

is RUGE's misreading). In other words, we would have here another example of *-g-* (*-gh-* before *i* not to give *-j-*) used to mark the hiatus stop (see « Coigangiu »).

The *hsien* of Pao-ying received that name in 676, became a *chou* in 1227, and almost immediately (?) thereafter was changed into a military area (*chün*); it is under the name of Pao-ying-chün that the diarist of 1276 registers his passage there (cf. *TP*, 1915, 396, 413-414). In 1279, it was raised to An-i-fu, but degraded to Pao-ying-hsien in 1283 (cf. *YS*, 59, 11 a; *TP*, 1915, 414; *Ta-Ch'ing i-t'ung chih*, 66, map, 3 a; text, 2 a). The name used by Polo is thus quite correct for the time when he wrote.

312. PEM

pain, paines, pera FB

pein F, Fr, FA, L, V(cor.)

peiti, terchin VB

peiu F

pem Ft, FA(?), Z

peym TA¹, TA³; R

peyn LT, P; G

piem, pien VA

pin V

poyn VL

This is certainly the correct form, despite BENEDETTO's hesitation (*B*¹, 446); we might only suppose that « *Pein* » of F is *Peim* > *Pei* > *Pein*, and that the « *Pem* » of Z is this same last form *Pein* misread **Pem* (hence **Pē* > *Pen* in Fra Mauro, *Zu*, 36; HALLBERG, 409). R has « *Peym* ». There is no doubt that Polo dictated a form with final *-m*. « *Pem* » is Hsüan-tsang's *P'i-mo* (**P'iei-muâ*); this last name has been restored into *Bhīmā* by Stan. JULIEN, but the *p'i* of *P'i-mo* is an ancient aspirate (*p'*-), and the theoretical reading is **Phema*, or possibly **Phima*. The « *Pīm* » of the ancient Turkish map mentioned in *Y*, I, 192, is interesting as a survival, but gives no clue to the proper pronunciation, as *Pīm* can also be read *Bīm*, *Pēm*, *Bēm*. More stress may be laid on the *Phye-ma* of ancient Tibetan texts referring to the region of Khotan, and F. W. THOMAS is probably right in seeing in that *Phye-ma* Hsüan-tsang's *P'i-mo* (*Zeitschr. für Buddhismus*, September 1924; *Notes relating to... Ancient Khotan*, p. 2 of the reprint).

« *Pem* » has been placed by HUNTINGTON at Keriya, by STEIN at Uzun-tati (better Uzun-tatir, « Long Tatir »; *tatir* means a stretch of hard barren ground), by CHARIGNON at Endereh. But HUNTINGTON's view belongs to an early stage of the archaeological study of Chinese Turkestan; CHARIGNON's theory (*Ch*, I, 104-107) is vitiated from the start because he denies the identity of *P'i-mo* and *Pem* and keeps « *Pein* » so as to identify it phonetically (!) with the T'ang station of Po-hsien. In the present state of our knowledge, the identification of *P'i-mo* and *Pem* with Uzun-tatir is the only plausible one, and it is at least probable.

I leave aside Abū Dulaf's باهي Bahā, corrected to بيمى Bimā by the last commentators (cf. *Fe*, 217-218). The form is uncertain, the location unknown, and the whole account most untrustworthy.