

INTRODUCTION

From the Khitans to the Jurchens & Mongols is a comprehensive writeup of the steppe barbarians, with emphasis on what the ancient Chinese annals termed by the Eastern Hu barbarians, i.e., the Hsien-pi (Xianbei) component from the Mongolia-Manchuria steppe or the Mongol and Tungusic stock barbarians whose successors included the Khitans, the Jurchens and Mongols. When adding up the Huns and Turks in the first, third and ninth chapters, the history period of this barbarian tetralogy *Book III* would have spanned more than one millennium. This book also provides the readers with a bonus writeup of history of the non-steppe barbarians like the Tibetans, the Tanguts and the Mywa (Nanzhao/Nanchao and successor Dali) in the seventh, eighth and fifteenth chapters, i.e., the Tibeto-Burman or the Qiangs from the larger Sino-Tibetan family, who differed from or differentiated among each other for their degrees of assimilation into and admixture with the ancient Haplogroup D-M174 people of the Tibetan plateau, the Hsien-pi (Xianbei) and Kra-Dai/Hmong-Mien/Mon-Khmer people of the south. The subtitle “*A History of Barbarians in Triangle Wars & Quartet Conflicts*” defines this book as mainly a military history of the barbarians in triangle wars & quartet conflicts for the different barbarian groups successively rising up to overpower the predecessor groups in the fluid steppe environment. The book threads together different groups of the barbarians in the trilateral, quadrilateral or more complicated settings, such as the Qiangic people versus their admixed Tibetan, Tuyuhun, Tangut and Mywa groups. The Huns’ successors were taken to have spawned the Turkic and Uygur successors, and the Eastern Hu barbarians or the Hsien-pi (Xianbei) successors further spawned the Khitans and Mongols. Genghis Khan’s Mongols were a Turco-Mongol mixture after their ancestors migrated to the three rivers’ area of central Mongolia. The Tungusic Jurchens were taken to be of the same stock as the Hsien-pi (Xianbei) but developed different traits due to geographic segregation from the Hsien-pi (Xianbei) kinsmen by the Great Khing’an Mountain Range. The difference of the Mongol or Turco-Mongol barbarians was measured by the degrees of extremely raw (i.e., black Dadan), raw (white Dadan), and cooked (semi-civilized). Similarly, the Tungusic barbarians, for their relative distance from Sinitic China, were classified into the ‘*he-su-kuan*’ cooked or acquaintance Jurchens (whom Khitan founder Abaoji forcefully resettled at Liaoyang with several thousand households of big-clan Jurchens after conquering thirty-six barbarian tribes in Manchuria), the noncooked and non-raw Jurchens in Xian[2]zhou (Xian[2]ping; Kaiyuan of Liaoning), the raw (i.e., uncivilized) Jurchens to the north of Sumo (Sungari) and northeast of Ningjiang, and the Huangtou (yellow-head with yellow iris and green apple) Donghai (east sea) Jurchens further to the northeast towards the Japan Sea. The Jurchen Jin dynasty founders, with ancestry in Koryo, came from the raw Jurchen tribe.

Jeremiah Curtin (1835-1906), in *The Mongols: A History* (Little Brown & Company 1908), divided the barbarians into five historic groups of the Huns, Bulgars, Magyars, Turks, and Mongols. Nazi SS commander Heinrich Himmler took Germany’s invasion of the Soviet Union as a same fight against the Huns, Magyars, Tartars, and Mongols, whom he took as the same subhumanity or the same inferior races. Applying today’s genetic knowledge that was not available one hundred years ago, the sequence of the barbarian groups’ intrusion to Europe, such as the Magyars versus Huns, could be inverted by the criteria of emergence of the Huns who dispersed the Magyars who actually first arrived in the west geographically speaking, which was in a similar fashion as the later Slavic people’s displacing the Finno-Ugric people (i.e., the Magyars, Bulgars and Moldovans) into two clusters separated by the Dnieper River. In the first chapter of the book, human migrations through the steppe and between North China and [southwestern] Siberia in the remote antiquity was explored to differentiate the N1c/

N1a-haplogroup Uralic or Finno-Ugric and the O-haplogroup Sino-Tibetans -- who could be bundled under the same Dené–Caucasian language family -- from the later-coming Q-haplogroup people who could be associated with the Huns (or later Turks) and the C-haplogroup Mongol and Tungusic barbarians. The Finno-Ugric and Sino-Tibetans peoples' same origin from the Dené–Caucasian or proto-Borean (Northern) language family, which also encompassed the R1b-haplogroup Basques and Celtic people and/or the agglutinative Korean and Japanese, pointed to a much ancient development of civilizations in the northern Eurasian steppe and northern Chinese continent. What likely happened was that after the Sino-Tibetan language split off from the Dene-Caucasian language family, the Sinitic branch lost the agglutinative feature, with some machine-molding operation that led to the singular syllable as existed today.

