

Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series
Volume 141

Denis Sinor, Editor

FOLKLORICA:
FESTSCHRIFT FOR
FELIX J. OINAS

Edited by
Egle Victoria Žygas and Peter Voorheis

Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies
Bloomington Indiana
1982

FOLKLORICA: FESTSCHRIFT FOR FELIX J. OINAS

Other Volumes in the Uralic and Altaic Series:

131. STUDIES IN FINNO-UGRIC LINGUISTICS IN HONOR OF ALO RAUN. Edited by Denis Sinor. Bloomington and Louvain, Edition Peeters, 1977, 440 pp., 2100.-FB., \$70.
132. CHEREMIS LITERARY READER, WITH GLOSSARY, by Thomas A. Sebeok, Bloomington and Louvain, Edition Peeters, 1978, 120 pp., 500-FB., \$17.
133. THE POLITICAL ROLE OF MONGOL BUDDHISM, by Larry W. Moses. Bloomington, 1977. 299-x pp., 500.-FB., \$14.95.
134. PROCEEDINGS OF THE EIGHTEENTH MEETING OF THE PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL ALTAISTIC CONFERENCE, BLOOMINGTON, JUNE 29-JULY 5, 1975. Edited by Larry V. Clark and Paul A. Draghi. Bloomington and Louvain, Edition Peeters, 1978, 212 pp., 1000-FB., \$34.
135. PRELIMINARY STUDIES IN TURKIC HISTORICAL PHONOLOGY by Vilhelm Grønbech, translated by John R. Krueger. Bloomington, 1979, 162 pp. \$8.
136. THE STRUCTURE OF THE TURKIC LANGUAGES By Kaare Grønbech, translated by John R. Krueger. Bloomington, 1979, 188 pp. \$8.
137. TANGUT (HSI HSIA) STUDIES: A BIBLIOGRAPHY, by Luc Kwanten and Susan Hesse. Bloomington, 1980, 125 pp. \$8.
138. BETWEEN THE HAMMER AND THE ANVIL? CHINESE AND RUSSIAN POLICIES IN OUTER MONGOLIA, 1911-1921 by Thomas E. Ewing. Bloomington, 1980, 300 pp., \$20.
140. A REVERSE INDEX OF MANCHU by William Rozycki with the Assistance of Rex Dwyer. Bloomington, 1981, 189 pp. \$14.

These volumes can be ordered in Europe from Edition Peeters, P.B. 41; B-3000 Leuven (Belgium), and in the United States from Uralic and Altaic Series, Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, Goodbody Hall 101, Bloomington, Indiana 47405.

ISBN No. 0-933070-09-8

Library of Congress Catalogue Number 82-062336

THE LEGENDARY ORIGIN OF THE TÜRK³S

Denis Sinor

The historical role of the Türk empire of Mongolia can hardly be overestimated. From the middle of the sixth century A.D. for about 200 years it was the major power on China's western border, but its zone of influence extended all across Inner Asia to Byzantium. The importance of the Türk empire is not limited to political history. Of all the great nomad empires centered on Mongolia, that of the Türks was the first whose official language can be identified without the shadow of a doubt. It was a Turkic dialect well known to us through some funeral steles erected in the eighth century, the first monuments of any Turkic--indeed of any Uralic or Altaic--language. By a process not quite well understood, the Türk people became the eponym of all the peoples speaking a language related to that of those early inscriptions, i.e. to all the the Turks in history.

Important though the indigenous sources of Türk history may be, quantitatively they reveal little, and most of the relevant information must be culled from foreign, predominantly Byzantine or Chinese sources. This is the case concerning some legends pertaining to the origins of the Türks, the topic of this short article written in honor of my friend and colleague Professor Felix Oinas, who has done so much in the field of folklore.

I

Legend A

The abandoned child brought up by a wolf

The earliest known text of this myth appears in the annals of the short-lived Chou Dynasty (556-581), the **Chou shu**, completed around 629, at a time when the Chinese were in constant touch with the Türks. It will be seen that the **Chou shu** contains also another account of the Türks' origins, but that there are reasons to believe that **Legend A** represents the tradition probably most current

among the majority of the Türks themselves. A slightly different version of the same legend is told by the *Pei shih*, completed ca. 659, and by the annals of the Sui dynasty (581-617), the *Sui shu*, compiled between 629 and 636. The texts of the *Pei shih* and the *Sui shu* are almost identical word for word, but jointly they do differ somewhat from the text of the *Chou shu*. I am reproducing here in translation, side by side, the two principal versions as represented by the *Chou shu* and the *Pei shih*. The texts have been translated previously, but I preferred to attempt a new translation which alone allows this parallel presentation. Only the short sections dealing with the mythical origins of the Türks are given.

Chou shu

No doubt the Türks are a detached branch of the Hsiung nu. They belong to the A-shih-na clan. An independent tribe, they were completely exterminated by a neighboring country.

There was a boy aged ten. The soldiers, in view of his youth, could not bring themselves to kill him.

They cut off his feet and threw him into a marsh.

There lived there a she-wolf who fed him with meat. As the boy grew up he had sexual intercourse with the wolf and made her pregnant. The king [who had earlier attacked the tribe], apprised of the boy being alive, dispatched someone to kill him. The messenger saw the she-wolf with the boy and wanted to kill her as well.

Pei shih

The ancestors of the Türks lived to the west of the Western Sea. They constitute an independent tribe.

No doubt they are a detached branch of the Hsiung-nu.

They belong to the A-shih-na clan. Later they were defeated by a neighboring country which completely exterminated their tribe.

They cut off his feet and arms and threw him into a marsh.

But the wolf fled to a mountain north of Kao-ch'ang.

At that time it was as if a spirit had suddenly transported the wolf east of the Western Sea. She landed on a mountain northwest of Kao-ch'ang.

In the mountain there was a cavern and in the cavern there was a plain covered with rich vegetation, stretching over several hundreds of li and enclosed on its four sides by mountains. Therein the wolf took refuge and later gave birth to ten boys. The ten boys grew up and took wives from the outside. Each of the descendants took a surname and called himself A-shih-na.

He was the cleverest among them and became their ruler. In front of the gate to the camp [the Türks] placed a standard with a wolf's head on it, so as to show that they had not forgotten their origins.

The children and the children's children multiplied.

Little by little they constituted several hundred families. Several generations later

they came out from the cavern and submitted to the Ju-ju. They lived on the southern slope of the Chin-shan. They served as blacksmith to the Ju-ju.

a certain A-hsien-shih led the tribe out from the cavern and submitted to the Juan-juan.

Only a few remarks will be made here to sketch the background of the sparse historical data given in these stories. The Hsiung-nu--often and mistakenly referred to as Huns--held sway over great parts of Inner Asia, and particularly Mongolia, between ca. 210 B.C. and 155 A.D. In Chinese eyes

they were the Barbarians par excellence. In a manner that recalls the practice of medieval western historians who were ready to label "Scythian" any nomadic people, Chinese sources often, and without specific justification, linked with the Hsiung-nu any new nomadic tribe appearing on China's western border. The identification of the Western Sea (Hsi-hai) poses some problems, but it is certain that in Sui times it was thought to be adjacent to Fu-lin, i.e. the Byzantine Empire.² Chinese Kao-ch'ang corresponds to Turkic Kocho, a city of Chinese Turkestan some thirty miles east of Turfan. Chin-san is the Chinese name for the Altai mountains. The Türks' subjection to the Juan-juan (the Chou shu spells the name Ju-ju) is a historical fact. The Türk revolt leading to the overthrow of the Juan-juan empire took place in 552.

