2, 1938, p. 129b). The fact is that by the second half of the sixteenth century, the palatalization of <sup>°</sup>*k* was largely completed so that both characters *chi* and *chih* came to be used to render Mongol *-ji*. The author of the little vocabulary in the SYCTK referred to in the above lines may well have been aware of the derivation *beyiji* < *fei-tzu*, and for this reason said that "*beyiji*" is like "*fei-tzu*, a princess in the imperial family"; he may have been thinking of both the meaning and the derivation of the Mongol word. The word *beyiji* is nowhere listed in the dictionaries, as far as I know, and its spelling seems to have become more of a problem in modern manuscripts: in the *Qonjin sudur bolai*, a collection of poetical texts read at a wedding ceremony, from Ordos (p. 10a:8; 14a:2) we read: *abaqai tabunang buyijinar* "the prince's sons, the sons-in-law, and the princesses"; and another MS. collection of similar texts, the *Beri bayulyaqu-dur keregsekü qonjin sudur* (p. 11a:10) reads: *abaqai tabunang uyijinar*: modern scribes seem to be unsure of the real spelling of this word (see my "Four Manuals for Marriage Ceremonies among the Mongols", in *Zentralasiat. Studien* 7 and 8). *Beyiji* is a perfect parallel of *tayiji*. We may also come back once more to the name *Baya-ači* (*Pa-han-na-chi* 青) where *chi* is not Mongol -g. Strictly speaking, *chi* in *na-chi* should correspond to *-ji*, not to *-či*, but then late Ming transcriptions are far from precise and systematic. There may, however, have been uncertainties and dialectal differences in pronunciations, but there is no indication that such transcriptions as *t'ai-chi* (<sup>°</sup>*ki*) and *pi-chi* (<sup>°</sup>*ki*) could stand for such Mongol forms as *taigi*, *bigi*. Some contemporary scribes may well have known of an earlier <sup>°</sup>*ki* pronunciation, but it was sheer pedantry on the part of the translators in Peking to retranslate (if such is the correct word!) *t'ai-chi* as *taigi* and *chi-nang* (= *jinong*) as *ginang* in Altan-qan's vassal letter of 1580. For this letter see my *Sino-Mongol Relations during the Ming. Tribute System and Diplomatic Missions, 1400-1600, Mém. Chinois et Bouddh.*, Vol. 14, 1967, p. 469-70. L. Ligeti, *Mongol Nyelvelmeltár* IV, Budapest, 1965, pp. 86-90. The word *jinong* (*chi-nang*, *chi-neng*) "lieutenant of the qayan" is also of Chinese derivation: *chün-wang* 郡王: *jin-ong*, *jinong*. For this alternation *chi* (<sup>°</sup>*ki*)~*chih* to render Mongol *-ji*, we may also quote the word *lorji* (of Tibetan origin: *č'os-rje*) rendered in Chinese as *ch'ao-erh-chi* 計 (Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, pp. 643, 646), and *dorji* (Tibetan: *rdo-rje*): *to-erh-chih* 只 (Tamura, *Mōkohen* 8, p. 647, *et passim*). L. Hambis in *Documents sur l'Histoire des Mongols à l'Époque des Ming* (Paris, 1969) consistently transcribes *pi-ki* (*bigi*), e.g. pp. 65, 83, 88, etc.; also "Note sur l'installation des Mongols dans la Boucle du Fleuve Jaune", in L. Ligeti (ed.), *Studia Mongolica*, Amsterdam, 1970, pp. 175, 177; without sufficient reason, I think.

<sup>16</sup> Yeh Hsiang-kao 葉向高 (1559-1627), *Ssu-i k'ao* 四夷考 in *Wu-pei chih* 22b. 12b, spells *mien-ch'e-chin*; probably a carver's mistake.

married this girl,<sup>17</sup> although at one time Baya-ači was to refer to her as his wife. But whether actually he married her or not, things went wrong.

Altan-qan indeed had another granddaughter, also a daughter's daughter, and this girl had been promised to one "Ordos" meaning a prince of Ordos.<sup>18</sup> About this time Altan-qan, struck by this second granddaughter's beauty, kept her for himself, and needless to say, the Ordos prince felt cheated and so angry that armed conflict threatened to ensue. In order to placate his Ordos relative, Altan-qan found nothing better than to compensate him with T'u-ch'e-chin's daughter, Baya-ači's prospective second wife. This high-handed intervention in turn angered Baya-ači so much that with his first wife Baya-beyiji and a small number of followers he fled to the Chinese borders, breaking with his grandfather and setting in motion a series of events which were to give a new direction to Sino-Mongol relations.

This daughter's daughter first promised to "Ordos" but then taken by Altan-qan, is the woman from now on always referred to as the Third Lady. This identification is not found in the WLWKL, but in the *San-Yün ch'ou-tsu k'ao*,<sup>19</sup> in the *Ssu-i k'ao*,<sup>20</sup> in the *Ming-shih chi-shih pen-mo*,<sup>21</sup> and in still other works.

3 The *Ming-shih-lu* and the *Ming-shih*, however, tell the story a little differently, confusing the daughter of T'u-ch'e-chin engaged to marry Baya-ači and the qan's daughter's daughter first promised to "Ordos" but appropriated by the qan.

At the risk of repeating ourselves somewhat and causing some confusion in the reader's mind, the two versions must be compared a little more closely. According to the *Shih-lu*<sup>22</sup> and the *Ming-shih*,<sup>23</sup> after Baya-ači had married the girl named *Beyiji*,<sup>24</sup> he planned to take a second wife, the "Ordos" daughter (who, we are further told, was Altan-qan's daughter's daughter: an impossibility, as will be explained below), but the qan himself took her. The *Ming-shih* mentions the girl's beauty; the *Shih-lu* does not.

<sup>17</sup> SYCTK (*Feng-kung* 封貢 "Enfeoffment and Tribute"), 2.1a; WPC 226.12b.

<sup>18</sup> According to the genealogical tables of the Borjigid, "Ordos" designated Mergen Jinong, Altan-qan's elder brother, but he had been dead for many years, and the name here must indicate Mergen's son, Noyandara Jinong, who died in 1572. H. Serruys, *Genealogical Tables of the Descendants of Dayan Qan*, 's-Gravenhage, 1958, Table III.

<sup>19</sup> SYCTK 2.1a.

<sup>20</sup> WPC 226.12b.

<sup>21</sup> Ku Ying-t'ai 谷應葵, *Ming-shih chi-shih pen-mo* 明史紀事本末 (*Kuo-hsiieh chi-pen ts'ung-shu chien-pien*), Shanghai, n.d. (4 vols.) Ch. 60, p. 20.

<sup>22</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen*, 7 p. 705. *Mu-tsung SL* 5 (TP ed., Vol. 94, p. 1251).

<sup>23</sup> MS 327 (TP ed., p. 3766a).

<sup>24</sup> Hambis, *Documents*, p. 64, reads *Pi-ki Pa-han* as the girl's name. There is a stop after *Pi-chi*, and *Pan-han* (*na-chi*) is the subject of the following sentence.

And neither the *Shih-lu* nor the *Ming-shih* state at this point that the girl appropriated by the qan was the one subsequently known as the Third Lady. But in another chapter, in the biography of Wang Ch'ung-ku 王崇古, the *Ming-shih*<sup>25</sup> explains that Baya-aci first married Dayičing-beyiji (i.e. Baya-beyiji) with whom he did not get along too well; then when he wanted to take as second wife Ordos' girl, his grandfather took her; and she became the Third Lady.

For several reasons the version of the *Ming-shih* and the *Ming-shih-lu* cannot be correct. According to this version, the girl taken by Altan-qan was Ordos' daughter. As we have indicated, this "Ordos" can be none other than the *finong* Noyandara, a nephew of the qan, and like him a member of the noble Borjigin clan. Noyandara's daughter was a Borjigin, too, and according to Mongol custom, a member of the Borjigin clan must marry a commoner. Therefore neither Altan-qan nor his grandson Baya-aci, both Borjigin, could have married Ordos' daughter. Then Ordos' daughter could not possibly have been Altan-qan's *wai-sun-nü*, daughter's daughter. This would suppose that Ordos, a Borjigin, and nephew of the qan, had married the latter's daughter, also a Borjigin. Such a daughter of "Ordos" would have been a Borjigin again. Impossibilities all around.

Baya-aci's first wife, Baya-beyiji, was the qan's daughter's daughter: the children belonged to their father's clan, not to the mother's, so that a daughter's daughter was not a Borjigin, and Baya-aci could marry her. The second daughter's daughter of the qan promised to the Ordos prince could have married this Ordos prince since she was not a Borjigin; and for the same reason Altan-qan could take her as a concubine, although this would be an unacceptable union from a modern point of view.

T'u-ch'e-chin, whose daughter Baya-aci intended to take as a second wife but was given to the Ordos prince, belonged to the Üüsin clan. This according to Chiao Hung.<sup>26</sup> There was no objection to a Borjigin marrying a Üüsin, or any other non-noble clan.

As early as 1938, Hou Jen-chih came to the conclusion that the WLWKL version was the correct one, but for different reasons.<sup>27</sup> When Baya-aci and his wife Baya-beyiji crossed into Ta-t'ung territory, the governor Fang Feng-shih 方逢時 interrogated him personally and reported his findings to the governor-general, Wang Ch'ung-ku, of the

<sup>25</sup> MS 222, TP ed., p. 2561b.

<sup>26</sup> Chiao Hung 焦紘 (1541-1620), "T'ung-kung chuan" 通貫傳 (*Kuo-ch'ao hsien-cheng-lu*, Ch. 120), in *K'ou-pei san-t'ing chih* 13.22a, and in *Ch'a-ha-erh sheng t'ung-chih*, 1935, 20.20b.

<sup>27</sup> Hou Jen-chih 侯仁之, "Ming-tai Hsüan-Ta-Shan-hsi san-chen ma-shih", in *Yen-ching hsüeh-pao* 燕京學報 23, 1938, pp. 183-237. A summarized translation of Hou's paper may be found in E-tu Zen Sen and John de Francis, *Chinese Social History. Translations of Selected Studies*, Washington, D.C., 1956, pp. 309-32.

three military districts Hsüan-fu, Ta-t'ung, and Shan-hsi:<sup>28</sup> "that Altan-qan took the girl (T'u-ch'e-chin's daughter) Baya-aci intended to marry and gave her to "Ordos" instead of the girl previously promised to that prince, namely Altan-qan's daughter's daughter whom the qan kept for himself".<sup>29</sup> As Hou remarks, in the transcription and successive copying of those texts, some words must have been dropped, and the sentence rearranged in the *Shih-lu*, and from there the incorrect version entered the *Ming-shih*. Chiao Hung confirms the WLWKL version: (Baya-beyiji is not mentioned) "Baya-aci arranged to marry the daughter of T'u-ch'e-chin of the Üüsin clan; a (*wai*) granddaughter of Altan-qan previously promised to 'Ordos' the qan kept for himself, and instead gave T'u-ch'e-chin's daughter to 'Ordos', and Baya-aci observed to one of his followers: 'my grandfather marries his own (*wai*) granddaughter, and his grandson's wife [apparently they were not yet married] he hands over to other people'."

4 Altan-qan's taking his own *wai-sun-nü*, daughter's daughter, as a concubine, though acceptable from the point of view of Mongol exogamy, must have seemed strange and repellent to the Chinese. Whatever they thought of it at the time the sources do not reveal, and we do not know if any expressed surprise or dismay.

Later the same concubine, by now known as San-niang-tzu, Third Lady, was "inherited" by Altan-qan's son, and later again by his grandson. This Mongol and, in fact, general Central Asian custom of inheriting one's father's concubine had been noticed long before that by such medieval travellers as Marco Polo,<sup>30</sup> Johannes de Plano Carpini,<sup>31</sup> Guillelmus de Rubruc,<sup>32</sup> and others. It was also noted by such Chinese writers of the Ming period as Hsiao Ta-heng 蕭大亨<sup>33</sup> and Su Chih-ko 蘇志皋,<sup>34</sup> and probably others too. If this custom struck the Chinese as repulsive, in later

<sup>28</sup> The Ming border district Shan-hsi is not the province Shansi, but only its north-western corner, between the military district Ta-t'ung, and the Yellow River. I spell *Shansi* for the province as a whole, and *Shan-hsi* for this military district in its narrower acceptance.

<sup>29</sup> Hou, *op. cit.*, p. 209, n. 86, refers to the text of governor Fang Feng-shih's letter in the *Ch'ung-ya-t'ang ts'ung-shu*. *Ta-yin lou chi* 崇雅堂叢書大隱樓集 11.18b-19a.

<sup>30</sup> A. C. Moule and P. Pelliot (eds.), *Marco Polo. The Description of the World*, I, London, 1938, pp. 160, 170.

<sup>31</sup> *Istoria Mongalorum*, in An. Van den Wyngaert, (ed.), *Simica Franciscana* I, Quaracchi-Firenze, 1929, p. 32 § 3.

<sup>32</sup> *Itinerarium in Simica Franciscana* I, p. 185 § 4.

<sup>33</sup> Hsiao Ta-heng, *Pei-Lu feng-su* (*Kuo-hsüeh wen-k'u*, Vol. 29, Pei-p'ing, 1936), p. 2; H. Serruys, "Pei-Lou fong-sou: Les Coutumes des Esclaves septentrionaux", *Mon. Serica* 10, 1945, p. 130.

<sup>34</sup> *I-yü* 譯語, in *Chi-lu hui-pien*, Ch. 161. 31b. Instead of Su Chih-ko, Aoki Toritarō, "Sengge no jungiō shōshū ni tsuite", in *Tōhōgaku* 14, 1957, p. 20b, indicates Shen Chieh-fu 沈節南 as the author of this little work. Shen was the compiler of the *Chi-lu hui-pien*.

years for political reasons they were to insist upon those repeated unions of the Third Lady, but the expressions used subtly but unmistakably reveal Chinese contempt.

We have mentioned that, according to Chiao Hung, T'u-ch'e-chin belonged to the Üüsin clan. This does not mean that he was from Ordos as the name of the Üüsin banner in Ordos in the Manchu period might suggest. There were Üüsin in Tümed territory too. All clans had long been broken up, and representatives of any clan could be found almost anywhere in the country. Remnants of the old clans formed groups or sub-groups living together with other clans. The name of the Üüsin banner in Ordos came from the fact that the clan Üüsin formed a substantial part of the population of this banner. Such Ming works as the WLWKL list a fairly good number of clans settled in Tümed territory, the Üüsin, the Bayaud, the Urûd, the Dolôd-tümen, the Bârin seemingly being the more important ones.<sup>35</sup> I mention these in particular not only because they were important units among the Twelve Tümed, but because the princes ruling them (sons and relatives of Altan-qan) were often named after the most important clan among their subjects. Thus one of Altan-qan's brothers was known as Üüsin, and so were his son and grandson. There was also a Bayaud, an Urûd, and others who will be mentioned in this story. The WLWKL says that under Altan-qan's son, Sengge-dügüreng qung-tayiji, Tümed territory was divided into two main sections referred to as Eastern Patrol (*sao* 哨) and Western Patrol, and among the smaller subdivisions, the Üüsin, the Urûd the Bayaud, and the Bârin were the more important ones.<sup>36</sup>

5 When Baya-açi accompanied by his family and followers reached the Ta-t'ung borders, the governor estimated that Baya-açi was about eighteen years old. On the face of it, this seems an extremely low estimate: although

<sup>35</sup> WLWKL 7, p. 24; also Chen Hsiao 鄭曉 (1499-1566), *Huang-ming Pei-Lu k'ao* 皇明北虜考 (*Kuo-hsieh wen-k'u*, Vol. 45, Pei-p'ing, 1937), p. 52, and others.

<sup>36</sup> WLWKL 9, p. 104. For Üüsin, see also H. Serruys, *Geneal. Tables*, Table V. Urûd was a grandson of Altan-qan. Both a son and a grandson of Altan-qan were known as Bayaud tayiji; Bârin was a son of Altan-qan. Dolô(d)-tümen refers to a nephew of Altan-qan and his son (*Geneal. Tables*, Table IV, where Dolôn should be read Dolôd), but the name Dolô(d)-tümen, meaning "Seven Tümen" has been corrupted by some editors because they did not understand the word and failed to group the characters correctly. WLWKL 7, p. 24, punctuates as follows: *to-lo-t'ien. t'u-min-wei-wu-erh*; the *HM Pei-Lu k'ao* omits the period after *t'ien* and reads all eight characters as one name. In fact *t'ien* is superfluous and must be dropped; the remaining seven characters represent two clan names: *Dolô(d)-tümen* and *Uyiyur*. They are spelled correctly on the maps of Chang Yü 張雨, *Pien-cheng k'ao* 邊政考, Pei-p'ing, 1936, 1.3a. In his paper "Note sur l'installation des Mongols dans la boucle du Fleuve Jaune" in L. Ligeti, *Mongolian Studies*, Amsterdam, 1970, p. 177, L. Hambis transcribes *Dolo(n)-tümen* as I have done previously. It should be noted that a final *-n* is rarely omitted in Chinese transcriptions, and a final *-d* is rarely expressed. *Dolôd* is a plural form of *dolôn*, and there is little doubt that in this case, *Dolôd-tümen* is the correct spelling.

not entirely impossible, it seems rather unlikely that a mere youth of eighteen should make such a momentous decision as to defect to China always regarded as the enemy. True, there were Mongols in the Chinese service, but hardly any descendants of noble families, and ever since 1500 the number of Mongols crossing into China had steadily declined. Rather, from before 1550 the trend had been for impoverished Chinese farmers to run away to Mongolia. Another reason why eighteen years seems to be too low is that six years elapsed between Baya-açi's first marriage (Baya-beyiji) and his attempted second union. And then this quarrel with his grandfather around his prospective second wife must have been a long drawn-out affair, lasting months, perhaps a year or more. Indeed at the moment Baya-açi ran away, Altan-qan was not even home: their quarrel not only occurred before Altan-qan left, but he must have left some time after the controversy appeared settled and he could afford to leave. All this must have taken some time. In other words, Baya-açi's first marriage must have taken place not six years, but seven or more, before he fled to China at the very end of 1570: if he looked eighteen years old then, he would have been born in 1552, and if his first marriage took place seven years before his surrender, 1563, he was no more than eleven years old at the time of his first marriage. Rather improbable.

There may be another way of making a rough estimate of Baya-açi's age. His wife, Baya-beyiji, survived him by many years: the *Ming shih-lu* tells us that in 1615 she was seventy years old.<sup>37</sup> That may not be entirely accurate, but supposing it is, and supposing further that this is "Chinese" reckoning, meaning sixty-nine years in Western style, she would have been born in 1546. That would make her twenty-four years old in 1570, and her husband must have been roughly the same age.

But what was the age of the Third Lady, who first promised to the Ordos prince, was then taken by Altan-qan? The *Ssu-i-k'ao*<sup>38</sup> states that in 1611 the Third Lady was "more than sixty years old, in poor health, and her hair white" For the sake of convenience taking her age as sixty in 1611, she was born in 1551. In 1570, she was nineteen years old. According to our estimate, Baya-beyiji was born in 1546, and married in 1563 (seven years before Baya-açi's surrender) at the age of seventeen. The two girls were not necessarily of the same age at the time of their marriage, and our estimate is necessarily only a rough approximation. Baya-beyiji (b. 1546) was five years older than the Third Lady (b. 1551).

P'eng-sun-i 彭孫貽 (1615-1673) in his *Shan-chung wen-chien lu* 山中聞見錄 says that Altan-qan's concubine known as the Third Lady,

<sup>37</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 10, p. 6 (not in the TP edition).

<sup>38</sup> WPC 226.22a.

