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PREFACE.

The word "Notes" originally heading the title-page of this work clearly showed the spirit which guided its preparation, and at that time no more was meant, for it was first intended as a series of articles for the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, where the first of the series in fact appeared. This will account for the somewhat unsymmetrical arrangement of the text, as well as for the excessive disproportion in the length of its chapters, which would have been otherwise distributed and brought into shape if their embodiment into a compact volume had been planned from the outset, and if it could have been limited, as was then contemplated, to about one-third of the size it has ultimately attained.

It is entirely due to the initiative of the Royal Asiatic Society in honouring this work with a place among its Asiatic Monographs that the original notes, jotted down in a cursory manner, definitely assumed the present form. A start was made to put them into type as early as 1899, but the printing and preparation for the press lingered on year after year as the striving after greater comprehensiveness intensified research and disclosed new facts and issues. Thus the subject-matter steadily increased; considerable interpolations and additions suggested themselves and even became necessary in order to bring the work up to date in the light of recent discoveries. This accounts for the far greater length of later chapters and for the more diffused treatment which the subject received after the first hundred pages or so in comparison with the earlier ones. Moreover, such treatment was required in view of the opinion expressed by at least one eminent Oriental scholar as to the soundness of my method and the reliability of my identifications after the appearance of the first part of my "Notes" in the J.R.A.S., 1897, pt. iii, pp. 551-77. I shall revert to this point, however, at greater length later on; at present it may be of interest to add that nearly the whole of the book, i.e. up to
p. 656, was ready printed, and up to p. 724 set up in type, by the end of 1904 (cf. infra, p. 682, n. 2). But circumstances, which it is needless to mention, again prevented its being brought to a termination, and thus it lay incomplete till 1908. During the interval new sources of reference and personal investigations in situ, as well as the dies diem docet, had combined to bring forth new results, besides disclosing many imperfections and blunders which had been perpetrated in the text. Atonement has been made in the shape of Addenda and Corrigenda, which will practically bring the book up to date.

Before closing this plea of self-justification for the unshapely arrangement of the work, which drawback, it is hoped, has been somewhat diminished by a more logical distribution into parts and chapters introduced into the Table of Contents, as well as by copious cross-references both in the footnotes and Addenda at the end of the book, it behoves me to add in extenuation of its many shortcomings that the work is mainly the outcome of plodding labour during the scanty leisure of a long busy day in a tropical clime, and that it has been penned at an almost antipodean distance from works of reference and libraries. Thus, debarred from access to the principal editions of Ptolemy's treatise and to numerous authorities which a residence at home would have placed within my reach, the task was rendered harder of elucidating a wide and new subject like the present, which I trust will readily be acknowledged to be bristling with difficulties hitherto regarded as insurmountable.

Some of these are referred to in the course of the Introduction, but others, even more appalling, beset my path in the sequel. While investigating remote times of countries, on which local records throw but hazy light or none at all, and endeavouring to put under contribution foreign accounts extant in Chinese, Arabic, or other literatures, I gradually felt that the identifications of the place-names occurring in such accounts as had been proposed by their
European translators and commentators were for the most part unreliable. Thus a crucial alternative faced me—either to renounce availing myself of the valuable information contained in such accounts on the mistakenly identified places, for inferences based on such wrong foundations would be tantamount to explaining ignotum per ignotius; or, to overhaul all that had been done in the field by preceding labourers and do the work of identification anew.

This, it will readily be imagined, was by itself a heavy task, which considerably increased the labour and delayed the appearance of the book. It became no longer a question of elucidating Ptolemy's extra-Gangetic Geography, but also that of the Arabs and Chinese, to say nothing of the ancient Indús, and even of the accounts of early European travellers and navigators. However imperfect the results—and of its many defects no one is more sensible than myself—it is nevertheless hoped that a good and sound advance has been made in the identification of place-names and ethnonyms which, up to the present, were supposed to lie beyond the reach of recognition.

No wonder that a rudis indigestaque moles of facts and information was the outcome rather than a readable sketch planned to catch the roving eye of the general reader, and such it does not pretend to be, so little, indeed, that precision in the spelling of proper names, toponyms and ethnonyms especially, being indispensable in a work of this sort, the additional inflection could not be avoided of diacritical marks so peculiarly irritating to the English eye.

In a book crammed with thousands of uncouth native names, in a score or so of Oriental languages, an absolute uniformity of spelling throughout could not be expected. All the same, considerable pains have been taken to ensure such an uniformity, especially in the last three-quarters of the volume, where, moreover, the original characters for place-names have been supplied in half a dozen Oriental languages, and the derivation of many such names added where practicable, which is but seldom done in historic-geographical
works, and, what is still more regrettable, in the very Gazetteers published on some of the countries treated of here. On careless topographical nomenclature in maps and works of reference the severest strictures have now and then been passed by many eminent Oriental scholars, so that it is hoped the present volume may escape criticism in that respect.

No less pains have been taken throughout to quote the sources from which information has been culled and the authorities drawn upon, or to which obligation was to be acknowledged, and this in utter disregard of having to overload the notes with references, for in this, as in other fields, criticism of the source is the very foundation of research.

Mindful, moreover, of the maxim that geography is the eye of history, and, *vice versa*, as Carlyle has somewhere pointed out, that history should always go hand in hand with geography, not a few sidelights, often from hitherto unpublished and even unknown sources, have been supplied to obscure periods of the countries treated, in so far as fell within the scope of the present work. Thus, to quote but an instance which should prove of peculiar interest to Indianists, is the disclosure as to the Chola kingdom having been brought under the supremacy of the Zābej (Palembang) empire in or about A.D. 1077 (see p. 624, n. 1).

Nor has the geography of those countries received less attention, corroborated as it has been, not by arm-chair examination of often rudimentary maps and unsound treatises, but by the experience gained in a quarter of a century's residence on the very field of inquiry, intercalated with research and travel and aided by familiarity with nearly a dozen of the local languages and dialects acquired during the same period. Among the incidental results of such labours for historic geography, may I be allowed to mention the discovery that a branch of the Mē-Khōng River flowed of old to the Gulf of Siām (p. 775), the evidence as to the probable former existence of a marine channel across the Malay Peninsula (pp. 79, 751), and of an old frequented trade-route over the Kraḥ Isthmus (pp. 94, 756), etc.
Now, a word in justification of the graphic methods followed in connection with Ptolemaic geography, and of the reliability of the results attained. An eminent Indianist, Professor A. Barth, in a note published in the Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extême Orient (tome ii, 1902, p. 98, n. 4), kindly remarks en passant, in alluding to the first instalment of these "Notes," which appeared in the J.R.A.S., 1897, pt. iii, that "M. Gerini . . . a appliqué aux co-ordonnées de Ptolémée un système de corrections très-ingénieux, trop ingénieux même pour être toujours convaincant" (the italics are mine). This criticism, though flattering enough because made in a candid spirit, presumably represents the impression received by some of the leading savants and Oriental scholars after a perusal of the introductory part of the present work which appeared in the Journal. It is, indeed, no wonder that the results briefly set forth in that article carried no more conviction to the scholarly reader than was openly acknowledged by Professor Barth. The subject I had taken in hand was so amazingly difficult that it had long been given up as hopeless by more than one eminent authority, and my treatment of it was so novel and so far different from the stereotyped methods previously followed that the 'prentice hand could not implicitly be trusted, at any rate until further proofs were forthcoming in corroboration of the bare results submitted in such a summary manner.

Now, however, there is a chance of showing a better case, for the mathematical proofs presented in the introductory section of the work have been followed by an array of historical and circumstantial evidence covering no less than 697 pages (pp. 28-724 inclusive), besides 111 pages (pp. 725-835 inclusive) of appendices and additional notes. The correctness of my identifications of the toponyms occurring in the Ptolemaic extra-Gangetic Geography is thus not only mathematically proven, but checked and counterchecked by all sorts of evidence, historical and otherwise, that could be gathered and brought to bear upon the subject. Thus, no further doubt is possible as to the
soundness of the method followed and the thorough reliability of the results attained, except in a few isolated cases which, owing to imperfect data or to lack of information, could not be satisfactorily settled. It may, indeed, be added—to emphasize the precision of the mathematical rectification of the Ptolemaic extra-Gangetic Geography as exhibited in the introductory part of the present work—that the Ptolemaic toponyms identified thus fit in exactly with the sites of similarly named places in almost every instance all over Indo-China. In striking confirmation of this fact I may point out that some Ptolemaic toponyms which in the early stages of my researches proved absolutely refractory to identification, became by subsequent inquiry easy of recognition, thanks to the rectified position mathematically calculated for them in the Tables, which unmistakably indicated where the corresponding site should be looked for in the maps. I feel perfectly confident, therefore, that the small irreducible residuum of Ptolemaic place-names still doubtfully located or left unidentified in the course of the present work, will become capable of recognition to future investigators after a thorough study of the topography and protohistory of the locality which has been mathematically determined for them in the Tables. Some instances, in which the hope just confidently expressed has already been realized of late, might be quoted by way of illustration.

After the introductory section of this work and the Tables had appeared in the Journal, Mr. C. Otto Blagden readily recognized in Balonga métropolis (No. 121, Table V) the ancient Chân capital Bal-Angué or C'ha-bân (see the J.R.A.S., 1899, pp. 665–6), whereas in the Journal cited above the identification with "Qui-nhon or Cha-ban" had been proposed by myself merely as the result of a preliminary, and necessarily but superficial, inquiry, based on a comparison between the position mathematically ascertained in Table V for Balonga and the few data I had at hand relative to that locality, among which did not yet figure the
original name *Bal-Angwe*, but simply the new-fangled ones imposed by the Annamese after their conquest of the place. Thus, further investigation carried out by Mr. Blagden proved the correctness of the location of *Balonga metropolis* I had set forth in the Tables on the basis of mere mathematical calculation, and supplied the explanation of the hitherto puzzling Ptolemaic toponym.

Again, the same introductory section of this work, as well as an article of mine on “Shân and Siâm” which almost contemporaneously appeared in the * Asiatic Quarterly Review* (January, 1898, pp. 145–63), elicited from Mr. R. F. St. Andrew St. John the suggestion that the initial syllable *Bê* in Ptolemaic toponyms, especially rivers on the east coast of the Bay of Bengal, seemingly represented the *Mûn* (Peguan) *Bi* meaning a ‘river’ (see this writer’s papers in the * Asiatic Quarterly Review* for April, 1898, p. 424, and in the “Actes du Onzième Congrès International des Orientalistes,” 2ème section, Paris, 1898, p. 220). Acting upon this suggestion, which proved correct in several cases (though by no means in such a wide application as Mr. St. Andrew St. John had surmised; see Appendix II, p. 728 *infra*), I was soon able to recognize in the Ptolemaic *Bêsynga* River (Nos. 58, 187) the *Mûn* terms *Bi-ching, Bi-sing (Bi-chõîn)*, meaning ‘Elephant River,’ and, by antonomasia, *Sindura* or *Erāvati* (Irawaddy). Thus the identification of the *Bêsynga* River with the Salween I had proposed at the outset (Table III, No. 58, and Table IX, No. 187, in the *J.R.A.S.*, 1897, pt. iii) had to be abandoned in favour of the later one with the Irawaddy (*vide infra*, Appendix II, sect. 1, and Addenda, p. 750, note to p. 75).

Among the singularly obdurate place-names and ethnonyms before unscribbled, which I myself succeeded in identifying after the introductory part of the present work first appeared in print, thanks to the location mathematically calculated for them in the Tables, the following may be mentioned:—

No. 84, *Palanda*; Nos. 85 and 185, *Palandas* River: which, taken at the outset to refer to Pêrak and the Pêrak
River respectively, could afterwards be explained by the presence to this day in that neighbourhood of tribes known by the name of Bēlandas, Blandas, or Belendas, to which evidently the two Ptolemaic toponyms must be traced (see infra, Appendix II, sect. 2, and Addenda, note to p. 97).

No. 123. Zabai or Zaba, in which I have recognized the Scāī[-thāp] district, the Shih-pei or Sz-bei of Chinese records (vide infra, Appendix II, sect. 4, and Addenda, note to p. 217, l. 11 from bottom).

No. 218. Damassai, or Dabasai, people, an ethnonym I have since found to survive in the present Tamansai tribe of Upper Burma (see Appendix II, sect. 5).

No. 147. Palura, of which I have discovered the historical continuation in Paloor village, above the mouth of the Ganjām (see Addenda, note to p. 47, ll. 7–9).

No. 70. Pisinara, which I have connected with the capital of the ancient Pēh-tāz State in West Yūn-nan (see Appendix III, p. 739).

No. 125. Satyrōn Islands, which I have ultimately identified with the Siāntan or Syātan insular group, the Hsi-tung of Chinese records, known to European navigators as the Great (or Northern) Anambas (vide infra, pp. 707 et seqq.).

The above Ptolemaic place-names and ethnonyms I have purposely chosen in regions far apart, ranging from the east coast of India to the Eastern Archipelago, in order to exemplify how all over such a wide area the mathematical results arrived at in the Tables prove remarkably correct.

As regards the Indo-Chinese Peninsula proper, as well as the Archipelago, the evidence collected in the body of the present volume will enable one, in each particular instance, to check the mathematical results exhibited in the Tables with the historic-geographical commentary subjoined in the text, when it will be seen that the correspondence between the Ptolemaic names and the identifications I have adduced for them is in almost every case surprisingly accurate. In the face of the proofs gathered in the 800 and odd pages of
text, appendices, and additional notes, in support of the results obtained by the mathematical method of treatment of Ptolemy's extra-Gangetic Geography explained in the introductory part of the book, it is now legitimate to hope the unbiased reader will agree that it is not here a question of a fictitious—however ingenious—disguising of Ptolemy's geography under deceitful vestures, but of a genuine, sound interpretation of the same which may confidently be relied upon; which is the only possible one, not only in theory, but also in actual fact, for it is the true and correct one. This can hardly be gainsaid in view furthermore of the fact that some of the Ptolemaic place-names belong to languages still occurring, or known to have existed, in the countries in which they have respectively been located (see Appendix II). I may, moreover, personally testify, after over a dozen years' experience of, and steady work on, the basis of the plan of mathematical rectification adopted, that I was unable to detect any serious shortcoming in the location of the Ptolemaic toponyms, etc., calculated as shown in the Tables. The Ptolemaic sphinx, when repeatedly interrogated, has seldom given an equivocal response, while the rectified results of its data hardly ever failed me as a trustworthy guide to identification. As will be seen, it is entirely due to this framework of mathematically determined base-points that the riddle of Ptolemaic extra-Gangetic Geography became for the first time capable of solution. I have pointed out above that even when the method I have adopted most seemed to miss its purpose, it supplied by aid of inquiry the sought for clue to identification; hence it will perhaps not be overrating its soundness to state that in the few cases still left doubtful it may yet disclose to future investigators the right way out of the maze.

In the face of such issues I can unhesitatingly recommend the substantiated results I have arrived at as thoroughly worthy of reliance, and feel no misgiving as to my long and wearying task having been performed in vain. For, thanks to the towns, peoples, and tribes mentioned by Ptolemy in
the wide area covered by the present volume, invaluable sidelights are supplied to the ancient history of a region for which extant records do not go back, in the most favourable instances, further than the fifth or sixth century A.D. By virtue of Ptolemy's geographic lists, however arid they may be, it will thus be possible to carry back the history of those lands to the first century of our era. Accordingly, the section of the Ptolemaic treatise devoted to extra-Gangetic India fulfills even nowadays its purpose by supplying a new substratum to the history of the Indo-Chinese and Archipelagian countries; and it is perhaps not too sanguine to anticipate that future historiographers of those lands may see their way to adopt the Ptolemaic data as the starting-point for their inquiries and narratives to which, even for later periods where authentic records fail or are but fragmentary, they should be at times of help in understanding the political condition of the country.

Nor will the advantages of the present elucidation of Ptolemaic extra-Gangetic Geography remain confined to the historian, for the ethnographer and philologist will also find therein some food for speculation, of which Appendix II below is merely intended to supply a foretaste with a view to stimulate further inquiry.

Thus the present work, apart from its interest, however small it be, from an exegetical point of view, in so far as it elucidates an ancient text and department of historical geography, should prove of some retrospective value for the study of certain historic, linguistic, ethnologic, and geographic aspects of the countries it deals with. Hence it may be hoped that, even on this ground alone, the study of the Ptolemaic geography of Further India will be acknowledged worthy of revival, now that the rough gems treasured up in the treatise of the Alexandrine geographer have been freed from their dross and so made fit for use.

It will no doubt be due to this peculiar side of its merits that Ptolemy's treatise will become indispensable to Orientalists. Their lasting gratitude will now have to
be acknowledged to him who has left us so complete a description of the eastern part of the habitabilis as known in his own time; who has sedulously collected about it and recast the notions of all his predecessors and contemporaries; who was always on the look out for fresh information from the navigators and traders returning from India and the Far East (see his lib. i, chaps. 11-14 and 17); and who, finally, has bequeathed to posterity the most comprehensive and complete record of Eastern countries, towns, nations, tribes, itineraries, trade-routes, and of historic, linguistic, ethnologic, and geographical facts that the ancient Greek and Latin world can boast of. It is to all this—let us emphasize it—that we owe, among other important disclosures, the one now incontrovertibly established in these pages, that Western trade pushed along the China coast, at least as far as Hang-chou harbour, since the beginning of the Christian era, that is, at a much earlier date than has hitherto been imagined or suspected by our own savants. It is therefore only fitting that the present work, which owes its being to the labours of the Alexandrine geographer, should not be issued from the press without paying this reverent homage to him.

As shown on its title-page, this volume is merely devoted to Further India and the Indo-Malay Archipelago, albeit the Tables cover a far wider field, including China and Central Asia. Though the identifications of the Ptolemaic place-names and ethnonyms pertaining to these regions have been revised in the light of further inquiries which I made after the publication in the *J.R.A.S.*, 1897, pt. iii, of the first instalment of the present work, and are now for the most part reliable, nevertheless they cannot be considered as final till the volume to be devoted to such regions, which has now been for some time in preparation, has been passed through the press.

As regards the schematic map accompanying the present volume, it is the same as originally appeared in the *Journal*. Although it would now require substantial alterations to bring
it into keeping with the text as it now stands, it has been preferred, in order not to further delay the appearance of the book, to leave the map as it is, instead—as might have been better—of supplying a revised one. As an offset, however, against this drawback, I have added a larger special map of Indo-China proper and the Indo-Malay Archipelago, exhibiting, not only the Ptolemaic in particular, but also the other Greek and Latin, as well as the early Indū, Arabic, and Chinese, knowledge of that region, recast in the light of the researches embodied in the present work. This, it is hoped, may prove a valuable addition and help to grasp the principal results attained.

Before concluding, I feel it my duty to express my deepest obligations to the Royal Asiatic Society for the honour of its high patronage accorded to this volume, to its Council and Secretary for valuable assistance and suggestions, and last, but not least, to the printers’ reader for the very great pains he has taken, with remarkable success, in seeing the present work, bristling with enormous typographical difficulties in some twenty languages, through the press, with comparatively an insignificant number of misprints.

With this envoi I leave the volume to the judgment of critics, Oriental scholars, and the general public, regretting, alas! its many imperfections, but feeling at the same time honestly entitled to plead in extenuation of such shortcomings the enormous difficulties of multifarious kinds with which I had to grapple, and to console myself in the conviction that rem curavi quam optime potui.

G. E. GERINI.

CISANO-S.-NEVA (ITALY).
March 1, 1909.
FURTHER INDIA
AND
INDO-MALAY ARCHIPELAGO.

1. INTRODUCTION.

Mi ritrovai per una selva oscura
Che la diritta via era smarrita.

DANTE: Inferno, i, 1.

Having been for years past engaged in researches on the early history of Siam and its border countries, I had, as a matter of course, to go into their ancient geography—a hitherto unexplored field—and this naturally led me to a study of the documents that the Western geographers of antiquity left us, more especially Ptolemy, who gives us the first collection of anything like authentic data on the countries in question. Thus it came to pass that I found myself hopelessly entangled in the "selva selvaggia, ed aspra e forte" of Ptolemy's geography of India extra-Gangem. I must confess that the results attending my first attempts at interpreting this portion of the work of the great Alexandrian were far from encouraging. This was, however, to be expected, seeing that even master hands like those of Klaproth, Cunningham, Yule, Lassen, and others, whilst meeting with fair success in identifying Ptolemy's names of places west of the meridian of the Ganges, had failed to evolve the slightest order out of the chaos of his trans-Gangetic geography, and to locate with certainty even a single one of the numerous cities he names beyond the outskirts of the Gulf of Bengal. The more eastern portion of Ptolemy's geography came, therefore,
to be looked upon as utterly unreliable, if not fantastic; and the severest strictures were passed on the great cosmologist and geographer, to the effect that he had made a mess of his eastern longitudes and latitudes, coined names of cities and peoples out of his fancy, confused islands and continents, making pretence to a knowledge of regions which his contemporaries had never reached, and on which they possessed but second-hand information of the vaguest possible character.

But when I noticed the wide difference of opinion existing among Ptolemy's expounders and commentators as to the identification of his names of cities, gulfs, and even regions (some going so far as to connect his Magnus Sinus with the Gulf of Bengal, his coast of Sinai with that of the Malayan Peninsula, Kattigara with Kesho in Tonkin, and even with Kottawaringin in Borneo, Sērika with the Peguan coast, and so forth), I at once realized the impossibility of reaching any definite goal by following paths so widely diverging; and I confess that I began then to ask myself whether—granted that Ptolemy had muddled—his commentators and would-be elucidators had not, despite their zeal and learning and evident good-faith, often made confusion worse confounded.

The reason why Ptolemy's trans-Gangetic geography should have given rise to so much controversy is plain enough: it is to be found in the methods of treatment it received—at times far too theoretical on one side, and far too empiric on the other; but always, and invariably, too scholastically uniform and systematic. Thus the most faithful of Ptolemy's votaries, the sincerest of his admirers, ever missed the goal, despite the deep learning and indefatigable research they brought to bear on the arduous subject: some in unsuccessful attempts to find out a general formula of correction applicable to the whole of his habitabilis, and others in the vain endeavour of making his geographical nomenclature fit in in modern maps by simply connecting the names he gives with places designated by similar appellations in the latter.
As regards the first method, if susceptible of fairly successful application to the countries lying west of the Indus, it becomes utterly unfit for the more eastern portion of the habitabilis, where Ptolemy’s measurement errors are far from being constant and uniform as might be anticipated, the position of places here depending on much more imperfect data; whereby it ensues that the amount of error must be detected and determined in almost every particular instance if anything like approximation is to be arrived at. Now this can only be done by a careful selection and individualisation of the principal stations of Ptolemy’s system; the ratio of error in intermediate points between the base stations thus established will then be reduced to a minimum, so as to allow, in the majority of cases, of a satisfactory identification of the same.

I purposely say in the majority, and not in the totality of cases, because, in spite of the rectification thus effected of Ptolemy’s positions of his geographical elements, some of the latter will yet prove refractory to identification, owing partly to our still deficient geographical knowledge of some parts of Further India; and more—nay, principally—to our lack of reliable historical data on the past of the same regions, which often prevents us from tracing modern names of places back to the designation they bore in Ptolemy’s time, so as to recognize them in his lists.

This is, indeed, the greatest drawback in a study of the subject under consideration; for many towns, marts, etc., which had existed, and even flourished, at that period, and were recorded by our eminent geographer, have now disappeared from the face of the earth, as well as from the memory of man; while others have changed several times their names, each change being often into a different language, according to the race of people under whose sway they successively fell, and are now unrecognizable under their modern appellations. To this must be added the transformation that names of places have undergone in the mouths of travellers speaking different tongues, especially at that remote period when geographical science was still
in its infancy; not to speak of the alterations caused in their spelling as originally adopted in the work of our author, by its passing through the ordeal of a legion of copyists, often innocent of geographical knowledge; so that the wonder is rather—after all these difficulties have been considered—that any of Ptolemy's names of places could now stand the test of identification at all.

Yet I trust to be able to show in the sequel that, despite so many drawbacks, Ptolemy's geography of the India extra-Gangem is still capable of fairly accurate interpretation, provided it is carried on on the lines mentioned above; and that, once the amount of error as to his fundamental stations has been determined, it is possible to push the work with equal success outside the limits of that field, even up to the scarcely as yet known regions of Western China and Central Asia. It will then appear how great was Ptolemy's knowledge of these remote countries at so early a time as his, and how careful his handling of the data he had at his disposal; as well as how little he deserved the strictures passed upon him and his work by commentators who did not know how to avail themselves of the precious materials accumulated by him.

With regard to the second method of interpreting Ptolemy's geography, its shortcomings are too evident to need pointing out here. Its inevitable failure with respect to India was well exemplified at the hands of Lassen, who thought that all that was needed was to compare the ancient and modern names of places to connect the two. Proceeding on sounder critical principles, Cunningham and Yule far better succeeded in interpreting Ptolemy's data, and gave us the most reliable explanation of his geography of India which we now possess. Yet McCrindle, while acknowledging that Colonel Yule's map of ancient India "is undoubtedly by far the best that has been yet [1885] produced," has to avow that "the result is far from encouraging."

As a matter of fact, it will be seen that Ptolemy's trans-Gangetic geography, when treated according to the method
laid down in the present paper, presents perhaps fewer difficulties than the cis-Gangetic portion. The only real hard crux I met with, after having succeeded in identifying some of Ptolemy's principal stations of Indo-China, was the determination of the amount of his shortening of the Malay Peninsula and of the lower portion of the Cochin-Chinese headland in favour of the Arakan-Burmese and Tonkinese coasts respectively.

On the other hand, the amount of error in Ptolemy's latitudes and longitudes in the northern portion of Indo-China could be so neatly determined, that its rectification enabled me to extend the work far out of the limits originally contemplated, which included nothing beyond the outskirts of Southern Indo-China and Malay Peninsula, a region of which I can speak with some personal knowledge. If success led me further than I intended, and carried me on to China and Central Asia, countries to the knowledge of which I cannot and do not make the slightest claim or pretence, I wish it to be distinctly understood, ere I proceed, that I do not consider that extra portion of my work by any means complete; and if I gave it a place in my map and in the present sketch, it was in order to show the correctness of the plan on which I have worked out Ptolemy's geography of Indo-China, even when tested on a much larger scale. Hence I did not concern myself with it beyond what had relation with trade routes in Ptolemy's time, a subject on which I lay great stress, as I think it by far the most important gain to geographical science resulting from this study, and an entirely novel discovery most likely to alter the opinions generally held hitherto as to the easternmost limits of the knowledge of the world possessed by the ancients, and of their trade relations.

This is all I could do under the unfavourable circumstances in which I am placed, of living in a far-away country out of reach of any well-stocked library containing the literature that has reference to the countries in question. Therefore, I gladly leave it to scholars versed in the lore
of China and Central Asia to complete the investigation and fill in the blanks I have left. For the same reason I have had no access to any of the standard works bearing on Ptolemy’s geography, and have had to carry on all my calculations of rectification of Ptolemy’s geographical coordinates of positions on the base of the figures applied in McCrindle’s “Ancient India as described by Ptolemy,” 1885 edition—a work embodying, as far as I can judge, nearly all that is known on the subject up to the present date, and which I have followed throughout as far as the portion of Ptolemy’s geography treated on here is concerned. In the course of my labours I detected two misprints in it which somewhat led me astray at first, but which I have since corrected. The first regards the longitude of Parisara, which is given as 179° on page 225, a mistake for 149°; and the other the longitude of the mouth of the river Aspithra (page 244), printed as 170°, whereas it should be 173° or 175°. I trust I have not fallen a victim to other possible misprints in that book, in the determination of the position of some other of Ptolemy’s stations. Should, however, this prove to be the case, I would ask the indulgence of the reader, on the score that I had no means at my disposal to verify all such figures as I have taken from McCrindle’s Book.

With these premises and reservations, I shall now proceed to explain as summarily as possible the method adopted in my inquiry, and the means through which I arrived at the solution of most of the intricate problems connected with the subject under consideration.

I first took up the study of Ptolemy’s trans-Gangetic geography, in so far as had relation with the Gulf of Siām and the Malay Peninsula, as early as 1887; but I soon found out the inapplicability here of the formulas proposed for the correction of Ptolemy’s co-ordinates of positions, and the inadmissibility of the few identifications ventured upon by various authorities up to that date of Ptolemy’s places in these regions; with the sole exception of Zabai, connected by Yule with Campā, without, however,
attempts to definitely locate its position with any degree of precision. This prevented me from forming any estimate of the amount of Ptolemy’s error in longitude and latitude at that point, so the latter could not be used as a base station for the purpose I intended. I had, in fact, by that time found out that no advance was possible in this direction unless one of Ptolemy’s stations at least could be identified, and located with sufficient accuracy on the Gulf of Siām or the Cochin-Chinese coast, so as to give an exact idea of Ptolemy’s amount of error in these far-away regions, and to furnish a clue to the detection and rectification of the errors in neighbouring stations.

So far, the most easterly point in Ptolemy’s system that could be fixed upon with any degree of precision, was the delta of the Ganges, which was therefore considered as the ne plus ultra of all possible correct interpretation of ancient classic geography. As I was at the time—despite the most assiduous efforts—unable to discover any reliable base-point beyond that, I had to give up Ptolemy in utter discouragement, for I well saw that nothing could be done until such a point was found out. With this object in view, I, more unremittingly than ever, continued my study and collection of old records concerning these countries, confident that, should I arrive at establishing what were the principal marts and emporiums of trade that existed on these coasts in Ptolemy’s time, and under what names, I would most likely, unless Ptolemy’s names of localities were nothing but mere chimerical fancies, be able to recognize some one of them in his lists, whether in its genuine or modified garb. I need not tell how glad I was when some years afterwards—not a few though—my exertions were rewarded, and by the end of 1895 I was able to identify, with absolute certainty, Ptolemy’s Akadra and Pithōnobastē with the Bay of Ko: Tron or Ka-Dran (the Kadranj of the Arab navigators of the ninth century), corresponding to the present Hatien on the Kambojan coast of the Gulf of Siām; and Pentaimeas (French spelling) or Panthāi-mās (“golden-walled citadel”), near by, the
initial point from which Hindú civilization spread out over Kamboja, as I shall show in the sequel, and of which the present Hátien and Ko: Tron bay were the port, the most remarkable emporium of trade on the Gulf of Siám from the highest antiquity up to the beginning of the last century. This successful piece of work soon led me to the identification of Samarádē, Zabai, Aganagara, Takola, and other principal stations of Ptolemy on the coast of the Malay Peninsula and Cochin-China. I became then aware of a new and important feature of Ptolemy's geography of these countries, namely, that it discloses to us the positions of the outposts occupied at that early time by Southern Indian colonists who were then just at the outset of the exploits by which their civilization was subsequently spread all over the Malay Peninsula, Siám, Kamboja, Campū, and the Malay Archipelago in general; and thus we are supplied with the solution of an ethnological mystery that could not hitherto be penetrated.

The other important feature that I discovered afterwards was that of the overland routes that Western traders followed at that early period, most of which were hitherto not only unknown, but hardly even dreamed of. The rest of the task proved comparatively easy, and I need not weary the reader any further with the récit of my personal experiences in this matter, beyond adding that the ultimate result of all of them was this preliminary essay, with the map that accompanies it. Neither of these, as yet so incomplete and imperfect, would I dare to send to the press were I not confident that, even in their present humble and uncouth form, they may prove interesting and useful to lovers of Oriental research. This is the only reason that induced me to decide on their immediate publication, rather than to wait for a more favourable opportunity when leisure and less deficiency of means of study would have permitted me to considerably improve them.
2. Calculations.

Though the process of rectification of Ptolemy's measurement errors—on the co-ordinates of his fundamental stations and on the intermediate places between two successive co-ordinates taken as base-lines—is sufficiently shown in the map hereto appended, a brief exposition of the method of calculation followed for the determination of the error at the principal stations will perhaps render the process clearer and more readily understood. We shall then begin at Akadra the starting-point, which in our case proved the true key to the mystery that shrouded Ptolemy's trans-Gangetic geography. The longitude adopted for this harbour in the present study is 104° 21' E. Greenwich, which corresponds to the actual anchorage of ships during the south-west monsoon in front of Hatien.

The other base meridian worked upon in conjunction with Akadra is that passing through the centre of the Gangetic delta and the median mouth of the Ganges called Kambérikhon by our author, and supposed to correspond to the Barabangā estuary, for which the longitude adopted here is 89° 30' E. 1 Recently Rylands, in his elucidation of Ptolemy's geography—a book which deserves recognition,2 and from which I have derived useful hints as to the graphical method of treating Ptolemy's geography, although unable to accept his formula of reduction or his estimate of the true equivalent of Ptolemy's 180° as fit for my purpose—assigned long. 90° E. to Kambérikhon, which is evidently too much east of the centre of the delta. A glance at a map of Bengal will convince one of this. The longitude adopted by me for Kambérikhon, not only corresponding as nearly as possible to the centre of the delta, but also sensibly coinciding with the axis of the lower course of the Barabangā, must evidently lie within

1 All longitudes referred to in the present sketch are computed from the meridian of Greenwich.
2 "The Geography of Ptolemy elucidated," by T. G. Rylands. (Dublin, 1893.)
a few minutes of the true one as intended by Ptolemy. The calculation then proceeds as follows:

**LONGITUDE.**—Base Akadra—Kambērikhon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ptolemy's</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kambērikhon</td>
<td>Long. 146° 30' E.</td>
<td>89° 30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akadra</td>
<td></td>
<td>104° 21'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diff. 20° 30'</td>
<td>14° 51'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whence we obtain a formula of correction for Ptolemy's longitudes between Kambērikhon and Akadra:

\[
\frac{14° 51'}{20° 30'} = 0.725 \times \text{Ptol. long. (a)}.
\]

---

**Determination of the longitude of Aganagara.**

A. By formula (a) from Kambērikhon.

- Kambērikhon. Ptol. long. 146° 30'
- Aganagara.        169°
- Diff. 22° 30' × 0.725 (a) = 16° 18'
- True long. Kambērikhon + 89° 30'
- Corrected long. Aganagara 105° 48'

B. By formula (a) from Akadra.

- Aganagara. Ptol. long. 169°
- Akadra.       167°
- Diff. 2° × 0.725 (a) = 1° 27'
- True long. Akadra + 104° 21'
- Corrected long. Aganagara 105° 48'

which is the exact longitude of Hanoi.

---

**LATITUDES.**

As regards latitudes, let us, by way of trial, now determine a mean between those of Kambērikhon and Akadra. The true latitude assumed for the present for Kambērikhon is 22° 24' N., corresponding to that of the
village called Byracally on the maps, which may be Kambêrikhon itself, and if not, must be not very far from the mark; considering that nearly eighteen centuries have elapsed from the time of collection of Ptolemy's data, and that at that period the delta could not be so far advanced southwards as at present. The figure assumed here will be, however, checked in due course; as we shall see, the error in latitude between the parallels of Kambêrikhon and Akadra is far from being uniformly distributed. We have, then—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ptolemy's</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kambêrikhon</td>
<td>Lat. 18° 40'</td>
<td>23° 24' N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akadra (Hatien)</td>
<td>4° 45'</td>
<td>10° 22'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>13° 55'</td>
<td>12° 2'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whence a formula of correction for Ptolemy's latitudes between Kambêrikhon and Akadra = \( \frac{12° 2'}{13° 55'} = 0.8647 \).

Applying this by way of trial to the determination of the latitude of Aganagara, we obtain—

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aganagara</td>
<td>Ptol. lat. 16° 20' N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akadra</td>
<td>4° 45'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>11° 35' x 0.8647 = 10° 1'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True latitude Akadra + 10° 22'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected latitude of Aganagara 20° 23'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now the true latitude of Aganagara (Hanoi) is 21° 2', whereby we see that there is an error in the result of the above calculation of 39' less. This we shall be able to account for hereafter, and show that it is due to the excessive lengthening by Ptolemy of the coast of Arakan and Pegu between Chittagong and Cape Negrais; and, correspondingly, of the Tonkinese coast, whence the comparatively southern position resulting for Aganagara. But having made certain that the latter is really Hanoi, both by the approximation obtained in the determination of its geographic co-ordinates and by every other indication,
as shall be shown in due course, we must correct the error and adopt its true latitude of 21° 2', so as to be able to use it as another base-point in the calculations that follow.

The next step is to find the relation of Ptolemy’s and true latitudes between Akadra and Aganagara. This stands as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ptolemy’s.</th>
<th>True.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aganagara (Hanoi).</td>
<td>Lat. 16° 20'</td>
<td>21° 2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akadra (Hatien).</td>
<td>&quot; 4° 45'</td>
<td>10° 22'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 11° 35'</td>
<td></td>
<td>10° 40'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whence the correction for Ptolemy’s latitudes between the above two stations \( \frac{10° 40'}{11° 35'} = 0.92 \) (\( \phi \)).

Ptolemy’s equator deduced from this formula of correction would correspond to 5° 58' true North Latitude. This, we may observe, closely agrees with the result that could be obtained from Ceylon, where Ptolemy’s equator passes through Nubartha (Barberyin), the true latitude of which is 6° 30' N.; and will do for our purpose, as shall be proved by subsequent researches.

That neither the error of latitude between the parallels of Akadra and Aganagara, nor that in longitude between the meridians of Akadra and Kambêrîkhon, is uniform, is proved by the displacement of Cape Têmaina (Negrais) too far east and south. This better results from the following calculations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ptol. long. 167° 0' E.</th>
<th></th>
<th>157° 20'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akadra (Hatien).</td>
<td>Diff. 9° 40'</td>
<td>Cape Têmaina (Negrais).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying to this the formula of correction \( (a) \) found above for longitudes, we have: \( 9° 40' \times 0.725 = 7° \). Subtracting this result from the true longitude of Akadra (Hatien), we obtain 104° 21' — 7° = 97° 21' for the longitude of Cape Têmaina (Negrais). The true longitude of the latter, at Diamond Point, adopted in the present inquiry
is 94° 22' E.; whence we see that Ptolemy's displacement of this cape is about 3° too far East.

Its displacement in latitude is shown by the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cape Tēmala</th>
<th>Ptol. lat. 8° 0'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akadra (Hatien)</td>
<td>4° 45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 3° 15'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying to this the formula of correction for Ptolemy's latitudes found above (φ), we obtain—

\[ 3° 15' \times 0.92 = 2° 59' \]

True lat. Akadra (Hatien) + 10° 22'

Corrected lat. Cape Tēmala (Negrais) 13° 21'

The true latitude for this cape adopted in the present study being 16° N., it follows that Ptolemy's displacement of the same was nearly 3° further south than its true position. We see then that he lengthened the coast of Arakan and Pegu as far as Cape Negrais at the expense of the western coast of the Malay Peninsula, which thereby becomes represented shorter than it really is; and that therefore the latitudes given by him for stations north of the parallel of Cape Negrais (Tēmala) must be corrected to a greater extent than those of the places situated to the south of the same parallel.

Before, however, attempting to find what the new formula of correction should be, let us see whether the same rule applies to the coast of Tonkin, and in general all over the intermediate regions. In order to do this, let us prolong the parallel of Cape Tēmala (Negrais)—the latitude of which is 8° N. Ptol. = 16° N. true as shown above—as far as the Annamite coast. We see then that it intersects the latter a little below Turān (Tourane of French maps) and the homonymous bay, noted from the earliest time as a much frequented port on that coast, and which I have identified with Ptolemy's Throana. The latitude he assigns to Throana being 8° 30' N., namely, just a little above the parallel now under consideration, we obtain thus a confirmation that the said parallel, marking the 8° of North
Latitude in Ptolemy’s system, actually corresponds to the 16th parallel of true latitude in our maps. The consequence is that the coast of Tonkin and northern Annam has undergone at Ptolemy’s hands the same lengthening at the expense of the southern as the corresponding coast on the eastern side of the Gulf of Bengal. A single formula of correction will then do for Ptolemy’s latitudes of all places situated further north than his 8th parallel or our 16th parallel of North Latitude. This formula can be easily deduced from a comparison of the latitude of Cape Têmala (Negrais) with that of Aganagara (Hanoi), as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ptolemy’s</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aganagara (Hanoi)</td>
<td>Lat. 16° 20’</td>
<td>21° 1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Têmala (Negrais)</td>
<td>8° 0’</td>
<td>16° 0’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>8° 20’</td>
<td>5° 1’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whence $\frac{5°}{8° 20’} = 0.6 \, (\lambda)$.

This formula of correction, when tested all over the geographical field under consideration, was found to apply to all places situated by Ptolemy above his 8th parallel, even as far up as Mongolia and Central Asia. From it we may deduce the correct latitude for Kambêrikhon, as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ptol. lat. 18° 40’ N.</th>
<th>18° 20’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aganagara (Hanoi)</td>
<td>&quot;&quot; 16° 20’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>2° 20’ × 0.6 (\lambda) = 1° 24’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True lat.</td>
<td>Aganagara (Hanoi) + 21° 1’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected lat.</td>
<td>of Kambêrikhon 22° 25’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But a more correct result would be obtained from the latitude of Cape Têmala (Negrais) taken as a base, thus:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ptol. lat. 18° 40’ N.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Têmala (Negrais)</td>
<td>8° 0’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>10° 40’ × 0.6 (\lambda) = 6° 24’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True lat.</td>
<td>Cape Têmala (Negrais) + 16° 0’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected lat.</td>
<td>of Kambêrikhon 22° 24’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which checks the figure assumed for the latitude of the latter place at the outset of our calculations.

**Identification of Solana.**—As a test for our formula of correction for Ptolemy's latitudes north of the parallel of Cape Téimala (Negrais), let us look up the meridian of Aganagara (Hanoi) in our map; we will find Ptolemy's Solana, for which he gives—

| Long. | 169° 0' E. (same as Aganagara) |
| Lat.  | 37° 30' N. |

Reducing the latter according to formula (λ), we get 33° 43' corrected North Latitude, which, on the meridian of Aganagara (Hanoi = 105° 48' true E. Long.), brings us within 2' or 3' of Hsi-ho or Hsi-ho-Hsien, near the Si-niu river in Shen-si. This Hsi-ho, we may then reasonably conclude, is Ptolemy's Solana, a fact confirmed, moreover, by the similarity of names, as Hsi-ho was, in our author's time, known as Shang-lu.

**Identification of Sëra Metropolis.**—But supposing this to be a mere haphazard coincidence, let us test formulas (a) and (λ) together for the position of Sëra Metropolis. The co-ordinates given by Ptolemy for the latter are—

**LONGITUDE.**

| Sëra Metropolis | 177° E. |
| Aganagara (Hanoi) | 169° |
| **Diff.** | 8° |

By formula (a) 8° × 0.725 = + 5° 48'
Corrected long. of Sëra Metropolis 111° 36'

**LATITUDE.**

| Sëra Metropolis | 38° 35' N. |
| Aganagara (Hanoi) | 16° 20' |
| **Diff.** | 22° 15' |

By formula (λ) 22° 15' × 0.6 = + 13° 21'
Corrected lat. of Sëra Metropolis 34° 22'
The resulting position for Sēra Metropolis is therefore:

**LONG. 111° 36' E. LAT. 34° 22' N.**

This position, when looked for on a map of China, will be seen to fall a little to the south-west of Honan-fu in Honan, and therefore sensibly correctly near the site of where stood Lo-yang, which, it is well known, was the capital of China previous to and during the Han dynasty (A.D. 25-221), namely, exactly at the time that Ptolemy collected his data. I would not go so far as to say that the position here obtained is quite correct to a minute; I do not find Lo-yang marked in the maps of China lying at my disposal, and therefore cannot judge of its exact position; but all works on China agree in saying it lays somewhere to the west of the present Honan-fu. Hence the position just found must be correct within less than half a degree of either longitude or latitude. Such a surprising approximation will be obtained for the majority of the places named by Ptolemy in the region situated northwards of the parallel of Cape Tēmala (Negrais), after the above formulas of correction have been applied; and by this means they may be identified in nearly every instance.

The longitudes, however, present some complications in this field, owing to several slight errors affecting the intermediate regions between the meridians of Akadra and Kambērikhon. Such errors, nevertheless, are found, as in the case of latitude errors between Aganagara and Akadra, to compensate themselves to such an extent as not to sensibly alter the proportion of the whole. I shall explain this by an example. For instance, in latitude we find the position of Akadra correct enough respecting Aganagara and Kambērikhon; and yet the intermediate latitudes are not correct, because there is an error between the parallels of Kambērikhon and Aganagara, and that of Akadra. Yet this does not affect the position of Akadra in relation to the two former places. This shows that Akadra, Kambērikhon, and Aganagara must have been fundamental stations for
which Ptolemy obtained reliable data deduced from accurate observation; whilst Cape Têmala and other intermediate places were merely secondary points which he determined simply on the base of road and sailing distance as reported by travellers. Sêra Metropolis and other important inland towns, which we shall meet with afterwards, must have been also as many fundamental stations.

In the same manner, as regards longitudes, we find an identical proportion between Kambêrikhon, Akadra, Aganagara, and Sêra Metropolis; while we detect errors between Kambêrikhon and Cape Têmala (Negrais); the latter and Cape Takola (Takôpa); this and Balongka and Akadra; and we find the whole coast-line of Cochin-China and Annam as far as Hanoi displaced in longitude. Yet these errors compensate themselves so far as not to cause any sensible disproportion in the distances between the fundamental stations named above. This phenomenon confirms the fact resulting from the previous examination of the latitudes; that is, that Kambêrikhon, Akadra, and Aganagara are Ptolemy’s fundamental stations in Indo-China.

In order to more clearly prove this, I shall now show that the proportion mentioned above exists almost unaltered up to the extreme limits of the geographical zone considered in the present study and represented in the accompanying map.

Identification of Ptolemy’s “Stone Tower.”—As far as longitudes are concerned, the proportion alluded to has already been shown to exist as far as Sêra Metropolis, lying on Ptolemy’s 177° meridian of eastern longitude = 111° 36’ E. of Greenwich, and therefore pretty near to the easternmost limit of the habitabilis. It remains, then, to show that the same proportion exists up to the westernmost limit of our field, and this I will do by applying the test to the meridian of Ptolemy’s so-called “Stone Tower,” which is also that of his Kanagora (identified with Kanauj or Kanoje, in India). The result is as follows:—
Longitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ptolemy's</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aganagara (Hanoi)</td>
<td>169° E.</td>
<td>105° 48' E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithinos Pyrgos (&quot;Stone Tower&quot;)</td>
<td>135°</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>34°</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to which, applying formula (a), $34^\circ \times 0.725 = 24^\circ 39'$

Remains long. of Lithinos Pyrgos $81^\circ 9'$

As the meridian of Lithinos Pyrgos is the same as that of Kanagora (Kanoje), for which the true long. E. of Greenwich is about $79^\circ 50'$, we see that the error is only about $1^\circ 19'$ on the whole distance Hanoi–Kanoje, including some $26^\circ$ of longitude. But, as we shall soon see, the Lithinos Pyrgos is—who would ever have suspected it?—ILCHI, YI-LI-CH'1, or KHOTEN, the true longitude of which is $80^\circ$ E., a yet closer approach to our calculated result.

If the Lithinos Pyrgos be really Khoten, this ought to be proved by a close coincidence in latitude as well; and this is exactly what I am now going to show.

Latitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ptolemy's</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aganagara (Hanoi)</td>
<td>16° 20' N.</td>
<td>21° 1' N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithinos Pyrgos</td>
<td>43° 0'</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>26° 40'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to which, applying formula ($\lambda$), $26^\circ 40' \times 0.6 = +16^\circ 0'$

whence, corrected lat. of Lithinos Pyrgos $37^\circ 1'$

Now, this is, within one single minute, the latitude of Khoten, given by the latest authorities as $37^\circ$ N.

This surprising exactness at once reveals to us that the Lithinos Pyrgos, or so-called "Stone Tower," must have been one of Ptolemy's fundamental stations carefully established by observation, whether astronomical or otherwise. A perusal of the first book of his geography shows, in fact, the pains he took in rectifying Marinus' estimate of
the distance from the passage of the Euphrates to the "Stone Tower" (Lithinos Pyrgos), and from the latter to Séra Metropolis. This proves that both the latter belonged to his list of fundamental stations. On the strength of Ptolemy's assumption that the "Stone Tower" was situated near the parallel of Byzantium (real lat. 41° N.), and of the coincidence in meaning between it and Tāshkand (real lat. 42° 58'), most authors hitherto identified it with the latter place; though Heeren and Rawlinson located it much more eastward—the former near Ush, and the latter at Tāsh-Kurghān (true lat. 37° 46' N.), which are places situated much nearer to Khoten than the far-away Tāshkand. Indeed, the intersection of the meridian of Ush with the parallel of Tāsh-Kurghān would fall only a few miles to the north-west of Khoten, our identification.

It is easy to show that Ptolemy's "Stone Tower" could not be situated so far west as Tāshkand. Let us take, in fact, his longitude of Marakanda (Samarkand), which he gives as 112°, the real one being about 68° E. Greenwich, and let us observe that the same longitude is assigned by him to the central mouth of the Indus. The average longitude of the mouths of the Indus named by him is 112°; the real one would be about 67° 15', that is, within 45' of the meridian of Samarkand. This proves Ptolemy's estimate of the position in longitude of Marakanda with respect to the central mouth of the Indus so surprisingly correct, as to dispel any doubt that might be entertained on this score. This point settled, we see that Ptolemy assigns long. 135° to his "Stone Tower," that is, he places it 23° further east than Marakanda. Now the real longitude of Samarkand being about 68°, and that of Tāshkand 69°, we see at once the impossibility of identifying the latter place with the Lithinos Pyrgos, despite the coincidence of meaning in the two names.

Calculating the 23° of Ptolemy's longitude on the base of the longitudes of the central mouth (Kariphron) of the Indus (Ptol. long. 112° = real long. 67° 15') and of the central mouth of the Ganges (Ptol. long. 146° 30' = real long. 89° 30'), we obtain 14° 50' as an equivalent of
Ptolemy's 23°, which added to 67° 15', the longitude of Kariphron, gives us 82° 5' as the corrected longitude of the "Stone Tower."

This result is within 56' of that obtained at the outset from Aganagara and Kambêrikhon, i.e. 81° 9'. Both point out with sufficient approximation where Ptolemy's "Stone Tower" should be looked for. In calculations I have adopted Khoten, and its meridian, 80° real long., as equivalent to 135° Ptol., the longitude of his "Stone Tower"; and thus corrected his error in excess in the reckoning of its distance from Samarkand. This rectification will serve also to correct his distance errors on the stations between the Indus and Kanoje, and between the latter place and the Ganges.

Though we have shown the accuracy of our formula (λ) in the rectification of the latitudes assigned by Ptolemy to places north of his 8th parallel (Cape Tëmala), and the proportion existing in latitude all over that zone, it will be found, as a result, that most places west of the Ganges will yet prove to be, after that formula has been applied, somewhat north of their true position. This is due to a local error made by our geographer in the delineation of the course of the Ganges, to which he attributed a direction much more northerly than it really is, thus causing a displacement towards the north-east of all towns situated on its banks and in the neighbourhood. I have shown and corrected this error in the map only for those towns lying on trade routes between the Ganges and Tibet; as the small space available would not allow of extending the correction to all those represented in that portion of the map. What strikes one more than anything else in the examination of Ptolemy's geography north of his parallel of Tëmala, is the proportion maintained all over the field in his latitudes. Surely these must have been determined by astronomical observation, or by accurate computation from the length of the sun-shadow and other means. More lacking in accuracy are, as might be expected, his longitudes. The stations at which a high degree of approximation has been attained in this respect are few and far between, and the longitudes
of the intervening places had thus to be reckoned on the uncertain base of the estimated road distance travelled. This is the cause that while we find sufficient proportion maintained between the longitudes of Ptolemy's fundamental stations from the "Stone Tower" to Sëra, we detect local errors in the intervening region, which must be corrected if the identification of the places included within its limits is to be arrived at with any degree of success. For this purpose the map has been divided into vertical zones by base meridian-lines (in red), between which Ptolemy's error in longitude was carefully determined and corrected by a particular formula for each zone. A double set of scales shows how the general error was determined between the fundamental stations and apportioned among the secondary ones.

The process will appear clearly enough on the map, and needs no further explanation here. The following is a list of the base meridian-lines adopted, and of the corrections to be applied to the places lying within each particular zone determined by them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135°</td>
<td></td>
<td>80°</td>
<td>9° 30'</td>
<td>0·826 (§)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146° 30'</td>
<td></td>
<td>89° 30'</td>
<td>4° 52'</td>
<td>0·45 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157° 20'</td>
<td></td>
<td>94° 22'</td>
<td>3° 57'</td>
<td>2·9625 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158° 40'</td>
<td></td>
<td>98° 19'</td>
<td>0° 33'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162°</td>
<td>5°</td>
<td>99° 12'</td>
<td>5° 9'</td>
<td>0·725 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167°</td>
<td>2°</td>
<td>104° 21'</td>
<td>1° 27'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169°</td>
<td></td>
<td>105° 48'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The meridian of Kanoje (79° 50' E. Greenwich, true) was adopted in the map.
The correction between the Cape Taköla and Balongka meridians was required only locally for some places on the Gulf of Siam, and so was that between the Balongka and Akadra meridians. The corrections involved here were operated graphically, and represented on the map. The same may be said of similar corrections in the Gulf of Martaban, on the coast north of Cape Negrais, and on the Cochin-Chinese and Annamese coasts, in each of which cases the course that Ptolemy's coast-line would assume, were the local error left unrectified, is duly shown in red outline. Northwards of the Gulf of Siam, the intermediate errors between the meridians of Akadra and Taköla are so slight as not to need any special correction different from that given by formula (a), by which the real longitude of Taköla was originally determined. Hence the correction indicated by this formula was indistinctly applied to all positions in the zone between those two meridians lying northwards and southwards of the Gulf of Siam, even down as far as Sumatra. It may thus be seen that all longitudes of Ptolemy's places lying eastward of the meridian of Cape Taköla or Taköpa (Cape Papra), that is, eastwards of long. 158° 40' Ptol. = 98° 19' E. Greenwich, can be fairly corrected by that single formula. The most grave error is that made by Ptolemy between Capes Témala and Taköla, in assigning them a difference in longitude of 1° 20' only, against 3° 57' real. This proved at first a great drawback to the identification of their true position. But as soon as I had made sure as to the real latitude of Cape Témala and fixed its position, I obtained the correct longitude of Cape Taköla from the base-point, Akadra, by a simple calculation, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ptolemy's.</th>
<th>True.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akadra (Hatien).</td>
<td>Long. 167° 0'</td>
<td>104° 21' E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Taköla (Taköpa).</td>
<td>158° 40'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>8° 20'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By formula (a) 8° 20' × 0.725 = 6° 2'
remains, correct long. of Cape Taköla 98° 19'
This result is correct within three minutes of the longitude of Cape Papra or Cape Takōpa, on the western coast of the Malay Peninsula, just above Junkceylon Island. This cape, which I found confirmed by a calculation of latitude to be beyond any possible doubt Ptolemy's Cape Takōla, is really in long. 98° 16', but I thought it was unnecessary to make the slight correction of 3', as being of no consequence whatever on the results of this inquiry.

Having now dealt with the region situated to the north of the parallel of Cape Tēmala, and shown how Ptolemy's positions of places therein were rectified, it remains to speak of the region southwards of that parallel. The rules given in the upper zone for longitudes apply also here, with the exception of the islands in the Gulf of Bengal, for which there seems to be hardly any rule or order, but which will be briefly dealt with in the sequel. It remains, then, to explain the corrections that latitudes need in this lower zone. In it we find sufficient proportion south of the parallel of Akadra; hence, all this section is easily corrected by reference to Akadra and Aganagara as base-points, that is, by formula (φ). The only anomaly lies between the parallels of Akadra and Cape Tēmala, due, as we have seen, to the shortening of the southern coast of Annam and western coast of the Malay Peninsula between those two parallels. This is easily corrected, however, by dividing the interval between the parallel of Akadra (Hatien), lat. 4° 45' Ptol. = 10° 22' N. true, and that of Cape Tēmala (Negrais), lat. 8° Ptol. = 16° N. true, in proportion to their difference in latitude: lat. 3° 15' Ptol. = lat. 5° 38' true, whence the formula of correction for Ptolemy's latitudes in this section—

\[
\frac{5° 38'}{3° 15'} = 1.773 (\kappa),
\]

which will restore to the western coast of the Malay Peninsula and to the eastern coast of Cochin-China the length they had lost under Ptolemy's manipulation, and make them at once recognizable. The above correction is not sufficient, however, for the upper portion of the Gulf
of Siām, the coast of which, Ptolemy thought, was running parallel to the equator, wherefore he neglected to show its deep incavation northwards. As a result of this, Pagrasa and Samaradē are displaced right into the middle of the Gulf. This purely local error, due entirely to lack of accurate information as to the latitude of those towns, must be corrected as shown in the map; and one will then at once recognize in Pagrasa and Samaradē the towns of Kṛat (Kraṣ or Kraṣa) and Śyāma-raṣṭra (or Sāma-raṭṭhē), better known as Sri Vijaya Raṇadhāni, the most ancient capital of lower Siām.

Formula (κ) will furnish us with a satisfactory proof of its accuracy when tested in the determination of the position in latitude of Bērabai. The difference in latitude between the latter place and Akadra is:

\[
6° - 4° 45' = 1° 15' \text{ Ptol.}
\]

This multiplied by (κ) becomes 1° 15' × 1.733 = 2° 10', which, added to the true latitude of Akadra, gives us—

\[
10° 22' + 2° 10' = 12° 32' \text{ true N. lat.,}
\]

which is, within 5', the latitude of Mercui (real latitude 12° 27'). This place becomes, therefore, unmistakably identical with Ptolemy's Bērabai; and the close similarity between the two names confirms that identity.

The Islands.—It remains now to broach the most difficult subject of the islands, one perhaps that will never be satisfactorily solved, at least so far as the islands in the Gulf of Bengal are concerned. With regard to those east and west of Sumatra, and to the latter island itself, I believe there is reason to be satisfied that they, as will be shown by a look at the map, have been successfully identified. But as to the former, there is hardly anything that can guide us in forming an estimate of the amount of Ptolemy's error. However, I made an attempt at their identification on the assumption that Ptolemy reckoned their position in reference to the coast of Coromandel and Ceylon; this seems natural, as the ships trading between those coasts and Further India would touch at them on their way before reaching either
the Malay Peninsula or Sumatra. I therefore tried to fix
them in longitude by dividing the space between Ceylon
and the meridian of Cape Takōla in proportion to their
difference of longitudes as given by Ptolemy. Their latitude
was established: for the northern ones, in relation to the
difference of latitudes between the River Maisōlos (Godāvari)
and Podukē (Pondichery); and for the southern, in reference
to the latitude of places in Ceylon.

With regard to the three groups of islands to the west
of Sumatra, the same process was adopted only so far as it
was necessary to establish their longitudes; the latitudes
having been left to follow the law of all other places situated
south of the parallel of Akadra.

Of course, all these islands were very little known in
Ptolemy’s time; hence the great error in estimating their
position.

Identification of Ptolemy’s places on the Chinese Coast.—
I may now conclude this review of the methods of identi-
fication pursued with a few words in explanation of the
reason why I decided to swing the farther coast-line of
Ptolemy’s Magnus Sinus round the Lui-chau peninsula taken
as a pivot, until it came in juxtaposition with the coast
of China, instead of allowing it to remain in the traditional
position assigned to it by our geographer, and from which
none of his commentators and elucidators ever dared
to remove it. Evidently I must have arguments for
justifying this desecration of the work of our eminently
classic geographer. As a matter of fact, my justification
rests upon but one single argument, sufficient though,
I think, to meet all criticism; and this is, that when the
farthest coast of the Magnus Sinus is mapped down in the
traditional position, but with its latitudes uniformly corrected
according to the formula for places lying northwards of the
parallel of Tēmala, and then projected upwards as shown
in the map, all its gulfs, rivers, and towns will be found
to coincide, or nearly so, with gulfs, rivers, and towns
of similar names on the coast of China. When the names
are not similar in pronunciation, the meaning conveyed
by the two names in each case is identical. This ought to convince us sufficiently that the coast of China was meant here by Ptolemy and no other. But how was he led to make it turn southwards? Certainly out of homage to the belief, so firmly and generally grounded among his contemporaries, that the coast of Sinai turned south, and then running parallel to the equator joined the coast of Africa at Cape Prason. Impressed with this belief, he mapped all distances from Aspithra onward in a southerly instead of in a north-easterly direction in order to fulfil the dictum of the philosophers of his time, and thus obtain an eastern limit to his habitabilis and to his Green Sea.

That this must have been what actually happened with him, is plainly shown by a look at our map. As regards the reason why I selected Lui-chau as a pivot on which to swing Ptolemy's coast of Sinai upwards, it is because I discovered that this was really Ptolemy's Aspithra. Ho-p'u (in Chinese) or Hiêp-pô (in Annamite pronunciation) was, in fact, the ancient name of Lui-chau and of the whole of the homonymous peninsula, as I will show in the illustrative notes of the next section; and any tyro in philology will see that Ho-p'u and Aspithra are mere transliterations the one of the other. This striking identification of Ptolemy's extreme station to the east of the Tonkin Gulf—his Magnus Sinus—enables us to know exactly where the distortion of his coast of Sinai commences, and thus to correct it by bending the coast-line back to its true position as shown in the map.

With this the rectification of the main features of Ptolemy's geography of Further India is complete; and it will now appear how it would have been next to impossible to identify any of his stations in that region without having previously restored the principal among them to their true position. The errors and displacements detected not being uniform all over that zone, the uselessness and impossibility of a general formula that may serve as a panacea for so many different evils, becomes at once apparent. The reason of our success lies, therefore, in
having broken off for once with the old system of treating Ptolemy's work as if it had been the result of a regular trigonometrical survey of the regions in question, in which the only defect was bad mapping due to errors of projection and errors of scale by having underestimated the length of equatorial degrees and misplaced his prime meridian and equator.

It is to be hoped that with the above explanations and the map that accompanies them, our process of elucidation of this portion of Ptolemy's geography will be easily understood, and recognized to be the only practicable and correct one, at least in its main lines. Of course it would be too much to expect intermediate stations to fit in exactly in the place they should occupy; but it will be seen that the majority of them come within a degree or so of their true position; a result, I think, that ought to satisfy the most exigent and pedantic of Ptolemy's critics.

The map was drawn on the plane method, and not according to Mercator's system, the chief object being, not to preserve the real shape of islands and continents, but to render the numerous graphical corrections to Ptolemy's latitudes and longitudes easier of application and the more clearly understood. Thanks to the introduction of coloured outlines to represent Ptolemy's geographical features, and of particular contrivances to show the position of his stations as resulting from his data, and the direction in which the corresponding real stations are to be found when there is an error in the former, it is hoped that a clear graphical representation of what Ptolemy's geography is in comparison with what it ought to be, has thus been presented which will enable the reader to form at a glance a judgment and estimate of the differences between the two. For those who desire to verify the position of Ptolemy's stations as laid down in my map, I append tables giving the names and co-ordinates of each as transmitted to us by the great Alexandrian geographer, together with their positions corrected from calculation, and the actual stations corresponding to them whenever they could be identified.
3. Remarks.

(1) Coast of the Airrhadoi.

The Airrhadoi, whose country embraces in Ptolemy’s system the eastern coast of the Gulf of Bengal from the mouth of the Brahmaputra down to that of the Nāf, or, perhaps, even lower, to the mouth of the Arakan River, have been identified by some writers with the Kirātas, and their country with Ptolemy’s Kirrhadia. This determination seems, however, hardly plausible, and for various reasons. In fact, though it be true—as attested by the Rāmāyaṇa (canto iv)—that at an earlier period tribes of rude mountaineers, such as are generically termed Kirātas, occupied the region to the east of the Lower Brahmaputra even down to the sea-coast and the islands of the Gulf of Bengal, it appears that in subsequent times they were driven back towards the hill tracts by invasions of Dravidians—chiefly Andhras and Kalingas from the opposite coast of the Gulf—who forced their way along the littoral as far as the limits of Arakan, and probably even to the Gulf of Martaban, establishing colonies as they proceeded. These Dravidian invasions must have occurred, and probably ended, before 295 B.C., the approximate date of Megasthenes’ mission to the Court of Palibothra, since that author (in the extract quoted by Pliny the Elder) refers to the Kalingas and Andhras as being situated near the sea and on both sides of the Ganges in the last part of its course; and since a century later, in the Peutingerian Tables, the “Andre-Indi” are assigned a position corresponding to the coast between the left bank of the Ganges and the present Arakan River.¹ This being the region that Ptolemy calls the Coast of the Airrhadoi, it is reasonable, I think, to infer that by this name he meant the

¹ See Sir Walter Elliot’s discussion of this point in “Numismata Orientalia: Coins of Southern India,” pp. 9-10.
Coast of the Andhras, especially as he does not mention any other people of an identical or even similar name in or about the same region. Some two centuries before Ptolemy’s time, the Mahābhārata mentions—in conjunction with the Tāmraliptakas and other nations of Lower Bengal—the Śaivas and Aindras: Aindra is the name which, in the middle of the eleventh century A.D., Bhāskāra Ācārya gives to the eastern portion of Bhāratavarṣa (India), some time before termed Indra-dvīpa in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa; and Śaiva means the people of Śiva, a portion of Plakṣa-dvīpa which, as I shall show in the sequel, corresponds to Arakan and Burmā. All these are coincidences that concur in demonstrating that the coast now under consideration was the habitat of a people called Andhras or Aindras, who appear in Megasthenes’ extract as the Andārae, in the Peutingerman Tables as the Andre-Indi and in Ptolemy’s Geography as the Airrhadoi, and who were evidently of Dravidian extraction and probably identical with the Andhras of Orissa and Telingāna. This people, in conjunction with their near relatives, the Kalingas, founded, it appears, in that region, a kingdom consisting of three districts or separate communities called

1 In some MSS.: see Professor F. Hall’s note in his edition of Wilson’s “Viṣṇu Purāṇa,” vol. ii, p. 341.
2 The MSS. of the Mahābhārata have the readings “Andras,” “Andhash,” and “Aindras,” which, Professor Hall thinks, are, perhaps, errors for Andhras. I should not be surprised if it were found that the names Andhras and Andre-Indi are both derived from Aindra, the designation for the region to the east of the Ganges as surmised above. As to the presence of the Andhras in Orissa and Lower Bengal, see Sir Walter Elliot, loc. cit. At the same time it is worthy of remark that one of the two classes into which the present Andamanese are divided is that of the Argyatos or ‘Coast-dwellers’ (see J.R.A.S., Vol. XIII, n.s., p. 487). Whether this term was also applied to the Negrito aborigines of the littoral now under discussion, and whether it was retained by the later occupants of the country down to Ptolemy’s time and preserved to us under the form of Airrhadoi, is a mere conjecture, but one that will, perhaps, repay investigation. Sufficient to point out, in fact, that Ma Tuan-lin, in his celebrated cyclopædia (H. de Saint-Denis’ translation, vol. ii, p. 504), refers to a Buddhist kingdom by the name of A-la-t’o—hitherto unidentified—as having sent ambassadors to China as early as A.D. 450. There is every likelihood that the term A-la-t’o stands for Argyato, Aradhā, or Ahrodha, and thus applies to Ptolemy’s country of the Airrhadoi. I can hardly think that it, even in its alternative spelling Ho-la-t’o, can refer to such a far-away country as Araṭṭa (Hairat, or Aıradeşa), i.e. Gujarāth.
Tri-Kalinga or Tri-linga, a name from which the term Telingāna was derived, and employed to designate the country of Kalinga proper, on the western side of the Gulf of Bengal, as well as the country of the Mōns or Talengs (Talaings) on the opposite shore, which had been colonized by them.

Ptolemy’s capital city Triglypton, or Trilingon, has been identified with the capital of this eastern kingdom of the Kalingas; but a difference of opinion still exists as to its site, some locating it at Tripura (Tipperah or Tipārā), others in Arakan, and others still on the Chittagāon hills; the three places just named pertaining each to one of the three districts which, in the opinion of Wilford, constituted the Eastern Trikalinga. Ptolemy places his Triglypton on the Tokosanna River, identified by me with the Kulādān; and the position I obtained by calculation for that capital would fall on the main upper branch of the same river not far away from its source in Blue Mountain, and almost due east from Chittagong (Chittagāon), the supposed Pentapolis of Ptolemy. It may appear unlikely that a city of such importance could exist so far up the Kulādān and in such a wild country as it is known to be. At the same time, it is narrated in the Arakan Annals that in about 850 B.C. Kan-rāja-gyī, a descendant of the dynasty reigning at Tagōng in Upper Burmā, who became twenty-four years afterwards king of Arakan, settled in the Kyouk-pān hills near the same river, and not more than forty miles in a direct line south of the position assigned to Triglypton by my calculations. It is also stated that, before establishing himself in the locality just named, Kan-rāja-gyī had dwelt for some time at or near another hill called Kalē, in the

1 "The summit of Kyauk-pān-daung is a gently undulating plateau several miles in extent. Though in the midst of a mountainous region inhabited by rude tribes, recent exploration has discovered traces that it was once occupied by a civilized race. Palms and other trees, which are not natural products of the surrounding jungle, are found there. The remains of pagodas also exist, and these, though comparatively modern, with the other evidences of former habitation in this secluded spot, give support to the belief of its having been the resting-place of the race which at a remote period gave kings to Arakan."—Phayre’s "History of Burma," p. 44.
Kubo valley, west of the Chindwin. Here he was applied to for a ruler by the Kanran, the Sak, and the Phyū tribes, and he appointed his son Mudusitta king over them. This circumstance of a king by the name of Mudu or Mudusitta ruling over three tribes in a district called Kalē even up to the present day, suggests at once a connection with Mudu-Kalinga or Trikalinga, and makes it probable that Kalē is really the place referred to as Triglypton by Ptolemy. The location of Kalē is within a degree or thereabouts to the north-east of the position we obtained by calculation. It is also worthy of remark that Mudu is the name of one of the tribes wherewith Kanmyeng, one of the early kings of Arakan, is said to have peopled his dominions. This prince is represented as having come from India, and the legend states that he was appointed to rule over “all the countries inhabited by the Burman, Shan and Malay races” from Manipur to the borders of China. Though undoubtedly exaggerated, this tradition appears to confirm the existence of the eastern kingdom of Trikalinga mentioned at the outset; and when compared with the account of Kan-rāja-gyi’s establishment of a capital at Kalē, and subsequently at Kyouk-pān-daung, shows that the early seat of government of that kingdom was in the hill tracts between the coast of Chittagāon and the Chindwin. Triglypton must then be looked for either in the valley of the Kulādān or in that of the Kubo. Mr. Thomas, concurring with the views set forth in Horsburgh’s “India Directory,” prefers to locate Ptolemy’s capital city in the Chittagāon hills. Yule took it instead to be Tripura, and at first I adopted

2 Mudu = ‘three’ in Telugu and Kalinga. Hence Mudu-Kalē, or Mudu-Kalinga, is equivalent to Trikalinga. A corrupt form Trikalē, derived from either Trikalinga or Trikalipi, may also have been in use, as well as an alternative term Triśūlika, of which I have found traces in ancient records, both local and foreign. Of this latter Ptolemy’s Triglypton may, after all, prove to be a translation.
4 Ibid.
his identification; but reconsideration led me to reject it in favour of a place in the valley of either the Kulādān or the Kubo, as I have shown above. Yule's determination rests mainly on the fact that the name of Tripura, meaning "three cities," conveys the same idea of three separate settlements or communities as the term Trikalinga. Wilford⁴ says that these three districts were Kamīlā, Chattala, and Burmānaka, or Raśāng (now Arakan); and that Kamīlā alone retains the name of Tripura, the two other districts having been wrested away from the head rāja. This statement is apparently based on a similar legend to the one referred to above concerning the extent of the dominion of King Kan-myeng, and in no way shows that the capital of the whole kingdom was situated at Tripura (Tipperah), the most northern of the three districts, which seems unlikely. As a matter of fact, the original term Trikalinga only remained preserved in its integrity up to the present day in the name of the Talengas, or Talaings, the people of Pegu,² and the descendants of that great ethnic stock which played in Indo-China an analogous rôle to the Dravidians in Southern India, superseding the aborigines of Negrito race, the anthropophagous Rāksasas. Since the Kalingas and the Andhras appear to have been, in the third century B.C., masters of the valley of the Ganges from the frontier of Magadha to the sea, it is easy to conceive on the one part that the Kalingas could penetrate into Western Burmā through Silhet, Manipur, and the Kubo valley, and establish thereat a dominion called Mudu-Kalinga or Tri-Kalinga; and that the Andhras, in their turn, could easily advance along the coast-line as far as the Nāf or the Kulādān. Admitted that a dominion of the Kalingas as described above did actually exist, it did not evidently last long. As soon as their power waned, and they were driven away by later intruders towards the south of India—an event which,

¹ Apud McCrindle, op. cit., p. 232.
² I find Pegu often designated Kālinga-rāṭṭha in old Indo-Chinese records.
according to Sir W. Elliot, happened about a century before the Christian era—their empire was broken up, and only its name remained to attest its past existence. Hence, in Ptolemy's time we would search in vain for such a dominion. We only find three capital cities—evidently the seats of government of as many separate kingdoms or districts—recorded in that region, viz. Tagma, Triglypton, and Mareura.

The former is probably Tummu in the Chindwin valley, or some other place between it and the Surma River in Silhet; hence it represents the chief city of the district of Kachar or Manipur.

Triglypton, apparently the former capital of the whole Dravidian kingdom, corresponds, I think, with Kalē, and represents the chief city of the second district, including the Kubo valley, the Lower Chindwin, and extending probably across the Arakan Roma into the valley of the Kuladān.

Mareura I have identified with Old Prome, the capital of a kingdom which must have originally included the whole region of the Lower Iravati and its Delta; in a word, all that country that formed afterwards the kingdom of Pegu, in which alone the name Taleng (Trilinga or Trikalinga) was preserved intact.

After the fall of the Dravidian power in the above three districts, Manipur continued under Brāhmanic rule; Kalē was probably afterwards abandoned, its people passing partly to Prome and partly into Arakan; and Prome continued as a capital of the Talaing kingdom until conquered and destroyed by the Kanran from Arakan in 95 A.D. This historical sketch is scarcely in accordance with the native chronicles of Burma and Pegu; but it must be remembered that legend supplies in them the place for history in the earlier periods; and that many of the events narrated, though authentic, are antedated chiefly for religious or political purposes, in order to connect them with events in the life of Gotama Buddha and of the Kṣatriya kingdoms of Magadha and neighbouring states of India.
Besides the name of the Talaiungs already mentioned, and that of Kalē—the correct form of which appears to be Kulā—we have other linguistical indications of Kalinga domination in the region above spoken of. The Arakan River, for instance, whose valley is contiguous to the Kalē district, is called the Kulādān (often wrongly spelled Koladya) by natives of the country. Kulā, the term nowadays employed in Burmā to designate Western foreigners in general, more specially applies to natives of India, and above all to Dravidians. In Siam this identical term is used up to the present day to denote people from Malabar or Coromandel. It probably means a people of black or dark race, and also a barbarian, like the Sanskrit Kāla or Kola. Its connection with the Kalingas is demonstrated by the fact that Kolamca is an alternative name for the country of the Kalingas. It is also undoubtedly connected with Kola, Kora, and Cola, the denominations of the people that gave its name to Coromandel and to many places on the Indo-Chinese littoral and in Malaya.

As regards the term dān, meaning 'a place' in Burmese, it is easy to see that it is the equivalent of the Sanskrit sthāna. The correct form of the name Kulādān proves consequently to be Kolahāna or Kulā-sthāna, which conveys the meaning "place of the Kolas, or Kulās," i.e. of the Dravidians (more properly Kalingas).

The linguistical evidence is therefore to the effect that the rule of the Kalingas had for centres three places at least, namely: 1, Kalē; 2, the valley of the Arakan River; and 3, Pegu proper round the Gulf of Martaban.

Turning now to the Andhras, it appears that they did not advance beyond the Arakan River. In fact, it is at this point that Ptolemy makes his Coast of the Airrhadoi terminate, and the territory of Argyra begin. Reserving our remarks anent the latter to a subsequent section, we shall now proceed to discuss the identity of the cities and streams recorded by our author as belonging to the Coast of the Airrhadoi.
Pentapolis (No. 43 of the Tables).

It is evident, I think, that the foreign settlements on this coast were grouped somewhat after the manner of the Greek colonies of old, in clusters of cities and petty states. The very names of Trilinga, or Trikalinga; Catur-grāma (Chittagong=four villages); and Ptolemy’s Pentapolis, recall to our memory the Greek Tripolis, Tetrapolis, etc. Once this principle established, it is easy to see how such names would be multiplied everywhere the Kalingas ruled. In fact, beside the Trikalinga named by Ptolemy in the region now under consideration, we have another about the Kṛṣṇā and Godāvari, and a third yet recorded as a feud of the Cedi rājas in Mālvā.

As regards Pentapolis, its name seems to be a rendering of the Sanskrit Paṅca-palli, meaning “five cities.” But it may be well to call attention to the fact that on the coast of India, a short distance below Masulipatam, there is a port called Modu-palli (meaning “three cities,” usually noted Motapalli in the maps), which is referred to by Floris and other navigators of the early part of the seventeenth century as Petapoli, and by De Barros as Pentepoli, a surprisingly accurate approach to Ptolemy’s Pentapolis. This is a capital example of the modifications that geographical names undergo at the hands of travellers. Not knowing, therefore, whether the name recorded by Ptolemy is a translation, or merely an imitative rendering of the native term, we may hold that it corresponds either to Paṅca-palli or to Mudu-palli, thus designating a cluster of either five or three cities respectively. The position I obtained for it by calculation falls a short distance below the Chittagong inlet; but when it is remembered that the calculated position of Katabėda still requires a correction in latitude of about a quarter of a degree more to the north, we might look for Pentapolis a little further up above the Chittagong inlet, either on the coast or on some of the islands at the embouchure of the Old Brahmaputra. If Pentapolis really stands for Mudupalli, i.e. “three cities,” it might represent Tripura or Tipperah (meaning also
"three cities"), which is the name of the district just close by. If, instead, it stands for "five cities," it will be probably identified with some other place in the same neighbourhood. But as to its corresponding to Chittagong—as surmised by some writers—I hardly can believe it, because the latter name distinctly designates an aggregation of four villages. Unless it can be proved that originally the villages were three or five, and were collectively named Mudupalli or Pañcapalli respectively, or else Mudugrama or Pañcagrama, I do not see how the term Pentapolis can apply to them.

Katabêda River (Nos. 44, 191).

Is by some identified with the Karmasuli or Chittagong River. Wilford went so far as to suppose that Ptolemy placed it by mistake to the north of Arakan, and tried to show that it must be sought for to the south, behind the island of Cheduba, the name of which, he says, is Kâtabaidâ. He evidently meant Catur-thûpa or Char-dhuba—"four capes," the name by which this island is known to the natives of India, and from which its European name has been derived. Its local designation is Man-oung, and the classical name Meghavati. The only toponym in that neighbourhood which closely approaches to Katabêda is Ga-tsha-bha, the local name for the Kulâdân or Arakan River. But our calculations show that the stream meant by Ptolemy is much further north and in the neighbourhood of the island of Kutubdia (not Cheduba), situated about half-way between Chittagong and Ramû. The name of this island is strikingly similar to that of Ptolemy's river; hence, without having—Wilford-like—to assume that our author made any mistake in fixing the position of the Katabêda, we may safely identify the latter with the Mori River behind the island of Kutubdia. Although there may not have been in Ptolemy's time any homonymy

2 Ibíd., p. 271.
between the island and the stream behind it, we may well imagine that navigators—as frequently occurs—might name the river from the island in front of it, thus saying, “the river behind Kutubdia island,” which expression by long use would become contracted into “the river Kutubdia.” It seems that some Latin translators or commentators of Ptolemy refer to this river under the name of Calincius. If so, we would have here a repetition of the term Kolainca, indicating a connection with the Kalingas. It would be worth while to inquire whether the term Calincius really refers to the Katabēda, or—as might appear more natural—to the Kulādān River.

Ptolemy carries, as we have already observed, his Coast of the Airrhadoi down to the Kulādān, thus including within its compass the mart of Barakura. But as we hold that the latter is intimately connected with Arakan, it will be dealt with under the next section.

(2) Argyra (Arakan).

The region following next in order on the same coast is by Ptolemy named Argyra, and evidently corresponds to Arakan. The meaning conveyed by the term Argyra is that of ‘Silver Country’; and in order to mark it the more distinctly Ptolemy takes care to add that “there are said to be very many silver-mines.”1 Though this be a mere dictur collected from travellers not sufficiently acquainted with the interior of the country, it decidedly shows nevertheless that the latter was considered to be a silver region, and was accordingly named ‘Silver Country.’ If it can be proved that this was the case, Sir Arthur Phayre’s theory that the ancient name of the country was Rakhaing, on account of it being inhabited by Rākṣasas, and that Argyra is but a transliteration or imitation of that name, naturally falls to the ground. This theory is really of native or rather Buddhist monkish origin; but the gallant General

1 McCrindle, op. cit., p. 219.
just named constituted himself its champion. I do not contest—on the contrary, I fully endorse—the opinion that the country was originally inhabited by savage tribes of Negrito race, similar to the actual Minicopies of the Andaman islands, or to the ancient Rākṣasas fabled to have been conquered by Rāma in Ceylon. But I object to the exclusivist view that such race had its habitat confined solely to the coast of Arakan. There are proofs that it extended at some time or other over the whole maritime region of Indo-China, in which case the epithet ‘Rākṣasa-land’ ought to admit of a much wider interpretation. The Andaman islands, the island of Bhilū-gyun in the Gulf of Martaban, and other places, were designated by the term Rākṣasa, or its local vernacular equivalent. Ptolemy populates the littoral all round the Gulf of Martaban with such cannibal tribes, while not mentioning any of them in Argyra.

The term Rakhaing can therefore be scarcely connected with the tradition of the Rākṣasas occupying at one time the land, and any such pretended connection put forward is undoubtedly the modern invention of Buddhist monks, anxious to find some explanation for the name of the country. Sir Arthur Phayre says that the latter was designated as Rakkha-pura by the Buddhist missionaries from India; but I should like to hear how far back in antiquity this name can be traced. It appears in the Mahāvamsa under the form Rakkhaṅga at so late a date as a.d. 1592; and in the Ain-i-Akbari at about the same period under the form Arkung. Barbosa speaks of Araguam in a.d. 1520, and some earlier mention of it is perhaps to be found in other Portuguese authors. But native records

1 Ch. xciv, v. 97 seq.
2 Since writing the above I have discovered an earlier reference to the country under the name of Lo-kh'ing (Ra-khêng or Rakhaing) in the extract from the Chinese traveller Ma-Huan (a.d. 1413), translated and published by Phillips in the Journal, China Branch R.A.S., 1885, pp. 209 seq. Phillips wrongly took that name to apply to Rangūn, a view which will be found refuted in full in the next section of this paper dealing with the islands named by Ptolemy in the Bay of Bengal. Soon afterwards, in circa 1430 a.d., Conti termed Racla the city of Arakan and its river (see Ramusio, vol. i, f. 339, F).
refer to Arakan previous to that period as Dhaññavati, Khamavati, Vaisali, etc., the names of its capitals; never, I believe, as Rakkhainga or Rakhaing.

Ptolemy's Argyra cannot therefore be a defective rendering of either Rakkhainga or Rakṣasa, but rather a modification or an adaptation of the original name of the country, which must have meant either silte or something to that effect. \(^1\) We shall meet with other instances of the same name or meaning at Achin in Sumatra, and at Pērak in the Malay Peninsula. The original vocable is either Pērak, Prak, Prakṣa, or Plakṣa, meaning 'silver.' It will result from my examination of the geography of the Puranās in a subsequent section, that the coast of Arakan, with its hinterland as far as the Iravati or the Salwín, represents the region designated by the term Plakṣa-dvipa, apparently on account of a plakṣa (Indian fig-tree) growing there. I found out, however, that the term Plakṣa really stands for the Sanskrit balakṣa and the Vedic palakṣa, both meaning 'white,' and, I firmly believe, also 'silver.' It is my conviction, in fact, that the Malay pērak and the Khmer prak used to designate silver are derived from them. In Mōn (Taleng) there appears to have remained no trace of this name for silver; unless sōn (written sran), its present name, be a corruption of the terminal syllable of plakṣa. Bhau or bhō in Burmese still means 'pure silver'; and bhyyū (written phrū) means 'white,' being probably equivalent to the Mōn phū. From Barbosa it would appear that a portion of Upper Burma was, in his time, still called Balassia, from which the so-called 'balas rubies' were exported. \(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Silver-mines exist, and seem to have been once extensively worked in the Chindwin valley, not far from Arakan.

\(^2\) " Li balassi sono di spetie di rubini, ma non così duri, il colore è di rosato, et alcuni sono quasi bianchi, nascono in Balassia, ch'è vn regno dentro à terra ferma di sopra Fegu, et Bengala, et di li vengono condotti da i mercantili Mori, per tutte l'altre parti," etc. Barbosa, in Ramusio's "Delle Navigationi," etc., vol. i, 1563 edit., p. 321, E. The prevailing opinion is that the balas ruby was named from Badakhshan near the Pamirs; but Upper Burma is evidently meant here. It is quite clear to me—and my view will receive repeated confirmations in the course of the following sections—that the term palakṣa or balakṣa was
to be an account of Buddha’s pretended peregrinations in Indo-China,¹ the kingdom of Burmá is referred to as Prasuluka-nagara, or Pasuluka, a term which seems to me a corrupted form of Balakṣa or Palakṣa. All these are coincidences demonstrating that the name by which the Purāṇas designate the region of Burmá and Arakan has not been indiscriminately applied, but is simply an imitation of the early local name for the country. In languages which, like the Arakanese, the Malay, and Khmer, delight in the r sound, and have a monosyllabic tendency, palakṣa and plakṣa become easily transformed into parakṣa and prakṣa, pérak and prak.² From parakṣa the corrupted forms arakṣa, arakkha, and even rakkha may be easily derived, which would explain the name of Arakan and the growth of the tradition as regards the rakṣas or rākṣasas originally infesting the country.³

transplanted in this region from Badakhshān, with whose name it is undoubtedly connected. It forms but one link in the long chain of place-names transferred from North-Western India to North-Western Indo-China.

¹ This work will be more particularly described in the sequel, in the paragraph devoted to Balongka.

² These forms become still further contracted in Sinitic languages, as exemplified by pak in Cantonese, bok in Annamese, and pso in Pekingese. The early Vedic term palakṣa may thus be traced all the way from the mouths of the Indus to those of the Yellow River.

³ In the same manner, I venture to think, was the name of Arakhōsia—notwithstanding that a very different opinion be generally held—derived from Badakhshān; and with it was probably also connected that of Baktra. The latter is traceable to a form Bāhikā or Bāhikā, still represented in modern Balkh, and usually identified with Bāhikā = ‘sand’; but may not white or quartzous (tphadikā, phalikā) sand be intended, in which case the connection with balakṣa and Badakhshān would become still more evident. It must be remembered that Ptolemy places in Arakhōsia a people by the name of Baktrici—

and that the Parthians called the country—according to Isidoros of Kharax—

‘White India.’ This must have been to some purpose; very likely out of reference to its name, meaning ‘white,’ and being therefore derived from balakṣa. In Further India it appears that Upper Burmá, or the portion of it bordering upon Arakan, was known as Badakhshān or Balakṣa, while Arakan proper was named after its derivative Arakṣa or Arakhōsia. The term was, however, modified by Dravidian pronunciation in the manner of its namesakes on the Coromandel and Sumatran seaboard, viz., Aryakharai (said to correspond to Ptolemy’s Argari, Argeiron, or Agkheiron); and Atjāh, Acheh, or Achīn (Ptolemy’s Argyrē), which bears a striking similarity to Agkheiron. Hence Ptolemy’s renderings Argyra and Argyrē for the names of Arakan and Acheh or Aceh respectively. The story of the silver-mines in Arakan must have originated from the fact of silver being imported thither from the Chindwin valley, and cannot be said to have been suggested by the name of the country exclusively. In fact, Ptolemy is perfectly silent as to silver being found at
That the term parakṣa or parakkha coexisted at one time in Arakan along with its derivative arakṣa or arakkha, is demonstrated by several facts. Ptolemy places on the coast either Argeiron or Argyrē. Though, in the case of the last-named town, he mentions gold among the productions of the surrounding country, he does not say in regard to the less noble metal.

Taking therefore Upper Burma to have been named after Badakhshān, and Arakan after Arakhosia, the Coast of the Airrhadoi would turn out to be a namesake of Areia (Ārya, Ārya?), that of Sandoway of Drangianē (Draṅga, Daranda, Zaran); and the territory about Cape Negrais and the upper portion of the Gulf of Martaban would be found to play in Further Indian geography the rôle of Gedrośia and Sindh. The parallel will at first sight appear very doubtful and unconvincing. A more exhaustive investigation, however, will disclose the fact that the nomenclature of the valley of the Indus and its affluents, with some of the names of the peoples, districts, and cities of that region, was at an evidently very early date transferred to the valley of the Iravati and surrounding territory in Further India, where they still subsist in part in a plainly recognizable form, fully testifying as to their place of origin. Once this fact is realized, many place-names occurring in Further Indian topography for which we have long sought in vain an explanation; and others, modelled upon prototypes of the Indus valley, for which we are at a loss to account the raison d'être, in unclassical Burma, Pegu, and Arakan, become at once intelligible and their presence easy to account for.

Suffice here to call attention to a few of them only. The Chindwin, and the lower course of the Irawaddi (Iravati) from the Chindwin confluence to the sea, becomes identified in name with the Indus or Sindhu, as shown by the term Sindhu—or some of its derivatives—being still preserved in the denomination of the Chindwin (Sindhu-in, Saṁdhavīn?).

The Kubō, a right tributary of the Chindwin, corresponds to the Kubbā, the affluent from the right of the Indus; the valley of the Kubō thus becomes an ideal counterpart of the Kabul valley, where Kalē probably stands for Puṣkara-vatī or Puṣkalāvatī. The Uru, a left tributary of the Chindwin further up, seems to have been named after the Haro, the left tributary of the Indus. The term Iravati was thus, at an early period, restricted to the portion of the Irawaddi's course lying above the Chindwin's confluence.

The names of the five rivers of Panjāb appear to have been likewise transferred to the traditional five streams of Pegu, said to have their estuary at Punzalaing or Pañča-lōng (Five Rivers), at the head of the Gulf of Martaban. The Salwin is the Sarasvatī; the Sittang or Chittōng represents either the Satlej (Satadrū) or the Chitrāng (Sadra); the Hlaing flowing past Rangān town is taken as the continuation of the major stream, the Chindwin or Indus proper; while the Chinabakeer branch of the Irawaddi (termed Asita in the old records) represents the Chināb (Asiknī). This puzzling name of the Chinabakeer River does not result, therefore, as Forchhammer thought ("Notes on the Early History and Geography of Brit. Burma"); I. Shwē Dagon Pagoda, Rangoon, 1891, p. 16), from Pokkhara the ancient name of the Dala district through which it flows, but chiefly from the term Chināb by which it was designated. The term Pokkhara may, at best, play in the compound the secondary rôle of simple affix, though even under this form its presence is pretty well doubtful. In comparing toponymics of Further India with those of India proper we cannot of course expect to find them always in systematic positions; but it will be seen from my further remarks on this subject in the sequel, that a certain correspondence in location exists all over the field. Thus Further India may in this respect be regarded as a second India, and certainly it was looked upon in this light by the Indū colonists who brought thither their civilization and made it, as much as possible, their second fatherland. This
of Arakan a mart which he calls Barakura, and which I have identified with the capital of the country at that period. Barakura is evidently but a form of balakṣa, which may easily become barakkха in the local pronunciation; and denotes not necessarily the proper name of the capital, but that of the country itself, as in the case of Samarāde, which will be found explained in a subsequent section. That Barakura was used as a name for the whole country, we have an instance in Porcacchi's book,¹ where this kingdom is still spoken of as "regno Baracuro." It may be objected that this is an expression imitated from Ptolemy; but then there is still Barboza's kingdom of Balassia' to be reckoned with, which, though it may have little to do with Arakan, still proves that Palakṣa or Balakṣa, the ancient name of the region, had not yet died out at that period.

Feature of Further Indian geography has hitherto been ignored or overlooked by scholars, who simply rested content with the fact of knowing that some of the place-names in Further India were imitated from Indian place-names or derived from Sanskrit. The fact that there has been much more than a simple borrowing of nomenclature, that is, an actual adaptation—in fact, an attempt at superimposition—of Indian to Further Indian topography, is, if I am not mistaken, for the first time brought to light in the present paper, and will be reverted to in the following pages from time to time when occasion demands, as far as space will allow. It is, as it will be more and more clearly seen in the sequel, the only means and method of getting at the bottom of some of the Further Indian place-names. I shall quote as an instance the name of Bhamo on the Irāvati, in Upper Burmā. Bhamo is believed to represent the Thai words Ban Mō—'Potter's village'; it is, in fact, so called by the Thai people (Shans). It is known, however, that Bhamo is an ancient Indū foundation formerly bearing the name of Campānagara. Now, by referring to the ancient topography of the Indian Irāvati or Rāvi, one will see that at its headquarters there existed a state of Campā or Chamba with capital formerly at Varmapura or Barmāvar, and, later on, at Campā-pura, still known as Chamba (see Cunningham's "Ancient Geography of India," p. 141). The result of this comparison of Further Indian with Indian topographical details is, that the name of Bhamo is almost undoubtedly a Thai (Shan) adaptation of the ancient name Varma- or Barma-pura probably borne by the place at one time, perhaps earlier than the period when it was called Campā-nagara.

This is but one of the many instances that might be adduced to demonstrate the utility of comparing Indo-Chinese topography with its old Indian prototype; and there can be hardly any doubt that a comparative study of both cannot but yield good results and elucidate many of the Further Indian place-names that hitherto remained meaningless or unexplained.

¹ "L'isole più famose del Mondo descritte da Thomaso Porcacchi," etc. Venice, 1576, p. 193.
My conclusion is, therefore, that Barakura represents the local name of Arakan in Ptolemy’s time; that Argyra is but a derivation and adaptation of it; and that both can be traced back to an original term Palakṣa or Balakṣa, recorded in the Purāṇas under the form of Plakṣa, but locally changed in the course of time into Rakkha, Rakkham, out of which the Portuguese and other Europeans made Aracam and Aracan. It remains now briefly to discuss the position of the various places named by Ptolemy in this region.

Barakura, a mart (No. 45).

In Ptolemy’s time Arakan was apparently an independent state, and no longer subject to the sway of Kalė, as previously remarked. Its capital was, according to the local records, Dhaññāvati, situated about twenty miles to the north-east of the present Mro-houng or Old Arakan city. There, in A.D. 146, a king by the name of Candra Sūrya is said to have ascended the throne, and to have cast a famous metal image of Buddha, which he enshrined in the Mahā-Muni pagoda, built for the occasion on the Silagiri (now Kyauktaw) hill near by. Dhaññāvati remained capital up to A.D. 788, when it was replaced by Vaiśāli, a new city built in its neighbourhood. The position I obtained by calculation for Barakura exactly agrees in latitude with the site once occupied by the ancient Dhaññāvati, and only lacks correctness as to longitude, which is, however, only about 1° 14’ short of the real amount. I have, therefore, not the slightest doubt that the latter city is meant. Borongo island, at the mouth of the Kulādān, which forms a large harbour there, and Paloung, a village on the east bank of the same stream in the present Mro-houng township, most probably preserve, each in a modified form, the ancient name of the kingdom, district, and seaport represented by Ptolemy’s Barakura.¹

¹ For Paloung see “British Burma Gazetteer,” vol. ii, p. 472. Wilford calls it Palong, and identifies it with the Phalgun of the Kṣetra-Samaśa, according to which treatise, he says, another name for it was Pharūgūra (see McCrindle, op. cit., p. 235). In this last term we have, it seems to me, a very
Tokosanna River (Nos. 46 and 190).

My identification of this stream with the Kulādān or Arakan River agrees with those of Wilford and Lassen. Yule’s view that it is the Nař which, he says, is generally called the ‘Tek-Nāf’ from the Thek (more correctly Sak) tribe inhabiting its banks, is utterly untenable; and, besides, it is doubtful whether the term ‘Tek-Nāf’ is really correct. I do not find it recorded in the “British Burma Gazetteer,” which simply states (vol. ii, p. 445) that “Nař is the Bengali name customarily used by all but Arakanese and Burmese, to whom this estuary is known as the Anouk-ngay, i.e. ‘little west’ (country).”

The Kulādān or Arakan River is, according to the same work (p. 271), named by the inhabitants of the country Ga-tsha-bha, and by the Khami tribes Yam-pang. None of these names resemble the one given by Ptolemy; but in the account of the seizure of the famous metal image of Buddha (cast by King Candra Surya as explained above) by the Burmese, in A.D. 1784, we are told that “the image sank whilst being floated on a raft down the Thek-khyoun and Le-mro.”¹ Now, this Thek-khyoun, Thek-khyound, or Thek-chaung, as it is variously spelled, is evidently a branch of either the Kulādān or Le-mro, in the vicinity of the Mahāmuni pagoda, where the sacred image was kept, and may well represent Ptolemy’s Tokosanna. It is just possible that in the old times the name Thek-chaung was given to the main stream, whether it be the Le-mro or the Kulādān; but I hold preferentially for the latter until

more detailed information on the intricate hydrography of the Arakan district is forthcoming that will allow of a more definite opinion being pronounced.

Sambra, a city (No. 47).

This must be identified, I think, with the city of Rāmavatī, which is said to have once stood on this coast opposite the island of Rāmrī; or else with the island itself which took its name from it, corrupted by native pronunciation into Rām-brā or Rām-ī. Ptolemy's Sambra is thus probably a clerical error for Rambra. The corrected latitude obtained by calculation corresponds to that of the northern end of the island.

Sados River (48, 189) and Sada, a city (49).

Whether the city derives its name from the river, or the latter is named after the city, is a question difficult to decide. One thing is certain, however, and this is that Sada corresponds to Sandoway. As this is reputed to be a very ancient settlement, it is reasonable to infer that it was, as told in its own traditions, a foundation from India, and that its original name was probably Sanskrit.¹

Its pretended founder, Sammuti Deva, is fabled to have hailed from Benares; and the Nats or spirits built for him, it is said, the city which was called Dvāravatī. Its present name, Than-dwai (Sāndicē), which is explained as 'iron-bound,' rests on a legend to the effect that the city had the power of soaring above the earth, out of reach of danger, when attacked by enemies from outside on a particular occasion, and had to be bound to the earth with an iron chain before it could be conquered.²

¹ Two inscribed stones in Sanskrit of the eighth century, one of which contains the first couplet of the Buddhist "Ye dharma" stanza, have been found in the neighbourhood of the town; and also a number of cells or stone implements of the smooth age. See "British Burma Gazetteer," vol. ii, p. 616.

² "British Burma Gazetteer," vol. ii, p. 614. The legend is evidently based on the myth of the three cities of Tripura built for the demons by Maya, of which one was of gold and situated in the sky, the second of silver poised in the air, and the third of iron resting on the earth. I am unable to find out in the works of reference at my disposal what the names of the three cities were.
If we read the name of the city as it is written, Saddai or Sántvai,¹ and allow for the softening of the r into y usually occurring in Burmese, we may trace it back to some Sanskrit form like Sadvāra, equivalent, or nearly so, to the pretended ancient name Dvāravatī of the town. But I think that the latter and its district must be identified with the Sāntabhaya region mentioned in the Purāṇas as belonging to Plakṣa-deīpa. The letters b and bh are, in Indo-Chinese languages, easily and frequently interchanged with v; hence Sāntabhaya can easily become Sāntavaya, which would then be written with the last syllable contracted, and read Sandvē.

In the early Portuguese maps Sandoway is noted as Ledda, Ledoa, Sedoa. The latter form appears also in João de Barros, lib. ix, ch. i. This shows it beyond doubt to be Ptolemy’s Sada. Yet Yule, while thinking the latter might be Ezata or Zetta—which appears in the legend of the foundation of the Shwê Dagon pagoda of Rangūn as the name of a seaport between Pegu and Bengal²—did not attempt to locate it; and overlooking the linguistical connection between Ezata or Zetta (Issada, Sada) and Sada, he identified Sandoway with Ptolemy’s Bērabonna without any apparent good reason or cause whatever.

Should the second or third of them turn out to have names similar to that of Sandoway, we would then know for certain that this latter city was the capital of one of the three districts or kingdoms of the Further-Indian Tripura. The ancient name Dvāravatī ascribed to Sandoway would, on the other hand, show it to have been regarded as a counterpart of the capital-city founded by Kṛṣṇa near the entrance to the Gulf of Kach, on the corresponding side of the Indian Peninsula.

¹ သနားမြော် in Burmese, ဗိုလ် in Mōn (Taleng), and စန္ဒ္ဒီ in Siamese, is the ordinary way of spelling it. The form last given, actually written Darandevai or Drandevi (though pronounced as above), tends to confirm our opinion that the region about Sandoway was probably named after Drangiana (Darandi, Zarandi, or Zarang). I identified it with the country of Sand-tō mentioned by Chinese authors among the eighteen kingdoms tributary to Pīnō (see Hervey de St. Denis, loc. cit.). The phonetical spelling Tham-dvai, adopted in the pages of the “British Burma Gazetteer,” utterly precludes linguistical investigation.

² The “British Burma Gazetteer,” vol. ii, p. 636, has “Ezai or Zetta.”
At ch. xiii, § 7 of his introductory book, our author mentions Sada as the terminus of the sea-passage across the Gangetic Gulf (Bay of Bengal) from Palura, effect ed in a direct line from west to east, and covering a distance of 13,000 stadia. It was, therefore, the first port touched at in his time by ships proceeding from India to the eastern coast of the Bay of Bengal. Palura, hitherto taken to be the mouth of the Ganjam (about 19° 20' N. lat.), has been in my Tables placed at Conora, above Vizagapatam, in 18° N. lat., which is also the latitude I obtained by calculation for Sada. Some ships, however, took a more northerly route, and touched at the riverine port of Antibolē on the Dākkā or Old Ganges River, before making out for Sada and the Gulf of Martaban.

With regard to the Sados River, its mouth, by calculation, is made to be 18° 42' N. lat. The present mouth of the Sandoway River is in lat. 18° 32'. As Ptolemy places Sada city in 18° corrected, it follows that the Sados cannot be the Sandoway River, but some other stream further north, such as the An (Aeng), Ma-i, Tan-lwai, or Toung-gūp rivers. Though not conspicuous in size, the Tan-lwai seems preferable as being only a little distance above Sandoway, and as bearing a name not very dissimilar to it and Sados. Its old name was probably Sanskrit, such as Sadā-vāri (a river always bearing water) or Śāda (mud).

Bérabonna, a mart (No. 50).

Yule identified it, as stated above, with Sandoway; which is undoubtedly wrong. By calculation, its position would fall about Gwa (Khwā) or on the river of the same name. Bérabonna seems to represent the Pāli Paripunna or the Sanskrit Paripurna. On the Khwā River there is a village called Pienne-goon-rwa still within reach by boat during the spring tides,1 and which might represent whatever remains of Ptolemy's station. In the map, by G. De l'Isle, dated A.D. 1781, inserted at the end of the first volume of

Sonnerat's "Voyage aux Indes Orientales,"¹ there is noted just above Cape Negrais an islet or mart on the coast inscribed as Barrebam. This place I assume to be the same as that which Daniel Sheldon (in his report published by Ovington) calls Perrem. Whether they both correspond to Pienne-goon-rwa or not I am unable to say; but it is clear, from their close similarity in name to Bérabonna, that Ptolemy's mart is identical with either of them.

Témala River (51, 188).

My identification of this stream with the Bassein outlet of the Iravati, called the Nga-won River, rests on the fact that Diamond Island at its mouth is called Thamee-hla-Kywon (i.e. Thamee-hla island),² a fair approach to Ptolemy's designation; and that, therefore, the river might have been so named in ancient times. The word Thamee-hla is really written, as I have ascertained, ꪒꭞ꬗ꭞꭖꭜꭚ꭛, which, according to the system of transliteration adopted by the Royal Asiatic Society, would read Chimiëla or Simihla. It would seem, therefore, that we are here confronted by a name similar in form to that of Simylla or Timula (Tiamula?), which Ptolemy gives to a mart and headland on the west coast of India, and which is generally identified with Chaul and Chaul Point near the Indian Bassein (Vasai). As it is known, most names of cities in Indo-China are but repetitions of the names of ancient cities of India, the mother-country whence Indo-China received its civilization; a phenomenon which we see repeated in modern times in connection with the names of American and Australian cities, adopted from those extant on the Old Continent. It is not surprising, therefore, that we should find on the coast of the Indo-Chinese, as well as on the coast of the Indian Peninsula, and in symmetric positions, two identical names of cities such as

¹ Paris, 1782.
² "British Burma Gazetteer," vol. ii, pp. 130, 723.
Bassein and Timula (Simylla or Tēmala). But there are some difficulties in the proper location of these cities on the Indo-Chinese side, and a suspicion is aroused in connection with the native term Simīhla given to Diamond Island. In fact, this term when analyzed and translated turns out to be a compound of the three Burmese words Si-mīh'-la, which mean 'a beautiful lamp-fire'; and as the island has only recently been occupied by a station of the detachment in charge of the Alguada Reef lighthouse, erected 3½ leagues S.S.W. of it, it may have happened that the name 'Beautiful lamp-fire island,' by which Diamond Island is known to the natives, originated from that fact. On the contrary, if the name can be proved to be more ancient than the event referred to above, it may be held for certain to represent Ptolemy's Tēmala. But even rejecting such connection, it is possible to demonstrate the existence in ancient times in this region of a city known by the name of Tamāla or Sāmala corresponding to our author's designation, as will be shown in the next paragraph. It will then result even more clearly that Ptolemy's Tēmala River is really the Nga-won or Bassein outlet of the Irāvati as surmised at the outset of the present inquiry.

Tēmala, a city (52).

In the introductory book of Ptolemy's Geography it is spelled Tamala—a word which may be at once identified with the Sanskrit Tamāla, meaning 'dark' or 'brown'—and placed at 3,500 stadia (2,330, corrected measurement) south-east of Sada, almost due north of Cape Negrais.

The position obtained from calculation for Tēmala (94° 27' E., 16° 36' N.) closely agrees with that actually

---

1 The name Tha-mee-hla (Simīhla) appears in various other points of the country. We may adduce two instances, both in the Akyab district, from the "British Burma Gazetteer," vol. ii, pp. 722-3. Another island, identically named Tha-mee-hla Kywon, is to be found nearly opposite Mergui. A lighthouse cannot evidently be implied in each of these instances; hence I think that the name Simīhla really corresponds to the Sanskrit Tamāla.
occupied by Bassein (94° 46' E., 16° 14' N.); and I have not the slightest doubt that its site was identical with, or near to, the latter, on the Nga-won River, and not on the coast off Cape Negrais. There is nothing extraordinary in this apparent tampering with Ptolemy's order of things. If we examine the early Portuguese maps we may form an idea as to the confusion that reigned in the graphic representation of that seaboard even at that period, fourteen centuries after Ptolemy lived. We may there see that the Bassein River is made to debouch above Cape Negrais, and that the latter and surrounding land are depicted as an island. It will only be natural, therefore, to look for Tēmala on the Bassein River, rather than, as Yule did, on the barren coast above Cape Negrais, where it could hardly have been.

The ancient name of the Bassein district was Kusimaraṭṭha; and of its chief town, Kusima-nagara, evidently imitated from Kusuma-pura, 'the city of flowers,' the old designation for Pātaliputra or Patna. The name Kusima for Bassein was in use up to the last century. Ralph Fitch, Mandelslo, and other travellers refer to it as Cosmin, Cosmin, Casmi, etc., all corruptions of Kusima; and the same spelling is adopted in the old maps. The names Pusin, Pasin, Pasim, and Basim¹ appear to have been introduced at a comparatively modern period, otherwise they may be modifications of either Kusim or Vasai. The town itself seems to have been founded as late as 1249 A.D., but the old name of the district undoubtedly existed much earlier; and under the date of 625 A.D. it is mentioned

¹ Burmese: ဌ ်ျွ = Pusin, and ဌ ်ျွ = Pasin. Peguan (Talaing): ဌ ်ျွ = Phāchim (P'asim). Siamese: พระน = Pusin, and พระน = P'asim (Basim). In the summary of Oriental peoples translated from the Portuguese and published in Ramusio, vol. i, 1563 edition, it is referred to as Pusin, p. 335. It requires, indeed, a great stretch of imagination in order to see in these forms the vestiges of Ptolemy's Bēaynga. A comparison with the name of the Indian Bassein shows that the old form should be Vasai or Basai.
in the Peguan (Taleng) chronicles as consisting of a confederation of thirty-two cities subject to the sway of the Möns or Talings of Pegu. Notwithstanding these facts, most of Ptolemy's commentators up to the present day have, with an obstinacy worthy of a better cause, endeavoured to connect Bassein with Ptolemy's Bēsya, deceived, no doubt, by a mere fickle similarity of names. But this alone, we have repeatedly shown, is not sufficient evidence upon which to build up an accurate interpretation of his geography, and all attempts based simply upon such outward indications must necessarily fail.

We shall show at the proper time and place where Ptolemy's Bēsya is to be looked for. Our present concern is Tēmala or Tamala, and before dismissing it we propose to demonstrate that it is the same city as that mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa (Kiśkindhā-kāṇḍa) under the name of Timira. Timira and Tāmala, it must be premised, are Sanskrit words of almost identical meaning. In the Bengal recension of the Rāmāyaṇa, after a reference to the Amgas (people of Campū, now Bhāgalpur); the Lauhitya River (Brahmaputra); the Kirātas (people of Tipperah and Silhet, Ptolemy's Kirrhadia); lands rich with silver-mines (Argyra), and mount Mandara (Maiandros = Arakan Roma), there is a mention of the city of Timira abounding with gold and where silkworms are reared. These two peculiarities help us admirably in fixing the position of Timira in the region between the Arakan and Pegu Romas; that is, in the lower valley of the Irāvati, celebrated both by eastern and western classics as the Golden Region, and known as the seat of a people, the Zabaings or Zamengs, noted for silkworm breeding. And as the name Timira conveys the same meaning as Ptolemy's Tēmala or Tamala (Tamāla), there should be no doubt left as to both designations belonging

---

1 "Sir Arthur Phayre remarks that the term Yabaing [Zabaing] is rather the description of an occupation than the distinctive name of a race. . . . . The term is probably a Shan word [most assuredly not], applied to those who first introduced the worm from the eastward, and the meaning of it is not now understood." — "British Burma Gazetteer," vol. i, p. 183.
to the one and the same city occupying a position close to, or on the very site of, the present Bassein, as set forth above.¹

Once this point settled, the Cape (beyond) Têmala, placed by our author to the south and a little to the west of the city of the same name, becomes identical with the present Cape Negrais (Nâgareśvara), and any further discussion as to its site is rendered unnecessary.

(3) Country of the Zamîrai and Dabasai (Upper Burma).

"Beyond Kirrhadia"—says our author (ch. ii, § 16)—"the Zamîrai, a race of cannibals, are located near Mount Maiandros." I am firmly convinced that Ptolemy’s Kirrhadia corresponds to the districts of Silhet, Tipperah, and Kachār; and that the habitat of the Zamîrai must as a consequence be sought for in the valley of the Chindwin or Kyendwen, that is, in the western part of Upper Burma. This region is now occupied by the Yaw (Yo) tribes, said—though I doubt it—to be of Burmese stock and speech; but it was probably, in Ptolemy’s time, settled by populations of Môn-Khmer race, such as, I believe, the Zabaing and Khami are. The Zabaings’ territory is now restricted to the hill tracts of the Pegu Roma, between the Irâvatî and Sittang rivers. They are described as rude, wild, and ignorant by nature; cultivators and mostly breeders of silkworms by occupation. I have no doubt that the hills which form their present habitat represent but their last refuge, to which they have been driven by more powerful, and perhaps younger, occupants of the country. At the period we treat of they must have extended over a larger zone, including the whole, or nearly so, of the Chindwin valley, which they probably held in conjunction with the Khami. Their headquarters were probably at Kalê, where we have noticed a motley agglomeration of tribes during

¹ I am convinced that it is the place mentioned under the name of Tun-mei-liu by Chinese authors in this region.
the supposed sway of the Kalingas. In a preceding paragraph I have identified the zone just mentioned as their ancient haunts with the breeding land of silkworms alluded to in the Rāmāyaṇa. I now complete that premise by connecting the Zabaing—and their probable kin, the Khami—with Ptolemy's Zamīrai and the Samīras of the Mahābhārata. The literal coincidence of the three names, Zabaing (or Zameng), Zamīrai (another reading for which is Zameraí), and Samīra, is too evident to need demonstration; while there is a close likeness between Khami and Samī or Samīra. In favour of the coincidence of location I submit that in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma Parean) there are mentioned, together with the Samīras, the following peoples hitherto not identified, and which I subjoin in the same order as they occur in that epic, accompanied with the name of the country or people which in my opinion corresponds to them:—

1. Tiragrahas. I think I recognize in this name Ptolemy's Tilogrammon, a town on the Gangetic Delta which Yule identifies with Jesore.

2. Śūrasenas. Suratan (=Śūra-sthāna?) was the name of Eastern Bengal, to be probably identified with Sonār-gāon. (See "Brit. Burma Gaz.," vol. ii, p. 9, n.)

3. Ḡikas or Ḡikas. (?)

4. Kanyakāgunas. (?)

5. Tilabhāras. Evidently Ptolemy's Tiladai, placed by him to the north of Maiandros, i.e. about the Garō Hills and Silhet.


As our author places his Zamīrai beyond Kirrhadia and near Mount Maiandros, it follows that they occupied, with respect to his Tiladai, the same position as the Samīras hold in regard to the Tilabhāras in the Mahābhārata; and therefore the Zamīrai should be identical with the Samīras.

Concerning the connection of the Zamīrai or Samīras with the Zabaing or Zameng, enough has been said already, and
the probable relationship of the latter with the Khami has also been pointed out. But there are a few more points which deserve consideration. It is known that the habitat of the Khami was in the past in the upper valley of the Kulādān, and in the mountain ranges to the north-east of Arakan, whence they were driven south-west by their more warlike neighbours the Shandū. Moreover, Ptolemy, speaking of the Golden Country, i.e. Lower Burmā, tells us that its "inhabitants resemble the Zamīrai in being fair-complexioned, shaggy, of squat figure, and flat-nosed." We have here a picture which applies as well to the Zabaing as to the Khami. The natural inference to be drawn from the foregoing considerations is this—that the Zamīrai or Zamīras represent the Zabaing and their co-relatives, the Khami who were, in Ptolemy's time and for some centuries previously, located in Western Burmā, from the Irāvatī to the Arakan Roma, whence they have since been driven to their actual homes by subsequent invaders, probably of Tibeto-Burman race. The inroads of the new arrivals seem to have cut them through the centre, separating them into two portions, which found refuge on the mountain ranges encompassing the lower valley of the Irāvatī: the Khami on the Arakan Roma; and the Zabaing on the Pegu Roma, where they still survive.

Having so far dealt with the more southern section of Upper Burmā proper, we must now turn to the portion of it extending northwards of the Irāvatī's junction with the Chindwin and including the upper valleys of both these streams and those of their affluents. It is in this region that Ptolemy places his Dabasai, the most southern of the folks he names between the Bēpyrrhos and the Dobassa or Damassa ranges, i.e. between the Patkoi mountains and those forming the boundary between the Salwīn and Mē-Khōng rivers.

Though Ptolemy appears to connect the name of the Dabasai with that of the Dabassa or Damassa mountains, in which view he is most probably correct, as I shall point out in due course, there is scarcely room for doubt that the
country which that people occupied was similarly known as the land of Daba or Dabassa. Owing to the interchangeability of the letters ḍ with ḗ, and b with v, in most East-Indian languages; and keeping also in mind the point that β very probably had in Ptolemy's time, from several indications to be found in his contemporaries, the value of v it possesses in Modern Greek, it follows that we may also read the term Daba either as Dava or Lava. Once this distinction has been made, it is easy to prove that the region now under consideration was of yore really designated by either of the three forms of the term Daba given above, or by some of their derivatives.

As regards the first two, Daba and Dava, we are told by Chinese writers that Upper Burmā, or part of it, bore, since the time of the Han, the name of Tu-p'ō or Shé-p'ō, a compound sounding in Annamese as Dou-ba, Da-ba, or Hsa-ba, and apparently representing the Sanskrit Dava, Java, Yava. Then, as late as A.D. 1207, we find in a Cām inscription the mention of "Pūkām, Syām, Davaeın, Maraɪ, Maṅ, Maṅ."² Pūkām represents Bukām, i.e. Lower Pagan, the capital of Central Burmā at the time; Syām is, of course, Syāmarāstra or Lower Siām; Davaeın is the country, or people, of Dava, i.e. Upper Burmā; and Maraɪ (or Marai-maṅ?) is Maraɪ-rattha or Maramma, the land of the Maras or Mro, corresponding to the present Lower Burmā or, more properly, to the country about Prome.

Two and a half centuries later we meet, according to some authorities, with the term Dava in Conti's travels, which

---
¹ Vide D'Hervey de Saint Denis' translation of Ma Tuan-lin, pt. ii, p. 228 and p. 231, note. Also, A. de Michel's "Annales Impériales de l'Annam," fasc. iii, p. 169. The Cantonese and Annamese pronunciations, it is well known, are those that best represent the ancient sounds of Chinese characters; hence they are to be given the preference, especially with geographical names, in the region of which we treat.
² Numbered 383 in Aymonier's "Étude sur les inscriptions Téhames," in the Journal Asiatique, t. xvii, p. 51. In another inscription (409 B, 1), mentioned at p. 49, we have "Loe, Syam, Fukain." Aymonier translates Loe as Chinese, and explains elsewhere that the Chinese are still nowadays so designated by the Cām. But may not it mean in this case Līu or Lūw? The term Maraɪ Maṅ he translates doubtfully as "vinrent du (?)" [Cambodge]. It occurs to me that we might recognize in Maraɪ Maṅ a proper name, that of the Mara, Mān, or Mro, then just beginning to develop into Maramma, Baramān, Barmān.
appears, however, to be meant for either ‘Ava’ or ‘d’Ava’1; and we find thenceforward the kingdom of Burmā designated Ava by most European writers up to the last century. The city of Ava was founded in 1364, and was also called Shwé-va. The fanciful etymologies given of both these terms by the modern Burmese authors must of course be discarded in the present inquiry as utterly unreliable, for there is plenty of evidence to show that both Ava and Shwé-va as forms of Dava had existed in the country long before that period, a fact which goes far towards explaining the ambiguous Chinese term for Ava,2 capable of being read either Shé-p’o or Tu-p’o, and of being thus referred to both Shwé-va and Dava. Ma Tuan-lin, whose work was composed during the latter part of the thirteenth century and published a.d. 1319, that is, nearly fifty years before Ava was built, already has Shé-p’o or Tu-p’o as second term in the compound Tu-lo-shu Shé-p’o, which, he states, is one of the names by which the country of Piao was designated by its own inhabitants. The country of Piao approximatively corresponded to the present Lower Burmā; but as the Tu-shu-chi-ch’eng, the great Chinese cyclopaedia, mentions Shé-p’o among the eighteen kingdoms once tributary to Piao, it plainly results that Shé-p’o must have been situated outside of Piao proper. Later Chinese writers applied the same name, Shé-p’o, to the kingdom of Ava, which became known, therefore, as Shé-p’o-kuo or Tu-p’o-kuo (in Annamese Hsa-ba-kok or Dabakok). Though in these compounds the word kuo properly stands for kingdom, it is possible that its introduction dates from an earlier period and was originally intended to do duty for the syllable ka in Darāka, one of the alternative,

1 Ramusio (Giunti, ed. 1563, vol. i, fol. 340, A. and F.) invariably has Ava, which renders, of course, the reading Dava of other editions of Conti’s travels rather doubtful. Phayre (“History of Burma,” Trübner’s Oriental Series, p. 262) says that Conti calls Dava the river Iravati, basing himself upon a reading Dāvā, which appears to have been adopted in the Hakluyt Society’s edition of Conti’s travels (p. 11).

2 阮婆 or 阮婆國 (Shé-p’o-kuo or Tu-p’o-kuo), “the kingdom of Ava”; see Giles’ Chinese Dictionary, p. 958, s.v. 9,783.
or rather derivate, forms of Dāva, under which we find the country referred to as early as the fourth century. Dāvāka—or Dāvāka as it is spelled in the Allahabad pillar inscription—is, in fact, one of the five "frontier countries" whose kings, according to the epigraphic monument just named, paid homage to Samudra Gupta, the famous sovereign of Magadha, who reigned circa A.D. 345–380.\(^1\) Hitherto Dāvāka has remained unidentified, and so has Thafec, the form under which the same country has been alluded to by the Arab travellers and geographers from the ninth century downwards. After a careful study of the subject I have not the slightest doubt left that Dāvāka, the tributary and coterminous state of Magadha in the fourth century; Thafec, or Tafan (i.e. Dācan), the kingdom referred to by the Arab travellers of the ninth century and Masaudi as being situated in the mountains and bordering upon the powerful dominions of the Balhara (with the capital at Monghir) and of Rohmy, or Rahman (Rāmañña, viz. Pegu and Arakan);\(^2\) and Daba, or Dava, the country of the Dabasai of Ptolemy in the second century, are one and the same region corresponding with the Upper Burma of the present day. In 1228 it is spoken of as Ta-wei or Ta-wai, in the Shan Chronicles quoted by Ney Elias, who explains that "the situation of this district is said to be towards the north" [of Burma].\(^3\) In that particular instance Ālavī (the Pāli name for the Mogaung and Mohnyin districts according to the Po U Daung inscription) may be intended; but this term seems to have been rather elastic, it being sometimes applied also to the territory of Ch'ieh Rung. Ālavī must therefore at one time have included the whole of the intervening country, being thus synonymous with Dāvāka or Dāvāka. The connection will readily become apparent when it is considered that the Sanskrit form of Ālavī is Ālavī; ālavī meaning, like dāva, a 'forest,' a 'wood.' Dāvāka would thus seem to

---

\(^1\) See Mr. Vincent A. Smith's article in the J.R.A.S., January, 1897, p. 29; and October, 1897, p. 579.

\(^2\) Compare Reinard's "Relations des Voyages," etc., t. i, pp. xevii seq. and 27; and Thomas' remarks in Numismata Orientalia, "Coins of Arakan," p. 18.

\(^3\) "History of the Shans," p. 42.
mean 'forest country.' And, as Āṭavi, or Ālavī, designated in Western India a city and district of the Yavanas, it cannot cause surprise to find in Western Indo-China its counterpart in a region which, we shall see further on, was also called Yavana (or Yonaka)-deśa, because occupied at one time by offshoots of the great Yavan, Yon, or Yuen race.

From Tu-p’o or Shé-p’o, says the great Chinese cyclopaedia,¹ in eight days' march one may reach the kingdom of P’o-hui-kia-lu, i.e., as identified by myself above, the state of Barakura, or Pharuigara. This shows that Tu-p’o (i.e. Dava, Davūka) must have extended to within a short distance of the Arakan Roma, since it took Conti 17 days to cross from Racha (read Rakā), the capital of Arakan, to the Burmese watershed, and thence 15 days to reach the river of Ava (Irāvati).

Whom the Dabasai were and of what race, is the next point to be determined. In order to do this, however, it is necessary to refer to the third form of the term Dava as Lava (as Āṭavi = Ālavī). It is evident that this term can but apply to two races known to have been present in the country in the early days, namely: the Lavā (Lavā) or Vāḥ (Wa), and the Lāu. The Lavā or Vāḥ are mountain tribes, racially connected with the Negrito stock of aborigini inhabiting the Salwin and Mē-Khōng valleys. In Ptolemy's time, however, they were no longer in undisputed possession of the country, having had to withdraw to the mountain slopes of the Irāvatī-Salwin and Salwin Mē-Khōng watersheds, where they were repelled to by the Lāu. The Lavā are also called Dōi, or Khā Dōi, terms which in Lāu mean respectively 'mountain' and 'mountaineer' ² and which may have some connection with

¹ D'Hervey de St. Denis, op. cit., p. 231, note.
² In Siamese Khā Dōi. This literally means 'mountain slaves,' i.e. mountain savages usually employed as slaves by the conquering race, which is the Lāu, or Thai, race in this case. Some of their kin are termed Thāt Hūi, i.e. 'slaves of the brooks,' because of their dwelling nearer to the banks of mountain streams. It must be remarked here that Thāt (in Sanskrit dāsah), which is equivalent to Khā, has in Sanskrit, like the latter in Siamese and Lāu, the double meaning of 'slave' and 'savage.'
Dava. Owing to the similarity in names between the Lava and the Lau (Lāva) it is difficult to decide from which of these two peoples the country took its denomination of Dava or Davāka. The probability, both historic and linguistic, seems, however, to rest with the Lau.

It is notorious, in fact, that at least from the first century of our era the Lau—then known to the Chinese under the name of Ai-Lao or Ai-Lāu—were in possession of Western Yünnan, where, in A.D. 59, the Ai-Lao and Po-nan districts were established in order to enforce Chinese supremacy in that quarter. Chinese writers do not, at this period, trace the Ai-Lao further west than Momien; but, from evidence which I have collected from the early records of the Lau themselves, I am now convinced that they had extended over most part of the modern Upper Burma long before that time, that is to say, from some five and a half centuries before the Christian era; and I propose to show below how the overthrow of the Tagōng dynasty is to be ascribed to them. Curiously enough, the name of the Ai-Lao is derived by the Chinese from the Lao mountain, which is stated to have been the cradle of the Lau people. Which is the mountain so named, and where it is to be found, I am unable to say. Professor de Lacouperie places it at the intersection of Hu-nan, Hu-peh, and Ngan-hwui; other authorities believe it to be in Western Yünnan, in the old Ai-Lao district itself. Should the latter view prove correct, we would have a curious coincidence in the fact that Ptolemy also appears to refer etymologically the name of the Dabasai to the Dabassa range; and the country of Dava, Davi, Alavi, or Lava would thereby prove to have been part and parcel of the Ai-Lao territory.

In any case, whether the country of Dava or Davāka be geographically and etymologically connected with the Ai-Lao district and the name of the Lau people or not, it must now appear pretty certain that it corresponded, more or less, to the present Upper Burma, and that its inhabitants, the Dabasai, were people of the Lau (Thai) race. Some further considerations may be adduced in support of this view.
In the map appearing in the Nicholaus de Donis edition of Ptolemy (A.D. 1482) the Dabasai are located close to the south-west of Adeisaga, the town or district which I have identified with the modern Yung-ch'ang. The Ai-Lao, or Nan-Chao, are said by Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 190) to border on the west on Kia-t'o, or Chia-t'a, while in the Chinese history of the Nan-Chao these people are described as coterminous in the same direction with Mo-k'ua-t'o, i.e. Magadha.¹ Now, it is curious to find in Ma Tuan-lin (pp. 184–5) that the Ai-Lao had relations westwards with Ta-ts'in (Syria). So had the kingdom of Tan, Chan, Shên, or Dan, which the Chinese locate beyond the Yung-ch'ang borders, and of which we shall have to speak below; thus the curiosities of Ta-ts'in came to China through the Ai-Lao territory by way of Yung-ch'ang.² Though the communication was probably effected through some seaport on the coast of Pegu, it no doubt took place also overland. So, at least, I think must be interpreted the Chinese statement that “In the south-west of the country of Shan [the Tan, etc., spoken of above] one passes through to Ta-ts'in.”³

If we take Kia-t'o (or Chia-t'a) and Mo-k'ua-t'o to be identical and to refer both to Magadha, there is nothing extraordinary in the statement as to the Ai-Lao bordering upon the Magadha kingdom, so long as we consider Darâka as part of the Ai-Lao territory. The proof is supplied to us in Samudra Gupta’s inscription already referred to, where Darâka is mentioned not only as a frontier country of that monarch’s dominions, but also as a tributary state. This dependence further results from the fact of the Gupta Era being employed at least upon one Sanskrit inscription which was found at Pagan, dated Gupta Samvat 163 (A.D. 481).⁴ There are, besides, numerous traditions of princes from Magadha having emigrated to Upper Burma,

¹ See Parker in China Review, vol. xix, p. 73, note.
² See Hirth’s “China and the Roman Orient,” p. 179.
³ Ibid., p. 37.
⁴ See Dr. Führer’s “Annual Progress Report,” etc., for the year ending June 30, 1894.
Western Yunnan, and Laos, where they founded dynasties several centuries previous to Samudra Gupta’s period, and built temples amongst the ruins of which tablets bearing inscriptions in Gupta characters are still to be found. Then we have from Chinese writers the statement as regards the intercourse of the Ai-Lao country with the West, to further confirm the close relations of Dava or Đavāka with Magadha. All these data from Indu, Chinese, and local sources are perfectly consistent and mutually corroborate themselves.

However, according to at least one authority, Kia-t’o or Chia-t’a = Chu-po or Shu-po = P’iao which bordered eastwards upon Chên-la (Kamboja).1 In the great cyclopaedia Tu-shu-chi-ch’eng, Kie-t’o = Ch’i-t’o or Chieh-t’o, is mentioned among the eighteen kingdoms formerly tributary to P’iao.2 Chu-po or Shu-po, and P’iao, I propose subsequently to demonstrate, mean not Upper, but Lower Burma. They bordered on the east upon Chên-la, and were situated to the south-west of Yung-ch’ang according to Chinese authors.

Kia-t’o may, again, be Kacho or Katha, which is in Dava or Đavāka. Should this identification prove to be correct, it would detract nothing from the results arrived at above. Both statements of the Ai-Lao being bounded on the west, (1) by Kacho or Katha and (2) by Magadha, would yet be found consistent, Đavāka being naturally considered by the early writers as lying within the sphere of influence of Magadha.

In conclusion, Đavāka anciently designated the present Upper Burma, and its inhabitants, the Dabasai, whether or not connected etymologically with the Lāu, were undoubtedly a people of the Lāu (Thai) race.

Arisabion (54).

I feel certain, with regard to my identification of this place with Shenbo, Tshenbo, or Tsenbo, above Bhamo,

1 Vide extract from the P’ei-wén Yün-fu in Ma Tuan lin, op. cit., p. 190, note 21.
2 Ibid., p. 231.
which I believe to have been the chief city of that ancient state of Shen, whose king, Yung Yu-tiau, according to Chinese records,¹ sent rarities to China in A.D. 97 and 120. This state was most probably a Shan kingdom.

The territory about Shenbo, as far down as Bhamo and Kaung-sin, was formerly called by the Burmese Sein (written Sin or Cin), classicized into Cina-rattha.² We find it mentioned in the great Chinese cyclopaedia T'iu-shu-chi-ch'êng,³ under the name of Chan-p'o or Shan-p'o (Shen-bo ?), among the eighteen states once tributary to Piào (Burmã). The Burmese chronicles supply us with some data for ascertaining the time and origin of this state of Sein or Shen. According to them, there existed not far south of Shenbo, on the Irâvatî, the ancient Kṣatriya kingdom of Tagaung (Tagông, or Hastinâpura), founded in b.c. 923, superseded later on by that of Old Pagan (Bhukâm or Bukâm), established b.c. 523. The Tagông kingdom was, in circâ b.c. 550, overthrown by an invasion of tribes coming from a country to the east called Gandhâra-rattha (i.e. Yûnnan) in the land of Sein or Sin.⁴ The kingdom of Old Pagan was destroyed in a similar manner, and although it is not stated who the invaders were and whence they came, we may well conjecture that they were the same people of Sin or Sein, who renewed their inroads and succeeded at last in obtaining a permanent footing in the country, as proved by the fact that the Burmese capital was in the sequel transferred much further south, at or near Prome, about 483 b.c. Sir A. Phayre believes that the above events are historical, but that they have been

² Occurs in this form in the Burmese inscription of the Po-u-daung pagoda, A.D. 1774.
⁴ The ancient K’iuung-tu (now called Yüech-sui) district represents, in my opinion, what was classically termed Gandhâra in South Szechuen and Yûnnan. It undoubtedly is the Châindu or Cauindu of Marco Polo, and must be regarded as including also both his Joci and Choragia (Kârajâng). It must be remembered, in fact, that Kârajâng was the name given by the Moguls to the capital of Gandhâra on the Indus. (See Cunningham’s “Ancient Geography of India,” Buddhist Period, p. 53.)
antedated by several centuries; and ascribes the overthrow of the two Kṣatriya kingdoms of Upper Burma to people of the Shan (Thai) race, who, he holds, must have been driven westward towards the basin of the Irāvati by Chinese expeditions into Yūnnan in B.C. 122 and 109 and A.D. 9. I am inclined to believe, however—on the evidence of the early traditions of the Thai race—that the advance of the Shan into the Shweli (Nam Mau) and Tapeng valleys dates from the middle of the sixth century B.C.

The term Arisabion evidently represents some Sanskrit name like Ṛṣabha or Ārṣabha, or else like Ari-śambala, Ari-śamanani; for it is to be remembered that the old name of Pagan, or Bukām, was Ari-mardana pura, a similar term, erroneously taken in the Mahāvaṃsa (ch. Ixxvi, 38) as the name of the king of Rāmaṇa (Pegu). In some old maps, a city by the name of Arian, or Ariano, is marked at the place corresponding to either Shenbo or Bhamo.¹ This form Arian, as well as those occurring in Marco Polo’s account of this region, Amie and Mien, are evidently connected with Arisabion or its probable local spelling as Arisa-mien or Ari-sein-myō.²

I trust that I have now sufficiently demonstrated the identity of Ptolemy’s Arisabion with the kingdom of Shen of Chinese annals, and the state of Sein or Cina-rattha of Burmese records. That the latter was established by invaders of Thai race from Yūnnan appears quite certain to me, although the Burmese chroniclers, relying on the mere fact that this people came from China, called them Sein (really written ⁰⁻⁸ = Sin, Ts’in), i.e. Chinese, taken

¹ Ariano, in G. de l’Isle’s map accompanying Sonnerat’s “Voyage aux Indes Orientales,” dated A.D. 1781, is placed in long. 115° E. Ferro (=96° 40’ E. Greenw.) and lat. 24° 15’ N.; which is within a few minutes of the true position of Shenbo (long. 96° 48’ E.; lat. 24° 50’ N.).
² A place by the name of Thamien or Thaman-gyi is noted in modern maps on the left bank of the Irāvati between Shenbo and Bhâmo. This proves that the term Arisa-mien or Arisabion still exists in a modified form, though perfectly recognizable, in that region, and confirms our identification of Ptolemy’s city. It is worth remarking that the French manuscript version of Marco Polo’s narrative has Damien for Amien; which, if not a clerical slip for d’Amien, may be compared with Thamien above.
by latter-day authors to mean Tarup, or Taruk, the term now applied in Burma to the Chinese and Manchu.

Adeisaga (69).

I take this place to be Yung-ch'ang, the chief city of the province which Marco Polo calls Arndan. Videha and Vaideha were the ancient names of this part of Yunnan, and may be connected with Ptolemy's rendering Adeisaga (Vaidehaghara or Vaideha-grāma?), although the latter can be more plausibly referred to some word like Vidiṣā or Vaidīṣā (Vaidiṣāghara, Vaidiṣagrāma), which would appear to survive up to the present day in Yi-hsi, the name of the circuit comprising the part of Yunnan in which Yung-ch'ang is situated. Such forms as Ādisarga and Ahiṣāgara also suggest themselves to the mind. The latter designation would suit better Ta-ho or Tai-ho, the ancient Tali with its lake, the Ėrh-Hai¹; but the corrected position we obtained by calculation being within a few minutes of that of Yung-ch'ang, we adhere to the above identification, which seems confirmed by Marco Polo's Arndan.


Khrysē, that is the Gold Country (Χρυσῆ χώρα), is situated, according to our author, "in juxtaposition to the Bēsyangetai" or "Cannibals on the Sarabakic Gulf," i.e. the Gulf of Martaban. It cannot then be literally taken to correspond to the Suvaṇṇabhūmi of Buddhist fame, except in part, and much less even to include the

¹ Ta-ho or Tai-ho, the ancient name of a city near Tali, seems to me a Chinese transliteration of Deha, i.e. Videha. If so, the Tali lake would be called Vaideha-saras or Vaideha-sāgara, which could easily become in vulgar parlance Vaide-sāga and Adei-sāga. Its Siamese name is วิสาล the Šē lake. Another name for the Tali lake was Mi-hai, from the Mi or K'un-mi, a people dwelling on its shores and who were conquered by the Chinese general Chwang-k'iao in B.C. 315. From them the territory about the Tali lake became known as the country of the Mi. With this designation is undoubtedly connected the classical name Mithilā, which was given to that territory as part of Videha, i.e. Western Yunnan.
whole of Indo-China as exaggerated by some authorities;¹ and has nothing whatever to do with the Malay Peninsula or Golden Khersonese (Χρυσῆς Χερσονήσου), with which it has been so often confused. According to the Kalyāṇi inscriptions, engraved by order of King Dhammaceti of Pegu in A.D. 1476, Suvaṇṇabhūmi was an alternative name for Rāmaṇṇadesa ² which comprised the three provinces of Kusima-maṇḍala (Bassein or Kusuma), Haṁsāvatim-aṇḍala (Pegu proper), and Muttima-maṇḍala (Martaban). Suvaṇṇabhūmi thus embraced the maritime region between Cape Negrais and the mouth of the Salwin; where, as we have seen, the Rāmāyaṇa places the city of Timira, abounding with gold; and corresponds therefore to the country that our author terms Coast of the Bēsyngēitai. The hinterland of this region was named Suvaṇṇaparanta, a designation usually syncopated into Sunāparanta or Soṇṇaparanta, the “Further Golden Land,” and, according to the Po-U-Daung inscription,³ included the districts of Kalē, Teinnyin, Yaw, Tilin, Salin, and Sagu; that is, the country between the Lower Irāvatī and Chindwin, and the Arakan Roma; but it evidently must have extended of old down to the head of the Delta, and east of the Irāvatī as far as the Pegu Roma and the Sittang River, thus embracing the whole of Lower Burmā then subject to the sway of the kings of Prome and New Pagan. It is then this hinterland now referred to that must be identified by coincidence, both in name and position, with Ptolemy’s “Gold Land” or Khryse Khōra;

¹ "It would be difficult to define where Ptolemy’s Chryse (Chryse Chōra aut Chryse Chersonesus) terminated eastward, though he appears to give the names a special application to what we call Burma and Pegu. . . . . Chryse then, in the vague apprehension of the ancients, . . . . was the region coasted between India and China. It is most correctly rendered by ‘Indo China.’”—Colonel Henry Yule, quoted in the preface to Colquhoun’s “Across Chryse.”

² "Sonatheram pana Uttaratheraṅka Suvaṇṇabhūmirattha-sakaḥita-Rāmaṇṇadesas saśaṇan patiṭṭhitopum pesesi.” [And sent Sonathera and Uttara to establish the Religion in Rāmaṇṇadesa, which was also named Suvaṇṇabhūmi.]—Taw Sein Ko’s “Kalyāṇi Inscriptions,” Bombay, 1893.

³ "The Po-U-Daung Inscription erected by King Sinbyūrin in 1774 A.D.,” Rangoon, 1891.
and not the maritime region below. Our author's statement that there are "very many gold-mines" would then find some confirmation in fact, as would also that with respect to its inhabitants resembling the Zamūrai in features, which we have already discoursed at length in a preceding paragraph.

Mareura or Malthura, a metropolis (55).

This capital I take to be Old Prome, founded, according to Burmese tradition, five to six miles east of its modern namesake, about 443 B.C. Its ancient name appears to have been Śrī-Kṣetra, and not Śrī-kṣatra, as I see generally written; it was the seat of a dynasty up to 95 A.D., when the monarchy was broken up. The last king fled to Mengdūn, which he founded on one of the bends of the Ma-htūn River, circa A.D. 100, naming it Bhūmavatī. Here he tarried for a while, and finally he founded the city of Lower Pagan in 108 A.D. Mengdūn and the Ma-htūn River, on which it was built, remind us, by their resemblance in names, of Ptolemy's Malthura; and I have no objection against admitting their probable identity. I firmly hold, however, that Mareura cannot be any other city than Old Prome. As regards the discrepancy of names between the two, I may remark that this is only apparent, and disappears as soon as it can be demonstrated that Mareura Metropolis means the Maurya's or Mayūra's capital. It is known, in fact, that the dynasty which reigned at Old Pagan claimed descent from the Maurya or Mayūra monarchy of Magadha, and that it settled first at a place east of the Irāvati, which it named Maurya, situated in about long. 96° 35', lat. 23° 55', between Tagōng and Bhamo. The northern part of the Kubo valley, in the Upper Chindwin district, which is the direct route from Manipur towards Burma, by which the founders of that dynasty must have arrived, is likewise, according to Sir A. Phayre, called Maurya; and is referred to as a district under the name of Mwēyin, its Burmese equivalent, in the Po-U-Daung inscription. Every subsequent dynasty that
reigned in Burmā claimed descent from the Mauryas or Mayūras through the princes who founded Tagōng and Old Pagan; hence the Burmese kings placed the peacock (Mayūra) on their coat-of-arms, and this bird became the national emblem of the country Burmā. It appears, therefore, natural that Old Prome, being founded by a scion of those princes who, only some fifty years before, had settled at and given their name to Maurya, should be called the Mauryas’ or Mayūras’ capital, which Ptolemy recorded as Mareura. The position we obtained by calculation: long. 96° 20′, lat. 18° 42′, agrees very well with Old Prome, which is in about long. 95° 25′, lat. 18° 47′. Mengdūn is another degree further to the west. It may be objected that Old Prome ceased to be a capital in 95 A.D., and that therefore Mareura Metropolis must mean either Mengdūn or Lower Pagan, which succeeded it as such in A.D. 100 and 108 respectively. But it seems hardly possible that Ptolemy—reputed to have published his Geography about A.D. 150—could, in those days of slow travelling and difficulty of obtaining information, receive news of the change, and accurate data as to the site of the new seat of government, in such a brief lapse of time. He might, at best, have received intelligence of the removal of the capital to the neighbouring Mengdūn on the Ma-btūn River, which would explain the alternative name Malthura (= Mathurā?), which he gives evidently as a later addition. But as to Lower Pagan having been meant, it is out of the question, as this city is some 2½ degrees of latitude further north, and could thus never correspond to the position that our author assigns to Mareura. It seems, therefore, clear that the latter name is intended for Old Prome, the capital of the Maurya, or Mayūra, kings of Burmā.

Before dropping this subject, I may, however, make bold to suggest another interpretation of the term Mareura, which might, in the end, prove the right one. This term, it seems to me, is connected with Marammā or Mranna, the name of Burmā and its people. There is a great difference of opinion as to the origin of such an appellation;
but there is no doubt that Sir A. Phayre's theory of its
derivation from Brahma is untenable, and must be dis-
missed on two grounds. The first—based on negative
evidence, and already referred to by several scholars—is,
that the Burmese, in their lithic records and literary works
of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, make use of the
barbarous appellation Marammā to designate themselves or
their country, which they would never have done had they
known that their national name was derived from Brahma.
The second—based on positive evidence gathered by myself,
and not referred to as yet anywhere as far as I know—is,
that Maramma derives from Mra or Mara, which is
the real ancient name for Burmā and its people. Already
in a former page I noticed the form Marai, or Marai Mañ—
evidently designating the natives of Burmā—which appears
in a Cām inscription of a.d. 1207. I may now add that the
Lāu (Shaṅs) even up to the present day call the Burmese
Māns or Māras, and in several old manuscript chronicles
of Upper Lāos I find Burmā and its king usually referred
to as Māra-rattha and Māra-rajā respectively. Māra
is the Lāu, and Mara the Pāli, modified garb of the name;
it's correct and original native form is evidently Mra.
That this was the ancient designation for the Burmese race,
would appear from the fact that the Mro, Mra, or Mru,
said to be the pioneers of that race in the Chindwin valley
and Arakan, are called after it. Mru or Mro is, up to the
present day, the Mro word for 'man.' Its actual Burmese
equivalent, yo or yok (꼬꼬, 꼫꼬꼬꼬), is probably
a derivation or corruption of Mro, explicable by the
softening of the r into y as usual with Burmese, and by
the dropping of the initial m customary in languages
which, like Burmese, possess a monosyllabic tendency. The
curtailed form yo is still the name of the Yo (commonly
spelled Yau or Yaw by Europeans) branch of the Burmese
race. Mro, or rather Mra, was therefore the original
name that the ancestors of the Burmese gave themselves,
or were given by the neighbouring populations, and meant
simply 'a man.' This is quite in accord with the custom prevailing in nearly all wild countries where the inhabitants are in the majority of cases named after their own word for man. In the course of time the affix mā was no doubt added for euphony, and the name of the nation became thus Mramu, classicized into Mrammā and Marammā. Burmese pronunciation is responsible for the peculiar forms Myammā, Byammā, and Bammā, misled by which most authorities on Burmā and its language concluded that the original name of the country or race was Mien, and in some instances were even ingenious enough as to accept the native stupendous fad of a derivation from Brahma. I am perfectly convinced that the euphonic form Mrammā only came into use after the introduction of Buddhism and of the Pāli language into the country. Up to that period the name of the race must have been simply Mra or Mrō, just as it is up to the present day with that portion of their kin which still dwell in a quasi-primitive state in the hill tracts of Arakan. And it is very likely in such forms of these terms as Mara, Marai, Mru, or Maru—and in the corresponding designations of the country as Mara-raṭṭha or Maru-raṭṭha, contracted by the vulgar into Mara-rāth, Maru-rāth—that the origin of Ptolemy's Mareura or Marura is to be sought for. This view, if correct, would be in antagonism with the tradition which locates at Prome the Phyū and not the Mrō, and would credit the ancestors of the modern Burmese with a far more ancient footing in the country than the historical records of the latter lead us to assign them. It may be observed, on the other hand, that the foregoing discussion has been based throughout on the assumption that the Mrō belong, as asserted by several authorities on Burmā, to the Tibeto-Burman stock from which the present Burmese are descended. Is this absolutely certain? Or, may not these Mrō or Mru be the modern representatives of the ancient Phyū or Brū of tradition, and therefore may they not belong to the Môn-Khmer race? Here is a doubtful point which requires to be thoroughly cleared up ere an ultimate judgment can be expressed. The
phonetic transition from Brū to Mrū is just as easy in Indo-Chinese languages as it was the inverse one from Mrammā to Brammā. In the event of the Mro or Mrū proving to be identical with the Phyū or Brū, it is to these people of Mōn-Khmer blood that the origin of the names for Burmā, as Mara-rattha, etc., will have to be ascribed, and not to the later settlers of Tibeto-Burman stock. These latter would owe their present name of Burmese to the land in which they came to reside, just as several branches of the Thai race are indebted for their name of Shān, i.e. Siāmese, to the fact of their having occupied a country originally known as Siām which had been likewise held, prior to them, by populations of Mōn-Khmer extraction.

The pretended descent of the early kings of Burmā from the Maurya or Mayūra dynasty of Magadha is probably another fiction similar to that by which an origin of the people from Brahma, or from the Brahma angels, is claimed. It is nevertheless certain that kings of Indū lineage reigned for some time at Tagōng and Pagan, and probably at Kalē and Prome as well.

Be that as it may, the term Mareura used by Ptolemy to designate the capital of Lower Burmā, finds adequate explanation in either of the two versions given above.

(5) Coast of the Bėsyngkeitai and Sarabakie Gulf (Gulf of Martaban).

This region includes the coast from Cape Tēmala (Negrais) to Bērabai (Mergui); that is, the country of the Mōn or Taleng usually termed Rāmaṇa and anciently, as shown above, Suvaṇṇabhūmi. How Ptolemy could have called this people Bėsyngkeitai, qualifying them as cannibals into the bargain, and their gulf, our present Gulf of Martaban, the Sarabakie or Sarabaric Gulf, has hitherto been a puzzle to his commentators. These have always endeavoured to get out of the difficulty by connecting the former name with Bassein, which ingenious artifice we have shown to be untenable; and by passing over in
silence the name of the gulf. But we think that both terms can be easily explained, and reserving any further discussion of the first one to the paragraph devoted to Bésynga, we shall confine ourselves for the present to the second only. The epithet Sarabakic, the more correct reading of which is certainly Sarabaric, is given to this gulf from the Salwin River, the Pāli classical name for which is, as I find variously recorded in several palm-leaf MSS., Saravari, Sāravari, and Sarasvatī. The present vulgar forms Sanluen and Salwin are only corruptions of Sallavarin and Saravarin. The mouth of this river being situated at the head of the gulf, it is natural that the gulf should be named after the river, just as it is now named after the town of Martaban, which occupies the same position. A remnant of the ancient name Saravārika or Sarabarik, borne by this gulf and the country along its shores, is, perhaps, to be found in the district and town called up to the present day Sārava or Sārāvatī, usually noted in maps as Tharrawaddy, situated at the head of the delta of the Irāvatī; and the name of Syrian (Śrīṅg, Sanīteng) is probably another instance of the wide application of that term to the whole extent of the gulf.¹

With regard to the statement that the inhabitants were cannibals, it is in accordance with the tradition of the Rākṣasas, said to have once populated the coast and islands of this gulf. It cannot be held, however, that this statement applied to the whole extent of its shores. The tracts inhabited by cannibal tribes were probably to be found in the Martaban district alone, and in the islands near the mouth of the Salwin, one of which still retains the name of Bhilū-gyun, meaning the island of the Rākṣasas, or Ogres. The Peguan (Talaing) chronicles record that, previous to the foundation of the town of Martaban (A.D. 576), that district was covered with impenetrable forests. As regards cannibal—or, at least,

¹ Barago Point may also preserve in its name a vestige of the ancient appellation of the (Sara)bārih Gulf.
head-hunting—tribes, they exist to this very day, not a long distance up the Salwin, and are known as the Wild Wahs (more correctly Lawās). Those inhabiting the region of the gulf in the early days were probably, as I already observed, of a Negrito race not dissimilar to the present Andamanese. They may be identified with the Chiau-yau (Negrito pygmies), spoken of by Chinese writers as dwelling beyond the Yung-ch'ang borders. [It is curious to note that the term chiau, meaning 'scorched, burnt,' has in Chinese the same sense as the Greek Aithiops, and sounds almost the same in the old Chinese pronunciation, which, as in modern Annamese, is tieu.]

Sabara, a city (56).

From similarity of names this city would appear to correspond to Syria, with which I identified it at the outset, misled by a regrettable error in its longitude which appears in the pages of the "British Burma Gazetteer."1 But if we take the mart of Besynga to be the present Rangūn, as I am now strongly inclined to believe, the site of Sabara must then be looked for to the westward of the Rangūn River, somewhere about Dala, now called the An-gyi district. Here, on the site of the present Twantē, stood the ancient city of Ukkalaba (Utkalāpa), at one time capital of a Taleng (Kalinga) kingdom extending over the delta of the Irāvati, frequently mentioned in the old native records. The position of Twantē (long. 96° 0' 30" E.; lat. 16° 41' 30" N.) admirably coincides with the corrected position of Sabara (long. 95° 55' E.; lat. 16° 18' N.). Near Twantē is the small village of Khabeng, which also marks the site of an old city classically known as Kappunga-nagara; and the Meruda Hill on which stands the famous Shwē-tshandaw pagoda, said to have been built in 577 B.C. (!) by the then king of Khabeng. The term Sabara might represent the Sanskrit Šabara or Śacara, meaning 'a mountaineer, a savage,' like the term Kirāta.

1 Vol. ii, p. 672. Here the longitude is given as 96° 19'E., while it should be something like 96° 59'E. I believe I have met with a repetition of this same error on another page, the number of which I regret not having noted down for future reference.
referred to elsewhere. This epithet may have been applied to the city under the impression that the city itself, or the surrounding country, was at one time peopled by wild tribes, probably of Kolarian stock like the Śavaras, found up to the present day in the hill tracts of the coast of Orissa on the other side of the Bay of Bengal. The presence on the shores of the Gulf of Martaban and in a district probably named after Utkala, i.e. Orissa, of such tribes, would perhaps explain certain affinities which have been traced between the Kolarian and Mōn (Taleng) languages, and which have hitherto puzzled the philologist. The Śavaras of Orissa are referred to by Ptolemy as Sabarai.

The probability of tribes by the name of Śabara or Śavara having, at a remote time, occupied the region in question, is further enhanced by the fact that several Chinese writers speak of a people by the name of Chu-po or Shu-po who, they state, were the early inhabitants of the whole or part of the country known as P'iao at a later period. Now, P'iao-kuo—i.e. the kingdom of P'iao or of the P'iao people—is located by all the Chinese authorities at between two and three thousand li to the south-west of Yung-ch'ang; and it is made to border, on the north and north-east upon the Nan-Chao (Thai) States of Upper Burma and Northern Siam; on the east upon Chên-la (Kamboja); and on the south upon the sea (Gulf of Martaban). It is therefore evident that by P'iao the tract of country now called Lower Burma must be understood; and very likely P'iao-kuo is meant for Pago, i.e. Pegu, which existed, though interruptedly, as a powerful kingdom, including the whole—and at times more—of the present Lower Burma, down to the dawn of the seventeenth century A.D.

Even admitting with Mr. E. H. Parker that P'iao designates the Phyū, a tribe said by the local tradition to have settled since about 484 B.C. in the country of which Old Prome was the capital—and elsewhere identified by me with the Prū, Brū, or Brao branch of the Mōn-Khmer race—the term P'iao-kuo would still apply to Lower Burma, the region which, from its having formed part of the
ancient Trikaliṅga empire, early became known as the Talaing (Triliṅga, Teliṅga)—changed afterwards into Pegu—kingdom, while its people, Mōn-Khmer by blood, were thereby designated Talaings and Peguans, as they were called Mōn, or Mañ, and Rāmañ (Rāmañnas) from Rāmañna-desa, the name applied later on to their country or the part of it which skirted the Gulf of Martaban.

The earliest Chinese notices of P'iao go back to the time of the Wei and Tsin (A.D. 220–440);^1 Chu-po or Shu-po as a name of a country or people must be referred to a far earlier date. In the Hsi-yū-ch'uan, published during the T'ang period (A.D. 618–907), the country of Shu-po is spoken of as having been simply a portion of the P'iao kingdom. The fact that P'iao was, according to Chinese accounts, conquered at least twice by the Nan-Chao, viz. in A.D. 755–757 under their king Ko-lo-fêng and in A.D. 832 under Fêng-yū, compared with the circumstance that from the very same period—or, exactly, from A.D. 781 according to the Talaing chronicles—and for the subsequent four centuries the history of Pegu presents a blank, indirectly corroborates our identification of P'iao-kuo with Pegu besides disclosing the probable reason for that blank. During those intervening centuries the kingdom of Pegu, i.e. P'iao, must have been broken up into petty states subject for the most part to Shān (Thai) rule,^3 until conquered in A.D. 1057 by King

---

^1 Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 228–9.
^2 Ibid., p. 228, note 3.
^3 This assumption is well borne out by the Kalyāṇi Inscriptions, wherein it is said that during the period now under consideration "the power of Rāmañna-desa declined, because civil dissensions arose and the extensive country was broken up into separate principalities, because the people suffered from famine and pestilence, and because, to the detriment of the propagation of the excellent religion, the country was conquered by the armies of the Seven Kings" (Taw Sein Ko, op. cit., pp. 7 and 37). The late Dr. Forchhammer thought ("Notes on the Early History of British Burma," ii, p. 10) that by the sattarājaṇemāya—"the armies of the Seven Kings"—the seven clan chiefs of the Taungthūs (Tōngsū) were meant, who harassed the Talaings by their constant inroads. This must have happened, he says, in the ninth or tenth century A.D. Taw Sein Ko (in his "Remarks on the Kalyāṇi Inscriptions," reprinted from the Indian Antiquary, pp. 9, 10) seems to share that opinion, though making the Karens and Yábëns also take part in those incursions of the Taungthūs. It is evident, however, from the facts we quoted above, that the conquest of the Seven Kings must be mainly ascribed to Shān (Thai) chiefs of Upper Burmā, while it is possible that the latter may have had the co-operation of chiefs of local clans, such as the Taungthūs, etc.
Anuruddha of Pagan. The country then remained for a time under Burmese power; but after 1281 it partially recovered its independence under Wareru, king of Martaban, and his descendants; while the sway of the Thai race was reasserted, and became almost general in both Upper and Lower Burmah.

In A.D. 802 the king of Piao sent, it is true, according to Ma Tuan-lin and others, his younger brother to do homage to the Chinese Emperor; but the fact that this mission followed in the train of the embassy despatched to the same potentate by the king of Nan-Chao well shows that the so-called Piao king was, at best, but a vassal tsaw-buc of the powerful Thai empire which then ruled supreme over most part of Northern Indo-China.

Once the fact established that Piao embraced in the early days the region at present known as Lower Burmah, it is not illogical to infer that the whole or part of this region was originally occupied by a people probably of Kolarian race, identical, or nearly so, with the Sabaras or Sacaras of Orissa, and whose name was rendered by the Chinese with the characters 朱波, which may be read either Chu-po or Shu-po. This people, driven towards the Gulf in about 484 B.C. by the Phyū advancing from Kalō and Prome, may have founded near its shores a settlement named after them, which is very likely the one recorded by Ptolemy as Sabara.

Bésynga River (58, 187).

This stream may correspond either to the Salwín or to the Hlaing (an eastern branch of the Irāvati) which flows past the town of Rangūn. The greater share of probability rests with the Hlaing or the Irāvati itself, on account of the name Bésynga being evidently derived from the Śrīṇa or Singuttara Hill of Rangūn. It must be remembered, however, that the Irāvati and the Salwín have, in nearly every instance, been merged into one river by cartographers even up to the middle of the last century. A glance at the maps of Gueudeville and his predecessors
will be useful as showing in what a muddle the geography of the Gulf of Martaban was even at that period, and will give some hint as to what Ptolemy's conception of that region must have been.

Bēsynga, a mart (57).

The position of this settlement, as given by Ptolemy, is to the north-west of the mouth of the Bēsynga River. At the outset of my researches I was strongly inclined to identify that river with the Salwin and the homonymous city with Tha-hùn (Sathōm), the ancient Saddhamma-nagara, which was so celebrated of old as a mart in that neighbourhood, and which may have been termed, in its early days, Siṁha-pura or Vara-siṅha-nagara, from the fact of its having been founded by a prince named Siṅha-rājā. ¹ I have, however, since acquired the conviction that Ptolemy's Bēsynga can hardly designate any other place but the settlement on the Hlaing near the Siṅguttara Hill, which has of later days grown into the town now called Rangūn. Various names are recorded in native chronicles for the villages that clustered, from high antiquity, round the celebrated hill; but it seems only natural that these, as well as the territory upon which they stood, should collectively be named in the first instance from the hill itself. The existence on the latter, and from a very ancient time, of a shrine supposed to contain relics of Buddha, which has subsequently developed into the present monumental Shwē Dagon pagoda, is confirmed by recent researches, especially by those of Dr. Forchhammer. The original shrine was a small spire, termed the Siṅguttara-ceti. The surrounding territory was, and is up to the present day, known to the Burmese as the Tsingkutsā (their pronunciation for Siṅguttara) country. A palm-leaf manuscript that I had occasion to examine, containing

¹ As an example I may refer to the old capital of Kalinga, which was at first called Siṅha-pura after its founder, Siṅha-bāhu, the father of Vijaya, the first recorded sovereign of Ceylon. See Cunningham's "Ancient Geography of India," p. 518.
a legendary account of the Shwè Dagon pagoda written in Pegu, tries to explain the Burmese form of that name by a legend to the effect that on that spot a centipede devoured an elephant. This is very well, and speaks volumes for the inventive genius of the Buddhist priests, always ready to concoct strange etymologies and stranger stories to support them, but the name is decidedly Pāli. The hillock on which the spire stands was probably known in the early days simply as a Śṛṅga, i.e. ‘peak’ or ‘height’; to which name the prefix vara, indicating excellence, was probably added later on account of its sacred character. Vara-Śṛṅga, the excellent or splendid peak, would thus become the general appellation for the hill and neighbouring territory, and which, corrupted by vulgar parlance into Var-siṅga or Bar-siṅga, may well represent Ptolemy’s Bēsynga. A second explanation of this term may be suggested, based on the fact that Bi is the Mōn (Talaing) word for ‘river.’ The Hlaing, from the fact of its flowing past the Śṛṅga Hill, may have been called the Bi-Śṛṅga, i.e. “the Śṛṅga-Hill River,” and the mart near the famed spire may thence have received the name of “Bi-Śṛṅga Mart,” viz. “the Mart of the Śṛṅga-Hill River.” The position of Rangūn, to the north and a little to the west of the mouth of the Hlaing, well suits the location which our author assigns to Bēsynga with respect to the mouth of the homonymous river. The reasons given in a preceding paragraph, and the fact that Ptolemy places both his mart and river high up in the gulf (nearly 5° long. to the east of Cape Tēmala), ought to dispose definitely of their attempted identification with Bassein and its river respectively.

(6) The Golden Khersonese (Malay Peninsula).

Marinos of Tyre and Ptolemy are the first to speak of the Malay Peninsula as the Golden Khersonese. The geographers that preceded them, among whom Eratosthenes, Dionysius Periegetes, and Pomponius Mela may be named, all refer
to it instead as Khrysé or Chrysé Insula: the "Golden Isle,"—and so does long before them the Rāmāyāna, under the name of Suvarṇa-dīrpa, which conveys the same meaning. No stress has, so far, been laid on this wide difference in representing that region on the one part as an island and on the other as a peninsula. I believe, therefore, that I am the first to proclaim, after careful consideration, that both designations are probably true, each in its own respective time; that is, that the Malay Peninsula, or rather its southern portion, has been an island before assuming its present highly-pronounced peninsular character. The view I now advance is founded not only on tradition, but also upon geological evidence of no doubtful nature. Having had occasion some years ago, in 1885, to pay a visit to Ligor and its district, where I journeyed some thirty miles away from the coast, I was struck with the curious appearance of the soil, stretching as an undulated sandy plain with occasional sand hillocks and a few ridges of rocky formation but of no relevant height, all these characters stamping that region as a former sea-bottom, which has emerged at a comparatively recent period. Being not at the time interested as yet in the researches which form the subject of the present paper, I did not think of pushing my explorations any further so as to reach the opposite coast of the peninsula; and have, therefore, to depend for what I say in respect to it and the adjoining zone, both to the north and south of the Ligor parallel, on the scanty information I was able to gather of late. This is to the effect that the whole tract of country just mentioned, that is, between Singora and Bān-Dōn on the east coast, across the peninsula to between Kedah and Korbie on the opposite side, presents, with few exceptions, a similar formation. The mountain ridge running along the middle of the peninsula here presents wide gaps where hardly any elevation above 100 feet is noticed. All geological evidences concur in pronouncing most of this country an old sea-bed, probably a former succession of straits interspersed with rocky islands, but through which sea-going ships must have
found passage from one side to the other of the peninsula. There are, indeed, traditions of ships from India and Ceylon having come across that way to the Gulf of Siām; and travelling by boat is still possible at the present day, during the rainy season, nearly all the way between Pāk-lāu and Bān-Dōn, and also, for a good distance, between the Trang province and the inland sea of P'hattalung. The route that connects Kontani, the chief town of the Trang district, with Ligor, crosses the peninsula at a very slight elevation above sea-level, and so will the newly projected railway between Kedah and Singora. If communication is yet so easy at the present day between opposite points of the peninsula, and could, but for the slightly raised barrier opposed by the main ridge, still be effected in one or two places by boat, I do not see why it should not have existed of old for sea-going craft, and why it could not be easily restored by artificial means, thus solving the problem of a ship canal across the Malay Peninsula, which presents so many technical difficulties at the Kra Isthmus. The old channel must have become obstructed partly through sands being heaped up at both ends by the action of the waves, and partly by upheaval or by gradual emersion of the country above sea-level. A gauge of the amount the land has risen within a comparatively recent period is afforded by the numerous limestone caves, evidently the result of sea-action, which are now found, at a height of one hundred feet or more, up the steep slopes of the hills of calcareous formation so frequent along either coast of the peninsula. It is plain that the blocking up of the channel across the latter must have coincided with the emersion of those caves above sea-level; and judging from the detritus of marine shells and recent animal remains forming the floor of some among them, and from other indications, the events just mentioned must have occurred within historical times. The rising movement is still proceeding, as shown in the case of both Ligor and P'hattalung, which, situated formerly on the sea-beach, are now many miles distant from it, and will, in a few years hence, become entirely inland towns.
The last authority to mention Khrysē as an island is, I believe, Pomponius Mela, *circa* A.D. 50. As, less than one hundred years next to him, Marinos and Ptolemy refer to it as a peninsula, the passage across it must have become impracticable soon after the middle of the first century A.D. It is from that period, then, that the island became connected with and formed part of what we now call the Malay Peninsula. The name of Golden Khersonese, given the latter, was transferred to it, no doubt, from the island of Khrysē: in fact, it is to be observed that the gold-mines that would justify that appellation are to be found only in its southern portion, that which formed the supposed island; whilst the northern part constituting the old peninsula is noted chiefly for tin, and could never be properly termed a golden land.

In the Purāṇas the Malay Peninsula is called Śālmali-deśa, and the sea that bounds it on the western side, the Sura Sea. But this is, as I have found out, only another name for the Lohita or Śrī-lohita Sea of the Rāmāyaṇa, which the Arab geographers and navigators transliterated as Shelaheth, and the Malays nowadays term Selat, or Sea of the Straits. This explains the names of Celates, Saele, and Selat, given to the native inhabitants of its shores.

The term Śālmali, justified to a certain extent by the abundance of the silk-cotton trees (*Śālmali=Bombax Malabaricum*) in the low jungles of the coast, is more or less, as in the case of the other deśas of the Purāṇas, a conventional epithet. I believe it to be a corruption of Suvarna-māli; for Siamese MSS. contain a legend of Buddha having left one of his holy footprints on the shining mount of Suvarnambāli-giri in the Tenasserim province, which I identify with the Kuṭa-śālmali peak on whose summit the Rāmāyaṇa places the abode of Vainateya.

---

1 It is also referred to as an island in the "Periplus Maris Erythraeini," whose date has been fixed at *circa* A.D. 89, while the information it is based upon undoubtedly belongs to an older period.

2 *Celates* in Portuguese authors; *Saele* or *Scalete* in Floris' "Travels." *Selat* is the Malay form from which the terms *Orang laut*, 'seaman,' and *laut*, a general name for the sea, may have been derived; also, I think, *selatan*, 'south.'
(Garuda). The name of the peninsula, Malaya-deīpa, mentioned, besides in several MSS., in the Kalyāṇī inscriptions of Pegu,\(^1\) is evidently connected with the alternative designations Śālmali- and Suvarṇa-māli-deīpa; and probably was introduced from the Malaya districts of the extreme south of India and Ceylon, the early dark race of which, the descendants of the rude Rākṣasas, and their successors the Dravidians, have undoubtedly been the pioneer colonizers not only of the peninsula, but also of the islands and entire sea-coast of Southern Indo-China.

Ptolemy had as yet but a very hazy idea of the orography and hydrography of the Golden Khersonese. Having shortened it by about one-third, thus giving it a somewhat rounded shape, he made some rivers rising in unnamed mountain ridges to the north of it to unite and flow through the peninsula, detaching in succession the three streams which he names Attabas, Khrysoanias, and Palandas. His commentators carried this confusion to extreme lengths, and thus my patience was put to severe tests before some order could be evolved out of that chaos. How far I have succeeded, and how much yet remains to be accomplished, the following examination of Ptolemy’s position of places on the peninsula will show.

Bērabai, a city.

Ptolemy really makes his Golden Khersonese begin with Takōla beyond Cape Bērabai (Boyce’s Point), and end at Balongka, after which the region of the Lēstai (Gulf of Sīām) commences.

His displacement of the base, or point of attachment, of the peninsula so far south is evidently due to his underestimate of the deep incavation northward of the upper part of the Gulf of Sīām, which he does not carry beyond the 11th parallel of true North latitude. Hence Bērabai and the cape beyond it, which, according to his notion, do not as yet make part of

---

\(^1\) Wherein it is stated that in A.D. 1181, or thereabouts, Rāhulathēra left Rāmaṇāṇḍena and proceeded by ship to Malaya-dīpa, whose king he instructed in the Vinaya.
the peninsula, are included under this heading here, and treated on with the other places that in Ptolemy's treatise are located in the Golden Khersonese.

The identity of Berabai with Mergui has been already demonstrated, on geographical grounds, in the first part of this paper. It now remains to deal with it from a purely philological and historical point of view. This is, however, no easy task; for, though it is known that Mergui is a very ancient town, and the famous seaport of Tenasserim, of which it is older by many centuries, nothing has come down to us of its early history. Captain Butler, after stating that in Burmese the district is called Myatmyo, but pronounced Beitmyo, proceeds to explain this term as follows:—

"The word myat literally means a fringe or border, and was probably given as a name to the Mergui district from its forming the outer fringe or border of the Burmese dominions. How such a name came to be transposed into English as Mergui, I have been unable to discover, nor can I even suggest an explanation." ¹ Here is darkness, and in it we would ever remain were we content to accept the fanciful etymologies, thoroughly unscientific and illogical—based, as they are, on mere phonetical coincidences and similarities—that satisfy the unpretentious natives of the Far East, and form the legitimate pride of their ignorant inventors, generally, as we have remarked, amateur chroniclers, and Buddhist monks of great leisure and ingenuity, but of no philological training whatever. If we investigate the etymology given above, we shall soon find that amyit, and not myit, is the Burmese for a fringe; and that the name of Mergui, though pronounced myit and byit, is really written ㎡ ㎡ ㎡ mrit. This spelling is quite in accordance with the Siamese form of the name, ㎡ mārit, which represents the Sanskrit Mṛtsā and Mṛttikā, and the Pāli Mattikā, meaning earth, clay, mud.

¹ "Gazetteer of the Mergui District," p. 1; by Captain J. Butler. Rangoon, 1884.
There is not the slightest doubt as to this being the correct derivation of the name for Mergui; but I shall go a step further, and suggest that the above is but its abridged form, and that it should be identified with the seaport Rakta-mrttikā (red earth) mentioned in the Sanskrit inscription found in the northern part of province Wellesley, and translated by Dr. Kern, who fixes its date at about A.D. 400. The eminent scholar was inclined to recognize in that name the port called Ch'ih-chu by the Chinese, which name also means Red-earth, and is generally taken to denote Siām, or some ancient harbour on the Siamese coast. I do not contest this view, but as there are several places named in the same manner, both in the Gulf of Siām and the Malay Peninsula—among which I might mention Tanah-merah (the Malay name for Red-earth), a point on the west coast of the peninsula a little to the north of Koḥ (or Pulo) Lantar— I hold on to my identification of Rakta- mṛttikā with Mergui, also because of the latter being situated on the same side of the peninsula as Province Wellesley, where the inscription was found, and not very far from it. There is, moreover, evidence of other places on the same coast having names of which the word mṛttikā or its Pāṭi equivalent form part. As an instance I might point out Gōla-mattika-nagara (the present Ayethēma), mentioned in the Kalyāṇi inscriptions of Pegu as having been so called because it contained “many mud-and-wattle houses resembling those of the Gōla people.” All evidence, including the red appearance of the soil, seems therefore to be in favour of Mergui; hence I take the latter to be the ancient and famous harbour of Rakta-mṛttikā, or, at least, Mṛttikā, the origin of its present name, Mṛit or Mārit.

But it remains yet to show how Ptolemy’s name for it, Bērabai, can be explained and accounted for. Up to the present day the island of the Mergui Archipelago opposite

1 See “Essays relating to Indo-China,” vol. i, pp. 224, 225, 234.
2 Another strip of land of the same name is situated in proximity to Cape Rachado, in the Negri Sembilan district, further down the peninsula.
3 Taw Sein Ko’s “Kalyāṇi Inscriptions,” p. 6.
Mergui is named *Pa-ree-kywon*¹ (i.e. the Pari island). Here is to be found, I think, the origin of Ptolemy's name for Mergui. In fact, by early Indu colonists and navigators such as dotted all these coasts with Sanskrit names, any harbour or refuge for ships behind the island of Pari would be called *Pari-abhaya*, that is, Pari's protection or safe place; which, by rule of *sandhi*, would become contracted into *Paryabhaya*, vulgarly pronounced as *Parabbhaya*, whence Bérabai. But even independently of the name of the island, *Pari*, Ptolemy's term might be explained as *Parabhaya*, the opposite or further (place of) safety, i.e. harbour, speaking either in reference to the coast of India, whence the ships crossed to the Malay Peninsula, or in relation to the *Pari* or other island of the Mergui Archipelago.² I think this district to be the *Pāriḥadā* region placed in Śālmaladvīpa (Malay Peninsula) by the Purānas.

As regards the present European name for Mergui, it presents, in my opinion, much less difficulty. By looking at the European maps of Further India that appeared from the second part of the sixteenth to the first part of the eighteenth century, we find that town successively noted as: *Mirgira* (A.D. 1580), *Mirgin* (Van Langren, 1595), *Mergi* (Janssonius, 1638), *Mirgin* (Père Placide, 1684), *Mergui* (Gueudeville, 1713). We see that the form

¹ "British Burma Gazetteer," vol. ii, p. 477, s.v. 'Pa-ree-kywon.'
² *Parabhaya*, i.e. 'excellent protection,' might also be suggested, which, by the usual change of e into ë, would become also *Barabhaya*. In the Palatine Law-Code of Ayuthia, promulgated in A.D. 1360, among the Southern States tributary to Siām, is mentioned that of тельного (Varavári), hitherto unidentified, which might turn up to be identical with Bérabai. The transition from Varavári through Barabári is quite possible.

In the account of Ike Mese, translated by Groeneweldt and published in "Essays relating to Indo-China," vol. i, 2nd series, p. 154, it is stated that "in the year 1272 he [Ike Mese] was sent by the emperor across the sea as an envoy to the kingdom Pa-lo-p'ei; he came back in 1274, bringing with him people of this country, who carried precious articles and a letter of tribute." The translator makes no attempt at identifying Pa-lo-p'ei. It seems to me that Bérabai may well be the place meant, which was at the time a petty State tributary to Siām.
Mergui immediately succeeded the form Mirgin; just as on the opposite coast of the peninsula, in the upper part of the Gulf of Siām, the reverse happened for the name of Cape Kui, previously written Cui, and which was afterwards changed in the maps into Cape Cin, by a simple transposition of the dot on the i. Thus Mirgin or Mergin could easily become Mergui. It must be admitted that there is a funny side also to the apparently dry and stern science of geography. As to the early names Mirgira and Mergi, they originated from the Mōn (Taleng) form of Marit, which is also written မော်မိုမှူး, and could thus easily become Mrig, Miry, etc.

The main line of communication between Mergui and the opposite coast of the peninsula was, and is, by the Khuāu Mōn (Pillow-mount) pass, termed by the Burmese Mō-doung (Tired hill), which is about 750 feet above sea-level. This track, as I ascertained myself in loco, was once practicable to bullock-carts, and remained so up to the end of the last century. It reaches the Gulf of Siām a little below Kui, the famous Cin spoken of above.

Takōla, a mart (79).

Several places of a similar name existed along the western coast of the Malay Peninsula and in the Malay Archipelago. We have in the first instance a Taik-kulā, or Takkula, near the present Ayetthêmā (Ayetthima), in the Sittōng subdivision of the Shwegyin district. This Taik-kulā is the corrupted form of the name of the ancient Goḷa-mattika-nagara referred to in the Kalyāṇī inscriptions. It appears in early Portuguese maps as Tagalla. Professor Forchhammer considered it to be a foundation of the Gauḍas, from Northern Bengal; whence its name, formed out of the corresponding Pāḷi term Goḷa. But this seems by no means certain. In some MSS., in fact, the Pāḷi name of

1 Taik in Mōn (Taleng) and in Burmese, like Tāk in Siāmese, means a masonry building in general; but, more properly, a loam, earth, or brick structure, thus conveying in some measure the same sense as the Pāḷi mattika.
Taik-kulā is written Gulâmattikā and Kulâmattikā. Now, Kulā, as we have already remarked, is a term applying to Dravidians, and designating more especially the dark people of Malabar and Coromandel. Gulā is the name which the Siamese give the Taungthūs (Tongsū), still so numerous about Ayetthêmā and Thatôn, which country they claim as their original home. But Gulā is probably only a corruption of Kulā, and was applied to the Taungthūs simply because of their being held in subjection by the numerous Dravidian (Kalinga and Kola or Cola) colonies on that part of the Gulf of Martaban. The evidence appears, therefore, to be in favour of Taik-kulā having been a foundation of the Kolas or Kalingas, and not of the Gaudas. Its name would then mean "The Kola (or Cola) Buildings."

The second instance is that of a Tagala in the Tavoy district, referred to in João de Barros (lib. ix, ch. i) among the seaports of the Malay Peninsula, in a list with the following order: Vagaru, Martaban, Re [Yay], Tagala, Tavai, etc. This Tagala is probably Thagara-myō (Takkala or Sāgara?), built in 751 A.D. by the Talengs on the western bank of the Tavoy River, and nineteen miles distant from the present Tavoy town, now known as Myo-houng or Old Tavoy. Professor Lassen marked it on his map as Takkala, at a few miles north of Tavoy.

A Tagal on the north coast of Java might be adduced as the next instance, and reference be made also to Tagala, the name of a people and language in the Philippines. It might be interesting to investigate the origin of the last two forms of Takkala, and to determine whether any relationship exists between them and those given above.

The last place in this discussion we have reserved for Ptolemy's Takōla, which, as already mentioned in the first section of this paper, we have identified with a harbour in the district of Takōpa (Takūa-pā), situated probably in the Pāk-chān inlet, near the Kra Isthmus. It seems, however, that the whole region on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, south of that isthmus as far as Papra Strait or further, was, in Ptolemy's time, named Takōla, Takkula, or
Takkala. In fact, the three districts included within its compass are, up to the present day, designated by terms of which the word Takūa, the Siamese corruption of Takola or Takkula, forms a part. The three districts alluded to are:

1. Takūa-thai, called also Ranōng district.
2. Takūa-pā, called by Europeans and Malays Takōpa, or simply Kōpa; generally noted in maps as Kopah.
3. Takūa-thūng, termed also the P'hang-ngā (in Malay, Panga or Punga) district.

This shows that Takūa, or, anciently, Takōla, Takkula, or Takkula, was the generic name for the whole region. Takūa in Siamese means a black metal, and is indiscriminately employed to designate either lead or tin. Its allied word Takō still enters to form part of terms used to indicate something of black colour. Thus, Tōn-takō designates a tree with a black bark; Dam-takō means a black colour; and Hin-takō, Thab-takō, Nin-takō denote respectively a black stone, hut, jewel. My contention is that both the terms takūa and takō originate from the Sanskrit kāla or some of its South Indian derivates, corrupted into kūa and kō, and prefixed with the particle ta, or tak, as done for many other words in Siamese and other Indo-Chinese languages.

