

Before BEREZIN, this same passage had been edited and translated by ERDMANN (*Temudschin*, 573-574). He too speaks of the «fourth of *ramadān*»; but instead of the absurd «*šawwāl*», says «on the fifteenth of the *هون آی* *hūn āi* of that year».

In the Paris mss. (Mīrzā Muḥammad QAZWĪNĪ was kind enough to collate them for me), three contain the corresponding passage; they read as follows :

Suppl. persan 209, 154 r^o : «... on the fifteenth of *شون ای* *šūn ai* of that year, corresponding to the fourth of *ramadān* of the year 624 of the Hegira...».

Suppl. persan 1113, 121 v^o : «... on the [lacuna] of *سون ای* *sūn ai* of that year, corresponding to the fourteenth of *ramadān* of the year 624 of the Hegira...».

Anc. fonds persan 68, 121 r^o : «... in *سون ای* *sūn ai* of that year, corresponding to the fourteenth of *ramadān* of the year 624 of the Hegira...».

Before discussing these readings, I must quote a last passage :

d. (*Ber*, III, Pers. text, 117; transl., 119) : «In ... *شون* *sūn* (var. *شمردن*) of this (*این*) said year of the pig, corresponding to the fourteenth of *ramadān* of the year 624, they brought his coffin to the *ordo* (*ordōhā*), and [then] made known the catastrophe about him...»

This passage, according to QAZWĪNĪ, occurs in two of the Paris mss. in the following form :

Suppl. persan 209, 160 r^o : «... in [lacuna] of *sūn* of this (*این*) said year of the pig, corresponding to the fourteenth of *ramadān* of the year 624», etc.

Suppl. persan 1113, 124 r^o : «... in [lacuna] of *šūn ai* of the said year of the pig, corresponding to the fourteenth of *ramadān* of the year 624», etc.

We are now in a position to restore the correct text. It is clear that instead of *hūn ai*, or *sūn ai*, or *sūn* alone, we should read *شون ای* *šūn ai* everywhere; but *ای ai*, which was not understood by the copyists, was altered by them to *این in*, «this», in the two texts of *d.* out of three, although *in*, «this», was pleonastic with the «said» year.

There can be no doubt either as to the meaning of *šūn ai*; it must be vocalized *šūn ai*. *Ai* means «month» in Turkish, and Rašid is merely quoting a month of the Uighur calendar. *Šūn ai* occurs in the Sino-Uighur Vocabulary of the Bureau of Translators of the Ming dynasty; it is the name of the intercalary month, formed with *šūn* < Ch. 閏 *jun*, «intercalary [month]», and Turk. *ai*, «month» (cf. RADLOV, IV, 1109).

There is, however, a difficulty. The year 1227 was embolismic, but, in the Chinese calendar, the intercalary month of 1227 followed the fifth month, and the fifteenth would correspond to June 30, 1227, which is clearly unacceptable.

But here intervenes the fact that the Uighur calendar did not always coincide with the Chinese. Although the phases of the moon were of course the same in both countries, it may be that the Uighurs placed the intercalary month of 1227, not after the fifth month, but after the seventh. In such a case, not having an intercalary month after the fifth, the Chinese intercalary fifth month would be their sixth month, the Chinese sixth month would be their seventh, and the Chinese seventh month would be their intercalary month. The fifteenth of the Chinese seventh month would thus correspond to August 28, 1227, and this is exactly the date corresponding to the fourteenth of *ramadān* A. H. 624. So I have no doubt that the fourteenth of *ramadān* is the date actually given by Rašid, in agreement with most mss. in one case, and with all the mss. in the