Legend B The Lord of Wind and Rain

Immediately following the text of Legend A, the Türk chapter of the Chou shu (50, 2a) relates "another tradition" concerning the origin of the Türks. It reads as follows:

"It is reported that the ancestor of the Türks originated in the country of So, located north of the Hsiung-nu. The head of this tribe was called A-pang-pu, who had seventy younger brothers, one of whom was called I-chih-ni-shih-tu. He was born from a wolf. A-pang-pu and his brothers were dull-witted and their country was soon destroyed. Ni-shih-tu had the supernatural power to produce rain and wind. He married two girls said to be the daughters of, respectively, the Spirit of the Summer and the Spirit of the Winter. One of them became pregnant and gave birth to four sons, one of whom changed into a white swan, while another established a state between the rivers A-fu and Chien. It was called Ch'i-ku. The third established his realm on the banks of the river Ch'u-chih, the fourth dwelled on the mount Chien-hsi-ch'u-chih-shih. He was the eldest. On this mount lived also a tribe of A-pang-pu's stock. They suffered greatly from the cold. The eldest made fire,

warmed them and kept them alive. Saved, they submitted to the eldest, elected him their ruler and called him Türk. He was Na-tu-liu-shih.

Na-tu-liu-shih had ten wives. Their sons adopted the surnames of their respective mothers. A-shih-na was the son of one of the concubines. Na-tu-liu died and the sons of the ten mothers wanted to elect as leader one of themselves. They agreed under a big tree that they would elect as leader him who could jump highest up on the tree. The son of A-shih-na was young, he jumped higher than the other sons. They elected him their leader and called him A-hsien-shih. Though this story differs from the other one, nevertheless it shows that [the Türks] descended from a wolf."

Little need be said on the historical kernel of the legend. It is minimal. The identification of the kingdom of So is doubtful and should not preoccupy us here. Of the personal names given in **Legend B**, those of A-shih-na and A-hsien-shih appeared already in **Legend A**. Descendants of the former became the ruling clan of the Türks and played an important role in their subsequent history. In **Legend A**, A-hsien-shih is credited with leading the Türk exodus from the ancestral cavern of which no mention is made in **Legend B**. He is thus cast twice in the role of a hero, but the parts played by him differ according to the story. He seems to be a legendary figure. I have no solid data on him. The same applies to A-pang-pu and to Yi-chih-ni-shih-tu, but--to the best of my knowledge--their names appear only in the *Chou shu* or, of course, in texts derived from it. Na-tu-liu-shih is slightly better known. In the annals of the T'ang dynasty (618-930), the T'ang shu,³ he is said to be the great-grandfather of T'u-men, who may be considered the real founder of the Türk empire. Here, the third character of his name is written 陸 lu--not 六 liu as in the *Chou-shu*--but there can be no doubt that the two graphics render the same name. There are other examples of confusion between 陸 lu and 六 liu, e.g. in the spelling of the name Tu-lu kaghan, ruler of the Western Türks from 638 to 653.

It so happens that 都陸 Tu-lu is the name of a confederation of five tribes, the eastern of the two tribal groupings which constituted the nation of the Western Türks.⁴ According to Marquart 1914, 71, they were "das eigentliche Stammvolk der Türk"--an unproven possibility. Tu-lu is also one of the names borne by a Western Türk kaghan who ruled in 633-634.⁵ The last character 𐰇 shih in Na-tu-liu (~lu)-shih and A-hsien-shih is a much used transcription of the Türk title šad. It is thus possible, even likely, that the names of the *personae dramatis* were, respectively, A-hsien and Na-tu-liu (~lu). If this is so, both held, or were supposed to have held, the dignity of a šad. Of course, it is an arbitrary procedure to detach the last two characters (tu-lu) from Na-tu-lu's name and to equate it with those of a tribal confederation and of a kaghan without accounting for the initial Na. But I thought that, subject to this proviso, no harm would come from calling attention to a possible connection between these names. Their partial identity may not be altogether fortuitous.⁶

As for the geographical names appearing in the legend, the river A-fu is the Abakan, Chien the Upper Yenissei, while Ch'u-chih may be the name of the middle reaches of the same river. Much has been written on Chien, more recently by Hambis 1956 and Vásáry 1971. Without any doubt it is the Chinese transcription of Käm, the river's current name. Vásáry has convincingly shown that it is of Samoyed (one might say Uralic) origin. The mount Chien-hsi-sh'u-chih-shih cannot be identified.

An interesting aspect of the story is that it establishes a link between the Türks and the Kirghiz, who appear here under the name Ch'i-ku. The ancestors of, respectively, the Türks and the Kirghiz are brothers, or at least half-brothers, sons of Ni-shih-tu, who could produce rain and wind. Other sources, however, expressly state that the Kirghiz "do not belong to the race of the wolf." The Yu-yang tsa-tsu, which reflects this view, goes on to say that the ancestor of the Kirghiz "lived in a cavern to the north of the Kögmän

mountain. He was the offspring of a spirit and a cow (not a bull, as Boodberg 1936, 181, would have it). In this article our concern does not lie with the Kirghiz, but it may be worth recalling that they are linked with metallurgy.

Evidently there are considerable divergences between legends A and B. They prompted the Chinese historian to remark that, at least, both "show that the Türks descended from a wolf." Let us make a rapid comparison.

In **Legend A**, A-shih-na is the grandson of the wolf, in **Legend B** a great-grandson. Both legends reflect a matriarchal system. A does not trace at all the male ancestors of A-shih-na. B does give such names, but, on reaching the semi-historical period, quite explicitly states that the sons adopted their mothers' surnames. **Legend B** gives the names of two of the wolf's sons (A-pang-pu and Ni-shih-tu) and also that of one of her four grandsons. These constitute a quite remarkable brood, one of them being a white swan, the other the ancestor of the Kirghiz, the eldest the first man called Türk. No indication is given as to whether their mother was the daughter of the Spirit of the Summer or of the Spirit of the Winter. Whoever she may have been, her first born--as behooves the offspring of a storm-god (he who can produce rain and wind)--could kindle fire to warm his ineffectual cousins. They are the ones--descendants of the dull-witted A-pang-pu--who elect Na-tu-liu their chief. The first-born remains within his larger family; two of his brothers (and I am discounting the Swan) leave to establish their own state. Election to leadership on the basis of exceptional skills occurs twice in B and once in A. Only **Legend B** makes mention of an eponymous ancestor, who appears quite late in the narrative, with no indication given of why he was given the name (or title) Türk. The extremely dense presentation of the story (much more so in the original than in the English rendering) does not make the issue quite clear, but it seems that the newly-elected chief Na-tu-liu-shih belonged to a tribe or clan related to, but different from, that of his new

subjects. Looking at it from their point of view, they imported their leader. In B the personae of the eponymous ancestor of the A-shih-na--the Türk ruling clan--and of the guide-liberator leading the people to a new country are fused. A-shih-na and A-hsien-shih are equated, a compromise between two traditions which may originally have been hostile.

Legend C The Spirit of the Lake

A third legend on the origins of the Türks is preserved not in the official histories but in the *Yu-yang tsa-tu*, a collection of anecdotes, curious or miraculous histories and the like, written probably in 860. The text of what I call Legend C runs as follows:

"The ancestor of the Türks was called Shê-mo-shê-li, a lake spirit who lived to the west of the A-shih-tê cavern. A miraculous thing happened to Shê-mo. Every evening the daughter of the lake spirit sent a white deer to fetch him and take him into the lake. At dawn she sent him back. After several decades the tribe [of Shê-mo] set out for a great hunt. In the middle of the night the [daughter of the] lake spirit said to Shê-mo: 'Tomorrow during the hunt a white deer with golden horns will come out from the cavern where your ancestors were born. If your arrow hits the deer we will keep in touch as long as you live, but if you miss it our relationship will end.'

