QAN-QAγAN AND THE BEGINNINGS OF MONGOL KINGSHIP

by

LAWRENCE KRADER

Ann Arbor

The appearance of a number of editions and translations of the *Secret History of the Mongols* by Haenisch,[1] Pelliot,[2] Shiratori,[3] and Kozin,[4] during the past decade, enables us to examine at closer range the process of development of the Mongol empire. Inherent in this process is the development of the concept and functions of the ruler. The Mongols grew in power with enormous rapidity, within the scope of a few men's lifetimes. They started from the chaotic beginnings of nomad life, their later political institutions present only in foetal form. During the course of the 11th and 12th centuries they came into contact with other nomadic or recently nomadic peoples such as the Ju-chên and the Ch'i-tan, who had conquered China, the Turkic peoples who then occupied Outer Mongolia, and minor related groups, such as the Naiman and the Kereit with whom they fought and allied. They gradually built up a vast political being, a state, an emperor, a retinue, advisors, ministers, judges and priests, a tax and census system, an imperial court, a garde-de-corps, an army, an empire. Many of these particulars originated in the Chinese sphere, others were part of the life on China's northern marches, in the nomadic steppe; still others went from China through the nomadic margin to the Mongols as they evolved into a functioning entity along that margin.

The Mongols evolved from a body of herders endowed for the purposes of unity only with a consciousness of ethnic identity, to a political system with a complex internal structure, and finally to a vast state and empire, at an accelerating tempo. A measure of the growth of the Mongol political

[1] Erich Haenisch, *Mangḫol-un Niuca Tobca'an* (*Yüan-ch'ao Pi-shi*), Leipzig 1935; *Wörterbuch zu Mangḫol-un Niuca Tobca'an*, Leipzig 1939; *Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, 2nd ed., Leipzig 1948.

[2] Paul Pelliot, *Histoire Secrète des Mongols*, Paris 1949.

[3] Shiratori Kurakichi, *Onyaku-Môbun-genchô-hishi*, Tokyo, Tōyō Bunko, 1942.

[4] S. A. Kozin, *Sokrovennoe Skazanie Mongolov*, vol. 1, Leningrad 1941.

being may be found in the development of the functions of the ruler, and in the choice and use of his title. For the latter, the care with which the Secret History reports the forms of the titles, the modes and styles of address, the formulae of enthronement, together with changes in titularization, is of unique significance.

It is important to know whether the Mongols gave their rulers the same titles and endowed them with the same forms of address as they did the rulers of the other nomadic peoples on the one hand, and the emperor of China on the other. We will thus infer whether the Mongols in the *Secret History* place their ruler on the same plane with other rulers, if not, on what plane, and in relation to what other rulers. The *Secret History* was composed in the middle of the 13th century, possibly twenty or even forty years after the death of Chingis Khan, and before the founding of the Yüan dynasty.[5] According to Haenisch, its author was possibly Shigiqutuqu, who was the compiler of the Mongol yasak or codex, and who had been one of Chingis's ministers.[6] The author was undoubtedly a man of letters, and had participated in great events. He has thus much to tell us about the ideological position of Chingis vis-à-vis his peers and his forebears and successors.

The time lapse between the death of Chingis Khan and the composition of the *History* raises the problem of a possible "rectification of names".

The precise signification of titles, relationships among these significations, formulae of enthronement, and honorifics, may possibly permit the recognition of difference in rank among the Mongol rulers synchronically and diachronically.

We may distinguish three sub-periods within this stage of Mongol history. The first begins with Qabul *qahan*, the great-grandfather of Chingis Khan, who was the first to have the governance of all the Mongols. To govern them all means to have unified them. Two processes were unfolding at the same time: one, the establishment of the political unity through force of a unifying ruler; and two, the establishment by the Mongols of their political identity through their recognition of themselves as a state, through the force of their political self-consciousness. Thus a ruler had a double function in regard to unification; one, in the act of unification, and two, in the ideology built upon the recognition of that unity, of which he was the protagonist.

[5] William Hung, 'The Transmission of the ... Secret History of the Mongols,' *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 1951, XIV, p. 488. In this perceptive article Professor Hung proposes 1264 as the year of completion of the *Secret History*.

[6] Haenisch, *Geheime Geschichte*, p. i.

The first period, then, extends from Qabul through the young manhood of Chingis Khan, his great-grandson. In the first period, the Mongol self-recognition manifested itself in a distinction in title between the Mongol ruler and the emperor of China, and an identification in title with the rulers of the other nomadic peoples. The emperor of China was called *qaγan*, as had been the old T'o-pa emperors and the Uigur, both Altaic peoples. Qabul and his sons, Ambaγai and Qutula, were called *qan*, as we shall have occasion to show. If Qabul and Ambaγai were a'so called with the bisyllabic title *qahan* in the *Secret History*, this was a posthumously endowed honor which was made accessible by the glory of his line. There is a second possibility. Qabul, Qutula, and Ambaγai had the title of *qan*, for that is how Chingis Khan refers to at least one of them, Qutula, and all of them had the same rank. On the other hand, the form *qahan* may have been merely an honorific, that is, an element added to the name, which is honorable in a general way. We cannot decide this question in the absence of the formula of enthronement or contemporary diplomatic correspondence. The title *qan*, the significance of which is made very clear by the *Secret History*, refers to the nomadic rulers, specifically, rulers of more important peoples, the Mongols, the Naimans, the Kereits, and possibly the Qarlu'ud.

Several conclusions follow from the foregoing. One, *qaγan* was higher than *qan*, just as the Chinese empire was more grandiose a political phenomenon than any nomadic people. Two, the ruler, of the Mongols was on an equal plane with his neighboring nomadic princes. Three, China was the leading cultural, political, social force in the entire cultural world of which the Mongols were a part; the political control of the entirety of this world with China at the core did not necessarily bring cultural dominance within it.

The second period is different in kind from the first. The ruler of the Mongols, Chingis Khan, became the ruler, not only of his own people, but of many others. This period covers the last three decades of his life, from about 1200 to his death in 1227. At his enthronement he was titled *qan*, he called himself *qan*, later his queen called him *qan*. His subjects called him *qaγan*, and referred to him in the third person as "his Majesty", as opposed to the formula of enthronement ceremony, where he was addressed in the second person.[7]

[7] Certain rhetorical devices common to European linguistic culture have not been fully worked out in Orientology. For example, in "Peter the Great", "the Great" is in apposition to "Peter". However, the apposition is not an independent element, and is not applied alone to Peter, above all, not in address. *Qaγan*, on the other hand, is at

In the third period, after the death of Chingis, and beginning with the reign of Ögödei, two titles were in use. Ögödei was titled *qan* at his enthronement. But at the very end of the *Secret History* he was called Universal *qaγan*, and in later writings of the Yüan dynasty he was referred to as the *qaγan*. All the successors to Chingis in the Mongol dynasty used this title exclusively.

