

lei-pien or in the short notice of Nayan (cf. 30); and I have failed to discover any such passage in the rest of the work. Moreover, there is nothing of the kind in the *pên-chi* of the *YS* itself, nor in the *pên-chi* of T'u Chi or in his account of Nayan (see «Naian»). The texts relating to the other Nayan, the descendant of Bālgütai who has sometimes been confused with Polo's Christian Prince Nayan, are silent too on the point. One must exclude, however, the possibility that PALLADIUS's account was entirely baseless; the Russian sinologist must have found the original statement in some biographical notice, either in the *Yüan-shih lei-pien* or elsewhere. But in any case, no safe conclusion can be reached from this text as to the location of the tombs of the Great Khans. What PALLADIUS calls «the modern Talnor» is not of course the «Tal-nor» west of Kobdo, but the «Dalai-nör» of our maps situated about 120 kilometres north-north-east of Dolōn-nör (see «Barscol»), GERBILLON's «Taal-nor» (in DU HALDE, IV, 167-168), called 魚兒泊 Yü-êrh-po (or 魚兒澤 Yü-êrh-po), «Fish-Lake», 捕魚兒海 Pu-yü-êrh-hai, «Fish-catching Lake», and 苔兒腦兒 Ta-êrh-nao-êrh (*Dar-nör, ? possibly *Dal-nör) in the Mongol period (cf. *Br*, I, 48-49; II, 162-163). BRETSCHNEIDER explains it as Tal^a-nör, «Flat-land Lake», and PRŽEVALSKIĪ and POZDNĚEV have adopted Dalai-nör, «Sea Lake». The original form is doubtful, and may not be either Tal^a-nör, or Dalai-nör, since the transcription of the Mongol period would regularly suggest *Dar-nör, which is indeed supported to some extent by the transcription 達里泊 Ta-li-po, «*Dari Lake», of Chinese geographical works, and by the modern form Dari-yangya (if the two are actually connected; cf. TIMKOVSKI, *Voyage à Péking*, I, 206; POPOV, *Mêng-ku yu-mu czi*, 281, 291; *TP*, 1931, 166). But no form approaching any of these Chinese and Mongol names occurs in the accounts of Qubilai's campaign against Nayan, and we are left entirely in the dark as to the name which PALLADIUS equated with «Tal-nor».

But, whatever the truth on this point may be, it does not affect the question of the location of the Imperial tombs. In a passage translated above (p. 342), Rašid says that when the princes who were under the orders of Nomoyan rebelled (in 1276; see «Nomogan»), most of the chiliarchy guarding the Imperial tombs joined the troops of Qaidu. It is quite probable that, either at that moment, or at the time of Nayan's rebellion, which Qaidu favoured though he did not actually come to Nayan's rescue as he had promised, Qaidu took possession of the «great *goriq*» itself. This would explain Qubilai's grief, as expressed in the text of undetermined origin alluded to by PALLADIUS.

III. — Long after Qubilai's death, the *ordos* of defunct Emperors were still maintained, though we cannot ascertain whether they remained at their original location or were transferred to the vicinity of the tombs; the Chinese custom, which would favour the second solution, need not have been binding for the Mongols. As an illustration, I may quote the four following passages of the *YS*, which occur in the course of three years :

α. (33, 9 a) : «The second year *t'ien-li* . . . , in the eleventh month, . . . on the day *ping-ch'ên* (November 24, 1329) . . . , an Imperial Edict prescribed that the Empresses and concubines and the servants who accompanied (陪從 *p'ei-ts'ung*, the usual term for those who live at the tomb of a deceased Emperor) the [defunct] Saints (*i. e.* Emperors) should be given for ever clothing and grain, fodder and millet.»