

unbroken and credible record in Chinese tradition. Let us now see what Uriyangqadai's biography says. Qubilai, then only a prince, had conquered the city of Ta-li in 1253 and gone back to the north, leaving the command to Uriyangqadai who was to bring to an end the war with the Ta-li kingdom by conquering its eastern half, that is to say the region of the second capital, the modern Yün-nan-fu. We are then told that, in 1254, Uriyangqadai detached certain troops who attacked the « second capital » (附都 *fu-tu*) Shan-shan, and then attacked and sacked the « Water-city » (水城 *Shui-ch'êng*) of the Qara-Ĵang, « who are the Black Barbarians » (Wu-Man). Prior to that, Uriyangqadai's troops had had to overcome the resistance offered by one of the Ta-li generals at what is to-day the *hsien* of Lo-tz'ü, and after that they laid siege to Ya-ch'ih, « the capital of the Black Barbarians »; Ya-ch'ih, being protected on three sides by the Tien-ch'ih (Lake of Yün-nan-fu), naturally enjoyed a strong defensive position. This is followed by a fairly detailed account of the siege and the fall of Ya-ch'ih.

I cannot help thinking that there is something wrong in this text. Uriyangqadai's biography in *YS*, 121, contains many exaggerated and inaccurate statements, some of which have been pointed out in the new notice written by T'u Chi, 29, 14*b*-17*b*. It is clear that the compilers have combined, not always very happily, more or less scanty official statements with the narrative of a private document, probably the « temple-tablet » (廟碑 *miao-pei*) of Uriyangqadai which is sometimes quoted in the notes of the *Yüan-shih lei-pien*, and, from it, in the notes of Ch'ien-lung's editors at the end of *YS*, 121. The official document spoke of the conquest by Uriyangqadai's troops of Shan-shan, the « second capital », that is to say the second capital of the Ta-li kingdom. The *miao-pei* spoke of the siege of Yači, capital of the Qara-Ĵang taken in its broad sense, that is to say of the Ta-li kingdom also (see « Caragian »). Both places must be the same, but the compilers of *YS* have badly combined two texts, one using the official Chinese nomenclature, the other the popular Mongolo-Chinese names. The order itself in the biography betrays a double origin. Uriyangqadai's troops start from Ta-li, and the events at Lo-tz'ü ought to be mentioned before the capture of Shan-shan, and also the siege of Yači should precede this capture, if Yači was different from Shan-shan and to the west of it. The careless redaction of *YS* has often been denounced; it is well known that it goes to the extent of giving two separate biographies of Sübötai without suspecting that they relate to one and the same man; that is more surprising than to see, as here, the two names of one town taken as referring to two different places. I conclude that Yači is just another name of Chih-tung and Shan-shan, that is to say of Yün-nan-fu.

One point remains obscure : what is the origin of the name Yači ? It is not given by any text before the Mongol period, yet it must then have been in popular use instead of Chih-tung and Shan-shan. No satisfactory answer is possible for the present. Chih-tung which appears to be purely Chinese was an early designation, already in use in the 8th cent., but Shan-shan is said to belong to the language of the Nan-chao, and this is probably right (the spelling is well fixed; we find nevertheless 善闡 Shan-shan in *YS*, 61, 1*a*, and 善善 Shan-shan in *YS*, 167, 2*b*). It has been suggested (*Bl*, II, 494) that Yači was possibly altered from 姚州 Yao-chou, since it is said in *YS*, 61, 1*a*, that Yün-nan-fu is the ancient Yao-chou. But this must be an error of the *YS* compilers; the ancient Yao-chou was much to the west of Yün-nan-fu (cf. also *TP*, 1905, 17); and I do not exclude the possibility that the hasty compilers of *YS* may have themselves wrongly introduced Yao-chou under the