

two different places called Aden occur on some old maps, as for instance on that of Martin Behaim.

The name of 'Aden is not traced back with certainty beyond the Middle Ages; but R. DUSSAUD, in *Rev. de l'Hist. des Relig.*, CVIII [1933], 43, 47-48, has shown that it was possibly mentioned, in the 5th cent. B.C., by Ezekiel, XXVII, 23.

11. AGIUL

aguil F
anguil VB

angul R
eguil FA, FB

giel V

Although admitting that the name can be read « Agiul » in the best ms. (F), BENEDETTO (*B*¹, 438) has kept « Aguil » in his edition, and so has RICCI (*RR*, 211), but it is obviously « Agiul » that is correct (*RR*, 410). It is said in *Y*, II, 138, that « Agul » was the *name* of a prince, father of Nayan (see « Naian »), and this has been interpreted in *RR*, 410, and *B*¹, 437, as meaning that the prince « Agul » was the man who fought against Li T'an. *B*¹, 437, adds that, according to CHARIGNON, our « Agiul » is « Arcu », the son of Uriyangqadai. YULE was right in saying that the names are the same, that is to say not « Agul », but أجول Aĵul (cf. *Bl*, II, 94), but the individuals are different. On the other hand, CHARIGNON was equally right when he said that we have here to deal with Uriyangqadai's son, but he only gives the Chinese form 阿朮 A-shu (= Aĵul); « Arcu » itself does not exist (it is not even one of the valueless forms introduced by Ch'ien-lung's commissioners).

If I say that the names are the same, it is partly on the authority of Polo's « Agiul ». Rašidu-'d-Dīn, who mentions our A-shu, calls him simply أجو Aĵu (*Bl*, II, 449), and the Chinese form A-shu (once 兀朮 Wu-shu in *YS*, 127, 1 b) does not permit us in itself to decide between *Aĵu and Aĵul; on the other hand, Aĵul, father of Nayan, is called in Chinese 阿朮魯 A-shu-lu (*YS*, 107, 3 b). But Waśśāf (*Ha*², 40; *Oh*, II, 397), who also speaks of our A-shu, calls him أجون Aĵun, easily miswritten for Aĵul, and so supports indirectly Polo's « Agiul ». There are several A-shu and several A-shu-lu named in *YS* (cf. WANG Hui-tsu¹, 17, 10 a-b), and it is possible that the real name of all of them is Aĵul. Unfortunately, I do not know the origin of the name, nor its meaning. The question is made still more obscure by the form given to the name of Uriyangqadai's son in Rašid's account of Mongol and Turkish tribes; there that son is called أجوقان Uĵuqan (in the doubtful passage missing in *Ber*, I, 146, and thus restored in the introductory remarks to the Persian text, p. xiv) and أجو Uĵu (p. 197). The first labial vowel falls in with one of the Chinese transcriptions. It looks as if the name actually was *Aĵu, also pronounced *Uĵu; Waśśāf's « Aĵun » would show the instable paragogical -n of Mongol endings, and Polo's « Agiul » would only provide one more example of a copyist's final flourish mistaken for an -l or -r. In such a case, « Agiul » would have nothing to do with the other well-attested name Aĵul.

Whatever may be the true name, the A-shu mentioned in Li T'an's biography (and in *YS*,