

and Yeh-lü Ta-shih, to be read Yeh-lü T'ai-shih, may simply mean « Yeh-lü the *t'ai-shih* ». This old Chinese title of *t'ai-shih*, « Great Instructor », correctly explained as such by Rašidu-'d-Dīn, was given under the Ch'i-tan, the Jučen and the first period of the Mongols to all kinds of high officials, both civil and military.

But the name given by Rašidu-'d-Dīn as that of the founder of the Qarā-Hītai Empire is different from all the forms occurring in Chinese sources. From the available readings in Rašid's mss. and in those of works derived from his own, it seems practically certain that the form intended by the Persian historian is نوسی طایفو *Nūši Ṭāifū*. BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, I, 224), noticing that D'OHSSON spoke once of « Tūši Ṭāifū » (*Oh*, I, 163) and another time of « Nūši Ṭāifū » (*Oh*, I, 443), supposed that the second form was a misprint. But it is in this second passage that D'OHSSON followed the mss.; in the first one, he tacitly corrected the reading to « Tūši Ṭāifū » so as to bring the form into some agreement with the second element of « Yeh-lü Ta-shih ». HOWORTH's hypothesis (*JRAS*, 1876, 263) that « Nūši » is « Jučen » (what a name at such a date for a Ch'i-tan!) and that Ṭāifū is the « Chinese » translation of a « native » (*i. e.* Ch'i-tan) title *taiši* is of course unacceptable. « Ṭāifū » transcribes the Chinese 太傅 *t'ai-fu*, « Grand Tutor », formerly a high civil title like *t'ai-shih*, but independent from it. D'OHSSON added in a note that *t'ai-fu* meant « commander-in-chief », and BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, I, 225), who only thought of 大夫 *ta-fu* or *tai-fu*, « great officer » (also an ancient civil title) questioned the validity of the explanation. But as I shall show in another note (see « Thai »), the Ch'i-tan gave the old Chinese title of *t'ai-fu* to men who were in fact army commanders. As to the first part of the name, and even granting that Ta-shih may perhaps not be the title *taiši* which I believe it to be and correcting *Nūši* to **Tūši* as D'OHSSON did, Ta-shih can only be **Taiši*, which could not give **Tūši*. Yeh-lü Ta-shih was perhaps given or took the title of *t'ai-fu*, although the Chinese texts make no mention of it. On the other hand, if I am right in supposing that Ta-shih merely renders the title *taiši*, *Nūši* might well be the real personal name, though unknown to Chinese sources. Yeh-lü Ta-shih was an agnate of the Ch'i-tan Imperial family, a descendant at the eighth generation of the founder of the dynasty; but his lineage is otherwise unknown (he was not a brother of the last Emperor as is said by BARTHOLD, *12 Vorlesungen*, 122), and he only came into prominence on account of his Western adventure.

Even then, the names and dates are often doubtful, and there are strange discrepancies between different passages in the *Liao shih* itself, and between the *Liao shih* and the *Chin shih* or other Chinese works (in particular Wu-ku-sun Chung-tuan's account of his mission of 1220-1222 in *Br*, I, 28-29), not to speak of the contradictions between Chinese data and those of Mussulman authors.

If we abide by the text of the *Liao shih*, Peking was taken by the Jučen in 1122 (not in 1120 as is said in *Br*, I, 211); Yeh-lü Ta-shih was captured by the Jučen in 1123 (*Liao shih*, 29, 3a; BRETSCHNEIDER [*Br*, I, 220] is mistaken when he says that this capture is not mentioned in the *Liao shih*), but was set free soon afterwards; he then repaired to the Ch'i-tan Emperor, but not feeling safe, proclaimed himself « king » (*wang*) in 1124 and left for the West (*Liao shih*, 29, 3a-4b). Yeh-lü Ta-shih's surprising release by the Chin is almost in favour of Wu-ku-sun Chung-tuan's account, according to which Yeh-lü Ta-shih had at some time betrayed the Ch'i-tan, at least,