

also in different parts of Central Asia. The regular Chinese word for «steel» is 鋼 *kang*, a secondary character derived from 剛 *kang*, «hard», so that *pin-t'ieh* must have been somewhat different. In *YS*, 85, 14 *b*, an officer is put in charge of the working of «*pin-t'ieh*, copper (*t'ung*), steel (*kang*)», etc.; this shows that, in Polo's time, a distinction was actually made between ordinary steel and *pin-t'ieh*. Round gerfalcon tablets in *pin-t'ieh* were manufactured by Imperial order in 1277 (*YS*, 9, 9*a*). In the first half of the 15th cent., mention is made of daggers of damascened *pin-t'ieh* in Java (*TP*, 1915, 239) and of scissors of *pin-t'ieh* in Bengal (*ibid.* 440). Arabic and Persian texts refer also to two principal kinds of steel, viz. ordinary steel (*šāburaqān*) and Eastern steel (Pers. *pūlād* > Arab. *fūlād*; cf. VALIDI in *ZDMG*, 1936, 26-27, 33; borrowed in Turk. *pūlād*, Mong. *bolot*, and also in Tibetan, Armenian, Georgian, Russian; exists also in Ossetian; cf. LAUFER, in *TP*, 1916, 82, 479, and *Sino-Iranica*, 575). Rubrouck speaks of Germans who were extracting gold and making arms at Bolat (*Wy*, 225, 289, 299; «Bolac» is a wrong form), the Pulad of Rašid and Hethum, the Po-lo (= Bolot) of Chinese texts. The name certainly means «steel», and I explain under «Ghinghin talas» why I suppose that these Germans were really making arms with the «steel and andanique» from the mountain north of «Ghinghin talas» mentioned by Polo. Since *pin-t'ieh* is different from ordinary steel, I conclude that BRETSCHNEIDER was right in identifying it with Polo's «andanique».

As to the term *pin-t'ieh*, it does not mean «hard iron» as stated in *HR*, 19. *Pin*, without the metal radical, means «guest», and, with this radical, is a secondary form occurring only in the term *pin-t'ieh*; *pin* is certainly a transcription. LAUFER (*Sino-Iranica*, 515-516) derives it from «Iranian **spaina*, Pamir languages *spin*, Afghan *ōspīna* or *ōspana*, Ossetic *āfsān*». His explanation is probably right in principle, but the Chinese must not be held responsible for the fall of the initial *s*-. In a Sanskrit-Chinese Vocabulary of the T'ang period, *pin-t'ieh* is given as the Chinese equivalent of Skr. *piṇa*; this is a pseudo-Sanskrit form, a Prakrit word probably borrowed from the Iranian, but it gives a clue to the *pin* of the Chinese (cf. my note in BAGCHI, *Deux lexiques sanskrit-chinois*², 280-281). Although many so-called Sanskrit words in the Sanskrit-Chinese Vocabulary are terms of colloquial use which may never have been employed in texts, the case may be different with *piṇa*. *Pin-t'ieh*, at least, occurs in the Chinese versions of two sūtras, one of which was translated in 707-709 (NANJIO, *Cat.*, No. 317; Tōkyō *Tripit.* of Meiji, 閏, II, 23 *b*). The other I cannot trace, though it must be earlier than 817, since those two mentions of *pin-t'ieh* are commented upon by Hui-lin (*ibid.* 爲, IX, 43 *b*, 51 *a*); it is just possible that the original texts of the two sūtras had *piṇa* or a word connected with *piṇa*.

I suppose that «andanique» and *pin-t'ieh* are the same as the Mong. *sorunča kūrāl*, of which a marvellous sword was made, as stated in SCHMIDT's *Die Thaten des... Bogda Gesser Khan*, 4¹⁴. The translation, p. 6, renders it «die härteste und feinste Erzmasse», which is not satisfactory. I think we should read *sorunča gürü*, equivalent to Kalm. *sorṃtso bol°* or simply *sorāntši*, the «sucking steel» or the «sucker» (cf. RAMSTEDT, *Kalm. Wörterbuch*, 332), all of them Mongolian names of the magnet.

Fr. RISCH, in his *Wilhelm von Rubruk*, Leipzig, 1934, p. 200, has translated «ab Amorrigo» of Rubrouck's mss. as if it were «ab andanico». «Ab Amorrigo» is unexplained, but must be the (corrupt?) name of a place in Persia. RISCH's tacit correction is not acceptable.