The Sanskrit kāla is usually explained as meaning 'black'; but the examples I shall adduce directly will show that Southern Indian and Eastern forms of this word undoubtedly designated also a black metallic ore, more especially of lead or tin. In fact, we find tin or tin-ore mentioned in all early Portuguese writers as calim or calin (kālin), the name by which it seemed to be known at the time in India and all over the Far East.1 This term can be traced back to the form

---

1 See also Balbi (Venetia, 1699, p. 123) : "Tanae [Tavoy], dono nasce assai calais in lingua loro, ma in nostra lingua si chiamà Calaia." Turpin (Hist. du Roy. de Siam, i, p. 214) and Tachard (Second Voyage de Siam) also write calain, and say that this metal is the same as tin. Other authors have calin, and believe it to be an alloy of lead and tin. The term calin, or kālin, is probably connected with the Western word galena. From it the Chinese have made lien, which in their language means both 'lead' and 'tin-ore' (see Giles' Chinese Dictionary, s.v. 7,118).
alkali or al-kalli, used by Arab geographers and travellers to designate the same metal as early as the ninth century.\(^1\) Kalten is, up to the present day, the name for tin-works in certain parts of the peninsula, such as, for instance, Perak and Jala.\(^2\) Kāla and Kola are both Sanskrit names for the planet Saturn, and may, therefore, be connected with either lead or tin; in fact, the former denotes also a kind of plumbago. It is also worthy of remark that the town of Kaulam or Kollam (Quilon) on the Malabar coast is, in the French relation of Oderic of Friuli, published by De Backer,\(^3\) termed Plumbum.

All the above considerations tend to show that in Southern India, at least, the terms kāla and kola were employed to designate either lead or tin, but more especially the latter metal; and that they were spread all over the East under the form of kālin, out of which the Arabs made al-kali and the Southern Indo-Chinese kīa and kō, which, by the addition of the prefix ta, became transformed into ta-kīa and ta-kō. Ptolemy's Takōla designates, therefore, a mart and a district rich in tin; and cannot better apply than to the region of the Malay Peninsula under consideration, where tin-mining has been carried on from time immemorial. I have not the slightest doubt that this is the country which Abu Zaid names Kalah-bār, and also the peninsula (or island) of Kalah, and describes as being eighty parasangs of surface (or length?); as lying about midway on the sea-route between Arabia and China; and as forming the centre of trade for aloes, camphor, sandal-wood, ivory, al-kali (i.e. tin, not lead),

---

\(^1\) See Abu Zaid's narrative in Reinaud's "Relation des Voyages faits par les Arabes et les Persans," etc., p. 94; and the translator's notes at pp. lxxii, lxxxv of the "Discours préliminaire." Ignoring the facts brought to light by us above, Reinaud translates al-kali as 'plomb alcalย,' whereas it should be 'tin' or 'calin.'

\(^2\) See Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 16, p. 316. Also, "Bangkok Calendar," 1873, p. 119, art. "A visit to the mines of Jala." This famous mining district is situated inland to the south-west of Patāni, and sometimes appears in the maps as Yala. I do not know what authority Professor Keane has for calling it Jlaap and Jalo in the second edition of his "Geography of the Malay Peninsula," etc., 1892, pp. 14-19.

ebony, etc. It is here, in fact, that Edrisi and Masaudi place a mine of tin (al-kali). The former of these two geographers is said to make of Kalah an island; if so, this may be taken to be the island of Junkeeylon (termed in Siamese Thalâng and C'hâlâng), also well known for its richness in tin-ore. But it is doubtful whether an island is meant, as the same word is used in Arabic for both an island and a peninsula. It is easy to see that Abu Zaid's alternative appellation Kalah-bâr—which may in Arabic be read also Kolah-bâr—denotes Ta-küa-pâ, i.e. Takôpa, without its prefix, and thus represents the Malay contracted form of the name of the district: Kopah (or Köpâ).

As regards Abu Zaid's statement that in his time (851–916 A.D.) Kalah was a dependency of the kingdom of Zabedi (Malay Archipelago), it may be due to the very probable act of Takôla being, like Taik-kulâ on the coast of Pegu, a foundation of those Kolas or Colas from Southern India who had established colonies all over the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago, as well as a very powerful kingdom at Palembang in Sumatra which exercised a nominal suzerainty over them all. In an analogous manner we find it stated in Ma Tuan-lin that Chu-lien (Cola or Coromandel) was, in A.D. 1068–1077, tributary to San-fo-chi (Sri-Bhoja or Palembang), which shows that at a later period even the mother country itself of those colonists acknowledged in some measure the paramount authority of the empire they had founded in the Archipelago. Takôla seems, however, to have attained far greater importance than the cognate settlement Taik-kulâ on the coast of Pegu; for in the section devoted to Pi'iao of the great Chinese cyclopaedia T'u-shu-chi-ch'êng the latter is modestly

---

1 Reinaud, op. cit., tome 1, pp. 17, 93, 94.
2 Ibid., pp. lixii and lxxxv, note.
3 Ibid., p. lxxxvi.
4 Hervey de Saint-Denys' translation, ii, p. 586.
5 Ibid., p. 231, note. The passage above referred to runs as follows:—
6 Between the kingdoms of Mi-ch'ên [Machaim of ancient maps, at the mouth of the Pegu River] and K'un-lang [Kamalahka or Kamalahga] there dwells the tribe of the Hisio-k'un-lun [Little Kolas = Taik-kulâ'], whose manners do not differ from those of Mi-ch'ên [Machaim]. Between the kingdom of K'un-lang
referred to as *Hsiao-k'ün-lun*, while the former is magnified as *Tu-k'ün-lun*, terms which mean respectively "Little *K'ün-lun (Kola)" and "Great *K'ün-lun" settlement, or "Little and Great Taköla." *K'ün-lun*, we shall demonstrate in the sequel, is a term corresponding to the Burmese and Siamese *Kulā*, and denoting like it populations of Dravidian race; but, more properly, the Malayas and the Kolas or Colas referred to above. From the last-named people—if not from the abundance of tin-ore as already surmised—the country about Taköla may have been termed *Kola-vāra* or

[Kāmalaṅga] and the tribe or city called *Lu-yū* [in Ann. pron. *Lm-k-vo = Ligor, the Lugor of João de Barros] there is the kingdom termed *Tu-k'ün-lun* [Great Kolas = Ptolemy's *Taköla*], more powerful than that of *Mi-ch'ēn* [Machaim]. From the royal residence of the *Hsiao-k'ün-lun*, marching half a day, one reaches the city of *Mo-ti-p'te* [Martaban], a dependency of the kingdom of *Piao." The identifications between brackets are all my own. *Mi-ch'ēn* may also be meant for Bassein, or else for the territory of the ancient *Besynga*, without modifying in any way the identifications of the other places named above. I have, however, preferred to suggest *Macham* or *Machaim* as an equivalent for *Mi-ch'ēn*, because this place appears noted in most old maps and must therefore have been well known, at least to navigators. Owing to the fact of Macham being at the mouth of the Pegu River, its name seems to have been employed at one time among foreigners to denote Pegu, under the abbreviated form *Chin* or *Cheen*; witness the following passage from the Ain-i-Akbari of Abul Fazl:

"Near to this tribe [of Arung, i.e. Arakan] is Pegu, which former writers called *Cheen*, accounting this to be their capital."

As regards the term *Hsiao-k'ün-lun*, it evidently applied in particular to Taik-kulā, but in general to the whole territory settled by the Kolas, which probably included also Thatōn. And, judging from the fact that the king of the *Hsiao-k'ün-lun* tribe resided at only half a day's march from Martaban, Thatōn may have been the place of his residence, although this statement as to distance should not be taken too literally. The *Hsiao-k'ün-lun* tribe mentioned here is, of course, that of the Taungthūs of Thatōn and Ayetthomā, who inherited the name of *Gulā* or *Kulā* from the ancient Kola settlers that first developed the country.

The remark as to the *Tu-k'ün-lun* State being "more powerful than that of *Mi-ch'ēn*," and so extensive as to occupy the whole tract of the west coast of the Peninsula between the Kāmalaṅga and Ligor kingdoms—that is, from the Kra Isthmus to Papra Strait or even further—gives the measure of the importance that Taköla must have attained, thus justifying our identification of it with the Kalah and the Kalahbār region of the Arabs.

Before concluding this note it may be well to call attention to the fact that the term *Hsiao-k'ün-lun* is applied by some Chinese writers also to the island called Pulo Condor by the Malays, owing probably to the latter having been occupied at one time by some Dravidian or Malay settlement; but this insular *Hsiao-k'ün-lun*, situated in front of the coast of Cochín-China, has, of course, nothing to do with the continental *Hsiao-k'ün-lun* now under discussion, which is so distinctly located near Martaban, and within the territory of *Piao* or Pegu. Again, the state of *Tu-k'ün-lun* is made, by several Chinese authorities, to include the whole of the region anciently colonized by ooshoots of the Dravidian race, to wit, the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago and part of Cochín-China; but its boundaries are so clearly defined in the passage quoted above from the *Tu-ahu-chi-ch'ēng* as not to need any further discussion.
Kola-bûr (as Malaya-vâra or Mala-bûr from the Malayas), whence the Kalahbûr of the Arab writers. But, whichever be the correct derivation of this term, it will suffice for our purpose to establish its connection with Ptolemy’s Takûla in order to dispose, before proceeding further, of the view advanced by Walckenaer and other distinguished geographers, that Kalî was to be identified—in spite of the surface (more probably length) of eighty parasangs assigned to it in the Arab records—with Kedah. It is clear that if eighty parasangs are meant for length, the term Kalah-bûr would not denote a mere district or island, but the whole stanniferous region on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, between the mouth of the Salwîn and Junkceylon Island. That this is so would appear from the fact that the sea bounding that portion of the peninsula, and extending up, I have reason to think, to the Gulf of Martaban, was, according to Masaudi, named the “Sea of Kalahbûr.” This sea I have identified with the Kûlodaka sea of the Râmâyâna, next to which comes the Lohita, Śrî-Lohita, or Śrî-Lohit sea, called Shelaheth by the Arabs, bounding, as I have already shown, the west coast of Śâlmai-dvîpa or the Malay Peninsula as far down as its southern extremity. It would seem, therefore, that the region of Kalahbûr, which gives this sea its name, cannot be located at Kedah, which is bathed by the sea of Śrî-Lohit; but must be looked for towards the northern part of the peninsula, where we have placed it. Papra Strait and Junkceylon formed, I think, the boundaries of the two seas of Kalahbûr and Shelaheth.

The place I have assigned to the mart of Takûla in the neighbourhood of the present Ranông, and at the mouth, or inside, of the Pâk-chân inlet, suits all requirements enumerated above. The Pâk-chân estuary forms here a splendid harbour, which must have been used by ships from a very early period, since it was the terminus of a much frequented land-route across the Kra Isthmus; while tin-ore abounds in the vicinity, at Malivan, Ranông, and all over the surrounding country.
Such favourable topographical conditions, coupled with the natural resources of the soil in its immediate vicinity, sufficiently account for the speedy growth of Takōla into one of the most thriving emporiums on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, and for the renown of its harbour as one of the most spacious, secure, and most frequented by sea-going crafts. A proof of its being already well known from over a century before Ptolemy's time is to be found in the famed Pāli work Milinda Pañhā (vi, 21), where it is referred to under the form Takkola in the following passage: "Just . . . . as a shipowner . . . . will be able to traverse the high seas, and go to Vāṅga, or Takkola, or China, or Sovira, or Surat, or Alexandria, or the Koromandel coast, or Suvaṇṇabhūmi . . . ."  

Professor Rhys Davids has designated 2 Karkoṭa on the coast of India as the probable place corresponding to the Takkola of the text; but I think it quite certain that Ptolemy's Takōla is meant. This appears from the place itself assigned to Takkola in the list of countries and seaports named: first the text mentions those situated on the sea-route to the east, to wit Vāṅga (Bengal), Takkola, and China; then it turns to places in the west (Sovira, Surat, Alexandria); next to places in the south (Koromandel Coast); and finally, again reverts to places in the east, e.g. Suvaṇṇabhūmi (coast of Pegu). 3 The inference is, therefore, that the Takkola referred to in the text was a country or seaport situated on the ship-route to the east, between Bengal and China.

From the same passage it also follows that Takkola was not in Suvaṇṇabhūmi, since this latter country is named separately. Takkola cannot, therefore, be identified with Taik-kulā on the Peguan coast; but is, from every indication, the very same place recorded by Ptolemy as

2 Ibid., p. xiii of Preface.
3 While on this subject, I would suggest that the Nikumbha referred to at p. 327 of the same work and left unidentified may be Negumbo, a place on the coast of Ceylon a little north of Colombo.
Takōla, which we have located lower down the Bay of Bengal, on the coast of the Malay Peninsula.

Takkola, as it occurs thus spelled in the text of the Milinda Pañhā, is a Pāli word designating a particular sort of perfume made from the berry of the Kakkola plant. As a place-name, however, I think that it must be considered a mere rendering, in Pāli form, of either Tak-kāla or Ta-kola, the ancient and original designations of the Takōpa District and its chief town. Be that as it may, the existence of Takōla as a country, a mart, and a seaport is thus fairly well proved from the very beginning of the Christian Era, the period at which it is believed that the work on Milinda was composed.

Some two centuries later on—or, more exactly, during the Wu dynasty of China (A.D. 229–265)—an embassy having been despatched by the king of Fu-nan to India, it is stated in the Chinese records ¹ that it returned by the mouth of the Tau-kiao-le, continuing its route by sea in the great bay (Gulf of Martaban) in a north-westerly direction; it then entered the bay (of Bengal) and ultimately reached India. In this account, the mouth of the Tau-kiao-le has been by various translators taken to mean either the mouth of the Salwin or that of the Irūvati, which is evidently absurd. It seems to me, if the identifications of the two bays named in the account prove correct, that we should read Tau-kiao-le as Takōla, and take it as a name given the Pāk-chān River, from the fact of the city of Takōla being situated at or near its mouth. The position of Tau-kiao-le would then suit all requirements with respect to the great bay (Gulf of Martaban) and the kingdom of Fu-nan (Kamboja), which at the period the embassy took place included Lower Siām, and no doubt also the northern part, if not more, of the Malay Peninsula. It would then seem but natural that the embassy in question, instead of taking the long sea-route round the southern extremity of the peninsula, should proceed in small skiffs or overland to C'hump'hōu, and thence across the Kra Isthmus to the mouth of the Pāk-chān, to

¹ See the translations from Ma Tuan-lin in the J.R.A.S. Bengal, 1837, p. 64.
embark at the famous port of Taköla on its journey to India. This is no doubt the usual route that was anciently followed by a great part of the trade between India and the Gulf of Siām, in order to avoid the difficulty and dangers of a long sea navigation through the Straits. The Kra Isthmus was the most northern point of the Malay Peninsula at which the latter could be most easily and speedily crossed; hence it was chosen as the point of transit and transhipment of merchandise from the Bay of Bengal to the Gulf of Siām, and vice versa; and the two harbours which formed the termini of the navigation on both sides, as well as the overland route that connected them, must have in consequence acquired great importance. And they must have retained their prominence for a long period until the advent of the Portuguese, and the introduction of more improved methods of navigation. But, notwithstanding all this, we find trade routes across the Malay Peninsula at the Kra Isthmus, and further north at Mergui, much frequented up to the middle of the eighteenth century. The causes that contributed to their being abandoned after that date were, in the first place, the stoppage of trade brought on by the continuous Siāmo-Burmese wars that raged up to the beginning of the present century, having mostly for theatre the northern part of the peninsula; and secondly, the final absorption into the British dominions and loss to Siām of the province of Tenasserim, which severed the bonds between the two latter countries, and prevented any continuance of the former intercourse between them being renewed.

Taköpa first appears in the maps of the "Neptune Oriental," A.D. 1781, as Tocapa. Papra Strait in this and preceding maps is noted Papera. The correct spelling is Pák-p'hraḥ; which in Siāmese means "Strait (or Mouth) of the Saint," probably owing to some legend of Buddha or some statue of his having passed through it.

Kokkonagara (82).

Yule suggests for this Ukkaka (meaning undoubtedly Ukkalāba, i.e. the modern Twanté in Pegu), mentioned in
the Mahāvaiśas as having been captured by a Ceylonese expedition sent against the king of Rāmaṇāśa. He notes also that the Indo-Chinese countries appear, from Tāranātha's "History of Buddhism," to have been anciently known as Kokī, and adds that Kokkonagara may, again, be perhaps the Kākula of Ibn Batuta.

It seems to me that Tāranātha's Kokī is, like the similar term Kochi employed up to quite recent times by the Malays to designate the Annamese Empire, merely a modified form of Kao-chih, the older name for that same region; and that, therefore, Kokī has nothing whatever to do with the place-name now under discussion. But in the account of the Ceylonese expedition against Pegu, about a.d. 1180, I find (Mahāvaiśas, c. 76, 57) a place by the name of Kākadvīpa referred to, which may, indeed, have some connection with Ptolemy's Kokkonagara. We cannot, however, rely upon a mere similarity of nomenclature. The last-named city is, by our author, placed in the Golden Khersonese or Malay Peninsula; and its corrected position falls a little to the south-east of Korbie Bay, just opposite Pulo Lantar near the mouth of the stream, noted as Khlong Kasei (Kāsai) in the maps. The correct Siamese reading of Kasei is Prakāsai; but in earlier maps, such as that of Pallegoix, it appears as Cassai. Added to the name of Korbie (Sanskrit Kapi, pronounced Kabī and Krabi in Siamese, and meaning a 'monkey') it forms the name of the province designated in Siamese Mīang Krabi-prakāsai, and in Malay, but corrupted, Korbie or Ghirbi. This province is, so far, but little known and very imperfectly represented in the maps. With its mūangs or districts of Ṝūr (Gura), Ṛṭṭ (Korū), Ṛṭṭa (Gurūt), respectively noted in maps as Corah or Kora (Crawfurd's and Survey

1 In the map of Indo-China published under the direction of Colonel H. R. Thullier, Survey of India Office, December, 1893, there is a place marked as Kokkāl on the coast of the peninsula just below Takūš-pā; but too much importance cannot be attached to such coincidences of names.

2 E.g. Map of the Malay Peninsula, 1887, published by the Straits Branch, R.A.S.
of India maps); Korak and Korat (Pallegoix’s map); and the neighbouring district of वङ्ग (P’haṅ-ngā, Ban-
ngā) or Puṅga, it formerly depended from the Takūa-pā province. Korbie, resting as it does on a well-sheltered bay of easy access to ships, and whence easy tracks lead to the opposite coast of the peninsula, may have been an important place in ancient times. Its name of ‘Monkey-
city’ recalls that of Myoukū (‘Monkey’s egg’) of the old capital of Arakan. How it ever came to be applied to it is difficult to account for, unless its origin can be found in the fact of a branch of the Vānaras or Monkey-
tribes of the opposite coast of India having anciently settled here. But some monkey legend is more probably at the bottom of it. The names of Gura, Korā, etc., may very likely be Malay corruptions of the Sanskrit nagara; hence the probability of an ancient city having stood here which bore a name identical with, or similar to, Ptolemy’s Kokkonagara. That the country was settled at an early time by colonists from India, is proved by ancient remains scattered about the land, among which I may mention a brass statue of Buddha found some forty years ago at Takūa-thūng near P’haṅ-ngā, bearing on its back a circular plate in the form of a cakra inscribed with the “Ye dhammā” stanza in Pāli, in Northern Indian characters, said to belong, probably, to the third century. Whether Ptolemy’s Kokko represents the Sanskrit Kāka (‘a crow’), Koka (‘a wolf,’ ‘ruddy goose,’ ‘cuckoo,’ and also ‘wild date-tree’), or Kukkura (‘a dog’), is for the present almost impossible to say. The latter reading would seem preferable in view of Captain (afterwards Colonel) Low’s statement that an impression of a dog’s foot, together with an image of that animal, are reported to have once existed upon a rock at the northern point of Junkceylon Island, which are said to be held in veneration by the Malays along the opposite coast.  

1 Captain Low’s “Buddha and the Phrabat,” London, 1831, pp. 11-12 (re-
acknowledged he had no opportunity of verifying by a visit to the spot, be confirmed in fact, we would then possess satisfactory evidence that the coast opposite Ceylon—that is, the present Taku-thung and Korbie provinces—was settled by tribes of dog-worshippers (probably offshoots of those Kukkurás mentioned in the Puránas and the two great Indú epics as living in the south of India), who possessed a city known as Kukkurá-nagara on or about Korbie bay, corresponding to Ptolemy's Kokkonagara, surviving yet, but in name, in the corrupted Malay forms Gura and Kora (for Kura and Kuk-kura?), and Gurót (Kurāta?), now applied to small districts or townships in the same territory. If the object of worship were a wild dog, or still better a wolf, such as is designated in Sanskrit Koka, the name of the chief city of the tribe would then assume the form Kakunagara, yet more approaching to Ptolemy's reading.

Khrusoas River (81, 186).

I take this stream to be either the Lungen or the Trang River. Many watercourses boast of similar names on the Peninsula, for instance, the Sungei Jarum-mas in Perak, the Sungei-mas in Johol, etc., in all of which the term mas, the Malay equivalent of 'gold' or 'golden,' plays a conspicuous part.

Palanda, a city (84).

It is mentioned by Ptolemy among the inland towns of the Golden Khersonese, and corresponds certainly to the district of Perak or to its ancient capital. The latitude 4° 45' N., we obtained for it from calculation is, within a few minutes, that of Kwála Lárut on the coast, and Kwála Kangsa in the interior, the present seat of the government of the district. Palanda, if it be a term of Sanskrit origin, may stand for palándu ('onion') or pralambha ('tin'). The name Perak for the district means 'silver' in Malay; ¹

¹ It is the same as the Khmer prak, and both are a corruption, as I have already observed, of the Vedic paláku, meaning 'white,' used in later times, perhaps,
and is represented in the "Kedah Annals" as having been applied to the country by the prince from Kedah who first occupied it, after a silver-pointed arrow he shot from his bow on taking possession of the territory. My impression is, however, that the name is far more ancient. According to the "Malay Annals," Pêrak, or part of it, was formerly called Manjong and was an ancient and great country, that gave Achin its first king. One of its chief cities was Gaṅgā-nagara, situated on a steep hill, with a fort on the bank of the Dinding River. This city was taken by Rāja Sūran of Bijnagar in about 1030–1050 A.D. (Leyden's "Malay Annals," p. 9).

The territory of Pêrak was, in former times, undoubtedly more extensive than at present, and probably stretched as far as Kedah, embracing the whole of the present Province Wellesley. Ancient remains as well as Pāli and Sanskrit inscriptions were found in the latter, which attest the existence, at a very early period, of Indu settlements along its coast. The simā slab, inscribed with the "Ye dharma" stanza and a few additional lines recording its erection by "the great ship-owner Buddhagupta, an inhabitant of Raktamṛttikā"—already mentioned in the paragraph devoted to Bērabai as having been assigned a date not later than the fourth century—was found in the northern part of the province; while seven Pāli inscriptions on a granite rock and monograms on bricks were discovered by Captain Low near the centre of the province at Tokūn, in about lat. 5° 27', or almost directly east of Pinang town. An inscribed slate-stone was found yet lower down, near Būkit Mertajam, in about lat. 5° 23'. Though I am not aware of any equally ancient remains having been discovered as
to designate silver. The Pêrak district is in Siamese called [Māry] (Mūang Pērā), pērā being a contracted form of the Malay Pērak (pronounced pēra).

It is the country called Pu-lah-kia by the Chinese, which De Rosny ("Les peuples Orientaux," etc., 1886 edition, p. 163) wrongly takes to be an error for Man-lah-kia (Malacca). In some cases the name Pū-ši seems also to apply to it, rather than to Bali or to the northern coast of Sumatra, as thought, respectively, by De Rosny and Groeneveldt.
yet in the present district of Pèrak proper, I have not the slightest doubt that some important settlement existed here from a very early period, corresponding to Ptolemy’s Palanda. For it is evident that there is a linguistical connection between the latter name and that of Pèrak; the Pèrak River and Ptolemy’s stream Palandos being similarly named after the district or its chief city. Hence it is logical, I think, to conclude that Ptolemy’s city was the capital of Pèrak situated on the upper part of the Pèrak River, somewhere about Kwāla Kangsa, the present seat of the government of that district.

Tharrha, a town (83).

The corrected position of this town falls within two or three minutes of either longitude or latitude of Trong, a small place at the head of the Kwāla Trong inlet, just below Lārūt. Names like Trong, Trang, Drang, etc., are frequent on the Malay Peninsula and the Gulf of Siām; and one finds them usually noted in old maps as Tarrana, Torano, etc., forms which closely approach the one adopted by Ptolemy in the present instance. Though there seems thus to be a perfect coincidence between Tharrha and Trong, which I could not help admitting at the outset in the map, I now feel strongly inclined to reject it, and to identify Ptolemy’s place with Tringano, further to the east on the other watershed of the peninsula. My reasons for this change in opinion are two. In the first place, Ptolemy assigns to Tharrha a position of 1° to the east of his Palanda, which he describes as an inland town and thus locates considerably away from the coast. It results, moreover, that at this point of the peninsula he made an error of displacement of his towns and coast to the west of their true position. This error is of about 42' at the mouth of the Pèrak River, and becomes greater as we proceed down the peninsula, reaching its maximum of 2° 13' at Kwāla Sembah, as shown by Table IV. If, then, we assume Kwāla Kangsa (true long. 101° 3') to be Palanda (Ptol. corr. long. 100° E.), Tharrha should be found at 101° 3' − 100° = 1° 3'
further east of its own corrected position, which is 100° 44' according to the table; hence the rectified longitude of Tharrha would become 100° 44' + 1° 3' = 101° 47' E. This carries us across the watershed into the boundaries of the Tringano district, and we would thus be justified in identifying Tharrha with the latter from a geographical point of view.

My second reason in support of the same identification is linguistical. Though Tringano and Treng-gānu be the usual spellings that obtain, among Europeans and Malays respectively, for the name of that district, the Siamese spelling is ǥānu (Tarānganū or Trānganū), which suggests a possible derivation from the Sanskrit Taramga ('a wave'), Taramgin ('wavy, undulating'), or Taramginī ('a river'). The latter designation would well apply to the stream flowing through the territory still termed the Trengan Valley. The probable old form of the name of the district is then Taramgana or Tarāngana, which may well represent Ptolemy's Tharrha.

Sabana, a mart (86).

I take this place to be the Selāngor district or its chief town. The corrected latitude resulting for Ptolemy's mart would show it to be placed near Kwāla Selāngor, that is, the mouth of the Selāngor River, where there is a small harbour. But it may be Kwāla Sembah further east, up the same stream. A place called Sābah exists at some forty miles further to the north near the mouth of the Bernam River; but whether it is a modern or an ancient settlement I do not know. At any rate, there is an evident connection between the names Sabana, Selāngor, Sābah, and Sembah; and without going into further particulars, I think it is safe to hold that Sabana represents a mart in the Selāngor district. From a linguistical point of view, Sembah seems preferable; in fact, in Malaysembah means 'obeisance, worship,' and its origin can thus be traced to the Sanskrit serana, which has the same sense and well represents, when
it be borne in mind that $c$ and $b$ are often interchanged in Sanskrit-derived terms, Ptolemy’s Sabana.

With this explanation I trust that I have clearly demonstrated that our author’s three towns in the Golden Khersonese, to wit: Palanda, Tharrha, and Sabana, correspond to settlements or chief cities in the districts of Pérak, Tringano, and Selângor respectively. I hardly think that, given the imperfect state of our present knowledge, a more satisfactory elucidation of Ptolemy’s geography of the southern part of the Malay Peninsula can be offered. The examination of the remaining places of the peninsula situated on the coast of the Gulf of Siãm will further confirm the foregoing results.

Cape Maleu Kōlon (87).

This is a term of evident South Indian extraction. We have in the Malabar and Dakhan districts many places of a similar name: for instance, a city called Malai-Kurram (near Nāgapatītan); Kollam or Quilon, which in the relation of Abu Zaid is termed Kulam-malai; the Kolla-malai Hills, etc. I have not the slightest doubt that the terms Malai or Malaya and Kola, Kāla, or Kolam have been imported to Further India by that stream of Southern Indian emigrants of dark or Negrito race, the descendants of the so-called Râkṣasas of old, and by their early successors the Dravidians, who constituted the pre-Āryan population of India; and who—driven to the south of the peninsula and compelled to take refuge in the islands by the Āryans advancing from the north—flowed on to the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago and to the coasts of Siãm and Kamboja, where they founded colonies and spread in the course of time their religion and newly acquired civilization among the rude natives of the country, as well as among the intrusive races that had settled upon it.

The term Malaya anciently designated in Southern India the region lying to the south of the Kāverī River,¹ probably

¹ See Kâlidāsa’s “Raghuvaṃśa,” iv, 45–51, written, according to tradition, during the first century B.C., and, according to the opinions of several Oriental scholars, much later, viz. in the fifth century A.D.
so named from the Malaya range of mountains which is said by Bhavabhūti to be encircled by that stream. Malaya was, in a word, the ancient name for the southern end of the Indian Peninsula, part of which is still termed Malayālam, Malayavāra, or Malabar. The Southern Indian emigrants above spoken of applied the same term Malaya to the Malay Peninsula evidently because of the latter forming the southern end of the Indo-Chinese continent. Hence the Malay Peninsula became known as Malaya-dīpa and its inhabitants as Malayas or Malays. This people anciently consisted of two distinct principal elements, namely: the Negrito autochthonous and the Mōn-Khmer, to which the Negrito-Draavidian or pre-Āryan from Southern India soon added itself; and should not be confounded with the modern Malay nation, which has apparently resulted, at least in the Peninsula, from a fusion of the descendants of the above-named races with later comers, from both the Archipelago and the Indo-Chinese continent. We must, therefore, distinguish between the ancient Malayas or Malays and the modern Malāys or Malayās. The Malayas are mentioned as an Eastern people in the Bengal recension of the Rāmāyaṇa; and enumerated along with the Vijayas in the Mahābhārata. Though both these names may refer to peoples in the east of India proper, who had nothing to do with the ancient Malays, yet we shall see in the sequel that Vijaya was the name of the portion of the Gulf of Siām next to the Malay Peninsula. This circumstance would tend to show that the ancient Malays (i.e. the early population of the Malay Peninsula) were the people meant in the two epics referred to above. The name Samangas, given to the savage Negrito tribes of the Malay Peninsula north of the Pèrak River, is also probably imported from Southern India, where the Mahābhārata mentions the Samangas.

1 In his “Mahāvīra-carita,” v. 3; date, seventh century A.D.
2 The Mahābhārata’s list has: “Samangas, Karakas, Kukkuras, Kokarakas,” etc. All these we find represented in the Malay Peninsula, in the names of the Samangas, the township of Kava or Korā mentioned above, and the name of Ptolemy’s city Kokkonagara.
As regards the terms Kola, Kolam, Cola, etc., they appear to be etymologically connected, and to have in the early days designated the dark-coloured pre-Aryan population of Southern India in general; for they still survive in many place-names of that region, such as Coromandel (Cola-maṇḍala), Kollam (Quilon), etc., and are met with in the old records in such toponymics as Kolapāṭṭana (a sea-port on the Coromandel coast mentioned in the Milinda Pañhā), Kolāmēca (a name for the country of Kalinga), etc. There is, besides, the evidence adduced in a former page, that in both Siām and Burmā the people from Southern India are up to this day called Kulā. In Siāmese the term Kulā (กู่, โกลา) is more particularly applied to the natives of Malayavāra or Malabar. It would thus appear that, as far as Malabar and even the whole of the ancient Malaya region of Southern India are concerned, Malaya and Kulā (or Kola, Kolam, Kulam, etc.) are synonymous ethnical terms. This explains how the Chinese came to apply the names of Ku-lun and K’un-lun (evidently derived from either Kulam or Kolam, transferred from Southern India to the Malay Peninsula along with the designation Malaya) to the ancient population of the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago. That this population included a large proportion of Negrito-Dravidian elements would appear from a passage of I-tsing (A.D. 671–685), who, speaking of the people of the Ku-lun, or as he terms it Chūeh-lun (i.e. Colam) country, says that its inhabitants are of a black complexion, with crisp hair.¹ The close connection we have noticed between the terms Malaya and Kola as applied to the southern end of the Indian Peninsula (the ancient Malaya country) also explains the fact that we find them in that region coupled together in many a place-name, such as Malai-kurram, Kulam-malai, Kolla-malai, etc., already referred to above. In the same manner we find both those

¹ Chavannes' "I-tsing," pp. 63, 64, note. In the Rāmāyaṇa, notes its eminent Italian translator Gorresio, the Rākṣasas are described as being of a complexion as black as collyrium, with curly woolly hair and thick lips. This picture thoroughly coincides with the one left us of the Ku-lun by I-tsing.
terms combined on the Malay Peninsula—where they were transplanted from Southern India—in the name of the cape recorded by Ptolemy under the form of Maleu-kölön, which is evidently a transcription of the compound Malai-kolam or Malai-kulam. It will be noticed that this promontory occupies on the coast of the Malay Peninsula a similar position to that which the town of Malai-kurram holds on the coast of India. This circumstance would justify the assumption that near the cape now under discussion there may have been a settlement named after Malai-kurram on the Coromandel coast, and that the cape came in the course of time to be designated after such a settlement. By calculation the position of the cape aforesaid would be fixed on that point of the eastern coast of the Malay Peninsula where runs the line of demarcation between the states of Pahang and Tringano; a point noted for no less than four rather conspicuous promontories distinguished in the maps as North and Middle Cape; South Cape or Tanjong Puling; and Tanjong Kuántán, the most northern of all, the actual latitude of which is 4° 8' N., exactly as calculated for Cape Maleu Kölön. I therefore do not hesitate to assume Tanjong Kuántán to be the headland meant by Ptolemy. My predecessors have almost invariably jumped to the conclusion that the promontory our author had in mind was Ramenia (or Rumenia) Point at the southern end of the peninsula. I must, however, differ from them on account not only of the calculated result obtained, but also on the score that Ptolemy evidently knew nothing of the configuration of the peninsula below the fourth parallel of North latitude. Hence he made the peninsula terminate abruptly at Palanda (Pérak) on the western side, and at Cape Maleu Kölön (Tanjong Kuántán) on the eastern; assuming, I suppose, that the coast ran straight, or nearly so, between the two places, since he assigns to both the latter the same latitude, and makes them 2° of longitude apart. The correct distance is 3° of true longitude.

A similar name to that of the headland now under
consideration is that of the town of Malacca, on the opposite coast but further south. Though a possible derivation from Āmalaka, the Sanskrit name for the Emblic myrobalan, has been suggested (why not from Mālaka = the Nimba tree?), I cannot credit it, and prefer to hold that the name of Malacca is either a modification of Malayakolam or Malayaka (meaning the 'country of the Malays'); or that it is identical with Mālaka, the name of a Southern Indian tribe mentioned in the Mahābhārata, transplanted, like many others, on the soil of the Malay Peninsula.

Attaba River (88, 184).

This stream cannot be other than the Tringano or, I think preferably, the Libih River. Both have their source in the vicinity of Mount Batu Ātap, a conspicuous peak in 4° 33' N. lat. In Malay batu = 'a rock,' and ātap = 'thatch.' Hence either of the two streams may have taken its early name from the mountain, and become known as the Ātap stream,' converted by Ptolemy into Attaba.

Kōli, a town (89).

This is Kelantan, more correctly spelled Kalantan. Its probable ancient name, Kōli, appears to have been introduced from Northern India, where a city called Koli (from the Koli or jujube tree, it is said) is known to have existed near Kapilavastu, and reputed to have been the birthplace of Māyā, the mother of Buddha. The present name (Kalantan) of both the district and its chief city presumably was formed by affixing to the word Kōli, or to some one of its dialectal forms Kolom, Kolam, either the term thāna (or tānah in Malay), meaning 'place,' 'country,' or the particles anta, antam (limit, boundary), thus obtaining the compounds Kolamthāna, Kolantaṁ, etc., which by vulgar parlance soon became modified into Kelantan and Kalantan. The district so named is, no doubt, the country of Ko-lo or Ko-lo Fu-sha-lo, described in the Annals of the T'ang dynasty (A.D. 618–907) and in Ma Tuan-lin as lying to the

south-east of both P’ian-p’ian (S.W. Siām) and Wan-tan (Bāndōn). The words Ko-lo Fu-sha-lo may represent either Kolā-badara, Kolā-bhadra, or Kola-bazar. In the first reading, Kolā and badara are, respectively, the Pāli and Sanskrit designations for the jujube-tree, the Siamese name of which is, however, Phusā (= Budrā), evidently from a Prākr̥ta or other Indian vernacular form Budara or Busar, plainly represented in the Chinese transcript Fu-sha-lo. In the event of this surmise proving correct, our identification of Ptolemy’s Koli with the Ko-lo of Chinese writers would receive a complete confirmation. That Ko-lo was a very ancient place appears from Ma Tuan-lin’s (loc. cit.) statement that it was heard of by his countrymen since the time of the Han dynasty (b.c. 206 to a.d. 221).

There is also frequent mention in Ma Tuan-lin and other Chinese writers of a seaport called Ku-lo, which appears to have been much visited by Chinese traders during the early times of the Sung dynasty (a.d. 960–1127). But though the location of this port was evidently on the Malay Peninsula, it is doubtful whether it was the same place as the ancient Koli or Ko-lo and the present Kalantan.

Kalantan is, no doubt, a very ancient foundation, early referred to in the Malay annals as a powerful kingdom, while its abundance in natural resources and mineral wealth places it in a prominent position among the Malay States. Hence it must have been from a very ancient period one of the principal resorts of trade on this coast.

Perimula (90).

The corrected position obtained for this town agrees very closely with Ligor, the longitude of which is about 100° E. and the latitude 8° 23’ N. The old city, however, appears to have been situated further south than the present one. Besides Ligor, a very ancient foundation itself, there are two other towns in this region which claim a very respectable antiquity, namely, P’hattalung and Singora (Saṅkhalā, or Sūṅkhalā). While formerly quite accessible from the sea, and connected by overland routes with the marts on
the western coast of the peninsula, those three towns have now almost entirely lost the high importance they had of yore as seaports, owing to the silting of their harbours and the accumulation of sands that ever tend to block them. Ligor is already an inland town, no more accessible but by small boats through a winding tidal creek; while P’hattalung may still be reached by light-draught vessels through the inland sea—now almost completely landlocked—encompassed by the island of Pulo Tantalam; and Singora, from being situated at the outlet of the same inland sea, enjoys yet a relatively better position as a maritime town than the two former, though also doomed to become an inland city at no distant date. While the earliest mention I can find of Singora and P’hattalung in the old Siamese records does not go further back than the thirteenth century, it is known, nevertheless, that both these towns coexisted with Ligor as Indu settlements prior to that period.

As regards Ligor, I find it referred to as an independent kingdom, and under the name of Nagara Śrī Dharmarāja, in a Pāli MS. chronicle of Lamp’hūn (Labong of European writers) discovered by me in Siām, as early as A.D. 924, when its king moved with a fleet to attack Lop’haburī (Lavapura). It is next mentioned in a Sukhothai (Sukhodaya) inscription—dated Śaka 1214 = A.D. 1292 and now preserved within the precincts of the royal temple Wat P’hraḥ Kēṭu in Bāngkōk—among the southern provinces of Siām subject to the sway of the kings of Sukhothai.

The foundation of Ligor is ascribed by tradition to Prince Danta-kumāra, who, with Princess Hemamālā, fled from Dantapura on the coast of India near the mouth of the Godāvarī in A.D. 310, taking with him a tooth-relic of Buddha, and was wrecked on the ‘Diamond Sands’ of the Malay Peninsula, where now rises Ligor.1

The famous tooth-relic is said to be enshrined in the caitya of Wat Nā P’hraḥ Thāṭ (Vara-dhāṭu) rising in the

1 See Mahāvīraśa, ch. xxvii; Cunningham’s “Ancient Geography of India,” p. 534 seq.; Colonel Low in Journal R.A.S. Bengal, 1848, part ii, p. 37.
centre of the present city of Ligor; and this monument is thus regarded as one of the most ancient in Siām. The story as vulgarly told is, that (a descendant of) king Śrī Dharmāsoka, driven by pestilence from his own land of Magadha, set sail with a remnant of his people in a golden junk, and was wrecked on the ‘Diamond Sands.’ These sandbanks, once sea-covered, are now the sandy plains in which stands Ligor, and the natives of the place call them up to the present day Sāi-p’het (साइपेठ = Vajra-vālukā in Sanskrit). A large body of Brāhmans still live in the city, remaining distinct from the Siāmese, and yearly performing the Swing Festival and other propitiatory ceremonies. They are commonly reputed to be the descendants of those that came with the founder of the city. The above is nothing more than one of the many Buddhist traditions transplanted on Siāmese soil from India; traditions which, when their origin remains undetected, may lead astray the searcher after the ancient history of this country. It is well known that the ‘Diamond Sands’ of this legend are to be found not at Ligor, but on the coast of India, at or near Dharaṇikāta, in the neighbourhood of the present Masulipatam. In that country, inhabited by Nāgas, a relic-casket containing one of the original eight divisions of Buddha’s remains, existed enshrined in a costly stūpa. It was, according to the Mahāvamsa, carried off thence to Ceylon in the fifth year of the reign of Duṭṭhagāmanī, i.e. B.C. 157, and enclosed in a great stūpa at Ruanwelli. But, according to other accounts, in A.D. 310, when prince Danta-kumāra fled from Dantapura, and was wrecked on the Diamond Sands of Majerika, these same relics were still preserved there, being removed to Ceylon three years later, that is in A.D. 313, which date General Cunningham thinks more correct. A gorgeous, magnificent stūpa existed, in fact, on the sands of Majerika between the Godāvari and Kṛṣṇā, as ascertained by General Cunningham; and there stood also the city of Veṅgi-pura, the capital of the country, which we find recorded in Ptolemy under the name of Malanga.
That country had early relations with the Malay Peninsula and Siam, as proved by the Veugi characters employed in inscriptions found in the neighbourhood of the stupa of Phra Phatham in Lower Siam, as well as in the province of Ligor and other parts of the peninsula. Hence it can be explained how the legend of the relics could be transplanted into Siam and referred to the ‘Diamond Sands’ of Ligor long after Buddhism was introduced therein. I have no doubt that it is only at a later period, perhaps in the eighth or ninth century, that Ligor and its district was given its present classic name of Nagara Śrī Dharmarāja, an evidently Buddhist designation,¹ vulgarly curtailed into Nagara, pronounced in Siamese Nakhon and corruptedly Lakhon, out of which the Malays and Europeans have made Ligor.

But the place had existed long before as an Indi settlement, under a name which I think closely identical with that left us by Ptolemy: Perimula. It must be observed, in fact, that the sandy plains about Ligor are up to the present day called by the natives Thalē-sāi (තල්හා ජායි), i.e. ‘Sea of Sands.’ As I previously remarked, they were once a sea-bottom, and a communication probably existed through them across the peninsula, which became blocked by sands thrown on the coast by the waves, and disappeared through elevation of the land above sea-level. Thus the extensive sandy plains about Ligor, and the large island of Pulo Tantalam skirting the inland sea between Singora and P’hattalung, were formed. This phenomenon is very common on both coasts of the Malay Peninsula. Where it occurs the country appears lined with sandbanks raised above the surrounding land, looking like as many sea-beaches or ridges thrown up by a meeting of currents, forty to fifty yards broad and very long. In Sanskrit one

¹ Dharmarāja—‘king of righteousness’—is one of the epithets of Buddha, and I do not think that it can apply in this instance to Kāla or Yama, the Indi god of the departed and judge of the dead, who is also called Dharmarāja, ‘king of justice.’
of such sandbanks would be called *pulina*; and a long succession or accumulation of them might be termed *pulina-mūla*. This is, I think, the origin of the Malay word *permātang*, which, according to Logan,¹ is employed to designate them. From this fact, I notice, a tract of land situated just above Kwāla Selāngor on the opposite side of the peninsula, is marked in the maps² *Permātang*. In a similar manner this term might be applied to the coast of Ligor, where the same sandy formation of the soil is perhaps more extensive and characteristic than anywhere else on the eastern coast of the peninsula or on the remaining part of the Gulf of Siām.

From *Pulina-mūla* and *Permātang* to *Puli-mūla*, *Perimūla* and *Permūda* is an easy transition; and that it is so, is shown by a map of the Malay Archipelago by Porro,³ where in the place of the Gulf of Siām we read "Golpho Permūda." Such is, then, beyond doubt the name by which that gulf was known in Ptolemy's time; and a name it received from one of its principal marts, i.e. *Perimūla*, afterwards known as *Nagara Śri Dharmarāja* or Ligor. From the first syllable, *Per* or *Peri*, of its name, the Chinese navigators and traders of the sixth and subsequent centuries made *P'o-li* and *P'o-lo*, terms which, by Groeneveldt and other Sinologues, have been in every instance taken to mean the island of Bali. I have reason to believe, however, that in some particular cases they designate *Perimūla*; whilst in others they apply best to *Palanda* (Pērak).

Towards the tenth century we begin to meet with the terms *Lo-yū*, or *Lu-yū* (already noticed at p. 90 above, as the name of a State adjoining *Ta-k'un-lun* or Takōla on the south), and *Lo-yūeh* (a country located by Ma Tuan-lin and others at fifteen days' navigation to the south of *Tan-meit-liu* or Tēmala), which warn us that by that time *Perimula* had changed its name to Ligor. A few centuries later on we find Ligor referred to in Japanese accounts as

¹ "Journal of the Malay Archipelago," vol. iii, p. 398, footnote.
² Map of the Malay Peninsula, published by the Straits Branch R.A.S., 1887.
Rikkon, Rokkon, in imitation of its vulgar Siamese name, Lakhôn.¹

Balongka (91).

This is mentioned by Ptolemy, along with Kokkonagara, Tharrha, and Palanda, as an inland town of the Golden Khersonese, and must not be confounded, as often has been the case, with Balonga Métropolis (121), which we shall meet in the sequel on the coast of Annam. The corrected latitude of Balonga, obtained from calculation, indicates its position to be on the Kra Isthmus of the Malay Peninsula; and I have therefore identified it with C’hump’hôn (คูมป์ or ขุ้มป้อม), the eastern terminus of the ancient overland route across the peninsula at that point. It is doubtful, however, whether the place-name C’hump’hôn (Jumbara, a vernacular corrupted form of the Sanskrit Udumbara) can claim so high an antiquity as to be already in existence, much less well known, in Ptolemy’s time. I have, in fact, reason to think that Kra, as a name of the village, mountain-pass, and isthmus in this region, must have been the better known, though under a more classic form, at a far earlier period. Hence the actual C’hump’hôn village, though already in existence at the time, must have at first acquired notoriety either as the port of Kra or as the eastern terminus of the route across the Kra Pass. Kra in Siamese (กร, literally Kraḥ), and Kura in Malay, are both names for the mottled land-tortoise (Testudo elongata, Blyth), so plentiful about the Kra Isthmus. Several personal visits to that district, and a protracted residence in its neighbourhood, make me certain of this fact; and I may add that more

¹ I do not know on what authority Professor Keane states ("Geography of the Malay Peninsula, Indo-China," etc., p. 17) that Ligor "was founded four centuries ago by the king of Ayuthia." The Kōf Monthierabia (Kata Mondirapa) or Palatine Law of A.D. 1369, enacted by the king who founded Ayuthia, already enumerates Nagara Śrī Dharmarāja (Ligor) among the States that owed allegiance to Siâm. See, moreover, p. 107 supra for the existence of Ligor as far back as A.D. 924.
than once I took part in tortoise-hunting expeditions in the valleys of that region, which form one of the sports one can have there after a shower of rain. The natives keep trained dogs for the purpose, which are taught to pursue the tortoises and to overset every one they may catch upon its back, belly upwards, rendering its escape impossible. In this manner the beautifully shell-clad Chelonians are easily and very soon captured by the dozen. One of the Sanskrit names for the tortoise is *palânga*, which well represents Ptolemy's *Balongka*. I therefore hold that *Palânga*, or *Palânga*, is the original name of the port and district, which was later on translated by the Siamese into *Kraḥ*, its actual designation. In this opinion I am further confirmed by the fact that some of the Siamese records mention a *Mūang Prong*, i.e. an ancient district by the name of *Prong*, which appears to have included the territory of Kra, or rather to have been identical with the present Kra District itself. In *Prong* one may plainly recognize the original term *Palânga*. I believe, moreover, that this is the country which Chinese writers of the Liang (A.D. 502–557) and Sui (A.D. 589–618) dynasties term *Lang-kia, Lang-chia-hsü*, or *Lang-ya-hsü*, and represent as having sent an embassy to the Chinese Court in A.D. 515 with a letter, one passage of which says: "the precious Sanskrit is generally known in this land." 1 I quote this sentence in order to show the possibility of the country being given a Sanskrit name such as *Palânga*, which I proposed above as the equivalent of either Kra, *Balongka*, or *Lang-kia* (*Lanka, Lanka*). In the same extract occurs also the statement that "the people say that their country was established *more than 400 years ago*," which carries us back to the first century of our era, and proves the existence at that early period of the port, district, or kingdom of *Palânga*, giving Ptolemy full time to be aware of it. After the legend of the sacred relics from Dantapura had been brought over and localized to Ligor, as previously

1 Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 135 seq. For other particulars see De Rosny, op. cit., pp. 208, 254; and Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., vol. ii, pp. 455, 456.
noted, the name Palānga, corrupted by vulgar pronunciation into Bālānga and Malānga, had become probably identical, in the minds of the people, with Malānga (Vengī-pura), the capital of the Nāgas of Majerika. At the same time, the vernacular form Krah having originated, it may have been brought into use coupled at first with the ancient classical name of the country in its corrupted form, thus: Kra-balānga, Kra-malānga, etc. Here we have the kingdom of Kia-mo-lang-kia (Kāmalaṅkā or Kamalanga) spoken of by Hwen-tsang about 638 A.D., and located by him to the south-east of Shih-li Ch’u-ta-lo (Śrī-kṣetra or Prome) near a great bay. Of all localities named by ancient authors in Indo-China, none has perhaps more puzzled scholars as this kingdom of Langa or Kamalanga, especially as next to nothing is heard of it after the seventh century. One solitary authority is, however, found to state that Lang-yā-hsiu is near to the country of P’an-p’an¹ (South-western Siām). Ma Tuan-lin locates P’an-p’an in the northern part of an island (Malay Peninsula) separated from Lin-i (Campā) by a little sea (Gulf of Siām).

The kingdom of Kāmalaṅkā or Kamalanga must have originally occupied the region of the Malay Peninsula above the Pāk-chān inlet and the Kra Isthmus, being thus conterminous with the district of Takōla on the south. Northwards it must have extended as far as the Salwīn; for the kingdom of K’un-lang, which in a former page (89 supra, note 5) we have identified with Kamalanga, is located by the great Chinese cyclopaedia between Hsiao-k’un-lun (Taikkulā) and Ta-k’un-lun (Takōla). In Hayton’s Travels there is mentioned a province called Kalaan, which is said to form the eastern limit of the Kingdom of India.² This term Kalaan may apply to the same region or district called Kalah-bār by the Arabs, Kamalanga by Hwen-tsang, and Camelān by the Portuguese writers.³ Another name of

¹ De Rosny, op. cit., p. 254, quoting from the “Yuen-kien-hui-han.”
² De Backer’s “L’Extéreme Orient au Moyen-Âge,” p. 130.
³ In Danvers’ “Portuguese in India” a mention of Camelān occurs in the following passage from vol. ii, p. 126: “Ribeiro . . . [in A.D. 1602] gained a victory over King Massinga, in the province of Camelān, in which the King was slain.”
country may be quoted, which is probably derived from *Kamalanga*, and as such may show that the Kamalanga Kingdom must have at one time extended well up the Salwin valley. The country alluded to is *Kammatani*, which I found mentioned as a kingdom (conquered by Warerū, the chief of Martaban, towards the end of the thirteenth century) in the "Rājādhīrāja," a chronicle of Pegu preserved in Siām. The kingdom of *Kammatani* is, perhaps, to be identified with the present *Kamantlay* (situated on the Salwin to the north of Martaban), which may have been its capital. It is evident, from the above considerations, that the ancient kingdom of *Kamalanga* must have been at one time pretty well extensive. In connection with the etymology of its name I may add a few more observations.

In a Peguan (Taleng) work, or rather romance, recounting a supposed journey of Buddha, followed by his Mōn (Taleng) disciple Gavampati-thera, throughout Indo-China and the Malay Archipelago, it is stated that Buddha, after paying a visit to Achīn in Sumatra, crossed over with a retinue to a place on the Malay Peninsula, where the celestials had provided for him a stone bench (*pallanka*) upon which to sit cross-legged. And thus did the great Teacher rest upon it for awhile, and from this fact that place was thenceforward known by the name of *Pallanka*, i.e. 'stone-bench.' Some commentators believe *Pallanka* to be Malacca, but there is no likelihood of the latter place being meant. It is quite evident that the allusion is intended for *Palāṅga*—Ptolemy's *Balongka*—for which the author of the romance invented a new etymology, endeavouring to justify it by the above legend. It is in

---

1 Through the kindness of the Rev. Edward O. Stevens, up to 1898 doing useful mission work among the Burmese and Mōns at Moulmain, I have lately obtained a complete copy of the Peguan text of this work, which I had, so far, seen but partially in a Siamese translation. Though based on pure fiction, this work is valuable because it contains many interesting particulars on the ancient geography and history of several countries in Indo-China, more especially Pegu. It is the work alluded to in the first page of the introduction to Haswell's "Grammatical Notes on the Peguan Language," Rangoon, 1874.
the same district or in its neighbourhood, in fact, that, as I have previously remarked, a Sri-pāda or holy footprint is said to exist on the Suvaṇṇa-mālī mountain, which is believed to have been left by Buddha as a memento of his visit on that same occasion.

Of the land-route from the Pāk-chān inlet across the Kra Pass to C'hump'hōn I have already spoken. The distance between the two termini is no more than twenty-three miles, and the elevation of the range does not exceed 500 feet. The bights on both sides offer even now good anchorages for ships; hence it is no wonder if a large portion of the Far Eastern trade passed through this way in the early days. The overland route across the Kra Isthmus must have acquired great favour after the disappearance of the supposed sea-passage between Trang and Ligor about the beginning of the Christian Era. Hence we hear of Lang-kia or Lang-ya-heiu being established as a State in the first century A.D. Ancient remains of temples and of earthen ramparts are still to be found in the environs of the present village of Kra, which would justify the assumption that it was, for some time at least, the chief city of that State in its early days. Adjoining the Kra district on the north is the province named Lan-ya or Legnya and, in Siamese, เมืองลังก้า (Muang Lāng-gya or Laṅkhā) , which name is probably another linguistic relic of the old designation of the kingdom of Palānga, alias Lang-kia or Kamalanga. There are besides the two islets of Laṅkachīu (Koh Langkachīu)—one only of which is shown in the charts and wrongly marked "Koh Katu"—lying nearly opposite C'hump'hōn Bay, to attest up to this day the true location of the seaport of Lang-ya-heiu, so much frequented by Chinese junks during the seventh century (see Chavannes' "Pélerins Bouddhistes," by I-.tsing, pp. 57, 78, and 100).
(7) Northern Siām and Lāos.

The region of the Eastern or White-bellied Lāu, lying to the south of Yūnman and encompassed by the two great bends of the Mé-Khōng on the west, by Tonkin on the east, and by the eighteenth parallel of latitude on the south, was known to Ptolemy as the country of the Doānai—a people living, he says, along the river of the same name. He does not give us any further particulars about either the people or the country, but simply states that to the latter succeeds a mountainous region adjoining the land of the Lēstai, wherein are found elephants and tigers. This mountainous zone must be identified, I think, with the territory of the present States of C'hiēng-māi and Nān, that is, Western Lāos, and with the hill tracts that bound the Mé-Khōng's bend at C'hiēng-Khān on the south and form the watershed between it and the Mé-Nām. In this region elephants and tigers are plentiful, in fact, up to this day, and the designation of Lān-c'hāng given from times immemorial to the territory of Eastern Lāos and its capital—and adopted by the Chinese under the form Lan-ts'ang for the stream that runs through that territory, namely, the Mé-Khōng River—contains an allusion to the presence of elephants in the region now under consideration. Lān-c'hāng means, in fact, as I shall point out with more details in the sequel, 'the Elephants' pasture-grounds.'

Previous to this designation being applied, however, or soon after its origin, the country of the Lāu was classically known as Mālāva-deśa or Mālēa, a name which it retained up to quite recent times, but under the corrupt forms of Malā, Mālā, or Mālāva. In native records of the last four centuries, the State of C'hiēng-māi is often spoken of as the Mālā or Mālāva country, and those of Lūang Phra Thām Bāng and Wiēng-Chan as the
Savaka-Malā, or Savaka-Malāva kingdom. But in Ptolemy's time, and probably for several centuries earlier, either the latter kingdom or its capital city was, as we learn from our author himself, named Dasana or Doana. As the term Malava collectively applied to the whole region of Lāos was imported from Central India, where it designated the country presently known as Mālavā, so was the term Dasārṇa introduced from the same quarter, and, as there it denoted the eastern part of Malava, it was by analogy given in Further India to the corresponding portion of the Indo-Chinese Malava, i.e. Eastern Lāos. The term Dasārṇa thus becomes identical with Ptolemy's Dasana. It must be remarked that, but for our eminent geographer, we could never have known that Eastern Lāos and its capital once bore such a name. For, although we shall meet with traces of it in the legend of the foundation of Lūang P'hraḥ Bāṅ, it is certain that Dasārṇa, as an appellative for that district and town, has long become forgotten, being superseded by the alternative designation Savaka Mālā and others, which we shall have occasion to notice in the sequel.

It is difficult to believe that the name Malava was given to the region of the Lāu by mere accident. The most natural inference seems to be, that it must have been suggested by the presence in that region of tribes calling themselves Lāu (Lāva) and Lāvā (Lavā). The former, known to the Chinese since A.D. 47 under the name of Āi-Lāu, had undoubtedly been, for some centuries previous, in occupation of the western part of Yūnnan, whence they extended southwards along the Mē-Khōng and westwards towards the Irāvatī. It was they, or an elder branch of their race, who founded on the banks of the latter-named river that kingdom of Sein, Cin, or Shen alluded to in a former section of this paper (p. 62 supra). Those who advanced down the Mē-Khōng,

1 In Siamese: Malā prathēt, Mūlā prathēt; or Mālāva prathēt, Mūlāva prathēt; and Savaka Malāi, or Savaka Malāva, prathēt. The Siamese term prathēt, though thus pronounced, is written prathēi, and thus it is equivalent to the Sanskrit pradeśa or deśa.
into the country which forms the present habitat of their descendants, retained their name of Lāo or Lāu, by which they have been known up to this day. It is, therefore, not unlikely that the region in which they settled was designated Mālava or Mālavā with special reference to their tribal name. In the dialect of the Northern Shans (Lāu) the term Mūang, meaning a country, is pronounced Mō; hence Lāu's Land, called in modern Siamese Mūang Lāu, would be termed Mō-Lāu, a name which immigrants from the districts of Northern India where Prākṛt tongues were spoken, would soon classicize into Mālava or Mālavā, thus identifying, as it were, the new country with a district of their venerated fatherland.

As regards the Lawās, Lawāh, or Wah, known to have occupied from a very early period the whole mountainous region between the Mē-Không and the Salwīn rivers, and now restricted mostly to the wild tracts of the main watershed between the 18th and 23rd parallels, they are essentially a hill people, as exemplified by the term Đōi (meaning a mountain), applied to them by the Lāu. Though they appear to have at one time held the country to the east and south of the upper Mē-Không bend as well, they were driven off to their present haunts by the Lāu; hence it is unlikely that they are the people alluded to in the name Mālava-pradeśa applied to the country whence they were so early expelled. Moreover, it is doubtful whether the Lawās were actually so called at that period. The only name recorded for them or the early ancestors of their race is that of C'hīeng, meaning an elevated place, hill, or plateau, which I think to be identical with the Chinese criptors (ching). Their cities, from being generally built on some eminence, were likewise termed C'hīeng, e.g. C'hīeng Tung, C'hīeng Rūng, etc., which the Burmese write Kyaing Tôn, Kyaing Yôn, etc.; and their country was called the C'hīeng, i.e. 'Hilly,' Country.¹ The branch of

¹ I cannot agree with Mr. E. H. Parker's opinion expressed in the China Review (vol. xix, p. 75, n. 65; and vol. xx, p. 340), that the prefix Kiang [C'hīeng] of Kiang-tung, etc., is identical with Kien, the Nan Chao.
the Thai race that conquered their territory was, as a consequence, named Thai-Čhieng or Lâu-Čhieng, and continued to prefix the term Čhieng to the names of the cities it established in the sequel, such as, for instance, Čhieng-mâi. In the course of time the word Čhieng thus became synonymous with Mûang, the Thai term for city, district, etc. But its original sense remained embodied in several expressions employed to designate products of the hills and woods, e.g. Čhamot-Čhieng, Kót-Čhieng, etc., meaning up to the present day, respectively, musk and medicinal bulbs of the hills.¹

word for 'department,' and that it "practically means the same as mûang." The actual Siamese word for department is krom; and this is, I think, what kien means. The Čhieng here alluded to is evidently identical with the Chinese 

¹ According to the traditions of the Lawâs, or Čhiengs, their ancestors had founded a powerful State, several centuries before the Christian Era, which extended eastwards to the frontiers of Tonkin. Their chief or king, styled Khûn Châkâng, resided in the city of Čhieng Chââng, now called Čhieng Chông, situated somewhere about Müang Liem, near the watershed between the Mê-Không and the Salwin. It was also the Čhieng who established the once famous State of Müang Yông or Mahiyâgana - naga, further down the Mê-Không Valley. The latter was overthrown, as I learn from the Müang Yông Chronicle, about 100 years before the Buddhist Era, or circa 644 B.C., by Suranda Kumâra, the second son of the Thai chief of Čhieng Rûng, who murdered all the Čhieng chiefs, making himself master of their country. The defeated Čhiengs then fled towards Lân-Čhieng, and settled along the Mê-Không.

After the Lân had conquered Čhieng Rûng, Müang Yông, and other foundations of the Čhieng people, and had practically become masters of the region occupied by the latter, they were thenceforward known as Lân Čhieng, i.e. 'the Lân of the Čhieng country.' They are, however, also termed Lân Čhieng, on account of their still worshiping, in common with the Lawâs and other hill tribes of non-Thaï race, several objects which they say once belonged to a superior being, perhaps a king or hero of the former Čhieng (Lawâ) empire, by the name of Čhieng. These objects are:

1. The Mahorâdika drum, a brass tymbal open at the bottom and ornamented on the top by four raised figures of frogs, disposed round the rim at equal intervals; whence its vulgar name of Klông-kob, meaning 'frog-drum.' It has
The peoples of the Thai race are, contrary to the Lawāṣ and other mountain tribes, a valley-dwelling population, and are wont to settle only on the banks of streams or lakes. Hence the Chinese called them Pa-i, a term meaning ‘valley barbarians.’ The corresponding Sanskrit word is Droṇaka, the sense of which is ‘people of valleys,’ or rather of lakes, and occurs as the name of a tribe in the Mahābhārata’s list, where Proṣaka is given as an alternative term. In Northern Indo-China the term Droṇaka appears to me to be represented by

been adopted from an early date in Siamese State ceremonies, and is much prized, besides the Lawāṣ, by many other hill tribes of the same race, such as the Karens, etc. (See McMahon’s “Karens of the Golden Khersonese,” pp. 279, 280.)

2. The Thâu Lê, a kettle-drum similar to the preceding, but of a ruder make. As to the use of gongs or tymbals in healing sickness among the rude tribes of Yünman, see Ma Tuan-lǐn, article Ye-lang.

3. Pieces of hyaline quartz, chalcedony, or even sandstone, bored through the centre and strung up together. This litholatry also predominates among certain tribes of Kamboja, e.g. the C’haráí, Stięng, etc.; and the Karens of Burmā, especially the Bghái, Sgaw, etc. (see “British Burma Gazetteer,” vol. ii, p. 241), who sacrifice animals in their honour, offering up the blood to them.

The term C’hien also means ‘mixed’ or ‘crossed,’ like the Sanskrit Yavana and Kirãna (for which latter see Cunningham’s “Ancient Geography of India,” p. 509); and is employed to denote a mixed population or crossed race, especially of new settlers with aborigines or hill tribes, such as expressed in the words Khóm C’hien, ‘the mixed Khóm or Kambojans’; Lâu C’hien or Thai C’hien, ‘the mixed Thai or Lâu.’ The term Lâu C’hien referred to above as originating from the C’hien worship adopted by this people from the Lawāṣ, means therefore as well, ‘Lâu that have become mixed or crossed up with the hill tribes (Lawāṣ, etc.).’ Here we have the key of the mystery by which the term Yona or Yavana was applied to that branch of the Thai race that settled in the country of the C’hienos or Lawāṣ, commonly known to Europeans as Western Lào or Shan country. The same region is, therefore, often spoken of in native records as Yonakadesa; and its Lâu or Thai inhabitants are named Yuen (i.e. Yavana) by their white-bellied brothers of Lüang P’hrab Bāng, Yun or Yôn Shan by the Burmese, and Lâu C’hien by Siamese; all these terms being equivalent in meaning.

1 “The cultivated valleys and uplands among the hills of Western Yünman are called ‘Pa’; ‘I’ means barbarian. Thus ‘valley barbarians.’” (Ney Elias’ “History of the Shans,” p. 37, n. 4.) — The Chinese spelling is: 白, 百, or 擇. 白 = Pa-i, or Po-i. 白 means ‘white’; 百 means ‘a hundred,’ ‘all.’

Ptolemy's Doānai and the Ts'wan of the Chinese, while its alternative Proṣaka remains probably preserved to us in the name of the P'u-tsz or Peh-tsz, a tribe undoubtedly of the same (Thai) race, which may be connected with the city of Western Yūn nan that Ptolemy names Posinara.1

One should not be in the least surprised at finding so many Sanskrit names of peoples, regions, and cities transplanted here from India, especially from its northern part, and often distributed in a similar topographical order as they originally occurred there. This latter circumstance is peculiarly interesting, and constitutes, perhaps, the most striking example of what we may be permitted to term toponymic mimicry that we know of. Already we have noticed the homology in the distribution and relative location of geographical names, between the coast of Arakan and the western seaboard of India at similar latitudes. Want of space prevents us from going into further details, beyond saying that the same imitation is carried on with some degree of accuracy, in so far as the relative positions of the topographical names are concerned, from the Gulf of Martaban across to Lāos and the greater part of Northern Indo-China. In fact, while we have here a second Mālvā and another Dāsārṇa, representing, respectively, Western and Eastern Lāos, as already noticed, we find further north, in Yūn nan, a second Gandhāra, as well as Mithilā and Videha or Videhā; a Campā in the east (Annam), and a Malaya in the south (Malay Peninsula).

The rule does not, of course, apply to every place of Indo-China; but, in general, it may be assumed that its northern districts have been given names corresponding to ancient districts of Northern India; while its southern divisions, including the Malay Peninsula, were called after

1 "Prince Hassan, son of the unfortunate Sultan Tu Wēn-siu [of Ta-li] informs me that the Nan-Chao were the p'u-tsz (as he calls them) or peh-tsz, and not the Shans or pai-i; but, though this tribe may have been predominant, it must have been a Shan or Thai tribe, for the general evidence to that effect is overwhelming." (E. H. Parker in the China Review, vol. xx, No. 6, pp. 339, 430.)—The Rev. Geo. W. Clarke, in the Chinese Recorder, vol. xv, p. 382, explains the term Pai-tsz-chī-tsz as meaning 'the ancient Yūn nanese.'
similarly located regions of the south of India. Such coincidences are due to the fact that a double stream of emigrants from India flowed into Indo-China at a very early period. One, proceeding from the north, advanced overland through Manipur and Burmā, and influenced the northern part of Indo-China as far as the Tonkin Gulf and the Chinese borders; the other, coming from the south, reached Indo-China by sea, and its influence extended mainly over the Malay Peninsula, Siām, Kamboja, and Southern Annam. Thus it will be seen that Northern Indo-China owes its early civilization to settlers from Northern India; while its southern portion, including the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago, is indebted for its ancient development to adventurers and colonists from the Coromandel and Malabar coasts. Once this point, never hitherto cleared up, is well understood, much that is yet incomprehensible and obscure of the early history of Indo-Chinese nations will appear more distinct.

For the present we are concerned only with that stream of emigration which flowed into Northern Indo-China from Northern India. That such a movement occurred is amply proved by the fact that during the three or four centuries preceding the Christian Era we find Indū dynasties, established by adventurers claiming descent from the Kṣatriya potentates of Northern India, ruling in Upper Burmā, in Siām and Lāos, in Yūnnan and Tonkin, and even in most parts of South-Eastern China. From the Brahmaputra and Manipur to the Tonkin Gulf we can trace a continuous string of petty States ruled by those scions of the Kṣatriya race, using the Sanskrit or the Pāli languages in official documents and inscriptions, building temples and other monuments after the Indū style, and employing Brāhmaṇ priests for the propitiatory ceremonies connected with the Court and State. Among such Indū monarchies we may mention those of Tagōng, Upper Pugān, Prome, and Sēn-wī (Theinnī), in Burmā; of Mūāng Hāng, Chīeng Rūng, Mūāng Khwān, and Dāsārṇa (Lūāng P’hrah Bāng), in the Lāu country; and of Agranagara (Hanoi) and Campū,
in Tonkin and Annam. As far as Yünnan is concerned, we learn from Chinese historians that a Jén-kwo, claiming descent from Śukladhānya-raja, fifth son of Śri-Dharmāsoka of Magadha, was, as early as B.C. 122, reigning at Pēh-ngai, to the south-east of the Ta-li Lake, and had, shortly afterwards, conferred upon himself from the Chinese emperor the sovereignty over the whole territory of Tien (Yünnan).  

We hear, moreover, that “the oldest traditions connect the Ai-Lao State of Yung-ch'ang with Meng-chia-ch'wo, son of Asoka.”

If we do not know more of the Indū dynasties founded in the south of China and on the shores of the Gulf of Tonkin, it is due, no doubt, to the fact that the Chinese looked upon the States lying outside the borders of their empire at that period as barbarous, and therefore concerned themselves very little about them. But the names of peoples and cities recorded by Ptolemy in that region, however few and imperfectly preserved, are sufficiently significant to prove the presence of the Indu ruling and civilizing element in those countries, undoubtedly not so barbarous as the Chinese would make them appear. A different complexion is thus put on the past of those

1 See E. H. Parker, in Chinese Recorder, vol. xxv, p. 104. The present Min-kia, or Min-chia, living along the shores of the Ta-li Lake are said to claim descent from the same Pai-fan-wang, or “White Rice Prince” (Śakladhāya). See op. cit., vol. xv, p. 384.

2 Ibid., in China Review, vol. xx, p. 394. The name of Asoka's son is there given in Chinese characters, which I have transliterated as above. In Cantonese they would be pronounced Mung-ka-ts'ūk. Mr. Parker adds that “these characters suggest the word Magadha, and an Indian origin for the ruling Ai-Lao family.” Magadhā or Magasas is the name of the Kṣatriya caste in Sāka-dvipa (Siām and Kamboja) according to the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (bk. ii, ch. iv). But the above characters seem to me rather to represent some Pāli term like Mañjuśaka. The Rev. Geo. W. Clarke, in his article “On the Aboriginal Tribes of Western Yünnan” which appeared in the Chinese Recorder, loc. cit., quotes a native historical work where a Ti Mingtsō [Ti Mēng-chū, evidently the same personage as the Meng-chia-ch'wo alluded to above], son of Prince Ahin [Asoka] of the Mo-chie [Magadhā] kingdom in India, is made to settle in Yünnan with his nine sons, who became the rulers of as many different nations, both in Yünnan and in the neighbouring countries.
countries and of China withal; for while, according to Chinese accounts, the Chinese appear as the civilized nation par excellence and the populations outside their southern borders as barbarians, the truth seems to lie rather in the opposite direction, as it was evidently through the medium of those barbarians that China received part of her civilization from India. As a matter of fact the Chinese never yet mentioned or admitted this; but it is as plain as can be that their astronomical knowledge, their calendar, and many of the arts and sciences for which they stood long celebrated as the original inventors, were introduced among them by Indū travellers or acquired by the Chinese themselves through contact with the barbarians of their southern borders where Indū influence had long been predominating. The embassy that the emperor Ming-ti sent in A.D. 65 to India, whence it brought Buddhism to the Chinese, was very likely prompted by and despatched upon the advice of Indūs then at the Chinese Court. It seems, in short, to me, that there is ample evidence as to the presence, within Chinese borders, of Indū and other western foreigners—whether adventurers, traders, or missionaries—early before the Christian Era and before active intercourse by sea could have been established. The presence of this western—chiefly Indū—element and its influence upon the development of Chinese civilization at a far earlier period than has hitherto been known or even suspected, commands attention, and can henceforth be hardly overlooked by Sinologists. But, reserving our further remarks on this highly important subject to a more suitable occasion, we shall here resume our discussion on the Doānai and their country just a moment ago interrupted.

As we remarked, Ptolemy's Doānai represent a valley-dwelling people, such as are termed in Sanskrit Dronaka and in Chinese Pa-i; and undoubtedly correspond to the Ts'wan, Tuwan, or Doan tribes of Eastern Yünnan. It was they, apparently, who overthrew the Indū kingdom founded at Daśārṇa or Lúang Phrahañ Bāng. They were—like the Ai-Lāu and their kinsmen, the Kāu, still existing at present
in the Lower Mê-Không valley under the name of Lâu-Kâu—a people of Thai race. Ma Tuan-lin\(^1\) mentions the Ts'wan (Doânai) as inhabiting, in the seventh century, the territory of K'un-ming to the east of the Ta-li Lake, thus bounding on that side the State of Nan-Chao or Thai empire of Mêng-shê, now Mêng-hwa T'ing. Parker, in his article on the Nan-Chao,\(^2\) says that the Ts'wan tribe "must have extended far east into Kwang-si, for the Suishu, which treats of a period earlier than this by two centuries [fifth century], says that General Shî Wan-sui was appointed commander-in-chief of a force sent to quell an insurrection of the Nan-ning barbarian Ts'wan Wan, and that he advanced as far as Nan-chung." But, early before that period, the Ts'wan must have extended to the south as well, thus occupying the high valleys of the Song-kā, of the Song-kōi or Red River, and of the Song-bo or Black River, whence they advanced into the basin of the Nam-Ű through Dien Bien-p'hū or Mūang Thén (T'iên); and thence to Lūang Phrah Bāng and the Middle-Mê-Không, as told in the chronicles and traditions of the Eastern Lāu. In A.D. 550 we find them in the country termed Da-nan-dông by the Annamese annalists,\(^3\) situated about the sources of the Đào-giâng, a stream which I identify with the Nam-Tâu or Red River, Ptolemy's Dōrias. About 960 A.D. we find the Đôan (T'wan or Ts'wan) tribes in occupation, jointly with the Kâu, of the same territory on the Red River\(^4\) which was, several centuries previous, held by the Ąi-Lâu. Moreover, in A.D. 819 we hear of the Huang-dông or Huang-tong, tribes of the Hsi-yuan-man inhabiting the valleys of Huang-ch'âng on the eastern borders of the territory of Nan-Chao,\(^5\) attacking Tonkin and killing its Chinese governor.

Although the term Doan, T'wan, or Ts'wan disappeared,

---

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 146.
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 178; and Ma Tuan-lin in Hervey's translation, vol. ii, p. 236 seq.
and so did in Indo-China its Sanskrit equivalent or prototype Dronaka—only those of Lâu-Kâu and Lâu-kiao-wâ, Jâvâ or Chua (老棚), remaining—the Doans may be easily recognized in Ptolemy's Đoâńai. They evidently were a non-tattooing population, unlike the Āi-Lâu, who, on account of their tattooing their bodies with dragons and wearing tails to their clothes, were nicknamed Ngîeu, a Lâu term identical with the modern Siamese Ngû, which means 'snake.' For the same reason their successors in Yûnnan, the Nan-Chao, were by the Chinese termed Lung-wei, i.e. 'Dragon-tails.'

"The Ts'wan," says Parker, "are stated by K'ang-hi to have been an influential clan in modern Yûn-nan Fu." Ma Tuan-lin has a notice on the Ts'wan, under the name of Liang-ts'wan-man, meaning 'the two [clans of the] Ts'wan,' to wit, the 'white' or 'western' (Pai Ts'wan) and the 'black' or 'eastern' (Wû Ts'wan). According to his information, they must have extended from the headwaters of the Red River to as far east as Kwang-si. This coincidence in location of the Ts'wan with the Doan, or T'wan, and the Kâu of the Annamese historians, coupled with the fact that T'wan, or Doan, is the Annamese pronunciation of the Chinese term Ts'wan, is sufficient evidence to show, I think, that they really were the same people. Similar coincidences in names and location also indicate them to be identical with Ptolemy's Đoâńai. It is therefore pretty certain that in our author's time a conspicuous portion of this people had already advanced into Eastern Lâos or Daśârña, which they held under sway.

The tradition of the Lâu of Lúâng Ph'rah Băng is, that their early ancestors settled first at Mûâng Thôn, the Dien

---

2 Loc. cit., p. 73, note.
3 A clan of a similar name, the Tuan, ruled over Nan-Chao, and subsequently over the Ta-li State. All these tribes were evidently of the same, i.e. the Thai race. Mr. Parker thinks the Ts'wan to have been the forbears of the Lolas (see China Review, vol. xxiii, p. 182); but this has yet to be proved. Lo-lo is a very vague and elastic tribal designation, and it may have formerly been applied to peoples of Thai race (Nora or Nara), the Ts'wan included.
Bien-p’hu of the Annamese, so called, to my belief, either from 滇 (Tien), the ancient name of Yün-nan, their preceding seat, or 天 (Tien), the Chinese word for heaven and its Lord, identified by the Lāu with the Indra of the Indūs. The latter hypothesis seems preferable from its being in accord with the legend of the Lāu as to their having received, while settled at that place, a king from heaven by the name of Khūn Borom (Parama), meaning ‘most excellent ruler.’ He was the son of P’hyā Thēn, i.e. ‘the Lord Tien,’ whom the Lāu now identify, as I said, with Indra. Soon after his advent they divided into seven branches, each led by a son of Khūn Borom, and set off for the surrounding countries, which they occupied as far as the frontiers of: Tonkin on the east, Burmā on the west, and China on the north. The northern branch settled in Yün-nan, where it founded the kingdom of Müang Hō, or Hō-tē, by which I believe the Nan-Chao State is meant, as Ma Tuan-lin gives Ho-chē (鶴柘), or Ho-shih, as one of the names under which the Nan-Chao were known.1 The eastern branch is said to have founded the kingdom of Culani, Cūlāmani, or Cullamālini, which must be identified, as we shall see in the sequel, with Lin-i or Campā. As the above legend is possessed by the Lāu of Lúang P’hraḥ Bāng in common with the Mau Shans (Thai Mau) and the Ahom of Asam, it is likely that the branching off took place rather at Tien (Yün-nan) than at Müang Thēn, and at a date much earlier than the one obtained by Ney Elias from Mau records, i.e. the year 1111 of the Buddhist Era, or 568 A.D. If we are to judge from the fact that in the first century A.D. the western branch of the Lāu had already founded the kingdom of Shen in Northern Burmā and their eastern branch occupied the Middle Mē-Khōng valley, becoming soon afterwards known to Ptolemy under the name of Doānai, we must place the event of the first branching off of the Lāu from Yün-nan at a date not later than the beginning of the Christian Era; but I think that two or

three centuries earlier represents perhaps a more approximate estimate, as these people must have taken some time on the way before reaching their present seats.¹

At any rate, the branch that wended its steps towards the Nam U and, descending its course, reached the Mê-Không at Lương P'hraň Bâng, found, according to the chronicles, the Khá Kanrâng tribe in occupation, who blocked the passage at the confluent of the Nam U, and had to be overcome before any further progress became possible. The Kanrâng were driven up the Mê-Không as far as the districts of P'hû Lâu and P'hû Khá, near the present C'hiêng Không, where, from their arranging the hair in a lump tied on the top of the head, they were since known as Khá Kâu; in Siamese, Khá Klâu. These Khá tribes, say the chronicles, were of the Chêh, i.e. the C'hiêng, race.² They evidently came from Kwang-si and Kwei-chou. It is worthy of remark that tribes of an identical or a very similar name, the Kanrân, are mentioned in the chronicles of Burma as having constituted,

¹ Compare, in fact, the tradition of the exodus of the various tribes of Yûnman under the leadership of King Ti Mêng-chû's sons, as given by the Rev. George W. Clarke in the Chinese Recorder, loc. cit. The event alluded to must have taken place about B.C. 250, and it is quite possible that the emigrants were populations of the Thai race, for the tradition looks substantially identical with the one possessed in common by the Lâu of Lương P'hraň Bâng and the Shans of Burma as referred to above.

² Chêh is, in my opinion, but a contraction of either C'hiêng or C'hiêng; and although it has nowadays become synonymous, to a certain extent, with Chêk or Chinese, it originally designated those populations, undoubtedly of Môn-Annam race, who peopled the one hundred Yûch (Pê Yûch) or districts of the South-Eastern Chinese border. Hence we obtain the following equation: Chêk = C'hiêng = Yavana or Jawana = Yûch = Chêk, by which alone we can arrive at the solution of certain intricate questions connected with the origin and identity of the early races that peopled the north of Indo-China. The Lâu term Chêk, which became Chêk in Siamese, assumes the forms Khâch or Chêk in Annamese, Kruk (pron. Chôk) in Môn or Taleng, and Chêk in Châm. The Châm still employ it to designate the Annamese. The present Khmu or Khamu of the State of Lương P'hraň Bâng, and other tribes along the Mê-Không are, by the Lâu, said to belong to the same race as the Khá Chêh. It is therefore evident that Chêh is but another name for the Môn-Annam race.

The term Khá in Lâu is equivalent to Khá in Siamese, though pronounced in a different tone, and means a servant or 'slave.' It is indiscriminately applied to all tribes which the Thai or Lâu reduced to obedience.
together with the *Phyū* (Prū) and *Sak* (Suk, Chēh, Chek?), its early population. They are said to have subsequently shifted on to Arakan. This shows that the advance of the Lāu or Thai was, both in Northern Siām and Burmā, confronted by populations of the same (Mōu-Annam) race, by the name of *Kanrān* and Prū, who had long been in occupation of the country, and who had either to be repelled or subdued. The early *Phyū*, or Prū, and *Sak*, on the Siāmese side, are still represented by the present Prū, Por, or Poru, and So, Suk, or Sak, of Kamboja. From linguistical and other affinities I have, moreover, come but recently to the conclusion that the *Khami* of Arakan and the *Khamu* of Lūang P'hrah Bāṅg must have been in origin the same tribe.

According to Professor Lacouperie, the Por, Poru, or Prū, and their cognate tribes in Kamboja, were driven out of Kwang-tung and Kwang-si b.c. 215. This appears to agree with the statement of the Lūang P'hrah Bāṅg chronicles that the *Kanrāng* and similar tribes were of Chēh or Southern Chinese origin, though the date given above refers, no doubt, to the exodus of the last remnants of those tribes; judging from the fact that the first inroads of the Lāu into the Middle Mē-Khōng valley must have occurred within the two centuries preceding the Christian Era, as I suggested above, and that at that period the Lāu found the Kanrāng and other tribes of the Chēh stock already in occupation of the country. As to the elder offshoots of the Chēh race, such as the C'hieng or Lawū, they must have found their way to Central Indo-China much earlier; and the Mōu and Khmer must have long preceded them, the date of their advent most probably coinciding with that of the establishment of their kinsmen on the shores of the Gulf of Tonkin some eleven or twelve centuries b.c. In the C'hieng Sên Chronicle the *Khôm* (Khmer) are spoken of as having been in occupation, long before 675 b.c., of the tract of country between the Mē-Khōng at C'hieng Sên and the headwaters of the Mē-Nâm, whence they were not finally expelled by the Lāu until A.D. 376.
The Poru, Brau, or Prů; the Bahnar, and cognate tribes, were very likely the Barrhai whom Ptolemy places to the south of Yûnnan and to the west of the Kudutai and Indoï of Tonkin.

From the foregoing considerations the movement and distribution of races in the north of Indo-China appears in a clearer light than hitherto depicted; and it becomes evident that prior to the advance of the Láu or Thai in Siâm and of the Tibeto-Burmese into Burmá, both these countries were occupied by tribes of the Môn-Annam race originally from Southern China, chiefly from Kwang-sí and Kwei-chou, who had long preceded them. These tribes were obviously of the very same stock both in Siâm and Burmá; hence the unexpected disclosure follows that the famed Kanrán, Prů or P'hyû, and Sak, hitherto held to have formed the bulk of the Burmese nation, were instead tribes of the Môn-Annam race whom the Tibeto-Burmese found already settled in the country, and whom they had to face and repel before being able to obtain a footing in it.¹

According to Aymonier,² the popular name of Jòk or Chòk applied to the Annamese by the Châm, is synonymous with the literary term Yûan or Ywan (Yavana) by which the former are designated throughout Indo-China, except in Annam itself, and which the Annamese pronounce Nguyễn or Nguyễn. This term I take to be identical with the Chinese 原 (yūan), meaning 'a high level, a plateau,' and synonymous with 枢 (ching) or Chiëng and the Sanskrit

¹ "In A.D. 790," says Parker (China Review, vol. xx, p. 393, notes), "the Nanchao conqueror Imousin established the Jwan-hwa prefecture at the modern T'êng-yüeh or Momien, then inhabited by three tribes called P'uh, P'iao, and Och'ang. This disproves Prince Hassan's assertion that the P'uh were the ruling Nanchao tribe: it also suggests that the Pyu tribe of Burmese then extended into modern China, or at all events crossed their way down from the Tibet direction that way. The Och'ang are the Lisu." The italics are mine, and the sentences set up in them well show into what ethnological chaos we get entangled and what mess we make of tribal origins if we follow in the old lines and admit, as the authority just quoted does here, that the P'hyû (Prû) were a Burmese (i.e. Tibeto-Burmese) tribe. The above extract plainly demonstrates that remnants of the old Môn-Annam tribes were still in the country at that period, mingled with new arrivals, e.g. the Lisu.

Mâla. It occurs in the name of the Hsi-yüan-man, called Tai-nguyên, or Têi-nguên, by the Annamese, whom Ma Tuan-lin⁴ locates on the north-eastern frontiers of Tonkin and makes conterminous with the Nan-Chao on the west. It follows, therefore, that the early settlers in Tonkin and Annam must have been of the same stock of the C'hieng, who peopled Mâla or Mâlava-deśa, i.e. the present Lâos, before the Lâu or Doans. Both the Nguyễn or Nguyễn and the Lawâ or C'hieng originated from the race and country of Yüan, i.e. Kwang-si, which was part of Yüeh, i.e. Southern China; hence we see the terms Chôk, Chêh, C'hieng, Yacana, and Javana—which mean, respectively, ‘tribes of South-Eastern China,’ ‘hill tribes,’ and ‘mixed tribes’—applied both to the early invaders of Tonkin and to the elder settlers in Lâos.

One of the ancient names of Lûang Phra Phô Băng was, in fact, Javâ or C'haâv, which the Lâu found on their arrival thither, and which they pronounce Sacâ. I have not the slightest doubt that this term is but an abridged form of Javana or Yavana; while its existence at so early a period is a proof that the city and the surrounding country then really belonged to the Yüan or Yüeh, namely, the Yacana, C'hieng, or C'hieng. The name C'haâvâ or Javâ was preserved in the country up to comparatively recent times, when the Chinese wrote it down as Choua (Chua, ch'üa, chua, or kua) and Lô Chua (Lau Chu or Lau-Chua).② On the other

---

② It is interesting to remark that the Miao-tze term the Chinese shuâ (vide China Review, vol. ix, p. 341). If this term corresponds, as I suppose, to the C'haâvâ, Sacâ, or Javâ, mentioned above, it must have been originally employed by the Miao to designate not the Chinese people proper, but the pre-Chinese-populations, chiefly of Môn-Annam race, inhabiting in the early periods the southern portion of China. Concerning the above term Mr. E. H. Parker observes (op. cit., vol. xii, p. 59) that the concurrence of sounds such as shuâ, sa, sha, etc., "would seem to point to some general name for the southern Chinese or some Chinese aboriginal race." The Hakkas, the same authority proceeds to say, often call Pontis (the natives of Kwang-tung) Sha-sha, a term which may correspond to the Sa-po of Fu-chou, the Zê-khü or Wên-chou, etc., represent, under different forms, the name of the race which
hand, from Jawa or Sarā, and Māla or Mālava, sprang the
denomination Javaka- or Savaka- (often wrongly spelled
Sevaka) -Mālā for the same district, which we have mentioned
at the outset. The first term of this compound toponymic
was, in its turn, recorded by the Chinese annalists under the
form 搏家 (Chia-kia), and at times employed in the place
of its synonym Lao-Chua to designate the State of Lúang
P'hraḥ Bāṅg.

It strikes one as very curious in this connection that,
while the Lāu of Lúang P'hraḥ Bāṅg ought, like their
western kinsmen and for the same reason, to be termed
Yuan or Yuen, they reserve this epithet, under the Pāli
forms Yona or Yón, and the Sanskrit dress Yavana modified
into Yuen, for their tattooing relatives of the C'hieng-mài
principality. Hence the designation Yonaka-desa for the
region of Western Lāo so often met with in local
literature. Evidently no race likes to be called Yavana
or 'mixed,' and the Annamese do not feel less aversion
for such an epithet. The C'hieng-mài Lāu, however,
retaliate upon their brothers of beyond the Mē-Không by
calling them Kēn, thus insinuating that the latter are of
the race of, or dependent from, the Kiao or Chiau of Kiao-chi
(Chiau-chih) or Tonkin. Remnants of the ancient Cheh race
still bearing the original name exist up to the present day in
the state of Lúang P'hraḥ Bāṅg, and they are called Khā
Cheh or Khamu (Khamuh). They dwell on the mountain
slopes, a fact which evidences their character of hill-tribes;
like their kinsmen the Khā Kāu, the Sō or Kasō, and the
Suk or Sak, etc., they speak a language of the Môn-Annam
class; and prove extremely meek and submissive. They
consider themselves, in fact, as slaves of the Lāu, and
accept without reluctance this condition of inferiority and

originally occupied the greater portion of Southern China before the advent
of the Chinese proper, and that such a denomination continued to be employed
to denote the natives of the various provinces of that region (whether or not
connected by descent with that race) in order to distinguish them from immigrant
Chinese from other provinces. Thus the terms referred to lost their original
signification and became synonymous with 'indigene,' 'native.'
subordination to the latter, owing to a legend of their own according to which their ancestors were worsted in several competitions with the pioneers and progenitors of their present masters. The disgrace of the Khā Chēh dates, in fact, from the day that the Lāu entered their country. Prior to that period they, and their kinsmen the Khā Kanrāng (Khā Kào), appear to have been blessed with a far more civilized status than at present; for, as the chronicles of Lúang Phhra Pāng declare, at the time of the Lāu’s advent into the country, the Khā Kanrāng were governed by a chief with the title and authority of king, who appointed ministers over the agriculture, fluvial communications, forests, etc.; and they had brought under cultivation the territory along both banks of the Mê-Không, as far up as the Nâm-Phā—an affluent joining the Mê-Không at Chiêng Lap, below Chiêng Khêng (Kêng-Chêng of the maps) and Mùang Sing. From these data we are enabled to form an estimate of the extent of that ancient kingdom of Eastern Mālava or Dasārna founded by the Chēh race under Indū auspices and conquered afterwards by the eastern branch of the Lāu, T’wan, or Doans. Indū influence had, no doubt, made itself felt in the country long before the Lāu’s advent, as it had indeed spread also further east and north into what we now call Tonkin and Yunnan; the probability is, therefore, that monarchs of Indū descent occupied the throne in Dasārna as they did in many a neighbouring State.

The foundation of Lúang Phra Pāng is, in fact, ascribed by the native historians to adventurers from India, a circumstance which sufficiently demonstrates the Indū origin not only of the reigning dynasty, but also of the names for both city and State. Dasārna was apparently the denomination given the latter, while Jāva, Javaka, or Yavana more properly designated its capital, as well as the race that peopled the country. Already I have pointed out the connection of these terms with Yūan, Yūeh, Ching, Chiêng, and Chēh or Chōk; more especially with Chiêng, which I consider as a Thai synonym of the
Chinese Yüeh, in Annamese Viet. I believe that it is this term Ch'ien which suggested to the early Indus adventurers the Sanskrit word Yavana as a designation for the race whom they found in occupation of the country. It may be safely asserted at any rate that Yavana, Yona, Yón, and Yuen, if not translations of Ch'ien, must be imitative renderings of Yüan and Yüeh.

Having thus shown the origin and meaning of the terms which Ptolemy has preserved for us in connection with the people and country of Lāos, we shall now proceed to briefly examine each individual name of cities and rivers in this region.

Doanas River (Nos. 118 and 182).

According to our author it is formed by two streams, one from Bépyrrhos and the other from the Damassa range, which unite in about long. 99° 31' and lat. 22° 37', corrected. The confluence would thus fall a little to the north-west of Ch'ien Rung. While the branch from Bépyrrhos is made to rise in the Southern Himālayas of Asam, a little to the east of Tawang, the source of the eastern branch from Damassa is located in the north of Yünnan, a little west of Yung-ning—a very close approach indeed to the true position of the upper course of the Me-Khõng. Misled by a similarity in names, Ptolemy makes the Doanas debouch through the Dahan or Thuăn-an River on the coast of Annam, in the Quang-tri district. He appears, in fact, to have been quite in the dark as regards its lower course; while, on the other hand, he traces it with remarkable correctness from the neighbourhood of the Ta-li Lake in Yünnan down to Lúang P'hraḥ Băng and even further, as a glance at our map will show. Its name of

1 The sense of Ch'ien, 'mixed, crossed, overlapping, diagonal,' seems to me to be presented to some extent by the Chinese Yüeh, Annamese Viet (越), meaning 'to overstep, to encroach on, to transgress, to cross.' Compare also K'ou and 交叉 (k'ou, kiau, chiao, giau) = 'to interlock, to blend' = Javana, Yavana.
Doanas he derived either from the people inhabiting its banks, the Doan, Ts'wan, or Ts'can, or from the Dahan or Thuăn-an River, its supposed outlet. No such or similar name has, within my knowledge, ever been given to the Mê-Không. The denominations which I find recorded for this important watercourse are, in its upper portion, that flows in Thibetan territory: Nam-Chu and Chiamdo-Chu. After it enters Yùn-nan, it goes by the name of Lân-ts'ang, by which it has always been known to the Chinese. There is no doubt that the latter named the river after the country or State of Lân-ch'âng, the Lâu designation for the territory of Lúang P'hrãh Bâng.¹ The Western Lâu term the

¹ In the Chinese 蘭倉 (Lân-ts'ang), Lân means an orchid, and also 'scented,' 'numerous'; while the second term, ts'ang, stands for 'granary,' thus corresponding, or being in fact equivalent, to the Siamese c'hâng, having the same meaning. The Chinese rendering of the Thai Lân-ch'âng is, therefore, merely phonetic and imitative; unless it be assumed that, like early European travellers, they took the Thai Lân to mean 'a million,' and, figuratively, 'numerous'; and they confused, moreover, c'hâng, 'an elephant,' with c'hâng, 'a granary.' The second term is, however, sometimes spelled 倉 (ts'ang) = 'an expanse of water.' The most common Chinese name by which the Mê-Không is now designated in the portion of its course which lies within Yùn-nan is Chin-lung Chiang (Kiu-lung Kiang), and means, taken literally, 'Nine Dragons' River.' This has in our days become a favourite term with cartographers, who, as a rule, absolutely ignorant of the meaning of the exotic toponymics with which they fill their maps, use it indiscriminately for the whole of the river's lower course, and even note it down at its mouths in Kamboja. It will surprise these gentlemen not a little to learn that Chin-lung Chiang simply means 'Ch'hieng Rung River,' as 九龍 (Chin-lung, Kiu-lung, or Kau-lung) is but a rough Chinese rendering of Ch'hieng Rung, alias Kiang Hung, employed at times in the place of the better known term Ch'î-li. It follows that the designation Chin-lung Chiang should be applied only to the portion of the river's course comprised within the limits of the State of Ch'hieng Rung, and not elsewhere.

Other less generally known Chinese names for the Mê-Không are: 哀 (Ch'iang, pron. K'oung in Annamese), evidently a phonetic transcript of the Lâu không; 風 (Fêng = 'wind'); 淇 宿 江 (Shên-k'ung Chiang); 復 (Wân), etc. (see China Review, vol. xx, p. 328). The last one bears some faint resemblance to Doan or Doanas without the initial D; but this is no sufficient reason for us to deduce that a connection exists between the two names. The Annamese (Song-lâm) and the Khmer (Tumt-Thom) designations for the Mê-Không are generic terms simply meaning 'Great River,' while our (originally
Mê-Không Nam-khái; the Eastern Lâu call it Nam-Không or Mê-Không; and the Siamese, with but little variation, name it Mê-Không or Mê-nam-Không. I find, moreover, in native records, among which is the Mìaug Yông Chronicle, that the portion of the Mê-Không running through the Lâu States was termed Yamunā-nadi, probably in analogy to the Yamunā or Jumna of Northern India, some of whose affluents flow through Mālava and Dāsārṇa. At times it is mentioned under the name of Mahānadi, whether in allusion to the Mahī or not I am unable to say. In the Pāli history of the Sīhiṇī statue of Buddha, compiled in C'h'ieng-māi by Bodhirainsi Mahāthera towards the end of the fourteenth century, the Mê-Không is referred to (ch. vii) as Khuraṅga-māli-nadi; while in the C'h'ieng-sèn Chronicle it is, at the outset, termed Khara-nadi or Hūei Khai, and the denomination Mê-Không is introduced later on, with a futile attempt to explain it by an absurd Buddhist legend, which it would be mere waste of space to reproduce here. Khara-nadi means 'the rough, or fierce, river'; Hūei Khai may be rendered as 'the stream that extirpates, or ravages.' This is also, on the whole, the sense conveyed by the word Không: 'impetuous, violent.' But in the lower portion of its course, which lies through Kamboja, the Mê-Không is, in some native accounts, styled Sīthandōn. This word, commonly pronounced Sīthandōn, is also the official Siamese name for Mìaug-Không, a township on an island in the middle of the Mê-Không, above Stūng-trêng. The suggestion made by some authorities that

Portuguese), 'Cambodia River' can no longer be accepted as a strictly correct appellation in our present day. The foregoing remarks will have made it evident that Loun-ts'àng and Mê-Không are the only two names which should be preserved, on account both of their antiquity and wide application, for that majestic watercourse.

1 Sīdanta or Sīdanta-sōgara (from sidati = 'to sink') is the name given to the oceans between the seven rocky circles of the Cakkaevu in Buddhist cosmology. They are so termed on account of their waters being so light and subtle, it is said, that no raft or vessel can float on them, and even the eyed tip of a peacock's feather would sink right down to the bottom.

2 Among whom Aymonier, in his "Voyage dans la Laos," t. i, p. 38, Paris, 1895. Garnier, whom this author criticizes for having said that Sīthandōn is the name of the mythical sea around Meru, was quite right.
the name of this township is a corrupt form of the Siamese  ServletException
Sí-p’han-dôn, meaning ‘four thousand islands,’ is simply ridiculous, to say the least of it.

The popular notion among Siamese and Lau alike has ever been that the Mé-Không flows through Nông Si, i.e. the Ta-li Lake or Hsi-érh-hai, and that before reaching it, it travels underground through a tunnel for a distance taking eight days to a boat propelled by means of poles to traverse. Here and there, tell native accounts, funnel-shaped holes in the roof and sides of the tunnel admit of the passage of light. This is, of course, but a repetition of the tradition concerning the Hsi-érh-ho, the stream which crosses the Ta-li Lake, joining afterwards the Yang-pi, an affluent of the Mé-Không, and has nothing whatever to do with the last-mentioned river. Colborne Baber deems it impossible for boats from the Mé-Không to reach the lake through the Yang-pi and its small tributary.¹

In conclusion, there is no indication as to the Mé-Không ever having borne the name of Doanas assigned to it by Ptolemy,² and we feel therefore justified in assuming that this name must have been given to it by our author either in reference to the people on its banks, the Doanas or Doānai, or to its supposed outlet on the coast of Annam, the Thuān-an River. A very early, if not the oldest, name for the Mé-Không is no doubt the one by which it is still known to the Chinese, i.e. Lan-ts’ang—or, as the Siamese pronounce this term, Lân-c’hâng—which is alluded to in the ballad quoted by Ma Tuan-lin as being already old in

¹ See his “Travels and Researches in Western China” in the “Supplementary Papers” issued by the R.G.S., vol. i, p. 161. Here the author describes having seen “the river which issues from the lake [of Ta-li] suddenly plunge under a natural bridge of rock,” a circumstance which may in part account for the origin of the tradition as regards the subterranean passage referred to above.

² Unless sufficient proof is forthcoming to show that the above cited 湾 (wān) is a surviving fragment of that name.
his time,¹ and cannot at the present day be ascribed an antiquity less than some fifteen centuries.

Rhingibēri, a city (No. 72).

This is no doubt C‘hieng Rung—the Kiang Hung of the maps²—the well-known capital of the twelve P‘han-nâ townships of the Lū-Shans (Sib-sông P‘han-nâ Lū) on the Upper Mē-Khêng. Its official name is Jotana-pura rājadhani, ‘the Resplendent Capital,’ appearing under the form Jotinagara in the Burmese Po-U-Daung inscription of A.D. 1774. The derivation is from the Sanskrit word Jyotis, meaning ‘light’ or ‘brightness,’ which occurs in Prāg-jyotisa, the ancient name of Asam.

Rhingibēri may be easily recognized in the compounds Ringi-pura, Ramiga-pura, Rung-pur, etc., which have as well their counterparts in Asam, in Rangāmati, Rangā-bāti, or Rangabarī, on the Brahmaputra. This homonymy has misled Saint-Martin and Yule into actually locating Ptolemy’s Rhingibēri in Asam. But, accustomed as we are to such repetitions of topographical names from India in the Indo-Chinese Peninsula, of which we have given many an instance, we shall not fall a victim to the same error, especially since our calculated results indicate a place of the exact latitude of C‘hieng Rung, and not very different from the latter in longitude. The very name C‘hieng Rung, in its present Siāmese form, well represents the Sanskrit compound Ramiga-pura, for in it the prefix C‘hieng stands for pura, ‘a city,’ and the second term Rung for ramiga, which means ‘colour,’ ‘hue,’ and thus conveys a sense not very dissimilar from the word jyotis, in Pāli joti. But I shall now demonstrate that the denominations Ramiga-pura,

² Termed 車里, Ch‘ô-li, by the Chinese, and, at times, 九龍, Chin-lung (see above, p. 135). I am of opinion that the term Ch‘ô-li is a phonetic rendering of the compound Chēh-li, in which Chēh (written exactly as in the name of the Chēh race) represents Mūang Chēh, anciently the northernmost of the three divisions of the C‘hieng Rung Kingdom; and Lū stands for the name of the
Joti-nagara, and Jotana-pura are but classical adaptations by Indu adventurers of the original name for the city and district, which undoubtedly was Chieng Rung—in Lau pronunciation, Chieng Hung—and had a similar meaning. Rung, in fact, in modern Siamese, and Hung in Lau, mean a 'rainbow'—in Shan (Lau of Burma branch of the Thai people inhabiting that region. The other two divisions were Muang Yong and Muang Sing; hence, according to the Muang Yong Chronicle, the three princes once ruling over them—who were brothers, being all sons of the Chieng Rung king—became vulgarly known, respectively, as Ai Cheh, Yi Yong, and Sam Sing. (Ai, Yi, Sam, Sai, Ngua, Lek, etc., were the ordinal epithets employed up to a comparatively recent period to distinguish male children in the order of birth—as may be seen from the law of A.D. 1731 in the collection of the Old Laws of Siam, vol. ii, pp. 7–26—and mean 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. From this we see that the prince ruling over Muang Cheh was the eldest, the Muang Yong one the second, and that of Muang Sing the third of the sons of the Chieng Rung king. The prince of Yong was, in the present instance, the Sunanda Kumara referred to at p. 119 above.) This political division of Chieng Rung into three principalities continued until A.D. 1399, when, in consequence of an attack made by the Chinese from Yunnan upon Muang Yong and Chieng-mai, which was successfully repelled by Prince Khun Sen from the last-named State, Muang Yong became part of the Chieng-mai dominions. The rearrangement of Chieng-Rung into twelve p'han-nu districts for administrative purposes then followed, but Muang Cheh and Muang Sing continued to retain their character of principalities. The state of affairs prior to that period, however, explains the expression San-ming (San-maing, i.e. Sam-Muang—'Three Districts' or 'Principalities'), which has so much puzzled Devria (see his 'La Frontiere Sino-Annamite,' p. 154), and misled Parker (China Review, vol. xxiv, p. 54) into believing it a clerical slip for Shih-san-ming, judging from the standpoint that 十二 (Shih-erh or twelve) is oftener than not in Chinese records misspelled 十三 (Shih-san or thirteen) in the expressions 十二猛 (Shih-erh-meng) and 十二板那 (Shih-erh-pan-na), employed to denote the 'twelve Pan-nu districts,' i.e. the State of Chieng Rung. It will now clearly appear that San-ming must have been meant for the three Muang principalities of Cheh, Yong, and Sing, referred to above.

1 The full name for rainbow in Siamese is Rung-kin-nam. In Lau Rung or Hung is also the name for the Brahmani kite. Hence the Siamese expression means 'the kite drinks out the waters.' Its origin is to be found in the popular belief that the rainbow is due to the trail of coloured rays left behind by the celestial kite when flying down to the earth to feed both on land and on the waters. The phenomenon is by some ascribed to the light emanating from
or Thai Yāi) _SITE_ (Hūng), or SITE_  (Hūng-hái)—and are identical with the Chinese 虹 (Hūng), conveying the same sense. Rùng, moreover, in a slightly different tone in Siamese, Hūng in Lāu and in Shan (晃 or 煌 in Chinese), mean ‘bright,’ ‘shining.’ Whether it be for the reason that the idea of colour is associated with that of light or brilliancy in the rainbow, or that the two terms expressing separately these ideas are easily mistaken the one for the other, owing to an almost imperceptible difference of tone existing between them, the fact is that the early Indū travellers who arrived into the country by the Manipur route from Asam, translated hūng or rūng by rānga and jōtis, thus transplanting on the banks of the Mé-Khōng two of the topographical names which they had met with en route on the banks of the Brahmāputra. Ptolemy’s Rhingibēri becomes therefore identical, on both geographical and linguistic grounds, with Raṅga-pura or C’hīeng Rūng.

Lariagara, a town (No. 73).

Probably Müang Lēm, or Rēm, which has its exact latitude and is situated on the Nam Lēm, a right tributary of the Mé-Khōng. Müang Lēm is nowadays the centre of the country of the independent Lawā or Wah. The name of the town here referred to by Ptolemy may have some connection with a possible Prākrit form Lāri-ūgāra. In India we have Lār or Lār-dēka, in Sanskrit Lāṭa; a Lawriya in the ancient Mithilā, east of the Gaṇḍak River; and a Lehri and Laragari towards the north-west frontier.

a dragon. I believe, therefore, that some misconception arose from the similarity of the term Rūng with Rōng or Ma-rōng, which is the old word for ‘dragon,’ taken from the Chinese 龍, tūng or tōng.
As names of peoples we have Lārga as a variant of Bharga in the Mahābhārata;¹ also Laraku, meaning ‘warrior,’ which is the designation the Hor of Sing Bhum give themselves.² So little is known of Mūang Lēm and of the surrounding country that it is for the present impossible to ascertain whether any of the above terms apply to its territory or to its inhabitants.

In the tables I suggested also, but doubtfully, Legya, often appearing in the maps as Leedah. Its real name is, however, purely Thai, and ought to be written Lāi-khā, which is the Lāu form of the Siamese expression Dāi-khā (Shan မောလ), meaning ‘slaves [were] obtained [here].’ Forchhammer was mistaken in believing the name of Legya to be of Indū derivation, thus identifying it, wrongly, with the Lakkhiya-pura of the Kalyāṇi inscriptions of Pegu (A.D. 1476). At the same time, not far to the south-east of Legya and to the north-east of its sister Shan town of Monē (more correctly Mo-Nāi = Mūang Nāi; anciently Mūang Phōng), Dr. Richardson in his journeys of 1830–37 discovered some ancient ruins with sarcophagi and other monuments which may mark the site of some forgotten chief-city of the Ch'iieng or Lawā, and thus justify the name Rājugrāha, which I find applied in native records to either Legya or some other city in its neighbourhood.

In my opinion, however, Legya is too far out, both in latitude and longitude, of the position where we should expect to find Ptolemy’s city. If due regard is to be had to the location assigned by Ptolemy to Lariagara in respect

¹ Hall’s ed. of Wilson’s “Viṣṇu Purāṇa,” vol. ii, p. 171.
² Cunningham’s “Ancient Geography of India,” Buddhist Period, p. 507.
of Rhingibéri (Ch'ieng Rung), we see that the site of Műang Lêm is the one which best answers all requirements. I do not therefore hesitate to discard Legya, and to pronounce myself in favour of the above-named township.

Lasippa or Lasyppa, a town (No. 76).

This city proves no less difficult of identification than the preceding, owing to the scarce, and at the same time conflicting, evidence which we obtain from the maps. Its name at once suggests Si-poḥ, the Thibo of European maps, in the Shan State of Sê-n-wî (Theinnee);¹ or, what may appear to be yet more preferable, Lashio, in the same district. Though the resemblance in names, especially in the case of the last-mentioned place, is striking, the positions in latitude of both Si-poḥ and Lashio of some four degrees to the north of Ptolemy's city, dispose of at once, I think, of their identification with the latter. If I referred to them here and in the tables, it is more for the sake of completeness than because I deem either of them to be really the place meant by our authority. My opinion is, in fact, that in the case in point, as well as in analogous ones when close similarity of names comes into play, we must not rely

¹ In Lâu records Sê-n-wî and Si-poḥ are very often mentioned bound up together in a single compound, thus: Sê-n-wî-si-poḥ, because of their forming part of the same State. The classical name of this principality is Śivi-rāṣṭra; not "Thiri- [or Sīri]-rata" as given by Ney Elias, which is undoubtedly wrong. Si-poḥ, in Shan ჰენ, in Siamese Si-ploḥ, is a Thai expression, meaning 'four tufts.' But this is probably a mere corruption or imitation of the original Sanskrit name of the city or State, which was apparently Śibi or Śivi. Otherwise Si-poḥ may be connected either with the 漢 (Phu) tribes which Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., vol. ii, pp. 298-306) locates about this region, or with the 滑 (P'u or P'uh), the ruling Nan-chao clan (c. supra, pp. 121 and 130), which Mongol history places exactly in Theinnee (see China Review, vol. xxiv, p. 158).
upon homonymy alone, discarding the evidence afforded us by calculation, unless the results issuing from both sources are in fair agreement. Taking, therefore, for our guide the calculated result which has, in other instances, proved so remarkably near the truth, we see that the position of Lasippa falls between C'hieng-mai and Nan, and precisely at Muang Ngü, closely above which Monsieur Pavie's map notes a small township under the name of—I use the same spelling—Wien Ngou-kay. In the neighbourhood we find similar geographical names, such as: Muang Saieb, a little to the east; and a small stream, the Si-pan, an affluent of the Me-Yom, on the south. Of course, we must not become too sanguine in the face of these results. But in a country which, like that of the Lau, has seen so many political revulsions, half-forgotten names of out-of-the-way and nowadays comparatively insignificant places often represent cities and marts once important and flourishing; and must be carefully examined into before being definitely rejected in a retrospective inquiry like this.

Besides, names similar to Lasippa are common all over the country. In the tables I have pointed out one instance: Lā-siēp or Lā-siet, the name of an islet and of an ancient city on the Mé-P'ching (pronounced Mé-Ping by the Lau, the western upper branch of the Mé-Nam River) some 2° of latitude south of C'hieng-mai and just above Kamp'ching P'het; wrongly spelled in Pavie's map as "B. Kuo [Bān Kūh, i.e. 'village of the island'] La-kiet." The city once existing there was, according to the Lamp'hūn chronicles, founded by Cūma-devi, the first queen of that State, in A.D. 528. But the name of the islet and district may have existed long before that; and very likely they were formerly occupied by some Lawā settlement similar to the apparently more important one which the same people had a little further up, above Rahēng, by the name of Muang Soi, of which conspicuous ruins still exist. Many places bearing names beginning with Lā or Lā are extant, moreover, all through the Lau country, such as, for instance, Lamīng or Raming, often misspelled Lamaing, the name
of the ancient site and stream of Čhieng-mái. Under the form \textit{Hl}ay-t\textit{sh}iep\footnote{"British Burma Gazetteer," vol. ii, p. 190.} the term \textit{Lasippa} is also met with in Lower Burma, particularly in the Henzada and Hlaing townships. These facts tend to show that it must belong to the vernacular of the ancient settlers, whether Möũ or Lawū, and that it is therefore a local term and not of Indian origin; though it might be traceable to some Sanskrit-Pāli form like \textit{Lakṣica}, \textit{Lakṣibha} (one \textit{lak} of elephants?), etc. In Yūnnan there is a chief city of the Hō which the Lāu chronicles call \textit{Mūang Hō-wōng}, giving the term \textit{Lakṣa-guha} (= one \textit{lak} of caverns) or \textit{Lakṣa-grhā} (one \textit{lak} of houses) as its classical equivalent.\footnote{This is probably Möng-hwa, the ancient Möng-shē, the chief city of the Nan-chao. The name of the \textit{Mūang}, or city and district, \textit{Hō-wōng}, seems to me to represent the Chinese \textit{鹤王} or \textit{獲王}; perhaps \textit{河皇}; i.e. [capital city of the] king of the Ho, Hwa, Ho-chē, or Ho-moan. I have remarked (p. 127 \textit{supra}) that the Nan-chao were known as Ho-chē; the Ho-moan (‘river-barbarians’) are, I think, the same people, to wit, the Droyaka or Poi-i. Yūnnan is known up to this day to the Siamese under the name of \textit{Mūang Hō}. Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 154) mentions a chief of that region, a certain \textit{孟獲}, Möng-ho, or Möng-huó, evidently \textit{Mūang Hō} in Siamese—against whom the famed Chukoh-liang had to fight in a.d. 224.}

Subsequent inquiries may disclose the correct name and site of Ptolemy’s \textit{Lasippa}; at our present stage of incomplete knowledge of the history and geography of the Lāu States we must remain satisfied with locating that city in the present Čhieng-mái district, and provisionally at Wieng Si-pou-kay above Mūang Ngū, until a more satisfactory site can be suggested.

\textit{Dasana} or \textit{Doana}, a town (No. 74).

The remarks prefaced to this section, as well as the result obtained from calculation for the position of this city, sufficiently prove that the latter can be no other place but Lūang Phrah Bāng, the present, as well as the earliest, capital of Eastern Lāos. In all Lūang Phrah Bāng chronicles and records which I had occasion to examine,
the foundation of this city is ascribed to two brother ascetics from India, the elder of whom bore the name of Thōng (gold) and the younger that of Drādaśan or Drādaśāh (twelfth). They were represented as having marked off the site of the city by means of golden and silver posts. The first of these was set up on the spot where now rises Wat C'hieng-thōng, a Buddhist monastery, at the upper extremity of the city; a second one was stuck at the confluent of the Nām Khān (Khāra) with the Mē-Khōng in order to delimit the lower end of the town; and three more pillars respectively of gold, silver, and stone were erected by the side of a gigantic coral-tree (Erythrina Indica, in Lāu Mai Thōng or 'golden tree,' in Siamese Thōng-lāng; evidently the Chinese 玳瑁) which then stood near the site of the present Wat C'hieng-thōng, in order to mark the auspicious site of the future royal residence. After these preliminaries the two ascetics summoned forth the seven mighty Nāga (serpent-gods) dwelling in the streams, mountains, and grottoes of the neighbourhood (who are even up to the present day worshipped by the Lāu), and committed the territory to their custody. The elder of the hermits then left Drādaśan in charge of the work of completion of the city, and ascended to heaven to pay P'hyā Thēn (the god Indra) a visit, and ask him to send one of his sons (Khūn Borom) to reign upon the newly formed State.

The first set of names that the city received was, always according to the chronicles, C'hieng Dong-C'hieng Thōng—in allusion, respectively to the Nām Dong rivulet flowing to the south and below the town, and to the coral-tree towering as a monarch of vegetation at its upper end.

An alternative designation was given to the city in reference to the configuration of its territory, which, the two ascetics had remarked, resembled the body of a snake lying with its head at the confluence of the Nām Khān and with its tail on the strip of land between the latter-named watercourse and the Mē-Khōng; the ridge of the Chōm-Śrī Hill running through the middle of it representing, as it were, in its undated outline, the ophidian's
spine. From this circumstance the city was styled Śri Sattanāgānahuta.1

A third name was yet given to it, viz. Lān-c’ḥāng, meaning ‘the elephants’ grazing ground,’ or ‘the elephants’ lawn.’ This was in allusion, it is said, to the shape of two hills, rising one to the east and the other to the south of the city, which resemble in profile two huge

1 In this compound term Kṛṅg (‘river’) means a capital city, or nagara. Sattanāga stands evidently for ‘seven snake-gods.’ Nahuta or nahuta is a vast number said to be equivalent to one unit followed by twenty-eight ciphers; hence it may be intended to express the idea of abundance. Native authorities, however, state that nahuta means also ‘crest, hood.’ Such being the case, the sense would be, ‘Glorious capital-city of the seven Nāga crests,’ or, possibly, ‘of the seven-crested Nāga.’ The seven crests are explained to be the summits of as many hills inhabited by Nāga chiefs, which lie within the limits of the territory. I do not, however, find the term nahuta for ‘crest’ in any Sanskrit or Pāli dictionary. The nearest word is apparently nakhya, meaning a ‘man.’ Again, Nāga denotes not only a snake, but also an elephant. I trust, nevertheless, that the interpretation given above is correct; at any rate, the native authorities hold such to be the sense that must be ascribed to the city’s name.

A city bearing the denomination of Cādāmula-nagara or Cādāma-nagara is mentioned in two inscriptions, one from Sukhotai and the other from Luang P’hrab Bāng, in terms which lead one to conjecture it to be Luang P’hrab Bāng itself, or anyhow a city not very far from it. Should further evidence be forthcoming to prove that it is actually Luang P’hrab Bāng, the explanation given above of Sattanāga-nahuta would also receive endorsement, because Cūḍā in Sanskrit means a ‘crest’ and would thus prove but an alternative term for nahuta in the above compound. It is more likely, however, that Cādāmula (or Cādāma-nagara) is but one alternative name for Cūḷāni, Cūḷāni, or Cūḷāmāliṇī, which, as we have noticed (p. 127 above), should be identified with Lin-i or Campā. It is true that—from the fact of the State of Luang P’hrab Bāng having been both historically and etymologically connected with Hsiaung-lin, the name which the Lin-i district was given under the Han—Luang P’hrab Bāng also may have shared with the latter the denomination of Cūḷāni or Cūḷāmāliṇī; but of this we have not as yet any positive proof. As a last hypothesis I may point out that, owing to the belief of the Nāgas being jewel-crested, the designation Cūḷāmanī, Cūḷāmāliṇī, or Cūḷāmalā may also have been applied to Luang P’hrab Bāng, quite independently of its connection with Lin-i. I shall revert to these points in due course when dealing with the geographical terminology of the ancient kingdom of Campā.

The particulars given above anent the foundation of Luang P’hrab Bāng clearly show that its original builders were spirit and serpent worshipers. So have become, and to a certain extent remained up to this day, their descendants, notwithstanding their adoption, from the middle of the fourteenth century, of Buddhism. As a consequence, at the expiration of each year two buffaloes, of which one is white and the other black, are immolated, and the flesh offered up to the guardian deities of the country on stands erected at each corner of the town. The two hermit founders of the city are also worshipped at the same season on the top of the Chôm Śri Hill and at the confluence of the Nâm Kāūn. It will be observed that this kind of worship is common to the Chinese, and was evidently brought by the Lāu from their ancient home in China, where it is a time-honoured custom, sanctioned by law, to offer bullocks to the spirits of the mountains, streams, and land, to the spirits of the dead, etc.
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elephants. Accordingly, they were termed one the major and the other the minor elephant, and the open grassy plain stretching between them was assumed figuratively to be the lân-c'hâng, i.e. the pasture-field for the two pachyderms. Thus originated, it is alleged, the name Lân-c'hâng, by which Lúang P'hraḥ Bâng and its territory have been longest and best known to foreigners, and after which the Chinese have denominated the principal stream running through that State, to wit, the Mê-Không River. It should be remembered, however, that the whole of ancient Chiao-chih, or Tonkin, including the territory of what became afterwards the kingdom of Campâ, was, according to Chinese and Annamese records, conquered and constituted into the chün (province) of Hsiang under the Ts'in, in B.C. 214. Also, that after the second Chinese conquest of B.C. 111, Lin-i, a district of the former chün of Hsiang corresponding, roughly, to the present Ha-tinh province, had its name changed to Hsiang-lin. Now, the Chinese term Hsiang, meaning an elephant, is exactly equivalent to the Thai c'hâng; and Hsiang-lin ('Elephant-grove,' and also, 'Elephant assemblage'), if turned into the grammatical construction peculiar to the Thai language, becomes Lin-hsiang and acquires a similar meaning to the Thai Lân-c'hâng ('Elephant grounds'). Here, then, we have a proof that the designation of 'Elephant country,' or 'Elephant territory,' existed for the region immediately to the east of the State of Lúang P'hraḥ Bâng from at least as early a date as 214 B.C. Such being the case, the question arises as to whether the designation referred to was invented by the Chinese for the territories of Hsiang and Hsiang-lin and came subsequently to be applied also to Lúang P'hraḥ Bâng (in a similar manner with the term Cûlanî alluded to above), owing to its being coterminous with those territories with which it was always more or less connected and often confused by eastern geographers and historians; or whether, per contra, the same designation originated in Lúang P'hraḥ

1 Phû C'hâng-nôi and Phû C'hâng-idang.
Bāng itself and the names Hsiang and Hsiang-lin were borrowed from it. It is more likely, however, that 'Elephant Country' was in origin but a generic term for the whole of the region extending, roughly, from the Nan-ling Mountains in Kwang-si to the Mê-Không at Lúang P'hraḥ Bāng and to the shores of the Gulf of Tonkin, as evidenced by the fact that we find the same term localized to three different sections of that region, to wit: Lúang P'hraḥ Bāng, Hsiang-lin, and even as outlying a district as Hsiang-chou in Kwang-si. In short, under the ancient denomination of Hsiang, or 'Elephant territory,' the State of Lúang P'hraḥ Bāng must also have been included. Whether the paternity of such a designation is really to be ascribed to the Chinese conquerors of that region or not, it is now difficult to judge. The probability is that the country was so named by its early occupiers, whether of Thai or Mûn-Annæam extraction; for it must be remembered that the term hsiang—under its multifarious forms, such as ch'ang, de'ing, etc.—is not peculiar to the language of China proper alone, but is equally met with in most languages and dialects presently spoken in the Indo-Chinese Peninsula, those of the Malay-Chàm group and Annamese being perhaps the only exceptions.

Under these circumstances one feels little inclined to credit the statement of native chroniclers that the designation of Lân-c'êhäng for Lúang P'hraḥ Bāng was invented by and applied to in situ the Lâu. It must have pre-existed, I repeat, as a generic term not only for the territory occupied by that State, but also for the surrounding country, long before the foundation of Lúang P'hraḥ Bāng city itself; and its survival as a name for the latter is merely one separate instance of its subsequent localization to distinct parts of that region.

In Ptolemy's time it still existed for both Lúang P'hraḥ Bāng and Hsiang-lin; but he referred to the former State, or its capital, under the name of Dasana or Doana (i.e. 'Country of the Te'wan') and to the latter as Kortatha, a term which, we shall see in due course, represents Kau-té or Chiù-té (in Annamese Kû-dûk), the ancient name for the Hsiang-lin or Lin-i district. While thus not making any
explicit mention of the term ‘Elephant Country’ for either of the above territories, Ptolemy appears nevertheless not to have been totally ignorant of its existence in so far, at least, as Lúang P'hrah Bâng is concerned, for he speaks, as we have already noted at the outset of this section, of elephants being found in the mountainous tracts dividing the country of the Doânai from the home of the Léstai (Lower Siâm and Kamboja). If the designation of Lân c'hâng for the territory of Lúang P'hrah Bâng can thus be traced back to B.C. 214, it is very likely that the date at which it was first applied to the adjoining Mê-Không River is scarcely less remote, and thus our previous remarks on this subject receive further confirmation.¹

We now come to the fourth name of the city, or rather of its territory, which is given as Jâvâ, Châvâ, or Savâ (Mùâng Châvâ). This term is stated in the local chronicles to have existed previous to the advent of the Lâu, it having been, in fact, adopted from the name of the first

¹ The Portuguese historians refer to the State of Lân-c'hâng under the name of Lângô (see Bocarro, “Decadas da India,” p. 117, in Collecció do Monumentos Inéditos, etc., t. vi). The Italian missionaries term it the kingdom of the ‘Langioni.’ This word is explained by Marini (Della Missioni, etc., Rome, 1663, p. 448) as meaning ‘migliaia di elefanti’ (thousands of elephants); which shows that he mistook the term Lân, natural tone, for Lâm, emphatic tone, which means ‘a million.’ The same error is repeated by Tosi (Dell’ India Orientale, vol. ii, p. 142), who calls the capital city Langiona (p. 139). The capital was at this period Wêng Chan (Candrapuri), which bore in consequence the same title of Nagara (or Krung) Sêri Sattanôga-nahut Lân-c'hâng belonging to the former capital Lûang P'hrah Bâng. The name Lûang P'hrah Bâng for the latter only came into use when it ceased to be capital in A.D. 1665. The city was then left under the nominal protection of the famous statue of Buddha known by the name of P'hrah Bâng (Vrah Pâng), and under the care and guardianship of the chief priests; thence its name of Lûang P'hrah Bâng or Mùâng Lûang P'hrah Bâng, the capital-city of the sacred Bâng statue of Buddha, by which it has always been known from that date, even after it became the capital of a separate kingdom from that of Wêng Chan later on. The Chinese corrupted Lân-c'hâng into Nan-chang (南 搗), this being the form under which they refer to Lûang P'hrah Bâng in their records after A.D. 1730. A much more accurate rendering was the one adopted long before that for the Mê-Không, i.e. Lân-ts'ang (南 倉); while none proved more exact for the second part of the name than the ancient Hsiang (象). The discrepancies in these renderings are no doubt due to differences in the pronunciation of the above Chinese characters at the various periods at which they were employed in the transcription of the name of Lân-c'hâng.
ruler (referred to as Khûn Ch'auvâ, i.e. 'King Ch'hawâ' or 'King Javâ') of the population of Chêh race who originally settled in the country about Lûâng P'hrañ Bâng, whence their descendants were driven away, as stated in a former page (129), by the invading Lâu under Khûn Lô. It thus appears that Mûâng Ch'auvâ must have been one of the very first names—if not, indeed, the earliest—borne by the territory of Lûâng P'hrañ Bâng, and, as I have already shown, its connection with the terms Chêh, C'hien, Yuan, Yavana, Javana, and Java, Yava, or Yüeh, clearly denotes a country inhabited by tribes of the same race as is known to have held from the remotest time the southern portion of China and to have subsequently spread over the whole of the Indo-Chinese Peninsula and part of the Malay Archipelago, all along which it has left standing vestiges of its domination not only in the language but also in the name of Java, which it has carried as far as the Sunda Strait. I need not repeat that the great people here alluded to is the so-called Mûñ-Annam race in its manifold ramifications. We shall meet it later on when dealing with the southern portion of Indo-China and the Malay Archipelago. In the meantime we may call attention to the fact of the persistence of the name Ch'auvâ in connection with Lûâng P'hrañ Bâng, which is a sure index of its importance. Had it been merely the name of a ruler it would have been no more preserved attached to the name of the country than those of Khûn Lô and other monarchs, no matter how illustrious, have been. The reason why it was handed down to posterity indissolubly identified with the name of the country was, then, that it was the name of the race which first occupied it and developed its resources. We have already traced the term Ch'auvâ, under its Lâu form of Savâ, or Savâ, in the designation Savaka-Malâ, or Savaka-Malava, which the region of Eastern Laois, and more properly the State of Lûâng P'hrañ Bâng, have borne down to this day; and we did not omit to remark how both Ch'auvâ and Savaka (Javaka) gave rise to the denominations Lao Chua and Chua-kia, applied from the earliest period by the Chinese to
the same region. These are, I think, sufficient arguments as to the antiquity of that term and its purport and correct application in so far as the State of Lüang P'hraḥ Băng is concerned.

The Lüang P'hraḥ Băng chronicles state that in the course of time the early terms Ch'ien-dông-Ch'ien-thông and Ch'aučă became somewhat obsolescent, and that the style Nagara Śri Satta-nāga-nahut Lān-ch'āng was adopted as the official title of the realm and its capital, completed afterwards by the addition of the words Rōm-khāu, 'white chatta or parasol,' as a reference to the symbol of royal dominion that surmounted the throne of its rulers. The above is, in fact, the usual form under which we find the kingdom of Lüang P'hraḥ Băng referred to in official documents and in the chronicles of Lāos, Siām, and surrounding countries. When, however, the capital was removed from Lüang P'hraḥ Băng to Wieng Chan (A.D. 1565), the same style was adopted for the latter-named city, and retained,

1 Another, so far unexplained Chinese designation for Lüang P'hraḥ Băng is 卯龍 (Lʻau-lʻuang). It cannot be very old, for it is undoubtedly meant for Lâu-Luang, i.e. the 'Lâu of Mūng Lâu,' as for brevity's sake the 'Lâu of Mūng Lōang P'hraḥ Băng' are often referred to by the natives. In a similar manner those of their kinsmen who hail from Wieng Chan are termed, simply, Lâu Wieng. This conventional tribal name was recorded under the form Lou-wen (pronounced Lau-weng in Flemish) by Gerard van Wusthof (A.D. 1641), who mistook it for the name of the country and employed it to designate the Mē-Khōng—a stream, he says, usually called 'the Lou-wen River.' The illustrious Francis Garnier, his translator and commentator, although he had been over the same ground, was much puzzled by the term Lou-wen, and could suggest no explanation (see "Voyage lointain aux royaumes de Cambodge et Laouwen," in bulletin de la Société de Géographie for 1871, p. 251). Its meaning will now be clear to the reader. It will also appear evident how, similarly to Wusthof with Lâu-Wieng, the Chinese took Lâu-Luang to be a name of country.

In the same work Wusthof mentions (p. 274) Meuang Saws, which Garnier identifies with Xieng-hai (C'hieng Rāi). Every reader will now see, however, that Meuang Saws, i.e. Lüang P'hraḥ Băng, is the place meant.

The utter inability of a scholarly man like Garnier to identify two well-known names in a region which he had not only visited, but also studied, plainly demonstrates how little reliance can be placed upon the effusions of less gifted travellers—let alone globe-trotters—who, from the mere fact of having journeyed post-haste through a country, think themselves entitled to speak ex cathedra upon the most intricate questions connected with its geography, ethnology, etc.

2 The name of Śri Sattanāga-maṇota for Lüang P'hraḥ Băng already occurs in the Siamese Kōṭa Mūsthērābāṅ (Kōta Mandira-pāla) or "Statutes of Palatine Law," enacted in A.D. 1368 by the king who founded Ayuthia.
even after Lúang Phrañh Bāng was restored as capital of a separate kingdom, down to the destruction of Wieng Chan in 1828. Owing to this circumstance several foreign authorities were misled into believing that Wieng Chan was the old and original Lân-châng, an absolutely mistaken notion.

I have remarked in a preceding page that traces of the classical name of the country, Dasana or Daśārṇa, may be detected in the legend of the foundation of Lúang Phrañh Bāng. We saw, in fact, that the junior of the two original founders, who afterwards remained alone in charge of the city, is called Deśādaśan or Deśādaśah in that legend. This name may well be a modification or corruption of some original term like Daśun or Daśārṇa, representing the name of either the first king of the realm, or of the country itself as designated by the early Indū adventurers who settled in it.

The alternative name Ch'hieng Thōng given to the city by the Lāu may be, not as the legend says, in allusion to the coral-tree, but to the elder of the supposed hermit founders, who, it will be remembered, is called Thōng (gold). The most probable conjecture seems to me, however, that both the terms Đông and Thōng, occurring in the Lāu name of the city, are connected with the name of the Lāu tribes which first occupied it, and with the designation of the country that formed their early habitat. We have remarked that Te'wan, T'wan, or Doan was the name of the first Lāu occupiers; and that Da-nan-dông was the designation of the country at the headwaters of the Red River formerly inhabited by them. Also, that Huang-dông or Huang-tông was the name of tribes of the Hsi-yüan-man living on the eastern borders of the Thai kingdom of Nan-chao. We have seen, moreover, that the small watercourse joining the Mē-Không below the city of Lúang Phrañh Bāng is called Hüei Nam-Đông, i.e. the Nam Đong rivulet, and that from

3 The founder of Old Pugān (Bukān) in Upper Burma was a kṣatriya prince from Gangetic India by the name of Dāsa (Dāna) or Dāsa-rāja. See Phayre's "History of Burma," p. 9.
it the city is held to have been named C'hiêng Dong. Here we are then, from all appearances, in the presence of the same term Da-nan-dông, transplanted from the headwaters of the Red River to the banks of the Mé-Không by the early Lâu invaders—the Ts'wan, T'wan, or Doan—who, we have seen, came exactly from that very spot. Da-nan-dông seems to me a purely Thai or Lâu toponymic. It can be taken, in fact, to mean Thà-nam-dông, i.e. 'the landing-place of the forest' or 'the jungle landing.' Dong, though often written with a cerebral d, can hardly be a proper name; it simply means 'forest, woods'; whence Nam Dong signifies 'forest stream.'

As regards the Huang-dông or Huang-tong barbarians of the Annamese and Chinese Annalists, although represented as belonging to the Hsi-yüan-man stock, they were nevertheless very probably of the same race of the Nan-Chao with whom they were conterminous on the west; for it must be remembered that the Lâu and other offshoots of the Thai race were called Yuan, Yonas, or Yavanas, from the fact of their occupying territories once belonging to Môn-Annam races, with whom they became to a certain extent intermingled. Besides, Yuan-man was, for the Chinese, a generic term by which they collectively designated the pre-Chinese tribes of Southern Kwang-si and South-Eastern Yünnan. It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the terms C'hiêng Dong and C'hiêng Thông, by which Lúang P'hrah Bâng was at one time designated, were introduced by the Ts'wan, T'wan, or Doan, and perhaps also by some branch of the Huang-dông or Huang-tong, coming thither from the upper reaches of the Red and Black Rivers through Lao-kai, Lai-chao, and Müang Thân (Dien-bien p'hu).

At the same time the names Doana and Doânai recorded by Ptolemy for the city or State of Lúang P'hrah Bâng, and for its people respectively, sufficiently attest of the country being, in his time, already occupied by the Ts'wan, T'wan, or Doan. Concerning the intimate connection, if not absolute identity, of the three tribal names just given,
and their application to branches of the Thai race, there can be no doubt; and I imagine that I have given enough convincing arguments to prove both these. Should, however, any further evidence be required, I might refer to the following point. Some people in the Sibsagar district are, up to this day, called Doanias. "These people," says Gurdon in his paper on the Khamtis, 1 "also, I think, are allied to the Khamtis . . . . The Assamese call them Dōanias from the word (Dōaniya) meaning 'interpreter.'" As the Khamtis—or, rather, Kham-di—are a people of the Thai stock, whose early predecessors in Asam, the Ahom (Asama), of the same race invaded and conquered the

1 Journal Royal Asiatic Society, January, 1895. The correct name for the Khamtis is Kham-di, a pure Thai expression meaning 'good gold.' Kham is still the common name for gold among the Lāu. Thōng, derived from the Chinese 粮 (t‘ung)—as Kham is from 金 (chin, in Cantonese kēm)—is often used instead, though it means also 'copper' and 'a yellow metal' in general. In Siamese always, and in Lāu at times, the term employed to designate gold is a compound of both words, thus: thōng-kham. It strikes me that the Khampi must be the same branch of the Thai race whom the Chinese term Chin-ch‘ih ('Golden Teeth') and to whom Marco Polo refers as the Zardandan (evidently a corrupt and contracted form of the Sanskrit Suvarn-danta); and that perhaps their name of Khampi has something to do with their ancient practice of gilding their teeth. In some of the southern Chinese dialects the words Chin-ch‘ih are pronounced Kam-ch‘i or Kam-sī; and sī in Siamese is a numerical affix employed in the numbering of teeth, while sīk in Shan ( зуб ) is also used as a synonym for tooth. Of course the Thai construction would be sī-kham or sīk-kham, which is quite different from Kam-ch‘i and Kham-di; yet it is evident that both names are connected in some way or other. Should this prove to be the case, the historical inference could be drawn that a branch of the Khampi, if not the entire body of them, was still dwelling in the territory of Yung-ch‘ang in Marco Polo's time.

Since writing the above I notice that Mr. J. F. Needham, in his "Outline Grammar of the OoO [Thai] (Khāmti) Language" (Rangoon, 1894, p. i, Preface), gives two different derivations of the term Khāmti, i.e.: (1) 'tied to the spot,' from kham = 'to stick, to remain where placed' (in Siamese khong), and ti = 'spot, place' (in Siamese thi); (2) kham-ti = 'golden locality.' In my opinion both these new-fangled etymologies are absurd and unacceptable, the first one on historical and the other on linguistic grounds, for it being a rule in Thai languages that adjective follows substantive, 'golden locality' would be expressed as Thi-Kham, and not in the form referred to. I therefore hold, until substantial proof to the contrary is forthcoming, that Kham-di is the correct etymology. Abbé Desgodins, though explaining it 'pays de l'or,' writes Kham-di (Annales de l'Extreême Orient, t. iii, p. 43).
country many a century ago, we see that the ancient, probably original, name of Doan has been preserved there. And this is evidently no other but the term Doānai given by Ptolemy to their kinsmen who settled along the Doanas or Mē-Khōng River, and in the city and territory of Doana or Lūang P'hraḥ Bāṅg. It conclusively ensues from the above that in Ptolemy's time the State of Lūang P'hraḥ Bāṅg was already occupied by a population of Thai race.

Bareukora or Bareuathra, a city (No. 75).

This is undoubtedly Barikan, a township officially known to the Siāmese as Pariganha-nigama, sometimes, but incorrectly, spelled Parikkhaṇḍa-nigama. It is situated on the Nam Chan (pronounced Nam San by the Lāu), a tributary from the left of the Mē-Khōng, at the foot of the P'hu Ngū ('Snake-mountain') Range; and usually appears in the maps as Borikan or Barikan, the common and shortened form in which its name is pronounced. Colonel Yule, misled by a similarity in names with Barakura, located by Ptolemy in Arakan, took Bareukora to be the same place, and thus assigned to both an identical position at Rāmu, below Chittagong. The difference of 12° in longitude and of over 4° in latitude between the sites of the two cities, as reckoned by Ptolemy, should have proved a sufficient indication that it was a question of two quite distinct places, and not of one only.

The name Bareukora can easily be accounted for as a corrupt rendering of Pariganha-ghara or Parigraha-nagara. One of its variae lectiones¹ is Bareuaṭra, in which I am inclined to recognize the Po-lo-la, or P'o-lo-la, kingdom located by Chinese authors to the east of Ch'iḥ-t'u (Sukhada, i.e. Sukhothai) during the seventh century A.D.²

As regards the other form, Bareuathra, it presumably stands for Pāripātra or Pāriyātra, the classical name applied in India to the northern portion of the Vindhya chain of

¹ Given in Nobbe's edition of Ptolemy's Geography, t. iii, p. 207, index.
² See Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., vol. ii, p. 466.
mountains in which the Mālava people had their dwelling. This term may have been transplanted here, in the Indo-Chinese Mālava country, by the early Indū settlers, and applied to either the P'hū Ngū or other mountain range in the neighbourhood of Barikan. Other possible readings are Parivastha, Parivarta, or Parivāsa, all terms which convey the sense of village, abode, residence, and may, to a certain extent, have done duty at one time for the modern nigama.


The region of the Gulf of Siām from Samaradē onwards to Kamboja and the Cochin-Chinese coast as far as Zabai beyond the Mē-Khōng delta, Ptolemy terms the region of the Lēstai, a name which by some of his translators has been taken to mean 'Country of the Robbers.' McCrindle, especially, lays great stress on the fact that the n in Λησταί has the iota subscripted, inferring thus that it "is not a transcript of any indigenous name, but the Greek name for robbers or pirates."¹ This will appear too sweeping an assertion when it is considered that stena, stainya, styena, laṭa, and, to a certain extent, laṭṭa and laṭaka, are Sanskrit terms each denoting a robber, and any of which, if actually found in use in the country at that period, may have suggested to our author the transliteration, and at one time translation, Lēstai. It may be as well to remark in this connection that Kambū, in Sanskrit, also means a thief or plunderer, wherefore the term Lēstai would appear to designate the Kambū-jā, i.e. a race or tribe of robbers, who may correspond to the ancient population of the maritime districts of Siām and Kamboja. The coasts of these regions have, up to quite recent times, been noted for piracy, and it is therefore possible that the name of their inhabitants, Kambūjās,

¹ "Ancient India as described by Ptolemy," p. 224.
originated from this fact, and was afterwards made to look more decent by a slight alteration of the vowel ṛ into o, thus making it identical with the classical name of a people in Northern India. The form it retains down to this day among Siāmese and Khmers alike is, however, closely similar to the one we have given at the outset, that is Kambūjā. How far the linguistic identity, if any, of the two terms, Lēstai and Kambūjās, can be maintained, it is difficult to say at the present stage of our knowledge of the country; I have only hinted at it as a possible coincidence deserving consideration. But as regards the ethnical identity of the two peoples, or at least of the Lēstai, with some tribe or tribes formerly inhabiting the territory along the Gulf of Siām, and perhaps also the interior of both Siām and Kamboja, I have not the slightest doubt. I may indeed add that if the term Lēstai be taken in the sense of ‘bands of armed men,’ or ‘people organized into armed bands,’ it has in some Greek authors, it will be found even in the present day applicable to one portion, at least, of the region now under consideration; to wit, the territory about Chanthabūn, on the eastern coast of the Gulf of Siām, inhabited by the C’hōng or Lasōng. These people, who consist to a considerable extent of outlaws from neighbouring tribes, are noted for their habit of forming into separate bands or groups, which are termed Sōng. Thence, I think, their name of Lasōng has been derived, while their proper and original designation appears to be C’hōng. This is, at any rate, the way their name is spelled in Siāmese. It is asserted that in certain traditions still extant in Kamboja this people is alluded to as having been the first to come and settle in the Lower Mē-Không valley. Whether such was really the case or not, the C’hōng appear at any rate to be the scattered remnants of the ancient population of Kamboja;

1 In the ancient inscriptions, especially in that of Pahāi-cham-krong (see Journal Asiatique, August–September, 1882, p. 151) Kamboja is termed the ‘land of Kambu,’ from a mythical Kambu Sāyamkhuva regarded as a sort of Manu of the Kambūjās, and as the progenitor of their line of kings. But this name Kambu is very likely a modification of some closely similar term previously existing in the country.
and the survival amongst them of the practice of forming into autonomous groups or bands, whether for the purpose of plunder or merely in observance to some time-honoured tradition, suggests that such a practice may at one time have been more generally followed among the early settlers of the country. The testimony of the Chinese travellers who visited that region—to which we shall again have to refer directly—tends rather to confirm that opinion.

The description that Ptolemy gives of the Lēstai is anything but flattering. "The inhabitants of the Country of the Robbers (Ἀργοτών)," he says, "are reported to be savages (Θηριώδες), dwelling in caves, and that have skins like the hide of the hippopotamus, which darts cannot pierce through."¹ This description applies just as well to the natives of the interior as to the Negrito tribes of fishermen anciently occupying the islands and the wild tracts on the littoral. If we compare it with the accounts left us of Fu-nan, which corresponded to the region now under consideration, by the early Chinese travellers, we shall find some points of resemblance. From the information gathered by Ma Tuan-lin, it appears that previous to and during the first two centuries of the Christian Era, the male portion of the natives of Fu-nan went about quite naked, until the two Chinese envoys who visited the country between A.D. 222–252 having called the attention of its ruler to this impropriety, he ordered his subjects to cover themselves.² On the other hand, in a Chinese account of Chên-la (Southern Kamboja) of a much later date (A.D. 1295)³ it is stated that the inhabitants of the country were wont to go about always armed and "cuirassées," as if being in constant war. This may help to some extent to explain the invulnerability ascribed to them by Ptolemy as well as his reason for naming them Lēstai, supposing that this term refers to their organization into armed bands. As to their dwelling in caves, it may be observed that such has always been the practice of the aborigines

¹ McCrindle, op. cit., p. 222.
³ Rémusat, "Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques," t. i, p. 77.
of those coasts, especially of fishermen. Even at the present day a primitive community of troglodytes is to be found in some islets of the former inland sea of Kamboja, now the fresh-water lake named Thalê Sâb, which have but recently been explored. Similar cave dwellings can, moreover, be traced all the way, on the path of the Ch'ien race, from Sz'chuen, Kwei-chou, and Kwang-hsi, to the southern end of Kamboja.

The Ch'ong (Jiang) or Lasông; the Kui or Kwei (also termed Khmèr-döm, i.e. 'primitive Khmèrs'); the Stien or Stteng; the Kan-chô, and other semi-barbarous tribes of Siâm and Kamboja, are probably the remnants of the presumably mixed population known to Ptolemy as the Léstai. While the Kan-chô appear to represent all that is left in Kamboja of the aboriginal Negrito element, the Stien, Kui, and other apparently non-Mongolic tribes, are believed by some travellers to be a branch of the Caucasian race that found its way from Central Asia to the southeastern extremity of Indo-China. This bold assertion,

1 "Des Cambodgiens habitent cette montagne [Ba-Tê Sôn, now generally marked Nui Ba-Tê in the maps, to the south-west of Long Xuyen on the Mé-Không Delta], soit dans les grottes ou cavesmes qu'elle forme à sa base, soit sur la montagne elle même. Ces gens-là ont la chasse pour industrie; ils prennent aussi des poissons dans les petits arroyos." ("Gia-dinh Thung-chi," Aubaret's transl., p. 224.)

2 The term Kan-chô—or, simply, Chô, kan being but a prefix—means 'dogs' (in Annamese, Ch'ông, Suk, etc.), and thus corresponds to Sakai, likewise designating a dog (from the Khmèr c'hakèi, in Por c'ham, in Khmu soh), the name by which the semi-wild tribes of the Malay Peninsula north of the Perak River are known to the Malays. The Sakai would thus appear to be identical with the Kukkuars (dogs) whom in a former section I have located in the territory of Kokkonagara (Korbie). They are not, however, Negritos like the Samanèg, from whom they quite differ in physique and in having a fairer complexion; but belong to the Ch'ien race, whose language they speak and term the Sen-èi language; though by gradually absorbing into their mass a considerable proportion of the genuine Negritos with whom they have long been in contact, they may have to a certain extent degenerated. In conclusion, the Sakai present in my opinion the same admixture of Ch'ien and aboriginal Negrito elements which may likewise be recognized in the Wah and in other semi-wild tribes of Siâm and Kamboja, and which must have been in Ptolemy's time a feature common to all the populations inhabiting the coasts of Indo-China.

The picture that Moura ("Royaume du Cambodge," vol. i, p. 425) draws of the Kan-chô is not a whit more inviting than the one left us by Ptolemy of the Léstai, which it resembles in a remarkable manner. Amongst other things Moura says: "leur peau est rugueuse comme celle du buffle; . . . l'aspect général d'un Cancho est celui d'une bête féroce." If here for buffalo we substitute hippopotamäus, we obtain a description tallying very closely with that of Ptolemy's Léstai.
however, requires substantial proof ere it can definitely be accepted. In the name of the Stien—apparently an abbreviation of a form Lastien or Lastyan, as Chōng or Jōng presumably is of Lasōng or Lajōng—it is possible to recognize a certain resemblance to the term Lēstai. On the other hand, if the latter term be interpreted as 'robbers,' the corresponding Sanskrit word styena or its homonyms, steyin and stānyā, may be easily recognized in the name of the Stiens. This name, by the way, is usually noted in European books and maps as Stieng; but I hear it pronounced by the Siāmese in the way I write it, Stien, which I therefore take to be the correct form. Though presently occupying a wild tract of country to the east of the Lower Mē-Khōng, the Stien may, at an earlier period, have extended further west as far as the Thalē Sāb, and down to the shores of the Gulf of Siām, whence they were driven out by later invaders of the country. If they really belong to a branch of the Caucasian race that descended from the Central Asian plateau, like the Li-su, Mo-so, etc., they may be connected with people of that stock still to be found along the north-western frontier of Indo-China, such as the Lu-tse, Li-su, Let-tha, and the Lahu (the Mu-sō branch of the Mo-so), who bear names similar in form to those of the Stien (or Lastien) and the Lēstai. And if, on the other hand, as indicated by linguistical evidence and other peculiarities, the Stien, like most tribes of Kamboja, belong to the Mōn-Annam stock, and came from Southern China, whence they were driven out by the impact of the expanding Thai race and the incursions of the Chinese, we find no lack, both on the Southern Chinese borders and on the banks of the Yang-tsz, of similar names to theirs. As an instance, I may mention the Luh-to, against whom the Āi-Lāu fought in A.D. 47. We have besides, all over Indo-China, many tribes of both Thai and Mōn-Annam race, whose names begin by either Li, Lū, Le,

1 Lastien is the form that the name of Pulastya, the mythical ancestor of the Rākṣasas, has taken in Siām and Kamboja.
or Lau, such as the Lāu, Lū, Lī (also called Le, Lai, and Loi), Lawā, Lamet, Lamāt, Lamang, Lami, Lān-tên, Lasōng (C'hōng), Lahu (Mu-sō), etc., mentioned above.

If it could be demonstrated that any one of the tribes just alluded to as having names beginning with Le, Li, etc., was, in Ptolemy's time, dwelling in Southern Siām and Kamboja, it would then be possible to assume that the term Ληοτόν Χώρα, by which our authority designates the country, stands for Lê-sthān, or Lêi-sthān, and means 'the land of the Le, Li, Lū, or Loi.' As to the Lū, they are evidently out of the question, no branch of the Thai race having at so early a period reached as far down as the Gulf of Siām. But the same cannot be said of the Li, Lai, or Loi, in whom we can easily recognize the Dōi or Lawā and cognate tribes of the C'hieng race. In fact, by virtue of an interchange of consonants peculiar to most Indo-Chinese languages, Dōi, a C'hieng term for 'mountain,' so pronounced in C'hieng-mài Lāu, becomes ꐄ (Lōi) in Thai-yāi (Shān, more properly Thai, of Burmā), and from it is formed the couplet ꐄꐄ (Lōi-le) having the same meaning. In some parts of the Lawā country, moreover, Dōi or Lōi assumes the form Hōi.¹ From this ensues that the Hōi of Campā and the Li, Le, Loi, or Lai of Hainan are probably the same people as the Lawā, or that at any rate they belong to the same stock. The term Dōi = Lōi = Hōi = Li, Le, or Lai becomes thus explained as meaning 'mountaineers' or 'hill people.'² And as the Hōi of

¹ The Lawā of Mūng Yong and C'hieng Tung, says Garnier, call themselves Hoi-mang, and those of the Salwin borders Hoi-kum.

² After writing the above I came across a passage of Ma Tuan-lin wherein it is stated (op. cit., vol. ii, p. 394) that the natives of Hainan call the mountains li and the mountaineers Li-jen. This fully confirms the result I arrived at quite independently, on the mere basis of philological investigation. It will be noticed that the identity of the word Li (which is also pronounced Lai and Loi) with the Lawā-Shan terms Dōi and Lōi suggests not only a racial but also a linguistic connection between the Li and the Lawā. I have no doubt that both were originally one and the same people. The Hainanese Li speak a language profusely interspersed with Thai words, and on this score they are supposed by some authorities to belong to the Thai race. But this is a mistake: so do the Lawā speak a language which is to a great extent Lāu in character, and yet they do
Campā are known still to survive in as southern a province as Binh-thuan, and ramifications of the Lauvā or Dōi in Siām still exist within a hundred miles of the Gulf in the Sup'han district, it is no wonder if at an earlier period they had been occupying most of the intervening country, thus justifying for the latter Ptolemy's appellation of Ἀγατῶν Χώρα or 'Country of the Lōi, Lai, or Le.' There are not, as a fact, indications wanting in Kamboja as to the existence of peoples similar in name to the Lauvā or Lōi. We have there tribes still known as Lavē or Lovē, Ve, and Bolocen; and cities or districts called Lawēk (Lava, Lavaka; the Lovēc of maps), Lavā-em (Lovēa-em of maps), etc.: all these being terms that remind us of Lauvā and Wāh. Neither are there lacking indications as to the presence of the term Chīeng in both Kamboja and Campā. The very word Doctrine for Campā, variously pronounced Chan, Cham, and Chien in the Chinese dialects and Chiem in Annamese, seems to be connected with Chīeng; and who can tell whether the term Cama appearing in the oldest Chām inscriptions as the name of the country was not belong to the Thai or Lāu races at all. Both the Lauvā and Lī are Chīeng, i.e. mountaineers, while the Thai or Lāu are a valley-dwelling people. I may add that upon examining several short vocabularies taken down from the Lī of Hainan, I found that most of the words which are not borrowed from the Thai language are traceable either to Mōi, Moeso, or Miau-tze; a circumstance tending to show that the Lī belong to the pre-Chinese hill-race of Southern China. Moura (op. cit., vol. i, p. 609) says that in Cochin-China the Lōi are called Hōi. Bouillevaux (in Annales Extrême Orient, t. ii, p. 321) states that the Annamese term also Hōi the Chām. The ancient Campā kingdom was known to the Annamese by the name of Bā-Lōi, i.e. the Great Lōi (Hōi, Hōi, Dōi, or Lōi) State (see "Gia-dinh Thung-chi," Aubaret's transl., p. 177), and is said (ibid.) to have extended to the south-east from the harbour of Kiao-chih (Tonkin) to Ch'ih-t'u* (Sukhoda, i.e. Sukhothai). In this Bā-Lōi country inhabited by Lōi, Hōi, Hōi, Dōi, or Lōi, populations, I think that we have the true equivalent of Ptolemy's Lēstōn Khōra (Lōi-sīlān). Traces of both the terms Hōi and Lōi are met with in the names of Dong-Hōi (meaning 'Field of the Hōi, i.e. Chām,' in Quang-binh) and S'ī Banî (Sī Manj), termed also S'rī Bā-nōi (= S'ī Bā-Lōi?), in that neighbourhood. To these we shall, however, revert more fully in the next section.

* [Ch'ih-t'u was also, according to the same work (p. 173) the name of the territory to the east of Bā-ria, which may be the locality meant here instead of Siām. In this case the area of the Bā-Lōi kingdom would assume more limited proportions, but our identification would thereby be not much impaired.]

1 Possibly from Lauvā (lovēa in French spelling) = 'fig-tree'; but it remains to see whether this is not a modern construction put upon the term. As regards Lawēk, its name means 'an opening, an entrance to the forest,' and thus proves identical with the name of Ava, the ancient capital of Burmā, which has
not derived from it? Do not the same inscriptions speak of \textit{Vṛlah-kirāta-vrtaś}, 'people (\textit{Vṛlahs}) that were Kirātas,' i.e. mountaineers? Who could these \textit{Vṛlahs}, these former mountaineers be, except some branch of the C'hieng race? These are, however, questions the solution of which depends upon a thorough ethnologic investigation of the numerous hill tribes of Kamboja and Campā as yet so little known; and therefore the definite answer must be left to time. It seems nevertheless pretty certain, that at the period we treat of, a population of the C'hieng or Mûn-Annam stock occupied almost the whole of Indo-China, extending from the Annamese coast to the Gulf of Martaban and the Arakanese seaboard; and from the southern borders of Yûnnan to the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago. Branches of this race bore different names; but the Lêstai referred to by Ptolemy undoubtedly belonged to it, whether they be the Stieng or Stien, the Dôi or Lôi, etc.

A tribe of Negrito extraction in the Malay Peninsula is actually known by the name of \textit{Udai}; but I am little inclined to believe that they are in any way connected with Ptolemy's Lêstai. Of the Negritos of Cochin-China we shall treat in the next section. For the present it only remains for us to add a few remarks in connection with the geography of Indo-China as known to the ancient Indūs.

the same meaning. \textit{Lavaka}, or \textit{Lava}; \textit{Dâvaka}, \textit{Dava}, and \textit{Ava} are therefore linguistically connected. There is, however, a tradition among the Khmērs that Lawêk was originally called \textit{Lava}, a term which, they say, means 'mixed,' 'crossed.' They explain the circumstance of its having been applied to their ancient capital by a legend to the effect that one of their old kings wedded the daughter of a Chinese trader. A son was born from this union, who killed the heir-apparent to the Kambojan throne, this being the offspring of a native princess and his junior in years, and having thus secured to himself the sovereign power founded a new capital which was called \textit{Lava} or Lawêk (Lavaka), because of its founder and king being of mixed descent. If so, the terms \textit{Lava} and Lawêk would be synonymous with C'hieng, Yûeh, etc. The Gûm are said to call Loù the Chinese, probably meaning that the latter are a mixed race (with Tartar-blood, etc.).

1 I am not sure whether this name has been correctly reported by explorers. It may be a mistake for \textit{Hudei}, which is, in fact, the name borne by certain wild tribes in the peninsula. In Eastern Siâm there dwell some tribes known as Út or Kha Út, about whom almost nothing has transpired.
Nothing can be gleaned from the Rāmāyaṇa except the hint that, beyond the Lohita Sea (Sea of the Straits) one enters the Ocean of Milk (Kṣiroda), in the middle of which rises a silver-white hill, Anśumat (or Rśabha), where there is to be found a delightful lake known as Sudarśana. After it comes the Sea of Ghee or Ghṛtoda. The Purāṇas place this first and make it surround Kuṣa-devīpa; but I preferred to follow the order set forth in the Rāmāyaṇa, which, being anterior in compilation, may be better relied upon. According to the Viṣṇu and other Purāṇas the Sea of Milk surrounds Śāka-devīpa, a region which I identify with Siām and Kamboja. The Ocean of Milk corresponds, therefore, with the sea encompassing the eastern littoral of the Malay Peninsula and the coastline of Siām and Kamboja as far as the Mé-Không delta; it is, in a word, the southernmost portion of the so-called China Sea, which should be here much more appropriately termed 'Sea of Malaya.' Masaudi names it the Sea of Kedrendj or Kerendj. ¹

¹ The Chinese used to call it the ‘Great Bay of Chin-lin’ (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., vol. ii, p. 511), i.e. of Kāmaliṅga or Kāmalaṅkā; for 金 (Chin-lin) reads Kam-lin in Cantonese and Kim-lan in Annamese, in which it is also spelled Kim-trän (cf. Kedrendj and Kerendj; and see Des Michels’ ‘Annales de l’Annam,’ p. 167). Chin-lin is, according to Kāśyapa, the same as Chin-Chou, i.e. Swarna-devīpa or Swarna-mālī-devīpa (Malay Peninsula, and not Sumatra as Mr. Takakusa infers in the ‘Record of the Buddhist Religion,’ etc., p. 17, n. 3). This identification of mine will be found in agreement both with Hwên Ts‘ang’s statement that Kāmalaṅkā is in a ‘great bay of the sea,’ and with Ma Tuan-lin’s passage (loc. cit.) that in setting out from Fu-nan (Kamboja) one crosses the ‘Great Bay of Chin-lin’ (Chin-lin-ta-wan). I may add furthermore that the ‘P‘či-wên Yün-fu’ and other Chinese works of reference locate the Chin-lin kingdom at 2,000 li (i.e. about 400 miles according to the old value of the li) to the west of Fu-nan (see loc. cit. and China Review, vol. xiv, p. 40), which is the exact distance from the capital of Fu-nan (as identified by me below, pp. 209, 210) to Krah, the capital of Kāmalaṅkā or Kāmaliṅga (over 6° of longitude in the maps). Thus it becomes easily understood how Chin-lin could join Chên-la (Kamboja) and Lin-i (Cambä) in supporting the rebel Annamese emperor Hâk-dê against the Chinese in a.d. 722 (Des Michels, op. cit., p. 165). Sumatra is at about twice that distance from Fu-nan; and then, far from being to the west of it, is almost due south. The P‘či-wên Yün-fu (loc. cit.) states moreover that Chin-lin produces silver. Well, the galena of the Tenasserim district in the ancient Kāmalaṅkā kingdom has been found to yield, on an average, 12 ounces of silver per ton of lead. Argentiferous is also the galena from Toung-ngoo, Martaban, Maulmain, and Tavoy (see ‘British Burma Gazetteer,’ vol. i, p. 64); but these places were all, except Toung-ngoo, situated within the territory of that State (v. supra,
been derived from the Sanskrit Kṣīrōda, Kṣīrārṇava, and, perhaps, also Kadūram. It is preceded by the Sea of Shelaheth (Srī-lohit), which we have identified with the Sea of Selat or Straits; and followed by the Sea of Senf, which, we shall show, corresponds to the Sarpis (‘clarified butter’) Ocean of the Purāṇas, called Ghytoda in the Rāmāyana, and to the present Gulf of Tonkin. No misconception is therefore possible on the position of the Ocean of Milk and of the region it encompasses, namely, Śaka-deīpa.

That the country here meant is really Kamboja, with the southern parts of Siām and Cochin-China, is unmistakably demonstrated by several coincidences in terminology which can be all but fortuitous. I can only summarily notice the most obvious, reserving a fuller treatment of the subject for a more suitable opportunity. First of all, the region is denominated Śaka-deīpa because, according to the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, of a large śāka (teak) tree being known to grow there. Apart from the fabulous manner in which the names of the various deīpas are accounted for in the Purāṇas, I think that the meaning intended in this case is, that the country abounds in teak-trees. This is actually the fact with the northern parts of Kamboja and Siām, where these trees are called Mai Sak, a word evidently derived from the Sanskrit Śāka. The name Śaka-deīpa given to this region is therefore amply justified; even if interpreted literally as ‘Region of the Teak-trees.’ But there is evidence as to some part at least of the country having been once called Śaka, apparently from the Sak or Suk tribes dwelling there along the Mē-Không banks,¹ who are often alluded to in ancient records, under the classical name of Śakas. These people are, as we already remarked, very probably identical with the Thek or Sak of ancient Burmā.

p. 114), and one has to go as far as the Chindwin valley in Upper Burmā ere he can find silver-producing ground. As to Sumatra, no silver has, to my knowledge, ever been discovered there. For the “Great Bay of Chin-lin” we must therefore understand the Bay of Kāmalakā; namely, the Sea of Kērdendj or Kerdendj of the Arabs, which is our modern Gulf of Siām.

¹ Now still to be found to the east of Bassac and Sténg-trëng, in the Attāpū district, formerly called Mūang Sok (Saka) from them.
A branch of the Chăm or people of Campā, coming across the borders subjugated, it appears, the Sak, and founded on the banks of the Lower Mē-Khōng a kingdom known by the name of Campāsak (Campāsaka), a term resulting evidently from the union of the names of the two peoples, conquerors and conquered. The new kingdom acquired at one time considerable power, extending down to the mouths of the Mē-Khōng; but it was since overthrown. Its name still remains preserved, however, in that of the present district and town of Bassac, more properly known as Campāsak; in the denomination of the western branch of the Lower Mē-Khōng, termed up to this day Khuc Pāsak (or Bā-Śak), i.e. 'the Pāsak branch'; and in the Bā-Śak, or Pā-Śak, district, existing up to the end of the last century in proximity to the outlet of that branch of the Mē-Khōng, called the Bā-Śak Mouth, or Kuā Bā-Śak. Bā in Khmēr means 'chief, principal, great'; hence Bā-Śak may be taken to signify the 'Great Śak, or Śaka, people (or country). It would thus appear that the term Bā-Śak existed previous to Campā-śak, which is probably a contraction of Campā-bā-śak. The existence of the term Śaka as the name of

1 In this connection it behoves me to rectify a rather awkward slip occurring in the translation and interpretation of the Po-U-Daung inscription of Burma printed at Rangoon, 1891. The passage I take exception to is at line 42 and runs in the original text:

My transliteration is:

Candapūrī, Campā, Pāsak, Maing Loun, tsa-ō pyi gyì dōh itiyā Lavaṟrtha daing.

The translation published in the above-quoted pamphlet is: "Lavaṟrtha with its districts Candipūri, Saṃpāṭṭhet [sic], and Mainglōn." Of these names only two are explained in footnotes: Lavaṟrtha as Lāos, and Mainglōn as Mainglōngry (1). Now the fact is that by Lava-raṭṭha Eastern Lāos is meant, Candapūri is Candrapuri or Wieng Chan, while Campā and Pāsak are intended to represent Campāsak, though apparently believed to be two separate States: Campā + Pāsak. This confirms the opinion we expressed above as to Campāsak being a contracted form of Campā-Bā-Śak. Saṃpāṭṭhet of the translator is really delicious, and a good example of the pranks that phoneticism plays with Burmese
a people in Kamboja will contribute, as we shall see in the next section, to accredit the Indu legend of King Sangara to the simple-minded Cām, and make them believe it to be an ancient tradition peculiar to their country. For the present the name of the Sak or Śaka constitutes for us, together with the fact of the existence of teak-forests, a strong enough argument, I think, wherewith to account for the name Śaka-deśpa as applied to Kamboja.

The Viṣṇu Purāṇa states further that the name of the king of Śaka-deśpa was Bhavya, and that his sons, after whom its varṣas or divisions were denominated, bore the appellations of Jalada, Kumāra, Sukumāra, etc. Among the mountain ranges enumerated are Udayagiri, Śyāma, and Astaṅgiri. Among the rivers, Sukumārī, Kumārī, Nalī. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa gives different names for the varṣas, i.e. Purojaṇa, Manojaṇa, etc. Now, I think that I can recognize most of these names in Siām and Kamboja. Bhava-varman, one of the early kings, and the only one of this name referred to in the inscriptions of Kamboja—among which that of Han-chei—reigned about 600 A.D., and probably is the Bhavya mentioned above. In Jalada one will recognize the lowlands of the Mê-Không delta, inundated for one-half of the year. From Jala or Jalada

scholars who, with an obstinacy worthy of a better cause, seem to be determined to stick to the end to their phonetic readings of geographical names, in preference to the written spelling. Maing Lun is, of course, Mūang Lāng (the major district or town), i.e. Lāng Phraḥ Bāng. We thus obtain a quite different interpretation of the passage quoted above; for, while the one given in the publication referred to led us to believe that it was question of districts in the Burmese Shān States—perhaps of the country of the Lōsā about Mūang Lōng (Maing-long-gyi)—we now clearly see that Eastern Lāos is meant instead, with its States of Lāng Phraḥ Bāng, Wieng Chan, and Campāsak (Bassac) which, at the time the inscription was erected (A.D. 1774), formed three separate kingdoms. The one called Campāsak was founded by Lān emigrants from Wieng Chan on the ruins of the ancient State of the same name, in A.D. 1712. A village named Bāh-Sak had already existed there, however, since about 1630, and was visited in 1641 by Wusthof, who says it had been founded just a few years before.

Since writing the above, I have found Campāsak mentioned under the name Champā-pāsak' in Khun Lāng Hā-wat (Memoirs, p. 159, Siamese text), who wrote at about the same time that the Po-U-Daung inscription was erected. He was very likely the person that suggested the full and correct form of that name for the inscription, as he was then kept in captivity in Burmā, though being in the priesthood.
originated, in my opinion, the Chinese name for Kamboja, Chên-la, pronounced Chôn-lap by the Annamites, which appears in both Chinese and Annamese annals since the beginning of the seventh century. It is to be observed in this connection, that the Sanskrit Jala = water, becomes Ch‘hon and Ch‘houna in Siämese and Khmër pronunciations, as, e.g., in Jalapuri, the name of the present district of Bāng Plā-sōi, on the eastern side of the Gulf of Siām, which is pronounced Ch‘houna-buri. It becomes thus easy of comprehension how the Chinese Chên-la could originate from a form Jala through its pronunciation Ch‘hon-la, of which it is a phonetic transcript. Kumāra and Sukumāra are the districts of the southern extremity of Kamboja, where the land ends in the promontory of Kumāri, and near which the Kumāri River finds its outlet. The term Kumāri has been transplanted here from the South of India, where it designates the cape termed Comorin in European parlance, and means Durgā or Kāli, the black and fierce goddess. The Khmërś call her Khmau or Nāng Khmau, ‘the black’ or ‘the black damsel.’ Hence the Kumāri Cape and River become, in their tongue, Chhrui Khmau (Cape Khmau) and Tük Khmau (water, i.e. River, Khmau), respectively. In this district there exists, up to this day, a township called Khmau, which one will see noted in modern maps in about 9° 10' lat., just in the centre of the headland. It probably is, with the names given above, all that remains intact of the old small State or realm of Kumāra, otherwise Khmau, which we find recorded by Abu-zaid under the denomination of Kingdom of Komar. It then (ninth century) probably included the whole of the country between the Mē-Khōng delta and the Gulf of Siām, as we shall demonstrate in the sequel. As regards the terms Udayagiri and Astagiri, they exhibit a certain resemblance to the names Udai and Lēstai already noticed in the same region, while Śyāma is undoubtedly connected with the country of Siām, along with which it will be treated on directly. The Nalini may be the Mē-Khōng River, since the easternmost stream, mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa as
flowing from the slopes of the Himalayas, is designated by that name. As regards Purojava and Manojava, they very probably correspond: the latter with Lâu Javâ or Lâu Ch'ued, i.e. Lúang P'hraḥ Băng, and the former with Lower Java, Saba, or Tha-bé, which, we shall demonstrate in due course, appears to be Ptolemy's Zaba or Zabai, near the present Saigon. In support of the identification of Manojava with Lúang P'hraḥ Băng I may add that, while the Bhágavata Puráṇa places the district of that name in Śāka-deīpa, the Viṣṇu Puráṇa locates a river Manojavá in Kraunca, which is the region of Kau-chi, or Kau-chên, i.e. Tonkin. From this I infer that Manojava must have been situated near the line where Śāka-deīpa (Kamboja) borders on Kraunca-deīpa (Kau-chi), which is the position corresponding to the ancient Java or C'havâ, the present Lúang P'hraḥ Băng.

In conclusion, it seems to me that we have in the above arguments sufficient evidence for holding that the hitherto supposed mythical Śāka-deīpa of the Puráṇas is really the region of Siām, Kamboja, and Lower Cochin-China; and from the fact of King Bhavya, i.e. Bhava-varman, being mentioned, along with the districts of Jala or Jalada (Chên-la) and Kumára (Komar or Khmau), we may deduce the approximate earliest possible date of the Viṣṇu Puráṇa and fix it within a few years of 650 A.D.¹

We have now to revert to Ptolemy's description of the country of the Léstai, and examine in separate paragraphs the names of the cities and rivers that he transmitted to us as being found in this region.

Samaradê, a town (No. 92).

This is not Śrī Dharmarâja, or Ligor, as erroneously supposed by McCrindle,² on the score of a resemblance in

¹ This date is arrived at on the basis of those of the reign of Bhava-varman (circa A.D. 600), and of the conquest by his descendant Isāna-varman of the whole of Kamboja in A.D. 627, when all the small kingdoms into which the country was divided disappeared.
names between Dharmarāja (or, as pronounced in Siāmese, Thammarat) and Samaradē. It is, on the contrary, the name for Siām or Sāmarattha in its locative case, Sāmaratthē, as frequently met with in the old native MSS., whether Pāli, Siāmese, or Lāu. Sāmaratthā\(^1\) or Syāmaratthā\(^2\) are its regular Pāli forms, which correspond to the Sanskrit Šyāma-rāstrā, and mean ‘the black, or dusky, country.’ Why Siām should originally be so termed it is now difficult to guess. Some saw in its name an allusion to the brown complexion of its inhabitants, just as others took the name given it by the Chinese, Ch'ih-tu or Ch'ih-t'u, ‘red earth,’ to refer to the colour of its soil. Both views are, in my opinion, equally unacceptable.

In support of the first, it might be urged that the Siāmese themselves take Šyām to really mean brown — a brown blended up of two colours, red and black; hence their own idea would correspond to a reddish brown or to a dusky colour inclining to redness, which, in their opinion, suits very well the complexion of the people. A brunette complexion, the nūa sōng sī (¼ bicoloured complexion), corresponding to the Sanskrit Šyāma, is much appreciated in young damsels and sung by native bards;\(^3\) it is, in fact, considered to be the typical colour of their race. But this, of course, only refers to modern times.\(^4\) In the ancient period of which we are treating on here, the complexion of the race in occupation of both Siām and Kamboja was assuredly darker, as proved not only by the contemporary

---

\(^1\) Mahāvamsa, Sāma, c. 98, vv. 90-93.

\(^2\) Bālavatara, i, apud Childers’ Pāli Dictionary, p. 492, s.v.

\(^3\) For easy reference I may quote the poem printed by Captain Low in his “Grammar of the Thai Language,” Calcutta, 1823, p. 84: “Chāu nūa sōng sī wimon ch‘ōm,” which he translates at p. 88: “Your delicate brunette [lit. bicoloured] complexion,” etc.

\(^4\) The Nan-Chao, a branch of the Thai race in Yūnnan, are by Ma Tuan-li (op. cit., vol. ii, p. 189) said to belong to the race of the U-ma or ‘Black Barbarians.’ This race was certainly not termed ‘black’ from the complexion; but, as is nowadays the case with several tribes in Indo-China, very probably from the colour of their dress. I do not think it likely that any offshoot of these U or Wu people had as yet reached the Gulf of Siām at the period of which we treat.
accounts of eye-witnesses, but also by statements to that effect in the local records.

According to the Chinese envoys who visited these countries during the Tsin and Liang dynasties (A.D. 265–556) the natives of Fu-nan and Chên-la were small, ugly, black—though among them were seen fair women—with frizzly hair, and they tattooed their bodies, rolling their hair up towards the crown. The natives of Ch'ih-t'ü (Siām) were of the same race as those of Fu-nan, but they cropped their hair and pierced their ears. These descriptions are in agreement with local tradition and with the statements of various ancient chronicles (among which I may mention that of C'hīeng Sēn), according to which the whole of Siām and Kamboja, as far up as the Mē-Không at C'hīeng Sēn, was inhabited by a dark-complexioned race which is called Khôm, a term meaning ‘black.’ It was only in A.D. 376 that the Lāu who had settled at C'hīeng Sēn were able to drive the Khôm from the borders of the Mē-Không into the Mē-nam valley as far down as Kamp'hēng P'het, which henceforth became the boundary between the country of Western Lāos and the Khôm State of Lop'h-buri (Lava-puri). The Khôm of that State—and, it appears, also those of Kamboja—used to crop their hair short; and therefore, whenever people from Lāos desired to cross the frontier at Kamp'hēng P'het they were compelled to cut their hair according to the Khôm fashion. While surveying the ruins of Kamp'hēng P'het in 1896 I was shown the remains of a square structure originally built, like most ancient edifices of that neighbourhood, of laterite blocks, and still called by the natives the Šālā Tat P'hôm, or ‘Hair-cutting Hall,’ where it is alleged that the tonsorial operation above referred to was performed.

Although remnants of the aboriginal Negrito tribes were during the early centuries of the Christian Era still in occupation of sundry portions of the seaboard and, perhaps, also of the interior, and a certain proportion of Negrito-

1 See Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., vol. ii, pp. 436, 437, 466, 479.
Dravidian elements who had emigrated thither from Southern India was also present and had to some extent become intermingled with the natives, it would be too rash to conclude from the extracts given above that the whole of the population of Siām and Kamboja was of Negrito blood. The circumstance of its being dark-complexioned can be easily explained by the fact that the main bulk of that population consisted, as we already observed, of hill-tribes of the Mōn-Annam race, such as the Stīeng, the Lawă, etc., who, as a rule, are much darker than the Thai and other valley-dwelling people. The evidence, we have seen, is strongest in favour of the Lāucă, Dōi, Lōi, or Lōi being the Lēstai referred to by Ptolemy; and our subsequent investigations will tend to corroborate that identification. If we compare the descriptions of the present Lawă or Wā made by recent travellers with those of the ancient people of Fu-nan, etc., left by the early Chinese envoys, we shall find that they tally surprisingly well. One missionary, who but a couple of years ago visited the Wā at Mūang Lēm, pictures them as "big, strong, robust, ugly, black, fierce-looking creatures."  

And Mr. J. G. Scott, who had the opportunity of becoming well acquainted with the same people, speaks of them in the following terms:—"In complexion they [the Wa] are much darker than any of the hill people of this part of Indo-China, even if allowance be made for dirt, for they never wash. They are considerably darker even than the swarthy Akha, who otherwise are the darkest tribe in the hills... are short, smaller even than the Shans.... They have short sturdy figures, perhaps a little too broad for perfect proportion, but many of the men are models of athletic build. ... In features the Wa are bullet-headed with square faces and exceedingly heavy jaws. The nose is very broad at the nostrils... the real Wild Wa crop their hair short. Heavy eyebrows do not improve the type of face... [and as regards dress:] In the

1 Bangkok Times, May 10, 1898.
hot weather neither men nor women wear anything at all, or only on ceremonial occasions." Here we have, especially in the passages which I have italicized, in every particular the race of Fu-nan of the Chinese travellers, who were small, ugly, black, naked, and who in Siâm clipped their hair short. The hill-tribes of Kamboja present, though not always in an equally marked degree, the same peculiarities, and accordingly it will be seen that it is both unnecessary and inconsistent with historical tradition to assume, as has been done by some writers, that the population of Kamboja at the period with which we are concerned was entirely composed of Negritos. Such undoubtedly were the aborigines, but by the early centuries of the Christian Era these had been to a great extent either got rid of or absorbed into the bulk of the hill-people of Môn-Annam extraction who had flowed into the country from Southern China, and who were themselves a remarkably dark-complexioned race. If we add to this admixture a considerable proportion of Negrito-Dravidian adventurers who had proceeded thither from the south of India, we obtain a race such as the much lighter complexioned Chinese and Lâu would be perfectly justified in calling black. Thus it happens that we find the early inhabitants of Siâm proper and Kamboja invariably referred to in the Lâu chronicles as Khôm and Khôm-dam, i.e. 'Black Khôm.' It is held by the Lâu that the term Khôm itself means 'black,' though it is no part of their language and appears to be derived from the Kambojan Khamau or Khmau. With it the tribal names of the Khâmêr, Khmu, Khâm, etc., are probably connected. The Khâmêr or Khmêr are, up to this day, a dusky race compared with the natives of Lower Siâm, where the copious onflow of the Thai element has impressed a much lighter complexion upon the people. The same may be said of Pegu, where the later admixture of Tibeto-Burman as well as Thai blood has

1 Both Khôm and Khmau may, however, be simply modifications of the Chinese 貘 (ch'ien), pronounced k'yâm, k'öm, and k'ien in the Southern Chinese dialects.
undoubtedly contributed in lightening the original dusky appearance of the Talaings. The phenomenon may yet be seen in action in the Malay Peninsula, where the remnants of the early Negrito autochthones represented by the Samang gradually drift and become absorbed into a comparatively fairer race—the Sakai—who appear to impersonate there, with their features and language essentially Môn-Annam in character, the last genuine survivors of the ancient and now almost extinct race of Fu-nan.

