

but this is of course an error, since the Ying-kuo kung, *i. e.* Chao Hsien, is mentioned in 1288 in *YS*, 15, 5 *a*. In that year, he was granted 100 *ting* (« ingots ») in paper money, and a few days later was sent to Tibet to study Buddhism. But there is no mention of the Ying-kuo kung, or of his mother, in the *pên-chi* of *YS* under the year 1296. We possess, however, authoritative information on Chao Hsien's death. In the *Li-tai fo-tsu t'ong-tsai*, written in 1333-1344, we are told (致, XI, 41 *b*, 64 *a*) that, in the fourth month of the third *chih-chih* year (May 6-June 3, 1323), the Emperor ordered the Ying-kuo kung 合尊 Ho-tsun in Ho-hsi (= Kan-su) to commit suicide. Ho-tsun, almost certainly to be read 哈尊 Ha-tsun, clearly is the religious name taken by Chao Hsien, and probably represents Tib. mKa'-bcun; it is written 哈臻 Ha-chên in a Ming work, the *Nung-t'ien yü-hua* (*Pao-yen-t'ang pi-chi* ed., 2, 14), drawing from an undetermined earlier source. The death of Chao Hsien in 1323 is not to be doubted; but it is more difficult to ascertain why he was ordered to commit suicide. WANG Kuo-wei has connected it with a story largely circulated in the second part of the Yüan dynasty : Chao Hsien was believed to be the true father of Shun-ti, the last Emperor of the Mongols. This story, the main source for which is the 庚申外史 *Kêng-shên wai-shih*, or « Unofficial history of Shun-ti » (designated as « Kêng-shên » because he was born in a *kêng-shên* year), has been much discussed by Ch'ing scholars (cf. *Ch'ien Tsun-wang tu-shu min-ch'iu chi chiao-chêng*, II A, 17-18). I think it is hardly credible. As I wrote, in opposition to the view of WANG Kuo-wei, in *TP*, 1929, 136-137, the Ying-kuo kung Chao Hsien, born in 1270, made prisoner in 1276, lived in Peking until 1282, was then transferred to Shang-tu (*YS*, 12, 5 *b*) and stayed there until 1288; he had then become a grown man and was sent to study Buddhism with the Tibetans and be a monk in Kan-su, from where it does not seem that he ever came back. Shun-ti was born in 1320, and it does not seem that Chao Hsien can have anything to do with this birth. Many other reasons can be imagined for the order to commit suicide, particularly possible attempts, on the part of pure Chinese, to revive the memory of the fallen Sung dynasty and to prepare the way to a restoration.

I do not know whether there is any connection between the story concerning Chao Hsien's alleged fatherhood of Shun-ti, and a later tale which occurs in the *Altan Tobči* (beginning of the 17th cent.; GOMBOEV ed., 155). According to the *Altan tobči*, when Hung-wu took the Mongol capital, Shun-ti's consort, a Qonrat, who was in the third month of pregnancy, hid in a cask, but was soon discovered and taken to wife by Hung-wu. Yielding to her prayers, Heaven made her pregnancy last long enough to let Hung-wu believe that he was the father of the child. And this child was no other than Yung-lo. If we combine the two tales, Yung-lo would have been the son of the last Mongol Emperor, and the grandson of the last Emperor of the Sung dynasty !

The names of Chao Hsien raise a last problem; we have seen that Qubilai had given him the title of Ying-kuo kung, and that he had taken the religious name of Ha-tsun, *mKa'-bcun; after his death, he was canonised as Kung-tsung. Now, in Rašidu-'d-Din's unpublished *History of China*, there is a list of the Emperors of the Southern Sung dynasty, which has been given by BLOCHET in *Bl*, II, 256; Tu Tsung's successor and last Emperor of the dynasty is there called شرجو Šūjū. BLOCHET thought (cf. also *Bl*, II, 451) that Chao Ping was meant, but there is no likelihood that Rašid, omitting Chao Hsien and Chao Shih, should have heard of Chao Ping. Tu Tsung's son and successor, and last real Emperor of the dynasty, is Chao Hsien; I have no doubt that he is