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Introduction

The present essay on the Mingrad, the Jáqačin, the Torqud, the Qošud and the Čaqar contains Chapters Six, Seven and Eight of Čeveng’s, i.e. C. Ž. Žamcarano’s book Darqad, Köbsögöl Nàyur-un Uriyangqai, Dörbed, Qotong, Bayad, Ögeled, Mingyad, Jáqačin, Torqud, Qošud, Čaqar, Dariyangqai, Altai-yin Uriyangqai, Qasaq, Qamniyan-nar-un yarul ündüsü bayidal-un ügül (Essay on the Origin and State of the Darqad, the Uriyangqai of Lake Köbsögöl, the Dörbed, the Qotong, the Bayad, the Ögeled, the Mingrad, the Jáqačin, the Torqud, the Qošud, the Čaqar, the Dariyangqai, the Uriyangqai of the Altai, the Qasaq, and the Qamniyan). Chapter One, devoted to the Darqad and the Uriyangqai of Lake Köbsögöl, appeared in translation in East Asian History 1 (June 1991): 55–80; Chapter Two, on the Dörbed, in East Asian History 10 (December 1995): 53–78; and Chapters Three, Four and Five, on the Qotong, the Bayad and the Ögeled, in East Asian History 12 (December 1996): 105–20.

In preparing the present translation we have followed the format and conventions of the previous ones, using the same abbreviations for primary and secondary sources, etc. A number of new items are listed in the Bibliography. However, owing to a lack of reliable data available at present to the translators on the ethnic distribution of the groups dealt with in these sections, the map that normally accompanies the translation has been omitted.
BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

(See Chapter One, pp.58–60; Chapter Two, pp.64–6; Chapters Three, Four and Five, p.106)


The Mingyad

As for the Mingyad who live on the north bank of the estuary of the Qobdo River, it was just in 1758 that the Sidar Vang Čenggūngjab, lord of the Qotoyoyid and Uriyangqai peoples, defected from the Manchu dynasty and fomented a rebellion. As a result of the fact that they had been oppressed for their involvement in the affair, and in order to impair the might of the Qotoyoyid and Uriyangqai, (the Mingyad) were severed in 1765 from the Aimak of the Jasaytu Qan and became a people administered by Qobdo. They had no governing princes and carried on with chiefs of (their own) choice.

The origin of the Mingyad is not clear and some scholars, such as Potanin, say that the Mingyad are of Turkic stock but of Mongol language. And, truly, if one considers their internal clans and lineages, there are lineages such as those called Mingyad Beskid, Külür, Sira Kirkid, Qara Kirkid, Bürgüd, Kitad, and Süu. In addition to these being a mixture of Turkic and Mongol stock, there may also be Dingling lineages. If we observe their customs, (we notice) that they are similar to those of the Qotoyoyid; and, as regards their physique, it is (also) similar to that of the Mongols.

Concerning their past history, as (history) is the same everywhere, irrespective of Asia or Europe and whether (a country) is far or near, (the Mingyad, too, have been subjects sometimes of one nation and sometimes of another). (Theirs) is a history in which, in 1550, the grandson of Dayan Qayan of the Mongols became the hereditary serf of Badmasangbuua; (in which,) in the map of Siberia done by Remezov in 1696 there is a ‘Mingyad territory’ separately delineated at the source of the Kem River; (in which,) in the eighteenth century, they were the subjects of the Jungar state; and, again, (in which) they were in the same place as the Qotoyoyid people (and under their authority).

What the Mingyad regard as important is raising cattle and transhuming. They do not practise agriculture. Now they are under the administration of the Qobdo Aimak, (but) at the time of the Autonomous (Government) they were administered by the nobles of Qobdo; and at the time of the People’s Government, and until the modernization of one section of the regional administration, they were in the Bayančindaman Banner of the Dörbed. Therefore, in the statistics for 1930 they were counted together with this banner. In 1916, at the time when there was a special banner called the Kökü Ayula (Banner), the Mingyad households were 591 and the individuals 3,537; in the recent year 1929, the households were 640 and the individuals 3,416. The reason why the number of the individuals decreased and that of the households increased is not clear.

