

place called Hai-chou in the *Yung-lo ta-tien*. Of course, this Hai-chou has nothing to do with the Hai-chou (now Tung-hai-hsien) in Northern Chiang-su, and can only be Hai-mên, on the coast east of T'ung-chou, and a great centre of salt production at least since Sung times. The difficulty is that the name of Hai-chou has not been registered for Hai-mên in the *YS*, nor in the *Ta-Ch'ing i-t'ung chih*, nor is it given for this place in the *Ti-ming ta-tz'ü tien*. With changes of locality corresponding to those of the sea-line, the place has only since the 11th cent. been officially registered as the *hsien* (and the *t'ing* under the Ch'ing) of Hai-mên. But we know of a number of cases when the data of official histories have to be supplemented by information from other sources. And the express mention of Hai-chou in the *Yung-lo ta-tien*, coupled with Polo's «Cingiu» < *Caigiu, obliges us to conclude that Hai-chou was one of the names given to Hai-mên during the Yüan dynasty, and probably the one which was popularly current.

From Polo's acquaintance with the local conditions at Hai-chou = Hai-mên, it seems evident that he had been there; he personally knew also the gabelle works at Ch'ang-lu (see «Ciangu»), and was acquainted with those of I-chêng (see «Singiu»). In the introduction to my notes, I state what conclusions we may be entitled to draw from these facts.

160. CINGSAN and see BAIAN CINGSAN

Used by Polo in «Baian cingsan», *q. v.* This is the Chinese 丞相 *ch'êng-hsiang*, «Minister». F writes «cinq san» (not «cincsan» as in *B*, 134, followed by *RR*, 412, and *B*¹, 438), but Polo's original form can only be «cingsan», and we find «Bajam Cingsan» in Pipino's chronicle published by MURATORI, *Script.* IX, b. iii, ch. 47; «cinq san» is perhaps a copyist's error due to the French word «cinq».

Ch'êng-hsiang has passed into Mongolian under the form *čingsang* (cf. SCHMIDT, *Gesch. der Ost-Mongolen*, 121, 123); it is written *činksan* in Armenian (with the Armenian hardening of -g into -k; cf. PATKANOV, *Istoriya Mongolov*, I, 52, 89-90). Rašidu-'d-Din writes regularly چينكساند *čingsang* (cf. QUATREMÈRE, *Hist. des Mongols*, 76-78, where we find also the spelling چنكسند *čingsang* from Waśśāf; *Bl*, II, 470, 472). But the «Chyansam» of *Y*, II, 150, must be excluded; this is a personal name, Hsiang-shan (cf. *Mo*, 264).

The Mongol emperors of Peking sometimes awarded the title of *ch'êng-hsiang* to high officials of the *ilkhan* in Persia, as in the case of Buya (see «Boga») in 1286 (cf. *Ha*¹, I, 422). BLOCHET (*Bl*, I, 235-236) says that the ambassador from Peking who arrived in Persia in 1326 conferred on the emir Čuban a high Chinese title which he believes to be *ch'êng-hsiang*, although he adds that the *YS*, dealing only with China, is silent on this event. But BLOCHET is mistaken. The mission which arrived in Persia in 1326 was dispatched from China in 1324; it is duly recorded in *YS*, 29, 7 b, with the mention of the Chinese titles which were conferred on Čuban; but the title of *ch'êng-hsiang* is not one of them.