When day came [Shê-mo] joined the battue and, indeed, a white deer with golden horns came out from the birth-cavern. Shê-mo ordered his followers to tighten the battue. As the deer was about to escape, it was killed. Shê-mo, angry, with his own hand decapitated the leader A-erh and swore saying: 'Following this killing [of the deer], forever, there will have to be a human sacrifice offered to Heaven. A man of A-erh's tribe will be selected and beheaded in sacrifice.' To this day as a sacrifice to the flag the Türks take a man from A-erh's tribe. When Shê-mo had decapitated

A-erh and in the evening had returned to the daughter of the lake spirit, she told him 'Your hand decapitated a man, the air stinks with the smell of blood. Because of this everything is over between us.'⁷

The A-erh tribe and Shê-mo-shê-li are not known from other sources, nor has it been possible to identify the Turkic forms which probably hide under the Chinese garb. Shê-li 舍利 happens to be the name of one of the prefectures established in 649 for the Türks.⁸ If we were to put a period after the first two characters, Shê-li could refer to the lake spirit and the sentence could be translated "The lake spirit of Shê-li...." I set little store by this idea, which at all events has no direct relevance to our subject.

The appellation of the cavern is quite interesting. A-shih-tê 阿史德 is the name of a Türk clan, in importance second only to the A-shih-na. Among other important leaders, the powerful minister Tonyuquq belonged to it, and so did the mother of the famous rebel An Lu-shan.⁹ She was a soothsayer.¹⁰ More will be said later concerning the cavern itself. Here I would call attention only to the fact that in Legend C the ancestral cavern is also the home of the white deer with golden horns.

Even a superficial examination of the legends shows quite clearly that they are rooted in three traditions. I have tabulated what I consider the principal themes of these legends. Others may prefer a different choice or may wish to add to or delete from the list; the essential differences cannot really be bridged.

The mythical themes may be tabulated as follows:

	A	B	C
She-Wolf, ancestor of tribe	X	X	
Cavern	X		X
Child mutilated	X		
Child fed on meat	X		

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>
Spirit of lake			X
Spirit of wind and rain		X	
Spirit of summer		X	
Spirit of winter		X	
Animal sibling of human (swan)		X	
Dull-witted relatives		X	
Invention of fire		X	
Election of chief on basis of excellence	X	X	
Lake, marsh	X		X
Deer			X
Human sacrifice			X
10 wives		X	
10 siblings		X	

As may be seen from this table, the thematical overlap of the three legends is minimal. Of the two motifs A and B have in common (she-wolf ancestor, election of chief on the basis of excellence), only one, that of the she-wolf, is central to the story. A and C share only one motif, that of the ancestral cavern, while B and C have no theme in common.

A survey of the proper names occurring in the legends gives similar results. The legends contain but few personal names. Of these, only one--that of the eponymous ancestor of the Türk ruling clan--is historically attested. In **Legend C** the name of another important Türk clan appears, but it is not linked with any person. In the following table I have marked with an * asterisk the two names for which there is independent, historical evidence.

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>
A-erh			X
A-hsien(-shih)	X	X	
A-pang-pu			X

*A-shih-na	X	X
*A-shih-te (not a personal name in the legend)		X
(I-chih) Ni-shih-tu	X	
Na-tu-liu	X	
Shê-mo		X

Although the three Türk legends appear only in Chinese sources, there is no reason to impugn their authenticity. Perhaps in a garbled or incomplete way, the Chinese records must reflect contemporary information gained from some Türks. In what follows I will adduce some historical data showing that some of the legendary motifs mentioned in our texts do, indeed, belong to the very fabric of Türk culture.

There is overwhelming evidence to show that the Türks--or at least some of them--did consider the wolf their ancestor. The *Pei shih* text of *Legend A* expressly says so. There is no reason to doubt the veracity of the statement that in front of their camp the Türks were wont to plant a standard with a wolf's head on it. The *Chou shu* (50, 4a) confirms the fact: the Türks "put golden wolves' heads on their standards. Those in charge of protecting the ruler were called *fu-li*, a word meaning 'wolf' in Chinese. The Türks descended from a wolf and did not want to forget their origin."

We actually have pictorial representations of such standards, as well as a bas-relief which "represents a wolf, probably a she-wolf, under whose paunch there is an oddly but clearly depicted human figure." This representation dates from the end of the sixth century and adorns a funerary stele carrying a Sogdian inscription and located in Bugut in Mongolia. The editors rightly connected it with the ethnogenetical legends reported by the Chinese.

Sir Gerard Clauson's (1964) pooh-poohing of the Türk wolf connection--published, it is true, before the Bugut inscription was discovered--cannot resist serious examination. He is off the mark in

denying (p.12) the generally accepted, phonetically and semantically unassailable equation of fu-li (*biu-lie) with Turkic böri "wolf". His specious reference to the Turkic title *boyla* deliberately, and for no other reason than weakening any possible link between the Türks and the wolf, disregards the crucial fact that the *Chou shu* does state that fu-li means "wolf". Sir Gerard also argues that since "there is no trace of any such meaning as 'bodyguard' for böri," Chinese fu-li cannot stand for this word. He also takes issue with Liu Mau-tsai's (1958, 9) translation of the just-quoted passage of the *Chou shu* "Auch die Gardeoffiziere wurden Fu-li genannt," and considers "most plausible in a Turkish context" Stanislas Julien's rendering "les satellites de leurs rois." All these and similar statements are made without any reference to the Chinese text which has (50, 4a) 侍衛 shih-wei. Robert des Rotours 1948, 543, points out that in Sung times, and again under the Manchus, shih-wei meant bodyguard, whereas in T'ang times "cette expression avait simplement le sens de 'garder l'empereur'." There is no reason to doubt that those in charge of protecting the (or a) Türk ruler were called "wolves". The reasons for this being so are less clear. They may or may not have been rooted in the ancestral legend. The modern French expression "gorilles" comes to mind, applied to men charged with protecting the President of France or other high dignitaries.

Of course, one has to dismiss also those who, for too long, have been "crying wolf" on the flimsiest of pretexts. Among the most irritating and tenacious mistakes, pride of place is due to that which--with no justification whatsoever--states that A-shih-na means "wolf".¹³ However unjustified, similar equations are hardly worse than Clauson's pseudo-rational explanation: "I do not of course state confidently that the Türkü's ancestral she-wolf is merely a piece of vulgar abuse put about by their enemies, but this is a possibility that cannot be ignored. Neither can the possibility be ignored that both legends are garbled reminiscences of the fact that some ancestress of the Western Türkü royal family had 'she-wolf' as a proper

name " (p.15). In this article Sir Gerard--whose memory I cherish and respect--went out on a limb.

Besides the wolf-ancestress, the only major motif common to at least two of the three legends (A and C) is that of the "ancestral cavern". There is strong evidence to show that belief in its existence was held by the Türks themselves.

According to the **Chou shu** (50, 5a; Liu 1958, 10) the kaghan of the Türks "every year leads the nobles to the ancestral cavern to offer a sacrifice." The statement is repeated in many texts derived from the **Chou shu** and refers to the ruler of the Eastern Türks on whose territory the cavern--clearly a national shrine--was located. This, and also the practice of the annual ceremony, is confirmed by the **Sui shu**, which reports that every year the Western Türks send a high dignitary (or several dignitaries) to offer a sacrifice in the ancestral cavern. (Chavannes 1903, 15) Pelliot 1929, 214, compared the two texts' comments, in obvious reference to **Legend A**: "La caverne en question est celle où l'ancêtre des Turcs s'était réfugié avec la louve son épouse; à travers cette caverne on pénétrait dans une riche pleine, ayant plusieurs centaines de li de tour, où les descendants du réfugié et de la louve vécurent pendant de nombreuses générations, jusqu'au jour où ils 'sortirent de la caverne' pour aller s'établir au Sud du Kin-chan...la caverne se trouvait dans les montagnes au Nord de Kao-tch'ang (Tourfan)."