The concept of duration in a house, the dynasty, was something new. The device used to signify the dynasty was a plural of the form *qan*: *qad*. The imperial throne was the *qan*'s seat: *qan oron*. An individual emperor was a *qaγan*, and he referred to himself as such: *qaγan ǰarliq manu*, "our imperial decree".

The evidence that the *Secret History* offers us in tracing the development of the institution of kingship will be analyzed in the following pages. Vladimircov,[8] who has gone over the same ground with the use of other sources, principally Rashid ed-Din, has adopted an entirely different point of view. He started from the premise that the Mongols during the era of Chingis Khan were evolving from one great historical stage, the tribal, into another great historical stage, the feudal. One may question whether these two formations in the evolution of society are at all applicable to the Mongols in the era of the 11th-13th centuries. That is, the Mongols were not essentially a tribal society before Chingis, certainly not immediately prior to his rule. They did not become feudal during and after his life time. It may be shown, although not in this paper, that they were not in the process of developing from one great evolutionary stage to another in this era. This follows from another premise, that they were not an independent cultural unity, but part of a larger whole. The historical forces at work in their development as a people and as an empire are not inherent in the Mongols alone; these forces emerge from the relations between them and their neighbors, Chinese, Turkic, Manchu-Tungusic. The Mongols evolved politically as they were embraced in the orbit of the Sinitic cultural world.

The Mongols as such moved definitively into the Sinitic culture world

---

once a title, "emperor", an honorific in Chingis *qaγan* and a mode of address, "his Majesty" – used by the Mongols in the third person. One bearing the title *qan* may bear an honorific *qaγan*, or *qaγan* may function as both title and honorific. "God the Lord" may be a closer parallel, where "Lord" is a separable and independent element, functioning simultaneously as a mode of address, albeit in the second person in Biblical usage. We will return to this point.

[8] B. Ja. Vladimircov, *Obščestvennyj Stroj Mongolov, Kočevoj Feodalizm*, Leningrad 1934; French translation, M. Carsow, *Le Régime Social des Mongols, Féodalisme Nomade*, Paris 1948.

in the era of the 11th-13th centuries. They moved into an area which had for long been economically related to the Chinese; and they began to apply to themselves cultural and political conceptions rooted in this sphere as they entered at this period into political and military relations within it. Thus there is a development observable in the Mongols in this era, but it is not one of great evolutionary movement. Rather, the development is along the lines of specific institutions and cultural features. And one of the primary of these institutions developed at this time was kingship. To one aspect of the development of the institutions of kingship the following pages are devoted.

I. ETYMOLOGY

There are a number of conflicting views on the origin of the term itself. Ramstedt[9] has equated Korean *kwan*, *kap-kwan*, with Avar *capcanus*, old Bulgar καυκάνος, καπχανος *qabqanas*, and probably with Orkhon *qaγan*. Ramstedt further alludes to the existence in Old Turkic and Mongol of two forms, *qaγan/qa'an* and the simpler *qan*, related to Sino-Korean *kwan*, Governor. According to him, whatever difference there had been between the two seems mostly to have been lost.[10]

Another school, represented by Altheim and Szemerényi, claims an Iranic origin for the terms, developing a view originally advanced by Schaeder.[11] According to Altheim and Szemerényi, there is a Middle Iranian (Northwest dialect-Parthian) **kav kavān* which was contracted to **kavkān* or *qawγan*. The fact that both *kav kavān* and *kavkān* are reconstructed and nowhere attested weaken this view, and it has come under severe attack by Sinor.[12]

Sinor in a recent article rejects an Iranian derivation for the title, and holds it to be an Altaic form. The title *qapqan* is an intensification of *qan*, just as *qap-qara* is an intensification of *qara* black. The form *qapqan* is distinguished by Sinor from another title, *qapγan*, which he etymologizes as a verbal adjective of *qap-* to attack.

Sinor's explanation has the advantage of being both internally consistent with principles of Altaic grammar and simple, that is, not going to

[9] G. J. Ramstedt, *Studies in Korean Etymology, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, no. 95, Helsinki 1949, p. 95.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

[11] F. Altheim, 'Das Auftreten der Hunnen', *Acta Archaeologica Acad. sc. Hungar.*, II, 1952, p. 270. O. Szemerényi, 'Südwestiranische Lehnwörter im Ungarischen und Türkischen', in: Altheim, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Sprache*, 1951, pp. 66–84.

[12] D. Sinor, 'Qapqan', *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, 1954, parts 3–4, pp. 174 et sqq., esp. pp. 181–183.

the field of Iranistics when an explanation can be made within the Altaic domain itself. One question remains, however, i.e., the phonological relationship between *qan* and *qaγan*. Are the two terms one, or is *qaγan* derived from another root, *qap-* (*qapγan*)? If the latter, how is the hyphaeresis regarding *-p-* accounted for?

In the same article, Sinor cites a passage from the *Annales Einhardi* which is most relevant to the thesis of the present article. Sinor writes:[13] "It is clear that after Theodore's death the *caganus*, who thus was certainly not the supreme chief of the Avars, wished to ask for a higher title [of the Byzantine emperor]; and I surmise that the second '*caganus*' stands for '*capcanus*'. The context clearly asks for this emendation, but even without it the passage shows that the dignity of a *qapqan* was thought to be superior to that of a *qaγan*."

Thus at the other end of the steppe world, on the margins of the Byzantine empire, a set of relationships closely parallel to the Mongol were established, in which an Altaic steppe people moved in the orbit of a greater politico-cultural sphere. The Avars did not consider themselves an independent unity, but were subordinate to Byzantium. This is true of certain eras in Mongol history vis-à-vis the Chinese. The Avars possessed a set of titles of varying rank, which they applied to their ruler. The choice of title depended on the actual power of the Avar ruler at the time, and ultimately, his relations to Byzantium. Finally, the terms themselves are etymologically related to those found among the Mongols centuries later.

