

unified ». This sentence, puzzling as it is, has been translated without comment by BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, I, 38) and by CHAVANNES (*TP*, 1908, 300). HUNG Chün thought that the « unification » was reached when the Mongol chieftain, heretofore called Tämüjin, took the title of « Chinghiz-khan » in 1206. If we count seven years back from 1206 in the Chinese fashion, viz. with both final terms included, the result is 1200, i. e. a *kêng-shên* year. HUNG Chün thus supposes that the Empire was « founded » in that year, which is that of the victory of Tämüjin and Ong-khan over the Taiči'ut, though the « unification » only took place when Tämüjin proclaimed himself « Chinghiz-khan » in 1206. The inference is possible, but not binding. Astrologers and certain chroniclers used to make Chinghiz-khan's reign begin at Ong-khan's defeat and death in 1203, so that he could be said to be born, to have begun his reign and to have died in « pig » years (cf. Rašid in *Ber*, II, 147; III, 110-111). According to the Buddhist chronicle *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai*, which was completed in 1344 (ch. 32; Nanjiō, No. 1637; Meiji *Tripit.* of Tōkyō, 致, XI, 36 a-b), Tämüjin took the title of « Chinghiz-khan » in 1206, but it was only in 1211 that he created (*chien*) for his Empire (*kuo*) the official designation of « Ta Mêng-ku », « Great Mongol » (cf. Plan Carpine's « Yeka mongal », Yäkä-Monyol, of same meaning, in *Wy*, 52). The words used are the same as in Yang Wei-chêng's *chien-kuo*, but they represent a different tradition since 1211 is a *hsin-wei*, not a *kêng-shên* year. It may be that Yang Wei-chêng gave a special and undue significance to the events of 1200, in order to make them fit into a forced parallel.

For Chinghiz-khan's birth in *ting-hai*, a year which in principle corresponds to 1167, HUNG Chün devised the following explanation. Diviners and astrologers use in their calculations only the duodenary « branches », not the denary « stems »; in other words, we ought to take into account for Chinghiz-khan only the duodenary *hai*, meaning that Chinghiz was born in a « pig » year like Sung T'ai-tsu. But it was only Sung T'ai-tsu's birth-year which actually was a *ting-hai* year; the comparison was valid, although Chinghiz-khan was born in a *i-hai* year, i. e. 1155. Consequently, Yang Wei-chêng, while apparently speaking of 1167, confirmed in fact the Mussulman information which gave 1155 as the birth-year of Chinghiz-khan.

This argument, proffered as a hypothesis by HUNG Chün, appeared so decisive to T'u Chi and K'o Shao-min that both, abandoning the traditional Chinese date, which was equivalent to 1162, came to state that Chinghiz-khan was born in 1155 (T'u Chi, 2, 1 a; *Ch*, I, 172; K'o Shao-min, *Hsin Yüan shih k'ao-chêng*, 2, 1 b; 3, 11 a; WANG Kuo-wei, *Kuan-t'ang chi-lin*, 14, 21 b, however, stuck to the date 1162). I am afraid that they have given to HUNG Chün's argument too ready an acceptance. I agree with them that Yang Wei-chêng, submitting a memorial to the Emperor, could not run counter to what was the official tradition of the time, and could not have said that Chinghiz-khan was born in a *ting-hai* year if it had then been admitted that the true date was a *jên-wu* year. On the other hand, Yang Wei-chêng, in his eagerness to find parallel dates, deviated, at least slightly, from the absolute historical truth in another case. When he says that Sung T'ai-tsu pacified Chiang-nan in *i-hai* (975) and *ping-tzŭ* (976), that was because the submission of the Sung to Qubilai took place in *ping-tzŭ* (1276); but Li Yü of the Southern T'ang had already tendered his allegiance to the Sung at the end of 975, and 976 can only be adduced inasmuch as, at the beginning of that year, Li Yü presented himself in audience at the Court of Sung T'ai-tsu and was granted a title. This is, however, merely a biased interpretation of the facts, not an actual misstatement. The case of the