In the case of the Samang it is possible that their present name is but a corrupted form of the Sanskrit Śyāmāṇga, meaning 'dark,' 'dusky,' although Samanga occurs as a tribal name in the Mahābhārata and may have been introduced in the Malay Peninsula from Southern India. But with respect to the name of Śiām or Śyāma, it strikes me that if the same referred to the dark complexion of the people in occupation of the country at the time with which we are concerned, and was invented by the early Indi adventurers as a substitute for the term Khôn, of which it is the Sanskrit equivalent, it likewise should have been applied not only to Kamboja, whose people were of the same race as Śiām's, but also and much more appropriately to the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago, where the more dusky Negrito-Dravidian element undoubtedly predominated.

The fact of the term Śyāma being restricted to Śiām, where there is perhaps less reason to expect it, sufficiently demonstrates that its origin must be sought for in other causes. We have seen that the Malay Peninsula owes its ancient name of Śâlmali or Suvarna-mâli to a mountain so designated. In the case of Śâka-dvîpa, represented by Śiām and Kamboja, we have noticed that one of the mountain ranges mentioned in the Purânas is called Śyâma. With this, I have no doubt, the name of Śiām is connected. In fact, if we turn to the inscriptions collected by Aymonier in the south-western gallery of Angkor-wat, we find after the mention of a chief leading the troops of Lavô (one of the ancient chief cities of Southern Śiām, now known as Lop'haburi = Lavapuri),
an inscription, numbered 27th in the list, which textually runs: “Neh Syäin Kut”—“Here [is the chief of the] Syäma-küta.” This is to explain a scene in bas-relief where a prince is depicted mounted on an elephant richly caparisoned, and followed by warriors wielding lances ornamented with Cámara tails, such as are used in Siäm up to this day. “Tatoués sur les joues,” remarks Aymonier about them, “ils ont tous une physionomie spéciale, sauvage, et à bon nombre les artistes ont donné une mine grotesque, un type qui semble avoir été réellement observé.” This scene is followed by a similar one, the last in the series, with an inscription (28th) saying that “this is the chief, or leader, of the Syäni kak.” These basso-rilievi and inscriptions can hardly be less than eight centuries old, and probably represent events much older: the triumph of some one of the mightiest sovereigns


2 The custom of tattooing the face seems to have been once in favour among several tribes of Indo-China, and still survives to some extent, as the following extract will show: “It has hitherto been the custom with Kheng young women, soon after they arrive at years of puberty, to tattoo the whole of their faces with vertical and closely adjoining narrow black lines which, as Symes very correctly observes, ‘gives a most extraordinary appearance.’ . . . The custom was lately universal, but in British territory it is slowly dying out.” (British-Burma Gazetteer, vol. ii, p. 265.) It is very curious to observe that the very identical custom prevailed among the Li or Loi of Hainan, of whom it is said in Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., vol. ii, p. 402) that young women, as soon as they reach puberty, have their faces tattooed with figures of flowers, butterflies, etc., as a mark of their nobility and a preliminary to marriage. The occasion is solemnized with great ceremony and with a banquet to all the relatives. Face-tattooing was also undoubtedly peculiar to the Lawä and Karens, who, we have seen, are racially connected with the Li or Loi; and, in general, to most Mäi-Annam tribes. Among the various branches of the Thai race it appears to hardly ever have been resorted to; only one section of the Lin is known to have employed it, which from this fact was termed the Hua-mien or ‘Flowered Faces’ tribe. (Ma Tuan-lin, ibid., p. 119.) As regards tattooing the body the Ai-Läu are principally noted for having, from a very early period, adorned their persons with dragons and other figures; a custom adopted afterwards by their descendants the Nun-Chao and the present Läu of the Ch’ieng-mäi principality. On the strength of these considerations I am inclined to think that the people meant in the Kambojan inscription quoted above under the name of Syäni-kut must be the Lawö or Wahö, also because the latter’s complexion is, as we have seen, considerably darker than any other hill-tribe in Siäm proper.

3 Professor Bergaigne (Journal Asiatique, 1884) believes them to be slightly anterior in date to the period of Jayavarman VII, who reigned a.d. 1162-1186.
of Kamboja, followed by the chiefs of the States that owed allegiance to him.

If we examine the condition of Siûm during that period, that is, between the tenth and twelfth centuries, we find that it included three principal States. One in the north with the capital now at Šukhothai, now at Sawankhalok; and two in the south. Of these latter, the one on the east had at times Lop'haburi and at others Deâravati (on the site of the present Ayuthia) as its chief city; while the one on the west had the seat of government first at Šri Vijaya, near the Prathama-cetî in the present province of Nakhôn C'hai-šri, and subsequently (from the beginning of the tenth century) at Bandhuma-pura, called afterwards (thirteenth century) Sup'han-buri (Suvarṇa-pūrī) a little more to the north. All the three kingdoms were subject to Kamboja, and though they eventually rebelled, they could not definitely shake off the yoke of vassalage until a.d. 1256-7, when the power of Kamboja had waned, and thus the opportunity came for their becoming united under a single ruler. As the king of Lavô (Lop'haburi) is represented apart, and referred to in the 26th inscription, it follows that the terms Šyāma-kut and Šyāma-kak must apply to the rulers of the other two States. By looking at the map we find the Kokarit (Kaka-raft ha?) Hills forming part of the main watershed near Myawadi. We also meet with two districts similarly named, of which one is a little to the south-west of Myawadi on the Kokarit stream, and the other away to the north-west at the confluence of the Salwin with the Yunzaleng. There is thus some probability as to the country to the west of the Kokarit Hills as far as the Salwin, and to the east as far as Rahêng and even Sukhothai, having anciently been known by the name of Šyāma-koka, or Šyāma-kaka-rastra, of which the modern term Kokarit would be but a contracted form. Kāka-dīpa, the place mentioned in the Mahâvamsa as one of the points where the Ceylonese expedition of about 1180-1190 a.d. landed, may have formed part of Kokarit, in the event of the region so named having extended at that
period, which is not improbable, as far as the mouth of the Bi-lin (Bi-löm) River.

Given that the foregoing surmises are correct, the name Śyāma-kūta would fall to the kingdom of Śrī Vijaya, in the western part of Southern Siām; and this is exactly the place where we should expect to find it, for various reasons, which will be hereafter adduced. This name of Śyāma-kūta or Śyāma-kūta may be explained either as the Śyām peak or the Śyām stronghold. In the first case it coincides with the Śyāma mountain placed by the Purāṇas in Śāka-dvīpa, and enumerated in some recensions immediately before Astagiri,¹ a term which indicates a western mountain. It follows that the Śyāma mountain or peak must be sought for towards the main range dividing Siām from Burmā, if indeed it is not to be identified with the main range itself. This would at any rate appear from a passage of I-tsing² wherein it is stated that to the south-west of Sz‘chuen, at a distance of one month’s journey or thereabouts, there is the so-called ‘Great Black Mountain.’ Southward from this and close to the sea-coast, there is a country called Śrī-ksattra or, according to my own investigations, Śrī-ksētra (Prome); on the south-east of this is Lang-chia-hsi (Laŭkchíchú and Laŭkhīa, alias Kāmalānkā); on the east of this is Deā(ra)pati (Dvāравati, i.e. the Ayuthia or Ayudhia of later times). The ‘Great Black Mountain’ here referred to may partly correspond to Ptolemy’s Damassa Range, if it be assumed that the name of the latter is of Sanskrit or Pāli derivation (i.e. from Tamas = ‘darkness’; whence ἄμμαςα ὁρη = ‘Dark Mountains’); but its location by I-tsing at over one month’s journey to the south-west of Sz‘chuen shows its identity with the main range forming the Mē-nam-Salwīn watershed, and with

¹ Professor Hall’s edition of Wilson’s “Viṣṇu Purāṇa,” vol. ii, p. 199, f.n. t.
² In Takakusu’s “Record of the Buddhist Religion,” etc., p. 9. It is to be regretted that Mr. Takakusu does not give us, as should be done for all proper names, the equivalent in Chinese characters, or at least a transliteration of the same. Owing to this omission we are unable to learn whether the term employed for ‘black’ in the original text is Hēh, Li, Ch‘ien, Wu, or any other, and further linguistic investigation is thus precluded.
the Śyāma mountain, or mountain-chain, of the Purāṇas. This latter, it will now be seen, is far from being a myth. It was evidently from this mountain range that the country extending eastwards, and southwards to the Gulf, was called Śyāma-kūta or simply Śyām. On the other hand, should the term Śyāma-kut designate a stronghold, this is most likely the city of Śrī Vijaya, the most ancient foundation in that territory.

In the Chinese records the name Hsien for Siām does not appear until after A.D. 650. Prior to that date we hear only of Ch’ih-t’u, literally, ‘Red Earth,’ a term which, according to Chinese authors, was given the country because at the spot where the capital stood the soil appeared of an extremely red colour. The capital meant by the Chinese may have been Sawankhalok,¹ where the soil is indeed reddish, it being composed of the débris of a very ferruginous lateritic formation. But this ‘Red Earth’ theory of the Chinese chroniclers, though hitherto blindly accepted by their European translators and commentators, is seriously open to criticism. Apart from the fact that all over Indo-China there are places where the soil is equally, if not more intensely, red, and which should in consequence have been similarly styled by the Chinese, against that theory stands the argument that the toponymics referred to in early

¹ See the pronunciation Sāvankhalōk or Swankhalōk, but corrupted by the vulgar into Saūkhalōk, so as to make it appear to the uninitiated as derived from Saūghalōka, ‘city of the Saūgha.’ It is possible that the early Chinese travellers, misled by such a faulty pronunciation, rendered the name of the capital as Sūng-ch’i Ch’eng, i.e. ‘Saūgha, or Saūkha, city.’ (In this connection I may remark that a similar mistake has been repeated in the nineteenth century by a certain writer publishing books on ancient Siām, who, with a cocksureness absolutely fin-de-siècle, tells us in his book that Sawankhalok means ‘city of the Saūgha’! My remarks upon Sawankhalok and Sukhothai rest upon personal investigations and a thorough archaeological survey of the ruins of those ancient capitals which I carried out during the autumn of 1894 and 1896.) It is not, however, by any means certain whether the capital was, at the period above referred to, at Sawankhalok rather than at Sukhothai. As Sukhothai is in the ‘Cāma-devi-vanāsa,’ a Pāli chronicle of Lamp’hūn (see p. 184 infra), said to have been built in the shape of a chank-shell, it is quite possible that one of its names was Saūkha-nagara, and that it is to it, and not to Sawankhalōk, that the Chinese term Sūng-ch’i Ch’eng was intended to apply. At any event, the two ancient cities just named being but some twenty miles apart as the crow flies, the location of the Chinese Sūng-ch’i may be assumed as sufficiently approximate for our purpose.
Chinese accounts in connection with Siām and neighbouring countries generally turn out, upon close examination, to be mere phonetic transcripts of indigenous names, albeit the characters employed to represent the latter have been systematically selected with a view to convey a meaning of some sort—no matter how puerile and absurd—to the Chinese reader. Of this artificial, and at the same time deceitful, system of transcription we have met with many an instance in the course of the present inquiry. I am therefore of opinion that in the case in point Ch'ih-t'ū is not, in spite of the express statement to the contrary, an exception to such an almost invariably followed rule. As this term is pronounced Ch'êk-t'ou, Ch'ak-tu in several Southern Chinese dialects, and Shaku-to in Japanese, I think that I am justified in assuming it to be a phonetic rendering of Sukhada, which is the name that Sukhothai and its kingdom have borne previous to being called Sukhodaya. Sukhada must have been pronounced Sakkadēa, and in syncopated form Sakdēa or Sakda, by the Mōi-Khmēr people occupying its territory at that period. Having observed that the soil was reddish in colour in the neighbourhood of its chief city, the Chinese envoys would, according to their peculiar way of thinking, transcribe Sakda phonetically in such a manner as to convey at the same time the meaning of 'Red Earth' or 'Red Soil.' Hence the origin of the term Ch'ih-t'ū—in reality, Ch'ak-t'ū or Shak-t'ou, as it must then have been pronounced.

At any rate, it plainly follows that at the period in question the Chinese envoys sent out to Siām must have become acquainted only with the kingdom of Sukhothai and Sawankhalok, and with the branch of the Mē- başındaem River that led to it from the gulf. It may be furthermore assumed that the term Śyāma, or Siām, had not yet spread as far as Sukhothai, since the Chinese envoys are silent about it. The conclusion is, then, that at that early period its application must have been still circumscribed to the western part of Siām, where we have located it. But after A.D. 650 we are told that the kingdom of Ch'ih-t'ū broke off into two parts, one called Hsien or Siem, and the other Lo-huh or
Lo-huk; that the former was barren and unsuitable for cultivation, while the latter was flat and eminently productive. We are thus confronted with two names of kingdoms, of which the first is quite plain and represents the term Syāma, while the other requires elucidation, and both need to be located. I identify Lo-huk with Lavō or Labō, then called Lahōt or Lahō, now Lop'haburi (Lavapuri). The position of this ancient city in the midst of an alluvial plain, intersected by numerous creeks and studded with ponds and marshes, justifies the identification suggested, and well suits the Chinese description.

As regards Hsien or Siem, it represents, according to me, the western and northern part of Siām, more mountainous and barren. It is here that, as we have shown, the term Syāma or Siām most probably originated. Restricted originally to the region nearest to the main range (Syāma-kaka), down to the Gulf (Syāma-kūta), it gradually extended eastwards, until we find it applied to the whole of Upper Siām, and, finally, to the entire country. The kingdom of Lavō or Lahō long remained quite distinct under this name. Its independence dates exactly from the time that the Chinese speak of the separation; that is, from the end of the seventh century or the beginning of the next, when it seceded from the State of Sukhothai and Sawankhalok that had founded its chief city, Lahō or Lavō, in a.d. 457, or only a few years before Dvārapuri or Dvāravatī (the To-lo-po-ti of Hwēn-ts'ang and Tu-ho-lo-po-ti of I-tsing) was built. It is worthy of note that the name of the founder of Lop'haburi is given as Kālavarnatissa, son of King Kākavatra or Kākavadda, ruling at Takṣṇāsilā in Northern Siām (identified by local scholars with Mūang Tāk, north of Rabēng), whose descendants reigned in Sukhothai. This name, Kākavatra, deserves comparison with the term Šyāmkak of the Khmēr inscription, and appears to confirm our location of the people so named in the western part of Upper Siām.

1 This name is taken from Lābor in India, which is said to have been founded by Lava, son of Rāma, and hence named Lohāvara. Lava in Siamese is spelled Lāb, pronounced Lōb; hence the name Lop'haburi (Lop'ha-puri).
During the period Chih-Chêng (A.D. 1341–68), say the annals of the Ming dynasty, the two States of Siem and Lo-huh were reunited into one single kingdom situated near the sea. This alludes to the conquest of those two States carried out by King Râmâthibodi I (Râmâdhipati), followed by the founding of Ayuthia, in A.D. 1350. Thenceforward the country became known to China as Siem-lo (暹羅), a hybrid Chinese combination of the two terms Siem and Lo-huh. But in reality the country had been formed into a single independent kingdom with capital at Sukhothai some one hundred years before, that is, in about 1256–7.

The conclusion we may elicit from the above remarks is, that in origin the name Śyāma was restricted to Western Siâm, and to the southern part of it bordering upon the gulf, which formed the territory of the Vijaya Kingdom. Though the latter seems, previous to the rise of the Lavô-Dvāravati State in about A.D. 650, to have comprised the greatest part of Southern Siâm, and the term Śyāma to have as a consequence already applied to nearly the whole of that region, Chinese travellers ignore it, and only appear to be acquainted with the eastern branch of the Mē-Nâm River, naming the territory along its banks either Ch’ih-t’u (Sukhada) or To-lo-po-ti (Dvāravatī), according as to whether it is the upper or the lower part of the river’s course that is implied. They become acquainted with the term Siem or Hsien only when Lavô secedes from Sukhothai, forming a separate kingdom. The character 阮 (Hsien) is said to be an imitation of Śyām. I do not reject this view, as that character is pronounced siam in Hakka and hsiem in Annamese, which latter represents the Khmer form siem still met with in some names of Kambojan districts, such as Siem-rāb, now Siem-rāṭ (Śyāma-raṭtra).\(^1\) I submit, however, that the

---

\(^1\) The Lâu of Lúang P’hra’h Bàng and Wieng Chan also pronounce Siem in the Khmer style. According to Mr. E. H. Parker the ancient Chinese used the character 阮 to denote Siâm, instead of the modern 阮 (see China Review, vol. xix, p. 197). According to the “P’ēi-wên Yûn-fu” (quoted by the same authority in the China Review, vol. xiii, p. 379), “the character
same character Hsien in Chinese means 'the sun rising,' and is therefore equivalent to the Sanskrit-Pali Udaya, a term which we have met several times in this region, and which occurs also in the compound Sukhodaya (Sukha+udaya = 'the dawn of happiness'), the later name of Sukhada, the ancient capital city of Northern Siam, and, at subsequent

Hsi is pronounced dan, and is the name of a State of southern barbarians." But it will be seen that this character is practically identical with 西 employed to designate the State of Ta'n, Shan, or Chao (whatever be the correct pronunciation), which we have identified with Ptolemy's Arisabion in a preceding section. In fact, Dr. Hirth (in "China and the Roman Orient," p. 36, note) points out that both the "Hou-Han-shu" and the "Yün-nan-t'ung-chih" have 西 for the name of that State. It is therefore evident that both 西 and 西 refer to the same State, and this is vaguely described by Chinese authors as being situated "beyond the frontier" and communicating towards the southwest with Ts Ts'in (Syria). As early as A.D. 97 its king, Yung Yu-tiao, is represented as having entered into communication with the Chinese Court. The most logical location that can be assigned to the Ta'n or Shan State would thus appear to be about the present Shenbo, near Bhamo, where we have placed it. But as regards the term 西 denoting Siam proper, and being equivalent to the 西 of a later period, it is scarcely probable, although there may be an indirect connection between the two terms in the event of both proving traceable to the "Great Black Mountain," which, it appears, formed the separation between Siam and Burmah and was in its northern portion called Tama or Tamasa (Ptolemy's DAMASSA Range), while the part of it that stretched towards the Gulf of Siam was termed Syama. Such being the case, the State of Ta'n or Dan of Chinese writers might be identified with Ptolemy's Land of the DAMASSAI; and the 西 (Hsien) of the former with the latter's Samarade, the Sama-ratha or Syama-ratha of classical literature.

1 This is evidently the region of Sukhada mentioned in the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa (Hall's ed., vol. ii, p. 191) as being ruled over by a king bearing the name of Sukhodaya. The Vīṣṇu Purāṇa makes it a division of Plakṣa-deśa (Burmā), whereas it was situated merely near the borders of the latter. In fact, in the Chinese account of the embassy to Ch'tih-t'u in A.D. 607-8, Ch'tih-t'u, i.e. Sukhada, is said to be bounded on the west by the kingdom of Po-lo-so or P'o-lo-so (see Ma Tsan-lin, op. cit., vol. ii, p. 446), evidently Plakṣa or Balassia (vide supra, p. 39). As regards the fact of Sukhothai being formerly termed Sukhada, it is positively proved by the often quoted Peguian work on Gavampati, where Sukhothai is referred to (book 1) under the name of Sukhada-gāma (Sukhada-prāma). There is, therefore, no further reason against this city, and the country of which it was the capital, being identified with the Sukhada of the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa and the Ch'tih-t'u or Shakt-t'u of Chinese literature. The name of its ancient king, Sukhodaya, is even mentioned in the local chronicles, though under the slightly modified and obviously incorrect forms of Aiokdaya and Dharmāśokdaya. I have found it stated in a native commentary that from this ruler the kingdom and its capital became afterwards known as Sukhodaya.
periods, of the whole country. Hence the character 適 Hsien may have been adopted by the Chinese to designate Siām, with the double object in view of giving as faithful a transcript as possible of the name Šyām, and of conveying at the same time the sense embodied in the term Udaya, forming part of the name of its capital. It follows, therefore, that while the term Šyāma originated in Western Siām, probably from a mountain peak or range anciently known as Šyāma or Šyāma-kūta (Black Peak), and was at first circumscribed in its application to the States of Vijaya and Kaka-rāstra or Šyāmakaka, whence it extended eastwards as far as Sukhothai, upon the absorption of the eastern portion of the State of Vijaya by that of Lahó or Lop'haburí, towards the end of the twelfth century, the term Šyāma became less common in the southern region, remaining in consequence localized almost exclusively to the northern. It is then that we first hear of Hsien and Lo-huh; Hsien being now used in the place of the ancient Ch'i-t'u, and representing therefore the State of Sukhothai-Sawankhalōk (but with its capital now at Sukhothai); and Lo-huh designating the kingdom of Lop'haburí with part of the territory of the ancient Vijaya. In a.d. 1256 the realm of Lop'haburí joined that of Sukhothai in the rebellion which resulted in the final emancipation of the whole of Lower Siām from the yoke of Kamboja; but though nominally recognizing Sukhothai as the paramount power, it continued de facto as a comparatively autonomous State until a.d. 1350. In the mind of the Chinese writers of the period the division of the country into the two kingdoms of Siem and Lo-huh would therefore still subsist during that interval. But in a.d. 1350 King Rāmādhipatī, having made himself master of the Lop'haburí kingdom, founded thither a new capital on the site of the ancient Dvāravatī, with the style of Krung Devya Mahānagara Pavara Dvāravatī Śrī Ayuddhya (vulgo Ayuthyā), formed by the union of the name of the old city of Dvāravatī once existing there with that of the capital of Rāma (Ayodhya), after whom the king had been titled. We then enter upon
the phase of the kingdom of Siam-lo with capital at Ayuthia, as it was known in later times to the Chinese.

In the opinion of some Siamese scholars, Thai, the name of their race, is derived from Udai (Udaya), either as forming part of the name of their ancient and most famed capital, Sukhothai, or as a symbol of their rise to a great nation with a mighty and vast empire. But this seems hardly to be the case, since the term Thai is spread far and wide, a long way beyond the limits ever attained by Siam proper, and is common to all branches of the race from the Tonkin-Annam borders to the outskirts of Asam, and from Yunnan to the Gulf of Siam.1 Besides, there is so far no evidence whatever that the race ever bore the name Udai; and although a people so named (Hudei?) exists up to this day in the Malay Peninsula, it belongs to a different ethnical stock, and has nothing to do with the Thai.2

1 The derivation from Udaya is accounted for linguistically on the score that the th of Thai represents in Siamese the Sanskrit and Pali d; wherefore Thai is equivalent to Daya, a contraction in this case, it is alleged, of Udaya. Others hold instead that Daya is not a contracted form at all, but a modification of Jaya or Jayin, meaning 'victory, victorious.' Although these views appear to be supported to a certain extent by the fact that two ancient kingdoms, those of Sukhodaya and Vijaya, the names of which embody, respectively, the terms Udaya and Jaya, existed in the country, they are nevertheless little worthy of consideration, because the term Thai is undoubtedly derived from the Sinitic family of languages to which the national idiom of the Thai race belongs. As a matter of curiosity I shall transcribe here a āthā from a Pali work composed at Lamp'ūn in the principality of C'hieng-mai, in which the term Thai occurs under the form deyya. The title of this extremely rare work, but recently discovered by me in an incomplete form, is Cāmadeviśāna, i.e. the story of the dynasty of Cāmadevi, the first queen of Lamp'ūn. Its author is a Lāu head-priest by the name of Bodhisattā Mahāthera, who lived towards the end of the fifteenth century. The stanza occurs in the introduction and runs literally as follows:—

"Cārikaṁ bhāsamānānaṁ
deyya bhāsānusāraṇaṁ
Taṁ bhāsaṁ lāhukaṁ hoti
Anurūpaṁ Jinaṁ purī."

The purpose is to explain that the Thai language (Deyya-bhāsa) is far from possessing the perfection of the idiom spoken in Buddha's native land (Magadhā); hence the author, as he goes on to say in the stanza immediately following, decided to compose his work in Pāli.

2 The Orang Udai (Hudei?), called also Orang Payas, inhabiting the borders of the Pahang district, are probably the same, according to Miciuho-Maclay, as the Orang Sakai-liar or wild Sakai, who are pur sang Melanesians (Negritos). See Miciuho-Maclay's "Ethnological Excursions in the Malay Peninsula," in
In view of these facts I think that we are justified in tracing the origin of the term Thai back to the point whence this race branched off towards Siām and Burmā, to lay in both the foundations of vast empires; and back to the time when, conscious of its greatness and independence, rightly considered itself unparalleled among all the semi-barbarous populations of Northern Indo-China. The cradle of the term Thai must have been, therefore, Southern Yūnnan or the Northern 'Shan' States; its initial date, one of the very first centuries of the Christian Era. Its meaning is ' eminent, free from bondage, master, independent.'

It is, therefore, a national title more than a tribal name, not dissimilar from the epithet Ārya which the Iranian ancestors of the present Indūs adopted for themselves. As

Journal, Straits Branch, R.A.S., No. 2, p. 220. It would be, however, interesting to find out how the term Udāi, if correct, came to be given them and what it means. As to the Sakai, they appear to belong to a fairer race than the Negritos.

1 This term, in Siāmese, is, by the Lāu or Shans, written and pronounced both as Thai and Tai, in a slightly different tone: Oō = Tai; Oō = Thai. The pronunciation Tai is faulty, being due to the practice, with some branches of the Lāu, of neglecting the aspiration in aspirated letters, such as th, pʰh, etc. The exact meaning, in both Siāmese and Lāu, of the term Thai is 'a man free from bondage, an ascetic, a chief or master.' The Lāu of Ch'ien-g'mai still designate their Mahātheras by the title of Chān Thai, i.e. 'Eminent Master,' or, in Buddhist terminology, Ārya. In Siāmese poetry the same term, Chān Thai, is often employed when alluding to the king or to some other exalted personage, while Ora-thai is used as a synonym for 'queen.' (Here ora, or ara, is a Khmēr derived word meaning 'beautiful.') A Siāmese synonym of Thai is Thāi, having also the sense of 'master, chief, eminent.' The signification of 'free' has generally been ascribed to the term Thai, without, however, accounting for it and showing its derivation. I think I am correct in saying that it and its synonyms must be traced to the Chinese 大 (tāi, tāi) = 'great, eminent, noble,' and its derivates or correlatives 大泰台 (t'ai or thai), etc. The branch of the Thai race that invaded and conquered Asam adopted for their name a Sanskrit translation, a little bit intensified, of the national term Thai, and called themselves Assma (Ahom) or 'peerless.' It therefore appears that the term Thai, implying an idea of greatness, superiority, or independence, is not properly a name, but a title, which originated with the expansion of the race into Burmā, Asam, and Siām.
the Āryans applied to the conquered tribes of aborigines and Turanians the epithet of Dasyu, so did the early Lāu call the former settlers of the countries which they brought under subjection by the name of Khā, 'slaves,' 'bondmen,' while distinguishing themselves as Thai, 'masters,' 'freemen,' in order to mark their independence as well as superiority. It is thus by contraposition to the term Khā, 'slaves,' denoting the conquered race, that the term Thai, originally meaning 'eminent,' 'great,' became synonymous with 'master,' 'chief,' 'free.'

As regards the term Shān, which the Burmese employ to designate people of the Thai race, it is derived from Śyāma or Siām, and not this from the former, as several writers have erroneously supposed. An examination of the way it is written in Burmese will at once convince one of this. The spelling is ʃən (hram or sham), which is pronounced shan. The ʃ (m) at the end betrays its origin from Śyāma, as also does the palatal sibilant ṛ, designed to represent the Sanskrit ś. A more correct form is, however, ʃyā (Hsyāma, pron. Shyān), which is as faithful a transliteration as can be given in Burmese characters of the word Śyāma. This evidence is, by itself, quite sufficient to explode the theory of Siām being derived from Shan; but further proof can be gathered from the languages of the neighbouring nations, in none of which does a form terminated by an n as in the phonetic spelling of Shan occur; but all terms given for Siām have a final m. In Mōn or Taleng, the word for Siām is cōcō (sēm) or cō (sēm). In Asamese and Kachīn it is Sam; in Malay, Siam; in Lāu and Khmēr, Siem; in Cām, Syam. The Siūmo-Malays in the Malay Peninsula are called Sam-sam. How could the term
be derived from Shan, if in all these languages, including the written Burmese, it is spelled with an m? And yet some authorities, relying on the fickle basis of mere phoneticism, in the most phonetically unreliable of languages, Burmese, in which the written words undergo in pronunciation the most peculiar alterations, managed to draw the stupendous conclusion that Shan is the original name of the race, and that Siām (or, as written and pronounced in Siāmese, Syām or Sāyām) is derived from it. This is another instance in which Burmese, "as she is spoke," has proved to be "the murderer of history";¹ and, considering the precarious foundation upon which the new-fangled theory rests, it is a wonder that it could gain favour during the last ten years or so without its fallacy being exposed. It is to be hoped that these few remarks will suffice to demonstrate its absurdity; while the present researches on Ptolemaic Geography—by means of which the antiquity of the name of Siām (Śyāma) could be established, and its existence in the region nearest to the Gulf traced back to at least the beginning of the second century of the Christian Era, that is, to a period when the Thai race had scarcely reached the head of the Mé-Nām Valley—give that quaint theory the coup de grace.²

It is quite clear that Sāmaradē (Śāma-raṭṭhē) designates a country and not a town, though Ptolemy presumably meant it for the capital of the said country or kingdom. Fortunately, we have an identical instance of such synecdochical nomenclature in Siām itself during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the then capital, Ayuthia, was not called so by European writers and navigators, but the "City of Siām," or simply, "Siām." We can,

¹ "It must always be borne in mind that as regards the Burmese language, equally with English, the orthography rather than the pronunciation must be taken as a guide, and that phoneticism destroys all the links which bind the words now used to those from which they have been derived, and is "the murderer of history."" (Major Spearman's "British Burma Gazetteer," vol. i, p. 142.)

² For a fuller discussion of this subject I would refer the reader to my articles on "Shan and Siām" in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1898, and January, 1899.
therefore, easily understand how Ptolemy’s misconception originated. That Sāmaradē was situated about the head of the Gulf of Siām, is shown by the position he assigns to it. This we have slightly corrected in latitude, in order to bring the town up to the true emplacement it should occupy in the deep incavation of the Gulf, which was underrated by our authority. Its corrected longitude is 100° 14’ E., which is within 10’ of the famous Prathom-cedi (Prathama-caitya) in the present province of Nakhōn C’hāi-śrī (Nagara Jaya-śrī). I therefore identify Sāmaradē with the ancient city that rose around (mostly eastwards of) the Prathom-cedi, and which bore, according to local records, the name of Śrī Vijaya-rājadhānī.

During a visit that I paid to the place in the Autumn of 1895, I noticed ancient remains scattered over a very wide area, as well as traces of the moat that surrounded the city; and upon this and other evidence I concluded that the city must have been some two miles in extent. The most important monuments to be seen within its compass are two ancient stūpas, one but recently repaired and built up in the shape of a gigantic spire, called the Prathama- (or Bandama-) cēti; and the other still in a comparatively good state of preservation, named the Phraḥ Thōn (Vraḥ, or Vara Dōṇa) pagoda. The latter owes its name to a tradition, to the effect that the golden bowl (dōṇa or droma) which served to measure Buddha’s relics after his death was brought here from India by a monk, and enshrined with a few of the sacred relics in this stūpa, purposely erected for their reception.¹ The date of erection of this monument is, according to native records examined by me, the year

¹ This is a tradition transplanted here from India. The Dōṇa or Kumbhān stūpa built by the Brāhman Droma over the vessel wherewith he measured the relics of Buddha, was, according to General Cunningham (“Ancient Geogr. of India,” Buddhist Period, pp. 441-2), at Deoghārā, a short distance to the south-west of Vaisālī, in India, where it was seen by Hwen-tsang in A.D. 637, or only nineteen years previous to the building of the Dōṇa stūpa in Siām. We may conclude, therefore, that the golden vessel enshrined in the latter was but an imitation or a supposed copy of the one used by Droma. I was assured that up to a few years ago a brass facsimile of the original vessel was still preserved in the yuhā or chamber at the top of the stūpa; but nothing of the kind is now to be seen there.
1199 of the Buddhist Era, or A.D. 656; and its founder was a king by the name of Indra-rāja. The original Prathama-ceti, so called from its being the first erected in that neighbourhood, must be of a still earlier date; but it was afterwards rebuilt several times. In the excavations that were made in about 1857 about the Prathama-ceti for the erection of the new structure, were discovered two terra-cotta tablets inscribed with the “Ye dhammā” gāthā in Pāli, in characters of a type between the Veṅgi and Western Cālikaya of Southern India, and which therefore I judge to belong to the sixth or seventh century. Inscriptions in similar characters were discovered both on stone slabs and tiles at other places in the neighbourhood of the Prathama-ceti. These epigraphic records, besides disclosing to us the quarter whence Indu civilization and literature were brought over to this part of Śiām, make it evident that Buddhism had by that time obtained there a firm footing, as is confirmed shortly afterwards by the accounts of Chinese monks and travellers, especially of I-tsing, as far at least as the neighbouring territory of Dwāravati is concerned.1

The position of the Prathom-cedi as determined by Mr. McCarthy, Superintendent of the Royal Siamese Survey Department, is (centre of pagoda spire) long. 100° 3' 46" E. and lat. 13° 49' 7". As the city of Śri Vijaya extended mostly to the eastwards of it, we see that the corrected position obtained by us, long. 100° 14' E., is within about 10' of the truth. The place can now be reached through a recently dug creek leading to it from the Thā-Chin River, just about ten miles long; it is, however, possible that at the period we treat of, the river not only flowed close by the town, but that the sea was not distant from it. The city must have been situated, in a word, at what was at the time the embouchure of the Thā-Chin River, and the head of the Gulf of

1 Vide E. Chavannes' "Religieux Éminents," etc. (Paris, 1894), p. 69, where we are told of a lad from Thanh-hoa, in Annam, who came to Dwāravati with his relatives, and there entered the priesthood. This must have happened circa A.D. 630–40.
Siām withal. It must soon have become an emporium of trade, the only one that Siām possessed for several centuries; until in the course of time, political events combined with the shifting of the river away from the town, and the rise of the rival emporium of Dwāravatī on the neighbouring branch of the river—which, from being more favourably situated, attracted most of the trade—led to its decline. The ruin of Śrī Vijaya became complete through an irruption of the Burmese under Anuruddha or some of his successors in the latter half of the eleventh century. The city was now abandoned as a capital in favour of Bandhuma-pūrī, the name of which was not long afterwards changed into Suvarṇa-pūrī, vulgo Sup'han. Thus ended the fortunes of what was, beyond doubt, the oldest city of Southern Siām. The lithic records discovered there had already proved its antiquity up to the sixth or seventh century. Thanks, however, to the mention that Ptolemy makes of this place under the name of Sāmaradē, we have not only been enabled to trace its existence back to at least the beginning of the second century a.d., but also to establish for the name of its territory, Śyāma or Sāmaratthē, an antiquity which it would have been otherwise impossible to demonstrate.

The inscriptions of Campā make rather an early mention of a country by the name of Vijaya. This, Aymonier identifies, though doubtfully, with Phān-thit on the Cochin-Chinese coast. But I think it probable that the State of Śrī Vijaya Rājadhānī alluded to above is meant. Its people may have been anciently known as Vijayas, as I already suggested in a former chapter; and the terms Udaya (Hudei? = Rjaya, Hṛdaya, or Ḭdai?), and Ĺestai, may as well be connected with them.

Pagrasa (No. 93).

This is undoubtedly the district now called Müang Krāt, the chief village of which has a longitude of 102° 30′ E. and a latitude of 12° 12′ N. The ancient settlement was probably situated a little further to the north-east on the
principal branch of the Thùng-yăi River, at the mouth of which the sea forms a deep inlet now shallowed by mud banks, but certainly practicable for large vessels in the early days. Though pronounced Krat or Krāt, the name of the district is written with a final ʂ, thus: Kras or Krāśa. In the early days it evidently was preceded by the syllable Bā, which occurs as a prefix to many place-names in ancient Kambojan territory.¹ In modern Khmēr Bā, like the Malay Pa', means a 'father,' but it is also employed in the sense of 'chief,' 'chief of a herd,' and 'great.' In Bahnar and some other dialects of the semi-wild tribes of Kamboja Bā or Bah means the embouchure of a river and also a confluent, thus corresponding in sense to both the modern Khmēr words Peam or Piem (river-mouth) and Bēk (confluent). As Krāt is situated near the embouchure of the Thùng-yăi River, we may easily conclude that it was in the early days called Bā-kraś or Bā-krāś, i.e. 'the Kras Mouth [village].' Otherwise, as there may have been two villages both named Krāt, the greater of the two may have been distinguished as Bā-krāś, i.e. 'Great Krāt' or the 'chief Krāt village.' As it is possible that Bā had in the old times a sound approaching to Pā, we have in either of the interpretations offered above the equivalent of Ptolemy's Pagrassā. The earliest mention I can find of Krāt is in the collection of Siamese laws called Phraṅ Thamnūn, dated A.D. 1611. The whole district is archaeologically unexplored. That it should be is shown by the results already obtained in the adjoining province of Chanthabūn (Candanaṇūra, or Candanaṇūra), where stelae bearing inscriptions in Sanskrit and Khmēr referred to the tenth century have been discovered.

Sōbanos or Sōbanas River (Nos. 94, 183).

I am strongly inclined to identify this stream with the Kap'hong Sōm or Soma River, which debouches in the Gulf of Siām through a large estuary situated in long. 103° 38',

¹ E.g. in Bā-Sāk or Pā-Sāk (vide supra, p. 166), which is a toponymic of the same class of Pagrassā (Bā-Krāś or Pā-Krāś).
lat. 10° 53', and is perhaps the most important watercourse on this coast. From the name of the district in which it flows, it may have been termed Somanādi or designated by some other similar name represented by Sōbanos. The word Suvarṇa has been suggested, and on this score McCrindle attempts to identify it with the Sup'hān River. But we have shown above (p. 190) that Sup'hān was called Bandhumapura in its early days; and it is very doubtful whether it existed at all at the period with which we are concerned. Moreover, the great difference in positions between the two streams makes that identification untenable. It is quite evident that Sōbanos represents some term like Sōbhaṇa, Sumanasa, or, in the vernacular form, Somanas. Suvarṇa or Socanṣa offer perhaps less probability. On this ground, and on account of the beautiful scenery, praised by several travellers,1 for which the banks of the Kampōt River are justly celebrated, I was led to identify the Sōbanos with this stream in the tables. But the Kampōt being but a small watercourse, I now think that the Kap'hang Sôm River has greater claims in every way to obtain the preference. It moreover occurs to me that this stream must be the Shu-chiang or Shu River mentioned in the accounts of Chinese travellers (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., vol. ii, p. 477) as flowing through a State named after it and situated to the west of Chén-tu. Shu means 'red,' being thus equivalent to the Sanskrit Šona; but more likely it is intended here to simply represent the first syllable of Sōbhaṇa or Somanas, the name of the Kap'hang Sôm River. However it be, the Shu-chiang State becomes identical with the Kap'hang Sôm District, and the stream flowing through it with the Shu-chiang of the Chinese and Ptolemy's Sōbanos or Sōbanas.

Pithēnobastē, a mart (No. 95).

This is Panthāi-māś or Banthāi-māś, usually spelled Pontéay-méas in French maps, and corrupted into P'huṭthai-

1 See Ch. Meyniard's "Le Second Empire en Indo-Chine," p. 387; Paris, 1891.
(or Buddai) -māś in Siamese. Banthāi-māś is a compound Khmēr term, meaning 'golden walls.' But both its component words are derived from Sanskrit, Banthāi being the Sanskrit bhikti = Pāli bhitti = 'wall,' and māś the Sanskrit māṣa or māṣīka = Pāli māsa = 'gold,' 'golden.'

It has always been, up to the last century, the most important emporium of Kamboja, the landing-place of all political and religious missions despatched from times immemorial to the country of the Khmērs. Buddhism and its Scriptures are said to have been, through its channel, introduced to this people—as at Tathōn in Pegu—from Ceylon by the famous divine Buddhaghosa, in 415 A.D. But this, of course, is a mere myth.¹

Banthāi-māś is situated in the centre of the district of the same name, some forty miles up the river, debouching at Hatēn, which was its port, known to Ptolemy as Akadra, and to the Arab navigators as Kadranj.

Its position is almost exactly due north of Hatēn, in long. 104° 29' E. and lat. 10° 52' 30". Its territory is conterminous with those of Trang (Drang) and Bāti, and notorious for important ruins, some of which, like those of Payanēr, to the east of Banthāi-māś, claim an antiquity of no less than twelve or thirteen centuries. It is certain, however, that a full exploration of this and neighbouring districts will reveal more ancient remains, as the name Banthāi-māś appears in the earliest accounts of the country. Thirty-four inscriptions are mentioned by Bergaigne as having been found in the province of Trang alone.

The Banthāi-māś River has communicated with the Pāṣak or Posterior Mē-Khōng River at Chaudoc (Chô-dok) by the canal of Vinh-té since A.D. 1820, the date at which this canal was dug. But at a more remote period it is certain that a branch (the westernmost one) of the Mē-Khōng flowed

¹ This legend is thus referred to in the Introduction to the "Northern Annals" of Siām: "In the year 959 (= A.D. 415) of the Buddhist Era, Buddhaghosācārya, having completed the translation of the Commentaries to the Holy Scriptures in Lāṅkā, took with him an emerald statue of Buddha, which was preserved there, and embarked, but his ship was blown by a tempest to the mouth of the Banthāi-māś River."
through the territory now intersected by the canal, as evidenced by the fact that up to the present day the country along the banks of the latter is low and swampy. This arm of the Mē-Không must have been, therefore, the earliest and shortest route to Phnom-p'heūn and former capitals of Kamboja from the west. An alternative river route to Kamboja was by the Pūšak branch of the Mē-Không; but this was often unsafe, owing to the shoals and sand-banks which skirted the approaches to the delta and the intricacies of the channels which gave access to it. Hence this route scarcely appears to have been used in the early days, and we always hear of Bantthāi-māś and its port at the mouth of the stream, called Pāk-nam (or Piem) Bantthāi-māś, as the entrepôt par excellence of Kamboja.

One of the first maps where Panthāi-māś appears is that of Siām by Robert, a.d. 1751, which notes it down as Pontiano. In modern maps this mart is almost in every instance omitted. The Pavie map, 1894, has in its place "Touk-méas," an evidently corrupt reading. The reason is that Panthāi-māś itself has long ceased to be of any importance, while the harbour of Hatien had to be abandoned from over one hundred years ago, when the Mē-Không and the canal of Vinh-té fell into the hands of the Annamese. Kampōt then rose into favour as the only port of Kamboja, merchandise being thence carried overland to Phnom-p'heūn and Udong. But now Kampōt harbour also became, in its turn, silted up, and inaccessible to vessels of even moderate draft.

Turpin,¹ who mentions Panthāi-māś under the name of Pontameas, says: "Le commerce y est entièrement tombé, depuis qu'il a été ravagé en 1717 par les Siamois." Crawfurd² repeats the same story, and calls the place Po-tai-matt. The Siamese Annals say nothing of this beyond that a naval force of Annamese (or Cochin-Chinese) was, in

1710, met by a Siamese fleet at the mouth of the Phuththai-
mâs (Banthâi-mâs) River; and that an ignominious defeat
was inflicted on the Siamese fleet under Phâyâ Kôsâ, who
was afterwards condemned to make good the value of the
vessels and material of war lost by him. This same fact
is placed in the Khmêr chronicles and Annamese records
in 1719, which is undoubtedly the correct date. It is,
therefore, difficult to understand how the Siamese, being
worsted at the mouth of the river, could destroy Panthâi-
mâs, which is about one day’s journey up the stream.
The place attacked was in reality Hatien, which was
defended by its governor and founder, a Chinaman named
Mak-kû, to whose generalship the brilliant defeat of the
rival force must be ascribed.¹

Akadra, a town (No. 96).

Yule rightly identified this city with the Kadranj of the
Arabs, but he located it at Chanthabûn, further up the
eastern coast of the Gulf. It corresponds instead, as I have
shown, to Hatien harbour, called also Kankao, within the
island of Koh Tron. The position of Hatien, at the
mouth of the Panthâi-mâs stream, is long. 104° 25' E.,
lat. 10° 22' N. It is now inaccessible to vessels of even
moderate draught, whereas in former times it was an
excellent harbour.² There is, however, good anchorage

¹ See “Gia-dinh Thung-chi,” Aubaret’s trans., p. 283, where it is positively
stated that Phâyâ Kôsâ took and ravaged Hatien. The destruction of his fleet,
however, is here ascribed to a dreadful tempest which swept the harbour
and submerged the Siamese ships. In the account of the reorganization of Kamboja
effected by King Nârai Râmâthibodi (Nâráyanâ Râmâdhipati) in A.D. 1795,
I find that Phuththai-mâs was assigned to the department of Phrayâ Yamarâja,
Minister of Police (or Mayor of the Metropolis), and that its Governor had the
title of Phrayâ Yodhâdhipati. Before that period Panthâi-mâs had been in the
hands of the Annamese, from whom Phâyâ Tâk, the gallant soldier-king of Siâm,
had wrested it for a moment in A.D. 1771. For Panthâi-mâs, the city, as well
as the whole of its district, formerly extending down to the coast in the present
provinces of Pêam and Trang, must be understood.

² The term Hatien is Annamese, and was given to the district after 1715, when
Mak-kû became its governor. Prior to that period the territory on the right
bank of the river formed part of the Panthâi-mâs province, while that on the
left bank belonged to the district of Trang. Near the mouth of the river, and
on the site of the present town of Hatien, stood a village, said in the “Gia-dinh
Thung-chi” (p. 21) to have been vulgarly called Man-kham by the Khmêrs and
outside in the bay during both monsoons. I selected as a base point the actual anchorage of ships during the southwest monsoon, which is in front of Hatien, in long. 104° 21', seeing that this position gave the best results and was most likely the site that Ptolemy had in mind. I am not prepared to maintain that ships in Ptolemy's time cast anchor at this point during the same season, the most favourable for them to proceed up to China, instead of entering the river; but I preferably adopted the position in the bay, because I believe this is meant and not the city. In fact, the bay was evidently named after the island Koř Tron, the longitude (central) of which is 104° E. It may be that Ptolemy made a slight error in the position of this island, and placed it too close to the coast, so as to make the centre of the intervening bay result in long. 104° 21', where the actual anchorage is. However this be, the

*Phnom-thanh* by the Annamese. According to the same work (pp. 22 and 270), the surrounding territory was, however, known as the *p'hu* (district) of Sai-mat, or Sai-mat-p'hu (i.e. Phnom-thai-mat, or Banthai-mat). At that village of Man-kham began and ended, after the lapse of over one century, the fortunes of the *Mak* (莫) family, represented at first in the person of the famed Mak-kü. This enterprising Chinaman hailed from Lei-chou, on the homonymous peninsula, Kuang-tung province, where he was born in 1658. Unwilling to submit to the rule of the newly established and unpopular Manchu dynasty of the Taing, he emigrated to Kamboja in 1658, and shortly afterwards settled at Man-kham. There he took up the management of a gambling farm, and engaged in trading speculations which soon enriched him. He founded several villages both on the coast and on Koř Tron Island. At last he was appointed governor of the district by the Annamese in 1715, as above stated. Thenceforward the process of murdering the old Khmēr toponymy of the district, setting up in its stead a new-fangled and often nonsensical Annamese nomenclature, commenced. In homage to a popular belief—presumably a tradition handed down from the old Indi settlers—that a river-deity or genius (in Chinese *Hsien*, in Annamese *Tien*) was wont to travel up and down the Banthai-mai River, the district was named *Ha-tien* (in Chinese 河仙, Ho-hsien), i.e. *territory of the river-genius* ("Gia-dinh Thung-chi," p. 21). The river itself was, however—for what reason it does not transpire—rechristened *Sông Vinh-tê*, i.e. "Vinh-tê River" (ibid., pp. 279 f., 248-9). Mak-kü, after an eventful life, died in 1736 at the respectable age of 78. His elder son Mak-ti'n succeeded him, receiving his official appointment in 1737. Having proceeded to Băngkêk at the request of King P'hyà Ták, who afterwards had him cast into prison, he committed suicide there in 1781 (ibid., p. 47). His natural son Sahn became governor in 1758 (p. 61), but died soon afterwards (1790). Mak-kong-binh, the latter's brother, was then appointed by the king of Siam to fill the post (p. 63). Having held it for but a short time he was in his turn carried off by sickness, and with him ended the adventurous career of the Mak family. Siamese governors were henceforth appointed (1802-3). As regards the term *Kaukao*, sometimes used to designate Hatien, I was so far unable to obtain any detailed information.
position I adopted is sensibly correct within 4°, and thus
formed, as it was shown in the preceding section, a capital
base point from which to work out nearly the whole of
Ptolemy's trans-Gangetic Geography.

We have met with other instances in Ptolemy of
a locality on the mainland being named from an island
opposite it. Among such I may mention the Katabèda
River (No. 44), so named by Ptolemy after the opposite
island of Kutubdia. In the present case it appears quite
possible that the bay and the present site of Hātién were,
by navigators in Ptolemy's time, designated after the
island which formed for them a landmark in directing
their vessels thereto. As regards the name of the island,
however, I am not sure whether it has been given to
it independently of any locality on the mainland, or
with reference to the province of Trang, which in the old
times extended down to the coast of Hātién, in what is
now the territory of another district named Pèam or Piem,
which means simply 'mouth' (of the river), or estuary.
Koḥ Tron is now variously styled in the maps Koḥ Dōt
and P'hu-Kuok. The former is its Siāmese and the latter
its Annamese name. Crawfurd says that Koḥ Dōt in
Siāmese means 'the far island,' this denomination being
in "reference to its relative distance, compared to other
islands, from the coast of Kamboja." I very much doubt
that such an interpretation can be put upon the word Dōt
in Siāmese. The only meanings known to me are, as
a verb, 'to jump,' and as an adjective, 'single, alone.'
The last interpretation is the only possible one, though
it does not clearly appear why it should be applied, since
there are other islands lying close by. I therefore doubt
whether Dōt is a Siāmese term at all. Crawfurd—who,
by the way, has made a minute survey of the island, of
which he gives a good description—proceeds to say that
its Khmēr name is Koḥ-trol, which means the 'shuttle
island,' on account of its peculiar shape. This second

interpretation is more reliable than the preceding; and
the name trol here, also pronounced tron, reminds one of
trasara, the Sanskrit name for a shuttle, and of its Malay
derivative tōrak. But the correct Khmer term for island is
ka, a contraction of the Mōn t'ka or t'ka; hence we may
understand how from Ku-tron or Ka-dron could originate
the Arabic form Kadranj or Kedrendj; and from Ku-trol or
Ka-drol the readings Quadrol,¹ Co-trol, Corol, etc., which we
find in most books of travel and maps of the past centuries.
An index to the importance in which the island and its
harbour were held by navigators, is the fact that it is one
of the very first localities mentioned in the earliest maps of
Indo-China. We find it noted as Coroll in the Portuguese
(anonymous) map of about A.D. 1550, preserved in the
Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris; as Carol in another map
of 1580; Carol in Mercator's Chart of the 1613 edition;
Carol again in Janssonius' Atlas, 1638; Caizol in the historic
Atlas of Gueudeville, 1713-1719. In the latter an in-
scription is added saying: "Isle peuplée de Cochinchinois
p' le bois d'Aigle." It next appears in the map appended
to Mandelslo's work as Corol; and in Robert's map of Siām,
1751, as Caicol.² In some of the maps just referred to occurs
the name Tarnova (or Tarisana), Tarnano, and Tarrana, which
must be identified with the province of Trang (Drang) on
the same coast. Trang in modern Khmer is the name for
the Corypha Taliera palm, the Sanskrit and Pāli Tāli; hence
I hardly think that there can be any connection between the
present name of the island, Tron or Trol, and Trang, or
even Tāli, supposing that the Sanskrit term for the Taliera
palm was also used to designate that district on the mainland
in the place of the native Trang. Such, however, may not
have been the case in the earlier days, when the island—

² Most of these maps were published by Mr. Gabriel Marcel in the introduction
to the first volume of Fournerau's "Siam Ancien"; but the identification
of the names for Koń Tron island (Carol, Corol, etc.) was, as in the case of most
other names in the same region, given up in utter despair. The cartographer
Marcel, in his remarks on Van-Langren's map, 1595, where the single name
Carol appears on the Kambojan coast, observes regarding it (p. 23): "vocable
dans lequel il est difficile de trouver un nom indigène" (sic).
whether already bearing or not its present name of Ka-Trol or Koh-Tron—may also have been called by the natives either Ka-Trang or Ka-Drang in reference to the Trang District lying opposite to it on the mainland. To navigators, so little apt to make subtle distinctions in foreign nomenclatures, Ka-Trang and Trang were of course the same, and thus they came to use the name of the island to indicate both the harbour and the mainland behind it, which became thenceforward known to them as Kadrang, Kadra, Akadra, etc. Similar toponyms seem to have been common in Further India in the past; in fact, beside many places known to this day as Trong, Trang, etc., we had Ya-katra in Java, the former name of Batavia, or at any rate of the stream flowing past its territory; and Ptolemy mentions another Akadra among the interior towns of the Sinai (No. 128), which I have since located in Kwang-tung, on the site of the ancient district of Chung-su (in Annamese Trung-tuk), the present Chi‘ing-yuan. Abu Zaid places Kedrendj, Kadranj, or Kadrenge¹ within ten days’ navigation of Bétumah, a place which I have identified with the Tamasak, or Ujong Tanah, of the Malays,² the 淡馬錫 (Tan-ma-hsi; in Hakka, T’äm-ma-siak) of the Chinese,³ and the Tamus, or Tamarus, promontorium of Strabo, Mela, etc., commonly called Samara after the fifth century.⁴

¹ Reinaud’s "Relations des voyages," etc., t. i, p. 18; and Renaudot’s "Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine," p. 13.
³ Noted thus in the Chinese map, probably of the fourteenth century, published by Phillips in the Journal, China Branch of the R.A.S., new series, vol. xxi, and left unidentified in the commentary to the same, p. 39. An inspection of that map will readily convince anyone of the correctness of my identification. Tan-ma-hsi is there noted on the mainland within Singapore island, just where the Tamasak of the Malay Annals is represented to have been, and where undoubtedly also stood the Bétumah of the Arab navigators. Close to the eastwards of Tan-ma-hsi the Chinese map has Ta-na-ch‘i-hsiū, a place which must be the Ujong (Cape) Tanah of the Malays.
⁴ See Santare, "Essai sur l’histoire de la Cosmographie," etc., t. ii, p. 340, n.; quoting from Gosselin, iii, pp. 188-9. The name Tamarus very likely represents the Sanskrit tamarasa, meaning ‘gold’; hence its connection with the Malay Peninsula and the island of Khrysè. A similar term, tamara, means ‘tin’ or ‘lead’; but I do not think that such a construction could be put upon the name of the Tamarus promontory, as Kalah-bär, the country of tin, was further up the peninsula. The first syllable Bè of Bétumah is, however, distinctly Mōña; and, like in other names of the Bè or Bé class, such as Bęsyaunga,
Bētumah was either the present Singapore island or the opposite mainland, forming the southern extremity of the Peninsula, where the embouchure of the Johor River is situated. It was, more likely than not, the name of the present Johor district, known later on and up to a couple of centuries ago as Ujong Tanah. From this district and the river flowing through it, the name Bētumah spread to the surrounding territory and islands; and up to this date it survives in the neighbouring islets of Batam and Bentan on the other side of the Singapore Straits. I cannot here go into further particulars on the sea-route of the Arab navigators of the ninth century, which I have now succeeded in fixing with unerring precision; suffice it to say that the distances of ten days' sailing given by Abu Zaid between Bētumah and Kadranj on the one hand, and Kalah-bār and Bētumah on the other, represent exactly the average time employed nowadays by sailing crafts in proceeding from Singapore to Hatien and from Takópa to Singapore respectively; and are, as may be ascertained on any modern map, within a few miles equivalent. The same may be said of the distance between the kingdom of Komar (west coast of Kamboja) and that of Zabedj (Śrī Bhoja or Palembang in Sumatra), equally estimated at ten days.

At Kedrendj, continues Abu Zaid, the vessels can obtain fresh water; and there is a high mountain whereto slaves and thieves often flee for refuge. The high mountain here alluded to is very likely the well-known P'hnom Bērabonna, etc., it stands for ๒ Bi, a river. Therefore Bē-tumah would mean the River of Tama, Tama, or Tamara. But the name may as well be entirely Mōh, e.g. Bi-t'umah = 'Stony River' or 'River of the Rock' (cf. Tamua). The latter interpretation would suit the Singapore River, or rather Creek, well known from having in former days a large rock at its entrance; but more probably the Johor River is meant. The latter may have been termed Tamasā, Tamesi, or Tamra, after some one of the homonymous streams in India. Hsi-li (息 力), the modern Chinese name for Singapore (Chavannes, op. cit., p. 42), which is, however, pronounced Shek-lek ( REGISTER, see China Review, vol. xxi, p. 281) or Sīt-līt, represents, in my opinion, the Malay Selat or Straits, and is not in any way connected with (Tama)-sak.
Damrei, or 'Elephant Range,' rearing its summit up to a height of over 3,000 feet near Kampôt, to the north-west of Hatien. The Bach-ma mountain, westwards of Hatien, is referred to in the "Gia-dinh Thung-chi" (p. 273) as having been of yore a refuge for bands of dacoits. Good water is plentiful on North Pirate Island (Isle du Phe) in the bay, near to which there are good anchorages in both monsoons; and several fresh-water streams are to be found on Koh Tron itself.

Masaudi, we have seen, calls his fifth sea by the name of Kedrendj or Kerdendj, a term which Reinaud thinks was given to it after the port of Kedrendj mentioned by Abu Zaid at which the Arab vessels touched on their way to China. This is quite possible, although, as I have shown above (p. 164), Kerdendj as the name of a sea may be an Arab travesty of Kṣiroda, Kadūram, or some such term.

Kedrendj, Kadranj, or Akadra, was undoubtedly part of the kingdom of Kumāra, or Komar, of the Purānas and Abu Zaid, which we have located at the south-western extremity of Kamboja. Our reason for holding so is, that Abu Zaid speaks of Komar as being situated on the mainland, "on the side which faces towards the country of the Arabs," which shows that it extended from the alluvial plain of the Mê-Không delta, now ending at Cape Khmau, or Kumāri, up the western coast of Kamboja or eastern shore of the Gulf of Siām; and that it must have included, at least at some time or other, the province of Trang, with perhaps Paynikar or Pāthāi-mās as its capital. The position of the two places just named is in accord with that of the residence of the king of Komar, located by Abu Zaid at one day's distance from the seaboard, on a fresh-water stream. Another particular which goes to confirm our location of the Komar kingdom and its capital, or at least principal port, is the reference to the "aloes surnamed al-komāri" as one of the chief products of the country. Kumāri is one of the Sanskrit names for aloes; but here

2 Ibid., t. i, p. 97.
aloëxylon, lignum-aloes, or eagle-wood, is meant, and this, we have seen above, is one of the productions for which Koh Tron and the neighbouring mainland have always been renowned. But if any further proofs were needed to justify our location of the kingdom of Komar on the seaboard extending from Kampot to Cape Kamboja (Khmau), we might refer to a very conclusive passage of Masaudi,\(^1\) to the effect that "the inhabitants walk for the most part barefooted, on account of the great number of mountains that cover the country, of rivers that intersect it, and of the small number of plains and plateaus." This passage luminously demonstrates that the hilly coast about Koh Tron Bay is meant, and not the lowlands lying further to the south-east, towards the Mê-Không delta. The conclusion is, therefore, that the kingdom of Kumâra of the Purânas, and of Komar of the Arab navigators and geographers, embraced the western seaboard of Kamboja and had as a centre the province of Trang, with Koh Tron Bay or the mouth of the present Hatien River as its principal port, and Panthâi-mâś or Payanâkar for its capital.

Some further information on this long-forgotten kingdom may be gleaned from Chinese sources. Ma Tuan-lin mentions,\(^2\) among the Kambojan States that sent tribute to China in A.D. 638 a kingdom of Chiu-mi or Chiu-mo (in Cantonese Kau-mo, or K'au-mo = Kuma, Koma, Khona), the ruler of which bore the name of Shih-li Chiu-mo (Śri Kuma). On the other hand, the Annals of the T'ang dynasty appear to state that Chén-la, when subject to Fu-nan, was also known as Kîh-mieh.\(^3\) I am inclined to believe that in both instances the kingdom of Kumâra or Komar referred to above is meant, Chén-la being a somewhat elastic term which, merely designating at first the low and marshy region of the delta, was afterwards employed by the Chinese in a much wider sense so as to include under it not only

---

\(^1\) Reinaud, op. cit., t. ii, p. 49, n. 177. The translations of this and other passages quoted from Reinaud's work are my own.


\(^3\) T'ang-shu, quoted in Des Michels' "Annales Impériales de l'Annam," fasc. iii, p. 191.
Kih-mieh or Komar, but the whole of Kamboja. The reason for this extended application of the term Chên-la is perhaps to be found in the very probable circumstance that, as we shall hereafter show, it was from the region of the delta, or from its two districts denominated Jalā or Jalada (Chên-la) and Kumāra (Komar) that the movement of conquest and unification of Kamboja under the rule of a single king had its inception. With the progressive march of that conquest the term Chên-la acquired a wider meaning, and whereas in the first instance the Chinese who became acquainted with the portion of the delta which bordered on the Gulf of Siām promiscuously applied that denomination to both Jalada and Kumāra, thus making Chên-la synonymous with Kih-mieh, they included in the sequel, under the same term, also the tract of country brought under subjection by the original kings of Komar; so that Chên-la now became the Chinese designation for the whole region, which had meanwhile been locally styled the 'kingdom of Kambūjā.'

Concerning the origin and history of the kingdom of Komar, I find it stated in the Talaing book of Gavampati Thera, already quoted in a preceding section, that after three hundred complete years from Buddha's Nirvāṇa (or about B.C. 243) a capital city was founded near the Hamsa-giri Mountain in Kamboja, which became known as Khomā-nagara. Here reigned a king of the Khōm race, Khoma-rāja by name, who greatly favoured Buddhism and made it flourish in his States. After nine hundred years from Nirvāṇa (or about A.D. 357) the dynasty founded by Khoma-rāja came to an end, and a new one was started headed by an Adharmīka or impious king, who extirpated the Buddhist religion from his dominions. This last statement perfectly agrees with I-tsing's information that in Kamboja there was no Buddhism left in his time (A.D. 671–695), although that faith had formerly flourished there, its decline being caused by a wicked king who expelled and exterminated all members of the Buddhist brotherhood.¹

¹ See Takakusu, op. cit., p. 12.
The advent of this impious ruler appears to coincide with the rise of the dynasty headed by Srutavaran, and mentioned in the Paksī-cham-krong inscription of A.D. 947, which substituted for Buddhism the worship of Brāhmaṇic deities and claimed descent from a Kambu Svāyambhūva, a sort of Manu, from whom the country was afterwards named the "Land of Kambu" and Kambujā or Kamboja. A king of this dynasty, or at any rate of one of its branches, was Iśānavarman, who reigned in A.D. 626. He is known to have established his capital at Iśāna-pura [mentioned by both Hwén-ts‘ang (A.D. 629–645) and I-tsing (A.D. 671–695)], and to have conquered and annexed Fu-nan in A.D. 627. As we shall see directly, Iśāna-pura was very likely situated on the Trang territory; hence the State of which it was the capital must have been the kingdom of Kumāra or Komar. But after the conquest of Fu-nan and many other States mentioned in Chinese records as having been annexed by the king of Chén-la between A.D. 638 and 650, the capital must have been transferred to or about the site of the capital of Fu-nan and of the Ang Chumnik inscription; that is, about Bā P‘nom. It may have been established at Āḍhyaapura, the city referred to in that same inscription in A.D. 667. From that period the kingdom of Komar became absorbed into the newly-formed Kambojan Empire; hence we do not meet with any further mention of Chiu-mo (or Kuma) and Kih-mich in Chinese records, any more than of the other petty realms formerly referred to along with Komar. We merely hear of Chén-la, a denomination now applied in a much wider sense; and of Kan-pu-chih or Kan-p‘o-ché (Kambuja), the new name for the unified empire. This completely accords with the account of the Arab traveller Sulaiman, who, having called

1 Vide Prof. Bergaigne’s article in Journal Asiatique, Aug.–Sept., 1882.
2 Wat Kedei (Kuț) or Kedei Ang, termed also Ang Chumnik, the Buddhist monastery where two inscribed stelae, bearing the date 551 Saka (= A.D. 629), and thus probably belonging to Iśānavarman’s reign, were discovered, besides the one referred to above, lies at about seven miles south by east of the Bā-P‘nom hills; and Āḍhyaapura appears to have stood in its neighbourhood.
at *Kedrendj* or Koh Tron harbour between A.D. 840–850, no longer speaks of the kingdom of Komar as actually existing at the time of his visit, but refers to the events which came to pass in that State as traditions handed down from the "temps anciens." Neither does he make mention of Komar among the realms of Further India extant in his time which he enumerates in another passage; but he tells us in its stead of a kingdom of the *Mudjahs*, which, I have good reason to think, represents the country of the *Bujas*, or *Kambujas*, i.e. Kamboja, under its newly acquired name. This identification is strengthened by the fact that, conterminous to *Mudja* and beyond it, Abu Zaid's account places the kingdom of *Mabed*, in which I have discovered the term *Bâ-viêt*, the early designation for the present Annam and Tonkin. A glance at the description of *Mabed* given by Abu-zaid will convince even the most sceptical that *Bâ-viêt*, and no other country, is actually meant. It follows, then, that when Sulaiman called at *Kedrendj* or Koh Tron harbour, he found the kingdom of *Muja* or *Buja* firmly established under the sway of a single ruler, and only heard of the kingdom of *Komar* as a thing of the past, but the events of which were still vividly remembered in the province of Trang, as the kingdom was situated on that very same coast and had its capital at a single day's distance from it. We have already expressed the opinion that this capital must have been either at Panthai-mas or in the neighbourhood of Payanakar, as the number of ancient remains and inscriptions discovered in that territory appear to confirm. There it must have remained up to the time of *Īsānavarman*, who, in about 626 A.D., founded *Īsānapura*. This city, I believe, must be looked for in the adjoining district of *Bāti* (Pādi), near Phnom Eiso, the 'hill of *Īsā*’ (*Īsāna* or *Śiva*), which is evidently the *Īsāna* mountain located by the Bhāgavata Purāṇa in the same country, viz. *Sākadevi*.

Reinaud, op. cit., vol. i, p. 97.

1 Ibid., p. 31.

3 Professor Hall's edition of Wilson's "Viṣṇu Purāṇa," vol. ii, p. 200, n. †.
hill called P'hnom Angkor-buri (Nagara-puri), whose name shows that some nagara or capital city existed in its neighbourhood. On the top of P'hnom Eisó are found the remains of a temple termed prásād Chisor (Jisūr); and a little to the west of it are the ruins of the prásād Nāṅg Khmau, or temple of Kumāri (Kālī).

It thus appears that the kingdom of Komar, or the territory of the actual districts of Trang and Panthāi-mās, must have formed the earliest nucleus of the Kambojan Empire, as well as the gate through which Indū civilization was introduced to Kamboja. Founded during the third century before the Christian Era as a mere dependency of the mighty Fu-nan Empire, it gradually waxed in extent and power until it acquired hegemony over the neighbouring petty States of the Kambojan coast and became capable of assimilating the paramount kingdom of Fu-nan itself. By the middle of the sixth century A.D., namely, during the reign of Īsānavarman’s great-grandfather, Kīh-mieh, or Komar, had already, according to Chinese authorities, grown “very powerful,”¹ which proves that it must have had by that time absorbed a good deal of the territory belonging to its suzerain of Fu-nan. In fact, the topographical distribution of the inscriptions mentioning the name of Bhavavarman—the predecessor of Īsānavarman, who reigned about A.D. 600—shows that his dominions extended over nearly all the present Kamboja,² as far up as the Great Lake and the Mē-Khōng rapids of Khōn, the historical boundary with the State of Campāsak, and, later on, with Eastern Lāos. We must take it, therefore, that Īsānavarman’s alleged conquest of Fu-nan in A.D. 627 merely means the subjugation of the last nucleus of that kingdom constituted by the districts immediately adjoining its capital, and the deathblow dealt to the metropolis itself, through which he acquired mastery over the whole of Kamboja.

In order to better clear up this point I feel constrained to

² See Professor Bergaigne’s “Chronologie de l’ancien royaume Khmer,” in Journal Asiatique, 1884.
say something of my identification of Fu-nan or Po-nan, the celebrated country whose location and name have formed the subject of endless discussions and remained so far unsettled. I cannot go into particulars here, but must limit myself with giving the results of my researches on the subject, reserving an ampler treatment of it to a future opportunity. Fu-nan is then, as I make it out, a Chinese imitation of the Khmêr term Phanom (Banam, or Vanam), meaning a 'mountain,' and also, therefore, a 'mountaineer.' It is thus a synonym of C'hieng, being employed as a prefix to names of cities, as C'hieng is in the upper part of Indo-China. Fu-nan turns out consequently to be the name of a tribe or tribes of mountaineers, evidently a branch of the Ch'hieng race, who anciently occupied Kamboja, founding therein cities whose names begin with or include the word Phanom, e.g. Phanom-phê'n, Nakhôn (Nagara) Phanom, Bâ-Phanom, etc. The modern representatives of the Phanom tribes are, no doubt, the people called, with but slight variation, Penong or Banong, still inhabiting the country to the east of the Mê-Không at Kracheh. With them are probably connected the Bahmar or Bânar (Vanara, Vânara) and other wild tribes of Eastern Kamboja, most of whom seem to be included under the generic designation of Phanom, Phnom, or Penong. These tribes may have

1 The term Phanom or Phnom may be connected with the Sanskrit Vanam, meaning 'a forest,' and Pavana or Pravana = 'height, slope.' It will be observed that most hill-tribes of Indo-China have been named after their terms for 'mountain,' e.g. the Dôi (Lawô), the C'hieng, the Li or Loi, etc.

If a native word, its original form may have been Phûnam or Phûnâm; Phû being the term for 'mountain' used in all districts to the east of the Mê-Không. The identity of Phanom or Vanâm with Fu-nan will appear in better relief when it is borne in mind that the latter word is pronounced Pu-nam in some of the Southern China dialects; and that the characters of which it is composed (扶南) anciently sounded like Vû-nam. The other form, Pa-nan (跋南) or Po-nan, though met with in I-tsing's works as early as the dawn of the eighth century A.D. (see Chavannes, op. cit., p. 5), does not appear to have been employed by the earlier Chinese travellers. The old sound of its two characters was Buot-nam, and they are still pronounced Bat-nam by the Annamese, while they may be taken to represent the Sanskrit syllables Pu-nan or Vanam. It will thus be seen that Fu-nan = Phû-nam or Phûnâm (Sanskrit Bhû-nâna), and Pu-nan = Banam or Phanom (Sanskrit Banâna or Vanâm).

2 In order to understand the relationship of the Phanoms with the Penongs, or Phnongs, it is necessary to explain that the term for mountain and mountaineer, which is Phanom or Phnom in Khmêr, becomes pûnam in Stieng; and pûnong
reached Southern Cochin-China after their kinsmen the Ddí, Lői, Li, or Lóí, since Ptolemy does not speak of this region under the names of Fu-nan, P'hnom, or Vanam, but only as the country of the Léstai. The probability is, therefore, that in his time, or not very early before it, the P'hnom were still in the Mé-Không valley above Bassac, and that it was only later on that they reached Central Kamboja, and thence expanded towards Siâm and its Gulf, laying the foundation of a vast and mighty empire. This feat must, however, have been accomplished before the end of the second century of the Christian Era, since the Chinese envoys who visited Fu-nan between A.D. 222 and 252 already speak of that country as having extended its domination over a considerably large area. The Annamese Annals do indeed incidentally refer to P'to-nam (i.e. Fu-nan) under as early a date as B.C. 1110, but it is in connection with a legend; and besides, as Lam-ap or Lin-i (a district which was not constituted until B.C. 214) is alluded to along with it, we may well assume that neither of these two States existed as yet at so remote a period. The first genuine mention occurring of Fu-nan in the same Annals is in A.D. 280, when it is described as joining with Lin-i (Campâ) in making depredations upon the territory of Chiao-chih (Tonkin), then subject to Chinese rule. On the strength of these considerations we can hardly assign to the Fu-nan Empire an earlier birth-date than the second century A.D., admitting at the same time that Fu-nan may have existed as a petty State of Central Indo-China earlier than that.

Once the origin and meaning of the term Fu-nan established, we can easily trace the boundaries of Fu-nan or nong in Samcê, Poru (Prú), and C'hông. Compare with the Malay gúnong. In Suk or Sak, and Huet, it is manam. In P'nong it is now ch'uki, but this is due to the vicinity of peoples of the Châm stock, from whom a few words got intermingled with the P'nong dialect. 'Mountain' is ch'ih in Châm, ch'uki in Radé, ch'ok in Kanchô, kông in Bahar, etc. On the other hand, the old Khmér form P'nhom survives to this day in many districts of the Malay Peninsula. A mountain is termed mun in Kallantan and Rumpin; bunam in Endau and Johor, etc. (See Journal, Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 27, p. 34.)

1 Des Michels, op. cit., p. 8.
2 Ibid., p. 108.
by following the limits, out of which the term P'hu nome does not occur as a topographical name of mountain ranges, towns, etc. These limits are approximately: on the north, Nakhôn P'hanom (Nagara Vanam) on the Mê-Không (lat. 16° 56' 1", Garnier) and dependent districts; the watershed between Annam and Kamboja on the east; the Cochin-Chinese seaboard and the Gulf of Siâm on the south; and the Mê-Nâm Valley on the west. Nakhôn P'hanom was probably the chief city of Fu-nan when that State was still in its initial stage, and was mainly confined to the Middle Mê-Không Valley. In its halcyon days, however, the capital was certainly much lower down the Mê-Không, and most likely at Bā P'hu nome; but whether at the foot of the Bā P'hu nome Hills (P'hu nome Bā P'hu nome), or by the Mê-Không’s bank at Banam, or at some intermediate point, it is now next to impossible to ascertain unless further investigations are made in that quarter. I am inclined to give the preference to some locality within close proximity of the hills, since we have seen it was the custom with peoples of the Chêng race to build their settlements on elevated ground, and in any case to a place not very far from the sites where the Wat Chakret and Ang Chumnik inscriptions have been discovered.

My reason for venturing, in the case of a State like Fu-nan, whose position itself has before this been a geographical puzzle, to locate with some accuracy its capital, is, that I have succeeded in identifying with certainty several of the petty States which the early Chinese travellers name as subject to that empire, giving their bearings with respect to it, or rather to its capital. Two of the nearest of such States were: Ts'añ-pan, described as lying to the north of Fu-nan; and Pé-t'ou, located to the west of Fu-nan and to the south-west of Ts'añ-pan, with which it was made conterminous. I have identified Ts'añ-pan, 参 半 (whose name, by the way, is pronounced Ts'âm-pun in

---

1 Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., vol. ii, p. 441. Its position is deduced from that of Pé-t'ou, lying to the west of Fu-nan, and to the south-west of Ts'añ-pan. Hence Ts'añ-pan must have been to the north of Fu-nan, or thereabouts.

2 Ibid., loc. cit.
Cantonese), with the ancient Śaṁbhū or Śaṁbhū-pura, the modern Sambaur or Sambór, termed Sambun by the Siāmese, where reigned the line of vassal kings from whom Jayavarman II (the ruler of Kamboja between A.D. 802–869) was descended.

In Pê-t'ou, 白頭 (in Cant. Pak-t'au, and in Ann. Bāk-dòu), I have discovered the Sanskrit Bhikti[māśa] and Ptolemy's Pithō[nobastē], although its name has been transcribed by the Chinese so as to make it mean country of the 'White-headed' people.

The location which the Chinese assigned to Fu-nan—to the south of Ts'ān-pan and to the east of Pê-t'ou—is evidently meant for the capital, or at any rate for the central or chief district of that kingdom, which thus becomes approximately determined by the intersection of the Sambór meridian with the Panthāi-māś parallel. The position obtained in this manner falls near to the southern border of the present Svāi-thāp district, and at about midway between Chōu-dōk and Saigon. However, as the country is even up to this day very swampy at that point, and as we should not be too pedantic in applying the rigorous methods of mathematical geography in a case like this, where it is a question of approximate bearings pure and simple, I think that the site I have fixed for the capital—or at least for the central part of Fu-nan proper—in the Bā P'hnom district, fairly agrees with the location ascribed to it by the Chinese in relation to Sambór and Panthāi-māś.

The boundaries we have assigned to the Fu-nan or P'hnom Empire are those it must have had at the time of its greatest power, that is, during the early centuries of the Christian Era, when the Chinese first became acquainted with it. Colonists from Southern India had long before that period settled on the shores of the maritime district of Trang, and it was undoubtedly they who developed the trade of Koh Tron Bay, the principal port of Fu-nan, and who founded the kingdom of Kumāra, Komār, or Kih-mīeh, with its capital in the Trang district, whence they gradually extended their domination over the whole of Kamboja,
and succeeded, by the end of the first quarter of the seventh century, to make themselves masters of all that constituted the erstwhile mighty empire of Fu-nan. That this was the course of events which brought Kamboja under Dravidian influence and civilization, is fully borne out by the ancient inscriptions discovered in the country, which form, as it were, so many landmarks indicating the stages of successive development of Indian ascendancy in that region. An examination of the age and topographical distribution of those epigraphic records shows the Trang district to be the quarter where that influence was first established and whence it subsequently spread out. The most ancient monument of the kind hitherto discovered is the inscription of Bayang (Payañ or Puyañ) bearing the dates 526 and 546 Šaka (A.D. 604 and 624), in the province of Trang; and that of Wat P’hó (Bodhi) in the same district, mentioning King Íśānavarman, and revealing to us the existence, at so early a period, of the worship of Hari-Hara in its territory.¹ The embankment, Thal Puyañ, which leads to the Puyañ or Payang temple rising on the top of a peak some 500 feet high, in the midst of the plain stretching to the north of the present village of Bayang, is also referred to. Payañ or Payañkar is, Aymonier explains, the name both of the peak and of a legendary king. I should rather think of a deity, something like the goddess Yāmpu-nagara of Campā. Wat P’hó is situated at a day’s march to the north of Payañkar, and the inscriptions discovered at both places lead us to infer that the capital of the early Kumāra kingdom must have risen in that neighbourhood. These epigraphic monuments, as well as those that were erected after them up to the reign of Yaśovarman (A.D. 889), were inscribed mostly in Sanskrit, the characters used being of a South Indian type, a circumstance which makes it clear that it must have been from the South of India that civilization was first introduced into Kamboja.

¹ See Professor Bergaigne’s notes to Aymonier’s paper on the inscriptions in Old Khmer, published in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1883.
Next in order come the inscriptions of the Bā P'hnom district, the most remarkable whereof are those of Wat Chakret (A.D. 626) and Ang Chumnik (A.D. 667), both making mention of King Ḡṣanavarman. The lithic records discovered in the districts lying further inland belong to later dates; in a word they diminish in antiquity the more one proceeds towards the north, until the great lake being reached, one finds that the oldest inscription on its borders is that of Kuḍi Thā-ḫām, dated 713 Ṣaka =A.D. 791. A few inscriptions of the epoch of Bhavavarman (circa A.D. 600) have indeed been found in the northern districts; but these are mere isolated instances, due no doubt to the first successful inroads of the armies of the kings of Kumāra into Fu-nan, which prepared the conquest, accomplished by Ḡṣanavarman a few years later, of the whole of that empire. The chronological and topographical distribution of the bulk of the inscriptions shows therefore beyond any possible doubt that Indū influence and civilization had their inception in the province of Trang, ¹ on the shores of Koḥ Tron Bay, and that thence they gradually extended towards the interior of Kamboja. The record left us by Ptolemy of two Sanskrit or Sanskritized names of towns on that coast, Pithōnobastē and Akadra, is sufficient evidence that in his time Indū influence had not only been already established in that territory, but had as well grown up to a very considerable extent. The fact of Ptolemy's designating Pithōnobastē "a mart" (ἐμπώριος) plainly demonstrates that this, and not Akadra, was the great entrepôt of trade with the interior; that is, with the whole of the Fu-nan Empire.

Speaking of the expedition sent by the Mahārāja of Zābej (Śri-Bhoja or Palembang in Sumatra) to punish

¹ Speaking of the inscriptions anterior to Indravarman I (A.D. 877), Professor Bergaigne says (Journal Asiatique, 1884): "Elles sont d’ailleurs toujours disséminées dans les lieux les plus divers, plus nombreuses dans la terre méridionale et maritime de Trāng [Trang], sans être rares dans les autres, par exemple dans la terre de Ba Phrom et dans la partie limitrophe de la Cochinchine..." This shows that up to Indravarman's time, or very nearly so, the Trang district was still the principal seat of Indū civilization and power.
the king of Komār, Abū-zaid says that the fleet entered the river which led up to the capital of Komār. In this statement we have the proof that sea-going vessels, at least those of the Indū traders, used to enter the river which they ascended in the old times probably as far up as Panthāī-māś itself, where, or in whose neighbourhood, the ancient capital of Komār was situated. Up to a quite recent period, Siāmese sailing-ships and steamers of moderate draught were able to proceed up the Panthāī-māś River as far as the canal of Vinh-té, and reach through it the posterior branch of the Mē-Không, which they ascended up to P'hnom-p'hēū or to the Great Lake. There is no doubt that this route to Kamboja was the oldest, besides being the safest, and the shortest from the Gulf of Siām and the Straits; hence the preference always given to it over the one which followed the course of the Mē-Không from its eastern mouths. It is only with the advent of the Portuguese and the introduction of improved methods of navigation that we hear of ships ascending the Mē-Không from its eastern mouths to P'hnom-p'hēū and further. The silting up of that westernmost branch of the Mē-Không, which of old supplied the communication re-established on a far smaller scale in 1820 by digging the canal of Vinh-té, led to the abandonment of the first-named route in favour of the second; and now Hatien only lives a rickety life, alimented by the coast trade, while Panthāī-māś is more of a geographical expression than anything else. And yet both were the gates through which Indū civilization first reached Kamboja, and ranked among the most important stations for ships on the route from India to China.

Zabai or Zaba, the city (No. 123).

The rectified position of this city falls in the neighbourhood of the present Sadēk,1 but it will be seen by a glance at

1 The vulgar form by which P'hoï-dēk is designated. This place-name is composed of the two Khmār terms p'hoï (‘mart’) and dēk (‘iron’), and means therefore ‘Iron-mart.’ It appears that at some time or other hardware was chiefly sold here, hence its name, which the Annamese transcribe as 沙嶺, Sà-dēk.
the map that the whole coastline of Cochin-China and Annam was by Ptolemy shifted too much westwards, thus causing a displacement of the cities on its borders back from their true position. Moreover, it is unlikely that the portion of the delta about Sadék had, in our author’s time, sufficiently emerged above sea-level as to be inhabitable, since it is even now a low-lying land of marshy character and periodically flooded. Very probably, as demonstrated by several concurrent circumstances to which we shall revert directly, the portion of the Indo-Chinese Peninsula comprised between the Sadék parallel and Cape Kamboja (Khmau) was then but in the initial stage of its formation, and may at best have consisted of shallows and mud-banks stretching for a considerable distance seawards. On the strength of these considerations we feel justified in looking for the site of Zabai further to the east and inland of Sadék. And, as I have now acquired the certainty that Ptolemy’s Great Cape (Mega Akrōtērion) corresponds to the present Cape Ti-wön or Thoê-wön (Tioan or Tiouane of French maps),¹ constituted by a spur of the Bària Hills projecting seawards at a little distance to the north-east of the but recently formed Cape

¹ Noted Ti-wan—which is fairly near the mark—in the “China Sea Directory,” vol. ii, p. 390, 1899 edition. For the Kwok-ngû spelling Ti-wan or Thuê-wan and its meaning—‘cloud-girdled’—see “Gia-dinh Thung-chi,” Aubaret trans., p. 163. The correct orthography of the second term should be, I presume, 垂雲, Thoê-wön (Chin. Ch’wei-yûn), which alone can convey that sense. I have noticed with no small degree of interest, after writing the above, that the Chinese map of the fourteenth century published by Phillips (vide supra, p. 199) spells the name of this cape 大灣 (Ti-wön), where 大 (in Annamese, Đài) = Méya, while the second character is, no doubt, mere guesswork for 雲, wön = ‘cloud.’ From this I infer that the headland in question may have been known of old as ‘Cape Great-Cloud,’ translated as Mahû-megha by the early Indû civilizers of the country. Whether Ptolemy’s méya be a translation of the first term in this compound or a mere transliteration of the second, I do not pretend to judge, my object being solely to call attention to this etymological connection, which contributes in some measure towards establishing the identity of Ptolemy’s Great Cape with the headland under discussion. This, by the way, is so conspicuous that it is usually seen by navigators before Cape St. James. (Vide “China Sea Directory,” loc. cit.)
St. James, we may arrive at a yet more approximate estimate of the position of Zabai by referring it to the rectified position of the Great Cape as coinciding with Cape Ti-wön. We would thus obtain for Zabai a longitude of 106° 39' and a latitude of 10° 53'; that is, a site on the Tôn-biũ (formerly Ben-ngê) or Saigon River, at about equal distances from the chef-lieu of Bien-Hoa in a north-eastern, and from Saigon in a south-eastern, direction. I have no doubt that in our author's time the sea reached up about as far as the place where now rises Saigon, forming there what we may call the "Bay of Zabai," sheltered on the east by the Nuí Diũ and Nuí Bària Hills, which, together with the hillocks (Nuí Gaũ-râi) of the actual Cape St. James, then an island, formed conspicuous landmarks for the navigators. As Zabai is mentioned in Ptolemy's introductory book (where it is spelled Zaba) as one of the principal stations on the sea-route from Takōla in the Golden Khersonese to Kattigara, it must evidently have been situated either on what was then the edge of the Bay of Zabai or, still more probably, at a short distance up one of the numerous channels then intersecting the delta jointly formed by the Saigon and Bien-Hoa (Dòng-nâi) Rivers, and by the Eastern Vaico, now flowing through the Sôi-râp or Lôi-râp (formerly C'huĩ-râp)¹ Estuary. The rectified position we obtained for Zabai by taking Cape Ti-wön as a basis appears therefore to answer all requirements as far as the geological conditions of the Saigon district are concerned. It remains, however, to show how the territory in question or its chief city could, at such a remote period, have borne the now locally forgotten name of Zabai. This task will prove less arduous than it appears at first sight when it is remembered that previous to the absorption by Annam of the Kambojan townships of Bària, Ben-ngê or Bén-nghé (now Saigon), and Mitho (Samîthô or Samiddho), between A.D. 1658–1752, their territories formed part of the

¹ "Gia-dinh Thung-chi," Aubaret trans., pp. 5 and x preface: Soi-rap, Xuí-rap. There was also about here a sôk or sak (meaning a village and a district in Khmêr) termed the sak of Xuí-rap (ibid., p. 13).
province of Svấi-thấp, which was thus the easternmost administrative division of Kamboja adjoining the seaboard. After that period Svấi-thấp became restricted to its present modest proportions, and nowadays it merely consists of a tract of swampy ground comprised between the two Vaicos and extending for a short distance to the south of the 11th parallel. It forms the south-easternmost corner of Kambojan territory. It is much if its name appears in modern French maps, usually filled in that vicinity with a host of new-fangled Annamese toponymics. When it does is printed Svấi-
théap. Its correct form is, however, Svấi-thấp or Svấi-thầbh (in Siấmese records Sawấi-thấp’h). Svấi or Svấi—the first a being pronounced so quickly as to become almost imperceptible—is the Khmer word for the mango-tree, so frequently occurring in the names of districts and townships, such as Kap’hong Svấi, Kien Svấi, Svấi Ramiet, Svấi Ràng, and the already mentioned Svấi-thấp.¹ From this last one, I suppose, a creek connecting the two Vaicos a little below the chief settlement of Svấi-thấp is named the Svấi creek, now Annamized in French maps into Svấi-giang. A similarly named stream, the Song Soà́i (i.e. Svấi River), is mentioned in the “Gia-dinh Thung-chi”² as being a tributary of the Saigon River much further to the south-east. Although no connection whatever may actually exist between the name of this stream and that of the Svấi-thấp province, the fact of the latter including in the old days the territory on the banks of both Vaicos and of the Saigon River as far as the sea, is sufficient by itself to justify

¹ The Khmấrs now pronounce this name Svấi-thềah, and say that it means ‘dwarf mango-trees’; hence Kap’hong Svấi-thềah = ‘Province of the dwarf mango-trees,’ Kap’hong Svấi = ‘Province of the mango-trees.’

² Kien means ‘a corner, a point, or projection of land’; whence Kien Svấi = ‘Mango-point.’ This district is, in fact, situated on the southern corner of the Caturamukha or quadrangle formed by the four arms of the Mê-Khấng at P’hnom-p’hềh, from which this town is often referred to in ancient records as Nagarấ Caturamukha (the Chordemico of Portuguese writers). Ramiet is the Khmer name for turmeric, metaphorically used also to denote anything of a yellow colour; wherefore, Svấi Ramiet = ‘yellow mango [fruits].’

The Annamese have the same term for ‘mango,’ which, however, they pronounce in a slightly different manner, that is, somehow between Svấi and Gheà́i.

¹ Aubaret’s transl., p. 172.
our location of the city of Zabai within the limits of its territory. For it is easy to see that the term Zabai—or, as it was very likely pronounced by navigators in Ptolemy's time, Zavai—represents the Khmēr word Sāvai or Scaaî, which, being part of the old language of the country, may have been employed from times immemorial to designate the territory of the Svāi-thāp district and its chief city, or else its principal seaport.

As regards the spelling Zaba which Ptolemy uses in the introductory book of his work, I think that it may be connected, if not with the first term of the name of Svāi-thāp, at any rate with the second, thāb, dāb; for it is quite possible that Svāi-thāp was pronounced by the early western travellers something like Sabāi-thāb or Zabai-zab, and, for brevity's sake, either Zabai or Zab, Zaba. This would explain how Ptolemy at times refers to it as Zabai and at others as Zaba. It is just as well to mention in this connection that Oderic of Friul, in the Latin text of his travels, writes Zapa.¹ This word has been taken by some authorities to represent Campā; but if not actually identical with Ptolemy's Zaba, I think that it may at best designate only the southernmost part of Campā, which, according to Chinese and Annamese writers, was called respectively T'oo-peî (𡨸 市) and Thā-bī or Thā-bî.² This designation appears, however, to have been employed only after the tenth century, i.e. after the disaster that befell Campā in A.D. 981, as a consequence of which its northern provinces passed into the hands of the Annamese, its capital was transferred further south, and its people driven further down the coast, so as to presumably encroach upon the Kambojan borderland of the Svāi-thāp province. In the course of the frequent wars which ensued between the two neighbours, the eastern part of that province, which then probably embraced most of the territory now forming the Bien-hoa

district, must have often changed masters, becoming at times Chām and at others Kambojan. It is therefore possible that the term \textit{T'o-pei}, or \textit{Thā-bē}, merely designated the southernmost part of Campā, consisting of territory partly taken to Kamboja in the Svāi-thāp province and partly bordering upon it. In such a case the identity of the terms \textit{T'o-pei} or \textit{Thā-bē} with \textit{Zabai} or \textit{Zaba} and \textit{Sāvāi-[thāb]} or \textit{[Sāvāi]-thāba}, which so far chiefly asserts itself on linguistic grounds, would become confirmed in history.

The transition from \textit{Thāba}, \textit{Dāba}, and \textit{Zaba}, to \textit{Dhāva}, \textit{Dāea}, \textit{Zaa}, and \textit{Java}, and \textit{vice versa}, is an easy one in Oriental languages, as exemplified in the \textit{Zābej} of the Arab travellers employed to express Fa-Hsien’s \textit{Ya-p’o-ti} (\textit{Ya-cadi} or \textit{Ja-cadi}) and Ptolemy’s \textit{Iabadios} or \textit{Sabadios}; and in the softening of \textit{d}, \textit{ḍ}, and \textit{dh} into \textit{j} and \textit{jh}, both in Sanskrit and Pāli, as in \textit{dyotis}, \textit{gyotis}, \textit{joti}; \textit{dyūta}, \textit{jūta}; \textit{dhyāna}, \textit{jhāna}; etc. In the case of the terms above referred to, the softening of the initial has been of the most varied, so that we have \textit{Dāea}, \textit{Yava}, \textit{Chava}, \textit{Java}, \textit{Zava}, \textit{Ṣava}; and in Chinese \textit{Tu-p’o}, \textit{Shē-p’o}, \textit{Chao-wa}, \textit{Ch’ea}, etc. In so far as the region now under examination is concerned, we have already had occasion to remark that the Bhūgavata Purāṇa gives \textit{Purojāva} and \textit{Manojāva} as the names of two divisions of \textit{Saka-deīpa}. One of these probably corresponds, as we said, to the State of \textit{Ja-cā} or \textit{Lao-Chua}, the present Lúang P’hraḥ Bāng.\footnote{\textit{Manojāva} should correspond to Lúang P’hraḥ Bāng, since the Viśṇu Purāṇa locates a river by the name of \textit{Manojāva} in Krauca dvīpa (\textit{Chiao-chi}h or Tonkin and its borderlands). \textit{Purojāva} ought then to be either \textit{Zabai} or \textit{Krachēh}. This last-named district is on the Mé-Không at a short distance below Sambon and Sambôc, and is said to have been so named from its being inhabited by a population of the same \textit{C’hēh} (\textit{O’haua}) race as is known to have originally settled at Lúang P’hraḥ Bāng.}

The other, unless represented up to this day by \textit{Krachēh} (the \textit{Kratié} of French maps) and its district in Upper Kamboja, cannot apparently be identified with anything else but \textit{Zaba}, \textit{Zapa}, or \textit{Thā-bē}.

Ancient remains are by no means absent in the territory where we have located Ptolemy’s famed seaport of \textit{Zaba} or \textit{Zabai}. An old temple, a few small brass idols, two blocks
of polished stone ornamented with basso-rilievi, terra-cotta representations of lotus flowers, and other interesting objects, in all appearance the vestiges of Kambojan antiquity, have been discovered to the west of Saigon at about half-way between this city and Chô-lôn, the famed Chinese mart. Yet more important remains have long been known to exist further to the north-west, on and about the hill now bearing the Annamese name of Kôi-Mài (桿梅 = the ‘Plumtree’ or, figuratively, the ‘Pronubial’ Hill, the Cây-Mai of French writers). On its summit a Buddhist temple stands on the ruins of an ancient Kambojan pagoda. When removing the débris of the latter in A.D. 1816, in order to erect the new structure, a large number of ancient bricks and tiles were brought to light, and two golden plates engraved with the image of Buddha riding on an elephant. More recent explorations have revealed the existence of very extensive lines of ancient ramparts and large lotus-ponds, indicating that a considerable settlement, with temples, etc., stood formerly in that neighbourhood. Nor is this all, for excavations effected at various points of that very promising district have led to the discovery of objects belonging to a yet remoter age, consisting of brass hatchets and stone implements, evidencing that from the earliest period a pre-historical station had been established there. No doubt can therefore arise as to the possibility of the place having been

1 See Aubaret’s transl. of the “Gia-dinh Thung-chi,” pp. 179, 180. Very likely the images were not of Buddha, but of the Bodhisattva in his last birth, in the character of Prince Vessantara. They may have been, on the other hand, Brahmanic representations of Indra riding upon his three-headed elephant Airâvata.

2 Since I wrote the above there has been issued Aymonier’s very interesting and painstaking work “Le Cambodge” (Paris, Leroux, 1900), where the learned author, in treating of the antiquities of Kôi-Mài—Cay May, as he writes its name—suggests that this place was probably the ancient city of Brai-nagar, whose name survives in the designation Prêi-nokor that the Khîmer still apply to the country about Saigon (pp. 135, 136). Prêi-nokor or Brai-nagar, he says, means “la forêt du royaume.” I rather think that this expression should be taken instead in the sense of “forest of the capital” or “forest of the city,” meaning the jungle now arising on the site of the ancient city or nagara, whether the capital of a kingdom or not. Such being, I imagine, the real signification, there is scarcely any doubt that the city implied is the one whose ramparts are still to be seen in the vicinity of Kôi-Mài Hill, for no other remains of a walled town have been so far discovered within the Saigon district. It seems thus very probable that the city and former pre-historical station, whose real name has long been
already an important and well-known commercial centre in Ptolemy’s time; and as the rectified position we have obtained for his Zaba is almost coincident with that of Kői-Mái, we have no hesitation in assuming that it stood in the vicinity of this place, its ruins being very probably represented by the extensive ramparts and other vestiges of the long-forgotten city discovered in that neighbourhood. It should be noticed, in fact, that no other traces of ancient towns or extensive settlements are to be met with in the Saigon district or the immediately adjoining ones, the only relics of a bygone age so far brought to light being, in the district first named, besides those of Kői-Mái, the few inconsiderable ones already mentioned lying between Saigon and Chô-lôn. The nearest archaeological remains discovered in the adjacent districts are those of an Indû temple on Mount Bâ-dên, far away north in the territory of Töinîh; two ancient statues roughly sculptured in sandstone dug out at Chih-Rosei on the western Vaico; and the ruins of an Indû pagoda, with inscribed slabs dating probably from the eighth century A.D., at Thâp-Mûái, in the so-called “Plaine des Joncs,” a few miles to the north of Sadêk.

Truly, the Khmer inscription on the stele now preserved in the town museum at Saigon, but said to have been originally found in the neighbourhood of Lavêk, the later mediaeval Kambojan capital, mentions a town by the name of Samudra-pura—the ‘Oceanic’ or ‘Sea-city’—which must have evidently stood on what was then the edge of the delta at some one or other of the Mê-Không outlets. But, as the inscription is probably not older than the seventh century A.D., I do not think it likely that this Samudra-pura could have been in existence in Ptolemy’s time, and that it has anything in common with his Zaba or Zabai. Possibly it corresponds to the present My-tho or Mi-tho, the name of which I find written in Siamese
records under the form Samithō or Samiddho, looking for all the world like a local dialectal corruption of Samudra.¹ I conclude, therefore, in favour of Kōi-Māi as the most probable site where to locate Ptolemy’s city.

Zaba, as we have pointed out, was one of the chief ports of call for ships bound from the Golden Khersonese (Takōla) to Kattigara. The sailing distance from Takōla to Zaba was twenty days according to one Alexander, quoted by Marinos and re-quoted through the latter by Ptolemy in the introductory book (ch. 14, §1) of his treatise. It will be seen that this is exactly the distance given by the Arab travellers for the passage from Kulah-bār to Kedrenj, via Betūmah, there being, of course, no appreciable difference in the length of the run from Johor (Betūmah) to either Hatien or Gaṇrāi Bay within Cape St. James. By continuing the voyage from Zaba southward, “but keeping more to the left” (πρὸς νότον διαπλέουσαντας, καὶ μᾶλλον εἰς τὰ εὐώνυμα),² the early sailors arrived in “some days” to Kattigara. Ptolemy has, judiciously enough, taken those “some days” to mean another twenty days, although the real purport was, as we may deduce from the Arab travellers, fully double that amount, viz. fifty days if reckoning from Kedrenj and forty from Ṣenef, which was situated further up the Cochinchinese coast than Zaba.

Our worthy author has not, however, exercised an equally sound judgment in the interpretation of the hint, καὶ μᾶλλον εἰς τὰ εὐώνυμα, “but [keeping] more to the left,” and not

¹ I have since noticed that Aymonier in his recent book quoted above states (p. 138) that the term Mg-thō is merely a corruption of Mi-so = ‘the white,’ ‘the fairy,’ a toponymic very common in Kamboja. I cannot, however, share his opinion in this case on account of the form Samithō or Samiddho occurring, as I said, in Siamese manuscript records, which totally excludes a derivation from Mi-Sū; and also in view of the fact that Samudra-parā has not been so far located, and that Mi-thō—or, more correctly, Samiddho—suits very well the case both as regards name and position. Not many centuries back, in fact, Samiddho must have stood at the very outer edge of the delta, and at the mouth of the branch of the Mī-Ţhō now flowing by it, the name of which has been barbarized by the Annamese into Ŭng Mī-thō; 滘美［， i.e. Mi-tho River.

laying sufficient stress on the \( \kappa \alpha \iota \; \mu \alpha \lambda \lambda \nu \) he was induced to map down Kattigara in a south-eastern direction from Zaba. We now have made clear what the "keeping more to the left" meant. If in leaving Zaba the ships had indeed, though but for a short time, to steer a southward course in order to clear Cape Ti-wön, they had afterwards to port their helm and sail in a north-easterly direction in order to reach the Chinese coast.

Great Cape, where the Great Gulf begins (No. 124).

The position of this headland, when corrected in the usual way, differs but 1° 5' in longitude and 0° 31' in latitude from that of Cape Ti-wön (long. 107° 15' E., lat. 10° 23' N.), with which I have finally identified it, after a careful study of this part of Ptolemy's Geography. In the course of such an examination it became evident to me that if Ptolemy made the coast to run almost in a straight line from Akadra (Hatien) to the Mega Akrōtērion (Cape Ti-wön), thus ignoring the southernmost projection of the Indo-Chinese Peninsula now ending at Cape Kamboja (Chrui Khamau), it was either because such a projection did not exist in his time or was as yet in its initial stage of formation, not extending in any case much lower down than the Hatien - Cape St. James parallel of latitude. As he says in his first book (ch. 14, §§ 1 and 6), on the authority of the already quoted Alexander, after the Golden Khersonese (Malay Peninsula) the coast faces the south, and must therefore run parallel with the equator. This observation applies, of course, only to the portion of the seaboard comprised between Hatien and Cape Ti-wön, which was the part of the Gulf of Siām best known to western navigators; and is fully supported by geological evidence. It is notorious, in fact, that the low-lying alluvial plain constituting the southern end of the Peninsula between the Hatien - Cape St. James parallel and Cape Kamboja, is but of comparatively recent formation. Although stretching like an inverted gigantic triangle for a distance of fully one hundred miles seawards and measuring quite
as much at its base, its emancipation from the Neptunian régime does not probably date from as many decades, nor can even now be said to be complete, since a good portion of its surface is up to this day either swampy or subject to tidal influence. The raising of such a big stretch of country from the sea-bottom within so brief a period would appear a most extraordinary performance had the task not fallen to the lot of as respectable a stream as the Mê-Không, which annually carries to the sea a load of fifteen hundred million cubic metres of alluvial matter; and had not the task itself been facilitated to some extent by the gradual upheaval of the land, of which there are no doubtful indications all along that coast.

In Ptolemy's time, therefore, the southern end of the Indo-Chinese Peninsula could hardly have extended as far down as the 10th parallel of latitude instead of the 8° 30' as at present. Its but faintly defined border must have run almost in a straight line from H;!ên to Găñ-răi Bay, skirting the sites of the actual Long-ch'wien, Sadêk, Viû-long, and Mi-tho,1 to the south of which a string of shallows and sandbanks stretched for a considerable distance seawards, masking the innumerable outlets of the Mê-Không, which must then have spread all over that coastline, diverging like the ribs of a fan, having their centre at Bă P'hnom or thereabouts. It is no doubt owing to the perilous character of the seaboard at that point, especially during the south-west monsoon, to the full violence of which it is exposed, that the early navigators did not venture into any of the channels affording access to the delta from its front, but preferred to give it a wide berth and turn round it either way, putting in at one of the ports situated immediately at its flanks, to wit: Akadra and Zabai. This circumstance explains how the

---

1 This line is also, it should be noticed, the outermost limit, southwards, of archaeological remains, marked by the ruins met with at P'hnom Bă-thê, Thâp-Măi (Prasâd Pram-lauêng), Kôî-Măi (Brâi Nagar), and Chê-lôn. As none of these—those only of Kôî-Măi excepted—seem to date further back than the seventh century A.D., it may be assumed that even at that period there was no firm land to be met with much to the south of the line indicated.
maritime towns just named could soon attain importance as entrepôts for the *Fu-nan* trade; and also how Ptolemy came to ignore that the Mê-Không had its outlets on the coastline intervening between those two emporiums, an ignorance which must evidently be put down to unacquaintance on the part of the navigators of his time with the mysteries concealed behind the sand and mudbanks which skirted that coast.

The state of the delta in those early days, and even at a later period, may be fairly gauged from a passage of I-tsing,\(^1\) who, towards the end of the seventh century, still speaks of the "one thousand streams" debouching into the sea in the country of *Fu-nan*, meaning, no doubt, the almost numberless channels through which the Mê-Không flowed from Bâ P'hnom towards the periphery of its gigantic delta. It must consequently have been this portion of the *Fu-nan* kingdom which very appropriately received the name of *Jala* or *Chên-la*, expanded at a later period by Chinese writers into "Water Chên-la."

\(^1\) Chavannes, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
(9) *The Region of the Great Gulf* (Annam and Tonkin).

The **Great Gulf** (*Magnus Sinus*) begins, according to Ptolemy, at the **Great Cape**—identified in the preceding section with Cape Trí-wôn—and extends up to lat. 21° 37' and long. 108° 42', corrected, near Pak-hoi (北海) Harbour. The coastline was, in our author's time, occupied by two nations whose struggle for its dominion lasted for upwards of thirteen centuries. One, that of the 賽 or 剃刀 (秈佃-佃 or 佃-佃) in the north, occupied most of the present Tonkin, and, conquered in a.c. 116–110 by China, gradually extended towards the south, absorbing or driving back, under the leadership of Chinese chiefs, the inhabitants. The other, that of the 姓 or 唐, mixed up with the aborigines of the mountains and of the coast—the latter being of a Negrito Indonesian or Melanesian race—developed under the influence of settlers from Southern India a civilization akin

---

1 The Annamese and Tonkinese are, up to this day, termed 賽 or 許 and 許-賳 by the Lâu. 賽 means, of course, 稈 (秈佃, 佃佃, 佃佃), the Chinese character by which the name is represented. If we examine the signification of this term, we see that it is a synonym of 姓, 姓, 姓, 許, or 許. In fact, 稈 means 'to interlock, to blend,' while its local pronunciation 佃 evidences its connection with 姓, 姓, 姓. Compare 稈, otherwise 勝, 勝, on p. 134 supra. 許 is, besides, connected with 原 (原; in Annamese, 原), designating, as we have already shown, an elevated country, a plateau; and with 房 (房) or 房, employed in a similar sense. The original 賽 were therefore of the same stock as the 房 and the 姓, 姓, or 姓; and it was they who gave the name of 剃刀 or 剃刀 to Tonkin. The second character in this name is often written 訡 (佃=foot, toes), instead of 役, out of homage to the tradition about the divergence of the big toes of this people from the rest of the foot. This is, however, but an instance of the manner in which etymologies are concocted all over the Far East, in order to suit special purposes and peculiar fancies. The separation or divergence of the big toes referred to is common to all barefooted populations of Indo-China, and I failed absolutely to detect it in any more marked degree in Annamese lower extremities. I quite agree, therefore, with Chavannes ("Religieux Eminents," p. 53), that the characters 剃刀 must have been in origin the phonetic transcript of an indigenous name.
to that of Kamboja, whereof it left monuments all along that seaboard. Though driven of late for refuge to the present Biñ-thūn or Biñ-thwōn (Binh-thuận)⁰ district

³ For the sake of consistency in the method of transcription of Annamese place-names with the one adopted in the preceding sections of this work for toponymics in Siamese and other Indo-Chinese languages, I have deemed it expedient to follow the same course in the present chapter where accuracy and uniformity of transliteration are no less desirable, breaking off altogether from the trammels of that hybrid Kvoä-ngū (Quốc-ngù) system favoured in French Indo-China, the absurdity, endless anomalies, and general inconvenience of which are well known and have now and again been pointed out, amongst others by the French scholars themselves (see, e.g., Aymonier’s sensible article, “Nos transcriptions,” in Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 27, May–June, 1886). In order, however, to enable the reader to recognize the place-names transliterated according to the new method, I have in well-nigh every instance in which each of them appears for the first time in these pages given within parentheses the corresponding Kvoä-ngū spelling. Ancient tonal marks, it should be observed that although similar conventional signs to those employed in Kvoä-ngū have been adopted, they are, in the new method, and in the case of no less than four of the Annamese tones, used in a different sense from that they have in Kvoä-ngū. These modifications became necessary in order to have the same marks to denote the identical (or practically corresponding) tones in both Annamese and the Thai (Siamese) group of languages, and thereby ensure uniformity of transcription for the whole of them. The following synoptic table will explain the nature of the modifications introduced in the use of diacritical marks, as well as the correspondence between Annamese and Siamese tones as nearly as could be determined by practical tests; i.e., by taking the ear as the sole guide and judge, and leaving theory to the tender mercy of lexicographers and grammatists. Though thus far from perfect theoretically, the method here adopted may perhaps claim to possess some redeeming feature from a practical standpoint; and, at all events, it appeared to be the only suitable one under the present circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annamese Tones in Kvoä-ngū (Quốc-ngù) Transcription</th>
<th>Corresponding Siamese Tones</th>
<th>New Transcription</th>
<th>New Spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Natural (even)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>= even (tonus rectus)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nǎng, or grave</td>
<td>as in .FETCH ERROR</td>
<td>= circumflex (and prolonged)</td>
<td>as in .FETCH ERROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sǎc, or acute</td>
<td>as in .FETCH ERROR</td>
<td>= emphatic (termed grave by some grammarians)</td>
<td>as in .FETCH ERROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Huyën, or descending</td>
<td>as in .FETCH ERROR</td>
<td>= descending (sinking)</td>
<td>as in .FETCH ERROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hói, or interrogative†</td>
<td>as in .FETCH ERROR</td>
<td>= ascending (high and rising)</td>
<td>as in .FETCH ERROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ngō, or reascending†</td>
<td>as in .FETCH ERROR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No diacritical mark used in either system.

† These two Annamese tones are practically identical, though they may once have been distinct, and it is acknowledged on all sides that they have become confused to such an extent that the difference between them is well-nigh imperceptible at the present day.
and to Kamboja, it no doubt occupied in the early days the whole of Chan-ch’êng or Cochin-China and even a portion of the present Tonkin.

The conquests of the Han dynasty in that quarter do not seem to have extended—if at all—any further than the present Kwâng-biû (Quang-binh) district, which formed, according to Chinese historians, part of the department of Jih-nan founded B.C. 116–110, next to those of Kiâo-chê (Tonkin) and Kau-chêen or Kâu-chôn (Thânh-hwâ, Gallice: Thanh-hoa). Before the Chinese conquest, when Tonkin had been established as an independent kingdom by the name of Van-lâng, the two southernmost of its districts were Kâu-dûk and Viet-thiàng, corresponding to the present Hâ-tiûn (Ha-tinh). Here was situated, according to the Annamese annals, the boundary with the country of the Hô-tôn or Campû. The latter, or at least its northern part, corresponding to the present Kwâng-biû and Kwâng-trî districts, had been, it is alleged, erected into a chûn (department) by the Ts’in as early as B.C. 214 under the name of Lin-i (in Annamese Lôm-ôp or Lam-ap, pron. exactly as Lum-up would be in English). It was then bounded on the north by the territory of the ancient Yêuh-shang (Ann. Viet-thiàng) kingdom, corresponding to the southern part of the Kâu-dûk or Hâ-tiûn district mentioned above. In B.C. 110 the Han changed the name of Lin-i into that of Hsiang-lin (Ann. Tâuang-lôm), and made of it a simple district dependent from the chûn of Jih-nan (Ann. Ứt-nâm) already referred to. It was only later on, or in A.D. 137—always according to the Annamese annalists—that Hsiang-lin rebelled under the leadership of one native chief by the name of Ch’ë-liên (Ann. Khû-liên) and set up as an independent kingdom with the ancient name of Lin-i.

1 Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 4–6.
3 Op. cit., p. 107. This territory is often referred to under the name of Yêuh-shang-shih, and wrongly believed by several authorities to have included the whole of Annam and Cochin-China, which is an evident exaggeration.
or Löm-ôp. The new State gradually waxed in power, becoming before long a serious menace to Chinese domination in Tonkin, whose borders it ravaged with continuous incursions. In A.D. 446, by way of retaliation, a Chinese army forced its way to the very heart of the kingdom, constraining its ruler to abandon the capital. This latter was stormed and plundered, but whether it again became the seat of government after the retreat of the invaders or not it is not clear.¹ All that the chroniclers tell us is, that not long afterwards the Châm renewed their raids into Chinese territory. The T'ang resolved to put an end to this state of affairs, and in A.D. 605 they despatched a strong expedition. The capital of Lam-ap was once more taken; but it was re-occupied by the Châm after the withdrawal of the Chinese force. Soon afterwards, during the period Chêng-kuan (A.D. 627—650), the name of the realm was changed into Huan-wang (環王).²

A new chastisement for repeated raids followed—this time at the hands of the protector general of Tonkin—in A.D. 809, which resulted in the final abandonment of Lam-ap by the Châm. The capital of the latter was then transferred to Chiem (Chan), and the realm received therefrom the name of Chan-ch'êng (Ann. Chiem-thân),³ meaning, according to Chinese interpretation, ‘the city of Chan.’ This is the epithet by which Campâ became best known to the Chinese since the epoch of the T'ang dynasty. Sometimes it is alluded to as Chan-pu-lao or Chan-p'o (in Annamese, Chiêm-bôt-lâu and Chiêm-bâ), two expressions which are evident

---

² Op. cit., p. 115. Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 433, states that this change took place during the period Chih-tê (756—758), which is probably more correct.
³ Des Michels, op. cit., p. 115. Aymonier (‘History of Tchampa,’ in Asiatic Quarterly Review, July, 1893) does not believe that the Châm abandoned their capital this time, and thinks that they must have held on to it until A.D. 982, when they moved from Sri Bami (Đông-Hội in Kwang-bìn?) to Bôl-Hanger, near Hwê. But the account given above, on the basis of the Annamese annals, clearly shows that there was a removal of capital in A.D. 809. This removal must, therefore, have been effected from some place lying further to the north of Đông-Hội.
IMITATIONS OF THE TERM CAMPĀ. The city of Ch'au or Chiem adopted as capital in A.D. 809 was apparently Śrī-Bani or Śrī-Banōi, identified with Đông-Hōi (Trùng-āi?) to the west of the present chief town of Kwang-biū (circa 17° 30' lat.).

It was destroyed in A.D. 982, and the seat of government was then probably removed more to the south at P'hōt-thē, near Hwē (Huế), termed Bal Hangoa by the Châm. This new capital was, in its turn, taken by the king of Annam in A.D. 1044; but once the war-storm over, it no doubt reverted to its former occupiers. A new reverse befell the Châm in 1061, which had as a consequence the transfer to Annamese rule of all their territory as far south as Hwē. The capital was then definitely abandoned, and a new one set up at C'hâ-bàn (termed Bal-Anqwē by the Châm) at

---

1. Đông-Hōi means, according to Aymonier, field of the Hōi or Hoī (barbarians), the name given the Châm by the Annameses. We have explained that Hōi = mountaineer. Đōng is evidently 陀, meaning 'field,' 'plain.'

2. In fact, in A.D. 1007, the king of Campā is stated by Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 548) to have written to Châna in the following strain: "Formerly my kingdom depended on Kidū-chī, but I have since shaken off the yoke, emigrating to the country of Fo-shīh [佛逝, by which evidently P'hōt-thē is meant], whose northern borders lie at 700 li [southwards] from my ancient frontier." It will be observed that this distance—which represents in European measurement about 200 miles—if set down on a map from the neighbourhood of Hwē north-westward, along the coast, brings us far into Ngê-an (Ngê-an), if not right up to the southern boundary of Thânh-hwē, which now evidently corresponds with tolerable approximation to the ancient Châm frontier alluded to in the above extract. As regards the term Fo-shīh (or P'hōt-thē), it, no doubt, is a transcript of some Sanskrit name like Bhōja, Bhṛūja, etc. The Bhāvavata Purāṇa mentions a region by the name of Bhṛūjāśa, as well as a mountain Bhōjana, as being both situated in Kraunca-dvīpa (Kidū-chī), (see Professor Hall's edition of Wilson's Viśṇu Purāṇa, vol. ii, p. 198). In a Sanskrit-Châm inscription of A.D. 1436 King Jaya Sinhavarman V styles himself a descendant of the Braēu-vānua, i.e. of the Braēu race or lineage (Bergaigne's "L'ancien Royaume de Campā," in Journal Asiatique, 1888, pp. 104–5). Whether this term Braēu has any connection with Fo-shīh or not, it is, of course, impossible to say for the present. We may rest content, in any case, with the fact—here for the first time brought to light—that the country about Hwē was, in the old days, known by the name of either Bhōja or Bhṛūja, whatever be the correct interpretation that should be put upon the term Fo-shīh. I may add that the latter is spelled in Chinese with the identical characters used by I-tsing and others to denote the country of Bhōja or Śrī-Bhōja (Fo-shīh or Shīh-li-fu-shīh), i.e. Palembang, on the eastern coast of Sumatra. (See Chavannes, op. cit., pp. 119 and 125.)
about six miles to the north of the present district city of Biñ-dīn. Here it remained until 1471, when it fell, with the whole of the territory as far south as Biñ-thwōn, into Annamese hands, and the kingdom of Campā was broken up. Bal-Batthinōng, in Biñ-thwōn, then became the seat of government of all that remained intact of the crumbling State, and upon that site having, in its turn, to be given up, in about 1567, Pāngdarang or Pānrag (Pāngdurāngā) formed the last resort of the Chām chiefs—now mere vassals of Annam and with only a shadow of authority—until about 1820, when the last of them emigrated to Kamboja and every relic of Chām rule disappeared with him.

This is, in short, the gist of what can be gathered as regards the early history of Campā from Chinese and Annamese sources, and on its later days, from the meagre records left by the Chām themselves. In the accounts first alluded to the limits of Sino-Annamese domination, as well as the exploits of the imperial armies, have naturally been magnified, and thus we are led to believe that Chinese rule had been established in Campā even since the time of Shih Huang-ti of the Ts’in (b.c. 221–209), who, it is pretended, founded there the chūn of Lin-i or Lôm-otp; that subsequently the Han reintegrated the sway over what had in the meantime blossomed forth into an independent kingdom, and made of Lôm-otp the district of Hsiang-lin, which continued under Chinese control until Ch‘ü-lien’s rebellion in A.D. 137. But a careful examination of both Chinese and Annamese records elicits the fact that such pretended domination over Campā, and indeed also over Tonkin, though reasserted now and then by armed expeditions, was in the interval little

---

1 These dates and scraps of information I have taken from the brief Chām chronicle published by Aymonier in Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 31.

2 The kingdom of Nan-yüeh, (in Annamese Nâm-viet), founded by Chao-t‘ō (Tr‘eu-dā), general of the Ts’in sent to subjugate Tonkin, in 207 b.c. It is said to have included the territory of the chūns (departments) of Lin-i (Lôm-otp) and Hsiang (Ts‘ang), the latter being the name given to the Tonkin division at that period; and also Nan-hai (Canton), the capital being situated at P’an-yü (Canton).
more than nominal. It is a story of continuous rebellions followed by the setting up of independent States. Chinese repression was rarely severe and complete, and usually left things unchanged. The fact is that the Cḥieng or Chăm element was, in spite of what the Chinese annalists say, still preponderant not only on the borders, but in the very midst of Tonkin; and this, as usual designated by its would-be oppressors as 'barbarians,' constituted the turbulent part of the population, intolerant of foreign rule, who always sought to repel the invaders from the north. In any case, never did the Han legions advance any further than Kwáng-bin, as I stated; and it is very doubtful whether they ever reached as far as that district, even in the solitary instance of the expedition led by the celebrated Ma-yüan in A.D. 43, which seems to have outdistanced all others down to at least A.D. 605. On that occasion Ma-yüan is said to have reached the capital of Lam-ap, and then to have marched past it some twenty lǐ up to where Hsiang-lin bordered upon the kingdom of the Hsī-t'ū (Tōi-dō) barbarians (西屠夷), at which spot he erected two brass pillars to mark the limit of Chinese dominion. As regards the expedition of A.D. 605, it is said on the other hand that it had to advance eight marches further than Ma-yüan's pillars in order to reach the capital of Lam-ap. The apparent discrepancy as to the site of the Chăm capital in the two accounts can only be explained by assuming that the capital was removed further down the coast in the interval between A.D. 43 and 605. As at the latter date it undoubtedly stood no further south than Đông-Höi (Dông-Hói), near the present town of Kwang-bin, it is evident that in A.D. 43 it must have been situated some eight marches further up, that is to say, somewhere about Hà-tiên, the ancient Kâu-duk. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact of Ptolemy placing a Kortatha Métropolis just in that neighbourhood, which I identify, both from coincidences of names and location, with Kâu-duk

1 Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 61, 62; and Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., vol. ii, p. 418.
(Chiut-té, in Cantonese Kau-ték). Ma-yuán's pillars cannot therefore have been erected much further south than the present town of Hà-tiên, which must as a consequence have belonged to Hsiang-lin or Lam-ap. It will be observed further that, whereas the independence of Lam-ap is said to date from A.D. 137, the year of Ch'ü-lien's rebellion, we are told in the Chinese account of Ma-yuán's exploits that Lam-ap was chastised and its capital taken in A.D. 43, which is a palpable proof of Lam-ap having existed as an independent kingdom prior to that date, despite the alleged Chinese conquests of B.C. 214 and B.C. 116–110. The mention by Ptolemy of Kortatha Métropolis, which—granted that the Chinese account above referred to is correct—must have been the capital of Lam-ap alleged to have been taken by Ma-yuán, seems to demonstrate further, that as soon as that famous general had turned his back the

1 According to the Annamese accounts Ma-yuán did not push his conquests further south than the district of Kâu-chôn (Cu-phong), which was situated on the territory of Kâu-chôn (now Thañ-hwâ), and it was here that he erected the famous pillars (see Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 60, 61). This being correct, it becomes impossible to accept the Chinese magnified version of Ma-yuán's exploits having included the subjugation of Ngâ-an, and withal of its capital Kâu-dûk. The Annamese annals say nothing of Ma-yuán's occupation of this capital, but simply tell us of his having routed the Châm forces. It is therefore very likely that the Châm capital stood at Kâu-dûk or Kortatha until the Chinese expedition of A.D. 446, which is said to have taken the Châm fortress of Kâu-lêt (Khu-lêt, lying, I think, somewhere about Vinh), penetrating thence into Tuang-p'hô (Hsiang-p'û, the old Hsiang-lin district). Lam-ap was thereby conquered, and it was probably from that date that the capital was removed further down towards Đồng-Hôi. Not quite as far as this place, however, because it took only eight days' march beyond Ma-yuán's pillars to the expedition of A.D. 605 in order to reach the Châm capital. In the face of this evidence I cannot see my way to admit that Đông-Hôi became the Châm seat of government at any period prior to A.D. 809. Whatever the Chinese chroniclers may say, it is clear that the Châm did not definitely abandon Ngâ-an (i.e. Kâu-dûk territory) until a comparatively late date. In A.D. 271 Kâu-dûk was acknowledged, by the Chinese officials themselves, to be anything but approachable (Des Michels, op. cit., p. 106); and in the interval between that date and A.D. 446 the Chinese governors of Kâu-chês had a good deal to do in order to keep the Châm out of Kâu-chôn (Thañ-hwâ) itself, whither the latter made continuous incursions (A.D. 347, 353, 399, 413, 415, 431). After that period Châm efforts were directed towards re-occupying Kâu-dûk, which now was, however, finally lost to them.
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Lam-ap State was, more solito, re-established as flourishing as ever. We cannot believe, in fact, that Ptolemy could have learned of Ch'ü-lien's coup of A.D. 137 at so short a notice, especially as its date is by no means certain, and the feat is ascribed by some authorities to a Ch'ü-lien secundus—in name at least—who would have lived at the end of the Later Han dynasty, or nearly a century later.¹

The kingdom known under the names of Lom-ıp or Lin-i seems not to have extended further down than the present Hwê or Turân, because, as we shall see, Ptolemy locates lower down another capital city by the name of Balonga Métropolis, which I identify with the site of the ancient O'ha-bâhn, known later on as Kwî-ñôn (Qui-nhon). I came on the strength of this and other evidence to the conclusion that ancient Campā consisted of at least two States, probably more or less dependent upon each other, of which the northern one had for capital Kâu-diik or Kortatha, and the southern had the seat of government at O'ha-bân, the well-known Châm capital of the fourteenth century. I shall distinguish the northern realm by the name of Northern or Upper Campā, and the southern one by the designation of Southern or Lower Campā. Perhaps we had also at one time a third State of Central Campā, which I take to be the kingdom of the TŌi-dō or Hsi-t'u barbarians alluded to in the account of Ma-yūan's expedition, and which may correspond also to the kingdom or country of T'o-huan (陀桓, Ann. Dà-huàn or Dâ-hân), spoken of in Chinese accounts of Kamboja² as being, in common with Lin-i, often at war with Chên-la (Kamboja). This country of the TŌi-dō, or T'o-huân, must have corresponded to the present territory of Hwê and Turân.

This division assumed by me of the Châm empire into two or more petty realms, is quite in accord with the political condition of Indo-China in the early days when the unification

¹ A.D. 221 is the year that marked the end of the Later Han's rule. See the date and identity of Ch'ü-lien impugned by Chavannes, op. cit., p. 203, note.
² Ma Tuan-lîu, op. cit., p. 479.
of its mixed population of new settlers with the aboriginal races was as yet in its initial stage, and the organization of large political units still looked rather like an utopia. It is only towards the sixth or seventh century that empire-making on an extensive scale commenced in Indo-China. I can therefore scarcely believe that the various portions of Campā were from the outset under a single paramount suzerain. It was the pressure from without, especially from Tonkin's side, that compelled them to make common cause against the common enemy, and that brought about the coalescence, first of Northern with Central Campā, and subsequently of the two latter with their southern neighbour and kin. The unification was probably complete by the time of, or soon after, the memorable reverse of A.D. 605; and thus we hear Hwên-tsang referring thirty-four years later to the Chăm empire under the epithet of Mahā Campā. I-tsang, however, usually speaks of it simply as Chan-po towards the end of the same century. At about the same period we find the first mention of Campā in the Sanskrit inscriptions of Kamboja. But we meet with the form Cama as a name for the people (Cama-bhṛtya) as early as the third century, in the inscription engraved on the granite boulder of Nā-trāng (Nha Trang) in the Khāñ-hwā (Khánh-hòa) district, by order of Mura-rāja, the first historically known of the Chăm kings. The statement of the Chinese and Annamese annalists that Campā was so named only after A.D. 809, when the capital was transferred to the city of Chan-ch'êng or Chiem-thān (Campāpura), proves thus a little bit too stale. It is true that we do not find any mention of Campāpura in the Chăm inscriptions themselves until A.D. 817, when it occurs in the title of the ruler: Śrī Campāpura-parameśvara; but we have Campā as the name of a State or Kingdom in the inscription of Glai-Lomov, in the P'ḥān-rāng

1 Ang-Chumnik inscription from the province of Bā P'hnom, dating from A.D. 667.
2 See Bergaigne’s “L’ancien Royaume de Campā,” in the Journal Asiatique, Jan., 1888, p. 46.
3 Ibid., p. 67.
district, which is older than the above by nearly half a century. It is to be presumed, therefore, that the name of Campā as a State and of Campā-pura as its capital existed from at least the beginning of the seventh century, since it was mentioned shortly afterwards by Hwén-tsang and the Ang-Chumnik inscription of Kamboja. I am not sure, however, whether at an earlier date the name Campā existed, at least for the whole country occupied by the Chăm race, since that country was undoubtedly divided, as we have shown, into several petty States. Perhaps it was only one of these States that had adopted the name Campā, the others being known by different appellations. The evidence seems to be in favour of the northern State, when it extended far into Tonkin, comprising the whole of the present districts of Hà-tiū and Thań-hwā. At that period, adventurers from Northern India had reached Tonkin overland by the Song-kā or Vīn route, and had established there, as in Yünnan and Lāos, cities and kingdoms easily recognizable from their Sanskrit or Prākrit names. It was then, perhaps, that the southern part of Tonkin received the names of Āṅga or Mālinī, from its being situated, like the Indū Āṅga, to the east of Mālava and Daśārṇa. In the course of time it must have become known also as Romapāda or Lomapāda; for these are the terms by which Āṅga is usually designated in the local versions of the Rāmāyaṇa and of other popular Indū literary works current in Indo-China. From Lomapāda, the name of the State, the Annamese derived, I think, their 林邑 (Lŏm-ŏp), two characters which the Chinese read as Lin-i. The latter reading may be accounted for also, as a contraction of Mālinī, obtained by omitting the initial syllable mā. I feel quite confident that such is the origin of the terms Lŏm-ŏp and Lin-i, which have remained so far

1 In the Siamese, Lāu, and Khammer translations or paraphrases of the Rāmāyaṇa, the name Āṅga never occurs, and scarcely does that of Campā; the common designation for that State being Romapāda (sic) and Romapattan or Lomapattan, from the fact, I think, that King Romapāda was reigning there when the Rṣyasṛṣaṇa episode occurred. At all events, the capital of the Indū Campā was variously known as Āṅgapuri, Lomapādapuri, Karnapuri, Mālinī, etc.
unexplained. Here we have, in fact, the germ of the name Campā given the country, presumably, in later times, when its capital Campāpura was founded. It is evidently absurd to believe that Chiem-bā is an Annamese modified transcript of Lōm-ōp, as advanced by some authorities. The difference between the digrams 林邑 (Lam-ap) and 占不 (Chiem-bōt) or 占波, 占陋 (Chiem-bā) is sufficiently apparent to preclude their being easily mistaken for one another. It may be that the term Romapāda or Lomapāda superseded that of Aṅga in Indo-China, because of some early king, reigning there, having assumed the appellation once belonging to the Indū monarch who figures in the Rṣyasrūga episode of the Rāmāyaṇa. We learn, in fact, that the few Chăm who are still found surviving in the Biū-thwōn district worship up to this day a deity or hero by the name of Pō Romē, whom Aymonier rightly assumes to be some deified legendary king. It is easy to recognize in Pō Romē the personage Vraḥ Romapāda; and we may thus reasonably conclude that there must have been an early king or hero of the Chăm—perhaps the original founder of the realm—bearing that name. The contracted local form Romē of the latter luminously explains the origin of the Annamese rendering of it as Lōm-ōp or Lam-ap. We have thus acquired the certainty that in origin the kingdom of Campā was called Romē or Romapāda, and perhaps also Mālīnī, by the Chăm themselves, the terms Lōm-ōp and Lin-i being not, respectively, Annamese and Chinese inventions, but mere phonetical imitations of those names. It becomes evident from these facts that the early civilization of Upper Campā was introduced from Northern India, and had as one of its first seats Kīha-duṅk, or Kortatha Mētropolis, in the present Hā-tiūn district. Campāpura, from which the kingdom became known as Campā, must have been founded later on, probably when the capital was removed further south towards Dōng-Hōi

---

1 Among whom Aymonier, in his "History of Tchampa," loc. cit.
2 Ibid. Another similar deity worshipped is called Pō Klong-garai, which I have not so far identified. It may be Gaurī. Pō in these names stands for Vraḥ or Varu.
(A.D. 446?). It is from that time, or shortly afterwards, that the terms Lóm-ōp and Lin-i begin to disappear in Annamese and Chinese accounts, being superseded by Chiêm-thâń and Chân-ch'êng respectively—meaning the city of Cam or Campâ, i.e. Campâpura.

While the civilization of Upper Campâ thus appears to have been due to emigrants from Northern India, that of Lower Campâ, the Cochin-China of the present day, is indisputably of Southern Indian or Dravidian origin. This is proved by the type of the characters employed in the inscriptions discovered there, the most ancient of which is, so far, that of King Mura-rāja already alluded to. Its characters closely resemble, in the opinion of Professor Bergaigne,¹ those of the Girnâr inscription of Rudradâman (A.D. 150); hence he assigns to that monument a date not earlier than the third century of the Christian Era. The civilization of Southern Campâ had its foci in the districts now called Kháñ-hwâ and Bîn-dînh, as we hope to demonstrate in the sequel. Thence it extended, as in Kamboja, northwards, meeting that of Upper Campâ about half-way up the coast, which it influenced apparently to a larger extent than it was influenced itself in its turn. This would appear from a series of inscriptions discovered in a grotto, situated near the point where the provinces of Kwâng-bînh and Hà-tiên border upon each other; that is, a little below the 18th parallel of latitude. The characters are, according to Professor Bergaigne, similar to those employed in the inscriptions of Southern Campâ.²

Early before the Christian Era the Rāmāyaṇa speaks of the Ghritoda or Ghṛta Sea, which becomes in the Purāṇas the Ocean of Sarpis or ghee, while it is termed the Sea of Senf or Ŝenef by Mas'ûdi and said to surround the centre of the empire of Zábej,³ just as in the Purāṇas it is represented to encompass Kuṣa-devipâ (the Sunda Archipelago).

¹ "L'ancien Royaume de Campâ," loc. cit., pp. 16, 44, 46, 75.
² See Bergaigne, op. cit., pp. 43, 44.
³ Reinaud, op. cit., p. 77, introduction.
Sulaimān calls also Šenef the harbour at which the Arab ships put in on the Cochin-Chinese coast.

This port I take to be Thī-nāi (詩耐, Shih-nai) Harbour, improperly named after Kwī-ṇān (Quinhon) by our ever muddling geographers;¹ but which appears to have been known as Hsin-chou (新洲) or, at any rate, as the port of the Hsin-chou district, in the old days. It is mentioned under this name by Chinese writers down to the middle of the fifteenth century, and the stream which discharges into it is entered as Hsin-chou Chiang (Hsin-chou River) in the Chinese map published by Phillips in the Journal China Branch R.A.S.² W. F. Mayers has wrongly taken it to be Touron (Turān) Harbour,³ but Phillips has clearly demonstrated that it must be identified with "Quinhone Harbour,"⁴ i.e. with the port of Thī-nāi. His identification I find corroborated by further evidence which I think very conclusive. This is briefly as follows:—

(1) In the Chinese map alluded to above, and to the left of the Hsin-chou River (which in this case corresponds to the

¹ No place delighting in the euphonious name of Kwī-ṇān (Quinhon) is now known to exist except in the fertile imagination of our geographers. The sea-port which they call by that name is known locally as Thī-nāi Harbour; while Kwī-ṇān city (which it will be seen in the sequel was the novel designation applied by the Annamese to Čō-na-bō, the ancient Chăm capital, after having taken it in a.d. 1471) ceased to exist under that name in 1798, when it was rechristened Bīn-diōn (Binh-dinh); and it has been a heap of ruins ever since 1800, the date at which it was destroyed by Jū-long (Gia-long). The present Bīn-diōn district city was then founded—on a different site about six miles further to the south—which has, therefore, nothing in common with the old one except the name. The term Kwī-ṇān has thus long passed into the domain of archaeology, and might at best be preserved to designate the inlet—now a shallow lagoon—near whose border the old city stood; but for that matter it would be indeed more proper to name the inlet right after Bal-Aungē (Ptolemy's Balenga), a term which possesses at least the advantage of being the local and original designation of the Chăm capital formerly standing in that standing. To, however, apply the name of Kwī-ṇān to the present Thī-nāi Harbour, situated just within the entrance to the lagoon and far away from the site once occupied by that city, is the very height of absurdity.

² Vol. xxi; the river will be found mentioned in the descriptive list at p. 40.


⁴ Op. cit., p. 40. Mayers’ mistake arose from his wrong identification of Wāi-lo Shan with Cape Touron, instead of with Kū-ṇōn Rfi (Culao Ray) or Palo Canton, as shown by Phillips (ibid., p. 41).
east side), there is depicted the figure of a tower rising very
cospicuously at the extreme of the headland that forms the
eastern boundary of the entrance to the bay. Though designed
after the style of a tapering, many-storied Chinese pagoda,
evidently it is intended conventionally to represent the group
of three towers—if not the central and loftiest of them
only—which rise in a close row, oriented in a N.-S. direction,
at a short distance to the west of the village of Thi-nâi, by
the side of the road leading thence to the Já mart, or Chô
Jâ (Chôu Giâ). These structures, called thâp by the
Aunamese ¹ (who, by the way, have wantonly demolished one
of them for base building materials), are but a portion of
the interesting remnants of Châm civilization that one finds
scattered about the Biû-diû district. A group of another
three, almost exactly alike in build and orientation, is, in
fact, met with several miles further to the west, on the
Thâp-bâ-môu-thien or Tâm-thâp (‘Three Towers’) Hill; but
I believe that the group formerly alluded to is the one
meant in the map. Although the sand-spit on which the
towers rise and the present Thi-nâi village stands may be of
comparatively modern formation, it is quite probable that by
the time the Chinese map was constructed (fourteenth century)
it had considerably advanced seawards, and that the towers
had already been built near its outer edge, where they
thus formed conspicuous landmarks not easily overlooked nor
forgotten by navigators. These assumptions being correct,
it is clear that the Hsin-chou River of the Chinese map
must have been the stream now called Lâng-song, from the
village of that name standing near its mouth; and not the
Dông-p’hô or Tôn-ân River, which debouches through several
channels into the lagoon further westwards, beyond the
present city of Biû-diû. As the lagoon must have been at
no distant period less shallow than nowadays, sea-going
crafts could then probably advance further into it as far
as the mouth of the present Lâng-song (then Hsin-chou),
where the anchorage was then presumably situated.

¹ From Chinese 雲廍, t’â = saïtya, pagoda; evidently the same word as the
Lâu Thạt, corrupted from the Sanskrit-Pâli Ñhâtu.
(2) Further to the north-west of the outlet of the Hsin-chou River, and at a spot corresponding very closely to the site once occupied by the ancient Châm capital city Châ-bân or Bal Angwê, the Chinese map bears the indication Chân-ch'êng Kuo (i.e. 'Kingdom of Campâ'). As Châ-bân was the capital at the time the map was compiled, it is but natural that the name of the kingdom over which it presided should be marked at the place where the said capital stood.

This was, therefore, the port of Ciamba or Cianba of Marco Polo, the Campaa of Nicolò di Conti, and other mediaeval travellers,¹ erroneously located in Biû-thwôn even by their most recent commentators. The anchorage was not evidently, however, right at the head of the lagoon, in front of the city and of the delta of the Dông-p'ho; but near the mouth of the Hsin-chou (now the Lâng-song), thus occupying a position slightly more inland than the present Thi-nâi Harbour. A settlement termed Hsin-chou no doubt existed there, after which the surrounding district became known. As spelled by Chinese writers, Hsin-chou means 'New Islet,' and may thus refer to the islet where rises the present village of Kûân (Quan), at the mouth of the Lâng-song—the Hsin-chou River of bygone days, according to the evidence adduced above. But one should be very cautious of taking Chinese transcripts of toponymics in this region too literally. It is, therefore, almost certain that while the second word of the compound Hsin-chou is genuinely Chinese, and was added in order to impress a Chinese character on this toponymic, the first term, Hsin, represents the original local name of the place, which was either Châm or Sanskrit derived. Of this fact there is no lack of indications, as we are going briefly to demonstrate.

The Chinese writer Fan Shih-hu, who composed his Kuei-hai-yû-hêng-chih—a treatise of descriptive geography and

¹ Jampa in the Catalan Atlas of 1375 (op. cit., pl. i), which, at its eastern boundaries, places the remark "Finta Indie"; and Jampa in Frâ Mauro's planisphere (circa A.D. 1460) reproduced in Zuria's "Di Marco Polo ed altri viaggiatori Veneziani," Venice, 1818.
natural history on the southern provinces of the empire—
towards the close of the twelfth century,¹ has about Hsin-
chou the following passages, quoted in Ma Tuan-lin’s
cyclopaedia²:—“The territory of Hsin, watered by a small
stream, supplies chiefly large quantities of scented wood.
Hsin-chou formerly belonged to Chên-la [Kamboja], but
Chiao-chih [Tonkin] has since made herself master of it.”³

From this we gather that Hsin-chou used to be also
alluded to by the Chinese themselves under the simple
form 新 (Hsin). Now, this character is pronounced Sên
in Cantonese and Ton in Annamese, whence we deduce
that its local form must have been Sen or Sôn. This, it will
be observed, closely tallies (minus the final f or ef) with
the Arab Şenf, Zenf, or Şenef, which is, in its turn, not very
dissimilar to Shihi-nai (Hsiin), the Chinese form of the Annamese
Thị-nai. The Fu-chou and Wên-chou pronunciations of this
toponymic are, respectively, Si-nai and Sz-ne, the last one
being a pretty close approach to Şenef or Zenef. It is possible
that the f at the end was added by the Arab navigators
through some misunderstanding, if not in the endeavour to
better mark the stress on the final e in Sz-ne, unless it can be

¹ According to his own showing (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 364), it was not
until A.D. 1173 that Fan Shih-hu (otherwise better known as Fan Chêng-ta)
took charge of his post in Kwang-hsi, to which province he had been appointed
imperial chief commissioner; thus his work, the outcome of his observations in
that quarter, could not very well have been written until several years afterwards.
He is said to have died in 1193.
³ The fact of the Hsin-chou territory having been—evidently for a short time
only—subject to Kamboja, is another indication that it could not lie very far away
from that country. Its supposed identity with Turán thus becomes still more
unlikely. In 1171 Champâ gained a victory over Kamboja, and in 1177 it made
an attack upon the Kambojan capital. It must have been, therefore, during the
course of these wars that Kamboja had to relax her hold upon Hsin-chou. As
regards the conquest of this district by Tonkin, it is not easy to guess when it
could have taken place, the Annamese and Chinese records furnishing us no clue as
to the date. But it may be well inferred that, if such a conquest really occurred,
it must have been effected before the end of the twelfth century, and can have
been all but lasting; for we are told that in A.D. 1199 Kamboja, having taken
the capital of Campâ and seized the king, placed a Khmer official to govern the
country. The capital of Lower Campâ, i.e. Bal-Angwê or Châ-bôn, is evidently
implied here.
demonstrated that the local name for the Hsin district and its stream was some Indū imported term like Chinab, Chenab, of which Ŝenef would be a not very imperfect rendering.¹

Another toponymic bearing some resemblance to Ŝenef or Ŝenef in that neighbourhood is that of Cape Sañ-ho, the high bluff headland forming the eastern point of the present Thī-nāi harbour. This, coupled with the two place-names already alluded to, viz. Hsin and Thī-nāi or Sz-ne, should go far towards establishing the connection, from a linguistical point of view, between them and Ŝenef. In other respects this connection is amply confirmed by the description given by Sulaimān, which applies to the seaport now under discussion in every particular. “At the place named Ŝenef,” says the Arab traveller, “fresh water may be obtained, and thence is exported the aloes [eagle-wood] termed al Ŝenfī. This place forms a kingdom. Its inhabitants are brown-complexioned, and each of them wears two skirts [pagnes, or loin-cloths].”² The reference to the eagle-wood tallies with what is said about this article of produce in the Chinese account of Hsin or Hsin-chou quoted above. As regards fresh water, the China Sea Directory³ thus remarks in connection with Thī-nāi harbour: “Good water can be obtained from a stream on the east shore of the harbour.” The district formed a kingdom, because here stood Balonga, that is, Bal Angucē (also known under the name of C'hā-bān), which was then

¹ That the latter hypothesis is not totally unfounded would appear from the fact of the Parisian codex—said to be the original one—of Marco Polo’s narrative, having the heading of chapter cxxii (on Campā) worded in this wise: “C' devise de la contrée de Cinaba” (Codex No. 7,367 of the Bibliothèque Nationale). While readily admitting that Cinaba may here be a clerical mistake for Činabu and Čīnban, the spelling adopted in the course of that chapter, I cannot dismiss altogether the idea that it may have something to do with Campā’s seaport Shīk-nāi, Sz-ne, or Ŝenef, which was undoubtedly the place where Marco Polo landed. It is, in fact, not unnatural that the Venetian traveller should first speak of the harbour—correctly recorded as Cinaba—where his ship anchored, and next of the kingdom—equally correctly recorded as Činabo or Čīnban—of which Cinabo or Ŝenef formed the principal seaport. Otherwise, it is quite possible that he, having heard the two terms Čhambu and Chinab, as they were then probably pronounced by the foreigners from whom he got them, took them to be alternative designations for the country and used them in this sense.

² Reinand, op. cit., p. 18.

(ninth century) the capital of Lower Campā. On the subject of dress, the rendering of *deux pagnes* for both the garments worn may be due to inaccuracy or oversight on the part of the French translator, or else to some clerical error in the Arabic text. Of the two garments alluded to, only one perhaps was a loin-cloth, while the other served to cover the upper part of the body. "The dress of the people of Chan-ch'êng," says Ma Tuan-lin, ¹ "consists of a long skirt formed by one *leh* [ell?] of the stuff termed *Pê-t'ie*² wrapped round the body, and a sort of tunic with narrow sleeves worn over it."

Previous commentators, more especially the late Colonel Yule, have suggested that the terms *Señf* or *Señf*, which they have twisted into *Sanf* or *Chanf*, represent Campā, whether as applied to the kingdom or to its capital. But this identification, from a linguistic point of view, seems to me too far-fetched.³ It will rest with subsequent inquirers into the subject to prove whether it can still hold its ground against those we have brought forward, which are, at all events, topographically justifiable.

Beyond the *Ghrutoda* or Sea of *ghee* the Rāmāyana does not mention any other sea, a fact which argues that at the time of the composition of that epic, the geographical knowledge of the people of Northern India did not extend


² 白繰, Ann. Bāk-dīep. It strikes me that this word closely resembles *P-hā-t'ien*, which is the Thai name for the rather scanty loin-cloth worn by nearly all the hill-tribes in Indo-China. Often it is woven from the fibrous bark of certain plants; hence it may have been termed *Pê-t'ie* by the Chinese by analogy with a soft whitish cloth similarly called (白繰), woven from a cocoon-like fruit, which is said to be manufactured at Karakhodjo. Of the people of *Līn-i* (Upper Campā) Ma Tuan-lin says (op. cit., p. 423) that all they wear is a piece, one *leh* in length, of cotton cloth, which they wrap round the body. The *Phmongs* or *Phanongs* of Eastern Kamboja call their loin-cloth or scarf by the name of *dōri*, a mere modification of *t'ien*. With them it is generally blue in colour.

³ The spelling generally followed in Arabic texts is صَنْف (or الصنف), which may be read either *Sañf*, *Zañf*, *Señf*, *Zañf*, and perhaps even *Sanf* or *Zañf*; but never *Chanf*. 
beyond the Sunda Archipelago and the Gulf of Tonkin. The Purāṇas, however, give us as next in order the Dadhi or Dadhimāṇḍa (Sea of whey), encompassing Kraunca-deīpa. My identification of this region is China south of the Yang-tsz or Kin-sha River, which included the territories of Kiāu-chi or Kiāo-chao, part of King-chao, and the districts of Kien-chung, Chang-sha, Chang, Kau-chên (Kū-chōn), etc., under the Han and Ts‘in dynasties, all of which names may have contributed in giving origin to the collective Indū designation of Kraunca. I am therefore inclined to consider Kraunca-deīpa as comprising the whole Chinese seaboard from the Gulf of Tonkin to Hang-chou, especially as the town just referred to was, to the early Arab and Indū navigators, known as Kinsay or Khansah; and also because the Bhāgavata Purāṇa mentions Āma (a district which I identify with Kwang-tung or Canton) among the divisions of Kraunca-deīpa.¹

The Arabs termed the Dadhi ocean the ‘sea of Śanjī,’² a name probably derived from Saraja or other Sanskrit synonym of Dadhi; unless it is more directly traceable to the Chinese 蔣 海 (Chang Hai), which may be, in its turn, but a clumsy transcript of Saraja, etc. Whether it is to Indū or to Chinese navigators that the honour of having first given a name to the ocean in question must be ascribed, I do not propose to inquire in these pages. I shall demonstrate, however, that Śanjī and Chang Hai designate the very identical sea, by a brief comparison of the accounts which the Arabs on one side and the Chinese on the other have left us of the sea thus respectively termed by them. This determination is both important and necessary for our purpose as well as for historical geography in general, since neither the Śanjī nor the Chang Hai sea have been so far correctly located by our predecessors in this field.

² The Arabic spelling of this term is, I observe, سُانْجِي، which may be read either Śanji, Zanjī; or Șanji, Zenjī.
On the Arab side both Sulaimān and Mas'ūdī agree in telling us that the sea of Ṣanjī, which bathed the China coast, extended to the north and to the east to an unknown distance, and that by sailing through it they passed the straits or "gates of China," as they term them (Formosan Channel, Chusan Strait, etc.), through which, after seven days' run, they made the gulf of Hang-chou, and reached Khānī (Ganfu or Kan-p'u), the terminus of their navigation.

On the other hand, the Chinese inform us that the sea of Chang Hai—which, at times, they term also Ta-Chang Hai—was a branch of the great sea of Canton (Nan Hai); that it formed the eastern limit of Fu-nan (Eastern Kamboja), and thence it stretched boundless eastwards as far as a large island called 杜藩, Tu-po, on which there was a State by the name of 諸藩, Chu-po. (This island I take to be Borneo, and the State to be the northern part of it, formerly known locally as Sabah.) They further tell us that the seven prefectures of Chiao-chih (Tonkin), in bringing their offerings to the Chinese Court, "always pass to and fro' by way of the Ta-Chang Hai." As tribute missions from Tonkin were invariably required to land at Canton, it follows that this sea stretched from the Gulf of Tonkin to at least as far as Canton, and thus coincided with what the Arabs termed the Sea of Ṣanjī or Ṣenjī.3

1 Reinaud, op. cit., Discours préliminaire, p. clxviii.
3 Since writing the above I have noticed that the Sea of Ṣanjī is actually said to be "the sea of China" in Captain Bozorg's "Ajālīb" (see Van der Lith & M. Devic's "Merveilles de l'Inde," p. 86), which expression must not be understood in the wide sense of the China Sea of our day, but more properly as meaning the sea bathing the China coast. The latter is, I think, the real Chang Hai of the Chinese, while the former corresponds to what they call, in a more extended sense, the Ta-Chang Hai. The "Mukhtasar al-Ajālīb" (see op. cit., pp. 279, 280) speaks of Ṣanjī or Ṣenjī as being also the name of a place. The passage runs as follows:—"In the vicinity of China there is a place called Senji. The sea is there more dangerous than anywhere else (lit. than all other seas), on account of the frequency of winds, high waves, straits, and mountains (reefs) that are to be found there. From this country (Senji), young men resembling Zenja (Zanjī, negroes of Zanzibar) come aboard the ships. Their stature is four spans. They come from the waters, jump on the decks, and there walk about without doing harm to anybody. After that they return to the sea." Here we have another confirmation of the existence of negrito pygmies on the China coast, or at any rate, on some of the islands facing it (see infra). For, as I am now going to demonstrate, the place above alluded to under the name of Ṣanji
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The notion of some among the Chinese writers was, however, that the sea in question was even more extensive,
or Senji lay almost certainly on the northern coast of Hainan Island, and, at all events, within the compass of Hainan Strait. This clearly results from a passage in Pigafetta’s Travels, wherein the famous navigator says: “Dietro alla costa della China sono molti popoli, come di Chenchij dove si trovano perle, & qualche legno di cannella” (Ramusio, op. cit., vol. i, f. 369 verso). This reference to pearls enables us at once to identify the Chenchij district with Hainan, and precisely with its northern coast, anciently forming part of the prefecture of Chu-yai, noted for its pearl fisheries. The name of Chu-yai, 珠崖, pronounced Chú-ngâi in Cantonese, and Chûn-nâi in the Annamese dialect, means, in fact, ‘Pearl-[oyster]-bank,’ * and both Chinese and Annamese records testify as to pearls being found there from the remotest period. According to the Thân-niên-thông-shih quoted by the Annamese annalists (see Des Michels, op. cit., p. 185), for instance, the pearl fisheries existed in the southern-eastern part of the Ho-p’u district, corresponding in this case to the north coast of Hainan, which had been in B.C. 43 subordinated as a simple district, with the designation Chu-lu, to the Ho-p’u ch’un. Even as late as the sixteenth century João de Barros (ch. i, lib. ix, in Ramusio, vol. i, f. 391 verso) mentions the “isola di Aiam [Hainan], dove si pescano le perle, ch’è il principio della governazione di Canti [Canton].” At that time, however, the mussel-beds that yielded the valuable supply were fast becoming exhausted, so that in 1599 the return is stated to have been merely Taels 2,100; as against Tls. 28,400 recorded for 1476, whereupon the fisheries appear to have closed. (See Notes and Queries on China and Japan, vol. i, Hongkong, 1867, p. 12.) In A.D. 627, under the T’angs, the territory corresponding to the ancient Chu-yai and Chu-lu districts was termed Ch’iung-shan (嶺山), sometimes also written Ch’iung-ying (嶺銜), (vide P’ei-wên Yün-lu in China Review, vol. xiv, p. 40), and the chou or department in which it lay was further denominated Ch’iung-chou. This designation, after a multitude of administrative changes, came at length in A.D. 758 to be bestowed upon the entire island, and this title has been borne almost continuously since that period, although under varying circumstances as to the relative rank and dependence of its government. (See Journal China Branch R.A.S., No. vii, 1873, p. 10.) The word Ch’iung denotes a red-veined stone, and is said to have been applied to Hainan Island on account of its red breccia marble and with special reference to a conspicuous hill, lying some twenty miles to the south of the present capital town, which appears to consist of that beautiful rock. Ch’iung-shan means, therefore, ‘Red-marble Mountains.’

The terms Senji and Chenchij are evidently identical, and if denoting a township or district may be meant for either Chu-yai (Chú-ngâi), Ch’iung-shan, Ch’iung-ying, or Ch’iung-chou. On the other hand, if designating a population, they may apply to the Shüang-chien (雙間) or Shōng-teyn, the so-called ‘Double Cloth’ tribe of the Li, so named, it is reported, on account of their wearing a double piece of cloth, one in front and the other behind, to cover their nakedness. This tribe must have formed, along with the kindred one of the

* "The Chinese chü is evidently connected with, and was in remote times probably pronounced not far differently from, the Sanskrit śukti (Pāli suttis) = ‘pearl-oyster.’ and śuktiśāli = ‘pearl.’ See, however, my further remarks on Chu-yai in the footnote to p. 250."
stretching as far as the Malay Peninsula. They actually called Chang Hai what we now term, in part very improperly,

Hsiao-chien (小) or 'Small Cloth' Lâi, now restricted to the Yai-chou district in the southern part of the island, the main bulk of the population of Hainan at the period in question. But with them there may have been dwelling on some tracts of the sea-coast the last remnants of tribes, now extinct, of a still more primitive type and shorter stature, evidently the descendants of the Negrito pygmyean autochthones, justifying their being compared to the African Negritos.* The reckoning of their stature at four spans by the Arab navigators is probably a notion derived second-hand from the Chinese settlers on the island, and thus four Chinese ch'îh (spans, usually rendered as 'feet') are probably intended, which, at the rate of 14½ inches, yield about 56½ inches English, or only 1 to 2 inches less than the average stature of Indo-Chinese and Melanesian Negritos. It will be interesting in the present connection to remark that this measurement of four ch'îh is just the average height ascribed by Chinese writers, among whom Ma Tuan-lin, to the inhabitants of 侏儒, Chu-jiu, or Chû-yü, a Pygmy State in the Melanesian region. (See China Review, vol. xix, p. 297.) This hitherto unidentified land I make out, by the way, to be Siguior, Sikior; or, more exactly, Gior, Kior—Si being a mere prefix to island-names in the archipelago—the local designation of the island otherwise known as Fuegos and inhabited by Aeta Negritos.

That the toponymic Chu-yaü survived in the popular tradition down to the time of the Arab travellers and further, appears from the fact that towards the end of the thirteenth century Ma Tuan-lin still speaks (op. cit., p. 394) of Ch'iuang-shan city under that name. "La ville de Chu-yaü," he goes on to say, in the words of his translator, "bâtie au bord de la mer, est la résidence de très- riches marchands qui s'entendent pour faire peser sur ces malheureux barbares toutes les charges et tous les impôts." This proves that the city had then become already a very thriving emporium.

The description of the dangers to which ships were exposed in the sea immediately adjoining Senji perfectly agrees, it will be seen, with the topographical conditions of Hainan Strait, notorious for its numerous sandbanks at both its entrances in and near the fairway, its shoals and patches of hard sand, its heavy overfalls or tide rips and strong currents, and the reefs that fringe its shores, especially at Hainan head and round Cape Kami (開 滅 尾, Kwâin [Pass or Gate of] Chiuo-wei or Kûn-mei†), the scene of so many wrecks. There can thus be no doubt as to the Senji of the Arab navigators being the

* Traces of such characteristics appear to survive in the present Hsiao-chien or Hsiao Li of Yai-chou, calling themselves K'îai (cf. with the Orang Glaï or 'Glaï Men' of the Campe hill-tracts below), who are described (Journal China Branch. R.A.S., No. vii, 1873, pp. 26, 71, 77) as smaller and a good deal darker than the Li in the interior.

† Pronounced Kwâin Kûn-wei by the Hainamese, and Kwâng Kûn-wei in Annamese, in which language, however, it is more popularly known as Mâi [Cape] Khâk-hien.
China Sea, although they had different names for portions or branches of it; e.g., Sea of Chin-lin (identified by us, p. 164, with the sea of Kamalanka and the sea of Kedrenj or Kerdenj), Ch'ih Hai ('Red Sea,' i.e. sea of Sri-lohit or Shelâhet = Sea of the Straits, if not actually sea of Ch'ih-t'u, i.e. Gulf of Siâm), etc. In fact, while some Chinese authors place in the sea of Chang Hai the island of Tu-po (Davak, Dabag, Dayak, i.e. Borneo in my opinion), sometimes also called Chu-po (after Sabah or North Borneo, see p. 245 ante), said by them to lie eastwards of Funan, and the farther outlying insular group of the Ma-wu or Mâ-ngû (= Manubo, Manguian, Wûgi, or

Chenchîj pearl-producing district of Pigafetta, and the Chi'ung-ying or Chi'ung-shan township of yore and of the present day—or, practically, its seaport of Hai-k'ou (海口), better known as Hoi-how.

Sender-fûlât or Sundar-fûlât, if not Chi'ung-shan (Sundara-parevata, Šouva-parevata?) itself, must have lain not far from it, as Sulaimân's account gives us to understand that it was not by any means an easy place for navigation. He says, in fact, in Reinaud's translation (op. cit., t. i, pp. 18, 19): "Sender-Foulât est le nom d'une ile. De là, les navires entrent dans une mer appelée Sandiy. Quand, par un effet de la faveur divine, les navires sortent sains et sâufs de Sender-Foulât, ils mettent à la voile pour la Chine."

The sentences that I have italicized in the last passage evidently mean that to get off safely from Sender-fûlât was no easy job, so much so that it came to be considered a feat which could be accomplished solely through divine favour. As no similar remark is made in connection with the other ports of call on the Arab ship-route mentioned by Sulaimân, it follows that Sender-fûlât was, in his countrymen's opinion, reputed to be the most dangerous point on that route. It must accordingly have been situated in close proximity to Šenji, that is, on Hainan Strait, and very probably on the same side with it, namely, the one formed by the northern coast of Hainan Island. On p. 250 I have touched upon the possible identity of Sender-fûlât with that island itself. Should such really be the case, Šenji would turn out to be merely the chief town, or district, and shipping port for Sender-fûlût.

I shall not digress any further to discuss the question, here cropping up, as to whether it is from Šenji or Šanji that the sea on the farther side of Hainan Strait became known as the 'Sea of Šanji' to the Arabs. It is quite possible that such was the case, albeit the etymological connection I have suggested between the Arab Sea of Šanji and the Chinese Chang Hai does in no way seem to be altogether accidental. Suffice it at any rate for the present to have succeeded in fixing the position of the hitherto mysterious Šenji on, or within close proximity of, Hainan Strait, and to have thereby got hold of the whereabouts of the farthest station on the Arab ship-route in Indo-China, which will serve us as a basis wherewith to trace that route with unmistakable certainty thenceforth along the China coast to its terminus in Hang-chon Bay. It was then from the farther side of Hainan Strait that navigation through the Sea of Šanji or Chang Hai commenced.

1 Vide supra, p. 91; also as regards the location of the Ch'ih Hai, my paper on "Siâm's Intercourse with China," in the Asiatic Quarterly Review of October, 1906, p. 367, n. 1.

2 Ma Tuân-lin, op. cit., pp. 449, 513, and 518. This Tu-po must be Ibn Batûtâ's hitherto unidentified Tuqulîsi.
Bugi tribes?), and of the ‘Fire Isles’ Jan-huco or Hwo-shan (Günong Api?), the writers alluded to make the Tun-hsün or Tun-sun (i.e. the Malay) Peninsula project far into that sea. From this it follows quite clearly that the sea of Chang Hai was not merely the Gulf of Tonkin, within whose narrow compass Wells Williams and Giles, copying him literally, have confined it in their Chinese dictionaries; but that it corresponded to our China Sea, and in its northern portion—i.e. between the Gulf of Tonkin (or the island of Hainan) and Formosa—to the Sea of Sanyi of the Arab navigator and geographers.

This was the last sea known to the Arabs, but the Purṇas mention another one still further, to wit: the sea of Jala or Toyān’budhi, the ‘Fresh-water Sea,’ surrounding Puškara-devipa, or Northern China and Mongolia. It will thus be seen that, while Krauncha corresponds to Ptolemy’s country of the Sinai or Thinai, Puškara represents—as we shall better demonstrate at the proper time and place—Sērikē or the land of the Sēres.

That the port of Šenēf touched at by the Arab navigators was either Shih-nai (Thi-nai) or Hsin-chou, is demonstrated, apart from the arguments adduced above, by the fact that its sailing distance from Kadranj (Koŋ Tron), given as ten days, is equal to the distance Betūmah (Batam, Bentan, or Tamasak)-Kadranj, which required the same number of days to cover. From Šenēf it took the Arab sailors another ten days to get to the island or peninsula of Sender-fulāt,

2 Op. cit., p. 445, where it is said to be called also Tien-hsün. Its proposed identification with Tenasserim (Tamāru-siri, Tamū, or Danān) is but one of those vagaries to which Sinologists dabbling in ancient Indo-Chinese geography are only too apt to abandon themselves. The location assigned to Tun-hsün by the Chinese writers—at 3,000 li to the south of Fu-nan—clearly indicates that the southern portion of the Malay Peninsula is meant, and not the northern. Here we have the extensive headland—formerly an island—of Dùn-sun, in front of Ligor. I prefer, however, to connect the Chinese name with the local ones of Ŭjung-tānah or Tānah-ŭjung, and with those, more ancient, of Tam-lak, Tamasū, Tuma, Tamus, etc., for which vide supra, p. 199.
i.e. to either Hainan or the opposite Lei-chou peninsula.1

1 Tan-érh, now Tan-chou (West Hainan), may well represent the Sandar, or Zandar, or Sender of the Arabs; the remaining part, fûlât, of the name being not unlikely traceable to Fu-lo, 富羅, the designation applied in A.D. 622 to the adjoining district since (A.D. 713) known as Lin-kao or Lam-ko; whence the possible combination Tan-érh-Fu-lo = Sandar-fûlât for the joint territory. With reference to the alternative derivation from Šoûa-parcata (Chiüng-shan) suggested on p. 248, I may point out that the title Chu-lu, 朱盧, conferred upon the island in B.C. 48, as noted above (p. 246), seems to lend support to that conjecture, as much as the first part, chu, of it means ‘red’ or soûa, while the whole—from the fact of its being still pronounced Chu-no or Shu-no in Chinese-derived dialects—looks like a transcript of the same term. Chu-yai (Pearl Shore), the name of the ancient eastern division and pearl-producing district of Hainan, which was adopted in A.D. 43 as a designation for the whole island in substitution of the term Chu-lu just referred to, should not, however, be altogether forgotten in the present discussion, since, it will now be seen, there is some probability as to its being somehow connected with Sender-fûlât. Pearls are considered by the Chinese to be the concrete essence of the moon; hence it may be that the original name applied on that score to the island being ‘moonstone island’—in Sanskrit, Candra-upala—took in Chinese the form Chu-yai. There is some likelihood of the island of Hainan having been named after the moon. The Bhagavata Purâna names eight minor devâpas situated beyond sea, among which is one called Candrâvakha, ‘the moon-bright’ (see Višṇu Purâna, ii, p. 129, n. 1). This, I surmise, may be Hainan. In conclusion, Sender-fûlât may well represent either Candra-upala, Candra-pulina, Candra-parcata, Šoûa-parcata, Tan-érh-Fu-lo, or some similar term; but never Pulo Condore, as advanced by Yule and others. The Malay, Châm, and Annamese terms for ‘island,’ Pulo, and Kû-lou, Ko, Hûn, etc., always precede the name; never do they follow it. Besides, the position of Pulo Condore is unacceptable. Owing to Yule and others having adopted it as the site of Sender-fûlât, they had to shift Kradranj and Senf on to the Gulf of Siâm, at Chanthabûn and Râch-jà respectively, thus making the Arab ships spend twenty days to cover the short distance Chanthabûn to Pulo Condore; just only one-third less than they took to go from Pulo Condore to Hang-chou! This is evidently absurd; and from my identifications of Kradranj and Senf it clearly follows that Sender-fûlât must have been either in Hainan or on the Lei-chou peninsula near by.

To the same conclusion lead the arguments I have brought forward in a preceding note (p. 248) as regards the position of Sender-fûlât in relation to that of Šenji. However, in view of the fact that it is not an easy matter to detect the native name which lies disguised under the term Sender-fûlât, I would not be disinclined to include the head of the Tonkin Gulf as well in the region within which the Arab seaport may be looked for, thus making its sphere of probable location comprise the whole of the coastline from the delta of the Red River to Hainan. By this means a chance of laying claim to identification with the very puzzling Sender-fûlât is also thrown open to the Tonkinese ports, where the trade at that period was undoubtedly far more considerable than in the districts previously pointed out.

From the accounts left us by I-tsong, who preceded the Arab merchant Sulaimân in these parts by scarcely more than one and a half centuries, we gather that the seaports most frequented by trading vessels in the region delimited as above were:

1. 神湯, Shên-ssen, which Chavannes (‘Les Religieux Éminents,’ etc.) does not attempt to locate. From a passage of I-tsong, however (p. 136), it appears to have been the shipping-port for the Hà-nô and neighbouring
A great uncertainty still prevails as to the identity of the
districts, occupying a position somewhere between the delta of the Red River
and Ha-long Bay. There is a hill-range called Shên-wén, or Shên-wan, to the
east of Kam-ti Bay, on the southern extremity of the Lei-chou peninsula and
within the territory of the old Hsi-wén or Si-wan district (q.v. infra), from
which it may have taken its name; but it seems very improbable that the seaport
alluded to by I-ting was in any way connected with it.

2.  合浦, Ho-pu, the ancient port (as well as prefectural city) of Lien-chou,
which we have identified with Ptolemy's Aspithra; since superseded by the
treaty port of Pak-hoi ( 北海, Pei-hoi).

3.  上景, Shang-ching, which appears (pp. 108, 135, 158) to have been
situated between Ho-pu and Shên-wan, but nearer, perhaps, to the latter.

4.  烏雷, U-lei or Wu-lei, located by Chavannes (p. 57) a little to the
west of Pak-hoi. It must have lain, in fact, on either side of the land-slit
terminating opposite Tui-mui-tiao Islet, and formed by the hill-range marked
On-lei Shan (evidently the local pronunciation of Wu-lei Shan, i.e. 'Wu-lei
Hills') in the Admiralty chart of the China Sea, 1884.

5.  Other Chinese writers mention besides 梵間, Hsi-wén, existing from the
T'ang period, but further south from its present namesake, on the southern
extremity of the Lei-chou peninsula.

6.  Again, there exists a little seaport bearing the name of Sin-tiao Fu on the
east side of the Lei-chou peninsula near Pei-li Fu and a little below the entrance
to Lei-chou river; but, apart from its insignificance, it is doubtful whether it can
lay claim to a respectable antiquity as a trade resort.

Only further exhaustive inquiries can disclose which, if any, of these
seaports is entitled to identification with Sender-fulat. As for myself, all
that I can add is, that the latter part, fulat, of this term, bears a rather close
resemblance to the Annamese words Bâ-lôt or Bâ-lôt occurring at present in the
name of one of the mouths of the Red River, to wit, the Kûn [mouth of] Bâ-lôt, often written also Ba-lacht (perhaps, more correctly, Bâ-lach, which
means the place of meeting of three streams). Though this is now considered
impracticable for sea-going craft, it may not have been so at a far earlier period.
In such a case the initial part, Sender, of the Arab name, may be connected
with the Song Dài, the southern branch of the Red River detached from the
main stream a little below Ộn-tôî (Sơn-tây), Ptolemy's Sindā according to our
identification. Though now discharging through the mouth called the Kûn Dài,
it may well have had at a remote period its outlet at, or near, the Bâ-lôt mouth,
with which it is even at present connected by several channels. Thus, from
the Song Dài, or Ộn-tôî branch of the main river, and from the name of its
—from perhaps principal—outlet, the Bâ-lôt, the territory in this part of
the delta may have become known as Song Dài (or OTTOM) Bâ-lôt, rendered
by the Arab navigators under the form of Sender-fulât. Of course, I give this
identification as merely tentative. It should be observed, however, that some of
the maps accompanying old editions or translations of Ptolemy's geographical
work, mark—though it be by oversight—his Sindâ just at the spot alluded
to above. As an instance, I may refer the reader to one of the best and most
esteemed editions, that of Nicholaus de Donis (A.D. 1482). Albeit the position
we obtained for Sindâ shows this place to be identical with Ộn-tôî, it does not
necessarily follow that the Bâ-lôt mouth, through which the Ộn-tôî or Sindâ
branch of the main river probably discharged of old, could not be regarded by
ancient navigators as the shipping-port for Sindâ. Hence the probability of
this port being, after all, the Sender-fulât of the Arabs. At all events I trust
to have sufficiently demonstrated that Sender-fulât must be looked for on the
section of the littoral comprised between the spot just alluded to and Hainan.
Hô-tôn spoken of in the Annals of Annam as the primitive population of Campâ, which is therefore styled at the outset, in that work, "the country of the Hô-tôn." Luro believes that the Hô-tôn were the aborigines driven into the interior by Malay pirates from the Archipelago, who occupied the coast and pushed up their incursions as far as Tonkin and the maritime districts of Kwang-tung. Launay thus concludes that the people of Campâ were a mixture of Malays, Annamites, and Kambojans. This theory seems to me too far-fetched. As to the Câm proper, they are evidently, both from their language and physical features, of the same stock as the Malays, and, like these latter, they undoubtedly came from Southern China, taking possession of the whole coast of Annam and Cochin-China, whence they spread.

Thence the Arab sea-route lay through Hainan Strait, and it was evidently by passing this that the Arab navigators reached the boundless expanse that they termed the Sea of Sânji.

Since writing the above I have noticed that in Captain Bozorg's "Ajâib" the above name is spelled Sundal-fâlât, and the place described as an island situated at the entrance to the Sea of Sânji, between Sênf and the China coast (Van der Lith & M. Devic's "Merveilles de l'Inde," p. 86). These indications place almost beyond doubt that the long-sought-for Sândar-fâlât is the island of Haiman; and it would be only by considerable straining that they could be made to apply to some other island formed by the delta of the Red River, either in the neighbourhood of the Ba-lacht mouth or up the Song Dâi at Phâ-li (Pulu of our maps), whence a branch is detached connecting the Song Dâi with the main river (Pulu Canal). For the translators of the above work, Sundal-fâlât is Pulo Condor (p. 220)—not even Marco Polo's Sundor; the Sea of Sânji, the Gulf of Tonkin (see their map); Betiswah, Pulo Tioman (p. 252); Kedah, Kedah (p. 255 seq.); and so forth in the merry old strain. Besides the argument of the sailing distances given by the Arab navigators between their ports of call, which tells strongly, as we have shown, against the above fanciful identifications, there is the fact that the equivalents named are either barren rocks or inhospitable places. Why on earth should the shrewd Arab traders studiously avoid the thriving emporia that we know to have existed on the coasts of the Malay Peninsula, Kamboja, and Cochinchina, in order to call at all sorts of straggling islets in the middle of the sea—uninhabited, except perhaps by pirates—and other miserable insignificant places such as Pulo Tioman, Pulo Condor, and the Brothers (Sundor)? This is, on the face of it, absurd; and, as regards Kedah, it did not then exist, at any rate under this name, and perhaps under any name whatever, except that of a hill (Gínong Jerai) and an islet (Pulo Srêt). Surely, the Arab merchants were not bent upon lithological investigations or on voyages of discovery. It is therefore high time, I should imagine, that such belated and absurd theories about the Arab sea-route should be abandoned for something more rational and consistent, at least, with the data of sailing distances handed down to us by the Arab navigators themselves.

1 Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 4, 6, text; and note 24, p. 12, notes.
2 "Le pays d'Annam," p. 70.
3 "Histoire ancienne et moderne de l'Annam," 1884, p. 28.
across to the Archipelago, being afterwards civilized, each in their new settlements, by emigrants from the south of India, with whom they became to a certain extent intermingled. But like their relatives, the Malays, in the islands of the Archipelago and in the Malay Peninsula, the Cám, upon reaching their seats on the coasts of Tonkin, Annam, and Cochin-China, found these countries occupied by a population of Negrito race, whom they partly drove to the hills in the interior and partly assimilated in the course of time. This must have been the same dark race which extended across from Madagascar and the south of India and Ceylon to the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago, to the coasts of Annam and China, and to Melanesia. On account of its primitive state and pretended cannibal habits, it received from the civilized Āryans of the north of India the name of Rākṣasas; but it does by no means appear that it was always and everywhere as rude and wild as represented.

On the contrary, there is reason to believe, from the accounts of the Râmāyana itself, from its ready spreading—as it is now admitted by many authorities—to Indonesia and even Oceania, and from the comparatively advanced social

1 "None of the Negritos proper," observes Professor De Quatrefages in his study on the Negritos (published in the Journal des Savants, Augast and December, 1882, and translated into English in the Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 13, June, 1884). "are cannibals." "As for the Papua-Negritos, mixed with the Papuas of New Guinea and the adjacent island-groups, it is very possible that they may have let themselves be carried away by example and may have addicted themselves to man-eating; but it is impossible, for want of accurate information, to give an opinion on the subject. . . . All Negritos cook meat by boiling or roasting: all, consequently, are able to procure fire, and no doubt use the same process, the friction of two pieces of wood."

2 "Flower is inclined to admit that the small black race which sprung up in the southerly regions of India, has spread itself east and west in Melanesia and Africa, and that the tall Negroes are descended from it. Professor Seeley thinks that the Negro race occupied, in former times, a strip of land which extended from Africa to Melanesia and is now submerged."—De Quatrefages, ibid. The same authority considers that the Negro tribes scattered from the Andámán Islands to the Philippines are all of an identical race, of which the Minkopi are now the purest representatives; that this race "is the fundamental negro element of all, or very nearly all, the Dravidian tribes." A connection has been noted by some philologists between the Dravidian and Australian languages. Mikiuho Maclay has ascertained the identity of language among Negrito tribes of the Malay Peninsula which are isolated and have no communication with each other, from Johor to Ligur.

Dr. Fraser also remarks (Polynesian Journal, vol. iv, Dec., 1895): "The Dravidian tribes of the Deccan and Southern India are descended from that black race which occupied the whole of India before the Āryans came in; and
condition attained in several of its settlements, that it enjoyed once a certain degree of civilization, and that the present low status of its last remains found in almost inaccessible jungles and mountains is due to their long segregation from society and intercourse with other races. In a word, those Negritos who preferred the liberty of their jungles to servitude and oppression at the hands of the invaders of their country, turned wild; but a large portion of them were assimilated into the bulk of the new settlers, or destroyed during the incursions and devastations of the latter. I have already drawn attention (p. 174 supra) to the fact that the process of

some ethnologists believe that portions of that black race were, by the Aryan invasion of India, driven eastwards into the Eastern Peninsula, Indonesia, and Oceania, and that the Melanesians near our shores are their modern representatives. the tide of migration flowing, on the one hand, to the east and south-east from India into Further India, and what is now called the Malay Archipelago; and, on the other, from India and Ceylon west and south-west into the Maldives and onwards into Madagascar, where the reigning language is well known to be a branch of the so-called Malayo-Polynesian family."