II. THE *SECRET HISTORY*

It is unfortunate that the death of Paul Pelliot prevented the publication of the notes to his *Histoire Secrète des Mongols*; only his reconstruction of the text and a translation of half of the "chapters" have appeared posthumously. In an earlier article reviewing Barthold's *Turkestan*[14] Pelliot had written on the problem of Chingis Khan's title: "I doubt whether Chingis Khan ever bore the title of *qaγan* and shall explain this in regard to the *Secret History* of the Mongols; his true title seems to me to have been Cinggis-xan or Cinggiz-xan."[15]

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

[14] W. Barthold, *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion*, 2nd ed., London 1928.

[15] Pelliot, 'Notes sur le 'Turkestan' de M. W. Barthold', *T'oung Pao*, XXVII, 1930, p. 25. Pelliot had criticized Barthold's use of the bisyllabic title for Chingis Khan, and had proposed the solution cited above. Barthold had written in his *Turkestan*, p. 382: "After the victory over the Tatars, when the Khān of the Keraits had made himself the

Several comments are necessary. The form *khān*, monosyllabic and with long quantity, is not to be confused with the much later, Spoken Mongol *xān*, which derives, through the loss of the intervocalic voiced spirant, from an originally bisyllabic word *qaγan* in Script Mongol, with two non-long vowels. The form Barthold uses is a Persian transcription of the Mongol term and will be referred to again in this paper in regard to an erroneous usage by Vladimircov. According to the evidence of the *Secret History*, the form *qaγan* did not disappear from use after the death of Qabul *qaγan* but is specifically conferred upon Ambaγai, who was selected by Qabul to succeed him and rule over all the Mongols (para. 52). Moreover, the assertion that Chingis's claim to descent from Qutula was "in all probability unfounded" seems to me gratuitous. Finally, according to the evidence of the *Secret History*, the Kereit Wang (Ong) Khan had nothing to do with the raising of Temüjin-Chingis to Khan.

Pelliot had in mind the scenes depicted in paragraphs 123–126 of the *Secret History*, and again in paragraph 202. In the first of them, Temüjin is called *Činggis qahan* and is entitled *qan*,[16] but only before a few of his immediate followers. In the second he is addressed as *Cinggis qahan* and entitled *qan* before the entire Mongol people. The first of these events took place shortly before 1200[17] although no calendar notation exists before the Hen year *takiya jil* (1201) (para. 141). The second event we know definitely to have taken place in the Tiger year *bars jil* (1206) (para. 202). In para. 123 Altan, Qučar, and Sača Beki say to Temüjin, *čima-yi qan bolqaya Temüǰin-i qan bolu'asu* "We will make you the *qan*. When Temüjin will be the *qan*..." And again, *Temüǰin-i Činggis qahan ke'en nereyitčü qan bolqaba* ..." they made Temüjin the *qan*, calling him Chingis *qahan*." This formula is repeated in the succeeding three paragraphs dealing with his accession to the new honor: para. 124, *Činggis*

---

chief personage in Eastern Mongolia, this troop proclaimed its leader kagan; with the consent of the Kerait, Wang Khān, Tamuchin accepted this title, and revived the family name of Mongol, which had disappeared in Mongolia proper after Qutula Qaghan. By adopting the term Mongols for his tribe Tamuchin declared himself the successor of Qutula Qaghan, and also asserted a claim, in all probability unfounded, to relationship with him."

[16] Professor N. Poppe in a personal communication has noted that *qahan* here is part of his new name. As such it would not be an apposition such as "Ivan the Terrible" or "Philip the Fair". It would rather be an honorific such as "Lord God of Hosts", where both "Lord" and "God of Hosts" are independent forms of address, unlike "the Terrible", "the Fair", etc. In this paper, such an honorific will be distinguished from a title as such.

[17] *Sanang Sečen* (I. J. Schmidt ed. and tr., St. Petersburg 1829), pp. 70/71, gives 1189. Why this date is rejected will be the subject of separate treatment.

qahan qan bolu'at "Chingis *qahan* becoming the *qan*"; para. 125, *tende Činggis qahan qan bolǰu* "Thereupon Chingis *qahan* having become the *qan*"; para. 126, *Činggis qahan-i qan bolqaba* "They made Chingis *qahan* the *qan*".[18] Note the use of the second person in the quotation from para. 123. This is opposed to the future modes of address to Chingis Khan which are in the third person.

The *Secret History* was set down in the Mouse year *quluqana ǰil* (tentatively 1264), that is, thirty-seven years after the death of Chingis Khan. Thus Pelliot could only have meant in his comment on Barthold's usage that the bisyllabic form *qa'an/qahan* came to be applied to the ruler only after his death, while during his lifetime he had only the title *qan*. Only when titles, styles of address, and honorifics are distinguished does Pelliot's note make sense. As we have seen from the forms of address at the enthronement ceremonies, in both instances his followers told him that they would make him *qan*, and he was named Chingis *qaγan*. He was also addressed as *qaγan*, as we shall see in a moment.[19] The style of address and the separable, generalized element in the name coincide in the form *qaγan*.

Aside from the passages containing the ceremonies and formulae of enthronement, entitlement, Chingis Khan does not bear the monosyllabic title. Nevertheless, it is clear that he regarded himself, and was regarded by his followers, as a *qan*; so much we can infer from these formulae.

Where he is addressed without name, he is addressed with the bisyllabic form (e.g., para. 140 and 145). In para. 140, Büri bökö and Belgütei were

[18] Why Pelliot made this sentence into the message which he sent by Daqai and Sügegei to To'oril *qan* of the Kereit is not clear. The text reads, *Činggis qahan-i qan bolqaba keyen kereyid-ün To'oril qan-tur Daqai Sügegei qoyar-i elči ilebe* "He sent as envoys both Daqai and Sügegei to To'oril *qan* of the Kereit saying, 'They made Chingis *qahan* the *qan*'." Pelliot's "pour lui dire" does not belong in a literal translation. Haenisch eschews the direct address in his translation.

