

are told in the *Hudūd al-‘Ālam* that the river Kīsau took the name of γiyān after having entered the boundaries of Buγšūr, and Gardīzī’s text seems to me to imply that the Qiyān was crossed at B.γ-šūrā. If Buγšūr or B.γ-šūrā is Lan-chou, the γiyān of the *Hudūd al-‘Ālam* and the Qiyān of Gardīzī, although rendering the Chinese word *chiang*, « the River », do not refer to the Yang-tzū, but to the Huang-ho. I readily concede that, from the point of view of Chinese usage, such a conclusion is disconcerting, and I shall not hold it as certain so long as we cannot account for the names of K.jā and of Buγšūr.

Even if, in the source common to the *Hudūd al-‘Ālam* and to Gardīzī, the name Qiyān was misapplied, its very existence makes it likely that it remained alive in Persian-speaking circles, from whom Polo would have heard it in China. But while accounting for Polo’s « Quian », it makes his « Quiansui » the more surprising.

The transcriptions of Ch. *k-* of *chiang* (= *kiang*) by Ar. Pers. *q-* in late T’ang times (« Qiyān »), but by *k-* in the Mongol period (« Kāng »), and of Ch. *k-* of 甘 *kan* (in Mongol times, still *kam*) by Ar. Pers. *h-* in T’ang times (« Ḥam[čū] »), but by *q-* in the Mongol period (see « Campçio ») are not without parallels. A difficulty remains. According to KARLGREN’s system, 江 *chiang* sounded **kāng* in Middle Chinese, just as 江 *kang* (*Analytic Dict.*, p. 157), that is to say without the palatalization so strongly marked in the 9th or 10th cent. transcription *qiyān* (or *qīān*?). But this is one of the few cases in which I think that the phonetic indications derived from the ancient Chinese dictionaries are misleading and do not represent the pronunciation from which « Mandarin » Chinese is derived. I have discussed in *TP*, 1930, 194-195, a similar case with 咸 *hsien*, **γam* according to KARLGREN, although it is used towards the end of the 5th cent. to transcribe the first syllable of *yamčīn*, « postmaster » (see « Iamb »). *Chiang* (*kiang*) and *hsien* (*hien* < *hiām*) must have been pronounced already in Middle Chinese with the palatal element which is suggested by the transcriptions and which appears for these words in modern Mandarin.

324. RUCNEDIN ACMAT

<i>acomant, aromant</i> VB	<i>reame de achomac</i> LT	<i>rucumodi acamat</i> F
<i>re amadachomach, re ruchomo</i>	<i>regno chamado achomat</i> V	<i>ruemedam ahomet, ruemedam</i>
<i>dediachomach</i> VA	<i>reumeda jachomat, ruccomot</i>	<i>acromac</i> FA
<i>re dininedano comoith, reume-</i>	<i>dyacamat</i> TA ¹	<i>ruemedan acomat</i> F, FB
<i>clauacomar</i> VL	<i>ruchmedin achomach</i> R	<i>ruemedan ahomet</i> FB
<i>re humeda iachomat</i> TA ³		

This name of the king of Hormuz mentioned by Polo has been much discussed. In his text, YULE adopted (*Y*, I, 107) « Ruomedam Ahomet », which was the form printed by PAUTHIER (*Pa*, 85) without any remark, although it was not actually given by any Ms. BENEDETTO (*Be*², 446) pronounced in favour of « Maimodi Acomat », which he says occurs once in F (so misread by the editor of 1824, p. 36, and YULE, in *Y*, I, 120), and RICCI-ROSS (*RR*, 426) added a note suggesting an ori-