Writing on man or animal

Ruth I. Meserve

The ancient history of Central Eurasia abounds in examples of writing styles and mediums from notched sticks and knotted strings, to writing on tree leaves and bark, incising tombstones, casting coinage or blocking on paper money, to the artistic production of elaborately illuminated manuscripts. One area of «script» often overlooked is literally the writing on man or animal. Just as with written documents, there were customs and/or regulations which governed where to affix such signs. Whether attached to a document or physically imprinted on man or animal, each had to be authenticated. The application of such seals or stamps (state or private) were often secured as legal testament with an expected effect or ensuing consequences if disregarded. Like their counterparts on documents, such signs on man or animal had a wide range of application.

Man: tattooing revisited

Nearly 15 years ago I dealt with «Tattooing in Inner Asia» at the 27th meeting of the PIAC (Walberberg, Germany). My intention at that time was to catalogue which Inner Asian peoples used tattooing (and to a lesser degree other body marks such as maiming or scarring) on themselves as indications of rank, prowess, charm, or adornment. Some attention was given to both method and linguistic terminology. Over the years I have continued to collect material which has now focused more on tattooing imposed upon others rather than that of self-adornment.

Use in diplomacy

Early in the history of Inner Asia, there was an instance of tattooing among the Hsiung-nu where it was one of two preconditions placed upon a Chinese envoy—the other was to submit the credentials (ch'ieh) of the Han court—to gain admittance to the felt tent (ch'ing lu) of the Hsiung-nu Shan-yü. The story was told by Ssu-ma Ch'ien (145–86 B.C.) in the Shih-chi 110 and involved the Han envoy Wang Wu. Although the text said that submission to tattooing was required by Hsiung-nu law, other records on the Hsiung-nu seldom mention such a practice. In any event,
Wang Wu, bowing to the demand, was tattooed on his face in black. The terms used for ‘tattooing’ in the Shih-chi were ch’ing mien ‘to brand the face’ and me [mo] ch’ing ‘to tattoo in ink; to tattoo in black’. The lack of additional examples of tattooed envoys may indicate that the policy was either not common or was abandoned by the Hsiung-nu. Certainly Chinese attitudes toward tattooing as a barbaric practice or one necessary for criminal elements might have led to objections to the use of such a practice for diplomats.

**Use in law as a punishment**

The use of tattooing and/or maiming as legal punishment(s) existed in Western antiquity expressed in the very terminology: Greek stigmas ‘brand’, Latin inscripta in fronte ‘inscribed upon the forehead’.

Throughout the Chinese dynastic periods, the punishment known as ‘branding’ (ch’ing hsing) also existed; it has been summarized, for example, in Section XXXI: Chapter 149 of the great Ch’ing encyclopedia, Ku chin t’u shu chi cheng, which dealt with law and punishments (hsiang hsing). According to one of the early Chinese dynastic histories, in a very brief passage in Chou shu 50, the old city-state of Kucha (Chiu tz’u) punished the robber (chih tsei) by severing (tuan) one arm and cutting off one foot (yüeh yi tsu). It was with the practice of penal tattooing, however, that writing on man assumed an ominous character.

In Khitan law, according to Wu Tseng in Neng kai chai man lu (c.1140) and citing Ssu-ma Kuang (1019–1086), the thief was tattooed on the wrist with the character for ‘thief’ (tsei) at the time of his first offense—hence, the use of an actual written word, not simply a mark or sign designating ‘thief’. Subsequent offenses would add tattoos to the lower arm, then the elbow, and then on the back; but with the fifth offense, the thief was decapitated. The written aspect of the tattoo meant that it was not necessary to record the crime because it could not be hidden from view. The issue was, however, more complicated in this multiethnic society. In the early years of Khitan rule over China not only were Chinese tattooed for crimes, but in theory so too could all Khitans be tattooed for theft. In practice, the «upper crust» of Khitan society would have their sentences commuted, especially to avoid tattooing on the face, but after 1011 the punishment was extended to include all on an equal basis, tattooing or marking anyone for an offence from a clan «attached to the Tents» in the same manner as an ordinary tribesman. According to Franke, «this shows that the punishment of tattooing belonged to Khitan law rather than Chinese law».
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Eventually the practice of tattooing came under imperial scrutiny, reflected in a new decree (*Liao shih* 62:1b–2a) in 1033, marking a change in attitude and abolishing tattooing on the face: «...transgressors who have repented and reformed are sometimes useful persons too. Once tat[to]oed on the face they are disgraced for life. We greatly pity them. Hereafter criminals sentenced to hard labor for life shall be tat[to]ooed only on the neck. In the cases of escaped slaves who have stolen their masters’ possessions, the masters may not tat[to]oo their faces without authorization, but are permitted to tat[to]oo the arms and necks. In the case of people who commit theft or robbery, the first time they are to be tat[to]ooed on the right arm, the second time on the left arm, the third time on the right side of the neck, and the fourth time on the left side of the neck. After the fifth offence they are to be sentenced to death.»