Hungarian philologist and Orientalist Sándor Kőrösi Csoma (1784-1842), a Székely (Magyar), spent over a dozen of years in Ladakh, next to Tibet, in search of the elusive Magyar homeland and believed from the linguistic perspective that the Magyars migrated to Bokharia to Hungary from northern Tibet. The Hungarians were affiliated with the Finnish, Bulgar and Sami people, i.e., the Finno-Ugric people who likely took the steppe route to reach the Semiryechye and Ural areas before further dispersion to Central Asia to the south and the Volga areas to the west. Over one hundred years ago, Finnish philologist Matthias Alexander Castrén (1813-1852) took the Uralic homeland in East Asia and west-central Siberia, and shared the same homesickness as Sándor Kőrösi Csoma. The Tibeto-Burmans, who split from the Sinitic people, were speculated by Jan Braun of the Oriental Institute of the University of Warsaw to have migrated to Mesopotamia to be the agglutinative Sumerians, i.e., the ultimate source of western civilizations, with the Sumerians likely taking the route of today's Wakhan Corridor to have left Tibet, which was mistaken by Sándor Kőrösi Csoma to be possibly the Magyars' point of exit from the original homeland of northern Tibet. Note that the Sumerians' link with the Sino-Tibetans could be validated by similar artifacts excavated in a midway archaeological site of Harappa, namely, the double-headed bird ivory found at the Mohenjo-Daro Ruins, which was similar to 6000 to 7,000-year-old sun-holding two-head bird ivory of Hemudu in coastal China. Sergei Starostin, on basis of a list of basic words compiled by Monis Swadesh and Sergei Yakhontov, compared the cognates among Old Chinese, Proto-Tibeto-Burman, Proto-North-Caucasian, Proto-Yeniseian, Proto-Indo-European, and Proto-Austronesian for estimating the relationship between Proto-languages in the prehistoric period, with the linguistic findings yielding to Old Chinese's 43% correlation with Proto-North-Caucasian rather 23% with Proto-Indo-European. Joseph Edkins (1823-1905), who authored *China's Place in Philology* (1871), also noticed the shared cognates among the Old Chinese and Indo-European languages, that the Jesuits stumbled on hundreds of years earlier.

This barbarian tetralogy was not about the Sinitic nation's virtuous and benevolent rule over the barbarians, nor assimilation and acculturation of the barbarians. This book's first passage started with the collective loss of memory about the Shimaos Culture (about 2300-1800 B.C.), a ruin with the patented Sinitic jar-shaped rostrum with double gates, and the outer walls and inner walls that spanned the range of 2000 and 2840 meters long. The Shimaos Culture, like the Mohenjo-Daro Ruins, was lost into oblivion due to the most likely cause of conquest and genocide by the unknown barbarians. Shimaos, which predated China's literature-corroborated dynasty of Xia by less than half a millennium, could be likely a joint works of the Finno-Ugric people and the Sino-Tibetans. In light of the Hongshan Culture and Xiajiadian Culture findings, the Finno-Ugric people's extinction in the area of today's southwestern Manchuria could be due to the onslaught by the Mongo, and Tungusic barbarians. The Khitans, the Jurchens and Mongols consecutively exhibited a progressively barbaric way of conquest, with their barbaric way of life blunted by hiring of the ethnic-Chinese or Sinicized Jurchen-Khitan Confucians along the way of conquest and eventually ending in the fate of being conquered by their more barbaric kinsmen. For example, the Jurchens, during rebellion against the Khitans in Manchuria

