

BRETSCHNEIDER. It is the brief notice on 楊樞 Yang Ch'u's embassy, which, in 1307, brought back to 忽魯模思 Hu-lu-mu-ssü, Hormuz, the mission sent by Ghazan to China nine years before (see « Caçan »).

As long as the Ilkhans remained on the throne in Persia, it seems that Hormuz was considered in China as belonging to them, and no diplomatic intercourse took place. Even Chinese traders must have taken small notice of the place, since there is no paragraph on it in the *Tao-i chih-liao*, written in 1349-1350. Hormuz comes to the front in Chinese texts only in the first half of the 15th cent.; its first embassy arrived at the Court of the Ming in 1414 (cf. *Br*, II, 132-135; *TP*, 1933, 243, 431-440; 1934, 296, 308; add. WANG Ch'i's *Hsü Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao*, 236, 13 b; and his *Pai-shih hui-pien*, quoted by T'u Chi, 160, 23 b). The wrong distinction between a kingdom of 忽魯謨斯 Hu-lu-mo-ssü and a kingdom of 忽魯母恩 Hu-lu-mu-ên, due to a corruption of 思 ssü into ên, seems to occur first in the *Ming i-t'ung chih* of 1461, 90, 23, and was taken over by HUANG Hsing-tsêng in his *Hsi-yang ch'ao-kung tien-lu*, and by CHÊNG Hsiao in his *Wu-hsüeh pien* (68, 40 a) as well as in the independent edition of his *Huang-Ming ssü-i k'ao* (*Kuo-hsüeh wên-k'u* ed., 128); the author of the *Huang-Ming hsiang-ksü lu* (5, 22 a) felt doubtful about it, and it was dropped from the *Ming shih* (326, 5-6). An additional proof that no embassy from Hormuz came in 1405 is provided by the fact that, according to the *Huang-Ming hsiang-hsü lu*, this embassy brought an ostrich, and Yung-lo ordered Chin Yu-tzü to extoll the bird in an ode; now, this ode is given in the *Shu-yü chou-tzü lu*, 9, 7-8, and it is dated 1419.

The main interest of the Chinese texts is to establish that the king whose embassy, arriving in 1433, must have been sent in 1432, was Saifu-'d-Dîn. From 'Abdu-'r-Razzâq, we know that the king reigning in 1442 was Faḥru-'d-Dîn Tūrân-šāh. Both fall within a period for which TEIXEIRA's translation of the Chronicle gives no information (cf. SINCLAIR, *loc. cit.*, 188-189).

The king of Hormuz acknowledged Portuguese suzerainty in 1507, and Albuquerque finally conquered the island in 1515 (not « 1509 » as in *Br*, II, 132, nor « 1510 » as in *Y*, I, 121). With the help of a British naval force, Šāh 'Abbās took it from the Portuguese in 1622 (not « 1621 » as in *EI*), and removed the trade to the near place on the mainland which had been known as Gombroon and which was henceforth called Bāndār 'Abbāsī, « Port of [Šāh] 'Abbās » (cf. *Hobson-Jobson*², s. v. « Gombroon »).

The name of Hormuz has long survived in the West as the designation of a textile : It. *ormesino*, *ermesino*, *armesino*, Port. *armezim*, French *armoisin*, *armosin*, Engl. *armesie*, *armosyn*, *armozeen*, *ormesine*. It was a light plain taffeta, generally black, of both western and eastern manufacture (cf. KARABAČEK, in *Mitteil. d. K. K. Oesterr., Mus. f. Kunst u. Ind.*, VII, [1879], 304-305; LOKOTSCH, No. 1596; GAY, *Vocabulaire archéologique*, I, 71; *Hobson-Jobson*², s. v. « Ormesine »; DALGADO, *Glossário Luso-Asiático*, I, 57; LUDWIG, in *Italien Forschungen*, I [Berlin, 1906], 297, 372; BOXER, *Jan companie*, 184). The various forms of the word betray the influence first of the mediaeval transcriptions of « Hormuz », and later of the Portuguese transcriptions beginning with *a*.

In the Introduction to the present notes, I have discussed the reasons which may have induced the Polos, once at Hormuz, to abandon their original scheme of reaching Qubilai's dominions by sea.