

his facsimile map (after p. 132) and also by RUGE (HALLBERG, 150). It was equated with Hsi-an-fu by BUCHON, and this has been repeated by HALLBERG; but the identification, based on phonetic analogy, is valueless since the name Hsi-an-fu did not exist in Polo's time, and the city was then known as «Quengianfu» (*q. v.*). In the meantime, CORDIER, whose facsimile map gives «Cinganar», had said that this «Cinganar» was Polo's «Ciagannor» (*L'Extrême-Orient dans l'Atlas Catalan*, 20). I do not think that CORDIER was right. Although I cannot identify «Cinganor» or «Cinganar», the location seems to be too southern for «Ciagannor». Moreover, CORDIER left out of account a name «Ciagamor», the location of which fits «Ciagannor» much better and which was already identified with «Ciagannor» by BUCHON (cf. BUCHON's map after p. 132, and the text p. 134; RUGE reads «Ciaganor»; cf. HALLBERG, 173).

The name Čayān-nōr is fairly common (nine Čayān-nōr are listed in the Index to POPOV, *Mên-gu-yu-mu-czi*, 73), and in Mongol times we find a Čayān-nōr («Čayān-nāūr») as far away as Persia (*Oh*, III, 415). Two Čayān-nōr are mentioned in North China in Polo's time. One, where the prince Ananda resided for a time, was in «Tangut»; it is known mainly from Rašidu-'d-Dīn's account who calls it چغان ناوور Čayān-nāwūr (*Bl*, II, 496, 501; *Y¹*, III, 127 [where «Fanchán Náúr» is a corrupt reading], 132; IV, 162 [which I cannot trace]). Its location is still doubtful. It could not lie as far north as lat. 45° 45' (with east long. 96°) as was supposed by YULE (*Y¹*, III, 133) and given as a fact by HOWORTH (I, 176). Still less could it be lat. 48° 10' and long. 99° 45', as given without comment by PENZER (*Pe*, XLIV), which would carry us north of the Altai, far to the north-western corner of Mongolia. I think that PENZER's «48° 10'» is a misprint for «45° 10'», and that the location is simply due to the fact that there is a Čayān-nōr with approximately such coordinates on our maps. But this Čayān-nōr is out of the question here. Prince Ananda's palace must have been in Shàn-hsi. This makes it difficult, however, to account for the following passage in Rašidu-'d-Dīn as translated by QUATREMÈRE (*Not. et Extr.*, XIII, I, 235; I cannot trace the original Persian text): «When one descends below the Čayān-nōr, one is near the city of Qarā-Hwājah (see «Carachoço») in the Uighur country, where they make good wine.» If I am right, the Čayān-nōr of «Tangut» must have been at a great distance from the region of «Carachoço» or Turfan. Unfortunately, I cannot find any certain mention of the Tangut Čayān-nōr in Chinese sources of the Mongol period (CHANG Hsing-lang, *Chung-hsi chiao-t'ung shih-liao hui-p'ien*, IV, 276, ignores it entirely; *YS*, 100, 2 a, is at least ambiguous). The place remained known, however, at the beginning of the Ming dynasty, and it seems to have been in the region of the Ordos, inside the great bend of the Yellow River, somewhat west of Yü-lin and north of the district of Huai-yüan (now Hêng-shan); cf. *Ti-ming ta tz'ü-tien*, 1086. In 1370, when the Ming armies were active in Shàn-hsi and Kan-su against the last upholders of the Mongol dynasty, a Chinese general, after Lan-chou had been conquered, entered Ning-hsia, and thence proceeded to Čayān-nōr, Tung-shêng (*i. e.* Tohto, at the north-eastern angle of the great bend of the Huang-ho), Ta-t'ung and Hsüan-fu (*i. e.* Hsüan-hua; see «Sindachiu»). This text of the *Ming shih* (126, 6 a; cf. also 124, 2 a) seems decisive in favour of the location adopted in the *Ti-ming ta tz'ü-tien*, and is supported, moreover, by a proposal made in the middle of the 15th cent. to remove to Čayān-nōr a neighbouring garrison of the Ordos.

While much remains to be elucidated in connection with the Čayān-nōr of Tangut, we can reach