

Tsêng-t'an was called Amīr-amīrān, « Emir of emirs », which is a Persian title, and his family had ruled for ten generations during 500 years (which is certainly excessive, since it gives an average of 50 years of reign for each prince). Tsêng-t'an (\*Zāng<sup>1</sup>dān, \*Zāngtān?) suggests no known name; -ān may or may not be a Persian plural. The products of the country are partly Asiatic, partly African, but some may have come there by trade. The *Wên-ch'ang tsa-lu* alone, the author of which had access to the Court archives, gives the names of the countries conterminous to Tsêng-t'an : to the east, Tsêng-t'an reached the sea; to the west, it bordered upon the kingdom of 胡盧沒 Hu-lu-mu; to the south, upon the kingdom of 霞勿檀 Hsia-wu-t'an; to the north, upon the kingdom of 利吉蠻 Li-chi-man. None of these names seems to be traceable anywhere else (I have not tried the *Sung hui yao*, the contents of which are hard to check). Hu-lu-mu (where *mu* is \*muət) would be a good transcription of Hormuz, but the geographical data would hardly fit.

In the Chinese map of the *Ching-shih ta-tien*, dated c. 1330 and based on a Mussulman map, the name of Hormuz does not occur now, but originally it must have been included, since it is found in the corresponding list of YS, 63, 16 b, where it is written 忽里模子 Hu-li-mu-tzū, Hurmuz (cf. *Br*, II, 130; T'u Chi, 160, 23 b [but T'u Chi has mixed up with Hormuz the Qurumši of the *Secret History*, which is the old Mongol form of an unidentified name which may or may not be Hormuz]). In YS, 123, 8 a, we read that Qubilai detailed an Alan (Asut), 忽兒都荅 Hu-êrh-tu-ta, to accompany the *noyan* 不羅 Pu-lo on an embassy to « the place (地 *ti*) of 哈兒馬某 Ha-êrh-ma-mou ». BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, II, 89) supposed that *mou* could be a mistake for *ssū*, and that the hypothetical Ha-êrh-ma-ssū might represent Hormuz, and later on (II, 132) spoke as if Ha-êrh-ma-ssū actually was the reading given in the YS; in Pu-lo, he proposed to see the famous Bolod, the informant of Rašīdu-'d-Dīn on Mongol history and customs; the whole of this second passage has been reproduced by CORDIER in *Y*, I, 115. In his unfortunate biography of Marco Polo, T'u Chi (117, 5 b; cf. also 102, 14 a) maintained that Pu-lo was no other than Polo, and that Ha-êrh-ma-mou was « Bombay the Black », Qara-Bombay (!). T'u Chi's solutions may be rejected without further ado. But the passage is puzzling. The only *noyan* Po-lo or Pu-lo in Qubilai's time is Bolod, in Persian Pulād, who actually was sent by Qubilai to Persia where he arrived in 1285 and remained until his death. On the other hand, Hu-êrh-tu-ta seems to represent \*Hurtuqta, and an Urtuqta actually arrived at the Persian Court on February 24, 1286, bringing the Imperial edict of investiture delivered to Aryun by Qubilai (cf. *Oh*, IV, 13 [where the name is read « Ordoucaya »], and *Bl*, I, 230 [where it is read « Urtukhata »]; cf. also p. 133). In spite of several difficulties which I cannot examine here, things really look as if Hu-êrh-tu-ta had been sent on a mission to Persia. But that does not imply that Ha-êrh-ma-mou may be Hormuz; apart from -r- in the second syllable, not one character is phonetically acceptable for such an equation. As a matter of fact, I do not know what name of man or of place is intended; *ma-mou* sometimes renders Maḥmūd, which gives no sense here; and we must not forget that the passage comes in a biography, probably based on a document of private origin. No solution can be reached for the present, but Hormuz is most improbable. As a matter of fact, if we except the Hu-li-mu-tzū based on a Mussulman map, Hormuz occurs in Chinese texts of the Mongol dynasty only once, in a document which remained unknown to