

as a designation of Southern China and more particularly of Canton. The reason may be that «Mahācīna» was more or less an honorific epithet, not conflicting with the name which foreigners of Central Asia then usually gave to China and which was no longer a form derived from Ch'in, but was the more recent «Taβyač», of northern origin (see «Catai»). On the other hand, in the south, sailors from Arab, Persian, Indian and Malay countries continued to refer to China as «Śīn», «Čīn», «Cīna» (Čīna). This explains how the name «Čīn» became in a way a synonym of Canton. The note of I-ching and of the two subsequent works already foretells the state of affairs which was later reflected in Polo's «Sea of Cin».

But the question is not so simple. Persian sources often speak of چین و ماجین «Čīn and Māčīn», Arabic ones more rarely of «Śīn and Māsīn» (cf. Kāšyari's map). VON GUTSCHMID (*Kleine Schriften*, III, 605) was of opinion that «Čīn and Māčīn» was a term created in Mussulman times as a «pendant» to Gog and Magog (see «Gog») and that «Māčīn» could have had hardly anything to do with «Mahācīna». This is surely an error. The intermediary form is provided by Al-Birūnī's book on India (c. 1030), where mention is made of «Mahāčīn», located north of the mountains where the Ganges takes its rise (SACHAU, *Alberuni's India*, I, 207). Rašīdu-'d-Dīn was conscious of the derivation when he wrote: «In the language of the Indians, southern China is called 'Mahāčīn', i. e. 'Great China', from which name 'Māčīn' was formed» (cf. QUATREMÈRE, *Hist. des Mongols*, XCII-XCIII; also LXXXVII for Bānākātī's *rifacimento*; Śādiq Iśfahānī, in *Fe*, 560). In the *Aīn-i Akbarī*, completed in 1595, mention is made of Hītā (or Hātā, China; see «Catai»), «which is also called Mahāčīn, commonly pronounced Māčīn» (*Fe*, 552). There is perhaps, however, that much of truth in VON GUTSCHMID's theory that the reduction from «Mahāčīn» to «Māčīn» may have been favoured by the influence of «Magog», and that the vague but popular «Gog and Magog» is to some extent responsible for the frequent recurrence and the loose treatment of the parallel couple «Čīn and Māčīn».

This loose treatment, however, is also and I think mainly due first to the various applications of the name «Čīn» and secondly to the confusion caused in geographical nomenclature when China became divided into a Northern and a Southern China, governed by sovereigns of different races.

We have seen that the name derived from «Ch'in» had reached India and Iran *via* Chinese Turkestan, which, moreover, was at various times entirely under Chinese rule. It is therefore no surprise that Chinese Turkestan should have been more or less included in the foreign notion of «Cīna» or «Čīn». What is more remarkable is that, when it became independent, its rulers, paying an unconscious tribute to the great Far Eastern civilization, still clung to the Chinese name. In the 11th cent. North China had come to be known as Hītai (see «Catai»), but the more ancient names were still in use, «Čīn» in Persian, «Śīn» in Arabic, «Taβyač» in Turkish: so the Qarakhanid sovereigns of western Chinese Turkestan took the Turkish title of «Taβyač khan», replaced on their coins by the Arabic «malik aś-Śīn»; both mean «King of China» («Ṭamyāč khan», a secondary form of «Taβyač khan», is the title of the *fayfūr*, or Emperor of China, in Al-Birūnī; cf. *Y*<sup>1</sup>, I, 33).

For Kāšyari, «Hītai» was North China (then ruled by the Qītai of Ch'i-tan), and «Taβyač» all the rest of China under Sung rule; the latter was also called «Māsīn». As to «Śīn», it is in