

a fairly accurate solution in regard to the Čayān-nōr referred to in Polo's text. Chinese sources often speak of it as 察罕腦兒 Ch'a-han-nao-êrh, sometimes 茶罕腦兒 Ch'a-han-nao-êrh (cf. WANG Hui-tsu², 49, 6a), or, translating the name, as 白海 Pai-hai, «White Sea» (*i. e.* White Lake; cf. YS, 160, 7a; 166, 5a). A «temporary palace» (行宮 *hsing-kung*, sometimes 行殿 *hsing-tien*, or 行營 *hsing-ying*), with clay walls, had been erected there in 1280 under the supervision of 蔡珍 Ts'ai Chên (YS, 11, 2a; 12, 3b; 166, 5a). The *Ti-ming ta tz'ü-tien* is evidently mistaken when it takes the erection of the palace of 1280 to refer to the Čayān-nōr of Tangut.

Different identifications have been proposed for Polo's Čayān-nōr. I leave out of account the one which is given by BENEDETTO (*B*¹, 441) as being due to PENZER and which would locate Čayān-nōr at lat. 48° 10', long. 99° 45'. As I said above, this is the identification adopted by PENZER for the other Čayān-nōr, and, although it is wrong, PENZER is not responsible for a bad blunder which would carry Polo, while on his way from Ning-hsia to Shang-tu, to the other end of Mongolia (cf. moreover *Pe*, 194). CORDIER's assertion (*L'Extrême-Orient dans l'Atlas Catalan*, 20) that the ruins of Polo's Čayān-nōr are at Čayān-ḥoto, «near Kōkō-Ḥoto or Kuei-hua-ch'êng» (*i. e.* near Sui-yüan, just beyond the north-eastern angle of the great bend of the Huang-ho), is also a glaring error. Neither can RICCI-ROSS's suggestion of an unknown «Hsin-hua» (*RR*, 416), whether it be a slip for «Hsüan-hua» or for «Hsing-ho», be retained. DEVÉRIA tentatively identified with Polo's Čayān-nōr the Čayān-tsang where the Emperor Jên-tsung (Buyantu-khan) signed an edict in the seventh month of 1314 (*JA*, 1896, II, 398) and this has been repeated by CHAVANNES (*TP*, 1904, 426). It is true that Jên-tsung, who had left Peking for Shang-tu (see «Ciandu») in the second month of 1314, only returned to Peking in the eighth month (YS, 25, 1a, 2a), and he may well have gone in the course of the seventh month from Shang-tu to Čayān-nōr for hunting purposes. But DEVÉRIA's hypothesis merely rests on the fact that there is a common element *čayān*, «white», in both Čayān-nōr, «White Lake», and Čayān-tsang, «White Granary». This is not enough to establish a real connection between the two names.

A long-accepted theory, partly based on the opinion of Chinese geographers of the 18th cent., located Polo's Čayān-nōr immediately east of the «Anguli-nōr» of our maps, at a place called «Tsagan balgassu» (= Čayān-balyasun, «White City»). This is still the view maintained by YULE (*Y*, I, 297) and by PENZER (*Pe*, 194). If YULE had lived long enough himself to prepare for the press the third edition of his *Marco Polo*, I have no doubt that he would have changed his opinion in view of the information given by BRETSCHNEIDER in *Recherches archéol. et histor. sur Pékin*, 91, 93, 129-131.

One point must be made clear: «Anguli-nōr», though the form is corrupt, represents the very name under which this lake was known in Mongol and even Chin times. In the *Chin shih* (24, 7a), mention is made of it as 昂吉灤 Ang-chi-po, «Ang-chi Lake» (BRETSCHNEIDER's «Ang-chi-[里]li» is the result of some oversight), also called 鴛鴦灤 Yüan-yang-po, «Brahminy-duck Lake». As BRETSCHNEIDER says, the second name is the translation of the first. *Ang-chi*, then pronounced Ang-ki, is the transcription of the Altaic name of the brahminy duck, *Casarca rutila*, and it is sometimes also applied to the cognate species «mandarin duck», which is properly the *yüan-yang* of the Chinese. The oldest Turkish form is *angit* in Kāšyari (BROCKELMANN, 9, where it is left unidentified); in Mongolian, we find *anggir* in the *Secret*