

and which forms the line of demarcation for the rivers flowing north, north-east, south-east, and south-west. The Burqan-qaldun, as we have located it, actually lies north of the Altai, taken in its broader sense, and the tomb of Chinghiz-khan, especially if it be on the southern slopes of the Burqan-qaldun, may well be said to have been on the sunny side of the Kântai Mountains. The conclusion would be that even the Mongol chroniclers of the 17th cent. agree, as to the site of the tomb, with the information provided at an early date by Polo and by Rašidu-'d-Din.

Yet, if I do not doubt the accuracy of the location, I am afraid that the mention of the Kântai-qan is highly doubtful. The Kântai-ḡan is mentioned elsewhere in «Sanang Setsen» (SCHMIDT, p. 159), but not in connection with Chinghiz-khan's tomb, and there the Chinese translation too (5, 15 b) renders the name 肯特汗山 K'en-t'ê-han-shan, «the Kântai-ḡan Mountains». On the contrary, in the passage relating to Chinghiz-khan's tomb, the Chinese translation gives Qadai-ḡan. NAKA (*Chingisu-kan jitsuroku*, 582) has quoted SCHMIDT's edition of the Mongol text to correct Qadai-ḡan to Kântai-ḡan, and T'U Chi (3, 33 b) concurred with him. But Qadai-ḡan, is also the reading in the *Altan tobči*. Now, the *Altan tobči*, the complete title of which is *Qad-un ündüsün quriyangqui altan tobči*, seems to be the first of the seven works used by «Sanang Setsen», that which he calls *Ḥad-un ündüsün-ü ärdäni-yin tobčiya* (SCHMIDT, 299). It cannot be an accident that we have «Qadayiqan» occurring in the *Altan tobči* as well as in the Chinese version of «Sanang Setsen». The only possible conclusion is that it is the original reading in both works (the second perhaps taking it from the first), and that «Kântai-ḡan» in SCHMIDT's Mongolian text is a misreading, due to the influence of this second well-known name. Whether «Qadayiqan» (= Qadai-qan?) be itself a correct ancient form is another question. The name exists in Mongolian. A postal relay «Qadaiqan» is mentioned in the *Mêng-ku yu-mu chi* (POPOV, 323), but remains unidentified; moreover, this may be merely an onomastic coincidence. My conclusion is that there is every probability of our being right if we locate Chinghiz-khan's tomb on the Burqan-qaldun, at the source of the Kerulen, but that we should not adduce, as additional proof, the pseudo-Kântai-ḡan of SCHMIDT's edition of «Sanang Setsen», as has been done hitherto.

A «southern» theory for the tomb of Chinghiz-khan has, however, been proposed, and CORDIER, who summed it up in *Y*, I, 249-250, seems to give it pre-eminence in his *Histoire générale de la Chine*, II, 223. According to this theory, which has taken different forms, Chinghiz-khan's tomb would not be in upper Mongolia, but in the region of the Ordos.

The first Chinese exponent of such a view was 張穆 CHANG Mu, the author of the *Mêng-ku yu-mu chi* (6, 9-10; POPOV, 312-315, where the translation is somewhat abridged; the preface to CHANG Mu's work is dated 1859). CHANG Mu started from the name 伊克昭 I-k'o-chao of the «league» of the Ordos, which is the Mongolian Yäkä-jō (or Yäkä-dzō), meaning «Great Temple» (in Chinese 大廟 *ta-miao*). The 理藩院則例 *Li-fan-yüan tsê-li* («Regulations of the Court of border vassals», under the Manchu dynasty) says that «in the Yäkä-jō League, there is the tomb (園寢 *yüan-ch'in*) of Chinghiz-khan. The seven 'banners' of the Ordos have established five hundred families of *darḡat* to guard the tomb and make sacrifices...» The name Yäkä-jō, according to CHANG Mu, was given because of the tomb, which had never been in northern Mongolia. To determine its location, CHANG resorts to the «Altai» (which he changes to «Altan») and the «Qadai» of the Chinese version of «Sanang Setsen». He connects «Qadai» with an