

the *Nan-chao yeh-shih*, 2, 41; cf. also SAINSON, *Hist. particulière du Nan-tchao*, 198.) But Rašidu-'d-Dīn says that «the king of Qara-Ĵang bears the title of *mah-ara*, which means 'great prince'» (QUATREMÈRE, *Hist. des Mongols*, xciv); D'OHSSON (*Oh*, II, 318) gives «Maha Radja» (*i. e. mahārāja*); BLOCHET (*Bl*, 378) corrects to مهاراو *mahāraū* the readings مهارار and مهارار of his mss. Without attempting to establish here what form Rašid actually used, it is clear that the transcriptions represent *mahārāja* or a form derived from *mahārāja* (perhaps مهاراز *mahārāz*). This title is confirmed by Chinese sources. The campaign of 1253-1257 in Yün-nan was very trying owing to the climate and to the resistance of the population; out of ten *tümän* of troops (100,000 men) which Uriyangqadai had under his command in Yün-nan, only 20,000 men survived (*Oh*, II, 318; *Ber*, 145-146). As early as 1254, Qubilai, perhaps fretting at his subordinate position under Uriyangqadai (if Rašid be right in that respect; the *YS* gives the supreme command to Qubilai), had come back to the Court in Mongolia. According to Rašid, Qubilai brought back with him the *mahārāja*. Chinese texts give a somewhat different account. At the time of the campaign, the power belonged in Ta-li to the Kao clan, under the purely nominal sovereignty of the Tuan family. The Kao were defeated, and mercy was shown to the Tuan; at that time, Qubilai had already left Yün-nan. Uriyangqadai's biography, a not always successful combination of two documents of different origin (see «Iaci»), says that, after Yün-nan-fu had fallen in 1254, Uriyangqadai «captured the king 段智興 Tuan Chih-hsing and the commander-in-chief 馬合剌昔 Ma-ha-la-hsi and offered them [to the Emperor]» (*YS*, 121, 3 a; Tuan Chih-hsing is the form given in this passage and it is retained in *Ch*, II, 221; T'U Chi, 29, 15 b, silently alters it to Tuan Hsing-chih, the form used in the biography of that ruler's son, *YS*, 166, 8 b; CHAVANNES, in *TP*, 1905, 15-16, gives Tuan Hsing-chih without comment; an error in the name as given in the biography of Uriyangqadai would be more probable than in a biography of the Tuan family; but, curiously enough, the form Tuan Chih-hsing is also the one we find in the *Nan-chao yeh-shih* [transl. SAINSON, 104], not always reliable, but generally based on independent tradition). Ma-ha-la-hsi may or may not be corrupt (? for Ma-ha-la-[𠵹] *cha*; more probably, *hsi* [sī] merely transcribes -s or -z, in agreement with Rašid's *mahārāz*), but certainly it renders *mahārāja*, wrongly taken as a personal name, and still more wrongly given as the name of another man than the actual bearer of the title, *i. e.* the king Tuan Chih-hsing himself. In 1256, Tuan Chih-hsing was received by Mongka who gave him the title of 摩合羅嗟 *mo-ha-lo-ts'o* (*YS*, 3, 3 b), or 摩訶羅嗟 *mo-ho-lo-ts'o* (*YS*, 166, 9 a; cf. CHAVANNES, in *TP*, 1905, 16); we must understand that Tuan Chih-hsing was then confirmed in his pre-existing title. A similar transcription *mo-ho-lo*-[𠵹] *ts'o* occurs in an inscription of 1325, also in connection with Tuan Chih-hsing (*TP*, 1905, 28). Here again I cannot examine the minor discrepancies existing between the various sections of the *YS*, including the geographical section (ch. 61), as to the date at which and the conditions under which Tuan Chih-hsing was entrusted as *tsung-kuan*, or «administrator general», with fresh authority over his former subjects; some pertinent remarks have been made by CHAVANNES (*TP*, 1905, 16) and T'U Chi (6, 9 a-b; 29, 15 b; 110, 2 b). But I wish to point out that, while the transcription of *mahārāja* in Uriyangqadai's biography is what we should expect in the Mongol period (except perhaps for the last character), the *mo-ho-lo-ts'o* occurring elsewhere, also adopted in *Yüan shih lei-pien*, 42, 58 b, and in *Nan-chao yeh-shih*