

between the kingdom of Cathay and the kingdom of Inde» and in which «fine diamonds» are found (*Hist. des Croisades*, Arm., II, 123, 263).

But our best informant is once more Rašidu-'d-Dīn. According to him, the country south of Hītai (= of North China) is called by the Hindus «Mahāčīn», hence «Māčīn», in Persian, but «Manzi» by the Chinese and «Nangias» by the Mongols (see «Mangi»). To judge from Bānākātī's account, Rašīd seems also to have said that «Čīn» was the Hindu name for Hītai (cf. QUATREMÈRE, *Hist. des Mongols*, LXXXVI-LXXXVII, XCI-XCIII). For «Māčīn» = «Manzi», cf. also *Bl*, II, 370-371. At other times, Rašīd uses «Čīn and Mačīn» as a mere synonym of «Nangias», i. e. South China (cf. *Ber*, I, 146).

But Rašīd also speaks of the «capital of Māčīn» as of a city which is neither Hīngsai (see «Quinsai»), nor Zaitūn (see «Čaiton»), and YULE has already surmised that the place referred to must be Canton (cf. *Y*<sup>1</sup>, III, 115; cf. also LE STRANGE, *Nuhzat al-Qulūb*, transl., 250, and the somewhat conflicting account on p. 254). According to YULE (*Y*<sup>1</sup>, II, 180), both Al-Bīrūnī and Rašīdu-'d-Dīn «distinctly apply the name Mahacin to a city, no doubt Canton». I do not think that this information should be traced as far back as to Al-Bīrūnī; it occurs in a chapter in which Rašīd freely culled from Al-Bīrūnī, but an additional section of which cannot be earlier than the Mongol period. It is in this latter part that we find the following very interesting passage (ELLIOT, *History of India*, I<sup>1</sup>, 45-46; I<sup>2</sup>, 71-72): «Beyond [Champa; see 'Ciamba'] is Hainam (see 'Cheynam'), subject also to the Qāān. Beyond that is Māhāčīn, then the harbour of Zaitūn, on the shore of the China Sea...». Instead of «Māhāčīn», an Arabic ms. gives الصين الاعلى, also meaning «Čīn the Great». YULE was certainly right when he said that Rašīd's «Māhāčīn» in this passage was Canton.

Canton is first mentioned in Arabic texts of the 9th cent. as خانفو Hānfū, which renders 廣府 Kuang-fu, a popular short form of Kuang-chou [州]-fu. I stated this in 1904 in *BEFEO*, IV, 215. To the examples of «Kuang-fu» I had then adduced, I can now add 結, III, 93 b, quoted above; *T'ang liu tien*, 20, 8 ro; and, at a much later date, SAINSON, *Hist. particulière du Nan-Tchao*, 45. But the identification was forgotten in the Mongol period, and Canton came to be known under new names. I concur with ELLIOT (*History of India*, I<sup>2</sup>, 71) who identified with Canton Idrīsī's صينية الصين Šīniyatu-'ś-Šīn, «China of China» (JAUBERT, I, 194), although Idrīsī also repeats elsewhere (*ibid.*, I, 84) the old information on Hānfū without suspecting that both names refer to the same place. Al-Baiṭār, speaking of the Persian «\*Šīn Māšīn» (properly «Čīn ū Māčīn») says that it is somehow equivalent to an Arabic form «Šīn as-Šīn», «China of China» (*Fe*, 269). Although this is not etymologically correct and although Al-Baiṭār wrongly refers «Čīn and Māčīn» to «Turkestan», his text shows that a correspondence was felt between the two forms. We must then take into consideration that Māhāčīn (= Mahāčīn, Māčīn) is used by Rašīd as a name of Canton, and that «Šīniyatu-'ś-Šīn» is practically the same form as «Šīn as-Šīn». The identification is already all the more probable when Idrīsī speaks of «Šīniyatu-'ś-Šīn» as being a city of unequalled greatness, which was situated at the extremity of the empire, and which was visited by a great number of traders from various parts of India.

This is made certain by a passage in which Ibn Baṭṭūṭah, two centuries after Idrīsī, speaks of «Šīn as-Šīn» as being the same place as صين كلان Šīn-kālān (DEFRÉMERY, IV, 92). Ibn Baṭṭūṭah