I very much doubt that the "ancestral cavern" (先虛 hsien k'u) in which the real Türk officials celebrated their annual commemorative service is the same as the huge cavern in which there was "a plain covered with rich vegetation, stretching over several hundreds of li...." The first of these was obviously real, the second, I am afraid, a legendary place. In fact, in referring to them the Chinese texts use two different characters. The "cavern" in **Legend A** is 穴 hsüeh, whereas the "ancestral cavern" compound uses the character k'u. The usage is quite consistent. Thus, both the **Chou shu** and the **Pei shih** have hsüeh for the former and

k'u for the latter. Only k'u appears in Legend C: "A-shih-te cavern", "the cavern where your ancestors were born", "birth cavern".

The Tung tien (193, 14a) has a valuable reference to the caverns (k'u) of the Türks, taken from a book now lost and entitled *On the origin and development of the Türks*. It occurs at the end of the chapter dealing with pygmies (Tuan jen) and states that their land is at a distance of "a month's journey by horseback" from these caverns. Let me add that in the above quote (p.12) from the Yu-yang tsa-tsu the cavern of the Kirghiz is also a k'u. In fact the passages dealing with "the cavern where the ancestor was born" are identical, word for word, in the Kirghiz and Türk sections of the Yu-yang tsa-tsu. It should be noted that nothing in Legend A suggests that the Türks' ancestor was born in a cavern. Thus the concept of the "ancestral cavern" (hsien k'u) appears only in Legend C, but its existence is confirmed by non-legendary, historical data.

* * *

A comparison of Legends A, B, and C allows some conclusions to be drawn.

1. The differences between them are so essential that these legends cannot possibly be taken to reflect tribal, let alone national, traditions.¹⁵ Their testimony would suggest that within the Türk state lived tribes or peoples that were not Türk themselves. Links with the Kirghiz are explicitly stated in B, and shared also are the legendary references to the cavern and the historical references to metallurgy. It is also clear that the wolf-theme is not shared between Türks and Kirghiz. The wolf, however, appears in the ancestral legend of the Wu-sun, about which more will be said later. Elsewhere (Sinor 1965, 1980, 1981) I have brought linguistic evidence to bear on the ethnic composition of the Türk people, suggesting that it had Ugric and Samoyed elements. Mythic evidence would point to a connection with the Wu-sun, whereas in the case of the Kirghiz the testimony of mythical

themes is supported by linguistic as well as historical data. If, as it seems likely, the Wu-sun were an Indo-European, perhaps Iranian people, the wolf may constitute their share in the mythic fabric of Türk proto-history. Carriers of this conception may have been the Sogdians, whose importance in Türk (and Uighur) societies has long been recognized. The wolf's appearance on the Sogdian Bugut stele would support the view that the wolf theme is rooted in the Sogdians' past. I think it is safe to say that the Türks--the first people known to have spoken a Turkic language--were a conglomerate of various tribes, possibly including non-Turkic-speaking populations.

2. It could be shown that the two major motifs of the legends (she-wolf ancestor, ancestral cavern)--whatever their origin and whichever ethnic entity within the Türk empire considered them their own--were part of the official fabric of Türk life. If we had more data we could even say that they formed a part of the state religion of the Türk empire.

3. None of the three legends makes any reference to Türk metallurgy, the importance of which is attested by historical evidence.

In the second part of this study I shall examine the appearance in some Inner Asian origin myths of three themes met with in our study of the Türk ancestral legends.

II

The Wolf

The Wu-sun variant

A legend of a small child cast out and brought up by a wolf is said to have been told by the Chinese general Chang Ch'ien to his emperor following his return from the Hsiung-nu around 120 B.C. The text was recorded in the *Shih chi* of Ssu-ma Ch'ien, a contemporary.

"When I was living among the Hsiung-nu," Chang

Ch'ien is said to have told the emperor, "I heard about the king of the Wu-sun people, who is named K'un-mo. K'un-mo's father was the ruler of a small state on the western border of the Hsiung-nu territory. The Hsiung-nu attacked and killed his father, and K'un-mo, then only a baby, was cast out in the wilderness to die. But the birds came and flew over the place where he was, bearing meat in their beaks, and the wolves suckled him, so that he was able to survive. When the Shan-yü (the ruler of the Hsiung-nu) heard of this, he was filled with wonder, and believing that K'un-mo was a god, he took him in and reared him.... When K'un-mo had grown to manhood... the Shan-yü made him the leader of the people his father had ruled in former times.... K'un-mo led his people far away, declared himself an independent ruler...."¹⁶

I have adopted here Watson's translation because of its literary merit and also because it is easily accessible, but the reader unfamiliar with Chinese should be warned that the use of the plural for "birds" and "wolves" is really unwarranted. Pulleyblank's "A crow brought meat in his bill and flew over him. A wolf came and suckled him." is a better rendering of the original.¹⁷ He also translates a different version of the Wu-sun ancestral legend, incorporated in the *Han shu*. The parallel passage has since then been studied also by Hulswé 1979, 214-215, who translates it as follows: "When I was living among the Hsiung-nu I heard of Wu-sun; the king was entitled K'un-mo and the K'un-mo's father was named Nan-tou mi; originally (Wu-sun) had lived with the Ta Yüeh-chih between the Ch'ien-lien (mountains) and Tun-huang; and they had been a small state. The Ta Yüeh-chih attacked and killed Nan-tou-mi, seizing his lands; and his people fled to the Hsiung-nu. An infant K'un-mo had recently been born, and the Pu-chiu Hsi-hou, who was his guardian, took him in his arms and ran away. He laid him in the grass and searched for food for him; and on coming back he saw a wolf suckling the child; furthermore there were ravens holding meat in their beaks and hovering at (the child's) side."

According to Pulleyblank, the compiler of the

Han shu based his story on that of the **Shih chi**, but added some information culled from other sources and some arbitrary embellishments, a view with which Hulsewé 1979, 217, strongly disagrees. Commenting on the story, Pulleyblank remarks that the miracle "is clearly a part of a tribal origin myth of a familiar type. The abandoned infant suckled by a she-wolf immediately reminds one of Romulus and Remus. The part played by the crow seems to be an embellishment based on the meaning of the Chinese characters used for the name of the Wu-sun, i.e. 'crow-grandson'. Since these characters are undoubtedly a transcription of a non-Chinese word, one can only suppose that this punning interpretation was added by Chang Ch'ien himself or some other Chinese." I cannot but fully agree with all this, though I am somewhat surprised that Pulleyblank, understandably mindful of Romulus and Remus,¹⁸ failed to mention the Türk myth with which he is surely familiar.¹⁹

The study of the history of the Wu-sun has probably presented more problems than solutions. Information about them is scant and difficult to interpret. Their first known location was probably in the region of Barköl.²⁰ At the time of Chang Ch'ien's journey to the west they were the western neighbors of the Hsiung-nu, and, according to Pulleyblank 1966, 29, in the first century B.C. they lived in Zungaria, north of the eastern end of the T'ien-shan.²¹ It will be noted that according to the **Shih chi** K'un-mo was killed by the Hsiung-nu, whose ruler, as it were, repented and adopted the young boy. The **Han shu** version ascribes the deed to the Great Yüeh-chih and also gives the name of the boy's murdered father. In spite of the impression the text may convey--both in English and in the original--K'un-mo is not a personal name but a title.²² On evidence that appears to be more preconceived than substantial, it has been put forward--more recently by Pulleyblank 1966, 29--that the Wu-sun were of the same linguistic stock as the Yüeh-chih. If this is really so, the theme common between their ancestral legend and that of the Turkic Türks is, a priori, surprising.

