

## 241. GIOGIU

<i>chugiu, gogiu</i> TA <sup>3</sup>	<i>enguy</i> FA	<i>giogu</i> TA <sup>3</sup> , VL
<i>chugni, cugni, gioghui</i> TA <sup>1</sup>	<i>gigi</i> Fr	<i>gioguy, guingui</i> LT
<i>chuigian, giugui, gugui</i> V	<i>gingim, giogin</i> VA	<i>giugiu, giungiu</i> F
<i>ciugiu</i> Ft, VL (?)	<i>gingni</i> FAr	<i>gouza</i> R
<i>cuguy, ginguy</i> FB	<i>gingui</i> FA; R	<i>guigui</i> FAt
<i>çingiu, gingui, zinqu</i> VB	<i>ginugui</i> LTr	<i>gyougium</i> P
<i>çonça, çonçu, çuçu</i> Z	<i>giogiu</i> F, L	

With the exception of MOULE who thought of 趙州 Chao-chou (TP, 1915, 409), all commentators have agreed that « Giogiu » is 涿州 Cho-chou, and they are certainly right. Polo says that at « Giogiu » the two roads meet, one of them leading to the west, the other to the south-east. The *Yung-lo ta-tien* (19423, 26 a) speaks of two routes followed by official envoys sent to the south, which branched off at Cho-chou (see « Cacanfu »). It has already been remarked that, if Polo begins the account of his journey to the south (south-south-east) with Cho-chou, it is because he had already described the part common to both roads in the account of his journey to Yün-nan.

Cho-chou is written جوجر Joju in 1812 by the author of the itinerary obtained by « Mir 'Izzet Ullah » (JRAS, No. xiv, 308), but YULE (Y, II, 11) is mistaken when he thinks that the same spelling is used by Rašidu-'d-Din in a text mentioning the vineyards of « Joju ». I have shown (JA, 1927, II, 261-263) that both mentions of « Joju » in the text where Rašid praises the vines of that region (Bl, II, 463) are altered from فوجر Fuju, which the Persian writer gives elsewhere, and apply to 撫州 Fu-chou, outside the Great Wall. But this does not mean that the name of Joju never appears in Rašidu-'d-Din. I have no doubt that it is the جوجر Juju or جوجير Jojiu of Ber, III, 21, and Bl, II, 180, 215, since the name of Cho-chou occurs in the parallel text of *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu* (ed. WANG Kuo-wei, 53 a; many other names are corrupt in the Mss. or have been wrongly restored by BEREZIN and BLOCHET; but this is not the place for a critical study of these passages of Rašidu-'d-Din).

The forms « Jonju » and « Giongju » adopted, instead of « Giogiu », in RR and B<sup>1</sup> are certainly wrong.

## 242. GION

<i>geichon</i> R	<i>gyon</i> Z	<i>iou</i> FA
<i>geon</i> TA <sup>1</sup>	<i>ion</i> F	<i>jon</i> F, FB, L
<i>gion</i> LT, TA <sup>3</sup> , V, VB, Z		

Represents جيون Jihün (also vocalized Jäihün), so that *gi-* is not here simply = *j-*; the name is *gi + on = jion*, not « Jon » as in Y, II, 458, 466, and RR, 424; it may even be that Polo's « Gion », like « Gyon » in the letter of Sembat of Febr. 7, 1247, « Gion » in Hethum (*Hist. des Crois., Arm.*,