

as far as Hormuz (cf. BROSSET, *Hist. de la Siounie*, I, 227; PATKANOV, *Istoriya Mongolov*, I, 33). But YULE (Y, I, 121) already connected the transfer of Hormuz to the island with the great raid of Qutluy-šāh's bands in 1299, in the course of which, according to Waśśāf, Hormuz (= Old Hormuz) was besieged; the invaders were repelled by the king Bahā-ud-Dīn Ayaz (*Ha*¹, II, 106). This king is evidently the same as TEIXEIRA's « Mir Bahadin Ayaz Seifin », and the chronological agreement is even greater than has been said hitherto. It is a matter of surprise that even SINCLAIR should have accepted and repeated in his own name TEIXEIRA's equivalence « A. H. 700 = 1302 A. D. », while it is 16 September 1300 — 5 September 1301 (*L'art de vérifier les dates*, I, 1783, 26-27). With such an agreement between Waśśāf and the Chronicle, it seems safe to date the transfer towards the end of 1300, under the reign of Bahā-ud-Dīn. Faḥru-'d-Dīn, whom YULE adduced with caution, must have been then far from Persia (see « Cačan », « Cocacin », and « Rucnedin Acmat »).

It may even be that the Mongol inroads left a lasting trace in the designation which the new settlement on the Jārūn Island adopted for the mainland; but I readily admit that I am here advancing on slippery ground. Ibn-Baṭṭūṭah, who visited the island of Hormuz c. 1330, gives to the Persian coast opposite the island of Hormuz a name which the translators have read « Mūyostān », adding : « The name Mūyostān, or Moyistān, refers to the part of the province of Kirmān which borders on the Persian Gulf » (DEFRÉMERY, *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, II, 230, 455). As results from DEFRÉMERY's reference to TEIXEIRA, his transcription « Mūyostan » was determined by the similar mention of « Mogostam » in TEIXEIRA's translation of the Chronicle (cf. SINCLAIR's transl., 156, 166, 173, 186); « Mogostam » also occurs in TEIXEIRA's extracts from Mirḥōnd (*ibid.*, 197; I cannot trace the name in Mirḥōnd, and this is clearly a digression due to TEIXEIRA); the earlier Dominican abridged version of the Chronicle gives « Magostam » (*ibid.*, 258). The alternative form « Mūyistān » has been adopted by LE STRANGE (*LL*, 319), « Mogistan » by SINCLAIR (p. 156), and « Mūghustān » by DAMES (*Duarte Barbosa*, I, 90); « Mughostān » has been adduced by HIRTH and ROCKHILL (*HR*, 14) as a possible original of Mo-lo in their unfortunate attempt at identifying this Mo-lo with Hormuz.

By interpreting the name as Mūyistān or Mōyistān, the various authors clearly understood it as one compound name, which ought then to be written موغستان *Mōyistan in one word, or مغستان *Moyistān if the first vowel be short. In both spellings it might mean « place of the Magi »; with the second, MENINSKI gives it with the sense, mentioned also by BARROS, of « palm garden », with a reference to KAEMPFER; cf. MENINSKI, *Lex. Arab.-pers.-turc.*, 1780, IV, 640 : « مغستان *mughystān. p. n. s. Palmetum. Kæmpf. amæn. exot.* ». But KAEMPFER, *Amoenitates exoticæ*, 1712, 665, only says that the palm is called *Mogh* (مُغ *moy*) in the Hormuz dialect, *Moch* (مُح *moh*) in the neighbouring dialects. But Ibn Baṭṭūṭah's form is different; موع استان *Moy-āstān*, something like « resting place of the Magi ». In the Portuguese transcriptions, -m is always used instead of -n; so the final makes no difficulty. But « Magostam » of the Dominican, « Mogostam » of TEIXEIRA prove that the second vowel was not -i-, but either -ā- as in Ibn Baṭṭūṭah, or -ō- (-ū-); while on the other hand, a survival of the old form *mōyu* of the name of the Magi is out of the question for the 14th cent. and later. Now, in several notices on his map, Fra Mauro gives to the Persian coast opposite the island of Hormuz the name of « Mogolistan » (cf. HALL-