1 This accords with the opinion expressed by Quatrefages, op. cit. Speaking of the Aetas of the Philippines, he says: "... this degraded social status is the consequence of the persecution which these Negritos have suffered at the hands of more powerful and vigorous races. ... If, in certain parts of the Archipelago, these diminutive negroes lead a wandering life, if they do not build huts or till the soil, the fault lies with those who persecute and civilize them. Have not these tribes known better days and enjoyed a more perfect social organization? ... It is more than probable that in the Philippines, the Aetas were once in a more advanced stage." And he goes on to say that they once occupied the whole of Luzon and had a form of government by elders; that they resisted the Tagal invasions. He then observes that the Mamanus of Mindanau and the half-breed Negritos of India and of the Malay Peninsula cultivate by the primitive method of jungle clearing. The Manthras have still preserved a recollection of the days when their ancestors ruled over the whole country. At that time, they say, they had numerous records written on leaves. Even now they have head-men, each exercising his authority over a district. The Russian traveller, Mikuho Maclay, in the account of his explorations among the Negrito tribes of the Malay Peninsula (published in Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 2, Dec., 1878) says that the Sakai consider themselves the original inhabitants; that they had kings, and that such Sakai-rajais still exist. So were the Benna in former times governed by kings whose descendants are still to be found. Relics of a stone-age have been discovered in the Andamanese, such as celts, chisels, etc., of the Neolithic period. Similar objects were also found in the neighbourhood of the Great Lake of Kamboja and in the Upper Me-Khong valley at Luang Pibrah Bang. The Minkopi of the Andamanese make sun-baked pottery, harpoons, nets, and canoes, all indications of anything but intellectual degradation. "In the Malay Peninsula, as in India," notes De Quatrefages, "conquest has destroyed States that were considerable and flourishing once upon a time, but of which even recollection has been lost, driving back to the jungles and mountains the races, more or less Negroid, which had founded them. There the race, like many other Dravidian groups, has returned to wild life. ... In the lands where they are still to be found, these Negritos have preceded the races by whom they have subsequently been oppressed, dispersed, and almost annihilated."
assimilation, here alluded to, may still be seen in operation at present in the south of the Malay Peninsula with the Samangs, the Manthras, and other either genuinely Negrito, or mixed Melano-Malay, tribes. The south and centre of India also teem with half-breed Negritos.

In several parts of Indo-China, the early Negrito, or Negrito-descended, tribes were termed, on account of their degraded social status, 'dogs.' Such are, or seem to be, the Sakai of the Malay Peninsula and Kanchô (Kon-chô) of Eastern Kamboja, whose names have that signification. But more generally, they were named 'blacks' after the colour of their skins; and the terms Aeta, Abeta, or Ita [= 'black'] in Tagala; Itam in Suli; Atom in Dusun (N.W. Borneo); hitam in Malay; dam in Siamese; he, hei, heti in Chinese; and tamas or tamasa (dark, dusky-coloured) in Sanskrit], applied to the Negritos in the Philippines, have probably their correspondents in the Karun and Kalang (cf. Skt. Kâla) of Java, in the Semang (Samanga, Syamanga?) of the Malay Peninsula, and the Hô-lôn of Campã. With these terms, the Greek designation Aithiopes, though interpreted in a different manner (Aitô+ô = [sun-] burnt countenance'), may be usefully compared. It was invariably applied to the dark-complexioned races of the tropical regions; but a distinction was made between the Ethiopians of the west and those of the east, that is, betwixt African Negroes and Asiatic Negritos.²

Ptolemy places his Ikhtyophagoi Aithiopes around the frontier and the Gulf of the Sinai; namely, about the Leichou Peninsula and the Formosan Channel. There can

¹ The Sakai, though now recognized to belong to a fairer (Môn-Khmêr, or Ch'êng) race than Negritos, may have inherited their name from the Negrito aborigines of the country in which they settled. I notice, in fact, that Sakai (presumably the same term as Sakai or Sakai) means 'black' in the dialect of the Pôrak-Sêmang (see Journal Straits Br. R.A.S., No. 5, p. 147). In this case Sakai would not signify 'dog,' but would imply a population of Negrito race, thus proving synonymous with Ita, Itam, Hitam, etc. It will take many years before this and similar philologic-ethnographical questions can be satisfactorily settled.

² See Herodotus, lib. iii, c. 94: but more especially lib. vii, c. 70, where he very clearly sets forth the distinguishing characteristics of the Ethiopians of Asia. Likewise does Strabo, lib. xv, ch. 1, 13, q.v.
scarcely be any doubt as to Negritos—the ancestors or relatives of the Aeta, Hô-tôn, and the savages of Formosa—being meant. At that period these Negrito populations must have been still in occupation not only of the seaboard of Southern China and the neighbouring islands, but also of many points of the littoral of Tonkin and Cochin-China, their last descendants being on the one end the hill tribes of Formosa, and on the other the Tiao or Trao (pygmies), the Tioma (or Choma) and Tjru (Chiu-ru, Chhrû, or Chhraû) of the Biû-thwûn and Khaû-hwû districts in Lower Cochin-China; perhaps the Kan-chô of Eastern Kamboja, and other tribes of the Cochin-Chino-Kambojan frontier, as yet but little known. Driven to the hills, they have now become a hill people, as did their relatives of Formosa and of the Malay Peninsula; but they dwelt originally on the sea-shore, and, like the actual Minkopi, Selung, and Akkyê or Rayat Laut, lived mainly by fishing; whence their name of Ikhthypagai. By referring to them under this term, followed by that of Aithiopes, Ptolemy puts us in possession of two data, the importance of which can scarcely be underrated, viz.: (1) that they were settled on the coast, being mainly fishermen; (2) that they were Negritos. Though he does not locate them all along the coastline of Annam, Tonkin, and China, we know very well that in his time, or not far earlier, these Negrito tribes occupied the whole, or nearly so, of the littoral between the Formosan Channel and the Gulf of

1 The ichthypagous aborigines of Formosa and the Pescadores are duly represented in the Catalan Atlas of a.d. 1375 (formerly belonging to the library of Charles V of France), and located at a spot corresponding approximately to the islands referred to above, with the legend: "Aqueste gent son salvaius [quiiuen de poyy crun & buen] de la mar d van tos nuus." (These people are savages who live upon raw fish and drink sea-water, and go [about] stark naked.) See Cordier's "L'Extrême Orient dans l'Atlas Catalan de Charles V, Roi de France," Paris, 1895, pl. ii., and pp. 18, 42. The identification of these tribes with the descendants of Ptolemy's Ikhthypagai is, however, my own entirely: Cordier (p. 42) merely suggests that many islands in the north-east portion of the Sea of Japan are inhabited by ichthypagous people; but this does not suit the present case. That fish-eating tribes occupied at an early period the littoral, as well as the adjoining islands of the Indo-Chinese coast, and that they racially belonged to the same stock of the hill-men or Kûrâs, is evidenced by the passage of the Ramâyana (Kûskindhu-kâmâ, xl), where allusion is made to "Kûrâs dwelling in islands, with stiff hair-tufts, subsisting on raw fish," in the regions to the east of India. The Lohamukhas, with faces of a harsh iron-
Martaban, besides the islands of the Gulf of Bengal and of the Malay Archipelago. We found them under the Burmese name of Bhilū (cf. Bhil, the Central India Negritos) and like black colour, called Kāhanukhas or 'black-faced' in the Bengal recension of that poem, are evidently the Indo-Chinese Negritos; while the Karrupapravaras, having ear-flaps as wide as a sheet, and the Oṭṭakarāgas, furnished with ears that reached to their lips, refer, in my opinion, to the tribes of Mōu-Khmēr and hybridized Negrito stock whom the Chinese of the Han period called Tum-ērh (聴耳) or 'Drooping Ears,' and after whom they named the western division of Hainan in B.C. 110. These are the stiff hair-tufted Lê, whose ears "reach down to the shoulders" (Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 401); the Lê, Lôi, or Lôi of other parts of Indo-China, inhabiting the hill-tracts as well as the sea-shore, and Ptolemy's cave-dwelling Léstai. (Vide supra, pp. 161, 162, 175, etc.)

1 The Kedah Annals also mention tribes termed Bīla, and Hill-Bīla, along with the Sakai and Samang (see Colonel Low's translation in Journal Malay Archipelago, vol. ii.). From the context I make out their habitat to have been the western coast of the Malay Peninsula, from the neighbourhood of Kedah up to the Gulf of Martaban. It is thus possible that they were the same people as the famed Bhilū, being moreover racially and otherwise connected with the Central Indian Bhil. Colonel Low takes them to have been, respectively, 'ryota' and 'hill-ryota'; but I cannot see my way to agree with him. I am, in fact, inclined to think Bīla to be, if not absolutely a tribal name, at any rate the characteristic designation for a special class of Negrito—or hybridized Negrito—tribes, as with Bīli and Bhilū. The Hill-Bīla would, in this case, represent the portion of the Negrito-descended population inhabiting the hill-tracts; the class of people or tribes, in a word, such as we find styled Vṛlah-kirāta-ṛta in the old Chăm inscriptions (see above, p. 163). We would thus have the equations: (1) Bīla = Vṛlah, and (2) Hill-Bīla = Vṛlah-kirāta-ṛta. In the event of these surmises being correct, the term Bīli (= Vṛlah?) will have been proved traceable all the way from Central India to Cochin-China. It may be of interest to point out, while on this subject, that the term Bīla survives to this day in connection with the Samang Negritos settled in Kedah, Pérak, Pahang, and Tringanu, it being apparently applied to the civilised portion of them, who are thus styled Samang Bīla. On the page quoted above, I have doubtfully suggested that the mountaineer Vṛlah of Campā might possibly be some branch of the Ch'êng race. But, like most of the hill-tribes of this race in Indo-China, they may have become more or less intermixed or blended with the Negrito autochthones, who were probably the Hồ-ton above referred to. Several well-read Annamese, born and settled in Siām, whom I have consulted on the subject of the Hồ-ton's identity, tell me that they were hill-tribes similar to those now called Kха Üt, scattered along the Siām-Annamese watershed and about the southern slopes of the Khôrât plateau. Unfortunately, as I have once already observed (p. 163 supra), next to nothing is known about the tribes so named.

I have, since writing the above, come across the term Bīla, which the Sītung employ to designate the hill-people, and, in general, the wild tribes. The missionary Axémar, in his Sītung Dictionary published in Excursions et Reconnaissances, Cochinchine Française, No. 27, explains it (p. 118) as meaning "les habitants du dessus, des montagnes," and suggests that it may be the contracted form of the two words bīla lū, 'homme d'en haut.' However it be, it is plain to me that this bīla must be practically the same term as Bīla, Vṛlah, etc. "C'est ainsi que les sauvages se nomment," the reverend Père observes; and, in fact, at p. 326 (No. 28 of the above-quoted magazine) we find
Śabarās in the Gulf of Martaban, in a former section of this paper. Of these latter the actual Seleung of the Mergui Archipelago are probably the last remnants. The fact of celts of a shoulder-headed type, perfectly similar in shape, having been traced all the way from the district of Chūtiā Nāgpur in Central India, throughout the seaboard of Burmā and the Malay Peninsula, to the Great Lake of Kamboja and the Upper Mē-Khōng in the district of Lūang P'hrahr Bāng, is sufficient proof that the same race occupied the coastline and lacustrine districts of Indo-China; and that this race is the one of the pygmy Negritos above spoken of.

The Chinese were acquainted—as evidenced by their old records—with Negrito tribes from several parts of Indo-China. The one that they denominated Chian-yau or Tsiau-yau is located by them beyond the Yung-ch’ang (S.W. Yūnnan) borders. I have already adverted (supra, p. 72) to the connection in meaning of this term—given that it be genuinely Chinese, and not a transcript of some indigenous tribal name—with the sense conveyed by the Greek compositum Aithioph. 1 Ma Tuan-lin describes the Chian-yau as cave-dwellers, three ch’i̇h (about 4 ft. 4 in. English) in stature, clever hunters of wild animals; and says that they came to Court twice between A.D. 58–76 and in A.D. 107, bringing presents of elephant tusks, buffaloes,

one tribe of the Stieng designating themselves Blū-Stieng. Is this the origin of the Ptolemaic Αὐραχ, or country of the Lēstai? (vide supra, p. 161)—in which case Blū would prove to be but another form of lē, tōi, Balōi, etc.

Postscriptum.—I just learn at the moment of going to press, from Siamese sources, that there still exists a tribe calling themselves Ha-tōn, but whom the Lān term Hō-thōn, in Eastern Kamboja, near the Bahmar and Bonam or Banūn, and between the Tumbuon (Tampouen or Chom-puen) and the Jarcī, to the west of Būn-dūn. These Hō-thōn, so far unknown, apparently, to our ethnologists, are no doubt all that remains of the Hō-tōn of ancient Campā.

1 H. de Saint-Denis (op. cit., p. 266) remarks that the character 疊, Chian or Tsian, means "brûlé, noir," while 亞, yau, signifies "nain, pygmée." Giles, however, in his Chinese Dictionary, s.v. 1,329, gives for the latter "false, deceitful." Wells Williams identifies the Chian-yau with a no less remote people than "the Negritos or Papuans of New Guinea"! Fancy their coming thither overland to China with "buffaloes and humped oxen"! 
and humped oxen. According to one of our Sinologists, the Chiau-yau are the same people who were denominated K'ang (抗; lit. 'fierce mastiffs') during the Ming period. From the fact that the Chiau-yau, or Tsiau-yau, did the first time (i.e. between A.D. 58-76) send tribute along with a kindred tribe called P‘an-mu, and that (kháng) is the name that the 'Shān' (Thai) of Burmā give to the Kachyen, or Kachin, settled to the north and east of Bhāmō, it would appear that the Chiau-yau's habitat was on the hill-tracts now occupied by the Kachin or Singphō, and that they were somehow connected with the forbears of this people, if not actually identical with them. It remains to be seen, however, whether the K'ang are really the descendants of the ancient Chiau-yau aborigines, or whether they are, on the contrary—as I am inclined to suspect—merely newcomers who substituted themselves for the original occupants of the country, whom they either drove out or destroyed and partly assimilated. In the latter case the Chiau-yau should be more correctly identified with the ancestors of the present squat-bodied Wild Wahrs. The K'ang are represented by the Chinese "as dwelling in the mountains of Sīān, as very short, very resolute and determined, [having] round eyes, yellow irides, ignorant

2 D. J. MacGowan in China Review, vol. xiii, p. 297. K'ang-lang, 抗巖, according to Giles, Dict., s.v. 5,924, is the name of "a kind of small ape, found in Siam, said to be employed in hunting." This is the Macacus Simicus, called simply Khāng in Siamese. Owing to the K'ang having simian habits, so far as they lived, according to the Chinese accounts, "on fruits like monkeys," it is possible that the designation applied to them was a mere nickname alluding to that characteristic.
3 E. H. Parker in China Review, vol. xiii, p. 27, n. 27. It is plain to me that this term, 榮木, P'au-mu, must be a transcript of Bhāmō, correctly Bàn-Mô, in its probable ancient form of Varumāra or Varumāvar, for which vide supra, p. 42. Mr. Parker remarks here, à propos of the Chiau-yau, "The Érh Ya had already mentioned the Tsiau-yau as the third of the eight sorts of man, or 'rude' men, and Hwaï-Nan Tsz had already described the south-west region as [Chiau-yau]."
4 See Cushing's Shan-English Dict., Rangoon, 1881, p. 68, s.v.
of metallurgy and sericulture, living on wild fruits like monkeys, dwelling in hamlets under the shade of trees impervious to the sun, their language resembles chirping of birds. The hill Laos (Liao) understand their nature, maintain them as slaves, dressing them in worn-out garments, feeding them on shark and other fish [which would argue them to be ichthyophagous], and giving them arrack to drink—all which satisfies them; they and their families serve their masters for life, and their masters' successive descendants, not quitting them to serve other masters; exposure to smoke and fire is fatal to them." At all events, the K'ang did not appear at Court until A.D. 1420, when they brought tribute to the Ming Emperor Yung-lè.⁵

Of the Ku-lun, or K'un-lun, whom I-tsing calls Chueh-lun and describes as being black-complexioned and woolly-haired, I have already spoken (p. 103), pointing out that they must be identified with the hybridized Negrito tribes of the Malay Peninsula and their descendants. Chinese historians mention another people in the same quarter under the name of Lo-ch' a (羅剎), or Râksas, whom they portray as black in colour, with red and curled hair, feet and toes like bird's claws, and teeth like brute beasts; they were dreadful in appearance, their ears were perforated; for clothing they used a strip of cloth (i.e. the usual Pê-tie, or P'ê-tie, alluded to in a former page). However, they engaged in commerce, trading with Lin-i (Campâ).³ They were therefore not so savage after all. They must have been the ancestors of the present Pangan, or Pang-gang, and Tumiors of Kelantan, Patani, and Pahang, called Ngoh

---

² Ibid.
³ See Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 489, and China Review, vol. xix, p. 289. Chinese writers locate the kingdom of the Lo-ch' a or Râksas people to the east of P'o-li; and as this place is invariably taken by our Sinologists to be the east coast of Sumatra, a position has been assigned to the Lo-ch' a either on that island itself or on the opposite shore of the Malay Peninsula. But I think that Févak is meant for P'o-li in this instance (see p. 110 supra), and the habitat of the Lo-ch' a would thus become fixed in Pahang.
(i.e. 'frizzly-haired') by the Siamese, and Girmassi, Gargási (or Rākṣasas) in the Kedah Annals.\(^1\)

In so far as Eastern Indo-China is concerned I have drawn attention (p. 171) to the fact that the Chinese envoys who visited Kamboja during the early centuries of our era described the natives as black and woolly-haired, characters evidencing that at that period descendants of the Negrito aborigines were still numerous in the country. The Kan-chô, I have pointed out, represent perhaps the remnants of that Negrito element. The Phmông, or Penong (v. supra, p. 207), I may now add, although taller and fairer-complexioned on the average than the neighbouring wild tribes, exhibit several distinctly marked characteristics which argue a primitive type and stamp them as descendants of the race of Fu-nan as described by the early Chinese travellers. Among such characteristics, the notable frequency of frizzly hair with them may be mentioned.\(^2\) The Tiao, Trao, Chrau, Tyru, or Churu, owing to their dwarfish stature, may, on the other hand, be more directly attached to the Tsiao-yau stock.

"Diminutive black slaves" were, according to the Kwang-tung Gazetteer, sent to the Chinese Court from the coasts of Indo-China during the Ming period.\(^3\) A Chinese work on novelties, 1636, speaks of the black dwarfs of Cochin-China in the following terms:—"Anywhere from Annam to Siâm, there are pygmies whose

---

\(^1\) It is just possible that the term Rākṣasa or Rākṣas still survives in a corrupted form in the name of the present Royat Utan or Jakan tribes in the southern part of the Malay Peninsula, and perhaps as well in the names—given that these are old enough—of the actual Rakhor River and District in the east part of Singapore Island. In connection with the terms Ku-lun, K'm-lun, and Chieh-lun, which I have shown to have been derived from Kolam and Cholan (p. 103 ante), I may call attention to the fact that the "Sejarah Malau" calls Raja Chulan the kinglet who was reigning over the southern part of the Malay Peninsula in the thirteenth century A.D. (see Leyden's "Malay Annals," p. 10). This term may have been not exactly a personal name, but a title derived from the designation then borne by the country, Chulan, Cholan, etc. In such a case its connection with I-tsing's Chieh-lun would be more than probable.

\(^2\) "Les cheveux sont le plus souvent droits et durs, mais on trouve parmi les Puongs un grand nombre d'individus qui les ont frisés . . . . Ce fait qu'on ne peut nier parait révéler une fusion de deux races bien différentes et qui ne remonterait pas à bien longtemps dans le passé." (Leclèrè's "Les Puongs," Extrait des Mémoires de la Société d'Ethnographie, Paris, Leroux, 1898, p. 143.)

\(^3\) China Review, vol. xix, p. 292. The native work here referred to is the Kwang-tung-t'ung-chib, first published a.d. 1698.
stature is not over three feet [Chinese ch'ih, or 3 ft. 7 in. English], who are regarded as of animal origin, who sell themselves for longer or shorter periods to dealers in aloes. When engaged they are provisioned, supplied with hatchets and saws, and sent into the mountains; when their collection is completed, in one or many months, they lead their masters to the depôts, whence the commodities are transported to the coast. These dwarfs are very submissive and servile."¹

The translator of this passage remarks that the expression "three ch'ih" as applied to human stature must not be taken too literally, but simply means shortness. It is not difficult to recognize in the savage people here alluded to the tribes designated Orang Glai (Woodmen) by the Châm, and Môi-hwông ('unsubmitted or undisciplined savages') by the Annamese, who often term them also Môi Kî-nâm, i.e. 'eagle-wood savages.' They inhabit the hill-tracts to the west of the Biũ-diũ and Khân-hwâ districts, and include several tribes known under the names of Ha, Tarîng (or Tareng), Tarum, Tathéak, and Chhàdâng. The first and last mentioned are probably identical to the Salâng or Hâláng, of whom more anon; and may have some distant racial connection with their apparent namesakes, the Selung of the Mergui Archipelago. It is these Orang Glai who, up to this day, do all the heavy work in connection with the exploitation of the eagle-wood and other commodities which they bring, as the Chinese authority quoted above correctly says, "to the depôts." Such are nowadays, for instance, the two emporiums of Khân-hwâ and Trüâng Sap, in the plain of Niũ-hwâ further to the north.²

At the stage of our present knowledge it would be too premature to say how far the Orang Glai would justify the qualification of Negrito pygmies which the author of the Chinese account referred to above seems inclined to apply to

¹ Ibid., p. 297. Here the translator, with the well-known slipshod way of identifying foreign peoples and places common to the majority of Sinologists, jumps at once to the conclusion that these dwarfish specimens of mankind were "evidently Alfours or Papuans"!
² See Aymonier in Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 27, pp. 8 and 27.
them. Some of the most salient characteristics which formerly enabled one to trace them to that early type may have by this time become obliterated or modified through intermixture with other races. But I think that, from the multifarious evidence I have adduced from both historical records and ethnological observations of various nature, the presence of Negrito populations all along the Indo-Chinese coast at no very remote period may be considered as fairly well proved. Further investigations into the hitherto unexplored districts of Cochin-China, Annam, and Tonkin will, I scarcely doubt, contribute towards strengthening that conclusion rather than shaking it. In dealing with the past of such regions, then, we must take this ethnical element into account, since it is, as with the Dravidian tribes in India, the fundamental negro element of most wild tribes of Southern Indo-China and the Malay Archipelago. No doubt it has been in a large measure assimilated by the early settlers from without; but it has evidently founded the primitive agglomerations of dwellings, the early States and principalities in this region, which have subsequently developed, as in Kamboja and Campā, under the influx of more vigorous and socially advanced races. I would conclude, therefore, that the Hö-tôn of Campā were very likely of the same race as Ptolemy's styles Aithiopes and we call Negritos. By effect of the Chām invasion, these dusky people were partly driven back to the hills of the Campā-Kambojan frontier, but partly assimilated, and the mixed race thus produced, under the influence of immigrants from Southern India, developed that power and civilization which started at first in the southern districts of Biū-thwōn and Khan-hwā and then gradually extended northwards until it reached the limits of the present Tonkin. This work must have been already accomplished in Ptolemy's time; for it follows from our examination of his geography of these regions, that the Chām possessed then no less than two kingdoms, with capitals in Biū-dīn and Hā-tūn respectively.

Tonkin or Kiāu-chī was then under Chinese domination;
but the Chăm element was probably still conspicuous in it. And this, under the influence of Indū adventurers who had come thither not from the South, but from the North, of India; and not by sea, but overland by that trade route which is now almost generally admitted to have existed between Manipur, through the Kubo Valley, Ava, and Ch’ieng-Tung to Hà-nōi in Tonkin—or via Lương P’hraḥ Bāng to Vīṅ—developed a civilization and founded kingdoms like those of Burmā, Lāos, Campā, and Kamboja. I have already remarked that the State of Van-lāng, the earliest mentioned in the Annamese Annals, was probably an Indū kingdom. In the chronicles of Mūang Yōng I find it stated that king Dharmāsoka of Magadha (some other Indian prince is meant) made an expedition, not only to Mūang Yōng, but also to Videha in Yūnnan; and to Mūang Kēu (Kiao-chi or Tonkin), whose king, out of despair, drowned himself. The shape said to have been originally given to the ancient Tonkinese capital, in the neighbourhood of Hà-nōi, like a conch-shell (sāṅkha), just as it is told of Sukhodaya and Lamp’hūṅ in Sīām; its Sanskrit designation preserved to us by Ptolemy under the form Aganagara; the name of the neighbouring district-city of Sōn-tōi (So’n-tāy), which he transmitted to us as Sindā; that of its population which he calls Indōi.—all these are evidences of the ascendancy of a Northern Indian element over the country, as in the neighbouring States of Yūnnan, Lāos, etc., at that same period. This incipient Indū civilization was, of course, nipped in the bud by the Chinese conquests; but not so suddenly or anything like so completely as not to leave traces in the country and not to influence the march of events in it for many centuries after the beginning of Chinese rule.¹ Every outward sign of that civilization has

¹ Since writing the above I have had the satisfaction of seeing my previsions in this respect in part verified, having come across the following passage from a very interesting paper on "The Black River of Upper Tonquin and Mount Ba-vi," by G. Dumontier, published in the China Review, vol. xix. Here is what the painstaking author says in regard to surviving traces of Indū influence in that region (p. 165): — "Legends abound among the tribes of the Black River: we discovered among them several of the Indian fables which, coming to Europe
probably been swept away by this time owing to the rather troubled existence which the country has had to experience; yet a thorough exploration of its remains may still reveal some indications of early Indū influence in that territory.¹

We have now to proceed to an examination of the names of towns and streams which Ptolemy locates in this region, beginning from the lower end of Southern Campā.

Thagora (No. 122).

This term does not represent, as one may think at first glance, the toponymic Tagara or Tagarapura occurring in Western India, but the word Sāgara, the name of an island at the mouth of the Ganges, given it in honour of the mythical king Sāgara. The corrected latitude of Thagora is 12° 32', namely, a few minutes in excess of that of Nā-trāṅg (Nha-trang)² Bay, in Khaṅ-hwa, where, near the mouth of the Nā-trāṅg River, rose the famous temple of Pō-Nagar, the tutelary goddess of Campā, and the city of Yāmpu-nagara, most likely the first capital of the kingdom, with which I identify Thagora. It was in this neighbourhood, in the paddy-fields by the village of Vō-kan, that the most ancient inscription of Campā, that of king Mura-rāja, engraved on a block of granite, was discovered,³ which

from the opposite direction, have supplied such pretty themes for our fabulists. Such are: The Fox and the Raven; The Three Wishes; and a few others, travestied, unfortunately, in such a way that it would be necessary in giving them to translate them into Latin, as that dead language possesses privileges denied to the living tongues. We also discovered traces of the human sacrifices which used to be made at one time near Moc-Tiah, to a sort of genius [Rākṣasa] whose shrine still exists there: this genius, who was a cannibal, used to consume an enormous quantity of human flesh, and almost depopulated the country, etc.

¹ Such is also the opinion of Professor Bergaigne, op. cit., p. 43. Sanskrit inscriptions have been, so far, discovered up to the borders of the Hà-tiū district.

² 牙 (or 齒) 莊, pron. Ya-cheuaman in Chinese. This toponymic is not, however, of either Chinese or Annamese derivation, but a mere phonetic transcript of the Chăm words Ī-trāṅg, meaning 'Reed-water' according to Aymonier (Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 26, p. 179). The district is now no longer so designated, it having been renamed Khaṅ-hwa (慶 和).

³ See Bergaigne's "L'Ancien Royaume de Campā" in Journal Asiatique, tome xi, pp. 44, 75.
Professor Bergaigne assigns to the third century A.D. the city of Yāmūpura-nagara, or its site, appears to have borne at an ancient period the name of Kūthāra, which I take to signify the city of Koṭarī, 'the naked,' a name of Devī; for such is the goddess alluded to under the term Pó-Nagar. Bergaigne, however, does not appear inclined to ascribe it this meaning. The other name for this town, Sāgara, which I have adopted as the equivalent of Ptolemy's Thagora, is easily explained from the fact—mentioned in various inscriptions found about the monument of Pó-Nagar—of a mythical king by the name of Vicitra Sagara having here erected a famous liṅga and other monuments of a religious character at an enormously remote period, no less than the year 5911 of the Dvāpara-yuga. Here we have, it seems to me, the legend of the Indu king Sagara transplanted with additions and new embellishments; and we can easily understand how the city—or the mouth of the Nā-trāṅg River, in analogy to that of the Ganges—would be named after him, and the traditions of his exploits in India would become localized here, just as if they had taken place, and he had lived, in Campā. And, of course, the simple-minded Cām, in listening to the account read from Sanskrit books originally imported from India or recited from memory, of how the mighty king Sagara subdued the Śakas and the Yavanas, the Kambojas, etc., naturally believed that their neighbours, the Śuk or Suk of Campāsa (Śaka dvipa), the Yuen (Yavana) or Annamese, and the Khmers were the people referred to; just as among other populations of Indo-China events related in similar legends, from either Brāhmaṇic or Buddhist sources, as having occurred in India, are believed to have actually taken place in Burma, Siām, Lāos, and Kamboja respectively.

1 Ibid., p. 51.
2 Kūthāra means, of course, an axe or hatchet, and also a spade; but it is evidently either, as Bergaigne observes (p. 51), "la déformation savante de quelque nom indigène," or a modification of Koṭarī as suggested above, for an axe is also called Koṭarī.
3 Ibid., pp. 62, 66, 67.
However fabulous the account of the erection of the *liṅga* by king Vicitra Sagara at such a remote period at Āra-trāṅg may appear, we must nevertheless conclude that this must have been the most ancient foundation of Indū adventurers in Southern Campā, and that therefore here must have stood the most ancient settlement of the immigrants, whence their civilization and power were gradually spread all over the country. For this reason I consider Thagora or Sāgara to have been the first Indū outpost on that seaboard. Sāgara as a toponymic has apparently not yet been found in the inscriptions of Campā; but, as Professor Bergaigne himself acknowledges,¹ many geographical names occurring in the latter are still uncertain, and therefore they have been left for future consideration. Besides, the most ancient Chām inscription hitherto discovered does not go further back than the third century, whereas we have here to deal with a name in use from at least one century before, and which may have changed in the meantime. The most probable conjecture is that the site of the town or the port at the mouth of the Āra-trāṅ River was originally named Sāgara, and that after the building of Yāmpu-nagara it was named Kuthāra in honour of the goddess Devī.

The *liṅga* above alluded to was carried off and the temple of Pō-Nagar at Āra-trāṅ destroyed, according to the inscriptions, in 696 Saka = A.D. 774, by armed men “from Java² who had come thither in ships”; but the temple was soon rebuilt, ten years later or A.D. 784, by king Satyavarman. This evidences in what great veneration both the site and temple were held, a fact to which the inscriptions bear otherwise ample testimony. Āra-trāṅ Bay, protected by the large island of Trè or Dam-mong, forms an excellent harbour, and sea-vessels of moderate draft can ascend the river as far up as the present town of Khān-hwā. Hence

² This may be either Zaba or Zapa of Ptolemy and Friar Odoric, or else the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra; and not, I think, the island of Java, the name of which invariably appears in the ancient local inscriptions as Yava, and is, in any case, of later introduction.
we can understand how it could easily become the initial seat of civilization in Southern Campā.\footnote{Crawfurd, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. i, p. 352, speaks of this place as being "the entrepôt of the commerce of all this part of the country." See also vol. ii, pp. 237, 238, in which last he remarks that, "being very conveniently placed, [it] is the centre of all commercial transactions of all this part of the empire."}

Turning now from topographical to linguistic considerations, it behoves me to justify the adoption of the term Sāgara as the equivalent of Ptolemy’s Thagora, in order to dispel any doubt that may be entertained on the identity of the two words, on account of the very marked difference in sound between their initial letters. I hasten, therefore, to explain that this objectionable discrepancy is only apparent, and vanishes at once when it is understood that, according to the genius of the Chām language, the initial sibilant in foreign imported words, especially of Indian origin, is almost invariably lisped into an aspirated dental, not only in pronunciation, but also in actual writing. Thus: ʂakti becomes thak; svar, thūor; siddhī, thūdik; ʂevasti, theattik, etc. This peculiar change is likewise often noticeable in medial sibilants, nakṣatra becoming nōthak; əśea, athēḥ, etc. Analogously, Sāgara would be pronounced, and perhaps also written, Thāgara or Thāgor, and it will be seen that Ptolemys’s transcription Θαγόρα is not only perfectly justifiable, but is in entire agreement with the linguistic peculiarities of the region where this toponymic occurs.

Balonga, a Métropolis (No. 121).

This is most certainly Bal-Anonymous, situated, as pointed out at the beginning of this chapter, at about six miles to the north of the present district-city of Bīn-dūn. Bal-Anonymous is its Chām designation, while in the Annamese records it is variously styled C‘hā-bàn, C‘hā-làng, and Dō-bàn. We have seen how, in consequence of the loss of Upper Campā in the struggle with the Annamese, the Chām kings had to shift on to this city, and how, as a result of new reverses, they had to abandon it in 1471, retreating
further south into Biũ-thwôn. But long before the advent of this period of decline Châm rule extended, as we have shown, as far up as Tonkin, upon whose southern borders it was continually encroaching. The Châm capital was then established in the north, but this was apparently only the royal seat for the rulers of Upper Campâ, while the rest of the country formed one or more separate kingdoms. In what relation these stood to the former is not clear, but undoubtedly it was at Bal-Angwê that the capital of one—presumably the southernmost—of them was situated. This is made evident from the fact of Ptolemy placing here—in 14° 16′ N. lat. corrected 1—his Balonga, which he terms a Mêtropolis. Topographically, the position differs only by some 20 minutes from that of the now almost forgotten Bal-Angwê, whose ruins lie in circâ 13° 56′ N. lat. Linguistically, there can be no doubt as to the identity of the two toponymics Balonga and Bal-Angwê. Bal is the very genuine Châm term for “palace, capital, royal residence,” 2 occurring as a prefix to most names of the Châm capitals, e.g., Bal-Hangor, Bal-Batthinöng, and the subject of the present discussion. Angwê is, to my belief, the local corrupted form of Aṅga or Áṅga, the name of the kingdom in Northern India of which Campâ, sometimes called also Campâ-puri, Aṅga-puri, Lomapâda-puri, Mâlini, Karna-puri, etc., was the capital. Already I have pointed out that Lam-ap and Lin-i, the designations by which the Indo-Chinese Campâ kingdom or its ancient northern capital is referred to in the Annamese and Chinese records respectively, may be traced to either of the Indû imported toponymics Lomapâda and Mâlini. It cannot surprise, therefore, to find the correlated term Áṅga brought to Indo-China and applied along with them to a portion of it, of which it undoubtedly constituted an alternative name. Ptolemy’s Balonga thus proves to be an accurate enough transcript of either

1 See Table V, No. 121.
2 Vide Aymonier’s “Grammaire Chame,” in Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 31 (vol. xiv), p. 85.
Bal-Āṅga or Bal-Āṅvē, meaning, according to Chām construction and interpretation, the "Capital [of] Āṅga [alias Campā]."

This identification compels us to recognize that Bal-Āṅga or Bal-Āṅvē must have existed as a capital—though it be only of Lower Campā—since at least the first century A.D., and thus puts us in possession of an historical fact which is a couple of centuries ahead of those that the oldest inscriptions hitherto discovered locally have disclosed. Here it was then, in all likelihood, that king Mura-rāja, the author of the inscription in Khan-hwā, reigned some time about the third century, and not further up the coast, where there were other Chām capitals and other rulers. Notwithstanding its very respectable antiquity, it is just possible, however, that Bal-Āṅvē was but the second historical seat of royalty for Lower Campā, it having superseded in this honour the far more ancient settlement of Yāṁpu-nagara or Sāgara, which, we have seen above, was undoubtedly the initial focus of civilization—and consequently of organized government—in that part of the country.

How long Bal-Āṅvē continued as a capital for Lower Campā we are unable to state with precision. The probability seems to be that this southern kingdom was gradually absorbed by the northern one as the latter grew more and more in power, and that Bal-Āṅvē became in the course of time merely the seat of a prince or chief subordinate to the monarch who held sway in the upper part of the country. This state of affairs must have come to an end in 1061 or thereabout, when the suzerain, being forced to abandon the last resort of royalty in the north, transferred his residence to Bal-Āṅvē, making it the capital of his now much diminished dominions. It was but natural, in view of the reverses sustained, that the suzerain would prefer taking up his quarters in a city which, like Bal-Āṅvē, had been from the remotest time a renowned seat of royalty and a stronghold of some importance withal, rather than proceed to build a new capital for himself elsewhere. A similar course
was adopted later on when one of his successors shifted on further south to Pândurāṅga, likewise an ancient foundation and, presumably, also the residence of some petty ruler.

There must have existed of old a certain number of such diminutive kingdoms, more or less dependent on one another, along the coast of Campā, which were successively incorporated by the northern State, au fur et à mesure that the latter was being curtailed at its upper end, and its capital had to be shifted over and again southwards. The chief cities of most of those realms thus came to form, as it were, so many stations in the retrograde career of the paramount kingdom, to which the capital was successively shifted back and but temporarily maintained. The second rôle that Bal-Angwē played as capital was, therefore, the historical reverse of the first. While the first one marked a decided step in advance of the budding Chām civilization northwards, the second represented merely a stage in the phase of decline, which preceded the final collapse and disintegration of the ill-fated kingdom.

Whether the names under which Bal-Angwē is referred to in the Annamese records, to wit, C'hà-bàn, C'hâ-lâng, and Dō-bàn, sprang into use at the time of its second and last existence as capital, and were mere Annamese inventions, or whether, per contra, they were modified forms of local toponymics existing prior to that period, and belonging therefore to either the Chām language or that of the Indû immigrants, it is not an easy task to determine. Judging from the characters employed to represent them in Annamese, they are not exotic, but indigenous designations of very long standing—the very tribal names, in fact, borne by the early settlers. C'hà-bàn and Dō-bàn, written, as a local Annamese scholar informs me, 鬧盤 (in Chinese Shé-p'an) and 都盤 (in Chinese Tu-p'an or Tou-p'an) respectively, strongly remind us of the terms Jacean (Javana or Yavana) and Daven (Davean, Taфан) we have met with in Upper Burma, Eastern Lāos, and elsewhere, as names for the Chêh, Java, or C'hieng tribes, after whom so many districts and even whole regions in Indo-China, the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago
were designated. 1 Issued from the great Mōn-Annam stock, to them or their descendants the Châm and the original Malays belonged, as well as the Lavā, Loi, or Lōi, whence the name of Lōi given to the Châm. We still find tribes known as Chevēa or C’havēa, Veh, Loveh, and Davak in the hill-tracts to the north-west of the Biū-diūn district. These were undoubtedly the pioneers of the Châm who settled and gave their name to that strip of the sea-coast, whence they were afterwards driven back by more powerful oncomers.

The term C’hā-lān, written 舍襄 or 舍馕 (in Chinese Shè-lang), leads, upon investigation, to similar results. In this digram Shè apparently stands for the name of the Cheh tribes, 2 which the Annamese pronounce and call C’hā. It occurs in the name of Mēng Shē (蒙舍, in Annamese Mong C’hā), the original seat of the kings of Nan Chao. Lang (literally meaning ‘wolves’) is likewise a tribal name still to be met with in the valley of the Black River, 3 and mentioned by Ma Tuan-lin as existing, since the first century A.D., on the north-western borders of Sz-ch’uen. 4 It was not long ago well known also in Kwang-hsi, and, at a still earlier

---

1 It will be observed that the initial character 閤 in C’hā-bān is the same that comes first in the term 閤婆, Shè-p’ō or Tu-p’ō = Java, Dava, which we have met with as a name for P’iao, or, at any rate, for the part of the region so named which corresponds to Upper Burma (see above, p. 55). It also occurs, as we shall see later on, as a designation for Sumatra, the country of Java or Java Minor. The Annamese pronounce the above characters C’hā-bè and C’hā-vyè, and now use them to designate the Malays from Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula, as well as those who are settled in Kamboja.

2 Vide supra, pp. 129–133.


4 Op. cit., p. 163. They seem to have sometimes been called also Pai [white]-Lang or Pè-Lang. In this case the name of Balonga given to their settlement may have something to do with them, or may have been suggested by their presence in the territory. Tribes termed 青穹, Lang-k’ìang, and 施濡, Shi'h-Lang, occupied two of the ancient six Châū or principalities of the Nan Chao kingdom. The Shi'h-Lang are said to have been north-west of the Iron Bridge that spans the Kin-sha River near Li-kiang (see China Review, vol. xix, p. 73, note). It is quite possible that the Kanrâng (or Kan-Lang?) were mere branches or subdivisions of these Lang tribes, the Sak being in their turn offshoots of the Chêh (vide supra, p. 129).
period, in Kwei-chou,\(^1\) whence the Chêh and other offshoots of the Môň-Annam race, from which the Châm as well as the original Malays are undoubtedly descended, seem to have brought it down with themselves.

But whether C'hâ-lâng be a compound of two different, though strictly correlated, tribal names or not, the most luminous proof of its having been, in its turn, employed as an ethnical designation is, in my opinion, to be found in the fact that in the mountainous country to the west of the ancient Châm capital, Bal-Angwê, there live down to this day wild and, it is said, occasionally anthropophagous tribes known as the Halâng or Salâng, and C'hâdâng or Sadâng (Çêdang of French writers), who apparently are but varieties of the Orang Glai. Even excluding the Sadâng on the ground of a d occurring in their name where an l might be pedantically pretended in order to make the linguistical connection acceptable, I think that there can hardly be any doubt left as to the Salâng being the tribes after whom Bal-Angwê became known under the alternative designation of C'hâ-lâng. It is nevertheless highly probable that the Salâng and Sadâng were in origin—if, indeed, they are not even now—the same people, or, at any rate, two closely related tribes issued from a common stock.

\(^1\) These were originally called 獵兵, Lang-ping (‘Wolf-soldiers’) or Lang-jên (‘Wolf-men’), and are now known either as 獺人, T'ung-jên, Chwang-jên, or 山人, Shan-jên (‘Mountaineers’), according to Devéria (‘La Frontière Sino-Annamite,’ p. 94). They appear to form the majority of the population of Kwang-hsi (ibid., p. 95), whether they are said to have come during the Yüan period (a.d. 1280–1368), their original home being in Kwei-chou (ibid., p. 96). They are by Chinese authors connected with the Yau, and, therefore, with the race of T'ao-hu; part of them are, in fact, called Yau-t'ung. These latter appear to have preserved traces of cannibalsm down to at least a.d. 1454 (see China Review, vol. xxv, p. 196). All these tribes used poisoned arrows. They seem to be in more than one way connected with the Lawâ, and thus I have scarcely any doubt that they belong to the Môň-Annam stock. Hence I consider that Lacouperie was for the nonce correct in assigning them to the Môň-Annam family (‘Languages of China before the Chinese,’ pp. 42, 43), although, strange to say, the meagre vocabulary upon which he based his assumption is for a good three-fifths Thaiic, and, in his ignorance of either language, he took several words to be Môň-Annam derived which are purely Thai.
It may be well while on this subject to call attention to
the possible identity of the term C’hâ-lang or Salâng with
C’hâlâng or Salâng, the name of the island (distorted into
Junkceylon by our ever muddling geographers)\(^1\) which lies
off the west coast of the Malay Peninsula; with Selangor,
the appellation of a district further to the south of the above,
and, eventually, also with Selung, the designation borne by
the descendants of the primitive population of the Mergui
Archipelago. If connected, these terms would but prove
once more the racial affinity we have over and again pointed
out between the early inhabitants of Eastern Indo-China
on one side and of the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago on
the other. But, I repeat, a more exhaustive enquiry into
these philological and ethnical questions is necessary ere
a final judgment can be pronounced.

Both the terms C’hâ-lang and Dê-bân occur, under the
forms respectively of Xâ Lâng and Dô Bâng, in Abbé
Bouillevaux’s somewhat garbled account of Châm history.\(^2\)
He says they designate the same town, which is, as we had
to find out for ourselves, the Châm capital Bal-Angwê.

The second phase of this city’s existence as capital was not
one of unmixed pleasure, if we are to judge from the Chinese
and Annamese accounts. Already I have quoted the passage
from Ma Tuan-lin according to which Hsin or Hsin-chou,
that is, the territory on which Bal-Angwê stood, had been
held in subjection by Kamboja until about A.D. 1171,
and apparently conquered by Tonkin a few years later.
Between the former date and A.D. 1177 the Châm retaliated
successfully upon Kamboja, and went so far as to attack
even its capital. But retribution was not slow to come from

\(^1\) Misled apparently by Òjông Salâng, the form under which the island is
known to the Malays. Here Òjông merely means a cape, or promontory;
hence Òjông-Salâng = the promontory of Salâng [Island]; perhaps originally
applied to some headland of the island itself or of the neighbouring coast. In
any case, the name of the island ever appears to be simply Salâng or C’hâlâng.
In Siamese it is generally spelled C’hâlâng, and, at times, Thâlâng.

\(^2\) “Le Ciampa,” in Annales de l’Extrême Orient, t. iii, p. 168. The name
Dê-bân was borne also by one of the ancient districts of Kûu-chûn, now
Thañ-hwâ (see Des Michels, op. cit., p. 49).
that quarter, and in 1199, we are told, 1 Kamboja invaded Campā with a powerful host, stormed the capital (Bal-Angwē), seized the king, carrying him into captivity, and placed a Khmēr general to rule over the conquered country. It was not until A.D. 1220 that the Khmērs withdrew from Campā. Peace was then concluded between the two countries (1222), thus terminating a war which, according to the Chām inscriptions, had lasted for thirty-two years; 2 and in 1227 the new Chām king Śrī Jaya Paramēśvara-varman (II) could finally have himself crowned and enjoy a peaceful reign. To one of his immediate successors was reserved the satisfaction of getting at last the best of Kamboja, whose power had then begun fast to decline, for we hear how this kingdom had become a tributary to Campā towards the close of the thirteenth century. 3 A new era of prosperity had then probably once more dawned upon Campā. However, not many years later on troubles began with the Annamese. At first the struggle was confined to the northern borders, and even carried at times far into Annamese territory in the endeavour to regain the lost

1 Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 557–8. The Chām inscription 409, B, 4, of Aymonier’s list places these events in Śaka 1112 = A.D. 1190, but this was probably only the date at which the war began, while the capital may have fallen several years later. On the other hand, in the Chinese records the said events may have been post-dated a few years, owing to the chroniclers having put them down to the year in which information concerning them reached the Chinese Court.

2 Same inscription (409, B, 4) as quoted above. The thirty-two years during which the struggle lasted would thus seem to comprise the period A.D. 1190–1222.

3 This appears from the “Chēn-la Fēng-t’u-ch’i,” the account of Kamboja written by one of the employees who visited that country in A.D. 1205–7. Herein it is stated that every year the King of Kamboja was bound to send a certain quantity of human gall “to his Majesty the King of Campā, a coterminous State, as tribute which its neighbour Campā exacts from its vassal, Kamboja” (see China Review, vol. xix, p. 293). At the time when the author of this narrative was in Kamboja, the practice had been abandoned, but Kamboja was apparently still subject to Campā. The human gall was used, as we learn from a Chām inscription (No. 398), to sprinkle the royal elephants, and the barbarous custom is alleged to have existed up to the reign of An-Duān in the middle of the century just elapsed (nineteenth) among the Khmērs. So says Aymonier ("Inscriptions Chames,"") in Journal Asiatique, t. xvii, p. 64), who adds the following piece of information: "Les éléphants de guerre royaux étaient chaque année arrosés de fœl humain, enlevé à vie sur des enfants, des jeunes gens, par les gardiens ou premiers de fœl, dont le souvenir est resté à l'état de Croquemitaine dans les campagnes Cambodiennes."
provinces of the Central Campâ of bygone days. But in the course of time the Annamese took a more vigorous attitude, and in 1377 they invested the Châm capital, while their fleet blockaded the port of Thi-nâi. Happily, on the throne of Campâ there was then the valiant Chê-bong-ngâ, whom Aymonier rightly styles the Châm Hannibal, and the Annamese forces were completely routed. A second no less serious siege was successfully resisted by Bal-Angwê in 1404, but its fortunes declined after this. In 1446 a double Annamese expedition, like that of 1377, again blockaded Thi-nâi and invested Bal-Angwê. This city was taken by assault, the king being made a prisoner. The final blow came, however, in 1471, when the now doomed capital was once more stormed, plundered, forty thousand of its people put to the sword and thirty thousand carried into captivity, including the personage who had newly set himself up as king. This disaster for ever sealed the fate of Bal-Angwê. The capital of the last remnants of the unfortunate kingdom was established further south, and the territory of the fallen one left in Annamese hands.

The first thing that the conquerors did was, with their usual barbarity, to efface the name of Bal-Angwê from the map of the world. They accordingly renamed it Kwei-nôn, degrading it to the level of a common district-city of their own proud dominions. They, however, kept a Châm chief to govern it until the middle of the seventeenth century, when Annamese officials were substituted, who helped in bringing about its final ruin. The palace was razed to the ground, and on its site vulgar Annamese shanties were erected; the plan of its old fortifications was altered; in a word, "le génie de l'impuissance et du mauvais goût n'épargna aucune insulte à l'art vigoureux et délicat des vaincus." 2

1 師仁, in Chinese Kwei-jen = 'restored to meekness,' or something of that sort.
2 These are the textual words of a French official, Mr. E. Navelle, who visited the ruins of the ancient city, giving an interesting account of them in Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 29, pp. 51 seq. It is mainly to this publication that I am indebted for the particulars anent the history of the old Châm capital from the time it passed under Annamese rule, as well as for other information on its monuments and those of Thi-nâi.
Under its exotic name the fallen city still had, in truth, the marvellous power of once lifting up its head—though for a brief period—to a height worthy of its old traditions. Nāk, the leader of that Tōi-sōn revolt through which he acquired the mastery of almost the whole of Annam and Cochin-China, made Kwī-nōn the capital of his dominions. After two sieges and five assaults it fell in 1798 into the power of Jā-long (Gia-long), and had once more to undergo the ordeal of a re-christening with a name expressive of its new status. Thus its appellation Kwī-nōn was changed into that of Bin-dīn,¹ 'the Pacified.' The spell of this novel designation did not prove, however, of sufficient virtue as to prevent the city from reverting to its former rulers, the Tōi-sōn, and it took all the power and dogged persistence of Jā-long, backed by foreign assistance, including that of French officers, to reduce it, and then it was only by famine that the task could be accomplished. By way of punishment Jā-long abandoned the city after having plundered it, destitute and nameless withal, for he built a new stronghold which he called likewise Bin-dīn, which is the city known to this day under that designation. Thus ended the fortunes of Ptolemy's Balonga, the Chăm Bal-Anqē, and C’hā-bān or C’hā-lāng, the Annamese Kwī-nōn and, for but a brief interval, Bin-dīn.

On the extensive site it occupied now rise three villages, as insignificant as they are uncouth; and a lonely brick tower, the only one left to stand, together with the débris of a few statues, bas-reliefs, and lingas, scattered about pèle-mèle, and the traces of ancient ramparts, ditches, and causeways, are about all that is left to attest its ancient grandeur. But through the pages of Ptolemy its original name was handed down to posterity, and can be traced back to almost the dawn of the Christian era; while what Annamese conquest did its best to efface, subsequent European research will revivify and partly reconstruct.

¹ 平定, in Chinese Ping-ting, 'Peacefully settled' or 'Brought back to Peace.' Just the very term: Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant.
Thus, despite the heavy effects of Annamese vandalism, we may yet hope of learning at no distant date a good deal more about the ancient Balonga, although we may despair of ever being able to see the day when our geographers, cartographers, and navigators will consent to part with their pet toponymic Kvw-\-n\-n or Qu\-nh\-n, which, in defiance of history, topography, and every other positive science, they persist in applying to the present, the barely one-century-old, Bin-d\-n, to its district, and to Th\-n\-n Harbour.

I have already given my reasons for holding that either this trade resort or the neighbouring older one of Hsin, alias Hsin\-chou, must have been the Senf or Senef of the Arabs placed at ten days’ navigation from Kedrenj, and noted for the kind of aloes (‘eagle-wood’) termed al-Senf. It is well known that eagle-wood forms one of the principal productions of Campa, and that to this day in the Bin-thw\-n district, where the last remnants of the Cham are to be found, the care of gathering this product is confined to certain villages, the hereditary chiefs of which, called ‘masters of the eaglewood,’ when entering on their duties, offer up worship to the deities of the agallochum trees on certain sacred hills.\(^1\)

Ma Tuan-lin has recorded several interesting particulars on the exploitation of the eagle-wood forests of Campa during the first quarter of the twelfth century. “Scented wood,” he says,\(^2\) “is plentiful on the hill-tracts of Chan-ch‘eng [Campa].” Each year the people make regular cuttings of the trees under the supervision of government officials. The State levies a duty in kind upon the felled wood. Everyone must comply with this regulation before he is allowed to appropriate the surplus. It is, on the whole, what is done in China with regard to salt, in the districts where this commodity is produced.”\(^3\)

\(^1\) See Aymonier’s “History of Tchampa,” loc. cit.
\(^3\) As is well known, inspectors were appointed to control the production and sale of salt in China since the time of the Chou dynasty (n.c. 1122–249); and although the industry was taken in hand by government for a short time
That Hsin, or Hsin-chou, i.e. the territory about Bal-Angwē, was one of the chief centres of the eagle-wood industry, we have demonstrated on the basis of unimpeachable evidence in a preceding page. It is of particular interest to learn further from Ma Tuan-lin that the Arab traders still frequented the seaports of Campā towards the end of the twelfth century. The learned cyclopedist tells us, in fact, how at that period "a certain U-shih-tien [Ashī-(Aji, Hájī?)-ud-Dīn, Uzdrī?] and several other merchants of the Ta-shīh [Tājika or Arab] nation" complained to the Chinese authorities of Fuh-kien that the king of Campā, who had just ascended the throne, had had seized from them certain valuable articles, which he afterwards sent as presents to the Chinese Court in order to obtain investiture. Upon receiving a report of the matter the Emperor refused the presents, and ordered an investigation of the charge, suspending meanwhile the grant of a patent. From the context it clearly appears that the place where the alleged spoliation was perpetrated must have been either the capital (Bal-Angwē) itself or its seaport, known to the Arab navigators of an earlier period under the name of Senf or Senef, and thus the relations of the Arab traders with the Chăm emporium are proved to have continued for a further four centuries after Sulaimān’s time.

Throana (No. 120).

The position of this city at Turān (Tourane or Touron) has already been fixed with certainty from geographical data in the first section of this paper. Little or nothing can be


1 Loc. cit. The Chăm ruler here alluded to is called Tsou-ya-mo (鄰 亞 郴) by Ma Tuan-lin, and I have accordingly succeeded in identifying him with the Jaya Indravarman (III) of the Chăm inscription dated Śaka 1105 = A.D. 1183 (No. 499, A, 3 of Aymonier’s list; see his "Inscript. Tchames" in Journal Asiatique, t. xvii, pp. 44, 45). He was already reigning in A.D. 1175, according to the same inscription, and was, no doubt, the king taken prisoner to Kamboja in A.D. 1190-1199.
learned as to the history of this place, which, possessing a spacious, secure, and completely landlocked harbour, must have early become an important trading-mart. I presume it is referred to in Ma Tuan-lin's account of Chên-la (Kamboja),¹ where it is said that Chên-la was often in war with Lin-i and T'o-huan. Lin-i or Lôm-üp being, as I have demonstrated, Upper Campâ, T'o-huan very likely is meant for Central Campâ or Turân.² In any case Turân looks like a name of Sanskrit derivation. Given that this is its correct spelling, which I doubt, it may represent the word Torâña (a pandal or gateway); or else it may be referred to other terms such as turâña, turânya, etc. Ancient remains of city walls and ramparts are said to exist at Thang-biû (升平),³ a little below Turân, which will very likely repay exploration. A large inscribed stela was only a few years ago discovered in that neighbourhood amongst the


² T'o-huan is written 陀桓, which suggests an old form Dhavan, Dravan, Darvan, Darseana, or Dhrusvana, not very dissimilar to Ptolemy's Throana. With the latter may also be connected the term Shang-yüan (上源), in Annamese Thiang-ngucien, which, according to Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 539), was at one time the name of the western portion of Chan-ch'êng (Campâ). The name of Turân is now spelled 沙暹 T'o-nang; and that of its port, vulgarly known as Tai-fo (corrupt Chinese Hwei-p'û), is written 會安舖, Hweian-p'û.

Even the modern form, T'o-nang—in Annamese, Dâ-ung—tends to show that the original name, whether Sanskrit or Châm, must not have been very different from Da-lang, Da-yan, and, consequently, from the forms suggested above. The European way of spelling it Turân, Touron, etc., without the unaspirated t, would thus seem to be, as too often is the case, incorrect. For these reasons I am inclined to back Ptolemy's form, Throana, against the new-fangled one of our modern geographers. Whatever Ptolemy's failings be, there is no doubt—and these pages have repeatedly shown it—that he had a far higher sense of his mission, in so far as the spelling of proper names is concerned, than the modern continuators and improvers of his work have up to the present seemed to possess. Turân's original name must therefore have been something like Dravan or Dhrusvam. In this connection I may call attention to the fact that the Bhâgavata Purâña gives Dravâga as one of the tribal names in Krauenca-devâ (Professor Hall's edition of Wilson's "Viśu Purâña," vol. ii, p. 198).

³ Des Michels, op. cit., p. 154. Their remains are situated in the Djen-p'ihnêk division, close to Tai-fo Bay, lat. 15° 50'.
ruins of Bā-du; and several epigraphic records were also found in the environs of Turān itself.  

Doanas River, mouth (No. 119).

The course of this stream has been fully discussed in a preceding section (supra, p. 134 seq.). It is clear that the river referred to as debouching here is either the Dā-hàn (Kwāng-trī River) or the Hwē River having its outlet at Thwōn-ān (Thuān-an). Its Sanskrit name was probably Drōṇā or something similar. One should not be surprised at Ptolemy's mistake in making the Mē-Khōng disembogue here, when we see it repeated fully fifteen centuries after him in the map of the East Indies accompanying Mandelslo's travels.  

Though a stream is traced in that map in the place of the Mē-Khōng and made to flow out at the southern end of Kamboja, it is left without a name; on the other hand, a river described as “Langcang flu.,” evidently meant for the Mē-Khōng or Lan-ts'ang, is represented as rising in the centre of Tonkin and debouching at or a little above Hwē on the coast of Annam; that is, at the identical spot where Ptolemy placed the mouth of his Doanas.

It has been suggested 3 that Ptolemy's Doanas may be the Dyardanes mentioned by Quintus Curtius as flowing through the remotest parts of India (evidently India-extra-Gangem), and breeding crocodiles and dolphins, besides various aquatic monsters unknown to other nations. 4 And as the Dyardanes has been by several authorities 5 connected with the Oidanes of Artemidōros, who, according to Strabo, 6 described it as a river that bred the same creatures and flowed into the

---

1 Aymonier (in *Journal Asiatique*, Jan.–Feb., 1891, p. 86, note) says he received eight new rubbings of ancient inscriptions from the neighbourhood of Turān, as well as from the stela of Bā-du; but I have, so far, seen no account of them. They ought to contain some particulars as to the historical past of Turān.
2 "Voyage de Perse," etc., Amsterdam, Le Cène, 1727, pp. 8, 9.
3 McCrindle, op. cit., p. 209.
4 "Dyaranes [Dyardenes, Deardenes, var. lect.] minus celeber [sc. quam Indus] auditus est, quia per ultima Indiae currit; ceterum non crocodilos modo, uti Nilus, sed etiam delphinos ignotasque aliiis gentibus belluas alit" (lib. viii, ch. ix, 9).
5 C. Müller's *Strabo*, Ind. var. lect., p. 1,034.
6 Lib. xv, ch. i, 72.
Ganges, it has been concluded that both the Dyardanes and Oidanes were one and the same stream with the Doanas, and that such a stream was what is now termed the Brahmaputra. From a geographical point of view this identification would not be very objectionable in so far only, however, as the western branch of the Doanas is concerned, which, we have seen (p. 134 supra), Ptolemy has made to rise in Bépyrrhos, i.e. in the Southern Himālayas of Assam, a little to the east of Tawang. This branch stream, very likely intended to represent the Brahmaputra, our author may have by error made to join the eastern branch of the Doanas flowing down from the Damassa range, which is undoubtedly, both here and in its continuation below the confluence, the Mē-Không River. Linguistically, there is not an easily surmountable gap between the name Doanas on one side and the terms Dyardanes and Oidanes on the other. While both the latter may be etymologically referred to the Brahmaputra's upper course in Tibet, where it goes by the name of Yaru Ts'ang-po or Yaru Tsang-bu, and through the Himālayan gorges, where it becomes known as Dihong (possibly Yar-Dihong?)—terms not very dissimilar from Dyardanes, Yar-danes, or Yar-denës,1—I do not know how

1 It is evidently on the close similarity in sound between the first syllable Dyar and Yaru or Yar, the Tibetan word occurring as a prefix to other names of rivers besides the Ts'ang-po, e.g. the Yar-lung, one of its tributaries, that any attempt at establishing the etymological connection between the Dyardanes and the Brahmaputra must be based, rather than on artificial transpositions of letters in the names given by Curtius and Artemidóros, as has hitherto been done. McCrindle, for instance, ever intent to advocate the identity of the Doanas with the Dyardanes, again observes in his "Invasion of India by Alexander the Great" (2nd ed., p. 184, n. 2): "If the first two letters in Doanas be transposed, we get almost letter for letter the Oidanes of Artemidóros, and we get it again, though not so closely, if we discard r from the Dyardanes of Curtius. That these two writers had the same river in view is confirmed by their mentioning the very same animals as bred in its waters." Müller, in his turn (loc. cit.), having dwelt on the possible connection between Oidanes, Oiamanes, and Pliny's Doiamanes, thus comments upon Curtius' passage: "Itaque pro Oidāνes legendam videtur Διάνδανας vel fort. Διάνδρας. Literae AI, praecedente N, facile exciderunt." Another possible clue to the origin of the terms Dyardanes and Oidanes might be found in the fact that Di or Döi are the local Assamese and Kachår terms for 'water' often occurring as prefixes in the native names of streams in this region, as, e.g., in Di-hong or Di-hang, in Di-bang, and in Döi-ma (the 'mother of waters' or 'river mother'), the nickname given to the Brahmaputra by the Assamese, who apply to it also the Sanskrit designation Hīrango, meaning the 'Golden' (River). Döi-ma, it will be readily seen, is not very dissimilar to Oidanes and Oiamanes (or Doiamanes); while Dyardanes might
far the Brahmaputra could lay claim towards possessing the varied fauna ascribed by Curtius to the Dyardanes. I may, on the other hand, confidently submit that of all the great Indo-Chinese rivers the Mé-Không is the one that meets the case—or, at any rate, that does so in the most eminent degree. In the portion of its course which lies through Eastern Laos, in fact, the Mé-Không is famous for two kinds of large-sized and edible fish, which Oriental fancy may well have likened unto dolphins, termed Plâ Bûk and Plâ Rôm (i.e. Bûk and Rôm fish respectively), attaining on the average a weight of rather more than 120 lbs. and a length of some 10 to 12 feet.¹ Mermaids (in reality some kind of water-snakes) be etymologically referred to Di-hiranya, Doi-hiranya, or Di-haranya, the latter seeming to be the form in which the second part of the name is pronounced in Asam.

The term Jamuna (or Yamunâ) is, indeed, borne by what is now the chief channel of the Brahmaputra, after its leaving Asam and entering the plains, to its confluence with the Ganges (near the railway station at Goalanda); but this channel was, prior to the middle of the eighteenth century, a mere secondary branch of the main stream. It may, of course, have been the principal channel at a remoter date; however, no proof of this exists, neither is it possible to guess how far back into antiquity the name Yamunâ for this channel may be traced. Balfour's "Cyclopaedia of India" (3rd ed., vol. ii, p. 413) calls it also Jagni, probably a corrupted form of Jamunâ. But even in the event of this proving to be the original designation for the lower section of the Brahmaputra, it would not help one whit in establishing the pretended linguistic connection between the Dyardanes, Oidanes, or Iomanes, whatever the correct spelling of this river-name be, and the Doanas, which would remain quite a distinct river, it being rather an herculean task to make its name read Dowdanus, Doi-danas, or something similar. On the other hand, it would not be difficult to show that the term Iomanes, if it really be the correct equivalent of Oidanes, could apply just as well to the Doanas or Mé-Không, since there is positive proof (as shown above, p. 136) that this stream was also designated Yamunâ (Yamunâ-nadi).

¹ The Plâ Bûk appears to be a kind of sturgeon, and its roe is highly prized. It is by some people believed to ascend the course of the Mé-Không from the sea. Strabo (lib. xvii, ch. ii, 5) tells us that not only dolphins, but also the fishes he calls Krestes and Thrissa, used to ascend the course of the Nile from the sea, despite the crocodiles which kept in respect the other members of the marine fauna and prevented their entering the river.

Since I wrote the above there was issued by the Royal Geographical Society a book by Mr. McCarthy on "Surveying and Exploring in Siam" (London, 1900), where the reader will find on pp. 63-65 much interesting and detailed information about Mé-Không river-serpents, as well as on the Plâ Bûk and Plâ Rôm, the two fishes whose names have become well-nigh as famous in Indo-China as those of the Oxyrhynchus and Lepidotus of the Nile were in Egypt and, indeed, throughout the ancient Western world. See also Dr. LeFèvre's "Voyage au Laos," p. 152, where he speaks of Plâ Bûks of enormous size, "de six mètres de long."

As regards the many points of resemblance between the Mé-Không and the Nile, the parallel has been first drawn, I think, in so far at least as the annual
called Ngūak (i.e. Nāgas or Nāga-kanyaś) by the Lāu of Lūang P'hraḥ Bāng, are moreover said to haunt its upper waters, while crocodiles are plentiful almost all the way, but more especially from the point that the river enters Kamboja down to its mouths.¹ Large cetaceans, among which there may be dolphins, ascend its course from the sea and reach as far as the Great Lake during the period of the river’s overflow. As regards its possible connection in name with the Dyardanes, I have pointed out (p. 136 supra) that one of the names for the Mē-Khōng occurring in the old Lāu chronicles is Khara-nadī, while the districts it flows through in south-western Yūnnan once bore designations approaching those recorded by Marco Polo under the forms respectively of Carajan and Cardandan, Zardandan, or Ardandan, after which the Mē-Khōng may well have been termed. It will be observed how closely these names, especially the last two, approach Dyardanes (or Zardanes) and Oidanes. Another possible connection may be pointed out with Jotana (Jyotana, overflow is concerned, by Camoens, who, as everyone knows, was wrecked at the Mē-Khōng’s mouths in A.D. 1556. Sings the immortal bard—

"Vês passa por Camboja Meconu rio,
Que capitão das aguas se interpreta;
Tantas recebe d’outro só no estio,
Que alaga os campos largos, e inquieta:
Tem as enchentes, quese o Nilo frio:
Agente delle crê, como indiscreta,
Que pena e gloria tem despois de morte
As brutos animaes de toda sorte."

Os Lusiadas, canto x, estancia 127.

¹ I have since noticed that , ngūak, is employed by the ‘Shāns’ (Thai) of Upper Burmā to designate a crocodile (see Cushing’s “Shan and English Dictionary,” Rangoon, 1881, p. 121, a.v.). This term becomes ngīk in the Pai-i (Thai of Yūnnan) dialect, wherein it denotes the same reptile (vide F. W. K. Müller’s “Vocabularien der Pa-yi und Pah-poh Sprachen” in Tonung Pau, vol. iii, p. 30). This evidence tends to show that ngūak is more probably the Thai corruption of the Sanskrit nakra, or Pāli nakka = crocodile, than of Nāga as surmised above, and that originally it had this sense in Lāu as well. Such being the case, the title of the Mē-Khōng to identification with Curtius’ crocodile-breeding river Dyardanes becomes further justified.
Zodana, Iodana)-pura\(^1\) or Chiang Rung (supra, p. 138), from whose classical designation the Mē-Không may well have borrowed one of its names, as it took its well-known appellation of Kau-lung or Kiu-lung Kiang from the vulgar one Chiang Rung. Finally, on the hypothesis of a quite possible error in transcription which resulted in a \(A\) being substituted for an original initial \(A\) in the Greek MS. whence Curtius probably drew his information, or owing to some other cause whereby the reading Dyardanes came to take the place of a preceding one having the form Lyardanes, Landzanes, or something to that effect, it would be easy to connect these terms with Lan-ts'ang, the time-honoured name of the Mē-Không under its variæ lectiones Lân-ch'äng, Landzang, Landjian, etc. It plainly follows from this discussion that Curtius' Dyardanes, whether the same with Artemidóros' Öidanes or not, may be the Brahmaputra just as well as the Mē-Không, but more likely the latter, especially if the circumstance be kept in view that Curtius says nothing about its joining the Ganges, and speaks of it as if it were quite an independent river from the latter. The possible fact of Curtius having learned the existence of the Mē-Không at the extreme eastern borders of India (as the extent of this region was understood in his days), need not cause surprise when it is kept in mind that by the time he wrote his history (early in the first century A.D.) intercourse had been going on between the valley of the Upper Mē-Không and Assam or Bengal for several hundred years, as proved by the multifarious indications which have from time to time been alluded to in these pages. Thanks to such active intercourse, the existence of so imposing a watercourse as the Mē-Không must have become well known in both Assam and Bengal; and as a result of this, we have seen (supra, pp. 138, 139) that Chiang Rung came to be given a name taken from an Asamese city. In the same manner, it may be presumed, the river flowing past it (i.e. the

---

\(^1\) For Zodana witness, e.g., the spelling Zodinagara (for Joti-nagara) adopted by McLeod in his report (Parliamentary Papers, 1869, pp. 72, 78).
Mê-Không) may have been designated by the very identical terms belonging to the stream (i.e. the Brahmaputra) washing the Asamese counterpart of the Further-Indian Raṅgāvari, Raṅgämati, or Prājyotis-pur.¹ This hypothesis would

¹ See above, p. 138. Prājyotis-pur on the Brahmaputra is now called Gauhati. As regards the name Khurānqa-mǎlī-nadā for the Mê-Không referred to above (p. 138), it evidenty is the one that gave origin to the term Kau-lang or Ku-lang (Chi-lung)-Kiāng by which the Chinese designate at times that river. From the fact that they use it also to denote Chi-hieng Rung it would appear that Khurānqa or Khurānqa-mǎlī was originally one of the alternative names for that district. In any case, its Chinese form proves to be a simple phonetic transcript, and should not be taken to mean ‘Nine Dragons’ or ‘Nine Dragon River’, respectively, as Sinologists delight to translate it. Colborne Baber—small blame to him—is among the chief sinners in this respect. From the extract he quotes (Supplementary Papers, Royal Geographical Society, vol. i, pt. 1, p. 186) from the “Yünnan Topography,” a Chinese work published under the Ming dynasty, it appears that the mountains at whose foot Chi-hieng Rung is situated were called the Kau-lang or Ku-lang Shan—or, as he puts it, ‘Nine Dragon Hills.’ The Mê-Không above this point, we are told in the same passage, was called the ‘Black Water’ (Hia- Shwe?)—unfortunately the original Chinese name is not given, so that we are unable to institute comparisons). De Véría (”Frontière Sino-Annamite,” p. 119), quoting from Chinese sources, refers to the same Kau-lang or Ku-lang Hills as being the place where the descendants of Ku-lang (the second part of this name is written with a different character), the ancestor of the Ai-Lao people, settled and gave origin to the ninety-nine tribes whence sprang afterwards the kingdom of Nan-Chao. In all likelihood, therefore, Khurānqa, the term transcribed Kau-lang or Ku-lang by the Chinese, was the name of the hill-range on the outskirts of Chi-hieng Rung, and it was thence transferred to the Mê-Không flowing past its foot. Khurānqa-mǎlī or Khurānqa-mǎla may mean ‘Highlands of Khurānqa.’ Under the form Khurānqa-mǎla, or Khurānqa-mǎli, this toponymic appears in Buddhistic literature (see, e.g., the Supparāka-Jātaka, No. 463) as the name of a half mythical sea off the west coast of India, wherein ‘fish with bodies like men, and sharp razor-like snouts’ and diamonds are to be found. It is just possible that it was thence adopted as a name for the Mê-Không, on account of the strange beings said to inhabit its waters, or else of the ‘razor-like cutting power’ of the stream. It would be interesting to find out whether the term Khurānqa is at all connected with the name of the half mythical ancestor of the Ai-Lao whose descendants settled on these highlands, or whether it is an Indā imported term belonging to the set of Raṅgāmati, etc. I may point out that Ku-lang is the same personage as the Kun-lang whom the Mao Shans (Thai Man) acknowledge as their progenitor (see Ney Elias’ “History of the Shans,” p. 13 seq.); while the Kun-lang or Ku-lang mountains find their counterpart in the Korung or Chorai Korung Hill (located by tradition in the Patkoi Range, south from the ancient capital of Asam), on the summit of which the Ahom branch of the Thai race believe that their ancestor Khun-tai (practically the same as Kun-lang and Ku-lang) alighted when descending from heaven (loc. cit., p. 31). The spelling Korung occurring in the Ahom legend for the name of the mountain where the Thai people had their cradle, is sufficient evidence to show that the Chinese term Ku-lang or Ku-lang is really a transcript of an original non-Chinese mountain name such as Kurung, Kurung, and, in all probability, Khurānqa, as surmised above.

At p. 135 supra, I have left the Chinese term Shēn-K’un⁰ Chiang, sometimes applied to the Mê-Không, unexplained. It has since occurred to me that it must mean the ‘River of Chi-hieng Không,’ this being the name of a well-known town,
explain the fact, noticed above, of the name Yamunā or Jamnā being common to both the Mē-Khōng and the Brahmaputra. Owing to such a homonymy these streams may have been frequently confounded in the accounts of travellers. And owing to it, again, Ptolemy may have mistaken the Brahmaputra for a tributary of the Mē-Khōng, and may thus have been led to make of it the western branch of his Doanas. But from all this it does not at all follow that the main body of this stream can be in any way connected with the Brahmaputra. That geographically it is the Mē-Khōng, and that its name, as recorded by Ptolemy, can be identified with the designations borne, either by tribes settled on its banks or by localities lying along the course assigned to it by the Alexandrian geographer, we have, it is hoped, conclusively demonstrated. By way of postscript, I may add here that a tribe bearing the name of Duan or Doan (noted as Douon in Pavie's map) still exists in the hill-tracts of the Mē-Khōng watershed due west of Hwē or Thwōn-ān, the point at which, as we have shown, Ptolemy fixed the Mē-Khōng's outlet.

and a pretty ancient foundation too, on the Mē-Khōng, not far below C'hieung Sên, and in about 20° 16' North lat. There now remain only the term Fêng and Colborne Baber's enigmatical 'Black Water' to be dealt with, in order to complete the decipherment of the rich terminology belonging to the Mē-Khōng River. The epithet 'Black Water' appears to have been applied also to either the Irāvati or the Brahmaputra, but more likely to the latter, as may be inferred from the following passage occurring in an article, based upon Chinese sources, on "Manchu Relations with Tibet," which appeared in the Journal China Branch R.A.S., vol. xxi, p. 249:—" ... the 'Great' Golden Sand River (or Irawaddy) rises in the south [frontier of Tibet], flowing through Burma to the sea. The Yarn-tsang-pu, which runs through Tibet, is an upper branch of the same stream, which is also called the 'Black Water,' and is much larger than the 'Small' Golden Sand River which joins the Yang-tsze." The translator or compiler, who is Mr. E. H. Parker, has here taken the 'Great' Golden Sand River—or Ta-Kin-sha, as it is probably called in the Chinese text—to be the Irāvati; but it will be seen that the Brahmaputra is probably meant, from the fact that the Yarn-ts'ang-pu is considered to be an upper branch of that stream, and that the Brahmaputra goes in Asam by the alternative name of Hiranše, the 'Golden,' as pointed out above (p. 282). The Irāvati, furthermore, can hardly be said to be larger than the Yang-tsze, while the Brahmaputra would be easily looked upon in that light. In any case, the designation 'Black Water' may have been applied also to what was considered to be the upper branch of either, i.e. the Yarn-ts'ang-pu. On this assumption, the Mē-Khōng and the Brahmaputra would prove to possess yet another epithet in common.
Kortatha Métropolis (No. 118).

I have already pointed out that this city corresponds to Chiu-tê or Kiu-tê (九德), in Annamese Kâu-duk, the ancient name of the town and district now called Hai-tin (河靜). It is mentioned early in the Annals of Annam⁴ as one of the fifteen bô or divisions of the ancient kingdom of Van-lang, founded, it is pretended, upwards of fifteen centuries B.C. After the Chinese conquest it is alleged to have formed part of the ch'un of Jih-nan; to have been next erected into a separate ch'un by the Wu² in circa A.D. 270, and again belittled into a simple district by the Liang (circa A.D. 502). But, as we have previously observed, this dependence was, at least in the early days, merely nominal if ever; for in reality the territory belonged to the Châm. In fact, the annals say that at the time of the Wu dynasty (A.D. 229-265) the Kâu-duk and adjoining districts were dangerous and impenetrable; the Liao barbarians that occupied them were indomitable and knew no fear; they could not be tackled for centuries.³ It was only Tao-hwang, one of the Wu generals sent to subdue Kiao-chi in 260-270 A.D., who succeeded, according to the same source, in coercing the refractory districts. We must conclude then, on the strength of the above information, that Kiu-tê as a town or district had long existed prior to the beginning of the Christian era; and that in spite of the trumpeted Chinese conquest of the whole of Tonkin in 111 B.C., Kiu-tê was still in the hands of the Lâu, Lôi, Lôi, or Lê—i.e. the Châm⁴—as late as 260 or 270 A.D. It must consequently

---

¹ Des Michels, op. cit., p. 3.
² Ibid., p. 107.
⁴ The Lâu, as the early confederates of the Northern Châm, had also a finger in the pie, as will be shown directly. I have taken the Lâu referred to in the above extract to be the Châm, as it appears from the descriptions given of the Liao or Lâu (獠, 獠) by Chinese authors, that these were populations of the Ch'ieng or Môn-Annam race, who should be connected with the Laua, Li, or Lôi (黎), etc., and not with the Lâu (牢, 老, or 老), as has been hitherto recklessly done by Sinologists. Devéria ("Frontière Sino-Annamite,"
have formed part of the kingdom of Upper Campā down to at least the last-mentioned date, if not to A.D. 446, as would appear from the evidence adduced at the outset of the present section. Hence it is reasonable to identify Kortatha Métropolis with the capital of that kingdom.

We have shown that, whereas Chinese historiographers would fain make us believe that the kingdom of Lin-i was not founded till A.D. 137, or even so late as 220 circē, by the rebellious native chief Ch'ü-lien, the old records, whether Chinese or Annamese, state that Lin-i was chastised and its capital taken, as early as A.D. 43, by Ma-yūan. We have furthermore drawn attention (supra, p. 127) to the fact that the Lūang P'hraḥ Bāng chronicles ascribe the establishment of the kingdom of Lin-i—or, as they style it, Cūlaṇi, Cūḷāmaṇi, or Cullamālini—to the leader of the eastern branch of the Thai emigration, whose name, I take this opportunity to add, is given as Chū-sōng. I have been lucky enough to find the counterpart of this tradition as to the exodus of the Thai people from Yūnnan and their

pp. 112 f., 114) confounds both these peoples into one on the assumption that the character 𧘔 is also pronounced Lào or Lāu. As a matter of fact, this only occurs nowadays among the Annamese, who, however, more generally pronounce it Liên. So may one hold, for analogous reasons, that the Lāu (Lāca) are the same people as the Lāvu (Lavā). Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., pp. 107-112) speaks of the Lāo as being a hill people, wonderful mountain-climbers, head-hunters, cannibals to the extent of eating their deceased relatives, honouring dogs and offering them up in sacrifices, practising couvadism—all characteristics still to be met with to a certain extent among the wild Wah, the Karens (dog-worship), and other hill tribes of the Ch'iang stock, but never among the Lāu.* Ma Tuan-lin adds, moreover, that there are two classes of Lāo, to wit, the valley-dwelling, and those living on the mountain slopes, representing the unconquered and wildest portion of them. Both classes are to this day exemplified in the Khā Dô and Thất Hâci divisions of the Lāvu (vide supra, p. 58, n. 2). I think it is high time that Sinologists should be persuaded to draw a line of distinction between two so widely different peoples as the Liên and Lāu. Indo-Chinese ethnology would profit a good deal thereby, and be assisted to rise from the muddled state it is now in.

* Marco Polo mentions, it is true, couvadism as being practised in his day among the people of Zar tandem or 'Golden Teeth,' at Fuzian (Yung-ch'ang of the Chinese and Wūn-ch'āng of the Lāu); but it is probably to the Lāvu and tribes of Miao stock inhabiting that district that his remarks more particularly apply. N.B. that Colquhoun mentions the couvade as existing among the Miao.
subsequent spread over the surrounding countries, in the legend given in the chronicles of the Nan-Chao as regards the kingdoms founded by the sons of Ti Méng-chü;¹ and I have by this means got hold at last of the hitherto missing link connecting Nan-Chao with Lương P'hraḥ Băng history. The names of the chiefs alleged to have established the various kingdoms are somewhat transposed in the two

¹ See Devéría's "Frontière Sino-Annamite," p. 118 seq., where a far more detailed and clear account has been given of this important group of traditions than the one I had to make use of, for want of anything better at the time being, at p. 123 above. If Devéría is correct in making Jên-keo a descendant of Méng Chü-sung, we would obtain the approximate date of n.c. 200 for the advent of the latter's brother Méng Chü-lin in Lin-i, and consequently also of his other brother Khán Lô at Lương P'hraḥ Băng; our estimate at pp. 127 and 128 supra thereby receiving ample confirmation.

Since coming to the above conclusion my attention was drawn to the "Histoire des Princes du Yum-nan," compiled chiefly from local sources by M. E. Rocher, of which the first instalment appeared in the T'oung Pao for March, 1899. I was not a little surprised to find that in this valuable compilation a mess has been made of the dates concerning Ch'uang K'tiao's conquest of Yünnan (which is placed towards the beginning of the Christian era, whereas it occurred so far back as n.c. 315 or thereabouts) and the deposition of his descendant Ch'üang Kiang in favour of the above-mentioned Jên-keo. The latter event, having taken place under the Western Han emperor Wu Ti's rule (n.c. 140–86), is instead attributed by Rocher to the Eastern Han Kwang Wu Ti's reign (A.D. 25–68), and thus the history of the intervening period is, as far as Yünnan is concerned, thrown into a hopeless muddle. We have here a fairly instructive example of the care that the unwary student should exercise before accepting as thoroughly reliable the results arrived at, as regards Indo-Chinese history and kindred topics, by Chinese scholars, however they may have distinguished themselves in other fields. Fortunately, in the present instance there is the evidence from Chinese historical works coming to our assistance in re-establishing the above events at their proper chronological places. Apart from this blemish, Rocher gives us the important information (p. 16) that Jên-keo was Méng Chü-sung's grandson. Bearing, therefore, in mind that Méng Chü-sung is alleged to have been, in his turn, the grandson of A-yu (Asoka) of Magadha, we get for the accession of Méng Chü-sung at Pêh-ngai and the establishment of his brothers Méng Chü-lin and Khán Lô in Lin-i and Lương P'hraḥ Băng respectively, a date about midway between those of Asoka and Jên-keo; say, between n.c. 325 and 125 or n.c. 259–125, according to whether we follow the Buddhist chronology or adhere to the views of Western scholars on the date of Asoka's coronation. These two sets of chronological data yield on the one hand the year n.c. 226, and on the other n.c. 192, as mean resultants. I am strongly inclined to adopt the former date, i.e. n.c. 225, as the one probably nearer the truth. This for the reason that Lin-i, whether as a district or kingdom, is mentioned by Chinese historians as being already in existence in n.c. 214, whence it follows that it must have been founded somewhat earlier than that period. Of course, in coming to this conclusion, I am guided by the fact that the true original name of this kingdom was, as I have demonstrated, of Indi derivation, and therefore in accordance with the tradition that the kingdom was founded by a prince of Indian descent, as Méng Chü-lin is represented to have been; and it goes without saying that I reject as utterly unacceptable the Chinese version, according to which the ch'in of Lin-i was established by the Ta'in in n.c. 214.
accounts, and the locations assigned to the kingdoms themselves do to a certain extent disagree; but the substance of the story is practically the same, this being in itself sufficient evidence that both accounts have been derived from an identical source. The same remark applies to the modified versions of the same legend still surviving among the Thai of Upper Burmä and Asam, to which we have adverted in a preceding section. As regards the eastern branch of the emigration with which we are concerned at present, the Nan-Chao chronicle places it under the leadership of Chü-lin, or Meng Chü-lin (蒙直林), and ascribes to it the foundation of the kingdom of Kiao-chi, whereas it makes Meng Chü-sung (蒙直頌)—evidently the same personage with the Chü-sông of the Lüang Phraha Bâng account—thefounder of the Pai-tsz, or Pêh-tsz (白子), kingdom, with capital at Pêh-ngai, over which his almost immediate descendant Jên-kuo (仁果) was reigning, as we have seen (supra, p. 123), in b.c. 122, being shortly afterwards (b.c. 109) established by the Han emperor Wu Ti as king over Tien (Yünnan).

The designation of Kiao-chi as the kingdom founded by Meng Chü-lin is, no doubt, an oversight on the part of the Nan-Chao chroniclers, for Kiao-chi was, down to b.c. 258, but a district of the ancient realm of Van-lâng represented to have been conquered that year by Asoka himself, who, according to Lâu accounts, almost immediately withdrew, leaving it intact, or, according to the Annamese records, set down to rule it himself. Whatever may have been the real state of matters, however, this realm was overthrown in b.c. 208 by the Ta'in general Chao-t'îo, who the following year proclaimed himself king of Nan-yüeh (Nâm-viet), with capital at P'an-yû (Canton); and from that period down to the Han conquest of b.c. 111 Kiao-chi, with the adjoining districts as far south as Kâu-chôn (Thaï-hwâ).  

1 The Annamese Annals (Des Michels, op. cit., p. 23) include also Hsiang and Lin-i in the new kingdom's territory; but a few lines further on state that in b.c. 198 Trieu-du (Chao-t'îo) appointed delegates with full powers to control
formed part of the Nan-yüeh kingdom. It is not therefore very likely that Meng Chü-lin could have set himself up as king of Kiao-chi at some time between B.C. 225 and 200; and viewing this toponymic as a mere generic term resorted to by the Nan-Chao Chroniclers in order to designate—without any aim at precision—the approximate location of the realm founded by Meng Chü-lin, I prefer to follow the Luang Phrañ Bâng version, which states Culañi to have been the kingdom in question, otherwise known as the country of Keu Ch'ông-bua, or Kêu Kôt-thê Thên-bua. I take the expression Kêu Ch'ông-bua to mean the Kiao (交 Chiao) people of Chiem-bâ (占波 or 越 or Campê. Thên-bua, literally meaning ‘Lotus-throne’ in Lâu, seems to be more likely a phonetic transcript of Thañ-hwâ (清 化, Ch'îng-hwa); while Kêu Kôt-thê evidently implies the Kiao people or district of Kau-têk, or Kâu-duk (九 德, Chiu-tê), Ptolemy’s Kortatha, now Hà-tiên. Some of the chronicles add, moreover, the explanation that this country is also called Anâm Prakan, or Prakung. By this, I think, that part of (modern) Annamese territory once constituting the district of Pêi-king, or Pi-kin (比 景, Pi-ching, pron. Tî-kân by the Annamese), is meant. Originally forming part of the chûn of Jih-nan (B.C. 111), this district was made to include the whole of the latter’s territory under the Sui, and thus the erstwhile chûn of Jih-nan became henceforward known by the name of chûn of Pi-ching, or Pi-kin. Later on it was incorporated with Chan-ch’êng, or Campê.¹ It must have therefore corresponded to Ngô-an and Hà-tiên,

the affairs of Jâu-ch’ê (Kiao-chi) and Kâu-chôn, and say nothing about either Hsiang or Lin-i. This circumstance I take as evidence that the boundaries of the Nan-yüeh kingdom could not very well have extended beyond Thañ-hwâ at the utmost.

¹ See Des Michels, op. cit., p. 51. The Annamese Annalists regard the two terms Jih-nan and Pi-ching as almost synonymous, the former meaning ‘[situated to the] south of the sun,’ and the latter ‘shadow [falling] below’ [i.e. to the south]. The translator explains “ombre correspondante.”
with perhaps the northern part of Kwâng-bîn included. At one time the toponymic Pi-kin, Prakan, or Prakûng seems to have been employed not only by the Lâu of Lûâng P'hrah Bâng, but also by the neighbouring nations of Western Indo-China, to designate that southern part of Kiao-chî, or Tonkin, comprising, in fact, the districts just named. The Burmese, we are told, used to apply the term 'Kio-pagan' (i.e. Kêu Pakan or Kiao Pi-kin) to Tonkin itself. But this was probably only a generic designation, meaning more appropriately the southern part of that region. The same remark applies, I should think, to the other term, Kio Kâzêh ( كال_K), given by Judson as the Burmese name for Tonkin and its native inhabitants. Kâzêh cannot here mean Kê-chô (Kesho), as might be thought at first sight, because the name of this capital is written in a different

1 The Annamese Annals (loc. cit.) would give us to understand that the territory of the ancient chên of Pi-chîng, or Tî-kâñ, is nowadays represented by the districts of Kwâng-bîn and Kwâng-trî. There has ever been a tendency among native historians, whether Chinese or Annamese, to assign to Jîh-nan a far more southern position than it has ever occupied, in the endeavour to show that the dominions of their race extended farther than has really been the case. Not only did our Sinologists blindly follow these historians' erring footsteps, but, dazzled by Chinese bombast and tinsel, they even exceeded the native overestimate. Thence it comes that we are told in the works of the said Sinologists how Jîh-nan was Kwâng-nâm (Journal China Branch R.A.S., vol. xxi, p. 41), or "Quang-bình and Phu-yên [!] with all between" (China Review, vol. xx, p. 328), Lin-i, or Campâ, comprising "the modern Kann-hoa and Binh-thân," and so forth. In a similar strain even the scholarly Chavannes, having laid down the apodictic premise that Jîh-nan "correspond au Quang-nam actuel," concludes that "il est donc probable que Pi-king [i.e. Pi-chîng, or Tî-kâñ] est le port connu aujourd'hui sous le nom de Tournan [!!]" ("Voyages des Pêlerins Bouddhistes," p. 108, n. 1). It is to be hoped that the foregoing critical examination of Châm history will luminously prove to him and his over-zealous colleagues that Lin-i, or Chau-ch'êng, or Campâ, included in her haleyon days something more than Khan-hwâ and Bîn-thwôn; and that their exaggerated notion as to the extension of Jîh-nan must suffer not a few clippings ere it is brought within the bounds of historical truth.

2 In the abstract from Mr. Gibson's Journal given by Crawfurd in his "Embassy to Siam and Cochinchina," vol. ii, p. 437.

3 Burmese-English Dictionary, Rangoon, 1883, pp. 139 and 713.
way, viz. 令1; nor can it evidently stand for Kiao-
chi; but is more likely intended for Chiu-té, Kót-thé, or
Kortatha. The latter being the capital, and at one time
the chief district of an independent kingdom, it is but
natural that its name should have spread far and wide and
become employed to designate the surrounding territory,
and even Tonkin as a whole, in preference to the term
Kiao-chi, which at best denoted but a province of the Chinese
empire, and was specifically a tribal name rather more than
a toponymic. It was only in the former character that it
survived among neighbouring nations, and thus when these
speak of the Kiao, Kêu, Kió, etc., it must be understood
that they refer to the people,2 and not to the territory, of
Tonkin; a people, by the way, who were in the early days
composed purely of Môn-Annam, i.e. Ch'ien, or Chăm
elements, and not of the hybrid Sino-Indo-Chinese breed
constituting the modern Annamese. The same occurred
with the terms Prakan, An-nam, and Tonkin, which only
became known to foreign nations as soon as the cities or
regions which they designated set up as independent States.
Although Prakan is given as a synonym of Kót-thé or
Kortatha in the Lüang P'hraḥ Bâng chronicles—and it
is quite possible that it was so at the period when the
whole of Jih-nan was included under that denomination
—the original district or city known as Prakan or Pi-kin was,
under the Western Han period, but a small
subdivision of the chūn of Jih-nan alleged to have

1 Burm.-Eng. Dict., p. 713.
2 The inhabitants of Cochin-China, says McLeod in his Journal (op. cit.,
p. 39), are called Mên and Kio at Ch'ien-m'ai. These terms should be read
Mên and Kêu. The chronicles of Ch'ien Sên, I may here add, speak of one
of the former kings of that country, Khôn Chûang by name, as having made war
upon the Kêu Mên or Kêu Mên Tâ-tôk, and set up to reign in the country of the
Kêu Phâkan (or Kêu Prakan) for seventeen years. His coronation as king of the
Kêu Phâkan is placed in the year Kêh-yi, and 496 of the Culla era = A.D. 1134.
From this it would appear that the Kêu Mên were the people of Pi-kin and
Chiâng. I cannot trace the puzzling racial name Mên elsewhere than in the
Chinese Mân and in the name of a tribe on the Annam frontier called Mên
by the Lâu.
been established in B.C. 111, and as such is said to have been situated to the north of Lin-i, then called Hsiang-lin. For this reason I am inclined to identify Prakan with Ptolemy's Pagrassa, the city or seaport which will be treated on under the next paragraph. Like Kot-thê, it was a Lâu foundation and formed part of the kingdom of Culañi, as evidenced by the frequent relations it had with the Lâu kingdoms lying beyond its western borders; hence,

1 See Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 49-50.
2 So states Chavannes, op. cit., p. 108.
3 Especially with the kingdom of Muang Phuên or Ch'hieng Khêâng, situated between the Lüang Phra-phao Bang State and the Nghê-ân district. I always thought that this kingdom had something to do with Ptolemy's Bareukors, especially as its people are called Phuên (or Läu Phûen), this being very likely an old tribal name belonging to the early inhabitants of Ch'hieng stock, connected with those of the tribes of the Black River called Phü-ôr or Phu-ô (sometimes spelled Pou-ôrh by French writers), of the Pu-na (清那) or Po-la (see Devéria, op. cit., p. 116) and, perhaps, of the Pu-ôrh or Pu-ôrl (清珥) of the Chinese, whose name still survives in Pu-ôrh-Fu, away in S.W. Yunnan.

The Phuên or Ch'hieng Khêâng kingdom was, according to the Lüang Phra-phao Bang chronicles, established by Khun Chet-chhuang, another of Khun Borom's sons, and therefore brother to the founders of the Lüang Phra-phao Bang and Culañi kingdoms. For this reason amicable relations existed for a long while between Culañi or Prakan, and Phuên. But, according to one account, later on dissensions broke forth, and two princesses from Prakan, at the head of a strong army, invaded the country of Phuên. They were victorious despite the efforts of Thau Yi, a descendant of Chet-chhuang, the original founder of the realm, who was then on the throne. This war was, however, brought to a close by the marriage of Thau Yi with the two gallant princesses, a union that resulted in the fusion of the two kingdoms. Thus the sway of the Phuên Lâu seems to have extended at one time to the shores of the Tonkin Gulf. Dr. Lefèvre, in alluding to the above events, adds a tradition collected locally which seems to confirm them. There are to be found in the Nam Nga in the Phuên district, he says ("Voyage au Laos," Paris, 1898, pp. 296-7), many objects in cut stone, sword-hilts, etc., remaining, it is stated, from the wars that took place between Prakan and Phuên. The Phuên State was finally annexed to Lüang Phra-phao Bang by King Fû-nym in a.d. 1355.

A manuscript chronicle from Ch'hieng-mai tells us how a prince from Culañi, by the name of Chhin Khum-deng (i.e. 'Prince Red Gold'), having gone westwards in pursuit of a golden deer, reached as far as the site where the city of Ch'hieng-mai rose long afterwards, and settled in that neighbourhood, founding there a city which was named Muan Lân-nâ, or 'City of the Rice-fields Plain.' After many generations the town disappeared through subsidence of the ground, and its site became a lake. A new capital was built near by, and in this some
I think, the reason why its name, Prakan, was also used by the Lão to designate the State of Cûlanî. It is, no doubt, owing to the active intercourse existing in the early days between Cûlanî and those Lão kingdoms, as well as to the tradition of their common origins through their having been founded by rulers belonging to the same family, that the various instances of homonymy between them and their capital cities we have noticed in a preceding section (supra, pp. 146–147) have sprung forth. It would not be surprising if it should turn out that the change which took place in the name of the Lin-i district into Hsiang-lin soon after B.C. 111 had some connection with the amalgamation of Müang P’hüen with Prakan, brought about by the marriage of the P’hüen king with the warlike Prakan princesses mentioned in the last footnote (p. 295). Was it through this event that Lin-i, having become part and parcel of Lân-c’hâng, received from the latter its new name, turned by the Chinese, according to the genius of their language, into C’hâng-lan or Hsiang-lin? And was it through some similar event, but perhaps with inverse issues, that the name of Cûdâmâla or Cûdâmâ-naagara was transferred from Chiu-tê or Kêl-tê to Lúang P’hrah Băng, or vice versa, given that the conjecture about Lúang P’hrah Băng having at some time or other borne such a name is correct? I shall not attempt to answer these puzzling questions, which I gladly leave to future inquirers to definitely settle by further and more far-reaching researches into the ancient history of the regions concerned. Suffice for the present to establish the fact that Cûdâmâ-naagara is evidently but one of

generations afterwards the king of Mên Tû-tôk was invited to come and reign. But his rule did not last long, as he was assassinated and a local chief put in his stead on the throne. These events must have taken place during the early centuries of the Christian Era.

It will appear from the above traditions that the State of Prakan (Pî-kin) or Cûlanî (Lin-i) must have occupied in its early days the territories of the present Thân-hwâ, Ngâ-ân, and Hà-ťûn districts; and that although inhabited by a O’hiêng or Châm population, the ruling element must have been Lâu, its kings claiming descent from the Indû dynasty which, in the third century B.C., ruled in Yûnnan.
the many variants of the toponymic Chiu-tê, Kót-thê, Kâu-dûk, etc., blended with the term Mâla or Mâlni; wherefore its correct and full form would seem to be Cúgâmâla, Cúgâmâlini, Cûlâmâlini, or Cullâmâlini. From this, I think, the defective readings Cûlanî, Cûlanî, Cûlâmâni, Cûgâmâni, and the Chinese Lin-i originated. Campâ and Campâmâlini only came into use, perhaps, later on, when the capital was transferred further down the coast to Campânagara or Campâ-puri,¹ the Chinese Chun-chêng (占城), and Annamese Chiêm-thân; but as this city would also be designated by the epithets Mâlini and Lomapâda belonging to the old capital, coupled or not with its name, as e.g. in Campâmâlini, the Chinese would continue to call the country, or its capital, Lin-i, and the Annamese Lôm-ôp, Lom-op, or Lam-op, using these terms as alternative designations for Chun-chêng and Chiêm-thân respectively. At this later period we find Campâ generally styled in Lâu records the kingdom of Cûlanî Brahmadatta, and its king Phrayâ Campâdhirâja.²

¹ An event which probably happened, as surmised above, in A.D. 446.
² Francis Garnier, in referring to the sîtra relating to the foundation of the Phânom stûpa (Thât Phâm or Dhatu Phâmû) in his "Voyage d'exploration" (edited by Léon Garnier, p. 222), wrongly spells the first of the designations above alluded to Chomrâkî Phûnomat, and says: "La tradition veut que Chomrâkî Phûnomat [sic] soit un pays Annamite." In some of the Lâu ground chronicles occurs the form Cûlanî Brahmadatta-râja, evidently meant for Cûlanî Brahmadatta-ratha. I am of opinion that Brahmadatta here represents the name of the Châm king given as Phâm-hô-dât (Phâm-hô-dât) in the Annamese Annals (Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 114–117). It was this ruler who in A.D. 399, according to the same Annals, attacked Jih-nam and invaded the district of Kûn-dûk, from which he was repelled by the Chinese governor of Kiao-chî. In A.D. 413 he renewed his raids, but was defeated in A.D. 415, and Lin-i is said to have finally submitted and become a tributary in A.D. 420 (ibid., pp. 119, 120). It is not improbable that owing to his warlike exploits King Brahmadatta came to be looked upon as a national hero, and his name associated with that of the country for the time being, while among neighbouring States it survived much longer, being regarded as part of the name of Campâ, otherwise Cûlanî. I cannot avoid, while on this subject, drawing attention to the fact that there is a very decided Buddhistic ring about the name Cûlanî-Brahmadatta adopted here as the designation for the kingdom, whereas it occurs in the Mahâsaddha-Jâtaka as the personal name (or title?) of the king of Pâñcâla when that country was in war with Videha and its capital Mithilâ. Such a coincidence would seem to point out that in ancient India Cûlanî may have been likewise a toponymic, perhaps an alternative designation for either Pâñcâla or Angâ (Campâ, whether in Angâ or Kashmir).

In another section of his book, where he gives a brief account of the foundation of the stûpa on the Yông hill (Thât-, or Dhatu-, Chôm-Yông), from the Mûang Yông Chronicle, Garnier says (op. cit., p. 402) that Aśoka, after having conquered
The identity of Cuñanî with Chiú-te or Kâu-duûk and the Lin-i or Upper Campá kingdom that we have thus far demonstrated on geographical, historical, and linguistical grounds, receives further confirmation from the similarity in names between the Chû-sûng and Chû-lin of, respectively, the Lûang Phra Phoảng Bâng and Nan-Chao chronicles—but more especially of the latter—and the rebellious Chù-lien to whom the foundation of the kingdom of Lin-i is ascribed by the Chinese annalists. It will readily be seen that the initial term in all these names is Chu or Chū. Hence we may well surmise that Chù-lien was very likely a descendant of either Chû-lin or Chû-sûng, whatever the correct name of the original founder of the Lin-i—Campá kingdom may have been. The Chinese account followed by Ma Tuan-lin¹ describes Chù-lien as the son of a kung-tsăn, receiver of taxes for the hsien (district) of Hsüan-lin, and spells his name Chù, adding that Chù was his family appellation. The date of his rebellion and enthronement as king of Lin-i is placed in the last years of the Eastern Han dynasty (i.e. towards A.D. 221). Other Chinese texts, according to Chavannes,² refer to a Chù-lien (with the second character in his name differently written) who likewise rebelled in A.D. 137, but met with failure, the Chinese governor of Tonkin having succeeded in restoring

the country of Yûn-nan, vide supra, pp. 64 and 121), turned his arms against Mûang Kên (Kiao-chi), whose king, in utter despair, committed suicide. But Aûoka resuscitated him, and “lui rendit son royauime qu’il appela Chûlanî.” We shall show in one of the following paragraphs that this episode is to be connected with the invasion ascribed by the Annamese annalists to the king of Shû in n.c. 258. The authorities just referred to say, however, that the Shû potentate, having overthrown the Phû-sûng dynasty which then ruled over Kiao-chi, changed the name of the country into An-tâk or Ou-tâk (Chinese Ou-li and Hsi Ou-li), a term which has evidently nothing to do with Cuñanî. I may add that none of the tammany (sûtras, narratives) on the foundation of the Thâi Chôm Yông, nor the several versions of the Mûang Yông Chronicle I have met with, do contain a word as to this story of Aûoka having, after his conquest, changed the name of Mûang Kên into Cuñanî. Hence the latter must have been an arbitrary addition, introduced by the interpreter from whom Garnier obtained his information, and I more than ever see fit to adhere to my identification of Cuñanî with the kingdom of Kôt-thâ or Upper Campá, feeling quite certain that Aûoka’s conquest had no connection whatever with it.

order. The Annamese Annals, quoting from the *Hou Han-shu*, make of the *Ch'ü-lien* of A.D. 137 a native chief, and explain that his name was that of a family of "southern barbarians." They say nothing, however, as to this *Ch'ü-lien* having set up as king of *Lin-i*, and are likewise silent as to the coup of *Ch'ü-lien secundus* about A.D. 221, which is only alluded to *en passant* in the commentary, compiled at a later date from Chinese sources. At the same time they warn us that the *Ts'iu-shu* and other Chinese historical works write by mistake the term *lien* with a different character, although conveying the same sound. Which this character is, we are not shown by the translator. Later on, between the dates corresponding to the period A.D. 226-230, we are told that the kings of Fu-nan, Lin-i, and T'ang-ming (or T'ao-mêng?) sent envoys with tribute to the Wu emperor Ta Ti ruling at Nan-king, and we are thus indirectly given

---

1 Des Michels, op. cit., p. 70.
2 Ibid., p. 114.
3 Ibid., p. 70.
4 Ibid., p. 94.
5 The kingdom of T'ang-ming is said (ibid., p. 98) to be the same as Tsur-ming (or T'ao-mêng?)—in Annamese Dâng-mûn = Dōo-mûn—and to have been situated on the seaboard, and at the head of an extensive bay to the south of Jiê-nan, with whose southern borders it was coterminous for a length of 7,000 li (some 200 miles!). It is difficult to gather, from this vague description, whether the kingdom in question was to be found on the northern or on the southern side of Lin-i. Judging from the fact that Lin-i, although then and long before that an independent kingdom de facto, was nevertheless still considered by Chinese writers as part of Jiê-nan de jure, Dâo-mûn, or T'au-mêng, must have occupied a position somewhere in the north of the present Kwang-biai district, perhaps about the mouths of the Song Jâng (Song Giang). There is a place marked Minh Cân in modern maps, close by the left bank of this stream. The Mên tribe referred to in a preceding note appear to have been settled in that neighbourhood. Otherwise, we must look for the location of Dâo-mûn to the north of Lin-i, that is, either in Ngê-an or in Southern Thanh-hwâ. Whichever of these two surmises be the correct one, it seems, I think, very probable that this must have been the country and kingdom of McLeod's Mîn, and of the Kêo-Mên or Mên Ti-têh mentioned in a preceding page. Owing to no Chinese characters being given, and no other information being contained in the books at my disposal as to the whereabouts of the Dâo-mûn kingdom, it is impossible to push investigation any further; but it is to be hoped that Sinologists as well as Annamologists will be able to tell us something more definite from the native sources inaccessible to me. Meanwhile we may rest
to understand that Lin-i was, at the time, an independent State. We may, then, well conclude, on the strength of the above fragmentary evidence, that Chü-lin and Ch'ü-lien are very likely identical terms, though spelled in different ways, representing either the dynastic or the family name of the early kings of Lin-i, but more probably the name of the State itself, in its full form Cūlanî. In support of this conjecture I may point out the coincidence in spelling between the last part of the name of Chü-lin (直林) and the initial one of the term Lin-i (林邑), which would thus appear to be but a shortened form of Chü-lin-i (直林邑), the probable original Chinese phonetic transcript of Cūlanî. It must be noted, in fact, that the three characters which compose it, sounding Chü-lang-eik in the present Fu-chou dialect, may have been pronounced something like Chu-lan-i or Chu-lan-ik in the old days. Père Legrand de la Liraye spells lan the second character in the name of the rebellious Ch'ü-lien, whom he accordingly describes as Khu-lan.¹ The connection between the two toponyms Cūlanî and Lin-i content with having discovered a new independent State within the limits of the pretended Chinese dominions, to be added to the kingdom of Lin-i and to the realm of the Hsi-t'ui I (whose borders were reached by Ma-yuan in A.D. 43); making altogether no less than three independent kingdoms, all to be found within the zone said to have been embraced by the famous chin or department of Jh-nan established by the Western Han.

¹ See Des Michels, op. cit., notes, p. 108. The reverend Père, however, took Chü-lin or Khu-lan to be the name of a tribe, in which guess it will now be seen he was not so very far wrong as Des Michels thinks, since that name was the designation borne by either the kingdom or its capital. The Chinese character 邑 means 'a capital city' as well as 'a district,' and this is most probably the reason why it was employed in the transcription in preference to another more suitable for conveying the sound i. In the language of the Lâu populations of Yunnan, the sense of country, district, or city was conveyed by the term Mùang (transcribed as Mêng by the Chinese) prefixed to the name of the kingdom; thus, Mêng Chü-lin (蒙直林), alleged to have been the name of the founder of the Kiao-chi (read Lin-i) State, is instead, no doubt, the Lâu designation for the State itself, to wit, Mùang Chûlanî.

Abbé Bouilleux says (Annales de l'Extrême Orient, t. ii, p. 323) that Chû-lin, alias Khu-lan or Kû-lan (whose rebellion, by the way, he places in A.D. 263!), was also called Khu-dat, a term which, it will be observed, approaches very closely to the form Kortatha recorded by Ptolemy as being the name of its capital city.
thus receives further demonstration from the etymological point of view. There would seem, then, to be no further room for doubt that the kingdom of Çułanî, or Upper Campû, although inhabited by a Châm—i.e. Môn-Annam descended—population, owed its original establishment to the Lâu from Southern Yûnnan, headed by a prince of Indû lineage belonging to that dynasty which, said to have hailed from Magadha, founded kingdoms all over Yûnnan and adjoining countries, introducing therein the civilization, the laws, customs, and beliefs, current at the time in the country of his ancestors. This circumstance proves our contention that Northern Campû, unlike its southern counterpart, received its civilization from Northern India. Numbers of natives from that region who had come to settle in Yûnnan followed, no doubt, in the wake of the Indû-Yûnnanese prince that led the way to Çułanî; and many more continued to flow in the new State, either directly viâ C'hîeng Rûng and Lûang P'hraî Bâng, or indirectly viâ Yûnnan, whither they had at first directed their steps, jointly contributing to the development of the country on Indû lines and causing it to attain that comparatively high degree of advancement of which unmistakable traces are left to this day, as we have noticed now and then in the course of our inquiry. Later on, the number of the Indû settlers who had reached the country by the overland route began to receive considerable additions from those of their countrymen who had found their way thither by sea, and a considerable trade was, no doubt, established and carried on by the latter with their mother-country and the numerous Indû settlements spread all over the Indo-Chinese coast, the Malay Archipelago, and the Southern Chinese seaboard. Hence we may take it as certain that by the first century of the Christian era the name of the capital of Upper Campû—like those of other conspicuous cities on the same coast—must have become well known not only to Indû traders, but also to those of far more Western regions, thus easily coming to the notice of our incomparable geographer, who handed it down to posterity in
the form of Kortatha Méropolis. It is now well known, in fact, that early before Ptolemy's and Marinos' time, not only Syrian, but also Parthian, Arab, and Alexandrian merchants,—outdistancing the exploits of the Phœnicians and Chaldaens, the Western world's pioneers in Eastern navigation, and following in the wake of the Dravidians of Southern India, to whom belongs the honour of having first opened the sea-route leading to the China Sea and founded mercantile settlements all over the coast of the Far East,—pushed their journeys further from India and Ceylon on to the Malay Peninsula and the Tonkin Gulf, reaching thence Canton and the mysterious far-outlying Kattigara, which we have identified with, and shall incontrovertibly prove in due course to be, Hang-chou. In our author's own days the famous embassy from the Roman Orient, alleged to have been sent by Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, landed at a port of Jih-nan and thence journeyed overland to the Chinese capital Lo-yang. In referring to this event the Liang-shu informs us that "the merchants of this country [Ts-ts'in, or Syria] frequently visit Fu-nan, Jih-nan, and Chiao-chih." ¹ We shall try to find out in the next paragraph the location of the seaport at which that so-called embassy—in reality but a private commercial mission—landed. In the introductory book of his treatise² Ptolemy, after having referred to "those who have sailed from us to those places [in India] and have for a long time frequented them, and also those who have come from thence to us," proceeds to say: "from the same informants we have also learned other particulars regarding India and its different provinces, and its remote parts as far as the Golden Khersonese, and onward thence to Kattigara. In sailing thither, the voyage, they said, was towards the east," etc. These passages clearly show how the seaports of the Tonkin Gulf must have been frequented as stations on the then well-known sea-route to the China coast, and, at the same time, as entrepôts for

¹ Hirth's "China and the Roman Orient," p. 47.
² Ch. xvii, §§ 4 and 5.
the trade which thence was carried on overland with the western parts of the Celestial Empire. Hopelessly lost in their attempts to fix a suitable site for Kattigara, to locate which almost every simulacrum of a seaport on the whole stretch of the Indo-Chinese coast from Tonkin to Martaban was variously resorted to,¹ our Sinologists have come to the conclusion that it was not until A.D. 166, the date of the

¹ Richthofen ("China," vol. i, pp. 509, 510, note 1) identified it with Kiao-chi!—a view which, strange to say, Colonel Yule adopted, declaring the arguments adduced by that authority in favour of the location of Kattigara in the Gulf of Tonkin to be "absolutely convincing." Some time afterwards Mr. Holt, in a paper read before the Royal Asiatic Society, showed himself determined to believe with Gosselin that Kattigara was probably not far from the present Martaban! The latest dictum of Sinology on the subject is, to my knowledge, to be found in a lecture delivered by Dr. Hirth before the Berlin Geographical Society (printed in the Verhandlungen der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin, 1889, No. 1). Therein the author, concuring in the main with Von Richthofen's view as to the location of Kattigara near the Chinese frontier on Annamese territory, attempts to arrive at a more precise determination of its site by basing himself upon the similarity in names between Ptolemy's city and Chié-té, Kau-tek, or Kiu-dik, which latter, he thus concludes, may be the long sought for Kattigara. The present pages, where Chié-té, etc., is, I hope, conclusively shown to be instead identical with Ptolemy's Kortatha Mâtropolis, will prove Dr. Hirth's suggestion to be untenable. It may interest the general reader to learn that besides the places above named, Canton, the mouth of the Mê-Không River, and even Singapore have severally been mentioned as the sites of the ancient Kattigara (see Richthofen's "China," vol. i, p. 508, etc.).

I have noticed, since writing the above, that in a lecture delivered the 7th December, 1893, on the occasion of the Winckelmann jubilee, by Mr. H. Nissen, of Bonn, on "Der Verkehr zwischen China und dem Römischen Reiche," Hà-nôî is accorded the preference, although Canton or some other town further up the coast of China proper is also suggested as a possible location for Kattigara. Of the same opinion is Professor Schlegel, who, in reviewing the above essay in the Trong-Foo (vol. v, 1894, p. 369), expresses himself in the following terms:—"Von Richthofen denkt an Hanoi, während man gewöhnlich darunter Canton oder irgend eine Stadt des eigentlichen China (z. B. Chinkiang, mit Fragezeichen in einer älteren Auflage des Kiepert'schen Atlas antiquus) versteht. Hanoi ist jedenfalls derjenige Punkt, der sich noch am ersten mit der chinesischen Tradition vereinigen lässt. Nur müssen wir nicht vergessen, dass nach der letzteren, der Platz, wo die fremden Gesandten landeten, Jih-nan-kiao-noi (日南徼外), d.h. 'ausserhalb der Grenze von Jih-nan zu suchen ist' (Hirth, op. cit., passim), während Hanoi im Herzen dieses Grenzlandes gelegen war. Der Vortragende hätte Ausführliches über diese Frage in Hirth, Chines. Studien, S. 19 ff. vorgefunden." These passages will give a fairly accurate idea of the stage that Western research on this question had reached when the first part of the present inquiry into the Ptolemaic geography of Far Eastern Asia appeared (in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, July, 1897).
Ta-ts’in embassy to China, that the sea-route to the Far East was opened by Western traders, and that Tonkin formed then, and from that time only, its terminus, which was not removed further on till the third century, and then only as far as Canton.¹ Such narrow views will have to be considerably broadened now that we have shown Kattigara, the Heraclian pillar of early Western Oriental navigation, to have stood considerably further to the east since the very first century of the Christian Era. **Kortatha Métropolis** and the other cities or seaports on the Tonkin Gulf mentioned by Ptolemy cease accordingly to play the rôle of termini tentatively ascribed to them by our predecessors in the field of Far Eastern historical geography, and appear to us in their true light of entrepôts for the trade with the southern China frontier and intermediate stations on the maritime route to the Chinese coast.

Having thus far shown the part that **Kortatha Métropolis** performed in Indo-Chinese history as well as in Western Oriental commerce, it remains to be seen whether its site can be determined with greater approximation within the district where we have located it, and to account for the form of its name (Kortatha) adopted by Ptolemy.

As regards the emplacement of the city, the corrected latitude we obtained for it in the tables being 18° 42' N., it will be seen that its position coincides with the site of the present Viñ (Vinh), close by the mouth of the Song-Kā (淹 湖) River (termed Nam Nôn in Lâo). As this was the eastern terminus of the overland route from India and Burma known to have existed from at least the first century A.D.,²

---

² See Parker in China Review, vol. xx, p. 339, where, however, he makes, as usual with Sinologistes, a muddle of ancient Indo-Chinese geography by making Yüeh-shang (an old kingdom occupying the southern part of the present Thaï-hwâ district with, perhaps, a portion of Northern Hâ-tîn) extend as far as Burma, and suggesting that the Ta-ts’in embassy of A.D. 166 “most probably landed at Mergui or somewhere else in the Talaing kingdom of Burma, which was therefore held to be a part of Yüeh-shang” (!), and proceeded thence overland to Viñ. See also Hirth in Journal Royal Asiatic Society for July, 1896, p. 494, where he quotes the following passage from an old Chinese work: “To reach Tiêm-chu [India] from Annam, there is an overland road by which one may go to this country,” etc.
I am inclined to adopt the position of Viṅ for Ptolemy’s capital city rather than that of Hā-tūn, a little below. It is, however, only by means of archaeological investigations conducted in that neighbourhood, that the exact site of that capital can definitely be determined. The Annamese Annals, we have pointed out, make mention of a fortress of Khū-tōt on the Northern Campā frontier, which, unsuccessfully besieged by the Chinese governor of Kiao-chi in A.D. 431, was finally taken in 446, access being thereby gained by the invaders to Hsiang-lin (i.e. Lin-i or Campā) territory. This frontier stronghold, said to have stood on the northern bank of a stream called the Lo-dzung, must have been situated either on the Song-Kā about Viṅ or considerably further to the north by the bank of the Song-Mā in the present Thañ-hwā district, and it had, I think, nothing in common with Kortatha. I prefer, in fact, to connect it rather with Ptolemy’s Pagrasa, which will be treated on in the next paragraph.

As regards the connection in names between Kortatha and the Kūn-dūk, Kau-tēk, or Kōt-thē district, or the chief city which gave the latter its name, I should think it has been made sufficiently evident in the foregoing pages as to scarcely need any further demonstration. I shall, however, add a few more remarks of a purely linguistical nature in order to throw, if possible, more light on this highly interesting subject. Which was the real original name of the district or its chief city it is impossible to guess, since it was differently spelled and pronounced, as evidenced by the different forms we have given, to wit: Chiu-tē, Cūdā, Cūdāma, Cūdāmāla, Cūlā, Cūlāni, Cōlāni, Cūlāmāni, Cūlāmālini, Cullāmālini, Lin-i, Kōt-thē, Kau-tēk, Kūn-dūk, Ko-tik, etc. Although these are, as a rule, mentioned as designations borne by the district or kingdom, it is almost certain that they belonged originally to its chief city, and that it was from the latter, as usually occurs in Indo-China,

2 Ibid., p. 122.
that the kingdom took its name. If a distinction were to be made, I should be inclined to think that we are here in front of two sets of names, one of which may be assigned Chiu-té, Kot-thê, or Cûḍā as prototype, and the other Mālinī (the name of the Indū Campā, transferred to its Indo-Chinese counterpart). It is apparently from the union of both that the form Cūḷamālinī and its derivatives were arrived at. Whether of these two sets of names one belonged to the kingdom and the other to its capital, or whether both were indiscriminately used for either, it is impossible to say. The latter was probably the case in later days. But at an early period I should imagine that Chiu-té, Kot-thê, or Cûḍā more properly designated the city which, at the same time, as usual with Indū and Indo-Chinese capitals of kingdoms, may have also been known under several other names. The term Kortatha can, in fact, be traced to various distinct denominations belonging to ancient cities of India.

In the first place, I observe that it may be a contraction of Nagar Ṭhāṭha, vulgo Nagar Thatha, in which case its name would seem to have been imported here from the banks of the Indus,¹ and its location would suit very well—allowing for presumable displacements that occurred in the course of the Song-Kâ—either Viṅ or Hâ-tûṅ.

In the second place, it may be observed—as I already pointed out at the outset of this chapter—that the name of Kortatha, or Kau-ték, very likely represents the term Kuṭhāra, or Kauṭhara, occurring in Southern Campā as the probable designation once borne by the ancient city of Yâṃpu-nagara. Final k is, as a rule, pronounced indifferently as k or t in Annamese and some of the Southern Chinese dialects: thus

¹ See Cunningham’s “Ancient Geography of India,” p. 288 seq., for Nagar Thatha, a name which, he says, means ‘city on the river bank.’ It was an ancient and important emporium. The contraction of Nagar in Gar, Gor, Khor, or Kor is a very common one in Indo-China. I may quote as instances in Siām: Khorát, a contraction of Nagar-rāj[ā]-siṁā], therefore termed Khorasemā in nearly all books of travel of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; Korayok or Khorayok, the vulgar designation for Nagar-nāyaka, etc. The Khmers generally make Angkor out of Nagar, Naṅgār, or Naṅgor, by metathesis. Another common modification of these terms in Siām is Lakhõn (for Liger, Nagor).
the characters 九德 (Chiu-tê) used in spelling the ancient name of the Hā-tīn district, while being read Kau-tēk at Canton and Kâu-dük in Annam, are instead pronounced Kin-tet by the Hakkas and Kâu-dük in some parts of Cochin-China. Their ancient sound may thus have been something like Kau-tet, or Ko-tat; and as it is a well-known fact that final r in Western words is often changed into final t in their corresponding Chinese equivalents, it follows that the above characters may well be a phonetic transcript of the term Kūṭhāra, or Kauṭhara, as pronounced in the early days by the Chinese settled in Tonkin and the Chino-Annamese cross-bred natives of that region. We have incidentally drawn attention to the form Khu-dat for the name of Khū-lien, Khū-lan, or Ch'ù-lien, which we take to be a dialectal corruption of Cuđâ, Chiu-tê, or Coḷāṇī. Hence there appears to be nothing improbable as regards the terms Kau-tēk, Kin-tet, or Ko-tat being meant for renderings of Kauṭhara, Kūṭhāra, etc. And it is but natural that Ptolemy's informants, hearing them thus variously pronounced from the natives of Sino-Annamese extraction who roamed and trafficked about the seaports of the Tonkinese and Chăm coast frequented by Western traders, reported them to him under the somewhat hybrid forms Ko-dat, Ko-tat, Kotar, Kortat, etc., which were synthetized by the Alexandrian geographer in the form Kortatha he handed down to us.

Thirdly, it may be suggested that the Chinese dialectal forms referred to above sprang from an original term, Ĉuđā or Ĉuḷā (meaning a crest or diadem in, respectively, Sanskrit and Pāli), possibly a contraction of Cuḍāmālā, Cuḍāmāṇi, or Cuḷāmāṇi, constituting the early designation

1 See "Chinese equivalents of the letter 'R' in Foreign Names," by Dr. Hirth, in the Journal China Branch Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xxi, p. 214 seq. At the same time I may remark that the forms Kau-tēk and Kīn-dük may also be directly traced to the Sanskrit Kāṭaka (= 'tableland,' a 'royal capital or metropolis'), however different this be from Ptolemy's transcript Kortatha. Kāṭaka was the name of the former capital of Orissa, now usually written Cuttack.

2 A jewel worn in the top-knot on the crown of the shaven head, in the crest or diadem. In support of this conjectural name of the capital compare Śrī Bāni, the designation borne by one of the Northern Campā capital cities, pronounced
of the country, and subsequently transformed by the Sino-
Annamese into Chiu-tê, Kiu-tet, Kau-têk, etc.

Whichever of the three surmises made above be the
correct one, only further local investigation will be able
to disclose. Meanwhile, we may rest satisfied with the
conclusion that Ptolemy's Kortatha most assuredly corresponds
to the district-city of 九德 (Chiu-tê, etc.). Were other
evidence wanting, the mere fact of these characters being
to this day pronounced Kiu-tet by the Hakkas would be
sufficient to establish the etymological connection.¹

Pagrasa (No. 117).

We are here in the presence of a toponymic identical to
the one (No. 93) we have already met with on the eastern
coast of the Gulf of Siâm, and explained (supra, p. 191) as
being composed of the two Khmêr terms Pâ or Bâ, meaning
'chief,' 'great,' and Krâs, of as yet undetermined signifi-
cation. Given that the name of the city or mart now under
discussion can be traced to the same original terms, it would
but prove that an identical language prevailed on both
the Gulfs of Tonkin and Siâm, a fact which does not come
as a surprise to us, since we have over and again insisted

Śri Bauśa by the Châm. This term may well be a mere travesty of Śri Mañi,
unless it can be proved to be connected, as I have already pointed out, with the
indigenous term Bâ-lôí.

¹ Dr. Hirth, in the paper referred to above, in which he endeavours to trace
the origin of Ptolemy's term Kattigara to the name borne by the ancient
district of Chiu-tê or Kiu-tet, makes a quotation from a Chinese work which
requires rectification. "The Chinese geographer," he goes on to state (see
China Review, vol. xvii, p. 53), "points out a city called Huan-chou, situated
south-east of Nge-ân, opposite the promontory of Hainan, as the place where
the ancient Kao-tê [i.e. Chiu-tê, etc.] was located when it was the capital of one
of the three principalities—Sin-ch'ung, Wu-p'ing, and Kau-tê [in Annamese,
Tên-t'hüang, Vô-bôn, and K'ân-tûk]—which formed the three divisions of
Annam which existed in the beginning of the third century." This extract does
not help us one whit in establishing the exact position of Kau-tê, since Huan-
chou was not a city, but a district established in 581-601 by the Sui in the place
of the ancient bô of Hênh-keuan (which included Ngô-ân and part of Hâ-tiêô),
and since K'ân-tûk itself did not at first make part of Huan-chou, but was
included in it much later, viz. between a.d. 627 and 650, by the T'ang (see Des
throughout the preceding pages on the fact that the coasts of both those regions were at the early period we are concerned with inhabited by a population of the same—i.e. Mōn-Annam or, as I prefer to call it, C'hieng—stock, to which the Chăm also undoubtedly belonged, notwithstanding what is asserted otherwise by ethnological and philological authorities. The term Bā passed over to the Thai, who retain it to this day in the sense of 'chief,' 'master,' 'teacher,' or 'guru'; and that it obtained favour with the same signification among the Chăm is exemplified by the term Bā-shēh, still applied to the highest caste of the priesthood, descendants probably of the Brāhmāṇs of Campā, who are to be found all over Bīn-thwōn, more especially in the valley of Panrāng.

But we have likewise observed that in some dialects of the semi-wild tribes of Kamboja, Bā or Bah means also the embouchure of a river as well as a confluent, and it is probably in this sense that we find it in many a name of the Bā or Pā class, such as Bā-Śək or Pā-Śək, Pā-Tāni, and Ptolemy's Pagrasa, Palanda, etc. In Annam Bā (巴, Bā) is frequently used as a prefix to the names of marts owing to the fact, it is said, that many of these were established close by the house of some influential tradeswoman, wherefore they came to be designated as the 'market of Bā (dame) so and so'; Bā literally meaning 'dame,' 'lady,' in this case. It is, however, doubtful whether at the early period now under

---

1 In the expression Khrū-Bā-Āchān (Guru-Bā-Ācārya), used as a collective designation for teachers. In ancient works, such as the "Northern Annals," Bā is used as a title of respect prefixed to the name of chiefs, princes, chief artisans, etc.

2 See Aymonier's "History of Tchampa," loc. cit., p. 26, and the same author's "Les Tchames et leurs religions," p. 43. The term Bā-shēh may be compared with the Siamese Bā-śei (Bā-ji) and the Khmēr Bā-knu, both meaning Great or Chief Teacher, Chief Priest (as applied to Brāhmāṇs).

3 Usually explained as Pā (father) of Tāni, but I am inclined to think that Pā has the old Mōn-Khmēr sense here also. Locally, however, it is now pronounced with the short vowel thus: Pā-Tāni.

4 See Landes, "Contes et Légendes Annamites," in Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 22, p. 388, footnote; and No. 26, p. 281, index, s.v. This privilege accorded to the fair sex finds its explanation in the fact that all over Indo-China the retail trade is mostly in the hands of women, and that, as admitted in conte 52 (see index, p. 291) by the Annamese author himself, "in Cochinchina women are superior to men in the conduct of business, an often-remarked fact."
consideration the term Bā was as yet used in this sense in the district where Pagrasa stood, and I should accordingly think that either of the two significations given at the outset are entitled to our preference, the second one appearing to be the most eligible.

The rectified latitude, 19° 54' N., obtained in the tables for Pagrasa indicates for this city or mart a location about the mouths of the Song-Mā, not far away from the present district-city of Thăn-hwā and from the Kūa-Dāi or 'Great Mouth' forming the southernmost outlet of the Song-kāi (Song-koi) or Red River flowing by Hà-nōi city. In the term Kūa Dāi or 'Great Mouth' we may have the Sino-Annamese—and consequently modern—equivalent of the ancient Mōn-Annam toponymic Bā- or Pā-grāṣa. If not, the location proposed at the mouths of the Song-Mā would agree very well with the name of the city, given that the prefix Pā or Bā is to be taken in its second sense of embouchure of a river; and in this case the term Pagrasa would mean the Grāṣa (or Krāṣ) mouth (city, village, mart, or harbour). There is a place marked P'ḥū-khē (Phu-khê) in modern maps, a little above Thăn-hwā and by the bank of the Song-Mā, which would seem to answer all requirements, its name meaning 'city of the stream' or 'city (at the mouth) of the river,' and approaching very closely in sound — allowing for the modifications it must have undergone in passing through Annamese tongues unable to pronounce the r's and final s's—to Bā-Krāṣ or Pā-grāṣ. But it is perhaps better to leave the final settlement of these questions to local experts.

Proceeding, therefore, in our preliminary inquiry, the next toponymic that attracts our attention is that of Kazēh, already noticed as applied to a part of Tonkin by the Burmese, in the expression Kio-Kazēh meaning evidently the Kēu or Kiao (people) of the Kazēh (region or district). Kazēh may well be intended to represent Krāṣ or Grāṣa, and Pā-Kazēh the mouth of the river of the Krāṣ country (Pāgrāṣa). I do not insist, however, on this identification, which is to be regarded as merely tentative, owing to the
lack of sufficient data wherewith to establish the exact location of the Kiô-Kazêh district. The same remark applies to our suggestion as regards the possible identity of Pagrasa with the stronghold of Khû-lót or Khu-lât made in the preceding paragraph. This fortress, we have seen, was situated on the northern border of Châm territory, and by the bank of a river recorded under the now forgotten name of Lô-dzung, which may have been either the Song-kâ or the Song-Mâ. The district of Lô-dzung, where the source of this stream is located, and from which the latter took its name, is described as part of Jih-nan from the time of the Han conquest (n.c. 111), and located to the north-west of Lin-i.¹ From the fact that it is mentioned in the list of the Jih-nan subdivisions immediately after that of Tî-kâã (Pi-kin), and two places before that of Hsiang-lin (Lin-i), it would appear that Lô-dzung was lying considerably north of the last-named, being at the same time coterminous (probably on the west) with Pi-kin.² Khû-lót stood then, probably, on Pi-kin territory, and may have been its chief city, corresponding at the same time to Ptolemy's Pagrasa, which it somewhat resembles in name. The term Khû-lót or Khû-lât is, in fact, possibly the Annamese corruption of the local word Krat or Krâs, which, in conjunction with the prefix Bâ or Pâ, may have formed the real name of the city. Not being supplied with the native characters used in spelling the Annamese name of the

¹ See Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 122 text and 87 notes.
² Ibid., p. 50. The names of the five districts into which Jih-nan is alleged to have been subdivided by the Han in n.c. 111 are given in the following order, proceeding from north to south:—
(1) Chôu-ngô (Chou-on)—location described as being north of Chau-ch'êng (Campâ, or Lin-i).
(2) Tî-kâã (Pi-kin)—location described as being north of Chau-ch'êng (Campâ, or Lin-i).
(3) Lô-dzung (Lu-yung)—location described as being north-west of Chau-ch'êng (Campâ, or Lin-i).
(4) Töï-kwien (Hsi-ch'üan)—no location given.
(5) Tüang-lôm (Hsiang-lin)—located to north-west of modern Chau-ch'êng (Southern Campâ).
city, we cannot judge how far the etymological connection we have suggested can be maintained. But it seems quite certain, from the arguments we have adduced in the preceding pages, that Pagrasa must have been somehow connected with the ancient district of Ti-kân and its well-known port, whether Khû-lôt was its chief city or not. The correct name of this district, we have shown, must have been Pakan, Prakan, or Prakûng, since it is up to this day so pronounced by the Lāu, and very slightly differently by the Burmese (Pagan) and Southern Chinese (Pi-kin, Pei-king); Ti-kân being merely the modern Annamese way of reading the characters by which its name has been recorded in Chinese historical works. We have likewise pointed out that it was most probably a Lāu foundation, forming part of the Indū-Lāusian kingdom of Čūlaṇi, and have located it to the east of the Phûen State in the present Thâm-hwâ district in accordance with the evidence elicited from Lāu as well as Chinese records, which latter describe it as lying to the north of Lin-i. That Pagrasa stood in the territory of Prakan seems, therefore, an undeniable fact. And the very close resemblance in names noticeable between the two places suggests also an etymological connection. Truly, the finals in both differ considerably, but it must be borne in mind that well-nigh two thousand years have elapsed since Ptolemy noted down as Pagrasa what he heard pronounced Pâ-krâs or Bâ-grâs, and that during that interval there has been ample opportunity for these terms to become modified into Pâ-krân or Bâ-grân, and thence, by metathesis, into Prâkân, Prakan, Pagan, etc. The modern Annamese form Ti-kân is a good instance in point as to the evolution that the pronunciation of those terms must have undergone. In any case, I shall leave it to future research to establish whether the name of Pagrasa is to be connected with that of the Ti-kân or Prakan district or of its chief city, be it Prakan or Khû-lôt that the latter was called, or something to that effect. Suffice it for the present to have fixed the position of Pagrasa within the territory of Prakan and at the mouth
of the Song-Mā, not far from the present Thanh-hwā district-city, which is the place obtained by calculation in our tables on the basis of Ptolemy's data. It will be seen, then, that Pagrasa was very likely the famous port on that seacoast called Pi-kin in Chinese records, after either the name of the district, Pi-kin, i.e., Prakan, or its chief city. Which was the case we are unable to decide, but it seems very probable that the expression 'port of Pi-kin' merely meant the 'shipping port for the Pi-kin [i.e., Prakan] district,' and had no specific reference to the name borne by the port itself or the town or mart rising on its border. At any rate, we presume that this may have been the place at which the Ta-ts'in embassy of A.D. 166 landed, since this mission is said, it will be remembered, to have proceeded to China from the northern frontier of Jih-nan, and it must accordingly have disembarked about here in territory which was then considered, de jure, as part of the Chinese chün of Jih-nan, though perhaps not as yet belonging to it de facto. Should the latter have been the case, Pi-kin or Pra-kan must have passed under Chinese domination in A.D. 43, as a result of Ma-yūan's expedition, which reached, as we have seen, the borders of Thanh-hwā. On the other hand, should Pagrasa turn out to be identical with Khū-löt, its territory must have remained part of the Cūlaṇi or Upper Campā kingdom down to A.D. 446, the date at which Khū-löt fell at last into the power of the Chinese.

Dōrias River (Nos. 116 and 181).

This is the river of Hā-nōi, usually referred to under the vague designation of Song-kōi (more correctly Song-kāi), which merely means 'Chief river' in Annamese. It is formed by the junction of three respectable streams all rising in Southern Yūnnan, to wit:
(1) The ‘Black River’ or Song-Bô, termed Nam-Thê by the Lâu, Thê being, no doubt, its correct and time-honoured name.\(^1\)

(2) The ‘Red River,’ known to the Lâu as the Nam-Tâu, i.e. the Tâu River, which, we shall demonstrate directly, is its old and real appellation.

(3) The ‘Clear River’ or Song-Lu, designated by the Chinese Lu Kiang (瀘江, Lu Chiang) and Ch'îng-Ho (清河) or Ch'îng Kiang (清江).\(^2\)

Of the three branches just named, the Red River or Nam-Tâu has, from the greatest antiquity, been regarded as the principal one; hence its name was also applied to their

---

\(^1\) In fact it is known under a similar designation, Dâ-jâng (沉 江, To-chiang), to the Annamese.

The Chinese names Pa-pien Kiang (把 边 江, ‘boundary encompassing river’) and Li-hsien Kiang (李仙江, ‘Plum-fairy River’), applied to it within Yûnanese territory, do not deserve being retained in our maps, since they evidently are comparatively modern. It is to be noticed that the Chinese consider the Pa-pien a mere tributary, and the Sa-p’u Ho (薩 普 河), one of its upper affluents, the principal branch, and give the name Li-hsien to the watercourse resulting from their junction. Somehow the term Sa-p’u appears to be of Buddhist origin, and connected with the term P’u-sa (菩 薩), the Chinese contracted form of Bodhisattva. The term Hâk Hô (黑 河, Hê Ho), i.e. ‘Black River,’ applied to the Li-hsien in the lower part of its course, before it joins the Red River, is also, no doubt, of very modern (Chinese) growth; while the native denomination Song-Bô which the river bears here is very probably derived from Chô-bô (砦 坡, ‘Market-limits’) — the Cho-bo of our incorrigible geographers and cartographers, a flourishing village situated at the point where the stream, after precipitating itself down a barrier of limestone boulders, enters a very picturesque defile and turns towards the north to meet the Red River. The term Song Phuam marked on the Black River above An-Châu in Devêria’s map (op. cit., p. 84) is, if correct, another possible designation for this stream.

\(^2\) To the Annamese it appears to be known also as Song Bô-dê (潯 菩 提, Song Pu-ri), meaning the ‘River of Bodhi,’ presumably of the Bo- or Bodhi-tree (Ficus religiosa), from some such tree having formerly stood on its banks, or else from the town named Bô-dê (Bodhi), which Taberd, in his “Tabula Geographica Imperii Anamitici,” 1838, marks on the right side of this stream.
combined waters from Sôn-tōi (Son-tây) down to the sea. The terms Song-koï or Song-kâi (滄丐) and Song-kâ (滄 哥) —both equally meaning 'Principal,' or 'Chief,' 'River'—by which their common channel is now usually designated, are, it goes without saying, of too recent introduction and too vague withal to deserve of being paraded in our maps and geographical treatises as is so often done. If time-honoured tradition counts for anything and is to be at all followed, the name Red River, Nam-Taû, or its Sino-Annamese form Dâu-jâng, should be preserved and applied to the main river throughout its whole length, from its sources in Yûnnan to its principal outlet in the Tonkin Gulf, discarding altogether the multiform designations that both Chinese and Annamese have devised for the various portions of its course.¹ The term Dâu-jâng occurs in the Annamese Annals

¹ The designations here referred to are:—

(1) Ch’ih-shwe-i Ho (Red-water River?) for its headwaters in the neighbourhood of Mêng-Hwa.

(2) Yüan Chiang for the portion of its course lying within the Yüan-chiang (元江) district lower down. It must be noted that this district only dates from Mongol times, being formerly in the hands of the Lâu, who called it Miûng Ching. Hence the name Yüan-chiang for this portion of the river's course is indisputably modern and of Chinese origin.

(3) Ho-ti Chiang, 河底江 (Lower River?), for the next tract down to Man-hao.

(4) Li-hwa Chiang, 梨花江 (Pear-blossom River), or Li-thô Chiang, 禮社江 (River of the sacrificial offerings), below Man-hao, the point where it begins to become navigable by boat.

(5) Fu-liang Chiang, 富貴江 (Very rich or very wealthy River), in Annamese P-hû-liûng Jâng, for the portion of its course within Annamese territory.

(6) Êrh Ho, 耳河 (Earring River), in Annamese Ñîi-hâ, a poetical name for the portion of its course that lies within the Hà-nôîi district.

(7) Hung Chiang, 紅江 (Red River), for the portion of its course nearest to the sea, on account, it is said, of the colour of its water, especially during the high tide.

Besides these designations it may possess several others which did not come
since as early a date as circū a.d. 550,\(^1\) and I have already
within our notice.\(^*\) All those just now referred to are, with one exception, of
very modern introduction. The exception is to be made in favour of the
fifth term, Fu-liang Chiang, which I find mentioned by Ma Tuan-lin once under
the date 1076 a.d. (op. cit., p. 335), and the next time in a passage he quotes
from Fan Shih-hu (better known as Fan Ch'êng-tu, last quarter of twelfth
century), reading as follows (ibid., p. 349): "Starting from T'ai-p'ing [South
Kwang-hsi] and proceeding straight southwards, one passes Kwang-lang and
Hwa-pu: next he crosses the rivers Fu-liang and Fe-t'êng [White-creeper
River], and reaches the capital of Annam [then called Thang-long = the ancient
Dâi-lê and the modern Hà-nôï] in four days." I shall not concern myself
with the 'White-creeper River,' which is presumably the Song-kao, Song
Kâ-lô, or Thâi-binh, and should have accordingly been enumerated first, but
shall confine my remarks to the Fu-liang or P'hây-liang. That this is the
Red River most Sino-Annamese scholars seem to be agreed (see, e.g., Devéria's
"Frontière Sino-Annamite," p. 55, where only the Annamese name is given
and no native characters, which I had, as usual, to hunt up for myself, and
found, as above stated, in Ma Tuan-lin; and his "Histoire des relations
de la Chine avec l'Annam," passage quoted by the Abbé Launay in "Histoire
de l'Annam," p. 25, n. 1). It is mentioned under this name in connection
with the ill-fated end of the patriotic Trông (徽, Chêng) sisters, vanquished
by Ma-yüan in a.d. 43, whose bodies, drowned in a tributary of the Fu-liang Chiang,
float down until they reached the main watercourse (Launay, i.e., quoting from Devéria, op. cit.). From the antiquity of the native text
where this narrative occurs, it will be possible to judge how far back into
the past the term Fu-liang can be traced. If it already existed in a.d. 43, the
date of the events referred to, it would prove a formidable rival to the designation
Tsun or Bié. Both terms may have, however, coexisted from an early period
as alternative names for the same river. It may turn out, on the other hand,
that the native author of the above narrative used, when penning it, the name
Fu-liang current in his time for the river, instead of the old one Ts'an or Dân
occurring in the ancient records he consulted. The Abbé Launay, in his
"Histoire de l'Annam," p. 68, between the dates 1279 and 1293 a.d., speaks of
a river called Vân-khîp in Annamese, which, he says, is the same as the Red
River and the Fu-liang Chiang. If so, we should have still another entry to make
in our list of the designations borne by the Red River. It would be well worth
while to ascertain whether the character used to represent the first syllable of the
term Vân-khîp is the same or not with 湾 Wan, employed to designate the
Mê-Không (v. sup., p. 135).

\(^1\) See Des Michels, op. cit., p. 144, where this river is described as rising in
the country of the Ai-Lao. This is exact, as the Red River has its sources

\(^*\) A possible one is 滇濁, Song-Lâ (in Chinese 濁江, Lâu Chiang),
occuring in Sino-Annamese records, which seems to apply more to the Red
River than to the 滇濁, Song-Lô or Lu Chiang (瀕江), i.e. the Clear River.
The map in Rocher's work ("Le Yün-nan," vol. i, 1879) has the term Ta-yang
Chiang marked above the river's confluence with the Chin-shwei Ho, its left
tributary coming from San-chia-ch'êng. Again, the denomination Lien-hwa
Tsan (蓮花灘, properly meaning the 'Rapids of Lien-hwa') is sometimes
applied to the portion of the river's course about Man-hao in the relations
of Western travellers (see, however, Devéria, op. cit., pp. 51, 52).
pointed out in these pages (p. 125 supra) that the Red River or Nam-Tâu is the stream therein alluded to. I have
since found out that to this day the Annamese still designate the Red River by the same term, Đâu-jâng, which they
write 漂江 or 桃江 (in Chinese T‘au-chiâng), meaning ‘Peach River’ in Chinese; but locally, more properly,
‘Rose-apple River’ or ‘Pink River,’ as the first character is used to denote the rose-apple (Eugenia Jambu) and
the pink colour in Annam. It goes without saying, however, that this is merely the interpretation put by the
modern Annamese upon the old name given to this stream by the early settlers about its banks, whether of Môn-
Annam or Indû descent. What that old name was like, we may judge from the form Tâu or Đâu in which it has
come down to us from antiquity,¹ and yet more accurately from the form Dôrias in which it has been recorded by
Ptolemy. For it is most certain that Ptolemy’s Dôrias

in the neighbourhood of Mêng-shê (now Mêng-hwa T‘ing), the ancient chief
town of the Ai-Lao and Nan-Chao. Des Michels has, however, left the Đâu-jâng
unidentified, nor has he given us the native characters with which its name
is spelled. One of the fugitive Annamese princes, we are told (ibid.), settled at
the headwaters of the river and built there a city, proclaiming himself king of
Đâu-lâng (T‘au-lang). From this it would appear that his State was named
after the Red River. Since writing the above I was glad to find in Devéria’s
“Frontière Sino-Annamite” (pp. 52 and 55) the confirmation, from Chinese
sources, of my identification of the Đâu-jâng or T‘au-chiâng with the Red
River. It is to be regretted that this author, also, does not give the equivalent
Chinese characters, which I had to find out for myself. I trust that these
I obtained and gave above in the text are correct. From a Siamese translation
of the Việt-nam Sử-kí, a native history of Annam which has recently appeared
in Bângkôk, I gather (p. 80) that the kingdom of Đâu-lâng had been so named
from the Đâu, or Red, River, my surmise thus proving correct.

¹ I am of opinion that the term Lôm-Dâu (臨桃, in Chinese Lin-t‘au),
still existing as a designation for the Lôm-Dâu district (臨桃府, Lôm-dâu
Phâ, the Lam-dao or Lam-tao of maps) on the left bank of the Red River just
above its confluence with the Black River, is simply the local transcript of the
Lâu name Nôm-Tâu for the Red River, of which T‘au-chiâng or Đâu-jâng is
the Sinicized form. These considerations show that the character 桃 or 漂
in the above toponymics must not be taken in its literal sense, but should be
viewed as a mere phonetic rendering, in Chinese dress, of the old name Tâu—
or of its probably still older form Đâu, etc.—borne by the Red River.
designates no other river than the one we know from at least the sixth century A.D. to have been called Tāu or Dāu, and but recently termed by Europeans the ‘Red River’. The positions we have obtained in our tables for both its sources and outlet agree most remarkably with those assigned to them in modern maps. The difference is merely 10' of latitude in excess for the mouth, which can be explained by variations that may have taken place in the river bed, an ordinary occurrence in all deltas. The difference is greater for the sources, but yet within one and a half degree of the truth, in both latitude and longitude. Hence not only does the topographical identity of the Dōrias with the Red River become incontrovertibly proved, but it plainly follows that Ptolemy had a far clearer idea of this river’s course than even the Jesuit Fathers who mapped it down in the early part of the eighteenth century and innocently considered it to be a branch of the Kin-sha or Upper Yang-tsz! ¹

From a linguistic point of view, the identity of the name of the Dōrias with those—Tāu, T’au, Dāu—by which the Red River has been for centuries, and is still at the present day, known to the Lāu, Annamese, Chinese, and, in fact, to all neighbouring nations, is too evident to need demonstration. Dāu and Tāu are undoubtedly the apocopated forms of some ancient term not far different from Dōrias, and presumably of Indū origin. This may have been Türya, Taurya, Durniyā, Duryā, or something to that effect.²

¹ See Devéria, op. cit., pp. 55, 56, who adds that the error was reproduced by d’Anville in the maps he drew up on the pattern of those of the Jesuits.

² Compare, in fact, any of these with the name Fu-liang of the Red River alluded to above, should it really be so ancient as it seems. But for the initial it might be taken as the equivalent of Dōrias. The characters used in spelling it sound Hau-liang or Pou-liang in the Fu-chon dialect, Pu-ryang in Korean, and Fu-riō in Japanese. Substituting T or D for the initial we would have Türyang, Duryang, Turiō, Duriō. Possibly the river was called in the old days both Fu-liang and Tāu-liang. In any case, there is sufficient evidence of its having borne in the sixth century the name of Dāu-lāng (Chinese T’au-lāng), for we have seen that the fugitive Annamese prince who settled at its headwaters in about 550 A.D. christened his new kingdom Dāu-lāng after the river. The term Dāu, T’au, or Tāu now applied to the Red River by, respectively, the
Aganagara (No. 114).

In the first section of this paper I have identified this city with Hā-nōi (Hanoi),\textsuperscript{1} the present capital of Tonkin. An examination of Annamese records shows that the seat of government of Kiao-chī has almost invariably been either at Hā-nōi or in its immediate neighbourhood. At the time of the early kingdom of Van-lāng (文郎, in Chinese Wōn-lang) the capital was established at Ph'ông-ch'ou, on the site or a little to the north of the present Sōn-tōi (Son-tây).\textsuperscript{2} Later on, namely, in 258 B.C., P'hūn (渓), king of Thūk (the feudal state of Shu, 蜀, in Sz'ch'üan), overthrew the

Annamese, Chinese, and Lāu, is thus very likely a contraction of an ancient term Dūn-lāng, Tān-lāng, Tūn-lāng, or Tāu-lang, which constituted the full name of the river in question. This being the case, the connection of the latter with some Indī term such as, e.g., Tārīya, Tāriyā, Tāriyā, Damrēya, etc., would become still more manifest.

It may be without interest to recall here the fact that Dampier, in 1688, terms Dornæ the northern branch of the Song-kāi (Song-koi) River, after the name, he says, of the first town he met after entering it, which stood on the left bank, at from five to six leagues from the mouth (see Prévost's "Histoire Générale des Voyages," vol. xi, 1753, p. 431). This Dornæ branch is, as I have ascertained, the Kūa Thái-bīn, or present western outlet of the Thái-bīn (太平) River, through which an arm of the Song-kāi discharges to this day, and the main stream could easily be reached by merchant vessels in Dampier's time and later (vide Taberdi's map, 1838, which marks the outlet in question as 'C. Đại-bính,' and makes the main body of the 'Song Cả' flow through it). Other writers, however, apply the term Dornæ, which they more frequently spell Dornea (as e.g., in Everard's "Treatises," p. 17, quoted in Balfour's "Cyclopædia of India," 3rd ed., vol. iii, p. 909, s.v. 'Tonkin'), to the 'Tonkin River,' i.e. the main course of the Song-kāi itself, thus leading one to conjecture that this term Dornæ or Dornea, whether now applying to the river or to a mere village on its banks, may be a relic of the name Dōrias, etc., once borne by that stream.

\textsuperscript{1} 河内 (in Chinese Ho-nēi = "river interior"), formerly called Kē-chō, 几番 (in which 几 is the Latin quī [Parker, in the China Review, vol. xxi, p. 281], is mistaken in suggesting 謎, chi, ki, or ke, "metropolitan area"), and 市 means 'market'; hence, 'those of the market,' 'market people,' or, simply, "the mart."). The latter is the term so recklessly transcribed Keshe in our maps and geographical treatises. Needless to say that both these designations are quite modern, the name of the ancient chief city of Tonkin, which stood practically on the site of the present Hā-nōi in Ptolemy's time, being Lăng-pien, as will be shown in due course.

\textsuperscript{2} Des Michels, op. cit., p. 2.
monarchy of Van-lâng,¹ changed the name of the State into

¹ I must call attention to the fact that the account of this expedition of the king of Thûk agrees very closely with that of the conquest of Tonkin by king Dharmásoka of Magadha, as given in the Mûang Yôn chronicle referred to on pp. 297–8 supra. The Annamese Annals say that the king of Thûk invaded Tonkin in order to punish the king of Van-lâng for having refused to give him his daughter in marriage; and that the Van-lâng monarch, upon learning of the advance of his enemy, jumped into a well, causing his own death. (Des Michels, op. cit., p. 9.) The Mûang Yôn chronicle states that Asóka, having conquered the whole of Jambu-dvîpa except Videha-rattha (Yûnman) and Mûang Kû (Kiao-chi), whose kings had not yet gone to pay him homage, marched an army into their countries. The king of Yûnman submitted, but the ruler of Tonkin, in utter despair, "jumped into the water," drowning himself, as soon as he saw the enemy approaching. The meek Asóka, however, had his body recovered and brought to him; then, by pouring over it some consecrated water of divine virtue from a goblet, he recalled the deceased potentate to life. The king of Kû, as soon as he recovered his senses, made his obeisance to Asóka; and the latter, satisfied with having obtained his submission, reinstated him upon the throne, and withdrew with the army in the direction of Mûang Yôn. It will be seen that the date given in the Annamese Annals for the invasion of the king of Thûk, 258 n.c., falls about midway between those stated in Buddhist accounts and those put forward by Oriental scholars for the period of the reign of Asóka, i.e. 325–289 B.C. and 259–223 n.c. respectively. Moreover, the king of Thûk is called Phûn or Thûk-Phûn (蜀 汴), while Asóka is also known by the name of Asóka-vardhana. (Professor Hall's edition of Wilson's Vîrû Pûrâṇa, vol. iv, p. 187. See also p. 188, where the variant Sáka occurs.) Does it not, then, seem likely that the name Thûk-Phûn is intended to represent the term Asóka-vardhana or Asóka-Brāhman (Sak-van, Sâk-brâhnu)? I leave these questions to the reconsideration of Oriental scholars. In the meantime, it appears to me pretty well certain that the king of Thûk must have been a prince from India and not from Chîn; and that here, as I have remarked on p. 301 ante, the establishment of an Indû monarchy in Tonkin is implied. The name of the district where the king of Thûk established his residence, P'hông-khê, looks like a rendering of Vaṅga, or Baṅga; the new designation given to the kingdom, Òu-lâk, Ân-lâk, savours also of Sanskrit (Alakâ, Arakṣa, Aryaka?: The Bhâgavata Pûrâṇa places a river, Aryâkâ, in this region); in fine, the shape given the city, like a conch-shell, or ñâkku, and other coincidences show very clearly the Indu character of the conquest. Even the commentators of the Annamese Annals (see Observations, p. 10) do not believe that the invaders were from China, and are of opinion that allusion is made to some prince from the north-west, beyond the frontiers of Van-lâng. It must be remembered that at about the same period, or n.c. 315, the general Chwang-Kîao, from the southern Chinese-State of Ch'û, conquered Tien (Yûnman) and then established himself there as king, having to contend before long for the mastery with a prince from Magadha. An Indian prince bearing the name of Asóka had, in fact, by that time settled near the Ta-li Lake, where his descendants reigned afterwards for many generations (see above, p. 123). The State of Shû, whence king Thûk-P'hûn is said to have hailed, had been annihilated by the Ts'in since 326 n.c., or sixty-eight years before his invasion of Tonkin. Hence there could not have been any king of Shû in 258 n.c., when the said invasion took place.

As regards the designation Òu-lâk or Øu-lâk applied by the victorious king Thûk P'hûn to the conquered country, the Annamese annalists tell us (Des Michels, op. cit., p. 11) that Tonkin had already been known as Lâk-viet
Öu-lǎk (Åu-lâk), and established his residence at P'hōng-khê (封 溪, in Chinese Fēng-ch'i) in the province of Bâk-niûn (Bac-ninh), district of Dông-nган, a little to the north-east of the present Hû-nôi. Here, in 255 B.C., he built for himself a capital by the name of Lûcâ-thân or Lôu-thanh (in Chinese 螺 城, Lo-ch'êng = ‘conch-shell ramparts’), so

(駝 越, in Chinese Lo-yüeh) or Mâk-viet (Mak-bet, etc., cf. with Sulaimân’s Mâhed, p. 205 supra; in Chinese 達 越, Ho-yüeh) at the period of the Chinese Chou dynasty (n.c. 1122-255), and was called Western Ôu or Ôu (西 貴, in Chinese H'ai-OU) and Ôu-lâk (駝 貴, in Chinese Ou-ho) under the Tarîn (n.c. 255-206), both these being evidently contractions of Òi Ôu-lâk (Hái Ou-lo or Hái Ou-ho). Fields on the seaside called the ‘Fields of Lâk’ (Lâk-dien 駝 田, in Chinese Lo-t'ien) are also mentioned, with the remark that the natives who lived by their produce were termed ‘Lâk-hôn’ (駝 侯, in Chinese Lo-hou) and the district chiefs Lâk-thiăng. Ôu or Ou (貴) is still a name for Wên-chou (and a river in its neighbourhood), the kingdom of which it was the capital in Han times being called T'ung-Ou, i.e. ‘Eastern Ou.’

This State then included Southern and Western Chênh-kiang. By analogy, it appears, Tonkin was called H'ai-OU, i.e. ‘Western Ou.’ H'ai-OU, we are told, in fact (loc. cit.), was lying to the west of Pan-yû (Canton). According to Kang-hi, it has been remarked (China Review, vol. xviii, p. 320), the inhabitants of modern Hainan are still called Ou-jên (貴 人), being immigrants from Ou or Ngeu, as Wên-chou is designated to this day. From this it would appear that the early populations of Tonkin and Chênh-kiang belonged to the same racial stock, which, ethnographically, is to a certain extent probably true. I cannot help, however, thinking that the designation Ôu-lâk or Ôu-lâk (駝 驒, 貴 驒, in Chinese Ou-lo, Ou-ho, An-hôk, etc.) formerly borne by, or applied to, Tonkin may be of Indû origin. Besides the derivations suggested above, I would advance a possible one from Ureuga, in view of the local legends ascribing a Nâga origin to the early kings of the country, and the connection that is noticeable in the names of its ancient capitals with the dragon or king of serpents.

The name Kiao-chî or Jâu-chî was not applied to the country, according to Sino-Anamese historians (see Ma Tuan-lûn, p. 308, and Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 46, 46), until the Han conquest of n.c. 111. Before that period it existed as the mere name of a province (including the territory around the present Hà-nôîi and adjoining districts on the east, north, and west) under the ancient kingdoms of Yan-lân (down to n.c. 258) and Nan-yüeh (n.c. 208-116). Originally Kiao-chî or Jâu-chî was probably a tribal name, connected, as I have pointed out, with Jao, Yao, Yavana, etc. (its first syllable is still pronounced Yâû instead of Jâû in several parts of Cochin-China). Its extension to the whole of Tonkin dating only from after n.c. 111, it is evident that it cannot have been before that period the racial name for the whole of its population—as many writers have hitherto assumed—but only for a limited portion of the same.
called because its walls turned round spirally like the whorls of a conch-shell. It was called also Tü-long-thăn (思蘄城, in Chinese Sz-lung-ch'eng), Khá-lá-thăn or Khá-hà (古蝶, Ku-lo), and Kôn-lôn-thăn, the latter name being due to the height of its walls, which towered above the ground not unlike the K'un-hun (崑崙) Mountains.

The kingdom of Öu-lâk or Thâk had but a short existence, for in 208 B.C. the Ts'ìn general Chao-t'o (趙陀) conquered it and made himself king with capital at P'an-yü, at that time the name for Canton. In B.C. 116 the Han overthrew this dynasty, and in B.C. 110 they sent an official to govern the ch'ün or province of Kiao-ch'i. The seat of government was then established at Long-biên (龍編, in Chinese Lung-pien) or Long-wiên ('the Dragon's folds'), a city so called because when its walls were built a dragon was seen coiled up in the neighbourhood.

This city is, according to one version, the same as Hà-nôï, the metropolis of Tonkin, and it appears to have held this rank, with short intervals, ever since. Another version is to the effect that the administrative residence was first established by the Western Han at Lien-thô (somewhere to the north or north-east of Hà-nôï), whence it was removed in B.C. 106 to Kwang-hsin (廣信, now Ts'ang-wu, the prefectural city of Wu-chou in Kwang-hsi), being successively shifted in A.D. 210 to P'ân-yû (Canton), and back again in Tonkin to Long-biên in A.D. 264.

Finally, a third version states that the Western Han seat of

---

1 Des Michels, op. cit., p. 11. It is evident that a conch-shell is implied. Of this surmise I have since found the confirmation in the Siamese version of the Viet-nam Sû-kî alluded to above, where (p. 18) the city walls are said to have wound round spirally like the volutes of a Sâûkha shell. The Annamese Annals translated by Des Michels (ibid., p. 12) state that there were nine convolutions or folds, the king's palace standing in the centre.

2 Also occurring in the inverted form Thảo-khâ-lâ (城可縷, in Chinese Ch'êng-k'o-lâ or Ch'êng-k'o-lou = Sûukha?).

3 Des Michels, op. cit., p. 53.

4 Ibid., pp. 52, 53, and 101.
government stood at the outset at Lucā-tōu, an ancient city the ruins of the ramparts of which are still to be seen near the actual village of Lóng-khē, district of Sieżu-luēi, province of Bak-niû, at some thirty li (about five miles) to the north of Hà-nōi. The ancient name of the district just referred to was Din-tōu. 

It would appear from this description that Lucā-tōu, if not absolutely identical with the Lucā-thān of K'ünlunic fame—I borrow this reboant, although perfectly harmless, adjectived form from Lacouperie, who so well loved to employ it,—must have stood very close to its site (which, we have seen, was also in the province of Bak-niû, district of Dông-ngăn, and a short distance north-east of Hà-nōi), and may perhaps have been named after it; for Lucā-tōu and Lucā-thān look practically identical as toponymics. It is a pity that the native annalists do not tell us whether these terms designate one and the same city or not. Some among them give us indirectly to understand, however,—which is rather more important for our present inquiry—that the city of Lucā-tōu rose within the territory of Long-bien.

Most of the evidence is thus in favour of the seat of government for Kiao-chi having been situated, during Western Han rule, in the Long-bien district, and, if not at Hà-nōi itself (identified with the Long-bien district-city of the period), at any rate within a radius of no more than five or six miles from it.

Opinions again differ not a little as to the location occupied by the administrative residence during the succeeding Eastern Han dynasty (A.D. 25–221). Those who incline to place it at Long-bien (i.e. Hà-nōi) in Western Han times, declare that it was removed thence to Mè-liûn

1 Ibid., p. 181.
2 Ibid., p. 53.
3 Ibid., p. 181. This I make out by inference as follows:—The ruins of Lucā-tōu are stated (loc. cit.) to have been still extant in the district called Tōng-biû in A.D. 825, the date at which the latter became the seat of government under the T'ang dynasty. This district of Tōng-biû is said to have been formed out of a portion of the territory belonging to the district known by the name of Long-bien under the Han. Hence it follows that Lucā-tōu must have stood on ancient Long-bien territory.
(north-east of Sôn-tōi) in about A.D. 25, and there remained under the Eastern Han. But this view is emphatically rejected by the modern native historians, who hold that Mê-lûn never enjoyed such a privilege at the period in question. At the same time they are not at all explicit as to what they believe to have then been the seat of government for the chûn of Kiao-chi proper, as distinguished from the bô or chou of Kiao. Since the latter included Tonkin as well as Kwangtung, its general administrative residence may well have been from B.C. 106 to A.D. 210 at Kwang-hsin in Kwang-hsi, and next at P'ian-yû or Canton (A.D. 210–264) as stated. But with regard to the former, the district governor must have resided either at Luâ-lîou or Long-bien. The greater share of probability rests with the latter-named city, for we are told that its ramparts were built since A.D. 208, or fully

1 Ibid., pp. 52, 53.
2 Ma Tuan-lûn says (op. cit., p. 308) that the Western Han emperor Wu-Ti decided (n.c. 111) that the governor of the nine chûns of the bô or pu of Kiao-chi was to reside in the chûn of Kiao-chi proper. "It is thus," he adds, "that the toponymic Kiao-chi prevailed," an observation corroborating our previous remarks as to the date at which this term began to spread beyond the limits of the district where it had originated. In A.D. 203 the Eastern Han changed into chou the administrative designation of bô or pu formerly applied to the region, and thus the latter became known as the chou of Kiao, being usually termed Kiao-chou or Chiao-chou (Des Michels, op. cit., p. 85); but the Tonkinese district of Kiao-chi proper continued to retain its name and character of chûn of Kiao-chi. Not long afterwards, however, and precisely in A.D. 264, the Wu emperor Mo-Ti split the chou of Kiao into two territorial divisions, of which the northern one—termed chou of Kwang or Kwang-chou—had its gubernatorial residence at P'ian-yû (Canton), and the other on the south—called Kiao-chou, and practically corresponding to the Tonkin of our days—had the seat of government fixed at Lung-pien (Long-bien). Hence Long-bien came to be often alluded to in historical accounts since that period as the Kiao-chou capital, or simply Kiao-chou. A knowledge of these frequent changes in the nomenclature of both the province and its chief city is absolutely necessary in order to avoid the confusion of localities and place-names which may easily arise from a superficial examination of Sino-Annamese records. Thus, prior to A.D. 264, the term Kiao-chi designated at one time (1) the region including Tonkin and Kwang-tung, with the southern part of Kwang-hsi; (2) the district of Kiao-chi proper (territory about Hà-nôi) in the same region; (3) the chief city of the latter. After A.D. 264 the term Kiao-chou denoted the country that we now call Tonkin, as well as its chief city; while Kiao-chi was used both for the said chief city and for the particular district in which it stood. Verily, "the heathen Chinese is peculiar," none the less so in his topographical nomenclature.
fifty-two years before it became the capital of the re-organized chou of Kiao-chi, now reduced by the Wu to practically the same limits occupied by the Tonkin of the present day. There would be no reason for such defensive works, had not Long-bien been at that period the seat of government for the Kiao-chi district. I am not prepared to assert that the jurisdiction of the official residing at that city extended to the adjoining Tonkinese chūns as well, for these appear to have had separate governors, subordinate, equally with that of the Kiao-chi chūn, to the governor-general at Kwang-hsin or P'an-yū. But in view of the long connection that the Long-bien district had had with the ancient capitals of the region, and that the chūn of Kiao-chi of which it formed part and parcel now had with the name borne by the whole territorial division of Kiao-chou, I should imagine that the Long-bien district-city must have enjoyed a certain prestige, if not actual ascendancy over the sister-towns, and must somehow have been regarded nominally as the chief city, and its district as the principal district not only of the Kiao-chi chūn but of the whole Tonkinese territory. Its strategical position at the head of the delta of the Red River, which made of it, down to recent years, the key of Tonkin, and to about four centuries ago its principal commercial port,1 has no doubt, and in a great measure, contributed to heighten that prestige and give point to that ascendancy, granted that the latter already made itself manifest at the period in question. At any rate, it is undoubtedly due to the peculiar advantages enumerated above that Long-bien was singled out among all the sister district-cities for protection with defensive works; and it is difficult to perceive the full necessity of such a step being taken without admitting that Long-bien was, at the same time, the seat of government for, at least, the chūn of Kiao-chi.

It was in connection with the building of its bulwarks that a coiled dragon is fabled to have been discovered in

1 "Il n'y a guère plus de quatre cents ans que Hanoï a cessé d’être port de mer" (Excursions et Reconnaissances, Cochinchine Francaise, No. 30, p. 166).
its neighbourhood, as already stated. From this incident, we are told, the city had its name changed into Long-wien (龍婉, in Chinese Lung-yüan), the 'Dragon's stealthy approach.' But its former designation, Long-bien (龍緯, in Chinese Lung-pien), must have been also connected with some dragon story, for it means, as we have seen, 'Dragon's folds,' or 'Dragon's coils.' Under this name the district had been known since the time of the Han conquest (B.C. 111), when, according to one of the versions given above, it became the seat of government for the whole region of Kiao-chi. Since A.D. 208, the date at which its chef-lieu was girt with protective ramparts, it is mentioned in native records both as Long-bien and Long-wien. From A.D. 264 to A.D. 533 the administrative residence for the whole chou of Kiao-chi stood at Long-bien district-city.\(^1\) At the latter date a revolt broke out headed by the patriotic Li-bón. This personage took possession of Long-bien, drove out the Chinese governor maintained there by the Liang dynasty, and having readily become the master of the adjoining districts, he set up as king of the country (A.D. 538), which he called Nâm-viet (南越, in Chinese Nau-yüeh).\(^2\) His reign, however, was but of brief duration, and in consequence of reverses he met with at the hands of the imperial troops he had to withdraw westwards into the hill tracts of the Black River, where he was carried off by jungle fever in A.D. 548. Thereupon one of his valiant generals proclaimed himself king with the title of Triệu-Viet-vūang, and having defeated the imperialists made Long-bien his residence (A.D. 550).\(^3\) Thus, after an interval of seven and a half centuries, Tonkin recovered its independence from foreign rule, with Long-bien as capital.

A few years later a formidable competitor arose against Triệu-Viet-vūang in the person of Li-p'h̄ôt-tâ, a relative of the former king Li-bón. Civil war broke out, and fortune favouring Li-p'h̄ôt-tâ, he suppressed Triệu-Viet-vūang,

---

2 Ibid., pp. 132 and 135.
3 Ibid., pp. 143, 144.
and set himself up as king (A.D. 569). From that date Long-bien ceased to be the capital, for the new ruler established his residence at P’hong-ch’ou (north-east of Sôn-tôi), the ancient metropolis of Van-lâng. The Viet-nâm kingdom was destined, however, to be short-lived. In A.D. 602 the Sui despatched against it an expedition which was successful, and Li-p’hôt-tú made his submission. Tonkin thus became once more a Chinese possession, being known under the old name of Kiao-chou at first, and Kiao-chi shortly afterwards.

The T’ang re-established the designation Kiao-chou in A.D. 619; but having reorganized the country in A.D. 679, they called it ‘Protectorate general of An-nan’ (安南), i.e. the protectorate general that was to ‘pacify the south.’ Thence originated that vague term Annâm (this being the local pronunciation of the above two characters), which, in the course of time, with the extension of Sino-Annamese dominions southwards at the expense of Campâ, came to be applied to what was formerly Châm territory, while being superseded (in 1428) by the term Tonkin (東京, Đông-kiű, Tung-ching, Tung-king, etc.) in the region it used to designate at first. The seat of government for the protectorate was established at Kiao-chou, i.e. the chef-lieu of the Kiao district. Whether this was the old Long-bien city or not we are not told, but we may well declare ourselves for the affirmative. In A.D. 757 the designation An-nan for the protectorate was changed to Chén-nan (in Annamese Trôn-nâm), only to be re-established, however, in 768.

In the interval we hear of a new city being founded, which is termed Lâ-thân (羅城, in Chinese Lo-ch’êng). Its construction, the native historians tell us, was started in A.D. 767, continued in A.D. 791, and completed and improved upon in A.D. 808, from which date the town

1 Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 149, 150.
2 Ibid., p. 161.
4 Des Michels, op. cit., p. 158.
5 Ibid., pp. 168 and 171.
6 Ibid., pp. 169, 173, 176.
is usually mentioned under the slightly modified form Dāi-lā (大羅, in Chinese T'ài-lo), evidently a contraction of 大羅城, Dāi Lā-thān, ‘the great city of Lā.’ The foundation of this city is wrongly ascribed by some to the famous Kau-P'ien (高駢) in A.D. 866.¹ A fortress by the name of Lā-thān was indeed built by this Chinese general at the date mentioned, but elsewhere.² At the same time a little citadel also called Lā-thān had been erected outside of Dāi-lā city, close by the banks of the Tō-li kh, apparently a small branch of the Red River detached near the present Hà-nói. Hither, we are informed, the seat of government for the Annam protectorate was transferred in A.D. 824,³ presumably from Dāi-lā. This frequency of the term Lā-thān, applied promiscuously to three different places, viz., (1) the city of Dāi-lā, (2) Kau-P'ien’s fortress, and (3) the citadel outside the walls of Dāi-lā, generates a good deal of confusion, which is made worse confounded when the commentators of the ancient annals tell us how the earthen mounds rising on the exterior of the four sides of the present Hà-nói are likewise called Lā-thān.⁴

We shall try to find our way through all this chaotic nomenclature in order to establish the identity of Dāi-lā, which is the pivot upon which turns the whole of the present inquiry. We have seen that Dāi-lā had been known as Lā-thān scores of years before its less glorious namesakes came into existence. Now, we are told in a note of the translator that this Lā-thān, otherwise Dāi-lā, is the same city as is now termed K'é-chô (Kesho) or Hà-nói.⁵ At the same time, we have seen on a former page that the native commentators identify the ancient Long-bien city, whose walls were built in A.D. 208, likewise with Hà-nói.⁶ Therefore

² Ibid., p. 210. Outside of Kim city is the place indicated, but in which district this was to be found we are not told by the befogging commentators.
⁵ Ibid., p. 173, and note 979, p. 197 of the Notes.
⁶ Ibid., p. 53.
Dâi-lâ must have arisen close to the site of the ancient Long-bien or Long-vien; perhaps on its ruins, as it is possible that Long-bien may have been dismantled and partially destroyed during the Chinese invasion of A.D. 602, which is the last time we hear of its existence.\(^1\) We thus obtain the equation: Long-bien or Long-vien (A.D. 208–602) = Lâ-thân (A.D. 767–808) = Dâi-lâ (A.D. 808–866 et seq.). Let us see what further proofs can be adduced in support of its correctness.

The native commentators tell us that the Lý made Long-vien their capital, changing its name to Thang-long (‘Dragon at rest’), a designation which it preserved under the Trân and the Lê.\(^2\) Now, according to the Abbé Launay, Lê-thái-tô, the founder of the local Lý dynasty, who reigned between A.D. 1010 and 1028, had established his capital at Dâi-lâ, and, after having embellished it considerably, he changed, in consequence of a dream, its name into Thang-long. This capital, that author tells us in a note, is the present-day Hà-nội. We learn furthermore that towards 1399 A.D. a new capital having been built further to the west with the name of Tô-i-dô (西 都 in Chinese Hsi-tu = ‘Western Capital’), Thang-long, i.e. Hà-nội, became known, by contrast, as Đông-dô (東 都 in Chinese Tung-tu = ‘Eastern Capital’).\(^3\) On or shortly after A.D. 1428, the date of the Lê’s advent to power, its name was once more changed into Đông-khiến\(^4\) with exactly the same signification (東 京, in

\(^1\) See ibid., p. 150, where it is said that the indigenous king Lý-p’êë-thê, whose capital was then at P’hông-chôn, had just appointed a governor over Long-bien.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 53.

\(^3\) ‘Histoire de l’Annam,’ p. 48. I have to avail myself of this work for this later period, although I am aware that it is by no means a standard one, for want of a better authority. Des Michels’ valuable translation of the Annamese Annals unfortunately stops at A.D. 967, and it is a pity that it was not brought down to completion, especially as he would then have given us an index of all proper names with their transcription in native characters, as he promised to do at the outset. In inquiries like our present one the toiling investigator is always handicapped in his identification of toponymics by the difficulty of getting at the native characters by which they are represented in the countries where they occur.

\(^4\) Launay, op. cit., p. 89. He seems to ignore, however, the designation Thang-long which the city had borne up to that date.

\(^5\) Ibid., p. 111.
Chinese Tung-ching or Tung-king). Thence the designation Tung-king or Tonkin came to be applied to the whole region. We are therefore on perfectly solid ground in asserting that the present Hà-nội, the former Đại-lã or Lã-thành, the ancient Long-bien of A.D. 208, and its still more remote though less conspicuous namesake, which constituted the chef-lieu of the famed Long-bien district of the Han since at least B.C. 110, are practically identical in so far as they rose on the same site—perhaps on the ruins of one another—each being the historical continuation of its predecessor, and all together representing in almost unbroken succession, for fully twenty centuries down to the present day, the administrative seat for the government of the country.¹

¹ In confirmation of this result of my independent investigations I have since come across the following passage by Mr. E. H. Parker (in the China Review, vol. xx, p. 53), where the identity of Hà-nội with Long-bien is demonstrated by evidence collected on the spot. This identity is, however, traced down to A.D. 550 only, when Long-bien had become the capital of Nôm-viêt, the first independent kingdom established in Tonkin since the Han conquest. The passage referred to runs as follows:—

"Mr. Dumoutier, of Hanoi, has made the interesting discovery that the ruins of Kau Pien's capital or citadel are still visible in the immediate neighbourhood of Hanoi. [This must refer to the Lã-thành citadel, which, we have seen, was not built there by Kau Pien, but elsewhere.] In the month of July last Mr. Dumoutier conducted me for the second time over the site, and pointed out the débris of bricks and pottery several feet in thickness. Referring to the native Annamese History Primer, 启童記約 [Khải-dòng-thuyết-ủak], I find it distinctly stated that the modern Hanoi is the Taila city [T'ai-lo-ch'êng] of Kau-Pien, and the still more ancient Long-p'ien, the first real independent capital of Yích-nan, the capital of the Southern Emperor [Thien-Li Nôm-đê], who with his successor Chao-yích Wang [Trêu-Viet-viâng] reigned there for thirty years. Thirty-two years later [A.D. 602] the country was incorporated with the Sui Empire of China, and it was during the succeeding dynasty of T'ang that the great struggle for supremacy between the Chinese and Siamese [sic for Nan-Chao, i.e. Lâu, but not at all, properly, 'Shân,' i.e. Siamese] races took place, Annam being a mere catspaw. Mr. Dumoutier has prepared a history of Kau Pien," etc.

From the above passage it appears that the native literati are not unaware of the identity of Hà-nội with the ancient Long-bien, although they make so much confusion in annotating the old records. As regards the location of Đại-lã, the following passage from a historical work is quoted in the Annamese Annals (Des Michels, op. cit., p. 210):—"According to the Đại-thành-nüst-thạng-shì the city of Đại-lã stood outside the provincial town of the chou of Jâu [Kiao-chí chou]. At this spot [the seat of government for] both the chün, which bore the name of Kiao-chí under the Han, and the protectorate of the T'ang were to be found. In the course of time they fell into ruins, and it is now difficult to
Summarizing now the results of the above discussion, we find that, according to the most accredited views and the evidence to hand, the capital of the chūn (province) of Kiao-chi—if not, indeed, for the whole region of Tonkin as understood in our days—stood, during the two and a half centuries or so immediately preceding the publication of Ptolemy's work, on territory forming part of the Long-bien district; and, more precisely, at either—

(1) Luêâ-tōu, a city about five miles to the north or northeast of the present Hâ-nōi, which is seemingly identical with Luêâ-thân or Kô-lêâ, the capital of the ancient Où-lâk or Ôù-lâk (Ou-lo) kingdom (B.C. 258–208); or,

(2) Long-bien district-city—after A.D. 208 called Long-vien, and later on Lâ-thân (A.D. 767) and Dâi-iâ (A.D. 808)—rising practically on the site of the present Hâ-nōi.

There is, therefore, no possible doubt that either of the two ancient cities just named corresponds to Ptolemy's Aganagara, and that the location we have assigned to the latter in our tables on the site of Hâ-nōi has every chance of proving absolutely correct, and in the worst instance cannot be out more than some five miles from the position indicated. We must remain content with this result, so eminently satisfactory, it being impossible at the present stage of our knowledge to push the topographical inquiry any further. Investigations conducted locally should very soon settle the question as to which of the two neighbouring cities pointed out must be finally identified with Ptolemy's Aganagara. Provisionally we hold for Long-bien, i.e. Hâ-nōi, which appears to be the most eligible of the two.