Much useless and confusing ado has been made over the allegedly blue eyes and blond hair of the Wu-sun. Although the textual misinterpretation which is the basis of this assumption has clearly been exposed by O. Franke 1904, 17-19, the dangerous mistake keeps emerging from time to time in the scholarly literature.²³ Among the mythical themes present in **Legend A** of the Türks, that of the abandoned child nursed by a wolf is clearly present in the Wu-sun ancestral legend. But even there a significant difference can be shown: the wolf of the Wu-sun myth saves the ancestor, but is not, as in the case of the Türk myth, the ancestor of the people.

The Mongol Variant

The oldest extant historical text written in Mongol, the **Secret History** of the Mongols, which dates from the mid-thirteenth century, has the following laconic statement on the origin of the Mongols (given here in the translation of de Rachewiltz 1971, 118):

"The origins of Chinggis-qahan. There was once a blue-gray wolf who was born with his destiny preordained by Heaven Above. His wife was a fallow doe. They came crossing the Tenggis. After they had settled at the source of the Onan river at Burqan-qaldun, Bata-chiqan was born to them." Then follows a lengthy genealogy leading to Chinggis himself.

The Mongol original of blue-gray wolf is **börte činu-a**, that of the fallow doe **foo-a maral**.²⁴

To secure the benefit of Buddhist legitimacy for Mongol rulers, later Mongol chronicles artificially link Chinggis's ancestry with Tibetan rulers. In these works the myth is euhemerized: **Börte činu-a** and **foo-a maral** become personal names. Thus, the **Altan-tobči** written in the first decades of the seventeenth century has this to say in Charles Bawden's (1955, 113) translation (slightly altered by me): [Following a list of fictitious

Tibetan rulers:] "Of his sons the eldest was Boroču, the second Šibayuči and the youngest was Börte Činoa. As they quarrelled amongst themselves, Börte Činoa crossed over the Tenggis Sea in the direction of the north, and came to the land of the people. Taking a girl called ʔooa Maral, who had no husband, he settled in the land of the Jat people, and became of the Mongol clan."²⁵

Here, and also in Sayang Sečen's *History of the Eastern Mongols* completed in 1662, the mythical wolf and doe are completely humanized. The former is the youngest of three brothers, who takes as a bride the maid called Fallow Doe. Schmidt 1829, 56: ʔoo-a maral kemekü ökin-i gergei abču.

Yet traces of Börte Čino's supernatural personality remain in Mongol historiography. They appear clearly in a chronicle also entitled *Altan tobči*--to avoid confusion often quoted as *Altan tobči nova*--the work of a certain lama Blo-bzan bstan-jin (in Mongol: Lubsan Danzan) completed around 1655.²⁶ It contains passages taken from a number of other Mongol chronicles, including a version, now lost, of the *Secret History*. In the *Altan tobči nova* the genealogy of Börte Čino is presented in the same way as in the *Altan tobči* or Sayang Sečen's *History*, but one reference is made to his divine nature. It occurs in a genealogical list and reads: *tegünü qoyin-a tngri-yin köbegün Börte čino-a törübe* "after him was born the son of Heaven Börte Čino-a". (Mostaert 1952, p.186 of the first vol. of the Mongol text.) Another chronicle written in the early sixteenth century, the *Sara tuji*--a work of an unknown author--contains long, verbatim quotes from several Mongol historical works, including the *Secret History*, the *Altan tobči nova* and the *Köke debter*. Following the description of the aforementioned marriage of Börte Čino with ʔooa Maral, the text refers to the former as "son of Heaven" (*tngri-yin köbegün Börte čino-a*, cf. Sastina 1957, p.19).

There is no need to list further mention of Börte Čino in Mongol chronicles. The question that needs to be answered is this: do these data mirror

a living tradition or are they rooted in the clerkly habit of copying the sources? I have no doubt that the second of these alternatives is the correct one. The **Secret History** excepted, none of the chronicles seem to reflect the belief that Börte Čino, the Blue-gray Wolf, was in fact the ancestor of the Mongols. Nowhere is he listed at the beginning of the genealogy. Thus, the tradition reflected in the opening paragraph of the **Secret History** was no longer alive among those for whom these later histories were written, and the occasional reference to Börte Čino's supernatural connections do not alter the fact that he is but one in a very long succession of Chinggis's presumed ancestors.

Such a view is supported by the testimony, or rather the silence, of the Chinese sources, which make no mention of Börte Čino. The **Sheng-wu ch'in-chêng lu** does not trace Chinggis's ancestry beyond his father Yesügei. This text, the earliest Chinese narration of Mongol history, is probably a translation of a Mongol original now lost, through which it is linked with a proto-chronicle, usually called **Altan debter**, the Golden Book. The official annals of the Mongol dynasty of China (1279-1368), the **Yüan shih**, have drawn heavily from the **Sheng-wu ch'in-chêng lu**. In the case of Chinggis's genealogy, it goes further back, to Dobun Mergen and his wife Alan Qoa, his eighth generation ancestors, but, if we are to believe the **Secret History**, still ten more generations removed from Börte Čino. On purely textual grounds it could be shown (Hambis 1945, 2) that the **Yüan shih**, and other Chinese sources, represented a tradition different from that mirrored in the **Secret History**.

The **Altan debter** provided information not only to Mongol and Chinese historians but also to the Persian Rashid ed-Din (1247-1318), whose **Jami al-Tawarikh** "Complete Collection of Histories", completed in 1307, is a most important source of Mongol history. Of the Mongols' origin he has this to say (Smirnova 1952, 9):

"Concerning the details of the beginnings of their existence, reliable Turkic narrators report that all the Mongol peoples descend from those two persons who in former times went away to Ergene Qun. Among those who came out thence, there was an honorable lord called Börte Čino, chief and leader of some tribes whence issued Dobun Bayan and Alan Goa."

Later in this article I will have to speak in some detail about Ergene Qun. Here I would only point out that Rashid ed-Din expressly indicates that he has the story from Turkic narrators and that to him Börte Čino is definitely a human being, though clearly one of importance, since he is the ancestor of the couple (also half-mythical) universally regarded as the ancestors of Chinggis. Most genealogies stop with Alan Čooa and Dobun Bayan, also called Dobun Mergen.

With some caution I am prepared to bring into the picture another element--a curious, controversial episode related by the *Secret History* and some other sources. Chapter 129 of the *Secret History* speaks of a pitched battle fought at Dalan baljut (Seventy Marshes) between Chinggis khan and his arch-enemy Jamuqa. In de Rachewiltz's translation (1974, 56): Chinggis "was repulsed there by Jamuqa and sought refuge in the Jerene gorge by the Onon. Jamuqa said 'We have forced him to take refuge in the Jerene by the Onon', and, as he was about to return, he had the prince of the Chinos boiled alive [my italics] in seventy cauldrons...."

De Rachewiltz's insertion of the word *alive* is unnecessary; it tilts the balance of the narrative in favor of one of the two possible interpretations. The *Secret History* leaves open the question of whether the Chinos were boiled dead or alive, and so should we.

