

(\*Sək-ka-šjəm; cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 164) and by Al-Bīrūnī, is Skāšim > Iškāšim; I think « Scascem » would be more correct than « Scassem »; Polo never uses -ss- for -s-, and -ss- may here be corrupt for -sc-. As may be seen on the map of Y, I, 178, Ishkashm, on the left bank of the Pānj, is much to the east of Kishm. On the place, cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 165, 219; STEIN, *Serindia*, I, 61-62; RR, 433; LENTZ, in ZDMG, 1932, 10-12, 31. In 982-983, the *Hudūd al-ʿĀlam* (25 b) reads سڪاشم i. e. Skāšim; cf. Mi, 121, 366 (where I should prefer to read Al-Bīrūnī's form as Skāšim rather than Sikāšim).

## 332. SCIENG

fieng P

scieng F, FA, L, LT, VA

sian V

Palace

scien F

scieng VA

sieng VB

sinech VL

stieng VB

singh R

stranis FB

stin V

In all cases this represents 省 *shêng*; PAUTHIER's assertion that it is 相 *hsiang* is wrong, and there is no more foundation in the opinion expressed by YULE and maintained by CORDIER that both *hsiang* and *shêng* have merged into « scieng » (Y, I, 432); *hsiang* (*siang*) is rendered otherwise in Polo's « Cingsan » (q. v.) = *ch'êng-hsiang*, and moreover there is no reason to bring it in here.

By « Scieng », we must understand the 中書省 *Chung-shu-shêng* or Grand Secretariat, and the name refers to the members of the board as well as to their place of meeting. Polo is absolutely correct on that point. Rašidu-'d-Dīn uses شينك *šing* in the same way, and we find شن *šin* (or *šen* ?) in the *Masālak al-Absār* (cf. Y, I, 432; Y<sup>1</sup>, III, 122-123; Bl, II, 478-480, 616).

It is more difficult to account for the number of the « twelve barons » of the « Scieng », who in their turn seem to have influenced the « twelve barons » of the « Thai » (q. v.). PAUTHIER, with too much confidence, has given a list of twelve members of the *Chung-shu-shêng* (Pa, 329-330). According to Rašid, the *Dīwān*, or Great Council, was composed of four *ch'êng-hsiang* and four *p'ing-chang* (Y<sup>1</sup>, III, 120; Bl, II, 470). As to the officials of the *Chung-shu-shêng*, their number was often changed in Qubilai's time, and it would be a long task to follow these changes from year to year; but there is nothing to warrant PAUTHIER's list (cf. YS, 85, 1 b-2 b). Moreover I am afraid it would be a vain task, since Polo's text, as we have it, seems to have mixed up two different notions. I am therefore obliged to enter here into some detail.

The Grand Secretariat, or *Chung-shu-shêng*, worked at the capital, but had provincial delegations, called « moving » (行 *hsing*) *Chung-shu-shêng*, or simply *hsing-shêng*, and even *shêng* alone; the areas under the control of each *hsing-shêng* soon came to be themselves named *shêng* colloquially, and this is the origin of the modern use of *shêng* in the sense of « province ». In spite of minor changes, there were twelve *shêng* in the Mongol period, one being the metropolitan *Chung-*