Khitan law assessed punishment according to the number of thefts committed; Chinese law and its influence on foreign dynasties of conquest usually punished according to the value of the article(s) stolen.

Early in Jurchen history the chieftain Po-hai-na had a message carved in wood (*mu-k’o*) in 972 relating to the law and punishment, which contained a passage on maiming: «If somebody’s life was redeemed by paying goods, his ears and nose were cut off in order to identify him.»

During Jurchen (Chin) rule over China, thieves were tattooed depending on the value of the stolen article and sent to serve in a «low-grade» army. If the value of the stolen articles exceeded thirty strings of cash the thief was banished for life and the «full amount of the stolen goods [was] tattooed indelibly on their faces». The harshness of Jurchen law returned tattooing to the face. Later Mongols emperors moderated such punishments, but usually involved various military units or special expeditions (see below).

Tattooing also existed during the Manchu (Ch’ing dynasty) rule over China. Here the term for tattoo was *tz’u-tzu* or literally ‘to brand a letter, word, or character’. It did not simply apply to theft and once again the location of the tattoo was important. For lesser crimes people were tattooed on the arm(s), usually the right forearm (*yu hsiao pi-po shang tz’u-tzu*); but for major offences, the character for ‘robbery’ or ‘homicide’ was tattooed on the face of anyone convicted of such a serious crime.

The sentence for such serious crimes usually included exile for life (*fa-ch’ien*) to the frontier; in such instances the place of exile was also tattooed on the face. Often these criminals became «police guides» or «runners» or were forced into the military. As an even severer measure such tattooed exiles could be given as slaves to Manchu Bannermen.

Perhaps of greater interest was the appearance of an Article in the Ch’ing Code (*Ta Ch’ing lü lì*, Art. 281) on the removing of tattoos: «If there is
any removing of the tattoo, then he [the thief] will receive 60 strokes of the heavy bamboo and the tattoo will be replaced." Removal of a tattoo by drugs usually meant through the process of moxibustion; others tried cautery.

It was also true that some societies went beyond tattooing the criminal with a mark or written word indicating his offense and/or place of exile, but instead made the tattoo a social comment or stigma as it were. Thus, old Tibetan legal punishments could include «stamping» or branding with a hot iron the word meaning 'dog' (kidam; i.e. khyi dam) on the forehead of a criminal. It was, perhaps, ironic that tattooed criminals were often exiled to border regions where they were expected to defend the State which had mutilated them. This should bring the use of such criminals and the question of loyalty to a given regime under further scrutiny.

Use by military: identification and strategy

During the Mongol Yüan dynasty, one of the agencies serving the imperial court was the Directorate-General for Agriculture and Hunting in Huai-tung and Huai-hsi (huai-tung huai-hsi t'un-t'ien ta-pu tsung-kuan-fu). One office which it oversaw was the Hunting Chiliarchy of Tattooed Soldiers (shou-hao chün-jen ta-pu ch'ien-hu-so) established in 1288. These tattooed soldiers had been part of the Southern Sung army where they had been tattooed on the hand(s) for identification and to prevent desertion. In this instance, perhaps these tattooed soldiers were grateful to the Mongol rulers for sparing their lives and giving them an opportunity to serve; in exchange their loyalty to the Mongol state would be less questionable than to the Southern Sung which had originally tattooed them. Some 604 households were on the Mongol registers, with their primary duty to hunt wild animals for their pelts.

