

to a wrong arabization; although Bärkä became a Mussulman, his name was never changed. Cf. also *EI. s. v. «Berke»*.

Ĵuwainī (I, 144, 215, 221) calls him بركه Bärkä (with بركا Bärkä in one ms.), and so does Waśśāf (*Ha*², 92) when he speaks of بركه اغول Bärkä-oyul, «prince Bärkä». We find also بركه Bärkä in Rašidu'-d-Dīn when Rašid gives the genealogy of Ĵöči's branch, but I am at a loss to explain why Rašid calls him بركاي Bärkäi in the rest of his book (*Bl*, II, 138, 139, 433, etc.), hence «Barcai» in *Oh*, II, 251, and in the genealogies at the end of *Oh*, III; here, Rašid's source cannot be Ĵuwainī. The name of the prince 別兒哥 Pie-êrh-ko (*Bärgä, for Bärkä) occurs in *YS*, 3, *pên-chi* of the year 1251. Polo's form is in complete agreement with Plan Carpine's «Berca» (*Wy*, 66); Hethum the historian writes «Barcha», and we find «Bareque» in the *Gestes des Chiprois* (*Hist. des Crois.*, Arm., II, 891). Although Abū'l-Ghāzī also writes Bärkä, his mss. often give برك and بركه Bürkä (cf. DESMAISONS, *Hist. des Mogols*, II, 181); but it is simply a wrong form which ought not to have been adopted by the editors of *Hist. des Crois.*, Arm., II, 891 («Bourkai») and which does not deserve BLOCHET's attempt at an etymological interpretation (*Bl*, II, 114; moreover, *bürgä* means «flea» and not «partridge» in Turkish).

The *YS*, 3, in the *pên-chi* of 1253, says that 必闌別兒哥 Pi-shê-pieh-êrh-ko was (or were) then sent to make a census in Russia (this census of the Russians and the Alans is also mentioned in *YS*, 63, 16a, but without names; it is the census which Kirakos places in 1254 [cf. BROSSET, *Deux historiens arméniens*, I, 175; PATKANOV, *Istoriya Mongolov*, II, 78]). BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, II, 80) thought that *pi-shê* was a shortened form of 必闌赤 *pi-shê-ch'ih* (cf. Uigh. *bitikči*, etc., Mong. *bičigäči*), well attested as meaning «secretary». As to Pieh-êrh-ko (*Bärgä, Bärkä), he proposed to see in him one of the commissioners of a census of 1259 whom the Russian chronicles call Berkai. T'u Chi (6, 7b), on the contrary, considered that two men's names were referred to, restored Pi-shê as another transcription of Batu (which is impossible), and identified Pieh-êrh-ko with the prince Bärkä. I am afraid that both explanations may have to be discarded. From *YS*, 85, 2b, and *Yüan tien chang*, 21, 34a (cf. P. RATCHNEVSKY, *Un code des Yuan*, 123), we see that officers called 別里哥 *pieh-li-ko* were employed to levy taxes. Although the Mongol original of the title is still unknown, it is probable that we must read it as **bärgä* (= **bärkä*). In such a case, *pi-shê[-ch'ih]* and **bärgä* would have been sent to the Russians and the Alans in 1253 and in speaking of a «Berkai» in 1259, the Russian chronicles would have taken the title of an officer for the name of a man. But I cannot as yet give this as a final solution.

Batu died at the end of 1254, or more probably early in 1255 (see «Batu»), and was succeeded by his eldest son Sartaq (more or less a Christian, he was the man to whom Rubrouck carried a letter addressed by St Louis). Very soon afterwards, Sartaq died childless, and, after the short reign of Sartaq's brother Ulayči, the rule of the Golden Horde passed in 1256 or 1257 (1257 according to BARTHOLD, *12 Vorlesungen*, 171) to Ĵöči's third son, Batu's younger brother Bärkä, born c. 1206-1208 (cf. BLOCHET, *Moufazzal*, 118). Bärkä died in 1265 or 1266 (cf. *Ha*¹, 254-255; *Bl*, II, 549; BARTHOLD, in MINAEV's *Marko Polo*, 5, and in *12 Vorlesungen*, 171, is in favour of 1266). Bärkä was the first Chinghiz-khanid to become a Mussulman. He was already a Mussulman when Rubrouck heard of him in 1253-1255 (*Wy*, 209).

Mufazzal quotes from a «Life» of Baibars the following description of Bärkä's appearance