[19] The Mongol language in the 13th century maintained a phonemic opposition between voiced and unvoiced velar plosives and spirants in intervocalic position; at some time in this period the intervocalic voice plosive or spirant disappeared with compensatory lengthening of the postconsonantal vowel, with the exception of the syllables: *uγa*, *üge*. For an analysis of these syllables cf. N. Poppe, 'The Groups **uγa* and **üge* in Mongol Languages', *Studia Orientalia*, XIV, 1950, pp. 1–15. This process has reached virtual completion today, e.g., *xān* (Khalkha, Kalmuk), *xāă* (Ordos) <*qaγan* (Script Mongol) "khan"; (Script Mongol) *naγur*> *nūr* (Khalkha, Kalmuk, Ordos) "lake"; (Script Mongol) *nigür*> (Ordos, Kalmuk, Khalkha) *nūr* "face". During the process of transition, the reduction of the plosive gave rise to an allophonic aspirate, back spirant and glottal. This accounts for the alternation *qahan/qa'an/qaγan*. Cf. G. J. Ramstedt, *Das Schriftmongolische und die Urga Mundart phonetisch verglichen*, Helsingfors 1902, p. 21; for the rule and its exceptions noted above, cf. N. N. Poppe, 'Die Sprache der Mongolischen Quadratschrift und das Yüan-ch'ao Pi-shi', *Asia Major*, 1944, N.S., I, p. 100 f.

commanded by Chingis Khan to wrestle. The "*qahan* bit his lower lip" *qahan ilügey-iyen ǰa'uba*. Büri bökö had had his back broken in the wrestling, and in speaking to the Khan said "fearing the *qahan*" *qahan-ača ayuǰu*. Thus we see the bisyllabic form used in direct address, which is in the third person, in contrast to the enthronement formulae. The same manner of direct address to the Khan is encountered in a later passage (para. 145). During this scene, Jelme, who had just saved Chingis Khan's life in battle, reported his action to the Khan with the words *qa'an-a u'ulba* "caused the *qa'an* to drink", and his thoughts to the Khan with the words *qa'an-u hangqaqsan* "the *qa'an*'s thirsting".

These passages indicate the use of the bisyllabic form applied to Chingis Khan in conversations purported to have taken place during his lifetime, but as a mode of address, not as a title, and to that extent, there is a corroboration of Pelliot. In the same scenes, as well as elsewhere, Chingis *qahan*, or simply the *qahan* (*qa'an*) is referred to by the author of the *Secret History*. These are instances of the honorific usage, and not the titular.

For the rest, only a few other rulers in the *Secret History* are qualified by the bisyllabic form. We may regard these as posthumous honors. Qabul *qahan*, the first to have all the Mongols under his rule, is the first to bear this honorific after his name, in para. 52.[20] The others who bear it are Qutula *qahan*, Qabul's fourth son, and Ambaγai, who was Qabul's successor, whom Qabul himself had named (para. 52 and 53)[21] despite the

[20] The earliest references to any social stratification in the *Secret History* is in para. 1, where Batači *qan* is mentioned; thereafter in para. 8, *ejen* "master", and para. 9, where the *ejet* "masters" of the Uriankhai are mentioned. Later there are *ba'atur*, as Qabiči *ba'atur* (para. 43), Način *ba'atur* (para. 45), etc. This rank, "hero", was the noble stratum to which Yesügei, Chingis' father, belonged.

[21] Cf. Archimandrite Palladius (Kafarov), *Starinnoe Mongol'skoe Skazanie o Čingis xane, Trudy Členov Rossijskoi Duxovnoj Missii*, 2nd ed., tom IV, Peking 1910. Palladius has subjected this passage to analysis in note 48, p. 86 to para. 52: "Ts s [Ch'ien Ta-hsin? If this is the man, then Palladius cited erroneously, for his book is the *Nien erh shih k'ao i* Critical Remarks on the Twenty-two Dynastic Histories, and not the *Nien erh k'ao i*, as he notes on p. 80] asserts that the Mongol khans begin at this time. Qabul was the descendant of Boduanchar [Bodančar] in direct line. Tsar, in the Mongol-Chinese text is *Khagan* or *Kekhan* (e ke-khan) [Yeke Khan = Great Khan]; the Mongol *khan* is probably taken from the Chinese *huang*: tsar."

In defense of Ts s be it noted that Qabul *qahan* is in fact the first ruler of all the Mongols. Qabul was in fact the descendant of Bodončar mungqaq, but no significance can be attached to this, since Bodončar Mungqaq had no imperial title. He was the fifth son of Alan γo'a, one of the three sons born after the death of Dobun mergen, and hence tinged with illegitimacy, against which charge Alan γo'a defended herself so vigorously (para. 17–22). Qabul was not a tsar or emperor, he was simply, as the text says, the ruler of all the Mongols. It would be more in keeping to call him "prince" or

fact that he was not his own son. Qabul and Ambaγai both had the governance of all the Mongols: *qamuq mangqol-i Qabul qahan meden aba Qabul qahan-u qoyina Qabul qahan-u üge-ber dolo'an kö'üd-iyen bö'etele Senggüm bilge-yin kö'ün Ambaγai qahan qamuq mangqol-i meden aba* "Qabul *qahan* was the ruler of all the Mongols. After Qabul *qahan*, Senggüm Bilge's son, Ambaγai *qahan*, was the ruler of all the Mongols."

Although in this paragraph there is no reason mentioned why Qutula should also have been called *qahan*, nevertheless we know from para. 179 that he did rule all the Mongols: *Qutula qan-lu meden yabu-lu'a* "Qutula *qan* was the ruler". For this reason, he may be placed side by side with Qabul and Ambaγai, in the matter of function, and honorific.

Para. 179 indicates the difference in outlook between the author of the *Secret History* and Chingis Khan himself. The author of the *Secret History* makes Qabul, Qutula, and Ambaγai all into *qaγans*, posthumously honoring them in view of the subsequent glories of the Mongols. But Chingis Khan's own words, and hence his views, as reported by the author of the *Secret History*, reveal a quite different outlook. Qutula was not a *qaγan*, but a *qan*. Moreover, Altan, Chingis's friend, was offered the opportunity to become *qan* by Chingis, as were Qučar, Sača, and Taiču. All refused, and Chingis Khan became the *qan*. Thus we have another unmistakeable bit of evidence that Chingis Khan regarded himself, and was in turn regarded by his cohorts and followers as a *qan*, and not an emperor or *qaγan*. Nevertheless Jelme, Büri bökö, and Jebe (para. 147) all address him as *qa'an*/*qahan*. And he bore the latter the bisyllabic form as honorific.

