

*History* (§ 78). Later Turkish dialectical forms are *angar*, *angyar*, *angqir*, *angqur* (RADLOV, I, 184, 186, 187), *angqut* (PAVET DE COURTEILLE, *Dict. turc-oriental*, 38), *hangyut* (SHAW, *Vocabulary*, 215), *hangyirt* (at Turfan; cf. VON LE COQ, *Sprichwörter*, 98), *hang-yirta* (read *hangyirt*; in ROSS, *A Polyglot list of birds*, No. 157). I shall not discuss here the various finals *-t*, *-r*, *-rt* in Turkish; in Mongolian, the word is always *anggir* (Kalm. *ängi*), plur. *anggit*. An *-u* vowel in the second syllable occurs only in western Turkish forms, and I suspect that the modern Chinese transcription 昂古里 *Ang-ku-li* is the result of a clerical error for *Ang-chi*[吉]-*li*, rendering an original *anggir*. It is this *anggir* which occurs already as *ang-chi* in the *Chin shih*, but I do not think that it is the transcription of a word really used in Jučen. In Manchu, *anggir niyehe*, «*anggir* duck», was borrowed from the Mongolian at a late date. We have two Jučen vocabularies, one edited by GRUBE, the other unpublished: both give for *yüan-yang* a word \**guyahu* or \**guyahung* which has nothing to do with *anggir*. We are thus led to believe that the *Chin shih* gives us the Mongol name of the lake, either because the Chin inherited this name from the Ch'i-tan, or because the population of the region spoke Mongolian. At any rate, the persistence of the Mongol name from the 12th cent. down to our days precludes the possibility that it might have been superseded by that of Čayān-nōr in the 13th and 14th cents.

Still more than the name, the study of the postal stages and the itineraries between Peking and Shang-tu in the Mongol period proves that Polo's Čayān-nōr cannot be the ruined city east of the Anguli-nōr which was spoken of by TIMKOVSKIĪ, PALLADIUS and YULE, and which is called Čayān-balyasun in Mongolian, and 白城子 *Pai-ch'êng-tzū* in Chinese, both meaning «White City». The discussion, started by BRETSCHNEIDER, has been pursued in much greater detail by YANAI, 752-768. It seems clear that *Pai-ch'êng-tzū* is not Čayān-nōr, but rather the place which in Mongol times was known as 昌州 *Ch'ang-chou*, 寶昌州 *Pao-ch'ang-chou*, and also as 中都 *Chung-tu* (of course different from the old *Chung-tu* = Peking; see «Cambaluc»). The lake called Čayān-nōr by Polo must be the «Pain Čayān-nōr», about 80 li north-east of the «Anguli-nōr», and the «palace» with clay-walls lay probably just south-east of the «Pain Čayān-nōr».

YANAI (pp. 684, 761, 763) has also tried to identify with the palace of Čayān-nōr another *ordo* or *hsing-kung* mentioned in *YS* and certain other Chinese sources. In *YS*, 30, 4 *b*, it is said that, in 1326, «the 清寧殿 *Ch'ing-ning-tien* ('Ch'ing-ning Hall') of Shang-tu was removed to the 伯亦兒行宮 *Pai-i-êrh hsing-kung*». In 1327, «the 欽明殿 *Ch'in-ming-tien* ('Ch'in-ming Hall') was completed at the *Pai-i wo-êrh-to (ordo)*» (*YS*, 30, 7 *a*), and «camels and oxen were given to *Pai-i wo-êrh-to (ordo)*» (*YS*, 30, 8 *a*). The name of the *Pai-i wo-êrh-to* also occurs in the *Ching-shih ta-tien* and in the 禁扁 *Chin pien*. YANAI explains the «Pain» of «Pain Čayān-nōr» as being the Mong. *bayan* «rich», and thinks that the same word is meant by *Pai-i-êrh* or *Pai-i*. The equation of «Pain» with *bayan* is by no means certain. On the other hand, *Pai-i-êrh* cannot render *bayan*, nor be identical with «Pain»; but if we take into account that *Pai-i-êrh* occurs only once, it may be that *êrh* unduly crept into the text (perhaps through a contamination due to *wo-êrh-to*), and that the true reading is *Pai-i* as in all other passages. But even then the phonetic resemblance between the name of the *Pai-i ordo* of the Mongol period and the modern name «Pain Čayān-nōr» is not enough to