<sup>39</sup> Quoted in Aoki Tomitarô, "Minmatsu Môko no joshu Hankanji ni tsuite", in *Kita Ajia Minzokugaku ronshû* 1, 1965, p. 27.

according to some, was a singing girl from Ta-t'ung or Hsüan-fu.<sup>39</sup> Professor Aoki refers to Chinese women and girls taken prisoner and abducted to Mongolia. That prisoners were often taken back to Mongolia is quite certain; but that is no proof that P'eng-sun-i's suggestion is correct. There were enough Chinese refugees and immigrants living in Mongolia with their families. P'eng probably wants to find a reason for the Third Lady's "pro-Chinese" feelings; but his is a late source, and his "some maintain" is of little weight compared to all the contemporary sources flatly stating that the Third Lady was Altan-qan's granddaughter.

6 Baya-açi's surrender was seen by border officials as a unique opportunity to come to some kind of agreement with the Mongols. The governor-general of the three military districts, Hsüan-fu, Ta-t'ung, and Shan-hsi, and his assistants correctly figured that Altan-qan would be eager to have his grandson back; especially since his first wife who had raised him blamed the qan for this unexpected misfortune. If Baya-açi could be sent back under Chinese "protection", Altan-qan might be ready to stop the endless border raids that had plagued the area for several decades. To induce Altan-qan to do this, Wang Ch'ung-ku was ready to promise him the privileges of a tributary (with suitable payment for his "tribute") and trade facilities at certain points along the borders. Wang and his colleagues with border experience knew full well that fundamentally raids were caused by Mongol need of certain Chinese manufactures and foodstuffs. But the Court in Peking had always taken the opposite view, refusing to accept the causal connexion between lack of trade and raids: no tribute rights and trade facilities could be considered as long as there were border raids. In fact since 1550, it had been forbidden under severe penalty to submit the very proposal Wang Ch'ung-ku intended to bring before the Court for the Emperor's approval. No need to go into this long and complicated story;<sup>40</sup> suffice it to say that Wang's view in the end prevailed: Baya-açi and his followers returned to Mongolia after receiving honorary ranks and many presents intended to dazzle the Mongols. Altan-qan himself received the title of Shun-i-wang 順義王 "Obedient and Righteous Prince," and a large number of his relatives were given appropriate military ranks, proportionate gifts, and the right to present the tribute and to trade at a number of horse fairs at certain times of the year. By a strange turn of events the troubled Sino-Mongol borders saw a measure of peace for the first time in many years. If causes of conflict and friction between Chinese and Mongols would never entirely disappear, by and large the peace arrangement initiated at the end of 1570 prevailed until the end of the Ming.

So in a way the Third Lady first promised to the Ordos prince and then

kept as a third wife by Altan-qan was the reason of it all. But when her biographical note says that the 1570 settlement was due to her<sup>41</sup> as if she had planned things that way, that is a gross exaggeration. This was written after 1600 when the Third Lady had married several princes in succession and had exercised her influence in favour of peace and good relations with China. The same statement appears a couple of times in the *Shih-lu* but again that is in retrospect, reading later impressions into earlier events, none too well based on fact. In 1570, the girl later known as Third Lady was much too young to begin with, and then she was too new at the headquarters of the qan to have any influence at all. How ill-founded the statement of the WLWKL (and other works) is appears from the fact that after she has been mentioned in connexion with Baya-açi's flight in 1570, she is no more mentioned until 1578 when her name is listed among others who had been presented with some gifts.<sup>42</sup> Before that other women had been mentioned without her, a strong indication that she was not so prominent at that time; perhaps totally unknown to the Chinese officials. What could well be of even greater significance is that in 1579, the *Ming shih-lu* records gifts sent to her rival Baya-beyiji, but not to the Third Lady.<sup>43</sup>

7 In early Mongol society, the wives of rulers and noblemen lived in their own, often distant, *ordos* or residences, owned property in horses and cattle, had their own subject people including servants and armed men, and often moved their living quarters to other places independently of their husbands. To what extent that was still true in the late sixteenth century is hard to say, but Chinese sources vaguely imply the very same conditions. It is extremely difficult to visualize how independent those ladies were; to what extent their wealth and property came under or escaped their husbands' jurisdiction and power. That may have differed from case to case, depending on the personalities involved. The ladies seem to have passed their private property on to their children. But once again, had the husband no say in the matter? Around 1600, we will notice a long struggle between the Third Lady's husband and her relatives for her possessions. At any rate, the Third Lady never was completely ruled by her successive husbands.

There can be no doubt that this new third concubine of the qan was an ambitious and resourceful person; in retrospect it is easy to understand that she would not be content with playing third or even second fiddle. If the qan showed a liking to her, she was ready and able to take advantage of his predilection and of every other opportunity.

Altan-qan's son by his first wife, Ai-k'o-ha-t'un (*Yeke Qatun*: Great

<sup>41</sup> WLWKL 9, p. 3.

<sup>42</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 171.

<sup>43</sup> Tamura, *Mókohen* 8, pp. 400-1. *Shen-tzung SL* 90 (TP ed. Vol. 100, p. 1856).

<sup>40</sup> For details see my *Tribute System and Diplomatic Missions*, V, pp. 64-93.

Lady, also referred to as Ta-niang-tzu) was Sengge. Baya-ači, according to the WLWKL, was a grandson by the second wife, whom the author calls I-k'o-ha-t'un.<sup>44</sup> As already indicated, this must be a mistake: both ladies were unlikely to be known as Yeke Qatun. (Baya-ači's grandmother was one Molon; see above). Any way the two women did not get along very well. Wang Shih-chen 王世貞 states that at one point Altan-qan repudiated his main consort in favour of a concubine<sup>45</sup>, who can be none other than the Third Lady, with the result that the first lady's son, Sengge, became very angry with his father. Although we do not know the exact circumstances of the removal of the first consort from her prominent position in favour of the Third Lady, we find a sort of echo of this affair in the WLWKL. At one point, the author of that book tells us that one of the reasons for Sengge's discontent with his father was the latter's love for his last concubine and the preference shown to Baya-ači; especially after Baya-ači was back from his trip to China, Sengge suspected that Altan-qan and his uncle (Kündüli-qan) were out to kill him.<sup>46</sup> Then the author, recording some events that occurred between Altan-qan's death (1582) and Sengge's appointment as Shun-i-wang, all of a sudden switches back to earlier events: "Previously when (China) made Altan-qan (Shun-i) wang and granted (honorary) ranks to various tribal chieftains so that they felt greatly honoured, (Sengge) qung-tayiji's tribal subjects asked to be treated on an equal basis. Then also (Altan-qan) requested that his Ta-niang-tzu's imperial gifts be awarded to the qatun, that is the Third Lady. At that time (Sengge) qung-tayiji's mother, the Ai-k'o-ha-t'un (Yeke Qatun) had greatly fallen out of favour with Altan and for this reason he requested no more gifts for her. Some time later the Ta-niang-tzu died, and then Altan-qan, too, died."<sup>47</sup> The meaning of this passage is crystal clear, that the Third Lady had been growing in stature at the expense of Sengge's mother.

But the rivalry between Altan-qan's main consort and his third concubine was not the only cause of Sengge's ill feeling towards his father and the favoured concubine. There was also "money" involved. Ever since relations with China had been normalized in 1571, and Chinese manufactured goods could be had through the horse fairs and direct gifts from the government,<sup>48</sup> Sengge had been competing with his father for a larger

share of the revenues. This appears, among others, from a statement by Feng Shih-k'o that Altan-qan and Sengge had separate fairs because they could not get along together.<sup>49</sup> Here again the Third Lady is in the background: the *Ming-shih* in the biographical notice of Cheng Lo 鄭洛 (at one time governor-general of the three districts), says that the Third Lady assisted Altan-qan in the administration of affairs pertaining to tribute and trade, and that all the tribes felt her control;<sup>50</sup> then the biographical note of another border official, Wu Tui 吳兌, explicitly states that Sengge and the Third Lady detested each other and that both tried to ruin each other's reputation with the Chinese, and then: "under three successive Shun-i-wang's, the Third Lady controlled the revenues of the fairs and the tribute".<sup>51</sup>

Ch'ü Chiu-ssu summarizes the situation by noting that Sengge's influence was very limited and that he held a grudge against his father because of his limited access to income from the fairs; he goes on to relate that at one point Sengge's wife sent a messenger to the governor-general, Wang Ch'ung-ku, to explain how limited Sengge's resources and power were and beg the governor-general to help "her husband dispel this hatred for his father",<sup>52</sup> no doubt meaning allow him a greater share in the revenues. Indeed, as we shall see, the struggle for Chinese goods seems to have dominated the lives of Mongol princes and chieftains of this period.

8 Whereas during the qan's lifetime the Third Qatun is seldom mentioned, when he died in January 1582, according to the *Shih-lu*, his wife, the qatun, and his sons sent an official notification to the Chinese border officials;<sup>53</sup> the qatun is none other than the Third Lady as Ch'ü Chiu-ssu confirms.<sup>54</sup> Sengge, too, sent messengers (an additional and independent mission).<sup>55</sup> Memorial services were prescribed by the Court, and according to another *Shih-lu* text, the qan's wife, the qatun, and his sons, of whom only Sengge-qung-tayiji and Budaširi are mentioned by name, sent a vassal letter to express their gratitude to the Court.<sup>56</sup> Probably it is not without significance that of the two sons mentioned by name, Sengge was the son of the first wife and was to succeed his father, and the other, Budaširi, was the Third Lady's son. Budaširi and his son were to remain rivals of Sengge and his descendants. The WLWKL also speaks of a memorial service held at

<sup>44</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 193; 9, p. 3. Feng Shih-k'o 馮時可, *An-ta hou-chih* 俺答後志 in *Kuo-ch'ao hsien-cheng lu* 120. 27b, confirms that Altan-qan's wife, obviously his main consort, was *i-k'o-ha-t'un*: Yeke qatun.

<sup>45</sup> *Pei-Lu shih-mo chih* 北虜始末志 in *Kuo-ch'ao hsien-cheng lu* 120. 6a.

<sup>46</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 185.

<sup>47</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 193.

<sup>48</sup> As a matter of fact these gifts, "rewards" (*shang*) as they are called, which I render as "subsides", usually came from the military authorities along the borders; they were intended to keep the Mongol chieftains happy, and more than once the Mongols blackmailed the border officials into paying out more and heavier "rewards".

<sup>49</sup> *Kuo-ch'ao* ... 120.32b; WLWKL 8, pp. 188, 189.

<sup>50</sup> MS 222 (TP ed., p. 2566a).

<sup>51</sup> MS 222 (TP ed., p. 2565a).

<sup>52</sup> WLWKL 8, pp. 188-9.

<sup>53</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 8, p. 448. *Shen-tsung SL* 121 (TP ed. Vol. 101, pp. 1254-5); WLWKL 9, p. 3.

<sup>54</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 193.

<sup>55</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 191.

<sup>56</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 8, p. 453 (not in the TP ed.).

Kuei-hua-ch'eng 歸化城 presided over by Chinese officials, and it was "the wife (and?) the Third Lady" with the late qan's sons who stood at the head of the Mongols present; and one month later, the Third Lady alone sent a vassal letter and tribute to the Ming Court.<sup>57</sup> It is evident that with the death of the qan, the Third Lady has come to the fore, and from now on she was to remain in the limelight until she died in 1612.

In the texts from the *Shih-lu* and the WLWKL referred to in the foregoing lines it is not clear how the words *ch'i ha-t'un* (lit. "wife, qatun") are to be understood: "wife and qatun", or "wife, namely the qatun". If the texts mean two different persons, then who is this wife? Not the first wife, Sengge's mother: she had died before the qan did. A second wife then? Baya-ači's grandmother? I am unable to elucidate this question, but it is of little importance for our present story.

It is a little strange that Ch'ü Chiu-ssu, after clearly stating that Sengge's mother, the Yeke Qatun, had died before Altan-qan, then goes on to relate how after the qan's death, and after seventy-nine noblemen had presented a joint petition in favour of Sengge's enfeoffment as Shun-i-wang, Sengge himself dispatched a messenger to the border officials to point out (1) that as eldest son of the main consort he should be appointed successor to the dignity of Shun-i-wang; (2) that his own son (and future successor) should be promoted to a higher rank; and (3) that the Great Qatun of the late Shun-i-wang should receive gifts.<sup>58</sup> To begin with the third point: it is obvious that Sengge here is trying to have restored to his mother the yearly gifts which at Altan-qan's request had been assigned to the Third Lady. But his mother was dead! Did Sengge perhaps figure that after her disgrace the Great Qatun had lived long enough in obscurity for the Chinese to have forgotten her and to be ignorant of her death? Whatever Sengge thought the Chinese knew, his intention was to acquire a greater share of the yearly gifts. Then with regard to the first point, Sengge claims the right of succession as the eldest son. This was the rule accepted by the Chinese as we shall see in the question of the succession 1607-12; but it was not the Mongol principle of succession. According to Mongol custom, the youngest son inherited the father's property and territory. Sengge seems to have feared that his younger (half) brother, the Third Lady's son, Budaširi, might claim the succession. Indeed, if not at this juncture, Budaširi's name was later repeatedly mentioned in Chinese circles as a possible alternative to the elder line. Indeed, in 1607-12, Budaširi's son would invoke the right of the younger son to the succession.

9 The biographical notice of the Third Lady in the WLWKL tells us that shortly after Altan-qan's death, in the spring of 1582, the governor-

general, as was his custom, sent messengers to various parts of Mongolia, urging the chieftains to present the regular tribute on time. There was, however, another motive behind this action, namely the messengers were to spy out what was going on at the headquarters of the various chieftains. The Third Lady sent messengers of her own to the governor-general asking for a postponement of the regular tribute presentation. The reasons for the postponement were the recent death of the qan, the burial having taken up too much of her attention, and also a drought which had weakened Mongol horses.<sup>59</sup> The *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi*<sup>60</sup> mentions another pretext for not presenting the tribute at the usual time: with Altan-qan dead and no successor appointed, the princely seal could not be used on vassal letters supposed to accompany the yearly tribute. In this connexion it should be noted that the "collective" tribute of the qan and his relatives and tribal chieftains was presented as one tribute coming from the qan, and under his seal; but all those noblemen contributed a certain number of horses, and, of course, received payment for those horses, and additional gifts. The real purpose of the Third Lady's attempt to postpone the tribute was probably to prevent, or at least postpone as long as possible Sengge's appointment as Shun-i-wang. An interruption of the tribute, as will appear later on, did not mean an interruption of all benefits coming from China: the fairs continued to be held, and "subsidies" were to be had, and in these Sengge had always had a small share compared to that enjoyed by the Third Lady. As long as Sengge was not enfeoffed the situation would remain unchanged. Indeed, the WLWKL states that after Altan-qan's death, vassal letters were made in the name of the Third Lady and she was the main beneficiary of many gifts from China.<sup>61</sup> However this may be, the governor-general Cheng Lo pressed for the tribute anyway, and advised that vassal letters should remain unstamped with the seal of the Shun-i-wang. This procedure would be followed later, too, every time the position of Shun-i-wang was vacant.

Another related question is the whereabouts of the seal itself. If we keep in mind that during Altan-qan's lifetime the Third Qatun had practically been in charge of tribute and horse-fair affairs, and further that in later years, after Sengge's death (1585), and later again after the death of his successor (1607), during two interim periods, the Third Lady had the seal in her possession and wielded it as a weapon to promote her own interests, we may assume that this time, too, Altan-qan's seal was in her hands and Sengge was unable to get it from her. Even during the vacancy, the possession of that seal gave the lady great prestige and power not only over ordinary chieftains but over the prospective successor himself.

<sup>57</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 175.

<sup>58</sup> WLWKL 8, pp. 191-2.

<sup>59</sup> WLWKL 9, 6-7.

<sup>60</sup> *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi* 2, 47b.

<sup>61</sup> WLWKL 9, p. 6.

10 The Chinese always thought very highly of the Third Lady but it is not clear what precisely was the reason for her "pro-Chinese" attitude. True, it appears that she wanted the Mongols to maintain peaceful relations with China, and in fact, as we shall see, she was more than once praised and rewarded for her efforts to restore peace when the borders had been violated. But was that because of genuine pro-Chinese sentiments, or was it her interest in gifts and trade? Whatever the reason, given the lady's prestige with the Chinese and her influence over at least a good part of Mongol nobility, Sengge soon came to the conclusion that he would have to marry her, in spite of their rivalry, if he wanted to amass some property and improve his position in Mongolia and induce the Chinese to give him his father's rank. The Chinese were in favour of the marriage in spite of the abhorrence such a union inspired and made it a condition for Sengge's enfeoffment as Shun-i-wang: the *Ssu-i-k'ao* and other works<sup>62</sup> use the term *cheng* 蒸 "incest with an older generation". But the Third Lady, for reasons not too hard to guess, was as reluctant as Sengge was willing. In fact she even moved her living quarters and her subjects away so as to be no longer importuned. But the governor-general, Cheng Lo, insisted upon this union. He reckoned that if the Third Lady could maintain independent relations with China indefinitely, there would be no point in appointing Sengge Shun-i-wang. And indeed he dispatched a message to persuade her to accept Sengge's proposal, with a promise that she would lose none of her privileges. Evidently the governor-general considered the Third Lady's loyalty and influence a guarantee that Sengge once enfeoffed would continue to observe the pacts accepted by his father in 1571.<sup>63</sup> In the meantime other moves were on the way to promote Sengge's ambition: first a group of seventy-nine noblemen presented a joint petition for his appointment, and then shortly afterwards a second petition was made by ninety-nine men.<sup>64</sup> There is no indication on whose initiative these joint petitions were presented, but later on these petitions were to become part of the necessary procedure before a new Shun-i-wang was to be appointed. If such joint petitions enhanced his prospects of being enfeoffed and granted the title of *wang*, they also made Sengge in a way obligated to those noblemen who had supported his claim. We do not know to what extent this was true in Sengge's case, but there is ample evidence that it was true in 1607-12. On the other hand it might also seem that the joint petitions of the nobility were directed against the Third Lady, but that is not so certain. It is more probable that apart from the pressure exerted by the governor-general, the Third Lady had come to the conclusion that Sengge as Shun-i-wang would

<sup>62</sup> WPC 226.19b-20a; KPSTC (Ch'ien Ch'ien-i, *Mu-chai shih-chu*) 16.24b; SYCTK 2.5a.

<sup>63</sup> MS 222 (TP ed., p. 2566a).

<sup>64</sup> WLWKL 8, pp. 191, 193.

not be much of an obstacle to her own plans; she may even have come to see that marriage and Sengge's appointment could well be turned to her advantage. Anyway she soon came to support Sengge's claim to the rank of Shun-i-wang: the WLWKL records a religious ceremony, probably including an oath, at which the Third Lady promised that if Sengge was enfeoffed, tribute relations would continue in the same peaceful manner as before.<sup>65</sup> It is rather unlikely that without the marriage and the Third Lady's support, Sengge would ever have been appointed. Anyway, now things began to move fast: according to the WLWKL, Sengge married the Third Lady in the tenth lunar month (October 28-November 25) of 1582,<sup>66</sup> and on April 3, 1583, he was finally appointed to succeed his father as Shun-i-wang.<sup>67</sup> When the patent of enfeoffment was handed to Sengge, the Third Lady was present as might be expected.<sup>68</sup>

11 We have just mentioned the lady's promise of continued peace on the borders: during Sengge's lifetime as well as under his son and successor, she actively helped him prevent border violations or punish the guilty: shortly after Sengge had become Shun-i-wang, we read that when some Mongols had caused trouble on the borders, the Third Lady saw to it that they were punished.<sup>69</sup> That was not too long before Sengge's death; he may already have been in poor health which gave her a new opportunity to assert her independent power.

