

## 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).<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

### 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 (*chieh*) 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 *stigma* 'brand', Latin *inscripta in fronte* 'inscribed upon the forehead'.<sup>3</sup> 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 (*chieh tsei*) by severing (*tuang*) 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.<sup>4</sup> 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».<sup>5</sup>

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[t]ooed on the face they are disgraced for life. We greatly pity them. Hereafter criminals sentenced to hard labor for life shall be tat[t]ooed only on the neck. In the cases of escaped slaves who have stolen their masters' possessions, the masters may not tat[t]oo their faces without authorization, but are permitted to tat[t]oo the arms and necks. In the case of people who commit theft or robbery, the first time they are to be tat[t]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.»<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup>

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.»<sup>8</sup> 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».<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> Perhaps of greater interest was the appearance of an Article in the Ch'ing Code (*Ta Ch'ing lü li*, 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.»<sup>12</sup> Removal of a tattoo by drugs usually meant through the process of moxibustion; others tried cauterization.

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.<sup>13</sup> 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 Chiliarcy 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.<sup>14</sup>

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.<sup>15</sup> Notice also appeared in 1294 when «hand-tattooed» soldiers, not previously in Yüan service, were enlisted to reinforce garrisons.<sup>16</sup> In the dynastic

history *Yüan shih* 13, it was noted that in the 22nd year, 11th month, of the reign of Qubilai, prisoners (*ch'iu*) were pardoned (*she*), but branded on their faces (*ch'ing ch'i mien*); they were *not* free, but to be a part of the planned (but later aborted) third invasion force against Japan.<sup>17</sup>

### Use in medicine

Stories of tattooing/branding on man and animal to prevent the plague appeared in European antiquity. Brought about by the great influx of peoples and livestock during the *Völkerwanderung*, such epidemic outbreaks were greatly feared at a time when there were no medical remedies.<sup>18</sup> In a world where Christianity was gaining ground, this religion was turned to at such times; crosses were burned on livestock to ward off the evils of the plague.<sup>19</sup> In terms of man, the following tale was related by Theophylactus Simocatta (d. 638) in his *History* (V. 10: 13–15), concerning an event which took place in the late summer of 591 during the reign of the emperor Maurice (r. 582–602). «When he [the Persian king] had learned that some of the captives were of the Turkish race, he sent them to the emperor Maurice to publicize Roman strength and offer the emperor the first-fruits of victory. On their foreheads was inscribed the sign of the Lord's passion, which is called a cross by the ministers of the Christian religion. So the emperor enquired what was the meaning of this mark on the barbarians. And so they declared that they had been assigned this by their mothers: for when a fierce plague was endemic among the eastern Scythians, it was fated that some Christians advised that the foreheads of the young be tattooed with this sign. The barbarians in no way rejected the advice, and they obtained salvation from the counsel.»<sup>20</sup>

The famous tattooed chief at the Pazyryk burial led Rudenko to suggest that the rows of discs on the back were of a «therapeutic nature.»<sup>21</sup> Though far removed from this ancient site, a concrete example of tattooing for medical purposes may now be given concerning the Aghāch Eris people of southwestern Iran.<sup>22</sup> Speaking a form of Turki (western Ghuz dialect) mixed with Persian, material was collected on them by Pierre Oberling in 1957 in Mengeles among the Jaghatā'i (Chaghatay) clan. Ornamental tattooing existed among the women, but never on the men, who had themselves tattooed only for the purposes of recovering from illness or injury. «A man showed me,» Oberling wrote, «his injured knee, which had a circle consisting of blue dots tattooed around the wound.» The tattooing (*khāl*) operation was done by a gypsy woman (*zan-e-kuli*) with a needle and the dye made of gall bladder (*zahreh*) extracts. Oberling also reported that branding (*dāgh kardan*)

could also be performed on man in a therapeutic sense, using a red-hot iron.<sup>23</sup>

### **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 *tamγa* (Common Turkic) ~ *tamaγ-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.*»<sup>24</sup> Also included were earmarks (Mongol: *im, im-e, nim*) on livestock made by cutting or punching. Extensive literature exists on brands,<sup>25</sup> including on the early Bulgars 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.»<sup>26</sup> Rintchen then gave 210 examples of brands, as well as 9 examples of ear-marking, all with explanations.<sup>27</sup> 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 'Alī b. Djūlūgh; 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 (*kasīda*) commemorating the springtime branding of the fine horses of the emirs of the Muhtadjid dynasty of Central Asia: «Branding fires, like suns ablaze, are kindled/.../Branding 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/...»<sup>28</sup>

