

the city bore when the Mongol invasions brought China into communication with the west, and Klaproth supposes that this was modified by the Mongols into KENJANFU. Under the latter name it is mentioned by Rashiduddin as the seat of one of the Twelve *Sings* or great provincial administrations, and we find it still known by this name in Sharifuddin's history of Timur. The same name is traceable in the *Kansan* of Odoric, which he calls the second best province in the world, and the best populated.

A. D. 635, bringing sacred books and images; of the translation of the said books; of the Imperial approval of the doctrine and permission to teach it publicly. There follows a decree of the Emperor (T'ai-Tsung, a very famous prince), issued in 638, in favour of the new doctrine, and ordering a church to be built in the Square of Peace and Justice (*I-ning Fang*), at the capital. The Emperor's portrait was to be placed in the church. After this comes a description of Ta-T'sin (here apparently implying Syria); and then some account of the fortunes of the Church in China. Kao-Tsung (650-683, the devout patron also of the Buddhist traveller and Dr. Hiuen Tsang) continued to favour it. In the end of the century, Buddhism gets the upper hand, but under HIUAN-TSUNG (713-755) the Church recovers its prestige, and K'HO, a new missionary, arrives. Under TE-TSUNG (780-783) the monument was erected, and this part ends with the eulogy of ISSÉ, a statesman and benefactor of the Church. 3rd. There follows a recapitulation of the purport in octosyllabic verse.

The Chinese inscription concludes with the date of erection, viz. the second year *Kienchung* of the Great T'ang Dynasty, the seventh day of the month *Tai'su*, the feast of the great *Yaosan*. This corresponds, according to Gaubil, to 4th February, 781; and *Yaosan* is supposed to stand for *Hosanna* (i.e. Palm-Sunday; but this apparently does not fit; see *infra*). There are added the name chief of the law, NINGCHU (presumed to be the Chinese name of the Metropolitan), the name of the writer, and the official sanction.

The *Great Hosanna* was, though ingenious, a misinterpretation of Gaubil's. Mr. Wylie has sent me a paper of his own (in *Chin. Recorder and Miss. Journal*, July, 1871, p. 45), which makes things perfectly clear. The expression transcribed by Pauthier, *Yao-sân-wen*, and rendered "Hosanna," appears in a Chinese work, without reference to this inscription, as *Yao-sân-wâh*, and is in reality only a Chinese transcript of the Persian word for Sunday, '*Yak-shambah*.' Mr. Wylie verified this from the mouth of a Peking Mahomedan. The 4th of February, 781, was Sunday; why *Great Sunday*? Mr. Wylie suggests, possibly because the first Sunday of the (Chinese) year.

The monument exhibits, in addition to the Chinese text, a series of short inscriptions in the Syriac language, and *Estranghelo* character, containing the date of erection, viz. 1092 of the Greeks (=A. D. 781), the name of the reigning Patriarch of the Nestorian church MAR HANAN ISHUA (dead in 778, but the fact apparently had not reached China), that of ADAM, Bishop and Pope of Tzinisthân (i.e. China), and those of the clerical staff of the capital, which here bears the name, given it by the early Arab Travellers, of *Kündân*. There follow sixty-seven names of persons in Syriac characters, most of whom are characterised as priests (*Kashtshâ*), and sixty-one names of persons in Chinese, all priests save one.

[It appears that Adam (*King-tsing*), who erected the monument under Te-Tsung was, under the same Emperor, with a Buddhist the translator of a Buddhist sūtra, the Satpâramitâ, from a Hu text. (See a curious paper by Mr. J. Takakusu, in the *T'oung Pao*, VII. pp. 589-591.)

Mr. Rockhill (*Rubrick*, p. 157, note) makes the following remarks: "It is strange, however, that the two famous Uigur Nestorians, Mar Jabalaha and Rabban Cauma, when on their journey from Koshang in Southern Shan-hsi to Western Asia in about 1276, while they mention 'the city of Tangut,' or Ning-hsia on the Yellow River as an important Nestorian centre, do not once refer to Hsi-anfu or Chang-an. Had Chang-an been at the time the Nestorian Episcopal see, one would think that these pilgrims would have visited it, or at least referred to it. (*Chabot, Mar Jabalaha*, 21.)"—H. C.]

Kircher gives a good many more Syriac names than appear on the rubbing; probably because some of these are on the edge of the slab now built in. We have no room to speak of the controversies raised by this stone. The most able defence of its genuine character, as well as a transcript with translation and commentary, a work of great interest, was published by the late M. Pauthier. The monument exists intact, and has been visited by the Rev. Mr. Williamson, Baron Richthofen, and other recent travellers. [The Rev. Moir Duncan wrote from Shen-si regarding the present state of the stone (*London and China Telegraph*, 5th June, 1893): "Of the covering rebuilt so recently, not a trace remains save the pedestals for the pillars and atoms of the tiling. In answer to a question as to when and how the covering was destroyed, the old priest replied, with a twinkle in his eye as if his conscience pinched, 'There came a rushing wind and blew it down.' He could not say when, for he paid no attention to such mundane affairs. More than one outsider, however, said it had been deliberately destroyed, because the priests are jealous of the interest manifested in it. . . . The stone has evidently been recently tampered with; several characters are effaced, and there are other signs of malicious hands."—H. C.] Pauthier's works on the subject are—*De l'Authenticité de l'Inscription Nestorienne*, etc.; B. Duprat, 1857; and *l'Inscription Syro-Chinoise de Si-ngan-fou*, etc.; Firmin Didot, 1858. (See also *Kircher, China Illustrata*; and article by Mr. Wylie in *J. Am. Or. Soc.* V. 278.) [Father Havret, S. J., of Zi-ka-wei, near Shang-hai, has undertaken to write a large work on this inscription with the title of *La Stèle Chrétienne de Si-ngan-fou*; the first part giving the inscription in full size, and the second containing the history of the monument, have been

transcription of the Sanskrit word for silver, *rūpya*, which in the *Pen-ts'ao-kang-mu* (ch. 8, p. 9) is given as *o-lu-pa*. If we can find further analogies, this may help us to read that mysterious word in the Nestorian stone inscription, being the name of the first Christian missionary who carried the cross to China, *O-lo-pên*, as "Ruben." This was indeed a common name among the Nestorians, for which reason I would give it the preference over Pauthier's Syriac "Alopeno." But Father Havret (*Stèle Chrétienne*, Leide, 1897, p. 26) objects to Dr. Hirth that the Chinese character *lo*, to which he gives the sound *ru*, is not to be found as a Sanskrit phonetic element in Chinese characters, but that this phonetic element *ru* is represented by the Chinese characters pronounced *lu*, and therefore, he, Father Havret, adopts Colonel Yule's opinion as the only one being fully satisfactory.—H. C.]