As we have seen, Chino = Čino = wolf. The Mongol text puts the name in the plural. Instead of "the princes of the Chinos" one could translate "the sons of the wolves". The word *kö'üt* has the primary meaning of "sons". It would also be sur-

prising if the small tribe of the "wolves" had seventy "princes". The Chinos "wolves" constituted one of the thirteen corps which Chinggis commanded in the battle. They may have been charged with protecting Chinggis himself. It will be remembered that the bodyguard of the Türk kaghan was also known as "wolves". The *Shen-wu ch'in-chêng lu*, which provides this information, even speaks of twin tribes (or one tribe divided into two parts) called respectively Gändü Cino "male wolf" and Ülükjin Cino "she-wolf".²⁷ The same work gives a twist to the story which makes it radically different from that related by the *Secret History*. Here, Jamuqa is defeated by Chinggis and it is the latter's army which not only sets up seventy ranges to cook the "wolves" but also eats them.

Rashid ed-Din, who relied heavily on the Mongol original of the *Shen-wu ch'in-chêng lu*, describes the events in a similar fashion; he makes Chinggis the victor, but in his version men and not wolves are boiled in seventy cauldrons. (O. I. Smirnova, 1952, 88.) The data may be summarized in a table:

SOURCE	CHINGGIS	JAMUQA	CHINOS	
			Nature	Treatment
Secret History	defeated	victor	human/animal	boiled
SWCCL	victor	defeated	animal	roasted eaten
Rashid	victor	defeated	human	boiled

In a learned note dealing mainly with textual problems, Pelliot (in Pelliot-Hambis 1951, 135-139) correctly remarked that the *Secret History's* version--in which Chinggis is the loser--is the one most likely to reflect the truth. It is reasonable to suppose that Chinggis's defeat was transformed into victory by sycophantic historians writing under Chinggisid rule (Rashid ed-Din, it should be

remembered, belonged to their number), whereas the **Secret History** more or less preserved the original story. The other versions contain some incongruities. Whosoever the Chinos may have been, they were on Chinggis's side, and it makes no sense that, alive or dead, they be boiled and consumed by his own men. The same may not be said about Jamuqa, who, victorious, may have wished to wreak spectacular vengeance on the defeated army.

There are really two separate questions to be answered. Were the "Chinos" boiled in the seventy cauldrons men or wolves, and in either case, were they or were they not eaten? No definite answer can be given to these questions, but to some extent our response to the first is contingent upon that given to the second. Pelliot was quite right in discarding as mere hostile propaganda any reference to the Mongols' cannibalism.²⁸ It is indeed unlikely--as the **Shen-wu ch'in-chêng lu** would have it--that seventy men be consumed at a cannibalistic banquet. To boil and eat seventy wolves is less untoward, more feasible and, as we shall see, may achieve the same aim. It may be asked why such a deed be done; why should the chronicles, or rather the bard, find it necessary to record the event and do so at this juncture of the narrative?

To torture to death a number of prisoners taken from the defeated enemy is one thing; to boil them in cauldrons--and seventy is a numinous number--is another. The events described show a ritual character reminiscent of Chinese practices. This was recognized by Pelliot (p.167) according to whom Chinese parallels can be found also to other happenings described by the **Secret History**. What a pity that he was reluctant to explore the matter further! To eat one's enemy is a sacrificial way to assimilate his strength and to assert the victor's authority. If the defeated is a wolf, so much the better, and the usefulness of the action is further enhanced if the wolf happens to be the ancestor of the vanquished tribe. There is nothing unlikely in Jamuqa's wish to consume a symbolic number of the defeated Chinos. Whether he actually did so is another matter.²⁹ From the ritual point

of view the difference is not essential. You may eat your antagonist, but the same effect--vengeance and acquisition of his strength--can be achieved by eating his essence, the repository of his strength. The ritual consumption of wolves is tantamount to eating the defeated Wolves. The victor's triumph is clearly asserted by the ingestion of the enemy's totem. And, be it noted, it is for the first time that I am using this much abused term.

There is no evidence of ritual cannibalism among the Mongols, and I know of only one, isolated instance in which the mention of the eating of human flesh may be given credence. In his *La Flor des Estoires de la Terre d'Orient* the Armenian monk Hayton relates how the il-khan Abagha (1265-1282) was betrayed by the so-called Pervane, whom he had made governor of one of his provinces. The traitor was then executed and, according to Hayton, his flesh was added to the meat served to Abagha and to some of his entourage.³⁰ The story may be true, since Hayton was a friend of the Mongols. Be that as it may, this instance of cannibalism belongs to a category different from that of Jamuqa.

Without new evidence, the events following the battle of Dalan baljut cannot be clarified. I have dealt with this question mainly to show that the role of the wolf among at least some of the Mongols may have been greater than that suggested by the remnants of the legend of Börte Čino mentioned in the *Secret History*. Jamuqa's behavior may be telling proof of the importance attached to the wolf in pre-imperial times.

The Cavern

In my analysis of the ancestral legends found in Chinese sources I pointed out that distinction should be made between two types of caverns: k'u and hsüeh. It appeared that the second of these is, in fact, rather an open-air amphitheatre of mountains of considerable dimension. Such a large, enclosed valley is the habitat attributed to the early Mongols by Rashid ed-Din and also by the

seventeenth century Khivan historian Abulghazi Bahadur khan, whose *Genealogy of the Turk* written in Chagatay relies heavily on Rashid ed-Din.

As told by these historians the legend can be summarized as follows:³¹

In the distant past two men, Kiyan and Nukuz, following a defeat at the hands of the Tatars, escaped with their wives and sought refuge in the mountains, where they found a valley so secluded that it could be reached only by one small path made by argalis. The valley, surrounded by impenetrable mountains, was fertile, with lush grass, pastures and fruit trees, and rich in game. It was called Ergene Qun--a name for which Rashid ed-Din and Abulghazi offer various etymologies. There the descendants of Kiyan and Nukuz multiplied until the territory became too small to accommodate all of them. They wished to leave, but did not know how until a man versed in metallurgy came up with a suggestion. In the mountain side he recognized some ore-bearing rocks and suggested that by melting the metal they might open a road to the outside world. On his advice they set against the mountain side layers of wood and charcoal, manufactured seventy bellows from the skins of horses and cattle, placed these at seventy locations, and set the wood on fire. With the help of the bellows the metal became molten and a path opened by which the people could leave Ergene Qun. According to Rashid ed-Din (I, 2, p.9), their leader was no one else but Börte Čino. According to the Persian historian, "to this day" the Mongols celebrate the anniversary of their exodus in a ceremony in which the ruler, using blacksmith's tongs, places a piece of red-hot iron on an anvil and hammers it. He is followed in this action by other dignitaries.

This, then, is the gist of the story as reported by Islamic sources. It should be noted that in it Börte Čino plays the same Mosaic role as does A-hsien-shih in the *Pei shih* version of **Legend A** (see p. 225 above). The Liberator, the Wolf, the Blacksmith, the Cavern form here an associative grouping, the cohesiveness of which is further

emphasized by Rashid ed-Din, I, 1, 184. According to him the Chinos constituted that branch of the Mongols which exited from Ergene Qun through melting the iron mountain side by means of seventy bellows. The number is the same as that of the cauldrons in which, as we have seen, the Chinos are said to have been boiled by Jamuqa.

The legends are quite explicit in their linking of metallurgy with caverns; the connection of ore extraction, mining, with pits is, of course, obvious. It is perhaps not too far fetched to assume that the annual ceremony performed by the Türks in the ancestral cavern, and described in the *Chou shu*, took place in the manner described by the later Muslim historians. Though it would be mistaken to equate Türks with Mongols, it is quite possible that some Mongols lived within the Türk empire, and it is certainly true that the Mongol empire was saturated with Turks. A Türk tradition may well have survived, and we have seen that Rashid ed-Din expressly states that the Ergene Qun legend is based on the report of "reliable Turkic narrators". At all events it is abundantly clear that--besides the Ergene legend--there existed a tradition which viewed Chinggis-khan as a blacksmith.

