

*pên-chi* of the Emperor Li-tsung in the *Sung-shih*, under the third *pao-ch'ing* year (A. D. 1227) : « [In the third *pao-ch'ing* year,] . . . the chief (主 *chu*) of the Mêng-ku (= Mongols) T'ieh-mu-chên (Tämüjin) died (殂 *ts'u*) at the Liu-p'an-shan. » But in fact there is no such text in the *Sung shih*, under the year 1227 (41, 3 a-b). Nor should we expect to find it there, at least in such terms. Both the *Chin shih* and the *Sung shih*, compiled under the Yüan dynasty, always speak retrospectively of the Mongols of Chinghiz-khan as « Ta-Yüan », « Great Yüan », never as « Mêng-ku », and give to Chinghiz-khan himself the title of *huang-ti* or *ti*, « Emperor », not merely of *chu*, « chief »; nor is the word *ts'u*, « to die », the term to be used for an « imperial » death. As a matter of fact, both the *Chin shih* (under the fourth *chêng-ta* year, A. D. 1227; 17, 3) and the *Sung shih* deliberately ignore the death of Chinghiz-khan, which in fact is alluded to merely in an indirect way by the *Chin shih* when we are told that, at the beginning of 1228, an envoy was sent to the « Great Yüan » to « express condolence ». But although the source is wrongly indicated by T'u Chi, the passage he quotes was certainly not invented by him. Either it is a Chinese rendering of Rašid's statements by an earlier modern scholar, or, as the case certainly is with one of GAUBIL's accounts of Chinghiz-khan's death, it is to be found in some historical work of early Ming date. GAUBIL's direct or indirect source, which must be the same as that of WEI Yüan as well as that of the *Tz'ü yüan* and of the *Chung-kuo ti-ming ta tz'ü-tien* can be identified with almost absolute certainty : it is the « continuation » of the *T'ung-chien kang-mu* composed by 陳 經 Ch'ên Ching, in 24 chapters, under the title of 通鑑續編 *T'ung-chien hsü-pien* : there Chinghiz-khan is made to die at the Liu-p'an-shan. Ch'ên Ching lived towards the end of the Yüan and saw the beginnings of the Ming dynasty. Though often said to be a Ming writer, the first edition of his *T'ung-chien hsü-pien* was engraved under the Yüan, in 1361 in fact (cf. *Ssü-k'u ch'üan-shu*, 47, 49-51; Mo Yu-chih's *Lü-t'ing chih-chien ch'uan-pên shu-mu*, 4, 17 a). Ch'ên Ching is not always to be trusted; his work, however, is earlier than both the *Cho-kêng lu* and the *Yüan-shih* and sometimes gives more correct names than the official history. On the other hand, writing under the Mongol dynasty, he certainly could not refer to Chinghiz-khan as « Tämüjin, the chief of the Mêng-ku », not at least in the edition of 1361, and so cannot be the author of the passage erroneously quoted by T'u Chi as taken from the *Sung shih*. Unfortunately the *T'ung-chien hsü-pien* is a rare book (not only in the original edition of 1361, but even in the Ming editions, one of which was published in 1562), and I can only quote the passage on the death of Chinghiz-khan from NAKA's *Chingisu-kan jitsuroku*, 579. From the *T'ung-chien hsü-pien*, the tradition passed into the *Hsü t'ung-chien kang-mu* compiled in 1476 by 商 輅 Shang Lu, where we read (19, 13; cf. *Pa*, 183) that « Tämüjin of the Mêng-ku died at the Liu-p'an-shan ». I have no doubt that this is the text which T'u Chi erroneously quoted as from the *Sung shih*.

The *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu* (64 b) merely says that in the autumn of 1225, Chinghiz-khan started again with his army to march against the Hsi-Hsia, reached their country in the spring of 1226, in the course of a year conquered all their cities, and, in 1227, « destroyed their kingdom and returned » (滅其國以還). The next sentence relates to what occurred after Chinghiz-khan had gone to Heaven.

The second Chinese tradition, which makes Chinghiz die at the Liu-p'an-shan, falls in remarkably well with part of Rašidu-'d-Din's account. According to Rašid (*Ber*, III, 94-99, 118-