But, this did not reflect the total picture of these tattooed soldiers. Not only were these soldiers tattooed on the hand (shou-hao chün; also called shou-chi chün, or nieh-shou chün), but could also be marked on the forehead («Imperial Guards marked on the hand and forehead», shou-e-hao chin-chün). There were considerable numbers of these men. In 1283, for example, military units were established for 83,600 of these «hand-tattooed» soldiers with officers to command them. Under the Southern Sung, when one of these soldiers died, a brother or son was taken to assume his duties; under the Mongols it would seem that this practice was continued, but by decree (1284) their hands were not tattooed. Notice also appeared in 1294 when «hand-tattooed» soldiers, not previously in Yüan service, were enlisted to reinforce garrisons. In the dynastic
history 永安十世，13年，在22月，11月，区的统治者(ch’iu)的囚犯们被赦免(she)，但被烙上脸(ch’ing ch’i mien); 他们不是自由的，而是成为计划（但后来被中止）的第三支入侵日本的部队的一部分。

Use in medicine

故事关于在人与动物身上的纹身或烙印来预防黑死病出现在欧洲的古代。由于人们和牲畜的大量涌入，黑死病的暴发被极大地害怕了，那时没有医疗的药物。

在世界基督教获得力量的情况下，这种宗教在那时被用于防止疾病的邪恶。在牲畜身上画十字来防止疾病的邪恶。

在男人身上，下述的故事被菲利克斯·西莫卡塔(d. 638)在11世纪10月13-15日的《历史》(V. 10: 582-602)中描述过其事件发生在591年夏季的末期，皇帝毛里求斯(r. 582-602)统治时期。

当波斯国王得知一些俘虏是土耳其人时，他将它们送到皇帝毛里求斯展示罗马的力量，并向他提供胜利的果实。在囚犯们的前额上，刻有耶稣受难的记号，这被称为由基督教的教士们所叫的十字。

皇帝询问了这个记号的含义。囚犯们声称是他们的母亲给了他们这个记号：因为东部斯基泰人中，当严重的黑死病流行时，一些人建议年轻的额头被纹上这个记号。这些囚犯们没有否定这个建议，他们从这个建议中得到了拯救。

著名的布里克鲁的刺字 chief 被鲁登科建议，刺字戒指上的这些符号可能具有“治疗性质。”

尽管与这个古老遗址相隔甚远，一个具体的纹身用于医疗目的的例子现在可以被提出来，涉及由皮埃尔·奥伯林在1957年于蒙格勒斯对贾哈塔伊(Chaghatay)氏族的调查。装饰性的纹身只存在于女性，从不用于男性，他们只在恢复健康或受伤时才纹身。

奥伯林写道，一位男人让我看他的受伤的膝盖，周围有许多蓝色的点被纹在了伤处。纹身(khāl)操作是由吉普赛女性(zan-e-kuli)用针和用胆囊(zahreh)提取的染料完成的。奥伯林还报告说烙印(dāgh kardan)
could also be performed on man in a therapeutic sense, using a red-hot iron."23

Animal: branding, ear-notching, and banding

The brands themselves were a form of writing, literally burned or cut into the animal and were valid not only as an indication of property, but sometimes indicative of very specific functions of the animal, especially in the case of horses. The tamya (Common Turkic) ~ tamay-a(n) (Mongol), an ownership/clan mark or brand on livestock, was used to identify the property of an individual, clan, tribe, state, religious order, etc. «Every Lord or other person who possesses beasts has them marked with his peculiar brand, be they horses, mares, oxen, cows, or other great cattle, and then they are sent abroad to graze over the plains without any keeper. They get all mixt together, but eventually every beast is recovered by means of its owner’s brand, which is known.»24 Also included were earmarks (Mongol: im, im-e, nim) on livestock made by cutting or punching. Extensive literature exists on brands,25 including on the early Bulghars and other Turkic peoples, where the marks are often similar to Turkic runes. This was noted by B. Rintchen many years ago regarding Mongolian brands: «Certains tamgas sont écrits en caractères chinois, ouigouro-mongols et pakspa, tibétains et même en caractères des Turcs orkhoniens, évidemment empruntés aux monuments turcs, très répandus en Mongolie du Nord.»26 Rintchen then gave 210 examples of brands, as well as 9 examples of ear-marking, all with explanations.27 It is not my intention to repeat this material, but to add to it and to remind everyone of this early form of writing which was an important practice throughout Inner Asia by Turkic, Mongol, and Tunguz peoples.

