

Polo must also have used a form with *m*, either «Cinchim» as in Chinese, or «Cimchin» with the Persian metathesis; that is why I have adopted «Cinchim». The problem is always that of divergent interpretations by copyists of an *-ī*, which could be read as *-in* or as *-im*. The mss. do not vouchsafe any definite conclusion.

The name given to Qubilai's eldest son is purely Chinese, and Rašidu-'d-Dīn must have thought so to divide it into its two elements. As Chên-chin was born in 1243, it is somewhat surprising to see Qubilai give him a Chinese name. At such a date, when the supreme power was in Ögödäi's branch, Qubilai could not have foreseen the accession of his own branch, nor the early death of Mongka, nor the later circumstances which, from a nomad of Upper Mongolia, turned him into an Emperor in China. But Qubilai was always attracted by what was foreign to his native land, and so his eldest son was named Dorji, which is Tibetan rDo-rje, *vajra*, «diamond». Moreover, a Buddhist priest of the Lin-chi school, born in Shàn-hsi in 1202, 海雲 Hai-yün, had probably come into touch with one of Chinghiz-khan's sons already in 1214. At any rate he found real favour with the first Mongol Emperors, and seems to have been responsible for the name given to Qubilai's eldest son (cf. H. KUNISHITA, in *Tōyō gakuhō*. XI, 547-577; XII, 89-124, 245-249).

Chên-chin was nominated Heir-Apparent in 1273; he died on January 5, 1286; his biography is in YS, 115, 2a-4b, and, with additional matter and with notes, in T'u Chi, 76, 1a-4a.

The same name, Chên-chin, was borne in the middle of the 14th cent. by a son of the Emperor Shun-ti who died when he was one year old (YS, 114, 4b).

157. CINGHIANFU

chinghianfu FB
chyngghiamfu FBt
cianghianfu Ft, Z
cigianfu P⁵
cigiansu, *gigiansu* Pr
cinghiafu TA¹, TA³

cinghianfu F, Fr, L, Z; R
cinghiansu LT
cinghinanfu F
cinghyanfu Z
cingiafu, *çingiafu* VB
cingianfu Lr, VA

cinginanfu FAt
cygianfu, *syangfu* P
cymgiansu, *cyngiasu* G
giginafu V
pingianfu VL

Ch. 鎮江府 Chên-chiang-fu, on the southern bank of the Yang-tzū. All particulars about Chên-chiang and the ancient Christians there have been collected and studied by MOULE and L. GILES in *TP*, 1915, 627-686; cf. also *Mo*, 145-165, and see here «Marsarchis».

For Odoric's «Mençu», etc. (*Wy*, 470), which has been sometimes associated tentatively with Chên-chiang (cf. HALLBERG, 350; *TP*, 1915, 412; *Pe*, LII; *Wy*, 470), I rather side with those who see in it Ming-chou, the ancient name of Ning-po; but I must add that Odoric's data as to the position of «Mençu» can hardly be reconciled with such an identification.