

the Great Khan Tämür and died on his way back in India (see « Cačan »). YULE supposed that Polo had confused *Ruknu-'d-Din* Mas'ūd and Faḥru-'d-Din *Aḥmad* to form his « Ruknu-'d-Din Aḥmad ». This has been accepted by PENZER (*Pe*, 175, 176), and has caused hesitation in SINCLAIR, 160. I am not altogether convinced that the chronology of TEIXEIRA's Chronicle is always to be trusted, but, in the present case, its text provides what I believe, with MARSDEN, to be the obvious solution. Polo has confused the two kindred forms Aḥmad and Maḥmūd, but his Ruknu-'d-Din Aḥmad can be no other than the Ruknu-'d-Din Maḥmūd of the Chronicle (for a similar confusion, cf. Hethum who gives to the *ilḥan* Aḥmad the name of « Mahomet Can »; see « Acmat² »). It might be suggested that the chronology of the said chronicle is inaccurate, and that Ruknu-'d-Din Maḥmūd was still on the throne in 1293. But no such change is required, since there is no reason to date Polo's notice on Hormuz from 1293. On the contrary, the statement in the Chronicle, according to which Ruknu-'d-Din Maḥmūd died in 1277/1278, provides a powerful argument for placing Polo's notice at the time of the outward journey, *i. e.* in 1273.

325. SACIOU

<i>sacchion</i> LT	<i>sacion</i> F, FA(?), FB, L	<i>sanzechiam</i> VL
<i>sachiom</i> VA	<i>saciou</i> (?) FA	<i>sazizion</i> VB
<i>sachion</i> LTm, P, TA ¹ ; R	<i>sagiom</i> TA ³	<i>suçio</i> V

This reading, instead of the « Sacion » of F, is supported by Z's « Suçio »; on this rare rendering of °*chou* with °*ciou* instead of °*giu*, see « Campçio ». « Saciou » is of course 沙州 Sha-chou, better known to-day under its older name of Tun-huang. The name of Sha-chou goes back to the second quarter of the 4th cent. (it does not first appear in A. D. 622, as CORDIER says in *Y*, I, 206, relying on *Br*, II, 18). Situated at the western limit of Kan-su province, this oasis is the first to be reached by travellers coming by the road south of the Lop-nor, as the Polos did.

The name of Sha-chou must have been known to Mussulman geographers in late T'ang times; it has passed from them into the *Hudūd al-'Ālam* of 982-983 and into Gardīzī (11th cent.), where it is spelt ساجو Sājū (= Šāčū) and شاجو Šājū (= Šāčū). According to Gardīzī, Šājū is the first important stage after Qomul (see « Camul ») on the way from Činānčkāt (= Qočo; see « Carachoço ») to Ḥumdān (= Hsi-an-fu; see « Quengianfu »), which is perfectly true. The *Hudūd al-'Ālam* says that the inhabitants of Sājū and of Ḥājū (probably Kua-chou in Kan-su) are Manichaeans, and there were really Uighur Manichaeans in Kan-su in late T'ang times (cf. *Mi*, 85, 229, 233). MINORSKY also gives Sha-chou as the probable original of شانجو Šānjū on Kāšyarī's map of 1076 (*Mi*, 230), and HERRMANN (*Imago Mvndi*, 1935, 21-28) has taken the same view. I have already said in *TP*, 1936, 363, that, in my opinion, Kāšyarī's Šānjū is not Sha-chou, but 善州 Shan-chou on the river of Hsi-ning, an important place for foreign intercourse in late T'ang times; it would take too long to give here the reasons for such an identification (see also « Silingiu »).

Sha-chou is also named in Tibetan and « Šaka » (= Khotanese) documents of the 9th-10th cents.; the name is spelt Śa-ču in Tibetan, Śaču in Khotanese (cf. *JRAS*, 1927, 808; 1931, 303).