Among early Mongol peoples, in 1026 by imperial decree, the Khitan ordered the branding of all government animals on the left side.<sup>29</sup> Mongol

practices concerning the branding of livestock, during the imperial period of the Yüan dynasty in China, were recorded in the *Yüan 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 tzu 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 *Qalq-a jirum* (18th century) said that branded camels and horses (*tamayatu temege moriyi...*) could not be given to messengers except for major state concerns, usually clarified as the Three Affairs (*yurban üile*; earlier these were called the Three Great Affairs—*yurban yeke üile*). Both the relay station attendants and the messengers were responsible if caught breaking this rule.<sup>30</sup> 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.»<sup>31</sup>

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 and animals of officials, soldiers, and commoners in the districts of *Γašintu*, *Čayan obo*, *Engger ebüljen*, *Qota usu*, and *Bayan obo* within the territory subject to the mare-herds of the *Šangdu* eastern wing» (*šangdu jegün yar gegüü aduŷun-u qariyatu Ʒajar doturaki. Ʒašintu. cayan obo. engger ebüljen. qota usu. bayan obo jerge-yin nutuŷa-un. tüsimel daruŷa cerig arad olan-u erüge ama köriingge mal toŷan-u quriyangŷui [sic] on-u ilerkei cese*).<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, once livestock was branded or earmarked to indicate possession, there were official, written and branded, means of recognizing rightful ownership.

Among the Aghāch 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].»<sup>34</sup>

### 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-yin üjilge*, folio 21v); or MONG 127 with the auspicious days for marking animals (*aliba mal-un imenekü cimenekü edür anu*, folio 5v).<sup>35</sup> 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.<sup>36</sup> 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.<sup>37</sup>

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.»<sup>38</sup> Prior to 1036, among the Khitan, dishonest herdsman 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.<sup>39</sup>

### **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*).<sup>40</sup> 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.»<sup>41</sup>

### **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.<sup>42</sup> 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.<sup>43</sup>

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.<sup>44</sup> 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.»<sup>45</sup> They were called Rhinocorurites or «dock-noses».<sup>46</sup> 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.»<sup>47</sup>

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.»<sup>48</sup> 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.

## Notes

- 1 This paper may be found in that meeting's proceedings, *Religious and lay symbolism in the Altaic World and other papers*, edited by Klaus Sagaster with Helmut Eimer, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1989), pp. 206–224. Included in that discussion were also Uralic peoples who practiced tattooing. In that regard, one important article was overlooked, namely, Artturi Kannisto, «Über die Tatuierung bei den Ob-ugrischen Völkern», *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 67 (1933): 159–185, with illustrations.
- 2 Some of these materials were brought to my attention by colleagues, whom I would like to thank for their interest and suggestions. Thus, the following may be added to the linguistic evidence: Prof. Kara assisted in the Evenki and Even evidence. Evenki *huldrii-/hullii-/uldrii- /ullii-* 'to sew; to tattoo' with *huldriichaa* and *huldrii-* in the Sym dialect with the obsolete meaning of 'to stitch the skin with a sooted thread; to tattoo', and *hulliichaa* in the Stony Tunguska dialect 'tattooed face'. For this data see G. M. Vasilevich, *Evenkiisko-russkii slovar'*, (Moscow, 1958), pp. 493a-b–494a; V. I. Tsintsius et al., *Sravn. Slovar' tunguso-man'chjurskikh yazykov* (Leningrad, 1977), II., p.345. Tsintsius (II., p. 345) also gives the Even form *huldicha* and *huldricha* meaning 'tattoo'. A note from Prof. Austerlitz on 12 January 1990 supplied the Gilyak form of *hiw-* or *hi-ju-* connected to 'blackspot'. I may also add the Mongolian form *sibe-* 'to tattoo, mark by incisions on the skin; to perforate' and *niḡur-tur temdeg sibekü* 'to tattoo the face'; see Ferdinand Lessing & al., *Mongolian-English Dictionary*, corrected re-printing with a new supplement, (1960; rpt. Bloomington: The Mongolia Society, 1973), p. 694.
- 3 For recent studies see: C. P. Jones, «*Stigma: Tattooing and branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*», *Journal of Roman Studies* 77 (1987): 139–155; W. Mark Gustafson, «*Inscripta in fronte: Penal tattooing in Late Antiquity*», *Classical Antiquity* 16 (1997): 79–105.
- 4 Herbert Franke, «Chinese law in a multinational society: The case of Liao (907–1125)», *Asia Major* 3rd series, 5 (1992): 111–127; see p. 119.
- 5 Herbert Franke, «Treatise on punishments: *Liao-shih* Chapters 61 and 62», *Central Asiatic Journal* 27 (1983): 9–38, esp. p.23; see also Karl A. Wittfogel and Fêng Chia-sheng, *History of Chinese society: Liao (907–1125)*, (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1949), pp. 232, 466, 467.
- 6 Karl A. Wittfogel and Fêng Chia-sheng, *History of Chinese society: Liao (907–1125)*, (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1949), pp. 499–500.
- 7 Herbert Franke, «Chinese law in a multinational society: The case of the Liao (907–1125)», *Asia Major*, 3rd series, 5 (1992): 119.
- 8 Herbert Franke, «Chinese Texts on the Jurchen (I): A translation of the Jurchen in

