

161. CIORCIA

cicorcia LT*ciorcia* F, FA, FB, L, TA¹, VL(?)*ciorza* R

(c. 160)

çorça Z*facirocia* VA*fuciorcia* P*furcirocia* VL*giorgia* LT, TA³*zorza* R*sargia* VB*siorcia* FB*trocirocia* L*zorzania, zorzie* V

This name is written *Zorça* on Fra Mauro's Map (not «*Zorza*» as in ZURLA, 36, and HALLBERG, 572 [who apparently did not suspect that it was identical with his «*Ciorcia*» of p. 150]). It has long been recognized that it represented the name of the tribe of south-eastern Manchuria which founded the Chin or «Golden» dynasty (see «*Roi Dor*») in northern China and which we generally call «*Jučen*»; the «*Jučen*», or more correctly **Jurčen* or *Nü-chên*, were Tungus, and near kin of the later Manchus.

In principle, Polo's «*Ciorcia*» represents **Čörčä*; some of the readings may point to an original **Giorcia* = **Jörčä*, though this seems to be less probable.

The form used by Polo is, as usual, the one then current in Persian-speaking circles. Rašidu-'d-Dīn mentions more than once the *جورچه* (cf. *Bl*, II, 446, 485, 498, and several times in Rašid's *History of China*; also QUATREMÈRE, *Hist. des Mongols*, xc, xcii). BLOCHET, without comment, always writes it *جورچه* *Čürčäh* (= *Čürčä*), but this is arbitrary; the mss. do not distinguish between *č* and *j*. As a matter of fact, Rašid's spelling gives no clue to enable us to determine whether we should transcribe it *Jürčä* or *Čürčä*. The form *جورچت* *Jürjät* (or *Čürčät*) of the *Nuzhab al Qulūb* (LE STRANGE, Pers. text, 257¹²; transl., 250), although stated by the author himself to be based on Rašid, is a misreading in which the vowel of the first syllable has been omitted and the final *t* developed into *ī* = *ت* *t* (this error, aggravated by a misplacing of dots, occurs sporadically in Rašid's mss., hence the *جورچب* «*Jürčäb*» or «*Čürčäb*» in QUATREMÈRE, xcii); it has nothing to do with the plural in *-t* which I shall discuss farther on. Whatever the explanation of the form **Jürčä* or **Čürčä* with a final *-ä* may be, the form is confirmed by Polo's «*Ciorcia*». Moreover, even in the Ming period, the Persian form, though slightly different, was without a *-t*; it is given as *جورچی* and phonetically transcribed *Jorji* (or *Jörji*) in the Sino-Persian Vocabulary of the Board of Translators (13*b*; this ms. does not distinguish between *č* and *j* in Arabic writing). For the vocalic ending in Persian the probabilities are that it is due to a form ending with a quiescent *-n* as in the Chinese transcriptions. If the name came to the Persians direct from the **Jurčen* or through a Mongol channel, Rašid's form must be transcribed **Jürčä*, and Polo's «*Ciorcia*» would stand for **Giorcia* = **Jörčä*. On the other hand, if the Persians received the *I* name from the Uighurs, **Čürčä* in Rašid and «*Ciorcia*» (= **Čörčä*) in Polo might be correct. BARTHOLD (12 *Vorlesungen*, 121) says that the Mussulman form of the name was *Jurji*; but find *Jurji* (or *Jörji*) only in the Sino-Persian Vocabulary of the Ming period, the authority of which is of course very small for earlier times in comparison with Rašidu-'d-Dīn.

In Uighur, the name occurs in the legend of Oyuz-khan as *Čürčät*. In *TP*, 1930, 336,