

with what has now become the portion of the Grand Canal until it meets with the lower Hu-t'o-ho. MOULE in 1915 (*TP*, 1915, 400) thought that the Ling-chou of the itinerary of 1276 was the modern Ling-hsien; this is not quite correct. The modern Ling-hsien is the ancient Tê-chou; and the modern Tê-chou is the ancient Ling-chou, afterwards Ling-hsien; the exchange of names dates only from the Ming dynasty (see for instance *Ti-ming ta tz'ü-tien*, 791, 867). So the Ling-chou of the Imperial envoys of 1276 is in principle the modern Tê-chou (now Tê-hsien), on the banks of the former Wei-ho and now of the Grand Canal (it may nevertheless be that the Wei-ho flowed then a little more to the east than it does now, and that the Ling-chou of the Mongol period was somewhere between the present Tê-hsien and the present Ling-hsien). The Ling-chou of the Mongol dynasty must be Polo's «Ciangli».

I had reached this conclusion before I found what I believe to be the true explanation of Polo's toponym. Under the Sung and Chin and at the beginning of the Mongol dynasty, Ling-chou (= modern Tê-chou, Tê-hsien) had always been called the *hsien* of 將陵 Chiang-ling (Tsiang-ling); it became Ling-chou only in 1253, reverted to a *hsien* in 1265, but was promoted again to a *chou* in 1266. The envoys of 1276 used the new administrative name, but the name of the *hsien*, in use for centuries, did not die out immediately from popular usage, and it is the one Polo heard. «Ciangli» is Chiang-ling; the «Ciangli» of the mss. must stand for *Ciangli = *Cianglin, the fall of the final *-n* being due perhaps to the attraction of «Cianglu».

«*Cianglin» and «Cianglu» are examples, in Polo, of notations in *-ng*, and not simply in *-n*, of Chinese finals in *-ng*; others are «Cingsan» and «Scieng». We have many similar cases in Rašidu-'d-Dīn when the Persian historian has to deal with terms which had not taken a «spoken» form in Mongolian — and Persian — speaking circles (see «Pianfu»), or when he wants to be quite accurate (see «Quinsai»). CHARIGNON, who declares it necessary to divide the names into «Cian-gli» and «Cian-glu» (*Ch*, III, 5), nevertheless maintains the usual division a little further on (*Ch*, III, 8). And we have only to accept here Polo's forms at their face value, with *-ng* for Ch. *-ng*.

One difficulty remains. In this note, I have not taken into account the city of «Cianglu» mentioned by Polo as lying between «Cacanfu» and «Ciangli»; for a discussion of the point, see «Cianglu».

150. CIANGLU

<i>cagnul</i> VB	L ¹ , VL, R, S	<i>cyanglu</i> FB, P
<i>chiuanglu, cinuanglu, zinuan-</i>	<i>cianglu</i> Z	<i>cyangula</i> G
<i>glu</i> VA	<i>cinaglu</i> Fr	<i>cynamguy</i> FB ²
<i>ciaglu</i> TA ¹ , TA ³	<i>cionglu, ciunglu</i> LT	<i>zanglo</i> V
<i>cianglu</i> F, Ft, FA, LT, Z, L,	<i>ciuglu</i> TA ¹	

From the days of MARSDEN and MURRAY, the place has been identified with Ts'ang-chou, on the Grand Canal. PAUTHIER, however, pointed to the name of 長蘆 Ch'ang-lu, not far from