The manuscript ‘F’ of Sir-a Tuyuji

Kápolnás Olivér

The nomadic lifestyle did not provide perfect conditions for written accounts to survive the centuries. It is one of the reasons why only a few of the chronicles could survive the storms of history. Therefore, every new version of a Mongolian historical work is valuable and important to research. In this short paper I am going to give a brief description of the new version of a work called Sir-a Tuyuji, which is an important Mongolian historical works from the 17th century. Besides, I am also going to share some new ideas concerning its origin.

The Sir-a Tuyuji is a well-known work, many articles have been written about it, and several text editions were published over the last decades. Its research history was summarized well by Bayarsaihan in 2006 and Chuluun in 2011, but a little introduction to the different versions must be presented here. Until now 5 manuscripts were known:

A: Radlof’s manuscript (held in St. Petersburg).
B: Pozdneev’s version (also held in St. Petersburg).
C: Erten-ü mongγol-un qad-un ündüsün-ü yeke sir-a tuγuǰi (it is kept in St. Petersburg too).
D: Činggis qaγan-u teüke or its other title is little (or bay-a) Sir-a Tuyuji. It is held in the National Library of Mongolia.
E: Manǰusiri version (it was discovered by Chuluun in Mongolia in 2006).

Thus, the newly identified Sir-a Tuyuji’s version must be called the version F.

The version F is held in the Library and Information Centre of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, its call number is Mon. 326. The manuscript was described by György Kara in 2000, he called this work the Norbu-Ćoyimpil’s Genealogy of the Khalkha Nobles. He wrote that it is from the mid-19th century, the type of paper is a greenish blue Russian paper, written by calamus with black and red ink. It consists of 34 pages (35.5*8.3cm), with Mongol pagination on every recto page. There is no information regarding when and from where it arrived to the library.

1 Research for this paper was supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA) [K 116568].
4 Kara (2002), 400-401.
Perhaps every scholar, who paid attention to the previous studies on the Sir-a Tuγuǰi, would ask two questions: 1. What is the title of the work? 2. Is there any further evidence that Šamba was the author as it had been suggested by some scholars previously? Unfortunately, a thick paper was glued on the cover of the newly discovered Sir-a Tuγuǰi, thus the title of the work is invisible, so the first question remains unanswered. Despite the fact that Šamba is listed in the version F too, he could not be the real author. He is not related to the version F of the Sir-a Tuγuǰi. \(^6\)

The version F of Sir-a Tuγuǰi can be divided into three main parts: a historical part, a genealogical one, and a short colophon.

The first part is almost identical with the other versions of Sir-a Tuγuǰi, there are only a few differences. Let us have a look at some examples: after the short foreword, which draws attention to the importance of ancestors, we can find an added sentence only in the versions D and F (ene jarim adalis-un tula medeküi-e

\(^5\) Although there were five manuscripts, only the version C bears the title Ertən-ü mongol-un qad-ün ündüsün-ü yeke sir-a tuγuǰi. The manuscript A does not have a title, but on the cover we can read that it is a Mongolian history, brought by Radlof from his expedition to Mongolia in 1891 (Монгольская история, привезенная акад. В. В. Радловым, с Орхонской экспедиции 1891 г.). The first pages of the manuscripts B and E are missing. The D version has two titles: one on the front cover: Dalai blam-a-yin nomlayṣan jalaγus[-un qurim kemekü qad noyad-un uγ teüke, and we can read another title on the back cover: Činggis-ün teüke . qad-un uγ ba učir . omoy-i darularyaṣan sudur.