- the *San ch'ao pei-meng hui-pien*», *Zentralasiatische Studien* 9 (1975): 119–186; see p. 142.
- 9 Herbert Franke, «Jurchen customary law and the Chinese law of the Chin Dynasty», in *State and law in East Asia: Festschrift für Karl Büniger*, edited by D. Eikemeier and H. Franke, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981), pp. 215–233; see p. 223. This article has also been reprinted in Herbert Franke and Hok-lam Chan, *Studies on the Jurchens and the Chin Dynasty*, (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 1997), essay V.
  - 10 E-tu Zen Sun, *Ch'ing administrative terms: A translation of the terminology of the Six Boards with explanatory notes*, *Harvard East Asian Studies* 7, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), item #1733 (p.271) and item #1782 (p.279).
  - 11 Shiga Shūzō, «Criminal procedure in the Ch'ing Dynasty—With emphasis on its administrative character and some allusion to its historical antecedents. I.», *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 32 (1974): 1–45, see especially page 18, note 53.
  - 12 William C. Jones, *The Great Qing Code*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 266–267.
  - 13 Rebecca Redwood French, *The Golden Yoke: The legal cosmology of Buddhist Tibet*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), p. 323. Here, an older study of Tibetan punishments should be mentioned: S. Hummel, «Strafen und Torturen der Tibetaner», *Geographica Helvetica* 12, no. 2 (1957): 93–102, with some illustrations. The article does consider mutilating punishments but does not mention tattooing.
  - 14 David M. Farquhar, *The government of China under Mongol rule: A reference guide*, *Münchener Ostasiatische Studien* Bd. 53, (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1990), pp. 78, 80, 115 note 42. Farquhar reported that tattooing was forbidden after 1281, but this does not always appear to have been the case. On the Sung practice of tattooing soldiers, see: Sogabe Shizuo, «Sodai guntai no nyuboku ni tsuite» («On the tattooing of troops during the Sung Dynasty»), *Toho gakuho* 24, no. 3 (1937): 71–92.
  - 15 Ch'i-ch'ing Hsiao, *The military establishment of the Yuan Dynasty*, *Harvard East Asian Monographs* 77, (Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1978), pp. 87–88, 173 note 51, 202 notes 344 and 345.
  - 16 Ch'i-ch'ing Hsiao, *The military establishment of the Yuan Dynasty*, *Harvard East Asian Monographs* 77, (Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1978), p. 117.
  - 17 Besides in *Yüan shih* 13, this passage has been summarized in the *Ku chin t'u chi*