These are not the only ones to bear the bisyllabic form. Altan Khan, according to Haenisch, Emperor Shih-tsung of the Chin dynasty,[22] also had this form attributed to him. And it is understandable that the emperor of China would have such a title, the highest that the Mongols, and other Altaic peoples, had. Variant usages in para. 150 of the *Secret History* call Ong *qan* of the Kereits Ong *qa'an*, but this is an exception, for everywhere else (e.g., para. 96, 105, 157–165, 183–189, etc.) he is called *qan*. In that same passage there is another variant. Yesügei, who during his lifetime bore the rank *ba'atur* "hero, brave", is called posthumously, as the father of Chingis Khan, Yesügei *qa'an* in para. 150. Generally in the text, however, he is posthumously called Yesügei *qan*,

"ruler", hence a *qan*, since a Mongol kingdom or empire as such did not come into being until the third generation after him, under Chingis Khan and Ögödei.

[22] Haenisch, *Geheime Geschichte*, p. 150, note 53. There are numerous Altans mentioned in the *Secret History*, as well as other Altan Khans of the Kin. Cf. e.g. Haenisch, *ibid.*, p. 163, note 250; also *Wörterbuch*, Namenliste, s.v. *Altan hahan*.

for the same reason. Cf. para. 96, 177, etc. *Ba'atur* was a minor noble rank.

Was Chingis Khan addressed as *qan* by other peoples than the Mongols? He probably was. He was certainly so addressed (para. 155) by Yesügen *qatun*, daughter of Yeke čeren of the Tatars.

Finally in regard to Chingis Khan's honorific, there is one line in para. 255 where the author of the *Secret History* refers to him variantly as Chingis *qan*: *Tende-eče Činggis qan ügülerün* "Thereafter Chingis *qan* said . . .".

Following Chingis Khan, Ögödei, his son and appointed successor was also honored as *qaγan* and entitled *qan*, as his father had been. The enthronement formula, as the *Secret History* explicitly shows, was identical with that whereby his father had been so honored. In the Mouse year *quluqana jil* (1228) Ögödei became ruler. *Činggis qahan i nereyidüksen mün jarliγ-iyar Ögödei qahan-i qan ergübe* "They raised Ögödei *qahan* to *qan* by that decree whereby Chingis *qahan* had given him the title". The same usages of *qahan* in conjunction with the name and *qan* in conjunction with the title of the new office applied both to Chingis Khan and Ögödei. His elder brother conducted the accession: *Ča'adai aqa Ögödei qahan-i degü-yü'en qan ergüjü* "Ča'adai the elder brother, raising his younger brother Ögödei *qahan* to *qan* . . . " (para. 269). Compare the following para. 270 where the same formula is repeated: *Ögödei qahan ör-iyen qan ergü'üljü* "Ögödei *qahan*, causing himself to be raised to *qan*". In the cases of both Chingis Khan and Ögödei, men of noble rank themselves conducted the enthronement ceremonies; commoners had only a passive role at the ceremonies.

As we shall see in dealing with the subsequent developments of the *qan*/*qaγan* problem during the Yüan dynasty, there was later differentiation in title.

The *qan* is a common title for nomadic leaders in the *Secret History*. Beside the already mentioned Mongol Batači *qan*, there were others as Ong *qan* of the Kereits (para. 96 To'oril Ong *qan* or To'oril *qan*, para. 104–105), Buyiruq *qan* of the Naiman (para. 142–144), Inanča *qan* of the Naiman (para. 151), Tayang *qan* of the Naiman (para. 166), Güčülük *qan* of the Naiman (para. 202), Arslan *qan* of the Qarlu'ud (para. 235). In addition, we have such a usage as in para. 149, where Tarqutai kiriltuq, *noyan* of the Taiči'ud,[23] is addressed as *qan*, evidently a raising of rank.

[23] Haenisch, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. *noyan* "Beamter, Würdenträger, Befehlshaber, Chef". It is evident that the last meaning is here most applicable, since the others refer to a far more complex social system than the Taiči'ud possessed. Pelliott ranslates the term as "seigneur".

His group was probably not as important or as highly regarded as the Naiman, Kereit, Qarlu'ud, etc., whose prestige and power warranted such a title for their leader.[24]

We turn now to an analysis of the terms of royalty found in Vladimircov's *Régime Social*, where a completely different approach to these questions may be found. Vladimircov held, in the interests of a theory that the Mongols had a feudal type of social structure, that the form *ha'an* meant "tribal chief",[25] and that *qan, han, qa'an, qaġan, haġan* meant "tsar, emperor".[26]

He equates *han* with *qan, qa'an*, etc., opposing them all to *ha'an*, recognizing only unimportant differences among the terms equated. On the phonological side his position is untenable. No one who has worked on the Mongol language of the 13th and 14th century, neither N. Poppe,[27] nor E. Haenisch,[28] nor P. Pelliot,[29] recognizes a phonemic opposition between an initial voiceless velar plosive and a continuant in

[24] W. Barthold, *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, Leiden 1924, s.v. Khān, pp. 897b f., raises an interesting problem in this respect. He writes: "Not till the Mongol period is a distinction made between the *Ḳaghan* or *Ḳāān* as supreme ruler and the *Khān* as a ruler of a separate portion of the whole empire. In course of time *Ḳaghan* and *Khākān* were completely ousted from the popular language by *Khān*. In the last centuries before the Mongol conquest, the Turkish *Khān* like the Arabic *Malik* and the Persian *Shāh* was used as a princely title in contrast to the supreme title *Sulṭān*, *Sulṭān* only retaining the meaning in Western Asia and Egypt. In Central Asia in the various kingdoms into which the Mongol empire broke up *Khān* was the real sovereign title and *Sulṭān* the title of each individual member of the dynasty descended from Čingiz Khan." However the usage may have been in the Islamic world, and certainly the opinion of so eminent an Islamicist as Barthold must be given all credence, this situation does not apply to the Mongols themselves. The form *khān* (to use the corresponding form of Barthold's) applied to Chingis Khan or Ögödei Khan. Barthold's *Ḳaghan* for Islām is the same as the Mongol *qaγan* while *khān* is the Mongol *qan*. In Arabic script, *qan* and *qān* cannot be distinguished.

[25] Vladimircov, *op. cit.*, Fr. tr., pp. 100 ff.

[26] Vladimircov, *op. cit.*, pp. 103, 127, 154 ff.

[27] N. Poppe, *Kvadratnaja Pis'mennost'*, Moscow-Leningrad 1941, Table 6, p. 32, and text passim. There is no voiceless velar spirant in this transcription system, only a voiceless velar plosive *q*, both in initial and medial positions. There is an initial aspirate *h* which in its development over later centuries became a zero phoneme corresponding to Manchu *f*, Korean *p*, etc. Cf. G. J. Ramstedt, 'Ein anlautender bilabialer Spirant', *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, XXXII; A. de Smedt and A. Mostaert, *Le Dialecte Monguor*, Part 2, Peking 1945, and Part 3, Peking 1933, *Monumenta Serica* VI. In intervocalic position in Poppe's system there is only a glottal', and not an aspirate or voiced velar spirant. All these are variants on the same phoneme.

