

Kāšyari a very comprehensive term, the value of which had to be specified by some epithet : either « Upper Śin », which was China proper (sometimes used for « Hītai », sometimes also for « Taβyač » or « Māśin »), or « Lower Śin », which was that part of Chinese Turkestan which was under the rule of the Qarakhanids (cf. BARTHOLD, *12 Vorlesungen*, 97-98; BROCKELMANN, 250-251). HERRMANN was mistaken when he tried to identify Kāšyari's « Lower Śin » with Burma (cf. *TP*, 1936, 362). I think, moreover, that the terms « upper » and « lower » are to be understood in reference to people who took their bearings to the east, as is the case in Kāšyari's map, so that « upper » and « lower » would normally mean « east » and « west » respectively. Al-Baiṭār speaks of the rhubarb found in northern China, « that is to say in Turkestan, which the Persians call « *Śin Māśin » (LECLERC, in *Not. et Extr.*, XXV, I, No. 1018; *Fe*, 269; in both the spelling has been iranized as « Čin Māčīn », which makes meaningless what follows).

The names « Čin » and « Taβyač » spread still farther over the map of Asia. In 1246, the Nestorian Simeon Rabban-ata handed over to André de Longjumeau for transmission to the Pope a *libellus* which he had brought *de pectore Orientis, scilicet de terra Sin*, and there is no doubt that « Sin » here means Northern Mongolia (cf. *Pe*, 32, 41, 53). A few years later, the author of the *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāsirī* speaks of « the haughty Moyol infidels of Čin », *i. e.* of Mongolia (RAVERTY, 1288). Chinghiz-khan was first heard of in Egypt as *malik aš-Śin*, « king of China » (cf. BLOCHET, *Hist. d'Égypte de Makrizi*, 563, in the extracts from the *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*). For Stephen Orbelian, Qara-qorum, the Mongol capital, lay « in the country of Čin and Māčīn » (BROSSET, *Hist. de la Siounie*, I, 224; cf. also *Hist. de la Géorgie*, I, 485; PATKANOV, *Istoriya Mongolov*, I, 68-70). An-Nāsāwī, the biographer of Jalālu-'d-Dīn Māngūberti, gives the name « Ṭamyāč », other form of « Taβyač », to the capital of the Jučen, *i. e.* Peking (cf. *Y*¹, I, 33; HOUDAS, *Hist. du sultan Djelad ed-Din*, 8, 9, 58); but, in the *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāsirī*, Chinghiz-khan rose up « in the kingdoms of Čin and Ṭamyāč », and the « country of Ṭamyāč » means the « region of Qara-qorum » (RAVERTY, 935, 1291). In the 17th cent., the khans of Crimea proclaimed themselves « Great Emperors of the Tāt and Tawyāč [or 'Tawyāj'] ». The Tāt are the non-Turkish tribes; but this use of « Tawyāč » has puzzled scholars (cf. MINORSKY, in *EI*, s. v. « Tāt »). I consider it merely as the last outcome of the undue extension to the Turks and Mongols which the name Taβyač, « China » and « Chinese » (although etymologically the designation of a forgotten Altaic nation), had developed in the Middle Ages.

A similar undue extension of the name Čin, but at an earlier date, accounts for the would-be « Chinese » origin of the princes Orbelian and Čanbakurian-Orbelian (< Čenbakur, = *fayfūr* of Čin) of Armenian history, who must have been of Turkish descent (cf. BROSSET, *Hist. de la Siounie*, II, 181).

The Polian use of « Cin » is of course different. For Polo, « Cin » is the name used in the South by foreigners for « Mangi », *i. e.* South China, and the « sea of Cin » is the sea off the coast of « Mangi ». This is corroborated by Mussulman sources already at an early date. Ḥuwārizmī (first half of the 9th cent.) mentions the *bahr aš-Śin* « sea of Śin », as the most remote part of the Indian Ocean, and the same information is given in later works like the Persian *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam* (« Čin ») or the geography of Abū-'l-Fidā (cf. *Fe*, 591; *Mi*, 52, 179; REINAUD, *Géographie d'Aboulféda*, II, I, 25). Hethum mentions the « wealthy province Sim [read Sin], which is