

to the «white-powdered skin» (白粉皮 *po-fên p'i*), it refers merely to the «white-tanned skin» of which the boots, the outer warm boots and the belt-depending bowl used for the mortuary costume of the defunct Emperor were made.

THE TOMB OF CHINGHIZ-KHAN. — Opinions concerning the place where Chinghiz-khan was buried are no less divergent than those about the dates of his birth and death.

GAUBIL (p. 54) and MAILLA (IX, 128) state that Chinghiz was buried «in the cave («caverne») of Kinien», and this has been repeated by CORDIER (*Hist. gén. de la Chine*, II, 223); it is doubly misleading. The actual text (YS, I, 9 b) says that Chinghiz was buried at the 起輦谷 Ch'i-lien-ku. Although the second character is often now read *nien* (POPOV too, 313, transcribes «Cinyan» = Ch'i-nien), it occurs in mediaeval transcriptions only with its correct reading *lien*; as to *ku*, it is not a «cave», but a «valley [in the mountain]», in principle, a dry one, as opposed to 川 *ch'uan*, a wellwatered «valley». All the Emperors of the Yüan dynasty, except Mongka, are expressly stated in the YS, and before it in the *Cho-kêng lu* (I, 11-14), to have been buried in the Ch'i-lien-ku. Even for the last Emperor, who was expelled from China in 1368, and who, according to the YS, died in 1370 at Ying-ch'ang-fu (see «Barscol»), we are told (YS, 47, 6 a) that «his coffin was taken north to be buried». In several cases (YS, 26, 8 a; 28, 7 a; 31, 4 b; 36, 4 a; 37, 2 b), the mention of the burial at the Ch'i-lien-ku is followed by the words 從諸帝陵 *ts'ung chu-ti ling*, «after the funerary mounds of the [other] Emperors». This would seem to imply that *tumuli* were erected over the tombs; but it is probable that Chinese writers here used merely the ordinary term for a Chinese Imperial tomb, without any reference to its nature.

Where did the Ch'i-lien-ku or Ch'i-lien Valley lie? The *Yüan-shih lei-pien* alone (I, 10 a), we do not know on what evidence, says that it lay «north of the Desert». As to the name, if Ch'i-lien be a transcription, the possible originals would be \*Kilän, \*Kiläl, \*Kirän, \*Kiräl (the other «K'i-lien» mentioned in Y, I, 248, is 祁連 Ch'i-lien, and, as PALLADIUS says, lay in quite a different region; on the confusion made at a late date between the two, cf. *infra*, p. 361-362). PALLADIUS suggested that Ch'i-lien was an abbreviated transcription of the name of the Kerulen (cf. Y, I, 248; *Ch*, I, 195), and this opinion has been expressed independently, and with greater confidence, by YANAI (p. 751) and in 沈曾植 *Shên Ts'êng-chih's* notes on the Chinese version of «Sanang Setsen» (蒙古源流箋證 *Mêng-ku yüan-liu chien-chêng*, 4, 7 a). I felt inclined to adopt the same view in *TP*, 1935, 167. But, after reconsidering the case, I have come to a different conclusion.

The name of the Kerulen is now pronounced *Herülün* in Mongolian, and the modern Chinese transcription is 喀魯倫 *K'a-lu-lun* or, more correctly, 克魯倫 *K'o-lu-lun*. In the Mongol period, despite Rubrouck's «Kerule» in «Onankerule» (= Onon and Kerulen; *Wy*, 208 [where, and also on p. 29, «Orkhon» is a slip for «Onon»], 243, 268), the name was *Kälürän*, attested by both the *Secret History* and *Rašidu-'d-Dîn*; «Kulurum» is still found in WITSEN's *Nord-en Oost-Tartarye* (1705 ed., 279). In Chinese, the river is designated either by the regular transcriptions of *Kälürän*, 怯綠連 *Ch'ieh-lü-lien*, 怯綠憐 *Ch'ieh-lü-lien*, 怯呂連 *Ch'ieh-lü-lien*, 怯魯連 *Ch'ieh-lu-lien* (ch. WANG Hui-tsu<sup>2</sup>, 49, 2 a), 翁陸連 *Hsi-lu-lien* (cf. WANG Kuo-wei's edition of Ch'iu Ch'u-chi's *Hsi-yu chi*, 2, 13 a-b; *Br*, I, 54), or they render a name of unknown