

again mentions «Šin aš-Šin» in iv, 254, and «Šin-kälān» in iv, 271-272 (cf. *Fe*, 455, 673). Now, «Šin-kälān» is the arabized form of Pers. Čin-kälān, «Great China», thus synonymous with «Mahāčīn», and there is not the slightest doubt that «Čin-kälān» is Canton. The name occurs before Ibn Baṭṭūṭah in Rašidu-'d-Dīn and in Waśśāf. Rašid's passage begins as follows (*Bl*, II, 493) : «The ninth province (*šing*; see 'Scieng') is that of كوني كوني Kōngi (?) which the Tāzīk call Čin-kälān . . .»; the Tāzīk (misread «Tāzī» in *Fe*, 673) are the Persians. The name I have read «Kōngi» with the Vienna ms. is uncertain; other readings are «Lūmkālī», «Lūtkālī», «Lūtāqālī», «Kūilkī» (adopted by BLOCHET). We should expect the name of Kuang-chou-fu, either as such or under the abbreviated form Kuang-fu. In Rašid's transcription, Kuang-fu would become كوني كوني *Kōnfū or كوني كوني *Kōngfū. The reading لوتقالي Lūtāqālī of L has a ق *q* which may easily be corrupt for ف *f*. On the whole I feel inclined to correct the name to *Kōngfū. This would dispose, however, of the very doubtful hypothesis I have suggested for «Choncha» (*q. v.*).

Waśśāf's passage has suffered at the hands of the translators. In the text (*Ha*², Pers. text, 43) it is said that there are in China 400 great towns, the smallest of which is of greater extent than Bagdad or Širāz; among them are «Lūngin-fu (Lung-hsing-fu), Zaitūn and Čin-kälān». D'OHSSON (II, 418) misread the first name as «Kenkan-fou». As to HAMMER (*Ha*², transl., 43), he jumbled up the first two names into «Lonkin Ferwezetium» and simply omitted «Čin-kälān».

This name of Canton is also mentioned by Western travellers. It is the «Censcala» of Odoric (*Wy*, 458; var. «Cescalān», «Censscolān»; read «Cencalan» or «Cincalan»). I have little doubt that the «Cincalan» of the Catalan Map comes from Odoric (cf. CORDIER, *L'Extrême-Orient dans l'Atlas Catalan*, 35). Shortly after Odoric, Marignolli, in enumerating cities of «Manzi, formerly Cyn», speaks of «Cynkalan, i. e. Great India, since *kalan* is 'great'» (*Wy*, 543). Marignolli, for whom Southern China («Manzi») is the first of the three Indies, opposes «Cynkalan», which is «Great India», to «Cynkali» of «Mynibar». «Mynibar» (Malabar; see «Melibar») is Marignolli's second India, and his «Cynkali» has in fact nothing to do with «Čin»; nor is it easy to see what Oriental word he is referring to when he says that «kali» means «small» (cf. *Y*¹, III, 249; *Hobson-Jobson*², 828-829). All these texts provide overwhelming evidence that, in the Mongol period, the name «Great China» specifically referred to Canton, a reversion to the use which obtained in I-ching's time.

The intricacies involved in the name «Čin» are not brought to a close, however, with «Čin-kälān». The case of the sort of brazil-wood called *verzino sieni* or *seni* by Pegolotti is still obscure (see «Brazil»). Čin and Mačīn («Chin et Machin») are a designation of Southern China in an unpublished section of the *Libellus de notitia orbis*, completed in 1402 (cf. A. KERN in *Arch. Frat. Praed.*, VIII [1938], 89). The double term «Čin and Māčīn» occurs c. 1470 in Nikitin (*Y*¹, I, 151). Josafa Barbaro, giving c. 1480 information collected in the Crimea in 1436, speaks of «the Cini and Macini, part of Cataio» and of «all those of the Cini and Macini and of Cataio» (RAMUSIO [1559], II, 106); he also says that «Cini and Macini are two very great provinces inhabited by idolators» (cf. *Y*¹, I, 269). In 1503, Syrian bishops were ordered to go «to the land of the Indians and the islands of the seas which are between Dabag and Sin and Masin» (*Y*¹, I, 127; S. GIAMIL, *Genuinae Relationes*, Rome, 1902, 8 vo, 558-600).