On two occasions the author of the WLWKL states that Sengge spent a dissipated life with women and banqueting; and the Third Lady took advantage of the situation to take control over his best troops, and installed herself in the Western Patrol, at a distance from Sengge's headquarters. Altan-qan, a much more assertive personality had always been tough with her, and she had had to yield. Sengge, less capable and busy elsewhere anyway, was no match for her. In fact many thought that "he would die at her hands!"<sup>70</sup> That may sound a little dramatic, and there is no indication that she ever tried to harm him, but in another passage, the same author in a final note on the Third Lady's biography, says that she compelled him to divorce his other wives.<sup>71</sup> Five of Sengge's many wives are listed in the *San-Yün ch'ou-tsu k'ao*: four are known by their clan names: Šiba'učin,

<sup>65</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 192.

<sup>66</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 181; 9, p. 7.

<sup>67</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 8, p. 471. *Shen-tsung SL* 134 (TP ed., Vol. 102, p. 2497). The WLWKL 8, p. 193, has a different date: 16th day of the second lunar month: 10 March, but the date found in the SL is more likely to be the correct one.

<sup>68</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 194.

<sup>69</sup> WLWKL 8, pp. 195-6

<sup>70</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 196; 9, p. 7.

<sup>71</sup> WLWKL 9, p. 12.

Uyiyürčin, Mongyölčin, Čaqar, and one by her personal name Uran-beyiji.<sup>72</sup> At least for this Uran-beyiji there is an indication that Sengge divorced her. In a previous article,<sup>73</sup> I have erroneously stated that this lady Uran died before her husband, that is before 1585. Manifestly I had misinterpreted the text of the WLWKL.<sup>74</sup> *ku* 故 here cannot mean that the lady had died; nor does it mean "the late Sengge", since he died only later. *Ku* here must mean "Sengge's former wife." Later on we shall come across the same idea expressed with *chiu* 舊. This would confirm that the Third Lady had forced Sengge to repudiate all his wives. As to this lady Uran, she reappears in 1589,<sup>75</sup> and from both passages it appears that she too was a lady of means, owning property and subjects, and that she presented tribute.

When these divorces took place we are not told, but there is no doubt that while "married" to Sengge, the Third Lady continued to pursue her own plans.

Sengge qung-tayiji did not live long. He died in the twelfth lunar month of the fourteenth year Wan-li: 1585-6.<sup>76</sup> According to a passage of the *Shih-lu*, the Third Lady was among those who officially informed the Chinese government of his death,<sup>77</sup> but the WLWKL fails to mention her in this connexion. When a Chinese delegation came to Mongolia for a memorial service as had been done for Altan-qan in 1582, the Third Lady is mentioned again as present at the reception of the Chinese delegation, and a little afterwards she is listed ahead of Sengge's son and prospective successor when a mission was sent to China with gifts to show their gratitude for China's expression of sympathy and concern.<sup>78</sup>

If at first Sengge had been viewed with some concern because of his actions in the past, and even after his enfeoffment as Sun-i-wang border officials remained suspicious of his intentions, when he died he was praised as a faithful vassal.<sup>79</sup> By the time of his death it was clear that an unstable and precarious situation was developing in Mongolia, and the Chinese therefore hesitated to appoint a successor immediately. Before they did, they would study the situation and let the Mongols make the first move.<sup>80</sup>

<sup>72</sup> SYCTK 2, 23a.

<sup>73</sup> H. Serruys, "Notes on a Chinese Inscription of 1606 in a Lamaist Temple in Mai-ta-chao, Suiyüan", JAOS 78, 2, 1958, p. 110b.

<sup>74</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 195.

<sup>75</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 211.

<sup>76</sup> WLWKL 8, pp. 195-6. Tamura, *Mökohen* 8, p. 553. *Shen-tsung SL* 170 (TP ed., Vol. 103, p. 3082).

<sup>77</sup> Tamura, *Mökohen* 8, p. 577 (not in TP ed.).

<sup>78</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 196.

<sup>79</sup> Tamura, *Mökohen* 8, pp. 497, 559. *Shen-tsung SL* 143, 172 (TP ed., Vol. 102, pp. 2664; Vol. 103, p. 3149).

<sup>80</sup> Tamura, *Mökohen* 8, p. 553. *Shen-tsung SL* 170 (TP ed., Vol. 103, p. 3082). WLWKL 8, p. 196.

12 Sengge's eldest son was called Čürüke, in Chinese Ch'e-li-k'o, sometimes Ch'e-li-ken;<sup>81</sup> although he was Sengge's presumptive heir and successor, the Chinese showed no inclination to give him the desired appointment. Indeed the situation must have seemed rather unsettled and not very promising. If Sengge had been at odds with his father Altan-qan, the rift between Sengge and his son Čürüke was even worse, and both the WLWKL and the *Shih-lu* testify to the enmity between father and son: even before Altan-qan's death, Čürüke, supported by Bayaud and Üüsin, was at odds with his father on account of markets; things went so far that at one point Sengge was reduced to extreme poverty as a result of depredations carried out by Čürüke. This is confirmed by the latter's biography: Čürüke allied to Bayaud and Üüsin "revolted" against their father and took subjects away from him, with the result that his father deeply hated him.<sup>82</sup> The *Shih-lu*

<sup>81</sup> The Chinese transcription Ch'e-li-k'o, rarely Ch'e-li-ken, bears little resemblance to the name as spelled in the *Erdeni-yin Tobči* (Schmidt, *Geschichte*, p. 200:14, 201): Čürüke qung-tayiji. The first two syllables of the Mongol spelling leave no doubt; the final syllable *-ke* could also be read *-ge*, but if the Chinese *k'o* means anything at all, we must accept the reading Čürüke. In the *Altan kürdan mingyan hegesüti biçig*, p. 59 [IV.7v]: Čürüke sečin qan; this was taken over by Rasipungsuγ and entered into the *Bolor Erike*, Part V, p. 343 [Kalgan ed., p. 685]. *Sečen* "wise" was the title taken first by his father Sengge: WLWKL 8, pp. 193, 194; Tamura, *Mökohen* 8, pp. 483, 500; *Shen-tsung SL* 138, 143 (TP ed., Vol. 102, pp. 2576; 2669), MS 327 (TP ed., p. 3767a). Čürüke must have assumed the title after his father: WLWKL 8, p. 212; Tamura, *Mökohen* 8, p. 678; *Shen-tsung SL* 205 (TP ed., Vol. 105, p. 3826); *Mökohen* 9, p. 27; *Shen-tsung SL* 226 (TP ed., Vol. 106, pp. 4197). B. Vladimirtsov, in his article "Nad-pisi . . ." (1927, pp. 223-4) gives the text of the colophon of the *Siluyun onoltu* (damamüka "The Fool and the Wise") of the Leningrad MS version, in which "tere qamuy-a aldarsiyan (N)amudai sečen qayan" - "(N)amudai Sečen-qayan whose fame has spread everywhere" is mentioned as "sitting on the throne of Altan-qayan," and the colophon of the printed *Qutuytu bilig-in ünadu kijayar-a kürügen tümen silüg-tü kemekü yeke kölgen sudur* mentions him, too: "[Altan qayan] nom-un qayan-u auy-a ači inu. nom-un šasin bariyči (n)amudai šasin [= sečen] qayan" - "The elder grandson of the Dharmarāja [Altan-qayan] (N)amudai Sečen qayan upholder of the Religion . . ." L. Ligeti, *Catalogue du Kanjur mongol imprimé* I, Budapest, 1942, pp. 182-3, Nr. 765 (1). W. Heissig, "Zur geistigen Leistung der neubekehrten Mongolen des späten 17. Jhdts.", *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 26, 1954, pp. 109-10, partially quotes this colophon while adopting a few readings different from Ligeti's. In the same colophon mention is also made of *Boγda Čečen qayan-u oron-dur sayuysan bušuytu nom-un sečen qayan . . .* - "Bušuytu, wise Dharmarāja, who sat on the throne of the Saintly Sečen qayan's . . ." Fred A. Bischoff, *Der Kanjur und seine Kolophone*, Bloomington, 1968, p. 323, where the translation is unsatisfactory. This Bušuytu is Čürüke's grandson and successor who apparently also took the title; in fact the text implies that all successive qan's bore the same title. Heissig, following Baddeley and Vladimirtsov, thought that Bušuytu of this passage was Bušuytu Jinong of the Ordos (cf. below note 123), and concluded that Namudai was another name for Bušuytu Jinong. This is not correct: the colophon has nothing to do with the Jinong, and the Mongol text clearly states that Namudai died before Bušuytu ascended the throne. Namudai being a grandson of Altan-qan cannot but be another name for Čürüke sečen. It was not so rare for Mongols to be known under more than one name. See my forthcoming paper "Jünggen, a Title of Mongol Princesses".

<sup>82</sup> WLWKL 8, pp. 188 (two passages), 201.

under the date of August 18, 1572, includes a report from Ta-t'ung and Hsüan-fu that Čürüke had stolen his father's people, horses, cattle, and sheep.<sup>83</sup> The WLWKL adds that Altan-qan admired his grandson's administrative and military skills, perhaps one more reason for Sengge's grudge against both his father and his son.<sup>84</sup>

This many-faceted rivalry within the Mongol noble family had ramifications in many directions: as early as 1583, the *Shih-lu* gives a report from the borders speaking of rivalry between on the one hand Čürüke and Baya-ači (both favourites of Altan-qan who had only recently died) and on the other hand Sengge and the Third Lady, then just married.<sup>85</sup> The struggle was for Bayising. Altan-qan, as has already been indicated, had left the people of Bayising<sup>86</sup> and his personal troops under Baya-ači's control, a powerful position. But Baya-ači died in an accident in August 1583, and with his sons still minors, it was his widow Baya-bey ji (or Dayičing-beyiji) who inherited the command, and so became a participant in many subsequent events. Among the many sons of Altan-qan there were three he had by the Third Lady; especially one, named Budaširi, was destined to play an active role. In the latter's biographical notice we read that several fairs along the Ta-t'ung borders were under Budaširi's control, but the tribes centred around Bayising were controlled by Dayičing-beyiji, and the Third Lady was to make every effort to lay hands on Dayičing-beyiji's resources.<sup>87</sup>

At the end of Sengge's biography we read that he was a weak ruler and the Third Lady was able to take command of Sengge's best troops and withdraw to the Western Patrol, and that Čürüke, compelled to remain in the Eastern Corner 東隅, had very little influence: the Third Lady was even able to appropriate the princely seal, and she hid it in the hope of one day favouring her own son (Budaširi).<sup>88</sup> The three biographical notices of Budaširi, the Third Lady, and Čürüke state that "the seal and the tablets of military authority" were in the lady's hands.<sup>89</sup> Not surprisingly, as the author of the WLWKL continues, Čürüke was extremely angry with the lady and her son, but apparently he was totally helpless. Obviously there existed a running enmity between Čürüke and Budaširi, and only after Čürüke married the Third Lady, did the tension somewhat relax.<sup>90</sup>

13 Needless to say, the Chinese followed these developments and favoured the Third Lady's side. We see this, for example, in the fact that Budaširi

was regularly promoted in rank, evidently in order to please his mother. Later when Čürüke was appointed Shun-i-wang (May 3, 1587), Budaširi and Čürüke's son (and possible successor) Čoytu were given the same rank, which could not fail to exacerbate their rivalry.<sup>91</sup>

The Third Lady's plan was to lay hands on the resources of Bayising and in order to do so she wanted her son to marry the widow Baya-beyiji. The Chinese approved of this scheme since it would strengthen the "pro-Chinese faction". From the fragmentary accounts scattered over various places of the WLWKL it is difficult, if not impossible, to reconstruct the exact sequence of events. The author is often imprecise in his dates, but the small facts and the details which he records often convey the real flavour of life in Mongolia better than the more accurate facts devoid of details recorded in the *Shih-lu*. At any rate, it was one Kiya-tayiji who was the main opposition to the Third Lady's plans. This may well indicate that at the headquarters of the late Altan-qan, behind Baya-beyiji, Kiya-tayiji was the real power.<sup>92</sup> Čürüke, for the same reasons as Budaširi, also wanted to marry the widow Baya-beyiji, and he had Kiya-tayiji's support. Baya-beyiji herself favoured Čürüke: even after the Third Lady had sent her the required wedding presents, Baya-beyiji declined, preferring to remain on Čürüke's and Kiya-tayiji's side.<sup>93</sup> Warlike conditions ensued between the two rival factions: Budaširi moved troops to the south of Great Bayising, and as a countermeasure, Kiya-tayiji and Čürüke sent troops into the mountains just north of Bayising. The Third Lady, fearing Čürüke's crafty tactics, readied her own soldiers.<sup>94</sup> Small-scale and indecisive yet vicious clashes occurred; all sides suffered losses, and this only aggravated their enmity. A period of raids and counterraids ensued.

With the support of Kiya-tayiji, Čürüke in 1584 married Baya-(Dayičing)-beyiji<sup>95</sup> to the great chagrin, of course, of the Third Lady, who was not at the end of her means, however. Čürüke's biography lists<sup>96</sup> three wives of his: a certain Mongyolčin, Baya (Dayičing)-beyiji, and lastly Erketü Qatun, i.e. the Third Lady. These were not contemporary wives.

<sup>81</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 8, p. 620. *Shen-tsung SL* 184 (TP ed., Vol. 104, p. 3453). WLWKL 8, p. 199.

<sup>82</sup> Kiya-tayiji was an adopted son of Altan-qan, and it was his administrative duties that gave him his power. *Kiya* indeed was not his real name, but his function, and the name of his function became his personal name. The SYCTK 2. 24a defines the word *kiya* as "sülingge, i.e. a capable man administering affairs, big and small, and making decisions, at the headquarters of a nobleman"; and the WLWKL 8, p. 202, states that "Kiya-tayiji who had been in charge of Altan-qan's affairs, was strongly against the Third Lady". Up to recent times, the term *kiya* indicated an officer in the entourage of a prince, and its plural became the name of a clan. A. Mostaert, *Dict. ordos*, p. 408a.

<sup>83</sup> WLWKL 8, op. 202.

<sup>84</sup> WLWKL 8, pp. 198, 202; 9, p. 7.

<sup>85</sup> WLWKL 9, pp. 9, 16.

<sup>86</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 232.

<sup>83</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 8, pp. 90-1. *Shen-tsung SL* 3 (TP ed., Vol. 96, p. 83).

<sup>84</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 201.

<sup>85</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 8, p. 470. *Shen-tsung SL* 134 (TP ed., Vol. 102, p. 2481).

<sup>86</sup> *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi* 2. 47b; WLWKL 8, p. 202. Cf. n. 9.

<sup>87</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 198.

<sup>88</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 196.

<sup>89</sup> WLWKL 8, pp. 196, 198, 203; 9, p. 10.

<sup>90</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 198.

Mongyolc'in at one time was divorced by Čürüke as we gather from this text "(in 1589) Mongyolc'in, the former (*chiu* 舊) wife of Čürüke . . . presented the tribute of horses".<sup>97</sup> And Čürüke must soon have yielded to the Third Lady's pressure and divorced Baya-beyiji too. Čürüke's marriage to Baya-beyiji might improve his power and prestige in Mongolia, but it could not improve his standing with the Chinese or enhance his prospects of becoming Shun-i-wang without the backing of the Third Lady. We know indeed that some time later Budaširi married Baya-beyiji, and that Čürüke in 1586 married the Third Lady. The divorce and marriage must necessarily have been connected.

Baya-beyiji's divorce, apart from the Third Lady's activities, may well have been the result of Chinese pressure: indeed just as the governor-general of Hsüan-fu, Ta-t'ung, and Shan-hsi in former years had urged Sengge to marry the Third Lady in order to insure his enfeoffment as Shun-i-wang, now he did the same and for the same reasons: the biography of Cheng Lo has this revealing passage: "in the fourteenth year (1586) the Čečen-qan, *i.e.* Sengge, died and his son Čürüke ought to succeed. The Third Lady now of mature age disposed of ten thousand well-trained troops; she built herself a city apart (allusion to the lady's withdrawal to the Western Patrol?). Cheng Lo fearing that nobody would be responsible for matters pertaining to tribute and fairs, urged Čürüke: 'for three generations this lady has shown her loyalty: if you can marry her, you will become (Shun-i) wang; otherwise the appointment will go to someone else.' Čürüke thereupon divorced all his concubines and married the Third Lady".<sup>98</sup>

It is evident that Cheng Lo in case of non-compliance was thinking of recommending somebody allied to the Third Lady, namely Budaširi, as Shun-i-wang. If Čürüke, on the other hand, wanted to secure the backing of the Third Lady, he would have to give up Baya-beyiji (and his other wives), leaving Baya-beyiji free to join Budaširi. The result would be that the Third Lady would strengthen her own position of power both in Čürüke's camp and through her son Budaširi in Baya-beyiji's faction as well. In the tenth (lunar) month of 1586, the Third Lady invited Čürüke to come over to her tent "hang up bow and arrow" as a sign of their marriage,<sup>99</sup> and Altan-qan's choice troops finally reverted to Čürüke.<sup>100</sup>

14 During the interregnum while all this was going on, the Third Lady continued to make every effort to preserve the peace with China: in 1585

<sup>97</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 212.

<sup>98</sup> MS 222 (TP ed.), p. 2366a.

<sup>99</sup> WLWKL 9, p. 10. For the meaning of "hanging up bow and arrow" see my paper "A Note on Arrows and Oaths among the Mongols", JAOS 78, 4, 1958, especially pp. 287-8.

<sup>100</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 209.

and 1586, a number of noblemen from Ordos and Tümed had gone to the West, namely to Köke-nuur and the Amdo region, which they could not reach without crossing Chinese territory, namely Kansu Province. Though these areas were thinly populated, the continuous passage and the long stay of the Mongols in the vicinity of such districts as T'ao-chou 洮, Ho-chou 河, Hsi-ning 西寧, inevitably resulted in conflicts with the Chinese population and clashes with the troops. Since Čürüke hoped to be appointed soon, some officials proposed to withhold his appointment until he applied enough pressure upon those marauding bands and urged them to return to their native places. Other officials, afraid to take too uncompromising a stand, instead preferred quietly to withhold the enfeoffment until the Mongols returned of their own accord and took the initiative by requesting the appointment for Čürüke. Some time later, the Third Lady herself promised that the noblemen in the West would soon come home.<sup>101</sup>

As had been done for Sengge, in the third (lunar) month of 1587, some 280 noblemen from Ordos and Tümed presented a joint petition in favour of Čürüke, with a separate letter of commendation from the Third Lady. He was finally enfeoffed as Shun-i-wang on May 3, 1587.<sup>102</sup> On that same day both Budaširi and Čoytu, as indicated above, received the same rank, *Lung-hu Chiang-chün*, and the Third Lady was granted the title of *Chung-shun fu-jen* 忠順夫人 "Loyal and Obedient Lady". According to the WLWKL, this title had been requested by Čürüke, Urüd, and others, evidently as an inducement, or a reward, for the marriage;<sup>103</sup> further, the *Ming-shih* explicitly states that one of the reasons for Čürüke's enfeoffment and the lady's title was the latter's military power and the guarantee she had offered of continued peace on the borders.<sup>104</sup>

15 The alliances and counter-alliances within Mongol society must have been of a very unstable nature. In the biography of Bayaud we read that the Eastern and Western Patrols formed the main divisions of the Twelve Tümed, and that Sengge headed the Eastern Patrol, or wing, while Dayičing (*i.e.* Baya-ači) headed the Western Patrol.<sup>105</sup> This observation must reflect an earlier situation when during Altan-qan's lifetime Baya-ači was put in charge of Bayising, and Sengge had his headquarters in the eastern section of the territory, north of Hsüan-fu.<sup>106</sup> After his accession Sengge moved to

<sup>101</sup> WLWKL 8, pp. 203-4.

