

Yet there is a difficulty. Aq-baliq is mentioned by Rašidu-'d-Din among the cities of Tangut, that is to say of Shàn-hsi and Kansu, which is no part of Manzi. It might be suggested that Aq-baliq being the Turkish form the Mongolian equivalent of which is Čayan-balyasun, Rašid's Aq-baliq may perhaps be the Čayan-balyasun of 甘肅州 Kan-su-chou named in the Mongol period by the 大元馬政記 *Ta-Yüan ma-chêng chi*, 8 a. I do not believe that the obscure Čayan-balyasun of Kan-su-chou can be taken into account here. Han-chung (then named 興元 Hsing-yüan) was, under the Mongol dynasty, in Shàn-hsi (consequently in Tangut) just as it is now (cf. *YS*, 60, 2b), and this must be Rašid's Aq-baliq, thus identical with Polo's; neither of them is in Manzi (see «Mangi»). But here intervenes RAMUSIO's explanation of the name, no doubt going back to Polo himself (the crucial words «de les confin dou Mangi» are already in F, and have equivalents in VA, L, V, VB) : in spite of the literal value of the name, it is said to mean «the White City on the border of Mangi». In other words, Polo does not make it a city of Manzi, but to distinguish it from the other Aq-baliq in Cathay, Persian-speaking people called Han-chung «the Aqbalīq of Manzi» because it was contiguous to Manzi. We must only admit that Polo expressed himself in a loose way when he also said of «Sindufu», *i. e.* Chêng-tu in Ssü-ch'uan, that it was «de le confin dou Mangi». Did Polo use «confin» with the double value of Arab. *ḥudūd*, or of Chin. 界 *chieh*, «boundary» and «territory»?

It is remarkable that Rašidu-'d-Din, who uses the Mongol form Čayan-balyasun when speaking of Chêng-ting-fu, gives the Turkish form Aq-baliq when he refers to Han-chung. In my opinion, the reason is that the accounts of the campaigns of Chinghiz-khan and Tului, which are at the basis of all mentions of Chêng-ting-fu in Rašid, have been translated by him from the chronicle in Mongolian which, translated into Chinese, still exists under the title of *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu*. And this is also the reason why, in his accounts of these campaigns, Rašid uses scholarly transcriptions of Chinese names, while in other parts of his book he uses the popular forms then current among Persians (see «Pianfu», «Taiianfu», «Saianfu»).

I attach no value to the difference in F and other mss. between «Acbalect Mangi», name of the province, and «Acmelec mangi», name of the capital; Polo must have used one and the same form in both cases. The same alternation, equally valueless, occurs between «melic» and «belic» (see «Melic»).

5. ACHBALUCH

achbaluch R

This paragraph appears only in RAMUSIO, but its authenticity is beyond doubt. YULE (*Y*, II, 14) has already given some good reasons for identifying «Achbaluch» with 正定府 Chêng-ting-fu (not «Ch'êng-ting fu» as in *Pe*, 343, 350, and *B*¹, 437), called under the Mongols 眞定府 Chên-ting-fu. CHARIGNON's objections (*Ch*, II, 163, 187) are a marvel of false reasoning, and it is to