

has pronounced his epitaph; but not before he had ascertained that China and Cathay were one. His journey we have chosen as a fitting close to our collection. After the publication of that narrative inexcusable ignorance alone could continue to distinguish between Cathay and China, and though such ignorance lingered for many years longer, here we may fairly consider our task at an end.¹

¹ Ricci and his companions, as we have seen, were before the journey of Goës satisfied of the identity of Cathay and China. So appears to have been, at an earlier date, the Italian geographer Magini. Purchas perceived the same, and the Jesuit Martini, in his *Atlas Sinensis*, expounded the identity in detail. Yet the Geographical Lexicon of Baudrand, in a revised edition of 1677, distinguishes between them, remarking that "some confound Cathay with China." I have not had access to Müller's *Disquisitio de Chataja*, which probably contains interesting matter on the subject.

A faint attempt to repeat the journey of Goës, but apparently in ignorance of that enterprise, was made a good many years later by the Jesuit Aimé Chesaud starting from Ispahan. He does not seem to have got further than Balkh, if so far. He still speaks of "getting to Chatao and thence to China." There is no date given. (See his letter in *Kircher's China Illustrata*, 1667, p. 86.)