

ginal form « Maḥmūd-i-Aḥmad ». But direct examination of F does not confirm BENEDETTO's decipherment; the actual reading seems to be « Rucumodi acamat ». As a matter of fact, there can be no doubt that the first part of the name is Ruknu-'d-Dīn. For the second part, there is no doubt either that the Mss. readings are based on « Acomat », and this is a well-known transcription of « Aḥmad » in most Polian Mss. for another Aḥmad and in European works of the later centuries. If I have changed it to « Acmat », it is on account of the two other Aḥmad mentioned by Polo (see « Acmat » [c. 85 and c. 202]), and with the assumption, generally borne out by experience, that Polo was consistent in his renderings of Oriental names and words; but « Acomat » might have been retained.

The name meant being certainly Ruknu-'d-Dīn Aḥmad, it is more difficult to determine to which king it referred. This aspect of the problem is connected to a certain extent with the date at which Polo met that king of Hormuz. PAUTHIER was of opinion (*Pa*, 86) that Polo had visited Hormuz on the homeward journey, when accompanying the Princess Kōkāčīn; but Polo himself says in so many words that he was at Hormuz in both the outward and homeward journeys. Although well aware of these two stays at Hormuz, YULE, for reasons which he does not state and which I cannot perceive, declared (*Y*, I, 120) that «there can, I think, be no doubt that Marco's account refers to the period of his return from China ». But it is in the account of the outward journey that Polo gives all the details about Hormuz, including the double reference to Ruknu-'d-Dīn Aḥmad, and there is a fair chance, on the contrary, that he heard the name during his first stay at Hormuz, *i. e.* in 1273.

For a list of the kings of Hormuz, and apart from valuable information in Waśśāf, unfortunately muddled up in HAMMER's *Geschichte der Ilchane*, and from occasional data due to various travellers and referring to times later than Polo's, our sole source is the lost Chronicle of the Kings of Hormuz translated in 1593-1597, with omissions and personal digressions, by Pedro TEIXEIRA: an English translation of TEIXEIRA's work, due to W. F. SINCLAIR, was published in 1902 by the Hakluyt Society (see « Curmos »). There we find (pp. 158-159) a notice on the king « Amir Roknadin Mahmud », the first one for which precise dates are given : « he reigned thirty-five years, and died in the year of the Hyxara 676, that is A. D. 1278. » This passage, by the way, has not always been quoted correctly. By a slip, YULE (*Y*, I, 120) says that the death of Ruknu-'d-Dīn Maḥmūd is assigned to « A. H. 675 (A. D. 1277) »; by another slip, in view of the « thirty-five years » of the text, he gives « from 1246 to 1277 » for the reign of the king, and the same is said by STÜBE (*EI*, s. v. « Hormuz »), while it ought to be 1242-1277. As to the discrepancy between 1277 and 1278, either year is possible, since A. H. 676 lasted from June 1277 to June 1278.

Labouring under the idea that Polo's « Rucnedin Acomat » must have been on the throne in 1293, YULE discarded Ruknu-'d-Dīn Maḥmūd, because he had died in 1277, and then proposed an intricate combination. One of the sons of Ruknu-'d-Dīn Maḥmūd is called « Masaud » by TEIXEIRA (= « Masa'ūd » according to YULE, « Masāūd » according to SINCLAIR, but HAMMER transcribes it « Mesud » as all the other Mas'ūd, and I think that TEIXEIRA's second -a- merely represents the 'ain), but HAMMER mentions him once as « Rokneddin Mesud » (*Ha*¹, II, 50). On the other hand, there was a Faḥru-'d-Dīn Aḥmad, who has been unduly connected with the transfer of Hormuz from the mainland to the island of Jārūn, since at that time he must have been sent by Ghazan to