The renowned poet Farrukhi (Abu’l-Hasan ‘Ali b. Djülugh; d. circa 1037/38) of Sistan sought the patronage of the Amir Abu’l-Mudhaffer of Chaghaniyan in Transoxiana. When Farrukhi arrived the Amir was at his «branding ground» (dagh-gah) where he may have owned as many as 18,000 animals. Before being presented to the Amir, Farrukhi was asked to demonstrate his poetic skills in a poem on branding. The result was a panegyric (kasida) commemorating the springtime branding of the fine horses of the emirs of the Muhtadjid dynasty of Central Asia: «Brandining fires, like suns ablaze, are kindled/.../Brandining tools like coral branches ruby-tinted glow a main/.../Steeds which still await the branding, rank on rank and row on row/.../On the face and flank and shoulder ever bears the Royal sign/...»28

Among early Mongol peoples, in 1026 by imperial decree, the Khitan ordered the branding of all government animals on the left side.29 Mongol
practices concerning the branding of livestock, during the imperial period of the Yuan dynasty in China, were recorded in the Yuan shih 100: 1b. Horses which belonged to the Court of the Imperial Stud «were branded on the left side of the rump with the official seal, (and) they are called ‘horses with the great seal’ (ta yin zu ma)». Branding was carried out during the 9th or 10th month and under the supervision of court officials. Written lists of the horses were prepared in three languages: Mongol, Uighur and Chinese. On consulting these records, officials could determine if animals had died in any given herd and demand restitution for them to be paid in kind by the herdsman if he was deemed to be at fault.

Later, the Mongol law code known as the Qaiq-a jirum (18th century) said that branded camels and horses (tamaratu temege moriyi…) could not be given to messengers except for major state concerns, usually clarified as the Three Affairs (yurban ùile; earlier these were called the Three Great Affairs — yurban yeke ùile). Both the relay station attendants and the messengers were responsible if caught breaking this rule. Serruys understood these branded animals to mean government owned horses and camels. There was, however, an interesting exception to this rule. «People lacking extra pack animals or mounts, may load or ride (branded camels or horses) at the time of the (seasonal) migrations.»

During the Ch’ing (Manchu) dynasty, census records were maintained for the herds cared for in Mongolian banner pastures. For example, the Royal Library (Copenhagen) has a manuscript (Katalogsignature MONG. 153) entitled «Yearly clear register summing up the number of the herds of the families of officials, soldiers, and commoners in the districts of Gashi, Chayan obo, Engger ebülen, Qota usu, and Bayan obo within the territory subject to the mara-herds of the Sangdu eastern wing» (Sangdu jegei gar gegei aduyun-u qariyatu qajar doturaki, yašintu, çarşan obo, engger ebülen, qota usu, bayan obo jerge-yin nutuy-a-un, tüsümel daruça ceriğ arad olan-u erüge ama köröngge mal toyan-u quryangyui [sic] on-u ilerkei cese). According the Great Ch’ing Code (Ta Ch’ing lü li), Article 235, it was illegal to hide young animals born into government herds. The herdsman was to report the birth of an animal within ten days and was subject to penalties if he didn’t, as were any of the officials supervising the herds if they knew of the births. Therefore, once livestock was branded or earmarked to indicate possession, there were official, written and branded, means of recognizing rightful ownership.

Among the Aghach Eris (and unlike many Inner Asian peoples), horses were never branded. Cows and donkeys were branded on the neck
or thigh; sheep and goats were branded on the cheek(s) or muzzle. «The only type of branding practiced on animals is in the shape of a letter [the first letter of the owner’s name], or a word [the owner’s name].»

Auspicious days

Astrology was used by various Inner Asian peoples to determine the actual day(s) on which branding or earmarking of livestock should be carried out. This led to the creation of astrological tables which have survived, for example, in the Mongolian collection of the Royal Library (Copenhagen): Katalogsignatur MONG 299 with a table for the marking and castrating livestock (aliba mal-un cimnekü cimkikü-yın ğijilge, folio 21v); or MONG 127 with the auspicious days for marking animals (aliba mal-un imenekü cimenekü edür anu, folio 5v). Such an association with astrology did not detract from the legal function of such property marks; instead, it more firmly placed branding and earmarking within the customs of a given people, who in turn reinforced the practice by including it in religious ceremony.

Altering brands to steal

Such brands were highly useful in determining the rightful owner of missing livestock, whether strayed or stolen—a very clear distinction was made between those animals which had been stolen and animals which had gone astray and which were overseen by special officials charged with the recovery and return of lost property. Those who found «lost» animals and failed to report or return them in a timely fashion (usually within three days) could then be considered in the same way as a thief. Under Kalmyk law, for example, a herdsman could not brand or mark stray livestock that he found without being fined; but if he made the proper public notifications within the three-day time limit that he had found such livestock, he could use the animals himself and if he then branded them, he was not punished. False claims of ownership also resulted in fines. Notice of branding as an inferred hindrance to livestock theft has occurred in the early written records of Inner Asian history. The animals of the Kao-chü (Kao-ch’e or «High-Cart» people of the 4th–5th centuries), for example, «all have marks of ownership and even when the animals range freely on the steppe, they never want only take what is not their own.» Prior to 1036, among the Khitan, dishonest herdsmen and receivers of stolen horses—usually accomplished by tampering with or altering brands—were considered criminals and were punishable by
death. Considering this a rather harsh penalty the Khitan emperor asked, «Is it not excessive to kill two men for one horse?» and the punishment was thus reduced to one degree less than death.39

