

wrong in thinking it to be Mongol; it has not even been borrowed by the Mongols, and no text in the Mongol language gives it; in Turkish, *balīq* is already known in the runic inscriptions, and is listed for «town» in Kāšyarī (BROCKELMANN, 29); it has survived to the present day. Rašīdu-'d-Dīn's mss. hesitate between خان باليق Ḥan-balīq and خان باليغ Ḥan-balīy (Bl, II, 456); Waśśāf (*Ha*², 45) writes خان باليغ Ḥan-balīy. We find «Cambaliech» in Montecorvino (*Wy*, 347) as well as in the much-debated letter attributed to *Peregrinus de Castello* (*Wy*, 367). Odoric's form is «Cambalec» (*Wy*, 471, 475, 478), which also appears in the Emperor's and the Alans' letters of 1336 (cf. *Y*¹, III, 181, 183), and in Marignolli (*Wy*, 526, 529); hence «Chambalech» on the Catalan Map (*Y*¹, I, 301). Andrea da Perugia writes in Latin «Cambaliensis civitas» (*Wy*, 374). Pegolotti's very bad transcriptions provide us with a «Gamalec» (*Y*¹, III, 149). The name has long survived among Turkish- and Persian-speaking peoples. In 1419-1421, Šāh-Rūḥ's envoys always speak of خان باليق Ḥan-balīq, but the *Zafār-namāh* has «Ḥan-balīy» (cf. *Not. et Extr.* XIV, I, 395, 401, 500). The ms. Sino-Uighur Vocabulary of the Ming dynasty in the School of Oriental Studies («Kö Kwö i yü») writes 罕里 Han-pa-li = Ḥan-balīq, with its Chinese equivalent, Pei-ching, Peking. Cf. also the «Kambaluk» and «Chaan balug» in WITSEN (1785), I, 277, 495. For other Mussulman writers who, from the middle of the 13th cent. down to the end of the 17th, have named Ḥan-balīq or Ḥan-balīy, see *Fe*, 711. In the first years of the 17th cent., Matteo RICCI was able to satisfy himself that the Mussulmans from the West still called Peking by the very name Polo had used (cf. TACCHI-VENTURI, *Opere stor. del P. M. Ricci*, I, 296-297, 377; II, 352). The name has now been forgotten for more than a century; the itinerary copied in 1812 by Mir 'Izzet Ullah has already بچين Bājīn, the only form known to-day in Chinese Turkestan (*JRAS*, No. XIV, 308, where the name is miswritten and misread بچين «Peḥin»); LE STRANGE [*Nuzhat al-Qulūb*, transl., 235, 250] is mistaken when he thinks that the name of Peking could already have existed in the first half of the 14th cent.). In the transcriptions of Ḥan-balīq, the variations between ^obaluc and ^obalec are due to the peculiar nature of Turk. *ī* (see «Achbaluch»).

It would most probably be wrong to suppose that the name of Ḥan-balīq, as applied to Peking, originated when Qubilai moved the capital there in 1260. The Syriac work on Mār Yahbalaha III speaks of Bar Čauma's father who lived «in the town called Ḥan-balīq, that is to say the Royal town of the land of the East»; and the time when that father could have lived in Ḥan-balīq is 1240-1250 at the latest. Of course, it might be suspected that the author, writing at the beginning of the 14th cent., used the name current in his own age; but there are no traces in the work of a modernized nomenclature (see CHABOT, *Hist. Mar Jabalaha III*, 9, and *Mo*, 94). The name of Ḥan-balīq appears also in the *Tables* of Našīru-'d-Dīn Aṭ-Ṭūsī (cf. *Fe*, 358), who is said by FERRAND to have died in 1261; but FERRAND is wrong; the death of Našīru-'d-Dīn occurred in June 1274 (cf. BROWNE, *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, II, 485). In fact, I think that the name of Ḥan-balīq was given in Central Asia to Peking while it was still the capital of the Chin, that is prior to 1215, and had perhaps then been in use already for a whole century. It is met with even earlier, but as an epithet for another capital (= Ch. *ti-ch'êng*, «Imperial City»): in the Uighur translation of Hsüan-tsang's biography, Ḥan-balīqī is the designation of the then capital Ch'ang-an (Hsianfu); cf. A. VON GABAIN, *Die uig. Uebersetzung*