

« Barscol » the hypothesis that « Sichin- » might be 始興 Shih-hsing (*Ši-hing), a district (*hsien*) at the seat of Chao-chou under the Chin; « Sichin- » would be correct enough for Shih-hsing, but there is little likelihood that this obscure *hsien* should have survived under the Mongols and come to the knowledge of Polo; moreover it never was a *chou*. The name of « Sichintingiu » is probably corrupt, with a wrong duplication of the second syllable; but I have as yet no reasons to decide for « Sichingiu » or for « Sitingiu ».

I do not believe in « Shang-ching » + « Tung-ching », quoted from YULE-CORDIER in *B*¹, 447, and still less in writing « Shing-king », *i. e.* Shêng-ching (Mukden); this last name dates only from the 17th cent.

337. SILINGIU

City		
<i>bugiun</i> V	<i>singui</i> L, VA, Z	<i>sirigai</i> VL
<i>singiu</i> F	<i>singuy</i> FA, FB, LT	<i>zigoï</i> VB
Province		
<i>silingui</i> Z	<i>siulagui</i> V	
City or Province		
<i>cinguy</i> P	<i>singhui</i> TA ¹ , TA ³	<i>singui</i> R

This had been identified with 西寧州 Hsi-ning-chou (Hsi-ning-fu under the Ch'ing) by MARSDEN, PAUTHIER, and YULE, even though the Mss. usually only gave « Singiu »; « Silingiu » occurs only in the recently discovered Z, but is confirmed by « Sinlingin » on Fra Mauro's map (*Zu*, 34; HALLBERG, 479). It is well known that in Central Asian languages the name of that place is Siling, Seling, etc. (cf. *Y*, I, 276; YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*², 846-847; LAUFER, in *TP*, 1916, 518-519); despite the usual Tibetan form Zi-liñ (for instance in Sarat CHANDRA DAS's *Dictionary*), the *Geography of the Min-jul hutuktu* (V. VASIL'EV, *Geografiya Tibeta*, 1895, p. 52) writes Si-lin.

PARKER's hypothesis of 善州 Shan-chou, quoted in *Y*, III, 61-62, is unnecessary and falls to the ground, at least phonetically, now that we have the true reading « Silingiu ». It is under the name of Hsi-ning that the place appears in *YS*, 60, 13 *a*, and in the itineraries of *Yung-lo ta-tien*, 19426, 6 *b*. Polo speaks here of a part of China which he never visited and which lay between his route Kan-chou–Liang-chou–Ning-hsia, when he came to the Court of Qubilai, and his later itinerary *via* Hsi-an–Han-chung–Ch'êng-tu, when he went to Yün-nan. Polo's tendency to put « seloc », south-east, for all sorts of places in China which he passed through affords ample explanation of his giving the same indication about a place of which he speaks from hearsay, and which is really south-south-west. CHARIGNON has proposed 靈州 Ling-chou (*Ch*, I, 233-234), which is impossible, since