Passing now from topographical to linguistical considerations, we find that the chances are almost equally divided between Luêâ-tōu and Long-bien. Luêâ-tōu, we have seen, is, to all appearance, the same as the erstwhile Luêâ-thân or recognize their ancient vestiges.” It is to be hoped that Mr. Dumoutier’s investigations, the results of which are so far unknown to me beyond what is set forth in the above extract, and the researches of other European scholars, will finally settle the points of detail that still remain doubtful or obscure in this topographical question.
Kô-luá, the ancient conch-shell-shaped city whose high towering walls were compared in majesty with the K’un-lun mountain, the Olympus of Chinese fiction. This particular as to the loftiness of the city walls may have suggested to the Indû settlers in the country the designation Agranagara (in Pâli Agganagara), meaning ‘High City’ or ‘High Citadel,’ which would naturally be adopted by the ruling class (of Indû descent, as we have shown), as well as by the people, at a period when Indûism was in the ascendant and Chinese influence was as yet probably nil.

On the other hand, as regards Long-bien, it is quite possible that its name, absolutely Chinese in character, is but the translation of some older designation of Indû origin borne by the city, and likewise connected with the dragon, the Sanskrit Nâga or Urâga, such as e.g. Nâga-nagara, Urâga-nagara, which may have become in the course of time contracted by the vulgar or by foreigners into Aganagara, whence Ptolemy’s Aganagara. The term Urâga, we have seen, is probably embodied in the toponymic Ou-lâk applied to the maritime region about Hà-nôï in general, and, specifically, to the kingdom founded there by the Thûk (Âsoka?) dynasty in B.C. 258. Subsequently to the fall of the latter the term Urâga or Ou-lâk may have survived in connection with Luá-thañ, the Thûk capital, and its later namesake Luá-lüö; or else with Long-bien, the name of the particular district where that capital stood, passing thence to the Long-bien district-city, in the event of this having been made the seat of government by the Han, instead of Luá-lüö.

Yet another interpretation may be put upon the term Aganagara should we feel inclined to derive it from the Sanskrit Agranagara or the Pâli Agganagara. Both these words may be taken to mean also ‘Chief City.’ In this sense Aganagara would imply the chef-lieu, the administrative residence for the chüï of Kiao-chi, and perhaps for the whole Tonkinese region, in Ptolemy’s time. This, again, leads us to either: (1) Luá-lüö, the erstwhile Luá-thañ; or (2) Long-bien, the present Hà-nôï.
Thus, unless we ascribe to the term Aganagara the meaning of 'High or Lofty City,' we find ourselves brought face to face, in the arena of philological debate, with the same alternatives that confronted us on the field of historical controversy. Surely, it is only from a thorough archaeologica survey of the sites of the two cities in dispute that the definite solution of this intricate problem can be expected, it being unlikely that the vague and often contradictory information contained in the extant records can throw any decisive light on the question.

In so far as the ancient and somewhat mythical Luâ-thân is concerned, it should be remarked that, although it may have been destroyed in consequence of the fall of the Thük kingdom in B.C. 208, its site was not forgotten, nor perhaps entirely abandoned. We have seen, in fact, that according to one version the Han seat of government was established there in B.C. 111, when the old Thük capital was perhaps rebuilt in the form of a provincial chief-city bearing the slightly modified name of Luâ-tâu. As time rolled on and the memory of its ancient glory dimmed in the mist of centuries, a halo of myth and fable began to grow around the historical traditions connected with the ancient city, to which each successive generation considerably added. The designation of Kun-lun or Olympus-like city was applied to it, we are told, by the Chinese of the T'ang period (A.D. 618–907). The story as to the loftiness and spiral arrangement of its walls has, no doubt, been sensibly magnified and partly invented in after ages.

In 939 A.D. a pleasant surprise awaited the legendary city. Ngô-kwâên, governor of the chou or province of Ái (established in A.D. 523 on the territory of the ancient Kâu-chôn, now Thân-hwâ ²), having rebelled against Chinese rule and set up as king of the whole Tonkinese region, established his capital at the ancient Luâ-thân, which became henceforth known by the name of Kô-luâ.

¹ Des Michels, op. cit., p. 12.
² Ibid., p. 131.
in Chinese Ku-lo). The Ngô dynasty founded by him had, however, but an ephemeral existence, and came to an end in A.D. 965, although the country managed, in spite of internal dissensions, to maintain its independence from Chinese domination for another four and a half centuries. The capital was then removed to Huế-lũ in Ngã-ăn, and next to Đại-lã or Hà-nội, now called Thăng-long, in the first quarter of the eleventh century; and never again do we hear of the ancient Luân-tha or Kô-lúcá coming to the front in Tonkinese history. Future investigations will tell whether, in its earlier days, it did so under Han rule, thereby winning a permanent place in Ptolemaic geography. Until its claim to such a position is established, however, I prefer, as I said, to consider its competitor Long-bien, the present-day Hà-nội, as the real Aganagara.

Sinda, a town (No. 115).

This name evidently represents the Sanskrit Sindhu or Sindh, which in Chinese takes the forms Shên-tu (身毒) and Hsin-tu (信度). The Annamese Sôn-tôi (Som-tây), although spelled with quite different characters and looking in more than one respect what it is represented to be—namely, a modern designation applied collectively to the territories of several ancient districts known of yore under absolutely dissimilar names,—is likely to have, as we shall

1 Des Michels, op. cit., p. 221.
2 I have just learned, although too late in time to make use of it in these pages, that Mr. G. Dumontier, several years ago, published a monograph on the ancient Luân-tha or Kô-lúcá, under the title "Étude historique et archéologique sur Cô-Loa, capitale de l'ancien royaume de Au-Lôc (réunion de Thúc et de Van-lang)," in Nouvelles Archives des Missions Scientifiques, t. iii, 1892. I draw attention to this work here, as perhaps in it the reader may find the elements for the solution of the question set forth above.
3 Sôn-tôi (山西, in Chinese Shan-hsi) has, in Annamese, the meaning of 'Western Hills' or 'Western Hill-tracts'; this designation being apparently applied to the province it now denotes on account of this being situated at the foot of the hills bounding Tonkin on the west. But probably it is, as surmised
see, some etymological connection, whether direct or indirect, with the term Sindhu and its derivatives, which it strikingly resembles in sound. Quite independently, however, of the still problematic circumstance as to the name Sön-töi being the modern Sino-Annamese travesty of an ancient local term Sindhu, or something to that effect, handed down in a more or less corrupted form through many successive generations, topographical reasons concur in pointing to Sön-töi or its immediate neighbourhood as the most probable site where Ptolemy’s Sinda must have stood. Hence, although my identification of Sinda with Sön-töi may still be open to criticism from a linguistic point of view—at any rate, in so far as the alleged modern term Sön-töi is concerned—it is almost beyond doubt geographically correct, especially if, as I think, Sinda in Ptolemy’s time—like Sön-töi in our own day-designated not only a town, but also the district of which it formed the chef-lieu. However it be, these topographical indications, coupled with the fact of the close similarity in names between the two places, entitle Sön-töi to be regarded, for practical purposes, as the present representative of the ancient Sinda.

Truly, it may be objected that the rectified position we have obtained for Sinda in the tables, while almost coincident in latitude with that of Sön-töi, which it exceeds by a mere 3’, is as much as 57’ less than the latter in longitude, thus falling far away into the valley of the Black River, somewhere to the west of Phū-yen Chou (富安州). This being, however, a rather peculiar location for a thriving commercial centre, such as we may well suppose Sinda must have been, above, merely a modern travesty of the early name borne by the district. In Chinese Sön-töi or Shan-hsi would mean instead ‘West of the Hills,’ which is topographically untrue. The chef-lieu is likewise called Sön-töi. The present province embraces the territories once belonging to the ancient districts of Chêu-vién, Phūhak-lök (福祿, Fu-lu), and Van-lãng of the primordial Van-lãng kingdom; to the districts of Chêu-vién and Mê-liâu of the Han period; to the chün or province of Tchin-ch‘iang (Hsin-ch‘iang) of the T‘ain (constituted A.D. 271); and to the chou of P’hông, or P’hông-chou of the T‘ang, formed A.D. 679. (See Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 2, 8, 49, 57, 103, 106, 160, and 232.)
it will be far more expedient not to lay too much stress on the result obtained in longitude, and to assume for that town a position somewhat more to the east and out of the wilds than that. By a glance at a modern map it will be noticed that at a short distance to the north-west of Sön-töi a most interesting geographical phenomenon occurs, for here both the Black and the Clear Rivers join the Red River within almost a stone’s throw of each other, forming, as it were, a common confluence, which has, indeed, ever been considered as such by the natives, it being usually referred to in the Chinese records of this region as the San-ch’i-chiang (三星江) or ‘confluent of the three rivers,’ and employed as an alternative term for Sön-töi.¹ The strategical as well as commercial importance of this multiple junction of waterways, tapping the valleys of three conspicuous streams, is too evident to need demonstration, and must have attracted attention since the earliest days. That such was the case is proved by the fact of the ancient kingdom of Vun-làng having been established just about this spot. It was on the northern bank of the main river that its capital Phong-châu stood, and precisely on the territories of the present Löm-dâu (臨桃, in Chinese Lin-t’au)² and Viên-thiăng districts, whose chef-lieux lie within short distances respectively, to the north-west and the north of Sön-töi city. The circuits of Bâkh-hâk (白鵠, in Chinese Pai-hau or Pê-ho), at the confluent of the Clear River with the main stream, and Sön-vi (山圍, in Chinese Shan-wei), near the junction of the Black River with the latter, are pointed out as the most probable sites;³ hence we may limit the position of the ancient Phong-châu between the two confluents.

Thus the territory in question became the scene of the

¹ See Devéria’s "Frontière Sino-Annamite," pp. 53–54.
² Evidently named, as we have already observed, from the Nam-Tâu or Dâu (Red River, whose name is sometimes written with the character 桃 instead of 洨. Löm-dâu, I notice, is now usually spelled Löm-thâu; but for the old form 気桃 see Devéria (op. cit., p. 54), who is, I believe, correct.
³ Des Michels, op. cit., p. 2.
earliest events mentioned in Annamese history, and seems to have been also one of the first seats of Indu power and civilization in Tonkin, for the place-names P'hong (崑, in Chinese Fêng, Fung, etc. = Banga or Vaṅga?) and Van-lâng (文郎, in Chinese Wên-lang = Banráng, Vanraing, Vanarainga?) look much like being of Indu origin. The Annamese annalists, thoroughly imbued with the spirit of their later masters, the Chinese, do, of course, endeavour, with a supreme pride as well as delight, to trace the ancestry of their ancient kings to the fabulous Chinese emperor Shên-nung, otherwise Yun-ti, the ‘Fiery God,’ said to have ruled between B.C. 2838 and 2698; but the legendary accounts they give must naturally be taken cum grano salis, and we are presumably within reasonable bounds of historical truth if we place the foundation of the Van-lâng kingdom at a much less remote date, say in the fourth or fifth century before the Christian era, or only a couple of hundred years before the invasion of king Thûk-P'hân (Aśoka-vardhana?) took place. This result is to some extent borne out by the native annals themselves. According to the latter, in fact, there were eighteen kings of Van-lâng, the length of whose reigns is not given. Reckoning back from the last ruler, dethroned in B.C. 258 by King Thûk, for the full number of eighteen reigns as indicated by the annals, and at the rate of twenty years a reign, a very reasonable average, we get to B.C. 618, say to the end of the seventh century B.C., which would thus prove to be the remotest date to which the foundation of the Van-lâng kingdom could be ostensibly shifted back.

1 This name should be compared also with that of P'hauâng—said to be a contraction of Pûdhavaṅga—in Lower Cochin-China. The Cantonese pronunciation, Mên-lang, of the characters with which it is spelled, suggests also a probable form Mauvang or Mên-rang; but it is little likely that the Mên or Kên-Mên are implied. Dumoutier, in the usual reckless style adopted by our Sinologists of interpreting Indo-Chinese toponymics transcribed in Chinese characters after the sense that the characters themselves have in the Chinese tongue, takes Van-lâng (in Chinese Wên-lang) to be the name of a tribe which he thus translates as the ‘Savants’ (see China Review, vol. xix, p. 150). It is, indeed, high time that our Sinologists should give up this absurd, useless, and utterly unjustifiable system of dealing with the foreign place-names occurring in Chinese records.
But as next to nothing is told us of the exploits of these eighteen rulers, history being silent even as to the individual names they bore, and simply referring to them as the Hùng-čiăng, i.e. kings of the Hùng dynasty, after the title of its founder, we may well reduce the number of them to a mere few without fear of being very far wrong, and thus we obtain the fourth or fifth century B.C. as about the extreme chronological limit to which the origin of the Văn-lãng kingdom can be logically assigned. Such being the case, this primordial Tonkinese kingdom would prove approximately coeval in its rise to other realms founded elsewhere in Indo-China by adventurers from Northern India, and there seems thus to be nothing extraordinary in our assumption, which we trust will one day find confirmation in fact, of its having had a similar origin.

Meanwhile it will be admitted, I hope, that the connection I have pointed out between the toponymic Sindā recorded by Ptolemy, and a Indū term Sindhu or something similar, is unmistakeable. It cannot fail to occur to one as quite possible that the district we have just described, being so rich in fluvial waterways, may have received from the early Indū settlers the name of Sindhu, which, it is well known, means generically a 'river,' and its native inhabitants the name Sindhus or Saindhavas, because of their dwelling in an eminently fluviatile region. Similarly, the chief city or commercial centre of the district—for something of the kind must have existed—may have become known as the town of Sindhu or Sindh, either from the district itself or from its being situated, as very probably was the case, on the banks of the main river and close by the Sindhu-saṅgama, as the San-ch‘i-chiăng of Chinese writers of a later period would then be called.

Against the objection that would naturally be raised as to no mention occurring in the native annals concerning the period in question of any district or settlement bearing a name similar or even slightly approaching in sound to Sindhu or Sindh, I shall oppose the demonstration that some well-defined trace existed within the very territory of the
present Sôn-töi, of some such term, handed down to us in the form of a tribal name which, whether derived from it or not, is with it undoubtedly connected.

We are, in fact, told in the native accounts of the ancient Van-lăng kingdom, that the latter was founded by a prince Lăk-long,¹ of Dragon (Nāga, Uraga, or Lăk) descent on his mother's side, who, as the legend has it, often appeared to his courtiers in the form of a dragon coiled up on the throne. This extraordinary personage wedded a girl of celestial, or divine, lineage (from Sun or Fire, identified here with the Chinese Fire-god and Emperor Yen-ti) bearing the name of Ơu-ki (＝ Aggi, the Pāli word for 'fire')?, and had a hundred children by her, of whom fifty were boys and the other half girls. When these had sufficiently grown up in age, the prince said to his bride: "I am of Dragon (Nāga, Uraga) descent, and thou art offspring of the Celestials. Water and Fire, being elements antagonistic to each other, cannot long dwell together," and forthwith he intimated that they should part, after having divided the children of either sex equally amongst them, each of the parents taking one half. This was agreed to by the mother, but before the separation took place their eldest male child was appointed to rule, by common consent, over the country that was the scene of these events, with the title of Hùng-viăng (雄王), i.e. King Hùng. It was this potentate who founded, according to the legends, the Van-lăng kingdom with capital at Phông-châu, on the bank of the Red River opposite to that of Sôn-töi. Princess

¹ Lăk-long quän of Des Michels (op. cit., p. 1) and others. But here quän (kwôn) is merely the Chinese 君, chūn = 'prince'; hence Lăk-long kwôn means Prince Lăk-long. In this name long is the Sino-Annamese term for 'dragon'; while Lăk (麤, Chinese, ㄌ), although having a different meaning, is very likely a corrupt rendering of its Indian synonyms Nāga or Uraga. The above name means, therefore, Nāga Prince, or Prince Dragon. Des Michels informs us (ibid., p. 6, notes) that according to the legend this prince, being of dragon race on his mother's side, took pleasure dwelling in the bosom of the waters. This is, of course, a fiction allusive to the amphibious character of the people of the delta inhabiting a country still subject to tidal influence, and having no doubt acquired proficiency in boatmanship, whereby they were likened unto serpents and called Nāgas or Uragas (Lăk, or Ơu-lăk), their country being termed the country of Lăk, and their fields the fields of Lăk (vide supra, p. 321).
Ôu-kì, his mother, returned with one half of her offspring to the region of Mount Bā-vi—situated to the south-west of Sôn-tōi close by the Black River, and not far from its junction with the main stream—apparently her original home; while Prince Lăk-long with the other half of the children, minus the newly crowned king Hùng, proceeded to the alluvial plains of the delta, the region of waters or Nāga country, as the legend says, where he settled. Some accounts represent him as having taken up his abode at the bottom of the sea, the mythical sojourn of the Nāgas; but this is, of course, merely an allegorical allusion to the mode of life of the people of the delta, spent for the most part afloat and, as it were, amidst the waters, owing to the periodical inundations, tidal and otherwise, to which the country was subject.

Endeavouring to read through the above legend by divesting it of all the mythical finery in which Oriental imagination has wrapped it up, we find that the sense it is intended to convey is very probably as follows:—The country of Tonkin was in its earliest days inhabited by two populations distinct in habits and mode of life, at least, although probably issued from a common original Môn-Annam stock, to wit: (1) a people of the plains, identified with the element of Water and ascribed a Nāga descent, either because of their dwelling on the border of streams and on that part of the delta subject to periodical inundations, or of their being addicted to serpent-worship; perhaps for both reasons at the same time; (2) a people of mountaineers, living in the hill-tracts on the west, about the celebrated Mount Bā-vi, and identified with the element of Fire ( Ağgi, or Ağni), because of their worshipping this element, especially in its celestial form of thunderbolt and genius of the mountains (volcanoes), a cult of which traces still

1 It should be understood that the version I have followed here is in the main that contained in the above-quoted Siamese translation of the Việt-nam Sū-kī, the account given in the annals translated by Des Michels (pp. 2, 3) being too brief, and the one presented by the Abbé Launay (pp. 8, 9) too garbled, to be of much use.
survive in that region, and of their probably being metal-workers like most hill tribes of C'hieng race now in Indo-China. Each of the two peoples had their own chief, both coming in the course of time nominally under the supreme authority of a king, said to be descended from an intermixture of the two races, but being more likely the scion of some adventurer who had come from India, and had united the two heterogeneous populations of the country under the same sceptre, thus founding the first simulacrum of a kingdom among peoples who were not at all by instinct kingdom-founders, but accustomed to independent tribal organization. The fact of the district where the capital stood being, like the whole kingdom itself, called Van-lăng, shows that the de facto jurisdiction of the new ruler did not probably extend much beyond the limits of that very district, while

1 At Mount Bā-vi, of which worship Dumontier speaks in the following terms (see China Review, vol. ix, p. 105) :- "Every three years, people say, in those parts the neighbours of Mount Bā-vi are in the habit of offering to the genius of Tǎn-Viến [another name for the mountain; see note on next page] axes of bronze and stone; the huyên [district] of Bát-bat supplies the stone-axes, and the huyên of Thống-thiênn those of bronze. The offering is made in the forest temple; the genius comes to fetch these axes, which he uses for knocking mortals on the head during storms. From the cloudy peaks of Tǎn-Viến, say the natives, amid flashes of lightning, he hurls shafts of bronze and stone indiscriminately: these shafts bury themselves deeply in the ground, but each thunderclap makes them jump up again, and they are found soon afterwards on the surface of the ground, whence they are carefully collected, for they constitute a valuable talisman against thunderbolts." From a Siamese MS. in my possession I learn that a similar worship was, and probably is still, practised in Yúnnan, as the following extract I translate will show: -- "The Họ-băng [i.e. the Great Hố or Yúnnanese] dwell in a city at the head of the Nông-Śê Lake [the Great Nông-Śê, i.e. lake of Yúnnan Fu], near which there is a high mountain. They practise the worship of genii. This they perform by placing a copper axe with offerings of food high up on the mountain slope; then they withdraw to wait at a sāla [resting shed] below. Soon the genius displays a flash of light like a rainbow descending upon the offerings. An interval of obscurity follows, during which the spirit devours the estables. When his repast is over the luminous streak reappears, and then the oblators go up for the tray left empty of its contents, which they take back with them. It is said that the Msiang Thun-wang-fā-hūen, in the Hố country, was at an early period the Msiang Sēi-Thēn [tributary to the Thēn or celestial spirits], where the copper axes were made which are offered [literally, brought as tribute] to Balarāma." We see from this extract that the early Indi immigrants identified the Indo-Chinese genius of the mountains and thunder with Balarāma or Rāma with the axe, the axe meaning the thunderbolt. Since that period he has ever been looked upon in this character by Indo-Chinese populations. The Sīamese call him more often Rāmaśevra.
the people of the delta and those of the mountains each continued, as will be seen directly, under their own particular chiefs. It is, in short, the same state of affairs that we meet with in ancient Kamboja: the lords, there styled kings, of Fire and Water¹ of the early populations, now

¹ *Sdach*-'Phlong or 'Fire-King,' and *Sdach*-'Tök (from Skt. udaka = 'water') or 'Water-King,' said to be still found among the Jarai and Tampuan tribes on the eastern frontier of Kamboja. For a brief account of them and their mode of life see *Excursions et Reconnaissances*, No. 16, pp. 172, 173. According to the Annamese, there would seem to have existed Fire and Water Kings—*Büa-ila* 蒐 and *Büa-niak* 蒐, as they style them—also in Campá. It would be well to ascertain whether those of the neighbouring Jarai and other frontier tribes are meant, or local ones. Marini ("*Delle Missioni,*" etc., Roma, 1663, p. 33) states that part of the territory of the Rumoi (by which he evidently means the country of the Khā tribes called Mōi, 母, by the Annamese and sometimes Khā-Mōi by the Lâu) acknowledged the authority of Fire and Water Kings ("... certi popoli [Rumoi] che habitano nelle montagne più alpestre, e che vbidisceco a due Regoli, che colà chiamano Re dell’ acqua l’ uno, e Re del fuoco l’ altro ... "). Tosi ("*Dell’ India Orientale,*" Roma, 1669, pp. 165 and 208), a few years afterwards, repeats the same statement with further particulars, and more correctly terms those tribes Kemoi, which spelling proves that the Khā-Mōi are really the people implied. His description runs: "... incominciamo dalla parte più lontana verso Ponente [i.e. from the westernmost part of Tonkin], cioè dalle montagne de’ Kemoi ... . Regnano in quei monti, che per lungo tratto stendono i loro aspri, e selvosi gioghi due Regoli, uno, che si chiama Re del fuoco, l’ altro, che si noma Re dell’ acqua, a’ quali rendono vibilità tra gl’ altri montanari i popoli Kemoi, buonemi, che hanno più del selvatico, che dell’ humano, e che resi dall’ asprezza di quei luoghi inaccessiblei securi, non riconoscono la soveranità del Re del Tunchino, benchè sotto la sua giurisdizione compresi sieno." (p. 408). As in December, 1646, when proceeding overland from Wieng-Chan to Ngā-ān, the Piedmontese Padre Léria crossed, according to Marini (op. cit., p. 538) the Rumoi (i.e. Kemoi or Khā-Mōi) Mountains, it follows unmistakably that the latter were the range forming the separation between Lâu and Tonkinese (or Annamese) territories, and that the tribes settled on its slopes had probably Fire and Water Chiefs of their own, as distinct from those of Campá and Kamboja.

It occurs furthermore to me that the puzzling terms—hitherto unexplained—火舍, *Huo-shē*, and 水舍, *Shuei-shē*, the latter of which is said to refer to *Lam-ap* (Campá), and especially to its ancient southern capital *Chā-hoën*, *Chā-lāng*, or Bal-Angwê (cf. *China Review*, vol. xx, p. 203, where 'Quinnon' is given, which is practically the same), mean 'Fire' and 'Water,' Shē, 〇-hē, or **Chēh** respectively, and therefore allude either to the above Khā-Mōi or to tribes of the same race settled on the hill-tracts of Lower Campá subject to Fire and Water potentates. Similarly, the terms—likewise so far unexplained—火異臘, *Huo-Chēn-la* (sometimes called *Lū*, 陸, i.e. 'Dry-land' or 'Highland,' -Chēn-la), and 水異臘, *Shuei-Chēn-la*, said to refer to the two

* Vide pp. 128–132 and 272, ante.*
relegated to the hill-tracts on the east of that realm, both acknowledging the nominal rule of the monarchs of Kamboja, alleged to be descended from the union of the hill tribes with women of Nāga race, but in reality owing their origin to adventurers from India. These coincidences in the early legends of the two countries tend to show that their primitive populations belonged to the same racial stock and were subject to similar influences, passing through analogous phases of social development.

Towards the fall of the Van-lâng kingdom, i.e. about 300 B.C., we hear that one of its last rulers of the Hùng dynasty had a beautiful daughter by the name of Mi-nuâng, whose hand was sued for by three different parties, these being the king of Thûk (evidently in Southern Yünnan) and the two chiefs of, respectively, the mountain and the riverine or maritime tribes. After much hesitation the princess was ultimately conceded in marriage to the chief of the hillmen, who led his prize to his residence on the Bâ-vê mountain. This unexpected dénouement aroused the indignation of the other two suitors. The king of Thûk, on his part, enjoined his son and grandson to destroy the Van-lâng kingdom as soon as a favourable opportunity presented itself. His threat became an accomplished fact under his grandson, Thûk-Phânh, in B.C. 258, as already explained. But the chief of the people of the plains took immediate

States into which Kamboja became split up in or shortly after A.D. 707 (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 483), evidently mean respectively ‘Fire’ and ‘Water’ Kamboja, and thus throw a novel sidelight into ancient Kambojan and, indeed, Indo-Chinese history in general, showing that the authority of Fire and Water Kings was at that period by no means restricted, and mostly nominal as at the present day. As Hôo-Chên-la, or ‘Fire Kamboja,’ included, according to the Chinese authors themselves, the ‘northern and mountainous region,’ and Sheh-Chên-la, or ‘Water-Kamboja,’ the ‘southern half of the country, bounded by the sea and studded with lakes’ (ibid., op. cit.), it will be seen that the portion of the population ruled over by the Fire King corresponded to the mountaineers, while that subject to the Water King consisted of the inhabitants of the plains and of the delta, living in a water-covered region, and therefore likened unto Nâgas, exactly as we have shown was the case in ancient Tonkin. In the face of this evidence one must feel inclined to admit that these Fire and Water Chiefs were real personages and not myths, as we shall see directly it has been suggested, at least in respect of Tonkin. Behind them there must have been tribes of flesh and bone, and not mere phantoms.
action against his successful competitor, and a long series of wars thus ensued between the dwellers of the plains and the hillmen, in which the latter ultimately came out victorious.

In Annamese tradition the chief of the mountaineers is called Sōn-tiū, and that of the people of the delta Thué-tiū—literally ‘Genius of the Mountains’ and ‘Genius of the Waters.’ They undoubtedly are, however, the mythical impersonation of two contending tribes of the mountains and plains, and in such light they are regarded by many a native chronicler and a Western commentator.

Now, it is with the Sōn-tiū or hillmen that we are concerned. The residence of their chief was, as we have seen, on the Bà-èi mountain, which has in consequence become so famous in Annamese legend. The tribe must

1 In native characters 山精 (in Chinese Shan-ching) and 水精 (in Chinese Shuei-ching). Tiū or ching means ‘essence,’ ‘spirit.’ Hence, Sōn-tiū or Shan-ching = ‘Spirit of Mountain,’ and Thué-tiū or Shuei-ching = ‘Spirit of Water.’ I may here incidentally point out the etymological connection, so far overlooked, I think, between the Sanskrit and Chinese words for ‘water’ = shuei, thué, shui, and toya.

2 So in the Viet-nam Sú-kì, for instance. The Abbé Launay (‘Histoire de l’Annam,’” p. 12), Romanet du Caillaud (‘Notice sur le Tong-king’), and others, positively take them to be tribes, and I think they are right, the terms Sōn-tiū and Thué-tiū being rather curious designations to apply to a single person, while there is nothing strange or improbable as to a conflict having actually ensued between the tribes of the plains and the hillmen. Hence I cannot at all agree with Mr. Dumoutier’s view (see next note) that Sōn-tiū and Thué-tiū belong entirely to the dominion of poetical myth. Fire and Water Chiefs, we have seen, are an old Indo-Chinese institution.

3 Bà-èi, 並位, so written in Annamese, means ‘Three tiers,’ or layers, owing to its being said to present a three-storied appearance. It is also called Tôn-vien, 雲 (in Chinese Sun-yüan), or ‘parasol-round.’ In connection with it and the Sōn-tiū legend the following extract from Mr. Dumoutier’s paper on ‘The Black River of Upper Tonquin and Mount Ba-Vi’ (see China Review, vol. xix, p. 165) should prove of interest:—‘Mount Ba-Vi has an elevation of about 4,000 feet; its jagged profile is distinguishable in clear weather from all parts of the delta. Ba-Vi is a popular name, which means Three Peaks [? see above], but its poetical name is Tôn-Vien (parasol-round). The Annamese regard this mountain with a timorous veneration, and connect it with all sorts of marvellous legends; they hold it sacred, and say that its peak is the dwelling of one of the powerful genii, who is able to launch thunderbolts upon the plain. There are historical traditions touching the very earliest beginnings of the Annamese nation connected with Ba-Vi. These
have accordingly extended along the hills skirting the right bank of the Black River, their chief settlement or trading centre being probably situated near the present Sôn-toi district city, on the edge of the main stream (Red River), and at the foot of the extreme spurs of Mount Bā-vi. This

traditions take the form of graceful legends, some of which are very curious. The oldest is in reference to the difference between the two genii, the one of the mountains [i.e. Sôn-tiû] and the one of the waters [i.e. Thuí-tiû]. Both were rivals for the hand of a young princess [that is, Mi-niăng of the Van-lãng kingdom], but the first secured it, and took his wife to the top of Mount Ba-Vi. Enraged at his discomfiture, the genius of the water declared war against the genius of the mountains; he raised typhoons and let loose aquatic monsters to attack Mount Ba-Vi. There was a terrible struggle, in which the genius of the waters was beaten, and had to retreat; but he returned to the charge every year, and so, when the Annamese observe the Red River, Black River, Clear River, and the Song Day leaving their beds, mixing their waters with the plain, and inundating the foot of Mount Ba-Vi, they say: 'There go the two genii again quarrelling for the woman.' The genius of Tan-Vien does not allow the privacy of his retreat to be violated, and therefore it is difficult to persuade the Annamese to ascend the mountain: they say that he shows himself to mortals, when it is fine weather, in the shape of a cloud which clings to the upper part of the chief peak. There are three temples on the mountain, dedicated to him, and representing the three separate peaks, and also the three 'layers' of the mountain, which, according to the Annamese, have each a different colour: the last layer, which is the dwelling of the god, is red; and it may be observed that the summit of Mount Ba-Vi does sometimes appear so to the people in the plain, when it is lit up by the rays of the setting sun. The topmost temple is in the second stage of the mountain, in the midst of the virgin forest, in a situation unequalled for savage grandeur; when this temple needs repairs, the genius takes the carpenters out of the villages, and carries them to the temple, and these personages return home in the same way without being conscious of the work they have done." For other stories told of the genius of Mount Bā-vi and his habits, see Landes' "Contes et légendes Annamites," in Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 29, pp. 311-313. Of course, many legends have grown up about this famous mountain, and the struggle between the Sôn-tiû and Thuí-tiû may have been, like the Trojan war in the old Western world, clad in the vesture of poetical fiction, in order to make it more marvellous and attractive to the Oriental mind. All these surviving relics and epic traditions of bygone ages, so replete of interest to the folklorist and historian, and so glowing with local colour, will soon be, however, a thing of the past, for their doom has been decreed. A scheme has been set afoot, and probably has by this time already been carried out, "of erecting on the highest peak of Ba-Vi a statue of St. Michael, striking down the devil in the form of a dragon, and of turning the mountain into an object of religious pilgrimage" (China Review, art. cit., p. 166). Mr. Dumoutier signified his approval of this splendid idea, only objecting that the allegory of the spirit of evil in the form of a dragon being ill-chosen for a country where that beast is the emblem of wisdom, virtue, military valour, and nobility of birth, it would have been better to replace it by a tiger, which is there emblematic of evil and the incarnation of the unspeakable One. So, let us by all means have St. Michael with the tiger on the top of Mount Bā-Vi, symbol of the triumph of righteousness as understood in our present utilitarian age! There will then be some hope, for Mark Twain's humorous scheme of erecting a statue to Adam, of meeting in its turn with its realization, through the instrumentality of some zealous missionary, on the top of some conspicuous peak of the K'un-lun or the Himalaya!
territory is what must have constituted at first the dominion and stronghold of the Sôn-tiūn. But in the course of time these people may have pushed on along the hill-range bounding on the south the delta of the Red River as far as the sea-coast just above Thañ-hwā. This seems the more likely from the fact of the Sôn-tiūn having been, as we are told, victorious over the Thue̍t-tiūn, part of whose country they may have annexed, at least that portion lying at the foot of the hill-slopes. If they have at all reached the littoral of the Gulf it must have been at the point where the southern branch of the Red River detached at Sôn-tōi, and, called the Dāi or Song-Dāi, has its outlet (Kāa-Dāi), which lies just at the extreme of the hill-spurs bounding the delta on the south. It is on the section of the coast comprised between the Kāa-Dāi and the Kūa Bā-lōt or Bā-lât, the present principal mouth of the Red River, that we felt inclined in a preceding paragraph (p. 251) to locate the Senderfūlat of the Arabs—the place which, as we have observed, may have been regarded by ancient navigators as the shipping port for Sindā. We have pointed out in that connection that in some of the maps accompanying early editions or translations of Ptolemy's geography, among which that of Nicholaus de Donis (A.D. 1482), Sindā is actually marked on the sea-shore just about the spot referred to; and, Ptolemy's Indoi, whose name is here spelled Sinda, are located to the west of it, that is, on the hill-tracts forming part of Sôn-tiūn territory. This transposition, if not caused by oversight, may be due to the fact of the Dāi, Song-Dāi, or Sôn-tōi branch of the Red River having been regarded and become known as the Sindā or Sôn-tiūn River, and its outlet as the shipping port for Sindā or Sôn-tiūn territory; Sindā, the chief settlement, lying, as it seems more probable, at the point of embranchment, or slightly further up towards the Sindhu-samgama or confluent of the three rivers, in the neighbourhood of the present Sôn-tōi. 

1 It may also be observed that the southern portion of the present Thañ-hwā district was known until quite recently under the name of Sôn-thāi or Sôn-thai Trōn, and is so marked in Taberd's map ("Tabula Geographica Imperii Anamitici."
I have scarcely any doubt that Ptolemy's Sinda and Indoi are connected with the Sōn-tiū tribes and their principal settlement in the neighbourhood of the present Sōn-tōi and Mount Bā-vi. The term Indoi is almost certainly a clerical error for Sindoi, as appears from the form Sindī adopted by Nicholaus de Donis and others. Its resemblance to the term Sōn-tiū is, it must be admitted, very striking; but still more so is that of Sindoi with Sōn-tōi, although, perhaps, this is merely an accidental coincidence, the toponymic Sōn-tōi being in appearance modern. Nevertheless, it would be worth while to enquire whether, as we have suggested with some reason, Sōn-tōi is an adaptation, in Sino-Annamese garb, of an old indigenous term like Sindhu, Sindhava, etc., that survived, in a more or less modified form, in local tradition down to a few centuries ago. The same remark applies to the tribal name Sōn-tiū, which, as we have explained, looks rather queer to be of Annamese origin. Nū, 嶽, is, in fact, the indigenous Annamese term for 'mountain,' and not sōn, which is the local, and perhaps old, pronunciation of the Chinese 嶽, shan. Now, at the dawn of the third century B.C., the epoch of the Sōn-tiū wars, Chinese influence in Tonkin was as yet practically nil. Hence we see at once that Sōn-tiū cannot be aught else but the Sino-Annamese travesty, at a later period, of a local tribal name or toponymic such as handed down to us by Ptolemy under the forms Sinda and Indoi or Sindoi, derived, in all probability, from the terms Sindhu, Sindhava, applied by the early Indī settlers either to the population they found in occupation of the territory about the Sindhu-sangama, the confluence of the three rivers, or to the place of meeting itself of the three streams. From the fact of this people living in a hilly country and bearing the traditional name of Sindhus or Sindhavas, the Chinese who centuries afterwards came to rule supreme in Tonkin, must have thought it a clever feat to Sinicize that term into

A.D. 1838). Of course, this name Sōn-thāi is spelled in a different way from that of Sōn-tōi, and is ostensibly modern; still, it is worthy to note the curious coincidence of the presence of such toponymics as Sōn-tōi, Sōn-thāi, Sōn-nām, Song-Dāi, in the very region where Ptolemy located his Sinda and Sindoi.
Sön-tiū, the probable pronunciation at the period of the two characters that represent it, thus making it convey at the same time the meaning of 'mountaineers,' tolerably well consistent with the topography of the country that formed their habitat, although in rather striking opposition to the Indū terms, which mean a river-people. But, as instanced by many Chinese transcripts of foreign place-names we have explained in the course of the present inquiry, the early Chinese colonists never bothered themselves as to what such names meant, their only preoccupation being of rendering them as nearly as possible phonetically by such particular characters as would convey some definite meaning, no matter however odd, to their countrymen. As regards the term Thuś-tiū, it was, no doubt, invented so as to make pendant with the other, for we have seen that the real name of the people of the delta or their country was Ōu-lāk or Uraga, probably exemplified in Ptolemy's Aganagara, their principal settlement—as the name of their ancient rivals the Sön-tiū or Sindhus is embodied in Sinda, undoubtedly their chief city or trading mart, practically corresponding, it will now be evident, to the present Sön-tōi (So'ntāy).

The Indoī (No. 225).

The original location of this people at and about Sinda, or Sön-tōi, and their probable subsequent expansion towards the sea-coast, along the hill-range bounding on the south the Red River Delta, having been fully discussed in the foregoing paragraph, it remains now to add but a few considerations, chiefly of a linguistic and ethnological character.

The name Indoī applied to them by Ptolemy is, we have suggested, a probably faulty transcript of Sindoi or, as some among his translators and commentators put it, Sindi. To this view we adhere, although perfectly aware that a tribe bearing a very similar name to Indoī is still found on the Kamboja-Annam watershed—much further south, it is true, but which may have occupied at the period in question part
of the Tonkinese hill-tracts referred to, being subsequently driven off thence by other peoples advancing from the north. The tribe to which we allude is that of the Intih, or Indî—so far, I believe, unheard of by our ethnologists—and forms a branch of the Ta-ôi (not Ta-hoi as I see generally written) inhabiting the hilly country of the Attapû district, the Attopeu of French books and maps. The possible fact of this tribe still dwelling on Tonkinese territory in Ptolemy's time can in no wise upset our conclusions, but would, on the contrary, furnish us one more plausible argument wherewith to account for the origin of the term Sindhu and its derivatives in that region. For, being granted that Indî was the original and local tribal name of its primitive inhabitants, the early Indû immigrants and civilizers would, upon learning it, be led to change it into Sindhu, and apply therefrom the designation Sindhu or Sindh to the country. From these modified terms, and not from their prototype Indî, Ptolemy's Sind and Indoi, or Sindoi, as well as the Sino-Annamese form Sôn-tîn, could only have been derived, it being quite certain that Indû influence had been exerted in the country long before Ptolemy's time. At best the reading Indoi, if correct, would prove that in our author's day the original term Indî was still current, along with the Indûized forms that ultimately superseded and outlived it. But perhaps it will be well for the present not to lay too

---

1 I dedicate this seasonable remark to all those—and they are legion—who write Nam-Hou or Nam-Hu instead of Nam Û, Hou-then or Hu-then instead of Û-thèn, and so forth, thus increasing the already considerable list of unrecognizable, and locally unintelligible, place-names. My information as to the existence of the Intih or Indî is derived from native sources, the basis being a Siamese description of twenty-one tribes, all said to belong to the Ta-ôi family, only three or four of which—the Dawák and Laiûau (the Legnau of our writers) among them—have, so far, been brought to the notice of the public. Now that we know the correct spelling of Ta-hoi to be Ta-ôi, we may obtain a clue to the antecedents of the presumably collateral tribe of the Sen-ôi of the Malay Peninsula (vide supra, p. 159), about whose origin nothing is so far known; whereas no connection could be inferred from the faulty spelling in vogue. This exemplifies the necessity of the topographical and ethnological lists concerning Indo-China being revised by competent authorities, if any further progress is to be made in the historical and ethnical study of this so highly interesting region.
much stress on the presence of the Indi on Tonkinese territory at the period in question; ¹ hence I prefer to ascribe the origin of the epithets Sindhu and its Ptolemaic derivatives to the causes at first referred to.

Turning now to examine into what was the racial stock to which the Indoi, or Sindoi, must have most probably belonged, there seems to be no reason for doubting, from what has been said, that this tribe was a branch of the so-called Môn-Annam race, or, to put it more precisely, of the same race as the tribes now on the Kambojan-Annamese watershed, which latter are, as likely as not, its very descendants driven further to the south by newcomers. No historical notice of the people inhabiting the hill-tracts to the west of Tonkin is found in Chinese records earlier than A.D. 271, when we are told that the said hill-tracts were, and had been long before that, occupied by the Liau. Now, Liau is a generic name for populations of the Môn-Annam race, the Li, Loi, Loi, etc. Although the old Indoi had by that time probably left for more southern climes, we may well take it that these Liau who replaced them were offshoots of the same racial stock to which the Indoi belonged—in a word, their younger brothers. The already quoted passage from the Annamese Annals ² most distinctly states that down to A.D. 271 the territories of Vô-biên (Wu-p'ing = present Bak-niên and Hưng-yen districts), Kâu-dûk (Hà-tiên), and Tôn-ch'üang (Hsin-ch'ang = P'hong-chou = Sôn-töi) were dangerous and impenetrable, for the Lieu I, or Liau, barbarians who inhabited them were undaunted and knew no fear: for centuries they could not be tackled. The Chinese general and commissioner T'au-hwang was first successful in chastising and pacifying them in A.D. 271; out of their territories he made the three chüns above referred

¹ There is a tribe known to the Phu-thai as Hìn or Khá-Hìn, dwelling on the hill-tracts of Miăng Thêng (Diên-bien P'ho) and Miăng Mun, between the Nâm Ú and the Black River, whose name may be etymologically traceable to that of the Indi, Sindhi, or Hindi. I have not seen it mentioned, so far, in any European account of that region.

² Des Michels, op. cit., p. 106.
to and established over thirty colonial districts, which he placed under the jurisdiction of Kâu-chōn (Thần-hwā). The Liau alluded to here, could not evidently be the Lâu, i.e. people of Thai race, for although we have seen that the latter formed the ruling class in Kâu-dûk, or Hà-tiê, and Ngê-ăn, the bulk of the population must have been Chăm; and it is besides highly improbable that they could hold Sơn-tôi and Bâk-niê as well at the period in question. At a much later date Chinese writers still speak of Liau tribes occupying the hill-tracts to the north and north-west of Sơn-tôi;¹ and quite recently we have been told of Mân-Liau (藩獠) being yet to be found in the district of Twien-kwāng (宣光), not far to the north of the same place.² I have no doubt that populations of the C'hieng or Môn-Annam race are in every instance implied, although Chinese writers may have made some confusion between Liau and Lâu, owing to these two terms being almost alike in sound.³

¹ In A.D. 546, according to the Annamese Annals (Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 138, 139), the fugitive native emperor Li-bôn took refuge among the Liau in the country of Kwôt-Liau Đông (K'in-Liau Tung = the caves or mountainous recesses of K'in-Liau), ending his days there in 548 A.D. From the account of Li-bôn's doings, the region here referred to, which has been left unidentified by the commentators, appears to have been on either the Red or the Clear River, in the north or north-west of Sơn-tôi. K'in-Liau is very likely the name of a branch of the Lâu, applied to the district where this particular branch had settled. Although the spelling in native characters is not given, it seems very probable that this people were the 峇獠, Chiu-Liau, the race from whom the modern T'u-Liau, 土獠, of South-Eastern Yünna and Kwang-hai are said by tradition to be descended. (See Devéria's "Frontière Sino-Annamite," p. 114.) It is worthy of note that these T'u-Liau are also termed Shan-tzu, 山子 (Annamese Sôn-tĩ), or 'Sons of the Hills,' a name much analogous in structure to those of the Shau-ching or Sơn-tiê and of the Khâ Đôi (for which latter see above, p. 58).

² See Devéria, op. cit., p. 69, where this people are, I believe wrongly, taken to be Lâu. According to Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 70) the name Môn-Liau was, in fact, applied to the Pêu-chhun Mân (板柵蠻), who are affiliated with the Miao stock.

³ See note on p. 288 above. Mr. Parker remarks (China Review, vol. xxii, p. 610) that "for some unaccountable reason the P'ti-wên Yün-fu reads the character 獠 or 獠 as chao," while "in another place the second character is read
I shall leave it to subsequent research to clear up this point, and also to show whether the 西屠夷 (Tōi-dō or Hsi-t'un I) located by some native writers on the northern side of the Hsiang-lin (Hâ-tiin) borders, and by others further to the south of Lin-i at the time of Ma-yüan's expedition into Tonkin (A.D. 43), are in any way connected with the Indoi or Sindoi. For although they are shifted so far down the coast, from the incidental mention that the brass pillars erected by

as lao," and vaguely adds that either character "is usually applied to the Indo-Chinese [?] tribes." In the preceding page (609 ibid.) he goes further and makes the sweeping assertion that "the 搖 [Lian] are the Thai, or Siamese [?] colonists who date from about 1,000 years ago. Liao or Loa [Loi, Lau?] is a term which covers Burmese, Siamese, Annamese, and Indo-Chinese generally, including Arabs and Hindoos, [excusez du peu!] when they come by sea." This far-fetched notion as to the ethnographical area embraced by the term Lian seems to have been suggested to Mr. Parker by the following extract he gives elsewhere in the same Review (vol. xxi, p. 56): "The 程史 [Ch'êng-shih] says that at Canton (番禺 [Fan-yü]) there were a good many Indo-Chinese (海黎 [Hai Lian, i.e. 'Sea-Lian' or 'Coast-Lian']). The most influential were the 蒲 [Pu'] family, called the 'white barbarians' (白番人 [Pê-Fan Jên]), originally nobles from Chan-ch'êng (占城, near modern Tourane [Campê, as we have diffusely shown]). Having had bad weather in coming to Canton, they were afraid of going back, and begged permission of their king to remain in Canton as a sort of commercial agency. With reference to the above, it may be noted here that 蒲 [Pu'] seems to have been a common family name amongst the ruling castes of Hindoo origin settled in the South seas generally."

However, in the foregoing extract, the term Hai Lian, i.e. Lian of the Sea or of the Sea-coast, seems to imply that the persons alluded to were Chăm, at least by naturalization, thus proving our contention that the word Lian refers especially to populations of the Môn-Annam race, and not at all to the Lâu or Thai or to other Indo-Chinese populations that do not belong to the Môn-Annam or Miao stocks. That the word in question cannot apply to Burmese, that is, to Tibeto-Burman tribes, is sufficiently evidenced from the statement of the Chinese historians, who class the Lian among the southern barbarians, and tell us that they did not spread into Shu, i.e. Sz-ch'êan, from their native homesteads in the southern mountains, until A.D. 343 and after (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 106–9, who draws his information from the Tsin Shu or Chronicle of the Tsin dynasty, the first historical work where the Lian are referred to). As regards the term F'ū, it is not a family name in the present instance, but the Chăm title Fô borne by Chám ministers and chiefs (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 545 and 547, for the names of two dignitaries of Chan-ch'êng prefixed by such a title). Fô means simply 'lord,' 'Mr.'

1 Vide supra, pp. 231 and 233; Des Michels, op. cit., p. 62; and Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 97 and 419.
Ma-yüan in that region denoted the line of demarcation between Han dominions and the territory of the Hsi-t'u I, we may well infer that their real habitat was no further south than Thâu-hwā, which district, we have shown, was in all probability the farthest point reached by Ma-yüan, and therefore the place where his famed pillars were set up. Now, it has been seen that the Sôn-tiën, Sindoi, or Sindi had very likely, and before Ma-yüan’s time, extended from Sôn-tōi towards the coast, reaching the latter at about the same point; hence the suspicion arises that the Hsi-t'u I may have been somehow connected with them. The Chinese historians of the T'ang period are inclined to regard the Hsi-t'u I as the descendants of the soldiers left behind in the country by Ma-yüan, and add that for this reason they called themselves Ma-liu (馬留), i.e. 'left behind by Ma[yüan]', or Ma-liu Jên, that is, Ma-liu Men; but it does not seem to me that this story deserves much credit. It should be probably classed along with the wonderful yarns wherewith Chinese writers delight to adorn their narratives. If Ma-liu were really an alternative designation for the Hsi-t'u I, it may be more likely connected with Mālinī or Cudāmala, Cudāmani, Cudāmalya, the name of the Upper Campā (Līn-i) kingdom, in which case the Ma-liu would prove to be Chām. The term Hsi-t'u I, if taken in the sense of 'Western T'u I' or T'u (in Annamese Dô-dâi or Dô), leads, more or less, to a similar conclusion, the native vocable implied being in appearance Đoi, a synonym of Loi, Lōi, C'hieng, and the generic designation for the hill tribes of Môn-Annam race. I should not think that people in any way connected with the modern T'u (tfoot) or T'u-jên (tfoot A) — called Thô by the Annamese — now occupying the hill-tracts about the Black River, the Red River, and to the east of the latter as far as Kao-bàng on the Kwang-hsi frontier, are meant, for these are said to be a very heterogeneous tribe, the scattered groups of which have not all the same language, and are alleged

1 Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 418.
2 Ibid., pp. 418, 419, and 97, 98.
3 Fide supra, pp. 127, 144.
to constitute the remains of those military colonies which the Chinese government used to station there to guard the frontier and the newly annexed territories.\(^1\) Should

---

\(^1\) See *China Review*, vol. xix, p. 162; and Devéría’s “Frontière Sino-Annamite,” p. 97. I may add that those among these tribes called Thô-dên, 土顒, or ‘Black Thô,’ by the Annamese, are apparently of Thai race, being the same people whom the Eastern Lâu term P'hu-Thai Dam, or ‘Black P’hu-Thai,’ from the colour of the garments they wear. They were in occupation, at no distant period, of the whole region comprised between the Black River and the Nam Mâ (the Song Mô of the Annamese), which then formed the Stô-sông Chù-h-Thai, or Twelve Thai Marches (literally, the ‘Twelve-Thai-holding’ [Districts]) of the Lâuang P’hrah Băng Kingdom. Parker is somewhat in error (*China Review*, vol. xix, p. 196) in suggesting 十二土州, or 十二歹州 (Shi-érh Tu [i.e. Thô], or Shi-érh Tai, Chou), as the probable Chinese equivalents. Chùh means ‘to hold,’ ‘to contain,’ and not exactly Chou, a political or administrative division. According to Dumoutier (see *China Review*, vol. xix, p. 168) the natives of the sixteen châu (Châu) of the Black River also style themselves Thô, 土. This has led later travellers in that region, among whom are Messrs. Nicolai and Lefèvre Pontalis, to identify the Thô in general with the Thai (see *Exéquences et Reconnaissances*, No. 33, 1890, p. 13; *Journal Asiatique*, 1892, No. 2, p. 10, extrait; and *T'oung Pao*, Mars, 1896, pp. 54–58). But while, on the one side, linguistical evidence argues several branches of the Thô to be Thai—such as, e.g., the above-mentioned Thô-dên, and the Tu-Jên of Kwei-chou and Kwang-hsi—it should be remembered, on the other hand, that Tu or Thô is not an ethnic, but merely a conventional term applied by the Chinese to ‘aborigines’ or ‘territorials,’ or, better to say, to old settlers in Kwei-chou and Kwang-hsi, who included people both of the Môn-Annam and Thai races. We have, in fact, Tu or Tu-Jên, Tu-Liou, Tu-Mân, etc., so that it is ridiculous to conclude, on the mere prima facie evidence of the term Tu or Thô being collectively applied to these populations, that they are all of the same stock. A more minute investigation of their racial affinities shows them, indeed, to be for the most part either Yêu or Mêu (Miao) by descent. This is also, practically, the view taken of the question by both the Lâu and Annamese, who agree on the whole in classing the Thô among the Kêh tribes. That such considerations could be either neglected or designately ignored by a writer of the stamp of Mr. Nicolai, whose article betrays throughout an absence of the most elementary knowledge of Indo-Chinese ethnography and history, does not come as a surprise; but the case is different with Mr. Lefèvre Pontalis, who had been not only over part of the ground covered by the Thô, but had the most favourable opportunities of studying the question on the spot. Not content with sweepingly asserting the Tu or Thô’s identity with the Thai and Lu-tai (六歹) or Pai-I, as well as with the Luk-thô (六土, Lûk-thô?), this writer does not hesitate to comprise under that denomination and to affiliate to the Thai stock also the 疍佬 or 疍佬, Kê-lau, Kîh-lau, or Hêt-lau (whom he calls ‘Chi-lao,’ see *Journal Asiatique*, Sept.–Oct., 1896, p. 19,
a population by the name of T'u be intended, it would be

extrait), of Central and Western Kwei-chou, who are notoriously of Mohn-Annam stock (see Lacouperie’s “Languages of China before the Chinese,” pp. 48-49).* Nor is this all, for the old 西屠夷, Hsi-t'u I or T'ai-dô, are by the same authority (in Young Poo, Mars, 1896, p. 61) thought to have been also Thô, 土, and therefore (in his opinion) Thai, on the assumption that Đô means ‘red’ in Annamese, a circumstance arguing (according to him) that they may have been the same tribe as the ‘Red Thai’ still found existing in the Song-Mâ valley down to the point where it debouches into the Tha高雄 district. But this is a mistake, for any tyro in Annamese knows that the word meaning ‘red’ in that language is represented by the character 赭, pronounced Đô, rising tone, and not by 屠, pronounced Đô, sinking tone, a fact quite sufficient by itself for anyone acquainted with the mechanism of Sino-Annamese phonology to relegate such a queer theory to the limbo of infantile absurdities. Neither does the suggestion as to the racial identity of the Hsi-t'u or T'ai-dô with the Thai and of the latter with the 土, T'u or Thô, appear any more tenable on historical grounds. It should be observed, in fact, that the 土屠, T'u-Môn or Thô-Môn—that is, the 土, T'u or Thô—are referred to in Annamese history since A.D. 858, in which year they are reported to have made raids into Tonkinese territory (see Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 189-190). With them are, immediately afterwards, mentioned the 南詔, Nan-Châu, Nâm-Chieu, or Thai of the Yûnumanese kingdom of Ta-li. Had those Thô been, like the Nan-Châu, of Thai stock, they would presumably have been confounded into one with the latter by the historians, and therefore passed over in silence. Neither can it be logically inferred that those Thô or Thô-Môn were the same people as the T'ai-dô or Hsi-t'u, for the characters 土 and 屠 employed to designate, respectively, these two populations are very dissimilar, while the dates at which the latter appear in history do not differ by more than eight centuries (A.D. 43-858), and far less if it be considered that the Hsi-t'u I do not seem to be referred to until the seventh century, that is to say, retrospectively, by the historiographers of the T'ang period (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 97), as being descended from soldiers under Ma-yüan, who had increased, by the time of the Sui dynasty (A.D. 589-618), to three hundred families, all bearing the name of Ma or Ma-liu (馬留). Had they been Thô, there would have been neither need nor reason for calling them Đô or T'ai-dô in the seventh century and Thô or Thô-Môn in the ninth.

As regards Lôk-thô (Lac-thô of French writers), the name of a district (chiefly on the Red River) inhabited by Mâyung (馬), i.e. Thai, populations, it would seem to occur in Annamese history, if P. Legrand de la Liraye is correct, since A.D. 679 (see Des Michels, op. cit., p. 187, notes), namely, nearly contemporaneously with the Đô and Thô. As, however, no native characters

* They are so much Thai that they do not at all understand the Chung-kia (牧家), who speak a Thai language (see Devéria, op. cit., p. 104).
far more preferable to identify it with the T’u-hiau (土獠), Shan-tsz, or Sôn-tú already alluded to.

In conclusion, Ptolemy’s Indoī or Sindoi, whether connected or not in name with the Hsi-t’u I, appear to belong to the same racial stock, Ch’ieng or Moû-Annam, as the tribes anciently inhabiting the hill-tracts of Tonkin, whose remains are now still to be found scattered theraabouts under the name of Liao, Loi, or Đôi, etc. Almost certainly they correspond to the Sôn-tūn of Annamese legend, while probably having connections, racial or otherwise, on the one side with the Shan-tsz or Sôn-tú of South-Eastern Yünnan and South Kwang-hsi, and on the other with the Indoī and other hill-tribes at present on the Kamboja-Cochin-Chinese watershed.

The Kudutai (No. 223).

Ptolemy locates this people south of the Khalkitis (the 合刺章, Karajang, or Black Lolas of Eastern Yünnan), and makes them, together with the Barrhai, extend to the Great Gulf (Gulf of Tonkin). In De Donis’ map they are marked, under the name of Codupe, to the north of Doana (Lüang P‘hraž Bang) and between the Doanas (Mê-Không) and the Dórias (Nam Tâu, or Red River). Their habitat becomes thus fixed at about half-way betwixt the Mê-Không are given, we cannot make any linguistical rapprochement except that, judging from the sound (Thô), the character here employed must be different from either of those used to represent the Đô and Thô tribes.

On the other hand, the Quan-to noticed since A.D. 1808 by Leyden ("On the Languages and Literature of Indo-Chinese Nations," in "Essays relating to Indo-China," 1st series, vol. i, p. 160), as being an ancient race inhabiting Kau-bâng (高平), who "regard themselves as the original inhabitants of Tonkin and Cochín-China," are no doubt 土, Thô; and the correct form of their name must be either 軍土, Kwôn-Thô, meaning ‘Thô-people’; or 君土, Kwôn-Thô; 君, Kwôn-Thô, meaning ‘Thô Chiefs,’ ‘Thô-district,’ or tribe. I may add, in explanation of the second form here given, that the native chiefs of the Thô districts bordering upon Lâu territory are, by the Lâu, called At-nâ (from the Sanskrit ajaña) Thô, of which term the Annamese Kwôn-Thô or Kwôn-Thô would seem to be a translation.
at Lúang Phraň Băng and the head-waters of the Red River at Yüan-chiang, straight away north. Such being the case, I have no hesitation in taking Ptolemy’s Kudutai to be the same people as the \( K'\text{a}-\text{t'o}\) or \( K'\text{a}-\text{t'o}\) (卡隋), whom Garnier found exactly in the territory of the Yüan-chiang or Yüan-kiang prefecture,\(^1\) whence they seem to extend along the hill-tracts further to the south. According to Lacouperie the \( K'\text{a}-\text{t'o}\) speak a language of the Lo-lo family, closely connected with that of the \( Ho-ni\) (和泥), whose name is usually applied to them.\(^2\) If so, they would belong to the Tibeto-Burmän group. It remains to be seen, however, whether this is the language they spoke originally, or whether it has been adopted, in the place of their primordial one, from the Lolos. Lacouperie’s suggestion that the \( K'\text{a}-\text{t'o}\) are “probably the same as the Kado of Burmā,” must as yet be taken with all reserve. Truly, the two tribal names are strikingly similar, if not actually identical, but the Kado, or Kādu, are far away on the Manipur borders, and though a tribe by the name of Kadun is mentioned along with the Li-su on the Burmo-Chinese frontier, I am unable to say whether it is in any way connected with the \( K'\text{a}-\text{t'o}\) and Kado. In view of our knowledge of the ethnography of these regions being as yet quite rudimental, it is impossible for the present to investigate the identity of Ptolemy’s Kudutai any further. I propose, however, to revert to the subject in the next volume, when dealing with the Ptolemaic geography of Southern Yünnan. Suffice it here to have established their very probable relationship with the \( K'\text{a}-\text{t'o}\) of our day, whose name appears to be the corruption of an older term, Khadu, Kadu, or Kādu; perhaps Kudut or Kuduta, in which case it might prove traceable to some toponymic or tribal name, Kultu, Kulūt, etc., introduced somewhere in this region by the early Indī immigrants. From Kulūta the derivation Kudutai could be easily accounted for, and with

\(^2\) “The Languages of China before the Chinese,” p. 93.
it could be eventually connected Kwo-lo (猳 獾) or Kwo-lu, one of the names borne by the Lo-lo or Lu-lu;¹ the tribal
designations of the Khá Huet, Khá Hôk,² and Khá-Út; and

¹ See Devérès, op. cit., p. 141.

² The Khá Huet or Khá Hôk, I learn from local sources, are so called by the
Lâu of the districts on the Upper Nam Û (Miang Hun, etc.) in which they
are settled, on account of their relish for squirrels as an article of food. Karôk,
the Thai word for squirrel, becomes, in fact, Kâhôk (and, by contraction, Hôk)
in Lâu, in virtue of the law of phonetic change by which Thai r is converted
into h in Lâu pronunciation. But Karôk is an Indû-derived word (from
Sanskrit Kâlkâ, Pâli Kâlakâ), whose more correct form should be Kâlôk
or Kâlkô. Now, it is interesting to observe that the Lô-lo are also called Laka,
and that their name or nickname 獪猳 (Lo-lo, is said to mean ‘squirrel’
(see Lacouperie’s “Languages of China before the Chinese,” pp. 88 and 106).
It will thus be seen that Laka is undoubtedly a mere contraction of Kâlakô, as
Hôk is of Kâhôk (Kârakô, Kâlakô), and that therefore it is practically the same
word as Lo-lo. This term is also, in fact, sometimes written 獪猳 (Kwo-lo =
Kâ-la[-kâ], 獪猳 (Kwo-kwo = Kâ[-la]-kâ), etc. The result is that the
 Khá Hôk must be a branch of the Lo-lo, or else that the latter were so
nicknamed on account of having settled on Khá Hôk territory. The Khá Hôk
are described in the native records above referred to as being dark in complexion,
tattooing themselves in long stripes from the ankles to the hips, and wearing
the usual scanty loin-cloth. They live at the foot of the mountain slopes and
on the banks of rivulets, subsisting partly on fishing or on the birds and squirrels
which they kill with their crossbow, and partly on glutinous rice. Their
alternative name of Khá Huet seems to be a modification of Khá Hôk, and
suggests a parallel form Kalut or Kalot of Kâlôk or Kâlakô, which does not
much differ from Kulâto. It is consequently very probable that we have in
the Khá Huet or Khá Hôk a tribe closely related to the K’u-t’o, and entitled
to share with the latter the privilege of identification with Ptolemy’s Kudutai.
These, we have seen, are located to the south of the Khalkitis, whose name—
although transcribed by Ptolemy in such a way as to etymologically connect
it with kalôk in view of the many copper-mines (μεταλλα καλκού) he says
are to be found in their country—is evidently a mere adaptation or travesty
of Kâlakô, and seems to apply in this instance especially to the Lølos. Above
I have suggested Koraïang as its modern equivalent. It will now be seen
that Koraïang, whether it be formed from Kara = ‘black,’ or corruptly
derived from Kâlakô = Karaka = ‘squirrel,’ is in substance the same word
as the latter; for Kâlakô originates in its turn from Kâla or Kâlakô, meaning
literally ‘black,’ and figuratively a ‘squirrel,’ or any animal or plant of black
colour. I am on the whole inclined to think, however, that Kâlakô was the
original tribal name or nickname of the Lo-lo, Koraïang being a modification
of it introduced by the Mongols when they conquered Yûnmên under the Yûan
dynasty. It is from that time, in fact, that the term Koraïang began to appear
in history. In any case it is evident that Ptolemy’s Khudutai and Khalkitis
must have been, if not exactly one and the same people, at least related in more
than one way, and that the Khá Huet, K’u-t’o, and Lo-lo must be their modern
representatives. It should be remembered, however, that the term Lo-lo, as
used by the Chinese, is but one of those loose names or indefinite expressions
indiscriminately applied to populations of entirely different races, and therefore
altogether devoid of ethnological significance. In the case in point it cannot
certainly be taken to refer to the tall, oval-faced, Aryan-like race seen by
perhaps also that of the Hu-t’ou (虎 頭), Hó-dao, U-tu-t’au, or Khudu-t’au, the so-called ‘Tiger-Heads’ of the Black River. These modifications in nomenclature cannot surprise, in view of the fact that in India the tribal name Kulūta or Kulāṭa appears to have been eventually changed to Utūla, and vice versa.

As regards the form Colupe appearing in De Donis’ map, I believe that it is to some extent justifiable, for in the very same Yün-chiang district, side by side with the K’a-t’o or Kudu, we have the No-pi (糯 比), whose name is given under the form Lo-po by Garnier. These people are, like the K’a-t’o, mere varieties of the Ho-ni; in fact, Devéria Colborne Baber on the Chien-ch’ang border, but to tribes approaching the type of Lo-lo or Kuo-lo still occurring in Kwei-chou, described by the Chinese themselves as possessing black faces and other characteristics quite in keeping with those of the Khā Hōk or Khā Hūet. In his paper on “The Aborigines of Hainan” (in the Journal China Branch R.A.S., new series, No. vii) Mr. Swinhoe speaks of the Li of the central part of the island as calling themselves La or La-kia, a term which Dr. Edkins, in a note appended thereto (p. 39), thinks to be probably the same with Kuo-lo or Lo-lo. This view is, in my belief, incorrect, for here La-kia seems to mean simply La-chia or ‘La family’; and these La are described by Swinhoe (p. 26) as being “a short, sturdy, light coloured race,” thus widely differing from the Kuo-lo and Khā-Khā. As regards the “large, big - boned, dark men” inhabiting the ‘Nyehow’ (Yai-chou) district and calling themselves K’ai, referred to on the same page, they are very probably, as shown by their name (K’ai = Glai), racially identical to the Ōrung Gli of Campā (vide p. 261 ante).

Colborne Baber makes the following statement as regards the independent Lolos occupying the mountainous district of the Liang Shan tracts: “Old people say that the Liang-shin tribes are a branch of the La-kia (?) family, and came originally from the west” (“A Journey of Exploration in Western Ssu-ch’uan,” in Supplementary Papers, R.G.S., vol. i, pt. 1, 1882, p. 71). This would seem to imply that these so-called Lo-lo came to be considered as part of the aboriginal Kālākā (i.e. Kuo-lo, Khā-Hōk, etc.), not necessarily from their being racially connected with the latter, but merely from the fact of their having settled on Kuo-lo territory. Their original name was presumably neither Lo-lo nor Kuo-lo.

1 See China Review, vol. xix, p. 153. For the forms Ūdu, Wūdu, assumed by the term Hu (Tiger) in Southern China, see Lacouperie, op. cit., pp. 20 and 30. In the Chu State of yore it was called 虻, U-t’u-n.

2 Vide Professor Hall’s edition of Wilson’s “Vieṣṭ Purāṇa,” vol. ii, p. 174. We have also a (probably) contracted form of Utūla in the name of the T’u-la or T’u-la-Mūn, 稔 刺 霍, of the chronicles of the Yüan dynasty, who are undoubtedly Marco Polo’s Toleman or Tholeman (see Devéria, op. cit., p. 115).

3 Devéria, op. cit., p. 135. See also Lacouperie, op. cit., p. 93, n. 3.

4 Op. cit., p. 483. Colborne Baber says (op. cit., p. 78) that the Lo-lo are called Na-p’a (= No-pi?) by the Menia or Minia of Eastern Tibet.
gives No-pi as an alternative designation for the latter.\footnote{Ibid.} The Siamese and Lâu, in their turn, consider the Ho-ni to be the same as the Khâ-Kô or Khâ-Khô, and often call them by this name, occurring also in the Chinese variant Ko-ni (哥泥) of the term Ho-ni.\footnote{Ibid.} From this evidence it may be inferred that Kô, Khô, or Ko is the generic name or surname of this people, probably prefixed to the designation of the tribes into which it is divided: thus, Ko-Lo-pe, Kolu-pe, or Colupe may be explained as the Lo-pe, Lu-pe, or No-pi tribe of the Kô family. On the same lines, the term Ko-ni or Ho-ni would appear to be, not the collective name for the whole race, but a mere tribal designation denoting the Ni variety of the Kô; and the term Kudutai might be taken to mean the Duta or Luta tribe of the same people, its correct reading being thus Ko-Lu-ta. It should be observed in this connection that a tribe bearing the practically identical name of Koalut is actually to be found in Southern Formosa, on the territory around South Cape, where it made itself notorious for its predatory as well as head-hunting proclivities.\footnote{Op. cit., p. 58, note 5. The Chinese spelling is 六 話, sounding Luk-tai in the southern dialects. It is said to be the Chinese generic term for the Lâu or Thai race, and was employed as an equivalent of Pai-I. (See Devéria, op. cit., p. 102.) Probably it was meant to refer, retrospectively, to the original Six Châu (六 話, Lu-Chao) of the Thai confederation that became afterwards the kingdom of Nan-Chao, an observation which has escaped Devéria and others. Devéria remarks, nevertheless (I.I., note), that “Loc-thay [Lok-tai] pourrait se traduire par les six Thay,” mais pourrait être aussi un nom de localité”; and Parker, following him, translates the term as the Six Tai” (see China Review, vol. xix, pp. 79 and 196). On the other hand.} Again, there was a tribe in Yünna, apparently about the southern bend of the Yang-tsz River, bearing the very similar name of Lu-to or Luk-to (鹿 多), and first appearing in history in A.D. 47, to which we had already to call attention in a preceding section.\footnote{See “Aborigines of Formosa” in the China Review, vol. xiv, p. 123. Supra, p. 157. See also China Review, vol. xix, p. 68.} Lacouperie far too easily jumps to the conclusion that these people were the Lok-tai (Lu-tai, Liu-tai) of the Thai family;\footnote{Op. cit., p. 157. See also China Review, vol. xix, p. 68.} but this remains yet to be proved. Should
it turn out to be the case, the Lu-to could have nothing in common with the Kudutai and Colupe, who, so far as the

Dr. F. W. K. Müller—in his "Vocabularien der Pa-yi und Pah-poh Sprachen, aus dem 'Hua-i-yi-yi,'" of which he gives a partial translation in the T'oung Pao, vol. iii (March, 1892)—observes (p. 17), à propos of the Pai-I pronunciation 'Luk-tai' of the term 六歹, made there equivalent to the Chinese 百夷, Pai-I: " = kinder der Tai's; ลก = 'kind,' Schan und Siam.," thus taking the term to mean 'Children of the Tai,' an interpretation which Lefèvre Pontalis, in T'oung Pao, 1896, p. 54, sanguinely endorses. I must say, on my part, that this explanation, however ingenious and plausible it may at first sight appear, leaves me rather sceptical. For we have no proof that luk here means 'child' or 'children,' any more than ลก (the Thai form of the Sanskrit loka = 'people'), or ลก, which, as we have seen above (p. 139), was the old Thai pronunciation of the numeral 'six.' Further, there is no evidence to hand as to whether tai here means Thai, or Tài ('south,' 'below'), or anything else; not to speak of the very queer and unnatural sense of the term Luk-tai as an ethnical designation, if interpreted as 'Children of the Thai.' There is no precedent on record as to any Thai tribe ever having borne such an appellation, or even one in any respect similar to it. We have heard of Thai Nai and Thai Nâk (Inner and Outer Thai); and the Sukhothai inscription of a.d. 1292 (vide p. 107 ante) tells us of Thai Yâi and Thai Nôi ('Great Thai,' i.e. the famous 'Shâns' or Thai of Upper Burma, and 'Little Thai,' i.e. the Thai of Siâm), of Thai Châau Ði ('Elder Thai,' probably, in my opinion, the same as the Ði-Lau or 員勇, Ai-Lao) and Thai Châu Không (i.e., I presume, the Thai of the Mê-Không River): but never did we come across a tribal name signifying 'Children of the Thai.' I have, moreover, shown (p. 183) that the term Thai is of comparatively modern growth, and that, although already in existence many centuries before the time (fifteenth or sixteenth century) when the Pai-I vocabulary of the Chinese Interpreters' College was compiled, it is merely a title and not an ethnic. Hence I am inclined to ascribe to the words Lu-tai or Luk-tai a different meaning from either 'Six Thai' or 'Children of the Thai.' The real signification may be Lôk-tai, i.e. 'Southerners' or 'Lowlanders.' In any case, the interpretation 'Six Thai' is beyond doubt far more logical and consistent with Thai traditions than the one of 'Children of the Thai.' The organization of the early Thai States appears to have been, from the remotest period known to history, into groups or confederacies of six districts, of which the Twelve Chư Thai of the Nâm Mâ (Song Mâ) and Nâm Nôn (Song Kâ) and the Twelve Phan-nâ of Ch'êng Ruông are but doubles. The Lu-Chão, 六歹, or, in old Thai, Lôk-Châu (meaning the 'Six Chieftains' and, metonymically, the 'Six Principalities,' or, as they are sometimes called in Burma, Tonv-bouaships, from the Thai term Châu-Fâ = 'Prince'), were mentioned, in Chinese records, as early as a.d. 70. Later on we hear of another group of Six Châu in Northern Campâ, therefore sometimes called 'the ancient Lam-ay,' an identification that completely puzzles Parker, who takes them to be (China Review, vol. xx, p. 203) 'Siamese tribute principalities' (!). They must have been, on the contrary, part of the kingdom of Cûša, founded, as we
evidence adduced above goes, must have belonged to the Kô or Hồ-ni tribes now called K'a-t'ô and No-pi.

The Barrhai (No. 224).

These people close the list of the tribes mentioned by Ptolemy as dwelling on the Tonkinese borders and extending thence to the Great Gulf. In De Donis' map they are marked above Aganagara (Hà-nôi) to the east of the Codupe and the Đôrias River. The location I have assumed for them in the map about P'u-érh Fu, at the outset of these studies and before I had access to De Donis' work, is, as we shall see directly, not at all unjustified, although too restricted, for I have since acquired the conviction that this tribe must, in agreement with what Ptolemy says, have extended well into Tonkin in his time, it being still found on its western borders at the present day.

have shown above, by the Lâu in what is now the Hà-tĩnh district. We are told, again, of another confederacy on the Upper Red River, called 六猛, Lu-Mêng (pron. Lük-Mân in Annamese), a term again puzzling Parker, who translates it (China Review, vol. xxiv, p. 54) 'the Six Muangs of Tonquin,' and adds that 'in 1806 China said these belonged to Lin-an Fu, and declined to give them to Annam.' I doubt, however, that 'Muông' districts are here implied, as the term Muông is transcribed in Annamese under the form 蒙, and is in Chinese usually represented by 蒙, Mêng (Ann. Mûang); although 芒, Mang (Ann. Mûang); 孟, Mêng (Ann. Môn); and 猛, Mêng (Ann. Môn), appear to be at times employed in a similar sense. The districts in question must have been on the Red River in the neighbourhood of Man-hao and Mêng-te (蒙自) or Mongtze; and the term Lu-Mêng may have reference to the Lamang, a Môn-Annam tribe similar to the Lamet or Khâ-Mêt who are settled in that vicinity. Should the real meaning of the term be 'Six Muangs' (as in 三猛, San-mêng = 'Three Muangs,' vide supra, p. 139), this would be an additional proof as to the prevalence of the hexameros political organization among the Thai. The instance just quoted of the three Muangs of C'hieng Rung could scarcely be regarded as forming an exception, for three is a sub-multiple of six, while in the case of the twelve Phan-nâ we have a multiple of the same numeral. These seemingly abnormal groups may have resulted in the one case from the scission into two of an original aggregate of six districts, and in the other from the coalescence of a couple of the same typical aggregations. It will be seen below (p. 364), in fact, that when the P'u-érh Fu prefecture was formed, exactly six Phan-nâ were withdrawn for the purpose from C'hieng Rung territory.
About the identity of the Barrhai there can be no possible doubt. They are till now represented by the people called P'u-érh or P'u-érh (普洱) by the Chinese, and P'hu-O or Kho-O by the Lâu. They inhabit the territory to the east and south-east of Lúang P'hraḥ Băng, which the Annamese have wantonly styled Trôn-niū (鎮 寧, in Chinese Chên-ning, the Trân-ninh of French writers), although it has ever been known under the name of Müang P'hüen applied to it from time immemorial by the Lâu. This term P'hüen is, I presume, the ancient local corruption of P'u-érh, the final r being either dropped or turned into n in Thai pronunciation. P'u-érh being the name of the people whom the Lâu found in occupation of the country when they first reached it under Khūn Chet-c'hūang,¹ it is but natural that they should have preserved that denomination under the slightly modified form of Müang P'hüen, and become themselves known to the surrounding nations as the Lâu P'hüen, i.e. Lâu inhabiting the country of the old P'hüen or P'u-érh tribes. According to recent explorers,² local tradition points to the two great families of the P'u-érh and P'u-ch'a (普 甸) as being the original occupiers of the region comprised between the Mê-Không at Lúang P'hraḥ Băng, the Black River, and the Tonkinese borders, now improperly termed the country of the Müang, because of its having been at a later period organized into districts (Müang) by the Lâu conquerors.

As regards the P'u-ch'a, they evidently correspond to the people otherwise called Ch'ã (舍), Khmu, and Khâ Chẹ, to whom reference has often been made in these pages. Chinese writers attach them to the Chung-jên (仲人) or Chung-kia (仲 家) of Kwang-hsi, and through them to the Miao stock.³ This means that they belong to the Môn-Annam

¹ See above, p. 294, note.
³ Vide Devéria, op. cit., pp. 133, 161, 162. Lacouperie (op. cit., pp. 61, 62) says that the Chung-kia are also called Chung-Miao and I-jên, their own name being Pu-i, and that they speak a Thai dialect, their traditions pointing to Kiang-hsi as their ancestral home. This point requires clearing up; but the fact of their now speaking a Thai dialect is not sufficient of itself to affiliate them with the Thai stock, language being not always a sure criterion of race.
or Ch'ieng race, as we know, in fact, their kinsmen the Khmu or Khâ Chêh do.\(^1\) On the other hand, the P'u-êrh seem to have been a far more important branch of that race than the P'u-ch'îa, for we find traces of their existence all over Indo-China. The P'u-êrh district on the south-western Yünnan borders was, no doubt, like Mûang P'hüen, named after them;\(^2\) and with them were probably connected the dark-complexioned and dwarfish P'u-na (滿 那), now called P'u-la\(^3\) (撲 喆), met with by Garnier\(^4\) in the Lin-an prefecture of Eastern Yünnan, but known to extend thence southwards to Yüan-chiang territory and eastwards into Kwang-hsi. From the fact of the latter being known likewise by the name of Ma-la (馬 聞),\(^5\) it would appear that it was they who gave the Lâu country its first name of Mâla, classicized afterwards by the Indû settlers into Mâlaca-deśa. My suggestion in this sense made in a preceding

---

\(^1\) It is possible that the Chung-jên are actually represented on the hill-tracts of the Lâu-Tonkinese watershed by the Chiang or Khâ-Chiâng (the Thuong of recent French explorers), who are said to be closely akin to the Khâ Chêh. (N.B. that the Chinese character 緌 is pronounced chung and tung in Southern Chinese dialects, and trung, trung in Annamese.)

\(^2\) See Devéria, op. cit., p. 116, note, where it is stated that during the Ming dynasty there were P'u-na or P'u-la on the territory of Chê-li (Ch'ieng Rung), which then still included the six P'hán-na out of which the P'u-êrh Fu prefecture was formed much later on, viz. in A.D. 1729. While the name of Mûang Chêh indicates the presence of Chêh or Khmu tribes in the southern part of Ch'ieng Rung (vide supra, p. 138), the toponymic P'u-êrh argues the existence of P'u-êrh populations in the northern portion of the same State. To the very probable connection of Mûang P'hüen or P'hüer with Ptolemy's Bareukora or Bareuaora I have already called attention above (p. 294, note). It will now be seen that it was most probably, like P'u-êrh Fu, a foundation of the Barrhai.

It would be of no small ethnological importance to ascertain whether the P'u-na are in any way connected with the tribes called P'hânâ, Bân-nân (Khâ Bân-nân), and P'hânâ presently found in the P'hû-Fâng and Mûang Lai (Lai-chôn) districts. From local sources I gather that the P'hânâ and Bân-nân are, as a rule, dark-complexioned, but speak different dialects. That of the P'hânâ is similar to the Khâ-Kong's, and therefore of Tibeto-Burman type, while the Bân-nân tongue differs, being thus probably Mô Annam. So seems to be the jargon spoken by the P'hânâ, although the absence, so far, of a vocabulary of this speech prevents one forming a definite opinion.

\(^3\) Devéria, loc. cit.


\(^5\) Devéria, op. cit., p. 117.
section would thus seem to have been well founded. I have, however, also hinted at the possible racial connection of the Barrhai with the Prū or Pʰyū of ancient Burmā, and the present Poru, Brāu, Bahnar, etc., of Kamboja. This connection will appear all the more evident now that the Barrhai’s identity with the Pʰu-érh, Pʰu-rh, Pʰuⁿ, or Pʰu-na has been demonstrated. We may then take it as pretty well certain that the Pör, Poru, Pēr, or Bar, surnamed by the Khmēr Manus Pʰhrai (cf. Barrhai) or ‘Jungle-Men,’ the Brāu, Pru, or Pʰhrau, the Bahnar, the Bahorar, and other tribes of the Kambojan-Annamese watershed bearing similar names, and having practically the same customs and language, must be so many offshoots of the original Pʰu-érh, driven out of their home in Southern Yūnnan and on the Lāu-Tonkinese borders by the Thai and other more powerful races advancing from the north. So must be the Pʰyū, Pʰrū, or Brū of ancient Burmā, who settled, since about 484 B.C., at Old Prome (Praṅ) in Burmese, and Pran or Prön in Mōn), and very likely are the Pʰiao, Pʰiu (in Cantonese Pʰiu), of the Chinese, scattered remnants of whom were still lingering on the Burmo-Yūnnanese borders at Mōmien in A.D. 796. Probably this western branch of the Pʰhrū or Brū reached as far down as the Malay Peninsula, where, with the Bhilā, Bhil, or Bila, and other more or less cognate tribes, they contributed to form its early population, for the term Pahrū is used up to this day by the Mōn to designate its inhabitants, the present Malays, in the form Mnh Pahrū, i.e. Pahrū-Men.

1 Supra, p. 131.
2 Ibid., pp. 129, 130.
3 Ibid., pp. 73 and 130.
4 See the Rev. E. O. Stevens’ “English and Peguan Vocabulary,” Rangoon, 1896, p. 62, s.v. Malay. The Burmese pronunciation of Pahrū is Pashū. Leyden, however, uses the spelling Masū and says this is the name given by the Burmese to the Malays (see “Languages and Literature of the Indo-Chinese Nations,” reprinted in “Essays relating to Indo-China,” 1st series, vol. i, p. 87). The term is omitted in Judson’s Burmese and English Dictionary.
However, the tribes of this race that became known to Ptolemy and were by him recorded under the name of Barrhai merely included, as we have seen, the P'ü-érh or P'ü-'rh, then extending in scattered groups—in consequence of their having been cut off into sections by the stream of the Doanai or Thai invaders from Southern Yünnan—all along the hill-tracts intervening between the Mê-Không at C'hiêng Rūng and the Clear River of Tonkin, if not even further till the head of the Gulf, as Ptolemy would seem to imply. It is probably with the more eastern portion of them that his informants became acquainted, and these, we have shown, are still represented in the highlands of Mùang P'huên or Trôn-niû to the east and south-east of Lùang P'hraû Bâng,

1883 edition; and the late Dr. Rost, while remarking in a note to Leyden's paper that it also occurs in Karen, ignores its existence in Mûû under the form Pahruû, which is undoubtedly an earlier one. The term is of importance, inasmuch as it appears to be traceable, not only all over Indo-China, but also throughout the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago. The names of the Marût tribe of Borneo, and of the Biojû or Beojû of the same island, of which they regard themselves the aborigines, are probably connected with it. So may be, again, the designation Mau-sz or Mau-sû (毛思) applied by the Chinese to a piratical tribe of the archipelago, of which Groeneveldt acknowledges his inability "to find out the origin" (see "Essays relating to Indo-China," 2nd series, vol. i, pp. 224 and 237). Chinese writers make the Mau-sû native of a country which they term P'o-lo, 婆羅, and say it is also known as Wên-ts'ai, 文萊. Groeneveldt, I know not on what authority, spells this name Wén-laî, so as to twist it, with his usual facility, into Burnai or Brunei, and take it to mean Borneo, thereby concluding that the Mau-sû are Borneo pirates. However, according Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 460) and other Chinese authors, P'o-lo lay at some days' sailing distance to the south-west of Ch'îh-t'u (Siâm), and "at the limit of the eastern Ocean, where the western Ocean begins" (see China Review, vol. iv, p. 386). This shows that it must have been situated, not on Borneo, but either on the Malay Peninsula or on some neighbouring island, and that it may correspond to Ibn Baţû'a's mysterious Barah-nagûr, of which more anon (p. 400, n. 2). In any case the word implied is undoubtedly something like Baru, Bar, or Barû, which, again, brings us back to the Pahruû, P'ü-érh, P'hruû or Brû, etc., referred to above. Another country bearing a name similar, and possibly identical, to P'o-lo, is 波羅, P'o-lo (Pahruû, Baru?), whose memory survives in the Po-lo temple at Canton in connection with a legend concerning the image of a black man preserved there, said to have been a high officer from that land, who came in a junk to bear presents to China. (See China Review, vol. xii, p. 153, and vol. xiv, p. 173.)
under the old name of P'u-érh or P'u-rh and its Lāu forms P'hū-Ō and Khā-Ō. Every vestige of those that had settled in Northern Tonkin has probably disappeared long ago; and from no mention being found of them in Annamese history,¹ we must conclude that they have been partly absorbed into the bulk of the people, and partly driven southwards along with other tribes that entered to form the population of Campā.

On the other hand, groups of the P'hū-Ō or Khā-Ō are still found on the hill-tracts of the Black River, especially in the district of Müang Lai, the Lāi-chōu or Lai-chdu (萊州) of the Annamese. From a Siāmese account of them we gather that they, whether males or females, are wont to tattoo the part of the face around the mouth with black streaks and other designs. Now, we have formerly drawn attention to the fact that the custom of face-tattooing was peculiar to the Li or Loi of Hainan and to the Khyeng of Burmā in so far as women were concerned; and to the Hua-mien, or ‘Flowered Faces’ tribe of the Liau,² among whom it was presumably adopted by both sexes. Ma Tuan-lin tells us that it was also in favour among a tribe of the Pu (濮) somewhere on the Burmā frontier, termed for this reason Wèn-mien-Pu, i.e. ‘Striped-face Pu.’ These people, he says, tattoo their faces with blue designs.³ They may

¹ On the Chinese side Ma Tuan-lin makes mention (op. cit., p. 395) of natives—apparently of Hainan—called 符護, Fu-hu (Cant. Fu-wu, Ann. P'hū-hō), who gave some trouble to the Chinese authorities of the island in A.D. 1154–55; but it is difficult to judge, from the scanty information given, as to whether this tribe were in any way related to the P'u on the main.

² Supra, p. 175.

³ Op. cit., p. 301. It is interesting to notice that face-tattooing is also in favour with several Nāga clans on the Burmo-Asamese frontier, among which is that of the Abor, who, strange to say, bear a name strikingly similar to the one of the P'u-érh. Among the Kolarian tribes of India the practice prevails, especially with the Juāng, Khariya, Ho, and Orāon, where, however, it is restricted to women and to the forehead and temples only (see Crooke's "Folk-Lore of Northern India," 1896, vol. ii, p. 31). In the Malay Peninsula it is still observable among the Semang and Benna; while in Sumatra it was noticed since the first quarter of the fourteenth century by Friar Odoric at Sumoltra or Smahora (Sumatra city, near Pasel, or Samara); and in the century next following, by Nicolò Conti among the 'Batech' (Batta or Battak). In Northern
have been Wah or Pwo-Karens, not necessarily connected with the $P'u-hu-\tilde{O}$, although the character, 濃, employed in representing their name, is strikingly similar, both in form and sound, to that (撲) used to denote the $P'u-la$. In the alternative designation of the latter, $P'u-na$, it should be noticed, the initial character takes the form of 濃, which also occurs in the name of the $P'u-jên$ (蒲人), or $P'u-Men$, said by the Rev. George W. Clarke to be called Pu-Ren and $P'u-long$, and to have been termed Pen-pu from B.C. 1122–867. Some of them, he adds, live in the neighbourhood of Nan-tien, to the south-west of (modern) Yung-ch'ang. It would be interesting to find out whether these $P'u-long$—or, as he writes their name, Pulong—are one and the same people with the Palong or Palaung.

Indo-China it has been remarked of the Nu-tsz, Lu-tsz, or Nu-jên (怒子, etc.), dwelling to the east of the Nu or Lu River (怒, or 潘, 江 = Salwin), that they "tattoo their faces with blue lines" (see "Actes du 10\textsuperscript{me} Congrès International des Orientalistes," Leide, 1897, Section vii, p. 61), without any further particulars as to the part of the face where the disfiguration is applied to, and what form it takes. The tattooing about the corners of the mouth we have described as forming part of the toilet of the $P'u-hu-\tilde{O}$ was, therefore, probably in favour with all the $P'u$ or Pu tribes. It is a pity that the lack of more detailed information about these and kindred populations in Chinese literature prevents us from turning the above supposition into a certainty, as the question is one of great importance for ethnological classification. Outside of Indo-China the latter peculiar form of tattooing is found among the Che-hwan (Chinese: Sheng-fen) or hillmen of Formosa, and beyond it it reappears among the women of Fiji. Leaving, however, the last-named aside and confining our considerations to Formosa, it cannot fail to strike one as very probable that the presence of an identical custom in the same characteristic form among the Che-hwan of that island and the $P'u-hu-\tilde{O}$ of Northern Indo-China is a very strong argument in favour of racial affinity between the two peoples. The Che-hwan style of tattooing is minutely described in the Journal China Branch R.A.S., new series, No. ix, 1875, p. 64, and in the China Review, vol. xiii, pp. 200–201, to which I refer the reader. It is to be hoped that more attention will henceforth be paid to this subject, especially in connection with Indo-Chinese tribes, and that likenesses of the different patterns in use for the face will be taken, so as to enable ethnologists to institute comparisons, and eventually arrive at some definite result in respect of the racial relations in which those tribes stand to each other.

\footnote{Chinese Recorder, vol. xv, p. 387. Next the writer speaks of the Ma-la, whose name he spells 蜘詀, instead of 马啪 as in Devéria (op. cit., p. 117), without being apparently aware that they are the same people as the $P'u-jên$ or $P'u-la$.}
dwellings to the north-east of Ava (Taungbain district, etc.) and in the northern part of Mūang Lēm. These latter Lacouperie terms Po-lung (勃弄, really P'o-lung or P'u-lung), and rightly ascribes to the Mōn-Annam family. From the evidence adduced above, they must be identical to the P'u-la and closely allied to the P'u-érh or P'hū-Ō, in whose neighbourhood they originally lived, as exemplified by the fact that P'o-lung or P'u-lung (spelled with the same characters) was the name of the department of Peh-ngai of the Nan-Chao kingdom. Ma Tuan-lin, speaking of the south-western barbarians called Pu-jén (卜人), i.e. Pu-Men, takes them to be one with the Pu (濮) above referred to, and does not hesitate to suggest that all these tribes styled Pu must be the same people. From the prevalence among most of the Pu or P'u of the custom of face-tattooing; from the fact of their being, as a rule, dark-complexioned; from their speaking similar languages, and having practically the same customs, we have no hesitation, in our turn, to still more generalize Ma Tuan-lin’s view, and pronounce all the tribes mentioned above, whether Pu or P'u, closely related to the P'u-érh, and issued from the same racial stock, if not absolutely identical with each other. Another people with a name strikingly alike that of the P'u-érh or P'hüen are the P'hwcon or P'con (their name being so spelled by Ney Elias), mentioned in the Moguang Annals as one of the eight races dwelling in that kingdom at the time of its foundation, circa 1215 A.D. They were then divided into Great and Little P'hwons, and their descendants are still to be found settled about the third or upper defile.

4 The 濮, P'u, are described as being dark like the 利米, Li-mi (= Lamet?), by Chinese writers (see Devéría, op. cit., p. 169); the P'u-la, we have seen, are said by Garnier to be "sauvages petits et noirs" (op. cit., p. 504). The 濮 may be the same tribe as the P'hô or Khô-P'hô (so called by the P'hū-thai) who inhabit, according to the native sources I am quoting from, the high mountains of Mūang Lai (Black River), and are very dark in complexion.
of the Irāvati. According to a tradition surviving among them it would appear that their remote ancestors were already in the country at the time of the expedition from Sein, or Sin, that stormed and destroyed Tagaung in circa b.c. 550. These primeval P'hwons, the legend runs, were pressed into service by the conquerors to conduct the elephants captured in the city back to Sein; but they escaped thence and wandered back to the banks of the Irāvati, where they and their descendants have remained ever since. Ney Elias writes throughout 'China' instead of Sin, or Sein, in the above narrative; and, indeed, some of the native versions give Gandhāra-rattha (Yūnnan) as the land whence the invaders came. I have shown, however, that the country around Bhāmō, forming the ancient State of Shen (撫) of Chinese records, is very probably implied. Anyhow, the legend, while no doubt confusing events, points to some dim tradition still lingering amongst the P'hwons, as to their early ancestors having come into the country from Yūnnan by way of the Taping Valley, i.e. vía Yung-ch'ang, Momien, and Bhāmō, about the middle of the sixth century b.c., if not much earlier. Such being the case, it is quite possible that they are a branch of the P'u-ērh, P'hüen, P'hru, or P'hyū, left behind in the Taping Valley (where, we have seen, p. 130 ante, there have been P'iao, or P'hyū, at Momien down to A.D. 796), when the said P'hyū wandered down towards Southern Burma along with the Kanran and Sak (i.e. the P'u-ch'a and other tribes of Chēh race, such as the Khmu, Khami or Khami, Kanrang, etc.). As the P'hyū are said to have reached Old Prome in about 484 b.c., there is nothing improbable as to their having left the country around Bhāmō (Tagaung, etc.) at the time of the Shen, or Sein invasion (circa b.c. 550), instead of several centuries before as the legendary native records pretend. Otherwise the P'hwons may be regarded as a younger branch of the P'hyū, who followed

1 See Ney Elias ('History of the Shans,' p. 12).
2 See above, p. 62.
in the footsteps of their elder brothers long after these had permanently settled on Burmese territory, and were arrested, through some cause or other, in the country around Bhāmō, where they have remained ever since. Of the ethnical characteristics of the Pʰhwons, Ney Elias does not tell us much beyond that "they are closely allied to the Kadus on the borders of Munnipur [sic for Manipur] both in language and customs, and are probably of one origin with the latter, whether the above tradition be true or not."¹ Dr. Mason enumerates the Kadō or Kadū among his "eleven Burmese tribes of unquestionably common origin," but as with them he includes the Pʰyu ula, Kanran, and others whom we have shown to be, almost unquestionably, of Mōū-Annam origin, his classification can be no more relied upon than the modern title 'Burmese' he assumes for a group of populations who were for the most part in the country many centuries before the Burmāns ever put their foot in it.² Forbes more judiciously says of the Kadū, Yō, Yabaing, and others that "they are recognized by the Burmans proper as being the wilder and more primitive branches of their race; but, unfortunately, we have no trustworthy specimens of their dialects from which to form conclusions."³ Other writers on Burmā and its ethnology make it a point of ignoring both the Kadū and Pʰhwon. The fact is, then, that nothing certain is so far known about their language, and much less as regards their racial connections.⁴ It is to be hoped that new researches will throw further light on these questions; in the meantime there seems to be more than one probability that both these tribes belong to the

¹ Loc. cit.
² The Pʰhwon—whose name he spells Phucon or Mwcon—he classes, along with the Pᵃloon or Pala, among the 'Shan" (Thai) tribes.
³ "Comparative Grammar of the Languages of Further India," p. 56.
⁴ The recently published "Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States," Rangoon, 1900, vaguely says about the Pʰhwon, whose name it variously spells Ḥpōn, Ḥpōn, Hwcon, etc. (part i, vol. i, pp. 567-8): "It is possible that they are a mere sort of dishelout, like the Yaws and Danus and Kadus, full of traces of all their neighbours. On the other hand, they may prove a valuable link in the chain when the many detached links begin to be joined together.

The Ḥpōns look perilously like half-breeds, but they may be a back-wash."
Mōn-Annam race, and if Lacouperie’s suggestion as to the identity of the Kādū or Kadō with the K’a-t’o of Southern Yūnnan is in any sense justifiable, it is quite possible that we have in the former and in the P’hwuon western ramifications of Ptolemy’s Kudutai and Barrhai respectively.

Sēros River (Nos. 113 and 180).

I have identified this stream with the Hsi-yū (Hsi-yū ch’iang), noted as Si-you River in Dutreuil de Rhins’ “Carte de l’Indo-Chine Orientale” (1881) and as Tiah (or Tiak) You kiang in Pavie’s map (1894). This watercourse undoubtedly corresponds to the one termed Yū-chou ch’iang (漁洲江) in Devéria’s “Frontière Sino-Annamite” (p. 4, and sketch-map on p. 7), apparently so designated after a village of the name of Yū-chou (‘Fishing Islet’), marked simply as Yū in Dutreuil’s map above referred to, at a short distance to the east of the river’s embouchure and at the head of a bay denoted as Baie Liyu. This indentation of the coast lies immediately to the east of Cape Pak-lung, and in most modern maps, even down to the latest, it is made the estuary for a doubtful watercourse, to wit, the Ngan-nan kiang (Annam River), which seems to exist only in the fertile imagination of our geographers. Another stream further eastwards, the Lung-mén River, debouching near Ch’in-chou (K’in-chau), is given in the Chinese official descriptions of the country a name similar to the Hsi-yū.

1 See Devéria, op. cit., p. ix preface and p. 5 text. Ever since the appearance of the first Jesuit maps of the country—published by D’Anville in 1729—the Ngan-nan kiang has persistently occupied a conspicuous position in the cartography of the Tonkin seaboard. The latest Admiralty charts of that region still retain it, while Pavie’s map is almost alone among the few recent ones that omit it—or, to be more exact, that, following the example set forth in the rude Chinese sketches of the country published by Devéria, mark in the place of that stream an insignificant rivulet which they leave nameless. The “China Sea Directory,” vol. ii, 4th ed., 1899, still speaks (p. 465) of the indentation in the coast referred to above as “a deep bay into which the Ngan-nan-kiang discharges, apparently encumbered by shallow banks.” It duly acknowledges, however, that the coast about that point is but little known, a fact which accounts for the incessant repetition, down to this day, of the error as to the existence of that fabulous river.
or Yu-chou, to wit, Yu-hung (漁洪); but Ptolemy's rectified position of the mouth of the Seros (long. 107° 36' E. and lat. 21° 37' N.) points to a location further to the west, while the term Si-you occurring in Dutreuil's map—evidently the local name by which the stream in question has long been known—argues an origin from a designation somewhat like Hsi-yu, which is undoubtedly the prototype of Ptolemy's transcript Seros.

Indeed, the term Hsi-yu is by no means new on the upper seaboard of the Tonkin Gulf. The Annamese Annals, for one, tell us of an ancient district called Toi-vu (Tay-vu) whose name, though spelled with different characters (i.e. 西子, meaning 'westward going,' or 'extending towards the west') from those employed to denote the Hsi-yu or Yu River, is nevertheless identically read Hsi-yu. The location that this district occupied is unknown, but it formed part of the Kiän-chau department (Jâu-châu p'huá), it having been constituted by the Han at the time of their conquest of the country in B.C. 111. In A.D. 43 its population had grown up to as much as thirty-three thousand families; hence Ma-yûan, the Chinese victorious general, split the district into two divisions, which he named, respectively, P'hông-khê and Vông-hài, doing away altogether with the old term Hsi-yu or Toi-vu, which thus became obsolete from that date. As P'hông-khê (in Chinese: 封溪, Fêng-ch'i—'Fief Creek') was the original name—taken from that of a rivulet near by—borne by the territory on which the capital of the Thük king, afterwards termed Kô-liu, was built, and as we have seen that the same territory now forms part of the district called Dong-ngân (東墘), in the province of Bkain, we may well infer that the erstwhile Toi-vu, otherwise Hsi-yu, district, must have included part of the present Bkain territory, and may have stretched eastwards as far as Cape Pak-lung and the Hsi-yu River, having been possibly named after the latter. This would appear to some extent

1 Devéria, op. cit., p. 4.
2 See Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 49, 63, 107, and note 446.
3 Ibid., pp. 10-11.
from the sense of 'westward going’ embodied in the district’s name, which could thus be interpreted ‘extending to the westward of the Hsi-yü River,’ the then probably eastern boundary of the Kiu-chau department. The fact of the name of this river being now spelled somewhat differently does not constitute a sufficient plea against the etymological connection here suggested, as many a Chinese place-name is known to have been at various periods represented by characters differing in form, although identical, or nearly so, in sound.

But, without laying too much stress on the homonymy, if any, between the Hsi-yü River and the ancient Hsi-yü district—which latter, it must in any case be remembered, lasted until A.D. 43, i.e. up to about the period to which Ptolemy’s information about the region in question is apparently to be referred,—the presence of a water-course, on the tract of coast where our eminent geographer makes his Seros discharge, known to this day by such names as Si-you, Tiah-you, or Hsi-yü, is, I should think, sufficient evidence upon which to argue an etymological connection between the names of the two streams, and to conclude as to the latter’s topographical identity. Of course, we do not know how far back in antiquity the actual designations Si-you, Tiah-you, etc., may be traced, in the event of their having nothing in common with the name of the ancient Hsi-yü district. But there would still remain the old term Hsi-Ou applied to Tonkin in Ts’in times to resort to as an alternative, which no doubt long survived in the country and may have remained attached, albeit in a somewhat modified form, to the name of the river constituting its former eastern boundary, in the same manner that the term Ngan-nan became at a much later date identified with a neighbouring—however imaginary—watercourse, supposed to form the eastern limit of Annamese territory.

An apparently very serious objection that could be raised against our identification of the Seros with the Hsi-yü is the insignificant size of the latter as compared with so conspicuous a watercourse as the former is represented to be
in Ptolemaic geography. In this system, in fact, the Séros is made to rise in the Sémanthinos range from two sources, of which the more western lies in long. 106° 52' E., lat. 30° 24' N., and the more eastern in long. 109° 4', lat. 29° 13', their confluence being in long. 107° 15', lat. 27° 25'; all these being the rectified positions obtained by us as shown in the tables. Such data suggest the idea of a mighty water-course rising about the boundary of Sz-ch'wan and Hu-nan on the east and slightly above the Yang-tsz at Ch'ung-king on the west, uniting in a single main channel near Tsun-yi towards the centre of Kwei-chou, and wending thence its way to the Tonkin Gulf. A geographical monstrosity indeed, but for all that by no means exceeding those perpetrated by cartographers at different periods regarding the same region. We have already pointed out, in fact, how the real hydrography of the tract of country now under consideration has proved a puzzle to geographers up to quite recently, and, may be, is still so for some of them to this very day. By reference to the map in Mandelslo already alluded to it will be seen that the river of Hâ-nôì, and another more to the east as well, are made to issue from the Tung-t'ing lake in Hu-nan, not far from the point where Ptolemy located the eastern source of his Séros. And, by turning to Devéria's "Frontière Sino-Annamite" (p. 6), one will be not a little surprised to see how D'Anville, in the map of the Kwang-tung province he published in A.D. 1729, constructed upon that originally made by the Jesuits, connected—though it be by an oversight—the Lu-shwei River (a tributary of the Lung or Tso-kiang, i.e. the 'Left River' of Kwang-hsi, through the Min-kiang) with the Ngan-nan kiang of mythical fame, thus making—most absurdly—a branch of the Left River to flow down to the Gulf of Tonkin. Nor is this all, for Dutreuil de Rhins' map of A.D. 1881 repeats the same error and makes the Ngan-nan kiang drain the basins of the Tso-kiang, Min-kiang, and Lu-shwei, and so do the Admiralty charts down

¹ Supra, p. 243.
to A.D. 1886 and later. In comparison, and due regard being had to the time at which he lived, we may justly say that Ptolemy was far ahead of our modern geographers in his treatment of the hydrography of the region now under consideration.

But I will push on still further in the appreciation of his talents and demonstrate that in making his Sēros, that is, our Hsi-yü, rise in the Sēmanthinos range—or in what he believed to be such, or, at any rate, its prolongation—he was perfectly correct. By looking over the hydrographic description of the Hsi-yü—or, as he terms it, the Yü-chou—which Devéria compiled from Chinese sources, it will be seen (op. cit., p. 4) that this stream is, like the Sēros, formed by the junction of two branches; the one coming from the west taking its source in the mountain range called the Shih-wan Shan (十萬山) or 'Ten-myriads' Peaks,' a very conspicuous orographic group forming the natural boundary between the K‘in-chau district, that of Shang-sz chou in Kwang-hsi, and the Tonkin borderland. Now, the name of this mountain range, Shih-wan Shan, is variously pronounced Shēp-man Shan in Cantonese and Thōp-cūn Sōn in Annamese, a circumstance which argues that its old pronunciation must have been not very far different from Shé-man-shin or Shē-man-thin, in which forms it will not take a great stretch of imagination to recognize Ptolemy’s Sēmanthinos. Of course, this is not in reality the same mountain chain as the one which our geographer makes to run through Eastern Sz-ch’wan and Hu-nan. This, I propose to demonstrate in the next instalment of the present inquiry, owes its Ptolemaic designation to a closely similar term, the name of the Hsie-man (謝蠻) tribes formerly settled in that region—Ptolemy’s Sēmanthinoi, — and means 'Mountains of the Hsie-man tribes'; in Chinese, Hsie-man Shan. But it seems perfectly natural that Ptolemy having heard, as he very probably did, the Shih-wan Shan range vaguely mentioned as the source of the Hsi-yü, he rashly jumped to the conclusion that this must be the same as the Hsie-man Shan of Sz-ch’wan and Hu-nan, and thus he was misled into making his Sēros rise in the latter.
The last possible objection to be disposed of in the present retrospective inquiry is of a linguistical character, and concerns the etymological connection I have assumed throughout to exist between the names of the Hsi-yü and Séros. On this point I may say that I hope to conclusively demonstrate in the section devoted to Sériké that some term closely akin, if not absolutely identical, with Hsi-yü—and not 絲, Sz, Si=‘silk,’ as it has been generally held hitherto—is the most likely etymological prototype and equivalent of Séra, Séres, Sér, Sir, etc. Many circumstances concur in indicating that in the China of the old days Hsi-yü and allied toponymics were very probably pronounced somewhat like Sér-u or Sér-o; possibly Sé-ru, should one prefer believing that the strayed r in that compositum still survives in a latent and softened form, represented by the present y.

I may add, before dismissing this subject, that in the case in point the name of the Hsi-yü River may be of Sanskrit origin, that is, traceable to some such term as Saras, Sarayû, Sarjû, etc., corrupted locally as time went by into Hsi-yü or Si-you, but recorded by Ptolemy in the more correct and early form of Séros.

End of the Great Gulf towards the Sinai (No. 112).

This corresponds to the head of the Gulf of Tonkin between K'ìn-chau (欽州, Ch'ìn-chou) and Pak-hoi Harbour. Here the Indo-Chinese (India extra-Gangem) seaboard ended, and that of the Sinai or people of China south of the Yang-tsz commenced. Ptolemy, in fact, includes the Lei-chou peninsula and the Lien-chou district (ancient chūn of Hō-p'û, 合浦, Ann. Hiep-p'ho, whose name he renders as Aspithra) in the territory of the Sinai. In his time, however, this chūn, as well as the more eastern one of Nan-hai (now province of Kwang-tung or Canton), formed part,
administratively, of the bō (pu) of Kiāu-chī, from which they were not separated—and that but partially, in so far as the chūn of Ho-pʻu was concerned—until a.d. 226 temporarily, and a.d. 264 permanently, when the chou of Kwang (Kwang-chou) was constituted with its own seat of government at Pʻian-yū¹ (Canton, which on this account became from that date known as Kwang-chou, the name it has borne up to the present day). Ptolemy’s division is therefore more geographical and ethnological than political; and from that point of view it must be recognized as remarkably correct.

¹ See Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 91, 100, 101.
(10) **ISLANDS OF TRANS-GANGETIC INDIA.**

**A. The Andāmāns and Nikobārs.**

**Bazakata** (No. 156).

"In this island some say there is found in abundance the murex shell-fish (κόχλος), and that the inhabitants go naked, and are called Aginnatai."¹ So far Ptolemy's text. A good deal of speculation has gone on among Oriental scholars as regards the identity of this island; but Colonel Yule was certainly the most correct in assuming it to be the Great Andāmān. I think that the whole group of the Main Andāmāns should be included under Ptolemy's designation, as the three islands of which it consists—or rather four, if we are to include among them, as seems reasonable, Bāratān Island, closely sandwiched in between Middle and South Andāmān—have long been believed by navigators to form but one single island, and it was only in February, 1792, for instance, that the passage between the North and Middle Andāmāns (Austin Strait) was discovered.² Ptolemy's description suits also very well these islands, both his statements as to the nakedness of the inhabitants and the abundance of murex shell-fish being confirmed by modern travellers.³ It remains, then, to account for the name he collectively gives them, a task which preceding commentators have preferred not to broach. In order to arrive at an understanding of the term Bazakata it must be remembered that the group of the Andāmāns, together with that of the Nikobārs, has always been known as the 'Archipelago of Naked People.' This is not only the denomination applied to those islands by

---

¹ McCrindle, op. cit., p. 236.
² See Sykes' "Embassy to Ava" (Edinburgh, 1827), vol. i, p. 153 and footnote.
³ Ibid., p. 159, speaking of the Minkopi, "they go quite naked"; and at p. 163, "the shores abound in a variety of beautiful shells, gorgonias, madreporas, murex, and cowries, with many other kinds." The sentences here printed in small capitals correspond literalism to Ptolemy's words.
Chinese authors, but it is also the common term employed to designate them in India and Further India. Nikobár, in fact, is simply a corrupted form of Nagga-vaṇa (in Pāli Nagga-vāra) or Nag-bār, meaning 'Country of Naked People,' often written by mistake Nāga-vaṇa, in Siamese Nāgavārī. I found the latter name in an old Siamese map forming part of an illustrated Traip‘hūm, a famous work on Buddhist cosmology; a short explanation is appended, which means "naked people [are living here]." The Nagga-dīpa mentioned in the Mahāvamsa is probably the same archipelago. In modern times these names were

1 I-tsing, in Chavannes' "Religieux Éminents," etc., pp. 100, 120, has 裸國, which is apparently a misprint for 裸國 (Lo-kuo), i.e. the 'Kingdom of the Naked (unclad, or stripped) People.' The description he gives (pp. 120, 121) seems to apply to the Nikobārs and not to the Andāmāns, for he speaks of cocoanuts growing there, which are absent in the Andāmāns. Other Chinese authors have Lo-hsing-kuo (裸形國), which has the same meaning. See Phillips in Journal R.A.S., July, 1895, p. 529, note 3. I have since noticed in Takakusu's "Record of the Buddhist Religion," translated from I-tsing's work, that this author employs also the spelling Lo-jen-kuo (裸人國), i.e. 'Naked-Men Kingdom' (Introduction, p. xxxviii).

2 Compare with this Marco Polo's Noeueram or Negueram. The Burmese way of spelling the name — နကာရာ, pronounced Nagabārī—is practically identical with the Siamese; nevertheless, it should be observed that the term နာရာ, the Burmese transcript of Nāga, is not represented in it, thus making it probable that Nāga is the sense intended.

3 For a detailed account of this work, see my book "Culākantamānagala, or the Tonsure Ceremony as performed in Siām" (Bangkok, 1895), pp. 95 et seqq. The illustrated Traip‘hūm volume here referred to is now in the Königlichen Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin, where the curious and valuable map alluded to may be inspected by those taking interest in the geography of the Far East.

4 Chap. vi, where it is said that Vijaya's children and those of his followers drifted there. In other chapters (xii, xx, xliii, liv, etc.) we have Nāga-dīpa, which term appears, from the context, to refer to a district on the north-eastern coast of Ceylon Island. The same may be inferred from a passage in the Valākassā-Jātaka (No. 196), the text of which runs: "... parato Kalyāṇī orante Nāgadīpam ti evam samuddatārā." meaning: "... along the sea-shore as far as Kalyāṇī on the other side, and Nāgadīpa on this side [of Ceylon Island]." As Kalyāṇī must be the district or kingdom of the same name alluded to in the Mahāvamsa (ch. i passim, ch. li, etc.), still represented by the present village of Kallani, on the Kallani Ganga (Kallani River), on the west side of the island (about six miles north from Colombo), so
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restricted, apparently, to the Nikobär, the term Andämän being used to denote the islands of the northern part of the

must Nagadipa have stood on the opposite, i.e. eastern, shore of the island, termed “this side” in the text (in reference to the Yaksha city of Sirsavarthu alluded to therein, which I think identical with the Sirisattha of the Mahāvamsa (ch. vii) and etymologically connected with the haven of either Bizala (Sirisala?) or Spatana (= Sirsa-pattana, Siri-pattana?) recorded by Ptolemy on that coast in the neighbourhood of Trinkōna-malai (Trinkomalee) Bay]. It is here, in fact, and on the sea-shore, that our eminent geographer places Nagadibha, a town, and the Nagadiboi tribes. Colonel Yule has located Nagadibha on the north-west coast of the island; but this, it will now be seen, is unsatisfactory, as conflicting with both the evidence adduced above from the Valahassa-Jātaka and the position on the east coast of the island assigned by Ptolemy to Nagadibha city. I therefore believe Sir J. E. Tennent to have been far more correct in fixing for the latter a site near Trinkōna-malai Bay. The result I have obtained—8° 45' N. lat.—on the basis of the Ptolemaic latitudes of, respectively, the North Cape (Bōpeew Bɛpoe) and Cape Ormeön, the two extremes of the island, points to an emplacement a little to the north of that bay, that is, between it and Boulder Point; and calculations based upon Ptolemy's equator passing through Nābartha lead to practically the same result, the difference in this case being of barely 4' less in latitude. The district stretching to the north of Trinkomalee Bay is, therefore, the land of Nagadipa, where the Mahāvamsa tells us (ch. i) Nāga kings reigned over a Nāga population (Ptolemy's Nagadiboi), and whither it pretends Buddha to have come to pay a visit.* By perusing the chapter of the Mahāvamsa just referred to it will be seen that while Buddha is represented to have been to Ceylon twice only (i.e. in the ninth month and the eighth year, respectively, of his Buddhahood), and once besides to Nāgadipa (fifth year of Buddhahood), the account of these visits concludes with the words: “thus . . . . the all-bountiful luminary visited this most favoured land of the world thrice” (Turnour's translation), thus indirectly leading us to conclude that Nāgadipa must have been part of Ceylon, since it is only by adding the visit paid to that district to the two made to, respectively, Mahāiyangana and Kāliyūṇi in other parts of the island, that the sum of three can be made up.

It will, however, appear forthwith how, owing to the close similarity in names between the Nāgadipa district (in Ceylon) and the Nagadipa island or archipelago (Andämāns and Nikobär), the two toponymics and their locations became inextricably mixed up in Oriental legend, so that in the course of time the visit paid by Buddha to Nāgadipa came to be regarded as having been actually made to the Andämān-Nikobär group of islands.

Dr. Rouse, in his translation of vol. ii of the Jātaka tales, took the Nāgadipa referred to in the passage quoted above from the Valahassa-Jātaka to be an island lying off Ceylon (p. 90, and Index, p. 312), and so did, before him, both Turnour in his version of the first chapter of the Mahāvamsa (p. 4), Spence Hardy (loc. cit.), and Childers (Pāli Dict., s.v.). But it will be seen that in either instance no island whatever is meant, albeit the toponymic may be literally interpreted in the sense of ‘Nāga Island.’ Analogous is the case with the Nāgadevi of the Visūpa Purāṇa (bk. ii, ch. 3), which, although signifying literally the same, is distinctly stated to be part of Bhāratavarsa, i.e. to be a division of

* Its seaport appears to have been Jambākulə, where the Ceylonese embassy to Asoka embarked, and whither it landed on its return from India (see Mahāvamsa, ch. xi and xx). Spence Hardy says (“Manual of Buddhism,” p. 208, note) that Jambākulə is supposed to be Colomboğan, in the district of Jaffna; but it remains to be seen whether this surmise is correct. In the affirmative case, it would follow that the Nāgadipa district included the whole territory from Trinkomalee Bay to the northern end of Ceylon Island.
group. But such was by no means the case in the old days, when the designation ‘Archipelago of Naked People’ seems to have included the whole of this insular region. The connotation ‘naked people’ was, however, expressed in different ways in the Indian vernaculars. Nāga, Nāgga, Nāngā, often modified into Nāga, were but some of the renderings, the most widely known; \(^1\) Bazakata and Aginnatai, as occurring

continental India.* As regards the Jātaka, in particular, the context is quite clear, and no allusion is therein made as to going out at sea to any island, but simply as to wandering on foot (amuricarati) along the sea-shore (of Ceylon) as far as (the) Nāgadipa (district or city). Dr. Rouse’s translation “as far as the island of Nāgadipa” is, therefore, not only unjustified, but absolutely misleading.

There was, indeed, an island called Nāgadipa somewhere off the coast at that point. This is referred to in Jātaka 360 (Sussondi-J.) as lying on the sea-route from Bharukaccha (Bharuch or Bharach) to Suvamabhūmi (Gulf of Martaban). Merchants from Benares landed there to get firewood and water. In remote times it was known by the name of Serunua Island, and was then the abode of Garudas and the seat of a Garuda king. It may well be the Great Nikobār.

Ptolemy also, in his turn, mentions a Nāgadibha island, which he locates on the same latitude (8° 48’ corrected) of Nāgadibha city, but six degrees of longitude, according to his reckoning, further to the east, i.e. off the eastern shore of Ceylon. As there exists no island in that position, and as Ptolemy ascribed to Ceylon a width of 12 degrees of longitude against the true 27’ 13’, thus making it stretch out both eastward and westward far more than is the case, it is quite possible that the gap separating his island of Nāgadibha from the east coast of Ceylon was, in reality, much wider than he represented it, and that therefore the said isle was one of the group he terms Maniolai and we call Nikobārs. It will be observed, in fact, that the longitude he assigns to this group (140° E. circ.) is only 5° in excess of the one he ascribes to Nāgadibha (135°), against 0° of longitudinal distance of the latter from the east coast of Ceylon, whence it follows that, in Ptolemy’s opinion, Nāgadibha Island was nearer to the Maniolai (Nikobār) than to Ceylon itself. On the strength of these arguments, I have no hesitation in taking Ptolemy’s Nāgadibha Island to be one and the same with the Nāgadibha of the Mahāvamsa, which latter, in its turn, may be identical with the Nāgadibha of Jātaka 360, if we admit the confusion between the last two so closely similar toponymics to have originated from a very early period, as most probably was the case. To the bringing about of such a confusion may have contributed, in no small measure, the quite possible fact of the Andāmāns and Nikobārs being in remote times a dependency of one of the kingdoms founded by Nāgas, either on the Koromandel coast or on the eastern shore of Ceylon, early before the dawn of the Christian Era (as evidenced by the references in Mahāvamsa and Jātaka already adverted to, and by the toponymics Nāgadibha, Manjerika-Nāga, Nāgāpattana, etc., appearing in those parts since the earliest ages).

\(^1\) The reading Nāga-sūra for the name of the Nikobārs, already noticed in the Siamese work above referred to, seems to receive confirmation from Ma-Huan’s statement in respect of Buddha’s footprint in Ceylon, to the effect that “it is the imprint of Sākya-muni’s foot, made when he landed at this place coming

* This may have been the land of Mañjerika or Mañjeriku (termed Mañjerika-Nāga-bhavani in the Mahāvamsa, ch. xxxi), i.e. the Dharanikota or Maccherippattana (present Masulipatnam) district (see above, p. 108).
in Ptolemy, are possibly synonymous terms which were very likely in use in his time. It will be seen, in fact, that ba'za

from the Ts'wei-lan [Nikobâr] islands'' (Phillips in Journal China Branch R.A.S., vol. xx, p. 212). This piece of folklore, evidently picked up by Chinese navigators on the shores of the Bay of Bengal, corroborates the view that we have just described, namely, that the Ceylonese district of Nâgadipa became, from a very early period, identified with the Nikobâr Islands in Oriental legend. We shall have to revert to this curious tradition directly. Suffice for the present to note the equation Nâga-dipa = Ts'wei-lan = Nikobârs. The original spelling was evidently Nâga-dipa or Nâga-vâra, 'Archipelago or Country of Naked People,' the alteration into Nâga (serpent-person) being introduced in the sequel, presumably by Buddhist writers, as being more in accord with Buddhist ideas and with the character of the aborigines of those islands, who find themselves as well at home on the sea as on land. Or is it possible that, as we have suggested, the reverse was the case, and that these people were in origin called Nâga from their connection with the Nâgas of the eastern coast of India and Ceylon, and that the terms Nâga, Nangâ, etc., were applied to them afterwards on account of their nakedness?

As regards the name of the Andâmâns, I am under the impression that it is derived from the same source as that of the Nikobârs; hence it is that I am inclined to include both insular groups in the 'Archipelago of the Naked People.' Marco Polo, it will be seen, refers to the Andâmâns under the names Angaman (Latin texts), Angamanum (French text), and Aghama (Italian text), which all seem to me traceable to nangâ, the term for 'naked' in Urdu and other Indian vernaculars. Nangamanaa, Nangamanu, Nangamanu, and similar compounds, would explain, in my opinion, not only Marco Polo's Angaman, etc., but also Sulaimân's Lanjetâlits, or Lanjetâlits, which he records as the name of some islands separated from two others beyond by a sea called Andâmâns (Reinaud, op. cit., p. 8). The description given by Sulaimân of the inhabitants of these islands (p. 16) tallies almost word for word with that left nearly two centuries before (a.d. 672) by I-tsing (Chavannes, op. cit., p. 129). It is clear to me that the terms Nikobâr and Andâmâns are synonymous; or that, at any rate, they apply collectively to both the Andâmâns and Nikobâr groups, the one designating the insular region (Nâga-vâra or Nangâ-vâra) of the naked people, and the other (Andâmân or Nangâmân) the inhabitants themselves. It is worth noting in this connection that the Chinese renderings Lo-kwo, Lo-jen-[kwo], and Lo-hsing-[kwo] very closely resemble in sound the Arab Lenje or Lanje in Lanjetâlits or Lanjetâlits, as well as Rashid-ud-Din's Lâko-vârum, or Nâkâvarâm. Its seems, therefore, very probable that—as we have repeatedly insisted is the case with most Chinese renderings of foreign place-names—Lo-kwo, Lo-jen-[kwo], and Lo-hsing-[kwo] are mere phonetical transcripts of the Arab Lenje or Lanje (which in Captain Bozorg's 'Ajâib assumes the form Laja), contrived with such characters as are apt to convey at the same time the meaning of 'naked' or 'naked people'; and that thus the Chinese must have learnt these toponyms, amongst many others, second-hand from the mouths of the Arab or Persian navigators of the early days. In the Arabic transcript the term bâlîs must stand either for manus or purus. Nangâpurus is, I think, as closely approaching a form to Lanjetâlits as may satisfy the most capacious of critics. Another possible explanation which has occurred to me since writing the above is, that the term bâlîs may represent the Môni pakhru already noticed in the preceding section, or else the Sanskrit purus (Pâli phuru), meaning 'savage.' The composite Lanjetâlits (or, as Ibn Khurâd-dih has it, Lîkîbâlîs) would in this case prove traceable to either the Sanskrit-Pâli Nangâpurus, Nangâphuru, or to the Môni L'ka-pakhru, meaning 'islands of Savages.'

The late Sir E. Maxwell, à propos of the Malay poem Sri-Râma, expresses the following opinion in regard to the name of the Andâmân Islands, in the
may stand for the Sanskrit or Pāli vāsa = 'clothes,' a term which takes different forms in the vernaculars of Southern India and Indo-China, becoming bāju (= 'a coat') in Malay, patsō in Burmese, etc. Kata may have the sense of 'taking off, removing,' as in kart; or else it may stand for krta, as in the compounds vīcastrikṛta, māṇikṛta, etc. = 'stripped of clothes,' 'undressed.' However it be, there seem to be sufficient indications that kāta or kota, as it is variously spelt (Bazakata, Bazakota), has in this compound the sense of 'removed, taken off' (cf. koṭārī = 'a naked woman'). Hence, Bazakata looks like a derivation of Vāsa-karta or (Vi)-vāsakṛta, meaning 'stripped of clothes,' i.e. 'naked people.'

The same construction I am inclined to put upon the term Aginnatai. Lassen proposed to read Apinnatai (from the Sanskrit Apinaddha), which he translates 'unclothed.' McCrindle, however, points out that this interpretation is wrong, the sense being instead 'clothed.' Indeed, I think that Lassen might have more properly suggested apanita. But we need not have recourse to such radical alterations in the spelling of Ptolemy's term, since it can be more easily traced to the Pāli word acchinna, Sanskrit form ācchīnna, making it read Acchinntai, which is much nearer to Ptolemy's rendering. Acchinna has the same sense as apanita ('removed, taken off'); it was probably preceded or followed in the original expression by some term meaning

Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 17 (June, 1886), p. 88: "I have little doubt that the Andaman Islands owe their name to the fact that their inhabitants were identified by the Malays with the monkeys of Hanuman. The Malays call the group 'Pulau Handuman,' or the islands of Hanuman, and this we have corrupted into Andaman." This suggestion is worth considering; but in the old Siamese map elsewhere referred to, I find written Autōman, and the Burmese name of the islands is Andaman (323). The homestead of Hānumān

is, in the map just mentioned, noted down as "Country of Mē-Mái, here Hanumān Swayānabhū resides." I recollect that it is located on the coast of the Malay Peninsula, not far from Tanđū (Tanva-śrī or Tenasserim). It may be Ptolemy's Bērābāi (Mergui), which is the only name I know of on that coast bearing some similarity to the Siamese Mē-Mái. Possibly the Mergui Archipelago is meant. In any case, the position falls just opposite the Andāmāns.
'clothes,' which was dropped in the course of time. It should be noticed, furthermore, that the term acchina (or ṛacchīna) has also the sense of 'stolen,' ‘snatched away,’ wherefore Acchinna-vāsa would mean 'deprived of clothes,' as well as ‘stolen (or snatched away) clothes.' This interpretation finds support in the legend according to which Buddha, during his stay in Nāgadipa (here taken to mean the Andānān-Nikobār archipelago) had, whilst bathing, his yellow robes (kāśāya or kāśāya-vastra) snatched away by the wicked natives. This legend first appears, so far as I am aware, in Ma-Huan's relation, the Ying-yai Shéng-lan, published in 1416; but it must have been current long before that in and about the Bay of Bengal, where the Chinese traveller just referred to has evidently picked it up. Phillips' translation of the portion of the text relating to it runs as follows:—

"When you leave the south of 'Hat Island' [Mao-Shan, 帽山], and sail in a north-easterly direction for three days with a favourable wind, you sight the Ts'ewe-lan Islands [Ts'ewe-lan Shan, 翡藍山]. These islands are three or four in number, and one of them, the largest, has the foreign name of So-tu-man [So-tu-mān Shan, 捲築藍山]. Its inhabitants live in the hollows of trees and caves. Both men and women there go about stark naked, like wild beasts, without a stitch of clothing on them. No rice grows there. The people subsist solely on wild yams, jack fruit, and plantains, or upon the fish which they catch. There is a legend current among them that, if they were to wear the smallest scrap of clothing, their bodies would break out into sores and ulcers, owing to their ancestors having been cursed by Sākyamuni, for having stolen and hidden his clothes while he

2 Either Pulo Rondo or Pulo Way, more probably the latter; and not Pulo Braz, as both Groeneveldt and Phillips have surmised. I have put between quotation-marks, in this and the following pages, the absolutely useless English renderings of place-names which the translator—out of homage to a mistaken notion prevalent among Sinologists—has thought it necessary to supply; and I have given at the same time within brackets the Chinese originals, since these alone, being as usual, and as I shall always insist upon, mere phonetic transcripts of native toponymics, can lead us to the identification of the latter.
was bathing, at the time when he crossed over [from Ceylon] and stopped at these islands.

"Continuing your voyage, and sailing westward from here for seven days, the 'Hawk's Beak Hill' [Ying-ko-tsuei Shan, 鷹峰山] is sighted, and in another two or three days the 'Buddhist Temple Hill' [Fo-t'ang Shan, 佛堂山] is reached, near to which is the anchorage of the port of Ceylon called Piek-lo-li [別羅里]."

"On landing, there is to be seen on the shining rock at the base of the cliff an impress of a foot two or more feet in length. The legend attached to it is, that it is the

---

1 The two words here bracketed should be deleted, as they do not occur in the Chinese text. This merely says "crossed over the sea," meaning evidently from India, which is in agreement with the legend of Buddha's visit to Nagadipa as told in Buddhist literature.

2 Some hill about Trinkomalé, as the first two words Ying-ko (= Trinko) seem to imply. The literal meaning of the Chinese term is not, by the way, 'Hawk's Beak,' as the translator puts it, but 'Parrot's Beak Hill.' The native name of which it is a transcript has, however, nothing to do with either parrot, hawk, or owl, and is evidently connected with Trinkomalé.

3 I agree for the nonce with the translator in the identification of this place with Beligām, as 里 in the Chinese text means a village, whence Piek-lo-li = "Piek-lo village," or 'village of the Bel [trees]." Beligām is a well-known seaport and fishing village to the south-east of Point-de-Galle.

Professor Schlegel, in the new translation of the same account he has since published in the Young-Pao (vol. ix, pp. 182–183), adds here the passage: "To the present day the people cannot put on clothes. [This is the reason that the country is also called "the Land of the Naked" (Lo-hsing Kuo), observes the Ming-wui-shih' in this connection, ibid., p. 185.] People say that the Egg-showing village is in this country."

The toponymic that Professor Schlegel translates 'Egg-showing village' is 出卵塲, Ch'ü-lan-wu, in the original, and 赤卵塲, Ch'ih-lan-wu, in the text of the Ying-yai-Sheng-lan-chi (given therewith in footnote 18). The worthy but somewhat highly imaginative translator takes, more solito, these terms to be metaphrases, instead of phonetic transcripts, of native place-names, and thus-speculates a good deal upon the double meaning of lan as 'egg' and 'testis,' and suggests that it may be etymologically connected with the Sanskrit aṇḍa and the name of the Andaman Islands, concluding thereby that aṇḍa-mān may mean 'oviparous people.' Truly, there would be nothing strange in this derivation of the term, as the inhabitants of the islands, being reputed to be of Nāga race, would be held, in the popular phantasy, as is generally the case in the East, to be oviparous. But the Chinese Ch'ü-lan-wu or Ch'ih-lan-wu can scarcely have anything to do with this, and is most probably the phonetic rendering of the native name of some village or seaport in the Andaman-Nikobār archipelago.
imprint of Śākyamuni's foot, made when he landed at this place, coming from the Ts'wei-lan Islands."  

The same yarn is repeated, in well-nigh the identical words, by Fei-hsin a few years later (1436), and soon after this it found a place in Chinese historical literature. A no less wonderful story is told in the Ajāib concerning a golden shrine enclosing a tomb, to be found in the "Great Andāmān," to which the natives of "both isles" convene in pilgrimage to worship, believing it to be the burial-place of Sulaimān (Solomon), the son of David. Here, however, a confusion seems to have been made between Samāṇa or Śramaṇa, an epithet of Buddha (Samāṇa Gotama); Sumanakūṭa or Saṃanta-kūṭa, both well-known names of Adam's Peak; So-tu-man or Sudhāman (?) Island (Great Nikobār?); Adam; and Sulaimān (Solomon); for the Buddhist temple at Adam's Peak is evidently the place the author of the narrative had in mind, and there is no likelihood of such a splendid structure as the one he refers to ever having existed on either the Nikobārs or Andāmāns.

1 It should be observed that the author does not mean here the well-known footprint on Adam's Peak, to which he refers further on in his account, but some other similar vestige to be found at the base of some cliff in the neighbourhood of Beligām. Local inquiry may lead to the identification of the spot actually intended.

2 In the Ming-wai-shih or Outlandish history of the Ming dynasty, published a.d. 1459. (See extract on the subject given in the P'oung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 185.)


4 The same compilation refers (p. 69) to another island under the name of Armanān, which the translator thinks may be one of the Andāmāns, although no direct evidence to that effect can be gathered from the vague indications given in the text. These are simply, that in a.m. 309 (= a.d. 921-2) a sailor attached to an Arab ship then on a visit at Kākola left this place in the ship's gig and was blown for a distance of something over 20 zāms to an island called Armanān, inhabited, apparently, only by fishermen. Thence, having provided himself with fresh water and fruits (bananas, etc.), he set sail at a venture, and, after having made some 70 zāms, he chanced to come upon another island named Bedfa:kālah, from which he was enabled to reach Kala in safety, and thence his native country.

As no bearings are given, and as neither Kākola (Qiāqola) nor Bedfa:kālah have been as yet satisfactorily located, it will be seen that the translator's identification of Armanān is mere guesswork of the most vague character. As regards Kākola, which is evidently one with the city and seaport visited in 1345 by Ibn Baṭātā, lying at 21 days' sailing from Saṃudra on the north coast of Sumatra, it could not certainly be Angkola or Akkola in the interior of the island, as Mr. van der Lith most absurdly suggests (op. cit., pp. 239-241), nor is it to be looked for on Java as some wiseacres would have it. I am completely in accord with Colonel Yule in making it to be "certainly a city on the Gulf of
This story, nevertheless, did not fail to come, in its turn, to the notice of the Chinese, and to be duly put on record in their extensive repertoires of matters relating to foreign

Siām," and, more precisely, on its west coast. It is thus possible that Armanān was situated in that neighbourhood, being, possibly, an island of the Anamba group. Bedfōrkalāh suggests some word like Bī-Barkala, Bī-daṟ-kala, or even Bī-berkala, Bāra-berkala; and, accordingly, it might refer to the Berhala islets (Pulo Berhala) in Berhala Strait, near the east coast of Sumatra—not apparently to either of their namesakes in Malacca Strait, and in the Gulf of Siām, nor, to be sure, to Perlāk (Cape) on the north-east coast of Sumatra, as Van der Lith wildly conjectures (op. cit., p. 264).

The utter absurdity of Van der Lith's identifications is further proved by the fact that the distances given between the places mentioned in the narrative do not in the least correspond to those intervening between the locations he assigns to them. Truly, there is some difficulty in forming a correct estimate as to the distance actually travelled in each case, owing to its being given in zām, a measure about whose value there is still much uncertainty. As a measure of time all authorities are agreed that the zām is equivalent to three hours; as a division of the circle Reinaud says ("Géographie d'Aboulféda," t. i, pp. cxvili-xlv) that it corresponds to 12° 3'; while as a measure of length it is variously stated to be three and five leagues on Van der Lith's own showing (op. cit., pp. 197-8). But, strange to say, our Arabists have hitherto failed to see that in point of time the zām is the same as the Sanskrit yāma, and the yām or jām of Indian and Indo-Chinese vernaculars (rendered as gehe, giau, etc., by European travellers), which denotes a watch of three hours. Reinaud (p. cxvili) came very near finding this out when he compared the zām to the Indī pahar or pahā; yet he missed its etymological connection with—I should perhaps say derivation from—the term yāma or yām. Similarly, in point of distance, the same Arabists have failed to discern its probable connection with the Indī yojana, a term which becomes yozun, yozam, yozam, etc., in the dialects of Further India. Nicolas Doronton, cited by Van der Lith (i.e.), values the yem, as he calls it, at ten crosses (krodas); but ten here is probably a mistake for either eight or sixteen, which is the number of krodas (usual or smaller) assigned to the yojana in Indī classical treatises. Such being the case, we must take the zām or yojana as equal to a distance of from seven to ten miles. It is also possible that the zām denoted the distance travelled or sailed over during a yām or watch of three hours; but a calculation of this would lead to about the same result, say ten miles on the average.

By applying this value of the zām to the data contained in the itinerary referred to above, we obtain, roughly, 150 to 200 miles for the distance Kākolā—Armanān, and 500 to 700 miles for the next one, Armanān—Bedfōrkalāh. Neither of these results agrees, it will be seen, with the distances Angkola—Andāmāns (over 600 miles) and Andāmāns—Perlāk (about 400 miles), while the disproportion between these, as compared with those of the narrative, is too evident to need commenting upon. Against the identification of Armanān with the Andāmāns, there is besides the reference to bananas being found in the former, which do not seem to have been produced of yore in the latter-named group of islands. They occur, it is true, in the Nikobārs, which makes no great difference, after all; but it is difficult to see—given the position of Kākolā on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, where it undoubtedly stood—how Armanān can be identified with any of the Nikobārs, or even with the island of Malhān described by Sulaimān as lying between Serendib (Ceylon) and Kola. Had the author of the Ajīb supplied some information as to the distance between Bedfōrkalāh and Kola (Takōla) it would have been possible to arrive at a better understanding of the itinerary followed; but as regards Armanān I think it is quite plain, even from the little he says, that it cannot be part of the Andāmān—Nikobār archipelago.
countries. Chao Ju-kua, who wrote about the first half of the thirteenth century, is perhaps the earliest author who not only makes allusion to it, but who gives of it a far more detailed version than the Arabs, although being silent as to the legend of the stolen robes, which had not then probably reached the seaports of Fuh-kien, where he appears to have held office as Shih-po, or inspector of foreign trade and shipping, between A.D. 1234 and 1237. This is what he says on the subject, as translated by Dr. Hirth:—

"When sailing from Lan-ju-li [i.e. the Lambri or Ram-bri district in the north-west of Sumatra, as we shall show in due course] to Hsi-lan [Ceylon], if the wind is not fair, ships may be driven to a place called Yen-t’o-mân [安陀蠻 = An-dâ-mân]. This is a group of two islands in the middle of the sea, one of them being large [the compact cluster of the Main Andâmans?], the other small [Little Andâman?]; the last is uninhabited, whereas the large one, measuring seventy li in circuit, is. The natives are of a colour resembling black lacquer, and eat men alive, so that sailors dare not anchor on this coast. This island does not contain as much as an inch of iron, for which reason the natives use clam-shells with ground edges in lieu

2 Little Andâman—locally known as Egw-belong, and called Patang by the South Andâmânese—is, on the contrary, and seems to have been for a long while, inhabited, it being supposed to be the centre whence the Jarawa tribes of the Andâmânese have emanated.
3 Seventy li here is, very probably, a clerical mistake for seven thousand li, which is the reading adopted in the abridged version of the same account given in the San-ter’ai Tzu-huei (published A.D. 1607), and quoted therewith in the Pei-i-teen, ch. 107, i, fol. 30 (see Toung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 188).
4 The Pei-i-teen account translated by Professor Schlegel (Toung-Pao, loc. cit.) adds that the natives “are called Mountain-barbarians” (山蠻, Shân-mân). It strikes me that this term Shân-mân, Sang-meiing, or San-bân, as it is severally pronounced, may have something to do with the name of the Skom-benc or Shom-ben tribe inhabiting the Great Nikobar, now relegated to the interior of the island, but formerly in occupation, perhaps, of portions of the littoral. The only objection against this suggested etymological connection would be that the Shom-ben are somewhat pure Indonesians by race, whereas the description given of the Shân-mân in the text, as being of a colour resembling black lacquer, argues the latter to be Negritos, and would therefore suit best the Andâmânese Minskopi. But from the accounts of the ancient travellers it clearly appears that there were Negritos in the Nikobârs as well, and the Shom-ben may well be the result of the intermixture between these aborigines and the early Mén colonizers of the islands.
of knives. The island contains as a sacred relic the so-called 'Dead Man received in the Bed of Rolling Gold'; this body has been there for generations without decaying, and there is always a huge snake guarding it, on whose body hair has grown to the length of two Chinese feet; nobody dares to come near it. In the vicinity there is a spring, the water of which will overflow twice a year and flow into the sea; the gravel over which it passes, after it has been covered by this water, turns into gold, and all the natives offer sacrifice to that spring. If copper, lead, iron, or tin

1 "In their country is a sacred footprint," says the account referred to above (p. 389, n. 4), "and they have made a gilded couch whereon a dead man lies, who has not decayed through ages." There can be no doubt that the objects of worship here alluded to are, respectively, a Buddhist Śrī-pāda and a gilt statue representing Buddha when about to pass away from this world. Both are things characteristic of Buddhist temples and their surroundings, and I hardly think that anything of the sort could ever have existed on either the Andāmāns or Nikobārs. It is to some shrine in Ceylon that the description applies, which has come to be wrongly ascribed to the Andāmān-Nikobār archipelago through the original compiler of the account having inadvertently mixed up travellers' narratives concerning the two places. Much later on Ma-Huan speaks of the footprint at the base of the Beligāma cliff and of the temples to be found in that neighbourhood in the following terms (see Phillips, loc. cit.)—"There is a little water in the hollow of the imprint of this foot which never evaporates. People dip their hands in it, and wash their faces, and rub their eyes with it, saying, 'This is Buddha's water, which will make us pure and clean.' Buddhist temples abound there. In one of them there is to be seen a full-length recumbent figure of Śākyamuni, still in a very good state of preservation. The dais on which the figure repose is inlaid with all kinds of precious stones. It is made of sandalwood and is very handsome. The temple contains a Buddha's tooth and other relics. This must be the place where Śākyamuni entered Nirvāṇa. Four or five li distant from here, in a northerly direction, is the capital of the Kingdom." The capital was at Jayaveddha, not far from Colombo, between A.D. 1351-1541 (see Mahāvamsa, ch. xci, 7 et seq.). The five li of the text must therefore be an error for fifty li or more. The above description of the temples, statues, etc., must not, nevertheless, be taken literally. It is a hodgepodge à la Chinoise of Ceylonese topography, in which things extant at Adam's Peak, at Kandy, and elsewhere have all been brought up together higgledy-piggledy and treated of as if they were to be found at a single place. This has always been the line followed by Chinese writers in their accounts of Ceylon's 'Hons.' "It is supposed by the Chinese," says Sir J. F. Davis ("The Chinese," 1836), "that at its [Adam's Peak] base is a temple in which the real body of Buddha repose on its side, and that near it are his teeth and other relics." At all events, Ma-Huan's account is interesting as exhibiting all that was left in his time of the wonderful old story of the 'Body in the Bed of Rolling Gold' and of the stream transmuting everything into the noble metal; for it is evidently to the fabled marvels of Adam's Peak that the origin of both narratives must be traced.
is soaked with this water while in a state of red-heat, it will also be changed into gold . . . on this island live the 'Strangers of the Golden Bed,'¹ which is silently guarded by a spirit so that man may not come near the place."

The translator here adds by way of comment: "It is very probable that our author, who lived at Chinchew as Superintendent of Foreign Trade, got in the possession of this piece of island-lore through the Arab merchants trading to Zaitun, and that the account, as handed down by him, represents what was then currently reported among the travellers of the Indian Ocean. According to Conti ('India in the Fifteenth Century,' quoted by Yule and Burnell, loc. cit.), the name Andaman means 'the Island of Gold,'² and the tale of the 'Body in the Bed of Rolling Gold' . . . may be connected therewith." Conti's words do, indeed, show that he must have had some inkling of the above story. Although neither he, nor Chao Ju-kua and the author of the "Ajāb" appear to have heard of the legend of the stolen robes, it seems pretty well certain that the latter was current in their age, and had been so for a long while before, judging from its very probable connection with the terms Bazakata and Aginnatai. There would be, indeed, nothing strange in the fact of its having been in existence since Ptolemy's days, whence it was repeated for centuries, along with many others, by the navigators of the Indian Ocean, until it came to the Chinese notice. Observes Colonel Yule, of the early western travellers in those parts:³ "Had these ancient worthies, then, a Murray, from whom they pilfered experiences as

¹ It is sincerely to be hoped that Sinologists will some day come to realize the fact that literal translations like this unaccompanied by the original characters are absolutely worthless for the purpose of scientific investigation. Who knows that a tribal name may not be implied here, which translation makes undetectable, whereas transcription of the original characters, or even a transliteration of them, might lead to the discovery of its identity?

² The form that the name assumes in Conti's account, as printed in Ramusio's collection (ed. Giunti, 1563, vol. i, f. 339 verso), is 'Andramania,' the reference running: "isola nominata Andramania, che vuol dire 'isola dell' oro,' che ha di circuito 800 miglia." "India in the Fifteenth Century" has, part ii, p. 8, Andamania.

³ Quoted in the Journal R.A.S. for 1895, p. 524.
modern travellers do? I think they had, but their Murray lay in the traditional yarns of the Arab sailors with whom they voyaged, some of which seem to have been handed down steadily from the time of Ptolemy—peradventure Herodotus—almost to our own day." The same might be said of the Chinese travellers. The wonderful stories they have recorded were not certainly invented by themselves, but gathered, in all likelihood, from the mouths of the Arab merchants with whom they were in constant touch, who in their turn had picked them up from the highly imaginative inhabitants of the various Indian seaports at which they traded.

The original names of the Andāmāns and their inhabitants, although perhaps not absolutely identical with, respectively, Bazakata and Aginnatai, must have been not very far different from these terms, which look more like adaptations of the former so as to make them harmonize with the sense expressed in the legend, than pure inventions concocted on the base of the legend itself. It may yet be possible, by an inquiry into the names that the natives give to the islands and to their own various tribes, to find some local vestige of the Ptolemaic designations. Of the four Main Andāmāns, only the apparently indigenous name of the smallest one, that is, Bāratān Island, is recorded in the charts. Though somewhat similar to Bazakata, it does not seem to be connected with it. What the local designations of the three others are, I am unable to find out from the meagre stock of maps and books lying at my disposal; I only meet with the alternative names Egu-belong and Patang applied to the Little Andāmān. But those interested in the subject and possessing more favourable opportunities for inquiry would do well to ascertain what such local designations are, or what are those employed by the natives of the neighbouring isles to denote the Andāmāns and the tribes that inhabit them.

In the meantime I may observe that the name of the Bōjingqi or Bōjig-ngyida, also known as the Aka-Beadu tribe, living about Port Blair, bears some resemblance to
both Baza [Bōjig] and Aginnatai [Ngīita],\(^1\) while the
generic term Minkopi applied to the Negrito inhabitants
may somehow be etymologically connected with Andāmān
[Man-kopi?]. I do not know whether Minkopi is an
indigenous word or not. Strangely enough, it sounds like
the corrupt form of an exotic nickname of which the Arab
term Kāfsir was part, for the Andāmāns are vulgarly known
among the Burmese as Kappali-gyun (_styles_42 stylus_72 stylus_82),\(^2\)
a designation meaning literally 'Islands [gyun] of the
Caffres [Kappali],' or 'Negros.' Or, are we to understand
that, vice versa, the word Kappali here stands for [Min-]Kopi,
the correct interpretation of the whole compositum thus
being 'Islands of the Minkopi'?

Should the term Andāmān turn out to be connected
with the Sanskrit anda, 'egg,' it must be, as I have already
observed, on account of the original inhabitants being
reputed to have been Nāgas by race, and therefore, in the
popular belief, oviparous. In regard to the Chinese mention
(if correct) of an egg-village, I may remark that in Arabic
baizah, like the Indū anda, means an egg, as well as, owing to
the shape, the testis. This may have been the interpretation
put by the early Arab navigators, and after them by the
Chinese, upon either the name of the Bōjig[-ngīita] or
that of the island, Bazakata. The original correct form of
the latter may have been, by the way, Baza-koṭa, the 'Bōjig
Stronghold,'\(^3\) which some Oriental wag of the good old

---

1 The epithet of Aryawto or Aryanto, 'long-shore men,' applied to the
cost-dwellers might also bear some distant relation to the second name
Aginnatai.

2 Or _styles_42 stylus_72 stylus_82 the 'Kāfsir Archipelago.' See Judson's
Burmese English Dict., 1883, p. 711.

3 This recalls to mind the classical Bhōjakata, a city near the Narmadā river,
found by Rukmin, the brother-in-law of Kṛṣṇa and king of the Vidarbhas (see
Professor Hall's ed. of Wilson's 'Viṣṇu Purāṇa,' vol. ii, p. 159, and vol. v, pp. 71,
84), and suggests, moreover, an etymological connection between the name of the
Bōjiga and those of the Bhōjas and Bhōjakas of Western India. It is possible
that the former term is merely a modification, or adaptation, of the last two.
Shall we thus, after all, have to read Bhōjakata for Ptolemys's Bazakata? If so,
days perverted into Baizah-kota, thus making it mean 'Egg Stronghold.' This is, in fact, the literal sense of the Chinese Ch'ih-lan-wu, Ch'ih-luean-wu, or Ch'u-lan-wu, where 堆, wu, does not properly signify a 'village,' but a 'bank,' a 'wall,' and an 'entrenchment.' But it is more probable that the Chinese expression just referred to is merely the phonetic transcript of some local toponymic, such as, e.g., Sulambu, Serombu, Suklambu, etc., in which the character 卯, lan, may have been purposely chosen so as to express the idea of 'egg' in its double sense, on the Arab lines of Baizah and perhaps also on the Indu lines of Anda.² If the term baizah be also part of the old Persian, Parthian, or Syrian languages (as it is of modern Urdû), there would then be some probability of its having been employed as a substitute for anda to designate the Andâmânis since Ptolemy's time, and even before that.

An etymological connection with Andha or Andhra, the name of the populations in early occupation of the head of the Bay of Bengal, seems to be entirely out of the

the legends of the stolen clothes, etc., would be, as seems quite probable, mere accretions representing the efforts of a later age to explain a toponymic whose original derivation had by the time become forgotten. It must in any case be admitted that the similarity between the above toponymics and tribal names is very striking.

¹ I cannot omit calling attention in this case also to the close likeness between Ch'ih-luean-wu, Serombu, or Serumbu, and Seruma, the ancient name of Nâga-dîpa or Nâga Island according to the Sussendi-Jâtaka referred to above. It is possible that this term Seruma was still surviving locally down to comparatively recent times in some modified form, like, e.g., Serumbu, Selumbu, or Seluma, Selumen, etc. If so, So-tu-mân could, perhaps, be referred to it as well, as a variant of Sudhâman, Sudaman (whence its connection with Sulaimân occurred to the mind of the Arab navigators), etc. I shall revert to this question when dealing with the Ptolemaic nomenclature of the Nikobars proper.

² The Chinese transcripts Ch'ih-lan-wu or Ch'ih-luean-wu, 'Red-egg bank' or 'entrenchment,' and Ch'u-lan-wu or Ch'u-luean-wu, 'Egg-producing bank,' etc., convey too odd literal meanings to look like genuine versions of native toponymics. Ch'ih, it may here be observed, does not only mean 'red,' but also 'bare,' 'naked,' which would not, however, much improve the sense. Evidently the character 卯 was purposely adopted with a view to punning, just as its synonymous (in both its senses) and probably etymologically connected 蚤, tan (or dan), was hit upon to render the name of the Tanque (Tan-Ka, Tan-Chin) people, or boat population of Canton, wherefore they came to be called by some Western wisecracks 'Egg-people,' as their boats became known as 'Egg-boats.' Cf. also the name of the 蚤 矣, Tan-Mân, of Kwei-chou.
question, notwithstanding the fact that the term Angaman, recorded for the islands by Marco Polo, seems to argue some relationship with Anga, or Northern Bengal, and that the Vāyu Purāṇa mentions an Anga Isle (Anga-deIPA), probably named from that same region, which may be identical with Marco Polo’s Angaman. For, as I have already pointed out, Anga in the term Angaman is very likely a mere derivative of either Nagga, Nagna, or Nāga, through the forms Nanga, Nangā, Nānga, that these words assume in the various Indian vernaculars. The spelling Angaman employed by Marco Polo for Andāmān is, no doubt, an argument telling in favour of Anda in the latter term, being a mere alternative or corrupted form of the word Anga occurring in the former. The solution of this intricate philological puzzle had, however, perhaps better be left to future research, and I gladly give the above conjectures for what they may be worth, merely adding, by way of conclusion, that for me the traditions as to the stolen robes, as to the Nāga descent of the natives or of the early settlers, and their proverbial nakedness, weigh decidedly in favour of the view I have adopted, namely, that all the early names borne by the islands in question have invariably been based on either of these traditions or modified so as to suit them, and that therefore they are all more or less correlated in meaning when not actually etymologically connected.

---

1 If a kinship exists between the tribal names of the natives of the Andāmāns and those of the Indian peninsula, it should be rather with the Andhakas, who, it is known, were racially and otherwise related to the Bhogas (see Professor Hall’s ed. of Wilson’s “Viśṇu Purāṇa,” vol. ii, p. 159, note). It would seem not very improbable that adventurers from both these tribes could have founded settlements in the Andāmāns, since there is evidence, as we shall see in the next section, of their presence at an early period in Sumatra, where they apparently gave their name to the Bhogā and Andalās, or Andhalā districts, the territory that became afterwards known as Palembang. The Biajū or Bongā tribes of Borneo may also have received their name from them.


3 Among the conversion of Nāga into Nāṅga, and Naga into Nāgara, vide Childers’ Pāli Dictionary, p. 255, s.v. Nāgarāsi. It would be interesting to ascertain whether the name Angama, borne by one of the Nāga tribes on the hill-tracts of Upper Assam, has originated in a similar manner from either Nāṅga or Neṅga.
To the bringing about of such homogenetic nomenclature must have, no doubt, contributed the fact, which clearly issues from an examination of the Chinese and Arab accounts quoted above, that the Andāmāns and Nikobārs have ever been considered by ancient navigators as one collective archipelago, and not as two distinct insular groups, so that any name they found current in one particular cluster or island was apt to be taken by them as a generic designation for the whole archipelago, or at all events to be employed in that sense amongst them. It is thus that we find in the records of most of those navigators either of the popular names above referred to used collectively for both the Andāmāns and Nikobārs. Instances in which the native name of a particular island was made to do duty for the whole archipelago are not, however, wanting, and in such cases the designations recorded have, naturally, nothing in common with those based upon the traditions referred to.

Thus, e.g., the term Ts'wei-lan Shan occurring in Ma Huan's account—meaning, literally, 'Kingfisher-blue (or Turquoise-blue) Islands'—is not to be taken, as the fashion goes among Sinologists, as a genuine Chinese designation or as a metaphor of some local name for the archipelago,¹ but as the phonetic transcript of the name of Tilan-chong Island, the north-easternmost of the Nikobārs. The Chinese having probably become familiar with that island from its forming a landmark in the navigation of the eastern side of the Bay of Bengal, and learnt its name, they used the latter to denote the entire archipelago, which thus passed into history under the appellation of Ts'wei-lan Shan, i.e. the 'Tilan-chong Islands.'²

¹ Phillips (Journal China Branch R.A.S., vol. xx, p. 211, note 1) avows his inability to explain it. Professor Schlegel translates it (Ts'oung-Pus, vol. ix, p. 182) as 'the Green Islands' (!), thereby making of that archipelago an Oriental Erin.
² The largest and highest of these (such being the middle island, according to the Ming-wei-shih) bears, they state, the native name of Se-tu-mun, to which we have already adverted above. By this the group of the Main Andāmāns may be meant, and the name seems to be a Sanskrit-derived term, traceable to Sudhāman (a mountain name, "Visu Purāṇa," ii, 142), Sudharman, Suddhāman (in reference to the Buddhist legend), etc. It can hardly be etymologically connected with the term Andāman, even if made to read Sundaman, as done
The alternative Chinese designations *Lo-kuo*, *Lo-jén*-Kwo], and *Lo-hsing*-Kwo] for the same insular region, I have already shown to be, in their turn, mere travesties of either the Indū terms Nagna, Nāga, Naṅga, etc., or of their derivatives Laja, Lanje, Lanje, Laka, Liankia, etc., of the Arab geographers and travellers. Although acquainted with the term Andāmān as the name of a sea, the Arab navigators of the ninth century and their predecessors undoubtedly included both the Andāmāns and Nikobārs under the names Laja-bālus, Lanje-bālus, etc., and the Chinese followed suit with their own transcripts *Lo-kuo*, *Lo-hsing*, etc., of the latter or their Indū prototypes. Analogous appears to have been the case with Friar Odoric, who variously calls the archipelago *Hancera*, *Bacumeran*,

by Professor Schlegel, because the Chinese were well acquainted with such an appellation from the time of Chao Ju-kus, who had put it on record since the first half of the thirteenth century. Phillips (loc. cit., and Journal R.A.S. of Gr. Britain, July, 1895, p. 529) inclined to regard *So-tu-mān* as a misprint for *So-mu-luan* (梭馬蘭), which may be read also *Sa-bē-huān*. This, he observes, might represent *Sambelong*, which, according to Milburne ("Oriental Commerce," vol. ii, p. 294), is the name given to the largest of the Nikobārs. How far Milburne's authority is to be relied upon, I am unable to say. Professor Schlegel (loc. cit., p. 187) takes both him and Phillips to task, denying that any misprint has been perpetrated, and observes that *Sambelong* is a mistake for the Malav *Śambilan* = 'nine,' and applies to *Pulo Śambilan*, the 'Nine Islands' in Malacca Strait, and not to the Great Nikobār. I similarly find in Balfour's too often unreliable "Cyclopaedia of India," the term *Sambalang* explained as 'Nine Islands' and ascribed to the Nikobārs, which explanation is undoubtedly wrong, its fallacy being due to *Sambelong* having been mistaken for a Malay-derived word. I am, on the contrary, of opinion that it is part of the native language of the Andāmān-Nikobār Archipelago, for the second portion of the term, *belong*, is found recurring in *Egu-belong*, the local name of Little Andāmān. Apart from this fact, it should be noticed that the name of the *Shoombeng* or *Shom-ben* tribe inhabiting the interior of Great Nikobār may be connected with the term *Sambelong* applied to that island or to the whole insular group. The designation *Deoban* (*Deva-vora, Devarana*) borne by the highest mountain in Little Nikobār justifies the conjecture that some similarly named peak, such as, e.g., *So-tu-mān*, *So-tu-būn*, or *Suddhāmān*, may have existed on the greater island, from which the latter came to be known as *So-tu-mān* Island. We shall revert to this question when dealing with the etymology of *Agathodaimanos*.

I may finally remark that several tribal names of the Andāmān-Nikobār Archipelago are surprisingly similar to those of South-Eastern Indo-China. Compare, for instance, *Jaravana* and *Shom-ben* with *Charau*, *Jarāi*, and *Chou-pen* (often spelt *Tampowon*).

Since writing the above, I have noticed that in the "Bengal Pilot" (3rd edition, 1901, p. 292) the term *Sambelong* is given within parentheses tacked on to that of 'Great Nikobār.' It would be interesting to find out what its real meaning and origin are.
Nichomeran, etc. Marco Polo is almost unique among the early Western travellers in distinguishing between Nocueran, Necaran, or Nocueram, and Angaman, etc. But, as we have shown, no such distinction appears to have been made by Oriental navigators, both sets of names being indifferently applied to each of the two groups of islands.

Nicolo Conti's Andramania seems to have been likewise meant for the entire archipelago, and the explanation he gives of the term 'Island of Gold' sounds like a distant echo of the Sino-Arabic legend as to the gold-transmuting river. To the same tradition are probably traceable Pedro Teixeira's mysterious 'Ilhas do Ouro,' the 'Gold Islands,' vaguely located by him in the Indian Ocean, somewhere off the west coast of Sumatra.¹ In A.D. 1586 Balbi refers²

¹ See De l'Isle's map at the end of vol. i of Somerat's "Voyage aux Indes Orientales," 1782. I have since found further proofs of the inferences drawn above as to the continuity of the cycle of traditions concerning the Andaman-Nikobar archipelago in the following passages from Anderson's "English Inter-course with Siam," p. 30 and note 4.

² Faria-y-Sousa relates ("The Portuguese Asia," 1695, vol. ii, p. 29) that when Don Stefano da Gama, son of Vasco da Gama, was governor of Goa [A.D. 1540-42], a fleet of three Portuguese ships, manned by eighty men, went in search of an island of gold supposed to exist on the eastern side of the Bay of Bengal, a fable which, so far as European nations were concerned, may have arisen from Nicolo di Conti's statement that Andamania (the Andaman Islands) meant the Island of Gold. This myth expired very slowly, and existed down to the end of the seventeenth century. Dr. Careri's ("Giro del Mondo," t. iii, p. 290) notice of it is among the last, but he gives the English the credit of having originated it, but when, he does not say. The story related by him was that an English ship having been driven to take shelter from a storm, not in the Andamans, but in the Nicobars, to the south of them, a native, who had taken some fresh water on board the ship, spilt some on the anchor, the iron of which was turned into gold wherever the water had touched it. The crew, after they had learned from the native that the water came from a well in the island, killed him! This report of the gold-producing quality of the water, Gemelli Careri says he had been told on high authority, had led the Dutch to appropriate the Nicobars towards the end of the seventeenth century. "So said as early as the first half of the thirteenth century Chao Ju-kua (see loc. cit.) of the king of Nan-p'ei (Malabar), adding that the fleet sent by this potentate for the purpose of gaining possession of the insular El Dorado above referred to, met with a severe whirlstorm and was wrecked on the island, all the men being eaten up by the islanders. The story is therefore, it will now be seen, pretty old. It is also interesting to notice that Gemelli Careri locates the famous gold-transmuting spring in what appears to be the Great Nikobar, whereas both Chao Ju-kua and the Arab navigators designate the Andamans and 'Great Andaman' respectively as the homestead of the precious metal. This discrepancy, is, however, of little account since, as we have observed, the Nikobars were most likely also included under the generic denomination of Andaman Islands.

³ "Viaggio delle Indie Orientali" (Venetia, 1690), p. 133 verso and 134 recta.
to the island of Carnalcubär (evidently Kar-Nikobär), under which designation he seems to include also the neighbouring isles.

It will thus be seen that the Andämän-Nikobär archipelago has, in many an instance, been named after one of its islands, the particular local designation borne by such being extended to the whole group. On the other hand, Nàga-dîpa, Nagga-dîpa; and Nagga-vâra, Nânga-vâra, or Naîga-vâra (whence Lânga-vâra, etc.)—severally meaning ‘Islands (or Country) of the Naked (or Nàgas),’—were, as we have pointed out, generic designations which evidently still survive in the terms Nikobär for the southern group, Kar-Nikobär for the north-westernmost isle of the latter; and perhaps also in Chauri, Nanikauri, and even Narkondam, the straggling volcanic islet off the east coast of the North Andämän.¹ The Insula Nudorum of the Catalan Atlas of 1375 was probably intended to represent the same archipelago, in which case the term would prove to be but a reflection of the old traditional nickname ‘Islands of the Naked.’ To the same insular region may, perhaps, have to be referred the island of Naîlikera (Skt. Nàrikera, Nāḍikela, Nārikela), or Naîlikera-dîpa, the ‘Island of Cocoanut Trees,’ mentioned in both the commentary to the Jâtaka and Hwên-tsang’s travels. Its origin is, in Buddhist tradition, ascribed to a cataclysm, as a result of which a country, spoken of as the Bhûru kingdom in the Bharu-Jâtaka (No. 213), was invaded by the sea and became detached from the continent, forming a thousand islands which, according to the scholiast, “are yet to be seen to-day about the island of Naîlikera.”

The reason for my connecting these islands with the Andämän-Nikobär archipelago is, that this—or, at any rate, its southern division formed by the Nikobârs—is called Oung-gyun (ဥိုင်းကြီး),² i.e. ‘Cocoanut Islands,’ by

¹ The transition from Nâga or Nagga to Neya, Niga, etc., is easily explained by reference to Negapatnam, the common designation of Nâga-pattana. Hence, Nîceoran, Negueram, Nêceoran, Nichomeran, etc.
² Judson’s Burmese-English Dict., 1883, p. 709, column to the right. The cocoanuts are exported chiefly from Kâr-Nikobâr.
the Burmese, on account of cocoanuts being there procured by them. Although this commodity appears to be lacking entirely in the Andāmāṇs,¹ it is per contra superabundant in the group of isles known as Cocos Islands, which lie but a short way off to the north of them. Hence, it is very probable that the whole of that insular region is included by the Burmese under the denomination referred to.²

¹ See Symes, loc. cit.
² The Suppāraka - Jātaka (No. 463), mentions the seaport town called Bharukaccha, or the 'Marsh of Bharu,' as being situated in the Bharu kingdom, thus leading one to infer that the latter corresponded to the territory about Bharuch or Bharach on the north side of the Narmada River in Western India. But this kingdom does not seem to be the same as the one alluded to in the Bharu-Jātaka (No. 213), wherein no reference at all is made to Bharukaccha, but to a city of Bharu, Bharu-nagara, which was evidently the capital of the realm, and not apparently a seaport, although it may have stood not very far inland. It is thus possible that the Bharu kingdom of the Bharu-Jātaka was a Further Indian State, the counterpart of the Western Indian Bharu realm. If so, it should be looked for on the Pegu-Arakanese coast to the north of Cape Negrais, which occupies, on the Indo-Chinese Peninsula, a symmetrical position to the one held by the Bharuch district on the Indian continent. That a kingdom of that name, whether topographically identical or not to the one of the Bharu-Jātaka, once existed in the region just pointed out, seems undoubted from the evidence we are going to adduce, apart from the vague indications furnished by the commentary to that Buddhist story. To begin, however, with the tradition (or legend) referred to in the latter as to the origin of the Nālikera islands. It is plain that if the Andāmāṇ-Nikobār archipelago be really the insular region here implied, the legend in question would prove to be the dim reminiscence of a purely historical event, relating to the period when the strip of land out of which the islands originated became severed from the Pegu mainland at Cape Negrais. In such a case the name Bharu for the dismembered territory might turn out identical to that of the Pāhu, Pāru, Phar or Pahru tribe; and with it might be connected the term bāli or bāru occurring in the Arab designation of the archipelago, Lanji-bĕlūs, as well as the appellative borne by Bārattān (Bharu-thin?) Island. It cannot fail to strike one that the name of Cape Negrais (Nāgarē, Nāgarēnaya, or Nāgarāśi) is suggestive of a connection with Nāga-deipa and the Nikobārs. It is likewise possible that the region of Ptolemy's Barakura Emporion, the present-day Arakan, represents whatever is left, on the mainland, of the ancient realm of Bharu. To this latter may also be etymologically related Ptolemy's Bērbonna, as well as the present name of Baraga, Barag, or Baraguna Point in the Gulf of Martaban.

But the most weighty evidence on the question is to be found in the section of Ibn Batūta's travels regarding the country he terms Barakhnagur (see "Voyages d'Ibn-Batoutah," tr. par Defrémery et Sanguinetti, Paris, 1858, t. iv, pp. 224–228), which has remained, so far as I am aware, unidentifed. From one standpoint the country so named appears to correspond to the region just referred to, and from another to the Andāmāṇ-Nikobār archipelago: it seems, however, certain that it could not have occupied a position different to either of the two here suggested. In the year 1345 (as I make it out) Ibn Batūta sailed out from Sopargāon, the well-known riverine port of Bengal, bound for Java (Sumatra), situated, as he says, at a distance of forty days. At the end of fifteen days' navigation he put in at the port of Barakhnagur. This country he describes as inhabited by a savage population, without any religion, whether Indō or other, living in bamboo huts thatched with grass, and situated by the seaboard. Amongst them were a certain number of Musalmāns, originally from Bengal and
Another island which may be connected with the same archipelago is Mathan, described by Sulaimān as being situated between Ceylon and Kalah, in the eastern part

Java (Sumatra), who inhabited a separate quarter. "Les hommes de ce pays"—he proceeds to say—"nous ressemblent au physique, si ce n'est que leurs bouche

sont pareilles à des gueules de chien. Mais il n'en est pas de même de leurs femmes, qui sont d'une exquise beauté. Les hommes sont nus et ne revêtent pas d'habit; seulement, quelques-uns placent leur membre viril et leurs testicules dans un étui de roseau peint [in red?] et suspendu à leur ventre. Les femmes se couvrent de feuilles d'arbres." This description, it will be seen, agrees very closely with those of the natives of the Nikobārs left us by other travellers, especially by Friar Odoric and Marco Polo. The former depicts the inhabitants of Bacoñure or Nihomurum as naked, with canine faces, while the latter ascribes these characteristics to the people of Angaman, whom, he remarks, have heads, eyes, and teeth similar to those of dogs. Again, the statement as to the men's primitive toilet, with an "étui de roseau peint et suspendu à leur ventre," would seem to confirm, given that the colour of the paint was red, the Chinese expression Ch'ih-lun-su, or 'Red Egg Stronghold,' commented upon above, although not too much stress should, perhaps, be laid on such an apparent coincidence, even if Ch'ih be taken in its other sense of 'bare,' 'naked,' or 'exposed,' and assumed to allude to those among the natives who found it convenient to dispense even with the primitive étui.

There are, however, several points which seem to tell heavily against the identification of Barahangār with the islands in question. The first is that Ibn Batūta says nothing about Barahangār being an island or archipelago, but merely calls it a country. Another is that he is silent as to the natives being cannibals and dark-complexioned, as other travellers have, almost without exception, stated of the inhabitants of the Andamān-Nikobār isles. The third, and this is by far the most serious objection, is that Ibn Batūta speaks of elephants being plentiful in the country. The natives, he tells us, "ne traquent avec les étrangers que sur le rivage, et leur portent de l'eau à l'aide des éléphants, vu qu'elle est éloignée de la côte .... Les éléphants sont nombreux chez eux, mais personne, si ce n'est leur sultan, ne peut en disposer." Now, it may be quite possible that elephants were to be found of yore, and down to Ibn Batūta's time, in the Andamān-Nikobār Archipelago, having since disappeared, as they did in other islands known to have been once connected with the Indo-Chinese mainland. If proofs of the presence at one time of these pachyderms in the archipelago in question be extant, we should then have no hesitation in concluding that it is at some seaport of this insular region that Ibn Batūta called, finding it designated by the term Barahangār. It would, then, be interesting to compare this name with that of Bārubān Island, with Ptolemy's Bazarak, and with other disjecta membra, scattered about mid-ocean, of the Bharu kingdom of Jātaka fame. (The buffalo, it may be noticed, exists in Kamorta, and a species of deer in the Great Nikobār, while the wild bear roams over most of the islands of the Andamān-Nikobār archipelago.) A fourth, though not very weighty, argument telling against our proposed identification is that of the sailing distance recorded by Ibn Batūta of fifteen days from Sonargāon to Barahangār, as compared with the forty days occupied in the entire journey from Sonargāon to the northern coast of Sumatra, on the basis of which the position of Barahangār would become fixed on the east shore of the Bay of Bengal slightly above Cape Negrais, just about half-way between that headland and Gwa, the approximate site of Ptolemy's Bèrabonna. By placing blind reliance on the above sailing data we might identify Ibn Batūta's Barahangār with either Bèrabonna or Cape Negrais (Vāra-Nagarāśi?), extending, if necessary, the range of location even as far as Barago Point in the Gulf of Martaban, and, in fact, to all that we conjecture to have remained of the ancient kingdom of Bharu, P'hrū, or
of the Indian Ocean, and inhabited by a black, naked, and anthropophagous population, living chiefly on fish, plantains, and cocoanuts. This may correspond to either *Batti Male*,

*Pianu*. As to *Barakura*, it would seem to lie too far away from Ibn Batūta’s seaport, although it was no doubt, at some remote period, part and parcel of the same realm.

But it seems impossible that Ibn Batūta could have spoken of the people of that coast as being so savage and living in such a primitive Adamic fashion as set forth in the extract quoted above. This could not evidently be, even in his time. The most logical course is, therefore, to assume that his memory betrayed him on the subject of the sailing distance, causing him to assign fifteen days to the section *Sonargaoon-Barahmāgār*, and twenty-five to the passage from the latter place to the north coast of Sumatra, whereas the actual case was the reverse of this; that is to say, he should have ascribed twenty-five days to the first part of the voyage, and fifteen to the second. The mention of elephants in connection with *Barahmāgār* is perhaps due also to a *lapus memoriae*; it was very likely to Sumatra that the statement was meant to apply. If so, the site of *Barahmāgār* would become fixed at twenty-five days’ distance from *Sonargaoon* and fifteen from the north coast of Sumatra, falling thus slightly above the 12th degree of latitude, namely, abreast of Middle Strait between the Andāmāns; hence, either the South Andāmān, or Bāratān Island itself, on the north side of that passage, would become eligible for identification with Ibn Batūta’s *Barahmāgār*. From a broader point of view, however, any port on the east coast of the Andāmāns would suit the case well enough, it being now pretty well certain that the Andāmāns were, down to quite recent times, believed to be one single island, so that any designation applied to a part of the group was understood to cover the whole.

Whether the above deductions be correct or not, they will have, at any rate, made it evident that a connection in nomenclature existed of old, and still does to some extent exist even at the present day, between the islands of the Andāmān-Nikobār archipelago and the Pegu-Arakanese coast stretching away on both sides of Cape Negrais, thus warranting the conjecture that both the insular and continental regions here alluded to formed at one time part of a kingdom of *P̣huyā, Pīao, Bhārū*, or *Bharī*, which corresponded very probably to the Bhārīn kingdom of Buddhist tradition; for this kinship in toponymies presupposes, if it does not exactly argue, a bond of a more intimate nature. Geological characters point, in fact, quite distinctly to a former terrestrial connection of Pegu with Sumatra through the Andāmān-Nikobār archipelago, the islands of which now form, as it were, the scattered links of the severed chain. The Arakan-Yoma range, now rapidly falling in the direction of Cape Negrais, constituted at one time the backbone of the system, the continuation of which can, however, still be traced for brief tracts in mid-ocean by way of the Reparais and Cocos Islands, the Andāmāns, Nikobārs, and the islets lying off the northern end of Sumatra. Ethnographically, I have already pointed to a probable former kinship between the Negrito aborigines of the Pegu-Arakanese coast and those of the Andāmāns, going so far as to throw in a suggestion anent a possible relationship even in names between the *Aîrrhādōi* located by Ptolemy on that coast and the *Aryasitas*, *Aryauto*, or Andāmānese coast-dwellers of the present day (see pp. 29, 38, and 72 ante).

I may add here, by way of conclusion, that the old term *Nālikēra* may still survive, though in a somewhat corrupt form, in the name of *Naukuri*, one of the central islands of the Nikobār group, unless this name be derived, as suggested above, from *Nāṅga-vāra* or *Nāṅga-vāri*. The appellation borne by *Narkomāna*, where cocoanut-trees also grow, would seem likewise traceable to *Narekodam*, the Telugu word for cocoanut. It is, however, unsafe to make such rapprochements until the day—which it is to be hoped is not far away—when
south of Kār-Nikobār; *Meroe* (presumably the corruption of some native term); *Pulo Milū* (i.e. *Milū* Island), just

the extensive nomenclature of the Andāmān-Nikobār islands shall have been fully investigated on the spot by some competent Oriental scholar.

*Postscriptum.*—I have, since writing the above, procured a copy of the *Journal Asiatique* of February, 1847 (t. ix, No. 41), where M. Dulaurier gives the text from Ibn Baṭūṭa relative to the Asiatic Archipelago, accompanied by a translation and notes. Therein I was glad to find (note 1, pp. 114-115) that the painstaking inquirer arrives as regards the position of *Barah-nagūr* to a conclusion similar to the one independently reached by myself above; that is to say, he locates the place in question in the Andāmāns, with the difference, however, that he designates in particular the Little Andāmān as the most eligible site and as the port at which the Arab ships resorted to on their way from the Koromandel coast to the eastern archipelago—an opinion to which I cannot see my way to agree. He goes on, moreover, to suggest that the word بَارَاحَ bārath, meaning 'west,' 'western,' so that *Barah-nagūr* might signify 'western country,' which would be topographically correct enough of the Andāmāns in regard to Malaya. I must, observe, however, that the sense here alluded to would be expressed in Malay as *Negri-bārat*, but never in the form *Barah-nagūr* or *Bārat-nagūr*, which is decidedly, especially the former, Sanskrit or Indū. On Dulaurier's lines we might just as well take the term to be an improved transcript of نَجَرَ بَهَارَو Negri-Bhārū, that is, 'New City (or State).'* Bārat is, moreover, the mere Malayan corruption of the original Mōn අවුක්කා palit or palait, which survives as priet in Lamet and ilait in Khmēr, and must have been therefore in ages past pronounced rather differently from *barah*. We have, indeed, something very similar to bārat in Baraṭa Bay on Narkondam, but as this landing-place lies on the eastern side of the island, the word cannot possibly be connected with the Malay bārat, meaning 'west.' This is a fact telling heavily against the sense Dulaurier was inclined to ascribe to Barah. There remains, therefore, the only alternative we have adopted, of connecting the toponymic in question with an original denomination Bhāruu belonging to the whole Andāmān-Nikobār archipelago, traces of which may apparently be still detected in the name of Bārātān Island (Bāra-thān, Bāra-thān?), if not, perchance, in Baraṭa Bay, and in the various place-names on the Pegu-Arakanese coast referred to in the first part of this note. Whether situated on the coast just mentioned or in the insular region that was undoubtedly, at one time, part of the Peguan mainland, Ibn Baṭūṭa's *Barah-nagūr* must have been, if not one and the same topographically, at least closely related etymologically with the no less puzzling 波羅 Po-lo or 婆羅 Po-lo, of mediaeval Chinese history and tradition, to which we have had occasion to advert in the preceding section (see p. 366, note). Mas'idī's أَبِرَامَانَ, Abrāman or 'Barāman, it applying, as Reinaud says (op. cit., t. ii, p. 11), to the Andāmāns, may be a clerical mistake for بَرَاتَانَ, Berātan, Barāṭān, being thus somehow connected with *Bara* or Bhāruu and the name of Bārātān Island.
off the north-west coast of Little Nikobār; Menchal, close by the north-east coast of the same; or the Isle of Man (Laouk) just below Tilan-chong; forming at the same time part of the group called by Ptolemy the Maniolai.

By way of conclusion to this retrospective sketch, I shall give in the following synoptical tables, arranged in chronological order, the names recorded by the principal travellers and geographers of old for the Andāmān-Nikobār archipelago, so as to show at a glance the probable birthdate of each denomination, as far as it can be now ascertained. No doubt the list might be considerably added to by those having access to the full literature relating to those islands; but, considering the scanty information supplied in modern geographical works about them, the following tables may, even in their present skeleton form, prove of some interest:

CHRONOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF THE ANDĀMĀN-NIKOBĀR ARCHIPELAGO.

I. Terms more particularly traceable to the Name or Group of the Andāmāns proper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 100–150</td>
<td>Bazakata (= Bhōjakaṭa?); Aginnatai, its people (Ptolemy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851</td>
<td>Andāmān Sea (Sulaimān). (Abū-žaid's &quot;Salsilatu-t-Tawārīkh&quot;; Reinaud, op. cit., t. i, p. 8.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956</td>
<td>Armanān (Captain Bozorg's &quot;Ajāib&quot;). (Von der Lith and M. Devie's &quot;Merveilles de l'Inde,&quot; pp. 69, 210, 264.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>943</td>
<td>Great Andamān, probably Ceylon (ibid.). (Ibid., pp. 134, 209.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Angamanam, Angaman, Agaman, Agama, Ghama, etc. (Marco Polo).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Andamān Islands, 700 in number (Dimashki). (Mehren's &quot;Manuel de la Cosmographie,&quot; etc., Copenhagen, 1874, p. 214.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date.

