

BENEDETTO has in his *Indice* (452, 455) separate entries for « coturnici » and for « quaglie », I do not think that the difference in the words implies for him a difference in meaning; both words occur in F, which he followed in his translation. In the case of F's « cators, que nos apellon les grant perdris », it may be noticed that this is the only occurrence of the form « perdris » in F; in the two other cases where F speaks of partridges, it uses « pernis » (B, 27, 31), which is an italianism. So the question may be raised whether « que nos apellon les grant perdris » is not an early interpolation, analogous to the *cioè contornici* added in TA<sup>1</sup>, and due to a copyist who misunderstood the meaning of « cators ». In such a case, the term would simply imply quails which were fed for the Emperor's use. There is nothing impossible in this. I may add that YULE's text relating to this subject is not complete, leaving out all the details, certainly genuine, which are to be found only in RAMUSIO.

But there is perhaps another solution. BOERIO's *Dizionario del Dialetto Veneziano*<sup>2</sup>, under *pernice*, says that this is the « common partridge » (*pernice comune*, or red partridge); under *quagia*, that it is the *quaglia*, or *coturnice*, or *cotornice*, viz. the quail. But, under *cotórno*, we are told that this is a name used by sportsmen as a designation of the *Starna maggiore* or *coturnice*, commonly called *Starna di Piacenza* in Tuscany, LINNAEUS's *Tetrao rufus*. *Starna*, not used in the Venetian dialect, is the Italian name of a kind of partridge, and I think that VB's *stornelli* actually represents \**starnelli*, « great partridges », which is also the meaning of *starna maggiore*, given by BOERIO as an equivalent of *cotórno*. It would thus seem that *cators*, *quatornis* (in the chapter on Yazd), etc., may well have to be taken with the Venetian value of *cotórno*, and, in spite of the etymology, be the designation not of the quail, but of a kind of partridge.

## 128. CAUGIGU

|                                      |                                 |   |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| <i>caigu</i> Fr                      | <i>cauçugu, cauzugu</i> Z       | <i>gangigu</i> [mellichac (74 r <sup>o</sup> )] V |
| <i>cangighu, changighu, changigu</i> | <i>caugigu</i> F, FA, FB, P, L  | <i>gaugigu</i> F                                  |
| <i>changiu</i> TA <sup>3</sup>       | <i>chaugigu</i> TA <sup>1</sup> | <i>talugigla</i> LT                               |
| <i>cangigu</i> Ft, L, R              | <i>cjngoj</i> VB                | <i>tangigu</i> VA                                 |

I cannot see why we still find « Cangigu » in B, 125, and Pe, 293, 378, nor why B<sup>1</sup>, 440, while now adopting « Caugigu », adds that the reading is uncertain. Ch, II, 262, is absurd. The name, as already suspected by QUATREMÈRE and D'OHSSON, is evidently 交趾國 Chiao-chih-kuo, « Kingdom of Chiao-chih », Tonking, often so called in YS as an alternative name for An-nan (Annam, but in the sense of modern Tonking); cf. for instance YS, 10, 9 a; 11, 3 b, 4 a, etc. The etymology is confirmed by Rašidu-'d-Dīn's كفجه كوه Kafjäh-guh (Y<sup>1</sup>, III, 130; Bl, II, 451-452, 499). « Caugigu » and « Kafjäh-guh » are Chiao-chih-kuo, just as « Çipingu » and « Jimingu » are Jih-pên-kuo (see « Çipingu »). It is well known that the very old name Chiao-chih, through an intermediary Malay form, survives as the first element of our « CochinChina » (a name which was applied to Middle Annam until the end of the 18th cent.). In 1554, Sidi 'Alī names كوجي Kōjī (for Kōčī),