

the spiritus asper of the initial Greek *r*. In some Iranian dialects the spiritus asper is marked by an initial vowel: thus in Pahlavi Arūm, in Kurd Urum. The ancient Armenian words with initial *hr*, as explained by A. Meillet, were borrowed from Parthian dialects which transformed initial Iranian *f* into *h*: for instance, Old Iranian *framana* (now *ferman*, "order") resulted in Armenian *hraman*, hence from Parthian *hraman. Thus *Frōm, probably conveyed by the Sogdians, was the prototype from which Chinese Fu-lin, *Fu-lim, was fashioned. In my opinion, the Chinese form is not based on *Frōm, but on *Frim or *Frīm. Rīm must have been an ancient variant of Rūm; Rim is still the Russian designation of Rome.¹ What is of still greater importance is that, as has been shown by J. J. Modi,² there is a Pahlavi name Sairima, which occurs in the Farvardin Yašt, and is identified with Rum in the Būndahišn; again, in the Šāhnāmeḥ the corresponding name is Rum. This country is said to have derived its name from Prince Selam, to whom it was given; but this traditional opinion is not convincing. A form Rima or Rim has accordingly existed in Middle Persian; and, on the basis of the Chinese transcription *Fu-lim or *Fu-rim, it is justifiable to presuppose the Iranian (perhaps Parthian) prototype *Frim, from which the Chinese transcription was made.

¹ What Pelliot remarks on the Tibetan names Ge-sar and P'rom is purely hypothetical, and should rather be held in abeyance for the present. We know so little about the Ge-sar epic, that no historical conclusions can be derived from it. For the rest, the real Tibetan designation for Byzance or Turkey, in the same manner as in New Persian, is Rum (*T'oung Pao*, 1916, p. 491). In regard to the occurrence of this name in Chinese transcriptions of more recent date, see BRETSCHEIDER, *Mediæval Researches*, Vol. II, p. 306; and HIRTH, *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 141.

² *Asiatic Papers*, p. 244 (Bombay, 1905).