<sup>102</sup> The cosignatories, or most of them, are listed in the WLWKL 8, pp. 204-5. May 3, 1587, is the date of the SL: Tamura, *Mökohen* 8, p. 620. *Shen-trung SL* (TP ed., vol. 104, p. 3453). The WLWKL 8, p. 196, dates the appointment from the fifth lunar month, but this is a misprint for the "third month": correct in WLWKL 8, p. 206. MS 327 (TP ed., p. 3767b).

<sup>103</sup> WLWKL 9, pp. 10-11.

<sup>104</sup> MS 327 (TP ed., p. 3767b).

<sup>105</sup> WLWKL 9, p. 102.

<sup>106</sup> *Genealogical Tables*, Table IV.

the western part of Tümed territory. We have already indicated that during Sengge's lifetime, the Third Lady controlled the Western Patrol, and Čürüke, then with little power, was compelled to install himself in the Eastern Corner (*tung-yü*). I presume that "corner" here is the equivalent of "Patrol" or "wing". The SYCTK gives the following line-up: to the Eastern Patrol belonged: the Third Lady and her sons Budaširi (d. 1597), Sha-ch'ih-hsing (=?) (d. 1595), and Irjamtsu (d. 1588).<sup>107</sup> Budaširi's son Su-nang (Sodnam); then: Joriyту, Dayan qung-tayiji and Mergen tayiji of the Dolôd-tümen, Pu-chi-su tabunang, P'in-tu tayiji, Chang-ssu (=?) tabunang, A-pai tayiji (d. 1590), and Üijeng-darqan tabunang of the Uiyur-čin. To the Western Patrol belonged: Dayičing tayiji's (*i.e.* Baya-ači, d. 1583) wife Dayičing-beyiji; her son Leng-k'o-mu tayiji, and her grandson Mōngke; Kiya-tayiji (d. 1591); the Great Lady of "this Chieftain" (=?), Man-wu-she-han tabunang, and Dayičing a-hai tabunang.<sup>108</sup>

This list may well be a compilation of names of persons who at one time had belonged to either of the two groups rather than a precise description of the situation as it was at one particular time. Anyway, it is strange that neither Sengge nor Čürüke are mentioned. By 1586, Čürüke married the Third Lady and around the same time Budaširi (Eastern Patrol) married Baya-beyiji (Western Patrol): these marriages must have brought about new shifts and realliances.

In August 1587, Čürüke, the Third Lady, and the chieftains solemnly promised to observe the pacts and keep the peace.<sup>109</sup> The Third Lady's prestige was as great as ever with the Chinese who remained convinced that she could effectively influence Mongol affairs. We find a proof of this in the fact that when some Mongols in 1587 caused trouble in Kansu, the Shun-i-wang together with the Third Lady exerted enough pressure upon the guilty to restore peace and satisfy border officials,<sup>110</sup> and in the rewards granted in 1589 to Čürüke, the Third Lady, and other chieftains for restraining their subjects and punishing those who nevertheless had violated the borders.<sup>111</sup>

In 1589, the Shun-i-wang, Čürüke, the Third Lady, Baya-beyiji, and a number of leaders went themselves to Köke-nuur to take back to Tibet the ashes of the Third Dalai-lama who had died in Mongolia. This was a great

<sup>107</sup> Besides these three sons, at one point the SL mentions a daughter of the Third Lady, names *Chu-ken-ta(i)-erh*: *Jügender?* Tamura, *Môkohen* 8, p. 647. *Shen-tsung SL* 191 (TP ed., Vol. 104, p. 3584). Except for the fact that she, too, received gifts from China, nothing seems to be known about her.

<sup>108</sup> SYCTK 2.22ab.

<sup>109</sup> SYCTK 2.13b. WLWKL 8, p. 207. Serruys, *Tribute System*, pp. 598-9. "Four Documents . . ." *Mon. Serica* 19, 1969, p. 39.

<sup>110</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 8, pp. 634, 737. *Shen-tsung SL* 187 (TP ed., Vol. 104, pp. 3497-9; 3505-6).

<sup>111</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 8, p. 683. *Shen-tsung SL* 207 (TP ed., Vol. 105, p. 3870).

disappointment to the Chinese, but there was very little they could do about it; however, they kept in close touch with the Third Lady in the hope that she would exercise a measure of influence over her husband. It will be remembered that before his enfeoffment as Shun-i-wang, the Chinese had hinted to Čürüke that the appointment could just as well go to some other person, obviously an allusion to the Third Lady's son Budaširi. Now again the Chinese seriously considered deposing Čürüke and appointing Budaširi in his place.<sup>112</sup> Even if impracticable at this stage, the plan shows that the Chinese were still inclined to trust somebody closely related to the Third Lady. After many delays and false starts that must have been exasperating for the Chinese, towards the end of 1591, Čürüke, the Third Lady, Baya-beyiji, and most of their followers returned to the East. In July, 1592, Čürüke and the Third Lady apologized for their behaviour and the inconveniences caused;<sup>113</sup> Čürüke kept his title of Shun-i-wang and the Third Lady remained in the good graces of Chinese border officials, but the Chinese became increasingly suspicious of Mongol contacts with Tibetans of the Amdo and Köke-nuur regions.

After the Dalai-lama had first come to Köke-nuur in 1577, the Mongols had begun to make regular visits there under the pretext of worshipping the Buddha in Lamaist temples, and the Chinese as a gesture of goodwill and encouragement, hoping that Buddhist teaching would soften Mongol habits and inspire them with a measure of respect for life, had constructed several temples there. But now they began to have second thoughts about those Tibetan and Mongol contacts, even if religious; at least one temple was burned by Chinese soldiers, and border officials decided that from now on no more "pilgrimages" to Buddhist shrines in Amdo and Köke-nuur would be permitted.<sup>114</sup> But in Mongolia itself Lamaism continued to be favoured. As early as the first part of the fifteenth century and more recently in the 1570s, Mongol noblemen had often requested Buddhist sutras and various religious articles from the Ming Court; on several occasions the Mongols had asked that Tibetan lamas be sent to them (there were many Tibetans in Peking). The Court had usually met these requests. So now again (1593) Čürüke and the Third Lady asked for Tibetan lamas to instruct them in the sutras, and the Ministry of Rites readily complied.<sup>115</sup> The Third Lady's interest in Buddhism is also confirmed by Mongol sources, as we shall see later.

<sup>112</sup> WLWKL 8, pp. 198-9, 222; 9, pp. 11-12. Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 44. *Shen-tsung SL* 228 (TP ed., Vol. 106, p. 4227).

<sup>113</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 169. *Shen-tsung SL* 249 (TP ed., Vol. 107, p. 4633).

<sup>114</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 84. *Shen-tsung SL* 235 (TP ed., Vol. 106, p. 4363).

<sup>115</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 198. *Shen-tsung SL* 256 (TP ed., Vol. 107, p. 4754). One of the four lamas dispatched on this occasion had carried out a similar mission in 1572 (WLWKL 8, pp. 153, 155).

16 In 1593, an officer of Mongol ancestry commanding the garrison of Ning-hsia rebelled and actively sought the support of the Mongols. Should the Mongols side with the rebels, it was evident that the Chinese government would have a grave problem on its hands. Some Ordos Mongols, but not many, joined the rebels, but Čürüke and the Third Lady assured the government of their loyalty and promised to prevent as far as possible other Mongols from supporting the rebels.<sup>116</sup>

Hereafter no major conflicts seem to have broken out; in referring to Čürüke's relations, whether with China or with other Mongol tribes, Chinese sources most of the time mention the Third Lady together with him, implying that she remained a power in those relations. Thus, for example, in 1601-2 some sort of difference seems to have existed between, on the one hand, Čürüke and the Third Lady, and, on the other hand, the Čaqar Mongols.<sup>117</sup> In 1603 some border officials thought that they detected military preparations and emissaries were dispatched to ask for an explanation of Čürüke and the Third Lady.<sup>118</sup> In 1605, the nobleman Urūd tayiji had his subsidies and market privileges revoked and Čürüke was urged to intervene and punish the guilty; and indeed a little later Čürüke, the Third Lady, and Baya-beyiji's son, Su-nang, were praised for their efforts and successful intervention.<sup>119</sup>

In 1606 Čürüke was reported to be gravely ill; this illness caused some confusion and delays in the yearly tribute presentation. Once again the Chinese border officials foresaw the possibility of disturbances, especially on the part of this Urūd tayiji just mentioned, who had become one of the leading noblemen. The only trouble that did ensue was that Urūd competed more aggressively with the others for the yearly gifts and subsidies which border officials often illegally granted in order to buy peace in their particular area of responsibility. Čürüke had at times claimed a larger share himself. Now with the Shun-in-wang ill, it was the Third Lady who once more had taken possession of the seal and who intervened and played the same game.<sup>120</sup>

17 Čürüke's death is not recorded in his biographical note in the WLWKL, but we find it recorded in the *Shih-lu* under the date of May 15, 1607; on

<sup>116</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 213. *Shen-tsung SL* 263 (TP ed., Vol. 107, p. 4872). WLWKL 8, p. 232.

<sup>117</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 378, 394-5. *Shen-tsung SL* 363, 373 (TP ed., Vol. 112, pp. 6758, 7005).

<sup>118</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 416. *Shen-tsung SL* 387 (TP ed., Vol. 113, p. 7271).

<sup>119</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, 450. *Shen-tsung SL* 412 (TP ed., Vol. 114, p. 7716).

<sup>120</sup> E.g., Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, pp. 461, 465. *Shen-tsung SL* 421 (TP ed., Vol. 115, p. 7974; the second passage is not in this edition).

this occasion his widow, the Third Lady, is said to be "old".<sup>121</sup> The Ministry of the Army requested a postponement of memorial services for the deceased Shun-i-wang and advised withholding the appointment of a successor until the situation in Mongolia had stabilized. It was to become a long interim.

Immediately after Čürüke's death, it was the Third Lady again who officially informed the Chinese government on June 21,<sup>122</sup> and once again this indicates unmistakably her prominent position. Memorial services were ordered as had been done for Čürüke's predecessors, but the *Shih-lu* already hints at the rivalry between two contenders for the succession, a rivalry which, officials feared, could affect the security of border areas, and did in fact prevent an appointment until 1612. The two contenders were Čürüke's grandson Buşuytu<sup>123</sup> and Su-nang (Sodnam < bSod-nams)<sup>124</sup> the son of Budaşiri and the lady Baya-beyiji.

<sup>121</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, pp. 496, 498. *Shen-tsung SL* 432, 433 (TP ed., Vol. 115, pp. 8176, 8185). SYCTK 2. 39a: "fourth month of the 35th year" (26 April-25 May, 1607). The SYCTK 2.5a, and the *Ssu-i k'ao*, WPC 226. 20a erroneously have "34th year". The WLWKL, or at least this section on Čürüke, must have been written before 1607, although the general preface is dated from 1612.

<sup>122</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 502. *Shen-tsung SL* 435 (TP ed., Vol. 115, p. 8226).

<sup>123</sup> Mongol sources make Buşuytu the son of Čürüke (*Altan Kürdüin mingyan kegesütu biçig*, p. 59 [VI: 7b]; *Bolor Erike*, Part V, p. 342; Kalgan ed. p. 685). This is an error. The genealogical tables attached to the Pei-Lu feng-su, the tables in the SYCTK, and a number of other Chinese sources leave no doubt that Buşuytu was not Čürüke's (only) son, as the Mongol sources maintain. Čürüke had several sons, the eldest being one Ch'ao-t'u: Čoytu, who died before his father's death. Buşuytu was Čoytu's son: when Čürüke became Shun-i-wang (3 May, 1587). Čoytu was promoted to the rank of *Lung-hu Chiang-chün*, but in December 1587, She-la-k'o-t'an tayiji, another name for Buşuytu, inherited this rank: Čoytu must have died shortly before (Tamura, *Môkohen* 8, p. 708. *Shen-tsung SL* 217. TP ed., Vol. 105, p. 4053; SYCTK 2. 39ab). What *She-la-k'o-t'an* stands for is not certain. As to the name Buşuytu, this is the reading of the Mongol sources. One could also spell *Bofuytu*, the modern standard reading. Its meaning is "having a mandate". However, in view of the Chinese transcription *pu*, found in all sources, I believe that here we had better spell *buşuytu*. The Chinese rendition of the second syllable *shih* would normally indicate a reading *š(y)*, but in view of the Mongol written form we must maintain *š(y)*; the Chinese transcription most probably is due to a reduced pronunciation of the vowel, unclear to Chinese ears. Ivan Petlin (see Appendix) in 1618 heard *buşuytu*. As already indicated (n. 81), there is another Buşuytu repeatedly mentioned in Chinese sources, this is not the same person. He was the *jinong* of Ordos, who according to the Ordos chronicler SaYang-sečen, was born in 1565, became *jinong* of the Ordos in 1576, and died in 1624 (*Erdeni-yin Tobči*; Schmidt, *Geschichte*, pp. 222-3. *Genealogical Tables*, pp. 59-60). These two Buşuytu's were relatives of course, one a descendant of Mergen *jinong* of Ordos, the other a descendant of Mergen *jinong*'s brother, Altan-qan. Petlin, mentioned in the foregoing lines, who met or heard about Buşuytu during his trip through the Tümed region, identified Buşuytu as the ruler of the Uyi-yurčin. This is indeed confirmed by the genealogical tables.

<sup>124</sup> Su-nang, or So-nang, probably stands for Sodnam, bSod-nams, although one would expect a Chinese transcription *nan-nam* for the second syllable, not *nang*. The same name, not necessarily the same man, is also transcribed *so-lang*: Tamura, *Môkohen* 8, pp. 112, 113.

Su-nang~Sodnam has no place in the genealogical tables appended to the *Pei-Lu feng-su*, but the corresponding tables in the SYCTK say that Budaširi's eldest son was Su-nang. The *Wu-pei chih*<sup>125</sup> calls him Abuṣai, or Wen-pu: Ombo, or Su-nang, Sodnam. The SYCTK has this on him: "Su-nang qung-tayiji, offspring of Baya-beyiji. Formerly, when Baya-ači died, Budaširi married his widow Baya-beyiji: they had a son, Su-nang. Thanks to the power of his grandmother, the Loyal and Obedient [*i.e.* Third] Lady, he was able to annex the people of Bayising and he became known as very rich and powerful. He had a quarrel with Bušuytu. His mother, Baya-beyiji, grateful that (the Ming) had not killed (Baya-ači and herself) when they surrendered (1570), always showed extreme respect and obedience, and then when Bušuytu was appointed (as Shun-i-wang in 1612) a request was made to grant Baya-beyiji the title of *Chung-i fu-jen* 忠義夫人 'Loyal and Righteous Lady', and to make Su-nang *tu-tu t'ung-chih* 都督同知 in order to display sympathy and generosity. He has a son, Hsi-ling (Sereng tayiji)."<sup>126</sup>

We have seen how anxious the Third Lady was in 1583 to have her son Budaširi marry Baya-ači's widow, and the author of the WLWKL remarks that in the opinion of officials such a union would be greatly advantageous to China.<sup>127</sup> Such a marriage indeed would unite the subjects of Baya-ači and Baya-beyiji with those under the Third Lady's control. Baya-beyiji however, did not agree with the Third Lady and married Čürüke, who also intended to bring Bayising and Baya-beyiji's subjects under his control. We have seen that Čürüke married the Third Lady towards the end of 1586: he must have divorced Baya-beyiji some time before that date, and she must then have married Budaširi.

Su-nang, Sodnam, the son of this union had a son named Hsi-ling, Sereng, who is mentioned in the *Shih-lu* in 1625:<sup>128</sup> in that year Sereng inherited his father's title of *Lung-hu Chiang-chün*, implying that Sodnam was dead. The genealogical tables<sup>129</sup> list a grandson of Baya-ači and Baya-beyiji by the name of Mōngke tayiji. The commentary says that since the boy's father had died very early, he was raised in his grandmother's, Baya-beyiji's, quarters. That means that after 1585-6, he lived in Sodnam's entourage. Mōngke's name appears in the *Shih-lu* in 1612, when he was approved for a promotion in rank, together with many others including his grandmother;<sup>130</sup> but in another passage he is described as a grandson of the

<sup>125</sup> WPC 206.4a.

<sup>126</sup> SYCTK 2.32ab. *Genealogical Tables*, pp. 106-7. WPC 226.20a. KPSTK 16.24b.

<sup>127</sup> WLWKL 8, pp. 198-9 (biogr. of Budaširi); 9, p. 7 (biogr. of the Third Lady); 8, p. 202.

<sup>128</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 10, p. 203.

<sup>129</sup> *Genealogical Tables*, p. 73; SYCTK 2.30a.

old lady and a son of Sodnam.<sup>131</sup> Sodnam may have adopted him as a son; or the Chinese, since he lived in Sodnam's quarters, may have thought of him as Sodnam's son.

18 The *Ming-shih*<sup>132</sup> limits itself to a few lines to describe the struggle between Bušuytu and Sodnam for supremacy, and the delay of the appointment of a Shun-i-wang: "Bušuytu wanted to marry the Loyal and Obedient [*i.e.* Third Lady], but she refused. Sodnam tayiji, Urūd tayiji, and others who belonged to his tribes, all refused to submit to him, so that for a long time no decision was made regarding his appointment and title. In the 41st year [Wan-li: 1613; actually it was 1611] Bušuytu finally married the Loyal and Obedient Lady and all tribal chieftains presented a petition requesting (Bušuytu's) enfeoffment. The Loyal and Obedient (Lady) thereupon died. An imperial decree enfeoffed Bušuytu as Shun-i-wang, and since Baya-beyiji had always shown respect and obedience, she was granted the title of Loyal and Righteous Lady (*Chung-i fu-jen*). Bušuytu was Čürüke's grandson but at the time he inherited the enfeoffment (his power) was already on the decline. He controlled only the Twelve Tribes outside the border districts of Shan (-hsi) and Ta (-t'ung). Such chieftains of his as Urūd, Sodnam, Üüsin tayiji, and others possessed military power equal to that of the Shun-i-wang."

This rivalry between Bušuytu and Sodnam centred around control of people and troops, and control of the revenues derived from the tribute and the horse fairs. The contest, however, involved many more than just those two leaders; and among others it involved also the Third Lady. The contest was only indirectly about succession to the title of Shun-i-wang. Although Sodnam indeed on several occasions claimed that the title should go to him, the Chinese authorities never seem to have considered him as a possible alternative to Bušuytu. From the start, Bušuytu was considered the rightful successor, but the appointment was held up for years because the Third Lady in her old age refused to marry a fourth time, and Sodnam strongly backed her. It is a little difficult to understand why the Chinese continued to believe that the Third Lady would for ever be a restraining influence upon the Shun-i-wang. But the marriage seems to have been the first condition for the appointment. Then the struggle itself "around family affairs" as the Chinese sources put it, was closely followed by the border officials and as long as it was not settled they remained apprehensive of the outcome and the effects it might have on border affairs.

<sup>130</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, pp. 645, 648. *Shen-tzung SL* 500 (TP ed., Vol. 118, p. 9467).

<sup>131</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 10, p. 100. *Shen-tzung SL* 576 (TP ed., Vol. 122, p. 10910).

<sup>132</sup> *MS* 327 (TP ed., p. 3768a). L. Hambis' translation in *Documents*, p. 83, slightly differs from mine here.

