

translated (p. 333), though without discussing it from that point of view. P'êng Ta-ya, c. 1232, had described the tomb of Tämüjin, *i. e.* of Chinghiz-khan, without saying where it lay. In his notes dated 1235-1236 to P'êng Ta-ya's account of the Sung embassy of c. 1232, Hsü T'ing adds: «I, [Hsü] T'ing, have seen the tomb of Tämüjin. It is on the side of the 瀘溝河 Lu-kou-ho (Lu-kou-River); mountains and rivers surround it. It is reported that Tämüjin was born there and that for that reason, on his death he was buried there; I do not know whether it be true or not».

The first point to be examined is the identification of the Lu-kou River. We do not know the exact places where the Sung embassies of c. 1232 and of 1235-1236 were received by the Mongols, but it must have been west of the great bend of the Kerulen, in the region of the Tūla. There is not much likelihood that any of them should have gone as far north as the sources of the Onon and the Kerulen in the Kentei Range.

The form of the name used by Hsü T'ing is not quite certain. Lu-kou is given in Lo Chên-yü's edition without any comment, but HUNG Chün (I B, 47) gives 瀘渚 Lu-chu; this is also the reading adopted by T'U Chi (III, 33 *b*), but with a note to the effect that the ms. possessed by Lo Fêng-lu (1850-1903; cf. GILES, *Biogr. Dict.* No. 1385) gives 瀘局 Lu-chü (cf. also NAKA, 581). It may be that Lu-kou is due to the graphic similarity of 渚 *chu* and 溝 *kou*, coupled with the attraction of 盧溝 Lu-kou, another name of the Hun-ho, well known on account of the Lu-kou-ch'iao, «Lu-kou Bridge», the so-called «Marco Polo Bridge» west of Peking (see «Pulisanghin»). But, if we remember the various transcriptions cited above (p. 331) for a name *Lügü or *Lüngü of the Kerulen, it can hardly be doubted that the Kerulen is meant (cf. *TP*, 1935, 166-167). This is the view taken by T'U Chi (III, 33 *b*), while CHARIGNON (*Ch*, I, 201) silently substitutes «Kerulen» for «Lu-kou River» when translating Hsü T'ing's passage.

T'U Chi says that Rašid is in agreement with Hsü T'ing, since both speak of the Kerulen in connection with the tomb of Chinghiz, and, confusing apparently the γ ala'utu Camp of Sa'ari-kä'är with the tomb, finds it natural that P'êng Ta-ya and Hsü T'ing should have seen the tomb when following the main road from Kuei-hua-ch'êng (= Sui-yüan) to the camp of Ögödäi. As a matter of fact, I cannot find anywhere that Rašid speaks of the Kerulen in connection with the tomb, but only of the Burqan-qaldun, which is expressly stated by the *Secret History* to be at the source of the Onon. On the other hand, we do not know whether the Sung envoys travelled to Mongolia *via* Kuei-hua-ch'êng, and not direct from Peking which, since 1215, had been in the hands of the Mongols.

P'êng Ta-ya makes no positive statement that he himself saw the tomb, but his text almost implies it; Hsü T'ing, for himself, says this in so many words. We are thus faced with two possible solutions. Either both envoys of c. 1232 and of 1235-1236 were taken to the site of the tomb, perhaps to do homage to the *manes* of Chinghiz-khan, and Hsü T'ing may have spoken of the Kerulen because the Burqan-qaldun was near the sources of both the Onon and the Kerulen; or P'êng Ta-ya may have given second-hand information, and Hsü T'ing may have mistaken one of Chinghiz-khan's *ordos* (? that of Sa'ari-kä'är) for his tomb (the *YS*, I, 8 *a*, speaks of Chinghiz's return in the spring of 1216 to the «ordo [*hsing-kung*] of the 臚胸河