

case of *ci* = *š*-, see «Ciandu». The «Sulistan» of *RR*, 435, and of *B*¹, 447, is a compromise. Polo gives «Cielstan» as one of the eight «kingdoms» of Persia. Cf. *Y*, I, 85; *LS*, 245, 262; and the notices «Shūl» and «Shūlistān» by MINORSKY in *EI*. Fra Mauro, copying Polo, writes «Celstan» (HALLBERG, 148-149).

There is on the Chinese map of c. 1330 and in the corresponding list of *YS*, 63, 16*b*, a name, 設刺子 *Shê-la-tzū*, which BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, II, 127) believed to be Šūlistān (his opinion is adopted in MINORSKY's notice); I think it is more probably Širāz (see «Çiraç»). Next to it, however, there is another name, 泄刺失 *Hsieh-la-shih*, in which BRETSCHNEIDER saw Širāz, and which becomes available for Šūlistān. But the transcription would be most unsatisfactory. We should expect either simply a transcription of Šūl, or a complete transcription of Šūlistān. I have no certain solution to propose. Sāraḥs (Serakhs) is too far away in the north, and moreover appears as *Sa-la-ha-hsi*, *Saraḥs*. Perhaps we ought to read in both texts 泄刺夫 *Hsieh-la-fu*, *Sirāf*. No solution is offered in *T'u Chi*, 160, 24*a*.

155. CIN

chuigi, chuwichan V
ci F
rim FA, TA³
cin F, L, TA¹, TA³, Z; R

cino, zino VB
cym FA
cyn FB, P

cui L, VA
çin Z
çiri, ziri LT

The name occurs in Polo only in connection with the «sea of Cin», our China Sea, «Cin» being, according to the traveller, the name given to «Mangi» (*q. v.*) by the «islanders» of those parts. Polo evidently refers to the Persian form چین *Čin*. BENEDETTO's hypothesis (*B*¹, 441) that «Cin» should probably be pronounced «Sin» on account of the Arabic «aš-Šin» cannot be retained. HALLBERG (pp. 125, 148), under «Cataia» and «Cin», refers the reader to an «appendix» which I believe has never been published.

Classical antiquity knew China and the Chinese under two names, Σῆρες (Lat. *Seres*), and *Θίν (?; Θίνα, Θίναι) or *Sinai*. Both have been the subject of long controversies, summed up in YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*², 196-198, and *Cathay* (*Y*¹ I, 1-28). I agree with VON GUTSCHMID (*Kleine Schriften*, III, 606) that the formal distinction between «Seres» and «Sinai» is peculiar to Ptolemy and his school.

I shall not enter into a detailed examination of the name «Seres», but some statements will be of use for the further discussion of *Θίν. The occurrence of «Seres» in Ctesias and Onesicritus (in Strabo) is extremely doubtful (*Y*¹, I, 14), but the name was familiar to authors of the 1st cent. B.C. (Virgil, Horace, etc.). Σηρικα, «silk textiles», are said to be mentioned at the end of the 4th cent. B.C. by Nearchus (in Strabo, xv, 1, 20), and σηρικόν is hardly to be separated from