The horses of the Mingyad are somewhat different from those of the
Mongols. In the report of Lus, the livestock researcher, it has been shown that their bones and bodies are small and high.

The territory of the Mingyaq is not especially large. Along the northern escarpment of the lower Qobdo (River), there are, in the east, Mount Aýbasi and Jaqa Şana; in the west, Mount Köküi and Mount Sondui; and, in the north, Tala Bulağ and Moyoi River. In the middle there is (a lake) called Lake Jegeren, which is not salty. Within this territory there are interesting birds that are not found in the eastern districts of Mongolia; birds such as the swan, the white crane, the spoonbill, the malodorous pelican, and the pheasant.

With regard to the Mingyaq, Mayiski (= Maïski) wrote in his book Contemporary Mongolia that they value democracy and freedom. In the Manchu period, their corvée consisted in bringing firewood to the Treasury building of the city of Qobdo.

On the Sondui River there is a large monastery; and on the left escarpment of the Bulyantu River quite near to the city of Qobdo there is also a monastery, called Sira Süme. The august emperor of the Manchus called Tngri-yin Tedkügsen (= Ch’ien-lung) allocated 10,000 ounces of silver and established this as a temple in the middle of the Mingyaq and the Ögeled. Podzneyev (= Pozdneev) wrote that this event occurred in 1766.

The JaqaCin and Torýud, and the Qošud

To the south of Qobdo, from Bayan Quduy by the Jerge River up to the border of China and the Bayitay Boyda, along the northern and southern slopes of the Altai range, there dwells an ethnic group called JaqaCin. Their western border is the Bulyan River; their eastern border reaches up to Lake Qolmo and the Barlay River. In recent times, they called themselves the Qan Bayatur Qayirqan Aula Banner, which comprised five sumuns and went with the Čindamani Ayula Aimak. Now they are part of the Qobdo Aimak. Regarding the total number of households and individuals, according to the statistics for 1921, the households were 1,253 and the individuals 7,952; and according to the statistics for 1930, the households were 1,364 and the individuals 7,774.

As for the origin of the JaqaCin, they separated from the Torýud, and their dialect and customs are really quite like the Torýud’s. They call themselves Ögeled. If we consider their history, at the time when the Jungar state was (still) mighty and powerful, this state used to call JaqaCin those members of the army who guarded the border (jaqa) areas. (See) the letters of the Russian envoy who went to Čevengrabdan Qa’an and the Account of Mongol Nomad Grounds. At the time when the two states of the Manchus and the Jungar were fighting each other, the administrator (jakirul) of the JaqaCin called the Jayisang Maqamud (= Mahmüd), having been captured by the Manchu army in 1754 and submitted to the Great Ch’ing state, was rewarded with titles such as Privy Minister (sidar sayid) and Duke (gung). When (the Manchus) fought DavaCi Qayan of the Jungars he served their

---

11 Lit., ‘the lower body (= side) of’.
13 Lit., ‘they had the corvée of’.
14 Lit., ‘this affair is’.
15 Lit., ‘which was’.
16 In the sense of ‘to serve (> to belong)’, cf. DO, pp.399b-400b, s.v. jawy.
17 Lit., ‘they enter into’.
18 Lit., ‘full of strength and valour’.
19 The text has kemdeg for kemedeg.
20 Lit., ‘the people (arad) of the army’.
21 JaqaCin means literally ‘borderman’.
22 See the Commentary.
cause, and when (envoys) from Amursana Qayan came and urged him to rebel (against the Manchus), he spat (in contempt) and cursed Amursana. Because of this, he was (eventually) slain by Amursana.