Chinggis's given name was Temüjīn, which--with or without adequate reasons--quite early was equated with Turco-Mongol *temürči(n)* "blacksmith". Pelliot 1959, 290, saw correctly that the tradition according to which Chinggis was a blacksmith was unfounded though well established by the middle of the thirteenth century. It appears already in the description of the Mongols given by the Franciscan Rubruck, according to whom Chinggis was called Temüjīn "quia faber fuit". About half a century later, the Armenian Hayton (Bk. III, ch.1) speaks of a "povre home fevre qui avoit nom Canguis", i.e. of a "poor blacksmith called Chinggis", and Pelliot gives some other textual references reflecting that same tradition.

We cannot tell whether the tradition originated in a popular etymology of the name Temüjīn or

whether this name reflects some real link with metallurgy. Since the *Secret History*, which relates in some detail Chinggis's childhood, has nothing to say that may be construed as a reference to metallurgy, my preference goes to the first of these alternatives.

* * *

We have now reached the end of our present investigation of the origin legends of the Türks and followed their survival in later sources. More could be said on the subject, but unless new texts or new pictorial or sculptural representations are found, the principal conclusions here offered should stand. I hope that folklorists may find some not readily accessible data in this presentation. For the historian, the main question must remain unanswered: do we have Mongol elements in the Türk legends or have Türk motifs been preserved in later, Mongol traditions? That the Türks themselves held differing and incompatible views of their own origins is undeniable and, as pointed out earlier in this article, can be explained only by assuming that the people of the Türk empire was a conglomerate of differing ethnicities.

**Indiana University
Bloomington**

Addendum anent the "boiled Chinos" (p. 244). Following the completion of this article I came across Käthe U. Köhlami, "Sibirische Parallelen zur Ethnographie der Geheimen Geschichte der Mongolen", in Louis Ligeti, ed. *Mongolian Studies* (Budapest, 1970, pp. 247-64). On pp. 255-57 of her very fine article the author adduces some interesting Siberian parallels to the story of enemies boiled in a kettle. She also reproduces a remarkable petroglyph from the Yenisei region, which depicts such a scene.

NOTES

1 The bibliographic references given in the notes are abbreviated. Exact data are given in the bibliography.

2 Cf. e.g. Chavannes 1905, pp. 534-35. This notice escaped the attention of Schaeder in his excellent *Iranica*, specifically pp. 51-55, where he dealt with Chinese references to Fu-lin. The identification of Hsi-hai with Lake Aral, at least since Hirth 1899, 88, often repeated, is untenable.

3 Cf. Chavannes 1903, 47.

4 Cf. Chavannes 1903, 34.

5 Cf. Chavannes 1903, 27. Not to be confused with the Tu-lu mentioned above!

6 A note of warning to the reader unfamiliar with Chinese: the **shih** component of the names mentioned in the legend stands for several Chinese characters.

7 The meaning of the first two or three sentences is ambiguous. Besides the one given here, at least two other translations may be envisaged: (1) "The ancestor of the Türks was called Shê-mo. Shê-li, a lake spirit, lived to the west...." (2) "The ancestor of the Türks was called Shê-mo-shê-li. He was a lake spirit. The spirit lived to the west...." In the light of what follows in the legend, the second sentence makes no sense, since it would imply that Shê-mo had an affair with his own daughter. The difficulty is caused by the word **shen** "spirit" appearing twice in succession. None of the editions of the *Yu-yang tsa-tsu* I could consult were punctuated and all had the character **shen** twice. I consider this a dittography and have emended the text accordingly.

Most of the time the word **hai**, which I translate as "lake", stands for "sea", and, occasionally, could mean "marsh". I was tempted to opt for this word, in view of **Legend A** where the mutilated child is cast into a marsh. This, however, would be tantamount to hinting at a connection between **Legends A** and **C** at a point where such cannot, with certainty, be shown. I think that in the general context of the story "lake" is more appropriate than "sea".

8 Cf. Liu 1958, 584.

9 Pulleyblank 1952, 332.

10 Liu 1958, 267.

11 Esin 1978, p. 126, plates LVII, LVIII.

12 Kljaštornyj 1972, 71.

13 Cf. e.g. Marquart 1914, 71.

14 I have dealt with this quote and some other questions related to this subject in Sinor 1939, 552.

15 Thus, my conclusion differs considerably from that of Kljaštornyj 1965, 279, who views **Legends A** and **B** as variants of the same tradition. His thoughtful, well-documented article contains much with which I can agree, and some points which I view with serious reservations. To discuss these would take us away from our subject: the legendary--and not the historical--origins of the Türks.

16 Watson II, 273.

17 Pulleyblank 1970, 155.

18 Some years ago a well preserved wall painting of Romulus, Remus and the Capitoline wolf was discovered in the region of medieval Ustrushan in northern Tajikistan, in the ruins of a palace of the Afshin rulers. Cf. N.N. Negmatov--V.M. Sokolovskij 1975. The representation dates from the seventh century, when Byzantine influence in the region was quite strong. Romulus and Remus appear quite frequently on Byzantine coins of that, or earlier, periods. A statuette representing a man and a child riding on a wolf, discovered in 1952 in the city of Bekabad (northern Ustrushan), may or may not have relevance to the Türk legend. Ibid., p. 450). It cannot be said with any amount of certainty whether the region was under Türk influence at the time when these representations, particularly the wall painting, were made. Whether the wolf motif of the Wu-sun (and Türk?) legend is of Roman origin or the story of Romulus belongs to a tradition shared by the Wu-sun is too complicated a question to be discussed in this article.

19 Daffinà 1969, 3 is more vague: "È probabile che il nome stesso dei Wu-sun, che vuol dire 'nipoti del corvo', sie in qualche modo connesso con questa leggenda." The articles of Pulleyblank and Daffinà were published almost simultaneously; neither of them could take into account the other.

20 Cf. Haloun 1937, especially pp. 246, 295-96; view accepted by Pulleyblank 1966, 29.

21 This is not the place to concern ourselves with their various migrations. Cf. Daffinà 1969 and Pulleyblank 1970, with ample reference to previous research.

22 In the *Ch'ien Han shu* the name appears in the form *Lieh-chiao-mi*. For the discussion of the title *k'un-mo* the *loci classici* are Marquart 1914, 68-70 as amended by Pelliot 1920, 138-39.

23 An unfortunately worded sentence by Pelliot 1920, 136--though accurate in itself--has done much to perpetuate this misconception, which appears in such excellent general works as e.g. Grousset 1939, 63.

24 The Mongol script does not distinguish between *o* and *u*, and the separation of the final *-a* in the word for "wolf" is an orthographic peculiarity which may or may not be followed in Latin transcription. No effort is here made to follow a uniform spelling, since this would have interfered with the accuracy of my verbatim quotations. In Classical Mongol *börte* ~ *börtü* means "multicolored, motley". On the basis of some earlier "authorities" which I found superfluous to cross-check, Kretschmar 1938, 10 thought that it meant "der dunkle Winterbalg" and translated (p. 8) the personal name as "Wolf im Winterbalg"! To make matters worse--if this is possible--on the basis of a vague assonance (?) she identified *cino* (sic!) with *A-shih-na*, the name of the *Türk* ruling clan. It may seem pointless to drag into this study this reference, but I do so to call attention to the terrible pit-falls awaiting the "generalist" who ventures into the Inner Asian field without adequate philological grounding, and who relies on secondary sources. In many ways Kretschmar's work is quite meritorious, though she tends to equate dog and wolf. This is quite inadmissible in the study of the legends we are concerned with, though De Groot 1901, 265-71 is guilty of the same, overly open approach. The nonsensical *čino* = *A-shih-na* equation surfaces in the very learned Lech 1968, 180.

