

319. QUENGIANFU

<i>chandianfo</i> V	<i>guengyanfu, guengyenfu</i> FB	<i>qengunfu</i> Ft
<i>chanziafu</i> VB	<i>guenyasu</i> LTr	<i>quegianfu</i> F, TA ³
<i>gemgunphu</i> VL	<i>gyanfu</i> P	<i>quengianfu</i> F, FA, L, TA ¹
<i>gianfu</i> Pr	<i>margara</i> VA	<i>quengienfu</i> FAt
<i>guanciansu, guengiasu</i> LT	<i>qençanfu, quençanfu</i> Z	<i>quenzanfu</i> R
<i>guengianfu</i> FBt	<i>qengiufu</i> Fr	

There is no doubt that Polo applies this name to Hsi-an-fu, the metropolis of Shàn-hsi. Already in 1897, DEVÉRIA called attention to the fact that a similar form occurred in the Persian vocabulary of the College of Translators of the Ming dynasty. Polo follows here, as usual, the toponymy then current among Persian-speaking people. DEVÉRIA's paper has already been quoted by CORDIER (*Y*, II, 29; III, 77-78), but the facts have not been presented quite accurately. In the Persian vocabulary of the College of Translators, كنجانفو *Kinjanfu*, with the phonetic transcription in Chinese 欽張夫 *Ch'in-chang-fu* (金 *chin* in *BEFEO*, IV, 771, is a misprint, which has passed since into *JA*, 1912, I, 594), has for Chinese equivalent not 京兆府 *Ching-chao-fu*, as has been said, but 陝西 *Shàn-hsi*, that is, the name of Shàn-hsi province. The same equivalence, Shàn-hsi, occurs in the Turkish vocabulary of the Ming period, written only in Chinese characters, which is in the Library of the School of Oriental Studies in London (in the series « *Kö Kwö Yi Yü* »). In this work, Shàn-hsi is rendered by 勤昌府 *Ch'in-ch'ang-fu*, seemingly **Kinčangfu*, which would probably also be *Kinjanfu* if we had it in Arabic writing (the transcriptions of the vocabulary are not very strict). The name appears in Rašidu-'d-Dīn, written once كين جانفو *Kin-ĵanfu* (*Bl*, II, 495), but elsewhere كينجانفو *Kinjanfu* (*Bl*, II, 598; also in Rašid's *Ms. History of China*; the form « *Kenjangfu* » of *Y*¹, 127, 128, is only due to an arbitrary transcription by KLAPROTH, who himself gives the name in Arabic letters without -g-). In BEREZIN's translation (*Ber*, III, 28), Rašidu-'d-Dīn speaks of Hsi-an-fu as « *Czin-čžao* », *i. e.* *Ching-chao*, but this is a « learned » correction due to the editor and translator. Instead of كينك جايو *King-ĵayu*, adopted in the Persian text (p. 46), the various readings clearly establish that we must adopt كينك جانفو *King-ĵanfu*. *Kinjanfu* is also mentioned in the *Zafār-nāmāh* (cf. *Not. et Extr.* XIV, 500; *Y*¹, I, 175), and was still used about 1545 by the author of *Ta'rīḥ-i-Rašīdī* (transl. ELIAS and ROSS, 404); we find it *in situ* in a Sino-Arabic inscription of 1545 (*TP*, 1905, 279, 284; instead of كنجاففوی *Kinĵāfāfūyī*, read كنجانفوی *Kinĵānfūyī*, an ethnic derivative of *Kinjanfu*; HUART wrongly thought of *Kanchou*). In the fantastic itinerary of Ibn Baṭṭūṭah across China, قنجنفو *Qinĵānfu* probably also represents *Kinjanfu* (cf. *Fe*, 428, where FERRAND is misled by DULAURIER into believing that Polo's « *Quengianfu* » is *Chên-chiang* on the Yang-tzū, for which see « *Cinghianfu* »).

YULE (*Y*¹, II, 246) has taken it for granted that it was *Kinjanfu* which appeared in Odoric