

(lit. 'precious jade', *pao-yü*); that his road passed through Sha-chou (see 'Saciou') and that he encountered there the revolt of 火忽 Huo-hu (Hoqu); that [Wang] Hsiao-chung had escaped and had come for orders; and that [he ought] to be ordered to till the ground in Kua[-chou] and Sha-chou. The Emperor agreed» (YS, 9, 2 a). Hoqu (see also «Barac») was Güyük's third son, and took Qaidu's side when Qaidu rebelled against Qubilai; the present text proves that Hoqu's rebellion cannot be dated later than 1275. But the most interesting feature of the text is that it shows that, in 1275, Qubilai would and could send people to work for him in Badaḥšān, which was thus outside the territory of the *ilkhans* of Persia. It must be this text of 1276 which is alluded to in Y, III, 34, with PARKER's erroneous remark that it is the first mention of Badaḥšān in Chinese sources (the Pa-ta-shan of 1276 must not be confused with the Pa-ta[達]-shan mentioned in 1275, YS, 8, 10 a; the latter was north of the great bend of the Yellow River; cf. T'u Chi, 7, 31 a).

The text of 1276 is important for another reason. When Rabban Ḥauma and the future Mār Yahbalaha III undertook their pilgrimage to the Holy Land, they arrived at Khotan (see «Cotan), where the King «Oqo», having rebelled against Qubilai, had sought refuge (cf. CHABOT, *Hist. de Mar Jabalaha III*, 22-23). This king «Oqo», who has not hitherto been identified (cf. *Mo*, 100), is certainly the prince Hoqu, Güyük's son; Rašīd writes his name ھوق Hoqu (*Bl*, II, 5), with the weak *h*- not marked in Uighur-Mongol spelling. If Hoqu's rebellion occurred, as I think, in 1275, that would give us the clue, so long desired, for fixing the chronology of the two monks' journey.

48. BAGHERLAC

bagherlac L
barchelac VB
barcholach V
bargelach R

bargeolach LT
bargherlac F
bargolac VA

bargolach P
barguelac FB
barguerlac FA

This is the sand-grouse (*Syrhaptes Pallasii*, a kind of *Pterocles*); the common Chinese name, 沙雞 *sha-chi* («sand-fowl»; not «*sha-ch'i*» as in Y, I, 273), is applied also to other birds. The name given by Polo is Turkish; we find already *bayırlaq* in Kāšyarī (BROCKELMANN, 18). ZENKER's *boyurtlaq* must be wrong, but *bayırtlaq* is known in Osm. and Čay. (RADLOV, IV, 1452, 1455). For Turkī (in Chin. Turkestan), SHAW (*Vocab.*, 210) gives بېيتاق *bayıtaq* (with the usual dropping of *-r* in the western Turkī pronunciation); I have myself heard the form *bayırtaq* used in Turfan and Qomul; LE COQ (*Sprichwörter... von Turfan*, 84) has noted another form *bäyriltāq* in Turfan; cf. also E. D. ROSS, *A polyglot list of birds*, 129; RADLOV omits the Turkī forms by oversight.

With the sole exception of L, all the mss. have an *-r* at the end of the first syllable («*bargherlac*», «*bargelach*», etc.), but there should not be two *r*'s in the word. Even before