in the mid-1110s A.D., pillaged Qing[4]zhou and Rao[2]zhou, sacked Dong-jing (eastern capital), Huanglong-fu, Sufu[zhou], Bohai and Liaoyang, with several millions of ethnic-Chinese in the fifty-four prefectures massacred by the Jurchens. For another example, the Mongols could have massacred the whole city of Jurchen Jin capital city Zhongdu (Peking) in A.D. 1215, as seen in Minhaj al-Siraj Muhammad Juzjani's *Tabaqat-i Nasiri* (historic records of Sultan Nasir-ud-Din r. A.D. 1246-1265), wherein Khwarazm shah Muhammad II's emissary jotted down an exaggerated account of spotting a white hill like a snowy mountain outside of Peking, which turned out to be a pile of skeletons and corpses, with the human fat overflowing the ground that they trekked on, as well as a horrific story of 60000 young women and girls throwing themselves to their death from the city wall --which conflicted with the *Yuan Shi* biography on ethnic-Khitans turncoat Shimo Ming'an who was described to have accepted the surrender of the city on the 'xin-you' day of May without conducting massacre. More barbaric than the Jurchens, the Mongols fulfilled the Khwarazm emissary's foretold story in decimating the Central Asia population within merely five years, and accumulatively cut short the potential population growth of 100 million people on the Chinese continent during the period of three quarters of the 13th century, as detailed in "Chapter XXXVI: The Death Toll from the Mongol Conquest".

Continuing the theme of a civilization's good fight against barbarism, the Khitans, Jurchens and Mongols in the tetralogy *Book III*, who were more savage than the forerunner steppe barbarians like the Huns and Turks, were given credit for what they were able to launch the Sinitic-style dynasties of Liao (A.D. 907-1125), Jin (A.D. 1115-1234) and Yuan (A.D. 1271-1368) ruling parts of or whole China. The Khitans, Jurchens and Mongols adopted the Chinese governance system, which was the rites, protocols, laws, and most importantly the examination-based or talents-based officialdom system. This could be made into a parallel to the Mesopotamia civilizations' rise and fall, with the Assyrians replacing the Amorites who in turn replaced the Akkadians whose relationship with the Sumerians could be likened to that between the Khitans and the Chinese. Before the three barbarian groups, the Tuoba Xianbei people established the Northern Wei dynasty (A.D. 386-534), Eastern Wei dynasty (A.D. 534-550) and Western Wei dynasty (A.D. 535-557) in northern China, and the Tanguts, whose ruling clique claimed descent from the Tuoba Xianbei, established the Western Xia dynasty (A.D. 1032-1227) in northwestern China. (Before that, the Tuoba Xianbei established the Wei dynasties in northern China, with the Tuoba Wei history and many other short-lived barbarian dynasties to be detailed in the barbarian tetralogy *Book I* (i.e., the Huns) and *Book II* (i.e., the Turks). The Tangut Xia dynasty, that was launched with the assistance of two Confucians who flunked the Soong imperial exams, was launched by the Tanguts who claimed heritage from the Tuoba Xianbei, and is fully covered in this book.)

While the Mongols were progressively more barbaric than the Khitans and Jurchens, the Mongols appeared to have mastered the game of using the aliens against the aliens from the very beginning, with Genghis Khan not hesitating to employ the non-Mongols, such as the Uygur and Tangut (i.e., Central Asian migrant) fugitives, at the very early stage of internecine fighting among the Mongol-Tartar clans in the A.D. 1190s; later skillfully adopted the tactic of using the conquered people as fodder of war for snowballing the conquest; and after the conquest, resorted to a religiously tolerant policy for divide and rule, such as dispatching the Muslims to China as viceroys and governors – to the extent that the Muslims and Dungan people dominated in northwestern and southwestern China hundreds after the demise of the Mongol rule, as seen in the A.D. 1862-1877 revolt that echoed the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom rebellion. The Mongols, in sparing the lives of artisans and religious persons, et al., could have averted the outcome of loss of the human knowledge and cutoff of the trans-Roman Empire division of labor that led to the Dark Ages of Europe in the aftermath of the fall of the Western Roman Empire as seen in Professor Bryan Ward-Perkins' assessment of the post-Rome tiles and potteries.

