

JOHN L. MISH

New York Public Library and Seton Hall University

## THE RETURN OF THE TURGUT

A Manchu inscription from Jehol

The Turgut were one of the tribes of the "Eleuth" Kalmuks (Oirat in their own language). Under pressure from their neighbors, the Sun-gar Mongols, they left their lands in 1600 and migrated westward into Russian territory. They finally settled on the lower Volga in 1616.

For a long time they were left in the main undisturbed; but when Russian power expanded in the 18th century, the Turgut became liable to taxation and military service. In addition, they were unpopular with their neighbors, both Christian and Moslem, because of their Lamaist religion. Gradually they made up their minds to return to China, in which decision they were undoubtedly influenced by the news about the new strong Manchu Empire. Tulishen, a high Manchu official, actually visited the Turgut in 1714.<sup>1</sup>

The great exodus of the Turgut under the leadership of Ubashi Khan began in December, 1770. Altogether 169,000 men, women, and children started on their way to the distant Chinese border. They were the majority of the Turgut people, but not the whole nation; some remained in Russia and are still there today.

When their departure was discovered by the Russian authorities, orders were issued to pursue them. For the next few months they were attacked by bands of Bashkirs, Kirghiz, Kazakh, and Cossacks until they reached Chinese territory in Ili after a last frightful battle which was decided by the intervention of Manchu cavalry (1771). By that time, their original number had shrunk to a mere seventy thousand.

The epic return of the Turgut from Russia to China was described by

<sup>1</sup> A. W. Hummel, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, (Washington, 1943), under Tulišen.

the French Jesuits Mailla and Amiot, who were contemporaries of the event in Peking, in the *Mémoires concernant les Chinois* etc., and by de Quincy in his book *The Revolt of the Tartars* (1837). The story is retold by Sven Hedin in his *Jehol*.

The Ch'ien-lung Emperor was so gratified by the voluntary return of the Turgut to his own empire that he considered this one of the principal events of his long reign. He commemorated it by two quadrilingual inscriptions (Manchu, Chinese, Mongol, Tibetan) engraved in stone and set up in front of the Lamaist temple, the Potala, in Jehol, the imperial summer residence 110 miles north of Peking. One of these inscriptions was translated by Amiot in the above-mentioned *Mémoires*; the other is the subject of the present study.

It was published as a rubbing in the *Epigraphische Denkmäler aus China* by B. Laufer and O. Franke (Berlin, 1914). The Manchu text, which was edited by the Emperor himself, is given on plate 68. The text contains several illegible passages, where the writing has worn off, but the general sense is perfectly clear.

The Ch'ien-lung Emperor first expresses compassion with the fate of the Turgut and then details the measures taken for their relief. His report casts an interesting and favorable light on China's material resources and organizational ability at the end of the eighteenth century.

When the Turgut approached the Chinese border in July, 1771, the Emperor was informed of their progress by frequent messengers, and the necessary provisions for their relief were prepared in time. General Shuhede<sup>2</sup> was appointed special commissioner, and similar tasks were given to the Banner Commander of Kalgan and the Governor of Shansi.

The Turgut were settled in the Ili region, which had been partly depopulated in recent wars and uprisings. Since the refugees were destitute, the necessary initial capital had to be provided for both cattle breeding and agriculture. The Emperor mentions these imposing figures:

185,000 head of cattle, including horses and sheep  
41,000 bushels of rice and wheat  
20,000 packages of tea  
51,000 sheepskin jackets  
61,000 linen garments

<sup>2</sup> Hummel, l. c. under Shu-ho-tê.

59,000 pounds of cotton

400 felt tents (yurts)

200,000 taels (ounces of silver) for cash expenses.

The leaders of the tribe were called to the imperial summer residence at Jehol and received in a solemn audience. The most important of them were raised to the rank of princes and given costly presents, such as saddled horses, elaborate quivers, yellow riding jackets (a special imperial honor), and peacock feathers (another distinction for meritorious officials).

The Potala Temple in Jehol (so called after the famous Potala in Lhasa), before which the stele with the inscription was placed, has a special connection with America. A replica was made in China and shipped to the USA where it was erected at both the Chicago (1934) and New York World Fairs (1939). It is now packed away at Oberlin, Ohio, waiting for its final fate.<sup>3</sup> It is to be hoped that a proper place will be found for it. The author has been unable to find out what happened to the original inscribed stelae in Jehol. The descendants of the returned Turgut are reputedly still in Ili.

<sup>3</sup> Information obtained from Professor G. Baxter of Harvard.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Göbl, Robert: *Sasanidische Numismatik*, Handbücher der Mittelasiatischen Numismatik, Band I, (Braunschweig, Klinkhardt und Biermann, 1968), VII + 100 pp., mit 16 Prägetabellen und 16 Münztafeln, DM 45.—

Relying on his profound, scholarly erudition and supplying his own research experience, Dr. Göbl has produced a valuable book containing a systematic survey of nearly all aspects of the Sasanid coinage and of the pertinent numismatic methodology.

