

*Chochan, which would approximately represent the Fuchienese pronunciation of 福建 Fu-chien itself. I had myself thought of a somewhat analogous solution: «Choncha» may be < *Chocha = 福家 *Hok-ka, «Fu-chien people», a possible synonym of the modern Hok-lo, and built up in the same way as for instance Nan-chia, «Southerner», or the modern Hak-ka. But I do not know of any certain case when a name in Polo is to be explained from a Chinese dialectical pronunciation. One may also imagine a misapplication by Rustichello of a name which actually referred to the Canton province, not otherwise mentioned by Polo, and which would correspond to the كونيكي Kōngī, لوميكي Lūmkalī or كويكي Kūilkī of Rašidu-'d-Dīn (*Y*¹, III, 126; *Bl*, II, 493, 499), itself unexplained (see «Cin»).

But I am afraid that no derivation whatsoever can be valid, since I doubt the very existence of the name «Concha». This is the view taken by BENEDETTO. Polo speaks several times of the «kingdom of Fugiu», and only once says that the «city of Fugiu» is the capital of a kingdom called «Concha». Now, there are in Polo quite a few passages where we are told that a city bears a certain name and that the province or the kingdom bears the same name; but more than once the readings of the name are so much at variance that they have been accepted by some editors as representing different originals. Such is the case for instance for «Cuigiu» (*q. v.*), in which PAUTHIER (*Pa*, 432-433) saw a province of «Cuigiu» and a city of «Fungul». BENEDETTO suggested (*B*, 156) that «Choncha» was corrupt for «Fugiu», and that *com ele*, «like it», or some similar expression had been dropped. Consequently «Choncha» has disappeared from his translation (*B*¹, 268); and while it is retained by RICCI-ROSS, it is said in their Index to be a mistake for «Fugiu» (*RR*, 258, 417). I incline to the same opinion. An intermediary form seems to be provided by VB's «Cagui» or «Cangui» as the name of the city «Fugiu», which form has passed into a passage of RAMUSIO as «Cangiu»; and the name of the «kingdom» is «Cancha» in TA¹. But the reading «Choncha» must have been a very early corruption to have become so general. It is just because it is so general that I still hesitate to reject it altogether.

143. CIAGANNOR

ciagannuor F, L
ciagatimor LT
ciagnuorum VL
ciagunor VA
ciangamor P

cianganor R
cyagannor FA
gauor TA¹
gharuor TA³

gianga V
gianganor, zanganor VB
goangamor Pr
siasamor FB

This name has long been recognized to be Čayān-na'ur > Čayān-nōr; it means in Mongolian «White Lake», as correctly stated by Polo. Fra Mauro's map gives «Zaganaor» (*Zu*, 35; HALLBERG, 173), and it is possible that the correct reading in Polo's text was *Ciagannaor, partly supported by forms like «Ciagannuor» in F and L. On the Catalan map, there is a city the name of which is written «Cinganar» in BUCHON's text (*Not. et Extr.* XIV, II, 143), but «Cinganor» on