2. A.D. 1400. Chin Heû (Kam-sû), i.e. 'Gold Island' = Kamorta? (ibid.). (Ibid.)

1416. ? So-tu-män = Sudhâman?, the largest of the Ts'wei-lan Islands (Ma-Huan’s "Ying-yai Shêng-lan"). (Phillips, loc. cit., p. 211.)

1436. ? So-tu-män = Sudhâman? (ibid.). (Fei-hsien’s "Hsing-ch'a Shêng-lan"; T’oung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 185.)

1444. Andramania or Andamania, the 'Gold Island' (Nicolò Conti). (Ramusio, op. cit., vol. i, f. 339 verso; and "India in the Fifteenth Century," part ii, p. 8.)


1610. ? Ilhas do Ouro, the 'Gold Islands' (Pedro Teixeira). (Sonnerat, op. cit., vol. i, map.)

II. Terms more particularly traceable to the Name or Group of the Nikobârs.

Date.

r.c. 400–300? ? Nâga-dîpa (Sussondî and Akitta Jâtakas); formerly known as Seruma Island.

Kâra-dîpa; formerly named Ahi-dîpa = Kâr[-Nikobâr] (Akitta-Jâtaka).


Khalinâ = Kari-ne[ga], Kâra-dîpa, Kâr-Nikobâr?; or, Salinâ = Seruma, Seluma = Ts'wei-lan, Tilan[-chong] (Ptolemy).


459–477. Nâga-dîpa (Mahâvanîsa, chs. vi, xi, xx). The events in connection with which this island is mentioned are referred back to about r.c. 544–3.

645. ? Nâtilkera-dîpa (Hwên-tsang or Yuan-chhwang).

695. Lo-kwo = Nagga (L-ting). (Chavannes’ "Religieux Éminents," pp. 100 and 120.)

Lo-jen Kwo = Lunja-bâr, Nanga-bâr, etc. (Ibid). (Takakusu’s "Record of the Buddhist Religion," pp. xxxviii and 68.)

851. Lenjeblâtû, Lenjeblâtû (Sulaimân). (Reinard, op. cit., t. i, pp. 8 and 16.)


864. Lîkblâtû = Nikobâr-us], or Lîk - yâlûs (Ibn Khurdâdbih). (Journal Asiatique, 1865, p. 288.)

1 The inhabitants are said to have no king. The same states Marco Polo of Nocueran. Friar Odoric tells us instead of Nichomeras that there is a king, the natives go stark-naked, have faces like dogs, and worship the bull (cow?). Marco Polo makes a similar description of the people of Angaman, saying there are savage men, with canine heads, eyes, and teeth. Ibn Batûta relates the same things about the inhabitants of Barahmâgûr, whom he depicts as dog-mouthed and naked.
Khaliné or Saliné (No. 157).

Yule, having adopted the alternative reading Saliné, identifies this island with C'halâng or Thalâng, the Siamese names for Junkeeylon (Üjong-Salâng). Our experience of

1 Ajâib No. 127 states Lajabâlîs to be a numerous insular group extending over a length of eighty parasangs, say about 300 miles.
2 The explanatory inscription on the island on the map says: “Insula nudorum, in qua homines et mulieres portant unum folium ante et retro alium.”
Ptolemaic geography teaches us, however, that islands lying close to the mainland are generally taken to form part of the latter or neglected, unless they be of conspicuous size and well known to the navigators of that period. C'hālāng is, besides, rather more of a peninsula than of an island, as the strait (Pāk P'hraḥ) that separates it from the mainland is but half a mile across, and fordable by elephants at low tide in at least one place (presumably the bar at its western entrance). It seems, therefore, natural to look for the island in question farther off from the eastern shore of the Bay of Bengal, in view especially of the fact that Ptolemy assigns to it (see Table VI) a longitude of 3° less than Bazakata. Bearing this in mind, and taking furthermore into account that its latitude is likewise made slightly less (10') than that of the last-named insular group, its position becoming thus fixed approximately to the W.S.W. of Bazakata, we are constrained to identify the island with either Little Andāmān (Egu-belong) or Kār-Nikobār. As regards the former alternative, which I have at the outset adopted in the map, I am now, after a longer study of the subject, inclined to dismiss it, holding that Little Andāmān has either been ignored by Ptolemy or, as is more probable, regarded by him as forming one with Bazakata, owing to its but slight distance from the latter. Having thus been led to favour the second alternative, I cannot better justify the correctness of this course than by referring myself to the very marked similarity between Khalinē and Kār-Nikobār, which becomes still more accentuated if we reflect that the latter toponymic may be a contraction of Kārā- (or Kāri-, Kāli-)Nagga-(or Nāga-)vāra, which, according to the fashion prevailing among several populations of Southern India, would have been pronounced Kāri-negga- (or nega-)vāra and, in shortened form, Kāri-neg or Kāli-neg. ¹ I would not be so bold as to suggest that Khalinē or Kālinē is an anagrammatic form

¹ There is a tribe of Nāgas in the Assām hill-tracts called the Khari-Nāga (see Balfour's "Cyclopaedia of India," 3rd ed., vol. ii, p. 47). Cf. also Balbi's Cornalebar in Table II above; and Marco Polo's Neperanam, Neeperan, etc., whence Kār-Nē-[eueran], Kāri-Nē-[gueran], and so forth for Kār-Nikobār.
of Nālikēr or Nālikēra, although it may not be altogether impossible. In connection, however, with the name of Kār-Nikobār, I have no doubt that its ancient form must have been Kāra-Nāga or, simply, Kāra, since I think that this island must be the same as the one alluded to under the name of Kāra-dīpa in the Akitta-Jātaka (No. 480), and therein said to have been at a still remoter period called Ahi-dīpa, the 'Isle of Snakes.' Ahi, it will be seen, is a mere synonym of Nāga; and either from a desire to retain its old name under this form bound up with the new one, or to mark the fact that the island was, as the Jātaka says, "over against the island of Nāga (Nāga-dīpa)," its name passed into tradition under the complex form Kāra-Nāga, being corrupted into Kāri-Nēga, Kār-neg, or Kār-nig, as exemplified in the form we have it at present of Kar-Nikobār. There can be no difference of opinion, I venture to hope, on the identity I have suggested of Kār-Nikobār with the Kāra-dīpa of the Jātaka, for it is made evident enough by the location ascribed to the island over against Nāga-dīpa, or the Andāmān-Nikobār archipelago, as well as from the context informing us that from Kāvaripatțana, in the kingdom of Dāmilā (= Kāverīpatṭam, a little to the north of Tranquebar), the hero of the story passing through the air descended at the island of Kāra, so named apparently from a conspicuous Kāra-tree (= Canthium parviﬂorum) under whose hospitable shade he took up his abode. The recent translator of that Jātaka, Dr. Rouse,¹ at once jumps, more solito, to the conclusion that part of Ceylon, or some islet near it, is the place intended; but we have already pointed out in the preceding article that the term Nāga-dīpa, when designating an island, almost certainly applies to one of the Nikobārs, if not to the whole group itself of those islands.

There still remains, however, the variant reading Salinē,

¹ See the "Jātaka," translated from the Pāli by various hands under the editorship of Professor Cowell, vol. iv, p. 150, n. 2. The "Malabar coast" suggested as the location for the kingdom of Dāmilā in n. 1 is likewise wrong; it should be the Keromandel coast.
occurring in several editions of Ptolemy's text, to be dealt with. The task is easy enough, albeit at first sight this reading bids fair to upset the identification just suggested. It requires, in fact, but little discrimination to see that the Saliné of Ptolemy's days is nothing else but the very toponymic which, after the lapse of thirteen centuries, was found still surviving in a more or less modified form by the Chinese travellers, when it was fixed down by them as Ts'wei-lan. Sinologists of note, blinded in the endeavour to discover in this term the meaning of 'Kingfisher-blue Islands,' 'Green Islands,' and the like, have, as we have seen, egregiously failed to perceive that it is a mere transcript, and not a metaphor, of a local place-name still occurring, under the corrupt form Ti-lan, in Ti-lan-chong Island, the present-day representative of the Chinese Ts'wei-lan-Shan. It must be remembered, in fact, that the characters employed in the transcription 嶰蔚山 sound as Ts'ou-lam-Shan, Ts'ui-lam-Shan, Ch'ou-lang-Sang in various Southern Chinese dialects and Thui-lam-Son in Annamese; while those occurring in the alternative rendering 嶰蔚巃, Ts'wei-lan-Hsu, are pronounced Ts'ui-lam-i in Hakka, a form remarkably well approaching to the Ptolemaic Saliné (Salan-i, Sa-lin-i, Salanj). There seems to be no doubt that all these designations are traceable to an original term Seluma, Seluman, or Sulaman, which, under the form Seruma, occurs, as we have seen, in the Sussondi-Jataka, as the whilom name borne by Nāga-dipa Island. Although it is possible that at so remote a period this term was

---

1 See the Index Criticum at the end of Nobbe's edition, t. iii, p. 207, right-hand column.
2 A similar—and, no doubt, practically identical—name, Telanjung, is borne by the southernmost of the large islands fronting the west coast of Sumatra, better known to us under the Hispano-Portuguese designation of Engaño or Engano. It is a significant fact that in Malay Telanjung means 'stripped,' 'naked.' This would appear to further strengthen, from a different point of view, the connection of Tilan-chong with the 'Archipelago of the Naked.' The reason of this term being applied also to Engano lies in the fact that the natives of this island were, as testified by Houtman (A.D. 1596) and other navigators of his period, stark-naked. Houtman gives the local name of Engano as Pogniatoa, and says that the inhabitants were also known by that designation.
employed to designate solely the Great Nikobār or, at best, the pair formed by it with the minor sister island now known as Little Nikobār, it is evident that, like its later-day successors Nāga-dīpa, Nāga-vāra (Nikobār), etc., it must have been extended in the course of time to the whole group of the islands, and indeed to the entire Andāmān-Nikobār archipelago, as exemplified by the fact, already noticed in the preceding article, that the Chinese included all that insular region under the denomination of Ts'wei-lan Islands. Such being the case, there seems nothing extraordinary in the assumption that the term Seruma or Seluma came to be coupled with the name of the island of Kāra, in the same manner that later on it occurred with its substitute Nāga or Nāga-vāra, so that by the period at which Ptolemy collected his information the island in question was already known both as Kāra-Seluma and Kāra-Nāga Island, whence the probability of his having noted it down either as Salinē or Khalinē. It goes without saying that it would be of great importance for historical geography to find out which of these two readings was the one adopted in the original Ptolemaic MS. But this is now impossible, as that work has, no doubt, become either lost or destroyed long ago. At all events, I hope that I have conclusively shown how both readings may be justified as applying to Kār-Nikobār; and from the position assigned to Khalinē or Salinē by our geographer in respect of his Bazakata, there seems to be no doubt that Kār-Nikobār was the island he had in mind. Could it be possible, on the other hand, to ascertain that Salinē is the spelling he really used, we should then have probably, in spite of the reasons militating in favour of Kār-Nikobār, to give the preference to Tilanchong, as being the only island of the group that looks like having preserved as part of its name, down to this day, the over twenty-centuries-old term Seruma in one of its many modified forms. I need not further dilate upon this subject, I should think, in order to prove the practical identity of these two, apparently, so widely dissimilar toponymics. Suffice it to call attention merely to the fact that not only
initial but also medial $s$ is, as we have seen during the
course of the present inquiry, lisped in many an instance
in Further Indian dialects; wherefore Tilan—or, perhaps
more correctly, Thilan or Thsilan—may well be but the
modern pronunciation of Silan. But even this is not
probably the old correct form, which both the Chinese and
Ptolemaic readings argue to have been something like Su-
lan, Su-lan, Sa-lan, or Salin, none of which is very far
different from Seruma, Saluma, Sulama, etc. What the most
probable original form of this toponymic was we shall try to
find out in the next article.

Agathodaimonos (No. 159).

Ptolemy places this island on his equator; hence its
real position becomes fixed in the middle of the Bay of
Bengal between 5° 38' and 6° 30' N. lat. In De Donis'
map it is represented almost equal in size to Bazakata
and Iabadiâ, being thus made to rank as third in con-
spicuousness amongst the islands of the Indian Archipelago.
This circumstance argues that an island of very considerable
size is implied under that denomination. I have often
thought that the northern part of Sumatra might be the
island in question; but I have, after further consideration,
rejected that view, reverting to the opinion I had formed
from the outset that it, as shown in the map I have since
delineated, can be no other than the Great Nikobâr. The
configuration assigned to it in De Donis' map very closely
resembles, it will be observed, that of the Great Nikobâr
turned with its eastern side down towards the south. There
are, however, far more substantial reasons in support of
the identification we have suggested. Foremost amongst
them comes that of identity in nomenclature. In dealing
with this question we must, however, dismiss at the very
outset the idea that the term 'Αγαθοδαιμόνος ηῆςος as
applied to the isle in question signifies, as it has hitherto
literally been taken to mean, Insula Bonaæ Fortunae, or 'Good
Fortune Island.' It is this mistaken notion that has always misled previous commentators into locating the island in the most impossible places. The late Sir Henry Yule, although having proved by far the most sensible of them, was nevertheless inclined to take it to be the Little Andāmān, a position, it will now be seen, entirely incompatible with the latitude assigned to the island in the Ptolemaic text.\(^1\) Our experience of Ptolemaic geography, as gained in the course of the present inquiry, has long before this taught us that to hold any of the names he has recorded for places in Further India to be translations of native toponymics is simply absurd. From the many cases we have come across in the preceding sections we are justified in inferring that the course followed by Ptolemy, or by those from whom he drew his information, in taking down place-names, was not on the whole different from that adopted by the Chinese and Arab navigators; that is to say, he merely transcribed the native toponymics as accurately as he heard them pronounced or found them spelt in the records of his predecessors and contemporaries, not neglecting at the same time to slightly modify them so as to elicit a meaning out of them in his own language, whenever they presented him a suitable opportunity for so doing without their having to suffer too radical a disfiguration. In most cases he must have, of course, found that the Greek navigators to the Far East had already done this for their own satisfaction, and perhaps also with a view to easier retention of place-names belonging to the most strange tongues. There can be but little doubt that terms like Argyra, Lēstai, Khrysoana River, Satyrōn Islands, etc., originated in such a manner, Agathodaimonos being likewise of the number, while Khrysē is perhaps the only one capable of laying some claim to exception, which nevertheless, as we shall see in due course, cannot be as yet entirely proved.

\(^1\) I have since noticed that Mannert had before that identified the island, though in a purely conjectural manner, with the Nikobār group ("Geographie der Griechen und Römer," vol. v, p. 269).
This principle having been laid down as a preliminary, we may now proceed with our inquiry. We have already shown in the preceding pages how the Chinese travellers of the first quarter of the fifteenth century are agreed in stating that the largest, highest, and most central withal of the Ts’wee-lan-Shan or Tilan-chong Islands was then known by the native name of So-tu-man. We have likewise pointed out how this island, although sometimes mistaken for the ‘Great Andāmān,’ was instead more likely the Great Nikobār; and that, at all events, the term So-tu-man or Sudhāman did not seem to be at all etymologically connected with the name of the Andāmāns. Of course, owing to the fact that these islands, together with the Nikobārs, were considered to form an integral part of one archipelago, any term used for either of the two groups was liable, as we have seen, to be applied to the whole insular region; so that the designations Ts’wee-lan or Tilan, So-tu-man, Nāga-dīpa, etc., belonging more properly to the Nikobārs, were made to include also the Andāmāns, and vice versa the term Andāmān may have been extended to the Nikobār group. Hence the confusion that was made in the accounts of travellers between the two clusters of islands and the legendary lore concerning either. I hope that I have, this notwithstanding, succeeded in accumulating sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the terms Ts’wee-lan or Tilan, So-tu-man, and Nāga-dīpa or Nagga-dīpa most likely originated in the Nikobār group, to which they were at first confined, and more precisely in the Great Nikobār itself, which thus seems to have been the original Nāga-dīpa, prior to that called Serūma, or something to that effect. Although, as we have pointed out, the term Nāga-dīpa appears to have spread in the form of Ahī-dīpa, as far at least as Kār-Nikobār, by the time the Jātaka stories were compiled, it follows nevertheless, from the passage in the Akitta-Jātaka describing the position of the isle of Kāra (the present-day Kār-Nikobār) as being over against Nāga-dīpa, that this toponymic was then still applied in particular to a single island, which must have been the Great Nikobār itself, the Nāga-dīpa par excellence.
If so, it follows as a consequence that the same island must have been withal the original Seruma. For the very reasons stated above, the fact of this term surviving most probably to the present day, disguised in the name of Tilan-chong Island, cannot in any way prejudice the conclusion we have just enunciated. This is so less likely to be the case since there is sufficient evidence as to the term Seruma having not only originated in the Great Nikobār, but having been embodied down to comparatively recent times in the names by which that island itself has been designated at various periods. We have, in fact, already pointed out the very probable connection between the term Seruma in the various forms Seluma, Selama, Sulama, Sudama, etc., it has no doubt assumed at different periods and in different tongues, and the names Ts'ui-lam, Sui-lam, Sulam, Salan, Salin, or Salinē that we have found recorded for islands of the Nikobār group, suggesting at the same time a further relationship of all of them with the designation So-tu-man, Sudhāman, or Sulaman applied in particular to the largest island of that cluster, the Great Nikobār. We did not omit, moreover, to notice the apparent analogy existing between the name of Deoban (Deva-vana, Devaman) borne by the highest mountain in Little Nikobār, and So-tu-man or So-tu-ban. This latter term may well be referred to, on the strength of that analogy, to some such original form as Su-deo-man or Su-deo-ban (Sudeva-vana, Sudevaman; and, perhaps, Vasudevaman, Vasudāman, etc.). There may exist some mountain once having borne either of such denominations in the Great Nikobār, after which that island came to be styled the So-tu-man or Sudhāman Island. I prefer the second form, Sudhāman, because it occurs as a mountain-name in the Purāṇas, and because it is not far different from either So-tu-man, Su-da-man, Sulaman, etc., or Su-deo-man, Su-deo-ban, etc. If no mountain in the Great Nikobār can be proved to ever have rejoiced in any of these appellations, we would simply have to trace their origin to other causes, such as, e.g., the existence on the island of some settlement or tribe bearing the name of Serombu, Serumbu, Seruma, Seluman,
etc.,—perhaps the equivalent of the Chinese Ch'i-lan-wu or Ch'u-hwei-wu, and, if not, of the Shan-man, Shan-ban, or Shom-ben,—from which or whom the island acquired that designation. But in no case would we find ourselves under the necessity of having to give up the connection we have established between those names and the Great Nikobâr, for it rests upon the quasi-historical identity Seruma = Nâga-dîpa, and it would be necessary in order to upset it to demonstrate that the Great Nikobâr cannot lay claim towards having possessed either of these two denominations. This, it will now be seen, is no easy task, since both terms Seruma and Nâga-dîpa appear to have been down to this day incessantly bound up, in some more or less modified form, with either the name of the island itself or those of its population and their settlements.

Having disposed of so intricate a question of terminology, it remains to draw attention once more to the very probable fact of the names Seruma, Nâga-dîpa, and their derivatives or modifications, having soon spread to the other islands of the group to which they were indiscriminately applied by navigators and foreign traders, so that it became in the course of time necessary to use some supplementary appellations in order to distinguish one island from the other. It is thus, presumably, that originated the complex terms Kâr-Nikobâr, Tîlan-chong, etc., for two of those islands; and perhaps also that the name of ‘Chief,’ ‘Principal,’ or ‘Highest’ Nikobâr had to be given to the largest and at the same time loftiest of them, in a similar manner to what occurred in modern times, when the designations Great Nikobâr and Little Nikobâr had to be applied, for the sake of clearness, to the greater island and the one next to it in size respectively. A brief consideration of this not altogether unessential detail will enable us to grapple with the true origin and import of the Ptolemaic term Agathodaimonos,

1 In the Malay Archipelago we have Selima, Serimbun, and Seluman Islands, Soleman Rock, Selumay Hill, Serombu Bay, etc. Chirume, an almost exact counterpart of Seruma, occurs as the name for the southernmost of the Table Islands, two islets lying to the north of the Cocos and Andâmâns.
and show us the reason why it was applied to the Great Nikobār.

It will now have, I venture to think, become perfectly clear that this term is nothing else but an ingenious travesty, in the himation of Hellenic classicism, of the local toponymic So-tu-man, Sudhāman, etc., prefixed with the word Aga, which may stand, as noticed before in connection with Aganagara, for either Nāga, Nagga, or Agra, Agga (= 'chief,' 'principal,' and also 'high,' 'highest'). Hence, Aga-Thodaimonos, or Aga-Thūdaimōn, would mean simply Agga-Sudhāman, that is, the 'Chief' ('Principal' or 'Highest') of the 'Sudhāman' (or 'So-tu-man') Islands. It may be objected that it would have been perhaps more correct and conformable to well-established usage to call it instead the Muhā-Sudhāman; but I would point out that the interpretation I have here put upon the prefix Aga is merely the one suggested by the considerations made above as regards the island being the largest, and the highest withal, of the So-tu-man or Nikobār group. It might perhaps be more correct to adopt the other alternative set forth above, and view it as a contraction of Nāga or Nagga; but the settlement of this question is relatively a matter of secondary importance. The essential point is, that Aga is a mere connotative prefix, playing in the Ptolemaic designation of the island a similar rôle to those (Nāga, Nagga, Nānga, Nega, Anga, Lāka, Līkh, Laja, etc.) occurring in the names recorded by the early Western travellers for the island, or group of islands, in question; and that therefore its presence at the head of the composite under discussion is perfectly justifiable. The second part, Thodaimonos or Thūdaimōn, of the compositum is what constitutes the real name of the island, and as such its correspondence to So-tu-man or Sudhāman is so perfect and striking as to readily dispose of any further doubt respecting the identity of the two sets of terms. The only disparity observable consists in the slightly different initial letters; but this, as we now well know, is only apparent, it being quite possible that the initial s in the local name was lisped by the natives, so as
to cause the Greek navigators and travellers to represent it by a θ; or else this trifling modification was more likely introduced by them on purpose, so as to make the whole term convey the meaning of ‘Good Fortune Island,’ as suggested at the outset. There cannot accordingly, I should think, be any further doubt left as to the real purport and application of the Ptolemaic toponymic, especially when it is remembered that the Arab travellers were misled into connecting the island with Sulaimân, which shows that its name must have been at the period pronounced locally, or by the foreign navigators, something like Thudaimôn, Sudaimôn, or Sulaimôn: all forms evidently derived from Seruma, Sulama, Sudhâman, or Sulaman. To hold that in the case in point Agathodaimonos means ‘Good Fortune’ would be, therefore, no less a piece of absurdity than believing with the credulous old Arab navigators that Sudhâman, Sulaman, and similar terms were etymologically connected with the name of Solomon of Biblical memory.

While on this subject, it may be of some interest to recall the suggestion made by the late Colonel Yule to the effect that the name Andâmân might have been adopted from a transcript in Greek of the term Agathodaimonos in the contracted form Ἀγ. δαίμων. It will now be sufficiently clear that, however ingenious it may seem, such a conjecture cannot be endorsed; for, although the name Andâmân has been at times, as we have noticed, applied also to the Nikobârs, it can hardly have anything to do with the traditional designation of the latter, which was, instead, Sudhâman, Sudeoman, Sudaimôn, or something of that sort. And while it is true that, by further contracting the puzzling Greek compositum and restoring its first part to its probably correct original form Agga, we would obtain the reading Ἀγγα-μων, practically identical with Marco Polo’s Angaman—whereas by a simpler process we might elicit the variant Agaman of the latter from Ἀγα-μων, and by bolder methods trace the Arab forms Lajabalûs, Lajijbalûs, Likbhâls (Nâga-manus, Nagga-manus, Nanga-manus), etc.,

to problematic Greek transcripts Λαγά-μονος, Ναγά-μονος, Λαγγα-μονος, Ναγγα-μονος,—there still remains the stern fact confronting us that in all known Ptolemaic texts we have the full, or practically full, forms Αγαθοδαίμονος, Αγαθοδαίμονος, and no sign whatever as to any curtailing such as conjectured above having taken place. Moreover, the significant particular that both the Arab and Chinese navigators of the old days have put on record each of the two toponymics Andāmān and Sudhāman or Sudeoman (the island of Sulaimān or Solomon’s tomb according to the former), proves that both names were known to them as distinct designations for the islands, which could never have occurred had the term Sudhāman—or Aggasudhāman, Nāgasudhāman, etc., as represented in Agathudaimonos—disappeared in naval tradition by effect of the latter’s collapse into Andāmān. Both toponymics can be traced back in the relations of Arab travellers to at least the ninth century; and if Andāmān is not an Indū-imported term, nor originated locally, but was invented by the old western navigators, it must be the corruption, or adaptation, of some native name for the islands, such as, e.g., Nāga, Nagga, Nanga, Anga, Anda, Andha, Andhaka, Ananda, Ananta, Nanda, etc., then found current in the Bay of Bengal; but not evidently of Sudhāman, Sulaman, and kindred terms. Should the paternity of it have to be ascribed to the Arabs, it would not be difficult to conceive how, from the fact of their having heard the islands designated by some one of the above names, and noticed at the same time that the natives were living, as the Catalan Atlas puts it, with “unum folium ante et retro alium,” suggesting the idea of Adamitic apparel, they would be led to modify the name of the islands into Andāmān or Adamān, so as to make it practically mean the country of the Adamites. A similar course, we have seen, was adopted by the Chinese, who transformed Nagga into Lo-kuo, so that it might convey the sense of Regio nudorum, which again occurs in the Insula nudorum of our mediæval geographers. It is possible, on the other hand, that the etymological connection, if any, with the name of
Adam was suggested to the Arabs through Adam's peak and relative temple and footprint in Ceylon, with which island either the Great Nikobār or the Andāmān group was, as we have noticed, sometimes confused in the relations of the Arab travellers.

I have also thought for some time, as already stated, that the term Agathodaimonos, if taken in its literal sense of 'Good Fortune,' might be the equivalent of some Sanskrit word like, e.g., Subhadra, easily transformable into Sumadra in the Oriental vernaculars, in which case it could have meant the northern part of Sumatra, where the city of Samudra or Samadra and the homonymous district were situated, which, owing to imperfect knowledge of its geography, could have been supposed to form a separate island by the ancient navigators. The fact of the identical meaning 'Good Fortune' occurring in connection with a rather conspicuous island off the west coast of Sumatra, namely, Si-biru or Si-berut, the largest of the Mentawi group, termed Eyland Goede Fortuyn by the Dutch,⁷ seemed

¹ Now, more generally, 'Great Fortune,' in order to distinguish it from 'Little Fortune' Island, further down towards the entrance to Sunda Strait. I ignore the causes that led to such names being applied to the islands in question: probably they are to be traced to some bit of luck met with by some navigator when sighting them, but certainly do not appear to have been translations of local toponymies. This accounts for such designations being pretty well common in Far Eastern seas: another 'Fortune Island' is to be found lying off the south-west coast of Luzon in the Philippines. It has been observed (see Young-Pao, vol. ix, p. 178, note 6) that Agathodaimonos Nēsoς may be taken also in the sense of 'Island of the good Demons,' the allusion here being to the natives, who 'are very good devils.' On the same lines one might suggest that Andāmān may be a corrupted form, not of Handuman, as Sir E. Maxwell put it, but of Hantu-mānis or Antu-mānis,¹ which in Malay would mean 'good' or 'mild-tempered demon' or spirit, and could thus pass muster for an equivalent of Agathodaimon. In connection with the final syllable, man, of the term Andāmān, I may here observe that it occurs at the end of many a name of islands in the Malay Archipelago, such as, e.g., Tio-man, Pria-man, Mango-man, Rinja-man, Re-man, Su-man, Le-man, etc. It is not, however, absent in other place-names, as Charak-man (Creek), Kate-man (River), Sele- man (Rock), Pasa-man (Bay), Kema-man (District), etc. In some of these names man seems to be part of the base-stem, while in others it seems to play the rôle of a suffix, and in such cases it would be interesting to inquire into its purport or meaning.

⁷ N.B. that Antu, and not Hantu, seems to be the older and more correct form, obtaining in Borneo, Kedah, Penang, and elsewhere, and becoming Anito in the Philippines (see De Morga's 'Philippine Islands,' etc., translated by Stanley and published by the Hakluyt Society, London, 1868, p. 305, note). No doubt it is the same word as Manitō or Manito occurring among certain of the American Indians with the identical signification.
to lend colour to that conjecture. But I have since come to the conclusion that no connection can ever have existed between such names, or the islands they designate, and the Ptolemaic Agathodaimonos, the real origin of which, I am now perfectly convinced, must be traced to the causes explained above. Further, as regards the name of Sumatra, I hope to demonstrate in a subsequent section that it owes its existence to other circumstances.

Maniolai, ten islands (No. 158).

This insular group is but vaguely referred to by Ptolemy in the following terms:—"There are said to be also ten other islands forming a continuous group called Maniolai, from which ships fastened with iron nails are said to be unable to move away (perhaps on account of the magnetic iron in the islands), and hence they are built with wooden bolts. The inhabitants are called Maniolai, and are reputed to be cannibals."1 Here we have the well-known legend of magnetic mountains attracting ships built with iron bolts, repeated by so many authors, both Western and Eastern, not excluding even the Chinese,2 from the days of Aristotle to the very end of the Middle Ages. On De Donis' map these islands are located immediately to the south-west of Agathodaimonos between the Ptolemaic equator and 5° South latitude, which corresponds to a site between 6° and 1° 30' circē true North latitude. Ptolemy, however, does not assign to them any definite position, and merely mentions their existence on the strength of a vague ipse dixit. In my map I have doubtfully located them—prior to having had access to De Donis' work—abreast of the Nikobârs, and identified them with the latter, thinking that the legend as to the attraction of ships fastened with iron nails might have originated from the fact of the well-known eagerness of the inhabitants of these islands to obtain pieces of iron,

1 McCrindle, op. cit., p. 239.
2 According to Klaproth. On this legend see Santarem's "Histoire de la Cosmographie," etc., tome i, pp. 81, 82, 90, 91, 367; also McCrindle, op. cit., pp. 242-243.
testified to by both Sulaimān’s and I-tsing’s accounts. Since having, however, come to the conclusion that Ptolemy’s Khalinē is most probably Kūr-Nikobār, his Salinē either the same island or Tilan-chong, and Agathodaimonos the Great (with, may be, the Little) Nikobār, I am inclined to think that the Maniolai may more likely correspond to the smaller islands of that region, especially those of the Kamorta and Teressa groups, namely: (1) Kamorta, (2) Nankauri, (3) Trinkut (=Trikūta?), (4) Kachāl (with Mohēcan village on it); and (5) Teressa, (6) Bompoka, (7) Chauri, (8) Battimolv, to which might be added (9) Meroe, and (10) either Milū or Menchāl, on the southern side of Sombrero Channel near the Little Nikobār.

The islets located by Ptolemy to the east of Ceylon, i.e., Gūmara (=Kumāra, Kumārita, Kamorta?), Zaba (Jaba, Java), Zibala (Jivala, Ševāla, Šivāla), Nagādība (Nūga-, or Nagga-, dipa), Sūsūra (Śīśumāra, Suśumāra?), probably belong also, as we have observed, to the same archipelago, and may thus have at the same time formed part of the legendary Maniolai.

I have thought also, from the very uncertain position assigned to the Maniolai in Ptolemaic and post-Ptolemaic geography, that they might on the other hand correspond to some of the northernmost isles facing the west coast of Sumatra, especially those of the Si-Malur and Bānyak groups. The names of Si-Malur and of its deep bay,
Si-Malandan, are not very dissimilar—provided it is borne in mind that Si is a mere prefix—to Maniol, Mialiul, Maliur, or Malur. The same may be said of the names of the Bānyak (Māniak, Mānia) Islands, and of their inhabitants, the Maruwi. The Catalan Atlas of A.D. 1375 informs us that the island of Taprobana (here meaning Sumatra) is called Magno-Caulij, a term which, if not a corruption of Menang-kabau or Menang-kerbau, is capable of being referred to both Bānyak or Mānyak, and Maniolai, Mānya-[ka-]lai.

Sulaimān, in Abū-zaid’s relation, mentions an island called Malhan, lying between Serendib (Ceylon) and Kalah, in the Sea of India (Bay of Bengal), on the eastern side. Its inhabitants, he adds, are black and naked, with cannibal habits, although they normally live upon fish, plantains, coconuts, and sugar-cane; they dwell in thickets and have no king. A very similar picture, we have remarked, has been drawn by Marco Polo of the natives of Noecuan. From both this circumstance and the location assigned to Malhan by Sulaimān, it seems very probable that this island belonged to the Nikobār group. I have accordingly suggested its possible identity with the Armanān of the Ajāib, and with either Batti-Malv, Milū, Meroe, Menchāl, etc., asking myself at the same time whether its name was at all to be connected with that of the Maniolai. Be it

---

1 See Cordier (op. cit., pp. 17 and 42), who merely contents himself with transcribing Tastu’s doubtful explanation as “Magni-Cavilliatio: lieu où vous êtes trompés, où sont de grands trompeurs, Magni-Cavilli?” There was an Île Trompeuse or Îles des trompeurs in those parts, namely, Engano, so marked in several French charts of the eighteenth century; but evidently this designation can hardly have anything to do with Magno-Caulij, which, in my opinion, is almost certainly a clumsy transcript of Menang-kabau. It will be observed, in fact, that this toponymic generally appears in the relations of travellers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as Menencabo (Barbosa), Manimecab (Beaullieu), Maningcabo (Valentijn), etc., forms not very different from Magno-Caulij.

2 There is also an islet bearing the name of Maneh (Pulo Maneh), north-west of Pulo Raya, in Raya Bay, west coast of Sumatra.


4 Malhan looks rather like a Malay-derived word of the original form Malan, Malihan, etc. Malan or Malang is the Malay term for a rock a little above high-water, and would thus well suit the loadstone rocks, or else the coral reefs fringing most of the Nikobars. A great resemblance does, of course, exist between Malhan and the names of Si-Malur and its bay, Si-Malandan; but the identification would be geographically untenable, as the position assigned to Malhan in the Arab account on the line Ceylon-Kalah (Takōla) argues it to be one of the
as it may, there can be but little doubt, from Ptolemy's statement as to the inhabitants' reputation for cannibalism, that these legendary islands must correspond to either the central group of the Nikobars or the northernmost isles facing the west coast of Sumatra. And as regards the term Maniolai, there is some likelihood as to its having been derived from some Sanskrit name of the loadstone, Ayaskānta-mani, Ayomani, or simply Mani, which served as a base for some compound like Maniyāli, Maniyāla, or Maniyālaya.\(^1\) Or else the same term may be traceable to a compositum built upon the Mōn word ถกณ, mnih, meaning a 'man,' corrupted into Mniha, Maniha, or Mania, which we find, e.g., in the contracted form Nia or Niah in Pulo Nias, to which it gave its name. Originally it must have been followed by some other word (perhaps Ḍāla or Ḍāla?) meaning negro, pygmy, savage, cannibal, or something of that sort, conjointly with which it formed some compound (such as, e.g., Mnih-Ḍāla) suggestive of the transcript Maniolai, adopted by Ptolemy to designate the inhabitants of the islands as well as the isles themselves. From the resemblance of such a compound central Nikobars situated on either side of Sombrero Channel. Malihan, with due modifications (Malihan, Manihal, Manial), can be made to resemble the terms Manial, Maniyal, and Maniolai.

\(^1\) A fabulous island by the name of Mani-deviga is mentioned in Sanskrit literature as existing in the ocean of nectar; but its name is more likely to mean 'Isle of Jewels' than 'Loadstone Island.' A similar term, Ratna-deviga, was used, chiefly by Far Eastern Buddhists, to designate Ceylon. McCrindle (op. cit., p. 242, note) points out that Wilford (in Asiatic Researches, vol. xiv, pp. 429-30) gives the Indu legend regarding the magnetic rocks fabled to exist in the Indian Ocean, from the Caturvarga Cintāmanī, and identifies them 'with those near Purindra [?] or the Lion's place [?] in the Lion's mouth or Straits of Siagapūr [?].'] Colonel Wilford's vagaries in connection with Indu classical geography are too well known to make it necessary to demonstrate that Purindra or Purindra, as well as the 'Lion's place' and 'mouth,' never existed, in so far as the Straits are concerned, except in the fertile imagination of that Orientalist; and that they are, accordingly, far more mythical than the rocks with which he pretended to identify them. It may be noticed, furthermore, that Simha-pura or Singapore, the 'Lion City,' so named from a tradition that a lion was seen on the site where it rises, was not founded until a date which I fix approximately at A.D. 1340, but which, even in native legend, is not carried further back than the twelfth century. The tradition as to the loadstone reefs is far more ancient, and had McCrindle quoted from Wilford or from the source the latter mentions—to either of which I have no access—the name by which the rocks are known in Indu folklore, instead of giving the above twaddle, it might have been perhaps of some help in fixing the position of them.
to Māni, Maniyāla, etc., coupled with the probable fondness for iron common to the natives of the Nikobārs and neighbouring islands, the legend of the loadstone rocks could easily originate, and grow supported by the fact that all the boats built in Southern India, Indo-China, the Malay Archipelago, and China up to quite recent times, have always been constructed exclusively of wood and kept together with wooden bolts and cords, without a single piece of iron in them.

Before closing these notes on the islands of the Bay of Bengal, I wish to draw attention to the fact that the Nikobārs and Andāmāns have generally been located by early geographers and navigators much further north from their true position; so much, in fact, that they came to occupy a site in close proximity to Cape Negrais and the Arakanese coast. In the relation of Abū-zaid it is stated that after the island of Ramī or Rāmi (North Sumatra) there are the Lenjebālūs islands¹; after these there come two other isles (Andāmāns) separated from the former by a sea called Andāman; beyond there are mountains out of the sailing route, containing silver-mines (the Arakan coast, i.e. Ptolemy's Argyra).² It is apparent from this description that the Andāmāns and Nikobārs were believed to be nearer to the Arakanese seaboard than is really the case. Such

¹ The Lenjebālūs, or Lanjebālūs, of Sulaimān and Abū-zaid are most likely the Nikobārs. Besides comparing, as already suggested, the Arab account with I-ting, it is useful to refer to the description of the Nikobārs left by Dampier, who visited them in 1688. The Arab relation mentions coconut-trees, ambergris, and palm-wine among the productions of the islands, and so does Dampier. I-ting says that the beach is very steep and craggy towards the east, and Dampier repeats the same statement as regards the southern shore of the island he visited. The Lenjebālūs of the Arabs and the Lo-kuo of I-ting can scarcely be the Andāmāns, as, according to Symes (loc. cit.), there are absolutely no coconut-trees growing there.

² They were out of the route of the Arab ships, because this ran from Quilon, or Kollam, to the Nikobārs, and thence to Kolah-bār, or Takūa-pā (Takória). The landmark of the Arab navigators to reach the land of silver-mines (from the Andāmāns) was, according to Sulaimān (in Reinaud, op. cit., p. 9), a mountain called Kausāhnum (Jihāl Kausāhnum, lit. the ' Auspicious Mountain'), the name of which, Colonel Yule suggested, might be a translation of the Ptolemaic Ayēōrēi diáous rūtōs. This, it will now be seen, is impossible; and the greatest probability is that Kausāhnum was but an embellished transcript of Kausuni, the name of Basein, the landmark thus being the mountain of Basein, i.e. Cape Negrais.
a mistaken notion was by no means peculiar to Western navigators; for we find that the Chinese, in their halecyon days of interoceanic navigation, held the same view. No better proof could be given of the position that the Chinese ascribed to the Andâmãns and Nikobârs than by referring to the Chinese chart of the sea-route from Su-mên-ta-la (Sumatra) to Ceylon, published by Phillips in the Journal of the China Branch R.A.S. (vol. xx, Nos. 5–6, 1885). The chart, in the opinion of Phillips, is older than the commencement of the fifteenth century. I have made a new study of it, at least for the portion concerning the Bay of Bengal, and I was thereby able to add some new names left untranscribed by him to his list, to supply a few more identifications, and to rectify several of the identifications he suggests. I must briefly refer to these points, as on them depends the position of the Andâmãns and Nikobârs in respect of the coast of Arakan. Phillips' principal mistake arose from his reading the 落坑 of the chart as Lo-k'ang and identifying it with Rangûn, unaware perhaps that Rangûn was so named, or rather renamed, as late as A.D. 1763 by Alông-Bhura, previous to that date being known as Daqûn or Takum (Takông in Talaing). From this mistake the identifications suggested by Phillips of some places noted in the map between Lo-k'ang, as he reads it, and Chittagông, as well as of several others below Lo-k'ang, become wrong, and there still remain a few places impossible to identify, no matter how the names given in the chart are twisted. I could not account for this fact until I found out that Lo-k'ang, or rather Lo-khéng, as it is pronounced in at least one-half of the Chinese vernaculars, including Mandarin, really represents Rakkhéng or Rakhhaing, i.e. Arakan. Once this point settled, most of the neighbouring places in the map become easy of identification, as will appear from the following list, in which the names of places correctly identified by Phillips are printed in ordinary type, and those either added or newly identified by me are italicized; all being arranged in the same order as they occur in the chart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place on the East Coast of the Bay of Bengal</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chittagong River</td>
<td>Chittagong, or Bhagurban or Bhagpurigatar in the old maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boksobill or Makkho River behind Makkho Island</td>
<td>In Thitir-ti, Chitagong city, which gave its name to the present Chittagong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tari-tea hills, i.e., hills behind Alipore, which were named Thitir-ti.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alipore, or Arabpore city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boksa (or Bokshagachhi), which gave its name to the present Bokshagon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tari-tea, or Beaconsfield.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some hill about Calcuttah's Bay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The old maps mark this place on the map of the Bengal River.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hill or a hillside marked by the name of Dumas and Dobari.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hill or a hillside marked by the name of Kanguria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps the name of the old maps (Chittagong) are meant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Name</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-ti-chuang</td>
<td>Lt. Rebik of the Andaman Islands, marked at the mouth of the Andaman River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-kou-chi-chuang</td>
<td>Rebik Island (Nikobara), marked at the mouth of the Andaman River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boksobill</td>
<td>Rombo Island (Nikobara), marked at the mouth of the Andaman River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boksa (or Bokshagachhi)</td>
<td>Boksa Island (Nikobara), marked at the mouth of the Andaman River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tari-tea, or Beaconsfield</td>
<td>Tari-tea, or Beaconsfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some hill about Calcuttah's Bay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The old maps mark this place on the map of the Bengal River.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hill or a hillside marked by the name of Dumas and Dobari.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hill or a hillside marked by the name of Kanguria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps the name of the old maps (Chittagong) are meant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place on the East Coast of the Bay of Bengal</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chittagong River</td>
<td>Chittagong, or Bhagurban or Bhagpurigatar in the old maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boksobill or Makkho River behind Makkho Island</td>
<td>In Thitir-ti, Chitagong city, which gave its name to the present Chittagong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tari-tea hills, i.e., hills behind Alipore, which were named Thitir-ti.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alipore, or Arabpore city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boksa (or Bokshagachhi), which gave its name to the present Bokshagon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tari-tea, or Beaconsfield.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some hill about Calcuttah's Bay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The old maps mark this place on the map of the Bengal River.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hill or a hillside marked by the name of Dumas and Dobari.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hill or a hillside marked by the name of Kanguria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps the name of the old maps (Chittagong) are meant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Name</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-ti-chuang</td>
<td>Lt. Rebik of the Andaman Islands, marked at the mouth of the Andaman River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-kou-chi-chuang</td>
<td>Rebik Island (Nikobara), marked at the mouth of the Andaman River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boksobill</td>
<td>Rombo Island (Nikobara), marked at the mouth of the Andaman River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boksa (or Bokshagachhi)</td>
<td>Boksa Island (Nikobara), marked at the mouth of the Andaman River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tari-tea, or Beaconsfield</td>
<td>Tari-tea, or Beaconsfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some hill about Calcuttah's Bay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The old maps mark this place on the map of the Bengal River.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hill or a hillside marked by the name of Dumas and Dobari.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hill or a hillside marked by the name of Kanguria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps the name of the old maps (Chittagong) are meant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 It was probably, as stated in the "British Burmah Gazetteer" (vol. ii, p. 4), "a good landmark for ships in former times."
It will appear from the above list that, in the opinion of Chinese navigators, the Nikobārs and Andāmāns lay abreast of the Arakanese coast; and precisely, between Cape Negrais and Borongo Island at the mouth of the Arakan River. A glance at the map referred to will further convince one of this; and were it not for the fact that there are no islands of importance between Cape Negrais and Chedūba, one might be tempted to identify the Ts'wei-lan, Chin-hsū, Pei-p'ing-t'ou, and An-té-man Islands of that map, with islets and reefs off the Arakanese coast, or with the insular groups of Chedūba and Borongo lying further northwards. This is what actually occurred with Wilford, who took Ptolemy's Bazakata Island to be Chedūba; and the mistake might be repeated by many in the case of the islands marked in the Chinese map in question, but for the name An-té-man, which very clearly warns us that such isles belong to the Andāmān-Nikobār archipelago. In the face of these facts I think there should be no more hesitation in recognizing Bazakata, Khalinē, etc., as parts of the archipelago just mentioned.

B. Islands off the West Coast of Sumatra.

Barusai, five islands (No. 160).

I identify these with the islands facing the western Sumatran coast at Bārūs (بَارِس) —the Faṅsūr or Pansūr of the Arabs and Marco Polo, and the Pin-su or Pan-sok of Chinese writers. Prominent among them is Pulo Nias, which probably corresponds to the al-Neyān island of Sulaimān and Abū-zaid. Ptolemy does not supply us with any other

2 Reinaud, op. cit., p. 7. Captain Bözorg (Van der Lith & M. Devie's "Merveilles de l'Inde," pp. 126 and 245-7) locates the island of al-Neyān at 100 parasangs (300 nautical miles) from Faṅsūr, whereas the distance of Nias
information anent these islands except that their inhabitants were cannibals. This is quite correct, as up to this day they form a favourite haunt for the rude Battā or Battak, undoubted anthropophagi of the so-called Indonesian descent, though semi-civilized. From the district of Bārūs these islands were evidently named Barusai. It is also very likely from this district that the famous Fangūr (or Pansūr) camphor so praised by the Arabs was exported.¹

As a good deal of misapprehension has always existed among Western writers dabbling in Far Eastern geography anent the names applied by Oriental travellers to both this district and the camphor therein produced; and as in scarcely any instance have they been properly identified, and in none adequately explained, it should prove of some interest to go here into their history and show how far back into antiquity they can be traced, especially as this forms a point of first importance for the ancient geography of Sumatra to be dealt with under the next section.

Firstly, as to the district of Bārūs and the islands facing it. These seem to have been frequently confounded with one another, as probably was also the case with Ptolemy; for in both Chinese and Arab accounts we find the Bārūs district described at times as part of the coast of Sumatra, and at others as an island, and it is not until the thirteenth century that it becomes definitely recognized as part and parcel of Sumatran territory. This incongruity is, no doubt, due to the imperfect knowledge possessed by navigators, until a comparatively modern period, of Sumatra, which was believed to consist of several islands.

Proceeding in chronological order, we find I-tsing (A.D. 671-695) making mention of the island of Po-lu-shih

from Bārūs is only about 80 miles—say 30 parasangs. This notwithstanding, there seems to be no doubt that Negūs is meant for Nias, whose correct name is said to be Nīha, meaning 'man.' If so, nīha is evidently a corruption of the Mōn Ṃ, and proves a former connection of its inhabitants with the Mōn race.

(婆鲁师洲, Po-lu-shih Chou), which he locates to the west of Shih-li-fo-shih (户利佛逝国), i.e. the State of Sri-Bhoja, now Palembang.\(^1\) Shortly afterwards the History of the T'ang Dynasty (ch. 222, c) refers to a district called 郎婆露斯, Lang-p'o-lu-sz, which, it states, was the western part of Shih-li-fo-shih. Chavannes,\(^2\) with the facility peculiar to Sinologists, does not hesitate to identify both Po-lu-shih and Lang-p'o-lu-sz with Marco Polo's Ferlec, that is, Perlak, on the north coast of Sumatra, a view which Takakusu readily endorses, quite overlooking the fact that Po-lu-shih does not sound like either Ferlec or Perlak,\(^3\) but rather like Bārūs or Ba-ru-sz, it being besides pronounced Boa-lu-sai in the Fu-chou dialect, a surprising approach to the Ptolemaic Barusai or Barusae.

The late Professor S. Beal took no widely different view when he explained\(^4\) that "Po-lu-sse island . . . . is on the western coast of North Sumatra; in some Chinese geographical works this part of Sumatra is called Po-ssū;\(^5\) so called because, as Dr. Bretschneider ('Knowledge of the Chinese and Arabs,' p. 16) has observed, 'the Persians carried on a great trade with Sumatra, and probably had colonies there.' I assume that this is the same as the Basma of Marco Polo (Yule's 'Marco Polo,' ii, p. 231), the Pasei of the Malays, and the Pacem of the Portuguese."

But it would be sheer madness to expect correct geographical identifications from our Sinologists. It will have

---


2 Loc. cit.

3 That such is the case is evidenced by the fact that in the Chinese map of about A.D. 1400, published by Phillips (Journal China Branch R.A.S., vol. xxi), Perlak is transcribed in the form 巴碌, Pa-lu (in Cant. Pa-lak), in the term Pa-lu Tso (= Perlak Head).


5 波斯, Po-ssū or Po-sz. It really requires a brain stuffed with thousands of Chinese characters, let alone tones and similar niceties, to connect this with Po-lu-shih and Basma. Had there been any connection, I-tsing, who travelled from China to Sumatra on a Persian ship (see Takakusu, op. cit., pp. xxviii, xi), would not have failed to let it be understood.
by this time become apparent that P‘o-lu-shih, situated to the west of Śrī-Bhoja (Palembang), can be no other place than Bārūs and Ptolemy’s Barusai Islands; and that Lang-P‘o-lu-sz may be practically the same term but prefixed with the word Lam, meaning a ‘village’ in the dialect of North Sumatra, the whole reading thus, Lam-Bārūs, and meaning simply the ‘village (or settlement) of Bārūs.’

With P‘o-lu-shih and the Barusai we may connect the Nālūsh (نالوش) or Bālus Island of the Mukhtasar-al-Ajāib, said to lie to the right of Kalah (west coast of Malay Peninsula), and to produce bananas, camphor, coconuts, rice, and sugar-cane. Ibn Khurdādbih (circa A.D. 864) also refers to an island of Bālus with the same productions, but he locates it to the left, and at two days [sailing?] distance from Kalah Island (Malay Peninsula), and adds that it is inhabited by cannibals. Professor van der Lith suggests it may be the same place as the Nālūsh of the Mukhtasar, but I would point out that, while it is possible that Ibn Khurdādbih wrote by mistake ‘left’ for ‘right,’ it is equally possible that the island he names is quite a different one—say, e.g., the Bhiḷū Isle (Bhilū-gyūn) opposite Martaban, which would well suit the position and distance assigned to it in respect of Kalah (Takōla). The mention, by Ibn Khurdādbih, of “excellent camphor” being produced there would not in the least prejudice our identification, as we shall see directly that camphor similar in quality to that of Bārūs and China was and still is produced all over that region, especially in the Tenasserim district.

Shortly after the time of Ibn Khurdādbih, i.e. from the middle of the tenth century downwards, we find the Bārūs district designated, in both Chinese and Arab records, by

1 Like, e.g., Lam-bārū = ‘New village,’ the name of a hamlet on Pulo Bras; and many place-names in the Achêh district beginning with the same prefix Lam.
2 "Le livre des routes et des provinces par Ibn Khurdadbeh," trad. Barbier de Meynard, in Journal Asiatique, 1865, p. 288; and "Merveilles de l’Inde," pp. 256 – 263 and 279. Dimashiķī (see trans. in Meheren’s "Manuel de la Cosmographie du Mouyen-āge," Copenhagen, 1874, p. 208) evidently confuses the island of Bālus with his Lankāvas or Lanjbalūs (Nikobārs), since he includes camphor among the productions of the latter.
the name of the camphor therein produced, which name, we hope to demonstrate, was properly Pāṁsu or Pāṁsūm, but was corrupted by the authors of those accounts into Pansur, Fansūr, and the like.

The first traveller to mention the name was in reality Sulaimān, in circa A.D. 851, but he merely speaks of plantations called Fansūr (فنصور), producing camphor of first quality, in the island of al-Ramni (northern part of Sumatra), and not of a district bearing that denomination. On the contrary, Mas'ūdī (A.D. 943) and the authors that followed him apply the term to the district of Bārūs, which they describe sometimes as an island. Captain Bozorg (955) is one of those who take either course. He tells us of the island of Fansūr, and at the same time of a march along the coast from Fansūr to Lāmerī (Ramni, Rambrī, Lambri), passing by the bay of Lūlū-ḥilenk. Dimashkī

1 Reinaudi, op. cit., t. i, pp. 6–7. See also p. 93, where Abū-zaid mentions, on the testimony of Ibn Vahhab (circa A.D. 880), camphor being produced in the island of al-Rāmī (Ram-brī, Lambri). Marco Polo also refers to camphor in Lambri.


3 Op. cit., p. 125. Van der Lith is at a loss to identify Lūlū - ḥilenk (لعيلو بلئنك) Bay, and doubtfully suggests (p. 245) Singkel and Tapunuli bays. To me, however, Lūlū-ḥilenk represents either Telok-belang (pron. Telo-or Telu-belang) or its contraction, Lok-belang, Lu-belang. Telok or Lok means 'bay,' 'creek,' 'cove' in the tongue of that part of Sumatra; while belang, there being no g in Arabic, naturally becomes belank or bilenk in that language. Lok-belang, also known as Lok-belang Bayas, is nowadays more generally called Riau Bay, and is situated on the north-west coast of Sumatra not far below Achēb Head. It is interesting to notice that the bay in question is, in the Ajāib, loc. cit., said to be inhabited by tailed anthropophagous tribes, and infested with zarāfa (زارفا؟), which also abound in the Lāmerī (Achēb) district. Antent the zarāfa, Van der Lith is of opinion (p. 236) that either elephants or Sumatran bicornute rhinoceroses are meant. From the fact, however, of the Catalan Atlas of 1375 placing on the point of the coast of the Illa Trasobana (Tapobana, here Sumatra) corresponding to the spot in question, a city with the legend "Aquesta es duta et sa serrada per serpites" ("This city is desert on account of snakes"), I should think that the Arabic reference would be rather to sarpas, i.e. serpents of fabulous size. At the same time, as sapi is the Malay name for a peculiar breed of wild cattle, apparently derived from sarrahha, it is not altogether impossible that these are the brutes meant. The sarrahha of Indū folklore must have been, in my opinion, some sort of Sivatherium, an extinct genus of four-horned gnu or antelopes, remains of which were found in the Siwalik Hills of the Himalaya.
(about A.D. 1300) speaks both of an island of Fanṣūr, producing camphor of superior quality, and of a city of Fanṣūr situated on the island of Kalah (west coast of Malay Peninsula). Abū-l-Fedā, on the other hand, confines himself (A.D. 1321) to a cursory mention of "the city of Fanṣūr, whence the Fanṣūrī camphor takes its name," which, however, he places in the southern part of the island of Jāveah, here meaning no doubt Sumatra. So also do Ibn Baṭūta (A.D. 1345) and Marco Polo, the latter of whom (1292) locates his Fansur, Fanfür, or Fransur kingdom in the last-named island, termed by him Java Minor or Little Java.

On the Chinese side, although Chao Ju-kua speaks (about A.D. 1240) of the camphor of Pin-su, we do not find the Fanṣūr or Pansur district referred to until about 1399–1400, in the Chinese map published by Phillips, under the name of 番 萄, Pau-atsu, which seems to be a transcript of Pānsu.

1 Mehren’s translation under the title of "Manuel de la Cosmographie du Moyen-âge," Copenhagen, 1874, pp. 15, 127, and 208. The city of Fanṣūr here mentioned has apparently no connection whatever with the "island" (Bārus district), and very likely corresponds to either of the two villages bearing the name of Panchur ("an ‘imp’), situated on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, one on the homonymous headland (Tanjong Panchur), about eleven miles north-west of Malacca, and the other on the eastern bank of the Muār River (lat. 2° 6’ N., long. 102° 43’ E.), about fourteen miles from the entrance of the river. We shall come across other instances in which Fanṣūr, Pansur, and similar toponymies occurring in the relations of medieval travellers seem to apply more likely to Panchur than to Bārus.

2 Guyard’s "Géographie d’Aboulésa," t. ii (Paris, 1883), p. 127. The passage is partly extracted from Ibn Sa’id, who wrote about A.D. 1274. This geographer, however, according to Van der Lith (op. cit., p. 258), refers to the city of Fanṣūr as lying on a bay in the island of Kalah, along with the towns of Lāmērī (Lamri), Jāva, Kalah, and Malāvīr. Nowaīr (loc. cit.) describes the sea of Lāvrej as formed by the seas of Kalah, Jāveah, and Fanṣūr, and mentions the cities of Fanṣūr, Malāvīr, Lāvrej, and Kalah as being situated in the "country of Kalah." Here, again, unless the country of Kalah (West coast of the Malay Peninsula) has been made by mistake to include also the West coast of Sumatra, it is probable that Fanṣūr city refers to some village on the Malay Peninsula bearing the name of Panchur, rather than to the Bārus district. Another of the villages going by this denomination lies on the eastern bank of the Johor River, at one to two miles above Johor Lāma (Old Johor). As that part of the Malay Peninsula appears to have been known also by the name of Java, and is very likely the country which Ibn Baṭūta calls Māla Jāveah, being noted besides for the production of camphor derived, like that of Bārus, from the Dryobalanops tree, Abū-l-Fedā’s statement, placing Fanṣūr city in the south of Jāveah, would prove no less consistent with topographical truth so long as Fanṣūr is taken to be either of the three Panchur referred to above.

3 See Journal Royal Asiatic Society for 1896, p. 499, note.

4 In the Journal China Branch Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xxi (1887); see also p. 38 ibid.
rather than of Pansur, although there would be no very serious objection against the latter interpretation on account of the final t (often equivalent to r in transcripts of foreign toponymics) occurring in the Cantonese pronunciation, Pan-tsut, of the term. There is further mentioned in the history of the Ming dynasty, under the date 1415 circâ, a country of 班卒兒, Pan-tsu-érh or Pan-tsu'-rh, which Groeneveldt has taken to be probably Marco Polo's Fansur (i.e. Bûrûs) on the west coast of Sumatra, although it appears from both the form of the name and the context of the narrative that some place called Panchur in the Straits is more likely intended. Finally, the same Ming history contains a brief allusion to a country 古里班卒, Ku-li-Pan-tsu, hitherto unidentified, which seems likewise to have nothing to do with Bûrûs.¹

² The passage bearing on the point at issue reads as follows in Groeneveldt's translation: "About that time some followers of the imperial envoys [to Java] had been driven by a storm to the country Pansur, and a Javanese, hearing this, paid a ransom for them, and brought them to the place where the king lived." As it will readily be seen, the context makes it extremely improbable that Bûrûs on the west coast of Sumatra is the place where the junk carrying the envoys bound to Java from China was driven to. I cannot, therefore, agree with Groeneveldt's surmise, turned later on into a positive assertion by Parker (see Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1900, pp. 133-139), that the Pan-tsu-érh here alluded to is Marco Polo's Fansur. I feel almost certain that it is, on the contrary, the island of Panchur (Pulo Panchur), otherwise known as Medang and Ramsang, lying off the east coast of Sumatra; and, if not, some place lower down the same coast, or on the western shore of Borneo, bearing the name of Panchur, Banjar, or something similar. It is one of these terms that is meant to be represented by Pan-tsu-érh, while Pan-tsu or Pan-tsut seems invariably to refer to Bûrûs in Chinese geographical literature.
³ See China Review, vol. iv, p. 389, where all the information given from the Ming histories is that "there are heavy rains in summer in this country." In the Asiatic Quarterly Review, January, 1900, p. 139, Parker wrote: "A state called Kuli-Pantsu (the word Kuli elsewhere meaning 'Calicut') is stated to have sent tribute between 1403 and 1424, but there is nothing further said by which this state can be identified"; and further on: "I notice on a modern English map a large island called Panchur off the east coast [of Sumatra], opposite Malacca and Singapore; but whether the Chinese Calicut-Fansur [sic] and plain Fansur of the records are, both or either of them, the same place with Panchur, or with the Fansur marked on the Chinese map [published by Phillips], I cannot say." Professor Schlegel, in his turn, confidently asserted in the T'oung-Poo (vol. x, 1899, p. 290, note) that the Arabic Fansur is the transcript of Panchur, and is therefore to be identified with Pulo Panchur off the east coast of Sumatra. This, from what we have said above, seems unlikely to be the case. As regards Kuli-Pantsu, however, I am of opinion that it is almost certainly the rendering of Kuli-Panchur, Ksâla - Panchur, Kuli-banjar (cf. Banjar-kulam = 'Little Banjar,' the name given to Sâlû), or some similar term. A village called Ksâla-Panchur is to be found at the junction of a small affluent with the Malacca River, Central Malacca district (see Dennys' "Descriptive Dictionary of
In Malay literature Bārūs is referred to in the Chronicle of Pāsai¹ some time before the foundation of Sumatra city (say about A.D. 1270, or slightly earlier), while it appears under the form Faṣūrī (فصولى), a modification of Fansūr, in the account, evidently compiled from records originally written in Arabic, of the introduction of Islāmism into Sumatra (in about 1280–90) given in the “Sejarah Malāyu.”² That Faṣūrī here means the Bārūs district is evidenced by the route described as having been followed by the ship carrying the Muslimic mission from Southern India to Faṣūrī (Bārūs); Lambrī, Lamerī, or Pulok-Lamīrī (ظلمير لوميرى); and Āru or Hāru, هارو (east coast of Sumatra).

Turning now to the origin and history of the term Fansur or Pansur as a designation for camphor, and especially for that of the quality produced at Bārūs, I have no doubt that this term has originated from the Sanskrit पांसु: or पांशु: (Pāṅsuh, Pāṃsuh), denoting a kind of camphor, which word, brought over to Indo-China by the stream of Indī emigration and trans-oceanic trade, underwent several curious transformations which it will be of interest to study. I do not know how far back into Sanskrit literature that word may be traced, but it must be very ancient, and it is not unlikely that we have it in Pāṁsurāstra, the name of a people—and obviously also of a country—referred to

British Malaya," p. 188, s.v.) ; but I am little inclined to credit it with being the place the Chinese annalists had in view. There exists, furthermore, a village Kalapanzin (whose name actually spells カラパンチン = Kalapanč’an) on the homonymous river, a tributary from the right of the Mayu River, in the Akyab district, Arakan; now giving its name to the circle of Kalapanzin (see Koolapanzeng in the “British Burma Gazetteer,” vol. ii, p. 272), which may perhaps lay a better claim to identification with the Chinese Kuli-Puntu.

¹ See Marre’s “Histoire des rois de Pasey,” Paris, 1874, p. 27.
² Op. cit., pp. 110-111; and Leyden’s “Malay Annals,” p. 67, where the term is spelt Pusuri, after a reading تصورى occurring in the Singapore edition of that chronicle (ch. vii, p. 82).
in the Mahābhārata, probably lying in the south of India. As the word in question means also ‘dust,’ ‘dirt,’ and ‘crumbling soil,’ it must have originally designated either crude or powdered camphor. How it came to be applied to the best quality of, and to refined, camphor is a mystery to me. In Pegu we find the term first under the form Phummasāin (搞定 = Bhummasin), denoting, according to Stevens, crude camphor. But in reality, it is to the camphor extracted from the Blumea balsamifera—a large half-shrubby weed, common in waste grounds and abandoned hill gardens in Arakan, Pegu, Tenasserim, and several parts of Siām and Malaya—that it specifically applies. From the Mōn or Talaing language the term drifted into Burmese under the form Phong-matheing or Phhummathien (written 搖 = P'hummasim, P'hummascin), where it designates the Blumea and also, according to Judson, purified camphor. From the Mōn as well, it is probable that the word was adopted into Siāmese, in which it appears as Phimsēn and Phumsēn (Bimsēn, Bumsēn). It is here, however, applied to the Betonica officinalis, and to refined camphor, especially Borneo or Bārūs camphor; common and Chinese camphor being called Kārabūn (from the Sanskrit karpūra), and the Blumea balsamifera being known instead as Nāt (Tōn-Nāt),

1 See Professor Hall's ed. of Wilson’s Viṣṇu Purāṇa, vol. ii, p. 164.
2 English and Peguan Vocabulary, Rangoon, 1896, p. 16, s.v.
3 Burmese and English Dictionary, Rangoon, 1883, p. 419, s.v. Judson is completely mistaken in saying that it means “the camphor tree, Laurus camphora,” as Mason was also wrong, and with him Balfour (see his “Cyclopedia of India,” 3rd ed., vol. i, p. 390), in taking it to designate the Blumea grandis. The plant implied is, as I have endeavoured to personally ascertain, the Blumea balsamifera. This is termed Chāpa or Chāpu by the Malays in the Peninsula, and Sum-bun or Sunbun in Java (see Forbes Watson’s “Index to the Names of Indian Plants,” London, 1868, p. 532), where it also grows. The Taoyers make an impure camphor from it by a very simple process; and so do the Siāmese and other populations of Indo-China. The product, in its refined form, appears identical in all its properties with Chinese camphor. In China the camphor known as Ngai is said to be derived also from the Blumea.
and utilized in some parts of the country for the extraction of camphor.¹

Now, it is most surprising that, while in Malay the camphor obtained from the *Dryobalanops* is designated *kāpūr*, and that produced by the same kind of tree in Bārūs is termed *Kāpūr Bārūs* (کانهور باروس), a name wrongly applied also to Borneo camphor, it came to be alluded to as *Fansur* or *Pansur* (پانسر) by the early foreign traders.² This fact cannot be accounted for otherwise than by admitting that the latter term must have been originally imported into the Bārūs district by the pioneer Indū merchants, and that it was subsequently adopted there for the camphor-trees of the place (*Dryobalanops aromatica*, Gaertn., *Dipterocarpaceae*). It is scarcely as yet understood, even to this day, that this lofty tree grows only in North Borneo, Lābuan, North-West Sumatra, and in the Indau district of Johor, although there is evidence of its being formerly spread nearly all over the southern part of the Malay Peninsula.³ It yields two

---

¹ It is often planted in the neighbourhood or in front of houses, and twigs of it are stuck about gates and doorways, on account of their being reputed very efficient spirit-scarers. Powdered, the wood and bark are used in inhalations for the cure of various complaints.

² The name is often spelt *Fansor* (Fansūr) instead of *Fansur* in the relations of the Arab travellers, owing to the very close similarity between the letters *ف* (f) and *ق* (k), so apt to induce copyists of MSS. into perpetrating many a *lapis calami*. Other variants frequently met with on account of the imperfections of the Arabic alphabet are *Fansūr* (Fansūr) and, thencefrom, *Fansor* (Fansūr). See Mas'ūdī in Barbier de Meynard's "Prairies d'Or," vol. i, p. 338; Reinaud, op. cit., t. ii, p. 10; Guyard's "Géographie d'Aboulfeda," t. ii, p. 127; Dimashki in Mehren, op. cit., p. 16, note, for the reading *Fansūr*; etc. To the spellings *Fansūr* and *Fansūr*—evidently derived from the Arabic *Fansur*—occurring in several Malay chronicles, we have already alluded. Garcia, in his "Historia Aromatum" (1593), refers to the form *Fansur* as being used by Serapion, a Syrian physician of the ninth or tenth century A.D., but I doubt the correctness of his reading. He slovenly suggests that *Fansur* is 'Facon' (Pacon, i.e. Pāsūr), which, he says, also produces camphor. I have since noticed that in the amended passage from Serapion printed by Dulaureier in the *Journal Asiatique* for 1846, p. 229, no other reading but *Fansūr* occurs.

³ In the Malay Peninsula it is said to occur at present only at the headwaters of the Madek and Kahang Rivers, two tributaries of the Indau, where it is collected by the Jakūn tribes of that district and the produce sold to the Chinese at Kwālā Indau (see *Journal Straits Branch R.A.S.*, No. 26, pp. 23, 35, 38). The bend of the Indau River at about eleven miles from its mouth is, I notice, called *Teluk Kāpūr*, meaning 'Camphor Cove.' This was, no doubt, the old camphor mart in this part of the Peninsula. Another must have existed at or
distinct products, viz., (1) Bārūs camphor, (2) camphor-oil (Minyak kāpur). The *Blumea balsamifera* is, on the near the mouth of the Johor River, whither a good deal of the camphor collected in the Indau district was presumably conveyed overland across the watershed. Denny, in his "Dictionary of British Malaya," p. 181, reports that camphor is produced in the Kemāman district (between Pahang and Tringānu); and at p. 295 has the following passage: "The camphor-tree is also said still to grow in some parts of Pērāk. Formerly it was abundant, but it has been almost exterminated by the collectors in the more accessible parts of the country." On p. 67 he alludes to its existence in the basin of the Bernam River, further down the western side of the peninsula, where, however, he says, it is not collected by the local tribes. It is, therefore, perfectly clear that at no very remote date camphor-trees identical with those at Bārūs were plentiful all over the hill tracts of the southern part of the peninsula, from at least the 4th or 5th parallels of Northern latitude downwards, and that at the time of the Arab traders (ninth to fourteenth century) the collection of the drug must have been in full swing, not only in the south, but also in the north, where it was obtained from the *Blumea* shrubs. The subsequent decline of the trade and present scantiness of *Dryobalanops* trees have been brought about by the extermination of the trees themselves for the extraction of the valuable product.

Analogous must have been the case with Sumatra. Here, we have seen in the preceding note, Garcia mentions camphor as being produced in Pāsai in his time (1593); Marco Polo records its existence in Lambrī; Dimashki (c. 1300), in Arkhir (probably Achīb, i.e. Achin) and Ribāh (perhaps Kung Raba Bay); all these being places in the extreme north of the island, where it does not appear that any camphor-trees are left at present. Further, Dimashki states that some of the best camphor comes from Serīrah (Mehren, op. cit., pp. 199 and 204), which, we shall demonstrate in due course, is the Sarawī country in Palembang, East Sumatra, whence no such product is now heard of. In more recent times Beaulien (1621) speaks of camphor being found, besides at Bārūs, at Sinkel (north-west of Bārūs), and at Butaham (Batang district, south-east of Bārūs and below Tapanāli), which is not, however, surprising, as the range of its present production still extends as far south as Natal, only a little above the equator. The native name of the *Dryobalanops* tree in Sumatra is, according to Filet, Simar-bantayan, and, according to others, Siurawa-bantayan, Mara-bantayan, etc. (see "Essays relating to Indo-China," 1st series, vol. i, p. 41 note, and F. Watton's "Index," p. 524).

I have deemed it necessary to bring forward the above evidence as to the fact, as yet very little known and understood by most of those interested in ancient Oriental geography, of the former wide distribution of the camphor-trees all over the southern part of the Malay Peninsula and the northern half of Sumatra, in order to show how careless were those modern writers who, from the mere fact of a particular spot or district being mentioned in the relations of ancient travellers as camphor-producing, at once endeavoured to find for it a place either at Bārūs or Borneo, in spite of evidence to the contrary being in some cases overwhelming. The Malay Peninsula will henceforth have to be reckoned with as well in similar instances, and it will then be found at times that some of the most puzzling questions of historical geography connected with the Malay Archipelago and the Indo-Chinese mainland will become easier to solve.

Serapion, it should be observed, remarks (loc. cit.) that camphor was in his time exported, amongst other places, from the countries of Kalāh, Zābōj; and Herauj or Harauj, all (except perhaps Zābōj) situated on the Malay Peninsula and adjoining mainland. "But," he proceeds to say, "the best comes from Herauj, which is Little China." Dulanier's attempted identification of this country with Borneo is, to say the least of it, absurd. The capital of Little China was, according to Serapion's contemporary, Captain Bozorg (see "Merveilles de
contrary, far more widely distributed, its area including, besides Asām, Arakan, Pegu, the Malay Peninsula, Western Siām, the north-eastern part of Lūang P'hrah Bāng, and Western Tonkin, also Java, the Moluccas, and part of Southern India, especially Konkan. 1 From the significant

1 l'Inde," p. 92), Khāntu = Kan-p'u, Marco Polo's Gunfu; hence there seems to be no doubt that Chinese camphor from the south China coast is meant, and Haranb may stand for Kranne, Kranoc, or some similar word (see above, p. 244, Kranne-aspa), unless it be a corrupt transcript of Kadrenj, Kerdenj, or Kadranj (v. supra, pp. 198 et seq.).

For easily comparable evidence as regards its presence in the north-east of Lūang P'hrah Bāng I may refer to the following passage from the "Voyage au Laos" (Paris, 1898, p. 196, n.) by Dr. Leffre, who has, however, omitted to botanically identify the plant:—"Les environs de Muang-Hett [Miang Hêt, about fifty miles north-east of Lūang P'hrah Bāng as the crow flies, and near the Tonkin frontier] sont couverts de brousse parmi laquelle on remarque de nombreux petits arbustes couverts de feuilles lancéolées, velues et blanchâtres. C'est la plante connue sous le nom de 'camphrée.' Les feuilles broyées entre les doigts exhalent une forte odeur de camphre. Les Chinois en retirent, par l'ébullition et la condensation de la vapeur, un produit cristallin analogue au camphre de Bornéo, et qu'ils vendent très cher."

Next, as to the existence of the same shrub in the adjoining highlands of Tonkin, it will suffice to give the following extract from Dumontier's paper on "The Black River" (printed in the China Review, vol. ix, see p. 145), where, it will be seen, the author has likewise failed to identify the plant:—"Camphor is obtained in certain districts from a sort of plant having many points analogous to the Camphoroma Monspeliacum, L. This plant grows, with a vigour quite exceptional, just as well on mountain lands as in the plain; it is biennial, and reproduces itself without extraneous aid; it is not indigenous to the country, but is said to have been introduced by the Chinese [very probably a mistake], who cultivated it for a long period. Since their departure this industry has been almost abandoned. The natives call the plant Dai-si, and the article of commerce, which is called Bang-phen, is obtained in a most rudimentary way," etc. I have since found out from several Annamese here that this plant is the same as the Siamese Nät, i.e. the Blumea balansifera; that it grows also in Annam, although it is there very little used, except for medicinal purposes; and that its name is spelt 駄大悲, Kōi-Dāi-bi (in Chinese Ta-p'ei or Tai-p'ei).

I do not find any mention of this plant in Bretschneider's "Botanicon Sinicum."

The term Bang-p'hein (水片, Chin. Ping-pien, lit. 'iceicles' or 'ice-flakes'), applied by the Chinese to Bārās camphor (see Groenewoldt, op. cit., p. 260), and hitherto etymologically untraced, is, in some parts of Annam, pronounced Bīng-thien, and appears to me to be most certainly a derivative of the Burmese P'humathien, Siamese Phimsen, Arab Fanūr, and Sanskrit Vīśāha. My Annamese informants consider it, in fact, to be the same word as Phimsen. There can, therefore, be no doubt that it is a foreign imported term, and not an indigenous Chinese word. Moreover, Nicolò Conti enumerates camphor among the products of Campā (Ramusio, vol. i, p. 341 recto).

Again, as regards Siām, camphor is mentioned as one of the productions of the country, on the one hand, as early as A.D. 607, in the Chinese account of the embassy to Ch'ih-tu (Sukhothai) at that date (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 474); and on the other as late as the seventeenth century in the Spanish account translated in John Bowring's "Siām," vol. ii, p. 106. The "Ta Teing Hwei Tien," published 1820, enumerates camphor and camphor-oil among the articles sent by Siām as 'tribute' to China (see China Review, vol. xii, p. 99);
fact of the plant in question being indigenous to the Indian Peninsula,\(^1\) it is but legitimate to infer that the term but these, I have ascertained, were derived at that period from the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, and Borneo. At the earlier dates referred to above, however, there is ample reason to suppose that the camphor spoken of as being produced in Siàn was, for the most part, obtained locally from the *Blumea balsamifera*.

1 That camphor was at one time produced in India, no doubt from the *Blumea*, appears indisputable from the following evidence I have collected from reliable sources:—(1) Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 524) speaks of it having been sent as tribute to China between A.D. 627 and 649, by the kingdom of 烏邁邦, U-tu, U-tuk, or 鳥伎邦, U-chang-pang, "in the south of Central India"—evidently either Odga, Odra, Urdā, Utakula (Orissa), or Audamba (Kach); mayhap *Ucchāṇī* in Gujarāt; but not, I should think, *Hidambo or Hiraamba = Kachār.*

(2) The state of 秣羅矩呂, Mo-lo-chū-ta (= Mālākuṭa, Malūya, or Malabar), says the "Pei-wên Yün-fu" (see China Review, vol. xiii, p. 384), is the southernmost of the 胴, Shan, tribe on the sea-coast. It produces the 龍腦香, Lung-náo Hsiang (lit. ‘Nāga-brain perfume,’ or camphor, the equivalent of the Sanskrit Karṣūrā), according to Eitel’s "Handbook of Chinese Buddhism," 2nd ed., p. 72, s.v.; and of Camphor—Baros according to Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 260.

(3) Camphor, according to Mas’ūdi (see Barbier de Meynard’s "Prairies d’Or," t. iii, p. 49), was collected in the province of Manṣūrāh (Middle Sindh) and other parts of India. In t. i, pp. 378-9, the same author says that the name of that province is derived from Manṣūr, who had been one of its governors (about the middle of the eighth century). General Cunningham ("Ancient Geography of India," p. 271) accepts his version, which may be quite correct. I must point out, however, that the place-name in question is so strikingly similar to Pāṁṣū or Pāṁsuīra, as to suggest the suspicion that it may somehow be connected with that Indāī term for camphor, especially since that drug was one of its productions; or else that it may be a survival or a restoration of the old toponymic Pāṁṣūrāsīra already alluded to above. At all events it seems pretty well certain, from the foregoing extracts, that camphor was long centuries ago produced in considerable quantities in India—a fact which I have never seen brought forward as yet in any publication—and that it was, almost beyond doubt, collected from the *Blumea* shrub. Perhaps those who have at their disposal a larger stock of works of reference than I possess will be able to add other evidence to that here set forth.* In the meantime, in view of the undeniable fact of the existence of camphor as a product of ancient India, and especially of its West coast, it seems passing strange that that drug not only did escape mention in Western classical literature, but remained, apparently, altogether unknown to the Greeks and Romans, despite the frequent intercourse they had with the part of India just referred to. This can be accounted for in no other way than by assuming that to the Indāī themselves the drug, and the method of extracting it from the *Blumea*, did not become known until about the dawn of the medieval period. In fact, as far as I am aware, it does not seem to be referred to until somewhat later in either Sanskrit or Pāli literature. The earliest mention of camphor hitherto discovered is said to occur in Arabic, in the poems of Imrū-ī Kais, an Arabian prince who lived in Ḥadramaut, by the Gulf of Aden, in the sixth century. The name he uses for it, كفرن, Kāfir—evidently derived, like our ‘camphor,’ from the

* Serapion, op. cit., says that camphor comes even from Sofāla. How far this is correct I am unable to judge.
Paṁsuḥ was imported therefrom, and that the same early Indū traders who applied it to the Dryobalanops trees of Bārūs must have given it as well to the Blumea shrubs of the Malay Peninsula and contiguous regions.

Another no less surprising inconsistency in the Further-Indian terminology of camphor is, that while the camphor produced by the Dryobalanops, and coming from either Bārūs, Borneo, or the southern part of the Malay Peninsula, is in Burmā named after Bārūs—it being known in Mōn as गूङ, Prut, and in Burmese as မ်ို, Parūt (pron. Parouk),—in China, on the other hand, the term Bārūs is employed only for camphor-oil in the forms 媽律香, Po-ō-lū Hsiang (Bā-lūt Perfume), and 媽律膏, Po-ō-lū Kau (Bā-lūt Balm). Groeneveldt (op. cit., p. 261) rightly reports that “the name of Polut [Po-ō-lū, Bā-lūt] is said to be derived from the country where it is found (Baros).”

Sanāskrit Karpūra, Pāli Kappūra—shows that by that time the drug had become known to the Indūs. Whether the term Karpūra was applied to it long before Paṁsuḥ, or vice versa, I am unable to say, but it would be interesting to ascertain. In any case it is probable that the introduction of the latter into the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra took place at about the same period. The term Karpūra occurs, I notice, in the “Katha Sarit Sāgara” (in the story of Princess Karpūrikā, the camphor-maiden, whose father is represented as giving lumps of the drug as a marriage present), the first redaction of which is put down at about A.D. 500. Among the other numerous Sansākrit names applied to camphor, I desire to call attention to two especially as probably bearing on the subject of the present inquiry, viz., Candrahhasa (lit. ‘Moon-ashes’) and Sumah. Of the first we may have a mutilated representative in Marco Polo’s Basman, the Portuguese Pasem, otherwise known as Pāseī (Pāsai), a district, we have seen, noted for camphor, and therefore probably named originally, or nick-named as time went by, from that drug. In the second we have, as likely as not, a foreshadowing of the term Sumatra, applied to the district immediately adjoining ere it became the generic designation for the whole island. From Sumah, the Javanese word Sumbunfor the Blumea referred to in a preceding note is probably also derived.

1 In the Asiatic Quarterly Review of January, 1900, p. 139, Parker makes the following remarks:—“Colonel Yule seems a trifle over-zealous in twisting bārūs (camphor) round to be the same word as pansur (camphor). The word now pronounced pōlih (having retrospectively and provably the etymological power barūt) is as old as the first Chinese knowledge of the Archipelago, and is used in reference to the best ‘dragon-brain’ camphor [? this seems to be an error, and we should probably read camphor-oil, see above] brought by traders from Java, Sumatra, and other Archipelagian states. It is true two Chinese authorities say the said camphor comes from poliōh state (almost the same word).

But Panteu is a stray word [?], 1,000 years younger than Burūt [this may be true only in so far as Chinese literature is concerned], with which it cannot
authority, generally called in the Chinese 龍脣 香, Lung-nao Hsiang (‘Dragon’s-brain Perfume’), or 水片, Ping-pien (‘Icicles’). The former name, he goes on to state, “has probably been invented by the first dealers in the article, who wanted to impress their compatriots with a great idea of its value and rarity.”

possibly have any etymological connection [an opinion which I endorse on the basis of the evidence I bring forward in the present section].” I-ting, in Takakuwa’s translation (“Record of the Buddhist Religion,” etc.), is made to mention “Baros camphor” twice (pp. 48 and 129); but as no Chinese characters are given, we are unable to guess whether the term used in the original is Po-lu or a different one. I should think it is different, from the fact that, as we have seen, I-ting records the name of the Bârus district, or opposite islands, in the form Po-la-shih.

The Chinese name for the indigenous camphor-laurel is 槟榔, Chang; and that of its product 槟榔, Chang-nao, in the south, but 潮州, Ch’au-nao, in the north. The former term is said to be derived from 潮, Yü-chang, the ancient name of Kiang-si, because the tree grew there (see Giles’ Chinese Diet., s.v., 398). It would be interesting to know how far back these terms for local, and those above for foreign, camphor can be traced in Chinese literature. Another term, already noticed as occurring in Chinese, is 根布羅 Chie-p’o-lo (K’et-p’o-lo), according to Giles (s.v., 9412), and 獨布羅, Chie-pu-lo (K’et-pu-lo), according to Eitel (“Handbook,” p. 72), evidently derived from the Sanskrit Karpura—or, more likely still, from the Pâli Kappura—rather than, as Giles asserts, s.v., 9412, “from the Malay kapur,” which is a non-Malay word derived likewise from either Pâli or Sanskrit. As regards the transcription of the Indo-Chinese p’himâsā and correlated terms in such a manner as to convey the meaning of ‘iceicles’ or ‘ice-flakes’ (Ping-pien), I am of opinion that it must have been suggested by the idea of coolness attached first by the Indus, and afterwards by the Arabs, to that substance. In Sanskrit camphor is, in fact, called Himavâkalâ, and named Candra, Soma, etc., after the moon, whose influence is regarded as cool. Among the Arab authors Avicenna says that camphor is of a cold nature, an opinion endorsed several centuries afterwards by Garcia in his “Historia Anatomia,” and Ibn Battûta tells us that the kind of camphor called Hardalâh, having attained the highest degree of cold, is capable of killing a man by congealing his breath (Defrémery’s transal., t. iv, p. 241). However, Séraphin states in Dulauirier’s translation (Journal Asiatique, t. viii, 1846, p. 219): “Ces diverses espèces de camphre sont clarifiées par la sublimation et donnent un camphre blanc, en lames, qui ressemblent, pour la forme, aux lames de verre dans lesquelles il subit cette opération. On l’appelle alors camphre préparé.” Hence, I think, the Chinese idea of calling the product Ping-pien, comparing it to ice-flakes, as transparent glass does not seem to have become known in China until the seventh or eighth centuries.

The term Mi-nao, 米腦, ‘rice-camphor,’ applied by the Chinese to the second quality of that substance, and spelt Mei-nao by Hwang Hsien-ts’êng (a.d. 1520), has, perhaps, it has been suggested, “a connection with the sound of the native name of the tree, Mailangam [?]” (cf. Porter Smith’s ‘Chinese Materia Medica,’ p. 49).” See China Review, vol. iii, pp. 222, 224.

As no one has, to my knowledge, so far thought of comparing the names recorded for camphor by various Arab and Chinese writers of mediaval times, I have deemed it worth the while to present them together here in table form:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st quality</td>
<td>坊谷, produced at Fausur.</td>
<td>梅花腦, Mei-hua-nao, camphor in large pieces.</td>
<td>Fangiri.</td>
<td>Fangiri.</td>
<td>Hardalah, حردالة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>法蕃, 佛霧, thick and of a dusky colour.</td>
<td>Camphor of the second sort.</td>
<td>Azid</td>
<td>Arshir = Achel; Mahinsab, white and glittering.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>کوكسب, brown in colour.</td>
<td>蒼龍腦, Ts'ang-lang-nao = 'blue camphor.'</td>
<td>Blue Asferek.</td>
<td>Morjani, coarse-grained, dusky colour.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>娅士, 娅士, or Bākūs, mixed with fragments of the wood from the tree.</td>
<td>米龍腦, Mi-lang-nao = small-grained camphor.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Bātnāu, reddish colour. Mahbāber, red outside but white inside. Kondarj, black inside.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Other readings given by Dulaurier (loc. cit.) are Kasab and Karkasi, which latter, in my opinion, comes strikingly near to Girgasi or Garqasi, the Malay term for a Rakṣasa. Ishak-ibn-Amrān, according to Millies, writes Karkasi, which this author suggests may be derived from Garigis, the Batta (Batak) name for camphor (Millies, op. cit., p. 66).

† Dulaurier suggests that the Malay word باغوس, meaning ‘fine,’ ‘good,’ may be implied here; but this seems unlikely, since the drug here alluded to is of the most inferior quality.

‡ Groeneveldt, in his translation (op. cit., p. 230), most deftly, as is often his wont, skips over the difficulty entailed in the interpretation of this uncommon term by merely rendering it by ‘camphor of the third sort.’ The whole passage, as translated by him, runs as follows:—‘In the year 977 their [the people of P'o-ni = Brūnai, West Borneo] king, Hiang-ta, sent three envoys to bring as tribute: one cati camphor in large pieces, eight caties camphor of the second sort, eleven caties of the third sort, twenty caties small-grained camphor, and twenty caties of the last sort.’ Hervey de Saint-Denys, however, in his version of the same passage from Ma Tuan-lin’s work (op. cit., p. 569), manfully takes the bull by the horns (although omitting various other details) and translates the term in question ‘camphre bleu.’ It seems, therefore, pretty well certain that Avicenna’s ‘blue Asferek’ camphor is here implied. It is very regrettable that the original characters for the five kinds of camphor mentioned in the above passage—which is undoubtedly one of the oldest, and minutest as regards particulars, occurring in Chinese literature—have not been given in every instance, thus precluding further possible identifications. We must, therefore, leave this task to those having access to the original work.

§ Serapion says it is called Ryōhi because of its having been first discovered by a king whose name was Ryōh. Dimashki repeats the statement, changing, however, the name into Ribāh (see Mehren’s transl., p. 128). A district Ribah is marked on some of the old maps on the north-east coast of Sumatra, a little inland from the present Pāsai district. This may be the source of production for the kind of camphor in question; if not, Ribāh may stand for the territory on the Raba river (Krung Raba, debouching into Raba Bay), just below Achēh, on the north-west coast of Sumatra.
Ibn Batūta, strangely enough, although speaking (May, 1345) of camphor in Sumatra and Mula-Jāvah, makes no mention whatever of Fansūr. All he does is to describe the method of collecting the drug, and the properties of the latter from what he learned at Kākulaḥ (some port on the East coast of the Malay Peninsula), and says that the plants producing it are reeds, which gives rise to the suspicion that the drug was there obtained from Blumea shrubs rather than from stately Dryobalanops trees.¹ He may, however, be quite right after all, as some of the purest Phimsēn or Ping-pien camphor obtainable in Indo-China is, I am assured, found in the joints of a particular kind of bamboo.²

² It may or may not be a quite distinct product from the well-known Tabīḥīr, which is a siliceous concretion occurring in the joints of the female bamboo, and also in the coconut of the Straits according to Newbold (vol. i, p. 444). The bamboos containing the valuable substance are said to be very seldom met with. This notwithstanding, the hearsay evidence we have brought forward is more than sufficient by itself to absolve Ibn Batūta from the charge, if not of carelessness, at least of defective memory brought against him by Dulaurier (in Journal Asiaticque, February, 1847, p. 123) and others. The explanation ventured upon by some of his commentators that he took the bamboo canes or boxes in which the drug is kept for the plant producing it is, to say the least, childish. The account he gives is precise enough to make it clear that either Blumea stalks, or perhaps bamboos, were the plants from which camphor was collected at Mula-Jāvah. He very likely did not see them, but only heard the story told him to that effect, just as it happened with me as regards the camphor-producing bamboos at the present day. From the circumstance of his not mentioning Fansūr we may deduce that his Kākulaḥ is not Angkola (W. Sumatra), as Van der Lith has wildly conjectured ("Merveilles de l'Inde," pp. 239-40). Had Ibn Batūta been on the coast conterminous to the inland district of Angkola he could scarcely have omitted to speak of Bāris, which lies close by. Nor is it likely that Mul-Jāvah, the country where the port of Kākula was situated, is Java, as has been no less wildly fancied. All indications concur in pointing to places on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, with names ringing like distant echoes of the Ptolemaic Köll (if not exactly Takola nor Kokkonagara) and Perimula (= [Peri-]Mula-Jawa?). The triple coincidence in the mention of (1) stone walls surrounding the city, (2) abundance of elephants, which are employed also in warfare, and (3) scarcity of horses in the country, occurring in almost the same words in the accounts of (i) Kākula by Ibn Batūta and (ii) Ko-lo (哥 羅) by Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., pp. 414-15), seems to point to the unmistakable identity of the two places, and therefore, confirm the location of Kākula on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula at either Kelantan (v. ante, p. 165) or Lāgor. I-ting's commentator mentions a Ka-ko-la, or Ka-ko-ra (Takakusu, op. cit., p. 129), producing white cardamom. This place, rather than with Kākula, I would prefer to identify with Krakor in Kamboja, a district so named from the wild, or bastard, cardamom growing there, which is locally known as Krakor (Gragar). See Aymonier's "Cambodge," vol. i, Paris, 1900, p. 227. This plant must be the Siamese Renu, botanically Amomum xanthoides (Wallich). Kākula is, of course, the Arab and Persian word for cardamom; but whether it be derived from the Khmer Krakor, or this, as seems more probable, from it, I am unable to say.
The above considerations will, it is hoped, have made it perfectly evident that the Indī-imported term Pāṁsuh and its Indo-Chinese derivatives (P'hummasen, P'himsen, Bing-thiën, etc.), while originally designating more especially the produce of the Blumea balsamifera, which they still do to a large extent in Further India, came to be adopted in the sequel among Western (chiefly Arab) traders, under the form Fausür, as a specific name for the camphor from the Dryobalanops trees, exported at first, apparently exclusively, from Bārūṣ; and blossomed forth later on into a toponymic applied to the Bārūṣ district itself, on account of its most characteristic and valuable product.

The appearance of the word Fausür in this new rôle does not, however, seem to date further back than the tenth century, for as late as A.D. 851 Sulaimān still speaks, as we have seen, of camphor-yielding plantations called Fausür in the island of Rammi (North-West Sumatra); and it is not until A.D. 943 that we hear, in Mas'ūdi's "Meadows of Gold," of the country of فنصور, Kansūr—evidently, as we have shown, a clerical slip for فنصور, Fausür (= Pāṁsuh, Pāṁsūr). Whereas, as a botanical term and a name for camphor, the word in question is undoubtedly of far higher antiquity, and may possibly enter into the composition of the ancient Indian place-name Pāṁsurāṣṭra, its topographical application to a portion of Further India (Bārūṣ district) is apparently not traceable further back into history than the date above referred to. It follows, therefore, that it cannot have any etymological connection whatever, as has been before this conjectured by some inquirers, with the toponymic Bārūṣ, which possesses a far older record, and can be traced into the mists of ages through the Bālūs (Island) of the Muktasār, the Lang-P'io-lu-sz (Lam-Bārūṣ) of the T'ang chronicles, the P'io-lu-shih of I-tsing's memoirs (A.D. 671–695), the P'io-lū (Bālūt camphor or camphor-oil district) of earliest Chinese Archipelago navigation, and the Barusai (Islands) of Ptolemaic fame, to a still older

1 See "Les Prairies d'Or," text and transl. by Barbier de Meynard, t. i., p. 338.
term, presumably of Sanskrit-Pāli origin and of the form *Paruṣa* or *Pharusa* (= 'fierce,' 'savage,' 'eruel'), evidently applied to the aborigines of that district by the Indi pioneers of Far-Eastern trade, probably several centuries before the dawn of the Christian era.

The five *Barusai* islands of Ptolemy presumably include, besides Pulo Nias, the three largest Bānyaks (Bangkara or West Bānyak, Tuwangku or Great Bānyak, and Ujong-bātu or Little Bānyak); and either Pulo Tāpak (Flat Islands) or the neighbouring Si-Malur (also known, but incorrectly, as Pulo Babi), provided this last has no claim to be included among the Maniolai. The centre of the *Barusai* group, lat. 1° 4' N. corrected, falls, as will be seen from the map, on the parallel passing through the middle of Pulo Nias.

Sabadeibai, three islands (Nos. 98 and 161).

I have identified these with *Si-Berūt* (the Good Fortune Island of the Dutch) and the neighbouring islands of the Bātu group. There is said to be a district called Seibi in Si-Berūt, after which this island appears to have been formerly designated. In fact, John Crisp, in his account of the inhabitants of the 'Poggy' Islands, etc., refers to "some island to the northward [of that group] which they call Sybee." The islands in the region under consideration are usually named from either some stream, bay, or settlement existing on them. When several of such conspicuous topographical features occur on any one island, this latter becomes

1 Tuwangku, and not Tuw anyku; as well as Bānyak (= 'numerous'), and not Banjak (which is the Dutch spelling), as I see printed in the Admiralty maps and in the "China Sea Directory" (4th ed., 1896, vol. i, pp. 279-80).

2 Published in *Asiatic Researches*, vol. vi, pp. 77-91; and reprinted in "Essays relating to Indo-China," 1st series, vol. i, pp. 66-76. The passage here referred to occurs on p. 72 of the last-named publication. See also footnote 1 appended thereto by the editor as regards the Seibi district, of which I do not find any mention in the maps and books lying at my disposal.
more often than not known by various distinct names. The quasi-certainty of Si-Berút having been in the past better known as Seibi or Saibi is quite sufficient, I think, to account for the term Sabadeibai used by Ptolemy in connection with the group formed by this with the Bātu Islands. Sabadeibai simply means, in fact, Saba-dipa or Saba-dripla, i.e. 'Islands of Saba,' or, as we take it, of Seibi or Saibi. The name Si-Berút itself is, it will be seen, not very different from either Seibi, Saibi, or Saba. There may, of course, have existed some place similarly named on the opposite coast of Sumatra, as there are even now several further southward, after which the islands in question may have come to be designated; but in the absence of indications as regards the former, and in view of the fact of the other places just alluded to being too far away south to answer our purpose, we shall rest content with merely tracing the origin of the Ptolemaic toponymic under discussion to Seibi or Saibi, thus locating it no further than Si-Berút and adjacent islands.

Ptolemy describes the inhabitants of the Sabadeibai group also as cannibals. In connection with his description it is interesting to notice that Captain Bozorg tells us in his narrative that beyond al-Neyan (Nias) there lie three islands called Barāca or Berāca (בָּרַא), inhabited, like the former, by a head-hunting and anthropophagous population.  

---

1 In the Bengkūlēn district, where, just below the 3rd parallel of S. lat., modern maps show a stream called Saba (Ayer Saha) and two adjoining ones marked, respectively, Senaba and Seblat. There exist further a stream and settlement Sabaran on the east coast of Si-Porah (or Si-Kabau) Island, and a neighbouring islet bears the name Si-Buru. I am, however, inclined to include Si-Porah in the Ptolemaic group of the Sindal, which will be treated on in the next article.

2 By reference to No. 98 in the tables it will be seen that the rectified position for the centre of the Sabadeibai is long. 99° 17' and lat. 1° 51' S., which corresponds to a point only a couple of miles to the south of Si-Berút. It goes without saying that by the Sabadeibai group part of the coast of Sumatra opposite the point just referred to may be meant, which probably was believed by navigators in Ptolemy's time to be a cluster of islets. Furthermore, the term should be compared with Sabadin, with which it seems to have more than one point of analogy. The latitudes assigned by our author to the western limit of Sabadin and to the Sabadeibai group lying beyond it are, as will be seen from the tables (Nos. 98 and 126), identical. It is therefore possible that the group in question came to be so designated from its lying exactly opposite the site that was believed in those days to be occupied by Sabadiu.

data so surprisingly tally with those recorded by Ptolemy anent his Sabadeibai, as to suggest at first sight that one and the same insular group is here implied. I do not think, however, that such is the case, despite such seductive coincidences, coupled with the fact of the striking similarity between the terms Berāwa and Si-Berūt (in which Si is either an ornamental prefix or represents the definite article).

Van der Lith is inclined¹ to identify the Berāwa islands with those of the Bātu group rather than with Si-Berūt and the neighbouring islands settled by a Mentawi population, because, he says, the inhabitants of the Bātus came originally from the southern part of Nias, and follow, in common with those of the latter, the barbarous practice of killing their enemies for the sake of their skulls. It seems to me, nevertheless, that the term Berāwa is possibly a mere modification of Maruwi or Marawa, the name given to the natives, and once borne by one of the islands of the Bānyak group,² which is likewise situated beyond al-Neyān (Nias), in which case the three Berāwa islands of Captain Bozorg would correspond to the three larger Bānyaks. Or else Berāwa may be meant for Varāha, Hog Island, a designation applied to the two Tāpak Islands, and, incorrectly, also to the neighbouring Si-Malur. At all events the probability seems to be more in favour of the Berāwas belonging to the Ptolemaic group of the Barusai than to that of the Sabadeibai.

Although the Mentawi or Mantawi presently inhabiting Si-Berūt, Si-Porah, and the Pageh Islands are, comparatively, a mild-mannered people,³ there seems to be little doubt that

² Apparently Bangkaru (also known as West Bānyak), marked as Maros in Valentijn’s map of Sumatra (Nieuwe Kaart van het eyland Sumatra). The name of the Maruwi, Marawa (or Berāwa?) tribes should be compared with that of the Marawa race in the extreme south of India (districts of Madura, Tinnevelly, Rānnaid, etc.). Beru is a similar term occurring as a toponymic in Berua reef, in the approach to Susu-susu Bay, West coast of Sumatra. Bārea is the trans-Indus name for darbha or dub-grass, Cynodon dactylon, according to Balfour’s Cyclop. of India, 3rd ed., vol. i, p. 869.
³ Their name is said to be derived from Mantau or Mentau, their own word for a ‘man.’ Compare with this the name of the Mantra, Mentra, or Mintira tribes in the south of the Malay Peninsula.
they are descended from that Batta stock, or, at any rate, from that cross-breed between Battas and Negritos, which appears to extend even as far south as Engano. They may, therefore, have been head-hunters and cannibals as well at a former period. This conjecture finds support in the fact of Ptolemy applying the epithet of cannibals also to the natives of his Sindai, which undoubtedly correspond to the more southern of the Mantawi Islands (Si-Porah and Pageh group).

Sindai, three islands (No. 162).

Inhabited by cannibals. The latitude (rectified) of the centre of the group is 2° South, which is, within a single minute, the latitude of Indrapura, of the entrance to the homonymous river, the Sungei Indrapura, and also of Syetan Island, lying just off the northern extremity of Si-Porah.

The three islands constituting this group are very probably — (1) Si-Porah or Si-Kabau; (2) the two Pageh, Pagai, or Poggy, which, being separated by a very narrow strait (Si-Kakap Strait), may easily be mistaken for a single island; (3) and, perhaps, Sandion Island (Pulo Sanding), if not actually the farther outlying Engano, more properly Pulo Telanjang (i.e. 'Island of the Naked'). The name Sindai is easily accounted for from the fact that the opposite district of the Sumatran seaboard is termed Indrapura, which is also the name of a town, a stream, a headland (Űjong Indrapura), and of a very high mountain peak (12,255 feet), also called Günong Kurinchi, in the same territory. Evidently, either this district or town, or some other one adjoining it further to the south, was in the early days known as Sindha or Sindh, from the fact of Indu colonies being first established there; whence the name Sindai to
the islands fronting its seaboard. *Sindang* is, to this day, the name of a village and of an upper tributary of the Indrapura River. Villages called respectively *Sindar* and *Sintu*, and a district and river known as *Sindur*, exist in the Bengkülen district further down the coast. The most luminous proof as regards the presence at one time in that neighbourhood of a district or township bearing the name of *Sindhu* is, however, furnished to us by Chao Ju-kua, who, in his *Chu-fan-chih* ("Descriptions of the Barbarians," written in *circ A.D. 1240*), mentions a country called 新扵, *Hsin-t’o* (= Sinda, Sindhu), among the fifteen States dependent on *San-fo-ch’i*, 三佛齊 (＝Śāmbhujaya, the Sarbozah or Sarbazah of the Arabs), situated, therefore, in Sumatra.¹ In this country, he goes on to say, there is a port accessible to vessels of deep draught, and in the hills there grows pepper which is small-grained, but heavy, and superior to that of *Ta-pan*. This may be the Tapan district situated on the homonymous river (Sungei Tapan) to the south-east of Indrapura. Dr. Hirth takes it, no doubt wrongfully, to be Tuban in N.E. Java,² as he assumes *Hsin-t’o* to be Sunda

¹ See Dr. Hirth’s article in *Journal R.A.S.* for July, 1896, pp. 478, 504, and 505 n.; and Takakusu’s "Record of the Buddhist Religion," p. xliv.

² Tuban is correctly spelt 杜板 or 賭班, both reading *Tu-pan*, *Tu-ban*, in Ma Huan’s relation, as may be seen in Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 172; whereas *Ta-pan* is represented in the form 打板, *Ta-pan*, which may be read also Taban or Daban, but never Tuban. It is therefore certain that the last term is intended as a transcript of *Tapan*. Dr. Hirth must have seen the inconsistency, but, anxious as he was to identify all the places in *Shé-p’o* mentioned by Chao Ju-kua as producing pepper with localities in Java, holding as a matter of course that *Shé-p’o* must certainly be Java and no other place on the face of the earth, he skipped over the matter. Upon close investigation I now find, however, that the places in question are almost undoubtedly all situated in Sumatra, as the following brief remarks will show. Subjoined is Chao Ju-kua’s statement, with Dr. Hirth’s identifications as they appear in the *Journal R.A.S.* for 1896, p. 504, followed by my own new ones:—
INDO-MALAY ARCHIPELAGO.

without any further explanation as to where the place so named is to be looked for. If by this he means the western part of Java, inhabited by the Sunda nation and where Sundanese is spoken, known to the Malays as Tánah-Sunda, the 'Sunda Country' or 'Land of the Sundas,' he cannot be right, for the name Sunda of the district in question is, by the Chinese, transcribed 順 達 Shun-ta, and not Hsin-t’o.¹ We are therefore left to ourselves to find out the location of the mysterious and so far puzzling Hsin-t’o. That it must have been situated on Sumatra we have pointed out above, and that it must have included the portion of the west coast

"Pepper comes from the following places in Shè-p’o, viz. :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DR. HIRTH’S IDENTIFICATION</th>
<th>MY IDENTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Su-chi-tan. Sukitan, East Java.</td>
<td>Sukadána district in South-East Sumatra (residence of Lampung). May be the Sukitan of the &quot;Tung-hsi-yang-k’au“ in East Java, although Groeneveldt says, op. cit., p. 179 note, that no name like this has been handed down in Javanese tradition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu-pan. Tuban.</td>
<td>Tapan district, south-east of Indrapura, West Sumatra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pui-hua-yüan. Pajajaran?</td>
<td>Pagar-rüyung district, Pádang Highlands, West Sumatra, but more probably the village of the same name on the coast some twenty-five miles to the north-west of Bengkulu. It may be, though doubtfully, Pagarwán, on the East coast of Sumatra, in about 3° 30’ N. lat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma-tung. Madang?</td>
<td>Bátang district, south of Tapanáli (Tapi-an-áli), West Sumatra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung-yu-lu. Jangola.</td>
<td>Singel district?, West Sumatra; or Sungal Island, Lampung Bay, South Sumatra.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But the pepper coming from Hsin-t’o. Sunda. Sindhur, and very likely also Barbosa’s Zunda kingdom.

is the best; the Tu-pan variety takes the second place."

¹ See Hist. of the Ming Dynasty cited by Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 166, where it is said of Chao-wa (Java) that it is sometimes called Pu-chia-tung (Pekalongan), and also Hsia-chiang (Ha-kang, said by the translator to be Bantam) and Shun-ta (Sunda). Also p. 181, where he identifies the Shun-ta country with the district where Ha-kang (Bantam) is situated.
of that island occupied by the present district of Indrapura and residency of Bengkûlen, in front of which Ptolemy placed his group of the Sindai, is the next point to be demonstrated. This task is made comparatively easy from the fact that Barbosa, writing A.D. 1516, mentions "a kingdom called Zunda after a city bearing such a name, which lies in degrees four and three-thirds \[\frac{3}{4}\] or \[\frac{3}{2}\] on the southern side [i.e. West coast] of Sumatra," "In this kingdom," he proceeds to say, "there is likewise to be found very small grained pepper." ¹ That the "southern

¹ I have translated this passage from Ramusio's "Navigazioni et Viaggi," 1563 edition, vol. i, p. 318 verso, where it textually reads as follows:— "Vu' altro regno si chiama Zunda per una città che ha tal nome, che è in gradi quattro, & tre terzi, dalla banda di mezzodi, & in questo regno vi è similmente del pepe fine fine." Further on he alludes to an island called Sunda in the following terms:— "Paffita l'isola di Sumatra verso la Gianua, si trova l'isola di Sunda, dove nafe molto buon pepe. tien Re da per fe, il qual vien detto, che deffidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'esser alla obbiedienza del Re di Portogallo. Quindi si caricano per defidera d'ess...
side" of Sumatra here means its West coast seems beyond doubt, because the kingdom of 'Menancabo' (Menangkabau) is also stated to lie "dalla banda di mezzodi." Porcacchi, speaking of the ten kingdoms of Taprobana (= Sumatra, which he confuses at times with Ceylon), says, evidently after Barbosa: "On the same southern side is the sixth kingdom, called Zunda from a city of that name, lying in degrees four and three-thirds." His cartographer Porro marks Zunda for Sunda on the map on p. 189, abreast of two islets lying at the entrance to Sunda Strait. One of them is, no doubt, meant to represent Barbosa's island of Sunda, which, from the description given of its position, evidently corresponds to some island in Sunda Strait, and cannot therefore have anything to do with the Zunda kingdom. The latitude assigned by Barbosa to the capital of the latter, 4° 40' or 4° 45' S., closely corresponds to that of Sambat Bay in the Kowur district of the residency of Bengkūlen. This a country called Sunda (Sunda) producing excellent pepper: "Nella Giava maggiore è una terra nomata Sonda di verso Tramontana dirimpetto alla costa di Somatra. Questa terra . . . . ha il contado, che produce diverse specierie, una principalmente pepe molto eccellente." Then he proceeds to relate the Portuguese expedition of A.D. 1526 under Francisco de Sa to the said country, which Danvers (op. cit., vol. i, p. 382) recounts in the following strain: "Francisco de Sa had been dispatched to the island of Sunda, whose king had . . . . offered a place for the erection of a fort, and a yearly tribute of 350 quintals of pepper to the King of Portugal." Du Jarrie ("Histoire des Indes Orientales," Bordeaux, 1608, t. i, pp. 32 and 178) speaks of a city and seaport called Sunda, situated on Java, after which the Strait of Sunda received its name:--"Du乙sté le plus Austral de Sumatra, l'on voit l'Isle nommée Iana Major, qui fait anec celle de Sumatra vn destroy appellé Sunda, prenant son nò d'vne ville de la Iane Majeur. Il y a vn port fort hanté appellé de mesme" (pp. 32-33) . . . . . "qu'on nôme le deestroy de Sunda: par ce que par iceluy l'on va à vn haure fort hanté des marchâis, qui est en l'Isle Iana major, appellé Sunda" (p. 178). The Sunda kingdom thus appears to correspond to the country forming in later days the State of Bantam, but known at an earlier period as Sunda and Sunda-katapa (apparently upon its annexation of the district of Jakatra, now Batavia). Its capital and seaport must have been situated either on Sunda Strait or very close to the north-eastern entrance to the same; and from it not only did the Strait get its name, but also some island or group of islands lying within the compass of the Strait itself, which probably formed a guide to navigators to reach the Sunda harbour. Hence the confusion made by writers of the period between the island of Sunda and the neighbouring kingdom of the same name. As to Barbosa's kingdom of Zunda, it was evidently quite a separate affair, and there seems to be no reason for doubt that it was situated, as he puts it, on the west coast of Sumatra.

1 "Dall' ifetta parte di Mezzogiorno è il fetto Regno, detto di Zunda da una città di quello nome, posta in gradi quattro & tre terzi" ("L'Isole pive famose del Mondo, descritte da Thomaso Porcacchi," Venetia, 1576, p. 186).
measurement should not, however, be taken too literally, as it is, no doubt, meant to be merely approximate. We may therefore assume, without fear of being too much on the erring side, that the Zunda capital city, if not the actual Indrapura (S. lat. 2° 1' circá), must have lain not far lower down the coast, perhaps no further than the modern Bengkūlen settlement and the neighbouring well-sheltered Pulau Bay, into which the Selebar (or Salabar) River discharges. As regards the kingdom of Zunda itself, it must have comprised the whole of the intervening tract of sea-coast, extending perhaps even so far down as Sunda Strait. It is difficult to judge, in the state of our present knowledge, whether the name Zunda came to the kingdom in question from its being settled by tribes of the Sunda nation, or whether on the other hand that name is a mere misspelling for Sindha, Sindhu, or similar term, due to some mishap of Barbosa or of his informers. If, however, so slight a discrepancy in form prevents us from positively asserting the identity of Barbosa’s kingdom of Zunda with Chao Ju-kua’s Hsin-t’o State on linguistical grounds, there is fortunately such a perfect coincidence between the statements of the two authors as regards the quality of the pepper produced in either of the two countries named, as to convince us that, if they were not one and the same topographically, they must have been at least close neighbours, one being perhaps politically part (township, district, or province) of the other. We have seen, in fact, that both Barbosa and Chao Ju-kua speak of very small-grained pepper being found in, respectively, Zunda and Hsin-t’o, the latter authority adding besides that “the pepper coming from Hsin-t’o is the best.” Now, this little bit of apparently trifling information is of the greatest value in the present case, because of its being quite sufficient by itself to establish the position of Hsin-t’o on the west coast of Sumatra, where most later travellers are agreed that the best pepper coming from that island was produced.¹

¹ Beaulieu (A.D. 1621) says the kingdom of Indrapura produces pepper of the same quality as Jambi (which is better than Indragiri’s); at Pasaman, however, the pepper grows to perfection, and it is here that the pepper-gardens.
There is further the circumstance that while in Barbosa's list of the Sumatran kingdoms the first one of them mentioned as coming immediately after Menangkabau on the south is Zunda, in the enumeration made a century later by Beaulieu Indrapura is inserted instead, thus taking the place of Barbosa's Zunda.¹ There does not seem to have ever existed any other kingdom on the west coast of Sumatra and to the south of the Menangkabau State except this one of Indrapura, which is, at any rate, the only one in that position to which reference is made in the accounts of the early European travellers. We may therefore conclude with sufficient reason that Indrapura is the realm Barbosa meant by his term Zunda and Chao Ju-kua by his designation Hsin-t'ou. No doubt the ancient name of this State or of its capital was something like Sinda or Sindhu, terms which probably still commence. Tikú produces still more; but at Príaman it is less plentiful, and at Pádang and Menangkabau scarce (see Prévost's "Hist. Gén. des Voyages," vol. ix, 1751, pp. 340 and 341). Mandelala tells us ("Voyage aux Indes Orientales," Amsterdam, 1727, t. i, p. 354): "Le poivre de Sumatra est sans doute le meilleur de toutes les Indes, après celui de Cochim." And Crawford still more explicitly remarks ("History of the Indian Archipelago," Edinburgh, 1820, vol. i, p. 482): "Those countries of the Archipelago ... in which pepper comes to the greatest perfection ... [are] the south-west coast of Sumatra, the north coast of Borneo, and the eastern coast of the Malay Peninsula. Java, so famous for the fertility of its soil, produces the worst pepper of the Archipelago." This makes it perfectly clear that Hsin-t'ou—which, we have demonstrated, was undoubtedly part of Sumatra—could not have been situated elsewhere on that island but its south-west coast. Strange to say, Jean Parmentier, in his Journal, refers to Indrapura under the name of Andripouvre, probably in allusion to the quantity of pepper therein produced (see Millies "Monnaies des Indigènes," etc., p. 68, note 1).

¹ In Barbosa's list the kingdoms are referred to in the following order:—
(1) Pedir, on the north side towards Malacca; (2) Paeem (Pasıa); (3) Achew (Ahêb); (4) Campar, opposite Malacca (E. coast); (5) Menaceabo (Menangkabau), on the south side (W. coast); (6) Zunda on the south side (W. coast); (7) Andragide (Indragiri); (8) Auru (Aru or Haru). Beaulieu, after pointing out that Pádang and Deli bound on either side the kingdom of Achêb, proceeds to say: "Au Levant, près de la ligne, est le petit Royaume d'Andugt [Indragiri]; plus loin, celui de Jambi [Jambi], les plus riche après Achêb; ensuite, celui de Pulimbam [Palembang]. A l'ouest, après Páulang, suit le Royaume de Ménacibo [Menang-kabau], puis celui d'Andripouvre [Indrapura]. Le reste de la côte, jusqu'au détroit de la Sonde, est désert et couvert de bois" (Prévost, op. cit., vol. ix, p. 339).

In the letter from the Sultan of Achêb to King James I of England, dated A.D. 1624 = A.D. 1612 (published in the Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 31, July, 1898, p. 123), the last districts or places of any importance mentioned on the west coast of Sumatra are Bengkula (now known as Bengkulu) and Salibar (= Selebar, a little further south); the preceding ones being Indrapura, Sâldâ, Príaman, Tikú, Pasaman, Bârus, Dâyâ, and Chalang.
survive in the Sindang River and village near Indrapura, in the Sindang district on the hill-tracts to the north-east of Bengkûlen, and in the settlements, river, and district of Sindar, Sintu, and Sindur in the same neighbourhood, to which reference has already been made. The islands fronting the tract of sea-coast in question came naturally to be styled by the early navigators 'Islands of Sindar,' and they most assuredly are, by reason of both name and geographical position, those that Ptolemy has recorded under the term Sindai, which his Latin translators have transcribed as Sindae Insulae. This insular group thus proves, as we have pointed out, to be identical with the one of which the two islands now called Pageh, Pagai, or Pagi, lying so close to each other as to be easily mistaken for a single one, form the centre. Here, again, the old term Sindar seems to survive in slight disguise in the islet of Sandion, otherwise known as Pulo Sandion, lying fourteen miles south-eastward of South Pageh. Although the present inhabitants of these islands are described as simple and inoffensive, we have seen there are good reasons for presuming that the epithet of cannibals applied by Ptolemy to their remote predecessors was not altogether undeserved. From the fact that some modern ethnologists affiliate the natives of Nias on the one side and of Engano on the other to the Batta stock while others consider them to be cross-breeds between Battas and Negritos, it would seem that the early population of the intervening Pageh islands cannot have been of a far different nature, and that if not actual anthropophagy, at any rate head-hunting must have been in full swing at the period when Ptolemy compiled his treatise.

In the course of the foregoing notes on the insular groups located by Ptolemy off the west coast of Sumatra I have assumed throughout that they actually were what he represents them to be, namely, clusters of islands corresponding to those known to us to exist opposite the west coast of that
island. But from the fact of the insular groups in question being recorded in the Ptolemaic list under names belonging to places on the Sumatran seaboard, it might be argued that the portions of the littoral of the main island after which they were named may also have been believed to form as many separate islands, and may, for this reason, have been respectively included in the groups aforesaid. If so, it would appear that the west coast of Sumatra was, in Ptolemy's time, known to navigators only at the points opposite the islands he names, and that such points were not well understood to be part and parcel of one and the same large island until many centuries later, when the Sumatran coastline stood thoroughly revealed. This was undoubtedly the case with I-tsing and the Arab travellers and geographers, who describe districts situated on the Sumatran seaboard as if each were an island in itself. In so far as Ptolemy is concerned he seems, indeed, from what we shall see in the sequel, not to have had a definite idea of the size of Sumatra. He had apparently some substantial knowledge only of the portion of the island corresponding to the actual district of Palembang, and had heard of Achêh, the capital of the island, as being situated in the western extreme of the latter; but he was evidently far from suspecting that Achêh was so far away, hence he assigned to the island only two degrees dimension in longitude. He had, of course, learned of several groups of islands lying off its west coast and bearing names corresponding to places on the seaboard opposite them, but he, as well as his informants, was probably quite unaware that these places formed part of one and the same island, just like the travellers and geographers who followed after him for many centuries; hence there is nothing improbable that he thought those places to be as many separate islets, and that he included them among the insular groups he mentions. I am therefore inclined to conclude that the clusters of islands he locates in this quarter presumably represent not only islands fronting the west coast of Sumatra, but also the corresponding portions of the Sumatran seaboard opposite those islands, after which the latter have, in the
majority of instances, been named. These considerations apply especially to the two groups of the Barusai and Sindai, in which it is very probable that the districts respectively of Bārus (like Fansūr with most Arab geographers) and Sinda or Indrapura are included as if each were an island belonging to those groups. Be it as it may, I hope at any rate to have conclusively demonstrated what is the actual location that should be assigned to the groups of islands in question in our maps, a task that has hitherto been looked upon as hopeless by all our modern commentators and dissertationists on the Ptolemaic geography of the Eastern Archipelago.

C. Sumatra.

Iabadiū or Sabadiū, an island (No. 126).

Ptolemy's information as regards this island is to the effect that its name means the 'Island of Barley.' "It is said to be of extraordinary fertility, and to produce very much gold, and to have its capital, called Argyrē [No. 127], in the extreme west of it." ¹

On account of a similarity in names, most of Ptolemy's elucidators have identified this island with Java. But Ptolemy's explanations show it beyond any possible doubt to be Sumatra. No gold whatever appears to have ever been found in Java, while it is notoriously plentiful in Sumatra. No city by a name approaching that of Argyrē is known to exist in the west of Java ²; whereas we shall show it does in the "extreme west" of Sumatra, and corresponds to the present Achēḥ or Achīn. It remains to account for the name

¹ McCrindle's translation, p. 239, § 29.
² A place called Argyapura (i.e. 'High City'), where relics of antiquity have been found, exists at an elevation of 9,000 feet above sea-level, on a mountain towards the eastern end of the island. But this cannot have anything to do with Argyrē, both from its location in a diametrically opposite direction, and from its name which, in Ptolemaic transcription, would have assumed a form similar to that of Aganagara ( supra, p. 332).
Iaba-diū = Yava-dīpa, 'Island of Barley'—better, perhaps, to say of millet—which is taken to apply solely to Java. This is most certainly a mistake, as it is probably also to hold that the name means barley or millet. The name of the island is, it is true, spelled Yava (Yava-dīpa) in the Sanskrit inscriptions discovered in its very territory; but in the speech and literature of the whole archipelago it does not appear otherwise than as Jáva or Jáva, while Java or Javā are the forms that obtain in all the neighbouring countries, among which I may mention Campā, Kamboja, and Siām.

It should besides be pointed out at the very outset of this inquiry that, although the expression Nusa Jáva (the 'Island of Java,' or, still better, of the Java race) occurs in the legendary tales of the Javanese, the term Jáva does not by any means seem to have ever been locally applied to the island itself as a whole, but merely, as Crawfurd declares, to its 'central and eastern provinces, those portions occupied by the Javanese race, strictly so called,' whereas its western part appears to have never been designated otherwise than as Tānah Sunda, i.e. the 'Sunda country.'

1 Yava-dīpa does not mean, as has been thoughtlessly said and repeated, the country of the barley, for the simple reason that barley could not grow there; but instead of barley we must read millet, of which there are different varieties indigenous in the island, many of them called by the generic name Jawa. It is not impossible that the first Hindus found this cereal used instead of rice, and that the latter was introduced by them. (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 132, note.)

2 It equally occurs in the form Yava in the Pāgar-rāyung inscription of A.D. 656 in Central Sumatra—of which more anon—as a name for the powerful kingdom then flourishing there, which probably held sway over the whole island. This shows the absurdity of making the term in question an exclusive appurtenance of the island of Java, as has been most recklessly done by every writer who has treated the subject hitherto. All evidence is in favour, as we shall see directly, of the term having been imported into Java from Sumatra, which appears to be entitled to priority in respect of its use.

3 Jawa in the Campā inscription of King Indravarman I, dated 721 Śaka (=799 A.D.), Javā in the Khmer inscription of Sodok Kok Thom, belonging to the reign of Jayavarman II, who ascended the throne in A.D. 802. (See Bergaigne's 'Champā,' loc. cit., p. 56.) This form Javā is also the one we have noticed at Lūang Phrāb Bāng, where it is pronounced Sāva (cf. Saba, Sabādī, Zaba, Zābej). In Siāmese it is invariably spelled Jēa, Jēva; but it must be remembered that final a's in Sanskrit or Pāli words are nearly always lengthened in Siāmese; hence the Siāmese and Khmer Javā may be taken to represent the Sanskrit Jawa. The same remark applies to the Annamese chá-ra.

4 Crawfurd's 'History of the Indian Archipelago,' vol. i, p. 322.

5 Cf. Millies' 'Monaies des Indigènes,' etc., p. 7; and Dennys' 'Descriptive Dictionary of British Malaya,' p. 390, s.v. Tunah.
The appellation Java for the entire island is not, perhaps, so much a poetical fiction of native bards as an invention of foreign merchants and travellers who came to adopt it owing to the fact of their having, naturally, been brought in touch mainly with the eastern part of the island, the very district that exclusively bore that designation, because of its being then the centre of culture and trade; so that in the course of time the term Java became to them suggestive of the island itself. I have, nevertheless, remarked how some of our old travellers, such as, for instance, Barbosa, as well as the early Portuguese historians of the East Indies, used to distinguish between Java (the eastern part of the island) and Sunda (the western part), thus believing them to form two different islands.

The next important point on which I feel compelled to lay considerable stress is, that all over the Archipelago and Indo-Chinese mainland the term Java is not viewed in the light of a toponymic proper, but is, on the contrary, distinctly understood to be a racial name, and even when used singly, in a topographical sense, it invariably means 'country of the Java (in Malay جاوا, Jawa or Jáwa) race.'

In such an acceptance, we have seen, the range of this term is far from being confined to the sole eastern part of Java, which would, indeed, seem to have been, in point of time, about the latest place and, geographically, the furthest limit to which it extended. Already I have in a former section (pp. 131 and 150) dwelt upon the connection between Java and Yueana, and shown that this was the name of the Môn-Annam race; that race which overspread the whole

---

1 "Bilâd el Jâwah, the country of the Jâwah (plur. Jâwâh or Jâwâ) or Jâwi (plur. Jâwâ or Jâwîyân), means in Arabia every country inhabited by Malays. This is from Siâm and Malacca to New Guinea" (A. G. C. van Duyl in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for April, 1895, p. 435, note).

جوابی, "Jâwi = 'bastard, or of mixed race.' The Arabs apply this term to Javanese, Malays, and other natives of the Archipelago" (Denny's "Descriptive Dictionary of British Malaya," p. 168, s.v.). In Kamboja, Annam, and Siâm Oêvä, Châ-uô, 楚吧, and O'hauô, respectively, mean properly the Malays of the Peninsula and Sumatra, but not at all the Javanese.
of Indo-China and most of the Malay Archipelago before
the advent of populations of a more decided Mongolic type.
I have also pointed out that the territory originally occupied
by the innumerable tribes of this complex race was Southern
China or Yüeh; and that Yüan, meaning 'a plateau' or
'high level,' and also a people of mountaineers on the
southern Chinese borders, was either one of its names or
that of one of its branches. Whether Yüeh and Yüan are
derivations of the Sanskrit Jawa, Javan, and Yavana, or
they were original terms modified afterwards by Indo-
settlers into the latter mentioned classical forms, it is for
the present impossible to determine. The same may be said
of the term Māla, the Sanskrit equivalent of the Chinese
Yüan which we find embodied in the name of the Malay
people. I have suggested (pp. 130–131 ante) that it was,
most probably, introduced from Malaya-vāra, i.e. Malabar,
whence a stream of Dravidian emigrants is known for certain
to have flowed into the Malay Archipelago and Peninsula.
But there is the fact that the same term Māla was applied
to the region originally occupied by the Ch'hieng or Yüan,
corresponding to the present territory of Laos; and that it
was there probably coexistent with the term Javā which we
have traced at Luang P'hraḥ Bāŋ as well as in southern
Cochin-China. It may therefore that the term Māla
travelled down from north Indo-China to the Archipelago
hand in hand with its cognate vocable Javā. This conjecture
would seem to receive support from the fact that we find
the term Jawa in the Archipelago under both the identical
forms, Jawa or Jaba and Sava or Saba, that we have met
with at Luang P'hraḥ Bāŋ and Saigon (v. p. 218). And
we have it, very likely under both forms also in Burmā,
brought thither, no doubt, by the same branches of the Yüan
or Ch'hieng race that spread it through Indo-China and the
Malay Archipelago. 1 Hence it is a most egregious mistake

1 Bishop Pallegoix—in the map at the end of the first volume of his work
"Le Royaume Thai ou de Siam," and in his "Dictionarium Linguae Thai"
(Paris, 1854), pp. 883, 884, s.v. Xāes—locates a district or township by the name
of Mūang Xāes (more correctly Ch'heā or C'hawēā) on the Malay Peninsula, near
to localize the term Java or Jaba, with its variant Sava or Saba, to the present island of Java alone, since it was the common designation for the whole archipelago, or, at any rate, for those portions of it that had been settled by the Javana or Yavana race, besides being the name of several

the Kra Isthmus and the mouth of the Pak-Chan River. In the map he has it noted as "Pak-cham or Xava." Crawford, in the map appended to the first volume of his "Embassy to Siam and Cochinchina," London, 1830, has "Pakchan or Chauva." This is a mistake. The place meant is a village—now called Ban Chauva ('Village of the Javas')—situated, it is true, at the height of the entrance to the Pak-Chan inlet, but on the opposite, or eastern, watershed of the Malay Peninsula, and near the place where the present district of Chauer borders upon that of Long-suen. It was probably at one time an important settlement of Javas or Malays. Now it is known chiefly for its turtle-doves, which are of small size, but very much prized and sought after as pets on account of their cooing note being, it is said, far more melodious and varied than that of similar birds of other districts. There exists nevertheless a rivulet debouching on the eastern side of the Pak Ch'am inlet, a little below Krah, bearing the name Sava (Khlong Sawá); and in an east by south direction from this, on the opposite or eastern watershed of the Peninsula, a similarly named stream, Khlong Sawa, gives its name to Sawf Bay, a very conspicuous and well-sheltered recess in the coast, and to a village on its banks. Moreover, the Annals of Ayuthia (Siamese edition, p. 21) make mention of a country or principality of Chau (Manx Ch'au), i.e. Jàva, among the sixteen States tributary to Ayuthia at the time of its foundation (A.D. 1360), which may correspond to the above territory about Ban or Manx Ch'au, etc., immediately below the Krah Isthmus, and may at the same time be the mysterious Mul-Jaivah at which Ibn Batutá called in A.D. 1345. See, however, below for further remarks.

As to the name Java being applied to the whole or part of Sumatra, we have the evidence: (1) of the Kedah Annals (ch. 13, Low's translation in Journal Indian Archipelago, vol. iii) that Achin, or Acheh, was called the country of Jàwi (Jawi); (2) of Ibn Batutá, who records Sumatra in 1345—6 under the name of 'Island of Jàivah (or Jàvah)' (see Defrémery & Sanguinetti's ed. and transl., tome iv, p. 228); and (3) the still more decisive and far older testimony of the Pàgar-râyung inscription in the central part of the island (Menang-kaban district), dating from A.D. 656, where King Aditya-dharma is called the ruler of the 'First (or Primeval) Land of Java,' Pratämha-Yàva-Bhà, meaning, apparently, the first kingdom founded by the Yava or Java race in Sumatra, or, still better, in the Archipelago (see Journal Bombay Br. R.A.S., June, 1861, Appendix, p. lxvii),. It should be mentioned, however, that the natives of Nias speak of the Malays of Sumatra as Dava, a term which evidently is but a corruption of Jave or Java, especially as the Battak apply to the same people on their borders the slightly different denomination of Jaw (eide Van der Lith & M. Devic's 'Merveilles de l'Inde,' p. 238).

In Burma (and Pegu) we have traced the name Java under most of its forms: Jaba, Sava, Saba, and Dava or Daba, and shown (p. 56) how Chinese writers tell us that the country was called by the natives Tsú-lo-shà Shà-p'o, while they state further that Shà-p'o was the name of one of the eighty kingdoms tributary to P'iao (Lower Burma). It should be observed that this term Shà-p'o is in Chinese spelled with the same characters as those employed to render the name of the supposed island of Java, viz. 閩婆, although the first syllable Ja, Da, or Sa is sometimes written in the case of the latter in the former社, and at times社, which read, respectively, Tsu (Du) and Shà (Sha, Ja). Hence, Shà-p'o may represent either Jave, Jaba, Sava, Saba, Daba, or Daeva.
regions on the Indo-Chinese mainland. It is only by keeping this fact well in mind that we can understand how, up to the periods of Marco Polo’s, Ibn Batūta’s, and Nicolò Conti’s travels, not so much the present island of Java itself, but more particularly those of Sumatra and Borneo and parts of the Malay Peninsula, were known by the common name *Java*.

The most ancient Chinese forms of this term are to be met with: (1) in Fa-Hsien, who visited the Archipelago on his return voyage from Ceylon to China, a.d. 414, as 那婆提, *Ya-p’o-t’i* (in Annamese *Jā-bā-dē* = *Yavadi*, *Yabadi*, *Jābaj*); (2) in the history of the First Sung dynasty (bk. 97), under the date a.d. 435, as 達婆達, *Shē-p’o-ta* or *Tu-p’o-t’a*¹ (which is, however, almost certainly a clerical slip for *Shē-p’o* and *P’o-ta*, two distinct though neighbouring States, of which *Shē-p’o* or *Tu-p’o*, Ann. *Chā-bā* = *Jāba*, *Saba*, *Dāca*,

¹ The history of the Later Sung dynasty, as well as Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 499), ascribes the embassy of a.d. 435 to a State called simply *Shē-p’o* (達婆達). So does the *Pien-i-tien*, which mentions, apparently incorrectly, a still earlier embassy in 433; while the history of the First Sung dynasty says the mission of 435 came from a kingdom named 達婆達, *Shē-p’o-ta*. It is the *Nan-shih*, according to Professor Schlegel (*T’oung-Pao*, vol. x, p. 252), which solely employs the contracted (?) form *Shē-p’o-ta* adopted by Groeneveldt in his translation (op. cit., p. 135), and rendered by him as *Javada*. I have not the slightest doubt that two States are here implied, one of which is *Shē-p’o* and the other *P’o-ta*. A kingdom of this name is, in fact, referred to by Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 508) as having sent missions with presents to China in a.d. 449 and 451. Like *Shē-p’o*, *P’o-ta* was almost certainly situated on the Malay Peninsula, and very likely corresponds to Tavernier’s *Bata*, of which more anon. Nieuhoff, writing in a.d. 1662, mentions a pretty large island called *Satpa*, lying at two leagues from Malacca (see Denny’s “Descript. Dict. of Brit. Malaya,” p. 209), which seems to be the one now called Pulo Besar, the largest of the Agudas or Water Islands, situated at seven miles south-eastward of Malacca town. I should not think, however, that either this island *Satpa* or any similarly named place on that coast (such as, e.g., *Sapetang*, otherwise known as Port Weld) have anything to do with the old *Shē-p’o-ta* or *Shē-p’o-p’o-ta*, the resemblance in names being purely accidental. *Shē-p’o-ta* is undoubtedly a faulty reading for *Shē-p’o-P’o-ta*, and this, notwithstanding the amusing vagaries of our Sinologists to restore the name to its supposed original form, is a binary compound of the names of two States, and not the exclusive designation of a single one.
is the only one falling within the scope of this list); and (3) in the travels of Yüan-chuang or Hwên-tsang (A.D. 629–645) as 阇摩耶洲國, Yen-mo-na (Yamana, Ramana, or Yabana, Yavana). Subsequent forms are: (4) during the T'ang (A.D. 618–907), 阇婆, 社婆, or 社婆, Shê-p'ô (Saba, Saca, Jaba, Daba, etc.), this name being applied to a country otherwise called 詩陵, Ho-ling (Haling, Halang, Khalang); (5) 阇婆, Shê-p'ô (Jaba, etc.), under the Sung (A.D. 960–1280); and (6) later on, in the Yüan period (A.D. 1280–1368), 粗, Chan-ka, sometimes mis-spelt 粗, Kua-ka, which remained thenceforward in use.

1 Even shortly before that this State of Shê-p'ô is mentioned as having been visited by Guṇavarman, grandson of a former king of Kābul, on his way from Ceylon to China, A.D. 424, according to the Kwai-Yuen Catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka, compiled in 730 A.D. (See Journal R.A.S., April, 1903, p. 369.)

2 Yen-mo-na is placed by Yüan-chuang to the south-west of Mahā Campā, hence it must be either part of the Malay Peninsula or Sumatra. Eitel ("Handbook of Chinese Buddhism," 2nd ed., p. 208) explains: "Yavana or Yamana deva-pura or Yavadeva (Pāli: Yavana or Yona), lit. the island kingdom of Yamana, or 野魔尼 (Yamani) or 耶婆提 (Yavadeva). The island of Java (sic), described (by Fa-hien and Huien-tsang) as peopled by Brahmans and other heretics." I think that this country, or insular region, may correspond to either the Yama-deva or the Ramanaka-deva of, respectively, the Vāyu and the Bhāgavata Purāṇas. In another of the eight minor diviṣas enumerated in the last-named work, Āvatrāna (Dāvatrāna?), we may have the prototype of the very doubtful Chinese Shê-p'ô-ta (Dāvatra?). At all events, it seems very probable that Yen-mo-na (Yamana or Yamani) and Raman or Ramanaka are identical with the island of Rāmī, Rāmin, or Ramni of the Arab travellers and geographers, which is, in my opinion, the district otherwise called Lāmri, Lāmri, etc., i.e. the north-western part of Sumatra (Marco Polo's Lumbri). On the other hand, Yen-mo-na, if taken as a transcript of Yavana, Jabana, Sabana, may well designate the same district on the south-west coast of the Malay Peninsula where Ptolemy has located his cart of Sabana (for which see pp. 100–101 ante). It is not unlikely that Captain Bozorg's island of Armanān (Ramanam?) is somehow connected with Yen-mo-na and Ramanaka, although I am inclined to refer it to either the Andāmān or the Anamba groups. It will be seen, in any case, that Yüan-chuang's Yen-mo-na island or district must be sought for on either the south of the Malay Peninsula or the northern part of Sumatra, and that it can in no wise be connected with Java. I shall revert more fully to these points later on.

3 See Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 131 seq., and Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 494 and 525.
Of all these forms only the last given, Chau-wa or Chica-wa, applies to the island of Java, while the others designate, as I shall show, parts of the east coasts of Sumatra and of the Malay Peninsula. It will be seen that the first two are remarkably similar to Ptolemy’s renderings Iabadiū and Sabadiū. They may be abbreviations of the term Yava-deīpa or Java-deīpa; but then, as Groeneveldt properly remarks,1 such shortened forms must have been generally used at that time, for if the Indī colonists had called the island by its full name, Fa-Hsien for one, who knew Sanskrit, would have transcribed it according to that form. So would have Ptolemy, who elsewhere writes Nagadiba, Nagadiboi, Sabadeibai, Trikadiba;2 and the Arabs, who have Serendib, Dība-jāt, etc.3 And yet in this particular instance Sulaimān, Masʿūdī, and other Arab writers, following the example of Ptolemy and Fa-Hsien, write Zābej, and not Zabedīb. The natural inference to be derived from a comparison of the three forms Iabadiū, Ya-p’o-t’i (Yabadi), and Zābej, belonging respectively to the second, fifth, and ninth centuries, is, that they are identical or at least of a common origin, and designate one and the same country. It follows, then, that if we succeed in locating any one of these three names, the identification will hold good for the other two as well. The information left us in this respect by Ptolemy (apart from his geographical determination) and Fa-Hsien is too vague to be of much avail; while that supplied by later Chinese writers and the Arab navigators, though confused to a degree, is more rich in details and useful.

We shall try to find out our way through the maze of Chinese and Arabic geographical riddles, and evolve some order out of that chaos instead of remaining content with

---

2 Lib. vii. ch. 4, §§ 9, 13; ch. 2, § 28; ch. 1, § 95.
3 Reinaud, op. cit., t. i. pp. lv, lvi, Discours préliminaire; and p. 5 transl. Divā, dība, bīva, dīvā, etc. = Skr. deīpa, Pāli dīpa. Ammianus Marcellinus (lib. 22, cap. vii) uses the term divīs: “Inde nationibus Indicis certatim cum donis optimates mittentibus ante tempus abusque Divis et Serendivis,” in which passage Divis and Serendivis correspond, respectively, to Sulaimān’s Dība-jāt and Serendib.
taking it for granted—as has been slovenly done by the writers who have preceded us—that one and all of the terms in question apply solely to the Island of Java, no matter how illogical such a course may be, and though by it the progress of historical geography be impeded. It is time that the absurdity of such a priori methods should be exposed, and researches instituted in a rational manner as behoves an age like the present one, when empiricism and theorism may well be said to have had their day.

It is beyond doubt, as I shall demonstrate, that in the good old mediæval days the Chinese and Arabs alike used to distinguish very clearly between at least two, if not three, regions all bearing the name Java, Yava, or Dava, one of which was situated in the present Northern Burma, the second in the Malay Peninsula, and the third (if any) in Sumatra.

I. The Chinese Evidence.

In commenting upon the attack made upon Tonkin (Kiāu-
chau) by the populations of Java (in either the Malay Peninsula or Sumatra) and K'un-lun (Malay Peninsula), in A.D. 767, the Annamese annalists quote from the T'ang Shu and other contemporary Chinese works the following explanations:

A.—“One kingdom of Dà-bà or Ch'á-hà-vâ [in Chinese, 閩婆, Shé-p'o'] was Java of the mountains [Highland Java] or Chau-lang, commonly called Dōt-lâ.1 It bordered on the east on Upland Chên-la [Upper or 'Fire' Kamboja]; on the west on Eastern India2; on the south it belonged to the maritime region [Gulf of Martaban]; and on the north it

1 For Dōt-lâ-chu, the Chinese 突羅雀閩婆, Tu-là-chu Shé-p'o, for which see note on next page.

2 天竺, Tien-chu, here no doubt meant for Bengal, although this province is said to lie in the east of Tien-chu by Chao Ju-kua. (See Journal R.A.S., 1896, p. 496.)
was conterminous with [the territory of Hsieh-lo³ of] the Nam-châu [Nan Chao, 南 詔] country. It had under its rule eighteen lesser kingdoms."²

The boundaries here described are, it will be seen, exactly those assigned in other accounts to the kingdom of P'iau, 瑪³; and, indeed, the name T'u-lo-shu or T'u-lo-chu, otherwise spelt T'u-li-ch'ueh, 徒里 楓, is stated to be one by which the natives called the country termed P'iau in Chinese history.⁴ The eighteen lesser kingdoms are the eighteen tributary States of P'iau enumerated in the "T'u-shu-chi-ch'êng" (in circâ A.D. 1700), among which there was one likewise called 阿 婆, Shê-p'ô or T'u-p'ô, situated at eight days' march from the kingdom of P'o-hwei-ka-lu, 婆 贰伽廬, i.e. Pharûgara.⁵ It is, accordingly, evident that in the mind of the Chinese historians of the period Shê-p'ô corresponded at some time or other to P'iau (Lower Burma), and to a portion of P'iau (in Upper Burma). The name or title of the P'iau king was apparently, at the time of the embassy sent by this potentate to China in A.D. 802, 摩 羅 悼, Mo-lo-jê,⁶ a contraction of either Mara-râja, Mura-râja, or Mahā-râja (possibly Mayûra-râja). This kingdom of Highland Java or Dava we have identified with Daivaka (Dava country) = Upper Burma.⁷

¹ 些 樂. This toponymic, which has hitherto baffled the wits of our Sinologists, I have identified with the Cheioa of Ney Elias ("History of the Shans," p. 16), the ancient capital of the Thai Mâu or Thai Luang, superseded in the eleventh or twelfth century by the more modern Sê-Lân or Sê-Rân. It stood, like the latter, on the left bank of the Nam-Mâu (Shwê-li River), in lat. 23° 57', long. 97° 53'.

³ Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 230.
⁴ Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 228.
⁵ Ibid., p. 231, note; and supra, p. 44.
⁶ Ibid., p. 232.
⁷ Vide p. 55 ante. Mr. E. H. Parker says in his "Burma" (Rangoon, 1893), p. 11: "The Javanese [i.e. the people of Shê-p'ô] (i.e. the emissaries of Hindu kingdoms in Java) who visited China said that the P'iao or Pyu called themselves Dulichu (or some such word), and that their territory was bounded by Cambogia, East India, Yûnman, and the sea." Here, evidently, what is glibly rendered as Javanese and Java is simply Shê-p'ô, that is, the State of that name on the Malay Peninsula. The same writer once more tells us, in the China Review, vol. xxi, p. 43: "... the king of the Pyu... also sent a mission [A.D. 802]. The envoys of Java [Shê-p'ô] then in China gave
B.—“There was another kingdom of *Ha-lak* [?] \(^1\) called *Châ-vâ* (Java), afterwards *Châ-vâ Kwok* [in Chinese, *She-p'o* or *She-p'o Kwô*], far off in the southern sea.” \(^2\) This is the *She-p'o* of Sung history, mentioned since A.D. 992 with a king 穆羅 茶, *Mu-lo-ch'a*.\(^3\) “Jâu-chê [Tonkin], say the Annamese annalists, attacked this kingdom with 30,000 troops and subdued it.” \(^4\) An earlier embassy is stated in Sung history to have been despatched by this country to the Chinese an account of the Pyu, and indeed some passages in Chinese history distinctly say that ‘Java is another name for Pyu.’ Doubtless the mistake arose through the civilizations being largely identical, both being Hindoo” [!!].

No comments are needed on the reckless manner of treatment of historical geography followed in the above extracts, which is unfortunately but too typical of modern Sinology. Fancy Javanese envouys giving, and that too at the dawn of the ninth century A.D., an account of the country and people of Burma! Far more reasonably one might have expected Cypriotes or Cretans supplying the Andalusians, at about the same period, with a report on the customs and institutions of, say, Helsingeland or the Chudes.

The term *Tu-lo-shu* (= *Triâlikâ*, vide p. 31 ante), I have since identified—as I shall more fully explain in one of the addenda at the end of the present volume—with the *Disurv* mentioned in one of Andrea Corsali’s letters dated A.D. 1515, and printed in “Ramusio,” vol. i, p. 180. Strange to say, the term is forcibly suggestive of *Tulâkṣtra*, a name of district occurring in the Sanskrit MSS. from Nepal, commented upon by A. Foucher in his “Iconographie Bouddhique de l’Inde” (Paris, 1906), pp. 58, 178, 191, 210. However, those MSS. tell us that *Varddhamâna* is the country of *Tulâkṣtra*. Now, if *Varddhamâna* be really meant for Bardvân, as Foucher assumes (p. 58), which lies at some sixty miles north-west of Calcutta, *Tulâkṣtra* would prove to be a district of Bengal, and have nothing to do with *Tu-lo-shu* or *Tu-li-chwo*. But may not *Varddhamâna* be meant, in the case in point, for either Bhâmô (*Varma-pura*, see p. 42 above) or some district in Lower Burma, e.g. Jayavarddhamâna, i.e. Tônû? The resemblance between *Tu-lo-shu* or *Tu-li-chwo* (Ann. Dô-li-chwiet) and *Tulâkṣtra* is too striking to justify the identification of the latter with the former, well-known to us from Chinese sources, rather than with a hypothetical *Tulâkṣtra* in Western Bengal, which has never been heard of elsewhere in Indian literature.

\(^1\) As no native characters are supplied for this term it is difficult to guess what is meant. Should the spelling be 哈, 剌, *Ha-la, Ka-la*, the reference might be to the *Ha-la* tribe, a tattooing branch of the Sakai people still to be found in the Perak district on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula. (See Newbold’s “British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca,” London, 1839, vol. i, p. 421, and vol. ii, p. 383.) Or is the connection with the state of *Ha-la-tan* or *Ka-la-tan* referred to hereafter, or with the *Kalâh*, ‘island’ of the Arabs?

\(^2\) Aymonier, op. cit., p. 9.

\(^3\) Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 494, 499; and Groeneveld, op. cit., p. 143, where the last character in the king’s name is misprinted 茶.

\(^4\) Aymonier, loc. cit.
China in A.D. 821, under the reign of Mu Tsung.\(^1\) Another mission of A.D. 435 is, in Later Sung history, recorded as having been the first one sent by Shê-p'o, whereas in the annals of the First Sung it is ascribed to Shê-p'o-P'o-ta.\(^2\) Gunavarman, we have seen (p. 463), visited this State of Shê-p'o in A.D. 424 on his way from Ceylon to China.

On the island of Shê-p'o a State named Ho-lo-tan, 阿羅單, is mentioned as having sent several missions to China between A.D. 430 and 452.\(^3\) It is therefore almost certain that the Shê-p'o of A.D. 821–992 was identical with the Shê-p'o, 'island,' of A.D. 430–452, the Shê-p'o spoken of in a breath with P'o-ta (Shê-p'o-P'o-ta) in A.D. 435, and the Shê-p'o visited by Gunavarman, A.D. 424. The name of the king who despatched the mission to China in A.D. 435 is recorded as 師黎婆達陀阿

---

\(^1\) Toung-Pao, vol. x, p. 253, where the date is given as 820. But Mu Tsung reigned A.D. 821–825.

\(^2\) Ibid. See also p. 463 ante.

\(^3\) See Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 505–506. Parker thus translates, in the China Review, vol. xvi, p. 301, a passage from the "P'ei-wen Yün-fu" relative to the State in question: "The State of Ho-lo-tan has its capital at Shê-p'o Chên." The characters 阿婆, he adds, "are pronounced as 蛇婆 [Shê-p'o], the modern Japanese pronunciation being Jaba, i.e. Java, and not Aea as stated by Dr. Williams." Next he proceeds with his translation as follows: "Jaba State is in the South Sea; it is flat and suited for crops; in the year 1129 an officer was sent to confer a marshal's baton on the Lord of Java." In the China Review, vol. xiii, p. 384, the same Sinologist translates from the identical source: "The capital of Ho-lo-tan State is on Java island." Professor Schlegel, in Toung-Pao, vol. x, p. 249, renders the above passage as: "Kalatan in A.D. 430 ruled over the island of Shê-p'o." Hervey de Saint-Denys in his translation of Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 509) has: "le royaume [of Ho-lo-tan] est situé dans l'île de Che-po ou Tou-po [Shê-p'o, Tu-p'o]." It will thus be seen, owing to the discrepancies just quoted, that it is impossible to make out whether Shê-p'o was merely the name of the capital city of Ho-lo-tan State or that of the 'island' on which it was situated. The latter was more likely the case. The term Ho-lo-tan may stand for either Haradan, Halatan, Kaladan, Karañ, and the like. It may be compared with the Kalah and Kardan of Sulaiman, the Haranij of Serapion and Edrisi, and perhaps also with Ibn Batūta's Haradal (quality of camphor, possibly so named from the district where it was produced; vide supra, pp. 437, 441). It may, on the other hand, designate the same country as 話羅且, Kou-lo-tan (=Kulâta?), a State mentioned early in the seventh century as lying to the south of Ch'ih-t'un (Sukhothai, Siâm, see p. 179 above). Either, or both of them, may be now represented by the Krut district on the west coast of the Gulf of Siâm (lat. 11° 24' N., circ., by Gurôt (Karûta?) in the Ghrbi district on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula (vide supra, pp. 95, 97); and possibly, though it seems very unlikely, by Kalantan on the east coast of the latter. My view inclines in favour of Gurôt for Ho-lo-tan. This term may, however, be simply a transcript of the Malay word Kraton, meaning a 'fort' or 'citadel.'
FURTHER INDIA AND

羅跋摩,št Shih-li P’o-ta T’o-a-lo-pa-mo = Śri-Bhatta (Bata, Vata, Varta, or Vardhha)-dara (or dhara?) padma (or varma, varman), where P’o-ta is spelt with the same characters as occur in the name of the State of P’o-ta itself.

The situation of Shē-p’o was past San-fo-ch’i (Palembang) in coming from China, for in A.D. 904-5 San-fo-ch’i is described as lying between Chēn-la (Kamboja) and Shē-p’o.

Furthermore, in A.D. 992, Shē-p’o is stated to have had as neighbour a country called 婆羅門, P’o-lo-mên, where the natives “had the secret of looking into people’s minds; whenever anybody wanted to do them mischief they knew it beforehand.” In this connection it should be observed that under the date A.D. 802 we are told of P’iau (Lower Burmā)

1 Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 499, and Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 135. In Ma Tuan-lin the fifth and sixth characters are transposed, this portion of the name thus reading A-t’o-lo instead of T’o-a-lo. It is most unlikely that the State of P’o-ta is implied in the preceding words Shih-li-P’o-ta, which may mean simply Śri-bhadra (bhatta, vata, vata, etc.). As regards the State of P’o-ta, I have already pointed out (supra, p. 463) its very probable identity with Tavernier’s Bata. This famed traveller says, in fact, in V. Ball’s translation (“Travels in India, by J. B. Tavernier,” London, 1889, vol. ii, p. 162): “Some years ago [i.e. prior to 1645 cired] very rich mines of tin were discovered at Delegore, Sangore, Bordelon, and Bata,” of which places the translator gives us the magnificient equivalents of “Delli (?) Salangor, Billiton, and Banka (?)” [N.B.—The Bangka mines were only discovered, as Marsden informs us, in 1710 by the burning of a house!] We shall restore this barbarously mangled piece of historical geography by pointing out that the localities named are all to be found on the Malay Peninsula, and correspond respectively to Ligor, Singora, Phatallung, and mayhap Karidja (Chump’hân, so named from the islet Karidja marked on the old maps, which seems to be the one now called Koh Mattraj). Pathin, some twenty-seven miles above Chump’hôn, may also be meant, or even Bân-Dôn, below Ch’haiya, in about 9° 5’ N. lat.; in any case we may feel absolutely certain that Bata cannot be far away from the three places before named by Tavernier and identified by us as above. We may even take it for granted that it stood, like those, on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula. This Bata is, then, in all likelihood, the P’o-ta State of Chinese history, and Shē-p’o cannot have been very distant from it. I may add for completeness’ sake that in connection with the Ceylonese punitive expedition of cired 1175-1180 against Pegu, a Ceylonese chronicle appears to mention a seaport Sappattota on that coast, “over which Kurttipurapam was gourvernor” (Journal As. Soc. Bengal, vol. xii, pt. 1, p. 198). This toponymic Sappattota, if correct, is suggestive of the more fictitious than real Shē-p’o-ta. So is Ziv-bâd (i.e. ‘below the wind’), the term applied by Persian and Arab mediaeval writers to the countries of Further India and the Archipelago (see Abdur-Razzâk in “India in the Fifteenth Century,” pt. i, p. 6). But such resemblances in names are, of course, merely accidental, and should not be made the basis for serious rapprochements.

2 Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 559.
3 Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 145; and Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 502.
that near its capital there were "hills of sand and a barren waste which also borders on 北斯, Po-sz, and P'o-lo-mén, and is twenty days from the city of Si-shê-li (the Si-shê-li of the Buddhist classics is Central India)."1 Here Po-sz and P'o-lo-mén are almost certainly not meant for Persia and Brâhmaṇa-rāstra (India), but for some other similarly named countries in Further India. The second very probably corresponds to Brahma-deva, the country about Tagaung in Upper Burma.2

From the foregoing evidence it plainly follows that the situation of Shê-p'o must have been somewhere between

1 Parker's "Burma," p. 7.
2 The Sanskrit inscription discovered at Tagaung and dated Gupta Samvat 108 = A.D. 428, states that Hastināpura (Tagaung) is situated in Brahma-deva, which latter thus seems to be the region about Tagaung (see Dr. Führer's archaeological report for the year 1894). The P'o-lo-mén neighbour of Shê-p'o may, however, not have been the region just referred to, but some district largely settled by Brāhmans, of which there were several on the Malay Peninsula. Two well-known ones were Ligor and Phâttalung on its eastern coast; and as regards its west coast, Kazwiní, writing cive A.D. 1330, says that in Kalah there is a large city with plenty of gardens (which particular would suit well, among others, the Tenasserim and Phâung-ngâ, or Taküa-thüng, districts), which is a meeting-place for Brāhmans (see "Merveilles de l'Inde," p. 257). Doudart de Lagrée ("Explorations et Missions," 1883, p. 10) mentions C'hôva-Präma—i.e. Java-Brâhmanas, or Brāhmans from Java or C'hôva, C'havâ—as having settled at some unknown period in Kamboja, where descendants of them still exist. Tradition, he says, makes them hail originally from Benares; but there can be no doubt in my mind that they must have come from some Brāhmanic settlement founded by their forefathers on the Malay Peninsula, as their very designation, C'hôva or C'havâ, clearly implies.

As regards Po-sz, it might just as well refer to the Básisi (or Basisik, بيس tekst) tribe in the more southern parts of that coast. In cive 1240 Chao Ju-kua mentions a place identically called Po-sz or Po-su, of which Dr. Hirth remarks: "here probably not Persia, but some other country, which I have not been able to identify" (see Journal R.A.S., 1896, p. 479). On p. 429 ante we have seen the same name applied, according to Dr. Bretschneider, to part of the west coast of North Sumatra, from the fact of the Persians carrying on a large trade with that country and probably having colonies there. I shall revert to this point later on and show that the term Po-sz in the region in question has no connection whatever with Persians, although I fully admit the possibility of their having settled there in a certain number, as they did at many other trading centres in Further India. I-tsing in the seventh century tells us of their frequent navigations between East Sumatra and Canton (vide supra, p. 428); Kan-shin three-quarters of a century later (A.D. 748-749) finds an extensive Persian settlement in South Hainan (see Takakusu in the Proceedings of the "Premier Congrès des Études d'Extrême-Orient," Hanoi, 1903, pp. 58-59); Muhallabi (cive A.D. 1000), quoted by Abû-l-Fedâ, mentions Persians living in the city of the island of Kalah, and so forth. According to Dr. Bretschneider's theory, then, all these places should have become known to the Chinese as Po-sz, which was by no means the case; hence the untenability of the theory itself and its self-condemnation on its own showing.
San-fo-ch’i (Palembang) and P’iau (Lower Burma); that is, either in North Sumatra or on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula. The latter alternative seems to be the most probable, and in that case Shê-p’o State is very likely one and the same with the next.

C.—Finally, there existed a kingdom of 译陵, Ho-ling, which was likewise known by the name of Shê-p’o (A.D. 627-649), but which I-tsing (A.D. 664-665) calls also 浦陵, Po-ling.¹ It is described as an ‘island,’ but doubtless a peninsula is implied. Its capital city seems to have been Shê-p’o, possibly in A.D. 627-649, but probably not till later on (A.D. 774 to 873). Prior to that, during the reign of a king by the name of 吉延, Chi-yen,² the capital had stood more to the east, at the town of 羅露伽斯, P’o-lu-chia-sz.³

It is very probable that this Shê-p’o is the same country as B, especially arguing from the fact that no intercourse whatever is mentioned after A.D. 860-873 with Ho-ling, whereas it is recorded from 992 onwards for Shê-p’o. The embassy stated to have been sent by the last-named kingdom in A.D. 821 was probably despatched by Ho-ling-Shê-p’o. Similarly, the mission from Shê-p’o that reached China in or about A.D. 802, giving an account of P’iau, must have come from the same State of Ho-ling-Shê-p’o.

Chinese texts—or rather, perhaps, the translations given of them by our Sinologists—are far from agreeing as to the location of Ho-ling or Po-ling, alias Shê-p’o, in relation to

¹ Chavannes, op. cit., p. 60. In Annamese Bâ-lang, and Hâ-lang or Khâ-lang for Ho-ling.
² Kit-yen, Kệt-dzin, Kil-yôn, in the old dialects, which pronunciations suggest the words Khyan, Kirjan, Kerian, or Krian; and Kric, Krâyajna, etc.
³ A name strikingly similar to Bharu-kaccha or Baryaza. It may, however, be Malay derived, e.g., from Bûluh-gâjâh (=Pûlû-gâjo), meaning ‘Elephant-bamboo’; or else it may be connected with either Prakûsa (vide supra, p. 95) or Brûnas (Baruvas, Beruas, etc.), said to be the original seat of government in Perak. Berkuwâsa, a very similar term, has in Malay the sense of ‘strong,’ ‘powerful.’

Professor Schlegel gives, in T’oung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 275, an almost totally different translation of the last passage as follows:—‘The king lives in the city of Shay-po, but his ancestor Ki-yen had removed to the east from the city of Bolukiesze (Amoy, Polokam).’ In Groeneweld’s translation (op. cit., p. 139) the sentence here italicized is rendered ‘... but his ancestor, Ki-yen, had lived more to the east, at the town Pa-lu-kâ-sî.’
the neighbouring States. From Groeneveldt’s translations from both the Ch’iu T’ang-shu, the Old History of the T’ang Dynasty, bk. 197, and the Hsin T’ang-shu or New History of the T’ang Dynasty (bk. 222, p. 2),¹ that location may be deduced as follows:

1. East of P’o-li, 婆利, or Ma-li, 蒲利, which he takes to be Sumatra.
2. West of P’o-teng, 婆登, or To-p’o-teng, 塔婆登, which he most absurdly identifies with the island of Bali (!).
3. South of Chên-la (Kamboja).
4. North of the sea and of an insular State called 多摩長, To-mo-ch’ang.

In a further passage from the same book of the old T’ang history To-p’o-teng is, in agreement with the above, placed to the east of Ho-ling and to the west of 迷黎車, Mi-li-ch’ê.² However, in the amplified new history of the same dynasty Ho-ling is said to lie east of To-p’o-teng, in open contradiction to the preceding statements.³

The “San-ts’ai T’u-hwei” (published A.D. 1607) tells us that P’o-teng lies eastward (for westward?) of Lin-i (Campã), borders in the west upon Mi-li, 迷離 (same as 迷黎車, Mi-li-ch’ê?), and in the south upon Ho-ling.⁴

From the fact of all Chinese texts being agreed in making the country of 阿剎, Lo-ch’a (see above, pp. 260, 261), and not Ho-ling, coterminous with P’o-li on the east,⁵ it follows

¹ See op. cit., p. 133, and Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 522, 526, 534.
² Ibid., p. 183.
³ See Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 531, and T’oung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 284. Mi-li-ch’ê is, in the same contradictory manner, wherein located to the west of To-p’o-teng. Professor Schlegel, while saying, following the Old T’ang history (T’oung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 372), that Ho-ling "lay east of P’o-li," goes on to state in a note to the next page (373), apparently following the New T’ang history, that the texts have: "Kalêng borders to the east upon Poli, to the west upon Topoting, to the north upon Cambodja, and to the south upon the sea." This is also the interpretation put by Hervey de Saint-Denys upon a corresponding passage of Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., pp. 531-5), and under the chapter devoted to P’o-teng in the same work (p. 523), where it is stated that P’o-teng borders on the east upon Ho-ling and on the west upon Mi-li-chê.
⁵ See Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 460 and 489.
that Ho-ling could scarcely be looked for in the same quarter. Whether it be due to divergences of opinion on the part of the translators in interpreting the texts, or to clerical slips on the part of the Chinese writers who compiled or copied them from older sources, it is perfectly evident, from the contradictions pointed out, that there is an error, whether of misapprehension or misconstruction, somewhere, which it is of the greatest importance to correct before proceeding with our inquiry. After a careful examination of the subject I have come to the conclusion that Ma Tuan-lin's account as translated by Hervey de Saint-Denys is the most logical, inasmuch as it smooths over all contradictions, and the most consistent with topographical and historical evidence, as will become apparent in the sequel. I accordingly adopt the data as supplied in this version, on the basis of which the position of Ho-ling becomes fixed as follows:—

1. Eastward of P'o-téng or To-p'o-téng, to the west of which lies Mi-li-ch'ê.¹
2. Westward of P'o-li, to the east of which lies Lo-ch'a.²
3. Southward of Chên-la (Kamboja).³
4. Northward of the sea and of an insular kingdom called To-mo-ch'ang. This State has: (1) T'o-lung, 多隆, on the west; (2) P'o-féng, 嬰鳳, on the east; and (3) Pan-chih-pa, 半支跋, sometimes also spelled Ch'ien-chih-fu, 千支弗, on the south.⁴

It is further stated in the Ti-li-chê of the T'ang-shu, ch. 436, quoted by Chavannes,⁵ that Ho-ling lies four to five days' sailing to the east of 佛逝, Fo-shih (here meaning the whole eastern coast of Sumatra from Pâsai to Palembang), and that it is the largest island (read ‘peninsula’ or ‘district’) in the south. This makes it evident that Ho-ling must have

¹ Pp. 523, 526, 531.
³ P. 526.
⁴ P. 534.
⁵ "Les Religieux Éminents," etc., p. 42, note.
stood on the Malay Peninsula, and not on any of the islands fronting the east coast of Sumatra to the south of it as far as Palembang; for the only two of them, viz. Bû-lang and Gû-lang, bearing names closely related respectively to Po-ling (Bû-lang) and Ho-ling (Khû-lang, Ka-lang) are far from being the largest islands in the south, or, for that matter, even in the Rhio-Linga Archipelago.¹

I-ťsing mentions once only the fact of one Buddhist devotee having sailed from China, first to Ho-ling, then to 末羅瑜, Mo-lo-yû (Mallayo or Malâyu), and thence to Central India. From this Chavannes (loc. cit.) rightly argues that Ho-ling was to be found before Mo-lo-yû on the sea-route from China to India, although, as shown by the itineraries of I-ťsing and Wu-hing,² it was not necessarily touched at when making that journey. There is, however, nothing in the above statement which tells against our assumed position of Ho-ling on the Malay Peninsula; nay, even on the west coast of it. For, in the first place, the Buddhist devotee who undertook that journey may, after having reached Ho-ling and in vain looked for a ship there to convey him across to India, have found it more convenient, in order to obtain the desired passage, to sail back some distance to Mo-lo-yû, which, as may be seen from all itineraries described by I-ťsing, was invariably called at and must have accordingly stood on the regular sea-route from China to India, and vice versa. Secondly, Ho-ling, although mainly situated on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, may well have stretched partly across to its eastern seaboard on the Gulf of Siâm, in which case in sailing outward from China it would naturally have been met with, as Chavannes puts it, before Mo-lo-yû. Thirdly, I-ťsing’s allusion may be to

¹ Chavannes concludes, of course (loc. cit.), that “le pays de Ho-ling, se trouvant à l’est de la partie méridionale de Sumatra, ne peut être placé que dans l’île de Java”!! This in spite of the fact that Java does not at all lie to the east of any part of Sumatra, but only in a south-eastern direction from it, and very far south from Fo-shih.

² Op. cit., pp. 119 and 125 (where the outward route described is: Canton, Fo-shih, Mo-lo-yû, Chie-ch’a, Lo-’kwo or Nikobâr; and the homeward one: Támralipti, Chie-ch’a, Fo-shih, China); and p. 144, where the itinerary is: China, Shîk-li-Fo-shih, Mo-lo-yû Island, Chie-ch’a, Nâgapaṭṭana.
a quite distinct place, bearing the same or a similar name to *Ho-ling*, on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula. We have here, in fact, a Tanjong or Cape *Puling*¹ also known by the name of *Gelang*, the names of which closely correspond respectively to *Po-ling* and *Ho-ling*. Whichever of the three surmises here put forward be the correct one, it will be seen that there is not the slightest evidence to show that *Ho-ling* stood elsewhere than on the Malay Peninsula. As regards *Mo-lo-yü* (Mallayo or Malaya), I cannot see my way to agree with Chavannes and his followers in making it the same as Palembang, on the strength of I-ting's statement that *Mo-lo-yü* had shortly before his time or during his stay there become part and parcel of the *Shih-li-Fo-shih* dominions, and of Alboquerque's assertion that Palembang was called *Malayo* by the Javanese.² I shall demonstrate further on that I-ting's *Mo-lo-yü* must be sought for on the southern part of the Malay Peninsula. It is very strange, and therefore worthy of note, that I-ting seems to know nothing about *Shè-p'o*, but only speaks of *Ho-ling* or *Po-ling*.

The country of *Ho-ling* is said in the "Hsin T'ang-shu" (or New History of the T'ang Dynasty, compiled during the eleventh century, bk. 222) to produce "tortoise-shell, gold and silver, rhinoceros horns, and ivory."³ "There is a cavern from which salt water bubbles up spontaneously."⁴ The same things, it should be pointed out, are related of *Shè-p'o* State in the Sung annals: "The country produces gold, silver, rhinoceros horns, ivory, lignum aloes . . . .

¹ Already noticed above, p. 104, as the South Cape. In the latest map of the Malay Peninsula published by the Straits Branch of the R.A.S., 1898, the term Tanjong Puling disappears, and is replaced by the designation Tanjung Gelang, no doubt derived from the hill (Bukit Gelang) which forms the extremity of this headland. Its position is fixed in 4° N. lat. Likewise disappears the term Tanjong Kwântân, substituted by Tanjung Tembeling. This is mapped lower down. There is, therefore, every probability that Bukit Gelang or Gelang Hill is, after all, Ptolemy's *Malou Kôlon* (Malaya Gelang = Bukit Gelang), in preference to Tanjong Kwântân lower down, or Tanjong Guliga further up the coast.


³ Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 139. Professor Schlegel, in *T'oung-Pao*, vol. ix, p. 274, translates: "tortoise-shell, gold and silver, rhinoceroses and elephants."

⁴ Groeneveldt, loc. cit.
sulphur, and sapan-wood. . . . Salt is obtained by boiling sea-water."1 These productions again point to some place in

1 Ibid., p. 142. Salt is stated to be obtained by boiling sea-water at the following places mentioned in the same work: (1) at Tun-hai-chu, i.e. Pulo-Pemangil and Pulo Aor, but more probably on the sea-coast of the Malay Peninsula opposite them (p. 258); (2) at Pahang (p. 256); (3) at Sumatra city and adjacent territory on the north coast of Sumatra (p. 211). Numerous caves are to be found on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, among the most notable being those at Kwâla Lampor (Selangor); Ipoh (in Kinta, Pêrak); Gùnong Geriyang or Elephant Hill (Kedah); Langkawi Island, north coast (Gua Cherita); Trang; Kasom (near P'hang-ngâ), etc.; but whether one has a saline spring bubbling up in it I am unable to say. Sulphur may have been obtained on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula from the deposits of the many sulphurous springs existing there in the Malacca, Nâning, Klang, Kinta, and Upper Pêrak districts. Or else it may have been brought thither from the neighbouring north coast of Sumatra, where it has been noticed at Pulo Way and at a mountain between Achin and Pedir by Beaulieu (Prévost, op. cit., vol. ix, p. 340); and in mountain caves along that coast by Ma-Huan (see Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 209).

Veins of silver have been discovered in various portions of the Malay Peninsula (see Denny, op. cit., p. 347); and in Lârut (Pêrak district) it was found associated with the rich tin ores of that territory (see Comptes Rendus of the French Geol. Soc. for April 14th, 1882, p. 165).

The chief supply of tortoise-shell in the Malay Peninsula comes from the Dindings near Pêrak (see Denny, op. cit., p. 414). Gold is found in considerable quantities, either disseminated in quartz reefs or in alluvial deposits, especially about Gùnong Ledang or Mount Ophir, to the east of Malacca, where it was worked till 1817 by the Malays; on the upper waters of the Muâr River and its tributary the Gemencheh (Chendas and other mines), N.N.E. of Malacca town; in Upper Pêrak at Ayer Tawar, Busong, and Belum or Balom mines, of which last McCarthy says ("Surveying and Exploring in Siam," p. 16): "We saw traces of ancient gold-mines, gigantic workings, abandoned no man knows how long ago." On the east coast of the Malay Peninsula we need not mention its frequent occurrence in Pahang (on Lui, Lipis, and Jelei rivers); in Kelantam (Galas and Pergau rivers); and in Legeh or Rangêh (upper waters of the Tanjung Mâs and Telûbin, and Tomoh district). But it is of paramount importance for ethnological science to call attention to the fact that most of the gold-mines now being developed in Pahang through European enterprise were originally opened at apparently a very remote age by natives of an unknown race, whose workings, of which very evident and innumerable traces still remain, have rightly been styled "wonderful" by the Europeans who first visited them (see Denny's "Descript. Dict. of Brit. Malaya," pp. 265-266). The chief of these formerly exploited mines are Raub, Punjum, Selensing, Tui, and Kechnau, the Selensing being one of the most marvellous. "It is situated in a small valley surrounded by low hills, which in some forgotten period must have been the scene of very extensive mining operations. The surfaces of these hills are honeycombed with perpendicular shafts, circular in shape, which in some instances penetrate to the water-level below the surface of the valley, a depth of considerably over 100 feet. [Denny, op. cit., p. 266, speaks of pits over 160 feet deep extending for miles.] Many of these pits are placed so close together that a wall of rock not more than two feet thick separates them from one another. The antiquity of these workings is attested by the apparently virgin forest which clothes the hills in which they are situated, large slow-growing trees being in some instances found with their roots centred in the sides of the shafts. . . . No clue has yet been obtained which might serve to indicate the race to which these miners belonged. The mode of mining employed by them differs radically from that in use among the Chinese, and the
the north of Sumatra or on the Malay Peninsula, and exclude Java, making it thus probable that Ho-ling is identical with the Shé-p’o of section B above.

The true geographical position of Ho-ling may be further determined from gnomonical data handed down to us in the New History of the T'ang Dynasty in the following terms:—

"When at the summer-solstice a gnomon is erected of eight feet high, the shadow (at noon) falls on the south side, and is two feet four inches [Chinese ch'i'ih of ten ts'un or inches each, i.e. 2\(\frac{3}{4}\) or 2.4 'feet'] long."

The importance of such a statement can never too much be insisted upon, since it enables us to arrive at a correct

Malays possess no tradition on the subject. . . . . Whatever the race may have been, it is evident that it must have attained to a considerable degree of mechanical skill, and presumably to a fairly high state of civilization; and yet, from an examination of the excavations, one is led to believe that the race which mined them must have been of a somewhat more diminutive stature than either the modern Malay or Siamese. From the appearance of many portions of these workings, it would seem probable that the work of mining was suspended suddenly and never resumed, possibly on account of war, an epidemic, or some other public calamity." (H. C. Belfield's "Handbook of the Federated Malay States," London, 1902, pp. 127-128.) As for myself, I can add that traces of similar old workings have been noticed, not only in connection with gold, but also tin mines in various parts of the Peninsula; Neolithic implements, such as celts, axe-heads, etc., being found in the ancient timbered drives or tunnels. This has been the case, for instance, in Perak. Since A.D. 1516, Barbosa speaks of a gold-mine lying abandoned in Pahang (Ramusio, vol. i, fol. 318 verso). What, therefore, was the race that opened these mines? Evidently the same that built those wonderful monuments in Kamboja—the race of Fu-nan, now still represented in the Malay Peninsula by the Sakai and allied tribes. However, this race, as in Kamboja, no doubt did only the manual labour. But the intelligent mind that planned, directed, and superintended must have been, as there, Hindū. Or shall we have to assume that, in the case of the most ancient of these mines, where Neolithic implements occur associated with the workings, the directive mind was Phœnician? This is by no means improbable, as we shall see in the following pages that Phœnician influence once undoubted extended as far as Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula, where, especially on the latter, it must have been very considerable, the Biblical Ophir hitherto unidentified and vainly sought for lying very probably within its compass, or, at any rate, very close upon its northern borders.

Lignum aloes or Ghārū-wood (Aquilaria Malaccensis) is plentiful on the Malay Peninsula, where it occurs in dense forests in Johor, Malacca, Negri Sembilan, Pahang, etc. (See Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 35, January, 1901, p. 74.) It is also exported along with ivory, etc., from Selângor ("China Sea Directory," vol. i, 4th edition, 1896, p. 169). In Sumatra it appears to occur only in its southern portion (near Kebang, Turabangi River, Lampongs).

Sapan-wood "grows in abundance on the northern borders of Malacca and elsewhere in the Peninsula" (Dennys, op. cit., p. 338). It is peculiarly plentiful in the central and northern portions of the latter. Its occurrence on the north coast of Sumatra (Lambiri or Ramni) is mentioned by Sulaimân, Marco Polo, and most later travellers.
estimate of the real location of Ho-ling better than any attempt based simply on circumstantial evidence of not infrequently too vague a character, such as, for instance, toponymic resemblances, etc. It is plain that if some gnomonic datum of this kind accompanied each foreign place-name mentioned by Chinese authors, hardly any difficulty would be experienced in deciphering their geographical charms. And yet, to our utter surprise, we see no attempt made in the pages of Groeneveldt’s monograph to test that statement, while nearly two pages are wasted in conjectures as to the location of Ho-ling, which a simple calculation of three lines would have settled. Accustomed as we are to rank gnomonic and astronomic observations, however imperfect, high above mere verbiage and philological disquisitions in an enquiry of this kind, we shall at once proceed to find out what result can be drawn from the data contained in the passage quoted above.

Mindful, then, of the fact, too frequently overlooked, that the shadow cast by a vertical gnomon does not correspond to the altitude of the sun’s centre, but to that of its upper limb, so that the observation of it is tantamount to an observation of the sun’s upper limb; and calling $a$ the angle of incidence at which a ray from the said upper limb grazing the top of the gnomon will meet the plane of the dial at noon, we have—

\[
\text{tang. } a = \frac{8}{2.4} = 3.33333333, \text{ whence } a = 73^\circ \ 18' \ 2''.7.
\]

Apparent altitude of sun’s upper limb .. $a = 73^\circ \ 18' \ 2''.7$
Parallax for altitude .. .. .. $a = + \ 2''.4$
Refraction (approximately estimated) = $-17''.5$

$\underline{\text{True meridian altitude of sun’s upper limb}} = 73^\circ \ 17' \ 47''.6$
$\underline{\text{Less semi-diameter(approximately estimated)}} = \ 15' \ 45''.6$

$\underline{\text{True meridian altitude of sun’s centre}} = 73^\circ \ 2' \ 2''$

Say, $73^\circ \ 2'$.

Zenith distance $= 90^\circ - 73^\circ \ 2' = 16^\circ \ 58'$.
Assuming now the sun's declination at that summer solstice to have been something like 23° 27' N., we deduce the latitude—

Lat. of Ho-ling = 23° 27' - 16° 58' = 6° 29' N.

Had the Chinese annalists put on record also the year in which the above observation was taken, a far more precise result could be arrived at. But even with the drawbacks we have to labour under, the possible amount of error cannot very well exceed a few minutes of a degree; so that, making a fairly ample allowance for this as well as for other slight errors arising from imperfections in the method of measurement, we may feel assured of being well on the truth's side when we assert that the position of Ho-ling must have been between, say, 6° and 7° North latitude. It will thus be seen that Ho-ling cannot be looked for in either Java or Sumatra, both of which lie below the 6th parallel of Northern latitude. Borneo, although reaching with its northernmost extremity to the next parallel above that, is most certainly out of the question. There accordingly remains only the Malay Peninsula where that State could be located. And yet we see Groeneveldt, and after him Takakus and others, seriously identifying Ho-ling with Java on the mere strength of the statement contained in the above-quoted extract from the T'ang Annals, that "Ho-ling is also called Shé-p'o," which last term, although meant to convey the sounds Java, Jaba, Saba, Sava, etc., we have demonstrated to apply to many other places besides the island of Java.¹ I feel very sorry for the pet theories of these and other Sinologists obsessed with such geographical notions; but magna est veritas et praecadebit,

¹ The only instances, I believe, in Chinese literature in which the term Shé-p'ō, is employed to denote the island of Java, are two, and occur in a passage of Fei Hsin's itinerary, the "Hsing-ch'a Shéng-lan" (see for the text of this passage, Ts'oung-P'ao, 1901, p. 376, note 247). The same writer, however, invariably uses Chao-sea, every other time he alludes to that island.
and it is high time for the sake of scientific progress that it should do so.¹

We have seen that Ho-ling is located by the Chinese annalists themselves at four or five days' sailing to the east of Fo-shih. This appears to be one and the same with the State also called Shih-li Fo-shih, and I-tsing in his works uses both terms indiscriminately,² although Takakusu is inclined to draw a line of distinction between them and take Fo-shih as the old name of the capital, while assuming Shih-li Fo-shih to be a later appellation for both the capital and its now far more extensive dominions. I think, however, there is no reason or foundation whatever for such a subtle distinction, and consider that Fo-shih is a mere shortened form of Shih-li Fo-shih; an abbreviation of a character quite common in Chinese literature. According to a common custom in Oriental countries, the State would be often designated by the name of its capital, and vice versa, so that in such a case there could be no difference between the appellations of either. This point settled, it is gratifying to notice that I-tsing, as well as his contemporaries, furnish us reliable gnomonical data by which the geographical position and limits of the country in question can be determined accurately enough. As this is of great importance for our enquiry we shall avail ourselves of such an opportunity at once.

