

father, as for instance Činkim (see «Cinchim»), but, as far as I know, Rašid says nothing about the place where Činkim was buried. Moreover, various readings make it difficult to be positive about Rašid's statement which relates to some of the other Chinghiz-khanids. The explicit exclusion of Qubilai and Hülägü from among the children of Tolui who were buried at the «great qoriq» occurs also in another passage of Rašid which is alluded to by BARTHOLD (*Otčët o poézdke*, 20), but which I have not been able to trace. Systematic collation of the readings of all the important mss. of Rašid in the different passages would be necessary to determine, if possible, whether Rašid's various statements are reconcilable. Pending this, we must, I think, admit that the Persian historian excludes from the «great qoriq», among Tolui's children, Hülägü and his descendants on the one hand, and on the other Qubilai, though not Qubilai's descendants, about the burial-sites of whom he could know nothing. It seems hard to believe, however, that, at a time and for a reign of which Chinese history has kept precise records, the YS should err in stating that Qubilai was buried by the side of Chinghiz-khan and Tolui. If there is any foundation in Rašid's exclusion of Qubilai from the «great qoriq», the following solution might be imagined. At the time of Qubilai's death, and owing to the warfare that still raged between the Mongols of China and those of outer Mongolia and Turkestan, a provisional tomb of the late Emperor might have been erected somewhere in the mountains north of Peking, and the actual burial of Qubilai by the side of Chinghiz-khan and Tolui would have taken place only at a later date, when, after Qaidu's death in 1301, the Mongol princes of Mongolia came to terms with Qubilai's successor Tämür. Most of Rašid's text would have been written before Qubilai's remains had been carried to their final resting place at the «great qoriq». But Rašid may still have heard of the transfer, and this would account for the statement at the end of his biography of Chinghiz (*Ber*, III, 99) that Qubilai-qa'an, as well as Mongka-qa'an and Ariq-bögä, were buried by the side of Chinghiz-khan and Tolui. I admit that I can find no trace in Chinese texts of the supposition that Qubilai's burial took place in two stages. But we must not forget that there was a sort of a taboo on the publication of such proceedings, and Chinese history of the Mongol period never goes beyond the bare statement that such and such an Emperor was buried in the Ch'i-lien Valley, without any precision as to the dates and conditions of the burial. As a consequence, I dismiss the otherwise possible hypothesis of a constant and grievous error in the Chinese annals which would have made the Ch'i-lien Valley the site of the tomb of Chinghiz-khan and Tolui when it was merely that of Qubilai and his successors.

II. — In PALLADIUS's *Elucidations of Marco Polo's travels in North-China* (JNCB, x [1876], 12), we find the following statement, which has been copied in *Y*, I, 248, and in *Ch*, I, 195 : «When Khubilai marched out against Prince Nayan, and reached the modern Talnor, news was received of the occupation of the khan's burial ground by the rebels. They held out there very long, which exceedingly afflicted Khubilai; and this goes to prove that the tombs could not be situated much to the West.» PALLADIUS gives the *Yüan-shih lei-pien* as the source for this statement. No comment is made on the passage in FÊNG Ch'êng-chün's Chinese translation of CHARIGNON's book (I, 242); PALLADIUS's reference is, however, very puzzling. Not a word about the khan's burial ground being taken over by the rebels occurs either in the *pên-chi* of the *Yüan-shih*