The Khitans, under Yelü Abaoji (r. A.D. 916-926), launched a Khitan (Qidan) dynasty in A.D. 907, and designed a three-layer imperial system under the guidance of ethnic-Chinese minister Han Yanhui. In A.D. 947, Khitan Liao Emperor Yelü Deguang (r. A.D. 927-947), who hired Zhao Yanshou as a prime minister, destroyed the Posterior Jin dynasty, and for a short time period through January-June of A.D. 947, ruled northern China under the Da-Liao (Great Liao) dynasty. The Khitans, after intrusion into the ancient Chinese capital city of Kaifeng, ransacked all the Chinese classics in the city for the north. The Khitans, who renamed their dynasty back to Khitan in A.D. 983, reverted back to the Liao dynasty in A.D. 1066. The Liao dynasty lasted through A.D. 907-1125 till the last Liao Emperor Tianzuodi was captured by the Jurchens. Yelü Dashi, a Khitan royal, launched the Kara-khitai (A.D. 1124-1218) dynasty in today's Mongolia and Central Asia. Similarly, the Jurchens, in rebelling against the Khitans, hired Yang Pu, who was a Han-ethnic Khitan imperial examinee (or dropout), as a minister responsible for setting up the imperial system. The Jurchens, after sacking the Northern Song capital city in A.D. 1127, blanketed the Chinese classics, library and archives, which enabled the Jurchens to hire Confucian ministers to devise a *Daming-li* calendar for themselves. The Mongols were known for retaining Khitan Yelü Chucai (A.D. 1190-1244) as a counsellor after he came out of hermitage (A.D. 1215-1218) over mourning the Jurchen Jin dynasty's demise, and later was responsible for rebutting Mongol minister Bie-die's proposal to kill all ethnic-Han Chinese and make the agricultural land into pasture. Yelü Chucai spent ten years in Central Asia (A.D. 1219-1229), and hence did not play an important role till during the reign of Ogedei Khan who had two quasi-adopted sons (orphans), i.e., Yang Weizhong and Hao-heshang-badu, with the former responsible for seeking out the future Confucians who were to assist Khubilai Khan in the launch of the Sinicized Yuan dynasty. During Genghis Khan's absence for the Central Asia campaign (A.D. 1219-1224), it was viceroy Muhuali who first took the Confucians' advice to abandon the banditry psychology and beginning from A.D. 1221-1222, no longer ravaged North China in the autumn and left for north in the spring but chose to stay in North China for consolidating the Mongol rule. Yang Weizhong, an orphan picked up by Ogedei or abducted by the Mongols at a young age, served three Mongol lords and four courts. Yang Weizhong hired Confucian Yao Shu, and the two, during the Mongol murderous campaign in the Han-shui River area in the A.D. 1230s, saved dozens of Confucians from death ropes, with this core Confucian group responsible for establishing the Mongol imperial academy as well as the Taiji (grand, ultimate, ridgepole, polar) Academy. Hao-heshang-badu, an orphan picked up by Jochi while at age nine or abducted by the Mongols, was to become a Mongol '*wan-hu*' (*tarqa*) commander.

Tribal empires rose and fell, the conquered and the conquerors mixed up, and ethnic and linguistic dividing lines blurred. The Khitans, who were of the same family as the later Mongols, differentiated themselves from their barbarian cousins of the Mongol stock or Turco-Mongol stock by classifying the barbarians under nine Da-da or Da-dan[4] tribes in *Liao Shi* (history of the Liao dynasty). Da-da originally meant for a group of adversaries living to the east of the Turks in the 5th century A.D., and was seen in the Turks' steles, such as Otuz-Tatar (san-shi-xing [thirty surnames] Da-da[2]) on the *Kultigin Stele* (A.D. 732), and Toquz-Tatar (jiu-xing [nine surnames] Da-da[2]) on the *Bilge Qaghan Stele* (A.D. 734). The Khitans were ethnically different from the Turkic/Uygur/Kirghiz stock to the west and geographically different from the Tungusic stock in Manchuria. The Khitans, who belonged to the Eastern Hu or Tungusic group, were also called by the Da-da (Dadan), a name the Khitans apparently disliked for the likely reason that the Khitans were not admixed with the Turks or Finno-Ugric people as the Da-da people were. The Jurchens, who called the Mongols by Da-dan[4] in *Jin Shi* (history of the Jurchen Jin dynasty), could take themselves to be not admixed with the Turks or the Turco-Mongols. In another word, the Khitans were more kinsmen to the Mongols than to the Jurchens, one likely reason that Genghis Khan, after routing the Jurchens, claimed to Yelü Chucai that the Mongols had avenged on the Jurchens the old feuds on behalf of the Khitans. In the northern steppe, there were three areas

of the Yenissei and Orkhon rivers to the west and north of Lake Baikal, three rivers of Tu'ula, Kerulen and Onon to the south and southeast of Lake Baikal, and the Erguna (Shi-jian-he) River, Ordja (Woli-zhao) River and Hulun-buir lake to the east of Lake Baikal, with the Turks and Finno-Ugric people dwelling towards the west, Turco-Mongol Da-da people in the middle and the Mongol-Tungusic people to the east. The rivers of Tula, Orkhon (Orhon) and Selinga flew into Lake Baikal and continued on to the lower Angara and Yenisei (Yenissei) and ended in Nova Zembla, while the water of Onon, Ingoda and Kerulen (Kerulon) flew eastward to enter the Amur (Amoor) River for the Japan Sea.