On account of his (i.e. Maqamud’s) relatives consisting of twenty-three (altogether) thirty households, on top of which were numerous Jaqačin soldiers, in 1775 (the Manchu government) established ‘arrows’ (sumu) and ‘banners’ (qošyu), and elected a superintendent (bugiu-yin daruña), (thus) bringing (all of) them under the administration of the amban of Qobdo. Since the subjects of Maqamud’s descendants to whom had been assigned nomad grounds in (the region of) Üyenči and Bodonči were, by 1800, (already) 150 male (individuals in number), they were made into a sumun <see the Account of Mongol Nomad Grounds>. Further, the research unit of the student Kazakevič, who was sent by the Scientific Committee to investigate the southwestern frontier in 1924, reported as follows when it passed through (the territory of) the Jaqačin: “As for the Jaqačin consisting of five otogs altogether, when the Mongolian state was established, one of their otogs which was administered by a Chinese minister residing at Çayan Tüngge was included within the Chinese border. The other four otogs became the subjects of the Mongolian state.” It was also said that since the Jaqačins’ birthrate is falling, the population figures are being decreased but, in actual fact, the reason why the birthrate has diminished has not been written about. Then, with regard to the statement that the manner in which the people's health has been taken care of is very bad, we should ask whether there has been no such increase (in the birthrate) because of widespread illness among the population. And, looking at the statistics, it is impossible to overlook the fact that, within a single year, (the Jaqačin population) has decreased by 178 persons. No matter what, one must immediately investigate the problem of taking measures to protect (the people’s) health, and the way to do it (effectively).

As to the Jaqačin’s main occupations, they (raise) livestock and sow barley along the Jerge River on the northern side of the Altai and wheat in places such as Uliyasu(tai) which are on the southern side. They hunt very little. They subsist by transhuming.

Concerning the Jaqačin, Potanin in 1876–77, Pozdnejev in 1892, Kozlov in 1899–1901, Ladegín (= Ladygin) in 1900, and Kazakevič in 1920 have each said (something) about the Jaqačin, stating that they irrigate and sow their crops; that camels and horses are scarce; that sheep and goats are numerous; and that yaks are also there.

It is reported that in Kozlov’s time (the Jaqačin) killed marmots in excessive numbers, selling annually up to 40,000 skins to the Russians and the Chinese, so that soon they will have exhausted their marmots.

Pozdnejev remarked that taxes were not heavy, and that they had built only five post-relay stations.

They (also) say that in the Jaqačin (territory) there are four monasteries: the Jerge Monastery, the Tögorig Monastery, the Bodonči Monastery and the Gung Monastery.
As for Mayiski (= Maïskii), he said <in 1918> that the Jáqačin have six monasteries, and that they all transhume with felt tents. The largest of all monasteries is the Jerge Monastery. The next is the Töögörig Monastery.

In 1930, a special livestock and agricultural investigative mission was jointly sent by the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union and the Scientific Committee (of the MPR) to the territory of the Jáqačin and the Torýud, but the summary report of their investigation has not yet been published by the Academy. However, irrespective of the fact that the Jáqačin perform agricultural work rather crudely, it is claimed that they have also acquired (other) skills. And the item by item investigation of the geology, the flora, as well as the hydrography, farming and such things as small ploughs together with the livestock, etc., (of the Jáqačin) is analogous to the detailed investigation (carried out) in 1931 of the Qobdo state farms, the geology, flora, horses and livestock, agriculture, and even the precipitation of the Dörbed region.

Further, there are many illustrations in the relevant books. They are all in Russian, and they are quite interesting and not a few pages long.

**The Torýud**

[90] One should also note (the following): the Torýud of the Bulyan River seem to be included in the (population) statistics of the Qan Bayąatur Qayırqan Banner. And, since in 1930 the Office of the Çindamani Aidak issued the information that the Torýud households were about 600, and those of the Jáqačin about 750, by combining the two approximate figures (the total) would appear to be 1,364. But since one has not in fact sorted them out by qörins ('Twenties') and examined them, I could not say which is which. As for the Torýud, even though their way of life, customs, dialect, etc., are distinct, they are close to the Jáqačin and camp along the Bulyan River up to the Bayitay Boyda (Mountains). As means of subsistence they have livestock (suitable) for transhumance, they have little agriculture, and their temples (are also those suitable for) transhumance. They are a branch of the Four Öyirad. In the statutes of the Çing (= Ch'ing) dynasty, the Torýud of the Bulyan River are called the New Torýud. These are the ones who escaped in 1758 and went to Russia, (then) came back in 1771. They are referred to as the Torýud subjects to Cering Tayiji; and together with these same (Torýud) there is one sumu(n) of Qosud. [91] They are a tribe of the same kind (= people) as the Torýud of the Ijil (= Volga) River in Russia. When enumerating their clans, (says that they are the following): the Qotod, Šereggüd, Baryas, Šarmud, Kegerid, Qotong, Kereyid, Šaras Šarmud, Žamad, Bürdül, Merged and Qoyid.