Starting first with I-tsing, he tells us³ that in the country of Shih-li Fo-shih, at about the time of both equinoxes, at noon, there is no shadow cast on the dial-plate from the

¹ It is curious, and withal not a little amusing, to notice the serious geographical blunders to which incurable Javanomania has led our Sinologists. Takakusu, the only one who, as we have seen, has found courage enough to publish the result (although incorrect) of the gnomonical observation at Ho-ling, is not convinced even after obtaining 6° 8' N.; and, rather than give up his hobby about Java, attempts to otherwise explain the astounding discrepancy between his pet views and actual figures. "There is," he writes, "a confusion in the statement if a place in Java (6° 8' S.) be meant. I must leave the point unsettled, until I have examined all the parallel passages in the Chinese books" (op. cit., p. xlvii). But it is in his head, and not in the statement of the Chinese annalists, that the confusion lies, which has been communicated thence, as we have seen, to the process of working out the data set before him.

² Chavannes, op. cit., p. 126, note 2, gives us the most clear proof of this.

³ Takakusu, op. cit., pp. 143-144.
gnomon, or on the ground from a man who stands erect on those days. This argues that the land in question was crossed by the equator, and may have stretched for some distance on both sides of it.

On the other hand, the Nan-Man Chuan, or History of the Southern Barbarians, gives us the following interesting details.\(^1\) “Shih-li Fo-shih lies 2,000 li (about 400 miles) beyond Chün-t'uo-lung Shan, 軍徒弄山 (i.e. very likely Kundur Island in Durian Strait).\(^2\) The country stretches for 1,000 li (or 200 miles) from east to west, and 4,000 li or more (about 800 miles) from north to south. It counts fourteen cities, and is divided into two States. Its whole western part is called Lang-P'o-lo-su, 郎婆露斯 (i.e. Lam-Bārūś, see pp. 429-430 above). It produces much gold, cinnabar, and camphor (Lang-nao, for which vide ante, pp. 439 and 441). A gnomon eight feet high, erected on the day of the summer solstice, casts its shadow [at noon] 2 feet and 5 inches (or \(2'_{\frac{5}{9}}\)) towards the south.”

It will readily be seen that the dimensions here given correspond wonderfully closely with those of the island of Sumatra (the actual length of which is 960 miles and the greatest breadth 220 miles). The two States into which the country of Shih-li Fo-shih was divided were evidently: (1) Shih-li Fo-shih proper, comprising the whole eastern portion of the island; and (2) Lam-Bārūś, embracing its western half. The gnomonical data referred to, when worked out after the same method we have followed above for the determination of the latitude of Ho-ling, yield 5° 50' N. latitude. The position thus determined corresponds to that of Pulo Way or Wei, the island lying off the north-western

---

1 See Ts'oung-Pao for 1901, pp. 178 for translation, and 179, note 101, for the Chinese text with which I have collated it, inserting above the original terms with my own equivalents and identifications.

2 The translator, Professor Schlegel, interprets this as meaning the Kundurang or Gumturang mountains, which is nonsense. An island is evidently intended, and this is almost certainly the island of Kundur, lying opposite the mouth of the Kaman River. Although the distance from this island to Palembang, the capital, is only some 250 miles, it is fully 400 miles, as stated in the text, from Pulo Kundur to the north coast of Sumatra, the point to which, as we shall see directly, the gnomonical observation recorded in the above passage applies.
extremity of Sumatra, but may well be taken—after due allowance has been made for the usual imperfections inherent in the gnomonical measurement in question—to apply to the northernmost limit of Sumatra, i.e. Pedro Point (lat. 5° 39' N.). This gives us withal the northernmost limit of the land of Shih-li Fo-shih. There seems therefore no reason to doubt that the whole of the island of Sumatra, and more specifically its eastern portion from Achin in the north down to Palembang and even the Lampungs in the south, was included by the Chinese under that general denomination of Shih-li Fo-shih; and the list of the fifteen States dependent on it, under its later designation of San-Fo-ch'i, given about A.D. 1240 by Chao Ju-kua, to which we shall have to revert in the sequel, confirms that view.

Such being the facts it will be evident that the location assigned to Ho-ling in the books of the T'ang dynasty, at four or five days' sailing to the east of Fo-shih, perfectly agrees with the above deductions, and more especially with the results we have drawn from the gnomonical data handed down to us by the Chinese historians, which are: 5° 50' N. lat. for the northern limit of Fo-shih or Shih-li Fo-shih, i.e. the northern end of Sumatra; and 6° 29' N. lat. for Ho-ling, i.e. the west coast of the Malay Peninsula at about that latitude. These two points lie about 250 miles apart, a distance which it would take just about four or five days' sailing in the olden times to cover. The bearing is also correct, the latitudes of the two places being about equal, so that an easterly course would have to be steered in order to proceed from the former place to the latter.

Having thus made it certain, from calculations based upon data sufficiently reliable, that the position of Ho-ling or Po-ling must be fixed on the Malay Peninsula in about 6° 29' N. lat., it remains to be seen how far this result agrees with local

---

1 Among the fifteen States here referred to there are those of Po-lin-feng = Palembang and Hein-t'oe, which latter we have already shown to be Indrapura, on the south-west coast of Sumatra (vide ante, p. 455).
features, as well as with the location assigned to *Ho-ling* in respect of the conterminous States named in the Chinese texts.

A glance at a map of the Malay Peninsula will show that the 6° 29' parallel of latitude skirts the southern limit of the Pulo Butong group of islands, passing afterwards just halfway between Pulo Langkawi and Pulo Terutao or Trotto, and cutting next the west coast of the Malay Peninsula a little above the mouth of the Perlis or Polit River, and the chef-lieu of the district of the same name which, like its neighbour Satūn or Satūl adjoining it on the north, was abstracted from the dominion of Kedah and placed under the direct dependence of the Siamese Government in 1841. Continuing across the Malay Peninsula the same parallel reaches the eastern coast in the Sāi district, a little above Kwāla Menara, the mouth of the Tanjung Mās River. This was formerly part of Kelantan territory, the main stream of which debouches in the Gulf of Siām only some thirty miles to the south-east.

Returning, however, to the west coast of the Peninsula at the point where we left it, we do not here find in modern maps any toponymic suggestive of *Ho-ling* or *Po-ling*, except the very name *Perlis*, *Polit*, or *Palit*, which may indeed be somehow connected with the second form of the Chinese term.\(^1\) In order to arrive at something approaching to the

---

\(^1\) Of this district and its river thus wrote Michael Topping at the beginning of last century (see Dalrymple's "Oriental Repertory," London, 1808, vol. i, p. 399; and the reproduction of the account in "Essays relating to Indo-China," 1st series, vol. i, p. 1 et seq.): "Perlis has a deep narrow river, at the entrance of which is a small sandy island. . . . The bar of the river is very long, with only ten feet of water upon it at spring tides. The town is situated four or five miles from this entrance [this must be the village of Kulasah, or that of Kangar mentioned in the "China Sea Directory," vol. i, p. 140, as the capital; Palit or Perlis proper being situated some six miles further up], in a valley of a mile and a half in circumference, encompassed with steep hills. The old king, in his latter days, chose this place for his residence, which occasioned many vessels and people to resort here. Since his death it has sunk into its former obscurity," etc.

Perlis, under the form *Perlis*, is mentioned several times by Mendez Pinto in his *Travels* since A.D. 1539 and 1545 (see English transl., London, 1692, pp. 22, 24, and 189); also by Bocarro in his *Decadas* (p. 187) in 1612. It seemed then a well-frequented resort of trade.

Further to the north of Perlis and Satūl there is, of course, the little State of
first form of the same we have to look a little lower down the coast towards the mouth of the Kedah River, where we are at once stopped by a familiar place-name, that of Gunong Geriang or Geriyang, better known to seafaring men, by whom it is reckoned an excellent landmark, as the 'Elephant Hill,' and greatly famed for its magnificent stalactite caves. A streamlet flowing from its neighbourhood takes, nowadays, its name from the hill; but the more important watercourse a little to the south of it—known as Kedah River only since the establishment on its banks of the new seat of government for Kedah in A.D. 1720, or somewhat earlier—was no doubt, like the surrounding territory, also named Geriyang after the famous hill referred to above. ¹ Here, then, we very probably have a real relic of the ancient Ho-ling, as this term in its old Chinese pronunciation was perfectly capable of representing sounds like Garang, Kharang, Garing, etc. The caves mentioned by the Chinese annalists as existing in Ho-ling may well be the very ones on Geriyang Hill.² Similar caves occur, however, on several of the neighbouring islands of the Langkāwi group, as well as on the rocky islets fronting the mouth of the Trang river further up the coast.³ Particularly worthy of mention is the famous cave known as the Gua Cherita (from Skr. Guhā Carita,

² Pāli or Pāli, the name of which somewhat resembles that of Po-ling. Very little is known, however, of its past history. A mountain Kalong exists at some 5½ miles as the crow flies south of the capital of Perlis, but too much stress cannot be laid on such vague toponymic resemblances.

¹ Topping, loc. cit., says that the principal seaport, called Quedah by strangers, is termed "Quella Batrang by the natives"; that is to say, Kwella Batrang, Batang, or something similar. Here we have another toponymic which has long since disappeared from maps, and very likely also from the memory of the inhabitants. I am inclined to think, nevertheless, that both the river and territory in question must have been better known to ancient folk from the Geriang Hill.

² For a good description of the hill and its caves in 1833 see "Essays relating to Indo-China," 1st series, vol. i, pp. 212-215. T. Ward, its author, in noticing a tradition existing among the natives that the hill was at one time surrounded by the sea, remarks that he is inclined to believe, from geological indications, that such was the case at no very distant period (p. 214). Colonel Low also notices it (op. cit., p. 182); and, speaking of Gunong Cherai (Jarai, Sral) or Kedah Peak further to the south, says that large crystals of quartz, gold, and tin ore are to be found there, while hot springs exist in various parts of the neighbouring central range of the Peninsula.

³ For these caves on the Trang islets see Low, op. cit., pp. 183-184.
i.e. ‘Legend Cave’), on the north coast of Langkawi Island, so called from an inscription in Arabic character high up on the limestone cliff at the entrance. This epigraphic document seems to be very old, and shows, at all events, that the island was frequented at one time by Arab navigators and traders. Indeed, from the testimony of our own travellers some two centuries ago, it is legitimate to infer that the insular group of which it forms the principal part must have enjoyed in the past far greater notoriety and a busier life than nowadays. Its position within a few miles of

1 Marked Goa Cherika in the latest map of the Malay Peninsula published by the Straits Branch of the R.A.S. Hence the correct name may be, after all, Guhā Čarika (Čarika-guhā), i.e. ‘Inscription Cave.’

2 It would be very interesting to have the inscription deciphered and translated, as it may reveal to us some interesting phase of the as yet scarcely known past history of Langkawi and neighbouring islands and coast. Mr. Kynnersley, who visited the spot in 1900, and gives an account of his trip in the *Journal Straits Branch R.A.S.* for July, 1901 (No. 36), remarks on the inscription (p. 62): ‘Certain Arabic words and names can be made out, but whether it is ancient, as the Malays like to believe, or some hundred years old, it is impossible to say.’ Evidently further investigation is needed here.

Since writing the above I have noticed the late W. E. Maxwell’s most interesting article on “Pulau Langkawi” and its antiquities and legends in the *Journal Straits Branch R.A.S.*, No. 19 (1887), to which I refer the reader. Concerning the Guan Cherita, this accomplished scholar says (pp. 32–33) that the inscription, carved on the rock at a height of some twelve feet from the ground, is Malay, and contains a date, A.H. 1060 = A.D. 1649; it seems to record the visit of some rajah at that period, if the date alluded to is to be taken as the date when it was written, and not of some past event commemorated at a later period. Maxwell also gives a transcription of the opening sentences of the inscription as far as they are decipherable; of the remainder he notes, only a word here and there can be made out.

3 According to Colonel Low (in his notes to his translation of the Kedah Annals, in *Journal Malay Archipelago*, vol. iii), Lanūkpubi was the ancient name of this cluster of islands, now called Leihkëwuri by the natives, but Langkëwiri in the maps and modern books. In Siamese records I find their name usually spelled Nangkëwiri; hence it is probable that owing to their being, like the Nikōbārs, anciently inhabited by a stark-naked population they were similarly termed Nanga-vïrī, Nanga-vïrī. They are marked 龍牙交椅, Lung-eng-chiao-i (Cant. Lung-ngā-kān-i = Langkākāwi), in the Chinese map of about A.D. 1400 published by Phillips (*Journal China Branch R.A.S.*, vol. xxi, 1886, p. 38). This is perhaps the most ancient mention of them extant, at any rate under that name. In 1606 Matellief calls them Lanchevy; and shortly afterwards (A.D. 1621) Beautilieu gives a rather detailed description of “l’isle que ses habitants nomment Lanchevi, et ceux d’Achem Pulà Luda ou l’Isle au poivre,” and speaks of rather extensive pepper plantations situated at the foot of a large mountain there (Gùnong Rayà?), owing to which an active intercourse was maintained with the island (see Prévost’s “Collection de Voyages,” vol. viii, p. 336, and vol. ix, p. 334). Now rice and sugar are the principal productions, the valleys and plains being inhabited and cultivated. There are numerous villages, of which the principal one is Kwah, near the south-eastern extremity of
several once flourishing seaports on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, and in the track of sailing vessels proceeding thither from the southern coast of India and from Ceylon via the Nikobär, or travelling to and fro along the eastern shore of the Bay of Bengal, between the Gangetic Delta, Arakan, Pegu, and the Straits, coupled with the fact of its possessing good anchorages, cannot but have helped in making it, if not a large emporium, at least a well-known place of call for ships and an entrepôt for transoceanic trade. Even at present some considerable amount of commerce is carried on with Penang and the adjacent coasts by junks,
while larger vessels and men-of-war occasionally visit the island.

In conclusion, there is ample evidence to show that the insular group of the Langkāwīs, as well as the mainland abreast of it, were in the old days of exclusive sail navigation the centres of active trade and intercourse with transoceanic countries. We have, of course, no exact data as regards the extension of Ho-ling except the vaguely defined boundaries with adjoining States mentioned by the Chinese annalists, and we do not therefore know how far south and north it stretched on the Malay Peninsula; but I think that the position I have indicated in about 6° 29' N. lat. very closely corresponds to that of the central part of the kingdom, or, at any rate, of the district where its capital or principal seaport was situated. Tanjung Sāwah, the south-western promontory of Langkāwī Island, and Pulo Tuba, the island lying close eastward of Pulo Dayang Bunting, bear names strikingly similar to Shē-p'ō or Tu-p'ō; but it is more probable that this term was a generic designation of the Malay Peninsula at the time being, of which Ho-ling was merely a part. In fact, although Ho-ling is also called Shē-p'ō, i.e. Java, in the Chinese accounts of it, and its later capital is said to have been at the city of Shē-p'ō or Tu-p'ō (Java or Tuba), we have seen that the kingdom of Ho-lo-tan is likewise stated to have been situated on the island of Shē-p'ō or Tu-p'ō. Thus Ho-ling was most probably simply the name for a part of Shē-p'ō rather than a synonym for the whole of that region.

Off the north coast of Langkāwī Island, and nearly abreast of the spot occupied by the Gūa Cherita cave, there is an islet bearing the name of Pulo Kilim. Other toponymics similar to Ho-ling occur further up and down the west coast of the Malay Peninsula.\(^1\) We shall presently see, however, that

---

\(^1\) They are, on the north: Khelung or Khelung Bay, in the south-eastern part of Junkcylon Island; the islet of Khalem (Kōh Khalem), at the entrance to that bay; and, a good deal farther to the north, Khung or Mūang Khung, an ancient district above Takōpa, towards Ranōng. On the south: (1) Sungei Kling, a small eastern affluent of the Pērak River, close to its mouth in
none of the places they belong to is so suitably situated as the Geriang Hill and surrounding territory, in respect of the States named by the Chinese annalists as conterminous with Ho-ling. The positions of the States in question in relation to that of Ho-ling as given in the rectified account adopted by us above, and their probable modern equivalents with which we propose to identify them, are as follows:

I. On the west P'o-téng or To-p'o-téng, to the west of which lies Mi-li-ch'ê. To-p'o-téng, 隆婆登, is very likely the place marked Tupting in lat. 7°35' N. and long. 99°30' E., or just above Trang, in McCarthy's map; and may thus correspond to an old State having its centre in the Trang district and formerly bearing that name. Again, To-p'o-téng may, though less probably, stand for Takía-thùng in the elided form Ta-[k]-wa-thùng. So may P'o-téng designate Pulo Butong, the insular group lying off to the west of Langkawi; but it is more likely that it is a mere abbreviation

South-West Pérak. (2) Klang or Kalang, now the residence of Selangor, on the Sungei Klang at about twelve miles from its mouth, which is called Kwâla Klang. This river is marked in the Chinese map of about A.D. 1399, published by Phillips, as 吉令港, Chi-ling (Ki-ling) Chiang, a spelling which excludes its identification with Ho-ling. On this stream was situated the former State of Kalang, the foundation of which is claimed by the Beuâ (Banawa or Vâna) tribes. Kalang, according to Newbold, means ‘tin,’ and the country about Selangor was called Negri Kalang, i.e. ‘Land of Tin.’ After the foundation of Malacca (circa 1350-1400) Kalang became one of its dependencies, being governed by the chief of Pérak (see Newbold’s “British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca,” London, 1839, vol. ii, pp. 30, 376). (3) Pulo Klang or Kalang (sometimes marked as Kalam, Kallain, etc., in the old maps), an island at the mouth of the Klang River. (4) Tanjung Klang, a point six miles west of the town of Malacca. (5) Kalang or Kallang, a district on Singapore Island just above Gelang and east of Rochor, from which it is separated by a small stream, the Sungei Kalang. There is also a hill, Bukit Kallang, on the central part of the island. Of toponymies similar to Po-ling we have very few. One is Sungei Balang, a stream rising in Central Kedah and flowing into the Muda River. Another is Puatung, a considerable village in North Malacca, about twenty miles inland from Malacca town. Lastly, may be mentioned the Krian or Kerian River and District, just below Province Wellesley.

1 Annexed to his book “Surveying and Exploring in Siam,” London, 1900. The Siamese name of the place in question seems to be Thap-thien, which, if correct, would make very little difference in our identification. I have since noticed that Warington Smyth mentions it under the form Tuptieng as a great pepper district, to which the plantations give a delightful aspect (“Five Years in Siam,” London, 1898, vol. ii, pp. 8, 10). This spelling Tuptieng, if correct, is even more suggestive of To-p'o-téng.
of To-p'o-têng. In any case, it will be seen that the State so named has every chance of being the territory stretching from Trang towards Takua-thung and even further. Though it may be easy to find place-names somewhat resembling Po-têng further down the west coast of the Peninsula, I do not think one exists which could be connected with To-p'o-têng; hence I believe that my identification is correct.

As regards Mi-li-chê, there seems to be no doubt that it is Mergui further to the north, as the manner in which that name is spelled in Chinese, 迷黎 車, makes it capable of being read also Mi-li-chü or Mi-li-kü, Mi-li-ki, etc., which forms closely resemble those (Mergi, Mirgi, etc.) recorded in the early pages of this paper for Mergui (vide supra, pp. 84–85). The variant 迷離, Mi-li (Me-li, Mai-lei), we have noticed as occurring in the “San-ts'ai T'u-hweii” for a State situated to the west of Po-têng, evidently refers to the same place elsewhere termed Mi-li-chê.

1 Groeneweldt, we have seen, has not hesitated to identify To-p'o-têng with the island of Bâli, बाली, east of Java (see “Essays relating to Indo-China,” 2nd series, vol. i, p. 183). Professor Schlegel (in T'oung-Pao, vol. ix, 1898, pp. 284–285), although asserting he is wrong, is at a loss to find a suitable equivalent for To-p'o-têng, and inclines to locate it at Tringânu. He makes bold to suggest some Malay equivalent like Bâtang, but cannot manage to dispose of the first syllable To of the name.

2 In Groeneweldt's opinion (op. cit., p. 237) Mi-li-chê would correspond to the Moluccas (!), which are situated neither to the east or west of his ‘Bali,’ Professor Schlegel (op. cit., p. 287) reads Bé-li-ch'iâ, and supposes the term is a transcript of the Sanskrit Mleccha [Pali Milakkha] usually applied to uncivilized tribes. He therefore takes it to refer to the wild Negritos of the Malay Peninsula. But this is altogether too vague. He might have, with better cause, connected the term with Marica, the Sanskrit equivalent of the Malay Lâda, i.e. pepper, which becomes Phrik (for Barica, Brica) in Siamese, and may have been the name given by Indi navigators to the insular group of the Lâda or Langkâwi Islands. This is, however, a mere conjecture, unsupported moreover by topographical evidence; may, in distinct contradiction with it, as it is related in the Chinese accounts. I have thought of Myitta or Mrittta on the Tenasserim River in the Tavoy district, which was once a flourishing town; but I believe that Mergui or M'rit, the ancient Mrittikâ (see above, p. 82), is really the place intended.

There also existed on or about the site of the present Patâni a city or fort known as Kota Meiigei or Meiigei (Maligai? Newbold, vol. ii, p. 68, writes Mālīkei), after which the country round about seems to have been named, before the foundation there of Patâni in about A.D. 1500 (see Leyden’s “Malay Annals,” pp. 85 and 319). Possibly this was somehow connected with the present Legeh, which formed until a few decades ago part of Patâni territory. From its situation on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula I do not think that this Meiigei is in any way connected with Mi-li-chê.
2. On the east P'o-li, to the east of which lies Lo-ch'a. P'o-li, 婆利 (P'a-lai, Bäléi, Valai, or Vāri), is stated in New T'ang History to be known also as 馬禮, Ma-li (Ma-lai, Barai, Bälai, etc.), to abound in ponies, and to produce also carbuncles, some being as large as a hen's egg.¹ The people of the country, according to the Sui Annals (a.d. 581–617), were skilled at throwing metal quoits or cakras, by which they never failed to hit their adversaries.² The history of the Liang dynasty mentions that in a.d. 518–523 the king's family name was Kauṇḍinya, who stated that the wife of Suddhodana was a woman from his country.³ The land produced a soft stone called

¹ See Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 206; and Pei-shung-Pao, vol. ix, 1898, pp. 290–291, also vol. ii (second series), 1901, pp. 334–335. Groeneveldt translates 'fire-pears,' but Professor Schlegel, more rightly, 'carbuncles,' for the description given of them is: "They are round and white, and shine to a distance of several feet; when one holds such a pearl at midday over some tinder, the fire immediately springs from it." This argues them to be crystals, very likely of quartz, shaped somehow like a lens, and capable as such of concentrating the sun's rays. The same articles are said to be produced at Lo-ch'a, and it is recorded that between a.d. 650 and 755 one of such crystals, as large as a hen's egg, was sent as tribute to China by Liu-i (Campâ), which was stated to have been obtained from the kingdom of Lo-ch'a. We have in a preceding page called attention to the fact that large crystals of quartz have been noticed by Colonel Low to the south of Gûnong Chenai or Kedah Peak. Very likely they occur also in the main range and on the eastern watershed of the Malay Peninsula, where it is probable that Lo-ch'a was situated. Newbold speaks of them as occurring in the alluvial earth thrown out from tin-mines in Sungai Ujong and other districts of the Peninsula ("British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca," London, 1839, vol. ii, p. 99, etc.). Also, in considerable quantities and with gold-dust, at the base of Mount Ophir (Malacca); in Tringânn, Pahang, Gomochi, etc. (vol. i, p. 403). The presence of such crystals very likely originated the legend of diamonds being found in Kedah, Jala, Malacca (Tanîpurâ or Tanjung-pura), and neighbouring places on the Malay Peninsula (see Denny, op. cit., p. 178; Mandelalo, Amsterdam ed. of 1727, p. 335; Garcia de Orta, etc.).

² The description given shows these weapons to be cakras: "It is the size of a (Chinese metal) mirror, in the middle is a hole, and the edge is like a saw" (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 206). Tavernier speaks of these discs being still used in his time at Sidhpur in India (see V. Ball's Tavernier's "Travels in India," London, 1889, vol. i, p. 82).

³ Kauṇḍinya, in Pali Kauṇḍâna, is the well-known name, amongst others, of the maternal uncle of Suddhodana, the father of Gotama Buddha. Suddhodana's wife was Mâyâ, Buddha's mother, and her birthplace was the city of Kolâ, or Kohiya, also known as Vâgrhâpare ("Tiger City") and later on as Devedâka from the Prince of that name, on the Rohini. Several kings in Indo-China are recorded who bore the name of Kauṇḍâna, one being a Brahmap, who, according to Chinese records (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 439), came from India in about a.d. 400–420 via F'un-pan to Ku-nan (Kamboja), and became the sovereign of that country, his descendants continuing to bear the family name of Kauṇḍâna, the founder of their dynasty. As far down as a.d. 970 the name Kauṇḍâna occurs in the Sanskrit inscriptions of Kamboja for
Kambala, out of which figures were carved that became very hard after long exposure. The Sui history adds that in A.D. 516 the king's family name was Ch' a-li Yaka, and his personal name Hu-lan-na-p' o; and says of the people that for their sacrifices they choose a time when there is the line of kings reigning there. From the passage cited above, it may be inferred that in P'o-li also there may have reigned a personage of the same name hailing from the ancient home of the Säkyá princes in the Nepal terai, where Koliya was situated. This would argue that the royal family of P'o-li were Buddhists at the time being. With these circumstances the fact may or may not be connected of a city bearing the name, as recorded by Ptolemy, of Koli (supra, pp. 105–106), existing right across the Malay Peninsula in the Kelantan district, which may have been founded by the P'o-li sovereigns or their relatives in order to record their place of origin.

Professor Schlegel (in Young-Poo, 1901, p. 183) identifies this stone with a species of marl called Nepal by the Malays. This, he says, though very soft at first, becomes under water so smooth and hard that sometimes the anchors do not hold upon it. He is unable, however, to cite any examples of carvings from this material as extant on the east coast of Sumatra, where he places P'o-li. I can, on the contrary, point out endless instances of images impressed on tablets moulded out of a somewhat stiff clay, which are to be found in many a limestone cave of the Trang, Jala, Pahang, and other districts on the Malay Peninsula. Some of these have been described in Man for December, 1902, pp. 177–178. The author of the article there says of them (p. 178): "On being exposed to the air they soon become harder and assume a paler colour." I have a few of them with me, and although I must confess the material is rather brittle, I am inclined to take it that this is the 'soft stone' with 'carved figures' alluded to in the above account. I have, since writing the above, come across two references to the very Nepal stone in Newbold's "Statistical Account of the Straits of Malacca," London, 1839, vol. ii, pp. 98 and 142. The author says it is steatite, and occurs in a stratum under the tin ore in Sungai Ujong and above the gold-bearing rock at Bukit Chimendras in Gominehi (Johol State). He adds that the first layer of Nepal is soft and whitish (p. 142). This proves that Nepal is more especially a product of the west coast of the Malay Peninsula than of the east coast of Sumatra, as Professor Schlegel would have us believe.

1 割利邪伽 and 護替那婆 or 護路那婆. The first name seems to mean Kṣatriya, Saka, Sakya, Yakha, or Yaga. The second sounds something like Haranya, Bhaññanya, Hula-nava, or Uru-lava, Upana. A Sanskrit inscription on a stele at Wat Mahéyong (Mahiyangement), near Ligor, dating probably from the seventh or eighth centuries, mentions a personage under the name of Arumáya (Arça, Ürpa?), the reading being uncertain, which may be the king in question, and also contains the name of a certain "illustrious Agasti," which may be the same person whose name is recorded above under the mutilated form of Saga or Yaga. The reason why I suggest these connections is because the same inscription speaks of Cina-dheuy, or 'Chinese flags,' perhaps banners made of China silk, thus showing that the country had intercourse with China. It is a pity that this epigraphic monument should be so badly preserved as to prove for the most part undecipherable. The fact of its having been found in the Ligor district is no certain proof that it originally stood there: it may very well have been brought across from the western watershed where P'o-li was, or erected on the occasion of some visit to Ligor of a king from P'o-li.
no moon; they then fill a platter with wine and eatables and let it float away on the stream; in the eleventh month they always offer a great sacrifice.\(^1\) The sea produces coral. The itinerary followed by ships sailing to their country from Tonkin was by way of Ch'ih-t'u (head of the Gulf of Siam) and Tan-tan (Pulo Tanta-lam, between Ligor and Singora).\(^2\) The New History of the T'ang Dynasty describes the people as having swarthy bodies and red frizzled hair, nails like hawks, and teeth like wild beasts; they perforate their ears and put rings (pendants) into them, and wrap a piece of cotton round their loins. Their markets are held at night and with veiled faces.\(^3\) The king, when going out,

---

1 Here it is a question of the festival of floating offerings in streams, introduced a long time ago from India into Indo-China, and known in Siam under the name of Lô-krathong, or 'Leaf-platters floating.' It takes place at the eleventh and twelfth full moons, which generally fall in October and November respectively. The custom is widespread all over the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago, it being practised with some variations even among the Bajaus of Borneo. It also exists in the Maldives Islands. (see Leyden in "Essays relating to Indo-China," 1st series, vol. 1, p. 123). It is probable, however, that its adoption in the Archipelago occurred at a comparatively modern date, and that earlier it was mainly confined to the Malay Peninsula, where it survives to this very day, even in the purely Malay States, such as Perak, Selangor, etc. (see Straits Times, Aug. 13th, 1895, art. "Malay Customs in Selangor").

2 Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 205-206, and Young-Poo, 1911, pp. 332 et seq. In these, as well as in the following passages, I have, as a rule, adopted the emendations to Groeneveldt's translation proposed by Professor Schlegel. I should like to call attention here to the fact that Valentijn in his map of the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra marks a place by the name of Tantan Velho (i.e. 'Old Tantan' in Portuguese) on the Old Singapore Strait, immediately to the east of Tailandia Borro (Tanjong Bulas).

3 Hervey de St. Denys translates the same passage as embodied in Ma Tuan-lin's work thus (p. 459): "Les naturels ont le corps noir, des cheveux rouges et crépus, des ongles d'oiseaux de proie, et des dents de bêtes féroces. Ils se percent les oreilles pour y suspendre de petites sonnettes et ceignent leurs reins d'umile d'étoffe de coton. Ils tiennent leur marchés la nuit, et s'y rendent le visage couvert." Practically the same description is given of the natives of Lo-ch'a', the State lying east of Poo-li, on p. 489 of the same work: "Les habitants sont très laids: ils ont la peau noire, les cheveux rouges, des dents de carnassiers, et des ongles d'oiseaux de proie. De temps en temps, ils vont faire le commerce sur les côtes du Lin-i (Campá). Ils arrivent et se montrent seulement pendant la nuit; le jour ils se tiennent cachés." Dr. MacGowan, quoting from I know not what Chinese work, writes as follows in the China Review, vol. xix, p. 289: "In the reign of Yang-ti of the Sui, 605-16, the Pali of Sumatra [read Poo-li and omit Sumatra] brought as tribute specimens of their wild men,—black in colour, hair red and curled, feet and toes like bird's claws, and teeth like brute beasts; their ears were perforated; for clothing they used a strip of cloth. Subsequently these savages are again named by an officer sent by Yang-ti to Pali [Poo-li], from whom it was ascertained that they were called Loaha [Lo-ch'a'] and occupied an extensive region east of Pali [Poo-li]. They were of dreadful
sits in a chariot drawn by an elephant, etc. Most of these particulars are repeated from the preceding histories of the Liang and Sui dynasties with but trifling additions, hence it seems that all Chinese intercourse with P'o-li practically ceased after 616 A.D., the date of the latest embassy mentioned in those records. I-tsing has merely a passing reference to it somewhat later on (A.D. 671-695).

It will readily be seen, from P'o-li's topographical location to the east (or, more correctly, south-east) of Ho-ling, that it must have been on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula from, say, the 6th or 5th degree of North latitude downwards. Such being the case, it must be identified either with Pêrak or the district on the banks of the Prai River (abreast of Pinang Island), or, again, the territory round about the Pulai stream and Gûnong Pulai, at the very south-eastern extremity of the Malay Peninsula, and at the western entrance to the Old Singapore Strait. There are, of course, many other places on the west coast of the Peninsula and elsewhere bearing similar names, but they

appearance, black, red-headed, with claws for fingers and toes. They engaged in commerce, trading with Lin-yih, all transactions taking place by night, or, if trading by day, it was with veiled faces." The translator then proceeds to suggest that these savages—hardly savages or wild men, by the way, for they engaged in trade with other peoples—might have been the progenitors of the present Kumas. There can be no doubt, however, that tribes of Negrito stock on the southern part of the Malay Peninsula are implied, and with them is wrongly included the far more civilized Môn-Khmer population settled along the sea-coast and on the adjacent islands, which was really the element that carried on the trade and maintained intercourse with neighbouring countries, employing, as a matter of course, slaves from those savage tribes to do menial work, man the boats and sea-vessels, etc. It is most probably only in such a capacity, i.e. of ship-crews, that batches of Sakai and Samangs ever got to the coast of Campê. As no native race is to be found on the east coast of Sumatra or the islands immediately adjoining it possessing the somatic characteristics depicted above—though evidently with exaggerated touches—for the populations of P'o-li and Lo-ch'ia, we are compelled to locate these two countries on the southern part of the Malay Peninsula, where we meet such characteristics in the Samangs, the Panggangs, the Tumiors, etc. As regards the practice of holding markets at night in P'o-li, it is interesting to observe that the same custom was followed down to the sixteenth century at Malacca, of which the "Hai-yü" (1537) says: "Women hold a market at night, but must finish at the second drum; when they stay over this term and are caught by the patrolling orang kayu, they are killed, and the king does not look further into the affair" (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 247). This shows that P'o-li must have occupied the very same stretch of country or a conterminous one, as we have already inferred for other reasons.
are mostly insignificant and of very doubtful antiquity. The one other place, now no longer existing, that might lay some claim to identification with P'o-li is Worawari or Varawari, which is mentioned as early as A.D. 1360 in the Palatine Law Code of Ayuthia as one of the tributary States to Siām in the south (Malay Peninsula). Whether the district so named has any connection with the Wāris tribe, better known as Bidwanda, who, settling in the southernmost part of the Malay Peninsula, proceeded to encroach upon Sakai territory further to the north, I am unable to say; but I should think not, because Wāris appears to be a relatively modern epithet. It is, of course, possible that the term P'o-li may represent some such word as Bālei, بالي, meaning a hall of state, a court, a term often applied to capitals of Malay districts, in which case it would have disappeared long ago, along with the particular place it designated. But it is not altogether improbable that, in its alternative form, Ma-li (or Malei, Malai), we have the country which Edrisi recorded in A.D. 1154 under the name of 'Island of Malāi,' مالاي.

1 Like, e.g., Pulai, a small village in South Malacca, about half a mile from the coast; Sungai Pulai, a rivulet further up the coast, below the Bernam River, etc.

2 See above, p. 84, where I have suggested its possible connection with Bēra bai or Mergui, which is, however, far from certain. So its spelling, which may have come down to us in a corrupt form. Wara-vāri, according to a Siamese list of Malay poetical terms given in the “Pathama Mālā,” p. 91, is the Malay word for the China-rose (Hibiscus rosa Sinensis). The common name for this plant is, however, Bunga Raya, and in the catalogues of Malay plant-names at my disposal I only find Waru or Baru = Hibiscus tiliaceus, L. The term Varawari may be, on the other hand, a contraction of Muār, موار, Muanāra, or Moru-Muār, the name of a well-known river below Malacca, which may have been known also as Muāra-vāri.

3 See Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., July, 1898, No. 21, pp. 47-59. Wāris is an Arabic word adopted into Malay, meaning an heir, and was probably given the Bidwandas from the fact of their having been the first comers in the Negri Sembilan district. See also the said Journal, No. 22, pp. 299, 302, 312-316.

4 See Jaubert’s “Géographie d’Édrisi,” Paris, 1836, t. i, pp. 86, 92. This term, together with the Chinese Ma-li or Ma-lei, should be compared with Sāmali, Suvarṇa-māli, Malai-kolam, etc., above (pp. 80, 81, 104). However, vide infra.
In any case, from the fact of *P'o-li* being described as quite an extensive country, containing 136 villages or settlements, we think we are justified in assigning to it the whole stretch of coast from the Prai River on the north to the Pulai stream on the south, thus including within its compass all places referred to above as likely to have given their name to the whole country in question.

It should be added that the Sui annals mention another State with an almost identical name, though somewhat differently spelled, viz. 霸利, *Po-li* (*Pok-lai, Bu-li*). This country, however, seems to have no connection with *P'o-li*, and probably must be sought for on the east coast of Sumatra, if not elsewhere in the Archipelago.

East from *P'o-li* lay, as we have seen, the land of *Lo-ch'au*, with customs and population similar to those of *P'o-li*. By this we have already suggested that the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, from Johor, or even the Rochor River on Singapore Island, up to Pahang and even further to the north, is meant. If *Lo-ch'au* stands for Rākṣas or Rākṣasa, it is no doubt intended for the *Jakūns*, جاکون, of the more southern parts of the Peninsula, and perhaps also for the wilder tribes of Negrito-Sakai stock populating its eastern coast. The term may, however, be merely a toponymic travestied, in Chinese spelling, so as to assume that meaning which it may not at all have had in its original local form. We have already pointed out Rochor as a possible equivalent. But there is a more approximate one yet, namely, *Latcha*, a small stream debouching a little above the river of Chana (Chānāh), in the district of this name, in about 7° 4' N. lat.

---

1 Fifty days' travelling from east to west and twenty days' from south to north according to the Liang Annals; four months and forty-five days respectively according to Sui history; several thousand li in extent according to the New T'ang History.

2 See Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 515. This country is described as situated in the bay formed by the sea to the south of the land of 抱利, *Chū-lī* (*K'iū-lei, Kū-pei, Kī-li, Kū-ri*). The natives are black-skinned, have very white teeth and red eyes, disposed horizontally. Men and women alike go stark-naked.

3 See above, pp. 260, 261.
Another not very dissimilar name is that of Legeh or Lăghē, also called Rangeh (but usually spelled Ranga), not far below (6° 15' N. lat.).

3. On the north, Chên-la (Kamboja). This bearing is fairly correct as far as Chinese bearings go; more correct in any case than that given for P'o-lêng, which, though lying to the west of Ho-ling, is located to the south of Lin-i.

1 The Chinese characters 雷 利 employed in writing the term Lo-ch'âa are, it should be observed, pronounced Lo-ch'at, Lo-au, Loa-suk in the Southern Chinese dialects, and Lâ-chuat in Annamese, the second one meaning, in reality, chair or chutta (Pâli chatta), a parasol or umbrella, the state canopy which is one of the insignia of royalty. If not intended to convey the significance of Bâkṣa, Lo-ch'al must have accordingly been the transcript of a toponymic sounding something like Lâch'âa, Lâch'at, Lâshâk, Lâjor, Lâjâj, etc., in its original form. Such being the case, it occurs to me that this kingdom of Lo-ch'al or Lâch'âa, Lâch'ak, etc., must have been the hitherto unidentified province of Locat, Looch, Lochee, Looch, Looar, or Loveat, visited by Marco Polo on his homeward journey from China and Champâ, which was most assuredly situated about this point on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, and not on the coast of Kamboja or Siam as has hitherto been conjectured. If not actually Loochâ in Chanâ, it is undoubtedly Loegg or Lâygê, which name, on account of the explosive and abruptly cut off sound of the last syllable, may seem to the uninitiated to sound like Lâygê, Lâygêk. I have often thought about Lâkhôn or Liger as being probably Marco Polo's Locat or Loeue, but on account of the wide difference in sounds between the two names I now consider the identification proposed to be preferable. It should be observed that Marco Polo says of this place that it is so bad that very few people go there; hence it cannot have been a great emporium of trade, and this is exactly what suits the district in question. His statement as regards gold being plentiful there also admirably suits Chanâl and Legeh, whereas it would ill apply to the coast of Kamboja and the upper part of the Gulf of Siam.

Our Sinologists have preferred to identify the country of Lo-ch'a with the Nikobârs, although most distinctly stated to lie east of P'o-li. Groenevedt (op. cit., p. 297) says: "This [Lo-ch'a] has been, for a long time, the name of the Nicobar Islands, probably on account of the wildness and bad reputation of their inhabitants." I should like to see what proofs he has for saying this. Bâkṣa-deīga is, as far as I am aware, a term given of old to Ceylon (see South, "La Légende du Bouddha," p. 272; and "Lalita-vistara," Calcutta ed., p. 196), and not to the Nikobârs. Professor Schlegel, in the Young-Plu, vol. ix, p. 177 et seq., takes it for granted that Lo-ch'a means the Nikobârs, and corrects into 'west' the bearing given of that country 'east' of P'o-li. The fact of Chang-šâun, the Chinese ambassadour to Ch'âa-lên (Sukhâda in Siam) in A.D. 607-8, having called at Lo-ch'a on his homeward route to China, does not alter the learned Professor's preconceived opinion and put him on his guard. Fancî Chang-šâun making a little pleasure détour via the Nikobârs in order to get back to China from Siam! I have carefully followed and laid down step by step his route in my "Siam's Intercourse with China" (see Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1901, pp. 163-164), where I have demonstrated that the place touched at, Lo-ch'a, must have stood on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, in Pahang or thereabouts. In that position, and that only, could it be touched at by Chang-šâun on his route from Siam to Campâ and China, as it was by Marco Polo on his outward voyage from China and Campâ to the Straits.
i.e. Champā. Those who are inclined to locate Ho-ling in Java have this in their favour, that they place it correctly in respect of Kamboja, but at what distance away! and are at a loss to make the other countries named as neighbours of Ho-ling fit in in the directions indicated for them.

4. On the south, the insular kingdom called To-mo-ch'ang, which has: (1) To-tung on the west, (2) P'o-feng on the east, and (3) Pan-chih-pa or Ch'ien-chih-fu on the south. The distance at which To-mo-ch'ang lies south of Ho-ling is not stated, hence the difficulty of identifying it. I have thought of Tamiang or Tamiyang, on the east coast of Sumatra, in about 4° 25' N. lat.; but this is recorded, at least, from A.D. 1436, by Fei-Hsin as 淡洋, Tan-yang or Tam-yang,1 and besides does not suit, both on account of its not being an island and of its not having in its neighbourhood places bearing names similar to those indicated. I have therefore come to the conclusion that To-mo-ch'ang, 多摩 mandated, is very likely Singapore Island, which in the Chinese map of about A.D. 1399 published by Phillips appears as 長 娵嶼, Ch'ang-yau Island,2 a term not unseemingly derived from the former. To-mo, the first part of the name, may very well represent the term Tama, Tuna, which we have noticed here in Bētūmah, Tamus, or Tamarus Promontorium,3 and which survives to

1 See Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 216; and Young-Pao, 1901, pp. 365-366. There is, in truth, an island as well called Temiang, which gives its name to Temiang Strait, between Kian (Bhio) and Linga; but this does not appear to suit the case. Neither does Pulo Temian in the south-western Anambahs.

2 Lit. 'Long-joined Island.' An island of the same name is mentioned in the Chinese account of Brūnai, West Borneo (see Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 223), as lying in the river.

3 See pp. 199-200, 249, ante. We have also Bukit Timah, or 'Tin Hill,' 550 feet high, to the north-west of Singapore town, and the highest elevation on the Island of Singapore; the name of which, Timah, may be connected with the above through the Sanskrit tama = 'tin.'

The passage in question says: "Formerly their city had a stone wall and a wooden wall; the stone wall was demolished in order to fill up the island Ch'ang-yau and shut out the sea." This evidently refers to the Kota Bātu or artificial bar formed in the river, according to the "Selesailah" of the rajas of Brūnai, by Sultan Berkat, between the islands Kāya Orang and Pulau Chermin, which jointly command the entrance of the Brūnai River (see Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 5, June, 1880, pp. 3, 7). Ch'ang-yau here does not seem to be a transcript of the name of either of the two islands, but a collective name given to them together with the connecting bar. Ch'ang-yau, or Ch'ang-in,
this day in Tumerau or Tembrau, the name of the Old Singapore Strait, the Selat Tebrau of modern maps. Ch’ang may stand for ūjong = ‘promontory,’ and the whole represent Tama-ūjong, or something similar, which would be a form analogous to Tamaśak = ‘Tama Land,’ that we have already met here (supra, p. 199). The toponymy of the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago offers us forms like Temanjung,1 Manjong, مانج، the ancient name for the Pērak district (see above, p. 98); and Temajo or Temaju, an island off the west coast of Borneo, abreast of Sangan Point; but I think that To-mo-ch’ang could nowhere be better located than on Singapore Island as proposed above.2

This point settled, it remains to look for the other places mentioned as its neighbours on the west, east, and south.

To-lung, 多隆, may be Pulo Tulang, below the Great Karīmon and on the west side of Durian Strait; it may, in fact, embrace the whole of the cluster of islands of which Tulang forms part, both Karīmons included.3

P’o-féng, 瑶鳳 (P’o-féng, Boa-houng, Bu-wung, Ba-fung), is far more difficult to locate. It can hardly be Pulo Papan, because this island lies close to the south-east of Tulang, from which it is separated by a narrow channel only; and can scarcely correspond to Pulo Abang in Dempu Strait (below Pulo Galang), as this does not lie in the direction indicated, and very likely belongs to the group to be next discussed. It is therefore probable that P’o-féng or Bu-hung may, after all, be meant for the Pāpan district (Pāpan Besar) eastwards of Old Jahor; if not for Pahang, or, at any rate,

Chōng-in, as it is variously pronounced, as applied to Singapore Island, may also stand for Changi, the name of the district and headland at its north-eastern extremity.

1 A village on the west coast of Pulo Weh, off the northern end of Sumatra.
2 I have since noticed that Professor Schlegel, in Tewung-Pūo, vol. ix, p. 286, is inclined to adopt the same site, but out of mere conjecture, and without giving, as we have done, any reasons based on similarity of nomenclature, etc., in support of his view.
3 For a long distance to the west there is no similar name to be found in the Straits until we get to Pulo Tulang in the Bindings, and Kwālā Trông further up towards Larut. Another Pulo Tulang lies south of Pulo Bintang (Rhio), but does not suit the case. To-lung may possibly be meant for Durian, the Durian group, otherwise known as Moro or Muro.
its homonymous settlement at Kwāla Pahang on the Endau River.¹

As regards Pan-chih-pa, 半支跋, or Ch'ien-chih-fu, 千支弗, I feel perfectly confident that under this name is comprised the insular group extending southwards from Penjabung Island and the homonymous strait south of Pulo Gālang to Lima and Penuba Straits and Singkep Island. In this cluster of islands, it will be at once noticed, Penjabung is a very close approach in nomenclature to Pan-chih-pa, while Singkep looks a surprisingly exact counterpart of Ch'ien-chih-fu, especially in its Cantonese pronunciation,

¹ Professor Schlegel, loc. cit., too readily takes Po-f'eng to be Pahang, which, after his own showing (Ts'oung-Pao, vol. ix, pp. 297-8), is spelled 彭亨, Pêng-hêng or P'ang-hêng, in the books of the Ming dynasty (Wan-li period = A.D. 1573-1619). But this, he contends, is the old name, taken from the Fanggang tribe; "the new name is transcribed 婆凰, in Amoy dialect Po-hong = Pahang." Nevertheless, I find it spelled 彭坑, Pêng-k'êng (Pang-hang), in the Chinese map of about A.D. 1399 published by Phillips (op. cit., p. 39), which is also the form adopted in Fei-Hsin's work, A.D. 1436 (see Groeneweldt, op. cit., p. 255); whereas the autograph 彭亨 is the one appearing later on in Ming history (ibid., p. 256). Thus, contrary to what the learned Professor maintains, 彭亨, his 'old form' of the name, proves relatively modern.

As regards his assumed 'new name,' 婆凰, it already appears in the New History of the T'ang Dynasty, published during the eleventh century, and cannot therefore be quite so 'new' in comparison with the above. And as its form is considerably different from what we know for certain to be the usual transcripts of the name Pahang, we should be cautious in identifying it too readily with this name. Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 507) mentions, apparently following the Sung Annals, a kingdom of 婆皇, Po-huang (Pa-hang, Ba-gang, or Ba-gwang), which sent tribute to China from A.D. 449 to 463. The "P'ei-wen Yün Fu" (see China Review, vol. xiii, p. 337) speaks of an even earlier embassy sent by the same State, and by the neighbouring one of 婆達, Po-ta, in the reign of the Sung emperor Wu-ti (A.D. 420-423).

It is possible that Pahang is the district alluded to under these various transcripts, especially as Po-huang is, in one instance, and under the date A.D. 449, mentioned at the same time along with the States of Ho-lo-tan and Po-ta (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 506), thereby leading one to infer that it must have been a neighbour of theirs, being like them situated on the Malay Peninsula; but perhaps it is better to reserve judgment until we know more of the ancient history of the Malay Peninsula than we do now.
Ts'yn-chi-fūt. There are, moreover, within its compass Pangelap and Penuba Islands and Straits bearing not dissimilar names. I have no doubt that in this insular

1 In other dialects: Ts'ien-chi-fūh; Korean, Ch'ŏn-chi-pul; and Japanese, Sen-chi-futos = Sinchipu, Sinkipur, or Sinkipulo. In a passage quoted by Professor Schlegel from the New History of the T'ang Dynasty, bk. 222, fol. 5 recto (see T'oung-Poo, vol. ix, p. 287, note 50), it is said that Ch'ien-chih-[fū], otherwise called Pan-chih-pa, which means roughly Wu-shan, i.e. the "Five Islands," is situated in the middle of the south-western sea, and was originally a State subordinate to Southern India, that is, perhaps, a Dravidian colony. Professor Schlegel misconstrues the interpretation "Five Islands," which he takes to apply to the five islands (called, however, Wu-hai, and not Wu-shan) after which the territory known later as Malacca was called, according to Ma Huan's work (1416). If the Chinese interpretation is correct, Pan-chih-pa (Pan-chi-pat, Pan-chi-pal) may stand for Panca-palli = "Five Cities." I have also a sort of a suspicion that 千支弗, Ch'ien-chih-fu, may be a lapsus calami for 千支弗, Kau-chi-fu, as the two characters, 千, Ch'ien, and 千, Kau, are often confounded with one another in Chinese texts. If so, 千支弗 might read Kañétpura (Conjeveram). This conjecture receives support from the fact that in the passage cited above from the New T'ang History the name is actually spelled 千支, Ch'ien-chih—the missing character 弗 being supplied within parentheses by Professor Schlegel—which suggests 千支, Kau-chih = Kañci, this being the abbreviated form by which Conjeveram (Kañci-varam) or Kañcípura is often designated in Sanskrit literature. I am, of course, aware that the name of this city is spelled 建志補羅 and 建志城, Chien-chih-pu-lo and Chien-chih-ch'ing, by Hwén-tsong (A.D. 639) and other Chinese Buddhist pilgrims; but the Arab transcript Kanjab, of which more anon, tends to confirm that conjecture. Being a dependency or colony of Southern India (probably Dravidia, the capital of which was Kañcípura), there would be nothing strange if the insular State in question had been named by its colonists after their fatherland. The same remark applies to the form Pan-chih-pa, if meant for Pancapalli, and so named from the homonymous town on the coast of south-eastern India. Should, on the other hand, the spelling Ch'ien-chih-fu be correct, we should then read Sāñci-pura or, perhaps better, Singkêp, as surmised above.

2 Other kindred toponymics in that neighbourhood are: Penjengat Island, off the entrance to Rhio Bay; Pulo Penjait Layar, further to the west, past Pulo Rempang; Pulo Penjaleh, off the entrance to Kampar River, east coast of Sumatra, etc.

Professor Schlegel, in T'oung-Poo, vol. ix, p. 279, note 25, basing his opinion on a Chinese commentary which says that Pan-chih-pa means 五山, i.e. "Five Islands," is misled into believing that these are the five islets off Malacca, after which this place became known of old to the Chinese. But above Pulo Singkêp there are likewise five islets, known accordingly as Pulo Lima (in Malay, "the
group of Pan-chih-pa or Ch’ien-chih-fu we have the hitherto-unidentified islands of Fanjab or Kanjab, فنجب، of Mas‘ūdī. This “Imām of (Arab) writers” tells us in his “Meadows of Gold” (A.D. 943) that among the natives of the many islands of his fifth sea, the sea of Kerdenj, “there is one tribe called Fenjab (or Fanjab): these have frizzly hair and strange figures; mounted on their boats, they lay in wait for ships that pass in their neighbourhood and shoot upon them poisoned arrows of a peculiar kind. Between the country they inhabit and the territory of Kalah there exist mines of white lead (tin) and mountains containing silver.”

Further on our author speaks of the same country as Kanjab, and has a passing allusion to its ruler: “and other princes of India, such as the king of Kanjab, and several other potentates of the mountains (islands) of China (China Sea) which face the islands of Zahej and others.” Edrisī (A.D. 1154), although mainly following him, calls the same people فنجب, Fanjab—evidently a mere clerical slip for فنجب, Fanjab—and adds that every one of these natives carries round his neck a collar of either iron, brass, or gold.

Five Islands’), which give their name to Lima Strait between Penuba and Linga islands, thus confirming, if necessary, our identification. I should think, however, that if Pan-chih-pa really means Panaa-pura or Panca-palī, i.e. five cities or islands, these five islands should be rather the pretty extensive and tolerably well populated islands of Singkep, Linga, Sebangka, Temiang, Panggulap, etc., up to Penjabung, where we still probably have a relic of the old term Panaa-pura. This insular cluster may also represent the island referred to as Panaa-janyā in the Bhāgavata and Padma Purāṇa, and classed among the eight minor dvipaś (see Professor Hall’s ed. of Wilson’s “Visṇu Purāṇa,” vol. ii., p. 129, n.).

1 See “Prairies d’Or,” text and transl. of Barbier de Meynard and Payet de Courteille, Paris, 1861, t. i, pp. 340-341 and 394. The translators have failed to perceive that Fanjab and Kanjab refer to the same place. Evidently they correspond respectively to the two Chinese transcripts Pan-chih-pa and Ch’ien-chih-fu; hence the Chinese must have got these terms from the Arab navigators, or vice versa.


3 Ibid., p. 394.

4 He places this population on some of the islands surrounding the great island of Sūmah or Sabarwah = either the southern end of the Malay Peninsula or the neighbouring Rhio-Lingga archipelago, and says: “There exist on some of these islands a people called Fanjab, with black and frizzly hair, attacking the ships with war engines, weapons, and poisoned arrows. It is difficult to withstand their attacks, and few of those that pass in their neighbourhood or fall into their hands succeed in effecting their escape. Each of these men wears round his neck
Evidently the population here referred to is that of the Orang-laut, severally called Sika, Sekah, and Bajau, inhabiting the islands of the Rhio-Linga Archipelago, and well known in the past for their very pronounced piratical habits.¹

¹ I have often thought that Fanjat and Pan-chih-pa may be in reality but transcripts of the term Bajau, which is met with under various forms, such as, e.g., Baju, Benju, Bajus, Banju, Banjau (Banjav = Banjab = Fanjab?). These terms are considered as having originated from the Javanese word Bajo = a ‘robber,’ modified in various ways in the dialects of the archipelago. Bajo is seemingly another of its forms, meaning a pirate or sea-robber. In Balfour’s "Cyclopaedia of India," however, it is stated (vol. ii, p. 328), I know not on what authority, that Baju means a ‘fisherman.’ According to another version, the term would be derived from Wajo, a district in Celebes whence the Bajo or Bajau hail from. But this may have been so named from the fact of being a country of robbers. Be it as it may, this people are said to have emigrated thence to Borneo and further west, probably as early as the sixth or seventh century A.D. The Sekah of Billiton call themselves by preference descendants of the Bajau, and it has indeed been suggested that there may have been a certain original connection between them and the Bajo of Celebes. The Sekah (Sika, Sekah, Sekat) are described as possessed of ‘short, stout, thickset figures, broad and very muscular arms and legs; long, frizzly, black hair, and open countenances—screaming and laughing whilst carrying the heaviest burdens on their broad shoulders—forming a striking contrast to the slender, inanimate, and crafty Malays.’ ‘Everyone who carefully and accurately notices their physical demeanour and their moral and intellectual peculiarities, is struck by the fact that the Sekahs are not Malays. Against this speaks not only the fact that their language is entirely different, but also the occurrence of hairy, frizzle-haired men and women, true Papuan types.’ (A. B. Meyer’s 'Negritos,' Dresden, 1899, p. 46.) Dr. Meyer thinks there may be in them an element which can be derived from the Negritos of the Malay Peninsula, and we are of the same opinion. This is the daring race that peopled all the Rhio-Linga Archipelago, and of which, it will now be recognized, Mas‘ūdi, in the first half of the tenth century, gave so strikingly true a description.

The Bajus, on the other hand, are described by Dr. Riedel (Meyer, op. cit., p. 47) as having ‘straight and curly, but not frizzly hair.’ This confirms me in the view I have ultimately adopted, viz., that the Fanjab depicted by Mas‘ūdi and Edrisí were Sekahs and not Bajaus; and that although Fanjab closely resembles the term Bajau, especially in its forms of Banju, Banjau, etc., it is not an ethnical designation, but a place-name, and should be more logically connected with Pan-chih-pa and the cluster of islands comprised under that heading.
I need not point out how this, I hope now well proved, identification of Pan-chih-pa or Ch'ien-chih-fu with Singkep and the islands lying north of it as far as Penjabung Island and Strait, deals the last blow to the Ho-ling, scilicet Java, theory. For it is plain that if Pan-chih-pa, which lies south of To-mo-ch'ang, which in its turn lies south of Ho-ling, is Singkep and the islands bounding it on the north, Ho-ling must be looked for much further northwards, that is, on the Malay Peninsula, and cannot in any wise be located away south in Java. This is, it must be admitted, even by itself alone, a conclusive argument capable of disposing right off of that question on geographical grounds; but when to it be added the multifarious points we have successively discussed and made out one by one in the course of these last pages, it cannot fail to strike even the casual reader that the sum of evidence in favour of the location of Ho-ling on the Malay Peninsula is absolutely overwhelming. Before dismissing the subject altogether, however, we think it worth while to make a few more remarks of a circumstantial character.

We have seen that Ho-ling was also called a 杜婆, Tu-p'o (Tu-ba, Tu-va, Dhu-va), and 閻婆, Shê-p'o (Jâ-va, Tu-ba, Sha-va), both which names we have found represented in the Langkâwi group in Pulo Tubah and Tanjung Sâwah. These alternative names for Ho-ling, it should be observed, are mentioned the first time in the new history of the T'ang dynasty (compiled during the eleventh century), and do not occur at all in the older compilation, which gives but a bare account of the country. The same remark applies to all the other particulars hereafter referred to, which all come to us through the new annals. Among such is the statement already dwelt upon that the king lives in the town of Shê-p'o (Java, Saba, or Tuba), while his ancestor Ki-yen had lived more to the east, at the town Po-lu-ka-sî, or, according to

1 Groeneweldt (op. cit., p. 138) corrects the first character into 社, Shê; but Professor Schlegel remarks in the T'oung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 274, note 5, that 杜 "may or may not be a clerical error for 社."
Professor Schlegel’s translation, “had removed to the east from the city of Polukiasze.” In the event of this latter interpretation being correct, the city in question would, as we have pointed out, very probably be Prakāsai, just below Ghirbi (about 7° 52’ N. lat.). For Ho-ling was pretty extensive. Twenty-eight small neighbouring States are said in the same annals to have acknowledged its supremacy, and there were thirty-two high officials in the country. The highest of these dignitaries is referred to as the President (大 坐, Ta-tso) Kan-hsiung, in Cantonese Kom-heng (敢 兄). Now this, it will be seen, is, as likely as not, the Siēmo-Khmør title Kambheng or Khamheng (the ‘Strong’), often borne by high officials.

On the mountains, continues the same account, is the tract of land (or district) called Lang-pi-ye (Long-pi-ya or Nang-pi-ya), 南 界 野, where the king frequently goes (or ascends) to get a view of the sea. Here we have a term similar to the Malay place-names Rumbei, Rambei, Rumbai, Rumbia, etc., which we meet with in several parts of the west coast of the Malay Peninsula. We even have a Kwǎla Rambai near the central range, and a village called Baling at the head-waters of the Muda River, in Southern Kedah.  

An anecdote is next told about a queen of Ho-ling called Hsi-mo (Sik-mok, Sit-mok, Si-lak, Si-mo), 悉 莫, who was taken by the people of the country as their ruler in A.D. 674.

---

1 Other instances of the occurrence of this and similar toponyms are: Ayer Rambai, a small affluent of the Sapatang, near Port Weld, Larut; Sungei Rambai, a small tributary of the Selangor River not far from its mouth; Sungei Rambai, a little affluent of the Kesang River, South Malacca; and Pulo Rumbia, the largest island of the Sembilan group, in front of the entrance to the Perak River. Rumbai and Lampai are the Malay names for several species of Euphorbiaceae (Baccaurea, Galaria, Aporosa), and Rumbia or Rumbia the Malay term for the Sago-palm. Lampai is the tree-nettle (Laportea crenulata), and Lampai-hitam the Gymnichodes sublancesolata. As the last character, 野, ye, in Lang-pi-ye means ‘wilderness’, and the whole name may, as Groeneveldt observes, also be translated ‘the wild region of Lang-pi’, the word intended may be Rumbia, which in Malay means forest or virgin jungle. Hervey de St. Denys, Ma Tuan-lin’s translator, takes (op. cit., p. 527) Lang-pi-ye to be a city on a mountain: “Sur une montagne est bâtie la ville de Lang-pi-ye,” etc.

2 Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 528; Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 139. The translation given by the last-named of the passage in question runs as follows: “In 674 the people of this country took as their ruler a woman of the name Sima. Her
Now it is a very curious coincidence that at about the same period the Peguan book of Gavampati mentions a queen, Sima-devi by name, as reigning at Re (Burmanice Yay), north of Tavoy, on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, who had attained to great power, many neighbouring States acknowledging her supremacy. It seems almost certain that this is the same personage as the one alluded to in the Chinese account, the topographical inconsistency being easily explainable by assuming that Ho-ling was, at the time being, one of the States that were tributary to her.

Later on, in the year 813, Ho-ling is stated to have presented to China, amongst other curiosities, four Seng-chih slaves (僧祇奴), who were most likely dancing slave-girls, such as are known to have originally been trained for theatrical exhibitions at Ligor and neighbouring districts in the Malay Peninsula, whence the practice spread on to Pegu, Siam, Kamboja, and the Malay Archipelago. We are told a few lines later on, in fact, that between A.D. 860 and 873 Ho-ling again sent an envoy to present female musicians.

The rule was most excellent; even things dropped on the road were not taken up. The prince of the Arabs [the Chinese text has 大食, Ta-shih, which is usually meant for Tajik, the Tjajka or Arabs; but which we shall see in the sequel refers in this and parallel cases to Achich or Achen], hearing of this, sent a bag with gold to be laid down within her frontiers; the people who passed that road avoided it in walking, and it remained for three years. Once the heir-apparent stepped over that gold, and Sima became so incensed that she wanted to kill him. Her ministers interceded, and then Sima said: 'Your fault lies in your feet, therefore it will be sufficient to cut them off.' The ministers interceded again, and she had his toes cut off, in order to give an example to the whole nation. When the prince of Tazi [Tajik, Achi] heard this he became afraid and dared not attack her.'

1 Noticed above, pp. 114, 182, etc. The passage here alluded to occurs in fasciculus ii.

2 Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 140, takes them to be negro slaves, assuming that Seng-chih stands for the Persian Zanggi = a man from Zang, i.e. Zangibar. Professor Schlegel argues, on the contrary (T'oung-Pao, vol. ix, pp. 91 and 278), that the ancient pronunciation of 僧祇 was Sang-ti (which I beg to doubt), and that therefore these characters never could have represented an Arab or Persian word Zenj, Zenj, or Zanggi, Zangi (black, negro). It occurs to me, however, that the term is almost certainly identical with the vocable Tseut-sz.
In fine, I-tsing mentions, in about A.D. 665, a very learned Buddhist monk, Jñānabhadra by name, who was

(Cheing-ni, Zang-sz, Ch'ing-sa) or Ts'êng-ch'i (Ts'êng-h'ei, Ts'ên-k'i, Cheing-ki, Zang-jî, Ch'ing-ki) appearing in the composite 島嶼時期, K'un-lun-Ts'êng-sz or K'un-lun-Ts'êng-ch'i, the latter being the spelling adopted in the Chinese encyclopaedia called the "Wan-pao Ch'üan-shu" (see China Review, vol. viii, pp. 188-189). Here apparently slaves or rather slave-dancers (Sêng-chih or Ts'êng-chêi) from K'un-lun are meant. This country, we have demonstrated (ante, pp. 89, 90, 103, 260), is not, as hitherto assumed by our Sinologists, the inhospitable and uninhabited (except compulsorily by convicts at the present day) Pulo Condore, but part of the Malay Peninsula, where Negrito and hybrid Negrito tribes are settled. From the fact of the K'un-lun people being described in the "San-ts'ai T'u-hwei" (1607) as "black as if covered with black varnish," Phillips (China Review, loc. cit.) infers that Ts'êng-chêi or Ts'êng-k'i represents the term Zang, Zanj, or Zangi, and that negro slaves imported from the African coast are meant. Dr. Hirth (China Review, vol. xviii, p. 314) adopts the same view, although unable to explain the term K'un-lun. K'un-lun slaves are mentioned as being brought to China in 976 by an envoy from Tu-shih (Arabia or Achin ?), and sent as tribute by San-fou-chi (Palembang) in 1017. Sometimes they are designated 島嶼奴, K'un-lun-Nu, a term which may be compared with 僧祇奴, Sêng-chih-Nu, above. Professor Schlegel, ever fond of the most extraordinary rapprochements, is led to connect the Sêng-chih-Nu with Upper Siâm, from the mere haphazard coincidence that the name of the capital of Ch'ih-t'ou (Sukhothai State) in A.D. 607 is likewise spelled 僧祇, Sêng-chih, which, I have demonstrated, is Senkha or Swankhalôk (vide supra, p. 178; and Asiatic Quarterly Review, Oct., 1900, p. 369). Hence he concludes that the Sêng-chih-Nu were "Siamese slave-girls" (T'oung-Pao, vol. ix, pp. 91, 278). This notwithstanding the fact that a few lines further on (op. cit., p. 278) he quotes a passage from the T'ang Annals stating that between A.D. 713 and 741 the State of Shi-kâi Fô-shih (East Sumatra) presented two dwarfs and two Sêng-chih slave-girls along with singing and dancing masters. (Here the character 祇, chih, chi, is employed instead of 祇, chih, chi, which makes, however, but little difference, though it shows, with Ts'êng-chêi or Ts'êng-sz above, that the real pronunciation must have been Sangi, Sangû, or something similar, and not Sang-ti as the worthy Professor maintains.) It will be plain that if such slaves or slave-girls could be sent by so distant a country as the east coast of Sumatra, it is most unlikely they were procured from the powerful Sukhothai-Swankhalôk State in Upper Siâm. It is true that a country of a somewhat similar name, Syangka, is mentioned in the fourteenth century in the "Nagarakretâgama," a Javanese poem composed in honour of the king of Mâjapâhit, among the continental kingdoms that maintained friendly relations with his (see "Compte Rendu du Premier Congrès International des Études d'Extrême-Orient, Hanoi, 1902," pp. 21-22). The kingdoms in question
a native of the State of Ho-ling, where he was met with

mentioned besides Syangka, with my identifications of them within parentheses, are: Ayodhyapura (Ayuthia, the old Siamese capital from A.D. 1350 to 1767); Dharmanagara (Sri Dharma-raja-nagara or Ligor); Maratuna (Marit or Mergui, or Muttima, Muttama = Martaban?); Rajapura (Rajburi, S.W. Siăm, or the puzzling Lo-cho'?); Singhamagara (Singapore, or else Sinhapura of the Chám inscription, No. 383?); Campa (Bal-Angwè); Komboja; and Ravana (Annam, or rather Tonkin). These being the facts of the case, I can hardly think that Syangka can mean Swankhalôk, and must take it that some State on the Malay Peninsula is implied, which may be the Tr'êng-ch'i or Sêng-chib above referred to; but as regards its exact location I am unable to make any definite statement. Indeed, Philip Baldeus, about the middle of the seventeenth century, does mention a harbour of Seneaza on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula between Tananur (Trang? or Ramong?, P'hang-ngâ?) and Perash (Pêrak). (See "Beschr. der Ost-Ind. Kunstern," etc., p. 154; Churchill's "Collection of Voyages and Travels," 1794, vol. iii, p. 588; Anderson's "English Intercourse with Siâm," p. 41.) This Seneaza may well be the Syangka sought for, but as Baldeus' work is chiefly a compilation from the writings of his predecessors, the term in question may be also a clerical error for Langkawi or something similar, so that his authority cannot be relied upon until more evidence is forthcoming.

I feel, however, rather doubtful as to Tr'êng-ch'i or Sêng-chib being a place-name at all, and would prefer to view it as a term designating dancers, more especially dancing-girls, somehow connected with the Môñ, Katsing, K'toing, meaning a 'female dancer' (perhaps from the Hindi Kasbin, Kanchi). It is my sad lot to have so often to disagree with Professor Schlegel that it affords me sincere pleasure to be able, for the nonce, to fall into something like accord with him on one point in this question, namely, that in which he holds the persons in question to be slave-girls (though not, as he says, Siamese). I would rather suggest 'dancers' in general, including both male and female. Such dancers, he observes, 'coming from the highlands' of Kelantan, Patani, Kedah, and Trengganu, on the Malay Peninsula, are known in the archipelago by the name of Majung [Mâyung, ماجن; Malay Mâyang and Bâyang, بانغ], which, however, more properly means a shadow-play or puppet-show, biduan, (bedoan), being the real name for a dancing-girl. Pijnappel (Malay Diet., ii, 129) says that they are probably of Siamese origin." I have elsewhere shown (see my monograph on the "Thiet Mahâ Ch'hat Ceremony as performed in Siâm," Bangkok, 1892, p. 31, note 3) that such dancers and the peculiar style of performances they go through originated in Ligor, from which fact they are usually known as Lakhôn, the vernacular name of Ligor (Nagara, see above, p. 109). Their prototype was, of course, the Indian nautch (nâtya, nauta, naka), but modified and adapted to local tastes so as to impress the display with a peculiar physiognomy of their own. Hence their name, which was introduced with them into Siâm and Kamboja, where it still survives in the
by several of I-tsing's confrères, whom he assisted in translating several Buddhist texts into Chinese.¹

From A.D. 873 no mention of further relations with Ho-ling is made in Chinese literature, which shows that either that State disappeared, was absorbed into others, or disintegrated as the case may be, or else, which seems less likely, that all intercourse between it and China ceased.

At all events, the circumstantial evidence we have collected above, coupled with the more direct data adduced at the outset, establishes beyond doubt, I venture to think, the position of Ho-ling on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula where we have located it, and absolutely excludes the possibility of its having stood on the island of Java, instead of which we have to read the country of Java, Sava, or Saba, on the Malay Peninsula, defined above under section B. Nor do I think that the term Ho-ling stands, as most Sinologists have suggested, for a word Kling, Kaling, or Kalinga introduced by immigrants or colonists from the east coast of India. This, we have seen, was already the name for the eastern Tri-Kalinga in Pegu, also at times styled Tuleng or Telinga, and Kalinga-raṣṭrā,² and it is

form Lakhon (although in Kamboja female dancers are also called Neang Robam, from riöm or riöm, which is probably but a shortened form of the North Indian raṇjanī, Skt. rāmā-jani = "a dancing girl"); into Pegu, where it has been modified into Lékón, Teákôn, or Takón; and into Java, where it yet subsists as Lākôn = 'theatrical play,' 'dramatic composition.'

It may be that youngsters from the neighbouring wild tribes were kidnapped as slaves in Ligor and neighbouring States for the purpose of being trained as actors in such performances, but of this we have no proof. All we know, and that from Chinese sources ('San-ts'ai T'ün-hweii," see China Review, loc. cit.), is that the inhabitants of K'un-lun "make slaves from among their own people, and sell them to foreign merchants, receiving in exchange dresses and other articles." Also that in San-fo-ch'i (Palembang) slaves from K'un-lun "make music for them by trampling on the ground and singing" (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 188); which extracts show that the K'un-lun, Ts'êng-ch'i, or Sing-chi, actors must have been Lakhons, and have hailed from Ligor and neighbouring States on the Malay Peninsula. Edrisi (A.D. 1154) gives a description of such dancing-girls as were attached to temples—probably in the capacity of Deva-dātis—in Jābāk (Malay Peninsula and Sumatra). See Jaubert's "Géographie d'Edrisi," Paris, 1836, t. i, pp. 80-81.

¹ Chavannes, op. cit., pp. 60-63.
² Vide supra, pp. 31-32. The Kedah Annals (see Journal Malay Archipelago, vol. ii) call it the country of Galungi or Kalungi, and place it at some days beyond Tavoy, at the mouth of the Changong River (= Bi-Tsing, Bi-Chōing,
unlikely that the denomination included the west coast of the Malay Peninsula as well, although we have mentioned indications of Ho-ling having at one time (seventh century) extended as far up as Rê (Yay) and perhaps further. A better suggestion would have been Kareng or Karieng instead of Kalinga, although there is no proof that the Karenga had as yet reached so far down the Malay Peninsula at the period in question. I prefer, therefore, to adhere to my own provisional identification with Gerieng.¹

Having thus disposed—it is to be hoped successfully—of the Ho-ling question, it behoves us to finally clear the ground by a more precise determination of the position of Shê-p’o or Châ-vâ classed under Section B. This, we shall now proceed to demonstrate, must likewise be fixed on the Malay Peninsula. Our evidence for such an assertion are the itineraries given by Chinese writers outward from Shê-p’o in different directions, which need, however, to be overhauled and laid out afresh, as they have been, more

Bê-Syunga, or ’Elephant River,’ i.e. the Irâvati). The sailing distance from Kedah is, in chap. iii of the same work, reckoned at one month’s time; and the country is said to be noted for great jars (Twanté pottery and Martaban). In chap. x the Râja of Kalungi is said to reside in a small island called Pulau Ayer-tâsar, i.e. ’the island of the fresh water,’ which is situated to the east of the country of Kalungi. This island is, in my opinion, undoubtedly Punzaling (called Gwoing-say Gunm or ’Wash-head Island’ by the Burmese), which lies between Martaban and Maulmain, and whence water was annually carried to Ava (and in the old days no doubt also to the Peguann capital) to wash the king’s head (Màrdhâbhiseka ceremony) on certain festival days. It becomes perfectly evident, after these explanations, that the country of Kalungi, or Galungi, of the Kedah Annals was Pegu. Certainly, the same work tells us that the Samang, Bila, and Sakai tribes were dependent upon Kalungi. But this dependence was probably merely a nominal one, as there is ample evidence to show that separate States existed on the territories of the tribes in question, though such States may, of course, have been to some extent tributary to the Peguan kingdom. In any case, if Ho-ling means Kalunga, it is from the Peguann, and not the Indâ, Kalinga that it got its name, or that it was identified with by the Chinese, owing to its being probably a dependency of that kingdom.

¹ The famous Professor Lacouperie, not satisfied with taking Ho-ling, which he reads, of course, Kalinga, to be Java (’Beginning of Writing,’ p. 185), in order not to be outdone by his confères in Sinology and fantastical geography, goes so far as to state (ibid., p. 201) that: ’The name of Java as Ho-ling is known much earlier in the Chinese records, and, under the form of Hu-kang, it is mentioned [sic] in the Shê-kî (xxviii, 44), where it is proposed to identify it with one of the five fairy islands spoken of in Shantung by traders of the Indian Ocean’!!! After reading this who will dare to come forward and say that our Sinologists lack imagination?
"solito, muddled to the utmost degree by our Sinologists. The itineraries in question are set forth as follows, starting from the centre of the State or, what seems more logical, its capital.

1. Eastwards: 1 month's march to the sea (Gulf of Siām), thence 15 days' sailing to K'un-lun, here apparently Pulo Condor or Kundur (distance 300 to 400 miles from the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, which gives an average run of about 20 to 25 miles a day).¹

2. Westwards: 45 days' journey to the sea (Bay of Bengal).

3. Southwards: 3 days' journey to the sea (Bay of Bengal). Thence, 5 days' sailing to the Ta-shih, 大食, or Tājk country = Dachi² or Acheb, Achin. (At the above rate of speed this would give a distance of about 100 to 130 miles, which proves too small, the least distance from Achin to the west coast of the Malay Peninsula—at Papra Strait—being 240 miles.)

¹ It is probable that what are here translated as 'days' are really meant for "stages." As will be seen from the calculations of the distances, 10 days or stages = 200–250 miles, which gives about 20–25 miles per day or stage.

² The "Tung-hsi-yang-k'ao" (A.D. 1618), which is the first Chinese work to speak of Acheb or Achin under the name of 順, A-te's (Ya-chi), says that formerly this was the Ta-shih or Tājk country (T'oung-Pao, 1901, p. 368). We have pointed out that probably this is the place alluded to under the same name of Ta-shih or Tājk in the document of Ho-ling, and under the date A.D. 674 or shortly afterwards. Whether the designation in question came to it, as Groeneveldt thinks (op. cit., p. 139, note), from the fact of Arab or Persians being of old settled there or not, is for me yet open to doubt. I hope to revert to this moot point later. Sufficient for the present to call attention to the fact that Balbi ("Viaggio dell'Indie Orientali," Venice, 1590) calls the country, in 1586, Dugiin, Dacin (pp. 129 verso and 130 recto), and Daechien (p. 132 verso), adding (p. 130 recto) that the ruler of the Dacin kingdom is termed 'King of Assi' (i.e. Acheb). "The Tombo do Estado da India," 1632, similarly has Daechien under the date 1521 ("Collezione de Documentos Ineditos," etc., Lisboa, 1865, t. v, pt. 2, p. 112). So Bocarro, under later dates, 1613, 1614, 1616, etc. ("Decada 13 da Historia da India, por Antonio Bocarro," Lisboa, 1876, pp. 279, 415–418, etc.), and calls its people Daechens (pp. 414, 421), using the term Achem to designate the king. Linschoten, circa 1587–8, still writes Daechem ("Voyage of Van Linschoten," Hakluyt Soc., London, 1885, vol. ii, p. 108). This constant recurrence of the terms Daechien, Daechem, Dacem for over a century after A.D. 1521 seems to imply a derivation from the former name, Ta-shih, Tājk, or Dachi, of the country.
4. Northwards: 4 days' journey to the sea (Bay of Bengal). Thence, sailing north-west (read south-west), 15 days to P'o-ni, 濱泥; 15 more days to San-fo-ch'i (Palembang); thence 7 days to Ku-lo, 古暹; again 7 days to Ch'ai-lih-ting, 柴歷亭, which is on the way to the land of Kiu-chi (Tonkin) and to Canton.

Every Sinologist has invariably taken the P'o-ni or Pu-ni, 濱泥, mentioned here to be Brunei or Burnai, برني, on the north-west coast of Borneo, for, according to the peculiar way of reasoning of such people, any toponymic that resembles Brunei in features must, of course, be Borneo and nothing else. Certainly, the name of Brunei in Borneo is similarly spelled P'o-ni, 濱泥 or 滄泥; but its distance from Shé-p'o is stated to be 45 days, and 40 from San-fo-ch'i (Palembang); whereas the P'o-ni, 濱泥, in question is located at a distance of only 15 days from the northern border of Shé-p'o, and 15 from San-fo-ch'i (Palembang). Both these P'o-ni cannot therefore be one and the same State.

Again, every Sinologist has hitherto invariably failed to identify Ku-lo and Ch'ai-lih-ting, for no names similar to these occur in the one-shilling school atlases on which

1 Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 495) and Schlegel (in Ts'oung-Pao, vol., x, p. 258) have four days instead of five, as stated in Groeneveldt (op. cit., p. 142), which must therefore be a slip. The Chinese text as given by Professor Schlegel (loc. cit.) has, in fact, I notice, 北至海四日.

2 The actual distance from Kwâla Pani, the entrance to the Pani River, to the mouth of the river Palembang is about 440-450 miles, which, apportioned over 15 days, gives an average of nearly 30 miles a day. Again, the distance from the mouth of the Palembang River to Kwâla Cherating (our identification of Ch'ai-lih-ting), via Rhio Strait, is cited 400-420 miles, which, apportioned over 14 days, yields 28 to 30 miles a day, i.e. about the same average. It will be seen, therefore, that the Chinese itinerary is consistent throughout, so long as common-sense is taken as a guide in its interpretation, and not unbridled fantasy, as is too often the case with our Sinologists.

3 Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 495, 567; Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 142, 229.

4 Professor Schlegel has here taken a wrong view of the matter in readily admitting the existence of two Shé-p'o's, of which the one stated to be 45 days distant from P'o-ni was the island of Java (Ts'oung-Pao, vol. x, p. 304); instead of perceiving that it is really a question of two Fo-ni's, as we have already demonstrated.
these gentlemen appear to base their abstruse geographical inquiries.

Now, I am perfectly certain that the P'o-ni, 濱泥, of the above extract—which cannot absolutely be Brünei—is, on the contrary, Pâni or Pânei, كالي, on the Barumun or Pâni River, east coast of Sumatra, in about 2° 20' - 2° 30' N. lat.¹ The bearing of the course steered upon leaving the northern part of Shé-p'o bound to P'o-ni, given as north-west, is undoubtedly an oversight for south-west. Such slips frequently occur in the accounts of old travellers, among whom even the usually accurate Marco Polo. Measuring on a map the distance from the mouth of the Palembang to that of the Pâni River (15 days' sailing), and setting it out in a northern direction from the last-named place, we reach a point slightly above Takūa-pā (Takópa) on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, and not far below the Krah Isthmus, which latter we may therefore take as practically the northernmost limit of Shé-p'o. Setting out the same distance (corresponding to 15 days' sailing) from Brünei (W. Borneo) towards the west coast of the Malay Peninsula viâ the Natunas and the Straits of Singapore, for three times in succession (equal to 45 days' sailing), we again get to a place somewhere between Pâk-p'hraḥ (Papra) Strait and Takópa, which is the position found for the northern limit of Shé-p'o, at the outset viâ Pâni. The Chinese itinerary is therefore perfectly correct, and it is only the recklessness of Sinologists and their infatuation in making Shé-p'o = the Island of Java, and P'o-ni, 濱泥 = Borneo (Brünei), that causes it to look absurd. It will, however, now be perfectly clear that this is

¹ This State is mentioned in a letter from the Sultan of Aehin to King James I of England, dated A.H. 1024 = A.D. 1615, and published in the Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 31, July, 1898, pp. 125, 127, and 129. It is even to this day the seat of a Prince, and the mouth of its river a frequented seaport. There is a small State of a similar name further down the east coast of Sumatra, viz. Birni, نبز, near Jambi; but this lies far too close to Palembang to be the place alluded to in the Chinese account above. It is likewise mentioned in a similar letter from the Prince of Birni to the English Captain at Jambi of about the same date or shortly afterwards, published in op. cit., p. 139 et seqq.
not the case; and I may add that I have found the same accuracy in several other itineraries recorded by Chinese writers, which have been, as in the present instance, hopelessly mangled and muddled under the tender mercies of our geographical-dabbling Sinologists. It should be pointed out that from the fact of the distance San-fo-ch'ī-Brūneī being given as 40 days,¹ and that from Shé-p'ō to the same point (Brūneī) as 45 days, it is not at all legitimate to infer, as has been done by several writers, that Shé-p'ō must lie at only five days' sailing beyond San-fo-ch'ī. The reason for this is that the route from Brūneī to Shé-p'ō (west coast of the Malay Peninsula) lies through the Strait of Singapore, whereas the one taken to reach Palembang wends via the South Natunas and Bangka.

Now, as regards Ku-lo and Ch'ai-li-ting. The last-named is, no doubt, the Cherating or Serating river and district² on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, in about 4° 10' N. lat. This, it should be noted, is more or less the point at which sailing-vessels from the Straits bound towards Annam or China during the season of the monsoon bid farewell to the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, and steer across the Gulf of Siām in order to make the east coast of Lower Cochin-China, after having passed leeward of Pulo Obi (Übi). The distance Palembang—Cherating (14 days' sailing, actual 420 miles) is, we have shown, in perfect proportion to the one given for the run Palembang—Pāni (15 days, actual 450 miles). Ku-lo (7 days, or, at the same rate, 210 miles) must therefore be looked for at about half-way between Palembang and Cherating. This brings us to Rhio Strait—which was undoubtedly the route taken—and precisely to Gūroh, جُور, village, on the northern shore of Bintang Bay, which is just that distance (210 miles) from Palembang. However, Ku-lo

¹ The actual distance from the mouth of the Palembang River to the entrance to Brūneī River is about 600 miles, which, apportioned over 40 days, yields 20 miles a day, i.e. very nearly the same average as in the distances already examined. The slight difference in such averages must, of course, proceed from the number and length of stoppages at intermediate stations on the route.
² We have here a Sungai Cherating (river), a Kuöla Cherating (its mouth), a Bukit Cherating (hill), and a Tunjung Cherating (cape).
may be the neighbouring Karas Islands at the southern entrance to Rhio Strait, or even the flat islet of Terkolei lying in the approach to both Bintang and Rhio, and from which either seaport may have been conventionally indicated by Chinese navigators.  

The itinerary in question becomes, in the light of the above considerations, perfectly clear. Leaving the northern border of Shé-p'ō at Takīa-pā, or, perhaps more likely, at the embouchure of the Sawā River in the upper reach of the Pāk-chān inlet, the Chinese junkas had to sail in a south-western (stated by mistake to be north-western) direction in order to reach the open sea and get clear of the dangers on the coast. Then, rounding Pāk-P'hraḥ point and Junkceylon Island, they shaped a S.S.E. course along the west coast of the Malay Peninsula to the Dindings or Pulo Sembilan, and thence crossed southwards to P'ō-nī, 滄泥 (Pānī), which they made in 15 days from the date of their departure from Shé-p'ō. In another 15 days they could get, if necessary, to San-fō-ch'i (Palembang); otherwise they would proceed on to China viā the Singapore Strait. From Palembang 7 days' sailing viā the Rhio Strait would bring them to Bintang Bay at Güroh or some neighbouring seaport (Ku-lo). Thence in another 7 days they would reach Ch'āi-lih-ting (Cherating) on the way to Kiao-chi (Tonkin) and Canton as stated.

Supposing now Shé-p'ō to be the Island of Java, and P'ō-nī, 滄泥, to be Brünei in N.W. Borneo, as our Sinologists would have it, how could they account for the unseamanlike idea that in order to reach Sun-fō-ch'i (Palembang) from Java the Chinese junkas should take such

---

1 The "Sung Shih" (History of the Sung Dynasty) mentions the fact that a Hoppe or Superintendent of Trade having been established in A.D. 971 at Canton, the barbarians of Ta-shih (Arab, Persian, or Achinese?); Ku-lo, 吉隆; Shé-p'ō, and P'ō-nī, 学泥 (Pānī, or Brünei?), all came to trade there (see China Review, vol. xviii, p. 379). To Mr. Parker, the translator of the above passage, the nations in question are, of course, "the Caliph Empire, Kulo [unidentified], Java, and Borneo." All the same, it is interesting to learn therefrom that as early as A.D. 971 the people from Ku-lo already went to trade at Canton.
an absurd détour via Brunei (N.W. Borneo), which seaport they could not certainly reach in 15 days, and which, on the strength of Chinese evidence itself, lay at fully 40 days' sailing from San-fo-ch'ü (Palembang)? The identifying of Shé-p'o with the Island of Java by the Sinologists is accordingly shown to be a mere fad, like so many of its kind set going by them which have been exposed in the course of this enquiry. Shé-p'o is now conclusively proved to be part of the Malay Peninsula below the Krah Isthmus, which formed its northernmost limit; a result agreeing with our former considerations connecting it with the Sava River, and the Chauca and Savé districts in the neighbourhood of the isthmus just referred to.¹

How far the southern border of Shé-p'o reached we have no precise information. If we are to judge from the fact that Ho-ling (or its capital), which we have demonstrated to have stood in about 6° 29' N. lat., was likewise called Shé-p'o or Tu-p'o (Java, Jaba, Sava, Saba, Tuba, Tuva, Toba, Duba), and that even further down the Peninsula Ptolemy locates a mart by the name of Sabana, which is, as likely as not, still represented by the present Sabah on the Bernam River, 3° 45' N. lat.,² we would have to infer that such southern limit of Shé-p'o stretched as far south as Selangor, if not further; for even lower down similar toponymics occur.³ However, we deem it a safer course not to lay too much stress on such unreliable indications, and prefer to remain content with the now well-substantiated fact that the land of

¹ See above, pp. 461-462, note.
² See pp. 100-101 ante.
³ E.g. in Jawa Island (Pulo Jawa or Jawa) in front of Malacca, which is the islet (or, rather, the double islet, for it is composed of two islets nearly joined) long known to the Portuguese as Ilha das Naus, because of its being the port or anchorage for ships trading to Malacca. The name may come to it from the Ipomoea quamoclit, a little scarlet convolvulus called Jawa in Malay; and may therefore have no connection whatever with the racial term Jawa or Java.

A Kadla Jawa exists in Sungai Ujong, north-east of Port Dickson. This term, again, may be derived from Sua, meaning a wet rice-field (called Bilang in Achin). A Kampung (village) Jawa is to be found on the west of Rumenia Point, south end of the Malay Peninsula; a Sungai Asam Jawa below the mouth of the Selangor River, etc., etc. One of the chief tribes in Bemau bears the name of Beduanda Jawa (Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 13, p. 242).
Shê-p'o, i.e. of the Java race, included at the period in question a portion of the Malay Peninsula below the Krah Isthmus, being still known in Ibn Baṭūṭa's time (a.d. 1345) as Mul-Jāvah, مَلْ جَاَوَهْ, for here it is that the country so named by the famous traveller is to be looked for. No doubt the terms Jāva, Jaba, Savā, Saba, Tuba, Toba, had long before this crossed the Straits with the race that bore them, and established themselves both on the east coast and in the very heart of Sumatra, becoming by Marco Polo's and Ibn Baṭūṭa's time by-names for the whole island, as well as for the more outlying island of Java, on the eastern half of which those terms had taken root in the interval.

I shall now, by way of conclusion to my arguments anent the location of Shê-p'o on the Malay Peninsula, draw attention to a passage occurring in the "Kwang-tung

---

1 Here is the well-nigh complete proof I have found of this assertion of mine. Speaking of Sultan Mālikūl Mansūr of Sumatra, banished by the king of Pāsei, Ibn Baṭūṭa says he wended his steps towards Mul-Jāvah, the country of unbelievers (i.e. Pagans, or Buddhists, Hinduists ("Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah," transl. by Defrémery and Sanguinetti, Paris, 1858, t. iv, p. 239). Now, the Chronicle of Pāsei ("Histoire des Rois de Pasey," by A. Marre, Paris, 1874, p. 52) states that Mālikūl Mansūr was transported to the country of Teming (? تّمّيّنج, Tumiyang, east coast of Sumatra?); whereas the "Ṣejarah Malāyu" most distinctly tells us that he was conveyed to تّمنّيّنج, Manjung, i.e. Pērak (see Marre, op. cit., p. 121; Loyden's "Malay Annals," p. 80; Dularier in Journal Asiatique, t. ix, Feb. 1847, p. 128), thereby furnishing us the proof that Ibn Baṭūṭa's Mul-Jāvah was the Malay Peninsula, Pērak or Manjung being part of it. This observation has escaped both Dularier and Van der Lith, who have most absurdly endeavoured to demonstrate that Mul-Jāvah was respectively the Island of Java! (Journal Asiatique, tasc. cit., p. 244) and the west coast of Sumatra! ("Merveilles de l'Inde," pp. 237-243). See also ante, pp. 432, 444.

2 Witness Ptolemy's Laba or Jaba, Java, and Saba or Sava, in Jabadiūn or Sabadiūn, in the first or dawn of the second century a.d.; the Yava in the Prastama-Yava-Bhū of the Pāgar-rūyang inscription, a.d. 656 (v. supra, p. 462 note); Marco Polo's Java Minor (a.d. 1295), and Ibn Baṭūṭa's island of Jāvah, both = Sumatra. The Battah kingdom of Tōbah is probably also connected in name with the above set of terms. In Sumatra, we have, however, many other instances of similar place-names: Tūnah Jāva, a district and tribe near Pānei, east coast, as well as Si-Jāwi-jāwi, a settlement in the same neighbourhood; Jawa village, two miles up the Achēb River; Jāwi-jāwi Island, the north-eastern island of the Bānyak group, off the west coast; etc. N.B. that Jāwi-jāwi = Jejūwi, Ara Jejūwi = Ficus rhododendrifolia, a large fig-tree. In Borneo we have a Jāwa village in the Kûtei district, east part of the island, etc.

3 Vide supra, p. 469.
T‘ung-chih” or “General Topography of Canton” (first published in A.D. 1693), which tends to confirm the result I have arrived at above, although the work in which it occurs being quite modern in date, the views and observations introduced therein by its compiler may in many an instance prove to be the mere guesswork of an uncritical student, insufficiently supported by historical evidence and at times in open contradiction to it. This is the reason why I have reserved the last place to this unsatisfactory authority. In the passage alluded to, then, Malacca is identified with the ancient 哥羅富沙也, Ko-lo Fu-sha-ye¹ (Kola-Fu-sha-ya

¹ The New History of the T‘ang Dynasty and Ma Tuan-lin both have 哥羅富沙羅, Ko-lo Fu-sha-lo (Ka-la-fu-sha-ra, i.e. Kola-badara, Koli-budara, or Kola-budara, as pointed out above, p. 106). See Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 241, who interprets the name as ‘Kora-besvar or Great Kora’; and Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 414. In the novel spelling given above, Fu-sha-ye may stand for Puyya, Puswa, Bhungyi, or something similar, as 富沙 is at times used to transcribe Puyya, etc. (see Eitel’s Handbook, 2nd ed., Hongkong, 1888, p. 124). The last character is, however, to all appearance, a clerical slip, and the correct form of the term is, no doubt, that adopted in the New T‘ang Annals and Ma Tuan-lin’s work. I may point out here that Biserut, the present Siamese headquarters in Jala (6° 32’ N. lat.), with famed caves in its neighbourhood, some of which have been utilised as Buddhist shrines, bears a name strikingly similar to Fu-su-la. Another similar toponymie on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula is Berserah, the name of a village, streamlet, and cove (Telok Berserah), above Kwâla Kwântan, in 3° 54’ N. lat. There is further the village of Kwâla Buai, at the mouth (Kwâla Buai) of the Besut River, between Kelantan and Tringânu (5° 40’ N. lat.). But any claim that such place-names may possess, on account of similarity of form, to identification with the old Koli-badara, Kola-budara (or bhadara), pales before the statement of the Chinese annalists that the walls of its capital ‘are built with stones piled upon each other’ (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 241). Now, so far as I am aware, in the whole of the Malay Peninsula there are no ancient cities except Ligor and Krah that possess either brick or stone walls. Ibn Batûtá, I have already pointed out (supra, p. 444, note), says of his Kâkula: ‘le mur, en pierre de taille, est assez lour pour permettre que trois éléphants y marchent de front’ (“Voyages d’Ibn Batoutah,” t. iv, p. 244). Ma Tuan-lin, in his turn, says of Kola or Kola-budara in Hervey de Saint-Denis’ translation (op. cit., p. 414): “Sa capitale est entourée de murs construits en pierre de taille”—the very same words. As other details tally remarkably well in both accounts, as I have shown above (p. 444), I have not the slightest doubt that the Chinese Kola or Kola-budara and Ibn Batútá’s Kâkula, or Kâkola, Kâkkola, are one and the same city (vide supra, p. 444), and can hardly be any other place but ancient Ligor (the walls of which have been long ago razed to the ground), those now seen standing belonging to the inner city and merely enclosing, according to local tradition, what were formerly the precincts of the principal Buddhist monastery, Wat Nâ-Praâ-thât), Krah (the walls seen now are of brickwork), and, more doubtfully, Ptolemy’s town of Kôli in Kelantan (see ante, pp. 105–106; whether
or Kola Pū-jā-ya), and its capital is said to lie "near Shē-p’ō, which is the reason that it is also called 大閭婆, Ta Shē-p’ō or 'Great Java.' It is now called 重迦羅, Ch'ung-ka-lo (Ch'ung-ka-la, Tsung-ka-ra, Jung-ka-la). East of it lies 吉里地阖, Chi-li Ti-mên. For this reason this country was a long time not named a kingdom. With a favourable wind it can be reached from 舊江, Chiu-chiang (or Kau-kong, Ku-kang = 舊港 = Palembang?), in eight days and nights. Near the sea are only a few mountains and a scanty population."

This, I am bound to say, is a fair example of the geographical hodge-podges so frequently served up in Chinese literature for the mortification of its toiling students, who, if successful in going through the ordeal of unravelling them, may justly be said to have made some strides towards earning for themselves the Kingdom of Heaven. Ko-lo Fu-sha-ye, or, more correctly, Ko-lo Fu-sha-lo, cannot, of course, have anything to do with Malacea, although its capital may well have stood near Shē-p’ō, and its territory may have been known as Ta Shē-p’ō, 'Great Java' (or Saba), as the compiler says. It may also have been called Ch'ung-ka-la or something similar,¹ and we shall demonstrate directly that it was. But to locate east of it Chi-li Ti-mên, which I have unmistakeably identified with Gili Timor,

there be remains of any walled cities in this district or not I am unable to say. Now, Ibn Batūta's Kākula is stated by him to be in Mul-Jawah, so was, therefore, the Chinese Kola or Kola-budara. Hence, I think, the reason why the author of the "Kwang-tung Trung-chih" connects the latter with Shē-p’ō. His identification of it with Malacea is, of course, absurd.

¹ This toponymic, I may point out, strikingly resembles Sukkhala or Sungkhla, the old form for the name of Singora, now better known to the Siamese as Sungkhia, and to the Malays as سونكوو, Saujara, Sungora, Sunggora. I do not think, however, that this place is implied here, for its name is usually spelled in Chinese literature 神姑那, Sun-ku-na or Sun-ku-la, as in the map published by Phillips (circa 1399). Professor Schlegel (in T'oung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 298) attempts to connect with it the 宋哥, Sung-chian or Sung-kök (Sungor?), of the "Hai-kwo Wên-chien-Lun" (published 1744, chap. i, fol. 25 verso), but I still feel somewhat doubtful about their identity. See, however, Professor Schlegel's remark in the same volume, p. 272.
i.e. the ‘Island of Timor,’¹ is to hopelessly confuse it with the other Ch'ung-ka-la, or rather Sung-ka-la, mentioned in the Chinese records, which I have, despite the blundering vagaries of our Sinologists, identified with Sumbāwā (سِمْبَاءْ, Sambāwā) and, more precisely, with the Sangar district on the north coast of that island.² Bar these few little—and, of course, perfectly ingenuous—inaccuracies,

¹ Groeneveldt has here, for once, correctly identified Chi-li Ti-men with Timor (op. cit., p. 236), although unable, of course, to account for the first part of that term. Professor Schlegel, on the contrary, unaware of the vagaries of the compiler of the “Kwang-tung T'ung-chih,” gets confused through reliance on his correctness, and, believing Chi-li Ti-men to lie eastwards of the treacherous Ch'ung-ka-la as stated by him, makes superhuman efforts to explain the term Chi-li Ti-men as Kirti-Timor, ‘East to the left,’ and what not, and to prove that it is not Timor at all, but some place on the east coast of Sumatra, or the island of Tjûman off the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, and so forth (see Toung-Pao, vol. ix, pp. 370–371). All nonsense! Had Groeneveldt or Professor Schlegel any knowledge of the geography and languages of the eastern part of the archipelago where Timor is situated, they would have very quickly grasped the right meaning of Chi-li Ti-men or Ki-li Ti-men. For in those parts an island is called Gili, and there are scores of them, from the south coast of Madura to the north coast of Flores and further, in the names of which the term Gili occurs as a prefix, e.g., Gili Dua, Gili Pandan, Gili Watak, Gili Banta, Gili Bodo, etc. Therefore, Chi-li Ti-men means Gili Timor, i.e. the ‘Island of Timor,’ and nothing more nor less. The solution is, it will be seen, very simple, like all solutions of puzzles, questions, after the key has been made known. After writing the above I notice that the “Tung-hsi-yang-k'ao” (A.D. 1618) says: “Ch'i-men, 遭闌 (in Fu-chou pronunciation, Ti-mung), is the vulgar name for Chi-li Ti-men, 吉里地門; this country is situated at the east of Ch'ung-ka-la,” etc. (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 237). And, further on: “Ch'ih-men, 地闌 (in Fu-chou pron. Tie-mung), is the farthest of all countries” (Toung-Pao, vol. x, p. 287, n. 137). What could be more plain?

² It is Fei-Hain who first mentions this Ch'ung-ka-la in his “Hsing-ch'a Shêng-lan,” A.D. 1436. Groeneveldt (op. cit., p. 182) is at a loss to find some equivalent for it, and timidly suggests Madura! making, however, all due reservations this time for what he meekly calls “our supposition.” Professor Schlegel (Toung-Pao, vol. ix, pp. 370–371), blindly relying on the correctness of his text, believes it to be Malacca, and reads Tangkara, vainly endeavouring to identify the countries stated by Fei-Hain to lie at several days’ sailing from Ch'ung-ka-la. Had, however, either Groeneveldt or Professor Schlegel read W. F. Mayers’ paper on “Chinese Explorations of the Indian Ocean,” published as early as 1875 in the China Review, vol. iv, they would have found (p. 181) sailing directions, extracted from the “Tung-hsi-yang-k'ao,” 1618, laying down the route from Gersik or Grissö (east coast of Java, right opposite Madura) to Ch'ung-ka-la. The course is explained to be by way of 磨里山, Moti Island = Bâli; 朗木, Lang-mu or Lang-muk = Lombok, beyond which lies 三吧哇, San-pa-wa or Sam-pa-wa = Sambāwā (Sumbāwā). The next point steered for,
quite characteristic of the Chinese compilers of geographical handbooks, etc., the above passage may be fairly correct; and, if so, it proves interesting as showing that Shé-p'o lay near to, or was conterminous with, Malacca; its location thus being on the Malay Peninsula.

Now, a word of explanation on the term Ch'ung-ka-la as a name for Malacca. It suggests some form like Jung-ko-la, Jang-ko-la, or Jangala (= 'Jungle'), Jángala. Joan Nieuhoff, writing about the same time (1682) as when the first edition of the "Kwang-tung T'ung-chih" appeared (1693), says that the capital city of Malacca was formerly called Jakola.¹

five watches (i.e. twelve hours; or else 600 li = about 100-120 miles) distant from Lombok, is Ch'ung-ka-lo; and five watches (100-120 miles) further lies火山, Hoo Shan, i.e. 'Volcano Island.' On the strength of these indications Mayers wrongly takes Ch'ung-ka-lo to be the island of Flores. But it will be seen that here Lombok means Lombok Bay and city on the east coast of Lombok Island; Sam-pa-sea = Sambawa Bay on the north-west part of Sambawa Island; Ch'ung-ka-lo = Sangar Bay on the north coast of the eastern part of Sambawa Island, which, being very narrow in the middle, may well have been mistaken for two separate islands; and Hoo Shan = Gümong Api, off the north-east extremity of Sambawa Island. The distances measured on a modern chart are: Lombok Bay to Sangar Bay, 115 miles; Sangar Bay to Gümong Api, 50 miles. It will be seen that the first one is perfectly in accordance with the Chinese itinerary, whereas the second is a good deal over-rated, but this is probably due to the imperfect knowledge as yet possessed by the Chinese of lands to the east of Sambawa. This is well exemplified in the fact of their mentioning Timor as lying to the east of it, without naming any of the islands between the two. Fei-Hsin's Ch'ung-ka-la is, therefore, most certainly the eastern part of Sambawa Island, where Sangar Bay and the Sangar District stand, and should not be confounded with Ch'ung-ka-la or Jakola, the old name for the Malacca district. Fei-Hsin most distinctly says, in fact, that Ch'ung-ka-la borders upon or is a neighbour of爪哇, Chao-sea, i.e. the Island of Java, and not Shé-p'o (see Groeneveldt, loc. cit., and T'oung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 368).

¹ "The capital city is likewise called Malacca, being the same in former times called Jakola" ("Embassy from the East India Company," etc., by Joan Nieuhoff, tr. by J. Ogilby, London, 1673, quoted in Denny's "Descriptive Dict. of Brit. Malaya," p. 208). I cannot, so far, account for the term Jakola otherwise than by connecting it with the Jugra district and river, Kwala Jugra and Bukit Jugra (far better known to navigators as Paracel Hill), which lie at some sixty miles north-west of Malacca town, in what is now the Langat district, but was formerly Malacca territory. Jakola and Jugra are not very dissimilar words, and the Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese characters employed to write the name Ch'ung-ka-la is Jū-ke-ra, a remarkably close approach to Jugra or Jugra. Again, the term may be connected with Jokol, one of the Negri Sembilan States conterminous with that of Malacca and lying immediately
Here, then, we have the Ch'ung-ka-la of the Chinese account. Which of the two spellings is the more accurate I am unable to decide; but I should think Nieuhoff's, for it is probable that the form Jakola was the cause that enticed the compiler of the "Kwang-tung T'ung-chih" into connecting this place with the old Kola Fushala. At all events, the original form of the term may safely be said to lie between Jakola and Jângala or Jângala, because Nieuhoff's notation excludes any connection with the Sangar series of toponymics.

It is quite possible that the epithet Ta Shé-p'o, 'Great Java (Jaba or Saba),' or Mahâ Java, Java Besar (?), stated in the passage quoted above to have been applied to the territory of Malacca, may have some connection with the place called Sabah on the Bernam River, not far to the north of Malacca, as well as with the historical continuation of Ptolemy's mart of Sabana, which, we have seen, if not actually Sabah itself, must have stood very near it. Indeed, the Shé-p'o said in the same passage to be near the capital of Malacca may be this very place Sabah. In any case, if this last was no part of Shé-p'o, the southern boundary of the country so named cannot have lain very far to the north; for at short distances in that direction existed, on either coast of the Peninsula, the States of Ho-ling, and Po-ta, and Ho-lo-tan, and Po-huang, which we have seen are in Chinese records either located on Shé-p'o territory or closely connected with it.

inland of it; or with the name of the Jakùn tribes inhabiting that territory; or it may have a totally different origin as yet not clear to me. Similar toponymics are: Segaro, the name of the island otherwise known as Rupat, lying close to the north-west coast of Sumatra right opposite Malacca town; Jangkul; Sekra; Sungar (river, Port Weld); Sanglar; Sungal; Singkei; the Jung-ya-su pepper-producing district of Chao Ju-kua (see p. 451 ante), etc. Jângala or Jângala was the name of one of the most ancient and celebrated kingdoms in Java, or tribes in India and Indo-China, etc.

"Johol originally included Jempol and the whole watershed of the Moar as far as the Pâlong on one side and Mount Ophir on the other, having on the north and west common boundaries with Telebu, Sungai Ujong, Rembau, and Nâning (the latter now included Malacca)."—Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 13, p. 245.

1 Supra, pp. 100-101. From a note by Takakusu (op. cit., p. xlviii) it would appear that Chao Ju-kua also mentions Ta Shé-p'o (Mahâ Java or Java Besar?).
There occurs, furthermore, a passage in Sung history which indirectly supplies us with the confirmation as to the boundaries of Shé-p'o stretching so far south as Sabah or thereabouts. This happens because the passage in question fixes the position of Châu-mei-liu, Chou-mei-liu, or Dan-mei-liu, in relation to other countries—among them Shé-p'o,—giving either the sailing or overland distance to each of them. As, contrary to Sinologists who have never succeeded in pointing out even approximately the location of the State just mentioned, we have in these pages established beyond doubt its identity with the present Ch'i-mí-hla and Ptolemy's Têmala within Cape Negrais.

1 See "Sung-shu," bk. 489, fol. 16; Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 583.
2 Vide supra, pp. 48–52, and note at foot of p. 52 for the identification. Also my articles in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1898, p. 157, and January, 1902, p. 119. The local forms of the name are, as I have shown, Ch'i-mí-hla, Tamila, Tamira (perhaps also Tumirí, Dámara, Damila or Dámila, Tamila or Tamira). There cannot be the least doubt that my identification of this place is correct. N.B. that in the Wén-chou dialect the characters that constitute its name are pronounced Tsı-mí-liu. The country in question is stated in the Sung Annals to produce gold and also the Yú-shíh (瑜石) stone, "very esteemed, although inferior to jade" (Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 584). Anyone will see at once that it is here a question of the jadeite derived from the serpentinite-mines on the banks of the Uru River in the northernmost part of Burma. This is the more certain as we are told ("Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States," Rangoon, pt. ii, p. 277) that this kind of stone is called Yú-shíh by the Chinese who purchase it there. As may be inferred from the above account, the stone must have been also taken down for sale to Ch'i-mí-hla, which is quite natural. Through our present identification of the stone and the locality of its provenance, we are enabled to trace the history of the Burmese jade-mines (hitherto stopping short at the thirteenth century, see op. cit., p. 279) still further back to the dawn of the eleventh century, for such is the period the account of Chou-mei-liu in Sung history refers to. Again, the same account states that in A.D. 1001 this kingdom sent envoys to China with presents. The names of the principal of these personages are recorded as 打古馬, Tu-ku-ma (Du-kó-ma); 打臥, Ta-la (Du-la, Ta-la); and 簡皮泥, Cha-p'i-ni (Chap-p'ei-mei), in which we easily recognize the names of the three cities and districts of Dagun (Môn, Tukung or Takung, older form Tukun, see Forchhammer's "Notes on the Early Hist. and Geogr. of British Burma," fasc. i, p. 17; now called Rangoon); Dala (Môn, Tu-la, Thala); and Khabeng, anciently Koppunga-nagara (see ante, p. 72), near Twanté, a former seaport, the name of which is spelled Copini and Coponim in the Summary of Eastern Kingdoms and Peoples translated from the Portuguese by Ramusio ("Delle Navigationi et Viaggi," Venetia, 1563, vol. i, pp. 334 verso and 335 recto. On the last-named page Dagun appears as Dagom). The three envoys from Chou-mei-liu were, then, the governors of the districts above mentioned, the names of which they bore as titles, as was
we are in a position to turn to account the data just alluded to for the purpose now in view. Here are the
custom in Pegu. By the kingdom of Chou-mei-liu was doubtless meant the
State of Bassein, so designated from the city or mart of Ch'í-mei-há, its seaport.
I trust that the foregoing explanations will have established beyond doubt the
correctness of my location and identification of Chou-mei-liu or Tan-mei-liu, so
that it can be safely used as a basis for the determination of the position of
Skhé-p'o as proposed above.

Professor Schlegel vainly attempted in the T'oung-Pao, vol. x, pp. 291-294,
to deal satisfactorily with the foregoing account from Sung history, and concluded
by placing Tan-mei-liu on the upper course of the Mê-nam River, in Central
Siam!! (p. 293). He went even so far as to confuse this State with the similarly
named one of 登流眉, Téng-liu-mei, mentioned by Chao Ju-kua (circa
A.D. 1240), and after him by Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 488); and—what seems
to have escaped the notice of Professor Schlegel and others—also in Sung history,
where its name is spelled 丹流眉, Tan-liu-mei (see Dr. Eitel's remarks
in the China Review, vol. xviii, p. 319). Besides Professor Schlegel, Dr. Eitel
and Dr. (now also Professor) Hirth have been at a loss to locate it. Ma Tuan-lin
says it lay to the south-west of Chén-li-fu, 聿里富, which he places at
the south-western limits of Chén-la (Kamboja). Chao Ju-kua merely tells
us that Téng-liu-mei stood westward of Chén-la (see F. Hirth's "Aus der
d. Wiss., München, 1898, Heft iii, p. 498). Now, I have successfully identified
Chén-li-fu—which is undoubtedly one and the same with the 占里婆,
Chan-li-p'o, city mentioned in the "Ling-wai-tai-ta" (A.D. 1178), although
it should, of course, be distinguished from the 乔里富, Tun-li-fu, introduced
almost immediately afterwards by Chao Ju-kua (Hirth, op. cit., p. 497)—with
Candana-pura or Chanthabūn, on the east coast of the Gulf of Siam, the name
of which is often spelled Chantibon by the early European travellers.

Again, I have identified Téng-liu-mei or Tan-liu-mei with Taluma, an ancient
State on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula. It is mentioned, along with
those of Bhukám (Pagán = Upper Burma), Rāmaňña (= Pegu), etc., in the
Memoirs of Lady Rëvati Nobamá, one of the oldest Siamese literary works
(part i, ch. 1), dating from the end of the thirteenth century, or the early part
of the fourteenth. I am still doubtful as to whether to connect it with Talum
or Talum (Phuttalung), or with the territory watered by the Telubin River
further down the coast (below Patáni); or else with the Talum-p'huk land spit
(incorrectly marked Lém Kolum-p'uk in the maps), in the Ligor roadstead.
But its position assuredly lay within these limits, i.e. between 6° 50' (mouth
of the Telubin River) and 8° 28' (northern extremity of the Talum-p'huk
promontory) N. latitude. This position, it will be noticed, bears S.S.W. from
Chanthabūn; that is, approximately as indicated in the Chinese account. Téng-
liu-mei or Tan-liu-mei (Taluma) should not therefore be confounded with
Chou-mei-liu or Tan-mei-liu (Ch'í-mei-há, Támála, or Timira). Tan-liu-mei
or Taluma may be Edrisi's island of نتُنُبُثُ، Tanumah, located by him at five
days' sailing from Kódr, i.e. South Kamboja.
sailing distances we propose to take as a basis for our calculations:

1. Southwards from Chou-mei-liu there are 15 days (or stages) to 羅越, Lo-yüeh.
2. South-eastwards from Chou-mei-liu there are 45 days (or stages) to Shé-p’o.
3. North-eastwards from Chou-mei-liu there are 135 days (or stages) to Keang-chou (Canton).

Now, the actual sailing distance from Ch'i-mí-hla (mouth of the Bassein River) to Canton, measured along the usual sea-route on a modern chart, is 2,700 miles, which, apportioned among the 135 stages set down in the Chinese account, yields us a ratio of 20 miles a stage, i.e. about the same result we have obtained from the Chinese itineraries previously examined. On the basis of this rate it is easy to calculate by elementary processes the distances we require. These become fixed as follows:

1. Distance from Ch'i-mí-hla to Lo-yüeh, 15 stages × 20 miles = 300 miles.
2. Distance from Ch'i-mí-hla to Shé-p’o, 45 stages × 20 miles = 900 miles.

Setting these measurements on a chart from the mouth of the Bassein River southwards along the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, we obtain for:

1. Lo-yüeh, a location a little above Mergui.¹
2. Shé-p’o, a location about Sabah on the Bernam River.

¹ It may be Letwe-gyum or Lakes Island, Tavoy district; or even Lengy or Lanyu below Mergui. The sounds intended may be either Lo-yü, Lo-yet, Lo-cok, La-vie, Lo-gur, etc. The map facing p. 7 in Mandelslo (Amsterdam ed., 1727) marks a Lugar immediately below Moro (Tavoy), which is very probably the place here alluded to. There seem to have been two 羅越, Lo-yüeh, on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, besides one 羅曳, Lo-yü or Lo-tü, and a Lengy, Lengy (Luk-yü, Lük-eu), (vide supra, pp. 90 and 110). The last one I have suggested (p. 90) may be Ligor, the Luger of João de Barros; but now I should think it may preferably be connected with the Lunger
There is therefore every likelihood, as we surmised, that Sabah is the Shé-p’o meant by the Sung annalists in the case at hand; and it becomes evident, at all events, that the Shé-p’o they had in view was the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, and not at all the island of Java.

I-htsing, we have seen, entirely ignores Shé-p’o and merely mentions Ho-ling or Po-ling, by which term, as pointed out above (p. 481), he very likely means Gelang (Galang) or Puling Cape, on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula (4° N. lat.); and, in any case, the eastern limit of the real Ho-ling State, which may have extended to that point or thereabouts. The only full itineraries he gives to and from India, with the sailing distances when recorded, are four, as follows:—

River, usually noted Langur or Lungar in the early maps, and Longur in De Barros, Decada I, lib. ix, ch. 1. Chao Jukua (see Hirth, op. cit., pp. 494, 513) employs a very similar notation, 彌, Lu-nu (Luk-nuat), for the name of the capital of Chên-la (Kamboja), which could not be as yet, in his time, Lawék, but was still at Angkor (Nagor).

The second Lo-yuâeh must have stood—if it ever existed—further down the west coast of the Malay Peninsula. On p. 110 ante I took it to be the same as the first Lo-yuâeh, lying at fifteen days’ sailing south of Tan-meî-lin, a view which, after the above exhaustive inquiry, I am now inclined to reject. The only indication we so far have as to the existence of this second, if any, Lo-yuâeh, is contained in an already quoted scholiun from the Tsang-shu, ch. 430, brought to light by Chavannes (op. cit., p. 42, n. 2), which he renders: “To the south of the Malay Peninsula [no original characters or transliteration given of the term employed for this in the text] one reaches a strait measuring 100 ń [i.e. 20 to 25 miles] from north to south; on the northern shore is the kingdom of Lo-yuâeh, and on the southern the kingdom of Fu-shih [i.e., as we have shown in the preceding pages, the east coast of Sumatra].” Now, this would point to one of the narrowest parts of the Malacca Strait, the least measurements of which are: (1) between Tanjong Bulus and Pulo Rangsang, 30 miles; (2) between Tanjong Tohor and Pulo Bengkalis, 25 miles; between Tanjong Tuan (Cape Rachado) and Pulo Medang, 20 miles. The shortest distance from the west coast of the Malay Peninsula to the east coast of Sumatra occurs between the Jugra River and Tanjong Senebu, 30 miles. However, as we are left in the dark about what is the term in the Chinese text which Chavannes translates by ‘Malay Peninsula,’ we feel unable to arrive at a precise estimate of the location of the said Lo-yuâeh; and must remain content with suggesting that it may be either Lârut, in Pêrak, or, still better, Lukut (Port Dickson), lower down, which is only a few miles north of Cape Rachado, and lies within only 40 miles from the Sumatran coast and 25 from Pulo Medang. Takakusu (op. cit., p. xlv, n. 3) says that this Lo-yuâeh “is the place where Shinnio Taka-oka, an imperial prince of Japan, died, A.D. 881, on his way to India to search for the Law. He was twenty years in China learning Buddhism, whence he started for the West.” The place referred to is instead, very probably, the first Lo-yuâeh near Mergui. In any case the notice here cited proves the existence of either Lo-yuâeh as far back as A.D. 881, which is of historical interest to note.
1. Tonkin to Lang-ka-hsü (Langkachiu near Chump'hoén, east coast Malay Peninsula);\(^1\) thence to Ho-ling, and onward via Lo-kwe (Nikobārs)\(^2\) to Tāmraliptī (western part of the Delta of the Ganges).\(^3\)

2. Tonkin to Shih-li-Fo-shih (Palembang), 30 days; thence to Mo-lo-yü, 15 days, and to Ka-ch’a, 15 days; then change of course to westward, making Nāgapaṭṭan in 30 days; thence across to Ceylon, 2 days.\(^4\)

3. Canton to Fo-shih (Palembang) with the first monsoon, 20 days; thence to Mo-lo-yü; thence, changing direction, to Ka-ch’a; thence, taking a northern course, to Lo-kwe (Nikobārs), in somewhat more than 10 days; thence, steering north-west, to Tāmraliptī in about 15 days (A.D. 671–672).\(^5\)

4. Return voyage from the last-named seaport: Tāmraliptī, on a south-east course to Ka-ch’a, 60 days; thence, in a southerly direction to Mo-lo-yü, 30 days; thence to Canton in about 30 days (A.D. 685 and 689).\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) See for our identification of this place p. 115 ante; and, for a more exhaustive discussion, my article in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1901, pp. 157, 158.

\(^2\) Vide supra, pp. 380 seqq.

\(^3\) Chavannes’ “Religious Éminents,” p. 100. Tāmraliptī = modern Tamluk, on the west of the Hāghli river near its mouth.

\(^4\) Chavannes, op. cit., pp. 144 and 136, in which latter it is shown that the starting-place was Shēn-wan on the Tonkin Gulf (for our remarks on which place see pp. 250–251 above). The distance thence to Palembang is about 1,500 miles, which gives an average of some 50 miles a day. That from Palembang to Nāgapaṭṭan, round by the north coast of Sumatra, is about 1,960 miles, which, apportioned over 60 days, the total length of the run, yields some 32 to 33 miles a day on the average. It should be noted, however, that in the Straits, owing to frequent calms and less freedom of navigation, the rate of speed must naturally be less than the above.

\(^5\) Chavannes, op. cit., pp. 119–121, in which the passage from the Nikobārs to Tāmraliptī is put down at over half a lunation; and Takaku’s “Record of the Buddhist Religion,” etc., from I-tsing’s work, pp. xxix–xxxi, where it is said “in about half a month’s sail,” undoubtedly a too mild estimate (see, in fact, next note). The distance from Canton to Palembang varies between 7,700 and 1,800 miles, according to the course taken. This yields an average of 85 to 90 miles a day, which does not surprise, as the passage was made with the first break of the monsoon, usually very violent. The passage from the Nikobārs to Tāmraliptī (real distance 900 to 960 miles) was also a very quick one.

\(^6\) Chavannes, op. cit., p. 125, and Takaku’s, op. cit., pp. xxxiii–xxxv. Here, we see, 60 days were spent in reaching Ka-ch’a from Tāmraliptī, as against 25 (or perhaps 30) in the outward journey (Itinerary No. 3). In A.D. 1345 it took Ibn Baṭṭa 40 days to accomplish about the same journey (see above, p. 400). The passage from Ka-ch’a to Mo-lo-yü is, it will be observed, here put down at
The points of most absorbing interest for us here are the determination of the positions of Ka-ch’a and Mo-lo-yü, so far only leisurely guessed by our Sinologists. Ka-ch’a, 納茶 (Kêt-ch’a, Kick-ta, Kiet-tra), I have identified with Kerti, anciently Katrea,¹ on the homonymous river, a little to the east of Pasei (north coast of Sumatra). The settlement of this moot point at once clears the ground for the further determination of the site of 末羅瑜, Mo-lo-yü (Mat-lo-yü, Mal-la-yu), or 末羅遊, Mo-lo-yu (Mut-lo-yau, Mat-lo-yiu, Mal-la-yu, or Mar-ra-yu), as the term is severally spelled in I-tsing’s works.² For this place, being met with, on his own showing, at about half-way from Ka-ch’a (Katrea) to Fo-shih or Shih-li Fo-shih (Palembang), very likely somewhat nearer to the latter seaport on account of its distance from Ka-ch’a being variously given (see above) as 15 and 30 days’ sailing, it must be looked for on either shore of the strait between

30 days, or double the time given in Itinerary No. 2. In comparison with this, 30 days from Mo-lo-yu to Canton is a very creditable performance, and must have been done, as on the outward journey, with a highly favourable wind. In connection with these singularly quick passages (compared with those set down in other Chinese works and discussed in the preceding pages), it should be observed that they were mostly made in Persian, Arab, or Malay, and not (except in but one or two instances) in Chinese ships. The outward journey from Canton to Palembang was accomplished, as I-tsing himself says, on a Persian vessel (see Takakusu, op. cit., p. xxviii). That from Palembang to Mo-lo-yü, and thence onward to Ka-ch’a and Bengal, was done in a ship supplied to I-tsing by the King of Palembang (ibid., p. xxx). Similarly, that from Ka-ch’a to Mo-lo-yü, on the return voyage, was again performed in a vessel from Palembang (ibid., p. xxxiv). This fully explains the discrepancies in the rate of speed noticed in previous itineraries.

¹ The name by which its river is mentioned in the “Sejarah Malaya” (see Ledyen’s “Malay Annals,” p. 78), whence we learn that on its banks was situated the palace of the Pasei king. Marre, in his “Histoire des Rois de Pasey,” p. 120, spells the name Katerei. The late Rev. S. Beal and others have, more soliloquy, jumped at once to the conclusion that Ka-ch’a is, of course, that hub of the universe, Kedah. So lately, also, Professor Schlegel, in Teung-Poo, vol. ix, p. 290. Chavannes, op. cit., pp. 105-106, has perceived the untenability of such an utterly unjustified identification; and Takakusu, rightly judging that Ka-ch’a must be looked for to the south of Lo-kwo (the Nikobars), has vaguely suggested its location “somewhere on the Atchin coast” (op. cit., p. xxx), and in his sketch-map has marked it close to the coast of Achin. I may here point out, for the guidance of those who connect Ka-ch’a with Kedah, that the name of the latter place appears in the Chinese-maps of about A.D. 1399 published by Phillips, wherein it is spelled 吉達. Chi-ta (Kit-tat).

² See Chavannes, op. cit., p. 119, n. 2.
the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra. Measurements taken on a chart lead us on the one side to Tanjong Tuan (Cape Rachado), a little above Malacca, and on the other to Pulo Rupat (or Segaro) and the Sumatran hinterland between Siak and Rakan. This, be it understood, if we adopt the statement as to Mo-lo-yü lying at 15 days' sailing from Ka-ch'a and at an equal distance from Palembang; that is to say, at exactly half-way from these two points. But the other statement assigning instead 30 days to the passage from Ka-ch'a to Mo-lo-yü fully justifies us in locating the latter place somewhat lower down Malacca Strait. Such being the case, I am bound to declare right off that on the tract of Sumatran coast under consideration we find no record or sign of a place identically or similarly named ever having existed. On the contrary, we have plenty of evidence that one or more places of such a denomination stood on the southern end of the Malay Peninsula, and precisely on the Old Strait of Singapore and its immediate neighbourhood. The writers who have preceded us in the treatment of this knotty question had nothing to go by but the bare statement of João de Barros mentioning a Tana-Malayu along with a number of other petty States on the Island of Sumatra. On the strength of this and of a passage in Alboquerque's Commentaries informing us that, in the language of Java, Palembang is called Malayo, they thought to have made an exceedingly clever hit in connecting these names with I-ting's Mo-lo-yu or Mo-lo-yü. Truly,

1 This was probably the site of the lower Lo-yüeh, as we have pointed out above, p. 525. Whether the term Lo-yüeh here has any connection with Mo-lo-yü or Mo-lo-you, being a contracted form of it, remains to be seen. It is not altogether impossible.

2 "Asia," Decada iii, pt. 1, pp. 510–511. The places enumerated—said to be states or kingdoms—are twenty-nine. The list starts from Daya (Dâyâ) on the west coast of Sumatra, a little below Achin, and, following the north and eastern shores of the island, rounds its southern end, and proceeds up the west coast, where it terminates. It seems, however, doubtful if this order is rigorously adhered to in every instance. If it is in the case of Palembang and Tana-Malayu, then the latter, being mentioned next to Palembang, should be looked for to the south of it. But this is absurd, and Tana-Malayu was most certainly the district on the river Malâyu, inland from Palembang, and Alboquerque's Malayo, as we shall see directly.
I-tsing himself (according to Takakusu),\(^1\) or an annotator of his during the later Chou period, A.D. 951–960 (according to Chavannes),\(^2\) says that the country of Mo-lo-yü or Mo-lo-yu "is now called [or 'has become'] Fo-shih" (or Shih-li Fo-shih).

But it must be remembered that on I-tsing's own evidence Mo-lo-yü lay at some 15 days' sailing—or about 300–350 miles\(^3\)—from Palembang, towards Malacca Strait; and thus it could have nothing to do with either De Barros' Tana-Malayu or Alboquerque's Malayo, which both evidently refer to an ancient district on the Malāyu River, situated within the limits of Palembang itself.\(^4\) Add to this that on I-tsing's own showing, after one had reached Mo-lo-yü from Palembang, he had to change direction in order to go to Ka-ch'a (Kerti), which would be absolutely unnecessary and absurd if Mo-lo-yü were situated on the east coast of Sumatra, for in such a case the same course would have to be steered throughout along that coast of the island. The construction that must be put upon I-tsing's (or his later

---


\(^3\) The actual sailing distance from the mouth of the Palembang to that of the Kerti or Kutrea (Ka-ch'a) River is about 660 miles, which would give 330 miles or thereabouts for Mo-lo-yü.

\(^4\) The river in question, Sungei Malāyu, is referred to in the "Sejarah Malāyu" (see Leyden's "Malay Annals," pp. 20–21). Therein it is distinctly stated that a king, Damang Lebar Daun by name, reigned in the country of Puralembang, now called Palembang. The name of its river was Muār-Tātang, into which falls another river known as Sungei Malāyu, near the source of which is a mountain named Sagantang Mahā-Meru. Muār-Tātang means Tātang-mouth, and the Tātang River may be the one nowadays called Talang, which is one of the outlets of the Musi. The Malāyu River may be either the Musi (Palembang River) or one of its principal tributaries. Both the river names now referred to seem to be at present forgotten. From the presence of a stream Malāyu in this region and the traditions connected with it, related in the "Sejarah Malāyu" and other Malay semi-historical works, Valentijn argues that the Malays must have derived their first name. This is, of course, absurd; but there can be no doubt that such is the country meant by Alboquerque and De Barros under the denominations, respectively, of Tana-Malayu ('Malay Territory, Malay Land') and Malayo. Tānāh Malāyu, as far as local tradition goes, was the name of the southern portion of the Malay Peninsula. If such a name was also applied to part or the whole of the Palembang district, it is because it must have been introduced thither by emigrant Malays from the south of the Malay Peninsula, and not the reverse. That this introduction could hardly have taken place in I-tsing's time or several centuries after him will be demonstrated in the following pages.
commentator’s) passage anent Mo-lo-yü having in, or shortly
before, his time become Shih-li Fo-shih is, therefore, that it
had been annexed by the latter; that is, became part and
parcel of the latter’s dominions. This view is perfectly
consistent with the early history of Palembang, which, we
shall demonstrate further on, was the seat of the potentate
so often referred to by Arab writers as the Maharāj (Mahārāja),
who ruled over an empire extending all over the northern
portion of the Archipelago.

Otherwise, we should have to assume that in I-tsing’s
time—as in Alboquerque’s and De Barros’ periods—there
were two Malāyu countries, of which one comprised part
of Palembang and the other the southern extremity of the
Malay Peninsula. But such does not seem to have been the
case either during I-tsing’s (A.D. 671–695) or his annotator’s
(A.D. 951–960) time. The name Malāyu had then not as
yet, apparently, travelled down so far south or crossed over
the Straits to Sumatra, but was still lingering on the
southern part of the Malay Peninsula, making ready to cross
whenever a favourable opportunity should present itself,
which was not slow to come.

Having thus disposed of our predecessor’s untenable view
as to I-tsing’s Mo-lo-yü being situated on the east coast of
Sumatra, and assumed that its location must have been
in the southern part of the Malay Peninsula, it becomes
necessary to demonstrate that a State of such a name existed
here of old. Subjoined, then, is our original evidence for it,
which goes many a year further back than Alboquerque’s
and De Barros’ time.

1. The ‘Koṭ Moṇṭhierabān’ (Kaṭa Maṇḍira-pāla) or
‘Palatine Law’ of Siām, enacted in A.D. 1360 by the king
who had a decade before founded the capital Ayuthia

---

1 The distance of thirty days (equal to the whole distance Kerti–Palembang)
given in one instance by I-tsing from Ka-ch’a to Mo-lo-yü, would seem to lend
support to the hypothesis of two Mo-lo-yü States existing in his time, the second
one of which was Palembang itself or part of it. But I think, after all, that
such a discrepancy can be satisfactorily explained by the variable state of the
weather encountered on the journey, which caused the passage to be at times
quick and at others very slow. Of similar discrepancies we have several instances
in the itineraries themselves of that pilgrim.
(Ayuddhyā), gives full lists of the States then tributary to Sīām, both in the north and south. Among the States of the south (Malay Peninsula), one bearing the name of Malāyū is mentioned, the order being as follows:—

1) Ujōng Tānah (known afterwards as Johor).
2) Malākā (= Malacca).
3) Malāyū.

Total, four States.

This source of information is authoritative enough to admit of no question. We may accordingly take it as positive that there was in A.D. 1360—and probably far earlier—a State named Malāyū or Malāyū in the south of the Malay Peninsula.

2. The (Chinese) history of the Yūn (Mongol) dynasty states that, in the first year of the Yūn Chēng period—i.e. A.D. 1295—of Ch'ēng Tsung's (Timūr's) reign the king of 𨦯國, Siem-kwok, i.e. Sīām (the capital of which was then at Sukhōthai), sent a letter written on a golden plate, praying that the Court might send an envoy to his country. As the Siamese had for a long time lived in feud and war with 麻里子兒, Ma-li-yū-érh, and this country had now returned to allegiance, the Emperor enjoined the Siamese that they should no longer molest Ma-li-yū-érh, in accordance with their promise.

1. Laws of Sīām, 5th Siamese edition, Bangkok, 1888, vol. ii, p. 72. A widely different list is given at the outset of the Chronicles of Ayuthia (Siamese edition, 1863, vol. i, p. 21); but this work having been compiled only recently, from motley materials of not always proved authenticity, pieced up in a somewhat happy-go-lucky way, it cannot be invariably relied upon, especially for the older periods. The list in question runs as follows:—(1) Malākā; (2) Chauca (Java); ... (8) Songkhā (Sukhāla or Singora). The names left out belong either to States on the north of Sīām or on the Malay Peninsula that were governed by viceroys (Tavoy, Tenasserim, Ligor). Chauca stands apparently here for either of the three districts of Ujōng Tānah, Malāyū, and Varavāri, or for the whole of them; but this is by no means certain.

2. T'oung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 289. Professor Schlegel here translates "a letter written in golden characters," which, although it may be a correct rendering of the original, is historically inaccurate. Royal letters of State in Sīām have always been written, not in golden characters, but with vermilion, or else engraved, on a golden plate which was afterwards rolled up and put into a casket adapted to the purpose.
Here Ma-li-yü-érh—or, still better, Malaya-vāra, Malayur—cannot evidently be aught but the Malāyū mentioned above, which, having returned to allegiance on or shortly before A.D. 1295, was still a tributary in 1360. Its existence thus becomes proved for at least another century further back, considering that in 1295 Siām had already long been at feud and war with it. 1

3. Marco Polo sailed, just two or three years before that, from Champā across to Locat or Lochac (Legeh or Latcha, see above, p. 497), on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, proceeding thence southwards by way of the two islands of Petam (Bintang and Batang or Batam, in my opinion), until he reached the island of Pentam, where he found a king, with a city named Malavir (Malla-vira?). Now, the itinerary followed by the great Venetian traveller from Champā to the Straits has never been satisfactorily determined. The identifications of Locat and the Petam islands given above are entirely my own; and so are those of Pentam and Malavir, both of which I locate on the north shore of the Old Singapore Strait, this being, in my judgment, the route taken by Marco Polo's junk. An important village named Bentan exists on that Strait in long. 103° 53' E., as well as a river Malāyū, only a few miles further to the west (long. 103° 42' E.); but probably the place our traveller had in view was the opposite island of Singapore, the ancient Bētumah; 2 while Malavir, given by him as the name of the king's capital, was more likely that of the realm—evidently the Ma-li-yü-érh and Malāyū of the two preceding paragraphs.

We thus arrive at the conclusion that the position of the puzzling State of Mo-lo-yū, Ma-li-yü-érh, or Malavir, was at the southern end of the Malay Peninsula, and precisely on

1 I should think this Ma-li-yü-érh is not the Kota Melīṣei or Melīṣei of the "Sejarah Malāyū" (see above, p. 490), the capital of a State occupying the site where Patāni rose in, or shortly before, A.D. 1500. The way in which the name is spelled in Chinese argues an original form something like Mālyā-vāra, Malaya-vāra, or Malayur; hence it is almost beyond doubt the same place as Marco Polo's Malavir.

2 See above, pp. 199-200.
the north shore of the Old Singapore Strait, where, besides the Maláyu River, time-worn traditions of a Malaya or Malaya-vāra country and people, of a Malaya-deipa (Malaya island or continent), and of a Tānah Malāyu confront the unbeliever. And, as my predecessors have chosen to ensconce themselves behind Alboquerque and De Barros, I shall also in my turn betake myself to as good a contemporary authority to pit against theirs. The king of Achīn, says Bocarro under date July, A.D. 1613, was met in the Straits by the Portuguese at the head of a great fleet with which he had taken the city of Johor and conquered the kingdom of Malāio (Malāyu), capturing the Rājāvaņa (Ratabonço), brother to the king of Johor, the principal warlike personage among the Malaios (Malāyūs). This passage plainly shows that at the period the events alluded to occurred the kingdom of Malāyu was Johor, the native State in the south of the Malay Peninsula that was the historical continuation of the mediæval Malaecca, and,

---

1 This narrow passage between the island of Singapore and the mainland was invariably used by western ships bound to the China Sea, until some time after 1615, the date at which the wider and easier passage now known as the Strait of Singapore was discovered. This was at first termed by the Portuguese Estreito do Governador, from the fact of Dom João da Silva, the Spanish governor of Manilla, having passed through it on his galleon shortly after its discovery in March of that same year, 1615. This first attempt was not altogether without a hitch, since the governor’s galleon grounded on the reef at the point of the strait and was grazed by the top of it, though not sustaining any serious injury. (See Bocarro’s “Decada 13 da Historia da India,” Lisboa, 1876, p. 428.)

As regards the Old Strait or Selat Tebran (a name queerly transcribed Salleta de Breve by Hamilton in 1727), it was still passed in 1699 on his way from Macao to Goa by Carletti, who describes it as so narrow that from the ship one could jump ashore, or reach with the hand the branches of the trees on either side. His vessel struck on a shoal whilst in the channel. (“Ragionamenti di Francesco Carletti,” Firenze, 1701, p. 209.) As late as 1822 Crawfurd went through the same passage, for curiosity’s sake, in a ship of 400 tons, and found the journey tedious but safe. This was, therefore, in the old days the only known route to China, and Marco Polo must have also passed this way on his homeward voyage. I do not think, however, that the credit of the discovery of the new Strait belongs to the Portuguese, for, from an examination of the sea-routes on the Chinese map of cirei 1399 published by Phillips, I found out that a course is there laid down through this channel. Hence this must have been well known to the Chinese at that date.

2 “E chegando aos Estreitos achou o Achem com uma grande armada comque tinha tomado a cidade de Jor, e conquistado o reino de Malaiio e captivo o Retabonço, irmão d’elrei de Jor, a principal pessoa de guerra entre os malaios.”— Decada 13 da Historia da India, Lisboa, 1876, p. 165.
through it, of the older realm of Singapore and of the still more ancient one of Malâyu, on the Old Singapore Strait, the name and territory of which it inherited and handed down to later ages.

I might go on but for want of space, quoting other authorities in support of my thesis, and give besides a fair amount of circumstantial evidence. I trust, however, to have already made out a clear case, and shall therefore limit myself to presenting the principal points chronologically arranged in the subjoined synoptical table:

OUTLINE HISTORY OF MALÂYU AS A TOPOGRAPHICAL AND ETHNICAL TERM.


672. Mo-lo-yû, Mo-lo-yu, or Mo-lo-you, 末羅瑜 or 末羅遊 (I-tsing).1 (Chavannes, op. cit., p. 119; Takakusu, op. cit., p. xxxix.) On the southern end of the Malay Peninsula and north side of the Old Singapore Strait, near the Sungei (river) Malâyu. Subject to the domination of Fo-shihr (Palembang).

1154. Malâi, ملاي, island or peninsula, very extensive, lying twelve days' sail from Sanf or Champâ (Edrisî), (Jaubert’s "Geographie d’Edrisi," pp. 86, 92, 93). Very probably the southern part (if not the whole) of the Malay Peninsula).2
cired 1180. Malâya Country, in which the king of Râmañña (Pegu) imprisoned the Ceylonese envoys sent to Kamboja ("Mahâvañsa," ch. lxxvi). This is from the translation of parts of that chapter published by Professor Rhys Davids in the Journ. As. Soc. Bengal, vol. xli, pt. 1, p. 198. Wijesinha ("The Mahâvañsa," Colombo, 1889, p. 229) takes Malâya in its literal sense of hill, and thus translates: "he [the Râmañña

1 Cf. 末羅, Mo-lo = Malla, i.e. the Malla people in North India (see Eitel’s "Handbook," p. 93), whence the correct reading would appear to be Malâyu. The Cantonese pronunciation of the term, Mut-lo-yau, faintly suggests some possible connection with Mul-Jâwak, Mul-ya, but more probably Malaya-râva is meant.

2 Edrisî is the first Arab writer to mention the term Malâi. Reinaud ("Geographie d’Aboulféda," t. i, p. cxxii) takes it, without sufficient justification, as the name of a people, the Malays. But it is instead a toponymic, Malaya or Malâyu, the land of the Malays, and not the people.
imprisoned them [the envoys] in a fortress in the hill country." This is manifest nonsense, that specification being in such a case a detail quite unnecessary for the purpose of the narrative. I accordingly agree with Professor Rhys Davids in considering Malaya as a proper name, and take it to imply the southern part of the Malay Peninsula, over which Pegu may very likely have acquired some influence at the period, and in some seaport of which the king may easily have had the Ceylonese envoys to Kamboja kidnapped and imprisoned.

1181. Malaya-dīpa = 'Malaya Island' (or Peninsula), (Kalyāṇi Inscriptions of Pegu, vide supra, p. 81). A Buddhist country. Evidently the same as Edrisi's Island of Malāi. 

1274. Malāyr or Malāyur, مالأري, a well-known and frequented district near Lāmerī, لامري, in a bay, in about the same longitude as Kalah (Ibn Ṣa‘īd). (Van der Lith and M. Devic’s "Merveilles de l’Inde," p. 258.) As Ibn Ṣa‘īd’s treatise is but an abridgement of Edrisi’s,¹ his Malāyr or Malāyur is, no doubt, the same as Edrisi’s Malāi. However, it is interesting to observe here for the first time the addition of an r at the end, which suggests a form Malaya-vāra, hereafter almost invariably employed.

1292. Malac, Malavir City, at 60 + 30 = 90 miles² from Petam or Pontain Islands (Bintang and Batang), on an island named Pentam (Betūmah, Bentan on north side of the Old Singapore Strait), a notable emporium (Marco Polo, see p. 533). The Malāyū Kingdom, same as in the above entries, on the northern shore of the Old Singapore Strait, about the mouth of the Sungei Malāyū (Malāyu River).

1292. Mu-lai-yu, 木來由 (Cant. Muk-lai-yau; N.B. 由 has the same sound as I-tings's 遊), a State to which Chinese envoys were sent to summon it to submission (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 155). Probably the same country as above.³

¹ Reinaud, op. cit., t. i, p. cxiii.
² Sixty miles, in my opinion, from the eastern side of Bintang to the entrance to the Old Singapore Strait. Here, says our traveller, there are but two fathoms of water, which leaves no doubt as to the navigation through the Strait commencing here. The other thirty miles were, of course, travelled through the Old Singapore Strait in order to reach either Bentan or the Malāyu River further westwards, in the Malāyu kingdom. N.B. that Ramusio states (vol. ii, f. 51 verso) that the city is called Malainur, and the island (i.e. the kingdom) likewise.
³ Groeneveldt, on what ground I am unable to guess, translates 'Malay States.'
Otherwise it may be *Mūl-Jâwaḥ*, which, according to Wassaf, submitted to China in 1292 ("Merveilles de l'Inde," pp. 241–2).

1293. **Mu-li or Wu-li**, 沒里, 巫里 (Mut-lai, Mon-lai, Buri), a State that sent a letter inscribed on a golden leaf to the Chinese emperor (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 152). Very likely *Wulah* or *Wailah*, west coast of Sumatra, a little above Malabu; although it may be a contracted form of 南巫里, Nam-bu-ri = Lambri (see op. cit., p. 155).¹ It possibly is also somehow connected with *Mūl-Jâwaḥ* (see last entry, and also "Merveilles de l'Inde," p. 243).

1295. **Ma-li-yū-krh**, 麻里子兒 (Ma-loi-ju-i, Ma-li-ur), a country which had long been at feud and war with Siām, but had now returned to allegiance (History of the Yuan Dynasty, see p. 532). The same as in the preceding entries except the last two.

1317–18. **Malamasmi, Calamak; otherwise Panthen, Pathen, Paten, or Naten**; an island and kingdom near Fana (Lana, Java) and Champā (Odoric of Friuli). (Ramusio, op. cit., vol. ii, f. 247 verso; and De Backer's "L'Extrême Orient au Moyen-Age," pp. 107, 454.) In my opinion, the same as Marco Polo's *Malavir* (city) and *Pentam* (island).²

1332. **Malāvr or Malāvur**, ملاعور, a city in the country of Kālah, in which are also the cities of Fangūr, Lūrū (＝Lo-yūeh,


² The form Malamasmi finds, I presume, its explanation in Marco Polo's *Malanir* (for Malaior), which occurs in the French text of his book. It is Ramusio who prints *Malamasmi* (op. cit., vol. ii, f. 247 verso). *Calamak* may be a *lapusus calami* for *Malamak, Mahamak*, or something similar. My location of this place on the Old Singapore Strait obtains confirmation. I think, from the fact of Odoric stating that on one side ("towards the south," says Ramusio) of this island there is the sea called the 'Dead (or deadly) Sea,' the waters of which run swiftly towards the south, so that if one falls down in it he can be rescued or found only with the greatest difficulty. This I take to mean the strong currents and tidal streams running through Singapore Strait, which at times attain a velocity of 4 to 4½ miles an hour (see "China Sea Directory," vol. i, 1896, p. 204).

1360. Malāy, a tributary State of Siām in the south (of the Malay Peninsula). ("Koṭ Monthierabāl," Laws of Siām; see p. 331.) Undoubtedly the same as the preceding ones.


This again shows that even in Pinto's time the country of Malāyu was in the south of the Malay Peninsula, commencing at the mouth of the Pērak River, that is to say, in 4° N. lat.

1613. Malayo (= Malāyu), the name given to the native kingdom of Johor in the southern extremity of the Malay Peninsula (Bocarro, op. cit., see p. 534).

1763-1766. Malāyu, a distant island; evidently the southern part of the Malay Peninsula, and same as Malaya-dīpa referred to in the Kalyānī Inscriptions under the date A.D. 1181. Mentioned in the Burmese inscription of King Singu Min at the Modi monastery, south of Ava. Therein this king states of his father, Sinbyuyin, who reigned A.D. 1763-1766, that "his dominion was so vast that tribute in the shape of spices reached him even from the distant island of Malāyu in fleets of ships" ("Inscriptions of Pagan, Pinya, and Ava," Rangoon, 1899, p. 167).


1 In the text, p. 282, لارنی, Lāreni or Lārenī, which Van der Lith thinks well to correct into لارینی, Lāmīrī, so as to elicit the meaning Lambri.

2 Spelled Malāyur-dīpa and Malaya-dīpa in the "Sasanavaṇṇa" (A.D. 1861), Mrs. Bode's ed., London, 1897 (Pāli Text Society), p. 66. The form Malārū of the name here should be compounded with Melaro, a place so marked on the "Ila Trapobana" (Sumatra) in the Catalan map of A.D. 1375.

The second transcript should be compared with the 木來由, Mu-lai-yu, of A.D. 1293, supra, with which it has the two last characters in common, while the initial ones in either differ but very slightly in sound. If, therefore, now employed to designate the Malays in general, or Malaya, the region they at present inhabit, it denoted in the past the Malaya district in the southern part of the Malay Peninsula.

Having now exhausted the Chinese sources at our disposal as regards the hitherto much debated location of 閱婆, Shé-p'o, Java, Jaba, or Saba, we may confidently conclude that there is absolutely no proof, in Chinese literature, of the Chinese having become acquainted with, or ever having made mention of, the Island of Java before the unsuccessful expedition sent thither by Kublai Khan in A.D. 1292–93. On the contrary, all evidence that we have before that period invariably points to the part of the Malay Peninsula below the Kra Isthmus as the site of the ‘Insular’—read ‘Peninsular’—Java; even Sumatra being almost entirely out of the question, in so far as Chinese

1 The only arguments that can be set against this conclusion of ours are two, and they are of very little weight. One is the belated and unsubstantiated allegation of Ma Huan in his “Ying-yai Shèng-lan” (A.D. 1416), that “The country of 爪哇, Chau-ua [i.e. the Island of Java], was formerly called 閱婆, Shé-p'o” (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 171)—at the best a mere guess, repeated in later compilations, such as encyclopedias and the like, and accepted without question by our Sinologists to this day. (An exception must, however, be made in favour of Professor Schlegel, who says that “the Djavá (Shay-po) described in the Books of the Sung dynasty was a principality situated [somewhere] upon the Malay Peninsula.”—Teung-Pao, vol. x, p. 304. As to the contrary view upheld by other Sinologists, see it confuted by the Chinese writers themselves in the next note.)

The second argument alluded to is the circumstance we have already mentioned (see p. 480) of Pei-Hsin twice making use in his “Hsing-ch'a Shèng-lan” (A.D. 1436) of the spelling 閱婆, Shé-p'o, in lieu of爪哇, Chau-ua, in speaking of the Island of Java. But this is a mere fortuitous occurrence, caused, no doubt, either by oversight or by a desire to render more closely the local form, Jawa, of the name of that island. On the Chinese map of about A.D. 1399 published by Phillips the Island of Java is most distinctly marked爪哇國, Chau-ua Kuo, i.e. the ‘Country of Java.'
records are concerned.¹ It is further of the highest importance to note that even as late as A.D. 1378, 鬭婆, Shé-p’o, whose king was then named 摩那駝喃, Mo-na-t’o-nan (Mālādhāna, Maṇīdhāna, or Mālādalam, Maradalam?), is recorded to have sent envoys to bring tribute; this being the last time that Shé-p’o was heard of. This country, in the opinion of the Chinese commentators themselves, is not Chau-va or the Island of Java at all.² Hence it is very probable that we have here the last glimmering of Tuba, Jaba, or Saba, on the Malay Peninsula. With this I now bring to a conclusion the present inquiry into the location of the ‘Insular’ Shé-p’o of the Chinese, appending summarized in a synoptical table, for greater facility of reference, the principal facts gathered anent its history and nomenclature from the sources alluded to.

¹ The only instances that could be brought forward as having some degree of probability of applying to Sumatra are Pa-Hsien’s Pa-p’o-t’i (Yabadé of Yabadio), a striking approach to Ptolemy’s Ḡababī; and Chao Ju-kua’s Shé-p’o in so far as the pepper-producing districts located there by him are concerned (see above, pp. 460-461). Chao Ju-kua may, however, have been mistaken in saying that such districts were in Shé-p’o. Having no access to the full account he has left us of Shé-p’o, I am not able to judge how far this conjecture can be maintained. But even admitting he is correct, there would be nothing strange in his mentioning Sumatra under that name at a period (A.D. 1205-1258) not very far distant from those in which Marco Polo, Ibn Baṭṭaṭa, and others similarly called that island Java or Javic. And this could never be held as sufficient proof that the Shé-p’o of preceding writers meant that Island of Java.

² See Tong-yu-Poo, vol. x, pp. 297-298. Here, from the same publication, are reproduced the comments of the editors of the “Pien-i-tien” (which is the section devoted to foreign countries in the “T’u-shu-chi-ch’êng” Encyclopaedia, published about A.D. 1700) upon the passage in question, which I heartily recommend to our Javo-spellbound Sinologists for thorough digestion. “In the books of the Sung, Shou-jo [Shé-p’o] is always spoken of, which brought tribute, and then again mention is made in 1378 of its king Mâna dâlana (?) sending a letter and offering products of his country. They never came again. Some say that Diao-ou [Chau-va] is the same as Shou-jo; but no mention is found of this statement in the Books of the Mongol [Yûan] dynasty, in which it is said, besides, ‘that their customs and products have not been ascertained.’ Now (at once), during the reign of the founder of the Ming dynasty, both countries come simultaneously to bring tribute; but the names of their kings are not the same [the king of Central Java who sent embassies in 1377 and 1379 was called Perdana Prâbû; and those of Eastern and Western Java, who both sent envoys to bring tribute in 1377, were known, respectively, as Bogindo Bog-kit and Mâla-Prâbû; see Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 161]; so that there must have been two [distinct] countries.”
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RETROSPECTIVE SURVEY OF THE ONOMATOLOGY AND OUTLINE HISTORY OF THE ‘INSULAR’ SHE-PO AND CONJOINT STATES ON THE MALAY PENINSULA, FROM CHINESE SOURCES.

A.D.

414. Ya-PO-T'ı, 耶婆提 (Yabadi, Yavadhi[-raja?], Yavaday[-a], Yavades, Yavadi[-pa], Yavadio). A country peopled by Brähmanś and other heretics, where Buddhism is only sparsely practised (Fa-Hsien). The text contains no evidence whatever as to this country being situated on an island or a continent. It must be identified either with the east and north coasts of Sumatra, Ptolemy’s Iabadiu, or with a portion of the seaboard of the Malay Peninsula on or about Malacca Strait.

420–423. P‘O-ta, 婆達 (Vada, Vata, Bāda, Baddha, Bata), a State, sends envoys to Court with tribute ("P‘ei-wèn Yün-fu"). Probably Tavernier’s Bata = Bardia (Koh Mattra) on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, abreast of Chump’hön.

420–423. P‘o-hwang, 婆皇 (Bawang, Bahang), a State, sends envoys (ibid.). Not far from the above. May be Pahang, or else its homonym further south on the Endau River (east coast of Malay Peninsula). Other possible equivalents are Pago, an ancient place, now disappeared, and district on the River Muār; and Pinggan, further down the coast.

424. Shé-p‘o, 闍婆 (Jaba, Saba, Daba, Java, Sawa), visited by Gava Varman, grandson of a former king of Kābul, on his way

1 Both these extracts are culled from the China Review, vol. xiii, p. 337. Mr. Parker, the translator, adds that K‘ang-hsi’s dictionary mentions a 婆達, P‘o-ta (Put-tat, Pwok-tak, Bud-dat, Pat-tat, or Baddha, Batta), State existing during the T‘ang dynasty, which may be one and the same with the above, although the pronunciation would argue a form Battla, Battak, thus leading us to identify it with the country of the Batta or Battak in North-Central Sumatra. But this country seems to be referred to severally in Chao Ju-kua’s "Chu-fan-shih" (circa 1240) and the "Kwang-tung T‘ang-chih" (published 1693) as 拔泉, Pa-t’u (Pak-tak, Bat-t’ap, Battak?). See Young-Pao for 1901, p. 135. The Battak, according to Kollewijen ("Pekopte Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Bezittingen"), at the time when Hindūism penetrated to them, formed a State in the north of Sumatra, of which a remnant is still to be found in the little kingdom of Bākara, on the Lake of Toba.
from Ceylon to China (Kwai-Yuen catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka, compiled in 730 A.D.). (See p. 463.) N.B.—This is the first mention of Jaba or Saba in this form; see next entry.

430. Shê-p’o, 阇婆 (Jaba, Java, Saba, Sawa), an island, according to some versions, and district (Shê-p’o Chou), according to others, on which the State of Ho-lo-tan (see next entry) was situated ("Sung-shu," bk. 97; Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 505).


433. Ho-lo-tan. Its king, Viśva-varman, sends on a letter with presents. A few years later he is deposed by his son (Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 505–6). The "Sung-shu" appears to place the mission here referred to in the eleventh year Yuan Chia = A.D. 434.

433. Shê-p’o sends an embassy, according to the "Pien-i-tien" section (ch. 97) of the "T’u-shu-chi-ch’êng" Encyclopaedia (compiled towards A.D. 1700). This mission, not being mentioned in the annals of the First Sung dynasty, the statement may be incorrect, or else it is possible that this refers to the very embassy sent by Ho-lo-tan, in the Shê-p’o country, and by mistake has been attributed to the king of that region itself.

435. Shê-p’o-ta of Shê-p’o P’o-ta; 阇婆娑達, or 阇婆娑達; a State. Its king, Śrī Pāda-dvāra-varman (or Śrī Vātadhanavarman, Śāli-vartivardhana-varman?), sends envoys with presents ("Sung-shu," A.D. 500–513, bk. 97; and "Nan-shih," written about A.D. 650). Here, evidently, I have explained (supra, pp. 463 and 469), it is in reality a question either of two States, Shê-p’o and P’o-ta, which may have been under the same ruler; or else of a single one, P’o-ta, situated in Shê-p’o, and accordingly designated Shê-p’o-P’o-ta, i.e. the P’o-ta [State] of Shê-p’o, in order to distinguish it from some other homonymous State in the neighbouring archipelago. Ma Tuan-lin mentions only one mission, which he ascribes to the State of Shê-p’o alone (op. cit., p. 499). The editors of the "Pien-i-tien" (1700) state that according to the "Ming-wai-shih" (1459) Shê-p’o
was formerly called Shé-p’o-ta; that during the T’ang dynasty it was called Ho-ling or Tu-p’o (Tuba, Dava), the king whereof dwelt in the city of Shé-p’o (Saba, Jaba), and so forth in a light way (see T'oung-Pao, vol. x, p. 298). These rapprochements should not be taken too literally, although the States named were all neighbours, if not actually conterminous, being all situated on the southern half of the Malay Peninsula. It is interesting to notice in this connection that the third and fourth letters of the ruling king’s name, P’o-ta, are identical with those employed to write the name of the P’o-ta State. This may, however, be merely a coincidence, and the originals of the two transcripts may convey totally different meanings.

436. Ho-lo-tan sends new envoys. It must have been the son of the lately deposed king (see under A.D. 433) who despatched them (Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 506).

449. P’o-ta. Embassy sent by its ruler, Śrī Pulinga-(Bṛṇga, Bhuliṅga, or Palamga)-varman by name, who thus receives investiture (ibid., p. 507).

449. P’o-hwang. King Śrī (or Śāli) Bala-varman despatches a mission to apply for investiture, which he obtains (ibid., p. 507).

449. Ho-lo-tan, P’o-hwang, and P’o-ta, mentioned in one breath in a decree of Emperor Wên-ti, and praised for their zeal. Honorific titles are conferred upon their rulers, which are sent on in charge of officials of the Chinese Court (ibid., p. 506).

451. P’o-ta renews its homage to the Chinese Emperor (ibid., p. 508). This State is not mentioned after this date.

451. P’o-hwang again sends envoys to Court (ibid., p. 507).

452. Ho-lo-tan. A grandee of this kingdom, Varā-Svāmi (or P’hraḥ Sāmi), appears at Court as ambassador, bringing tribute (ibid., p. 506). From this date no further mention of intercourse with Ho-lo-tan occurs in Chinese history.

456. P’o-hwang sends envoys with tribute at each of these dates (loc. cit.). No further embassy is recorded after 466.

466. 舍利不陵伽跋摩. The term Puling or Bulang here suggests a connection with Pulainga or Balangka (supra, pp. 111–115), thus somewhat increasing the probability that P’o-ta or Bata is really the neighbouring Bardia marked abreast of C’hump’hôn Bay in the old maps (probably Matträ Island or Koḥ Matträ).
631-640. **Yen-mo-na** (or **Yen-mo-lo**)—Chou Kwo, 阮摩那 (or 阮) 洲國; or **Ye-mei-ni**, 野賽尼. **Yamana**—(Yama, or Yamunā?)—devipa-pura = the island kingdom of Yamana (or Yama); or **Yamani** (Yāmi, Yāmini), an island, or district, lying to the southwest of Maha-Campā (Hwén Tsang, or Yuan-chwang). In my opinion the same as **Yama-devipa** of the “Vâyu Purâna” (which may be identical with the Ramañaka-devipa of the Bhāgavata and Padma Purānas). Possibly the country and city of Dharmarāja (= Yama), i.e. Ligor (see p. 109), east coast of the Malay Peninsula; if not Sumatra (Yabana, Yavani-devipa?), the Prathama-Yava, or simply Yava, of the Pāgar-rūyung inscription of A.D. 656.

647. **Tu-p'o** or **Shē-p'o**, 杜婆, 社婆, 闍婆 (Tuba, Daba, Saba), the alternative name of a State otherwise known as 訶陵, Ho-ling (Galing, Gariang), and the name also of its present capital (which formerly was more to the east—or west, according to other versions—at 婆露伽斯, P'o-lu-ka-nz = Prakāsi near Ghirbi? see p. 95); latitude 6° 29' N. This State comes to Court with tribute (“Ch'iu T'ang-shu,” bk. 197; and “Hsin T'ang-shu,” bk. 222).1 Probably the tract of west coast of the Malay Peninsula about Günong Geriang and abreast of Pulo Tuba (Langkawī group).

664-5. **Ho-ling** or **Po-ling**; 訶陵 or 波棱 (Gālang, Bālang, Buling). A State between Lang-ka-hu, 郎迦戎 (Langkakhū = Ch'humph'hōn, see p. 115), and Mo-lo-yū, 末羅瑜 (Malāyū), (I-tsing). Probably the east coast of the Malay Peninsula at Tanjong Gelang or Puling, 4° N. lat.; and perhaps the eastern portion of the country of Ho-ling referred to in the preceding entry.

674. **Ho-ling**. Queen Simā reigns there; presumably the same as Queen Simā-devī, who was at about the same period ruling at Rē (Yay).

767. **Tu-p'o** or **Shē-p'o** (Daba, Saba, Dāvāka). Its people, conjointly with those of Ku-lun (or K'un-lun?), invade and plunder the capital of Tonkin (Kiau-chau = at that time being, Long-bien, the western portion of the present city of Hanoi). Defeated by the Chinese troops at Chōu-vien

---

1 Although no precise date is given in the account of **Ho-ling**, except an indication of the period—Chéng-kwan = A.D. 627-649—it is added that contemporaneously with the envoy from **Ho-ling** there arrived in China those from To-p'o-tōng, who, in the account of this State, are said to have been sent in the twenty-first year of the Chéng-kwan period = A.D. 647.
(Des Michels' "Annales Impériales de l'Annam," p. 169). The country here referred to is the highland Java, Dava, or Ḍauṅka in Upper Burma (see pp. 55, 467 ante), and the expedition seems to have taken place by land. Ku-lun or K'un-lun here presumably includes both the Great and the Little K'un-lun, i.e. the eastern portion of the Peguan coast, and the western seaboard of the Malay Peninsula, as far south as Takōpa or Papra Strait.¹

774. Shē-x'ō? "Very dark and thin men coming from another country in ships" rob the Liūga of Kauthara, and destroy the temple of the goddess Pō-Nagar (Bhāgavatī) at Nā-trāng (Southern Campā). Pursuing them, King Satyavarman gains a complete naval victory over them (Chăm inscription, No. 407). Although the nationality of these robbers is not mentioned, it is probable they came either from the Malay Peninsula or the islands near it. See preceding entry and the one after next.


787. Jāva. The armies of Jāva, "arriving in ships" (nāvāgatair Jāva-valasamghaiḥ), burn the temple of Śiva at Pāndurāṅga. (This temple, dedicated to Bhadrādhipatīśvara, stood at about nine miles westward of Panrang, in Bin-ts'ōn. It was rebuilt in 799 under the name of Indrābhadrēśvara—Chăm inscription, No. 397.) Both Prof. Bergaigne and Commandant Aymonier readily take Jāva here to mean the Island of Java (Journal Asiatique, 1888, p. 56; and "History of Tchampa," p. 10), an absolutely chimerical assumption for which there is not the slightest foundation. Certainly, either the Malay Peninsula or Sumatra are meant.

802. Jāvā. Jayavarman II, king of Kamboja, who ascends the throne this year, "came from Jāvā," a dependency (?) of his to which he probably undertook a journey, or led an armed expedition (Khmer inscription of the Sdok Kok Thom temple,

¹ For Ta K'un-lun and Hsiao K'un-lun see pp. 89–90; also pp. 103 and 260. The king of Little K'un-lun at the period in question is stated to have been called Mong Ta-liet, and that of Great K'un-lun, Ta Lei-bak (see Aymonier's "History of Tchampa," reprinted from the Asiatic Quarterly Review, July, 1893, p. 9 of the reprint). No native characters being given for these names, it becomes impossible to institute any comparison. Aymonier readily fancies this to be an invasion of Tonkin from the coasts of Southern China [sic] by hordes of Malays and Javanese"!! notwithstanding that the native commentators to the Annals add a note clearly explaining that the invaders came from Bā-bā, the "C-hū-wā of the mountains," also known as Dū-la (i.e. T'ū-lo-shu, see pp. 31 and 466).
A.D. 1052). Aymonier here again too rashly assumes that it is a question of the Island of Java (Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 20, p. 283; "Actes du XIème Congrès des Orientalistes," 2ème Section, p. 192); whereas it is not unlikely—considering the political influence that Kamboja had had for centuries on the Malay Peninsula—that this is the country meant; or else Sumatra, but never the Island of Java. Besides, this alleged dependency of Javâ on Kamboja is by no means proved. That the reverse was more likely the case appears from the translation of the Khmûr portion of that inscription which Aymonier has, since I wrote the above, given in his "Cambodge" (vol. ii, Paris, 1901, pp. 263-264). After the statement that H.M. Paramesvara (Jayavarman II) came from Javâ in order to reign and reside at Nagara Indrapura, the document in question goes on to say that during the reign of the same monarch (circa A.D. 802-839) Hiranyadâma, a learned Brâhman, came from the Janapada (probably in India) at the King's own invitation, because the King, desirous of giving up the treatises (ritual books) which evidenced the dependence of Kamboja on Javâ, wanted him to frame rules for a new ceremonial more suitable to a cakravartin (universal emperor). Notwithstanding Aymonier's view that the dependence referred to in the text must thus have been merely 'moral,' it seems to me that the only logical inference that can be drawn is, that prior to that the Kambojan kings had not been independent rulers, but vassals, somehow, of Javâ, of which they had been compelled to follow the ritual laid down for her tributary princes. It is thus more than probable that we have here an unmistakeable indication of that punitive expedition undertaken against Kamboja by the Mahârâja of Zûbej of which Abû Zaid left us the record—a tradition, he says, handed down from the old times (vide supra, pp. 212-213). As his informant visited the country about A.D. 870-880, the event must have taken place at least one century before, thus being perhaps contemporary with the attack of Javâ on Panrang in A.D. 787. And as he adds that since that period the kings of Khmûr (Kamboja) used every morning to turn towards Zûbej and do homage to the Mahârâja, it becomes at once clear what the passage referred to above in the inscription meant about dependency on Javâ. I am accordingly inclined to take it that in the case in point Javâ means Sumatra; for there it was, as we shall demonstrate in due course, that the Zûbej empire had its centre.
802. Shé-p'o. Sends a mission to the Chinese Court. Her envoys give the Chinese an account of P'iau (Lower Burma). Evidently a country on the Malay Peninsula (see p. 467).

813. Ho-ling. Presents four Sêng-ch'i slaves (lakhôn actors) and other curiosities ("Hsin T'ang-shu," bk. 222, pt. ii). (See p. 506.)

821. Shé-p'o offers tribute to Emperor Mu Tsung in the tenth month of this year ("Chiu T'ang-shu, Mu Tsung Chi," ch. 16).


860–873. Ho-ling despatches an embassy to present female musicians (lakhôn girls) (ibid.). From this moment all record about intercourse with this State ends, and the field is occupied by Shé-p'o alone.

LATÉR HISTORY OF SHÉ-P'O.

904–5. Shé-p'o. San-fo-ch'i (Palembang) is stated to lie between Chén-la (Kamboja) and Shé-p'o ("Sung-shih," bk. 489).

971. Shé-p'o. People from this country come to trade at Canton ("Sung-shih"). (See p. 515.)


992. Shé-p'o. In the twelfth month of this year its king, 穆羅茶, Mu-lo-ch'a (Malaja, Mahrâja), sends an embassy headed by a personage, 陀湛, T'o-chan (Dacham, Datam), by name, and led by a Chinese shipowner from Chien-ch'i (in Fuh-kien). The envoy mentions that his sovereign bears the title of 夏至馬曬夜, Hsia-chih-Ma-lo-yo (Adhi Ma[hâ]-râja or Adhi-Malaya?); and that the kingdom has as a neighbour a country called 善羅門, P'o-lo-mên (Brâhman, Brâhmaṇa-[rāstra, or pura], Prome, Râmaṇ-ña-deśa = Pegu?), ("Sung-shih," bk. 489).

1015, or earlier. Yava-dvîpa. A famous statue of Dipânkara, the primeval Buddha, is preserved there: it has Avalokiteśvara on the left and Manjuśrî on the right.—Sanskrit MS. from Nepal, "Additional 1643" of the Cambridge University Library (Foucher's "Iconographie Bouddhique de l'Inde," Paris, 1900, pp. 79, 189). This is the oldest mention of Yava-dvîpa met with in Indian literature, if the somewhat doubtful one in the Râmâyâna be excepted. Foucher, like
all his Indianist colleagues, naturally takes it to be Java; but we must let it follow the lot of Fa-Hsien's *Ya-p'o-t'í* (see under A.D. 414 above). Hence, either north and east coasts of Sumatra, or west coast of the Malay Peninsula on or about Malacca Strait.

1109. Shé-p'o sends envoys to bring tribute in the sixth month of this year (ibid.).

1129. Shé-p'o. The Emperor of China confers investiture upon its ruler with a long title (ib.).

1132. Shé-p'o. New honours and benefits bestowed upon its king by the Chinese Court (ib.).


1279–80. Shé-p'o. Troops of Cháwa race advance to conquer the southern provinces of Siám (on the Malay Peninsula), subject to Sukhóthai. They are repelled by the Siamese king, as mentioned before. ("Rájádhirája," a chronicle of Pegu preserved in Siám, p. 10 of the Siamese ed.)

1292. Mūl-Jáwa, جاوار (Mūla-Java), an island (or peninsula), 200 parasangs in width and 120 in breadth (600 by 360 miles). As the result of an expedition sent by Kübláí Khan this year, it submits to him. Its king, Śrí Ráma, does homage and offers presents to the Chinese Court. Kübláí extends him a courteous welcome, and sets up his son on the throne as a tributary prince (Wassáf'). Possibly 木來由, Mu-lai-yu, or Mu-lai-yau, to which envoys were sent in 1292 to call it to submission (see above, p. 536). Also, perhaps, Ptolemy's *Perimula* (-Java?) = Ligor (see pp. 106–110, 444, 517).

1345–6. Mül-Jáwa, جاوار (= Mūla-Java, or Mūla[y vá], Malla-Java?), a non-Mughammadan country, two months' march in length. Its seaport and capital is Kākulah, or

---


2 A king Śrí Ráma Vikrama reigned on Singapore Island and neighbourhood in about 1320, according to my reckoning, which is, however, only approximate, and can be depended on merely within twenty years or so. Śrí Ráma Vikrama was the grandson of Śrí Tribhuvana (Níla Uttama), the founder of Singapore; and may well be one and the same person with the Śrí Ráma alluded to in the above extract. At all events, there can scarcely be any doubt that both these rulers were contemporaries, or very nearly so.
Kakola, a fine city surrounded by a wall of hewn stones, so wide that three elephants can march abreast on it. There are plenty of elephants, eagle-wood, good camphor, little cotton, and scarcely any ponies (Ibn Batūta). Undoubtedly the Ko-lo or Ko-lo Fu-sha-lo, of Chinese records, Han dynasty (206-221) and A.D. 650-656 ("Hsin T'ang-shu," bk. 222b). See pp. 432, 444, 518. Mentioned in A.D. 921-922 in Captain Bozorg's "Ajā'ib" as Kakola, where merchandise was unshipped and conveyed to another place distant seven days' march from the coast. The people said to be anthropophagous only in so far as they ate their enemies out of revenge ("Merveilles de l'Inde," pp. 66, 67, 126). Very probably Ligor, perhaps called Kakola from Koh Krah (Koh Kura), Cara of old maps, lying abreast of its bay. Otherwise, Kwala Biserat (in Jala, 6° 30' N. lat.); Kwala Berserah (3° 34' N. lat.); or Koli, Kolī-badara (Ptolemy's Koli) = Kelantan, further down the coast.

1350. C'ha-wā (Java), a State tributary to Siām, on the Malay Peninsula (Chronicles of Ayuthia, vol. i, p. 211). Apparently in the southern part of the Peninsula (see p. 532).

1378. Suk-p'ō. Its king sends envoys to bring tribute ("Ming-shih," concluded A.D. 1724). His name is 摩那駱営, Mo-no-t'o-nan (Mānah-dālam, Māladhāna, Mala-Donan1), ("Pien-i-tien," compiled towards A.D. 1700). Apparently the same State as the preceding (see p. 540).

1436-1693. Suk-p'ō. Near it is Malacca, which is therefore also called Ts Shé-p'ō, i.e. 'Great [or Greater] Java [or Saba, Jaba]' = Mahā Java, Java Besar (?). Another name for it is Ch'ung-ka-la (Jaṅgala, Nieuhoff's Jakola, 1662), ("Kwang-tung T'ung-chih," pub. 1693). The Java or Saba (Shé-p'ō) here alluded to is very likely, as in the case of several of the preceding entries, Sabah on the Beram River, Ptolemy's Sabana. (See pp. 517-525.)

1 May be Marah-Donan. Marah, راج دولن = 'a chief,' often occurs as a prefix to names of Malay personages; and Donan is a well-known name in Malay fiction, occurring in the popular story of راج دولن, Rāja Donan.
II. The Arabic Evidence.

Let us now turn to the information supplied on the subject by Arab writers. As we observed (see p. 462 above), they also, like the Chinese, clearly distinguish between two Jāba or Java countries, with the difference, however, that they locate one on the island of Kalab (central part of the Malay Peninsula), and by the other they seem at times to mean Sumatra and at times the southern part of the Malay Peninsula, in some instances confusing the two latter, in others confusing them with Kalab. Owing to this it becomes extremely difficult to unravel their geographical mazes. On the other hand, as regards their equivalent for the Chinese Shē-p'ō (Java, Daba) of the mountains, they are explicit enough, so that there can be no question that it is their Tufah, Tāfan, or Tāban, as I have demonstrated long before this (see p. 57). With this, however, we are not concerned now, and shall therefore proceed to deal with the statements relating to the former.

Ibn Khurdādbeh (a.d. 864) informs us, on the one hand, of the Jābah of India [extra-Gangem, i.e. Malay Peninsula], or Indian Prince, to whom belongs the Island (read 'Peninsula') of Kalab; and on the other of the island of the Jābah [King] of Shelāhet, whose personal title is Mahā-rāja. "This island is very extensive; the king who owns it is clad in a robe and a head-cover both of gold; he worships Buddha. Productions: cocoanuts, bananas, sugar-cane, sandal-wood, hyacinths, cloves. Near by there is a little mountain throwing up flames for a circuit of one hundred cubits and to the height of a lance. During the daytime only smoke issues forth, and the fire only appears at night. Fifteen days' sailing across the sea beyond it brings one to the country of cotton (another version says 'aromata'). The distance between Jābah and Shelāhet is about . . . . [lacuna]."

1 "Le livre des Routes et des Provinces, par Ibn Khordadbeh," in Journal Asiatique, 1865, pp. 288-289. The concluding sentence clearly shows, I think,
Edrisi (A.D. 1154) similarly states that on the island of Kalah dwells a king called the Jabah, or 'Indian Prince.' But then he makes two islands out of Ibn Khurdadbeh's 'Island of the Jabah of Shelahet' (or, perhaps more correctly, 'Island of Jabah and Shelahet'). He goes on to say, in fact: "In the neighbourhood of this island [Kalah] are those of Jabah, جابة; Salahat, سلاحة; and Harij, هريج. They lie apart one from the other about two [twenty?] parasangs, and all obey a single king. This prince is called Jabah." And then our author adds that the potentate just referred to has his likeness impressed on his coins; that he worships Buddha, to whom he has erected a temple faced with marble; that to such temples are attached dancing-girls (devadasi?), etc. (see p. 506). "This island [of Jabah]," he remarks further on, "produces in great abundance cocoanuts, excellent bananas, rice, and sugar. In the Island of Harnaj, هرنيج (or Harij),¹ there exists a large chasm of which nobody has ever been able to fathom the depth; it is a notable peculiarity." As regards the Island of Salahat, he informs us that it produces sandal-wood in plenty, spikenard and cloves. "On the island is a volcano² throwing up flames

that it is here a question of two islands (or two districts on the same island), of which one was called Jabah and the other Shelahet. Barbier de Meynard seems, therefore, to have been wrong in translating the opening sentence: "Deux fars plus loin est l'île du Djabah de Chehahet, nommée Maharajah." (op. cit., p. 288.) Edrisi, as will be seen below, makes of it two distinct islands; but Nowairi calls it the "Island of Jabah and Shelahet," which is, I think, the right interpretation.

Since writing the above I have noticed, in fact, that Professor De Goeje, in his new translation of Ibn Khurdadbeh ("Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum," pt. vi, Leiden, 1889, p. 46), takes the same view. He translates: "De la [Kaloh or Balus?] aux isles de Djaba, de Schalahit, et de Haraladj, 2 Par.," and ascribes to Shelahet the production of sandal-wood, Indian spikenard, and cloves. Then he adds that as regards Kalah, Abu Zaid's text reads: "it is the kingdom (belongs to the kingdom) of Zaboj," thus making it clear that Kalah was not exactly "a dependency," but part and parcel of the Zaboj empire. See, however, the extract from Yakut below.

¹ Professor De Goeje, loc. cit., reads, in both Ibn Khurdadbeh and Edrisi, Haralaj, هراليج; and adds that, according to Ibn Rosteh, the Island of Haralaj came to be so called after the name of one of its governors. If so, I wonder whether Hirunyakas or some similar term is not implied, thus making the form Harannaj a fairly probable one. See, however, note 3 on p. 552.

