

south of Badakhshān as Polo says. The bands must have afterwards gone down the valley of the Kabul river to reach Kashmir, and Dir would have been quite out of their way.

Fra Mauro has a « Paxan », which HALLBERG (pp. 56-57, 398) has not connected with « Pasciai ». But its vicinity on the map with « Chesmir » leaves no doubt as to the identification. Moreover « Paxan » is very near Z's « Paxay », a new link between Z and Fra Mauro.

310. PAUCA PAUCA PACAUCA

pacauca pacauca pacauca R *pauca pauca pacauca* Z

On the strength of « Pacauca pacauca pacauca » in R, YULE (Y, II, 346-347) has corrected the three words into « Pacauta » and considered certain that it was some form derived from Bhagavat, « holy », « divine », and has used it in *Hobson-Jobson*², 654, when discussing the etymology of « pagoda ». In spite of the fact that the Tamil forms put to contribution by YULE for his note on Polo suppose only « Bagavā » or « Pagavā », which does not account for a final *-ta*, we might think of some other forms with *t* from Bhagavatī, like Pogōdi. But RAMUSIO's form is not altogether convincing. Although RAMUSIO did not actually use our Ms. Z, his copy was very similar to it, and he has sometimes corrected it, so that on the whole Z is safer. Of course, a correction of *c* to *t* is easy, but the formula as it stands in Z, with a repetition of one form and then a third mention slightly different, is so well in agreement with Hindu invocations that it has a good chance of being correct. It is only strange that it cannot be traced for the present in native sources or in modern usage.

B¹, 307, retains the text of Z, without comment; RR, 429, keeps it too, but adds that it is probably a corruption of « Bhagava ». My objection is the same as for YULE's « Pacauta ».

311. PAUGHIN

panchi P, VA; G

panchin Fr, t, FAR, L

panchy P

panchym LT

panghi G

pangui VL

paquin, parchin VB

pauchi P(?), TA¹

pauchim TA³

pauchin F, FA, FAt, FB

paughin Z; R

paugin Z

pauian, pauin V

The location, one day south of Huai-an, leaves no doubt that 寶應 Pao-ying is meant, but surprise has been expressed at the transcription. Former editors have adopted the « Pauchin » of F; I think that V's « Pauin » is accidental, but that the « Paughin » of R and Z has every chance of being correct. Fra Mauro gives also « Paugin » (Zu, 36; HALLBERG, 397-398, where « Patigin »