Although there have been investigations of the Torýud who are among those that have become the special autonomous and independent Qalimay

(= Kalmyk) Province in the present SSSR (= USSR)—in the former Russian Empire—and (also) investigations of the Toryud of the Ili and Tarbayatai, there has been no investigation expressly directed at the Toryud of the Bulyan and Çinggil (rivers) of the Altai. Because (of this), it would be appropriate to send out a special exploratory mission with regard to these Toryud of the Bulyan River and the Qosud, as well as to the above-mentioned Jaqačin.

In general, the Dörbed, Ögeled, Toryud, Jaqačin, Qoyid and Qoșud of whom we have spoken earlier are all tribes of the Four Oyirad. They are indeed the remnants of the so-called Jungar State which perished in recent times. Concerning the Bayad, they used to be included among the Oyirad; as for the Mingyad, Uriyangqai and Qotoyoyid, they are the ones who were the subjects of the Jungars. [92] While the majority of all these is actually of Mongol stock, their dialects, customs, etc., are but little different (from those of the Mongols). One can say that the history of the Four Oyirad is truly great and rich.

The Čaqar

[93] In the Sinkiang province of China there are the so-called 16 sumuns of the Čaqars of the Ili. They nomadize along the Boro Tala. Another sumun of Čaqars nomadizes along the Qulusutai River, (a tributary) of the Emil River, as well as at the mountain called Čaγan Oboya in the military administration of the Tarbayatai district.41

As for these Čaqars, after the Manchu army in 1758 had destroyed the Ögeled government and killed off (the population), butchering them (like animals),42 (the Manchu authorities) looked (at the situation), as there were no longer people living in the region in question, and (the region) had become a wasteland. In view of the fact that one also needed to increase field produce, they brought in people moving them from here and there, settled them and made them earn a livelihood. Further, since one needed to guard the border regions, they made people transhume, separating them from the eight banners (qosiyun) of the Čaqar43 that were between Dolon Naγur (= Dolon Nor) and Koke Qota to the north of Çiyulultu Qayalγa (= Chiang-chia k’ou/Kalgan). And, allocating such things as subsidies for travelling expenses from the state treasury, they settled them as reliable troops to guard the new frontiers. [94] In 1911, a the time when the national revolution of the Mongols began and the Qalqa became independent, the Mongols of the north, south, west and east uniformly agitated,44 and all together participated at once (in the revolution) and the whole Mongol nation was united. Owing to the fact that in the province of Sinkiang the oppression of the Chinese had become excessive, Sumiya, the vice-chief (ded daruya) of the former Čaqars of the Ili, took more than 100 households and, passing through Russian territory, provided those who became subjects of the Mongols with nomad grounds

41 Lit., ‘the administration of the jangjun of Tarbayatai’. See the Commentary.
42 See the Commentary to p[77].
43 Lit., ‘cutting them off from the people of the eight banners of the Čaqar’.
44 The text has kõdelskijü for kõdeliskijü.

For kōl 'foot, leg' = 'upheaval, calamity, trouble' (caused by war), cf. MED, p. 484a (c).

Lit., 'if we show it in a table (kusūmūg), it is like this'.

Lit., 'because in fact one has not especially differentiated them as Čaqars'.

Lit., 'if one looks at this table'.

Lit., 'there is information saying'.

(nutūg) by the Qara Qujir Qabtaýai Garrison at the Jelter River in the plain west of Kiyaytu (= Kiakhta). He settled them there and named them the Ilayun Bayatur Sumiya Beyise Qosiyu ('Banner of the Victorious Hero, Sumiya Beyise'). <See A New History of Mongolia>.