[28] Haenisch, *Mangḫol-un Niuca Tobca'an*, passim; *Wörterbuch*, letters h and ḫ. The initial voiceless velar is rendered as a spirant *h*. There is no corresponding plosive. He likewise has an initial aspirate which is not under discussion here, and an intervocalic glottal '.

the same position; no one recognizes a phonemic opposition between an intervocalic aspirate, an intervocalic voiced velar spirant, and an intervocalic glottal. There is thus only one generic form for the bisyllabic title, which I render as *qaγan*. Let us analyze the question historically.

What Vladimircov has done is to create a new form *ha'an*, different from *qa'an*, etc., in order to establish a development in the concept of kingship among the Mongols; *ha'an* was used in his view, in a prior era to the empire, when there were only tribal chiefs. He then presents a theory that feudalism arose under Chingis Khan, who became a different ruler from his predecessors. Historically this theory is without foundation. At the time of his first enthronement, shortly before the year 1200, Chingis Khan was no different from a host of other nomadic rulers. We have in the *Secret History* the celebrated passage where Chingis Khan sends a message to Ong *qan* of the Kereits addressing him as *qan ečige minu* "*qan* my father", demonstrating that he recognized no higher rank for himself than for other *qans* of that era (para. 177 ff.). He fought with these other *qans*, allied with them as a relative equal. Vladimircov himself has given up the position he had previously undertaken, that there was a difference in ideology between Chingis Khan and Jamuqa.[30]

Thus the distinction in meaning among the bisyllabic forms of the title is unfounded on historical as well as linguistic evidence. Since the other rulers were all *qans*, and Chingis was their peer, then he was a *qan* too. Vladimircov, moreover, translates the term *ha'an* as "chief" on one page,[31] but adopts, perhaps from the translation of Palladius, the form "tsar (emperor)" on the next.[32]

His dates are unclear. Here he has apparently reference to the first enthronement of Chingis Khan. But in a long footnote[33] he asserts that Temüjin received the title *qan* as distinct from *ha'an* only in 1206. As we know, the *Secret History* leaves no doubt that he had already gotten this title and the change of name to Chingis *qaγan* already before the year 1200.

[29] Pelliot, *Histoire Secrète*, passim. Pelliot transcribes the relevant initial velar without voice as a plosive *q* and the intervocalic as a glottal '.

[30] Vladimircov, *op. cit.*, p. 106; cf. also id., *Life of Chingis Khan*, London 1930, pp. 33–34. Haenisch, *Geheime Geschichte*, p. 153, note 118, has shown the basis of this error as a mistranslation. Even Vladimircov, *Régime Social*, p. 103, indicates that, on the evidence of Rashīd ed-Dīn, Chingis Khan, Ong Khan, and Jamuqa all regarded themselves as equals.

[31] Vladimircov, *op. cit.*, p. 101: "They called them [the chiefs] generally *ha'an*." *Cf.* note 9 *supra*.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 102: "We will proclaim you tsar (*ha'an*)." *Cf.* note 9 *supra*.

[33] Vladimircov, *op. cit.*, p. 103, note 2.

How may we describe the use of the kingship terms during the era of the formation of the Mongol empire, that is, through the life of Chingis Khan? The supreme emperor in the case of both the Mongols and the Turks was the *qaγan*. Among the Mongols and their neighbors, as the Naiman and the Kereit, etc., the *qan* was a nomad ruler, of rank inferior to that of the *qaγan*. Chingis was titled *qan* and Ögödei was titled *qan*. They referred to themselves as *qan*, to their peers, such as Ong *qan*, etc., as *qan*, and to their predecessors and ancestors as *qan*, such as Qutula *qan*. The emperor of China was a *qaγan* in the Mongol conception. However, the emperor was given this form as an honorific, which we distinguish from the title. Presumably he also bore the title, but we cannot say positively for lack of evidence. The honorific *qan* was applied posthumously to Yesügei, and the honorific *qahan* (*qaγan*) was applied by the author of the *Secret History* – not by Chingis himself – to Qabul, Qutula, and Ambaγai. Chingis bore the title *qan*, the honorific *qaγan*, and was addressed by his followers as *qaγan*. He was addressed by his peers or cohorts, by his queen and referred to himself as a *qan*. There may have been a systematic re-editing of the record, oral or written. Pelliot presumably thinks so and cites the Chinese historical usage of the Yüan dynasty.[34] I shall leave this question open for lack of positive evidence.

There is a certain degree of looseness in the text of the *Secret History*, but the broad lines of signification are clear. Pelliot I feel was correct in his assertion that Chingis did not bear the title *qaγan*. But it is equally clear that he bore this honorific, and was so addressed.[35]

[34] Pelliot, *Les Mongols et la Papauté*, vol. 1, Paris 1923, p. 19, note 3.

[35] A word on Pelliot's usage. In the above cited work by Pelliot, he devotes a long note to the letter of Guyuk Khan (*loc. cit.*). He remarks in regard to the form "cingis kan et kan" found in that letter, that we are here faced with commands of two emperors, Chingis Khan and Ögödei *qaγan* (*qa'an*). We know from other evidence that Pelliot intended for Chingis the title *qan* (v. *supra* regarding *Notes sur le "Turkestan"*) in this case. But one cannot equate without further comment as this footnote implies (" . . . Genghis-khan, qui est à la fois khan et *qaγan* (*qa'an*) . . . "), since there was a difference in rank and in function as well as rhetorical form, which Pelliot by implication has referred to. Moreover, the solution proposed in this particular case is confused by the fact that "khan" without indication of quantity can mean either the monosyllabic form or the bisyllabic. Care in this matter is imperative because in Khalkha, Kalmuk, Ordos, a long quantity in the monosyllabic form, as we know, points to an earlier bisyllabism: *qaγan*<*xān*/*xāā*. The monosyllabic form *qan* remains monosyllabic and short: *xan*.

Vladimircov persists in using the form *han*, as does Barthold, basing himself not on Mongol, but on the Persian of Rashīd ed-Dīn, etc. The Persians and Arabs used the long quantity, monosyllabic form for the Mongol monosyllabic, then current, short quantity form. A clarification by Pelliot and Vladimircov would have cleared up this otherwise confusing usage.

