

of *bularyu*. For similar cases of metathesis, cf., in the Mongol period, *käräl*, «king (of Hungary, etc.)» > *kälär*, and the then current form *Kälürän* as the name of the river Kerulen. Under unknown circumstances, Buralqi, in modern times, has come to designate Kashgarians (cf. VON LE COQ in *Festschrift Kuhn*, 155).

The existence of the *bularyučī* (without the mention of their name) was known to Plan Carpine (*Wy*, 45).

In the beginning of the 14th cent., two Bilarity or Bularyu are known, one with the *ilkhans* of Persia, the other in Egypt (cf. *Ha*<sup>1</sup>, II, 405; *Hist. des Crois.*, Arm., II, 16-17, 867); I explain their name by *bularyu*, without the metathesis met with in Buralqi. The «Burlughi» of QUATREMÈRE, *Hist. des Sultans Mamlouks*, II, II, 211 and 213, must represent the same name, with wrong vocalization; and the would-be «Burlugou», *ibid.*, II, II, 279, is no other than the Mongol Bilarity or Bularyu who was in the service of the *ilkhans*.

## 87. CAAGIU

*caagiu* F, L  
*caagu* LT, TA<sup>1</sup>  
*calacuy* FA

*calcuy* FC<sup>1</sup>  
*calicuy* FB  
*chaagu* TA<sup>3</sup>

*chaangu* VA  
*thaigin* R

Polo says that Chinghiz-khan, six years after he had defeated Prester John (= Ong-khan, see «Uncan»), died from the shot of an arrow received at the siege of a «castle» named «Caagiu». As a matter of fact, Chinghiz-khan survived Ong-khan by some twenty-four years, and there is no likelihood that he died of an arrow-wound (see «Cinghis»). Moreover, the name of «Caagiu» cannot well be accounted for.

YULE (*Y*, I, 245), following OPPERT's suggestion, supposed that a confusion had occurred here between Chinghiz and Mongka, since Mongka was said by some to have died of an arrow-wound, and in any case died in the administrative district of 合州 Ho-chou (Ssü-ch'uan), of which «Caagiu» would be the transcription; this solution is fully accepted in *RR*, 414. Although it makes perhaps the best of a difficult passage, it is open to certain objections. First of all, it is rather strange that Polo should have mistaken Mongka for Chinghiz not only with regard to the cause, but also as to the place, of his death. Moreover, Ho-chou ought to be transcribed \*Cagiu, while all mss. agree in having a longer name, of which «Caagiu» is only one reading.

Without stressing the point, there is another possibility. We may leave out RAMUSIO's «Thaigin» (? < \*Caigiu), where a contamination has perhaps occurred with «Cangiu» (*q. v.*), also read «Thaigin» in RAMUSIO. But FA has «Calacuy», FB «Calicuy», FC<sup>1</sup> «Calcuy». With the usual confusion between *c* and *t*, a form «Calatuy» is possible, and it is even the one which PAUTHIER believed to be the reading of his two mss. and which he adopted in his edition (*Pa*, 183), whence it has passed into *Ch*, I, 186. Starting from it, CHARIGNON (*Ch*, I, 188) tries an