

and writes also كوشى Kōšī (*Fe*, 500, 515, 517, 519). The rich « island » called « Cauchī » of which LEGAZPI heard soon after his arrival at the Philippines in 1571, and the name of which has puzzled Father BERNARD, *Les Iles Philippines*, Tientsin, 1936, 7, is no other than Chiao-chih, *i. e.* Annam.

But, if the etymology is certain, it must also be admitted that Polo's description of the country is rather baffling, and this explains why commentators have thought of Upper Laos (*Pe*, 293; *B*¹, 440). My own solution is this : while Rašidu-'d-Dīn has a more correct notion of « Chiao-chih-kuo », Polo heard of it in Yün-nan, as is shown by the order of his narrative, and what he was told refers to the conditions of the Upper Red River, contiguous with Yün-nan; the Upper Laos properly so called was independent of « Annam ». On the other hand, Polo, misled by the second name An-nan (then read An-nam) of modern Tonking, thought that the two names represented different countries, so that he was under the impression that An-nan, but not Chiao-chih, touched the Gulf of Tonking (see « Amu »).

I am one of those who think it possible, and even probable, that Chiao-chih, very early attested in Chinese texts, is also the first component of Ptolemy's « Cattigara » (cf. *TP*, 1932, 181).

Barros has connected his tattooed and cannibal « Gueos » of Laos with Polo's tattooed people of « Caugigu »; it is by some confusion that DAMES (*Barbosa*, II, 167) has thought that Barros's allusion referred to Polo's tattooed cannibals of Fu-chien.

Fra Mauro's « Chauzuzu » (not « Chanzuzu » as in *Zu*, 40, and HALLBERG, 136) is in agreement only with Z.

129. CAULI

carli R
cauli F, LT, P, VL
cauly FA

causy FB
chalulon V
chauli VA

chauly TA¹, TA³
guli S

Ch. 高麗 Kao-li, Coreā. But it appears very doubtful that Nayan should have wielded any authority even over the north-western part of Coreā. Cf. *Y*, I, 345; *Y*¹, I, 303.

Rubrouck writes « Caule » (*Wy*, 270-271); Rašidu-'d-Dīn, كولى Kaūli (or Kōli?; *Bl*, II, 486, 498). The « Caulij » of the Catalan Map, although wrongly located, and bearing an epithet not traceable to Polo, seems also to represent Coreā; cf. HALLBERG, 126.

Rašīd, who sometimes gives Kaūli (or Kōli) alone, uses in his description of the Chinese provinces one of those repetitive forms which YULE (*Y*¹, III, 125) calls a « double jingle », but which would require a more pertinent explanation. Moreover, in spite of the versions published by HAMMER, KLAPROTH, D'OHSSON and BLOCHET, we still lack a critical study of this description. As to the name of the « province » of Coreā, previous editors have read the double name as كولى و كولى « Koli and Ukoli »; nevertheless, no « Ukoli » reading is quoted by BLOCHET (*Bl*, 496) from his mss., and he corrects the second form into كوكولى Kokuli = 高句麗 Kao-kou-li, although there is no indication that this old name of Coreā had survived in the Mongol period and could have come to the knowledge of the Persian historian. There is for Coreā another ancient name which