

lao-t'ai has been restored by POPOV as «Galtai» (*Mên-gu yu-mu czi*, 401) and as «Kalotai» by WALEY (*Travels of an Alchemist*, 31); both are only partly right. In the system adopted by the transcribers of c. 1700, a Mongolian *qa-* (WALEY's «ka-») is rendered 喀 *k'a*, and the regular value of 葛 *ko* is *γa-* (POPOV's «ga-»); on the other hand, the vowels of *lao* cannot be slurred and require an original *-lau-* (*-la'u-* > *-lō-*, *-lū-*); the name is thus to be read *γalautai* > *γalōtai*, *γalūtai* («Place with Geese», an adjectival form derived from *γala'un*, «goose»; **γalautu* would be identical). I may add that the name is «Kalotou Nor» (= *γalōtu-nōr*) in the «Carte générale de la Tartarie Chinoise» of DU HALDE, t. IV. GERBILLON, who camped there on August 1, 1698, describes the place and calls it «Kaloutou Nor» (= *γalūtu-nōr*; DU HALDE, IV, 411-412). Another *γalautu-nōr* is known in the region of the Ulyui River (south-east of the ᠬᠠᠯᠬᠠ River); cf. POPOV, 284 (where the name of the Ulyui is misread «ᠬᠣᠯᠬᠣ»). A third one is outside the north-western angle of the bend of the Huang-ho (D'ANVILLE's «Kalotou omo»). The form is confirmed by POZDNEEV, who speaks of «the steppe of Gün-Galūtai» (*Mongoliya*, II, 443, 444), evidently the «steppe» of the Gün-nōr and the *γalautai-nōr*. It is much to be regretted that POZDNEEV, when he passed the site, had no suspicion of its historical importance.

The question is then to decide whether the «Ha-lao-t'u *hsing-kung* of the Sa-li Valley» of the YS is to be located in or near the district of Ch'eng-shui in Kan-su, or in the Sa'ari-kä'är west of the Kerulen, where there is still a *γalautai*, at the very place where, according to Chin Yu-tzü, Chinghiz-khan «made himself famous». In other words, did Chinghiz-khan die in Kan-su or in Mongolia?

One of WANG Kuo-wei's notes (*Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu*, 3 a) would seem to imply that he believed Chinghiz-khan had died at the Sa'ari-kä'är in Mongolia, but this may be due merely to a too concise redaction. BRETSCHNEIDER is more precise (*Br*, I, 157-158). According to him, the «Sa-li Valley» of the YS can only be the Sa'ari-kä'är of Mongolia, and he adds that the *Secret History* and the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu* «both agree in stating that, after subduing the Tangut empire, Chinghiz returned home, and then died». This is not quite accurate. It is true that the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu* (64 b) has the sentence: «In *ting-hai* (1227), [the Emperor] destroyed their (*i. e.* the Hsi-Hsia) kingdom and went back» (丁亥滅其國以還; this may be the source of a similar statement in the *Hsi-Hsia shu-shih*, 42, 14 a). But the somewhat awkward wording and the fact that the work avoids speaking of the death itself do not permit us to attach much weight to this statement. As to the *Secret History* (§ 268), BRETSCHNEIDER relied on PALLADIUS's translation (*Trudy členov Rossijskoï dukhovnoï missii*, IV, 152), based on the Chinese abridged version; but it is not in the least supported by the original Mongolian text. The 回來 *hui-lai*, «returned», of the Chinese version, must not be understood as «returned [to Mongolia]», but represents the *nökö'ätä... iräju*, «came... a second time» of the Mongolian, that is to say Chinghiz «came» for a «second» campaign against Tangut. The death in Kan-su, implied in the account of the YS, and confirmed by its near location at the Liu-p'an-shan in the *T'ung-chien hsü-pien* and in Rašidu-'d-Din and even, to a certain extent, by the late Mongol chronicles which speak of Ling-chou, is moreover supported by an independent text which was first adduced by YANAI (p. 56). In the biography of Sa-ha-lien (**Sahaliyan*, «The Black») in *Chin shih*, 111, 4 b, there is the following passage: «In the fourth [*chêng-ta*] year (1227), after the Great Yüan had