\(^6\) In 1970, the famous Mongolian historian, Perlee raised the idea that the author of the Sir-a Tuγuǰi was Šamba, who was the brother of Byamba, the author of Asararči neretü-yin teüke. He suggested the obar-yin from this sentence: itegeltü neretü jasay-un čin wang šamba . obar-yin čoytu aqai is a mistake, it must be öber-iyen instead (Perlee (1970), 139-140). In 2011, Chuluun supported this idea, he found the following words in the manuscript E: Šamba bi öber-iyen čoytu aqai (Chuluun (2011), 20-21). The problem of their idea is that the majority of the Sir-a Tuγuǰi had been compiled when Šamba was alive, he could only be someone who continued the work and added new names to the genealogical part. In addition, one of the characteristics of the Mongolian historical works is that the point of view does not change, for example if somebody uses an older work as a source, they have to change such words as now (to that time), here (to there) or I (to that person), but it usually does not happen. In other words, if a later scribe who copied the text written by Šamba did not change the öber-iyen, and as a result we read these words, it does not mean that Šamba had written those lines himself. There is another problem with the čoytu aqai, for which reason I am not sure that this title belongs to Šamba. In the version D we can read this: itegeltü nayiratu [21/22] jasay-un köbegün čing wang šamba .. čoytu aqai dayičing qosıyuči-yin köbegün etc. (ST D, 21-22). Here, the punctuation shows that Šamba and Čoytu Aqai is not the same person (although the punctuation is not a strong evidence). There is a stronger evidence in the version E, where we can read the following: sayin noyan-u qoyaduyar köbegün nom-un ejen .. teşünli negedigüer köbegün yilden degürgeči .. yutayar köbegün čoytu aqai dayičin qosıyuči (Sayin Noyan’s second son is Nom-un Ejen, his first son is Yilden Degürgeči, his third son is Čoytu Aqai Dayičin Qosıyuči. ST E: 31b). Besides, the expression of bi öber-iyen is located before the name in the Asararči neretü-yin teüke (bi öber-iyen byamba erke dayičing. ANT (2002), 82). To sum up, Šamba was not the author of the Sir-a Tuγuǰi, and it is supposed that it was not him, but another person (a scribe) who copied an older work. However, in order to clarify this question, further research is needed.
kilbar-iyar nirayıla bıčibeı⁷). This is missing from the other versions. As another example, in the versions D and F, Chinggis khan was 30 years old when he attacked Buq-a qaγan,⁸ but the other manuscripts state that he was 31.⁹ Next example: when the Mongols attacked China, it was described as nayan tümen kitad (eighty tümen Chinese) in the versions D and F,¹⁰ but in the other versions we only read naiman tümen (eight tümen).¹¹ The next example is a confusing sentence from the D and F versions: ögedei γal γolomta-i döčin qoyar nasun-dayan.¹² According to the other versions, the γal γolomta-i (which means family hearth or homeland) is a mistake, it can be tracked back to the words γal qoni-tai (it means to be born in the fire sheep year),¹³ which is correct, it refers to Ögödei’s birth year. Another example is that it is only in the version F that we can read Saskya Pandita dayisun-i temečel-i darıγad.¹⁴ The dayisun (enemy) is a mistake, in all the other versions it is ters-üd (heretics),¹⁵ which can be the correct one. The next example is Gün Temür’s relation with Ölǰei / Ölǰei-tü Temür: in the versions A, B, C, E, Gün Temür was Ölǰei’s father,¹⁶ but in the D and F Gün Temür is his brother.¹⁷ In addition, Ölǰei Temür was written in the versions A, B, C, D while it appears as Ölǰei-tü Temür in the E and F. The last example is that in the D and F versions we can read the following sentence: qarγačuγ tayiji jegere abalayсан-tur qorin jegeren qoyari inu γarγaǰu. ¹⁸ inu alayısan (When Qarγačuγ Tayiji was hunting for gazelles, he unleashed two of twenty, and killed eighteen),¹⁸ but in the others this part is as follows: qarγačuγ tayiji arban jegeren-i yisüi-i alayısan (Qarγačuγ Tayiji killed nine gazelles out of ten).¹⁹ Although the different sentences have the same meaning, their wording is different. My objective was not to show all the minor and major differences, but to suggest that the version F has a closer relation to the version D than the others, and the A, B, C, E form one group.

Besides the differences, we can find typical errors that derive from copying, for example a missing line (here indicated with a square bracket): sidurγu qaγan bars bolun qubilaqui-dur inu eǰen [arslan bolun. sidurγu

---

⁷ ST D, 1a. ST F, 1a.
⁸ ST D, 4a. ST F, 5a.
⁹ ST ABC (1957), 23. ST E, 4b.
¹⁰ ST D, 4a. ST F, 5a.
¹¹ ST ABC (1957), 23. ST E, 4b.
¹² ST F, 8b. ST D, 7a.
¹³ ST ABC (1957), 47. ST E, 9a.
¹⁴ ST F, 9a.
¹⁵ ST ABC (1957), 48. ST D, 7a. ST E, 9a.
¹⁶ ST ABC (1957), 61. ST E, 14a.
¹⁷ ST D, 10b. ST F, 13a.
¹⁸ ST D, 12b. ST F, 15b.
¹⁹ ST ABC (1957), 66. ST E, 16b.
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qayan köbegün bolun qubilqui-tur inu : [ejen20] gormusta bolun qubilaju sidurğu qayan-i baribai21 (When Sidurğu qayan became a tiger, the lord [became a lion. when Sidurğu qayan became a child, the lord became Qormusta and seized him.) The reason for this missing line is that the previous lines and this line have the same ending words (here: ejen), and while copying the text, the scribe read a sentence and wrote it down, memorising the last words, and then searched these words in the original text. If two or more sentences had the same ending, the scribe’s eye could easily skip a line as it happened here.

