

the biography of Uriyangqadai in YS, 121, where the name appears several times. But nothing is said of Ya-ch'ih c. The geographical dictionary *Ti-ming ta-tz'ü tien* published by the Commercial Press, p. 467, registers only Ya-ch'ih a, from the biography of Uriyangqadai, and is content with saying that it is to the east of the *hsien* of Lo-tz'ü; this notice is simply taken from *Ta-Ch'ing i-t'ung chih*, 369, 4 b. As to Ya-ch'ih c, the same dictionary, p. 1257, knows it only as the name of a river in the Kui-chou province, where certain warlike events took place towards the end of the Ming dynasty. Ya-ch'ih c, in this last case, seems to be a purely Chinese name, meaning « Duck Lake ». But I think that the Ya-ch'ih c of YS, 8, 3 b (1274, 1st moon), and of YS, 10, 5 b (1278, 12th moon), is only another way of writing the Yači of Ya-ch'ih a and Ya-ch'ih b, and that the same holds good for the Ya-ch'ih c of *Yung-lo ta-tien*, 19417, 15 a and b. In any case, I can prove that Ya-ch'ih c was used in the Yüan period as a transcription of Yači. An unpublished inscription of 1340, in « spoken » Chinese, reproduces an edict then issued in favour of « the Chiung-chu-ssü of the Yü-an-shan of the city of Yači of Yün-nan » (雲南鴨池城子玉案山筇竹寺); here Yači is written as Ya-ch'ih c. The Yü-an-shan is not here the mountain of that name which is entered in *Ti-ming ta-tz'ü tien*, 235, and which is in the region of Ta-li, but another one, situated on the north-west side of the Tien-ch'ih or Lake of Yün-nan-fu, north-north-east of the Pi-chi-shan (cf. *Ta-Ch'ing i-t'ung chih*, 369, 2 b; *Hsü Yün-nan t'ung-chih kao*, 3, 10-11; 15, 9 b); the Chiung-chu-ssü is a well-known Buddhist temple of the Yü-an-shan (cf. *Ta-Ch'ing i-t'ung chih*, 369, 6 b; *Hsü Yün-nan t'ung-chih kao*, 66, 11-12). It might thus be supposed that Yači was close to the Yü-an-shan, and on the bank of the Lake of Yün-nan-fu, but to the west of Yün-nan-fu itself; and only Yün-nan-fu would be on the site of the former Chih-tung or Shan-shan, second capital of the Nan-chao and later Ta-li kingdom. I do not think, nevertheless, that such a supposition is satisfactory.

The inscription of 1340, like all official documents of the time in « spoken » Chinese, is certainly a translation from the Mongolian; and from its wording, we can be sure that the name of Yači, although already banished from official nomenclature, was still in use in 1340 in Mongolian and in the popular nomenclature of the Chinese even at the Imperial Court. The popular form *ch'êng-tzū*, instead of *ch'êng* alone, also testifies to a Mongol original; the temple Chiung-chu-ssü was certainly said in the original Mongol edict to belong to Yači-balayasan, « the city of Yači ». But that does not mean that it was in the city, which moreover is impossible in view of its actual position; Yači-balayasan must have then been in use in Mongolian as the ordinary form for the whole administrative district the centre of which was at Yači-balayasan, and that would imply that Yači was the most important place in that region.

This importance is also confirmed of course by the fact that both Polo and Rašid say that Yači is the capital of Qara-Jang. In the same way, we read that, after participating in the Tonking campaign of 1257, Uriyangqadai came back to Yači, and, in 1258, when he and his son A-shu (see « Agiul ») had engaged in an unfortunate campaign against the Sung, they wrought vengeance on Yači for the capture of some of their horses by the T'u-la-man (see « Toloman »; I cannot understand why they should have butchered the population of Yači; the text may be corrupt for « returned to Yači »). But what then about Chih-tung (*alias* Shan-shan)? It was certainly the Eastern capital of Nan-chao and, from the itineraries I have studied in *BEFEO*, iv, 368, 374, 376, 377 (add the quotation from *Man shu* in *Hsü Yün-nan t'ung-chih kao*, 15, 10 a), it is to be placed at Yün-nan-fu, in agreement with an