

in Arabic writing (cf. *Mi*, 209). The confusion was the easier as the Phison itself, one of the four rivers of Paradise, was believed to have an extraordinary course across almost the whole of Asia and, according to Marignolli for instance, to flow through China, India and the countries north of the Caucasus (HALLBERG, 405-407).

The name « Quian » used by Polo was known to Mussulman geographers at least three and perhaps four centuries before the date of our traveller, and it has been preserved in two later compilations, the *Hudūd al-Ālam* of 982-983, and Gardizī of the 11th cent. The true form قِيَان Qiyān or Qiān appears only in Gardizī's text, but the عِنَان 'Inān of the unique Ms. of the *Hudūd al-Ālam* is certainly a misreading for غِيَان ḡiyān (or perhaps قِيَان Qiyān), as has been shown by MINORSKY (*Mi*, 70, 206, 229-231). Unfortunately, these second-hand compilations are so full of misreadings and of contradictions that most identifications must remain extremely doubtful. Among the eastern rivers, the *Hudūd al-Ālam* mentions the Ḥumdān river, the كِسْو Kīsau river which, after it enters the boundaries of Buḡšūr, is called 'Inān (read ḡiyān), and the river فَجَاخ Wajāḡ; these three rivers empty themselves into the Eastern Ocean. Ḥumdān is well known as the ancient name of Hsi-an-fu among Westerners (see « Quengianfu », and cf. *Mi*, 229). Naturally enough, MINORSKY says that the river of Ḥumdān must be the Huang-ho, and that the ḡiyān must be the Yang-tzū. In the name « Kīsau » given to the upper course of the ḡiyān, MINORSKY proposes to see a corrupt reading of كِنْسُو K.nsw, which he thinks would represent 金沙 Chin-sha (Kin-ša) of Chin-sha-chiang, the ordinary Chinese name of the Upper Yang-tzū (see « Brius »). But this is hardly possible. Down to the 15th cent., 金 chin was pronounced *kim*, and we ought to have *K.mša, not *K.nsw. « Kīsau » remains unexplained.

The case of the other names is also more intricate than appears at first sight. The *Hudūd al-Ālam* and Gardizī have drawn from more than one source, and although most of these sources are lost, the texts have partly survived in quotations. For instance, such a late author as Dimašqi (c. 1325), writing at a time when the name of Ḥumdān had sunk into oblivion, has two paragraphs on the two rivers of Ḥumdān, the greater and the smaller; one of the two must be the Huang-ho, but the other may be the Yang-tzū (cf. *Fe*, 367-368; see also Ibn Sa'īd in *Fe*, 332-333; Abū-'l-Fidā, in REINAUD, *Géographie*, II, II, 123). A similar confusion has perhaps taken place in the case of the Qiyān. Gardizī gives an itinerary from Činānčkāt (= Qočo, see « Carachoço ») to Ḥumdān, which is certainly Hsi-an-fu. This itinerary, clearly corrupt in some of its indications, has been studied by MINORSKY (*Mi*, 229-232), who divides it into two parts, one leading to the Yang-tzū, the other to Ḥumdān. I incline to take another view, and, provisionally, I would suggest the following solution : Gardizī divides the itinerary into two sections : (1) From Činānčkāt to B.ḡ-šūrā (spelt « Buḡšūr » and « B.ḡsūz » in the *Hudūd al-Ālam*), where a river is crossed in a boat; (2) From B.ḡ-šūrā to Ḥumdān. In the first section, the first place named is Qomūl (see « Camul »), then Ša-čū (see « Saciou »), then Sang-lāḡ (?), then S.ḡ-čū (Suḡ-čū; see « Succiu »), then Ḥam-čū (see « Campcio »), then K.jā, then the crossing of the river Qiyān. For the second part, Gardizī is content with saying that it takes one month to go from B.ḡ-šūrā to Ḥumdān by a road provided with fortified stations and postal stages. It is well known that the crossing of the Huang-ho took place at Lan-chou, and I think that the Huang-ho may be the river which is crossed in a boat at B.ḡ-šūrā. In such a case, B.ḡ-šūrā would be a name of Lan-chou, and K.jā would be Liang-chou (see « Ergiuul »). But we