25 I leave aside the explanatory footnotes provided by Bawden and refrain from adding my own comments, irrelevant to our subject.

26 Šastina 1973 provides a Russian translation with remarkably good commentary.

27 Pelliot-Hambis 1951, 37, 131-35.

28 On this *topos* see Sinor 1977, 61.

29 On eating one's enemy see Granet 1926, 162-70, where reference is made to the defeated enemy boiled in cauldrons. Granet's presentation of the subject is magnificent.

³⁰ RHC.Arm.II, 180.

³¹ Rashid ed-Din I, 1, pp. 77-78, 153-56, 160, 184; I, 2 ,p.9.
Desmaisons pp. 31-33.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations:

- AOH. = Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
 BSOAS. = Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African
 Studies
 CAJ. = Central Asiatic Journal
 HJAS. = Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies
 JA. = Journal asiatique
 JRAS. = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
 MIA = Materialy i issledovanija po arxeologii SSSR
 SO. = Studia Orientalia (Helsinki)
 TP. = T'oung Pao
 ZDMG. = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen
 Gesellschaft

- - -

- Bawden, C.R. 1955. The Mongol chronicle Altan tobči. Wies-
 baden.
- Boodberg, Peter A. 1939. The language of the T'o-pa Wei.
 HJAS. I, 167-185.
- Chavannes, Edouard. 1903. Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs)
 Occidentaux. St. Pétersbourg.
- _____. 1905. Les pays d'Occident d'après le Wei
 lio. TP. VI, 519-571.
- Clauson, Sir Gerard. 1964. Turks and Wolves. SO. XVIII.2.
- Daffinà, P. 1969. La migrazione dei Wu-sun. Revista degli
 studi orientali XLIV, 143-155.
- De Groot, J.J.M. 1901. The religious system of China. Vol.
 IV, Book II. Leiden.
- De Rachewiltz, Igor. 1971. The Secret History of the Mongols.
 Papers on Far Eastern History 4. 115-164.
- _____. 1974. The Secret History of the Mongols.
 Chapter Four. Papers on Far Eastern History 10, 55-82.
- Desmaisons. 1871-1874. Histoire des Moguls et des Tatares par
 Aboul-Ghâzi Bèhadour Khan. I-II. St. Pétersbourg.

- Des Rotours, Robert. 1947-1948. *Traité des fonctionnaires et Traité de l'armée*. Traduits de la Nouvelle histoire des T'ang. I-II. Paris.
- Esin, Emel. 1978. *Islâmiyetten önce Türk kültür târihi ve Islâma giris*. In: *Türk kültürü el-kitabi*. Seri II, Cild 1/b. Istanbul.
- Franke, O. 1904. *Beiträge aus chinesischen Quellen zur Kenntnis der Türkvölker und Skythen Zentralasiens*. Anhang zu den Abhandlungen der königl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Berlin.
- Granet, Marcel. 1926. *Danses et légendes de la Chine ancienne*. I-II. Paris.
- Grousset, René. 1939. *L'empire des steppes*. Paris.
- Haloun, G. 1937. Zur Üe-Tši Frage. ZDMG. XCI. 243-318.
- Hambis, Louis. 1945. *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan che*. TP. Supplément au Vol. XXXVIII.
- _____. 1956. Notes sur Käm nom de l'Yénisséi supérieur. JA. 281-300.
- Hirth, Friedrich. 1899. *Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonyuquq*. In: W. Radloff. *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei*. Zweite Folge. St. Pétersbourg.
- Hulsewé, A.F.P. 1979. *China in Central Asia. The Early Stage: 125 B.C.-A.D. 23*. Leiden.
- Kljaštornyj, S.G. 1965. *Problemy rannej istorii plemeni türk (Asina)*. In: *Novoe v sovetskoj arxeologii*. MIA. 130. Moskva. 278-281.
- Kljaštornyj, S.G. - Livšic, V.A. 1972. *The Sogdian inscription of Bugut revised*. AOH. XXVI, 69-102.
- Kretschmar, Freda. 1938. *Hundestammvater und Kerberos*. I-II. Stuttgart.
- Lech, Klaus. 1968. *Das mongolische Weltreich*. Wiesbaden.
- Liu, Mau-tsai. 1958. *Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe)*. I-II. Wiesbaden.

- Marquart, J. 1914. Über das Volkstum der Komanen. In: Abhandlungen der königl. Ges. der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. NF. Bd. XIII, 25-238.
- Mostaert, Antoine. 1952. Altan tobči. A brief history of the Mongols by bLo.bzan bsTan'jin. Scripta Mongolica I. Cambridge, Mass.
- Negmatov, N.N. - Sokolovskij, V.M. 1974. "Kapitolijskaja volčica" v Tadžikstane i legendy Evrazii. Pamjatniki kul'tury. Novye otkrytija. Ežegodnik 1974, 438-458.
- Pelliot, Paul. 1920. A propos des Comans. JA. I, 125-185.
- _____. 1929. Le mont Yu-tou-kin (Ütükan) des anciens Turcs. TP. XXVI, 212-219.
- _____. 1959. Notes on Marco Polo. I. Paris.
- _____. - Hambis, Louis. 1951. Histoire des campagnes de Gengis khan. Cheng-wou ts'in-tcheng-lou. Leiden.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1952. A Sogdian colony in Inner Mongolia. TP. XLI, 317-356.
- _____. 1966. Chinese and Indo-Europeans. JRAS. 9-39.
- _____. 1970. The Wu-sun and Sakas and the Yüeh-chih migration. BSOAS. XXXIII, 154-160.
- Rashid ed-Din = Rašid ed-Din. Sbornik letopisej. I.1. edited by A.A. Semenov, translated by L.A. Xetagurova. Moscow-Leningrad 1952. I.2. by A.A. Semenov, O.I. Smirnova, B.I. Pankratov. Moscow-Leningrad 1952.
- RHC.Arm.II. = Recueil des historiens des croisades. Documents arméniens. I-II, Paris 1869-1906.
- Šastina, N.P. 1957. Šara Tudži. Mongol'skaja letopis' XVII veka. Moscow-Leningrad.
- _____. 1973. Lubsan Danzan. Altan tobči ("Zolotoe skazanie"). Pamjatniki pis'mennosti vostoka X, Moscow.
- Schaeder, Hans Heinrich. 1934. Iranica. Abhandlungen der

Ges. der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-hist.Kl.
Dritte Folge Nr. 10.

Schmidt, I.J. 1829. Geschichte der Ost-Mongolen und ihres Fürstenhauses, verfasst von Ssanang Secen Chungtaidschi der Ordus. St. Petersburg-Leipzig.

Sinor, Denis. 1939. A propos de la biographie ouigoure de Hiuan-tsang. JA. II, 534-590.

_____. 1965. Notes on the equine terminology of the Altaic peoples. CAJ. X, 307-315.

_____. 1980. Samoyed and Ugric elements in Old Turkic. Harvard Ukrainian Studies, III-IV, 768-773.

_____. 1981. The origin of Turkic **balıq** "town". CAJ. XXV, 95-102.

Smirnova, O.I. 1952. See Rashid ed-Din I.1.

Vásáry, I. 1971. **Kām**: an early Samoyed name of the Yenisey. In: Studia Turcica ed. L. Ligeti, Budapest, 469-482.

Watson, Burton. 1961. Records of the Grand Historian of China. I-II. Columbia University Press.