

Rašid attributes there a conspicuous role to Kau *finjan*. There can be no doubt that many instances of confusion have crept into Rašid's story. They may perhaps be partly accounted for in the following way : (a) There was a man called Ho-shang who is mentioned in the accounts of the famous siege, although I doubt whether he was notorious enough to have been heard of by Rašid ; but we are not in a position to speak definitely on that point. (b) Kao Ho-shang, as is shown by the text mentioning the order of March 12, 1280, really had some connection with the army. This is alluded to in Aḥmad's biography when it says : « At that moment, the monk of the black arts Kao Ho-shang, as his magical practices had had no effect while with the army, came back » (the translation in *JNCB*, 1927, 22, is not accurate). Rašid may have had a distorted echo of Kao Ho-shang's campaign with Qoryosun (on whom cf. *JNCB*, 1927, 23). (c) Although Kao Ho-shang was not a *p'ing-chang*, a *p'ing-chang* was really mixed up in the plot, and paid for it with his life.

4. RAMUSIO's Cenchu (see « Cenchu ») being the *ch'ien-hu* Wang Chu, his Vanchu (= *wan-hu*, see « Vanchu ») must be Kao Ho-shang. Now this title of *wan-hu* was hereditary, and an administration of a *wan-hu* belonging to a man called Ho-shang is mentioned in *YS*, 86, 6 b; but I am not yet in a position to say whether Polo, rightly or wrongly, may have had that *wan-hu* in mind when he calls « Vanchu » (= *wan-hu*) the man who must be Kao Ho-shang.

As to the authorship of that chapter, I think that MOULE (*JNCB*, 1927, 28) still gave too much weight to MURRAY's adverse arguments. I agree with *B*, CLXI, and with *Pe*, 202, that the chapter can have come from no one but Polo himself.

7. ACMAT²

acamat FAt
achomach [soldan]
Acmat, *Acmath* Z
acolmat FA⁴

acomant F, Ft
acomar Ft
acomat F, Fr, t, FA, L
alcamat FAt

archomac LT
chomach (cor.), *chomas* V
il Soldano TA¹, TA³

All editors, including *B*¹, 437, have kept the « Acomat » of F ; but I see no reason not to prefer the « Acmat » and « Acmath » of Z, which is the form that a man knowing Persian as Polo did must have used, and which agrees with the « Achmach » (read « Achmath ») given by RAMUSIO for the other Aḥmad, Qubilai's minister (see « Acmat¹ »). For the difficulties raised by a third name, see « Rucnedin Acmat ».

The Aḥmad here in question was one of Abaya's younger brothers, and he assumed power after Abaya died on April 1, 1282 (not 1281, as in *B*¹, 437). He is said to have been baptized in his youth under the name of Nicholas, but later on converted himself to Islam, and took the name of Aḥmad (Hethum says wrongly « Mahomet Can », *Hist. des Crois.*, Arm., II, 186-187). His real Mongol name has long been a matter of doubt, because the texts hesitate between Neküdär (or Negüdär ;