In 1921, the government of the People's Party was established; it struggled with the Chinese Ko-ming ('Revolutionaries'), and the White Baron Uŋgern (= Ungern-Sternberg), and men like Demberil, Sumiya and Sijije from the Čaqar Banner were deeply involved in the great task whereby the (Mongol) people were fighting for independence. They were active in the People's Army, and the entire banner sustained severe losses in the upheaval (caused) by that White Army. Later, when the new administration was established, it was named the Yeke Tūsig Ayula Qosiyu ('Banner of the Great Support Mountain') and, as regards its subsequent (development), if shown in tabulated form it is as follows. (The Čaqars) were included in the Jėgün Būrin Banner and, at the time of the last recent (administrative) division into aimaks, they were incorporated into the Tariyalang Aimak as the Yeke Tūsig Sumun. Statistics of these Čaqars were taken in the 8th, 12th, 14th and 19th years of the Mongolian (Republic), or, in European reckoning, in 1918, 1922, 1924 and 1929. Although the latest statistics are extensive, it is difficult to use them with profit because, in actual fact, the Čaqars have not been specifically differentiated as such (from the other Mongols). Also, there are numerous shortcomings because the first three (years') statistics have been summarized, and the original registers have not yet been found and examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1918</th>
<th>1922</th>
<th>1924</th>
<th>1931</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households/Tents</td>
<td>85 tents</td>
<td>45 households</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxen</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camels</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the above table, (one notices that) it contains information to the effect that in 1931 the Čaqar households were 135 and the individuals 751 (in number) showing that in the last seven or eight years the Čaqars have increased quite considerably.

When the census of the population, livestock and property of the entire
nation was taken in 1929, the Yeke Tüsig Ayula Banner was included in the Jegün Būrin Banner. Because of (this), and taking into account the fact that 15 qorins had been included in it as the Yeke Tüsig Ayula Sumun, if we consult the statistics of the qorin-units,51 (we see that) the households are 301 and the individuals 1,425 (in number), and that one cannot decide which among them are really Čaqqar, which are Qalqa and which are Buriyad. If we calculate the (number of) livestock which is found among these 301 households and 1,425 individuals by adding52 the newborn animals,53 (we obtain the following figures):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxen</td>
<td>4,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaks</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camels</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>10,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>4,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we calculate the figure per household54 on (the basis of) the total number, (we obtain the following figures):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxen</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaks</td>
<td>1 found in (every) two households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this, there is a considerable number of buildings for the people of the Yeke Tüsig Sumun, and there are also hay-mowing machines, rakes55 and hand scythes <grass-cutting sickles>. Their way of sowing crops is the proper one. There are not a few iron and wood axled carts. One hears them saying56 that (their usual) dwellings, and the cattle pens and shelters in their winter and summer quarters are abundant.

Since there has been no opportunity (yet for a mission) to go and investigate the Čaqqars57 who were brought back (from Sinkiang) by Sumiya Beyise and, having ascertained the truth, to report on how matters stand,58 I have not recorded any item (of interest about them here). (I shall say) merely that, whereas the people are by nature [98] alert, and their splendid zeal is great, in character and behaviour they appear to be light and quick. Also, in breeding horses, they are (especially) fond of swift horses; because of that, taking stallions of good stock, they keep on striving to improve the strain of (their) horses.59

Formerly, when the Čaqqars were still in their Ili (home), they used the Clear Script (todo bičig), as well as the Manchu script. Now they use solely the Mongol script. With regard to their dialect, they came from Sinkiang speaking Ögeled.60 As to the present, the young people are acquiring61 the Qalqa Mongolian dialect.
COMMENTARY

Page [82] The territory inhabited by the Mingyad (Myangad) is in the northernmost area of Xovd Aimak, beyond the Xovd River and bordering with Uvs. It is, therefore, adjacent to the Dörbed territory. For the physical geography of this region, see the descriptions of Xovd Aimak in Murzaev 1954, Ovdienko 1964, Schubert 1971, MNR, Mongolia, and OSZM, II.

For the Mingyad ethnic group, see OSZM, II, Prim., pp.13; 74a (Index); Pozdneev 1971, p.521a (Index), and esp. pp.227-8; Popov 1895, p.90b (Index); Grumm-Gržimašio 1930, pp.245–52; Maïskiï 1960, pp.33, 218–19; Hamayon 1970, p.35; Schubert 1971, p.106; Belfa-Hamayon 1983, p.132; Veit 1990, II, pp.124, 125, 200, 224; AELM, no.23.