Before the Khitans, Jurchens and Mongols, there existed the Hsiung-nu (Huns), Hsien-pi (Xianbei), Tavghach (Tuoba), Juan-juan (Ruruans), Ye-tai (Hephthalites), Tu-chueh (Turks), Gaoche, Tiele (Chile), Uygurs (Huihe), and Kirghiz. To provide a full history on the Khitans, Jurchens and Mongols, this barbarian tetralogy extended the writings to have included the Huns, Turks, Uygurs, Tibetans and Tanguts, etc., as well as a full annalistic account of history of the Sui and Tang dynasties, China's Five Dynasties (which had the Shatuo Turks' military caste taking the reign for three interluding time periods), and the two Soong dynasties, namely, official annals out of China's Twenty-Four History Annals. This tetralogy, with 700-800 pages of contents, exceeded Jeremiah Curtin's book which only covered the Mongols' wars and conquests, such as against the Kin (Jin) Empire, Sung (Soong) Empire, Assassin Commonwealth (Arsacia, i.e., Iran), Kalifat (Baghdad), and Egypt (Mamluk sultanate). *Book III* of the barbarian tetralogies had detailed coverage of the Ruruans, the Hephthalites, the Turks, the Tiele (Chile), and Uygurs (Huihe) for preparing the readers to enter into the official topics on the Khitans, Jurchens and Mongols. More details about the Huns' history could be located in *Book II* of this author's duology *The Sinitic Civilization*.

The first steppe empire started with the Huns who were evicted from mount Yinshan area north of the Yanmen-guan Pass, the Chile-chuan area on the northern bank of the Northern Yellow River Bend, and mount Qilian-shan area along the Western Corridor, which led to the Huns' singing a song that the Hunnic women lost the [cosmetic] color after expulsion from the old habitat. Purportedly, the Huns' fleeing from the Han Chinese army caused the chain reaction that led to the fall of the Roman Empire. The Western history books, in the attempt at tracing the origin of Attila the Huns, claimed that the Northern Huns, after the A.D. 91 defeat, migrated to the west, and further put the Huns' western migration under two stages, with Balamir's Western Huns relocating towards Europe in A.D. 372 due to a famine, which triggered the Eastern Goths and Western Goths' movement into the Roman Empire. The situation in Europe was that the Germanic tribes already moved into the border area with Eastern Gaul by the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C., where they were engaged in the triangular wars with the Romans and Celts. In the east, the Xianbei replaced the Huns as the dominant power on the steppe and in northern China, where the Tuoba Xianbei established a Sinicized Wei dynasty and fought against their former subordinates called by the Ruruans. The remnant Huns, who were called by the Ye-tai (Yeda/Yida/Yanda/Yitian) or the Hephthalites, for nearly 250 years controlled the area of today's Central Asia and Chinese Turkestan, an area more than what the later Khwarazm empire of the 12th-13th centuries had achieved. The Yeda empire in the mid-6th century A.D. was routed by the Turks who had origin at the Altaic Mountain and could be related to the last Hunnic state of Northern Liang (A.D. 397-439) on the Western Corridor.

Other than defeating the Hephthalites, Turkic Khan Muchu (Mugan/Muhan/Muqan. r. A.D. 552-572) also destroyed the Ruruans' steppe empire, and hence became a successor to the Huns in controlling both the eastern and western territories of the Eurasian Steppe, and furthermore subjugated the Eastern Hu barbarians' successors, i.e., the Khitans. The Turkic khanates were consecutively defeated by the Sui and Tang dynasties, with two Turkic khanates first destroyed by the Tang dynasty in alliance with the Tiele tribes including the Uygurs in the 7th century, and successively eliminated by the Tiele tribes and Uygurs in the 8th century. The Uygurs launched a Huihe Khanate (A.D. 744-840)