The second part, the genealogical section, is more detailed than in the other versions. It is the most valuable and the most problematic passage of the work. Unlike in the other versions, this part consists of only Dayan khan’s family tree, the focus being on the Geresenǰe’s descendants. I would like to show one example by the family tree of Geresenǰe’s second son, Noyantai Qatun Bayatur.22 His genealogical tree is not the same as the one we can find in other works. Besides the other Sir-a Tuyuji’s, I also used different texts for comparison: Iledkel Šastir,23 a history of Zasagt khan’s province24 and a genealogy tree.25 The beginning of the family tree is the same in all of the accounts: Geresenǰe’s second son is Noyantai Qatun Bayatur,26 his son is Töbed Qatun Bayatur.27 Töbed Qatun Bayatur had two sons: Qongγor Sečen Ğinong,28 the name of his brother is missing from the F version of Sir-a Tuyuji.29 Qongγor Sečen Ğinong had two sons, the first is Čerįskib Ğöökኡ,30 the second is Čeringǰab Sayin Aqai Dayičin.31 In addition, in the other versions of Sir-a Tuyuji we can find 2 more siblings.32

Čering Ğöökኡ’s son is Dorǰi Jőrįtu,33 his son is Mergen Gǔŋg Sonomǰab,34 who is referred to as

20 ST ABC (1957), 34. ST D, 6a. ST E, 7b.
21 ST F, 7a.
23 Iledkel (2006).
29 According the other text, he was called Sayin Badma Qatan Bayatur, his son and his grandson were also mentioned. ST ABC (1957), 85.
30 NKZ (2011), 47: Čering Ğći. He and his descendants were missing from the ENDA.
32 Bayaran Aqai and Čaŋskib Sečen Noyan ST ABC (1957), 85.
33 In the other versions of Sir-a Tuyuji he is called Dorǰi Jőrį-tu Ğinong (ST ABC (1957), 85). His name is missing from the Iledkel. NKZ (2011), 47: Dorǰi Sečen Ğinong.
Sonom Isi Gün in the other versions of *Sir-a Tuγuǰi*. Sonomǰab’s descendants appear only in the F version of *Sir-a Tuγuǰi*: Sonomǰab’s son is called Joriytu Čögükür Güng Lhawang, his son is Joriytu Čögükür Jincendorĳi, whose son is Mönge Joriytu Čögükür Güng Lhënsürüng. According to the Iledkel Šastir, Lhënsürüng heritaged the rank of *jasay ulus-tur tuslayći güng* in 1758, and in 1781 he was still alive.

Apart from the manuscript F, the second son of Sečin Jìnong, Čeringǰab Sayin Aqai Dayičin’s descendants were mentioned only in one sentence in the *Sir-a Tuγuǰi’s* versions. It is as follows: čeriskib aqai dayičin-yin köbegün čewan dorǰi čayan bars tegünü köbegün bükübei bars beyise (Čeriskib Aqai Dayičin’s son is Čewan Dorǰi Čayan Bars, his son is Bükübei Bars Beyise); however, in the version F we can find a long passage on Čeringǰab’s descendants. It is the following:

> sečin jìnong-un qoyaduγar köbegün čeringǰab sayin aqai dayičin .. ireküi-yin čayan bars . tegünü köbegün čewingdorǰi ireküi-yin čayan bars gelong boluşan-u qoγin-a tngri toγin .. tegünü qoyaduγar köbegün qongγor čayan bars beyise tegünü köbegün čayan bars tüsīy-e güng wangčuγ .. tegünü köbegün dalai dayičin güng lhawang .. ireküi-yin čayan bars tngri-yin tuslaycĩ iłdeng .. qosiyuči kesig .. tegünü ireküi čayan bars noyan qasq-a .. tegünü köbegün tuslaycĩ sayin aqai dayičin güngčuγǰal ..