Čenggüngjab’s title Sidar Vang is an interesting Sino-Mongol hybrid compound corresponding to chin. ch‘in-wang 親王, Prince of the First Degree (or Rank). For this title, see Brunnert & Hagelstrom 1912, p.445, no.873. For Čenggüngjab (Čenggțińjab; d.1771), Lord of the Qotoqoyid, see Veit 1990, II, pp.122-6 et passim.

For the Mingyad clans and lineages cf. OSZM, II, p.40.

Page [83] For Badmasangbuua, i.e. Badma Sambaua Šecen Byatur (b.1530), see Schmidt 1829, pp.207, 209. For Dayan Qa‘an, i.e. Batu Mongke (ca. 1464–ca. 1532), the unifier of the Eastern Mongols, see DMB, pp.17a–20a. For additional information on the period in question, see Pokotilov 1947, pp.103ff.; MBIGK, pp.389ff.


For S.U. Remezov (1642–after 1720), a native of Tobolsk and a leading Russian cartographer and geographer, see the numerous references in GSE, Index, p.618a. The ‘map of Siberia’ is his Siberian Sketchbook, the first Russian geographic atlas. See GSE, vol.21, p.583a.

The Köküi Ayula Banner (Xöüii Uul Xošuu) is not included in AELM, no.18, which covers the period 1911–19. See the “Explication de la carte 18” (p.31), where we find instead the Mingyad Banner (Myangad Xošuu).

Page [84] For Ya. Ya. Lus and his report, see the Commentary to p.[73].

The book Contemporary Mongolia by I. M. Maïskiï (Sovremennaya Mongoliya, Irkutsk, 1921) was somewhat reworked by the author and republished in Moscow under the new title of Mongoliya nakanune revolyucii (Mongolia on the Eve of the Revolution) in 1960. For references to the Mingyad in the second edition (hereafter: Maïskiï 1960), see pp.33–4 and 218–9. Zamcarano’s comments regarding the Mingyad’s love of democracy and freedom refer to Maïskiï’s remarks in Sovremennaya Mongoliya, p.272, also quoted in Grumm-Gržimašio 1930, p.252, n.1.
For the reference to the establishment of Sira Sūme (Šar Sum: ‘Yellow Temple’) in Pozdneev’s work, see Pozdneev 1971, pp.214–22. Ch’ien-lung’s edict in Mongolian for the dedication of this temple, dated 6 November 1767, is given in the old script, followed by a translation, on pp.217–21. 1766 is the year in which the proposal for the construction of the temple was made to the emperor, see ibid., p.215. Cf. also Grumm-Gržimailo 1930, pp.250–1.

The Jaqačin (Zaxčin) occupy an area south of Qobdo the borders of which, as given by Žamcarano, are valid for the period in question. For their present extension, see AELM, no.23. For the geographical features of this region see the references to Xovd Aimak in the works cited in the Commentary to p.[82] above.


For the intermingling of the Jaqačin with the Ögeled, see the author’s remarks on p.[75] concerning the area where the former nomadize. As for their affinity with the Torūd, see his remarks on p.[90].

The name Jaqačin does, in fact, mean ‘Borderman’, i.e. ‘Border Guard’. For the references to the letters of the Russian envoy who went to Čevengrabdan Quran’, and (p.[86]) to the Account of Mongol Nomad Grounds, see the reference to Ivan Unkovskii’s account of 1722–24 (published in St. Petersburg in 1887) in Grumm-Gržimailo 1930, p.260, n.4; and Popov 1895, p.486, n.609. Cf. Čimitdoržiev 1987, pp.62, 72ff. For Čevengrabdan (Čeveng Arabdan, Tsewangrabdan, etc.; 1643–1727), the nephew and successor of Galdan (1644 [1632?]–97), khan of the Jungars, see ECCP, pp.208a, 757b–759b; Veit 1990, II, p.280a (Index); MBIGK, p.573 (Index); Bawden 1989, pp.51, 70, 78, 113.