Francis Cleaves, in his review of Haenisch, has called attention to one additional usage in imperial titles.[36] Ögödei at the very end of the *Secret History* is called *dalai-yin qahan* (para. 280) "universal khan" – Pelliot's "khan océanique" and Haenisch's "Weltherrscher". Ögödei in this conception moves on the very highest possible level of imperial power that the Mongols had devised.

III. THE *ḥP'AGS-PA* INSCRIPTIONS

Shortly after the composition of the *Secret History*, the Mongols established the Yüan dynasty in China (1260/1280–1368) and from the Yüan court, chancelleries, mints, etc., flowed a series of documents and coins which are designated collectively as the *ḥP'ags-pa* inscriptions. Because of the dates (13th–14th centuries) in which they appear, immediately following the era of Chingis Khan, they throw light on imperial usage in general.

N. Poppe has gathered almost all the inscriptions in this script together in his work on the square writing, and has summarized the relevant evidence:[37] "It is important to note that Chingis here bears the title *qan* (cf. *qanu*) at the same time that in the edict of Buyantu Khan he bears the title *qaγan*. Further we find the form *qan* in the edict of 1314 (line 9) which was noted as a characteristic trait by B. Ja. Vladimircov who showed that in a series of Mongol texts of the 13th century Chingis is consistently called *qan* (*Obščestvennyj Stroj Mongolov*, p. 81 = *Régime Social des Mongols*, p. 103. Cf. also P. Pelliot, *Notes sur le "Turkestan" de M. W. Barthold*, p. 25). The title of Chingis *qan* is counterposed here to the title *qaγan* 'khagan (khan)'.

"Regarding this khagan, in the opinion of Chavannes, Ugedei was meant. The opinion of Chavannes is justified by the fact that the chronologically closest ukase after Chingis Khan, in agreement with the ukase of Buyantu Khan was precisely the ukase of Ugedei (cp. the reference there to the following ukase: *ǰiŋgis qaγanu öködeė qa'anu seč'en qa·anu k'ülüg qa·anu ba ǰarliqdur*). Obviously the privileges of the clergy were given by the ukases of Chingis Khan, Ugedei, Khubilai, Uljeitu, and Kuluk Khan. Our ukase relates to the year 1276, i.e., to the reign of Khubilai,

[36] Francis W. Cleaves, review of Erich Haenisch, *Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, in: *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, XII, December 1949, p. 533. Attention should also be drawn to another article by Cleaves, 'The Mongolian Names and Terms in the History of the Nation of the Archers', *ibid.*, p. 404 f., in which it is shown that the Il-Khans of Persia, e.g., Abaγa *Qan*, bore this form of the title.

[37] Poppe, *Kvadratnaia Pis'mennost'*, p. 107, note 8 (*qan*).

and therefore the ukases before him can only be of the first two, i.e., the ukases of Chingis and Ugedei. On the other hand, one must not forget that our edict was not made by the emperor himself, but by Mangala, and consequently it can only refer to the ukase of the reigning emperor, i.e., Khubilai."

In fact we are faced here with a situation parallel to that of the *Secret History*, because a distinction was made between *qan* and *qa'an* (*qaγan*). However, this distinction was not always followed. However, in all these inscriptions where the distinction is made, there is a normal form, and variant usages. I can supply no explanation of the variants, but will only indicate that contamination, careless script, a situation of linguistic change in the matter of a phoneme as the intervocalic voiced velar, may have caused a given scribe to lean to a variant of a normal form.

We have in effect five ukases attributed to Yüan emperors or high persons. In these ukases there are six king-lists with titles. In one of these, in Buyantu's first edict, of 1314, Chingis is a *qa'an* (*qaγan*). In all the others he is a *qan*. In another of these, Ögödei is a *qan*, while in all the others he is a *qaγan*.[38] But this second case, of Ögödei, is really not a problem since Ögödei had both titles in various parts of his career, and in fact even a more glorious one than either. All the other emperors in the six lists, twenty-six mentions in all, conform to the rule.

These are the king-lists as mentioned in the various edicts, in the order of their temporal sequence:

1. Edict of Mangala, reign of Qubilai, 1276:[39]
   ǰiŋ[gis] qanu ba qa·anu ba ǰarliqdur "by decree of Chingis *qan* and the *qaγan*".

[38] Pelliot, *loc. cit.*, notes, "in fact we know of a number of cases where *qaγan* (*qa'an*, *qa'an*), without other specification, is a sufficient designation of Ögödei (. . . Chavannes saw very well that Ögödei is in question here, but did not recognize the title of *qaγan* given by the Mongol versions; I could add many examples to the three cited by Chavannes)." The question is precisely whether Ögödei is meant by the title *qaγan*, where there is no other specification. In the edicts mentioned in the series below, the title *qaγan* without any other specification may or may not refer to Ögödei. In the series Chingis *qan ba qa·an*, Ögödei is meant. But in Mangala's edict, where we have the form *qa·anu sudur* "by the power of the emperor", not Ögödei, but Qubilai is meant; in Buyantu's edict the form *qaγan ǰarliq manu* "our imperial decree" not Ögödei but Buyantu is meant; while in the edict of Darmabala's widow, Ögödei is not meant in the forms *qaγanu sudur* "by the power of the emperor" and *qaγanu ǰarliqdur* "the decree of the *qaγan*"; etc. Moreover, the inverse is also true, as has been shown; Ögödei was not only called *qaγan*, but also *qan*. We may identify Ögödei as the *qaγan* only where historical context permits.

[39] Poppe, *Kvadratnaja Pis'mennost'*, Text I, line 6. The system of transcription in this work shall be here used throughout.

