

MERY, III, 335, where the text really has *كوكن تانه* «Kokan Tānah», «Thāna of Konkan». What is arbitrary in YULE is to have vocalized here with *-i-* to suit «Cucintana», while the only forms known for Konkan in mediaeval Mussulman sources and in modern texts are Konkan and Kokan (cf. Y¹, I, 309; *Hobson-Jobson*², 244). As a matter of fact, the Catalan Map writes «Cocintaya» and it is the Medici Map which has «Cocintana» (cf. Y¹, I, 309; HALLBERG, 505-506). YULE's explanation is probable enough, although we do not know how the double name came to be known to Western cartographers.

353. TANPIGIU (< *GAMPGIU)

<i>capiguy</i> FBt	<i>taipinçu, tanpinçu</i> Z	<i>tanpingiu</i> Ft, L
<i>capingam, capyngam</i> G	<i>tampingiu</i> L	<i>tanpiugiu</i> Lm
<i>capyguy</i> FB, FBr	<i>tampingui</i> LT, P ⁵ (?), VL	<i>tanpiugu</i> Lr
<i>carpiguy, tarpiguy</i> FA	<i>tampinguy</i> P	<i>tapigni, tapingni</i> TA ¹
<i>chanpigui</i> V	<i>tanpigui</i> F, Fr	<i>tapigu</i> TA ³
<i>chanpingui</i> VA	<i>tanpigui</i> VB	<i>tapinzu</i> R
<i>pigni</i> TA ^{3r}		

To the readings of the Polian Mss., add «Tapingui» of the Catalan Map, «Tampizu» of Fra Mauro (in agreement with «Tapinzu» in R, which may almost suggest that the prototype of Z had also an initial *t-*); cf. HALLBERG, 499; CORDIER, *L'Extrême-Orient dans l'Atlas Catalan*, 26. It has been identified with Shao-hsing, without any attempt at a phonetic equivalence. I can understand that the identification with Shao-hsing was accepted by YULE (Y, II, 220), who made Polo follow a zigzag route from Hang-chou to Fu-chou. It is more surprising that CHARIGNON (*Ch*, III, 99) should have accepted it, when he correctly follows Polo's itinerary south-west of Hang-chou; moreover, his etymology of «Tanpigui» by 東越 Tung-yüeh is sheer nonsense.

From *Yung-lo ta-tien*, 19432, 22 b-26 a, and 19426, 9 b-10 a, we can fairly well ascertain the list of the postal relays between Fu-chou and Hang-chou in the Mongol dynasty. A main point on the route was the branching off, after Yen-p'ing, of one road going to Chiang-hsi through Shao-wu, and the other to Hang-chou via Chien-ning (see «Quenlinfu») and Chien-yang. This last road is manifestly the one described by Polo, and I gladly acknowledge that, for that part of Polo's itinerary, CHARIGNON has gone a step further than PHILLIPS, who had already improved on YULE.

But it is then evident that we must look for «Tanpigui» etc. to the south-west of Hang-chou, and the first important place we meet on the postal road of the time is the modern 嚴州府 Yen-chou-fu. CHARIGNON had thought of it (*Ch*, III, 99) and of an alternative explanation of «Tanpigui» by a would-be form 東睦州 Tung-mu-chou of the beginning of the 7th cent., which however never existed. Yen-chou had been called Mu-chou (not Tung-mu-chou) in T'ang times, but was renamed Yen-chou in the beginning of the 12th cent.; and this is the name which remained in use, although its official designation under the Yüan was the *lu* of Chien-tê. Polo uses the common