For the Jayisang Maqamud (Mamud) of the Jaqačin, see the numerous references in Veit 1990, II, p.285a (Index). Davači, or Davaači (d.1759), was the grandson of Čeringdondub who once conquered Tibet (1718–20); and Amursana (d.1757), Lord of the Qoyid, was instrumental in the Chinese conquest of Jungaria after his submission to the Manchus in 1754. For these two personages, who are already mentioned on p.[77], and the political situation in Mongolia at the time, see ECCP, pp.9b–11b; 758a–759b; Veit 1990, II, pp.281a, 279b (Index); MBIGK, pp.451–2; Bawden 1989, pp.115ff. Cf. also C. R. Bawden, “The Mongol Rebellion of 1756–1757,” JAH 2 (1968): 1–31. The official title jayisang borne by Maqamud was usually conferred to chiefs or heads of a clan, and its connotations and functions varied in different periods. It was rendered as ‘headman’ in “Darqad,” p.68. See the Commentary, p.[15]. Cf. Vladimirtsov 1948, p.285b (Index); Jagchid & Hyer 1979, pp.351–2.

For the ‘superintendent’ (bügüde-yin daruya; ma. iberi dai), see Legrand 1976, p.109.
For the amban of Qobdo see the Commentary, p.[78].

For Üyenći and Bodonći cf. Popov 1895, p.444, n.537.


The otog (mo. otoy’tribe, race, clan; a tribal community under one authority’) was a lower administrative unit into which the ecclesiastical estates were organized. See Bawden 1989, p.470b (Index); Jagchid & Hyer 1979, pp.271, 319; Brunnert & Hagelstrom 1912, p.450, no.877A; and, especially, Vladimirtsov 1948, p.283b (Index), and Legrand 1976, p.214b (Index).

For the references to the works of Potanin (OSZM) and Pozdneev, see above, Commentary, p.[85]; for those of P. K. Kozlov and V. Ladygin see Grumm-Gržimailo 1930, pp.261, n.3, 263, nn.3, 5, 6. Cf. P. K. Kozlov, Mongoliya i Kam. Trekbletnee putesestvie po Mongolii i Tibetu (1899–1901 g.), 2nd edition by V. P. Kozlov, Moscow, 1947, p.48. I have no access to Kazakevič’s report.


Page [90] For the Torjûd (Torguud) of the Bulğan River (Bulgan Gol) in Xovd, see the general remarks on this region in the works cited above, p.[82]. The Torjûd of the Bayitay Bođa (= Baitag Bogdo or Baïtag Bogd Uul; chin. Pei-t’a shan) mountains are on the Sino-Mongolian border, as are those on the Činggil River (chin. Ch’ing-ko-li ho). Cf. AELM, no.23.

For the Torjûd ethnic group, see the numerous references in OSZM, II, p.79b (Index), and the scattered references, ibid., IV, p.1007a; Pozdneev 1971, pp.203, 214, 271; Popov 1895, p.91a (Index); Grumm-Gržimailo 1930, pp.184–95; Hamayon 1970, p.33; Schubert 1971, pp.103, 107, 108, 109, 113, 168; Beffa-Hamayon 1983, p.132; Veit 1990, II, pp.57, 93, 144.

The events concerning the Torjûd—a branch of the Oyirad—their epic journey westward to the lower Volga region at the beginning of the seventeenth century (1616) and, especially, their return migration to the Ili and Tarbagatai region of north and northwestern Sinkiang in 1770–01, form a special and fascinating chapter of Mongolian history. Much has been written on this subject, factually and fictionally, also in English and French (by G. Staunton, A. Gaubil, J.-M. Amiot, Th. De Quincey, W. L. River, etc.). See ECCP, p.1098a (Index), in particular pp.660, 785–6.


Page [92] The Torjûd dialect spoken in Sinkiang is a variety of Oyirad known as ‘the Torgut Vernacular’ (106,000 speakers in 1982). See AWI, p.186; LAC, map C-3. According to LAC there are no Torjûd speakers in the areas of the Činggil and Ili rivers; at present they are all found in the Tarbagatai Range region of northern Sinkiang (Xinjiang Uygur A.R.). Cf. Beffa-Hamayon 1983, pp.130, 131.
The information concerning the Čaqar minority in Sinkiang is mainly found in the Chinese sources. The major concentration of Čaqar speakers was in the homonymous province in north China (Chahar, chin. Ch’a-ha-erh), which is now incorporated into the Inner Mongolian A.R. See AWL, p.186; LAC, map C-3. Cf. Beffa-Hamayon 1983, p.126. With regard to the Čaqar sumuns in the Ili and Tarbayatai area (Boro Tala, etc.) to which Žamcarano refers, cf. LAC, map C-3, showing that the Mongols of this region are now all Törût-speakers. See above, Commentary to p.92. To this day, in Mongolia the Čaqar minority does not form a separate ethnic group (cf. Žamcarano’s statement on p.95), but is assimilated to the Qalqa. They are chiefly found in the northeast corner of the country (Dornod Aimak) along the border with China. See Hamayon 1970, p.21.