2. Edict of Prince Hay-shan, reign of Ch'eng Tsung, 1305:[40]
   ǰiŋgis qanu ba ök'ödeė qanu ba seč'en qa·anu ba ǰarliqdur "by decree of Chingis *qan*, Ögödei *qan*, and Sečen (Qubilai) *qaγan*".
3. Edict of Buyantu Khan, Jen-tsung, 1314:[41]
   ǰiŋgis qanu ba qa·anu ǰarliqdur "by decree of Chingis *qan* and the *qaγan*".
4. *Ibidem*:[42]
   ǰiŋgis qa·anu ök'ödeė qa·anu seč'en qa·anu ölǰeėtu qa·anu k'ülüg qa·anu ba ǰarliqdur "by decree of Chingis *qaγan*, Ögödei *qaγan*, Sečen *qaγan*, Öljeitü *qaγan*, and Gülük *qaγan*".
5. Edict of Buyantu Khan, 1314 (2nd Edict):[43]
   ǰiŋgis qanu ök'ödeė qa·anu seč'en qa·anu ölǰeėtu qa·anu k'ülüg qa·anu ba ǰarliqdur "by decree of Chingis *qan*, Ögödei *qaγan*, Sečen *qaγan*, Öljeitü *qaγan*, and Gülük *qaγan*".
6. Edict of Emperor Shun-ti, no date (reigned 1333–1368):[44]
   ǰiŋgis qanu ök'ödeė qa·nu seč'en qa·anu ölǰeėtu qa·anu k'ülüg qa'anu buyantu qa·anu gege·en qa·anu qutuqtu qa·anu renčen dpal qa·anu ba ǰarliqdur „by decree of Chingis *qan*, Ögödei *qaγan*, Sečen *qaγan*, Öljeitü *qaγan*, Gülük *qaγan*, Buyantu *qaγan*, Gegen *qaγan*, Qutuqtu *qaγan*, and Rinčen dpal *qaγan*".

Thus with the exceptions mentioned above, Chingis is in general *qan* in the decrees of the Yüan dynasty in *ḥPhags-pa*, and his successors are *qaγan*. The transition of the Mongols from a nomadic political entity to a vast empire with stable institutions over many generations was recognized in the assignment of titles. That Chingis's line all bore the imperial title *qaγan* clearly demonstrates this fact.

The foundation of an empire was a novelty in Mongol history. Other new terms were devised to designate phenomena hitherto beyond their scope, as throne, and dynasty. It is clear that *oran* was an old word given a new content at this time; *oran* means "place" in most Mongol dialects.[45]

[40] Pelliot, *Un rescrit mongol en écriture* " *'Phags-pa*", lines 9–10.
[41] Poppe, *op. cit.*, Text II, line 6.
[42] *Loc. cit.*, lines 7–12.
[43] *Ibid.*, Text III, lines 8–13.
[44] Han Ju-lin, *Ch'eng-tu meng-wen sheng-chih pei k'ao-shih* ('L'inscription mongole en écriture *'Phags-pa* de Tcheng-tou'), *Studia Serica*, II, Sept. 1941, lines 9–17.
[45] A. Mostaert, *Dictionnaire Ordos*, II, Peking 1942 (*Monumenta Serica*, Monograph V), s.v. *oron* (Mostaert gives *sūdal*>*saγudal* "trône"); A. R. Rinčine, *Kratkij Mongol'sko-Russkij Slovar'*, Moscow 1947, s.v. *oron* "country, state, region, locality; place"; G. J. Ramstedt, *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*, Helsinki 1935, s.v. *oron* "bett, platz, reich, land"; the relevant Script Mongol form is *oron* "lieu, etc., royaume, etc." (J. E. Kovalevsky, *Dictionnaire Mongol-Russe-Français*, I, Kazan' 1844). It is quite

Similarly, in the language of the *ḥP'ags-pa* inscriptions, in the form *oran*, it meant "place".[46]

In the *Secret History* there are the following meanings for *oro(n)*: "seat, throne, camp".[47] The phrase *qan oron* occurs in the passage (para. 201) where Chingis Khan made a pact of friendship with Jamuqa, that is, some time after he had been named ruler *qan* for the first time, and shortly before he was named ruler in 1206 for the second time. Earlier in the *Secret History*, the term *oron* "throne" occurs (para. 187), and in general we are faced here with the rhetorical device *pars pro toto*.

When we turn to the word for dynasty, the question is slightly more complex. The plural of *qan*, *qad* comes closest to that meaning: thus *qad-un uruγ* "the khan's family, reigning dynasty";[48] *kitad-un qad-un terigün qongγob-a qaγan buyu* "The founder of the Chinese [Ming] dynasty was *qongγoba qaγan*".[49] These examples are taken from Script Mongol. An example taken from a spoken idiom may be chosen from the Ordos dialect: *xad nojot* "sovereigns and princes".[50]

Thus *qad* means slightly more than "dynasty", but includes it in its constellation of meanings.

The inference is that the person of the *qaγan* is unique; *qan* alone may be rendered in the plural.

The Mongols during the 12th and 13th centuries evolved a set of institutions with great rapidity as they developed their empire. At their disposal, and seemingly at the disposal of all the Altaic-speaking nomads, was a set of terms to express the vast and complex structure of empire. The supreme ruler of the world of which the nomadic steppe was a part bore the title *qaγan*; in the Far East his seat was in the capital of North China whether he was Chinese or nomad. Or it might be on the steppe itself if the followers of a man felt that his star would one day bring him to the throne.

The lesser rulers of the steppe bore the title *qan*. These petty rulers were not sovereigns, however; the focus of political power lay in the throne of

---

usual in Mongol for *o*, *a*, and liquid sonant to alternate in unstressed positions as syllabic elements. Mostaert derives Ordos *oron* from Script Mongol *orun*, likewise Ramstedt.

[46] Poppe, *op. cit.*, Vocabulary s.v. *oran*.

[47] Haenisch, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. *oro(n)*; *yeke oron* "glorious throne"; *qan oron* "imperial throne".

[48] Kovalevsky, *op. cit.*, I, s.v. *uru*.

[49] *Činggis qaγan-u čadiγ*, n.p. n.d. (Reproduction, Peking 1941? of 1925 edition), p. 61, lines 2/3. *Qongγoba* is the emperor Hung-wu. This passage can also be rendered "The first of the emperors of the Chinese was *Qongγob-a/qaγan*".

[50] Mostaert, *op. cit.*, I. s.v. *xad*.

the *qaγan*. And toward this focus the loyalty of the tributary *qan* or the rebellion of the *qan* aspiring to imperial power himself was directed.

In this context the historical figure of Chingis Khan grew. The son of an aristocrat of minor rank, through his wars and conquests in the 12th century he achieved the rank of *qan*. His election by a small group of Mongol military leaders to monarchy over the Mongols about 1200 was expressed in the honorific, *qahan*, in his new throne-name, Chingis *qahan*. This form is not a title, and it is probable, as Pelliot claimed, that the supreme title was granted him only posthumously, just as his father, Yesügei, a *bagatur*, was granted the posthumous rank of *qan*.