

influence of the popular Yači. Another hypothesis would be that Yači is really a Ya-ch'ih c, a « Duck Lake », which was used as a popular name of the eastern capital of the Ta-li kingdom and adopted as such by the Mongols, but which the Chinese chroniclers have not recognized when translating it back from Mongolian into Chinese. There are other examples of these borrowings from Chinese into foreign languages, which have not been recognized when they reverted to Chinese. But I have no means to prove it in the present case; at the same time, it is not impossible that the spelling Ya-ch'ih c, « Duck Lake », was merely a wrong attempt at etymology on the part of more or less scholarly Chinese of the 13th and 14th cents.

255. IAMB

iaben V
iamb FA, VB
ianb F

ianbi VA
jamb FB, L

jambi P
lamb R

The *-b* only serves to maintain a reading in *-m*, not in *-n* (see « Campçio »). The original is Turk. *yam*, « postal relays », Mong. *jam*. Polo, as Rubrouck before him (« iam »), and as the Persians (يَام *yām*) and even the Armenians (cf. *iam* in BROSSET, *Hist. de la Géorgie*, I, Add., 439, 457), uses the Turkish form; the Chinese *chan* (= *jam*; hence Annam. *tram*) is based on the contrary on the Mongolian. Turk. *yam* appears in a Chinese transcription of *yamčîn*, « postmaster », already in the second half of the 5th cent. Cf. my note on the word in *TP*, 1930, 192-195. The Chinese etymology of *yam* from Ch. *i-ma*, still maintained in *Bl*, II, 311, is absurd.

256. IASD

adin V
iadys, *yadis* TA¹
iasdi F, Fr, FAt, L, LT, P; R
iasdy Pr
iasoy VL

jasd Z
jasdis LT
jasoi VLr
jasoy FB
ladis, *padis* TA³

sasdis LTr
yasdi Ft
zansoi VB
zasdi FA

Silk

iasdi F, L, V; R
iaseri TA¹, TA³
iasoi VL

jasdi VA
jasoi VL
jasoy FB

yasdi LT
zafuini VB
zasdi FA

YULE, RICCI-ROSS, and BENEDETTO have adopted « Iasdi », but I think that Z has preserved the right reading, and that the « Iasdi » of the other Mss. is due to the silk « iasdi » which is mentioned afterwards by Polo. Yäzd (« Yezd » of our maps) is a well-known place in Persia. Odoric seems to call it « Gest » (*Wy*, 419); the « Iest » adopted by YULE (*Y*¹, II, 107-108) without any comment does not seem to be supported by any Ms.; however, Fra Mauro has « Iest » (HALLBERG, 570).