Bušuytu was willing enough to marry the Third Lady, less it would appear, for the woman herself, than for the increment of power the marriage would entail. Through the process of ever-splitting appanages, through equal inheritance of all sons; then through endemic near-civil war conditions, and perpetual unrest in a very unstable society, Bušuytu somehow had been reduced to the status of a minor tribal chieftain, and that in spite of the fact that he was Čürück's eldest grandson and prospective heir to the title of Shun-i-wang. The title itself would certainly strengthen his position, but in the meantime he could not get the title without first improving his standing with the other chieftains. If he could marry the Third Lady even in her "old age", the people she controlled, the power she wielded, and especially the wealth she had accumulated during forty years of tribute relations would fall to him. The trouble was that Sodnam, the lady's grandson, closer to that source of power, was determined by all means to prevent the marriage, with the hope of blocking Bušuytu and inheriting the title himself. All the moves and countermoves by so many people involved and described in a fragmentary way in reports to the Central Government in Peking as they now appear in the *Shih-lu* are almost impossible to reconstruct,<sup>133</sup> but a few highlights from those years will help to give the reader an idea of how unstable Mongol society must have been.

19 The SYCTK<sup>134</sup> has a brief account of the tribute relations beginning with Altan-qan's "surrender" in 1570 (*Feng-kung*: "Enfeoffment and Tribute"). The section relevant to those years is more comprehensive than the summary of the *Ming-shih*, yet even so it is no more than a broad outline, but it gives us an insight into the mentality, and the various points of view of the many people involved, and I think it deserves to be translated here.

"[5a] The 34th year (Wan-li: 1606; error for 1607)<sup>135</sup> Čürüke died; his eldest son Čoytu tayiji had already died and his grandson Bušuytu was due to succeed, but the Third Lady's son Budaširi had married Dayičing-beyiji, widow of (Bay-a-) Ači, son of his [*i.e.* Budaširi's] elder brother by another mother, and had a son Su-nang (Sodnam) who was [5b] extremely crafty and intelligent, and skilled in the use of troops. He eyed the profits of the (Shun-i) wang's (horse) fairs.<sup>136</sup> He looked down upon Bušuytu who

<sup>133</sup> Prof. Aoki has described some of those events at length in his article "Bušuytu no jungiō shōchū ni tsuite" in *Kita Aija Minzokugaku ronshū* 2, 1966, pp. 1-24; 3, 1966, pp. 39-62.

<sup>134</sup> SYCTK 2.5a sq. The same events are retold, often in identical words, in the *Ssu-i k'ao*, WPC 226. 2a sq., and in the KPSTK 16. 24b-26a.

<sup>135</sup> The same error in the WPC 226. 20a; KPSTK 16. 24b: "32nd year".

<sup>136</sup> In the KPSTK 16.24b: "relying on his grandmother, he annexed the people of Bayising".

commanded so few tribes and belonged to a junior grandson's generation.<sup>137</sup> He rudely told his grandmother, the Loyal and Obedient (Lady): 'you are old; how could you again honorably marry a despicable youngster! The enfeoffment started with my mother Dayičing-baya-beyiji following Baya-tayiji when he surrendered to China. It was on account of my father<sup>138</sup> and mother that China enfeoffed my grandfather as a prince. When my grandfather died, (Baya-) Ači should have succeeded as wang, and when he died, my father, Budaširi, should have succeeded; and when he died, I was the one who should have succeeded. Who is this Bušuytu? I am the direct grandson of (you) my grandmother and, if the princely succession is not given to me but left to Bušuytu who is not even a relative (of yours), I cannot tolerate it. What is more, you are old and in poor health; you have served three princes in succession: how can you again love this greenhorn-boy Bušuytu? How are you to face the (tribal) people with honour?' The Loyal and Obedient (Lady) felt very much ashamed.

"Bušuytu, since he ought to succeed as prince, arrogantly entered the Loyal and Obedient (Lady's) felt tent and sat down in the place of honour, just staring at Sodnam without looking left or right. Thereupon Sodnam angrily [6a] conspired with the various tribes: if Bušuytu should ever again enter the Loyal and Obedient (Lady's) tent, they would give him a beating, so that Bušuytu did not dare to present himself again. The Loyal and Obedient (Lady) despised Bušuytu as a simpleton unequal to his business. Mau-mingyan<sup>139</sup> who was crafty and clever, was a secret ally of Sodnam and heavily bribed his entourage to praise (Sodnam) in unison, and the Loyal and Obedient (Lady) spoke to Chinese (officials) requesting the princely dignity for him. The flag (*tso-tu* 座纛),<sup>140</sup> the falcon-keepers, the fluteplayers<sup>141</sup> left

<sup>137</sup> Sodnam was a grandson of Altan-qan; but Bušuytu was a grandson of Čürüke, himself a grandson, so that Čürüke and Sodnam belonged to the same generation. Bušuytu was "minor".

<sup>138</sup> Baya-ači, of course, was not Sodnam's father, except by way of speaking, but his mother's first husband.

<sup>139</sup> Mau-mingyan, often referred to for short as Mingyan, was Čürüke's second son. *Genealogical Tables*, Table IV, No. 125. KPSTK 16.25a; WPC 226.21a.

<sup>140</sup> *Tso-tu* 座纛; in the *Ssu-i k'ao*, WPC 226. 21a, written *tso* 坐 -*tu*, in Mongol: *tuy* "the flag, *sūlde*, seat of the protector or the ruler"; the flag was not only a religious object, it was also a symbol of the ruler's power. See my paper "Mongol Prayer to the Spirit of Činggis-qan's Flag", in L. Ligeti (ed.), *Mongolian Studies*, pp. 527-35. For the derivation of Mongol *tuy* < Chinese *tu*, see J. Otto Maenchen-Helfen, *The World of the Huns*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1973, p. 411.

<sup>141</sup> It was not so much that the men associated with those objects were under Mau-mingyan's control, but that the property of the former Shun-i-wang was not in the possession of the presumed successor. *Pi-la* is derived from *pi-li* 鼙鼓, probably under the influence of the word *la-pa* "trumper". See my "Chinese in Southern Mongolia during the 16th Century", *Mon. Serica* 18, 1959, pp. 71-2, n. 263. The Mongol *pi-li* is sometimes described as *so-na*, a kind of obo. In standard Mongol the word is *biler*, *pileri* in Manchu: Kowalewski, *Dict. M. R. F.*, p. 1142b: "Chin. *so-na*: chalubler".

by Čürüke were in (Mau)mingyan's place. The governor-general Ma Ming-luan 馬鳴鑾 and the governor (of Ta-t'ung district) conferred: 'the Caitiff prince's seal is in the Loyal and Obedient (Lady's) place, and if she does not give it up, Bušuytu will be prince in name only;<sup>142</sup> and if she does not promise to marry, she will certainly not give up the prince's seal; if there are disturbances among the Caitiff tribes, we will rely on the Loyal and Obedient (Lady) to control them. At the present time internal control<sup>143</sup> rests with Sodnam, and his secret ally is (Mau-)mingyan. What can Bušuytu do?'

"As for a long time Bušuytu did not get the enfeoffment, he sent a messenger to the governor-general (with these words): 'the reason (why in (our) Caitiff land the (Shun-i-)wang is held in high regard is that he has the power to control the (horse) fairs and the subsidies; but now every year [6b] the tribute is presented with an unstamped vassal letter: if the (chieftains) do not lose the (income from) fairs and subsidies (while there is no Shun-i-wang) what do they need a (Shun-i-)wang for? If the fairs were closed and the subsidies stopped it would not take long for me to become (Shun-i-)wang!' The governor-general began by issuing an order to close the great fairs<sup>144</sup> but the Loyal and Obedient (Lady) violently objected to (this order) and maintained that it could not be put into effect, and as a result the tribute was presented and the (great) fairs were held as usual. Bušuytu was angry and resentful.

"From 1607 to 1610, the situation inside and outside (the borders) remained unsettled and it was said that it would not be possible to continue tribute relationship. In the first decade of the ninth (lunar) month [1610], Ma (Ming-luan) died,<sup>145</sup> and T'u Tsung-chün 塗宗澹 became governor-general;<sup>146</sup> Ho 霍 (P'eng 鵬) was removed from office and Wang K'o-shou 王可受 replaced him.<sup>147</sup>

—Continued from previous page

meau". *Wu-t'i Ch'ing-wen chien*, Peking, 1957, p. 717. For *pi-li* "obo", under the Sui and T'ang, see Ed. H. Schafer, *The Golden Peaches of Samarkand. A Study of T'ang Exotics*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963, pp. 41, 289, n. 2. In the Korean *Shih-lu*, *Yijo sillok* 李朝實錄, Tokyo, 1956, Vol. 10, p. 119, there are pictures of a "T'ang *pi-li*" and a "Country (native?) *pi-li*"; the difference seems to be the length of the instruments.

<sup>142</sup> Literally, "empty prince". WPC 226.21a adds: "although enfeoffed, he will be as if not enfeoffed".

<sup>143</sup> *Nei-chih*. In WPC 226.21a clearer: *chung-shun nei-chih*: "the Loyal and Obedient (Lady's) internal control. . ."

<sup>144</sup> The great fairs were held once a year in a number of places along the borders; the little fairs were smaller affairs held once a month, not necessarily in the same places.

<sup>145</sup> Ma's death is mentioned in Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, p. 609. *Shen-tsung SL* 476 (TP ed., Vol. 117, p. 8998). There is a biographical note in the *SL* 485, Vol. 117, pp. 9135-6..

<sup>146</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, p. 612 (14 March, 1611). *Shen-tsung SL* 480 (TP ed., Vol. 117, p. 9041).

<sup>147</sup> I believe that Wang is referred to the first time in early 1611. Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, p. 611. *Shen-tsung SL* 479 (TP ed., Vol. 117, p. 9025).

"The following year [1611] in the first (lunar) month, Urūd tayiji<sup>148</sup> summoned chiefs and tribesmen, over a hundred thousand in all, to assemble in the Plain of Feng-chou 豐州灘: he wanted to agitate against Sodnam and force (the Third Lady) to marry (Bušuytu), and Sodnam and the Loyal and Obedient (Lady) feeling ashamed to be thus forced, readied their best troops to fight Urūd and the other noblemen. This event became the occasion for Bušuytu to achieve his marriage plans, and together with the Loyal and Obedient (Lady) he conceived a plan: '(from) my ancestor to his grandson three generations have received the appointment of (Shun-i-wang) and over and above the regular subsidies we must demand more.' Therefore from the fifth to the eighth month no word was ever said regarding the petition for enfeoffment. Then finally in the ninth month (Bušuytu) sent Kan-t'ai [Taltai?], Batur, Chi Hu, and others to ask for a new seal,<sup>149</sup> [7a], larger subsidies, and an increase (in the number of) fairs 'to test me'. Unexpectedly, the Caitiff (Third) Lady died of illness. Now that Sodnam had lost his grandmother, in his arrogance and pride he failed to keep the appointment, and stole all the gold, silver, and other objects which the Caitiff Lady had given to Bušuytu and the latter dared not resist! Indeed Bušuytu's servants were subjects of the Caitiff Lady, and the people he relied upon were the Caitiff Lady's troops and cavalry. He had nobody else's support to impose himself (as ruler).

"Sodnam disposed his associates left and right and came again (through messengers to the Chinese borders) to argue (about the enfeoffment). The office of the governor remonstrated: 'Under Altan-qan we had a compact which one generation has handed to the next and it has always been the eldest son who was made (Shun-i-)wang and the tribes have always given him their loyalty; if you should go counter to the agreements, the Three Branches and the Twelve Tribes, devoted to their duty, will call for your punishment: how will you answer them? Moreover, our Celestial Dynasty gives out enfeoffment according to your custom; not to obey would be to go against the Celestial Dynasty.' The messengers returned to report (to Sodnam). Thereupon in the ninth month the tribal chiefs presented a joint guarantee and petitioned the enfeoffment (in favour of Bušuytu). But Bušuytu departed to pasture in the steppe over ten thousand head of cattle and horses left by the Caitiff Lady, and cunningly said that on account of the cold winter weather he was returning to his base [lit. 'lair'] to fetch clothes. The truth was that he drove the cattle and horses to Kōkenuur. The tribes gathered and petitioned again and [7b] obtained an imperial decree approving Bušuytu to succeed as Shun-i-wang; since she had displayed respect and obedience, Baya-beyiji was approved to receive the

<sup>148</sup> KPSTC 16.25a: Sengge's second son.

<sup>149</sup> *Kai-yin*, lit. "change the seal" meaning not only a new seal, but a new title with a new seal having the appropriate inscription.

title of *Chung-i fu-jen* 'Loyal and Righteous Lady'; others were promoted in rank and rewarded proportionately."

20 If this account gives an idea of the manoeuvrings of Buşuytu and Sodnam for supremacy, it does not provide all the details. The *Shih-lu*, in scattered fragments, provides additional information on these five years of intrigues, but even these scattered notes leave many facets unclear.

What is stated more than once is that Buşuytu was "only one man," and "a poor chieftain residing in Kōke-nuur";<sup>150</sup> and even if the Chinese took it for granted that the succession should be his, it was only thanks to the support of some powerful noblemen such as Urūd, that he finally came to be appointed.

In the eyes of Chinese officials the Third Lady had over the years become the symbol of good relations with China, and just as after the death of the previous Shun-i-wangs, they now insisted that Buşuytu first marry her, in spite of the difference in age. Now, just as in previous circumstances, the Third Lady held the Shun-i-wang's seal and during the years 1606-12 continued to present the tribute and receive revenues. True, as long as there was no Shun-i-wang, she could not affix the seal to any vassal letters, and officials found this quite normal.<sup>151</sup> On more than one occasion, officials stated that for generations, the Third Lady had been the main force for peace while the chieftains were debauched and ineffective. They compared her to a Hsiung-nu lady who exerted powerful influence over her husband in early history.<sup>152</sup> If Buşuytu was willing enough for the sake of revenues and power accruing to him, the Third Lady was not ready to comply, and for the same reason: if she pleaded old age, the real reason no doubt was that she did not want to give up all or even part of her revenues; then, as we read in the SYCTK account, her grandson Sodnam had reasons of his own to prevent the marriage: he had claims of his own and he did not want to strengthen Buşuytu's chances.<sup>153</sup> This is the reason, of course, why Buşuytu protested the tribute presented by the Third Lady during the interim period: if the lady and for that matter other chieftains continued to derive their benefits from official relations with China, he could not expect them

<sup>150</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, p. 647. WPC 226. 24a.

<sup>151</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, pp. 565, 566, 582. *Shen-tsung SL* 461, 468 (TP ed., Vol. 116, p. 8706; Vol. 117, p. 8848).

<sup>152</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, pp. 566, 611. *Shen-tsung SL* 479 (TP ed., Vol. 117, p. 9025). The reference to the Hsiung-nu chieftain Mao-tun's consort is in the *Shih-chi* 93 (Po-na pen) 3a. B. Watson, *Records of the Grand Historian of China*, New York, 1961, Vol. 1, p. 236. As to the term *yen-chih*: consort used in these texts, see J. J. M. De Groot, *Die Hunnen der vorchristlichen Zeit*, Berlin-Leipzig, 1921, pp. 50, 124; P. Demiéville, "Quelques traits de mœurs barbares" in *Acta Orient. H.* 15, 1962, p. 74, n. 17; V. S. Taskin, *Materialy po Istorii Syunnu. Po Kitaiskim Istočnikam I*, Moskva, 1968, p. 130, n. 88.

<sup>153</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, pp. 565-6.

to give him much support for his ambitions. He wanted the tribute stopped and the horse fairs closed until he was Shun-i-wang, and at one time a decision was made along that line. But then it was immediately revoked at the Third Lady's insistence.

Chinese officials, too, struggled with this question, whether to close the fairs and suspend the tribute for the time being: some officials in 1609 argued that as long as there was no Shun-i-wang, subsidies nominally going to him should be suspended, and any chieftain who in some way threatened to become a danger on the borders should be excluded altogether from tribute and subsidies; others thought that such a measure would amount to provocation. The former officials argued that there was no question of provocation: Buşuytu and Sodnam were fighting over the revenues, and if they could get revenues without there being a Shun-i-wang installed, they would have little appreciation for the dignity of the Shun-i-wang, and in such a case what leverage would China have left?<sup>154</sup> The fact is that during all those years tribute, fairs, and subsidies continued as before. The Mongol nobility's and the chieftains' need of Chinese luxuries and manufactures remained a powerful incentive to respect the borders and made them subject to Chinese manipulation. This controversy around fairs and subsidies seems to have originated with a fight between (Mau-) mingyan, one of Sodnam's associates, and Buşuytu for men and cattle: the *Shih-lu* explains that (Mau-) mingyan demanded extra subsidies just to discredit Buşuytu and prevent his enfeoffment.<sup>155</sup>

21 The narrative of the SYCTK speaks of a meeting called by Urūd early in 1611 to force the Third Lady to marry Buşuytu. In fact Urūd tayiji seems to have called more than one such meeting. Already in December 1610, the Minister of the Army in Peking mentioned an assembly convoked by Urūd to work for Buşuytu, but Sodnam and Mau-mingyan were strongly opposed and even chased Buşuytu away. Urūd and his allies were totally helpless, and even the Third Lady disapproved of Sodnam's and Mau-mingyan's action but was unable to restrain them.<sup>156</sup> Which seems to indicate that, contrary to frequent assertions by Chinese officials, the Third Lady was not always so effective in imposing her will upon her relatives and associates after all. It was shortly hereafter (in January 1611) that the same Minister of the Army stated that the tribute must be accepted, and the fairs must remain open in order to pacify the Third Lady, Urūd tayiji, Sodnam, etc., while at the same time Urūd must be encouraged to continue to work for Buşuytu and have the succession settled.

<sup>154</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, pp. 562-3, 565. *Shen-tsung SL* 460, 461 (TP ed., Vol. 116, pp. 8690-1, 8706).

<sup>155</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, pp. 565-7, 647. *Shen-tsung SL* 500 (TP ed., Vol. 118, pp. 9466-7).

<sup>156</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, pp. 608-9. *Shen-tsung SL* 476 (TP ed., Vol. 117, p. 8997).

The SYCTK places Urûd's convention in the first lunar month of 1611. In August 1611, the new governor T'u Tsung-chün mentioned a gathering of seventy-three tayiji's convoked by Urûd in the spring of the current year: the confrontation between Urûd and his allies on the one hand and Sodnam, the Third Lady and their associates on the other, almost led to armed conflict. As stated in the SYCTK, this meeting was held in Feng-chou-t'an,<sup>157</sup> but according to a passage in the *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi*<sup>158</sup> a second meeting was held at Bayan-obô in the fourth lunar month. It was at this meeting (or meetings), which must have been a stormy confrontation, that Urûd forced the Third Lady to accept Buşuytu's offer of marriage. And indeed shortly thereafter, she yielded, but not before a Chinese intervention to prevent war: through messengers sent by Sodnam, the governor-general exhorted Sodnam, the Third Lady, and Baya-beyiji not to resort to war, and they promised to obey. The governor-general also sent a message to Urûd to desist from military action, and Urûd promised to reduce his forces by half.<sup>159</sup>

The marriage between Buşuytu and the Third Lady is mentioned first in a report by the Minister of the Army,<sup>160</sup> and a few days later in a report by the governor of Ta-t'ung in the *Shih-lu* entry of August 1611, referred to above. According to the Minister, with the marriage concluded, Buşuytu's enfeoffment was soon to follow. However, he also noted that Buşuytu's main concern was to get hold of the military tablets of authority, probably including the princely seal as well, still held by the Third Lady, and to increase his share of the revenues. The Minister noted that Buşuytu craved Chinese manufactures. The governor's report from August states that the marriage took place on 21 June, 1611. Evidently the marriage was largely due to Urûd's pressure. But this marriage, now finally a fact, did not solve all the difficulties. Urûd, Sodnam, the Third Lady, and the Chinese border officials, all continued to play their own game.

22 With the marriage conditions fulfilled, Buşuytu's appointment as Shun-i-wang was not forthcoming automatically. As in the cases of Sengge and Čürüke, the Chinese wanted a joint petition by the leading noblemen, but Buşuytu was strongly opposed to such a petition, probably because he did not want to owe a debt to the Mongol nobility. He thought that China "needed" him more than he needed China, and that Chinese officials would be eager enough to appoint him without a joint petition and enhance his prestige both in China and in Mongolia.