- ch'eng* XXXI, 149 (Shanghai edition, 1934), but the purpose of the tattooing is omitted; see also Ch'i-ch'ing Hsiao, *The military establishment of the Yuan Dynasty*, Harvard East Asian Monographs 77, (Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1978), p.202 note 344.
- 18 George Fleming, *Animal plagues: Their history, nature, and prevention*, (London: Chapman and Hill, 1871). I would like to thank The Wellcome Trust and The Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine (London) for their support of my research and the use of this volume in their Library collections.
- 19 Cæsaris S.R.E. Card. Baronii in *Annales ecclesiastici*, volume V, edited by A. Theiner, (Barri-Ducis, Ludovicus Guerin & Socii, Editores, 1864), pp. 399–400. St. Ambrose is quoted on this means of dealing with cattle plague: «Quam autem immensa, nempe universam Europam occupans, quam dira animalium pestis ista, et quomodo a Christianis per signum crucis facillime curaretur...» p. 399. He also included a poetic eclogue by Sanctus Severus in which shepherds lament the loss of their livestock and the efficacy of branding them with a cross as a preventive measure against the plague (pp. 399–400).
- 20 [Theophylactus Simocatta]. *The history of Theophylact Simocatta. An English translation with introduction and notes*, by Michael and Mary Whitby, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 146–147. For a brief commentary on this passage see also Gustafson, «*Inscripta in fronte: Penal tattooing in Late Antiquity*», *Classical Antiquity* 16 (1997), pp. 84 (note 25), 99.
- 21 Sergei I. Rudenko, *Frozen tombs of Siberia: The Pazyryk burials of Iron Age horsemen*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), p. 112.
- 22 Pierre Oberling, «A note on tattooing and branding among the Aghāch Eris of Southwestern Iran», *Ethnos* 27 (1962): 126–128. I would like to thank Devin DeWeese for calling my attention to this article.
- 23 Pierre Oberling, «A note on tattooing and branding among the Aghāch Eris of Southwestern Iran», *Ethnos* 27 (1962): 127.
- 24 [Marco Polo] *The travels of Marco Polo. The complete Yule-Cordier edition*, (1871, 1875; 1903, 1920, 1929; reprint New York: Dover Publications, 1992), I., pp. 266–267. The emphasis is mine.
- 25 For example, see Klaus Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker, editors, *Runen, Tamagas und Graffiti aus Asien und Osteuropa*, Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, Bd. 19, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1985); Edward Tryjarski, «The tamgas of the Turkic tribes from Bulgaria», in *Eurasia Nostratica. Festschrift für Karl Heinrich Menges, I-II*, edited by Gyula Décsy and Christo D. Dimov-Bogoev, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977), pp. 189–200; Gunnar Jarring, «Owner's marks among the Turks of Central Asia», *Scholia. Beiträge zur Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde. Annemarie von Gabain zum 80. Geburtstag*

- am 4. Juli 1981 dargebracht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern, Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, Bd. 14, edited by Wolfgang Veenker, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981), pp. 103–106. For some recent illustrations of various brands and branding irons in use among the Mongols see: X. Luvsanbaldan, *Xülgiin shinj*, (Ulaanbaatar: Ulsyn Xebleliin Gazar, 1989), unnumbered pages preceding p. 129; D. Balsan, *Xülgiin sainyg unaya gevel*, (Ulaanbaatar: BNMAU Ardyn bolovsrolyn yaamny surax bichig, 1986), pp. 14 (ear-marking), 15–17 (branding locations and marks).
- 26 Bi. Rintchen, «Les signes de propriété chez les Mongols», *Archiv orientální* 22 (1954): 467–473; see p. 468.
- 27 Bi. Rintchen, «Les signes de propriété chez les Mongols», *Archiv orientální* 22 (1954): 467–473; see p. 470 for the illustrated brands; p. 473 for ear-marking.
- 28 G. A. Pugachenkova, «The terra-cotta horses of Bactria-Tokharistan: Semantics and image», *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 3 (1989): 15–19, see p. 18. For further material on Farrukhi and this poem see E. G. Browne, *A literary history of Persia, I-IV*, (1915; rpt. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1964), II., pp. 125–127; for a discussion on whether these horses may be of the Lokai breed, see V. M. Masson, «On the history of the origin of the Lokai horse», *Izvestiia Akademii Nauk Tadzhikskoi SSR* (1949) 5.
- 29 Karl A. Wittfogel and Fêng Chia-sheng, *History of Chinese society: Liao (907–1125)*, (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1949), p. 130.
- 30 Henry Serruys, «‘Three affairs’: A juridical expression in Mongol», *Mongolian Studies* 8 (1984–1985): 59–64; see esp. p.61.
- 31 Henry Serruys, «‘Three affairs’: A juridical expression in Mongol», *Mongolian Studies* 8 (1984–1985): 59–64; see p.62.
- 32 Walther Heissig assisted by Charles Bawden, *Catalogue of Mongol books, manuscripts and xylographs*, (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1971), pp. 122–123.
- 33 William C. Jones, *The Great Qing code*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), p. 223.
- 34 Pierre Oberling, «A note on tattooing and branding among the Aghäch Eris of Southwestern Iran», *Ethnos* 27 (1962): 127–128.
- 35 See Walther Heissig assisted by Charles Bawden, *Catalogue of Mongol books, manuscripts and xylographs*, (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1971), pp. 165, 170.
- 36 For Kalmyk laws on this see Hans S. Kaarsberg, *Among the Kalmyks of the steppes on horseback and by troika. A journey made in 1890*, translated