that was destroyed by the Yenisei Kirghiz, which was lamented by René Grousset (A.D. 1885-1952) as a civilized steppe society that no other predecessor or successor could match up with. The Khitans then conquered Da-da[2] [Dadan, i.e., Turco-Mongol mingles], the Xi barbarians (more a Khitan kinsmen tribe), and Shiwei tribes (i.e., later Mongols) in the late A.D. 880s. The Khitans expelled the Kirghiz Turks (more likely Finno-Ugric people of the Yenisei area) from Mongolia, founded the Liao dynasty (A.D. 916-1124/907-1125) in northern China/Manchuria, sent an invitation to the Uygurs for returning to the Orkhon homeland, and set up the northwestern ‘*zhaotao si*’ sub-ministries for ruling Mongolia and Siberia when the Uygurs declined the invitation. This was termed by René Grousset (A.D. 1885-1952) as the Khitans’ ending the Kirghiz barbarians’ rule of Mongolia during the time period of A.D. 840-920. The Jurchens, who had origin in the land between the Sungari River and the Japan Sea, overthrew the Khitan rule, repeatedly launched the sweep campaigns against the Da-da or Zubu tribes (i.e., Khitan allies), built the Great Walls on the steppe and adopted a scored-earth policy to make the border area cleared off the human dwellings and settlements so as to prevent the northern barbarians from invading south. This made the land of Mongolia fall into the barbaric status for a second time according to René Grousset (1885-1952). Ultimately, the Mongols rose up by taking advantage of the Jurchens’ wars with the Da-da or Zubu tribes, united the barbarian tribes of the steppe, and turned south to destroy the Jurchen Jin dynasty (A.D.1115-1234).

Now the origin of the word ‘Mongol’, or *Moghul* in Turkic and *Mughal* in Persian, or ‘Mengwu’ in the Chinese chronicle, which was said to be a Shiwei tribe of the Tang dynasty. Vasily Vladimirovich Bartold (1869-1930)’s *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion*, which was wrong about Genghis Khan’s birth year by one cycle of twelve years and failed to detect the missing one-year history of the Mongols’ Central Asia campaign (A.D. 1219-1224), including an ambiguous copycatting of the Mongol khan’s summer break under A.D. 1224, carried the forged or misunderstood entries in the Chinese history books in regards to a purported Meng[2]gu[3] chieftain *Ao-luo-bei-ji-lie* (E-luo beile [prince]), a title the Jurchen founders used for their sons, i.e., ‘*guo-lun bo-ji-lie*’ for civil (‘*guo-lun*’ [state discourse], also a Tibetan title) prime minister and ‘*du bo-ji-lie*’ for commanding marshal. The word ‘Mengwu’ was alternatively traced to a tribe which was located more likely to the east of the Khing’an Mountain than to the west. Genghis Khan’s Mongols did not take Meng[2]gu[3] or Meng[2]gu[3]si as an ancestor nor took credit for the Meng[2]gu[3] people’s fight against the Jurchens in the history annals. The history annals in the biographies related to the Jurchen veteran generals pointed to continuous confrontation between the Jurchens and the Da-da² (Zu-bu) tribes which were loyal to the defunct Liao dynasty in the area to the north and on the two sides of the Khing’an Mountain Range, like in the Wuna-shui River (i.e., upperstream Sungari River) area in the Tianjuan (heavenly blessing) Era (i.e., A.D. 1138). Through the 1190s A.D., there were continuous wars between the Jurchens and Yelü Dashi’s Kara-Khitay in the three rivers’ area of Mongolia and across the Gobi Desert. Meng[2]gu[3] could actually be corrupted pronunciation of the well-known Wu-gu (Ugu) tribe – which was related to the Khitan Di-lie tribe, with the Ugu people appearing to be the same as the Onggirats (i.e., the tribe Genghis Khan’s Mongols had intermarriage with) who frequently rebelled against the Jurchens around Tai[4]zhou and Linhuang throughout the 12th century A.D. In an alternative account, Menggu, another soundex word for the Mongols, was a mountain in *Liao Shi* (history of the Liao dynasty). Historian Zhou Liangxiao, citing a map with the marking of a Menggu-shan (Meng[2]gu[3]-shan) mountain in [forgery] *Qi-dan Guo Zhi*, believed that the word Mongol (Meng[2]gu[3]) derived from the Khitan ‘Meng[2]-gu si’ [barbarian management] sub-ministry, that was located in the Khitan Shang-jing (upper capital) city of Linhuang, where a Longmei-gong (dragon’s brow) palace was built in the shape of three mountains of Tianti (heavenly ladder), Mengguo (Meng country) and Bielu per *Liao Shi*. That is, Mengguo was a mountain, not a country, inverse to the case of Kunlun, i.e., the land where the immortals lived

during the Han dynasty, which was originally a tribe in *Yu Gong* (Lord Yu's tributes) in the late Zhou dynasty time period.