Sečin Jìnong’s second son is Čeringǰab Sayin Aqai Dayičin, Irekűi-yin Čayan Bars. His son is Čewingdorǰi Irekűi-yin Čayan Bars, after becoming a monk he would be called Tngri Toγin. His second son is Qongγor Čayan Bars Beyise, his son is Čayan Bars Tüsīy-e Güng Wangčuγ. His son is Dalai Dayičin Güng Lhawang. Irekűi-yin Čayan Bars Tngri-yin Tuslaycĩ Ildeng. Qosiyuči Kesig. His son is Čayan Bars Noyan Qasq-a. His son is Tuslaycĩ Sayin Aqai Dayičin Güngčuγǰal.

This part is not too clear and the names are not in consonance with the other genealogies. For example, Qongγor Čayan Bars Beyise, who was the second son of somebody, appears as Bübei in the other texts. Now let us focus on Čayan Bars Noyan Qasq-a. He and his son, Güngsuγǰal, were missing from other genealogies (even from the Iledkel Šastir), but he definitely belonged to Zasagt khan’s family; he was

35 ST ABC (1957), 85.
40 Here the *his* (tegünü) is ambiguous as of who it refers to.
41 Or *sons are*, because it is not clear whether one or two (or three) people were described in the followings.
42 The previous sentences are very problematic, they can be understood in different ways. Whom does the *tegünü qoyaduγar köbegün* refer to? Who was the father of qongγor čayan bars beyise?

---
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a descendant of Qongyor Sečen Jinong, the grand-grandson of Geresenje. Qasq-a belonged to a minor subfamily, which explains why they were missing from other genealogies. There is no data about his life, it is only known that his grandfather, Wančuγ passed away in 1766, and Lhawangdorji, who was his father (or his uncle?) died in 1784. Thus he presumably passed away around the beginning of the 19th century. Qasq-a is an important person for us, because, according to the colophon, he was the author, as it can be seen in the next passage.

The final section of the work is a short colophon, its important part (without the eulogy) is as follows:

üčüken taulai metü ebügen ireküi-yin čaγan bars noyan qasq-a norbu čös pel kemekü bertegčin üčüken oyutu tenig munggay ba erten-ü olan teiike-yi yeke noyad üjekü-dür üjejü sonosuγsan ba. basa blam-a noyad sečed merged ayiladdulčaq-yi olan-ta sonosuγsan-iyar ene qalq-a-yin noyad-i qoyitus-dur medekü-dür kilbar boltüyai kemen tobčilan bičigsen

I am, who is called Ireküi-yin Čaγan Bars Noyan Qasq-a Norbu Ĉös Pel, a foolish, half-wit old man, who is ignorant like a little rabbit. When visiting aristocrats, I used to hear and read old chronicles, in addition, I heard orations of high lamas many times. Thus I decided to write a summary of the history for the future generations of khalkha nobles so that they understand the past easily.

As we can read, the author was Čaγan Bars Noyan Qasq-a, and as we have seen previously, he was active in the last decades of the 18th century, consequently, he compiled his work that time, probably at the end of the 18th century. However, the present manuscript cannot have been written by Qasq-a, because many copy errors can be found in the newly added parts also. For example, he mentioned his grandfather’s brother, but his name was missing. Thus the manuscript might have been written later than Qasq-a had compiled it. The place of the writing can be localized to the territory of the Besüd otoγ, where the elite wore the title of čaγan bars (figure 1).

There is a very important question, however: what did Qasq-a do? It is out of question that he could be the author of the main text of the Sir-a Tuγuǰi, he could only have continued the work that had been written (compiled) by somebody else. He copied a previous work word by word, and added new genealogical fragments to the second part.

Another important question concerns the history of the work used by Qasq-a. It can be divided into different parts, whose author could not have been the same person, so the question arises that who could have been the author of these sections and who and when compiled them into one. In this short paper I do not

---

46 ST F, 34b. (Figure 2).
intend to solve these problems, nevertheless, I wish to add some remarks regarding this question.

In the part of *Sir-a Tuγuǰi* that describes Chinggis khan’s life, the most important person after Chinggis khan is Boγorči. The other famous people from Chinggis’ environment are missing, only Boγorči was mentioned and eulogized. It means that presumably this part was compiled or written by one of the descendants of Boγorči. There are several examples for this phenomenon, for example Mergen Gegen focused on Khasar in his historical work, because he was one of descendants of him. According to the *Bolor Toli*, Boγorči’s descendants still lived in Ordos in the 18-19th century. Although I cannot show any strong evidence for it, I suppose that one of Boγorči’s descendants compiled a historical work at around the end of the 15th century or the beginning of the 16th century in Ordos. Its evidence is the fact that Mandukhñai was the last person whose biography was written, after Mandukhñai the style completely changed, the narration was replaced by a pure genealogy. It is supposed that when Gerensenje’s sons moved to the northern territories, one of their scholars (or lamas) took this work and added a genealogical part to it. The original work was passed on through at least 2 branches: one to the Zasagt khan’s province (it would be the origin of the manuscripts D and F), the other to the Sayin noyan’s province (it provided the basis of the versions A, B, C and E). Over the decades, many scribes copied it and added new names to the family trees. To put it on another way: there are two redactions of *Sir-a Tuγuǰi*: one is the *Zasagt khan’s redaction* (it consist of the D and F manuscripts) and the other is the *Sayin noyan’s redaction* (the A, B, C, E versions belong to it). Further research can clarify the exact relations between the manuscripts.

