

true reading, not the الياس تو, tortured so as to give the 'Ulyasutai' of BLOCHET's edition) and the winter (*qīslaq*) at the اورنگه *Urüngä (= the Urungu of our maps, the Ürünggü of the *Secret History*, §§ 158, 177; such again seems to be the correct reading for the اورنگه of the mss., certainly not 'Uryāngqat' as in BLOCHET) and... (the name is corrupt; BLOCHET's *Qirqiz, 'Kirghiz', seems improbable here); the distance between both is a three days' route. Soryoqtani-bägi (or -bäki; the mother of Mongka, Qubilai, Hülägü and Ariq-bögä; on the name, misread by BLOCHET, cf. *TP*, 1932, 43-54) had been there (but she died in 1252, many years before Ariq-bögä). Ariq-bögä was one month and six days in the service of [Qubilai-]qa'an, and then died. They brought him to بודה اوندور Buda-ündür, which is the great 'forbidden precinct' (*γorūq-i buzurg*) of Chinghiz-khan, in the vicinity of the Selenga River (رودخانه سلنگه); Soryoqtani-bägi and the other princes have also been buried there, except (إلا illa) Qubilai-qa'an...» In the mss., the name I have read Buda-ündür is written بודה اوندور and نوره اوردند, نوره اوندور, which explains the «Nuda-undur» mentioned by SCHMIDT.

b. (*Bl*, II, 576-577) : « Another [chief] was جانكقى كورگان Čangqī-kūrāgān ('the Imperial son-in-law Čangqi'; he must be the Imperial son-in-law 'Čanggi' often mentioned in the *YS* as 長吉 Ch'ang-chi, 昌吉 Ch'ang-chi and 章吉 Chang-chi; cf. WANG Hui-tsu¹, 19, 3 b; his name occurs first in 1275; he was made a prince in 1287; for the name, cf. another Čanggi in the *Secret History*, § 277) of the Jalair (not 'Čalair' as in BLOCHET's edition), *emir* of a chiliarchy (*hāzārū*). This is the chiliarchy which was formerly that of an *emir* called اوقى Uqi, and this [Uqi], with a chiliarchy of Oirāt (*var.* Urāt), by the rule of *yarliγ* (*i. e.* on account of an Imperial order) kept guard at بודה اوندور Būda-ūndür (*var.* Būda-ūmūr), which is the great 'forbidden precinct' (*γorūq-i buzurg*), and the bones (*usthwānhāi*) of the princes (*šahzādāgān*) are deposited there. When the princes who were under the orders of Nomoyan rebelled (see 'Nomogan'), and the troops went with them, most of this chiliarchy joined the troops of Qaidu; [but] some remained there. Now, this chiliarchy belongs to the children of Uqi.» In view of the other passages, translated above, it is tempting to correct «Uqi» to «Ūdači» and «Oirāt» (or «Urat») to «Uryāngqāt». The place intended cannot be any other than the «Great qoriq», Yākā-qoriq, of the Burqan-qaldun. On the other hand, the readings in the present passage are in favour of the correction «Buda-ündür» in the preceding one. This was already the solution adopted by QUATREMÈRE (*Hist. des Mongols*, 118), which BLOCHET accepted. QUATREMÈRE also said that «Buda» must render Buddha, of which Burqan is the Mongolian equivalent. I feel inclined to agree with him, though partly only with BLOCHET, who explains «Buda-ündür» as «the great Buddha» (*Bl*, II, 561) : *ündür* is a geographical term, and Buda-ündür can only mean «Buddha Height», «Buddha Hill». One obscure point remains to be cleared up. QUATREMÈRE and BLOCHET found it quite natural that «Buda-ündür» should be in the vicinity of the Selenga. But the Selenga is in an entirely different region, west of the Tūla and the Orkhon. If Buda-ündür, as is practically certain, is but another name of Burqan-qaldun and of Burqatu-qan, the mention of the Selenga is a bad slip of the Persian historian.

The location of the Burqan-qaldun, and consequently of the place where Chinghiz-khan was buried, which, according to Rašidu-'d-Dīn, was at the source of the Onon, entails another important consequence. Several Mongol noblemen claiming descent from Chinghiz-khan told GAUBIL