- by John R. Krueger, *The Mongolia Society Occasional Papers 19*, (Bloomington: The Mongolia Society, 1996), p. 51; see also Ruth I. Meserve, «Law and domestic animals in Inner Asia», *Proceedings of the 40th PIAC* (Provo, Utah), forthcoming.
- 37 Hans S. Kaarsberg, *Among the Kalmyks of the steppes on horseback and by troika. A journey made in 1890*, translated by John R. Krueger, *The Mongolia Society Occasional Papers 19*, (Bloomington: The Mongolia Society, 1996), p. 51.
- 38 Edwin G. Pulleyblank, «The 'High Carts': A Turkish speaking people before the Türks», *Asia Major*, n.s. 3.3. (1990), p. 21–26, see p. 24.
- 39 Karl A. Wittfogel and Fêng Chia-sheng, *History of Chinese society: Liao (907–1125)*, (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1949), p. 500.
- 40 E-tu Zen Sun, *Ch'ing administrative terms: A translation of the terminology of the Six Boards with explanatory notes*, *Harvard East Asian Studies 7*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 257.
- 41 [Marco Polo] *The travels of Marco Polo. The complete Yule-Cordier edition*, (1871, 1875; 1903, 1920, 1929; reprint New York: Dover Publications, 1992), I., p. 403.
- 42 For a more detailed discussion of this see, for example, Ken Tani, «An essay on the custom of injuring one's body in the inland areas of Asia», *Shigaku Zasshi* 93, no. 6 (1984): 41–57 (in Japanese), with an English summary on pp. 144–145.
- 43 The tale appeared in Polyænus' *Strategica* (161–163 A.D.), VII, 11, 12. For an English edition of the text see *Polyænus' Stratagems of war*, translated by R. Shepherd, (Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1974), p. 272; or a more recent translation of Polyænus by Peter Krentz and Everett L. Wheeler, *Stratagems of war*, I–II, (Chicago: Ares Publishing, Inc., 1994). Also see the discussion of this passage by A. Sh. Shahbazi, «Early Persians' interest in history», *Bulletin of the Asian Institute* 4 (1990): 257–265, see p. 261. This story is also briefly discussed by John R. Gardiner-Garden, *Ktesias on early Central Asian history and ethnography*, *Papers on Inner Asia No. 6*, (Bloomington: Indiana University, Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, 1987), pp. 19–20. The same ruse was copied by one of Darius' *satraps*, Zopirus, who apparently used it successfully against the Babylonians; for this story see Polyænus VII, 12, in the Shepherd translation, pp. 273–274. Later, the story reoccurred in 484 A.D. in Central Asia where the Sasanian Peroz falls into a similar trap used by the Hephtalites; for this see Th. Nöldeke, *Das iranische Nationalepos*, 2nd edition (1920), p. 3 note 10.
- 44 For more information on Clearchus see Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth (editors), *The Oxford classical dictionary*, 3rd edition, (Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 343; *Paulys Real-encyclopädie*, new edition edited by Wilhelm Kroll, (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1921), Volume 21, columns 580–581.

- 45 Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists*, translated by Charles Burton Gulick, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1943), Book XII, 524, volume 5, page 365 [this edition provides parallel Greek and English text].
- 46 It should be noted that the *Rhinocorura* were described and located by various Greek authors to different peoples and places than found in Atheneaus' work. For further information see William Smith (editor), *A dictionary of Greek and Roman geography*, I-II, (London: John Murray, 1873), II., pp. 708–709.
- 47 Athenaeus, Book XII, 524, volume 5, page 365. See also C. P. Jones, «Stigma: Tattooing and branding in Graeco-Roman antiquity», *Journal of Roman Studies* 77 (1987): 145 for a discussion on the relation to stigma.
- 48 Athenaeus, Book XII, 524, volume 5, page 363.