Finally, I would like to draw attention to one thing: Qasq-a wrote that when he visited aristocrats, he

48 Möngke (1997), 206.

49 ĉinggis qan-i tngri boluγsan čaγtu šaril-i üǰebeši solongγ-a metü miraljirad nigen toqui keritei boluγsan-i bütgüdeger üǰeǰi γayiγaldarad olan tüsimed ba qatud keuķed jöbleldün kelečejü . altan qayirčaγ dotor-a jalayd tngri-yin ordo qarsi-yin bayidal-tu čomčog kemekü ordon-du orosiyiļju takibai .. tende-eče šaril-i egüride takiqui-dur kičiyeltei tüsimed-i songron kelečekü đür külig boγorči noyan ogülebei . boyda eǰeǰn-luy-a-ban bi baγ-a-ača qanilun qatayu jögen oyilx-y aǰdkūγ-y yabuluγ-a .. qan-u gegen sedkil dalda boluγsan bolbaču erdeni metü šaril-i bi ber takiqui küse-mu kemegsen-e bütgüdeger jöbsiyeǰi boγorči noyan-du tusiyaju takiyulbai .. teden-ü udum edüge ordos-un qosɣun-a darqadčud kemekü nigen keseg ulus (*Bolor Toli* (1984), 422) When Chinggis khan passed away, his ashes glared like a rainbow and became one cubit length. Everbody saw it and wondered. Several officials, consorts and princes created a council, they put the khan’s ashes into a golden box, placed it in a palace called Čomčog, which looked like a palace of god, and made an offering to it. After, they wanted to choose somebody who would be in charge of making offerings forever. That time Boγorči said that he became Chinggis’ companion from his childhood, they were together through thick and thin, he served him tirelessly. Now, although the khan’s will was unknown, he wished to make offerings to his ashes, which was like a gemstone. Everybody approved his intention and they made him in charge of the offerings. Now Boγorči’s descendants belong to the *darhats* in Ordos.

50 The evidence that somebody, who was one of the descendants of Sayin Noyan, copied (and continued?) a previous text, see the 6. footnote.
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used to hear and read old chronicles. It is a little reference to how the history was transmitted from generation to generation. It seems that the nobles were more interested in the genealogies than the historical events. Qasq-a did not mention any historical facts from the last decades, he continued only the genealogical part.

It is important that in the future the whole text of the newly discovered manuscript of Sir-a Tuyuji is published. The focus of the research must be on the genealogical part, in addition, the process of the formation of historical works and their authority also need to be re-examined.

Figure 1.

The main territory of the Besüids (after Ochir & Gerelbardah 2003: 115).

Presumably it was the cradle of the F version of Sir-a Tuyuji.

Figure 2.

The colophon of F version of Sir-a Tuyuji.

(With the permission of the Oriental Collection of the Library and Information Centre of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.)
Editions of Sir-a Tuγuǰi

Sir-a Tuγuǰi: A, B, C manuscripts

- ST ABC (1957) Шара Туджи. Монгольская летопись XVII века. Сводный текст, перевод введение и примечания Н.П.Шастиной. Москва-Ленинград.

Sir-a Tuγuǰi: D manuscript

- ST D (2011) Бага шар тууж буюу Чингис хаан, хаад ноёдын уг түүх. Монгол бичгийн гар бичмэлний харьцуулсан кирилл бичигт буулган тайлбар, хийсэн монгол бичгээр сийрүүлсэн Оюут овгийн Дамдинбазарын Пүрэвдорж. Улаанбаатар.

Sir-a Tuγuǰi: E manuscript


---

51 In the footnotes I refer to the page number of the original manuscript, the reader can find it in both of editions.
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Sir-a Tuγuǰi: F manuscript

It has never been published. The Institute of History of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences plans to release this manuscript in the near future.
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