

tive names with the equivalent of a French « ou », meaning « or », and not with a Persian copula *u*, « and ». In Rustichello's French (at least as we have it in F), that « ou » ought to be written « ou » or simply « o » (cf. for instance B, 20⁵, 20²¹⁻²², and the notes), but we do not have a correct archetype, and the whole work shows uncertainties of *o* and *u* in proper names. Whether by Rustichello's fault or by that of a very early copyist, that *o* (or *ou*) was misunderstood and the result is the pseudo-compound name. I may add that, while all Mss. give *u* here, Polo seems to have still heard as *o* what is now pronounced as *u* in Persian; so he writes « Cobinan », and also « Tunocain » for « Tun-u-Qāin ». This last name has precisely the Persian copula *u* which he heard as *o*, not as *u* in the would-be « Gheluchelan ».

Up to this point I am pretty certain of the solution, but I am not so positive about the true forms used by Polo for the alternative names. In spite of the Mss., and taking into account the constant confusion between *c* and *g*, I would myself have little hesitation in writing the second name « Ghelan » = Gīlān. But it is not clear that the first name should be spelt « Ghel » = Gīl. Most of the Mss. suggest « Gel » or « Giel », which would transcribe the Arabic form *Ĵil*; and although Polo's nomenclature is mainly Persian, he may have quoted here both an Arabic form, and a Persian one; « Ghel » remains nevertheless possible. The Catalan Map gives « Gellam », « Cilam » and « Cillam »; the name is « Zilan » on the Bianco Map, « Zila » on the Genoese Map; Schiltberger names « Gilan » (HALLBERG, 217-218, 571); Clavijo, « Guilan ». I read « Gillā » on Fra Mauro's map (not given by HALLBERG).

From the country named *Ĵil* or Gīlān comes, according to Polo, a certain kind of silk, the name of which is written « gelle » in F, « guele » in FB, « grelle » in FA and FA², « ghellie » in R. Gīlān was famous for its silk, and the name is of course derived from that of the country (« Ghel, the Caspian » is a slip in *Pe*, 167). I find « seta guieli » in a Genoese document of 1274 (BRÄTIANU, *Le commerce génois*, 306). The *seta ghella*, as YULE has said, is mentioned by Pegolotti (EVANS, 208, 297, 300); Clavijo mentions the silk of « Guilan »; as late as the 17th cent., « gilam », as the name of the Gīlān silk, appears in P. VAN DAM, *Beschryvinge van de Oostind. Compagnie*, 2nd part, Index, I, 695. But which was the form used by Polo? BENEDETTO has printed « g[h]elle » in F, and he is probably right. Yet it is also possible that RAMUSIO corrected the name according to a form which had obtained in Italy after Polo, and which is represented by Pegolotti's « ghella »; Polo's Mss. seem to be almost as much in favour of « giele » or « gielle ». If I incline to BENEDETTO's opinion, it is because the name in Polo is more likely to be Persian than Arabic, consequently Gīlī rather than *Ĵilī*. I have only to observe that Ya'qūt gives, as an adjective of origin, the two forms *ĵilānī* and *ĵilī*, but adds that *ĵilānī* has been reserved for the products of the country, and *ĵilī* for the men born there (cf. BARBIER DE MEYNARD, *Dict. Géogr.*, 187). The Western use is not in agreement with this.

YULE added (Y, I, 59) that « seta ghella » appeared also in Uzzano with what YULE calls « an odd transposition », to wit « seta leggi ». Since this was not corrected by CORDIER, it may be worth remarking that HEYD (II, 671) has already given the true solution : « seta leggi » is the silk not of Gīlān, but of لاهجان Lāhājān (also Lāhījān; cf. *Mi*, 497). This silk is praised by Abū'l-Fidā (II, II, 173) and by Ya'qūt (BARBIER DE MEYNARD, *Dict. hist.*, 503); the adjective of origin from Lāhājān was probably *lāhājī*, of which *leggi* is a fair transcription. Apart from