

recently the sole seat of Chinese trade with Japan, is at *Chapu*, some 20 miles further seaward.

It is supposed by Klaproth that KANP'U was the port frequented by the early Arab voyagers, and of which they speak under the name of *Khánfú*, confounding in their details Hang-chau itself with the port. Neumann dissents from this, maintaining that the Khanfu of the Arabs was certainly Canton. Abulfeda, however, states expressly that Khanfu was known in his day as *Khansá* (*i.e.* Kinsay), and he speaks of its lake of fresh water called *Sikhu* (Si-hu). [Abulfeda has in fact two *Khânqû* (Khanfû): *Khansá* with the lake which is Kinsay, and one *Khanfû* which is probably Canton. (See *Guyard's transl.*, II., ii., 122-124.)—H. C.] There seems to be an indication in Chinese records that a southern branch of the Great Kiang once entered the sea at Kanp'u; the closing of it is assigned to the 7th century, or a little later.

[Dr. F. Hirth writes (*Jour. Roy. As. Soc.*, 1896, pp. 68-69: "For centuries Canton must have been the only channel through which foreign trade was permitted; for it is not before the year 999 that we read of the appointment of Inspectors of Trade at Hang-chou and Ming-chou. The latter name is identified with Ning-po." Dr. Hirth adds in a note: "This is in my opinion the principal reason why the port of *Khanfu*, mentioned by the earliest Muhammadan travellers, or authors (Soleiman, Abu Zeid, and Maçoudi), cannot be identified with Hang-chou. The report of Soleiman, who first speaks of *Khanfu*, was written in 851, and in those days Canton was apparently the only port open to foreign trade. Marco Polo's *Ganfu* is a different port altogether, viz. *Kan-fu*, or *Kan-pu*, near Hang-chou, and should not be confounded with *Khanfu*."—H. C.]

The changes of the Great Kiang do not seem to have attracted so much attention among the Chinese as those of the dangerous Hwang-Ho, nor does their history seem to have been so carefully recorded. But a paper of great interest on the subject was published by Mr. Edkins, in the *Journal of the North China Branch of the R. A. S.* for September 1860 [pp. 77-84], which I know only by an abstract given by the late Comte d'Escayrac de Lauture. From this it would seem that about the time of our era the Yang-tzû Kiang had three great mouths. The most southerly of these was the Che-Kiang, which is said to have given its name to the Province still so called, of which Hang-chau is the capital. This branch quitted the present channel at Chi-chau, passed by Ning-Kwé and Kwang-té, communicating with the southern end of a great group of lakes which occupied the position of the T'ai-Hu, and so by Shih-men and T'ang-si into the sea not far from Shao-hing. The second branch quitted the main channel at Wu-hu, passed by I-hing (or I-shin) communicating with the northern end of the T'ai-Hu (passed apparently by Su-chau), and then bifurcated, one arm entering the sea at Wu-sung, and the other at Kanp'u. The third, or northerly branch is that which forms the present channel of the Great Kiang. These branches are represented hypothetically on the sketch-map attached to ch. lxiv. *supra*.

[*Kingsmill*, u. s. p. 53; *Chin. Repos.* III. 118; *Middle Kingdom*, I. 95-106; *Bürck*, p. 483; *Cathay*, p. cxciii.; *J. N. Ch. Br. R. A. S.*, December 1865, p. 3 *seqq.*; *Escayrac de Lauture*, *Mém. sur la Chine, H. du Sol*, p. 114.)

NOTE 10.—Pauthier's text has: "*Chascun Roy fait chascun an le compte de son royaume aux comptes du grant siège*," where I suspect the last word is again a mistake for *sing* or *scieng*. (See *supra*, Bk. II. ch. xxv., note 1.) It is interesting to find Polo applying the term *king* to the viceroys who ruled the great provinces; Ibn Batuta uses a corresponding expression, *sultán*. It is not easy to make out the nine kingdoms or great provinces into which Polo considered Manzi to be divided. Perhaps his *nine* is after all merely a traditional number, for the "Nine Provinces" was an ancient synonym for China proper, just as *Nau-Khanda*, with like meaning, was an ancient name of India. (See *Cathay*, p. cxxxix. *note*; and *Reinaud*, *Inde*, p. 116.) But I observe that on the portage road between Chang-shan and Yuh-shan