

In 1220, 嚴實 Yen Shih had submitted to Muqali, the lieutenant-general left by Chinghiz-khan in Northern China, and brought under Mongol rule 300,000 families of Chang-tê, Ta-ming, etc.; he was then made head of a government (*hsing-t'ai*), the seat of which was established at Tung-p'ing-fu, with 54 *chou* and *hsien* under him. When Yen Shih died in 1240, his son 嚴忠濟 Yen Chung-chi was appointed in his stead; the latter in his turn was replaced in 1261 by another son 嚴忠範 Yen Chung-fan. But Qubilai soon brought to an end the abnormal position given to the Yen family and to their fief of Tung-p'ing-fu. In 1268, Tung-p'ing-fu was reduced to the state of a *san-fu*, altered to a *lu* of the 3rd class in 1272, with only six *hsien* under its jurisdiction. The Yen family nevertheless remained at the head of Tung-p'ing-fu, and that is why the Imperial commissioners of 1276, when passing through Tung-p'ing-fu, note that they were the guests of Yen *hsiang-kung* (cf. YS, I, 8 b; 58, 10 a-b; 148, 7 a-8 a; TP, 1912, 432; 1915, 399; for the value of *hsiang-kung*, see « Sangon »).

The Yüan postal relays from Ling-chou (Tê-hsien, see « Chianglin ») to Chi-ning (see « Singiu matu ») were : From Ling-chou, south-east to P'ing-yüan, 90 *li*; to Kao-t'ang (no distance given); south-east to Shih-p'ing, 90 *li*; to Tung-o, 90 *li*; to Tung-p'ing (« Tundinfu », no distance given); to Chi-ning, south, slightly west, 70 *li* (*Yung-lo ta-tien*, 19426, 4 b; but the text is very corrupt).

369. TUNOCAIN

<i>canocain</i> G	<i>thimochaym, tymochaym</i> P	<i>tonochan</i> TA ¹ , TA ³
<i>chunonchaim, chunonchain,</i>	<i>thunacaim, thunochaym</i> LT	<i>tucoain</i> F
<i>tenochain</i> VA	<i>timocaim, timochaim</i> R	<i>tuncaï</i> VL
<i>cunocain, torocain</i> L	<i>tinchain</i> TA ³	<i>tunocain</i> F, FA, L, Z; G
<i>elot(?), nouochan, timochain</i> V	<i>tonacarin, tunecain</i> FB	<i>tunochayn</i> Z
<i>temocan, temochan, tenican</i> VB	<i>tonocain</i> F, L	<i>turnochain</i> TA ¹

Correctly explained as تون و قاین Tün-u-Qāin, from the name of two neighbouring cities in Kuhistan. YULE has quoted other examples of that same form (Y, I, 86, 128), and given an analogous modern double form Tun-u-Tabas or Tabas-u-Tun. I may add that another mediaeval form Tunutanjah (= Tun-u-Tanjah) is used in Armenian by Kirakos (cf. PATKANOV, *Istoriya Mongolov*, II, 114), but I doubt that « Tanjah » should be طنج Tanj near Merv, as PATKANOV says; Merv is very far from Kuhistan. On Tün and Qāin, cf. LS, 352-354; Mi, 103.

BRETSCHNEIDER (Br, II, 96) has supposed that a place 法因 Fa-yin, which is missing on the map of c. 1330, but is named in the list of YS, 63, 16 b, might be Qāin, but does not say how. An error *fa* for 怯 *ch'ieh* would be easy, but the result gives *Kāin, not Qāin. To have Qāin, we must suppose a misreading قاین *Fāin of an original map in Arabic characters, which is however not impossible. I do not know where T'u Chi, 160, 30 b (or rather his source HUNG Chün) found the singular information that Qāin was also called Fāin.