

(II, 40), PAUTHIER (*Pa*, 60), YULE (*Y*, I, 75) and CHARIGNON (*Ch*, I, 49) have explained as Gärm-sir, « Hot Region ». But MARSDEN (*Marco Polo*, 72) was certainly right when he saw in « Cremosor » merely a clerical error for « Curmos » or « Cormos ». For other cases in which possibly the terminal flourish of a copyist may have become -r, see « Caccia modun ».

Polo's « Curmos » is not the Hormuz Island, but Old Hormuz on the mainland. RAMUSIO's statement to the contrary certainly is not based on ms. tradition, but is due to scholarly editing (cf. Vol. I, 44, 123). Old Hormuz was a very ancient place, since there seems to be no reason to doubt its identification with Nearchus' Ἀρμολεία (c. 325 B. C.), as well as Ptolemy's Ἀρμουζα πόλις and Ἀρμολζον ἄκρον (VI, VIII, 5). This would dispose of the theory according to which Hormuz was founded by and received its name from the first Sassanian Emperor (cf. BARBIER DE MEYNARD, *Dict. histor. de la Perse*, 595; *Pa*, 86; *EI*, s. v. « Hormuz »). As to the name, like some others in Persia, it must represent Ahura-mazda. But, after the early Western classical mentions, several centuries elapse before Hormuz again occurs in any texts. The Nestorian bishop of Hormuz, mentioned under the date c. 540 by YULE (*Hobson-Jobson*<sup>2</sup>, 646) from ASSEMANI (*Bibl. Or.*, III, I, 147-148), seems to be of doubtful authority; no such see appears in CHABOT's *Synodicon Orientale*. As to Theodorus, bishop of « Hormuzdadschir », mentioned under c. 655 by YULE from the same source, he certainly was bishop of « Hormizd-Ardašir », later Hormuzšir, i. e. Ahwāz in Hūzistān, which has nothing to do with Hormuz (cf. BARBIER DE MEYNARD, *loc. cit.*, 57-61; CHABOT, *Synodicon Orientale*, 673; *LS*, 233; *Mi*, 381).

Hormuz became a place of some importance only well after the Mussulman conquest. HIRTH and ROCKHILL (*HR*, 14) proposed to see Hormuz in the 末羅 Mo-lo (\*Muât-lâ) of Chia Tan's itineraries (end of the 8th cent.), and this solution, accepted by BARTHOLD (*ZVOIRAO*, XXI [1913], 0164), has been mentioned by STÜBE in *EI* (s. v. « Hormuz »), not, however, without some qualification. But HIRTH and ROCKHILL's hypothesis was connected with their erroneous identification of Fu-ta with Old Cairo, while it is really Bagdad (see « Baudac »). Mo-lo must be inland, on the Euphrates and not far from its mouth. HERRMANN equated it to Baśra, a solution which is satisfactory from the triple point of view of geography, history, and phonetics. As a matter of fact, and since Hwārezmī's « Armuza », c. 833, is merely copied from Ptolemy (*Fe*, 593), the earliest mediaeval mention of Hormuz which I can trace is that of Ibn Ḥordāsbāh who, in 844-848, cites « Urmūz » as one of the ports of call on the sea route from Baśra to China. Its remains lie near the hamlet of Kumbil, some ten miles to the south of Mināb (cf. *Y*, I, 110-111; SINCLAIR, *Pedro Teixeira*, 155; Sir A. STEIN, in *Geogr. Journal*, LXXXIII [1934], 129, and his map).

The great prosperity of Hormuz dates from c. 1100, when it was ruled by an Arabic dynasty. Under « Rucnedin Acmat », I shall discuss who must have been the « melic », or king, of Hormuz mentioned by Polo. The city was transferred from the mainland to the island of جرون Jārūn (or Jārāun, or Zārūn) shortly after the return of the Polos to Europe, and the name of Hormuz passed to this new settlement. One fact is perfectly plain : Hormuz was already on the island at the time of Odoric's visit in 1321. But the date and conditions of the transference have not yet been established satisfactorily. The date 1302, generally adopted, is based on a passage of the lost *Šāh Nāmāh*, or Chronicle of the Kings of Hormuz, written by the king « Turonxá » (Ṭūrān-