For the Čaqar ethnic group, see OSMZ, III, p.360a (Index); Pozdneyev 1971, p.509a (Index); Popov 1895, p.92a (Index); Grumm-Grizimailo 1930, pp.257–9; Vladimirtsos 1948, pp.9, 169, 172, 174, 200; Hamayon 1970, p.21 (also for further references); Schubert 1971, pp.105, 111, 115; Veiit 1990, II, p.299a (Index); Jagchid & Hyer 1979, p.44a (Index); For their history see also ECCP, p.1074a (Index); Bawden 1989, p.461a (Index); and MBIGK, p.617 (Index).

‘The military administration of the Tarbayatai district’ (Tarbayatai-yin jangjun-u jakiryan), lit. ‘the administration of the jangjun of Tarbayatai’. The office of jangjun (< chin. chiang-chün 仲軍 ‘general’) corresponded to that of a military and civil governor or governor-general. On it see Brunnert & Hagelstrom 1912, pp.441, no.866; 452–3, no.879; Legrand 1976, p.214a (Index).

Concerning the Manchu campaign against the Ôgeled, i.e. the ‘Eleuths’, see above the section on the Ôgeled group, p.77, and the Commentary to the same.

For the Čaqar leader Sumiya Beyise and his breakaway movement in 1911 which led some Čaqars back to Mongolia, see Bawden 1989, pp.11, 218, 228. For his former office of vice-chief (ded daruya), see Legrand 1976, pp.98, 101. Beyise (ma. beyise; chin. pei-tzu 貝子) was the Manchu title for a Prince of the Fourth Degree (or Rank). See DOTIC, p.373b, no.4546 (where, however, ‘Bele Prince’ is a mistake for ‘Beise Prince’. Cf. Brunnert & Hagelstrom 1912, pp.5, no.19; 445, no.873.

The work A New History of Mongolia (Mongyol-un sine teüke) to which Žamcarano refers for the events in question is the Mongyol ulus-un sine teüke (A New History of the Mongolian Nation) by Maysurjub (Maysur Qurča) written in 1924, but as yet unpublished. On it see the Editor’s note 1 in Dindub 1977, p.ix. Cf. also below, p.108.

The White Baron Úngern is, of course, Roman N. Ungern-Sternberg (1886–1921). It is regrettable that although he figures quite prominently in publications dealing with the modern history of Mongolia, there is not yet a full and unbiased study of this interesting and controversial personage. On him see provisionally Bawden 1989, p.475a (Index); Lattimore 1955, pp.185b and 186b (Index); HMPR, p.894b (Index; with useful bibliographical references in the Notes). Cf. also Rupen 1964, I, p.509a (Index); and GSE, vol.27, pp.632d–633a.
Page [98] For the Clear Script (todo bičig) used by the Čaçars, see the Commentary to p.[47].

N.B. By far the best treatment of the ethnic groups discussed in this section is found in the two contemporary works in Mongolian cited in the N.B. on p.120 of “Qotong.” For the Mingyad, see also B. Sandag in Etnografiin Sudal (Ulan Bator), IV/1–5 (1969): 81–103.

(Commentary by I. de Rachewiltz)

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA TO CHAPTER TWO
(East Asian History 10 [December 1995]: 53–78)

p.54 after the entry Brunnert & Hagelstrom 1912 insert the entry BSOV MILIBAND, S. P. Biobibliograficheskii slovar’ otechestvennykh vostokovedov s 1917 g. 2 vols. Moscow, 1995.

p.77, l.7 for Bibliograficheskii read Biobibliograficheskii

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA TO CHAPTERS THREE TO FIVE
(East Asian History 12 [December 1996]: 105–20)

p.120 [77] add See the additional references in the Commentary to p.[86].
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