

be regretted that they should have caused hesitation in *B*¹, 437. «Achbaluch» is the pure Turkish Aq-balīq, and means «White City» (*balīq*, *balīγ*, is not Mongolian in spite of *Y*¹, II, 14, and *Ch*, II, 162, 163). YULE's opinion about the names given by the Mongols to Imperial residences is devoid of significance (in spite of STRAHLENBERG; cf. *Y*, II, 35), but the same author uses a more solid argument when he remarks that the Mongol equivalent of Aq-balīq would be Čayān-balyasun, and that Rašidu-'d-Dīn speaks of «Chaghan Balghasun which the Chinese call *Jintsinfu*». In favour of the equivalence of the last form to Chên-ting-fu (Chêng-ting-fu), YULE quotes the itinerary copied by Mir 'IZZET ULLAH in 1812, which gives (*JRAS*, No. XIV [1847], 308) «Jig zing fu جگزننگفو», corrected by YULE to «Jingdzinfu». This has to be abandoned. The itinerary of 1812 gives only modern forms, although the copy is very faulty, and we must almost certainly read جنگدننگفو Jīngdingfu. But the text, or rather the texts, of Rašidu-'d-Dīn remain, and I can quote four different passages, in *Bl*, II, 216 (where the form جندین فو Jīndīn-fu of his two mss. has been arbitrarily altered to چینگ دین فو Čīng-din-fu by the editor), in Rašidu-'d-Dīn's «Life» of Chinghiz-khan (*Ber*, III, 21, 29; Persian text, 33, 47, «Čayān-balyasun, which in the language of the Chinese is called جینگ زین فو Jīng-zīn-fū»; the Chinese parallel texts of the campaign mention here Chên-ting-fu), and finally in Rašid's unpublished «History of China», a manuscript translation of which I owe to the kindness of Dr. R. LEVY. We should expect Jīng-din-fu or Jīndin-fu in all passages of Rašid; but Rašid, owing to different sources, has often two spellings, one more scientific, the other more popular. It is possible that the *t*- of *ting*, heard of course by the Mongols as a sonant, had received a spirant palatalization, somewhat analogous to the one which, out of Chin. 頂子 *ting-tzū*, «knob of official cap», has given to-day *jingzǎ* in Turkī and in Mongolian.

Šāh-Rūḥ's envoys passed in 1420 through صدین فور, which has been read «Sadinfur» and corrected into «Sadinfu»; REINAUD and YULE (cf. *Y*, I, 278, 285) long ago proposed to see here also Chêng-ting-fu. The *śad* often renders a palatal č-, there is no vowel written in the first syllable, and I think the real reading is very probably صدین فو Sīndin-fu = Chên-ting-fu.

In *Bl*, II, 448, 449, Rašidu-'d-Dīn mentions سمکه بهادر *Sämkä (?) - [or *Šämkä-]bahadur in connection with Čayān-balyasun; Sämkä(?) - bahadur seems to be an epithet of 史天澤 Shih T'ien-tsê (BLOCHET's attempts to explain this last purely Chinese name through Mongolian and Manchu are futile), although I find no trace of it in Shih T'ien-tsê's biography (*YS*, 155, 4b-7a; T'u Chi, 78, 1-6). It is perfectly true that Shih T'ien-tsê was early in command at Chên-ting, where he came back to die in the beginning of 1275; but Rašid is mistaken when he gives at this point his account of the submission of Čayān-balyasun under Mongka.

RAMUSIO, our only source here, writes «Achbaluch». Now, Fra Mauro, in 1459, mentions on his map a city «Hacbaluch» near a city «Zouza» (*Zu*, 36; HALLBERG, 224, 236, where «Gouza» is not the form actually given on the map). «Hacbaluch» is certainly a wrong form of «Achbaluch», and it cannot be an abbreviation for «Acbaluc Mangi», since «Acbaluc Mangi» is also mentioned by Fra Mauro. But, if we note that «Zouza» is very near the abnormal forms «Gouza» and «Çonça?» peculiar to R and Z respectively for «Giogiu», the inference may be drawn that Fra Mauro knew, among others, a manuscript of Polo very close to the one which gave to RAMUSIO his «Achbaluch» and which is also represented, in an abridged form, by Z.