The history of the Khitans and Jurchens was well documented in the annals other than confusion over the name of a Meng[2]gu[3]-si tribe, likely the Da-da or Dadan people whom both the Khitans and the Jurchens warred with and resettled to Tai[4]zhou (Taonan, Jilin) of today's northern Manchuria, a group of people inadvertently ascribed to the later Mongols over the similar 'Menggu' soundex. Ancestors of Genghis Khan's Mongols, over ten generations backward, already migrated westward to the three rivers' area of Tu'ula, Kerulen and Onon, and enjoyed the hereditary conferral of the title of 'linghu' or Chinese 'linggong' which meant a Khitan Liao dynasty's court-sanctioned 'tribal duke' from the Khitans. The most important matter of this barbarian tetralogy is rectification of the missing or compacted one-year history of the Mongols' Central Asia campaigns from A.D. 1219 to A.D. 1224, and the second most important matter will be this author's restitution of the forgotten Mongol campaigns against Semiryeche through A.D. 1216-1219 and in North Africa in A.D. 1258, as well as Mongol operations against southern Russia, Crimea and Caucasus through A.D. 1238-1240. This author, after thoroughly studying biographies of the Mongol generals in the relatively authentic history annals *Yuan Shi* (history of the Yuan dynasty), derived the only correct history on the Mongols' Central Asia campaigns, which were inadvertently timestamped by one year wrong across the board. The one year's missing history, which was actually two earlier years of A.D. 1220 and 1221 being compacted into one year, led to the wrong history of the subsequent years for the A.D. 1219-1224 campaigns, up to the year that the Mongols returned to the east. This compacted or shortened one-year error likely passed down from the legacy Persian and Arab history compiling that dated back to Rashid ad-Din's "*Jami'al-tawrikh* (Collected Chronicles)", which was based on Shigi-Khutukhu's *Secret History of the Mongols*, a cornerstone book of all future Mongol history annals, that was faulty for its late oral recitals during Ogedei Khan (r. A.D. 1229-1241)'s enthronement years, which led the future historians in Europe (Russia), Central Asia and China alike on a stray path. (Rashid ad-Din was taken to have written "*Jami'al-tawrikh*" with the help of Beiluo-ahe (Polad Aqa/Bolad-*chingsang*) who was speculated to have brought along *Altan Debter-Golden Book* or Shigi-Khutukhu's recitals-based secret history book to the Ilkhanate.)

Vasily Vladimirovich Bartold (1869-1930)'s *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion*, which was wrong about Genghis Khan's birth year by one cycle of twelve animals' samsara years, failed to detect the missing one-year history of the Mongols' Central Asia campaigns (A.D. 1219-1224). This author, after realignment, came up with the specific episodes of the Mongol Central Asia campaigns, including the Amu Darya River Sweep Campaign (A.D. 1220-spring 1221), the Siege of the Urgenchi Twin Cities (autumn of A.D. 1221-spring of A.D. 1222), the Battle of the Buzgala Pass (April of A.D. 1221), Tolui's Khorasan, Mazandaran and Arsacia Campaigns (autumn of A.D. 1221-spring of 1222), the Siege Battle of the Taloqan Castle (autumn A.D. 1221-March of A.D. 1222), the Battles of Bamiyan and Beruwan (summer of A.D. 1222), and the India Campaign (A.D. 1222-1224). The Mongol history's one-year error could be detected and corrected only through the threading and reconciliation of events carried in the individual Mongol generals' biographies and back-tested or retrodicted with Genghis Khan's summer break camping activities. René Grousset (1885-1952), in *L'Empire Mongol*, expressed his helplessness over Genghis Khan's exact whereabouts of the timeline A.D. 1223 to A.D. 1225 - after leaving Central Asia, and pointed out that Shigi-Khutukhu's *Secret History of the Mongols* just said that Genghis Khan spent a summer break at the Ye'erdishi-he (Erdis) River before returning to Mongolia in late A.D. 1225, and speculated either summer of the year A.D. 1224 or A.D. 1225 could be right. Vasily Vladimirovich Bartold (Wilhelm Barthold, 1869-1930)'s *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion* similarly mistook the specific Ye'erdishi-he summer break under A.D. 1224, a time when Genghis Khan should be still in Central Asia for the India Campaign (A.D. 1222-1224) and was

contemplating on taking likely the Wakhan Corridor path for returning to Mongolia, a plan that was scrapped when being told that the Mongols could be intercepted by the Tanguts waiting at the other side if returning via the Indus route.