Special use beyond ownership/clan marks

Brands could also designate very specific types of horses. Under the Manchus, for example, military examinations included tests in mounted archery (ma pa chien). In these measures of skill, special horses were used which were inspected by the Board of War and branded with a half moon, called «moon-branded face» (mien yüeh yin-chi).40 Such horses were apparently not used for other functions and indicated both the importance of these tests to the Manchu military and, perhaps even, the special training required for the horse.

Banding of hunting birds

Branding or ear-marking were impractical on some animals, especially hunting birds. Here banding was used to serve the same function. Marco Polo noted, for example, that hunting birds had «a little label attached to the leg to mark them, on which is written the names of the owner and the keeper of the bird.»41

Concluding remarks

Where branding on animals was widely considered an acceptable practice, there was a tremendous difference in the man who chose to tattoo or mutilate himself and the man who was forcibly mutilated by another. The man who cut his face to mingle his blood with tears in funerary rites or the man who had himself tattooed for medical purposes gained honor, expressed loyalty or sought solace and protection in a spiritual way.42 Others chose what could only be deemed heroic, as in the well-known story of the Saka horse-keeper and his promise to cause the defeat of the Persian army in circa 520–519 B.C. on the guarantee that the Saka rulers would give his family all the booty. On receiving the royal pledges, the stable-keeper Siraces drew «his knife, cut off his nose and ears, maiming himself also in other parts of the body; and thus disfigured, deserted to Darius who gave credit to the complaints of the cruel treatments which he said he had received from the Saka kings...» Vowing revenge, Siraces told Darius «tomorrow night the Sakas mean to shift their camps; I know the spot where they intend to position themselves and can conduct you to it by a nearer way than they will take; there you can encircle them
completely. I am a horse-keeper and know every step of the country for many miles around." Darius fell for the trap, allowed his army to be led into barren, sandy land, but when his provisions and water began to run out after 7 days, one of Darius' hazarapatiš (chiliarch), Rhanosbates, realized the treacherous position the Persian army had been placed in and had the horse-keeper put to death.43

Forcible mutilation, however gruesome, usually fell within the rule of law. Under these circumstances, anyone committing certain crimes knew the penalties could include branding or mutilation. A second story represented this other, more gruesome side. The Greek Athenaeus of Naucratis (fl. 3rd century A.D.) quoted Clearchus the Soloi, who wrote in the fourth book of his Lives about the Scythians. Athenaeus is sometimes overlooked as a source on the Scythians, not only because of the fact that he lived long after Scythian power, but because his work, Deipnosophistae, is one of the oldest extant cookbooks. As such he was most interested in the Scythian use of mare's milk, but his use of Clearchus' Lives also provided other material.

Clearchus had been a pupil of Aristotle (384–322 B.C.) and had himself traveled as far as Bactria where he had Delphic maxims inscribed on a stele.44 The Scythians, Athenaeus wrote quoting Clearchus, «...cut off the noses of all the men into whose lands they penetrated; and the descendants of these men migrated to other places and bear to this very day a name derived from that outrage.»45 They were called Rhinocorurites or «dock-noses».46 Nor did such acts stop at this extreme. The Scythian «women tattooed the bodies of the women in the Thracian tribes who lived near them on the west and north, injecting the design with pins. Hence many years later, the Thracian women who had been thus outraged effaced the memory of that calamity in their own way by painting the rest of their skin, that the mark of outrage and shame upon them, being now included in a variety of other designs, might efface the reproach under the name of ornamentation.»47

What was most interesting, however, was Clearchus' attitude toward the Scythian nation and such mutilation. «The Scythian nation alone adopted at first impartial laws; afterwards, however, they became the most wretched of all mortals through their insolence.»48 The above examples of mass mutilation, seemingly carried out solely on the basis of ethnic identity, were given as the direct consequence of the Scythians living in «wonton luxury» and decadence. Such practices clearly went beyond impartial legal practice and reflected on the dignity of the state.
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