Following a brief introduction (pp. 1—3) the author presents an analytical register of the pictorial elements and of their positional occurrence on the Sasanid coinage (*Das Münzbild*, pp. 5—24). In the third chapter (*Die Nominalien*, pp. 25—30) the author discusses the metallic categories of the coinage, its denominational specifications, as well as the problem of the exchange ratio between the gold and silver issues. Chapters Four (*Organisation und Münzstätten*, pp. 31—33), Five (*Münztechnik*, pp. 34—37), and Six (*Münzkunst*, pp. 38—40), supply information about the administrative and technical organization of the operations of the Sasanid mints, about the technological aspects of the coining processes, and about the art of the coin-die engraving. In the seventh chapter (*Ergebnisse der Münzordnung*, pp. 41—45) the author proposes a typological categorization of the evolution of the coinage, which is related to individual Sasanid sovereigns. This is followed by a brief note (*Kontermarken*, p. 56) about the counterpoints, or rather their absence on the regular Sasanid coins. Chapter Nine (*Materialfragen*, pp. 57—59) raises the problem of the professional handling of the available Sasanid numismatic materials to promote a better understanding or even a solution of many historical questions. This entails the attainment of two essential prerequisites: a) the compilation of a corpus embracing all Sasanid numismatic specimens and pertinent realia; b) analytical survey of all accessible and as yet intact hoards.

Chapter Ten (pp. 60—63) dealing with modern forgeries is followed by a sketch of the Sasanid history (pp. 64—72). The remainder of the book consists of explanatory details relating to the materials presented in copious tables and plates. The latter are preceded by a list of decoded mint-symbols (pp. 84—85); by bibliographical notes (pp. 86—87); an extensive bibliography (pp. 88—93); a general index (pp. 94—99); a genealogical table of the Sasanid dynasty (p. 100); and a map showing the location of the identified Sasanid mints.

The neatly organized and executed illustrative materials contain sixteen tables with drawings of the pictorial and inscriptional elements, arranged according to their historical evolution, as well as fifteen plates with reproductions of 235 coin specimens covering the entire span of the Sasanid dynasty. The sixteenth and last plate shows nineteen examples of modern forgeries.

JOURNAL  
OF  
ASIAN HISTORY

EDITED BY  
DENIS SINOR

Assistant to the Editor  
Karin L. Ford

Volume IV  
1970

1970

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN



便恤土爾扈特部衆記

降歸順之不同既明則歸順降之甲乙可定蓋戰而勝人不如不戰而勝人之為盡美也

土爾扈特歸順源委已見前記茲記所以優恤之者方其渡額濟勒而未也戶凡三萬三千有

甚誠而其陸危求息狀亦甚憊既撫而納之苟弗為之瞻其生猶弗納也瞻之而弗為之計長

於目而惻於心凡宵旰所究圖郵函咨訪無暇無輟乃得志其大要於是為之口給以食人

息驅往供饋則以屬之張家口都統常青業帑運茶市羊及裘則以屬之陝甘總督吳達善而

爾巴哈台之察哈爾厄魯特凡市得馬牛羊九萬五千五百其自達里岡愛高都達布遜牧羣

麥四萬一千餘石而初至伊犁賚贖之茶米不與馬甘肅邊內外暨回部諸城購羊裘五萬一

布幅不與馬計儲用帑銀二十萬兩而賞貸路貳及宴次賚予不與焉其台吉渥巴錫等之入

成德母惑乎其見之隘也昔我

皇祖聖祖仁皇帝時喀爾喀土謝圖汗等為厄魯特所殘破率全部十萬眾來歸

皇祖殄其窮阨

命尚書阿喇尼等往撫之蒞歸化城張家獨石二口倉儲以振其乏且足其食又

勅內大臣費揚古明珠等齋白金茶布以給其用採買牲畜以資其生遂皆安居得所循法度樂休

其汗王台吉等世延爵祿恪守藩衛一如內扎薩克之效臣僕長子孫莫不感戴

聖祖德澤及人之深得以長享昇平之福也朕惟體

皇祖之心為心法

皇祖之事為事惟茲土爾扈特之來其窮阨殆無異曩時之喀爾喀故所以為之籌畫無弗詳啗苗

如喀爾喀之安居猶法勤畜牧務生殖勿替厥志則其世延爵祿長享昇平之福又何以異於

且以謫自今以往我諸臣之重其事者

乾隆三十一年歲在辛卯季

Handwritten text in Manchu script, appearing as a dark, high-contrast image. The text is arranged in horizontal lines across the page, with some characters appearing as white or light gray against a dark background. The script is dense and fills most of the page area.

TAFEL 68. Mandchurischer Text der vorigen Inschrift.

