

NOTE I.—The name here applied to Fo-kien by Polo is variously written as *Choncha*, *Chonka*, *Concha*, *Chouka*. It has not been satisfactorily explained. Klaproth and Neumann refer it to *Kiang-Ché*, of which Fo-kien at one time of the Mongol rule formed a part. This is the more improbable as Polo expressly distinguishes this province or kingdom from that which was under Kinsay, viz. *Kiang-Ché*. Pauthier supposes the word to represent *Kien-Kwé*, “the Kingdom of Kien,” because in the 8th century this territory had formed a principality of which the seat was at *Kien-chau*, now Kien-ning fu. This is not satisfactory either, for no evidence is adduced that the name continued in use.

One might suppose that *Choncha* represented *T'swan-chau*, the Chinese name of the city of Zayton, or rather of the department attached to it, written by the French *Tshuan-tchéou*, but by Medhurst *Chwanchew*, were it not that Polo's practice of writing the term *tchéu* or *chau* by *giu* is so nearly invariable, and that the soft *ch* is almost always expressed in the old texts by the Italian *ci* (though the Venetian does use the soft *ch*).*

It is again impossible not to be struck with the resemblance of *Chonka* to “CHUNG-KWÉ” “the Middle Kingdom,” though I can suggest no ground for the application of such a title specially to Fo-kien, except a possible misapprehension. *Chonkwé* occurs in the Persian *Historia Cathaica* published by Müller, but is there specially applied to *North China*. (See *Quat. Rashid.*, p. lxxxvi.)

The city of course is FU-CHAU. It was visited also by Friar Odoric, who calls it *Fuzo*, and it appears in duplicate on the Catalan Map as *Fugio* and as *Fozo*.

I used the preceding words, “the city of course is Fu-chau,” in the first edition. Since then Mr. G. Phillips, of the consular staff in Fo-kien, has tried to prove that Polo's Fujū is not Fu-chau (*Foochow* is his spelling), but T'swan-chau. This view is bound up with another regarding the identity of Zayton, which will involve lengthy notice under next chapter; and both views have met with an able advocate in the Rev. Dr. C. Douglas, of Amoy.† I do not in the least accept these views about Fujū.

In considering the objections made to Fu-chau, it must never be forgotten that, according to the spelling usual with Polo or his scribe, Fujū is not merely “a name with a great resemblance in sound to Foochow” (as Mr. Phillips has it); it *is* Mr. Phillips's word Foochow, just as absolutely as my word Fu-chau is his word Foochow. (See remarks almost at the end of the Introductory Essay.) And what has to be proved against me in this matter is, that when Polo *speaks* of Fu-chau he does not *mean* Fu-chau. It must also be observed that the distances as given by Polo (three days from Quelinfu to Fujū, five days from Fujū to Zayton) do correspond well with my interpretations, and do *not* correspond with the other. These are very strong fences of my position, and it demands strong arguments to level them. The adverse arguments (in brief) are these:

(1.) That Fu-chau was not the capital of Fo-kien (“*chief dou reigne*”).

(2.) That the River of Fu-chau does not flow through the middle of the city (“*por le mi de cest cité*”), nor even under the walls.

(3.) That Fu-chau was not frequented by foreign trade till centuries afterwards.

The first objection will be more conveniently answered under next chapter (p. 239).

As regards the second, the fact urged is true. But even now a straggling street

* Dr. Medhurst calls the proper name of the city, as distinct from the *Fu*, *Chinkang* (*Dict. of the Hok-keen dialect*). Dr. Douglas has suggested *Chinkang*, and *T'swan-kok*, i.e. “Kingdom of T'swan” (*chau*), as possible explanations of *Chonka*.

† Mr. Phillips's views were issued first in the *Chinese Recorder* (published by Missionaries at Fu-chau) in 1870, and afterwards sent to the R. Geo. Soc., in whose *Journal* for 1874 they appeared, with remarks in reply more detailed than I can introduce here. Dr. Douglas's notes were received after this sheet was in proof, and it will be seen that they modify to a certain extent my views about Zayton, though not about Fu-chau. His notes, which do more justice to the question than Mr. Phillips's, should find a place with the other papers in the *Geog. Society's Journal*.