The last thing to epitomize in this *Introduction* would be a question this author likes to pose to the readers as to the reasons for the prolonged Mongol campaigns in Central Asia (A.D. 1219-1224) since the two future Mongols' western campaigns were well documented as to abrupt termination related to Ogedei Khan and Mengke Khan's deaths, i.e., the Mongols' withdrawal from Hungary and Poland in A.D. 1242 and withdrawal from the Levant in A.D. 1260, respectively. Why did the mass murderer stay on in Central Asia for so many years with the Khwarazm defeated in A.D. 1222 and the Kiev Rus Principality defeated in A.D. 1223? It was the immortality that Genghis Khan was pursuing, with the immortals rumored to be living on Mount Kunlun which was taken to be the Big Snow Mountain of Badakhshan. Genghis Khan loitered in the Big Snow Mountain area for close to two years in the hope of meeting the immortals as the Qin dynasty Emperor Shihuangdi did in loitering along the eastern Chinese coast on numerous occasions. At Badakhshan, Genghis Khan crowned the mountain as King Xuanji-wang (utmost darkness) and a salty mountain lake as King Huiji-wang (benefiting). Genghis Khan, apparently realizing the coming death as he fell off the horseback numerous times, called over Taoist-master Changchun-zhenren (Qiu Chuji) from North China to consult on immortality, as seen in *Travels of an aichimist*. This was a prevalent pattern for blood-thirsty tyrants and dictators in human history, of clinging to the absolute power to the very end of life while pursuing immortality and seeking elixirs to extend life, with the consequence of disasters for the land and people this particular breed of tyrants and dictators render to, either through self-inflicted blunders or the inevitable power struggle among the heirs or the heirs' heirs, with their direct primogeniture heirs most likely being outlived by the tyrants and dictators. For loitering at the snowy mountain in search of immortality, Genghis Khan, a barbarian, apparently did not harbor the noble pursuits of Alexander the Great to reach "ends of the world and the Great Outer Sea" in the shadow of Aristotle's eternity of the world. (This author, in the early 1980s, read Mary Renault's *The Persian Boy*, two or three Abraham Lincoln's biographies, and etc., as English language textbooks, from among hundreds of and up to one thousand books in a library set up by virtue of Betty White who was among the pioneers teaching English in the barbaric communist China that just announced the 'open door' policy in December 1978, a policy that is being scrapped at the moment.)

To wrap up the *Introduction*, this barbarian book was not merely about the Khitans, Jurchens and Mongols. Extensive ink was given to the forerunner barbarian groups such as the Huns and Turks, as well as the non-steppe barbarians like the Tibetans, the Tanguts and the Mywa state (Nanzhao and successor Dali), all threaded together in the context of the annalistic history of the Chinese dynasties and under the interwoven theme of a civilization's good fight against barbarism. In the chapter on the Sui and Tang dynasties, China's wars with Koguryo, Paekche and Silla were covered. In the Five Dynasties' section, the Shatuo Turks' regimes of Posterior Tang (A.D. 923-936), Posterior Jinn (A.D. 936-946) and Posterior Han (A.D. 947-950), i.e., what Jacques Gernet termed by the Sino-barbarian autocracy for the southern and northern dynasties (A.D. 590-755) of China, and better termed here as the Sino-barbarian aristocracy regimes, for the Shatuo Turks' origin as a mercenary military caste for the Tang dynasty emperors, were given a detailed account. In the chapters on the two Soong dynasties, there was the detailed history of battles and campaigns that the Soong Chinese waged against the Jurchens and Mongols, with the descriptive texts highlighting the heroic fights that the Sinitic nation mounted in defending the civilization and reinforcing the recurring theme of mutual destruction of jade and stone as recorded in the history annals. In the *Afterword*, a discourse about Soong China's demise from an alternative angle of substitution of the copper coins with the iron coins, that was related to Soong emperors' decadent and depraved life style, will be presented to the readers for sake

of stoking reflection of a civilization's vigilance against such excessiveness. The tetralogy book is concluded with the Red Turbans' uprisings against the Mongols and expulsion of the Mongols in A.D. 1368, with expression of the lasting laments for the middle land's sinking over successor Ming China's ultimate fall, a second time for whole China, in the hands of the more barbaric Manchus in A.D. 1644.

Hong Yuan
August 2022



g
u
t
t
e
r