<sup>157</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 617. *Shen-tsung SL* 475 (TP ed., Vol. 117, p. 9145).

<sup>158</sup> *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi* 2, 48b.

<sup>159</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, pp. 617-18. *Shen-tsung SL* 485 (TP ed., Vol. 117, pp. 9145-6).

<sup>160</sup> Tamura, *Manshûken* 4, p. 397. *Shen-tsung SL* 484 (TP ed., Vol. 117, p. 9122).

Urûd had plans of his own too; as the *Shih-lu* tells it, he wanted Čürüke's remains to be transferred to Kuei-hua-ch'eng, but it is not clear what he had in mind by this. He also forced Sodnam to transfer half of the people of Bayising to Buşuytu's authority, but the Third Lady was opposed to such a move, and once again it almost came to war between the two factions. Whether the transfer was actually made or not is not clear; probably it was not, and the Third Lady had to mollify Urûd with gifts of horses, silver, and silks. Evidently the Third Lady, now married to Buşuytu, and so highly regarded by everybody, was still unable to control Urûd, and the majority of the Mongol leaders were backing Urûd tayiji rather than Buşuytu. His strength was growing all the time, while the Third Lady was getting more and more isolated. Urûd also felt strong enough to send a large delegation to the governor-general of Ta-t'ung, claiming great merits and demanding payment of allegedly unpaid subsidies of previous years, and a substantial increase of the subsidies, but the governor-general curtly rejected these claims.

But besides an increase of subsidies, Buşuytu, according to the *Ssu-i k'ao*,<sup>161</sup> also wanted another title, namely that of Ch'in 秦 wang: the reason must have been that even after their marriage he had been unable to pry the seal of the Shun-i-wang out of the Third Lady's hands. Although the SYCTK mentions only a request for a "new seal", seal and title are inseparable, of course.

The lady's independent wealth appears from another episode occurring about this time after their marriage: the *Ssu-i k'ao* relates how she showed Buşuytu the gold, silver, brocades, furs of every type and description, and precious stones which during three generations of Shun-i-wangs she had accumulated and stored in a Buddhist temple. Buşuytu was so impressed, the text goes on, that he decided to press again for more subsidies for himself from the Chinese.<sup>162</sup> This must be the Hung-tz'u ssu 弘慈寺 of Kuei-hua-ch'eng, dating back to Altan-qan's time. The Ming Court had granted this title in January 1581.<sup>163</sup> This must also be the temple which,

<sup>161</sup> WPC 226.23a.

<sup>162</sup> WPC 226.22b.

<sup>163</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 8, pp. 421-2. *Shen-tsung SL* 107 (TP ed., Vol. 101, p. 2060). The title is not in the SL, but in another passage listed by Tamura, in the WLWKL 8, p. 174, and in *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi* 2, 47a. There is every reason to believe that the Hung-tz'u ssu is the temple later known as *Da-juu, Yeke-juu* "Great Temple", and *Çaylasi ügei süme, Wu-liang ssu* 無量寺 "Immeasurable Temple". (Vladimirtsov, "Nadpisi . . .", p. 227). Pozdneev visited the temple in 1893, and impressed with its size and beauty surpassing all the other temples of Kuei-hua-ch'eng and neighbourhood, he gave a brief description of it (*Mongoliya i Mongoly*, St Pb. II, 1898, pp. 56-8). The *Çaylasi ügei süme-yin jerge-yin bügüde süme-yin uy bayiyuluysan yabudal-i baçayaysan dangsa* "Register wherein are investigated the activities of the founding of all temples of the kind of the Immeasurable Temple" in W. Heissig (ed.), *Erdem-yin Erike*, Kopenhagen, 1961, pp. 85-6 (2b-3a): "on account of the antiquity of this temple, it was im-

according to the Mongol historian Sayang-sečen, Altan-qan at the time of his meeting with the Third Dalai-lama had promised to erect: "Altan-qan decided to construct in his Blue City (Köke-qota) where he had assembled labourers, with precious stones, gold, and silver, (a statue of) the Lord Sigmüni [Śākyamuni], object of belief of the living beings; Bušurytu Čakravartin Sečen Jinong [of Ordos] decided to construct a temple of the (Buddha of the) Three Periods; and Čoyčas-un jürüken Šečin qung-tayiji decided to have transcribed with gold and silver and (adorned with) precious stones a copy of the Kanjur, symbol of the Doctrine, in one hundred and eight volumes."<sup>164</sup> The temple of Kuei-hua-ch'eng remained a bone of contention even after the death of the Third Lady: its treasures came into Sodnam's hands and Bušurytu was unable to take them back: early in 1613, an official noted that Bušurytu and Sodnam had been quarrelling over the possession of the Silver-Buddha Temple of Kuei-hua-ch'eng, the Eight Bayisings, and the revenues of the sale of horses.<sup>165</sup>

23 According to the *Ssu-i k'ao*<sup>166</sup> when Bušurytu asked for a new title and claimed extra rewards for "protecting" the borders, the governor-general replied that his services were not much needed: he could easily dispense with Bušurytu and divide the borders from Hsüan-fu to the Yellow River into a number of sections and entrust them individually to Sodnam, Üsün,

—Continued from previous page

possible to establish the year of its founding. During the *Degedü-erdemtü* [period: Ch'ung-te: 1636–43] upon order of the Dayičung [= Dayičing] Emperor . . . the temple was restored and enlarged and given the name *Wu-liang: Čaylasi ügei*". Chang Ting-i, *Sui-sheng* 纓帶 (Shanghai, 1920), Ch. 8, p. 22, lists this temple and repeats the information of the *Dangsa*; however, instead of "Ch'ing Ch'ung-te", the text reads "Ming Ch'ung-chen (1628–44)". Was this deliberately changed? Chang Kuo-ch'uan, *Kuei-sui hsien-chih* (1935; no chapter numbers: Vol. 2, section *Shen-chiao chih* "Religion", p. 3b) repeats the *Sui-sheng*, correcting the date: Ch'ung-te, 5th year: 1640, but fails to indicate a source for this. The *Hung-tx'u ssu*, or *Wu-liang ssu*, or *Čaylasi ügei süme*, the centre of intense translation activity, in the colophon of the *Siluyun onol-tu* is described in the following terms: "(He translated, while peacefully and for a long time residing in) The incomparable precious temple of the Lord [Juu: Buddha], perfected with all the symbols of the world, renowned in all directions, constructed with feelings of pure devotion, in the region east of the Yellow River, in the region South of the Lord of the Terrain [*i.e.* the ruling qan], and in the middle of the Vast and Great Mongol People". *Vladimirtsov*, "Nadpisi . . .", pp. 224–5. Pozdnev further mentions a Chinese inscription on the premises ordered by Ombo ma [*sic* = qung?] tayiji, and dating from 1623.

<sup>164</sup> *Erdeni-yin Tobči* (I. J. Schmidt, *Geschichte*, pp. 236: 12–14, 237). The Mongol text is corrupted. See A. Mostaert, Introduction to *Erdeni-yin Tobči. Mongolian Chronicle. Scripta Mongolica* II, Cambridge, Mass., 1956, Part I, p. 70. Such temples must have been in vogue among the Mongols if they could afford them. In 1607, a certain Bayandai of Ordos hoped to induce the Chinese to build him a temple with a statue of the Buddha, the head of which would be of gold and the body, silver. Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, p. 493. *Shen-tsung SL* 432 (TP ed., Vol. 115, p. 8169).

<sup>165</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, p. 659. *Shen-tsung SL* 503 (TP ed., Vol. 118, p. 9562).

<sup>166</sup> WPC 226.23ab.

Bayaud, Urūd, and Baiyiqungdai, and treat with these chieftains on an individual basis: let them present tributes separately, pay them for the tribute, grant them subsidies, and let them trade in their sectors of the border. What the governor-general here threatens to do is something that was already a fact although not openly acknowledged. To begin with, Bušurytu's power was only the shadow of what had been the power of Altan-qan, or even of Sengge and Čürüke who were not such outstanding personalities. As we have seen, the unstable nature of Mongol society was largely responsible for this deterioration of the power of the Shun-i-wang. But a gradual change in Chinese policy towards them was even more responsible. In Altan-qan's days, the territory of Inner Mongolia from the Yellow River to the borders of modern Jehol Province was ruled by brothers and sons of Altan-qan, but firmly under his control. In fact the title Shun-i-wang was granted to him in 1571 to give him added prestige so that he would be able to control effectively and restrain his relatives and so enforce peace along the borders. Initially the tribute was presented once a year by Altan-qan only, but in the name of all his subordinates: all contributed horses for the tribute and shared in the revenues. Any one whom Altan-qan wanted to exclude received no share in the revenues from the payment for the tribute and from trade at the horse fairs. The fairs were always contingent upon the tribute. But over the years, China had slowly begun to deal with individual princes separately: every border official dealt with the chieftains living across his sector of the frontier. These relations included payment of "subsidies", very often extra grants to keep them happy and the border areas in peace. Inevitably these dealings entailed an erosion of the central power of the Shun-i-wang who lost all leverage. Individuals no longer felt the need to work through the Shun-i-wang, if they could deal with Chinese officials directly and enrich themselves. The natural splintering of a nomadic society could not be hastened by these changes in Chinese policy.<sup>167</sup>

<sup>167</sup> See my *Tribute System and Diplomatic Missions*, pp. 109–11. In 1607, the governor-general of the border districts of Shensi and Kansu described the situation in Ordos in similar terms: the Ordos were divided into forty-two "branches" the chieftains of which competed with each other. The Jinong, Bušurytu, technically their lord, exercised only nominal power. All struggled for control of the horse fairs. Although their troops were said to number a hundred thousand, divided into forty-two branches, the larger groups comprised no more than two or three thousand mounted soldiers; and smaller groups, one or two thousand: "We must divide their power, accept (individually) those who surrender to us, so that those who surrender first will receive the greater benefits, and those who come later will be rejected and punished." Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, 493–4. *Shen-tsung SL* 432 (TP ed., Vol. 115, pp. 8169–70). Summarized in MS 327 (TP ed., p. 3768a); L. Hambis, *Documents*, pp. 81–2. Also my *Genealogical Tables*, p. 60. Obviously, here too, contrary to the procedure first adopted in 1570–1, Chinese officials preferred to deal with every individual chieftain, no matter how insignificant, rather than recognize one supreme head. The "forty-two branches" must represent the subjects of individual noblemen, but there must have been more than forty-two, but these must have been the ones best known to Chinese officials.

The passage from the *Ming-shih* quoted above regarding Bušuytu's marriage and accession states that Bušuytu ruled only the "Twelve Tribes", and in the text quoted from the SYCTK, the governor of Ta-t'ung district warned Sodnam that the "Three Branches and the Twelve Tribes" would fail to support him should he (Sodnam) oppose Bušuytu's succession. These formulas never used before are another indication of the fragmentation that had taken place. The "Three Branches and the Twelve Tribes" is an expression for the people of Inner Mongolia as a whole, but by now the unity has gone: Baiyungdai is leader of one branch, north of Hsüan-fu; the Ordos constitute the westernmost branch, and in between the "Twelve Tribes" form the central branch under the Shun-i-wang.<sup>168</sup> Contrary to what I have written in my study of the genealogical tables<sup>169</sup> the expression "Twelve Tribes" must be derived from the tribal name Twelve Tümed. Sayang-sečen explains how Altan-qan had inherited "the majority of the Twelve Tümed".<sup>170</sup> Altan-qan in his time ruled directly or indirectly over the whole territory, including the branch said here to be under Baiyungdai, a descendant of one of Altan-qan's brothers. But how the powers of the Shun-i-wang had shrunk by 1612 appears from the next sentence in the *Shih-lu* passage just mentioned: if the Twelve Tümed are said to be under Bušuytu, within that territory the nobleman with the greatest prestige was Urüd; the one with the strongest military power and able to resist Bušuytu was Sodnam; the one outstanding for his fair administration was Üüsin, and Baya-beyiji was loyal and able to pacify Sodnam, and all these various personalities, who did not always agree with Bušuytu, were subject to Chinese manipulations. Urüd, however, was then getting old.

What the governor-general says of border "defenses" entrusted to either Bušuytu or to individual princes calls for a word of explanation: it is no more than a figure of speech. The Mongols never were called upon to defend the borders. Against whom would they have to defend them? It was more like a general formula to describe the "duties of tributaries": serving as buffer zone and helping defend China against outsiders. Anyway, the Mongols never understood their relations with China in terms of defence, and neither did the Chinese for all practical purposes. But the Mongols in a certain way defended the borders, by abstaining from violating them as they had done for decades prior to 1570.

24 One specific factor in the shift of Chinese policy was the joint petition presented by the noblemen first in favour of Sengge's appointment as Shun-i-wang, and later in favour of Čürüke. The immediate effect must have been that the noblemen felt that the Shun-i-wang owed his rank and title to them,

<sup>168</sup> Tamura, *Mókohen* 9, p. 647. *Shen-tsung SL* 500 (TP ed., Vol. 118, p. 9467).

<sup>169</sup> *Genealogical Tables*, p. 111.

<sup>170</sup> Schmidt, *Geschichte*, pp. 204:11-12, 205.

and in their eyes this was a reduction of his power. The Chinese insisted upon the same procedure in Bušuytu's case. After Bušuytu's marriage to the Third Lady, officials pointed out that China must not take the initiative and show hurried inclination to enfeoff Bušuytu; if she appointed Bušuytu without a joint petition and guarantee to respect the borders, China would only weaken her bargaining power.<sup>171</sup> If China showed too much eagerness, the very tribute relations would become a weapon in the hands of the Mongols, as if they did China a favour (as in fact they did); the Chinese felt that the Mongols became increasingly arrogant and China had to rely more and more on the Third Lady's pro-Chinese sentiments. But rumours were being spread among the Mongols that China was obligated to offer the enfeoffment and increase the subsidies, and even the Third Lady herself had lately seemed to confirm these rumours.<sup>172</sup>

It was in the midst of these manoeuvrings that the Third Lady died. Her death is mentioned for the first time in the *Shih-lu* entry of 13 August, 1612;<sup>173</sup> it is mentioned again on 5 September: she had been sick for some time as we know and died on 24 July, 1612. The governor-general of Ta-t'ung specifies this date in his report announcing that Bušuytu qung-tayiji, together with Urüd, Bayaud, Üüsin, Baya-beyiji, Sodnam qung-tayiji, Dolô(d)-tümen, Čing-bâru(r), the Little Buddha-monk, and others had summoned the Three Branches from East and West and the Twelve Tribes to deliberate the question of the petition: this must be the meeting at which Sodnam, according to the SYTCK, failed to appear. By 23 July, the joint guarantee (*t'ou-chieh* 投結) was ready to be dispatched to the governor-general, but on the following day, 24 July, 1612, the lady died of her illness. The governor-general suggested that in view of the lady's good services going back four decades, memorial services be held as had been done at the time of Čürüke's death in 1607. Such services would make a good impression at this critical juncture. The Ministry of the Army despatched military representatives to attend the services to be held at the governor-general's headquarters. An imperial decree ordered seven altars with offerings, and besides, gifts of silk, clothes, etc. to various relatives according to their ranks.<sup>174</sup>

25 This joint guarantee and formal petition for Bušuytu's enfeoffment must have been presented either at the time of the governor-general's

<sup>171</sup> Tamura, *Mókohen* 9, p. 626. *Shen-tsung SL* 494 (TP ed., Vol. 118, p. 9297).

<sup>172</sup> Tamura, *Mókohen* 9, pp. 627-8, 637-8. *Shen-tsung SL* 497 (TP ed., Vol. 118, pp. 9297, 9374).

<sup>173</sup> Tamura, *Mókohen* 9, pp. 637-8. *Shen-tsung SL* 497 (TP ed., Vol. 118, p. 9374).

<sup>174</sup> Tamura, *Mókohen* 9, p. 641. *Shen-tsung SL* 498 (TP ed., Vol. 118, p. 9392). The "Little Buddha-monk" is a Tibetan lama whose name is transcribed Kun-ch'i-kai ch'ao-erh-chi: ? . . . čorji. Tamura, *Mókohen* 9, p. 643.

report of 5 September or shortly thereafter, and on 12 November, 1612, a decree made Bušuytu Shun-i-wang.<sup>175</sup>

The same decree appointing Bušuytu also granted Baya-beyiji the title of *Chung-i fu-jen* "Loyal and Righteous Lady", and several noblemen were promoted to higher honorary ranks. Baya-beyiji's new title, of course, meant that she was expected to continue the role played thus far by the Third Lady.

But that was not the end of this long drawn-out affair. Things were not that simple! Strange as it may seem, while deliberations were going on and the joint petition was being prepared as indicated above, now it was Bušuytu himself who objected to a petition on his behalf! After the Third Lady's initial refusal to marry Bušuytu, and Sodnam's opposition to Bušuytu's appointment, now Bušuytu did not want, or pretended not to want, an enfeoffment conditional upon such a petition. But Bušuytu, "a poor chieftain from Köke-nuur", as the governor-general describes him, of course, realized that there was little hope of getting an unconditional enfeoffment, and as the *Shih-lu* puts it: "only now did he allow the petition to be presented." But again, this was not yet the end!

In the *Shih-lu* entry of 14 November, 1612, Bušuytu is described as a little chieftain from Köke-nuur. During these interim years he is very often said to be in Köke-nuur, although as a descendant of Altan-qan he had his appanage right there in the old ancestral territory. Bušuytu must have gone to Köke-nuur on several occasions, and at about the time that the joint petition was forwarded to the Chinese borders, Bušuytu appropriated a huge number of horses and cattle from the Third Lady's property that had come into Sodnam's possession, and drove them to Köke-nuur. To the Chinese Bušuytu explained that he was returning to his base camp to fetch clothes for the winter.<sup>176</sup> Strange as this may seem, now that he was appointed Shun-i-wang, Bušuytu's absence from Inner Mongolia prevented acceptance of the official document of his enfeoffment to the great annoyance of all concerned. In fact Bušuytu was playing hard to get, to make it appear that China needed him more than he needed Chinese support. Probably nobody was fooled by this game; nevertheless, the game continued for some time. We may rapidly go over the rest of the story.

26 When during the intercalary eleventh month (22 December, 1612-20 January, 1613) the Chinese sent a messenger with Bušuytu's diploma (and presumably the diplomas of all those who had been promoted) there was nobody at the border to receive him: Bušuytu was away in Köke-nuur, and the other noblemen after their meetings had returned to their respective

<sup>175</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 647. *Shen-tsung SL* 500 (TP ed., Vol. 118, pp. 9466-7).

<sup>176</sup> SYCTK 2.7a. WPC 226.24ab.

homes. But on 12 July, 1613, Bušuytu, Urûd, Sodnam, Baya-beyiji, Üüsin, Bayaud, and others presented themselves at the borders near Te-sheng 得勝 (Ta-t'ung), and on 25 July, Bušuytu was handed his diploma at an appropriate ceremony held on the "Terrace for Airing Horses" *Liang-ma-t'ai* 涼馬臺, the same place where a similar ceremony had been held in 1571, when Altan-qan received his diploma of appointment.<sup>177</sup>

Thereafter the relationship between Bušuytu and Sodnam continued as tense as ever; for example, when in December, 1613-January, 1614, Bušuytu sent his two younger brothers Barman and Tarni to China with the regular tribute, Sodnam barred their way!<sup>178</sup> This shows also how powerful Sodnam was.

