

so sober and sound. As to the facts, ERDMANN's reading is arbitrary and certainly wrong; and the text of Pegolotti is too corrupt to give any solid clue. There can be little doubt as to the name having been read in two syllables, and the *p* is really superfluous; perhaps this *p* (in spite of isolated cases like «tiramprus», or Marignolli's «Campsay» [see «Quinsai», and «Campsay» in one ms. of Odoric]) helped mainly to prevent a reading in *n* of a contracted form in *m* («Cāciou» could be read «Canciou» or «Camciou», but «Cāpciou», even if developed into «Canpciou», would sound »Camciou»); the cases of «ianb» for *iam* (*yam*) and, above all, of «Campigiu», are analogous (see «ianb» and «Campigiu»). I explain in the same way the «Nemptai» (= Nemtai or rather \*Namtai) of Nicolo Conti (see «Namghin»), and the transcription of Pers. لَامَس *lāms* as «lams» in KUUN, *Codex Cumanicus*, 58. One might be tempted to revive the idea of a pronunciation in three syllables when finding the name written Kammicū in a Khotanese document of the 10th cent. (cf. H. W. BAILEY, in *BSOS*, VIII, 884, and IX, 522, who quotes from other Khotanese mss. the forms Kamacū and Kammacū). But a glance at the lists published by F. W. THOMAS, in *ZDMG*, vol. 91, 33-48, is enough to show that these countless -i endings of syllables in Brahmī script are a purely orthographical Khotanese device, and do not affect the pronunciation.

In Polo's text, *chou* is generally rendered by forms like °giu, °ciu (F), °gui [read °giu] or °zu (R), °çu (Z); but, just as we have a final °ion [read °iou] in F and R, and °io in Z, for «Campciou», the third *chou* Polo passed through on entering Western China, we find for the first one, Sha-chou, a final °ion [read °iou] in F and R, and °io in Z. The parallelism of the two cases is striking (Z has °io also for «Succiu»), although I am at a loss to say why Polo or Rustichello transcribes *chou* differently for Western Kan-su and for the rest of China. For other examples of *u* written *ou*, see «Oucaca», «Oulatai».

The recension in Court French says that Maffeo and Marco Polo spent one year at Kan-chou on an official errand («en légation»), and that is the version followed by PAUTHIER, YULE and CHARIGNON. But F and R agree that the *three* Polos were there together, for some business of their own. I do not think that any commentator has seriously discussed this point. It is practically certain that we have to accept the version of F and R. But when were the three Polos likely to have been together a whole year in Kan-chou? YULE (*Y*, I, Introd. 22) seems to take it for granted that it was at some undetermined moment after they had entered Qubilai's service; but that may be because he accepted «en légation» in his text. It seems to me much more natural to suppose that the three Polos, who are said to have spent three years and a half on their journey from Acre to Shang-tu, had stopped a whole year in Kan-chou. There is little chance of their having been there together at a later date. I do not even exclude the possibility that it was from Kan-chou that their arrival was reported to Qubilai; the messengers Qubilai sent on a forty day's journey to meet the three Latins must have travelled post-haste, and may have covered in that period of time the distance from Khan-baliq or from Shang-tu to Kan-chou.

The region of Kan-chou, after forming part of the territory of the Yüeh-chih, passed to the Hsiung-nu, and it was conquered by the Han who created there the *chün* of 張掖 Chang-yeh in 111 B. C. The name of Kan-chou was first adopted, for a short time, in 553, and revived in 619. The place acquired a greater importance when a Vice-Commissioner (*fu chieh-tu-shih*) of Ho-hsi (for this term see «Caidu» and «Tangut») was installed there in 710. In 766, Kan-chou fell into