

238. GEL or CHELAN (< *GIEL or GHELAN)

cechichelam LT
cheluchelam P⁵, VA
chieui e gielau V
geluchalat R

geluchelan FB, Z, VL, S
gheluchelam P
gheluchelan L
gieluchelan TA¹, TA³

gleluchelan FA
gleuechelam F
jerusalem VB

GHELLA

chella P
gella VL, S
gelle F, L
ghele TA¹, TA³

ghella VA
ghelle L¹, LT
ghellie R

gielie V
grelle FA
guelle FB

All Mss. treat both names as one, and although YULE (*Y*, I, 52) has translated « Sea of Ghel or Ghelan », and supposed (*Y*, I, 58) that Polo had said that the sea was called « La Mer de Ghel ou (de) Ghelan », the rest of his commentary, in a contradictory way, suggests that the double name is simply taken over by the traveller from the Persian. « Abulfeda », adds YULE, « uses exactly Polo's phrase, saying that the districts in question are properly called *Kil-o-Kilān*, but by the Arabs *Jil-o-Jilān*. » Hence, for instance, « Ghelukelan = Gil-u-Gilān » in *RR*, 422, and « Gheluchelan » in *B*¹, 443.

It is true that there existed a certain number of double names such as *Jūj-u-Mājūj*, « Gog and Magog » (*q. v.*), *Čin-u-Mačīn*, « North China and South China » (see « Cin »), and for instance Steph. Orbelian uses in Armenian the ready-made « *Čin-u-Mačīn* » in its Persian form (cf. BROSSET, *Hist. de la Siounie*, 229). But in such double terms, names are coupled which, although cognate, are not identical in meaning. The case of *Gil* and *Gilān* is quite different, inasmuch as both forms are strictly synonymous; one is the real name, the other a form derived from an old oblique plural. YULE is absolutely right in saying that they are in the same relation as *Hotl* and *Hotlān*, *Badaḡš* and *Badaḡšān*, etc. But these two synonymous forms have never been used as a joint expression. YULE's quotation from *Abū-'l-Fidā* is misleading. *Abū-'l-Fidā*, who writes in Arabic, simply says that the country is called in Persian « *گیلان Gilān* or « *گیل Gil* » (wa), and that these names become respectively *جیلان Jilān* and *جیل Jil* in Arabic (cf. REINAUD, *Géogr. d'Aboulféda*, II, II, 172); this has nothing to do with a compound name united by a copula (FERRAND is also misleading when, in *JA*, 1925, II, 112, he attributes to *Mas'ūdī*, among other names of the Caspian, that of « mer du *Gil* ou *Gilān* »; « ou *Gilān* » ought to be between brackets, as it is not in the original Arabic, which only says « Sea of *Jil* »).

I have no doubt that Polo spoke as *Abū-'l-Fidā*, that is to say that he quoted the two alterna-