The SYCTK and the *Ssu-i k'ao*<sup>179</sup> relate that, after the death of the Third Lady, Sodnam stole all the gold, silver, and other treasures left by her to Bušuytu, who was unable to prevent the theft. These must be the very same treasures the Third Lady had stored in the temple of Kuei-hua-ch'eng, and had shown to Bušuytu. In 1617, the *Shih-lu* once more speaks of the intense rivalry and of clashes between the two contenders and their allies.<sup>180</sup> In 1618 Sodnam again refused to hand over the key to the temple containing all the stolen treasures,<sup>181</sup> and in the same year "Bušuytu has nothing but an empty title, while Sodnam has the revenues of the fairs and the subsidies".<sup>182</sup> In 1620, "ever since Bušuytu has succeeded (to the position of Shun-i-wang) he has been unable to enforce this authority upon Sodnam who is backed by the majority of the people".<sup>183</sup> In 1621, a battle between Bušuytu and Sodnam took place in Fen-chou-t'an (芬 almost certainly an error for feng 豐) but Bušuytu, the weaker of the two, was unable to assert his supremacy.<sup>184</sup> Ch'ien Ch'ien-i summarizes the situation in one sentence: "after (Bušuytu's enfeoffment) Sodnam grew ever stronger and Bušuytu ever weaker".<sup>185</sup>

<sup>177</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, pp. 660-1; 671. *Shen-tsung SL* 504, 509 (TP ed., Vol. 119, pp. 9583-4, 9642). The date of 25 July (eighth day of the sixth month) is given as 26 July in the SYCTK 2.14b. See my *Tribute Missions*, p. 600. The details of the delay in delivering Bušuytu's diploma and of the ceremony of delivery itself may be found in the SYCTK 2.7b-10a. The actual place where the ceremony was held, Liang-ma-t'ai 涼馬臺 is mentioned in the *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi* 3, 21b. For this Liang-ma-t'ai, see my *Tribute Missions*, pp. 589, 590, 596.

<sup>178</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 701. *Shen-tsung SL* 426 (TP ed., Vol. 119, p. 9900). The genealogical tables spell Badman instead of Barman: *Genealogical Tables*, Table IV, p. 112, n. 75.

<sup>179</sup> WPC 225.24a.

<sup>180</sup> Taipei ed., Vol. 121, p. 10536 (not in Tamura's excerpts).

<sup>181</sup> According to the *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi* 3, 22b.

<sup>182</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 10, pp. 94-5, 100. *Shen-tsung SL* 572, 576 (TP ed., Vol. 121, p. 10792; 122, p. 10910).

<sup>183</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 10, p. 117. *Kuang-tsung SL* 2 (TP ed., Vol. 123, p. 44).

<sup>184</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 10, p. 135. A second passage is not in Tamura's excerpts. See Aoki, "Bušuytu" 3, 1966, p. 53.

<sup>185</sup> KPSTC 16.26 a.

In the end, however, Bušuytu found the solution to his problems: a new marriage, namely with Sodnam's wife! She was known as Jayisang-dai-beyiji (Tsai-sheng-ta-pi-chi), and like the Third Lady and Baya-beyiji, she must have been a lady of independent wealth and power. The *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi* tells us that early in 1624, Bušuytu began to think of marrying her. Sodnam died sometime before 1625: if he was still alive, we are not told of his reaction to Bušuytu's marriage plans! Or more probably it was his death that suggested this new plan. Anyway, Baya-beyiji, Sodnam's mother, was opposed to the marriage and once again it came to an armed confrontation.<sup>186</sup> That Sodnam died around that time is certain from the fact that early in 1625 his son Sereng inherited his rank; and that the appointment was made upon Bušuytu's request indicates that a measure of peace had been restored between the two rival families.<sup>187</sup>

The lady Baya-beyiji died in the summer of 1625: her passing away is mentioned in the *Shih-lu* entry of 2 August, but of course this must be the date when the news reached Peking and was officially recorded.<sup>188</sup> From another version of the *Shih-lu* we know that in 1615, she was seventy years old,<sup>189</sup> and that makes her eighty years old at the time of her death.

With the death of the lady Baya-beyiji, the last serious obstacle to Bušuytu's marrying Sodnam's widow was also removed: in October, 1627, "he married Sodnam's wife and annexed her territory".<sup>190</sup>

With regard to the name Jayisang-dai-beyiji, *Jayisang* (*tsai-sheng* < *tsai-hsiang* 宰相) originally meant an office, or a rank, and was the name of her former husband just as *Baya Dayičing-beyiji* meant "Beyiji of Baya (-aci), or Dayičing (tayiji)". This former husband of Jayisang-dai-beyiji must have been Jayisang-tayiji, as he is called in the tables appended to the *Pei-Lu feng-su*,<sup>191</sup> or Dalai-jayisang-tayiji as the tables of the SYCTK<sup>192</sup> call him. This Dalai-jayisang was a half brother of Čürüke: a son of Uiyürčin-beyiji, Sengge qung-tayiji's third wife, and therefore also known as San-ning-tzu "Third Lady" the same appellation used for *The Third Lady*.<sup>193</sup> No doubt that she was called Uiyürčün after her clan name. She is listed as Great Uiyürčün-čecen-beyiji in the SYCTK,<sup>194</sup> and in the WLWKL<sup>195</sup> as

<sup>186</sup> *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi* 2. 49a.

<sup>187</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 10, p. 203.

<sup>188</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 10, p. 231.

<sup>189</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 10, p. 6.

<sup>190</sup> T'an Ch'ien 談遷 (1594-1658), *Kuo-chüeh* 國權 88.4a.

<sup>191</sup> *Genealogical Tables*, Table IV, No. 97.

<sup>192</sup> SYCTK 2.28b.

<sup>193</sup> KPSTC 7.23ab, quoted from the *Hsüan-Chen t'u-shuo* 宣鎮圖說 (*Hsüan-lan-t'ang ts'ung-shu*, *Hsüan-Ta-Shan-hsi san-chen t'u-shuo*, Vol. 20.14b).

<sup>194</sup> See above, note 72.

<sup>195</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 190, 195 (Is there a contradiction that she is called *dai-beyiji* in one place, and *third* in another?).

(Wei-) wu-shen-ch'ieh-ch'in: Uiyürčün-čecen, and Uiyürčün; also as Dai-Uiyürčün.

Dalai-jayisang-tayiji is mentioned in the *Shih-lu* in the aforementioned entry dated 28 December, 1614:<sup>196</sup> he was still alive then. Whether he died shortly afterwards, or divorced the lady Jayisang-beyiji is not known. Anyway she must have married Sodnam sometime thereafter, and in 1627, married Bušuytu.

What role Bušuytu played thereafter cannot be gone into here, and it is irrelevant to the story of the two ladies San-ning-tzu and Baya-beyiji. Let us only note that he was the last of the Shun-i-wangs. By that time, the Ming were paying much greater attention to a new danger looming in the northeast, more threatening than the Mongols of the Tümed plain and Ordos.

27 It is time to revert to the Third Lady for a final note. It is evident that the Third Lady had nothing to do with Altan-qan's "surrender" in 1570 and his subsequent enfeoffment. Whatever the foundation of the Third Lady's pro-Chinese reputation, her later marriages to three successive princes became the condition for their enfeoffment. At the same time, Chinese officials could not but have contempt for this kind of union of sons with a concubine of their father and grandfather. As already indicated, some sources use the word *cheng* "incest with an older generation" to describe Sengge's marriage to the Third Lady;<sup>197</sup> two other terms regularly used in the *Shih-lu*, in the WLWKL, and in the SYCTK are *chü-yu* 聚塵 and *yu-p'ei* 塵配 "bestiality".<sup>198</sup> These expressions alone show enough what the Chinese thought of this Mongol custom.

One other thing that certainly must have surprised the Chinese was the authority exercised by a woman in Mongol society over men and over armies; the Third Lady appeared at official gatherings and received delegations from China, functions in China reserved for men. We have men-

<sup>196</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, p. 701. *Shen-tsung* SL 426 (TP ed., Vol. 119, p. 9900). The WPC 205.16a lists two sons of this Uiyürčün Third Lady: Dalai tayiji and Jiryüyan, but according to the genealogical tables, this Jiryüyan is a son, not a younger brother of Dalai (Jayisang) tayiji. Dalai-jayisang-tayiji is also called *Odtigin* "Youngest son"; he must have been the youngest son of Uiyürčün-beyiji.

<sup>197</sup> See note 62.

<sup>198</sup> For example, WLWKL 9, p. 10; SYCTK (above) 2.5b; Tamura, *Mōkohen* 9, pp. 611 *et passim*. Some time after I had written this, I discovered that the Third Lady was not the only concubine "inherited" by several generations of nomadic chieftains with official Chinese approval. In his book *Pei-Ya yu-mu-min-tsu yü Chung-yüan nung-yeh-min-tsu chien-ti ho-p'ing-chan-cheng yü mao-i chih kuan-hsi* 北亞游牧民族與中原農業民族間的和平戰爭與貿易之關係 [*Peace, War, and Trade relations between the Central Asian nomadic tribes and Chinese agricultural people*] (Taipei, 1972, pp. 212-13, 239-40), S. Jagchid (札奇斯欽) refers to a Chinese princess married to a T'u-chüeh (Turk) chieftain of the Sui period, and "inherited" with Chinese approval first by the chieftain's son, and then by the latter's successor (*Sui-shu* 84, chapter on T'u-chüeh, 14b). The fact is all the more striking as this was a Chinese girl.

tioned how a high Chinese official compared her to the Hsiung-nu woman able to influence her husband's decisions. When the Third Lady died, and her passing away was mentioned for the first time in the report from 13 August, 1612, she is characterized as the hen crowing in the morning, a reference to the *Shu-ching* passage where such an event is described as a sign of impending disaster.<sup>199</sup>

28 If the information regarding the Third Lady comes overwhelmingly from Chinese sources, she is not entirely unknown in Mongol writings, but it is a different side of her life and personality that is shown here, namely her concern with Lamaism. In the *Erdeni-yin Tobči*,<sup>200</sup> Sayang-sečen relates how in 1577-8, *Noyanču jünggin qatun*, i.e. the Third Lady (Niang-tzu), accompanied Altan-qan on his trip to Köke-nuur in order to meet the Third Dalai-lama. We have seen how in 1593, Čürüke and the Third Lady asked the Ming government to send them Tibetan lamas to instruct them.<sup>201</sup> The colophon of the *Siluyun onol-tu* "The Fool and the Wise" mentions her together with "Namudai" (i.e. Čürüke) as patrons of the translator of this work. This colophon calls her an incarnation of Tārā.<sup>202</sup> She is mentioned again as an incarnation of the Green Tārā, together with Namudai in the colophon of the *Qutuytu bilig-ün činadu kişayar-a kürügsen tümen silüg-tü kemekü yeke kölgen sudur*.<sup>203</sup> She is further mentioned in connexion with the translation of the Saddharmapundarikasūtra.<sup>204</sup>

In a prayer recited in the ceremonies honouring Činggis-qan at Edjinkhorô (Ordos) she is mentioned together with Altan-qan: *Altan-qayan noyanču qatun-laban* "Altan-qayan with his lady Noyanču".<sup>205</sup>

Like the Third Lady, Dayičing~Baya-beyiji became known for her devotion to Buddhism. A *Shih-lu* passage from the summer of 1617, in an incidental way, says that the "old widow turned to Buddhism".<sup>206</sup> The

<sup>199</sup> Tamura, *Môkohen* 9, p. 638. *Shen-tzung SL* (TP ed., vol. 118, p. 9374). J. Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, Vol. 3, Part 2: *Shoo-king*, pp. 302-3: "The ancients have said 'the hen does not announce the morning. The crowing of a hen in the morning (indicates) the subversion of a family'." S. Couvreur, S.J., *Chou King*, Sien Hsien, 1934, p. 185. Hsiao Ta-heng in his *Pei-Lu feng-su* (Serruys, *Monum. Serica* 10, p. 146) used the same expression to describe the power of women in Mongolia.

<sup>200</sup> Schmidt, *Geschichte*, pp. 230:18, 231.

<sup>201</sup> See note 115.

<sup>202</sup> Vladimirtsov, "Nadpisi . . .", pp. 223-4.

<sup>203</sup> Ligeti, *Catalogue*, pp. 182-3, Nr. 765 (1). Heissig, "Zur geistigen Leistung . . .", p. 110, n. 1. F. A. Bischoff, *Der Kanjur*, p. 323.

<sup>204</sup> W. Heissig, *Peking'er Lamaistischen Blockdrucke*, Wiesbaden, 1954, pp. 27-8. Vladimirtsov, "Nadpisi . . .", p. 228.

<sup>205</sup> S. D. Dylykov, "Edžen-xoro", in *Filologiya i Istoriya Mongol'skix Narodov. Pamyati Akad. Borisa Y. Vladimirtsova*, Moskva, 1958 (228-74), p. 244; also B. Rintchen, *Les Matériaux pour l'Etude du Chamanisme Mongol I. Sources Littéraires*, Wiesbaden, 1959, p. 84.

<sup>206</sup> Tamura, *Manşūhen* 4, p. 502 (TP ed., Vol. 121, p. 10536).

writer is speaking of Tümed affairs and except for Baya-beyiji, there was no "old widow" important enough to rate a mention in Chinese records. But here again it is from other than Chinese sources that we learn something more about the lady's religious activities.

The Mongol chronicler Sayang-sečen<sup>207</sup> relates that the *Yekede asarayči Mayidari qutuytu* "Great Benevolent Maitreya-incarnation" was sent from Tibet to occupy the seat established by the Third Dalai-lama during his sojourn in Mongolia, and that in 1606 the lady Tuγtai-mačay-buyan-tu dalai, wife of Altan-qan's grandson Dayičing-ejei invited him from Outer Mongolia to inaugurate a statue of Maitreya. From another source we know where the ceremony took place: it must have been at the Maitreya temple, *Mayidari-yin süme*, between Kuei-hua-ch'eng and the north-eastern corner of the great Ordos bend of the Yellow River, a place which later became known as Mai-ta-chao (from *Mayidari-yin juu*: Maitreya Temple). When the temple was built is not known, but it cannot have been very long before the arrival of the Maitreya dignitary: what Sayang-sečen describes as the inauguration of a statue of Maitreya must probably be understood as the inauguration of the temple itself, and for that occasion the lady Mačay (variants: *majay*, *mijay* Tibetan ma-göig "mother") had a gate constructed and a brief inscription in Chinese on stone placed in the wall above the gate to commemorate the event. The text of this inscription is as follows: "Čečen tayiqu Uran-beyiji, wife of Dayičing-tayiji by imperial command holding the rank of *Lung-hu čiang-čün* grandson of Altan-qan a descendant of the Yüan (Emperors) who by imperial rescript was enfeoffed as Shun-i-wang, in devout and sincere (execution) of a vow, respectfully relying on the Five Jewels, selected an auspicious place near Pao-feng 寶豐 Mountain, and started the construction of the Gate of Magnificent Harmony of the Temple of Spiritual Enlightenment (*Ling-čüeh ssu* 靈覺寺) . . . That the enterprise was entirely completed in less than one month is owing to the assistance of Divine Powers and was not brought about by men . . . Set up in the hour *keng-wu* of the day *chi-ssu* of the month *wu-hsü* of the year *ping-wu* [4 October, 1606] of the Golden Country in the Great Ming."<sup>208</sup>

The first thing we notice, of course, is that the lady who financed the construction of the gate is named Čečen-tayiqu Uran-beyiji, duly identified as the "wife" of Altan-qan's grandson, Dayičing tayiji, although the latter had been dead for more than twenty years. In spite of the unmistakable identification, one may doubt if Uran-beyiji is really the same person as Baya~

<sup>207</sup> Schmidt, *Geschichte*, pp. 262-3. There are many variants of the name Tuγtai mačay buyan-tu dalai. For *tuy* in personal names see O. J. Maenchen-Helfen, *The World of the Huns*, p. 411.

<sup>208</sup> For particulars, see my "Notes on a Chinese Inscription of 1606 . . .", *JAOS* 78, 1958, pp. 101-13.

Dayičing-beyiji, also known as Tuγtai-mačay-buyan-tu dalai. The list of lamaseries *Čaylasi ügei süme . . . dangsa*<sup>209</sup> mentions the Mayidari-yin süme, and with regard to its origin has this to say: "Examining (the origin of) the Temple of Mayidari, if one looks at the Chinese text carved on a stone on the great gate (one reads): 'Mijay qatun, wife of Dayičing tayiji, grandson of the Šun-i-wang Anda [interlinear gloss: Altan] had the Mayidari Temple built in the Red-Horse year [1606] of the Great Ming Dynasty. The name Ling-chüeh-ssu "Temple of Spiritual Enlightenment" is written in Chinese . . .'" Not only does the author of these lines refer to the Chinese inscription, he has manifestly "copied" it: *An-ta* is rendered in Mongol as *Anda*, and another hand has added the interlineal gloss "Altan". And yet the author reads the name of the lady as Mijay qatun. Being a lama he must have known from other sources, or from tradition, that Uran-beyiji was Majay qatun, but he preferred her official "Lamaist" name to her more popular name Uran "The Clever". Evidently, the Mongol author exaggerates a bit when he ascribes the construction of the whole temple, instead of the gate alone, to the lady. There was indeed, up to very recent times, a living tradition among the local Mongol population, linking the lady Majiy to this temple, and within the premises of the temple a stüpa is said to contain the remains of a Tümed princess, presumably the same lady, patron of the temple.<sup>210</sup>

Pozdnev who was in Kuei-hua-ch'eng in 1893, heard about the existence of the Maitreya temple but had no opportunity to visit it: he says that he learned that the temple was built during the Ming by a certain princess named Majin.<sup>211</sup> We do not know whether his informant was Chinese or Mongol; nor do we know if he was aware of what was written on the stone, but evidently this informant knew the tradition concerning a princess Majiy (here misspelled *Majin*) who built the temple (or rather the gate): another independent identification of Uran-beyiji=Majiy qatun. Pozdnev spells the name of the temple: *Ling-chu* (instead of *chüeh*) *ssu*. This, too, must be a mispronunciation of his informant. What Pozdnev heard as *chu* probably was actually pronounced *chao*: indeed the *Sui-sheng* lists the Maitreya temple as *Ling-chao ssu* (熙).<sup>212</sup> *Chao* may have been erroneously substituted for *chüeh* because of the Mongol word *juu* "Lord, Temple", usually transcribed *chao* in Chinese.

The identification of Majiy=Uran raises several questions. Why does the stone inscription of 1606 and the *Dangsa* text state that Majiy~Uran was the wife of Dayičing~Baγa-tayiji who had been dead so many years, instead of her second husband, Budaširi who died only in 1597? Then why

does the stone inscription ascribe to Dayičing tayiji a title *Lung-hu Chiang-chün* which he never held, but which was Budaširi's title? Probably those responsible for the inscription (and the author of the *Dangsa* followed the inscription) preferred to call her "wife" of Dayičing as closer to Altan-qan: he was the son of the qan's third son. As to the title *Lung-hu Chiang-chün*, they must have been ignorant of Dayičing tayiji's title *Chao-yung Chiang-chün* and taken for granted that his rank was the same as Budaširi's. Admittedly these are not very convincing reasons, but they do not directly affect the identification of Majiy=Uran-beyiji.

