

brothers. But there is another difficulty. Baraq died at the latest in 1271, and Abaya in 1282, so there must have been at least eleven years between the two events.

According to Rašīdu-'d-Dīn (*Bl*, II, 9, 435), Baraq had been brought up under Qubilai's care, and Qubilai sent him to take over the *ulus* of Čayatai in order to fight against Qaidu; but after a battle which was won by Qaidu, they came to terms and joined together in opposing Qubilai and Abaya (cf. also T'u Chi, 74, 6 b-7 a).

WANG Hui-tsu (31, 2) finds nine Pa-la in *YS*, but it may be that not all of the nine names have to be read as Baraq. Anyhow, it is our Baraq who appears in *YS*, 5, 5 b, when, in the second moon of 1263, an edict prescribes the purchase of 129 horses for the dismounted soldiers of prince Pa-la (Baraq). Also, in the first moon of 1275 (*YS*, 7 a), the order is given to recover the 34 gold and silver tablets of the princes Qaidu and Pa-la (Baraq); Baraq had then been dead for four years. In the fifth moon of 1268 (*YS*, 6, 6 b), 60,000 pieces of silk were granted to the princes Hoqu (see «Badascian») and 八刺合 Pa-la-ha; in spite of T'u Chi, the situation which obtained at that time between Qubilai and Baraq leaves some doubt as to whether we should also restore Pa-la-ha as Baraq.

If it be true that the elder Polos stayed in Bukhara from 1262 to 1265, which is still for instance BARTHOLD's opinion (*12 Vorlesungen*, 193), and if Baraq ascended the throne only at the end of 1265 or the beginning of 1266, Polo's text is hardly accurate, and the inference has already been drawn that perhaps the elder Polos found Baraq at Bukhara only on their homeward journey.

57. BARGU

bachu V

baigu F, FAt

banchu TA¹

banchum TA³

bangu Fr, t, LT

bargu L, VA, VL

bargu FA, FB, L, L¹, P; R

bergu VB

*B*¹, 438, says that the name and the identification are doubtful, and even alludes to the absurd hypothesis of *Ch*, I, 223-224, according to which the name of «Bargu» might be identical with that of Lake Baikal. But the name has been definitely ascertained, and the general localization too; YULE (*Y*, I, 270-271), availing himself of PALLADIUS's *Elucidations*, has already made a clear statement of the case, which can nevertheless be supplemented and corrected in some details.

Fra Mauro's would-be «Baregu» (HALLBERG, 68) is a mistake of ZURLA (*Zu*, 36); actually, the map gives the correct form «Bargu».

The name of «Bargu» may be the same as that of the 拔野古 Pa-yeh-ku of Chinese texts