and Howorth (1, 48) to c. 1165 in Vladimircov (p. 23). One point is clear: the years of the son's age are counted in Chinese fashion, that is to say, we have to add to the year of his birth not nine or thirteen, but eight or twelve, respectively. This is almost self-evident, but it is established beyond doubt by Rašīd (Ber, 11, 89; 111, 102-103, 111), who, dating Chinghiz-khan's birth in a «pig» year (1155), makes him an orphan at the age of «thirteen» also in a «pig» year, consequently twelve years later (1167). Too many complete cycles divide the main periods of Chinghiz-khan's life. The Secret History, our earliest source, is free from such combinations and therefore the age of «nine» years (eight actual years) which it gives is more likely to be true. If we add eight to 1155, Yäsügäi must have died in 1163. But such an early date is difficult to reconcile with the subsequent history of Chinghiz-khan. I am tempted rather to start from 1167 for Chinghiz-khan's birth, and to suppose that Yäsügäi died in 1175. It is quite by accident that this date falls in with the one suggested by Wolff, who started from entirely different premises, which are, moreover, warped with a miscalculation.

The title of ca'ut-quri. — At a date which was in a «tiger» year (1194) according to Raši (Ber, II, 104; Barthold, in EI, s. v. «Čingiz-khān»), but which is more likely to have been 1196 (cf. Naka Michiyo, Chingisu-kan jitsuroku, 129; Wang Kuo-wei, Kuan-t'ang chi-lin, 14, 23 a; T'u Chi, 11, 14 a), Tämüjin joined with the sovereign of the Kerait, To'oril (< Turk. Toyrul), in an action against the Tatars together with the armies of the Chin. As a reward, the Chin general gave to To'oril the Chinese title of £ wang (> Turk. and Mong. Ong), from which To'oril was henceforward known as «Ong-khan» (see « Uncan»), and to Tämüjin a title which has often been misread and, I think, misinterpreted. The problem of this title is fairly intricate, and must be studied in some detail.

Gaubil (Hist. de Gentchiscan, 4) merely states that Tämüjin received «a high office in the army». Bičurin (Istoriya pervykh četerëkh khanov, 39), translating from the Supplement to the T'ung-chien kang-mu, says the title given to Tämüjin was « Ca-u-tu-lu », meaning « commander-inchief against rebels ». The Yüan-shih lei-pien (1, 1 b-2 a), quoting from the Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu, gives likewise 察 兀 秃 魯 Ch'a-wu-t'u-lu, adding that it is the equivalent of 招 計 使 chaochi-shih. In Pi Yüan's Hsü tzŭ-chih t'ung-chien (chap. 156, s. a. 1202), the title is given as having been originally written 察 兀 圖 魯 ch'a-wu-t'u-lu, changed by the Ch'ien-lung Commissioners to 察 袞 圖 魯 ch'a-kun-t'u-lu, with the Chinese equivalent 招 討 使 chao-t'ao-shih. This points to a text of the Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu which had ch'a-wu-t'u-lu, although all our manuscripts of the latter work only give 察 兀 忽 魯 ch'a-wu-hu-lu, with a note saying that it was a title equivalent to the 移計 使 i-chi-shih of the Chin (WANG Kuo-wei ed., 13 a; but the ms. of the ancient Shuo fu, ch. 55, published by the Commercial Press, which Wang Kuo-wei did not know, gives as the Chinese equivalent chao-t'ao-shih [with a wrong reading 4 chin instead of 企 Chin]; the Fu Tsêng-hsiang ms., which was also not known to WANG, has 移計全使 i-chi Chin shih, which is absurd; Hung Chüng, 1 A, 28, and NAKA, Chingisu-kan jitsuroku, 132, say that ch'a-wu-hu-lu occurs in YS, but I cannot find it there. I am afraid that it was a slip of one author repeated by another). The curious fact is that, contrary to what will soon be seen to be the reading of the Secret History itself, the Ulan-Bator ms., in the passage