

Miśrayim), transcribed 勿斯里 Wu-ssü-li (*Mj̄uat-sī-lji) in 1178 by Chou Ch'ü-fei, and in the same manner in 1225 by Chao Ju-kua; but, in another section, and probably from a different source, Chao Ju-kua gives the same name, transcribed 蜜徐 𪛗 Mi-hsü-li (*Mj̄ët-zj̄^wo-ljī), as that of the capital of the Arabs (cf. *HR*, 24, 115, 120, 144-145).

Under the Mongols, the same name Miśr is transcribed 迷思耳 Mi-ssü-êrh on the map of c. 1330, directly traced on a Mohammedan original (cf. BRETSCHNEIDER in *JNCB*, x, 295, and *Br*, II, 135-136), but is omitted from the corresponding list of *YS*, 63, 16 *b*, because Egypt was outside the dominions of the Ilkhan, and has also been left out by T'u Chi (160, 22-33). A short notice on 密乞兒 Mi-ch'i-êrh (read Mi-[昔]hsi-êrh), Miśr, has been preserved in the account of Ch'ang Tê's mission to Persia in 1259 (cf. *Br*, I, 141-142; the text is poorly established, and partly mistranslated): «To the west (of T'ien-fang, Mecca), there is the kingdom of Miśr; this kingdom is very rich and produces gold. People examine at night the places which are brilliant and mark them with ashes (or «with lime»); the next morning, they dig at them, and there are pieces [of gold] as big as jujubes. There are more than 6 000 *li* [from there] to Bagdad. West of the kingdom [of Miśr] is the sea, and west of the sea the kingdom of Fu-lang (Franks)». In *YS*, 149, 6 *a-b*, the biography of Kuo K'an is often parallel to the account of Ch'ang Tê's mission (cf. also T'u Chi, 59, 5 *a*). There we are first told that Kuo K'an defeated the Arab (T'ien-fang = Arabia, Mecca, not Egypt) general Chu-shih, and that then the Sultan 巴兒 Pa-êrh made his submission and surrendered his 185 cities. The Mongol army went 40 *li* further to the west and arrived at Mi-hsi-êrh (Miśr). It was dark already. Nevertheless, leaving invalid soldiers behind, the troops went on for more than 10 *li* more to the west with gags in their mouths, and the enemy was assailed at night unawares. The Sultan 可乃 K'o-nai was greatly frightened and made his submission. All this is given in the biography as having taken place in 1257. The whole account is terribly confused, and, probably based on a private document where the part played by Kuo K'an was unduly magnified, it deserves only partial confidence. BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, I, 141) proposed to see in the Sultan *Bar «the Emir Baibars, who commanded the Egyptian army, which entered Syria in 1260». The same hypothesis has been formulated, perhaps independently, by NAKA Michiyo, and accordingly it is Baibars who is named in the new biography of Kuo K'an written by T'u Chi (59, 5 *a*, who moreover hopelessly confuses «Miśr» and «Mussulman»). However the account refers not to 1260, but to 1257, and one point is certain: Kuo K'an was already back in Ssü-ch'uan in August 1259; it is hard to believe that Baibars should have been called «sultan» before that date (see «Bondocdaire»); moreover the Sultan *Bar in the Chinese account is not connected with Miśr, *i. e.* Egypt. The Sultan K'o-nai of Miśr has been identified more satisfactorily: it must be Qoṭuz, and 可乃 K'o-nai is probably altered either from 可朶 *K'o-to as supposed by BRETSCHNEIDER, or from 可兀 *K'o-tao as supposed by NAKA Michiyo. I hardly need say that the Mongol army never entered Egypt; but, here as in the case of Polo's «Egipte», I think that we must take Miśr as the designation of the whole of the empire of the Mamlūk, and that any real fighting which may have taken place in 1257 must have occurred on the eastern borders of Palestine and in Syria. Qoṭuz did not make his submission to the Mongols, either then or later, any more than Baibars after him. But the biographer is lavish in praising the high deeds of Kuo K'an, who, he says, crossed the sea and came back with the submission of the Sultan of the Franks!

BRETSCHNEIDER says (*JNCB*, x, 295) that the name of Mi-hsi-êrh, or Egypt, occurs «several