Like the Third Lady, Baγa-beyiji~Majiy was also a promoter of Buddhist translations. The often-mentioned colophon of the *Siluyun onol-tu* states that after Namudai-sečen qan, the lady Noyanču jüנגgin and Ombo-üjing qung-tayiji had expressed the wish to have the *Siluyun onol-tu* text translated into Mongol, and the translation work had been completed, Mijay qatun, here represented as an incarnation of the "Precious Mother" Tārā, had the text "established", probably meaning that she had copies prepared for distribution. Vladimirtsov identifies this Mijay qatun with Tuγtai-maja-buyan-tu dalai of the *Erdeni-yin Tobči*.<sup>213</sup>

Professor L. Ligeti, while admitting the identity of Mijay qatun of the colophon with Majay . . . dalai qatun of the *Erdeni-yin Tobči*, questions the identity of Majay~Mijay qatun with Čečen-tayiqu Uran-beyiji of the stone inscription of 1606.<sup>214</sup> One hesitates to disagree with a great scholar like Professor Ligeti, but then what does one do with the identification Uran-beyiji=Mijay of the *Dangsa*, and the living tradition around the Maitreya temple? If I understand correctly, Professor Ligeti's reasoning is centred around a certain lady named Tegüs-buyan-tu Uran-sečen-qongkeu qatun "Perfectly meritorious Uran-Sečen Empress-Lady" wife of a Čaqar prince Nom-un Dalai (Ocean of Doctrine) Dayičing-Amudai-Bingtu qung-tayiji. He believes that this Uran-Sečen qongkeu qatun (of the Čaqars) is the same person as Čečen-tayiqu Uran-beyiji of the inscription in Tümed territory. The only argument for of such an identification comes from the words Uran-Sečen=Čečen-Uran appearing in the names. But there were other Uran-beyiji's and Sečen~Sečen-beyiji's. There are so many Mongols bearing the same name, just as there are quite a few Mongols known under two or three different names.

In the foregoing pages mention has been made of one Uran-beyiji, Sengge qung-tayiji's wife until he was compelled to divorce her. There is no indication that she ever married Baγa~Dayičing-tayiji. In other words, the name alone cannot prove or disprove an identity, and I see no reason to

<sup>209</sup> Heissig, *Erdeni-yin Erike*, p. 107 (13a).

<sup>210</sup> A. Mostaert, Introduction to *Erdeni-yin Tobči*, Part I, p. 12, n. 33.

<sup>211</sup> A. Pozdnev, *Mongoliya i Mongoly* II, pp. 147-8.

<sup>212</sup> *Sui-sheng* 8, p. 25.

<sup>213</sup> Vladimirtsov, "Nadpisi . . .", pp. 224-5, 227.

<sup>214</sup> L. Ligeti, "Deux Tablettes de T'ai-tosung des Ts'ing", *Acta Orient. Hung.* 8, 1958, p. 227.

change my earlier opinion that Uran-beyiji of the inscription of 1606 is Majay of the *Dangsa* and of the *Erdeni-yin Tobči*.

The Russian envoy Ivan Petlin met the lady Majiy in 1618 (see Appendix); he calls her Mančikatut, and testifies to her great power in Mongolia.

## APPENDIX

### *Pan-sheng: Bayising*

Bayising was the name of Altan-qan's residence; but it was also the name of other settlements in the Tümed area, and very often a general appellation for the area as a whole because of the many houses (*bayising*) built by Chinese settlers.

The place name *Pan-shang: Bayising* goes back to the first half of the sixteenth century. In 1559, the place was burned and destroyed by Chinese armies. The *Shih-lu* (summer of 1560) says: "Outside of the Great Wall of Yu-wei 右衛 (Right or Western Commandery) of Ta-t'ung, if one goes North from the old town of Yü-lin 玉林 crossing the Black River and the Erh-hui 二灰 River, and advances more than 300 *li*, there is an area called Feng-chou 豐州. It is surrounded by high mountains; the water is fresh and vegetation luxurious. Such deserters as Ch'iu Fu 丘富, Chao Ch'üan 趙全, Li Tzu-hsing 李自馨, and others live there; they have built a wall with towers and a very beautiful palace, and have opened several thousand *ch'ing* of excellent land. (This area) touches upon the valley of Tung-sheng 東勝. The Caitiffs [*i.e.* the Mongols] call this place *Pan-sheng* 板升 (Bayising). In Chinese this word means '(town) wall'." The text goes on to relate how a military expedition reached the area and burned the "palace" and the houses.<sup>1</sup> The *Ming-shih* very briefly tells the same story, but says that *pan-sheng: bayising* means "house".<sup>2</sup> The WLWKL gives various details of the construction of Altan-qan's "palace": halls, towers, gates, all with appropriate names.<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that according to the author of the WLWKL, the leaders of the Chinese "deserters" or émigrés, according to one's point of view, had proclaimed Altan-qan "emperor"; if this palace was no match for the Chinese imperial palace, no doubt that it was something out of the ordinary for Mongolia.

<sup>1</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 7, pp. 316-17. *Shih-tsung SL* 486 (TP ed., Vol. 89, pp. 8100-1).

<sup>2</sup> MS 327 (TP ed., p. 3764b); Hambis, *Documents*, p. 58.

<sup>3</sup> WLWKL 7, pp. 95-6; WPC 226.14b.

Feng-chou, or Feng-chou Plain,<sup>4</sup> mentioned in the preceding lines is a name dating from the Liao; what ever remains of Feng-chou is a little to the east of Kuei-hua-ch'eng. The name "Feng" itself indicates the quality of the land, and the reference to fresh water is more than a literary figure of speech. There are so many places in Inner Mongolia where agriculture is impossible on account of the brackish nature of the ground water. As the *Shih-lu* indicates, the area where Chinese farmers had begun cultivating the land stretched all the way from Old Feng-chou to old Tung-sheng, southwest of the modern town of Sui-yüan. In other words, there must have been farmers everywhere, but especially centred around Kuei-hua-ch'eng-Sui-yüan. *Bayising* means "Chinese-style house" in contradistinction to a Mongol movable tent. The *Shih-lu* says that *bayising* means "wall (of a town)",<sup>5</sup> but that is not quite correct. The *Ming-shih* is right: "house"<sup>6</sup>. In fact there was more than one Bayising: Altan-qan's palace and adjacent buildings around it was Great Bayising, and later in 1575 this became known as Kuei-hua-ch'eng "Return to Civilization". Other places were known as Little Bayising, or East Bayising and West Bayising;<sup>7</sup> or the Eight Bayisings;<sup>8</sup> there is even a reference to "all the Bayisings".<sup>9</sup> However we hear mostly about "Bayising" simpliciter, and this could indicate one particular area, most likely Altan-qan's residence, or the area in general. The maps in the *T'u-shu-pien*<sup>10</sup> indicate several *pan-sheng*, and besides, we find such names as "Altan's tribe(s)", "Altan's New Town", "Altan's New Tower", etc.

Chiao Hung in his *T'ung-kung chuan*, speaking of the "palaces" built by the Chinese for Altan-qan, attempts an "etymology" of the expression *pan-sheng*. He reverses the order of the characters: "*sheng-pan*: they raise (wooden) boards to construct walls and call them *pan-sheng*".<sup>11</sup> This is, of course, an allusion to a system often used to construct walls round towns and villages: earth tamped down between a wooden casing which is gradually raised as the work advances. Such walls are called *pan-ch'iang* "board walls". But this type of construction is rarely if ever used for houses.

<sup>4</sup> WLWKL 7, pp. 117-18. Under the Japanese occupation during the war, the Tümed region, as part of the so-called "Autonomous Mongol Border Government", was renamed *Pa-yen-t'a-la Meng: Bayan-tala* "Prosperous Plain" Confederation, although the two Tümed banners had never been a confederation (*čiyulyan*) like, for example, the Ordos, Ulayan Cab, etc. The name *Bayan-tala* was nothing but a modernization of the name Feng (-chou)-t'an.

<sup>5</sup> Same in *Ch'üan-pien lüeh-chi* 2. 38b.

<sup>6</sup> Also in WPC 226.7b.

<sup>7</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 202; 9, p. 7; Tamura, *Mōkohen* 8, p. 494. *Shen-tsung SL* 189 (TP ed., Vol. 104, p. 3548).

<sup>8</sup> See above, note 165.

<sup>9</sup> WLWKL 9, p. 9.

<sup>10</sup> Chang Huang 章黃 (1527-1608), *T'u-shu-pien* 圖書編 45.4b.

<sup>11</sup> KPSTC 13. 21b. The same words occur in the *Pei-Lu kung-shih chi-shih* 北虜實事紀事 in *T'u-shu-pien* 43.76b. I do not know who borrowed from whom.

Over the years an impressive number of Chinese had settled there. The WLWKL<sup>12</sup> speaks of 50,000, 10,000 of whom are said to belong to the White Lotus religion, a sect very much under suspicion in China for rebellious activities. There were also many Mongols living in their midst; Mongols, no doubt, who had adopted some measure of sedentary life and to some degree practised agriculture besides their traditional animal husbandry. The Chinese, too, besides being farmers and craftsmen, certainly devoted much effort to raising cattle, sheep, and horses, as all farmers used to do in Inner Mongolia in recent times.

When Altan-qan made peace with China in the fall of 1570, the Chinese insisted on extradition of the ringleaders of the "rebels", and indeed he handed a number over to the Ming.<sup>13</sup> But the vast majority of the Chinese settlers remained undisturbed in Mongolia; to have them all return to their native districts in China would have disrupted the economy of the Mongols to such an extent that inevitably they would have been forced to revert to raiding the borders. In 1572, Chinese officials noted that there were a thousand *ch'ing* of land under cultivation.<sup>14</sup> Yet the very presence of so many Chinese in Mongolia beyond imperial control and forming a strong economic basis for Altan-qan and his successors, remained a sore spot in the eyes of many officials and the idea of forcing them all to come home was put forth more than once, but apparently never acted upon. For example, according to the *Shih-lu*, in 1583, an official expressed the opinion that all the "barbarians" (he means Chinese, who in his eyes had become barbarians) numbering a hundred thousand should be given the opportunity to return.<sup>15</sup> In 1591, the WLWKL makes mention of a similar plan: originally there were several ten-thousands of Chinese in Bayising, prisoners of Altan-qan, and they would have liked to come back to their native villages, but the market policy (initiated in 1570-1) forbade them, and the borders were closed to them. A very unfortunate policy! Now they have multiplied to a hundred thousand and they furnish excellent troops and they constitute a danger on the borders. But lately an epidemic has reduced them by half, and recently some differences have come up between them and the Mongols, and this should be an excellent occasion to invite them to come back.<sup>16</sup> It is

<sup>12</sup> WLWKL 7, pp. 117-18.

<sup>13</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 7, p. 714. *Mu-tsung SL* 52 (TP ed., Vol. 95, p. 1292).

<sup>14</sup> *Shih-lu*: see n. 1. WLWKL 8, p. 150.

<sup>15</sup> Tamura, *Mōkohen* 8, p. 494. *Shen-tsung SL* 141 (TP ed., Vol. 102, p. 2635). Some Chinese officials made a distinction between "Chinese" barbarians and "real" barbarians.

<sup>16</sup> WLWKL 8, p. 231. I have found no corresponding passage in the *Shih-lu* for 1591. The author of this passage overstates his case: very few of the Chinese settlers were prisoners, and it is very questionable that they were so eager to return to China, although they maintained their ties with relatives in their native villages, and may at times have visited there. Very much like Chinese farmers in Inner Mongolia during the latter period of the Ch'ing and under the Republic.

questionable if those figures are to be taken at face value, but at least they give us an indication as to the size of the Chinese population in the Tümed region.

Instead of *pan-sheng*, some Ch'ing authors spell *pai-hsing*.<sup>17</sup> This may be closer to the Mongol original, yet it is interesting that at least up to 1948, Chinese farmers in Inner Mongolia always spoke of *pan-sheng*, not *pai-hsing*, for permanent houses in Mongol territory.

In 1618, the Russian traveller Ivan Petlin and his party passed through this area: "and from the Tsar' Čsakty you go for five days to (another) *ulus* ['people': here 'tribe'?), and this *ulus* is called Bisut [Besüd], and Čičen is its prince; from Čičen you travel five days to (another) *ulus* named Ilčigin [Eljigin], and Taičín-Čerektu is its prince; from Čerektu's *ulus* you travel five days to (another) *ulus* called Bešut [Besüd] and its prince is Čekur; and from Čekur's *ulus* you travel four days to (another) *ulus* named Giryut [?] and Čečen-noyan is its prince; and from Čečen's *ulus* you travel four days to (another) *ulus* called Tulak-tumet [Dolód-tümed], and Taiku-katun [Tayiqu-qatun] is its princess: from Taiku's *ulus* you travel three days to (another) *ulus* known as Yugurčín [Uyiyurčín], and Bušuktu [Bušuytu] is its prince, and from the tsar' Bušuktu you travel two days to (another) *ulus*, to the Yellow Mugal [*i.e.* Sira Mongyol], and this *ulus* is called Mugolčín [Mongyolčín] and Mačika-tut [Majiy-qatun] is its princess. And two days before reaching the Mugal [Mongyol] territory you go through a defile in the middle of the rock - fear seizes you! - and you come out of the defile into Mugal land, and at the exit of that defile there are two stone (-built) towns of the Mugal and the name of these towns is *baišín* [*bayising*] and in one of the towns the leader-prince is Tau-taiša, and in the other town the leader-prince is Onboi-taiša. And a third stone (-built) town in Mugal territory is Lobinskoi:<sup>18</sup> a woman governs it, her name being Mančikatut [Majiy-qatun] and her son is prince Ončín taiči. And this princess rules in all Mugal territories and everything and in every town. Whoever goes to her and from her proceeds to Chinese territory, she will give him a letter stamped with her seal for the towns (the traveller) goes to, and he will be allowed across the border into Chinese territory; but if there is no letter stamped with the seal from her, nobody will be allowed across the border into Chinese territory."<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Chang Mu 張穆, *Meng-ku yu-mu chi* 蒙古游牧記 (*Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu*), Ch'ang-sha, 1939 (continuous pagination), ch. 2, p. 46. Ch'í Yün-shih 祈麟士, *Huang-ch'ao fan-pu yao-lüeh* 皇朝藩部要略, 1839, ed., 1884, 1.23a. However, the *Ta-Ch'ing i-t'ung chih* 124.1a has *pan-sheng*.

<sup>18</sup> *Lobinskoi* is from *taba* ~ *lama*. In the old Russian documents concerning Mongolia, *Lobinskoi* often just means "Mongolia, Mongol".

<sup>19</sup> L. M. Gataullina et al. (eds.), *Russko-Mongol'skie Otnošeniya 1607-1637. Sbornik Dokumentov*, Moskva, 1959, p. 81. For the last sentence of this quotation, a very difficult one, I follow V. G. Šeben'kov's paraphrase: *Russko-Kitaiskie Otnošeniya v xvii v.*, p. 113. See also J. Baddeley, *Russia, Mongolia, China*, 1919, Vol. 1, p. 75.

The reader will have noticed that in this passage, Petlin speaks twice of the same princess Mančikatut, and the "third" town probably is nothing but another reference to one of the previous two. Petlin's *Mančikatut* cannot but be Majiy-qatun. He calls her son Ončín-taiči. We have seen that Baya-beyiji's son, Sodnam, was also known as Ombo.<sup>20</sup> One may wonder if Ončín taiči is not the same as Onboi-taiša mentioned a little earlier, and the same as Ombo-taiji: Sodnam.

In the seventeenth century, *bayising* was also the Mongol term for permanent buildings set up by the Russians in Southern Siberia: we know this from some manuscripts in Leningrad: *Čükü bayising-un kereg dayaysan kereg dayaysan tüsimel mayor*: "Major, officer in charge of affairs of the town Čükü; *Čükü bayising-un terigün* "head of the town Čükü", etc.<sup>21</sup> *Čükü* is the Mongol name of Chikoy near Kiakhta (*Kiyaytu*).

We may also mention the ruins of the lamasery known as *Čayan bayising* "White House", west of present-day Ulan Bator, dating from the beginning of the seventeenth century. The Tibetan and Mongol inscriptions found there have been studied by a number of scholars.<sup>22</sup>

The Chinese emigrants of the north-east, present-day Manchuria, also had their *pan-sheng*: *bayising* and the texts indicate that those emigrants of the Ming period were not so unhappy as some Chinese officials were inclined to believe; these officials forgot that if some emigrants were indeed prisoners most had escaped from intolerable conditions in the empire. A memorial by Hsiung T'ing-pi 熊廷弼 (1569-1625) in the *Ch'ou-Liao shih-hua* 籌邊碩畫, among other things, says: "Formerly, the Caitiffs were poor and hungry, and in winter and spring, when the grass was dry, their horses were as thin as sticks, and therefore we had some respite. Recently, however, their prisoners have built houses (*pan-sheng*) to live in; a great chieftain may have several thousand (prisoners and émigrés); a small one, a thousand; and a smaller one, a few hundred. They make them cultivate the land, and hand over grain and fodder, so that both men and horses are fed, and they can move against us at any time . . . ; (corrupt officials in China) force the hungry populace into the vanguard of their armies so that anger and resentment have become extreme: by force of circumstances (the oppressed people) must leave us and rebel. Once I overheard outsiders say: 'we used to fear especially that the Caitiffs might kill us', but now I hear (them say): 'the Caitiffs build houses (*pan-sheng*) to let us live in; they provide clothes and food to support us; from the yearly harvest they take

<sup>20</sup> Cf. above, note 125.

<sup>21</sup> L. S. Pučkovskii, *Mongol'skie Rukopisi i Ksilografy Instituta Vostokovedeniya I*, Moskva-Leningrad, 1957, pp. . . . 205-11.

<sup>22</sup> G. Huth, *Die Inschriften von Tsaghan Baišin*, Leipzig, 1894; A. M. Pozdneyev, *Mongolia and the Mongols. Volume One, 1892* (translated by John R. Shaw and Dale Plank), Bloomington, Ind., 1971, pp. 308-13; Vladimirtsov, "Nadpisi . . ."; N. Poppe, *Otčēt po Poerdke na Orxon letom 1926 goda*, Leningrad, 1929 (not seen by me).

only a sack of millet and a few bales of hay, and there are no other taxes to annoy us; and besides, among the prisoners previously captured we have relatives and friends who will look after us; rather than die of hunger and starvation and become empty-bellied pretas, or die by the sword and become headless ghosts, we rather throw in our lot with the Caitiffs; this way we may be able to save our lives.' These are ominous words coming up in daily conversation and recently even more often (than before)."<sup>23</sup>

Professor Wada Sei also quotes a brief passage referring to K'ai-yüan 開原 on the Sino-Manchu borders during the late Ming: "as temples they [*i.e.* the Manchus] have storeyed houses to worship the Buddha: bricks, tiles, wood, and stones were all prepared by captured Chinese craftsmen; some of those temples and shrines are very beautiful. There are monks of whom many are Chinese who treat the (native) chieftains as their equals. When a Fan [Tibetan?] monk arrives, all the chieftains greet him. They call (those temples) 'Towers'. The Caitiff camps are often near those 'towers', and all around for a distance of thirty or 40 li there are *pan-sheng* (*bayising*) which means 'Barbarian farm houses'."<sup>24</sup>

The reader may consult a brief note in my paper "Chinese in Southern Mongolia . . ." *Mon. Serica* 18, 1959, pp. 38-9, and a longer discussion by Hagiwara Junpei, "Arutan-kan to Hanshō", in *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 14, 3, 1955, pp. 187-99.

<sup>23</sup> *Ch'ou-Liao shih-hua*, Pei-p'ing, 1937, 1.1a; 11b-12a. Serruys, *Tribute System*, pp. 11, 14. Sei Wada, "Some Problems concerning the Rise of T'ai-tsu, the Founder of the Manchu Dynasty", *Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko* 16, 1957, pp. 65, 66 (translation a little different from mine); Wada Sei, *Tōyōshi kenkyū. Manshūhen*, 1955, p. 527.

<sup>24</sup> Feng Yüan 馬瑗, *K'ai-yüan t'u-shuo* 開原圖說 (*Hsüan-lan-t'ang ts'ung-shu*, 1st series, Vols. 26-7). Text in Wada, *Tōyōshi kenkyū. Mōkohen*, 1955, p. 758.