² In De Goeje's translation of Ibn Khurdadbeh this little volcano is ascribed to Jabah island (see loc. cit.).
a hundred cubits high. During the daytime only smoke is seen to issue forth, but at night a very bright fire appears.”¹ In the last statement he fairly agrees with Ibn Khurdâdbih, except on the location of the volcano, which the latter writer states to lie near the island. Shelâhet, or Salâhat, we have shown to be (pp. 80, 91), the name of Malacca Strait and its sea (Srî Lohit, Selat, Salet, etc.); the island of Shelâhet is therefore, very probably, Sumatra, or, more precisely, some portion of its east coast on Malacca Strait, while the term Jâbah is to be understood to apply to the race that inhabited that territory, rather than to the territory itself. I may point out, in this connection, that there exist in the north-west portion of the Āru, Hâru, or Ghûri (غربي جارو) Bay a district, village, and river, called Salahaji (4° 10’-15’ N. lat.),² which may be somehow traditionally connected with Edrisi’s Salâhat. Again, not very far to the southeast of Salahaji, in the Bâtu-bâra State (3° N. lat.), there is the district of Tânah Jâwa, which may well represent Edrisi’s Island (read ‘district’) of Jâbah, unless this really be meant for the ancient kingdom of Yava or Prathama Yava, further down in the central portion of Sumatra (vide p. 462 ante). Harij, Harnaj, or Harlaj, may be the adjoining Hâru district itself, and if not, a clerical error for Haranj (هرنچ) , which latter is, presumably, its correct form.³ As regards volcanoes, there are known to exist no

2 The bar at the mouth of the Salahaji River has a depth of twelve feet at high-water springs, and must have been, therefore, quite accessible to the shipping of the old days. I have no doubt that the Salahaji district is one and the same with the 日羅夏治, Jih-lo-hsia-chih, country of Ming history, bk. 324, unidentified, more solito, by Groeneveldt (op. cit., p. 184). It is therein stated to be near Chau-see (probably here not meant for the Island of Java, but for either Shê-p’o or the Tânah Jâva district in Bâtu-bâra), and named immediately after 僑里, Tsich-li or Tîh-lî = Deli, which lies but at some forty miles south-east of Salahaji and Āru. And yet Groeneveldt feels inclined to locate both places on the Island of Bâli!! Dr. Bretschneider has given up them both as unidentifiable in the China Review, vol. iv, p. 387.
3 It is pretty certain that Jaubert’s reading Harnaj is hopelessly wrong. Haranj should be the right form, which we have already met in Serapon (9-10th
less than sixty-seven on Sumatra Island, of which several are still active, e.g., Gûnong Gredong (4° 10' N. lat., that is, at the same height as Áru Bay); Merapi (0° 25' S. lat.); Talang or Sulau, etc. Although nearer the west coast than the eastern, they may nevertheless, being over 8,000 and 9,000 feet in height, be visible from several points on the east coast of the island. However, the volcano of Ibn Khurdádbih and Edrisi may, after all, be that of Krakatoa, further south in Sunda Strait.

Yâkût (A.D. 1218) evidently means the Malay Peninsula when he states (i, 516): "Ma'bar is the last part of India; then comes the country of Sin (India extra-Gangem and China), the first part of which is Jáwâ, reached by a difficult and fatal sea." And further: "... remotest Sin... is a far-off land...; only the merchants seek its outlying parts, to wit, the country known as Jáwâ on the sea-coast, like to India; from it are brought eaglewood, camphor, and nard, and clove, and mace, and China drugs, and vessels of china-ware" (ibid., iii, p. 445).

Ibn Sa'îd (A.D. 1274), quoted by Abû-1-Fedâ,¹ says: "Amongst the islands of the Indian Ocean mention should be made of that of Jáwâh, a large island famed for the abundance of its spices." He further mentions Jáwâh as a city situated on the island of Kalâh, along with the cities of Lâmeîrî, Fansûr, Kalâh, and Malâyur, which all, he states, are situated on a bay. Here Jáwâh may be either the Chinese Shê-p'o city mentioned in the new T'ang history (perhaps only after the eighth or ninth century A.D.) as being the later capital of Ho-ling; the C'hâwâ district below the Krah Isthmus; or Sabah, Ptolemy's Sabana, on the Bernam River. Fansûr may, likewise, be Panchur on the River Mwâr, east of Malacca town. In this case all the

cities named would turn out to be places on the Malay Peninsula, and would be all situated, as the author says, on a bay, to wit, Malacca Strait, while his island of Jāwah would be the same as Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s, viz. Sumatra. Otherwise we should have to admit that Ibn Saʿīd has recklessly confused the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra, which would be a grave charge not easily proved.

Dimashḥī (a.d. 1300) simply follows Ibn Saʿīd when he states that the island of Kalah contains the cities of Fansūr, Jāwah, Helābir (Malāvīr), Lāwezi (Lo-yūeh, Lārut, Lavet), and Kalah. En revanche, however, he supplies us with some curious particulars about Shelāhet—which name he spells Selāmit—as follows:—“The island of Selāmit has a circuit of 300 miles, and is covered with mountains and forests. It produces cocoanuts in plenty; there is to be found a species of animals resembling man and talking an unknown tongue. Their body is hairy; ... they dwell on trees like birds, and feed upon fruits; their stature varies from three to four spans. Their hair is red, and their paws resemble those of a bird. Upon perceiving men they take to flight and climb up to the tops of the trees.”

Abū-l-Fedā (a.d. 1321) hints beyond doubt, in Van der Lith’s opinion, at the Island of Sumatra under the name Jāwah when he says: “On the south of the Island of Jāwah one remarks the city of Fansūr, whence the Fansūrī camphor derives its name.” There can, in fact, scarcely be any question here that Sumatra (its northern half, at all events) is meant, which but a few years earlier Marco Polo termed Java Minor, and a few years later Ibn Baṭṭūṭa called the Island of Jāwah. For the ‘south’ of the island where...
Fanṣūr is located, we must, of course, understand here, as in Barbosa, its west coast. (See pp. 452–453.)

Kazwīnī (A.D. 1330) draws a distinction between Jáwah, جاوة, the country of camphor, and the Island of Jâbah, جابه, with a volcano.\(^1\) In the former we have either the southern portion of the Malay Peninsula or the north and west coasts of Sumatra; while in the latter I am more inclined to recognize Edrisī's island of Salāḥat than the Island of Java itself, which appears to have remained unknown to the Arabs.

Nowairī (A.D. 1332) repeats almost word for word Ibn Khurdādbih's account, introducing, however, now and then some not unimportant detail, or some useful variant to the latter's text. Here is what he says:—"Among these islands there is that of Kalah, inhabited by Indians [instead of 'by the Indian king who rules over it,' as in Ibn Kh.]. . . . The island of Nalūsh [same as I. Kh.'s Balūs?\(^2\)] lies on its right [instead of 'left' as in I. Kh.], and at a distance of two days. . . . Next one finds the Island of Jâbah and Selāḥīt، سالحیت [instead of 'Island of the Jâbah (Prince) of Shelāḥet,' as in I. Kh.], with a town. . . . There are cocoanuts, bananas, sugar-cane, . . . sandal-wood, nard, and cloves. Opposite this island there is a mountain; a fire burns on its top. The mountain is 100 ells high; its breadth and width are the same. At night the fire is seen, but during the daytime only smoke. At fifteen days' distance from this mountain one meets the Island of Spices (Jazyratū-l-Tyb، جزيرة الطيب), producing all sorts of spices."\(^2\) In this extract the position of the volcano is more clearly defined than in Ibn Khurdādbih's and Edrisī's narratives; thus it seems now almost certain that Krakatoa in Sunda Strait is intended. Fifteen days' sailing thence across the sea brings one to the Island of Spices, which must therefore be the insular group of the Bandas and Moluccas, situated just about that distance from Sunda

---


 Strait. However, of this island or country of spices the Arabs, even in Nowairi’s period, seem to have had but a very hazy idea, based on purely hearsay information, for none of them ever appears to have gone there; hence, the distance stated must be taken as merely approximate.

Ibn Batūta (A.D. 1345–1346) clearly distinguishes, as we have repeatedly observed in the course of our inquiry, between the Island of Jáwah, جاور، = Sumatra; and ملل جاور، the Infidel Country = Malay Peninsula, southern part. Hence we need not dwell on their respective identities any further.

Ibn-l-Wardī (A.D. 1349), although repeating, in the main, the statements of his predecessors, adds sundry hints of some importance. After having told us, for instance, that in the extensive island of Khalah dwells a king of the Banū Jába al Hindi people,¹ he proceeds to speak of the Island of Jābah with a volcano, inhabited by men who have red faces and hair-covered breasts.² As such somatic characteristics are nowhere to be met among the inhabitants of the western portion of the Archipelago except in Sumatra, this is, no doubt, the island meant.

It will thus be seen that the Arab writers, like the Chinese, almost unanimously distinguish between two Jávas, with the difference, however, that they place one on the ‘Island of Khalah’ = Malay Peninsula, and the other on

¹ Does Bēnu stand here for بنو, Benna or Beniwa, and if so refer to the Orang Benna or wild tribes of the Malay Peninsula? I have not access to the Arabic text of this passage, and cannot therefore judge as to the correctness, if any, of my surmise. Abū-l-Fedā states that in the principal city of the Island of Khalah there dwell Musalmāns, Indus, and Persians. To which particulars Kazwini adds that the same city is a meeting-place for learned Brāhmans.

² “Merveilles de l’Inde,” p. 257. The red colour is characteristic of the complexion of the natives of Engano, although it is also found in a lesser degree among the neighbouring Mantauwi islanders and other Indonesians (Batta, Kubu, Pasīma), with whom it occurs mixed with brown, the resultant shade thus being a light ruddy brown. Of hairy races, none has so far been found in the Archipelago except in the Krae (S.W. Sumatra, opposite Engano) and Siak (E. Sumatra) districts. In the former, hairy dwarfs occur; and in the interior of the latter, wild, hairy tribes, as yet not well known (see A. B. Meyer’s “Negritos,” p. 45). It is easy to see, on the face of this evidence, that the Island of Jābah referred to above cannot be Java, but Sumatra.
Sumatra (Islands of Jābah and Shelāhet); whereas the Chinese locate both on the Malay Peninsula, and although they became early acquainted with the east and north coasts of Sumatra, they seem not to have learned until the thirteenth century (and that very likely through the medium of the Arab or Indian navigators) that this island was also called Java. *Per contra*, while the Chinese made the acquaintance of Java through the expedition they undertook thither in A.D. 1292, and recorded its name as Chau-wa (in but very rare instances, and that by a mere oversight or slip, as Shē-p'ō), the Arabs seem never to have visited that island, or if they did they never made mention of it in their literature. This is, I think, the true state of affairs in so far as the Chinese and Arab geographical knowledge respectively of the Indo-Malay Archipelago is concerned.

III. Location of Zābej.

It now only remains to attack the last stronghold made by Arabists and Sinologists to protect their Java theory. This stronghold of theirs consists in the argument, which they think unassailable, that the Zābej empire mentioned in Arabic literature is, of course—who would not divine it?—Java, or had, at any rate, its seat and centre on that island.¹ Such being their position, I now propose instead to demonstrate that Zābej was Sumatra, and had its seat and centre on Sumatra, Java being entirely out of the question, except, perhaps, as a mere dependency of that empire.

Sulaimān (A.D. 851) says:—" Zābej, ـل، lies on the right-hand side of the provinces of India: the entire region.

¹ Their Kalimah on the Java question is thus summed up by Van der Lith in the "Merveilles de l'Inde," p. 231: "On sait déjà depuis longtemps que les états du Maharadjah de Zabedj étaient situés dans l'Archipel indien, et que l'île de Java en avait été le centre. Il y avait donc grande probabilité que la véritable île de Zabedj n'est autre que l'île de Java. Il restait pourtant encore des doutes. Mais il me semble, d'après ce que nous en dit notre auteur, qu'il n'est plus permis d'hésiter, et qu'il est bien certain que l'île de Zabedj et l'île de Java ne font qu'un . . . . . je soutiens que le véritable Zabedj, qui donnait son nom aux états du Maharadjah, ne peut être que l'île de Java." Amen!
obeys a single king; *Kalâh-bâr*, is one of its dependencies.¹ Near *Zâbej* is a volcano, and at the foot of this a spring of cool and fresh water; there is also a thermal well."² Here, it will readily be seen, it is simply a question of Ibn Khurdâdbih’s Island (islands) of *Jâbah* and *Shelâhet*, with its volcano close by, shadowed under the generic name of *Zâbej*. This will be confirmed by the extract now following.

Ibn Khurdâdbih (a.d. 864) tells us: "The King of *Zâbej* is called *Mahârâja*; amongst his possessions there is an island named *Dhûtâil* which echoes with the sounds of drums and cymbals. According to the reports of sailors, there exists in those parts a horse with a mane so long that it trails on the ground."³ Here we may notice that *Mahârâja* is the very title recorded by this writer for the king of the Island of *Jâbah* and *Shelâhet*, which is, of course, one and the same with that of *Zâbej*. *Dhûtâil* is a faulty spelling for a name correctly written بِرطایل, *Bertâyl* or *Bartayl*, by Kazwini, which is meant, in my opinion, for the Island of Bintang, otherwise known as *Riau*, or Rhio.⁴ Riau, ریو, means, in fact, ‘noise, noisy,

¹ This statement seems at first sight to clash with that from Ibn Khurdâdbih as to *Kalâh* Island belonging to the *Jâbah* of India; but the king here alluded to may have been tributary to the potentate ruling over *Zâbej*. Professor De Goeje, we have seen, considers that Sulaiman’s text shows that *Kalâh* was the country of *Zâbej* itself, or, at any rate, part and parcel of this empire. *Jâbah* and *Zâbej*, he adds, are two different pronunciations of the same name, and Ibn Rosteh substitutes *Zâbej* for *Jâba* in a passage from Ibn Khurdâdbih (op. cit., p. 46, n. 2).


⁴ The translator remarks, in a note, that Dimashqî calls the island طانيل, *Tâyyl*, and pretends it is inhabited by a population resembling the Turks. He also explains that the noises noticed by travellers issue forth from a high mountain. According to Mas‘ûdî, who describes the island in question without naming it, the Musalman navigators believed that it was the residence of the *Dejîlâl*, or Anti-Christ.

I have noticed, since writing the above, that Professor De Goeje, in his new edition of Ibn Khurdâdbih’s text, spells the name of the island *Brutâil*, بِرطایل (pp. 76 text and 48 transl.), thus confirming the deductions I had independently arrived at above. Kazwini, he adds, states that there are to be found petrified prawns, a peculiarity ascribed in the *Ajâib* to an island in the Sea of *Sanf* (see "Merveilles de l’Inde," p. 171), which may be the same place.
Hence the legend, and if not, from it the name. The horse with the long mane is, of course, the mythical marine horse, of which we shall hear more anon.

Abū Zaid (A.D. 880–916) informs us that Zābej city, مَدِينَة الْوَاسِطَة (read ‘State,’ see below), is situated facing China, between it and which country there is a distance of one month’s sailing, and even less with a favourable wind (same as recorded by I-ṭsing, see p. 527). The King of Zābej bears the title of مَهْرَاج, Mahrāj (Mahārāja). His capital (evidently ‘State’) has an extent (circuit?) of 900 parasangs (2,160 miles). This potentate rules over a large number of islands, stretching for a distance of 1,000 parasangs (2,400 miles) and more. Among his possessions are the islands of—

1. Sarbaza, or Serboza, سَرْبَزَة: extent (circuit?), 400 parasangs (960 miles) = Śrī-Bhoja = the east coast of Sumatra at, and about, Palembang.

2. Rāmnī رَمْنَى: extent (circuit?), 800 parasangs (1,920 miles); producing camphor (Sulaimān calls it Rāmnī, رَمْنَى, and locates here the Fansūr, i.e. Bārūs-camphor forests) = Lambri, Lāmerī, i.e. the north and west coasts of Sumatra.

1 See Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 22, p. 272, note, where the derivation of the term is suggested as from رِيْعَة, riyah or riauh, noise, noisy, loud sounds (of joy or distress); although, in Von de Wall’s Malay Dictionary the words are given as quite distinct: رِيْأَب, rijaub, “naam der bekende hoofdplaats”; and رِيْئُ, riauh, “huidrichtig; woelig.” N.B. that Gūroh, كُوُرْحُ, on the same island, which we have (see p. 514) identified with the Chinese Ku-lo, means ‘thunder, rolling noise.’

2 Nicolò Conti very curiously says that Greater and Lesser Java are distant from the continent one month’s sail (see Major’s “India in the Fifteenth Century,” part ii, p. 15).

3 Here and in the following distances I adopt Ibn Khurdābdī’s valuations of 25 parasangs to a degree, based on the Ptolemaic estimate of 20 stadins to the parasang, which seems even later to have been followed by Mas‘ūdī and Yāḳūt (see Journal Asiatique, 1865, pp. 228–229). Under Khalīfah al-Ma’mūn’s reign (A.D. 813–833), two measurements effected of a degree on the earth’s surface yielded 56½ and 57 miles respectively. Much later on the traveller Mukaddasī (A.D. 985) reckoned the parasang as equal to three miles, an estimate adopted by the cosmographer Dimashkī (A.D. 1300). I think it, therefore, best to follow the old valuation when dealing with distances recorded by the early Arab travellers.
3. *Kalah*, जङ्ग: extent, 80 parasangs (1,920 miles) = west coast of the Malay Peninsula between Papra Strait on the south and Mergui on the north. Over it ruled, as we are informed by Ibn Khurdâdbih, the Jâbah Prince of India (Pegu).

The island on which the Maharâja resides is extremely fertile and populous; the dwellings follow one another without interruption. No waste land exists in this country, nor dwellings in ruin. The palace of the Maharâja fronts a *thalâj*, ठाणी, or estuary (marsh, lagoon),¹ formed by an inlet of the sea. This is invaded by the sea-water at flow-tide, but the water therein turns out fresh at the ebb. A little pond (lagoon) is formed by the water contiguous to the royal residence. In this pond the king threw every morning a brick-shaped ingot of gold; hence it became known as the 'Pond of the gold ingots.'² This story,

¹ Van der Lith says (''Merveilles des Indes,''' p. 195) that *thalâj* is an Indian word meaning *étang*, i.e. marsh, pond. Its Sanskrit form, he adds, is, according to Professor Kern, *talâga*, and the explanation of the word given by Abû Zaid (as 'estuary') seems erroneous. Well, I may observe in my own turn that in such a case the true Sanskrit word is more probably *tadâka*, Pâli *tadâka* = a pond, pool, lake. With this the Malay term *teluk* or *telok*, स्तन् = a bay, a harbour, as well as the Khmer *touli* (*tôli, *thâli*) = a river, lake (cf. Persian *daryâ*, Kitan [Cathayan] *tê-li*-n = 'lake,' Nû-chên *tê-li*-n = 'sea,' Manchu *me-derin* = 'sea,' and Greek *thalass*, ṭhâlâssein, which, I think, are all etymologically related), may be connected. The meaning I make out, in any case, to be lagoon. Another Indian-derived Malay word, *Telâga*, means a 'well' or 'reservoir'; this may be the word alluded to by Professor Kern. Towards the end of the fourteenth century Palembang became known to the Chinese as 

² Reinaud, op. cit., pp. 92–95 and 98.
which I have abridged from the original, winds up with
the account of the expedition undertaken by the Mahārāja
to punish the King of Kāmar, تما، or Kumāra (Kamboja),
for which see pp. 201–205 above. En passant the author
drops the useful hint that between the two kingdoms (of
the Mulārāja and of Kāmar) there are ten days’ sailing in
latitude (i.e. following a given meridian), increasing to as
much as twenty when the wind is light. For the Island (or
district) of Zābej proper, i.e. that on which the Mahārāja
resided, we must understand, as will be most conclusively
shown further on, that of Sarbaza, i.e. the east coast of
Sumatra at, and about, Palembang. Now, Kamboja bears
due north of Palembang, the 105th meridian of E. longitude
(from Greenwich) passing exactly through the mouths of
both the Palembang and Hatien Rivers, on the latter of
which we have located Kmar, or Kumāra. Abū Zaid’s bearing
is therefore correct.

Masūdī (A.D. 943) repeats nearly the same statements,
only in a more confused order. Here is what he says:
“India [extra-Gangem] is conterminous with Zābej, which
is the empire of the Mahārāj, the ruler of the islands
(i, 163).1 The Zābej separates China from India, but
is comprised within the region of the last-named country
(i, 163). The throne of the King of Zābej overlooked
the pond renowned the ‘Gold-bars Pond,’ a small marsh
which communicated with the principal bay (estuary of
the river) of Zābej. The flow let the sea-water into
that bay, and the ebb allowed the fresh water to freely
run down (i, 176). Crocodiles are plentiful in the bay of
Zābej (i, 207). Serīra, or Sarīrah, سریره، is an island in the
empire of the Mahārāja, situated at about 400 parasangs
(960 miles) from the continent (read Kalah, see below,
p. 564), and entirely cultivated. This prince also owns
the islands of Zānj, or Zanej, زانج، and Rāmnī, رامنی،

1 The Roman figures refer to the number of the volumes, and the Arabic to the
number of the page, of Barbier de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille’s ‘‘Prairies
d’Or,’’ Paris, 1861–1874.
and many others besides; his sway extends, at the utmost, over the whole of the sixth sea, i.e. that of Sanf (i, 343). His territories produce all sorts of spices and aromata . . . . ; the exports are camphor, eagle-wood, cloves, sandal-wood, areca-nuts, nutmegs, cardamom, and cubeb. These islands, in the direction of the Chinese Sea, border upon an ocean of unknown limits and extent. In their remotest parts there are mountains inhabited by numerous tribes . . . . ; from these mountains issues a perpetual fire (i, 341–342). In the neighbourhood of Kalah and Serira there are gold and silver mines (i, 242). The volcano of Zâbej, in the Sea of China (Sea of Sanf), (iii, 68)."

The foregoing extracts plainly demonstrate that the capital of Zâbej stood on a creek or river outlet subject to tidal influence, which is exactly the case with Palembang. Zânj, or Zanej, occurring instead of Abû Zaid’s Sarbaza, has here evidently nothing to do, as Gildemeister thought on meeting the same form in Abû Zaid’s relation,1 with Zang, Zanj, ژانج, or Zanzibar, the country of Negroes; but is undoubtedly a clerical slip for Zâbej, ژابچ, a term which, owing to the imperfections of the Arabic alphabet, has given rise to the most extraordinary variants. If, therefore, Zânj = Zâbej Island stands in Mas‘ûdi’s text for Abû Zaid’s Sarbaza, it must be one and the same with it. So, we shall demonstrate further on, is also Serira, which is but an alternative name for Sarbaza. The mention of gold and silver mines in the vicinity of Serira proves that this so-called ‘island,’ alias Sarbaza, alias Zâbej, cannot be Java.2

1 See Journal Asiatique, 1846, p. 202, where Dulaunier gives other variants from Edrai: ژانج, ژانج, ژاک, رانج, Rânej, Rânach, Zâbej, Zanej.

2 Radermacher, in his “Sumatra” (in Verhandelingen Batav. Gen. v. K., 1787), p. 11, mentions silver-mines that existed in the interior of the Island of Sumatra, but which were not worked because it was found that they would not pay (see “Merveilles de l’Inde,” p. 248). Long before him Linschoten stated (c. 1587) of Sumatra: “The Island is very rich of mynes of Gold, Silver . . . . ” etc. (“Voyage of Linschoten,” Halkuyt Soc., London, 1885, vol. i, p. 109). As regards gold in Sumatra, its presence is so well known as not to require proof here. The question will be more fully dealt with in the sequel.
In the "Kitāb-al-‘Ajāib," ascribed to Masʿūdī, it is stated that in the Island (or islands?) of Zābej there were Chinese settlers who had left their fatherland on account of internecine troubles. The troubles referred to may have been the famous rebellion of Hwang-chʻao that devastated the whole empire from A.D. 873 to his death in 884, and was followed by other disturbances. All the same, we know very well from I-tsing and other Chinese sources that Sumatra had become known to the ubiquitous John Chinaman long before that time. Basing his statement on another, less clear passage of the same "Kitāb," Reinaud draws the unwarranted inference that at the dawn of the tenth century A.D. Zābej and Saṅf (Campā), which were distinct kingdoms in Sulaimān’s time (A.D. 851), had become a single empire through the one having subjugated the other. This, we are now well aware, is untrue, notwithstanding the fact that at earlier periods expeditions may have been undertaken by Zābej against certain points of the Chām littoral (A.D. 787) and Kamboja conquered (some time before A.D. 802). (See above, p. 545.)

CAPTAIN BOZORG (A.D. 955) has preserved to us several important details about the Zābej kingdom and its capital

1 Reinaud’s "Géographie d'Aboulféda," t. i, Introduction, p. 390; Arabic text of Masʿūdī’s "Kitāb-al-‘Ajāib" in t. ii of his "Relation des Voyages," etc.; also t. i, p. lxxv.

2 This famous rebellion is described by Abū Zaid, who names the leader Ban-zhua (for Hwang-chʻao). See Reinaud’s "Relation," t. i, pp. 62 et seq.

3 "Géographie d'Aboulféda," Introduction, p. 415; and "Relations," t. ii, p. 192 of the Arabic text (of the "Kitāb-al-‘Ajāib"). Reinaud quotes in support of the statement of the Christian monk of Najran who, having travelled through the Archipelago in about A.D. 980, mentions that at such a period the king of Lūkīn (Southern China) had just invaded and conquered Saṅf. But this event refers, in my opinion, to the expedition which the Tonkinese king Lā-Hang, or Lā-Dāi-Hān (who had then his capital at Huū-lū, 花闕, founded A.D. 968, a little to the westwards of the chef-lieu of the Ninh-bình district), undertook in A.D. 982 against Champā, resulting in the conquest of this country and destruction of its capital Śrī-Banes in Kwāng-bính (see above, p. 229). These facts have therefore nothing to do with Lūkīn (South China), and much less still with Zābej. The mention of Lūkīn as the place of origin of the expedition is a mistake proceeding, I think, from the fact that but a few years before (i.e. in 965) Tonkin was still under the sway of China. Our identification of the event alluded to by the Christian monk of Najran enables us to fix the date of his travels in Far Eastern seas in the year 982 or 983 A.D.
in his "‘Ajā íb-al-Hind." 1 The city where the Mahā rāj of Zābej resides, he writes, contains very numerous streets (creeks?) 2 where trade is carried on (p. 137). In the bay of Serirah, 5 ē r īr, there are innumerable crocodiles: charmed some time ago, they are now harmless (p. 158). Serirah lies at the extremity of the Island of Lāmerī (north and west coasts of Sumatra), and at 120 zāms (900 miles, see Masʿūdi, p. 561) from Kalah (west coast of the Malay Peninsula above Junkceylon). The bay (inlet, estuary) of Serirah penetrates, it is stated, for 50 parasangs (120 miles) into the island. It is a river far wider than the Tigris at Basra; its waters are fresh. There is no deeper (i.e. penetrating so far inland) bay in the whole island. Tidal influence makes itself felt at intervals of twelve hours. 3 There are crocodiles, but having been charmed they are now harmless in that neighbourhood. Some dwellings are built on shore, but the majority are floating houses supported by rafts made of timbers (bamboos?) tied together. The houses are built of wood; hence those on shore are liable to frequent fires. The dwellings in the bay are disposed in such a manner as to form something like avenues (creeks?) (p. 176).

This description admirably tallies with the Chinese account of Palembang left us by Ma Huan (A.D. 1416) and reproduced with but little variation in the History of the Ming Dynasty, bk. 324. 4 By comparison of the two extracts from the

---

1 See Van der Lith and M. Devie’s “Merveilles de l’Inde,” Leiden, 1883–1886, to the pages of which work the numbers within parentheses in the above extracts refer.
2 See below; canals are more likely meant. Palembang, as is well known, is intersected by numerous creeks, spanned by many bridges, and it is from the great number of these bridges that the town derives its modern name. Probably at the period we are now concerned with the bridges were very few, or not as yet existent.
4 See Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 196 and 197. Ma Huan’s account runs: “The country is not large. The people exercise themselves much in fishing on the water, and as there is more water than land, only the houses of the chiefs stand on shore, whilst the rest of the people build their houses on rafts, which are attached to piles, so that they rise with the water and cannot be flooded. When they want to go and live in another place they pull up the piles and remove with
'Ajāib (pp. 137 and 176) with the two Chinese versions just referred to, it clearly results that the district or city

their whole house, which is very convenient. The river has two flood-tides every day." The last statement is true of the river only during the south-east monsoon period, from April to October. On the other hand, during the north-west monsoon period freshets prevail, and the influence of the flood is then but rarely, if ever, felt. Sailing-vessels belonging to Palembang do then either remain in port or trade to other places, as it is almost impossible for them at this period to make any progress up the river against the freshets. (See "China Sea Directory," vol. 1, p. 399.) The account in Ming history says: "The inhabitants of this country are skilled in fighting on the water, and, therefore, their neighbours fear them. The country is rich in water; only the chiefs live on the land, whilst the common people dwell on the river. For this purpose they build their houses on rafts, which are fastened to poles in such a way that, when the tide rises, the rafts are lifted up without being flooded. When they want to remove to another place they have only to pull up the poles, which does not cost much money or labour. The lower classes call their superiors by the title of 老君, Chan-pi (Cham-pi, Ch'öm-bai), which means the same as sovereign of the country. Afterwards the place where their first chief lived was called Chan-pi (Ch'öm-bai) also. The country has changed its old capital [old name?] for Chu-eh-chiang (Kau-kong), (i.e. 'Old Lagoon' = Palembang)."

Concerning the king's title Chan-pi, the History of the Sung Dynasty, bk. 489, already records it in these words: "The king [of San-fa-ch'i] is styled Chan-pi, and in his country there are many people whose names begin with Fu, (lit. whose family name is Fu)." Now, we have long ere this demonstrated (supra, p. 352) that Fu is the Cham title Pō. This title, in common with many other Cham words, still survives nowadays in the Acheh district, where it means a 'prince." Pō-chut = 'Little Prince' is the style applied to the son of a princess when she is married to a man of no aristocratic lineage (see Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1897, p. 98). There can thus be no doubt that at the period in question the title Pō was diffused all over Sumatra, or at least as far down as Palembang. This fact throws a new sidelight on Cham-Malay relations at this period. Evidently all linguistic relics like the one here dealt with were swept away from nearly the whole of Sumatra by the Javanese invasions of later periods. As regards Chan-pi, it has been a crux to Sinologists. Groeneveldt (op. cit., p. 188) makes so bold as to suggest that this term stands for Jambis, the name of the State conterminous on the north with Palembang, and infers that the author of the above account, having heard the name of Raja Jambi, i.e. the King of Jambi, mistook it for the name of the king of Palembang. Professor Schlegel, with all his highly imaginative powers, can soar no higher than his confrère. And, after having enlightened us (Tonog-Tao, 1901, p. 125) on the meaning of Fu, which he asserts, 'stands for Bu, which is an abbreviation of the common Arab and Malay appellative Abū, 'Father'" ["this, N.B., in A.D. 960, when the title is mentioned in Sung history], he cannot but agree for the nonce with his colleague on the meaning of Chan-pi, and adds that in the language of the Orang Benū in the Malay Peninsula Jambi means a betel-leaf, in Siamese Champi means the Michelia champaea [a variety of it; the M. c. being known as Champak], and so forth. But, he remarks, in Malay names of plants are given to countries, and never, or very rarely, to persons. As regards Chan-pi, I hardly think that it stands for Jambi, for from the text it seems to have been a title given, not only to the sovereign, but also to the dignitaries of the State. Hence it was probably a word meaning 'lord,' 'chief,' or something similar. It may have been connected with either the Mōh Sōmār
where the Mahārāj of Zābej resided was that called by the Arabs Serirah and Serboza or Sarbaza, and by the Chinese Hsien-liu and San-fo-ch'i or Shih-li Po-shih, and later on—that is to say, after 1377—Chiu-chiang (Ku-kang) = 'Old Lagoon' (Thalāj). This place has, ere this, been satisfactorily enough identified with Śri-Bhoja, now called or Chia-smōi, قهط = a 'ruler,' 'king'; the Khmēr Sompā, Malay Sambah, 'to worship,' Sembuyang, 'to pray' (cf. Batāra, the title applied especially to Mājāpāhit rulers, which is derived from the Sanskrit Chaṭṭāra = revered, worshipful, noble lord); or even with Cāmpyaya, meaning 'gold,' as well as the Nāgakesara and the Campaka trees; and Cāmpyayaka = an inhabitant of Campā, a Chām. It is not impossible that some Palembang kings were of Chām descent. Edrisi (A.D. 1154) states (op. cit., p. 173) that in Rāneh (Zābej) kings are termed Funjab, فنجب (Pan-jau, Pō-jau, Pāṇḍava?). Panambahan means 'chief,' lit. 'object of veneration,' in Java, from the root pamba, pamba = 'homage, veneration, to pay homage,' according to Dulaurier (Journal Asiatique, 1846, p. 550). Pandu, فندو (Fandu), means a 'leader,' a 'pilot' in Malay. Chao Ju-kua (circā A.D. 1240) tells us in his turn that the king of San-fo-ch'i is commonly called 'Essence of the Snake,' (Takakusu, op. cit., p. xiv). No Chinese characters being, more solute, given, it is difficult to guess what the original term may have been, whether Nāga-sūra, Sarp-sūra, Pannya-sūra, Bhujaya- or Bhujayā-sūra, etc. The last two terms are not very dissimilar from Edrisi's Funjab, while Sarpā somewhat approaches the Chinese Chan-pī. The question must be left open until more definite information is forthcoming.

Should, on the contrary, Chan-pēi ultimately prove to mean Jambi, we should have then to conclude that Jambi, and not Palembang, was the ancient Śri-Bhoja. Of this possible eventuality we shall find other indications in the sequel, and meet also with a second Chiu-chiang, or 'Old River,' in the Jambi district itself.

Postscriptum.—I have noticed, since writing the above, that Professor de Goeje, in his new edition of Ibn Khurdaḏbīh's text, restores, on the suggestion of Professor Kern, the title of the king of Zābej as Puti-Jab, فنجب (pp. 13, 213), meaning the 'Prince of Java' (Puti-Jabha). This is ingenious, but not as yet quite convincing to me, because in such a case we should expect to find the traditional Arabic form Ḥāba instead of Jaba. I, therefore, still adhere to my own views as expressed above, although ready to agree on a possible Puti-Jambi, فنجب, or 'Chief of Jambi,' which would have the advantage of harmonizing with the Chinese title Chan-pēi in its alternative possible acceptation.
Palembang. However, Van der Lith is mistaken in categorically asserting that Serirah, سریره, is a clerical slip for Serboza or Sarbaza، سربزه，سرربزه，of which the latter is the truly correct form. It is by such dogmatic pronunciamientos that our predecessors in the historical geography of the Far East have often made confusion worse confounded. And my proof that Serirah is a distinct term from Sarbaza lies in the fact, so far overlooked by Sinologists, that the Chinese records of A.D. 961–962 give us the equivalent for Serirah in Hsien-liu, 先留 (Sen-liu, Sen-riu), which, they state, is an alternative designation for the kingdom of San-fo-ch'i (Serboza). Serirah, or Serirat, and Sen-riu, Sera-reva (or Sera-reva), may on the one hand represent the term Siri-rattha, or Śrī-rāṣṭra, and on the other the tribal name Sarawi belonging to a nation settled at Palembang; while it may be somehow connected with Chaleh and Saleh, two branches through which the Musi, or river of Palembang, discharges into the sea.

Al-Fares, or Faras, in his "Kitāb-al-Āṭwāl," or "Book of Longitudes" (A.D. 950–1000), states that Sarbaza, or Serirah, is the island on which the Mahārāja resided. This assertion we shall see confirmed later on by Abū-l-Fedā.

Muhallabī (cārā A.D. 1000) tells us that the island of Serirah is a dependency of China. This is fairly correct, as Hsien-liu, or San-fo-ch'i, is recorded as having sent tribute to China since A.D. 905.

---
3. The mass of the inhabitants of Palembang belong, according to Crawford, to a nation distinct from the Malays, called Sarawi (see Denny’s "Descript. Dict. of Brit. Malaya," p. 348). Whether this name has been introduced from India, where it denotes a sect of fakirs (see Balfour’s "Cyclop. of India," 3rd ed., vol. iii, p. 534), or not, I cannot say, but it would be worth enquiring.
4. Saleh (Ayer Saleh) is one of the eastern mouths, not now navigable, of the Palembang River, the best entrances to which are now the Sungsaat and Banju Asin. Chaleh River is a western tributary of the Banju Asin, which it joins near its mouth.
7. Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 188.
Al-Bīrūnī (A.D. 1031), after having spoken of an island of Ram, 넘, or Rāmīn, belonging to Ceylon,1 which is undoubtedly the one now called Ramesvaran, vulgo Ramisseram, lying between Adam’s Bridge and the opposite point of Madura, informs us that the island (or islands) of Zābej lies in that part of the Indian Ocean turned towards the east and nearing China, and adds that such island (or islands) corresponds to that termed Surendīb (Suvarṇa-đeśapa), or ‘Island of Gold,’ in Sanskrit literature2 (Fragments, 123).


2 Reinach’s Introduction to the “Géographie d’Aboulféïda,” pp. 390, 408. The term Suvarṇa-đeśapa already occurs in the Rāmāyaṇa (Kiśkindhā-kānda), but applying, apparently, to the Malay Peninsula (see above, p. 78). On the other hand, in the same book (iv) the Rāmāyaṇa mentions Jana-đeśapa with seven kingdoms, which is spelled Jana-đeśapa in Gorresio’s version (vol. ii, p. 234), and said to be rich in silver and gold. May not this be Sumatra, in which case the two spellings Jana and Jāna might go some way towards accounting for the form Zābej of the term Zābej in some of the Arab writers? Along with the above, Gorresio’s version also refers to a Jala-đeśapa (‘Island of waters’), which might be Jalada or Jalaja, i.e. Chēn-la or Kamboja (vide supra, pp. 167-168). Now, it is evident that if Sumatra is Ja-vadeša it cannot be at the same time Suvarṇa-đeśa. Moreover, Suvarṇa-đeśa (or Suvarṇa-đeśapa) is mentioned in the “Kathā-Sarit Sāgara” as a country that could be reached by sea, and apparently also by land, from India. In fact, in ch. 57 of that work, we are told of a caravan journeying thereto by way of a town named Kaśesa-pura (see Tawney’s transl., vol. ii, Calcutta, 1884, pp. 5 et seq.). So much for all those who have hitherto held it to be Sumatra! From various other passages in the same publication we gather that—

(1) Suvarṇa-đeśapa lay on the sea-route from Katākha (an island, “the home of all felicities,” where jewels are bought and sold, but the people whereof are not acquainted with eagle-wood) to Tāmrantsē, a city which may or not be the same as Tāmrantsū or Tamluks westward of the Hūghli river, but which was in any case on the delta of the Ganges. (Op. cit., vol. i, pp. 87, 92, 552; and vol. ii, pp. 44, 598.)

(2) Suvarṇa-đeśa was met with on the following itinerary: Jala-pura city on the east coast of India—Nārikela Island (Nikobar) — Katākha Island—Karpura Island (Telok Kapūr on the Indus River, east coast of the Malay Peninsula; or Bārūra, west coast of Sumatra; or west coast of Borneo?)—Suvarṇa-đeśa—Simhala (Ceylon). (Op. cit., vol. i, pp. 551-552.)

(3) The king of Suvarṇa-đeśa was brother-in-law to the king of Katākha (vol. ii, p. 599), a circumstance arguing that these two countries could not have been very far distant from one another.

(4) Kaṭalāpura was a city on Suvarṇa-đeśa; apparently its capital (vol. i, p. 530). Now, I have scarcely any doubt that the city here referred to is Kelānum, near Billin in the Shwēgyin district on the Peguan coast, near which rises the famous Kelānum pagoda, recorded under the name of
EDRĪŚI (A.D. 1154) does not tell us much that is of value, and his information is, as usual with him, confused

Kelāsabha-pabhala-cetiya in the Kalyān inscriptions. The capital, Golamattika-nagara, was situated, according to these inscriptions, to the north-west of the pagoda. Whether Kelāsagura was the same as Golamattika or a distinct city nearer to the Kelāsa Peak, it is in the present state of our knowledge difficult to say. But that a city of this name existed in the district in question is certain; for the History of the T'ang Dynasty, bk. 222 (see Tōmyō-Par., vol. ix, pp. 232-233; and Ma Tsuan-lin, op. cit., p. 529), mentions a kingdom Ka-lo-shē-fu, 迨逻舍弗 (i.e. Kelisabha-, or Kalala-pura), as lying to the north of Tu-ho-lo (which does not seem to be Taik-kulā, i.e. the old Golamattika, but either Tagala or Thagara on the Tavny River, see p. 86 ante, or Devarāvi in Śiām). A village bearing the name Kelāsa exists on the left bank of the Laming River above Rė, west coast of the Malay Peninsula; and another Kelāsa pagoda, apparently modern, rises above Pāgāt, not far from the confluence of the Gyaing with the Salwin River; but the site of Kalala-pura is evidently to be looked for in the neighbourhood of Kelāsa Peak. This district was part of Suvarṇabhūmi, the Golden Region of Buddhist fame; it is accordingly very likely that Suvarṇa-śeīpa, if not exactly identical with it, meant the Malay Peninsula, which immediately adjoins it, as we have suggested. Suvarṇabhūmi is, in fact, separately referred to in the "Kathā-Sarit Sāgara" (vol. i, p. 610) as an island, which may mean the Thatūn district, or some other deltaic island near by on the coast of the Gulf of Martaban. The Nepālese MS. (Add. 1643, Cambridge), of the eleventh century A.D. or earlier, on which Foucher has based his recent study on the "Iconographie Bouddhique de l'Inde" (Paris, 1909), mentions a Kalala-vara-pura (or Kalā-svaro-pura?) with a sanctuary dating from at least the seventh century (pp. 90, 179), which may well be the Kalāsagura of the "Kathā-Sarit Sāgara," and the Kelāsabha of the Kalyāṇi inscriptions. If not, there is no lack in that neighbourhood of similar toponymics, such as, e.g., Ptolomy's Sābara (= Savara) city and Sarabaric Gulf, and Abū Zaidī's Kalah-bār. The Suvarṇa-pura of the same MS. (op. cit., p. 105) may have stood also somewhere that way. Vijayapura, therein stated to lay in Suvarṇa-pura, may be, not Panyā, which, although bearing that name, was founded only in A.D. 1312, but Śrī Vijaya in Lower Śiām (vide supra, p. 188). Śrī-Vijayapura is, in fact, the full form of the name given in the MS. referred to. Suvarṇa-puri was the later name of Suphan in the neighbourhood of the latter (see p. 176 ante); but we have found (p. 80) evidence of a mountain Suvarṇa-mulī in the Tenasserim province. Further, Liet. Bagge's Map of Tenas-erim, 1888, marks the hitherto unexplored regions of an "Ancient city of Thoo-wna-boom-mee" (Suvarṇabhūmi) at the headwaters of the Yay (Rē) River near the Śiāmese frontier. As regards the mysterious fairy island of Kaṭāha, also mentioned in the Nepālese MS. above referred to (see Foucher, op. cit., pp. 105, 179) as Kaṭāha-deīpa, its identity with Cathay, first suggested by Tawney (op. cit., vol. i, p. 86), and recently again put forward by Foucher, is ridiculous: for the term Kitai, plural Kiten, whence medieval travellers obtained their Cathay and the Russians at the beginning of the seventeenth century their Kitai, had scarcely become notorious before the tenth or eleventh century A.D.; whereas the portion of the "Kathā-Sarit Sāgara" where the name Kaṭāha or Kaṭāha occurs may be considerably older. It would have been far better to suggest instead Kaṭṭigara. But, as we have seen, Kaṭāha could not have lain very far away from Suvarṇa-deīpa, although being apparently situated beyond Korşāya, say Sumatra or the southern part of the Malay Peninsula—at the very utmost Borneo, for according to Leyden a Persian treatise "termed Siir-ul-Ahlim... mentions the 'great island of camphor,' probably Borneo" (see "Essays rel. to Indo-China," vol. i, 1st series, p. 124). I should think, accordingly, that Kaṭāha
to a degree. He locates the island (or islands) of Zābej (which he calls, as we have seen, probably through the carelessness of his copyists, Zālj, Zānej, Rālj, Rānej, etc.) in front of the coast of Zanj, i.e. Zanjibār and Sufāla, and considers both countries, which lie some 3,000 miles apart, as almost facing one another. Hence, naturally, an inevitable jumble up of facts regarding them in his narrative. Anyhow, he goes on to state that the natives of Zanj being unprovided with sea-going vessels, their transoceanic trade is carried on by ships from Oman and others, bound for the islands of Zābej, which are dependencies of India. The people of Zābej, on the other hand, sail to Zanjibār in large and small craft and trade there, an easy task for them, as they can easily understand the language of the natives of that coast. The importance of this statement, on which Reinaud lays such great stress, as proving that commercial intercourse existed between the Archipelago and the east coast of Africa, and that the language spoken in both countries was the same or very nearly so, is marred by the possibility that the islands he calls here Zālj and Rālj are in reality those of Rānej, a term meaning Cocos Islands, which seems to have been the name supplied to the islands lying to the

may be the hitherto unidentified kingdom of Ch'ū-tu-K'un or K'int-tu-k'wén. 屈都昆 (Ku-to-kun), referred to in the Chinese History of the Looang Dynasty as having been conquered by Fan-man, the gallant king of Fu-nan (Kamboja), who reigned between A.D. 200–230 circa. This country must have been either on the Malay Peninsula or in the neighbourhood. A similarly named State, Ch'ū-tu-ch'ien or Ch'ū-tu-kan, 屈都乾 (Kut-tu-kan), is recorded in the “Tsin-shu” among the countries conquered between A.D. 336 and 347 by king Wên of Lin-i (Champā); and its name occurs at times under the contracted form 屈都, Ch'ū-tu, K'int-tu, or Kut-to (see Pelliot in Bulletin École Française d'Extr. Orient, t. iii, note 2, April–June, 1903, p. 266). Further, there is Ptolemy's Kortaka or Kin-té, Kan-ték, Ko-tat to reckon with (vide ante, pp. 288 et seq.), which may be, after all, the most eligible and likely representative of Kātāha. Kuti or Kutsi in East Borneo, the Katrea district on North Sumatra, and other similarly named places in the Archipelago are far less suitable.

1 Ibid., pp. 390–391.
west of the Maldives, among which Madagascar was presumably included. It is true that among the Zânej islands Edrisî mentions Sharbûah, also spelled Saranda), the name of which strikingly resembles Sharîrah, Sarbaza; to which he assigns 1,200 miles in circuit (400 parasangs—the same as the perimeter ascribed by Abû Zaid to Sarbaza, supra, p. 559). But along with it he refers to the island of Anjabanah, capital Anfûjah, Anfûjah, which is, it is alleged, Anküjah, i.e. Zanzibar Island, till this very day called Anguya by the Swahilis. The other island, Karmada or Karmadat, which he locates near Zânej Island, may, however, if not actually Karimâta, be Nowairi’s Karmûh or Karamû, which he places in his Larûi or Lâraç Sea (Straits of Malacca), and which I think may be the Great Kerimûn or Krimûn, or both it and its smaller homonymous island, opposite Tanjong Bûlus, the south-western extremity of the Malay Peninsula.

Apart from this medley, Edrisî mentions a volcano on an islet near his Zânej Island, which, from the description he gives of it, is apparently the same as the one he refers to further on as being situated on the island of Salâhat. The remainder of his information on Zânej (Zâbej) consists in

---

1 See Van der Lith in Merveilles de l’Inde, p. 294. Great affinity has, of course, been traced between the languages of the Archipelago and Malagasy, the tongue spoken all over Madagascar; so great, indeed, as to lead scholars to consider the latter to be affiliated to the Malayo-Polynesian stock, and to suggest the hypothesis that Madagascar was colonized by tribes from the west coast of Sumatra (see Papers relating to Indo-China, 2nd series, vol. i, p. 270). But this, although proving the expansion of the Malayo-Polynesian (or Melanesian-Negrito (?), see pp. 253-254 above) race to such distant lands, does not completely establish that commercial intercourse existed between the two regions at the time of which Edrisî speaks. More evidence is required ere we can unreservedly accept his statements.


3 Van der Lith is certainly wrong (op. cit., p. 281) in correcting Arabshâh Tûyûmah! I have several times already animadverted on this maniacal tendency of playing with the geographical nomenclature handed down to us in the old texts.

4 Jaubert, op. cit., pp. 60 and 82.
a repetition of the statement from Mas‘ūdi’s (?) “Kitāb-al-
‘Ajā‘ib” as regards Chinamen having emigrated and settled
there owing to the troubled state of their fatherland. With
this we take leave of Edrisī, who has caused so much
confusion in Far Eastern geography.

Yākūt (A.D. 1218) tells us that from Sarbaza, یسراء or
یسراء, as he spells its name, camphor is exported.\(^1\)

Kazwīnī (A.D. 1263–1274), following his predecessors,
describes Zābej as an extensive island situated not far from
the limits of China, but more towards India.\(^2\)

Ibn Sa‘īd (A.D. 1274), quoted by Abū-l-Fedā, is pretty
explicit in his statements. “The islands of Rānej” (Zābej),
he writes, “are celebrated in the accounts of merchants and
travellers. The largest of them is Sarīrah, which is 400
miles long from north to south and about 160 miles in
width all over. Several arms of the sea penetrate into it.
Its capital, Sarīrah, is situated on its middle on an estuary
and a river.” And further on he adds: “The islands of
the Mahāraj (Mahārāja) are numerous. Their sovereign is
one of the richest monarchs of India and the one who
possesses most gold and elephants. The largest of these
islands is the seat of his authority.”\(^3\) As a little before
Ibn Sa‘īd has declared that the largest of such islands
is Sarīrah, there can be no doubt left as to this being
the one containing the capital. The mention of elephants
entirely excludes Java. Abū Zaid (see p. 559) assigned
900 parasangs (2,160 miles) circuit to the capital (State) of
Zābej, and 400 parasangs (960 miles) circuit to Sarbaza
island (district). It will be seen, therefore, that while
Sarbaza or Sarīrah denotes the particular portion or district
of Sumatra in which stood the capital (viz. Palembang),
Zābej includes the whole island or nearly so. Sumatra is
1,070 miles long, and has an average breadth of over
200 miles. The 160 miles in width assigned by Ibn Sa‘īd
to the Sarīrah territory correspond very closely to the width

---

\(^1\) “Merveilles de l’Inde,” p. 248.
\(^2\) *Journal Asiatique*, 1846, p. 205.
\(^3\) Guyard’s “Géographie d’Aboulféda,” t. ii, pt. 2, pp. 126 and 132.
of the Palembang district from the sea (Bangka Strait) on the north-east to the central mountain range of Sumatra to the south-west.

Dimashki (circa A.D. 1300) follows Edrisi in confusing Zubey with the islands off the east coast of Africa; and thus he locates Anfujah (Zanzibar?) close to Serirah and separates both of them from Kamar or Komor, ما (Madagascar?), by a mere channel or arm of the sea. On Serirah, however, he is pretty well informed. He puts down its circumference at 1,200 miles, says it contains two rivers (the Jambi and Musi?) and many cities, amongst which Serirah is the most celebrated; and adds that the best camphor is derived therefrom. He then passes on to the island of the Mahārāja, which he seems to believe a quite distinct place, and unfolds his lore on it in this strain:—"The island of the Mahārāja is the most extensive, its length is of 12 and its breadth of 5 days' march (or sailing?). At its extremity stands a great volcano which throws up sparks and stones with a thunderlike noise and lightning. Owing to the fire there is no dwelling nor thoroughfare within a distance of one parasang (3 miles). This volcano is the largest in the world, there is not the like of it. The place it occupies is called 'Volcano Island,' and compared to the remainder of the island it stands to it in the same ratio as the foot does to the whole leg. When ships approach the island at the beginning of a squall, tiny black dwarfs, five spans or less in stature, resembling negroes, appear and climb aboard, without harming anyone . . ." Here we have a repetition (or the original version?) of the Negrito story located by the "Mukhtasar-al-‘Ajāib" at Sanjī (see above, p. 245, note). As to the volcano, it is evidently the same as mentioned by preceding authors. Furthermore, Dimashki

2 Ibid., p. 22.
3 Ibid., pp. 199 and 204. The text has, I suppose, 400 parasangs of circuit, as in Abū Zaid for Srbāsa, which calculated at the rate of three miles to a parasang yield the 1,200 miles of the translator.
4 Ibid., p. 207.
discourses of the islands of Rāmnī, circuit 500 miles (as against 800 parasangs = 1,920 miles of Abū Zaid); Selāmit (= Ibn Khurdādbih’s Shelāhet and Edrisi’s Salāhat), circuit 300 miles,\(^1\) already noticed above (p. 554); and Kāmrūn, near Serirah, so called from the name of its king.\(^2\) This Kāmrūn is evidently Edrisi’s extensive and fertile island of Sūmah, Sabarmah, Shūmah, or Tanūmah, producing eaglewood, cocoanuts, sandalwood, and camphor, a Buddhist country where cremation is practised and the king bears the name (or title) ṫa’mūn, Kāmrūn. It lies at five days’ sailing from Kmār (Kamboja), is surrounded by numerous islands small in size but inhabited, and the depth of the sea round it is about 40 fathoms; its mountains produce camphor superior to that of all other countries.\(^3\) The Kāmrūn king has two islands under his

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 265.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 198.

\(^3\) Jaubert’s “Géographie d’Edrisi,” pp. 82, 83, and 88; Dimashki, op. cit., p. 207, mentions a king named Kāmrūn, reigning over Kmār (Kamboja). Here we have, evidently, the 古龍, Ku-lang, king of Fu-nan of Sui history (Ma Tuann-lin, op. cit., p. 441) and T’ang annals (ch. 222, c); and above either the title Ku-lang or K’un-lun, 岡或崑崙, of dignitaries in the State of Pān-p’oàn (South-West Siām), or that of king Chulam, Cholan (or Kolam), reigning over the southern part of the Malay Peninsula during the thirteenth or fourteenth century (see p. 261 above). In the Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1902, p. 135, I have explained the title Ku-lang of the Fu-nan king as being the Mōi-Khâr word K’ung, meaning ‘River,’ and, metamorphically, the King, State, or Kingdom (from the fact of every Further Indian State being anciently situated on a river which gave access to its capital, the command of which was tantamount to the possession of the whole State). K’un-lun in the sense of Kollam, Cholan, etc., I have shown (also above, p. 103) to stand for Kula, Kola, Kollam, the name of the pioneer Southern Indian settlers on the Malay Peninsula and northern part of the Archipelago, which became afterwards the name for the Java race, now equally incorrectly called ‘Malays,’ from those same Kulas or Kolas, who came from Malaya or Malaya-vāra, i.e. Malabār, and gave its first name to the southern part of the Malay Peninsula. As regards K’un-lun as a prefix to the name of dignitaries in Pān-p’oàn, I have been hesitating between Gurn, Khleb, and Khun-lūang as its equivalents.

Kāmrūn, is also employed to designate Kāmarūpa or Kamrūp (Assām) by Ibn Khurdādbih and other writers that followed after him; but in the case in point there can be no doubt that the king alluded to under this title reigned over a country situated on Singapore Strait, or, at all events, on the southern part of the Malay Peninsula. I much doubt even if our Arabists are correct in identifying the Kāmrūn country with Kamrūp, for the only information that Ibn Khurdādbih and Edrisi give us thereon is that the States of king Kāmrūn abound in rhinoceroses and border upon Chuma. Abū Zaid adds that Kāmrūn produces the best eaglewood of India (Reinard, op. cit., p. 135).
sway, named respectively Famūṣa (Kamūṣa = Gomūṣ or Gomespola?), and Lāṣmah, لاسمه (= Basma, Bhasman, vide supra, p. 440). The natives of these islands are fair (almost white) complexioned; their women are exceedingly handsome. The men are brave and enterprising; they devote themselves to piracy on skiffs of remarkable speed, especially when they are at war with the Chinese, with whom there exists no truce (or respite). Sūmah or Shūmah cannot be, as was oddly enough suggested, Sumatra, for that name did not as yet exist in Edrisi's time (a.d. 1154). The term might at best be referred to Sumah, Simara, or Samara, all names for camphor (see above, pp. 439, 440), and through them to Samarlāng, or other district on either the north or west coast of Sumatra. However, such conjectures, based on mere phonetic similarities, do not appear to be sufficiently supported by other evidence. The real connection seems to be with Ibn Khurdādbih's island of شومه, Kyūma or Kayūmah (a misspelling for شومه or شومه, Tyūmah or Tanūmah?), which, he also states, produces eaglewood and camphor; as well as with Sulaimān's Betūmah or Bi-Tūmah, بيتومه; and, through both, with Tumeras or Tembrau, the Old Singapore Strait.

This is, or was, from an Arabian point of view, far more true of Kamboja (Kmār), the ruler of which is likewise, as we have noticed, called Kāmarūṣ by Dimashḵī. The rhinoceroses that our Arabists find so plentiful in Asām must be Buceros rhinoceroses, i.e. hornbills, for no other kind is known to be indigenous to that country.

1 Jaubert, op. cit., p. 91. It is possible that Edrisi may here have mixed up particulars about the warfare with the Chinese with those of the country of the other Kāmarūṣ king, whose states bordered upon China.

2 Jaubert, op. cit., p. 88, note, where the "Précis de la Géogr. Univers." (t. i, p. 379; and t. iv, pp. 255 et seq.) is also quoted in support. It was probably from such vagaries, or the reproduction of them in some later work, that Mr. E. H. Parker was misled into stating in the China Review, vol. xxiii, p. 257, that "the Arabs of the ninth century [sic] had already made use of the word Sumatra"!!

3 Samarlāng, سمركل, however, or, at any rate, the settlement known by this name, did not come into existence until a few years before the foundation of Sumatra and Pātāni, that is to say, about a.d. 1280. The term may, however, have sprung up long before that as a name for the district in which that settlement arose (see Marre's "Histoire des Rois de Pasey," pp. 14, 21).

4 Perhaps to Sabranj, one of its nicknames, for which vide infra.

the Tanus or Tamarus Promontorium, afterwards called Samara, etc. Here camphor, eaglewood, and sandalwood come down from the neighbouring borders of the Endau district, and all other conditions suit the description given by the Arab writers just quoted.\(^1\) This holds true, especially of the Kāmrūn king, for the "Şejarah Malāyū" tells us that a Rāja Chulan (=Kollam, Kāmrūn?) was in the thirteenth or fourteenth century A.D. reigning over the southern portion of the Malay Peninsula, and had a fort of black stone on the Johor River.\(^2\)

Abū-l-Fedā (A.D. 1321) fully confirms the identity of the island of Sarīrah with that on which the capital was situated, by heading his paragraph thereon with the words "Island of the Mahrāj or of Sarīrah."\(^3\) He then follows

---

\(^1\) See above, pp. 199, 200. The proposed identification by Van der Lith (op. cit., p. 253) and others of Betūmah, Tyūmah, etc., with Pulo Tyūman, off the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, is certainly unfortunate, for that rocky and sparsely inhabited island is surely not fit to become a station on the sea-route to China. Even admitting that the harbour at which the Arab ships called was on the opposite mainland at the mouth of the Endau, near which is—exult, O Arabists and Sinologists!—a mountain bearing also the name of Tyūman, and a cove termed the 'Camphor Cove' (see above, p. 436), the position of the place is not to be compared to that of the Tamerau district on the Old Singapore Strait, the very highway through which all the ships bound to China passed in the old days. The products mentioned could easily find their way thither from the upper reaches of the Endau and the Johor borders, where they are mostly to be found. Besides, the Endau district would of old, as it has been to this day, a dependency of the power that ruled on Singapore Strait, and the produce from the neighbouring districts would naturally flow there where the capital has always stood from the remotest period. There is, of course, the objection about the distance from Kyūma, Shīma, or Tanūma, to Knār, which both Ibn Khurdādbih and Edrisi state to be five days' sailing; whereas Sulaimān and Ibnī-l-Fakīh assign ten days to the passage from Betūma to Kadranj (Koh Troh). But this objection would be of little weight, as Ibn Khurdādbih and Edrisi are too often unreliable in the distances they give, owing to the manuscripts of their works that reached us being either mutilated or corrupt. Edrisi, for instance, merely puts down at ten days the distance from the same Shīma to Sendafalāt (op. cit., p. 84). If the correct spelling really be Tyūma or Tanūma, so as to argue a distinct place from Betūma, I would then be inclined to locate this place, not at Tyūman or on the opposite mainland (which would be yet too far from Knār if one could get thither in five days), but at Talūma (Talūbin?), the Chinese T'ing-lu-mei, farther up the east coast of the Malay Peninsula (see above, p. 524), which lies, as may be ascertained from a map, at almost exactly half distance between Betūma (Singapore Strait) and Kadranj Harbour (Ha-tien). It will thus be seen that Pulo Tyūman or the opposite mouth of the Endau will not do for our purpose. From its being within but 90 to 100 miles from Singapore Strait, if objection is taken to Betūma on the ground above stated, the objection applies to it as well.

\(^2\) Leyden's "Malay Annals," pp. 10, 12, 13.

with the quotations from Ibn Sa'id and Muḥallabī, which have already been noticed above.

Nowārī (A.D. 1320–1332) places Sharīrah, شریره, as he spells its name, in his first sea, i.e. the Sea of Ṣanjī, in which he is misled, apparently, to locate also Anṣūjah, أنسوْجة (=Zanzibār?).

Zābej—or as he writes it, زابج, Rānej—he correctly puts in his second sea, the Sea of Ṣanf or Ṣinf, along with other islands he calls Barkān, برقان; Kmar (Kamboja); Rāki or Rāli, رادی, رات (perhaps for Rawā, لگسوس, لگسوس); and Lankālūs or Lanyālūs, which may be the island of Bangkalis in front of Siak (east coast of Sumatra), or else that of Langkachīu (Lang-yah-siu of Chinese records), abreast of C'hump'hon Bay (east coast of the Malay Peninsula; see above, p. 115).

Bakū (circa A.D. 1430), the imitator of Kāzwīnī, assigns, like the latter, to Zābej a position intermediate between China and India, but nearer to the Indian (Malay?) Peninsula.

With him we have about exhausted the list of Arab authorities who left us useful information about Zābej. It will be seen that the identity of its capital and principal district with Sarbazn or Serīra, i.e. Śri-Bhoja, Hsiien-liu, or Palembang, is vouched for by no less than three respectable writers, viz., al-Faras, Ibn Sa'id, and Abū-l-Fedā, while it is impugned by none of them, and is besides supported by an overwhelming mass of circumstantial evidence. And yet our

1 “Merveilles de l'Inde,” p. 281. This oversight of Nowairī has thrown Van der Lidth off his bearings altogether, for he (p. 249) takes Nowairī's Sea of Sanjī to mean the Sea of Zanj, which is absurd, for this author starts from the east in the enumeration of his six seas, and names Sanjī first, relegating the Zanj Sea to the very end of his list. To be candid, I may say that I still feel very reluctant to pin my faith on our Arabists' identification of Anṣūjah (or Ankāja?) with Zanzibār; for it seems that some island or district in the Archipelago is meant.

2 This term Barkān looks very similar to Prakan, the name of a district on the coast of Annam referred to above, pp. 292–294.

3 Again, we have here a term very similar to the Randaī, or Rōdāī, of the Chām inscription, No. 409, A. 2 (Aymonier's "Inscription Théames," in Journal Asiatique, 1891, p. 42), dated Śaka 1092 = A.D. 1170; meant for the Radā tribe now settled on the western borders of Būn-dīn (Campā).

4 Dulaurier, in Journal Asiatique, 1846, p. 205.
Arabists and Sinologists have somehow managed to make out that Zābej was Java, that its capital stood on Java, and that the empire had been founded by the Javanese.\(^1\) And, strange to say, all this aerial castle of fiction they have built rests on a simple misconception, namely, that the term Java embodied in the name Zābej cannot, or rather could not, designate any other country but that 'Pearl of Islands,' Java. It is sincerely to be hoped, for the sake of that scientific progress our present generation has so much at heart, that such antiquated theories will now be abandoned in view of the evidence to the contrary we have brought together above. However, to omit no point that may prove one's thesis, I may add that I hold one more argument in reserve which, in my humble opinion, conclusively demonstrates the identity of the capital and seat of the kings of Zābej with Palembang. This important particular I was fortunate enough to discover in Captain Bozorg's narratives, and it is to the following effect:—

Captain Bozorg's 102nd 'Ajāib story\(^2\) tells us of an Arab navigator who obtained an audience from the then reigning king of Zābej, whose name is recorded as سرناگکله (or سرناگکله), Ser-Natākalah. Now, by turning to the Chinese

---

\(^1\) Excusing Reinaud and Dulaire for having expressed such views (Introduction to the "Géographie d'Aboulféda," pp. 389, 390; "Relation des Voyages," etc., p. lxiv; Journal Asiatique, 1846, pp. 204-208) at a time when these researches—of which they, the learned Reinaud especially, may be regarded as the founders—were as yet in their initial stage, there is no possible excuse for the Java-aberration of later scholars, such as Van der Lith (see above, p. 557), Takakusu ("Record of the Buddhist Religion," pp. xliii-xlv, where he makes Zābej=Java), and many others who represent the most recent research. Chavannes is, however, an exception—the only one as far as I am aware. He, in fact, had, among a number of misconceptions, the clear perception, at least, that Sarbaza or Śrī-Bhoja must have been the famous Zābej of Arab travellers. He, nevertheless, threw out the hint as a mere guess, without attempting to substantiate it, and his suggested connection simply rests, I must point out, on a wrong basis, viz., the analogy, as he explains, between the names Sarbaza or Śrī-Bhoja and Zābej ("Voyages des Pelerins Bouddhistes," p. 37, note). We shall see directly that such supposed analogy is groundless. Takakusu, loc. cit., instead of taking up the sensible hint, preferred to revert to the old Java theory, now obsolete and also a regression in science.

account of Sun-fo-ch'i given in the History of the Sung Dynasty, we find mentioned a king Hsi-li Hu-ta-hsia-li-t'an, 悉利胡大霞里檀, who sent envoys with tribute to China in A.D. 960 and in the Summer of 961. He must have died before the end of the year last referred to, for in the Winter of the same year, 961, tribute was offered by a new king, 室利鳥耶 (=Śrī Oja?), who had evidently succeeded him. Groeneveldt transcribes the name in question Si-ri-hu-ta-hia-li-t'an;¹ Takakusu interprets it as Śrī Kuta-harit or Śrī Gupta-hārīta;² and Prof. Schlegel gives the unlikely rendering Śrī Uda Haritan.³

It is, however, clear to me that this king is unquestionably the one mentioned in the 'Ajāib quoted above, whose name is restored by Van der Lith as "Śrī Nata-kala."⁴ By comparison of this form with the Chinese transcript Hsi-li Hu-ta Hsia-li-t'an, we may infer that the original correct name must have been something like Śrī Rudrāharita, Hutakālada, Hutta-(or Hotra-)hāla (or hālida), Udāhāra, etc. Accordingly, the Arabic transcript should perhaps be amended into سراحانالله.

As regards the synchronism of both the Chinese and Arab records on the subject of the reign of the potentate in question, there can be no doubt. Although Captain Bozorg does not, in this instance, mention any definite date, but vaguely refers the story concerning that king to some time before the compilation of his work (circa A.D. 955), we can judge from the fact that the stories he tells have been mostly collected from the mouth of seamen during the period between A.D. 901–953,⁵ that the anecdote relating to King Śrī Nālā-kalah presumably belongs to the same interval. As this same ruler, termed Śrī Huta-halidān in Sung history, must have died in A.D. 960, or even a year before that—for the envoys he sent cannot have taken less

¹ Op. cit., p. 188.
³ T'oung-Pao, 1901, pp. 125–126.
⁵ See preface to "Merveilles de l'Inde," p. ix.
than one year to reach the Chinese capital (then at Pien-liang, now K'ai-fêng Fu, in Honan),—it will be seen that he may very likely have begun to reign, say, twenty or thirty years before that event (or A.D. 930-940), thus allowing ample time for the story concerning him to reach Captain Bozorg's ear, so as to find a place in his book by 955 A.D. or thereabouts. There seems, therefore, no shadow of a doubt that the names Śrī Nātā-kalah and Śrī Huta-halidan refer to one and the same personage who was, as the Chinese and Arabic narratives respectively state, king of San-fo-ch'i (= Sarbaza, Śrī-Bhoja, or Palembang) and Mahārāja of Zābej. Hence, surely, Zābej = Sumatra, with capital at Sarbaza = Serira = Hsien-liu = Śrī-Bhoja = Palembang.1

Having thus, I venture to hope, proved my contention, it only remains for me to challenge the last argument to which Van der Lith clings in order to justify his identification of the Zābej empire with the Island of Java. From the fact that Captain Bozorg mentions2 Markāncand, مِنْدَرْؤِيْنَد, as a city of Zābej where amber (ambergris?) is plentiful, he glibly twists that word into Mazafāwīd, مَزِفَوِيْد, so as to be able to connect it with Mājapāhīt, مَعَجَابَاهِيَت, the name of the famous mediæval kingdom in the eastern extremity of Java.3 His success in name-changing may be judged by comparing his revised reading with the correct form of the toponymic last referred to, as it occurs in the Javanese chronicles.4 But, apart from this, to hold that the kingdom of Mājapāhīt already existed in Captain Bozorg's time, that is to say, from the first half of the tenth century—whereas its foundation

1 Although, as he has to confess, Van der Lith could not find in the lists of the kings of Java any name approaching in the least to his Śrī Nata-kala, he yet holds a brief for Java as being Zābej, the seat of his power (see "Merveilles de l'Inde," p. 233). Alas! Javomania is, I am afraid, incurable.
3 Ibid., pp. 231-232.
4 See extract from Javanese chronicle printed by Dulaurier in the Journal Asiatique for 1846, pp. 545-546, whence I have taken the above form of the name.
is not in the Javanese chronicles themselves put down earlier than A.D. 1233, and from Chinese records it may be inferred to have taken place between A.D. 1280 and 1293;—is an anachronism for which Van der Lith finds but poor justification. There is further the fact to face that no ambergris is, that I am aware of, collected on the Java coast or its immediate neighbourhood; the centre of its collection and trade being of old, as unanimously stated in both Chinese and Arab records, on the north coast of Sumatra. Markâawand or Markâawind, where amber—so says

1 See Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 158, note. The History of the Yuan Dynasty, bk. 131, translated on the same page, explicitly states that in 1293 Raden Vijaya defended himself against his rival (Aji Katang) at Mâjapâhít, "which place he had founded as a basis for his resistance."

2 The argument he brings forward in support of his idea is, that according to Professor Kern, who bases his opinion on documents found on the Island of Java itself, there already existed in A.D. 810 a king Utiungâ-dëwa, who reigned supreme at Mâjapâhít ("Merveilles de l'Inde," p. 232). But, I ask, is this correct? For, according to Lassen's "Indische Alterthumskunde," 1st ed., vol. iv, p. 482, the very same king Utiungadëwa is mentioned in an inscription of ascertained date, viz. A.D. 1294, where he claims to have subjected five kings and to be sovereign of the 'Island of Java'—Java-âeipo—which geographical expression is to be taken as meaning, of course, merely the eastern part (and perhaps only the eastern end) of the island. More evidence is therefore required to substantiate Van der Lith's standpoint.

3 Sulaimân (A.D. 851) tells us that ambergris is found in the Sea of Harkand (Bay of Bengal) during the south-west monsoon, and that a small quantity of it is bartered for iron by the natives of the Lomjakabalus islands (Nikobârs). (See Reinau'd's "Relation," etc., pp. 11, 17.) The last particular is confirmed nearly seven centuries later on by Barbosa, who states that in the islands of Nauacor (Nikobârs) there is very good ambergris, which is conveyed to Malacca and other places. Mandeslo ("Voyages," Amsterdam. 1727, t. 1, p. 81) names, as far as Further India is concerned, Pegu and Bengal as places whence the best ambergris comes. Fei Hein (A.D. 1436) speaks of a Lung-yên Hsû or 'Ambergris Island' near the point of Achin, North-West Sumatra, which Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 222, identifies with Pulo Rondo, but I myself with Pulo Bras or Lampung—Lampien [=Lung-[pi]-yen] of old maps—where large quantities of ambergris were collected and brought for sale in the market of Su-men-ta-la (Sumatra city). Ming history, book 325, mentions ambergris among the articles sent as tribute by Su-men-ta-la (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 214); and a passage from the "Pien-i-ten" (presumably taken from records of the Ming dynasty) distinctly states that "Su-men-ta-la is the country which yields ambergris." (See T'oung-Pao, 1901, pp. 333, and 340 for Chinese text.) The Tung-hsi-yang-k'au (A.D. 1618) tells us of the price of ambergris on the Achêh (Achin) market (ibid., p. 215). From this evidence we see that the north coast of Sumatra was the centre of the ambergris trade in mediaeval times; Malacca also sharing in it later on.

Van der Lith, however, adduces in corroboration of his theory a passage from the Pâsâi Chronicle stating that the tributary countries lying to the east of Java used to bring to Mâjapâhít offerings of their produce, among which was amber. This was, be it noted, after A.D. 1377, the date of conquest of those countries by Mâjapâhít, and has nothing to do with the period (A.D. 900-950) we are concerned
the text, whether rightly or not corrected into 'ambergris' by the translator yet remains to be seen—is plentiful, should consequently be looked for on that coast. If, on the other hand, it is really a question of amber, we must then locate that seaport either on the coast of Annam or on the Gulf of Martaban. Does not, in fact, *Markānand* (Martawand), look for all the world as the very perfect simulacrum of *Martavan* or *Martavan*, the usual way in which the name Martaban is spelt by our early travellers? I shall not, however, allow myself, like my predecessors, to be led away by phonetic resemblances, even although in this case the conjecture is, after all, not so improbable. I may, *per contra,*

with. The Pāsai Chronicle mentions the eastern countries referred to as being Bandān, Sirān (Ceram), and Larantuka (east portion of Flores); and names, among other articles, nutmegs, cloves, and musk (see Marre’s “Histoire des Rois de Paley,” p. 98). This clearly shows that the amber, or rather ambergris, must have come from the Moluccas (Tidore, etc.), which are, with Timor, the nearest places on the east of Java where the spermaceti whale and its product, ambergris, occur. Somnerat (vol. ii, p. 118) mentions amber as being found in Yolo (Sulā). But prior to that period, i.e. a.d. 1577, when the Island of Java was probably still a *terra incognita* even in the Archipelago, and Van der Lith’s *Makassar* did not yet exist, except retrospectively in his imagination, it is very unlikely that ambergris flowed thither and found there a market.

1 Amber is spoken of by Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 421) as being, apparently from a very early period, obtained from mines in *Lin-si* (Upper Champa); and, indeed, a certain amount seems to be extracted thence (Annamese territory) to this day. It is said to be derived also from Kambuja (†) and Yün-nan (Li-kiang and Yung-ch’ang districts). Williams ("Middle Kingdom," 1883 ed., vol. ii, p. 398) vaguely states it is found "in the Indian Islands (†) and localities in Annam and Yunnan." The chief source of supply in Indo-China has, however, been for centuries Upper Būrnā, where the Hā-Kōng valley in which the *Peguen-\* pang or 'Amber Hills' are situated (in about 26° 15' N. lat. and 96° 30' E. long.) has long become famous for the golden resin. This was worked at Ava, as more recently at Mandalay, into beads for rosaries, various trinkets, and even statuettes and boxes such as were found in the late king of Būrnā's treasure and are now kept in the South Kensington Museum. The output of the Hā-Kōng mines was, in 1896-97, about 14 cwt., valued at 2,330 rupees. It has, besides, been noticed in other places in Būrnā (see "Upper Būrnā Gazetteer," pt. i, vol. ii, 1900, pp. 294-295). Marini ("Delle Missioni," etc., Rome, 1663, pp. 69, 448) tells us how red amber was carried across from the kingdom of Ava to Eastern Lào (Wiang Chan), and thence forwarded, always overland, to Tonkin. There is, in conclusion, nothing strange that there should be a market for it, as well as for ambergris (see preceding note), on the Gulf of Martaban. I may here venture to notice how modern works of reference, even the most recent, are sadly deficient in information about this and similar important products of Further India, the particulars about whose history one is left to ferret out for himself in the original literature.

2 Martaban (see p. 71 above) is recorded to have existed, as a city, since a.d. 576; and as a name of a district it may be even older.
point out that scarcely more than two and a half centuries before Captain Bozorg, I-tsing (A.D. 671–695) tells us of a State or district named Mo-chia-man, 末迦漫 (= Makkaban, Markaban, Markawan), hitherto unidentified,\(^1\) which may very well be the same place as the Markāwān of the ‘Ajāib. As this last is distinctly stated to be a city on the Island of Zābej, i.e. Sumatra, it is evidently only logical to look for it there, and preferably on the north coast. Unfortunately, however, I could not, so far, discover in that tract any place-name resembling the one under consideration, although lower down, on the east coast of the island, there exists a settlement Makapan (on the west shore of Brouwer Strait or Selat Panjang, just below the 1st parallel of N. lat.) that may well represent I-tsing’s Makkaban, but scarcely, I am afraid, the ambergris trading centre Markāwān of the ‘Ajāib. In any case, I trust to have conclusively demonstrated that the proper site for the latter is to be fixed in the northern portion of Sumatra, and not on the Island of Java.\(^2\) And, to meet Van der Lith on his own ground, I may point out that if the ‘Ajāib toponymic under discussion is really to be read Mazafāwīd or Mājupāhīt, such a name does just as well occur on the east coast of Sumatra, where, in the Langsar district not far south of Perlak, we have a Mājupāhīt or Mānjupāhīt River (450 yards wide, and at least six feet deep in the entrance, but deeper within) with a village of the same name.\(^3\)

---

1 See Takaku, op. cit., pp. xxxix and I.

2 The other nearest toponymics, that I am aware of, would be Bakawan, a village about 8 miles up the Kateman River, Berhala Strait (circa 0° 16’ N. lat.); and Mangaman, an islet lying a little northward of Lagundri harbour, near the southern coast of Sumatra. Professor Schlegel, in T'oung-Pao, 1911, p. 121, suggests that Mat-kua-man (Mo-chia-man) may be a transcript of Marga-man, and cites Van de Wall’s Malay Dictionary to show that in Malay Marga means ‘tribe’ or ‘district’; but this is of very little help, even admitting there existed a district Marga-Mante (so-called from the Mante tribe in Aceh), of which there is no record. Marga-Mante would, of course, very closely represent the Arabic Maršawān (Markāmānt); but until more evidence is forthcoming we cannot accept such fanciful etymologies. In my opinion Markāwān argues some form like Makawan, Marrayan, Mārtawan, of which there are closely related examples in the Archipelago; e.g., the Makoapan alluded to above, Mārtapura in extreme south-east Borneo (north of which, however, we have also a Mārgawar), etc.

3 It may be objected that this place-name may have been introduced here from the famous Mājupāhīt kingdom of Java; but who can tell that the reverse did not happen, the name in question being transplanted from here to Java?
To wind up with the list of the place-names recorded by ancient writers and supposed by modern scholars to represent localities in Java, it only remains to mention Fo-shih-pu-lo, 佛逝補羅 (Bhoja-pura?), occurring in I-tsing’s list of countries in the Southern Sea. Takakusu¹ considers this place as distinct from Śrī-Bhoja (Palembang), and—unmindful of the fact that I-tsing never mentions the Island of Java, not even its supposed famous equivalent Shé-p’o, and never visited it in the course of his journeys to the south—he attempts to connect it with the Boja district and Boja-nagara settlement in East Java. Not content with this, he even boldly surmises that “we have here perhaps the origin of the name Śrī-Bhoja, for Palembang was certainly a colony of Java.” The last dogmatic assertion is only true in so far as concerns the period following A.D. 1377, or thereabouts; and as regards the name Śrī-Bhoja, we shall see that, like many others, it is more likely to have been introduced into Java from Sumatra than vice versa.² In any case, for Sumatra we have the proof in I-tsing that Śrī-Bhoja existed on Sumatra as a name for Palembang at least since A.D. 671, it being further recorded under the form Sarbaza by Sulaimān in A.D. 851; whereas as regards Java evidence has still to be forthcoming for a still greater antiquity of the term Bhoja or Śrī-Bhoja there. To me Fo-shih-pu-lo or Bhoja-pura ‘Island,’ as I-tsing terms it, is merely the name of the district, or particular township in which the capital Bhoja of the Śrī-Bhoja—or simply Bhoja—State was situated; and it is only by a misconstruction of I-tsing’s words that Takakusu is led on to draw such a subtle distinction between the two names.³

² We have a Bojo island off the south coast of Tānah-Bāla, on Si-berut Strait, west coast of Sumatra; a Bojer islet off the east coast of Bangka; a Bajur Bay (Koninginne) on the west coast of Sumatra; a Baju village on its north coast (on Meraksia River, Telok Semāwi), etc.; besides a Si-Boga city and district down the west coast of the same island (Ta-pian-na-ul Bay).
³ The only passage in which the term Fo-shih-pu-lo occurs is on p. 10 of Takakusu’s translation. Therein I-tsing enumerates the ‘islands’ (in reality
All the above, I feel sure, do away with the mistaken ideas by which Arabists and Sinologists alike have always

states or districts) of the Southern Sea, counting, as he says, from the west, in the following order (the identifications appended are my own):—

1. Pa-ku-shi island = Bârûs district, W. Sumatra.
2. Mo-lo-yu country (which is now the country of Śrī-Bhoja) = Malâyû State, south end of Malay Peninsula.
3. Mo-ho-sin island (Bokkusin) = Pukersang, N. Sumatra (see Marre’s “Histoire des Rois de Pasey,” p. 27).
4. Ho-ling island = Gerlang, west coast of Malay Peninsula.
5. Tan-tan (more correctly Tâ-t‘a) = either Pulo Terutur or Trotto, Langkawi group; or Datu Point, entrance of Pânei River, east coast of Sumatra; or Datu Point, or Baru, on the equator, east coast of Sumatra.
6. P‘ên-p’ên island = either Berba islet and river, Jambi district, east coast of Sumatra; or Bemban, on north-east extremity of Bâtang Island, Singapore Strait.
7. Po-li island = either the Prai or the Pulai district, west coast of Malay Peninsula.
8. K‘un-lun island = either Kundur island, off east coast of Sumatra, below Gelam Strait (0° 40’ to 0° 50’ N. lat.), or Pulo Gâlang, farther to the east.
10. A-shan or O-shan island = either Asahan district, east coast of Sumatra (3° N. lat.), or Banja-Asin (or simply Asin) River, close by the north of the Palembang River; or Asahan district, south-east end of Sumatra, 5° 31’ S. lat.
11. Mo-chia-man island = either Makapan on Brouwer Strait, Bakuwan on Kateman River, or Mangoman (Magaman?) island at the southern end of Sumatra.

As may be seen from the list just transcribed, I-ting follows but casually the order he proposed himself; but at all events he begins at the westernmost point, i.e. Bârûs, ending at the easternmost, i.e. Fo-shih-pu-lo (Palembang) and Mo-shia-man (may be Mangoman); his general course being from N.W. to S.E. And yet Takakusu has managed to haul me in Pulo Condore and Java! A glance at Professor Schlegel’s later attempts to identify the above places in the T’oung-Pao for 1901, pp. 109–121, will show that the equivalents he suggests are likewise untenable on some or other ground. But to revert to our subject. In the above list I-ting does not at all mean, by No. 2, Śrī-Bhoja, as Takakusu would have us to believe; but merely intends to refer to Malâyû, which, during his time, or at some later date, became part of Śrī-Bhoja (Palembang). Malâyû, we have seen, was 15 days’ sail from Palembang, and stood on the southern extreme of the Malay Peninsula, i.e. westward, according to I-ting’s notion, of Palembang; hence, why should be, in alluding to it, include with it Palembang, which should come at about the end of his list among the easternmost countries? This point settled, it will be evident that the real Śrī-Bhoja I-ting had in mind is No. 9, i.e. Fo-shih-pu-lo or Bhoja-pura (Palembang). This was the capital, the principal district of the sovereign State; Mo-lo-yu was but a dependency of it. The distinction that Takakusu is so anxious to draw between Śrī-Bhoja and Bhoja-pura as being two entirely separate localities (in order that he may drag in some little bit of the Java of his heart) is, therefore, utterly absurd, and in absolute contradiction with both the tenour and spirit of I-ting’s text.
sought to connect Zābej and Shē-p'o with Java, and unimpeachable evidence will be required to the contrary to prove their pet, but I am afraid now hopeless, thesis. From the fact of its lying so far away in the southern seas, Java evidently remained completely ignored, or but vaguely known to the Chinese and Arabs, until well-nigh the end of the thirteenth century A.D.; while as regards Javanese domination it did not spread beyond the limits of the island itself until about A.D. 1377, the approximate date of the Javanese conquest of Palembang and other neighbouring insular States in the Archipelago. It is therefore idle to talk of Javanese transoceanic empires before that date. For all evidence to hand concurs in showing that the power which was supreme in the Archipelago at an earlier period and became famous in Arabic literature under the name of Zābej had its centre in Sumatra, and precisely at Palembang, at least as far back as the date of I-tsing's arrival there (A.D. 671). Prior to that the seat of power may have stood further to the north, as would appear from the Pāgar-rūyung inscription of A.D. 656 already referred to, and from some circumstantial evidence tending to show that the paramount ruler may have resided somewhere in the Jambi or even Indragiri district. In A.D. 631–640 we get from Yūan-chwang dim echoes of his Yamana-, or Yabana-, dīpa, which may be one and the same with the Yava or Prathama-Yava State of the inscription just referred to. Before that, again, we have a Chinese tradition, or rather legend, which shall be referred to further on, according to which the eastern limit of the Sumatran empire was at San-fo-ch'i, viz. Palembang, while the western extended to India (extra-Gangem, i.e. Peninsula), thus inducing one to infer that its centre must have stood on the northern part of Sumatra. Still retracing our footsteps into the remote past, and taking note en passant of Fa-Hsien's Ya-p'o-t'i, Jabade(ša?), or Fabadiū, we reach our goal in Ptolemy's Iabadiū or Sabadiū at the very dawn of the first century of our era. The sequel is perfectly consistent throughout with historical as well as geographical and ethnological evidence, as will
now appear, after the field has been cleared of all imaginary resemblances which have been set up by our predecessors. We may therefore now proceed unhampered on our way to discuss his data and turn them into useful building material.

IV. Ptolemy's Iabadiû.

According to Ptolemy's geographical data, rectified as shown in our tables, the position of the transverse axis of Iabadiû or Sabadiû becomes fixed between long. 104° 21' E. and lat. 1° 51' S. on the west; and long. 105° 48' E. and lat. 1° 33' S. on the east; thus embracing the area intervening between the eastern seaboard of the Jambi district abreast of Pulo Bedawang, and the north coast of Bangka until a little beyond the eastern point of entrance to Kelabat Bay. Allowing for a slight error in excess of longitude, we may shift these two extremities of the axis of Iabadiû a little back until the eastern one coincides with the eastern seaboard of the Jambi district in lat. 1° 33' S. as indicated, when the western one will fall on the Tambesi River (the principal tributary, from the right, of the Jambi); and we shall then have pretty nearly the whole width of the Jambi district included within the limits of the Ptolemaic Iabadiû. How far this island extended, in the conception of our author, northwards and southwards of the axial line just now determined, he left us no data to judge by. All the same, from the oldest available reproductions—or imitations—of his maps, it may be argued that the axis above referred to was the major one, i.e., that it represented, according to his notions, the length of the island, its width being reckoned by him about one-half of that. There can thus be no doubt that his conception of the extent of the island was far short of reality; although it may be pleaded in extenuation of his shortcomings in this respect that if, as we have suggested, the insular groups of the Barusai, Sabadeibai, and Sindai scattered, according to him, off the west coast of his Iabadiû, both on the north and south, really represent portions of the west coast of Sumatra
(i.e. respectively the Bārūs, Padang, and Indrapura districts) mapped separately by him under the impression that they were distinct islands, and not contiguous parts of a single whole, of which his Iabadiū was but the mutilated torso, his share of responsibility in the matter would then be considerably reduced. For his error would then merely consist in his having handed down to us the tradition of these *disjecta membra* instead of a compact, connected whole. In thus proceeding he was naturally misled by his informants, who were not as yet sufficiently acquainted with Sumatra to perceive that its coast stretched in an unbroken line for 960 miles from north to south.\(^1\) And this ignorance of the real extent of the island continued, as we have seen, for over eleven centuries after him, ending, as far as the European world was concerned, with Marco Polo—who, first of all known travellers, no longer spoke of those portions of

---

\(^1\) As regards those informants, they were, like the later travellers, Arab and Chinese, misled in their own turn by the peculiar style of nomenclature followed by the natives in designating the various portions of the southern Asiatic continent and Archipelago. It is important to remember that Orientals—I speak especially of those of Further India—have no generic terms, nor ever thought or felt the necessity of inventing them, not only for the great divisions of the earth’s surface (continents, regions, peninsulas, etc.), but even for the less extensive tracts of land (such as e.g. large islands, isthmuses, etc.). The only words their scanty vocabulary supplies them with for denoting the multifarious features just referred to are at the very outside three, viz., one meaning ‘land’ (*sthāna, thāna, tānah, etc.); the second meaning ‘country’ or ‘kingdom’ (*rāagyra, ratha, re, etc., in some instances, and in others *nagara, negri, nagor, nakhōn, etc., which signifies at the same time the capital); the third meaning ‘island’ (*dīpa, dipa, dip, dīn, pulo, t’kōh, kōh, etc.), which is, however, applied to the smallest islands only. The Chinese have very ambiguous terms: (1) *chōu, 鄰*, an islet, a department or political division, province, district; (2) *chou, 鄰*, an islet, a continent; (3) *shan, 山*, meaning a mountain, a hill, a mountain range, as well as an island; and (4) *kō, 鄰*, meaning an island, generally of small size. In the Archipelago the terms almost exclusively used are: *tānah*, for country, land, territory; and *pulo* (replaced in some parts by *nuna, gili, etc.*), for island (of a small size). The term *negri* = country, region, territory, state, nation, capital, city, is but seldom used. It is with this very limited linguistic stock-in-trade that the populations of Further India have to meet all exigencies of geographical nomenclature in so far as the designation of parts of the earth’s surface are concerned. But for the largest of these parts they have not, as I remarked, generic names: they simply rest content by calling each of their smaller divisions (country, realm, district) by a certain specific name, leaving the whole to go down nameless to *Ewigkeit*, quite unconcerned. Who has ever heard, for instance, that Orientals ever devised a name for, say, Asia; that India ever had a comprehensive name for the Indian Peninsula, or the Chinese for
Sumatra as separate islands, but as of contiguous kingdoms—whereas it continued for some time to be handed down in both Arabic and Chinese literature. One redeeming

China; that native designations ever existed for the whole of, say, Indo-China, or the Malay Peninsula, or the Archipelago and its various sections? Nor is this all. When we come to islands (except of the very smallest size) we find no one collective name for them as a whole, but distinct designations for each distinct ethnographical or political division of them. When speaking of Ceylon (see pp. 380–382) I have shown that Nāga-dīpa, which has been taken by some writers as a quite distinct island, was really a portion of Ceylon; and from this example I am led to doubt as to whether there really was a comprehensive name for the whole island, those hitherto believed to be such (Śikāla, Tumbayāṇi, Maṇḍīpa, Raṅgāvīpa, etc.) being but, perchance, specific designations for distinct portions (or districts) of the island. But reverting to the Archipelago, it is of the greatest importance to point out that no island of any considerable size ever had a comprehensive name denoting the whole of it. It is with Europeans, and with Europeans alone, that originated the terms Sumatra, Java, Borneo, Madura, Bālī, Lombok, Sumbāwā, Flores, Celebes, etc., as comprehensive names for those considerable islands. The natives never thought of inventing a comprehensive designation for each of them, but merely denoted each particular district of them by a specific name of 'Tānāh so and so', i.e. 'So-and-so's Land.' It would be too long to give here examples; the respectable list of names sometimes belonging to a single island (mistaken by many of our geographers for alternative designations for the whole of that particular island, whereas they merely denote distinct portions of it) are sufficient proof of my assertion. To give but two instances, take e.g. Flores, variously known as Indē, Mangera, Larantuka; and Lombok, known besides as Silāpārang (or Selāpārān), Tānāh Siūtīk, etc.—all names of particular districts or ethnographical sections of them! And these are but medium-sized islands. Just think, now, what would happen with large islands like Sumatra, Java, and Borneo. The names the foreign traveller would hear be as many as the sections of the island where he would happen to land. And in the event of his not being sufficiently acquainted with the entire coast of each section so as to know that all are part and parcel of one and the same island, he would be led to infer that it is a question of a group of distinct islands and not of a single one. On the other hand, should the foreign traveller alluded to chance to land at a single point of a certain island and learn the name by which that particular section of the island is called by the natives, he would be led to think this to be the denomination applied to the whole of that island. This is exactly what occurred with the early Western travellers, to whom the whole of the islands of Sumatra and Borneo became so known from a single district on either of them: while, on the contrary, Java and Suma struck them as two separate islands (though being both districts of Java), because they happened to land at places situated on either of these districts. The same occurred to the early Chinese navigators, who, as we have seen, thought Sumbāwā and Sangar (both on Sumbāwā Island) to be two distinct islands, and took many a district on the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, and Borneo to be all islands. Absolutely identical was the case with the Arabs, who likewise regarded Bāmā (Lambri), Ṣarba (Palembang), and other places (all parts of Sumatra), as so many islands. It may therefore be argued with sufficient reason that Ptolemy's informants were under the same impression, whence his mistake, as referred to above. And it will be seen furthermore that those modern writers who translate Tānāh Mālāyā by 'Malay Peninsula,' Po-lo by Borneo, and so forth, meaning, of course, the whole of such great territorial entities as actually understood by us under such names, are not only showing ignorance of the nature and spirit of native geographical terminology, but unconsciously misleading the unwary reader.
feature with Ptolemy is, however, the fact of his having handed down to us from so remote a period the record of so many districts of Sumatra Island (Bārūs, Saba, Sinda or Sunda or Indrapura), and last, but not least, of the capital of its paramount kingdom, Argyrē, which, corresponding, as we shall see, to the present Achēh, demonstrates at any rate that he had some idea as to the extent of the island so far westward.

But passing on now to a more minute investigation of the nature and purport of the term Iabadiū or Sabadiū, he has recorded as the (in reality, only middle and northern portions) Island of Sumatra, we at once find ourselves puzzled by the derivation he gives of its name. For his statement is most explicit on this point: the term in question means, he tells us, 'Island of Barley': "'Iαβαδίου (ἡ Σαβαδίου), δ εμαίνει χρυθής, νήσος."1 This apparent crux need not, however, disconcert us. He here again repeats what his informants were told on the subject by the early Indū traders. And we know from experience gained during the course of the present inquiry that genuine scientific etymology, as now understood by us, is not, or at least was not in the old days, the forte of Oriental peoples, no more, indeed, than it was even about a century ago with ourselves. When the origin of a particular term was obstinately puzzling and could not readily be detected, the course adopted by those good people was to invent one to suit their taste and fancy. Throughout the preceding pages we have met with many an example of such amusing etymologies, concocted on the lines laid down in the "Diversions of Purley" by some Oriental Horne Tooke. In the case in point, then, it is not difficult to guess what actually did happen. The early Indū traders, being at a loss to account for the meaning of the racial term Java or C'hauvā they found applied to a certain section—the most enterprising and progressive—of the native population of Northern and Eastern Sumatra, somewhat

1 "Geographia," lib. vii, ch. 2, § 29.
misled, as we shall see directly, by the chance coincidence of a peculiarly large kind of millet growing there, evolved ipso facto a derivation from Yaca, 'barley,' corroborating it, moreover, with a legend which we give below, invented ad hoc as their kinsmen and followers have done for other ethnonyms or toponymics in various parts of Further India. And it goes without saying that the rude and ignorant natives—dazzled by the many-sided lore possessed by some of those early traders and emigrants, and by the Brāhmans and Buddhist monks, who naturally in the course of time followed in their wake—accepted all they were told as gospel, just as we had occasion to notice in other countries of the same region. Ignorant of their own origin, owing to the absence as yet of written records, they gladly accepted those which the cultured foreigners had fabricated for them—exactly as many a Western parvenu accepted the pedigree that some shrewd genealogist had traced back for him to the Crusades, to Charlemagne, or to the knights of the Round Table.

And now to the legend above referred to. I must preface it, however, with the remark that it comes to us, clad in poetic garb, from the Island of Java, although there is scarcely any doubt that it has migrated thither from Sumatra, together with the term Java or Yaca with which it is indissolubly connected. Perhaps it may be yet possible to trace it in the last-mentioned island. It is to the following effect:

A king of Hastināpura (on the Ganges), by the name of Aji-Śaka, was the first Indū adventurer who reached Java,

1 The Sung History (bk. 489) positively states of San-fu-ch’i (Sarbaza or Palembang), under the date A.D. 905, that "the country does not produce barley, but rice and green and yellow pens" (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 187).
2 The form Yavana, another locus a non lucendo derived from the same words Yaca or C’hacca, in the north of Indo-China (see above, pp. 128, 156), was probably also circulating in the south, if it were the real prototype of Hwèn-taṅg’s Yen-mo-na (Yabun) (?); see pp. 463–464.
3 See e.g. p. 266 above, as regards the legend about king Sagara in Southern Campā.
4 See Winter & Roorda’s "Adjī Saka," Amsterdam, 1857; Annales de l'Extrême Orient, Paris, 1880, t. ii, p. 293, etc.
then called *Nusa Mendang*¹ and peopled by Rākṣasas. Finding there an edible kind of grain called *Yava* or *Java*, he changed the name of the island into *Nusa Java*. Having in due course subdued the cannibal Rākṣasas, he founded cities, taught the people to write, and established the Śaka Era, so called after him, in A.D. 78.²

To prove that all this is mere invention, it will suffice to point out that the allusion is to the mythical Indū king Śālīvāhana, the fabled founder in India of the so-called Śaka or Śālīvāhana Era, which does not seem to have come into use until several centuries later than the initial year of that era.³ The only scintilla of truth embodied in the legend just referred to lies apparently in the reference made to the grain found growing on the island, which,

---

¹ Java is alleged to have been known, at a still more remote period than when the Indū immigration took place, as *Nusa Hora-hora*, or *Desert Island,* and *Nusa Kendeng*, or *Island of the mountain-ranges* (see Dulaureir in *Journal Asiatique*, 1847, p. 244). Its capitals are said to have been successively at Kuripan, Jangola (or Janggālā), Mendang Kamulan, Astina (Hastina ?), Giling Wesi, Pajajaran (in the vicinity of the present Buitenzorg, south of Batavia; A.D. 1280-1356 ?), Mājapahit (A.D. 1356-1475, or 1280-1475 ?), and Demak (1475-1478 ?). There can be no doubt, however, that several of these cities coexisted contemporaneously as capitals of separate states.

² The Javanese Śaka era has not for several centuries corresponded with the original, owing to the defective lunar calendar adopted there, it is said, in A.D. 1633. The divergence from the Indū Śaka amounts at present to four years in excess. This led some writers to infer that the Javanese era began in A.D. 74, which does not seem to be the case. The Javanese envoys to China are related in Ming history (bk. 324) to have presented “a letter stating that their kingdom had been founded 1376 years before, that is, in the first year of the period Yūan-k'ang of the Emperor Hsüan of the Han dynasty (B.C. 65)” (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 165). However, 1432-1376 = A.D. 56, a discrepancy which Groeneveldt, loc. cit., is at a loss to account for. Probably there is an error of 100 in excess in the number of years stated as having elapsed from the foundation of the kingdom, which should in this case be read 1276 instead of 1376, when we should obtain 1432-1276 = A.D. 156. But the error may be of several hundreds of years as far as we know; and evidently not only the Javanese who did the reckoning, but also the Chinese who went on comparing dates with their own chronology, were not mathematicians.

³ “In Northern India the earliest inscription which is avowedly dated in the Śaka era is that dated Śaka 784 at Deogarh in the Lalitpur subdivision of the Jhānsi District” (Vincent A. Smith in *Journal Royal Asiatic Society* for January, 1903, pp. 36-37). Earlier inscriptions in Western India may be dated in the same era, but this is by no means certain just yet. In Kamboja, however, the Śaka era appears on inscriptions as early as A.D. 629; in Champā even earlier (A.D. 479-577); and in Burmā in A.D. 610 (Kuzeik pagoda inscription at Pagan).
though not barley, but being presumably of a size similar to barley, was nevertheless called Yava, i.e. 'barley' (this being its Sanskrit name), by the Indū immigrants (and not by the natives) in order, as we pointed out, evidently to obtain a source from which to trace the derivation of the name Java or Chauvā borne by the population of the island. Ptolemy's mention of the meaning currently ascribed in his time to the term Java or Chauvā proves two things, and very important withal, viz.: (1) that in his time Indū immigrants had already settled on the island and concocted the etymology, with very probably also the accompanying legend in a similar form to that referred to above; and (2) that the island in which these events occurred was Sumatra (the northern half of it corresponding to his Iabadiū), and not Java. It follows, therefore, that both etymology and legend must have originated in Sumatra, whence they were in the course of time introduced into Java as I have shown.

But there is yet one more clue to show that the cradle of those linguistic and myth-making feats was really Sumatra. Such a clue is, in my opinion, to be found in the account of the voyage, seemingly not so fabulous as has hitherto been thought, of the Greek traveller and writer Iambulus, preserved to us by Diodorus Siculus at the end of the second book of his Universal History. Therein it is stated in the words of Iambulus himself, whose account Diodorus has transcribed at some length, that Iambulus, having been made a slave by the Æthiopians, was sent away by his captors with a companion in a boat which carried them to a happy island in the Eastern seas. After seven years' stay in this island they were ejected by the natives, whereupon having fitted a skiff they set sail, and after a voyage of four months reached the sandy shallows of India (Sunderbands?). Thence Iambulus alone (his companion

1 Java is the Telugu name for Hordeum hexastichum (see Forbes Watson's "Index to Indian Plants," p. 219, s.v.); and everywhere else in India Jav, Yava, or Yarla mean some variety of barley.
2 "Bibliothēkē," lib. ii, ch. 57.
having got drowned while attempting to land) was carried away by the inhabitants to Polibothra (Pātaliputra), many a day's journey from the sea. At length, after several incidents, he safely arrived in Greece, where he committed all his adventures to writing.

The happy island in the Eastern seas on which Iambulus had made so lengthy a stay has been supposed by some to be Ceylon, despite the fact that the space of four months stated to have been occupied in the passage thence to the Gangetic Delta well argues that it must have lain far more remote from the shores of India, and should therefore be sought for in the Eastern Archipelago. The description given of it suits remarkably well with Sumatra, especially in the particular points of thermal springs,¹ of the sun shining straight overhead and the polar star becoming invisible,² of the natives having their ears bored,³ of a deadly grass,⁴ etc. The circuit of the mysterious island is stated to be but 5,000 stadia, equal to about 500 miles, which would be, of course, far too short for Sumatra; but as it is added that there are seven more islands close by of the same size, it is very probable that these islands are, as in other instances inquired into by us, merely adjoining districts of Sumatra.

¹ Sulaimān (see Reinaud, op. cit., p. 21) mentions a hot well at the foot of the volcanic mountain near Zābej.
² Marco Polo notices the same fact of Java Minor (Sumatra) in general, and of the State of Samara (Sumatra) on its north coast in particular, adding when he reached Comari (the country about Cape Komorin, in the extreme south of India) that something could be seen there of the North Star, which he had not been able to see since reaching Lesser Java. Odoric records, when speaking of Lamori (Lambri, N.W. Sumatra), that he had lost sight of the North Star. As regards the sun being straight overhead, I-tsing mentions (Takakusu, op. cit., pp. 143-144) that no shadow is cast at midday by the gnomon at Sri-Bhoja during the equinoctial periods.
³ Nicolò Conti says of Taprobana or Sciamuthera (Sumatra): "The ears both of the men and women are very large, in which they wear earrings ornamented with precious stones" (Major's "India in the Fifteenth Century," pt. ii, p. 8). He does not in the slightest refer to this custom when speaking of the Greater Java, i.e. Java proper.
⁴ Ipoh or Upas tree. Odoric speaks of trees bearing a terrible poison in Natem, Punthen, or Calamak (Malayu kingdom on Old Singapore Strait, see p. 537). Fei-hsin (A.D. 1436) says of Arn or Hāru, east coast of Sumatra: "Every man carries a bow and poisoned arrows to protect himself" (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 217).
In such a case, the coastline of these districts joined together would give us a total not much inferior to the circuit of Sumatra.

The truthfulness of the above description appealed before this to a Portuguese gentleman alluded to by Ramusio as well acquainted with the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago, who had no hesitation in identifying as Sumatra the happy island that had hospitated Iambulus.\(^1\)

But there is more yet. The alphabet in use among the natives of that elysium is described as consisting of seven characters, each of which is capable of undergoing four different transformations, so as to produce in the aggregate twenty-eight letters or logograms. The important information is moreover added that the order followed by the writing is from top to bottom—all features that stamp that system of graphology as peculiar to Sumatra. The Battak there have, in fact, and from time immemorial, a system of writing disposed in vertical columns from top to bottom and then from left to right.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Ramusio’s “Navigations et Viaggi,” 1563 ed., vol. i, pp. 174 seqq. Lassen understood the island of Iambulus to be Bālī; but Colonel Wilford declared for Sumatra. And yet Lucian, in his “Verse Historiae” (i, 3), summarily pilloried Iambulus along with Klēsias as a writer of fables. But the same happened with Marco Polo, Mendes Pinto, and other travellers, whose generally voracious stories the Western world would not believe until very recently, when they could be verified.

\(^2\) Lacouperie rashly argued on this sole ground that Batta writing “is undoubtedly a degraded type of Indian descent, through the old Kawi of Java” (“Beginnings of Writing,” London, 1894, p. 93). But how did he know that the famous Kawi originated in Java, and was not on the contrary introduced thither from Sumatra, undoubtedly the stepping-stone through which Indā civilization reached Java? Batta writing may therefore be, not the degenerate type, but the fossilized prototype of the Kawi which afterwards attained so perfect a development in Java (and perhaps, before that, in Sumatra itself). What survived in the mountain fastnesses of the Batta country is very likely the embryonic form of that writing, as employed in the remotest days all over Sumatra. This, owing to the comparatively isolated condition of the Battas, could continue to be handed down unchanged, from generation to generation, amongst them, whilst undergoing steady improvement in the lowlands nearer the seacoast. As to the Battak being acquainted with this system of writing from a very early period, there can be no doubt, for their magic-books, written on bark and recording various stories and events, are very ancient. A system of writing similar to theirs seems to have been in favour all over the Archipelago. The Tagals in the Philippines employed fifteen characters, of which twelve were consonants and three vowels, that served as five, and wrote from top to bottom “on canes [bamboos].” (See De Morga’s “Philippine Islands,” London, Hakluyt Soc.,
And now we come to the most essential point for us. Diodorus refers, always following Iambulus, to a large kind of grain growing on the island where the latter resided. This grain Ramusio's Portuguese informant thought to be either Indian corn or a large variety of millet used as an article of food in the East Indies. We thus have, I think, in Iambulus' statement, the oldest link — dating from the end of the second century B.C. — in the chain connecting the notion as to the existence of a large kind of grain on Sumatra with the spurious etymology contrived in order to account for the name Java or Chawā of the race that inhabited it, and with Ptolemy's consequent explanation of the term Labadiū or Java, Yava-deipa, as 'Island of Barley.' The falsity of that derivation is clearly shown from the fact of Ptolemy having also put on record the alternative designation Sabadiū, from which we may legitimately infer that although the fictitious etymology Yava-deipa, with the legend attached to it, was already current in his time, the real name Java, Chawā, of the island (derived from that of the race that held supremacy over it) was, on the other hand, by no means unknown.

I trust, therefore, to have conclusively proved that the names Java, Yava, etc., with the various stories, partly genuine and partly invented, connected with them, were peculiar to Sumatra (especially its northern part) long before they became localized in Java, whither they were imported from the former island. Sumatran civilization, brought about by Indu influence, is, beyond doubt, far older than the Javanese. Not only is there evidence as to Sumatra having been already known, and perhaps settled, by the early Phoenician traders at a no less remote epoch

1868, pp. 294-5.) The Bhimas of Sambāwa wrote, it appears, likewise. Prinsep (Journal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1837, vol. vi, p. 476) found Iambulus' description of the writing in his mysterious island exact and true. Lacouperie (''Beginnings of Writing''), who at first (p. 94) doubtfully suggested Ceylon as its location, inclined in the end (p. 197) ''in favour of Sumatra-Java, which, as known at present, were not separated in antiquity'' [?]. And he winds up by declaring that ''at the end of the second century B.C. the Greek Iambulus described rather accurately, as a writing of that island, the Kawi syllabary originally from India.'
than five, if not more, centuries before the Christian era; but all indications concur in showing that the civilization

1 See Park Harrison's note on "Phoenician Characters from Sumatra" in the Journal Anthropological Institute, April, 1875 (vol. iv, No. 2), pp. 387-388, where the writer compares Rejang writing on ancient bamboo tablets, such as is still in use in the districts of Rejang, Lemba, and Pasimah, with Phoenician characters, finding an identity in form in nearly the whole of the letters. Both in Java and Sumatra—he proceeds to say, on the authority of Raffles ("History of Java," p. 85) and Marsden ("Sumatra," p. 3, note, 2nd ed.)—"written traditions, mixed with fable, refer to the arrival of ships in remote times, and at two different epochs, from the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf—in the one case at a time when vessels still coasted round the Bay of Bengal: in the other, in the age of Alexander, who is said to have built a bridge 'in the sea,' which may mean that ships commanded by some of his officers arrived direct from India. Three of his descendants are also said to have become kings of Palembang, etc. The ships would have been manned principally by Phoenician sailors." Lacouperie ("Beginnings of Writing," p. 77) did not seem to believe in a connection between Rejang and Phoenician characters. The question, however, was revived almost immediately after his death, in "Archaeologia Oxoniensis," part vi (1895), pp. 297-303, where the Rejang characters are declared, on the evidence of specialists such as Rénan and Professor Sayce, to be not only clearly Phoenician in form, but presenting marks of adaptation that point to Greek influence, such as might have been exerted on Tyrian epigraphy during the course of Nearchus' voyages. Dr. Neubauer is stated, in fact, to consider the shapes of the letters as those of the fourth or fifth century B.C., which would synchronize closely with the destruction of Tyre and the deportation of the Tyrian sailors to India. Some of the vessels built by the Phoenician shipwrights who were deported to the Indus for that purpose, it is surmised, may have proceeded southwards, in which case it would seem not unlikely that the Tyrian crews of some of them may have seized the opportunity of regaining their freedom, and either themselves have followed the old trade-route to the East, or, if they arrived there in ships commanded by Greek officers, may have deserted and acquired a new home in Sumatra; and so the Phoenician characters would have been introduced in the districts now perhaps inhabited by their Malayo-Polynesian descendants. It is further urged that after the successful voyage of Nearchus and Onesicritus in ships built by those Phoenician shipwrights, from the Indus to the mouth of the Tigris, and the narration by the former of his adventures to Alexander at Susa (end of February, B.C. 324), a long interval elapsed (15 months), during which both captains disappear entirely from the scene. They are heard of again shortly before the death of Alexander, who, according to Plutarch (confirmed by Quintus Curtius), was met by Nearchus on his approach to Babylon, and on the second day of his fatal illness heard from him the history of his voyage on the ocean, from which, it is said, he had returned. Quintus Curtius writes, in fact (lib. x, ch. 1), in a brief allusion to the meeting, that Alexander had ordered Nearchus and Onesicritus to proceed on a more distant voyage, and this is what Nearchus, or both of them, related to their sovereign just before he died (June, 323 n.c.). Although Dean Vincent supposed this to refer to the coasting voyage, it is possible that a second voyage is alluded to, the inducement to which may have been supplied by an account of an Arab pilot, met with, as we know, by Nearchus on the coast of Gedrosia, and who rendered him important services in navigating his ships.


I am, however, of opinion that Phoenician navigators were acquainted with the north coast, at least, of Sumatra even long before the time of Alexander,
introduced into the Archipelago from Southern India travelled on to Java by way of Sumatra, so that this latter was, so to speak, its first centre, and acted as a stepping-stone to its further progress towards the more outlying islands. Even as regards the Kāwi (or Kāvi) alphabet, acknowledged on all sides to have originated from Southern India, its Sumatran types have been recognized to be slightly archaic as compared with those of Java, a fact arguing that they must have been adopted in Sumatra before reaching Java.

The "San-ts'ai Tu-hwei" (by Wang Ki, pub. 1607) has preserved to us an account of a Sumatran State called

although the characters in question (which include Cypriote forms found in inscriptions at Citium, their introduction being accounted for from the fact of there having been Cypriotes among the crews of Nearehus' fleet) may have really reached Sumatra later on through some one or other cause. Burnell (op. cit., p. 3) is disposed to concede that the Phoenicians who voyaged for Solomon came to Southern India at least, and dates their commercial intercourse with India from the seventeenth century B.C. (p. 9), adding that it must have ceased, in a direct way, full five hundred years B.C., if not more (p. 9). I go still further, and have good reason to maintain that Acheh or Dacheh, the Ti-shih of the Chinese, so often confounded by them with Tājīkā or Arabia, was almost undoubtedly, if not exactly the Biblical Tarshish, at any rate a Phoenician settlement named after it; the famous Ophir lying not very far away, to wit, on the Malay Peninsula (Khr̆yā), or near the northern shore of the Gulf of Martaban (Khr̆y̆e Kh̆ora, with its city Sabara, the Suvarnabhumi of Buddhist fame). Again, in the name of Pāni or Pānei, east coast of Sumatra, we may have a relic of the terms Punt, Punti, Puni, Punī, φοῦντ, transplanted here by the Puni or Phoenicians themselves. I cannot afford space to enter here on the long discussion that the treatment of such a question would entail; hence I propose to deal with it separately elsewhere. Suffice, however, to have thrown out the hint and foreshadowed a novel probable solution for the Ophir problem. Jobab, Javan, and Sheba, or at all events counterparts of them created by the Phoenician settlers in Further India, can easily be detected in Jaba (North Sumatra) and Saba or Shē-p'ō (Malay Peninsula and Burma), while in Malaca, if the name, as we have previously noticed, is really ancient as it seems, we may have the toponomastic indication of an ancient Phoenician settlement named after (or for the same reasons as) Malaca on the coast of Spain. And with this we must stop for the present.

1 Skinner in his "Eastern Geography" says: "It was by the great rivers of Palembang, Jambi, Indragiri, and Kampar, before whose embouchures these islands [of the Johor Archipelago] lie, that the Hindus of Ceylon and Southern India must have gradually carried civilization into the interior of Southern Sumatra. The Indragiri, in particular, appears to have been crowded with Hindu-Malay settlements" (quoted by Denny, op. cit., p. 221). However, neither the author here nor indeed anyone else who has so far treated of these matters has ever understood the part played by the north coast of Sumatra, especially the Acheh district, in the transmission of that civilization. See the sequel of the text above, and the section devoted to Ptolemy's Argyrē following next.

Fo-lo-an, 佛羅安, which could be reached by sea in four days’ and nights’ sailing from Lin-ya-sz, 凌牙斯, and also by land. In this country were two brass statues of divinities which had arrived there by flying (probably aboard some ship), one having six arms (Avalokiteśvara?) and the other four (Viṣṇu?), and whose birthday took place on the 15th of the sixth month. Whenever outlanders wished to come in order to steal the pearls and jewels in the temple of these divinities, a violent storm and waves arose as soon as they arrived at the mouth of the river, so that their ships could not enter it.

Professor Schlegel identifies the two statues with Kuan-yin, the Avalokiteśvara of India, till this day represented with

1 Mentioned also by Chao Ju-kua; see Toung-Pao for 1901, p. 130, and Journ. Roy. Asiatic Soc., 1896, p. 478. Its neighbours were, according to Chao Ju-kua:

(1) Peng-feng, 適豐 (Bungbung, Bung-gung), very likely the Monggong of the Pasai chronicle (Marre, op. cit., p. 75) on North Sumatra, although the Chinese spelling suggests something like Bangong or Bung-gung. The Chinese map of about A.D. 1399 published by Phillips (Journal China Branch R.A.S., vol. xx, 1885) has a Peng-feng mountain, 屏風山, a little east of Nan-su-lu (Lambrì), north coast of Sumatra, which may be the same place as Peng-feng; for, although the spelling differs, the pronunciation is practically identical.

(2) Teng-ya-neng, 登牙儂, identified by me with absolute certainty with Trieng-gading, north coast of Sumatra, a little to the west of Samalangan.

(3) Chia-chi-lan-tan (Kākilantan), 齐吉蘭舟, may be Gigieng, between Beureuleug and Trieng-gading; but more likely some toponymic (such as Kāki-lontar, Kāki-lintang, Kāki-lintar) that has disappeared, or is not recorded on the as yet incomplete maps of North Sumatra.

2 See Toung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 402. Here we gather the important information that Fo-lo-an stood on the banks of a navigable river, which it is well to remember. Professor Schlegel appears to have forgotten this fact when he (op. cit., p. 404) suggests two insignificant places named Pusun, lying very far inland (one in the southern portion of Palembang, and the other in the Semangka district, near the southern extreme of Sumatra), which sea-going vessels could certainly not reach except by flying, like the statues in the legend related above. Our identification of Fo-lo-an is, it will be seen, far more justified, it being besides corroborated by that of its neighbouring district Teng-ya-neng, which is undisputably Trieng-gading as suggested above.
a triple head. His birthday tallies exactly with that of Ma-tsu-p'o, "Our Lady of Births," the Chinese patroness of sailors, "who herself is again identified with Kwan-yin, the legend of whose birth in the southern seas is thereby strikingly confirmed. According to this legend . . . . the father of Kwan-yin had a kingdom extending westwards to India, northward to Siem-lo (Siam), eastwards to Fo-ch'i [Bhoja or Palembang, if not Pāsai], and southward to T'ien-chên, 天真 [Indrapura?]"—in other words, including the northern half, if not the whole, of Sumatra.¹

Kwan-yin is often represented with a horse-head surmounting the triple crown he wears; and in the form of a magic horse is fabled to have saved Sūnhala, said to have been the original king of Ceylon, from shipwreck when he first sailed thereto from Southern India. Kwan-yin's birthplace is further located at Fo-ch'i (Bhoja),² whence we may infer that this divinity must be connected with the sea-horse of the Arabic legend, as well as with the hippoccephalic form assumed by Viṣṇu in the sea of the Archipelago of Indū myth.³

Professor Schlegel is at a loss to identify Fo-lo-an, and suggests a few unacceptable equivalents. But I have scarcely any doubt that it is Berūan or Barwān, mentioned in the chronicle of Pāsai⁴ as lying on the north

¹ T'oung-Pao, vol. ix, pp. 403-404.
³ See below, in the section treating of Argyrē. As regards the marine horse of Arabic legend, see p. 558, where Ibn Khurdadhīb (A.D. 864) is cited as locating it in the neighbourhood of the island of Dhūfāl, which we have shown to be very likely Rūa or Bintang. Kazwīnī (1269-75) again describes it (see Journal Asiatique, 1866, pp. 209-291, note). In the Malay Chronicles it is called Faras-ul-Bahri (Farasūl-Bahri), and represented as the progenitor of that marvellous steed named Scemberūni, which, both in the "Sejarah Malāyū" and the chronicle of Pāsai, is represented as a universal Pegasus, fit for either aerial, terrestrial, or marine journeys (see Leyden's "Malay Annals," p. 17, and Marre's "Hist. des Rois de Pasey," p. 69). Evidently the myth has been derived from the above legends of the marine horse, current from the remotest times in the Archipelago, and not from Arabic sources, for it does not appear to occur in Arabic folklore.
⁴ See Marre, op. cit., p. 21.
coast of Sumatra towards Achēh. It is now probably represented by Beureuleung in the Segli-Pedir territory.¹

As regards statues of Indian provenance or imitated from Indū models, it should be pointed out that there is no lack of them in Sumatra, and more will come to light when the country is thoroughly explored.²

Further, as to the antiquity of Sumatran civilization. The annals of the Chinese Liang dynasty ("Liang-shu," bk. 54, compiled early during the seventh century and embracing the period 502–556 A.D.) tell us of a State

¹ There is also a Belawon River, with an island and a promontory (Ujong Belawan) near the mouth of the Deli River, east coast of Sumatra, a little below 4° N. lat. Further, a Kota Benauseng (ruined) on the Rakan River, 1° 33’ N. lat.; and a Pelalawon River and village on Kamar River. As, however, Lin-yu-sze (which I make out to be Langsar or Langksa River below Perak, although it may be also Langkat near Deli, 4° N. lat., or even Ringat in Indragiri, 0° 30’ S. lat.) is located at four days’ and nights’ sailing from Fo-lo-an, I think the identification I have suggested in the text is the most probable; also because Lin-yu-sze is stated to lie at six days’ sailing from Tun-ma-ling, 卍馬令, which may be the Tambilang River on the east coast of Sumatra, lat. 2° S., just above the Palembang River. We would thus get the distances:—

(1) From Beureuleung (= Fo-lo-an = Berian) to Lin-yu-sze (Langkwa River), four days’ and nights’ sailing, actual distance 180 miles, or about 45 miles a day.

(2) From Lin-yu-sze (Langkwa River) to Tun-ma-ling (Tambilang River), six days’ sailing, actual distance 580 miles, or about 95 miles a day, which would seem excessive, although not improbable.

However, it is possible that Tun-ma-ling may have been some other place further to the north of the location assumed by us, of which there is now no record. On the other hand, the discrepancy in the rate of sailing per day between the places above referred to may be due to some slip on the part of the writer who recorded it, or to the fact of two separate estimates having been adopted, based on the rate of sailing speed of differently riggled crafts. The name Tun-ma-ling certainly suggests, rather more forcibly, either Temiling or Tembeling Cape at the mouth of the Kwāntān River above Pahang, or the Tembeling River itself (also called Temelin, and Tembeling in various Malay works) in Pahang territory; in which case Lin-yu-sze might be even Langat on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula above Malacca, and the distances Beureuleung–Langat and Langat–Tembeling (or Temiling, alias Tembeling, Cape) would be about equal, viz. 380 miles. But Chao Ju-kua appears to say that communication between Fo-lo-an, Lin-yu-sze, and Tun-ma-ling existed also by land, which statement, if correct, prevents us from locating the last two places away from Sumatra. He, on the other hand, tells us that Tun-ma-ling could be reached in ten days’ sailing from Chōn-la (Kamboja), a peculiarity that would suit well the territory about Temeling or Tembeling Cape in the northern part of Pahang.

² "In the State of Jambi, which borders on Palembang, Hindu images, identical with those of Java in all respects, except that the material is granite instead of trachyte, have been discovered" (Dennys' "Dictionary of British Malaya," p. 219).
called Kan-t’o-li, 千陀利, situated on an island in the southern sea, whose kings, devoutly Buddhist, sent envoys with presents to China as early as A.D. 455 to the then First Sung Emperor Hsiao-wu, and renewed their homage in 502, 519, and 520. The history of the First Sung dynasty also mentions the earliest embassy of A.D. 455, spelling the name of the State 千陀利, Chin- [or Kin-] t’o-li.¹ Neither T'ang nor Later Sung annals breathe a word about the now forgotten State, and so on until the Ming dynasty, when all of a sudden the historiographers of that period burst forth with the discovery that the old Kan-t’o-li of the First Sung and Liang was no other than the San-fo-ch’i (i.e. Sarbaza or Palembang) of their days. This late identification looks, I need not say, exceedingly suspicious, especially in view of the fact that we have more than once caught Chinese authors at fault in this sort of game; and last, but not least, because there was and still exists a Kanthuli or Kanturi district on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula,² which may very well be the old Kan-t’o-li

¹ See Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 185-187 and 192; Poong-Pao for 1901, pp. 122-125; and Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 451-453.

² The names recorded for the kings who sent these various missions are:—A.D. 455, Shi-k’o-lo-na-lin-tn = Sri Pala (or Bala?)-narendra; A.D. 502, Ch’iu-t’an Hsu-pu-t’o-lo = Gotama Subhadra; A.D. 519, Pi-ch’en-hsie Pu-mo = Visānau-(or Vaisya-) Varman, son and successor of the preceding, who was still living in 520, when he sent a new mission.
of First Sung and Liang periods. The idea that any such confusing of historical geography had taken place would, of course, be dispelled if we could certainly know that the Ming historians had something substantial to go on in the shape of trustworthy old records or traditions for asserting the identity of the two places; or at least if it could be shown that their Kan-t’o-li or Kin-t’o-li is etymologically connected in name with Andalas or Indalas, the ancient denomination borne, according to the “Sejarah Malāyu,” by the Paroalambang, now Palembang, district in south-eastern Sumatra. But who can tell that the same mistake did not happen in this case as with the old name Jakola of Malacca, which led the Chinese literati to connect it with Ch’ung-ka-la or Sangar in Sumbāwā? That is to say, may not the historiographers of the Ming period, on hearing from their seafaring countrymen that Palembang had been known at an earlier date as Andalas or Indalas, have jumped to the conclusion, on the mere ground of similarity in names, that

1 Since writing the above I notice, in Mr. Parker’s paper in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1900, p. 128, two more references to Kan-t’o-li belonging to later dates. One is an allusion to certain Kan-t’o-li cures or drugs occurring in a Chinese medical work during the seventh century, found by Dr. Breitneider (i.e. the “Kan-t’o-li Chi-kui-fang,” of the Sung period, 589–618; see Journal China Branch R.A.S., vol. xvi, 1881, p. 93). The other reference is still more direct and positive. A celebrated anti-Buddhist statesman, Han Yü, exiled to serve at the modern Swatow as penance for his iconoclastic zeal, mentions in a private letter, dated about 820, Mr. Parker tells us, the fact that “Champā, Kamboja, and Kan-t’o-li are amongst the countless States beyond the seas.” This, I am afraid, finally disposes of the theory that Kan-t’o-li was the old San-fo-ch’i territory. For if Kan-t’o-li was still the name of a State in A.D. 820, it could not be the same as Palembang, then called, for at least 150 years, Shih-li Fō-shih or Śrī-Bhoja. Kan-t’o-li must then be Khantulī on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, as we have suggested.

2 See Leyden’s “Malay Annals,” p. 20. Valentijn, who misspells the name Andelis, and Dulaurel (Journal Asiatique, 1847, p. 125) took this as an ancient designation for the whole of the island of Sumatra! Even if the form Polo Indalas occurs in Malay literature, as Dulaurel seems to imply, this ‘Indalas Island’ would merely mean the tract of the Sumatran coast comprised within the limits of Palembang territory, and nothing more.

3 See p. 519. It is interesting to notice that the author of the “Kwang-tung T’ung-chih” (published 1693), of Ch’ung-ka-la memory, states precisely that the San-fo-ch’i or Sarbasa kingdom is the old Kan-t’o-li (see T’oung-Pao for 1901, p. 125), whence we infer that it is probably from this dilettante of historical geography that the identification emanated and was adopted in Ming history (which was not concluded until A.D. 1724). If such is the case, then the identity of Palembang with the ancient Kan-t’o-li territory may be rejected at once as unworthy of credence.
this was the ancient Kan-t'o-li referred to in the records of the First Sung and Liang dynasties? As a matter of fact, we shall see presently that the term Andalas had such origin as to preclude almost every possibility of its connection with the name Kan-t'o-li; and other reasons militate against such a name ever having existed for the territory of Palembang. We are, therefore, unable, until further evidence is forthcoming, to accept the identification hit upon at the last hour by the Ming annalists.

However, we can do very well without the highly suspicious and scanty details about Kan-t'o-li, and turn to a far more trustworthy and older source—I mean the account left us by Fa-Hsien. Of course, after our conclusive demonstration of the identity of the Ptolemaic Jabadiū or Sabadiū, as well as of the Arabic Zābej, with Sumatra, it would be the height of absurdity to maintain any further that Fa-Hsien's Ya-p'o-t'i (Jabadiā or Yaca-dēš) is the island of Java, as has been hitherto almost unanimously asserted. And independently of the reasons that have led us to establish that undisputable identity, there is the fact that the itinerary itself described by Fa-Hsien, when examined in the light of sound judgment, and not wilfully perverted and misconstrued as has hitherto been done, leads to the conclusion that the Ya-p'o-t'i he touched at in the early days of the year A.D. 415 was the east coast of Sumatra, and not Java at all. Let us take a glance at it.

Fa-Hsien left Ceylon, according to what can be gathered from his account, in either September or October, 414, bound for China by the usual route through the Archipelago.

1 Although Buddhism flourished in Palembang during I-taing's time (A.D. 671-695), the glowing description drawn of the prosperity of that faith in Kan-t'o-li appears to suit better a State on the Malay Peninsula. Compare, in fact, the similar accounts in Chinese records that relate to Pan-p'en, Lan-yuhsiu, and Pe-li, which—significant particular—Ma Tuan-liu enumerates in a course with Kan-t'o-li.

2 This was rather late in the season, and the ship on which Fa-Hsien took passage must have been one of the most belated among those which usually did that journey. Mas'dī speaks of vessels leaving the coast of Omān for the East even as late as the month of Tirmah (21st June to 20th July), but adds that these were but of little value, and chanced it, so to speak, against the risks of navigation at that season.
Astern of the large merchant vessel on which he took passage, a small one was fastened as a provision in case of distress. With such an arrangement progress must have evidently been slow; say, two miles an hour or fifty miles a day on the average. Having got a fair wind they sailed eastward—mark this well, as it shows the unmistakable direction of their course straight for the Nikobārs—for two or three days (say 100-150 miles),¹ when they encountered a cyclone, and the ship sprang a leak. This untoward accident compelled them to jettison a part of their cargo and personal effects. The storm lasted thirteen days and nights, when they arrived at the shore of an island (unnamed), and, on the tide going out, they found the place of the leak. Having forthwith stopped it, they resumed their voyage. Owing, however, to the weather keeping yet cloudy, they could not take bearings for many a day. At last they were once more able to shape a correct course [eastward, naturally, see above], and went on, reaching Ya-p'o-t'i after about 90 days' sailing [say, early in January, 415]. Here, having stayed five months, Fa-Hsien took passage on another large merchantman for China [i.e. in May, with the setting of the south-west monsoon], reaching at last the coast of Shan-tung, after having weathered a violent storm, in three months [i.e. probably in August, 415].

It will be seen from the foregoing epitome that the island where Fa-Hsien's ship tarried to stop the leak, after 15 or 16 days' jolting and tossing at the mercy of the elements, cannot have been very far remote from Ceylon or the coast of India.² In September and October south-westerly winds

¹ Groeneweldt, op. cit., p. 131, has two days; but Legge ("Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms," Oxford, 1886, p. 111) says three. Even taking the last figure as the correct one, the distance travelled during this interval cannot have been anything above 150 miles.
² It cannot certainly have been one of the Nikobārs; firstly, on account of the cyclone travelling in the opposite direction to Fa-Hsien's route; and secondly, because even with favourable weather those islands could not have been reached in 15 or 16 days. It took, according to I-tsing, 30 days from Ka-ch'ou on the north coast of Sumatra, and therefore very close to (almost within sight of) the Nikobārs, to reach Nāgapaṭṭan under favourable weather (see p. 627). Even in the middle of the fourteenth century, when navigation was far speedier, it took Ibn Baṭūṭa as much as 40 days to go from Sumatra (city) harbour to
prevalent, it is true, between Ceylon and the north coast of Sumatra, which would favour the passage from the former to the latter; but at the same time cyclones are frequent, especially about October, in the southern half of the Bay of Bengal, which move either westward or north-westward. In such cases the ships exposed to their influence experience very bad weather and sea, with rain and wind of hurricane force. Now, this is exactly the weather Fa-Hsien's ship encountered; the storm he describes as a 大風, Ta-fêng, i.e. a typhoon, and moreover he speaks of rain, a characteristic of the October cyclones in those parts. There can consequently be no doubt that his ship was blown back on the east coast of either Ceylon or India, and the island at which the leak was stopped may have been some sandy islet on that coast. The mention of pirates in the sea thereabouts may help to better fix the locality. Thence Fa-Hsien's ship must have proceeded eastward to Malacca Strait by the usual route at that season, passing southward of the Great Nikobär Island, thence through Bengal passage, sighting Pulo Butong, and proceeding about midway between the Sembilan Islands and Pulo Jarak; then by the Aroas and the Great Kerîmûn to either Şâbong or Durian Strait, through which it would easily reach either the Indragiri, Jambi, or Palembang Rivers, according to the site then occupied by the capital of the Java or Yava kingdom. Here, changing ship—as his countryman I-tsing did two and three-quarter centuries later at Śrī-Bhoja when proceeding from India to China—Fa-Hsien would, in due course, resume his homeward voyage.

Kollum or Quillon. Chao Ju-kua (circa A.D. 1240) states the distance from Saun-fo-ch'î (Palembang) to Nan-p'o (Malabar) to be a little more than a month with the monsoon. (See Journal. Roy. Asiatic Soc., 1896, p. 483.)

3 Ibid.
4 This is the course also laid down in the "Muhîţ" (A.D. 1554), founded upon Arab, Persian, and Indû documents of older dates. After having passed the Nikobârs, the Sembilan group was sighted; then, working along the Malay coast, the Aroas and Parcelar Hill were passed in succession. See Reinard's Introduction to the Geography of Abulfeda, p. 437.
It would manifestly be absurd that Fa-Hsien, in order to go to China, should take the roundabout route by way of Java, especially as there is no evidence whatever as to such a remote and difficult route, requiring considerable skill in seamanship, ever having been used until the advent of European navigators in the Archipelago. I-tsing, who mentions several itineraries to and fro between India and China, never speaks of passages through Sunda Strait, nor does any Arab or Chinese author or traveller, even up to the days of Chao Ju-kua and Ibn Batūta. It is only when we come to the oft-quoted Chinese chart of about A.D. 1399 published by Phillips, that we find a route marked through Sunda Strait and thence along the whole length of the west coast of Sumatra to Acheh or Lambri, unaccompanied, however, by any sailing directions, which is a proof that it was as yet but imperfectly known and seldom used. On the contrary, the real and only route from India and Ceylon to China is laid down on the same map through Malacca Strait. I have accordingly come to the conclusion that no ship ever proceeded from India to China via Sunda Strait until the advent of the Portuguese in the eastern seas. Ptolemy's route from Ceylon to the China coast is, more or less, the one that was followed for fully thirteen centuries after him by either Arab, Persian, or Chinese vessels, with the exception that with further improved methods of navigation it became possible to

---

1 And I should have added in so far as Arab navigation is concerned, of the "Muhīt" (A.D. 1554). The Turkish admiral who is the author of that work on mediæval navigation of the Indian seas, based upon Arab, Persian, and Indi writings, cites many itineraries: but the only one he gives for Further India, the twenty-seventh in his list, is laid through Malacca Strait, and the route he describes turns to E.N.E. after Ceylon, advancing considerably into the Bay of Bengal, when a course is steered for one of the Nikobars called Sejgal, probably Ptolemy's Kholin or Salin (see p. 406), and thence for the Sembilan group in Malacca Strait (see Reinaud's Introduction to the Geography of Abulfeda, pp. 436-437). Reinaud, probably misled by his contemporary Sinologists' identification of Fa-Hsien's Ya-pô-hî with Java, seems to have conceived an idea of great superiority of Chinese navigation over that of the Arabs, and understood the Chinese junks to have followed the Sunda Strait route from a very early period, for in the same work, p. 413, he states that "les navires Arabes, à la différence des jonques chinoises, passaient au nord de Sumatra et traversaient le détroit de Malaka." Such blindness to facts has wrought much mischief and retarded our knowledge of historical and geographical science.
cross the Bay of Bengal via the Nikobars, instead of farther to the north between the mouth of the Ganjam and the Arakanese coast. It may, therefore, be safely held that the identification of Fa-Hsien’s Ya-p’o-t’i with Java is but the outcome of imagination such as we have encountered so frequently in the preceding pages.¹

As regards the length of the passage, 90 days, it should be remembered that the weather was far from favourable, and that the cyclone encountered during the first part of the journey may have blown Fa-Hsien’s ship far into the Bay of Bengal, thus increasing the distance to be travelled. It is well, moreover, to remark that I-ts’ing records 15 + 15 + 30 + 2 = 62 days for the passage

¹ In my age of faith in Sinology as applied to the historical geography of the Further Indian regions, that is to say, when I still innocently believed that our Sinologists really had discovered or identified something in the chaos of the early Chinese geographical literature relating to the countries in question, I was misled into the absurd belief that Fa-Hsien had really called on his homeward journey, as they declared, at Java. Accordingly I ventured to think, from Ptolemy’s knowledge of several islands or districts on the west coast of Sumatra, that the Sundra Strait route might have been known even in his time, and thus I was rash enough to enter it in my map and tables published with the first part of the present work. That was in 1896, the publication taking place in the year next following. Since those days of blind reliance on the results of the labours of Sinology in the direction stated, however, seven years have elapsed, during which I have had better opportunities of examining to my satisfaction the material they had worked out. The outcome of such study is well enough apparent in the preceding pages. Scarcely one out of a score or two of their identifications turned out anything like acceptable, and when it did so it proved, except in very rare instances, only approximately correct as regards either the meaning or the real location of the toponymic implied. This, be it understood, only refers to toponymics of the earlier periods, down to the thirteenth century or thereabouts, after which the accounts of European travellers as well as the local records of the countries in question rendered the task far easier for the new place-names that then came into use, and the work of our Sinologists met with a fairer measure of success, though as yet far from brilliant. For this achievement full credit is due to them, as well as for their labours in collecting not easily accessible texts and, what is of still higher importance, translating them, thus placing them within reach of the many who are unacquainted with the Chinese language. Had these good people stopped here, leaving the work of identification of the toponymics occurring in the older texts to better qualified hands, instead of suggesting haphazard equivalents, which on close inquiry prove for the most part wrong; they would have done a far greater service to science, and laid its votaries under far deeper obligations, sparing them also many a disappointment. Under such circumstances as above described, I need not say that now I entirely reject the opinion I had at first formed as regards Fa-Hsien’s route through the Archipelago, and accordingly withdraw the reference to it in the Tables, and with it the surmise that the route through Sundra Strait might have been known in Ptolemy’s time, which I do not at present think possible.
from Shih-li Fo-shih (Palembang) to Ceylon, passing by Nagapattan, under favourable weather. And further that it took the embassy from Chu-lien (Chola or Koromandel) to China in A.D. 1015, 209 days, or nearly seven months, to get from thence to San-fo-ch'i (Palembang).

The information that Fa-Hsien gives us of Ya-p'o-t'i is tantalizingly meagre, such as we would never expect from one who, like him, had resided in that country for fully five months. It does not amount to as much as two lines: “In this country heretical Brahmins flourish, but Buddhism hardly deserves mentioning.” From this we may gather that Buddhism was already practised there, although it may have been by a few people only. This is exactly what seems to have been the case in Sumatra at the period in question, judging from the ruins so far explored, and from the traditions connecting its

---

1 See p. 527.
2 Here, again, I regret having to point out, by the way, that the identification of Chu-lien with Orissa, suggested by Dr. Hirth in the Journ. Roy. Asiatis Soc. for 1896, pp. 489 seqq., is hopelessly wrong. I cannot afford to enter here into a detailed discussion of the subject, but while reserving the full demonstration of my contention for an early opportunity, I shall merely point out that Chu-lien, according to the result of my inquiry, so far from being Orissa, the empire of the Kesari dynasty, as Hirth thought, is incontestably and far more properly Chola, the Chulya country, of which Orissa became a mere dependency on or about A.D. 1015-1020. This, I may add, is made absolutely certain from the fact that I have identified the Chu-lien king Lo-ch'a-lo-ch'a, 羅荼羅 作, named by Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 574) as having sent an embassy which reached China in A.D. 1015, with Rajaraja the Great, or Rajakesarivarman, of Chola, said to have reigned from 985 to 1002. The mission was probably sent by his son, Rajendra-Cola I or Parakesarivarman, who may also, though not so far as known, have borne the title Rajaraja; otherwise the Chinese historiographers may, through some misunderstanding, have mistaken the deceased father’s name for that of the reigning son. Further, the king who sent a mission in A.D. 1033, whom Hirth was unable to identify, is Rajendra-deva or Sri Rajendra Cola; and that named Ti-wa-ka-lo in 1077 is Kothantina Cojadeva, or Kula-deva, his name being anagarammatized into Deva-Kula (Ti-wa-ka-lo) by the Sung annalists. Inability to grasp these matters has misled Dr. Hirth into vainly looking for the capital of the kingdom and its thirty-two districts all over Orissa, whereas the territory of Chola proper and that of the countries immediately adjoining it would have better rewarded his efforts.

3 Literally, “Buddha’s Law not sufficient to speak of” (Groeneweldt, op. cit., p. 132). Dr. Legge translates (op. cit., p. 115), “various forms of errors and Brahmanism are flourishing, while Buddhism in it is not worth speaking of.”
FURTHER INDIA AND

territory with Vishnavite myths, and its original colonizers with descendants of the Indu Yadas. It is true that two and three-quarter centuries later on (A.D. 671-695) I-tsing speaks of Buddhism being then flourishing at Sri-Bhoja (Palembang), the king whereof, as well as those of the neighbouring States, favoured it. But then he tells us of the Arya-mahasaaghika school having been but very shortly before his time introduced into the country, which is a sign that the latter was still passing through a phase of transition as regards the adoption of the various Buddhist tenets, which had probably begun not long before, and was just in its initial stage at the time of Fa-Hsien's visit.1

It is difficult to guess with anything like precision where the capital or principal seaport of Ya-p'o-t'i stood at the time of Fa-Hsien's visit. It may have been on either the Jambi or Indragiri river, or even further up the east coast of Sumatra, judging from the fact that the Pagar-ruyung inscription, where the Yava kingdom is mentioned in A.D. 656, occurs at the headwaters of the Indragiri, and that a district bearing the name Tanah Jawa exists to this day in the upland part of Batu-bara (3° N. lat.). I am little disposed to think that the centre of power was then already so far south as Palembang, for until I-tsing's time we do not find its ancient name, Sri-Bhoja, mentioned in any document or record, which fact is probably an indication that although the name may have

---

1 The course of religious evolution in Java seems to have run in a contrary direction. Javanese ruins are, in fact, well-nigh entirely Buddhist, and it is only in the central part of the island, to the north of Pekalongan and at an altitude of 6,500 feet on the slope of the mountain Prahu, that remains of Saiva temples have been discovered, dating at the very best not later than the seventh or eighth century. These, in Groeneveldt's opinion, point to a settlement of Saivas in that neighbourhood on the northern coast of the island (op. cit., p. 134). On Sunda Land, the western part of the island, on the contrary, Sanskrit inscriptions, Vaishava in character, have been found which are considered to date from A.D. 450 to 600. They are, in my opinion, a connecting link with ancient Vishnavite worship in Sumatra, from which the territory where they rise is merely separated by Sunda Strait. Perhaps they may be due to the earliest Indu or Indianized settlers who first crossed the strait from Sumatra and put their foot on Sundanese soil. Those who followed a century or two later on, when Buddhism had already acquired a firm footing in Sumatra, evidently brought that faith to the northern coast of the island, which has thus remained principally Buddhist ever since.
been introduced into that district from a very early period, it had not as yet attained any prominence so as to attract attention. It must have been only shortly before the time of I-tsing’s first visit to it (A.D. 671) that Śrī-Bhoja became the capital of the Java or Zābej empire; for from his account it follows quite plainly that Bārūs (P’o-lu-sz) on the west coast of Sumatra was part of Śrī-Bhojan territory, so that the latter must have comprised the whole or nearly so of the tract north from the Palembang River, corresponding practically to Ptolemy’s Iabadiū.

Having thus finally disposed of the questions connected with the location of those two difficult geographical puzzles—Ptolemy’s Iabadiū and Fa-Hsien’s Ya-p’o-t’t’i—we must for a moment turn our attention to the no less perplexing meaning and derivation of the terms Fo-shih or Shih-li Fo-shih and San-fo-ch’i, employed at different periods in the Chinese records to designate the kingdom, as well as its principal district and capital. The equivalent Bhoja or Śrī-Bhoja suggested by our predecessors in this line of research for the first term is very probably correct, although no plausible explanation as to why such a name came to be given to the country in question has been, within my knowledge, so far given; while all attempts to grapple with the meaning of the second term, San-fo-ch’i, have completely failed. We shall try to throw further light on both from the evidence we have collected.

As regards the term first mentioned in point of time, Bhoja or Śrī-Bhoja, it has already been traced by us in the Andāmāns in connection with Ptolemy’s mention of them under the name Bazakata, which, we have pointed out, very probably represents the Sanskrit toponymic Bhojakata, originally a city near the Narmadā River, founded by a brother-in-law of Krṣṇa. We have not omitted on that occasion to call attention to the possible connection between the name Bōjīg-[naṭyāda] or Bōjin-[gīś] of one of the most prominent Andāmānese tribes with Bhoja and Bhojaka, both well-known tribal names of
Western India; and to suggest that a kinship may have existed between the so far unsatisfactorily explained term Andämān—which we have found in at least one instance spelled Anthōman (Andhāman)—and Andhaka, the name of another Western India tribe closely related to the Bhojas. We then also hinted that such Bhoja and Andhaka tribes are doubtless those from whom the adventurers and colonists who first introduced the names Bhojakāta and Andhāman into the Andämān group issued, and the names Bhoja and Andhalās or Andalas (probably a corruption of Andharāṣṭra?) into the territory of Palembang. They must have been a great seafaring race, as were afterwards the natives of Palembang civilized by them; for we can probably trace relics of their name all the way from India to the remotest parts of the Archipelago, through the Bōjigs of the Andämāns, the Bhojas of Palembang, and the Baju or Baju of Borneo, Billiton, and extreme Waju in Celebes. Likewise we probably have the name borne by the Jaraea tribe in Little Andämān repeated in succession in the Saravea or Saravei nation of Western Palembang—which, we have seen, the Chinese called Hsien-liu or Ser-viu—the Sarawak district in Borneo, and the Charau or Chrāu savages of South Cochin-China. That these are not haphazard coincidences in nomenclature is evidenced by the fact of such names occurring together in different places situated along the sea-route to the Far East. I have, therefore, no doubt that if Palembang territory was called Bhoja and Andhalās or Andalas, it must have been for the reason that it was first colonized by settlers from those Western Indian tribes. An important point

1 Vide p. 393, note 3, and p. 395, note 1.
2 See also p. 229 for another Fe-shih or Bhoja country on the Annamese coast in A.D. 1007. It might have been originally a foundation of Palembang. For the Baju and their connections see pp. 366, 395, 503.
3 The Bhojas, Andhakus, Vṛṣṇis, and Kukurās are all branches of the Yādavas and kindred tribes originally settled in the Indus Valley and, later on, on the Gujarāt peninsula at and about Dvārakā, whence they dispersed all over India owing to the destruction of part of them by Krṣṇa. They are to be found even on the Ganges and in the Dakhan, but with greater frequency along the Vindhyā chain. The Rāmāyaṇa mentions them among the nations of the
not to be lost sight of is that while Bhoja in Bojakata is rendered Baza in Ptolemy’s Bazakata, so is Bhoja in Śri-Bhoja transcribed Baza in Sarbaza by the Arabs. Hence we may rest perfectly assured that Sarbaza really represents Śri-Bhoja (i.e. Palembang) and nothing else. As regards Shih-li Fo-shih, the second part of it, sounding Föt-shai, Föt-ch‘i, and Fut-sei or Futsz-zei in the various dialects, may represent some form (perhaps Bhojaka or Bhojik, Bhojika) of the term Bhoja more closely approaching to its Andāmānese corruption Bojig. I cannot, however, get behind the impression that Fo-shih is, as likely as not, a transcript of Vasai or Basai, a toponymic which we find surviving to this day, in the slightly modified form Pāsei or Pāsai, in its very territory.¹ I-tsing’s spelling Shih-li

¹ The origin of the name Pāsei, تامي (Pāsai) or مامي (Fāsī), is explained in Malay literature by one of those absurd legends we have often met with in analogous cases. The السحر مالو, “Sejarah Malāyu,” relates that Sultan Maliku-l-Sāleḥ (quondam Marah Silu), the founder of Sumatra city, upon Perlaḵ being conquered by enemies from the opposite coast (Malay Peninsula), and its population having taken refuge in Sumatra, determined to found another settlement for his sons. In the course of a hunting match across the river (i.e. the Katrea or Kerti River, and, if not, the stream to the west of it now called the Krong Pāsei), his dog, named Si-Pāsei (Śri-Pāsei), gave tongue, and the Sultan quickly flew to it. He found an elevated ground, very fine and smooth as if it had been levelled. There he ordered a nagara, or fortified city, to be founded, a palace erected, and the whole to be named Pāsei, after the Prince’s dog (see Leyden’s “Malay Annals,” p. 71). The حكایة راج فاسی, “Hikāyat Rāja-rāja Fāsī (Pāsai),” gives a similar story, but slightly different in detail, and adds that upon the building of the new city being completed the dog Si-Pāsei died. Hence the Sultan had its carcass buried there, and called the city after the name of the dog (see Marre’s “Histoire des Rois de Pasey,” pp. 43–44). The event may have taken place after Marco Polo’s visit to Perlaḵ (A.D. 1292), when this place was still an independent kingdom; and before A.D. 1309, the date at which Pāh-siiḥ (very likely Fāsī, Pāsai) is first mentioned along with Pāh-liu-pa (probably Palembang) in the history of the Yūan dynasty (see Parker in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1900, p. 132). Say, A.D. 1309, or shortly before. If, however, Pāsei be Marco Polo’s Basmar, which would appear somewhat doubtful on account of the conquest of Perlaḵ referred to above, its foundation must be placed at a date slightly earlier than 1292, say about 1290. What most concerns us in this matter is, however, the term Si-Pāsei, the alleged name of the Sultan’s dog after which the new
Fo-yu, 宝利佛遊 (Fōt-yau, Fōt-yiu), which he sometimes employs, points to some corrupted form Bhoya or Bayu, Bayau (Baju, Bajau).

After the first half of the eighth century the name Shih-li Fo-shih disappears from T'ang history, to reappear in the second half of the tenth in the annals of the Sung under the form San-fo-ch'i (San-Fōt-ts'ai, San-fut-zai), which has, in its turn, proved a crux to our predecessors. However, no corresponding change appears to take place in

foundation was christened. There can be no doubt, I think, that in Si-Pāsai or Śrī-Pāsai we have a revival, or survival, of Śrī-Bhoja, Śrī-Bhojik (Bhojika), or Śrī-Basai (or Vasāi)?, the ancient name of the famous kingdom on the Eastern Sumatran coast. The anecdote about the king's dog and its name would thus appear to be merely one of those usual yarns invented ad hoc in order to explain toponymics the origin of which proved puzzling to the later native inhabitants of this region. It would be interesting to find out whether the place-name Vasāi, now better known under the form Bassein, on the west coast of India near Bombay, is etymologically traceable to the Bhoya nation. We have already noticed its transplantation thence, undoubtedly through the agency of Indian traders and colonists, to the neighbourhood of Cape Negrais in the Bassein there (supra, pp. 48-49); and here we have very likely a repetition of the process in Pāsai or Bāsi, that becomes Pacem (a close approach to Bassein) with the Portuguese, and, may be, Basma with Marco Polo. The moot point still remaining is, whether this term Pāsai or Vasāi was transplanted here from India directly, or else indirectly, through its older prototype Bhoya, Bhojak, Bhojai of the Śrī-Bhoja kingdom. I need not say that, in view of the evidence adduced above, I am in favour of the latter alternative. For even the form Pāsi or Vāsi itself of the term seems to be very old, apart from the probable Vasī of the Chinese transcript Fo-shih. We have, in fact, a place or State Po-ch'i, 波剌 (Basei, Vasāi), in the “Southern Ocean,” mentioned as early as a.d. 655-700 in Chinese literature (see Journal R.A.S. for April, 1903, p. 370).

The only early reference to Pāsai in Chinese history seems to be that mentioned above (a.d. 1309, Chronicles of the Yüan dynasty). A very possible one, much later, is that pointed out by Parker in the China Review, vol. xxiv, p. 102, where it is stated that, according to Ming history (325, 20, 24), “in 1521 Pieh-tu-lu (Pestrello), having failed in China, ‘went for’ 巴西 [Pa-hai, in Cant. Pa-sai]. Again, from Pa-si, Malacca, to Lazon, they swept the seas,” etc. The Pieh-tu-lu alluded to here may be Botelho, Piteira, or any other Portuguese ship-captain of the time; but more likely Pestrello or Perestrello (Rafael), who is known to have had connections with China from 1516 to at least 1520. He had even been for a time a prisoner there in 1516. In 1521 he sailed from Cochin bound to China, but stopped on the way at Pedir, and took part in the subsequent ‘demonstration’ on Pāsai, where he loaded pepper (see Correia’s “Lendas da India,” vol. ii, pp. 474, 643, 645).
contemporary Arabic literature; for Edrisi, as we have seen (p. 571), in A.D. 1154, still writes Sarbaza, and so later on does Yākūt (A.D. 1218). Of course, Arab authors are, on such matters, doing little more than servilely copying each other from the ninth and tenth centuries downwards; but all the same, since their seafaring men kept up an active intercourse with the Far East until at least the twelfth century, it seems passing strange that they should have ignored a change in terminology that the Chinese had not failed to notice and to duly put on record. The inference is that either no change at all took place in the name Śrī-Bhoja for Palembang, the Chinese variant San-fo-ch'i being due entirely to a freak or a misunderstanding of the right pronunciation of the term Śrī-Bhoja on the part of later Chinese writers; or else that a change really occurred, but so slight as to be scarcely noticeable. On the latter supposition I would submit that the name of the State was changed into, or replaced at times as an alternative, by the term Seayanbhoja, which in time-honoured Indu tradition is held to be synonymous with, or, better still, a mere variant of, Bhoja and Bhojakā. In such a case the contracted form Sanbhoja of Seayanbhoja may have come into use, and in the course of time it may have gained favour over its prototype as well as over Śrī-Bhoja, the original name of the country.

On the other hand, if a radical change really did take place, then it consisted in the adoption of the term Śanbhū, a name of Śiva, as a basis for a compositum of the form Śanbhū-jā, 'the race of Śanbhū,' or Śanbhūjaya (Śanbhūjaya), 'the victory of Śanbhū,' on the lines of Kambu-jā (Kamboja), which is held to mean 'the race of Kambu,' and Kambu-jay (Kambu-jaya), 'the victory of Kambu,' applied to Indo-Chinese Kamboja. The late Rev. S. Beal's suggested form

1 See Professor Hall's ed. of Wilson's "Visṇu Purāṇa," vol. iv, p. 99.
2 See p. 204.
3 The form Kambujay or Kambojaya may be deduced from the spelling of the form Kambujay or Kambojaya may be deduced from the spelling Chien-p'u-chai (in Cantonese, Kan-pou-chai), made use of from the Wan-li period (A.D. 1573–1619) to designate Kamboja. Several chronicles and encyclopaedias have inadvertently printed the first character in the name.
Sambhoja, which would mean 'the united Bhojas,' as well as the quite untenable explanation by the well-known Professor Schlegel to the effect that the derivation of the term is from Semboja, the Malay word for the Plumeria acutifolia, which in the modified form Kemboja also gave the name to Kamboja,¹ are, of course, all guesswork; as,

¹ See "Merveilles de l’Inde," p. 174, and Young-Poo for 1901, pp. 175–176. Crawford tells us ("History of the Indian Archipelago," vol. i, p. 438) that it is in Java that the Kamboja plant (Plumeria obtusa) is called Sambhoja. Forbes Watson, in his "Index to the Names of Indian Plants," London, 1868, does in fact give Kamboja as the Malay and Sambhoja as the Sundanese names for Plumeria acutifolia. Such being the facts of the case, how does the highly imaginative Professor explain that, Kamboja being the local Palembang name for the Plumeria acutifolia, the natives should style their country Sambhoja after the Sundanese name of the plant? This could only happen through subjugation of Palembang at the hands of the Sundanese or Javanese in the tenth century or earlier, an event of which there is not the slightest evidence. The same authority (absolutely worthless as a rule in matters concerning the ancient geography and history of the Archipelago and Further India) again uniquely draws upon his inexhaustible imagination when he tells us (op. cit., p. 176): "Now we know that the latter form of Kemboja or Kamboja [sic] was given by the Malays [17] to the well-known country between Annam and Siam." How and from what sources he came to know this, the worthy Professor does not, of course, choose to disclose. What we really do know for certain is, on the contrary, that the claim to descent from a Kambu Sesayambhava was put forward by the kings of Kamboja since A.D. 947, and at that pretty early date the country is said to have been named 'Land of Kambu' after him (see p. 204). And note that such a descent is claimed retrospectively for kings of the country reigning since about A.D. 600 or earlier, so that the tradition as to the derivation of the name of the country from Kambu must go back to at least the period just stated. (See the more probable derivation of the term that I have suggested on pp. 156–157.) Further, the name Kamboja—more frequently spelled Kempa—appears in both Chăm and Khmer inscriptions since the ninth century. It has been traced as far back as A.D. 817 in that of Pô-Nagar at Nâ-trâng; and it may yet be discovered in still older dated epigraphic monuments by and bye. Under such circumstances, we must argue that Professor Schlegel must be the unique depository of some as yet unknown documentary evidence, earlier than, say, the eighth century A.D., proving that 'the Malaya' have given the name 'Kemboja' to the country we now call 'Cambodja.' If so, the Professor would do well to at once produce such evidence before the public, otherwise this latter will be entitled to take it, as many, including my humble self, already have done, that the evidence in question only
indeed, it is as a rule what has dropped from the pen of both these hard-working Sinologists anent the geography of Farther India and the Archipelago. Guesswork like this without the slightest shadow of evidence is bound to bewilder by its boldness, though convincing nobody.

Here is, then, my proof for the derivation from Saṃbhu. The Chinese chart of about A.D. 1399 published by Phillips marks an island 三佛嶼, San-fo Hsü, i.e. 'San-fo [or Saṃbhu] Islet,' opposite the mouths of the Jambi River, and between these and Lung-ya Mén (Linga Strait and Island). This San-fo islet, left, naturally, unidentified by Phillips, may be the island now called Singkep, from a village on its eastern shore, but more likely the far smaller one to the south of it, known as Pulo Berhala, which gives its name to Berhala Strait between it and the Sumatran coast of the Jambi district. No doubt the form that the

---


2 I infer this from the fact that on the coast of Sumatra, opposite San-fo Islet, the chart shows a river marked 百必, Pê-pi (Pak-pit, Bā-bi, etc.), which can be naught else than the Berba or Jambi River (a corruption of the Sanskrit पुरा = 'old'). Below it is noted the name 香港, Chiu-chiang ('Old River,' or lagoon), which Mr. Phillips, perhaps too rashly, has taken to mean Palembang. This may be correct in the sense that Jambi was part of Palembang territory, but not certainly in the sense that Palembang city is meant to be represented here, for further to the right (i.e. southwards) we find three branches of a single river shown, marked respectively Hsi-kiang or 'Western River,' Chiu-kiang or 'Old River,' and Tung-kiang or 'Eastern River.' These seem to be the principal arms of the Palembang River, now known as the Asin (or Pontiang), the Sung sang, and the Upang (or Saleh). The one after which Palembang became best known in later times to the Chinese was therefore the central of them, i.e. the Chiu-chiang, Ku-kang, or 'Old River,' corresponding to the actual Sung sang (or to either of its lateral branches, the Talang and Upang). We may gather from the above that the old local name of this river was probably Berba, of which Chiu-chiang is but the Chinese translation. It is not clear, in fact, whether the name Chiu-chiang marked below the Pê-pi or Berba (Jambi) River in the map is meant as a translation of the common name of this stream, or else as a hint that here commences the jurisdiction of the other Chiu-chiang State, which is Palembang. In the first case, we would have two districts equally called Chiu-chiang, i.e. 'Old River,' by the Chinese, viz., one on the Berba or Jambi River, and the other on a deltaic branch of the Palembang River, which branch was probably known also as Berba, Tiu, Luma, or something
term Śāṁbhū or San-fo locally assumed was, as usual, Śambhor. Originally some linga or other monument dedicated to Śāṁbhū, i.e. Śiva, may have stood there, whence the island became afterwards known by the generic designation Pulo Berhala. But its specific name was unquestionably Śambhor, for the strait or straits near it and leading from it to the Rhio-Linga Archipelago were styled, as put on record in the “Sejarah Malāyu,” the ‘Straits of Sambor.’ Though this term has disappeared, unless still represented partially and in a corrupt form in the strait now called Sabayoro, west of Singkep Island, the record of it is quite sufficient to prove that Śāṁbhū or Śambhor, the old designation of the straits leading to Palembang from the north, must have come to them from the name of their southern terminus, i.e. the Palembang district itself, which name must therefore have been Śāṁbhū, Śambhor, or a derivative of it; say, Śāṁbhū-jaya or Śāṁbhjā. Through this the Chinese term San-fo-ch‘i or Sam-bud-zai (Śam-bhor-jay) becomes thoroughly explained, for it must be remembered that the first two to that effect (i.e. a word meaning ‘old’). If so, the homonymy in question must have led to some confusion in the later Chinese records, although the mischief may perhaps not have been very considerable, owing to Jambi being then part of Palembang territory.

1 So e.g. in Kamboja, where there is an old city commonly called Śambhor or Sambor, but in the inscriptions Śāṁbhū-pura. I am at a loss to understand why Aymonier ("Le Cambodge," vol. i, Paris, 1900, pp. 308-309) also accepts the alternative reading Śāṁbhapura, which is defective, and entirely due to an oversight on the part of the lapicide in omitting the sign for the vowel u below the bh. In Khmēr it is faultily written Sambūr (= Sampūr), thus making it look like a contraction of Śāṁbhū-pura. But such is not the case, for, as shown by several inscriptions in Kamboja, Śambhor is a mere modification or inflection of the name Śāṁbhū.

2 See Leyden’s "Malay Annals," p. 34, where it is recounted that King Sangsapurba, having left Java, "set sail and traversed the sea till he arrived at a strait, when, enquiring the name of a hill which he saw in view, one of the guides answered, the hill of Lingga, and that the galley had now arrived at the straits of Sambor. The news quickly reached Bentan [Bintang] that the raja ... had now arrived at the straits of Sambor." Devie, in "Légendes et Traditions historiques de l’Archipel Indien," Paris, 1878, p. 47, prints Sambou (= Śāṁbhū) in his translation of the same story. This is a proof as to the correctness of the view we have expressed. The strait may have been called both Sambor and Sambu.
characters with which it is written are absolutely identical with those making up the name of San-fo Island. The truth of the whole matter may, after all, be that Śrī-Bhoja did not change its name at all, but that the Chinese navigators, accustomed to reach it through Šambhor or San-fo Straits, as they called them, came gradually to completely confuse this name with that of Shih-li Fo-shih borne by Palembang, thus perverting the latter into San-fo-ch’i. At all events, I trust to have made it sufficiently evident that the explanation of this puzzling term must be sought for in either of the two alternatives here set down. The second one has in its favour the fact, already noticed, that the Arabs always called that country Sarbaza down to the thirteenth century, thus giving us reason to infer that it never changed its old name Śrī-Bhoja.

Having now cleared up the mystery that has so far hung upon the onomatology of the Palembang State employed in both Arabic and Chinese sources, we are enabled to reconstruct, in its main lines, its history down to the period when it became a dependency of the Javanese empire of Mājapāhit. Such a reconstruction, possible only after the results attained through the foregoing inquiry, we offer in the subjoined sketch.

OUTLINE HISTORY OF THE PALEMBANG KINGDOM.

A.D. 671. Fo-shih or Shih-li Fo-shih kingdom = Bhoja or Śrī-Bhoja. Its capital, Bhoja, situated on the Bhoja (Musi) River, is the chief trading port with China, a regular navigation between it and Canton being conducted by a Persian merchant. Large sea-going vessels anchor at the mouth of the river. The king of Bhoja owns ships, probably for commerce, sailing between India and Bhoja. He favours Buddhism, and his capital is a centre of Buddhist learning in the Archipelago; there are more than a thousand bhikṣus. Gold is fairly abundant. Dependencies of the kingdom are: (1) Po-lu-shih (Bārūs, west coast of Sumatra); and (2) Mo-lu-yo, 15 days’ sail away (Malāyu kingdom, on the Old Strait of Singapore and southern end of the Malay Peninsula). I-ting (Takakusu, op. cit., pp. xxxiv, xl, xli).
670–673. King Ho-mi-to, 昌密多 (Gomeda, Harimedhas), of Shih-li Po-shih, sends envoys to China ("Nan-Măn Chuan"). There can be no doubt this personage is the patron of I-tsing, whom he assisted by forwarding him on to Malâyū in a.d. 672 on his own ship.

672. One of the king’s ships, with I-tsing on board, sails to India vid Malâyū, Kerti (north-east Sumatra), and the Nikobârs, reaching Tâmrâlîpti (Tamluk) in the spring of next year (673), after prolonged stays at Malâyū (two months) and Kerti.

688–695. I-tsing is staying at Bhoja, except for a brief period of six months in a.d. 689, when he takes a trip to China. (Takakusu, op. cit., pp. xxxiii–xxxvii.)

713–741. At some time between these two dates King Ho-mi-to sends new envoys, presenting two dwarfs and two Sêng-chih slaves (dancing-girls), as also singing and dancing masters ("T‘ang-shu").

770–800. At some time between these two dates, perhaps not many years before a.d. 802,³ the mahârâja of Zabej (Javaea or Javaka, residing at or near Palembang) leads an armed expedition against Knâr (south-west Kamboja), seizing and beheading the king thereof, as a punishment for some slight inflicted upon him. (Ibn Vahab, circâ a.d. 880, apud Abû Zaid; Reinauld’s "Relation," t. i, pp. 97–104.) As a consequence of this expedition Kamboja seems to have remained dependent (perhaps more nominally than de facto) on Śri-Bhoja until a.d. 802 or thereabouts (see p. 546).

851. Kalâh-bâr (west coast of the Malay Peninsula) is a dependency (or part of the empire) of Zabej (Palembang). Sulaimân (see p. 558).

864. Amongst the possessions of the mahârâja there is also Dhûtâlî or Bertâyl Island (= Bintang or Riau). Kalah Island (west coast of Malay Peninsula) belongs to the Indian Jâbah prince. Ibn Khurdâdbih (pp. 556–558). The last

1 Quoted in T’oung-Pao for 1901, p. 179. The date given is the period Hsiien-kêng, which corresponds to a.d. 670–673.

2 T’oung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 278. The clue as to the king who sent the embassy being Ho-mi-to is supplied us by the "Nan-Mânchuan" (see preceding note), which states that this ruler also sent envoys during the period K’ai-yuan = a.d. 713–741. Such being the case, the event just alluded to must have taken place in or soon after a.d. 713, for the king must have been already pretty old then (he having been already reigning in 670–673, or fully forty years before this).

3 See p. 546.
statement seems to mean that Kalah was ruled by some Peguan prince, but whether independently or not from Palembang it is not clear. From the next entry, however, it may be inferred that such a dependence existed.

880-900. The mahārāja of Zābej rules over a large number of islands, among which those of Sarbaza or Serbaza = Śrī-Boja (Palembang district); Rāmi = Lambri (north-west part of Sumatra); and Kalah. Abū Zaid (p. 559).

904. San-fo-ch'i sends envoys with tribute to China. ("Sung-shih," bk. 489.)

943. The empire of the mahārāja is conterminous with India (extra-Gangem, i.e. probably Pegu is meant). His palace is built by the edge of the 'Gold-bars Pond,' wherein tradition says he causes a gold ingot to be thrown every morning. Serira or Sarirah is one of the islands (districts) constituting his possessions, others being Zānj or Zānej (Zābej?), Rāmini, etc. Numerous Chinamen have settled on such islands (especially in the Palembang district) owing to disturbances in their country (in a.d. 878?). Masūdī (pp. 560, 561).

955. Serīrah (= Sierra-rattha or Sarawi) lies on a large fresh watercourse forming a wide estuary, penetrating some 120 miles towards the interior. There are many streets and creeks, and the dwellings are partly on shore and partly floating-houses. The waters swarm with crocodiles, which, however, are said to be harmless in consequence of a charm. Lately a king named Ser-Nātākalah was the ruler of Zābej. Captain Bozorg (pp. 564, 578).

960. King Hsi-li Hu-ta-hua-li-t'an (Gupta-hārīta, or something similar) of San-fo-ch'i sends an envoy with tribute to China. ("Sung-shih," bk. 489.) See pp. 578, 579, where I have identified this ruler with the one referred to in the preceding entry.

961. King Hsi-li Hu-ta, etc., renews his attentions to the Chinese Court (op. cit.). His envoys relate that the kingdom of San-fo-ch'i also bears the name Hsien-liu (Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 562). This is the equivalent of the term Serirah used by Arabic writers (see preceding entries). His embassy only reaches China this year, but he seems to have died in the interval, probably towards the close of a.d. 960. (See remarks on pp. 579, 580.)

1 For this and following references from Chinese literature see Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 188 et seqq.; and Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 561 et seq.
961. Towards the end of this year a new mission arrives at the Chinese Court from King Shih-li-U-ya (= Śrī Oja?), who has just succeeded to the throne of San-foo-ch'i. Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 562) calls this ruler Li-hsi-lin-nan-jih-lai, 李犀林男迷日来 (= Rṣi Raṇāṇjaya, or Hṛṣi-Raṇāṅga-rāj?).

962. The same king sends three envoys with tribute. (“Sung-shih,” loc. cit.)

971. A new mission is despatched to the Chinese Court by the same ruler, with a tribute consisting of rock-crystal and petroleum.¹

972. The homage is renewed.

974. New envoys are sent with a tribute of ivory, olibanum, rose-water, dates, and flat-peaches, white sugar, finger-rings of rock-crystal, glass bottles, and coral-trees.

975. Another mission reaches China.

980. King Hsia-ch'i, 夏池, or 達至, Hsia-chih (= Harṣa, Gāḍhī?), sends an envoy. In the course of the same year it is reported from Ch'au-chou that a foreign merchant from San-foo-ch'i has arrived in that port with a cargo of perfumes, medicines, drugs, rhinoceros horns, and ivory. (“Sung-shih,” loc. cit.)

983. King Hsia-ch'i despatches a new mission with a tribute of crystal, cotton-cloth, rhinoceros horns, perfumes, and drugs. (Ibid.)

985. The master of a ship from San-foo-ch'i reaches China and presents products of his country. (Ibid.)

988. A new envoy arrives in China with tribute. (Ibid.)

990. San-foo-ch'i is invaded by Shé-p'o (Saba or C'tacā State on the Malay Peninsula; see p. 547), and war rages apparently until a.d. 992, if not later. Tidings of these hostilities reach the envoy of 988 while returning from the Chinese capital in 990. This personage, after waiting one year at Canton, sails in the Spring of 992 to Champā, but hearing no good news he returns to Canton to ask for an imperial decree in order that his country might follow his

¹ Fire-oil, 火油, Hwe-yu, evidently petroleum obtained from Sumatra, was sent at about the same time (a.d. 954-989) as tribute by the king of Champā. It is described as capable of burning in water with redoubled vigour. (See Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 545.)
lead. The governor of Kwang-tung forwards his request to the Chinese Court, which grants it. (Ibid.)

950–1000. SARRABA (= Śrī-Bhoja) or SERIRAH (= Sirī-raṭṭha, Saravi) is the island (read 'district') on which the mahārāja resides. Faras (see p. 567).

1000. The island of SERIRAH is a dependency of China. Muḥallabi (see p. 567). From the preceding entries it may be seen, at any rate, that Śrī-Bhoja used to send regular missions (doubtless diplomatic as well as commercial) with presents to China.

1003. Two envoys arrive with tribute at the Chinese Court from King Sz-lí Chu-lo-wu-ni Fu-ma-t’iau-hua, 思離朱嘯無尼佛麻調華 (Śrī Cūḍa-marṇi Bhūmya-deva, or Bhūpa-deva). They relate that in their country a Buddhist temple has been erected, and that they come to solicit a name and bells for it as marks of the emperor's benevolence. The name is granted for the temple by an imperial decree, and bells are east in accordance with the envoys' request.

1008. King Sz-lí Ma-lo-p’i, 思離麻嘯皮 (Śrī Maruvi, Mallavi, or Maruppiyā?), sends three envoys with tribute.


1028. King Shi-li Tisch-hu-a, 室離疊華 (Śrī Deva), despatches a mission with tribute.

1077. An envoy from San-fo-ch’i arrived in China. He is one of the great panjandramos in that country, and the emperor honours him accordingly. He must have met at Court the mission from Chu-lien (Chola) that arrived there this same year. (See following entry.)

1 Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 563, says (in the translation): "in order that his sovereign may be informed" (of the delay).

2 The name bestowed upon the temple was Ch’eng-t’ien-wun-shou, 永天萬壽. Here is a good chance for local amateur archaeologists of finding out the site, and thus arriving at an exact determination of the emplacement of the old capital; for ruins of the temple must still exist, with perhaps commemorative Chinese inscriptions and other relics leading to the establishment of its identity.
FURTHER INDIA AND

1077. At this period Chu-lien (Chola, Koromandel) is stated in Sung history to have been already tributary to San-fo-ch'ı; hence a reply is sent to the Chu-lien king on strong paper, with an envelope of plain silk, instead of on gold-flowered silk, etc., as done with independent kingdoms. This subordinate position of Chu-lien in respect of San-fo-ch'ı is said to be still enduring in 1106. (See Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 586.)

1078. Envoys from San-fo-ch'ı reach China, bringing silver ingots, pearls, camphor-oil, olibanum, and other products of the country.

1080. A great dignitary from San-fo-ch'ı arrives at Canton, saying that he had the direction of affairs in his country. He brings a letter from the king's daughter to the superintendent of 1 It will be a matter of infinite surprise to our Indianists to hear, what must certainly be news to them, that the Chola kingdom that had risen to such mightiness through the exploits of Rājarāja the Great (985-1002) and his son Rājendra-Chola I could be tributary to the Zābej empire a few decades later. It is true that even during the latter monarch's reign the Western Chālukyan Jayasimha II claims to have subdued the Chola kingdom (in about 1018), and so does a few years later (1052-1060) Jayakesin I, Kādamba of Goa, which circumstances argue that the ill-fated kingdom was already tottering to its fall. In fact, shortly afterwards a revolution broke out that gave opportunity to a Western Chālukyan prince to occupy the throne; but in 1070 the Eastern Chalukyan Rājendra Chola II, King of Vengi, seized the Chola crown, and this is represented in the inscriptions to have passed down to his descendants until 1250 and further, although there is a blank of half a century in the history of the dynasty from 1165 to 1215. Nothing thus transpires from local records as to the Chola kingdom being a dependency, even as much as nominal, of the Zābej empire. Yet there can be no doubt that such a dependence must have been a fact, although we have no means of ascertaining its exact nature. The Chinese Court must have had full information on the subject, since the missions sent by both States in a.d. 1077 must have met there, so that any doubtful point cropping up as regards the relation in which they stood to each other would be easy of elucidation. We have besides other indications of Malay interference into Southern Indian and even Ceylonese affairs at a not much later period. In a.d. 1250 Malays called Jawaku in the Ceylonese chronicles, under the leadership of Prince Candrabhānu, attacked Ceylon. Though repulsed, they returned to the rescue between a.d. 1270 and 1275 under the same leader, but aided this time by Tamils from the mainland (see "Mahāvanisa," ch. 86, v. 36-37, and ch. 88, v. 62-63). From the Chinese evidence referred to above, and from the fact that the invaders are called Jawaku (as being from Java, Dawaku, or Dubag, i.e., Zābej), I consider it pretty certain that they came from Sumatra, and perhaps from Palembang. It thus turns out that the Zābej empire used not only to keep an active trade with the southern parts of India, but also exercised there a certain measure of political influence, which may have been at times very considerable, so as to weigh in one way or the other on the destinies of the petty Southern Indian kingdoms of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. It is to this interesting fact, never before this brought out in a clear and definite form, that the attention of students of Southern Indian history is called with a view to a further investigation of its details and bearings.
trade, written in Chinese characters, and presents of Bārūs camphor and cotton-cloth.

1082. Three envoys arrive at the Chinese Court bringing golden lotus-flowers containing pearls, Bārūs camphor, and other rarities.

1083. Three other envoys come with presents.

1094–1097. Between these two dates they once again make their appearance.

1106. On the occasion of the reception of envoys from P'u-kan, 棗甘 (Bukām or Pagān, capital of Burmā), the president of the Board of Rites submits to the emperor that "Chu-lien is a vassal of San-fo-ch'i." Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 586. (See entry above under date 1077.)

1156. King Hsi-li Ma-hsia-lo-shē, 悉利麻霞墀蛇 (Śrī Mahārāja), sends envoys with tribute.

1168. A new ruler (son of the preceding) succeeds to the throne of San-fo-ch'i. (See entry under date 1178.)

1172. The king of San-fo-ch'i solicits from the Emperor the authority to purchase copper for shipment to his country, and to engage Chinese artisans to convert this metal into tiles wherewith to roof his own residence (after the fashion of the Emperor's palace in China). The Emperor grants the request, but with the express condition that it be not renewed. (Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 566.)

1178. New envoys from San-fo-ch'i arrive with tribute. The Emperor, finding that the presents he usually gives in return for this tribute are rather expensive, directs them not to come to Court any more, but to make an establishment at Ch'üan-ch'ou (i.e. Zaitun) in Fuh-kien province. On this occasion the king of San-fo-ch'i has information conveyed to the Chinese Court that he has succeeded to his father's throne in the fourth year of the period Ch'ien Tao (A.D. 1168). Hence the investiture is accorded him. (Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 566.)

It is most probably owing to the decision of the Chinese Emperor making Ch'üan-ch'ou the terminus of San-fo-ch'i missions, that the Chinese annals present a blank as regards relations with this State, extending over nearly two centuries,
i.e. from A.D. 1178 to 1370. Part of this gap may, however, be filled from information left us by Chao Ju-kua, from whom we cull the following items, referring to the period between:

1205–1240. Fifteen States are subject to San-fo-ch’i, viz.:

1. Tan-ma-ling, the capital of which is surrounded with a palisade, 6 to 7 feet in width by over 20 in height, strong enough on the top for the purpose of warfare (see Toung-Pao, 1901, p. 128). The country produces camphor, etc., and manufactures gold and silver ware. Perhaps the Tambilang River, east coast of Sumatra, lat. 2° S. (see p. 601).

2. Lin-ya-sz, which can be reached in six days’ sailing from Tan-ma-ling, but there is also a road by land. Products: camphor, rhinoceros horns, ivory, etc. It pays yearly tribute to San-fo-ch’i (op. cit., p. 129). Probably the Langka or Langur River, below Perlak; if not, Langkat near Deli, Ringat in Indragiri, or Rigas, west coast of Sumatra. (See p. 599.)

3. Peng-feng, a neighbour of Nos. 4, 5, and 7 (op. cit., p. 132). Perhaps Mong-gong, North Sumatra (see p. 599). If not, Bu-bun district near Malabu, west coast of Sumatra (4° 20' N. lat.).

4. Teng-ya-neng, a neighbour of Nos. 3, 5, and 7 (ibid.). Undoubtedly Trieng-gading or Tringading, North Sumatra (ibid.).

5. Chia-chi-lan-tan or Ka-ki-lan-tan, a neighbour of Nos. 3, 4, and 7 (ibid.). Possibly Gigieng or Giheen, North Sumatra (ibid.).

6. Hsi-lan (op. cit., p. 133), 細 蘭 (Sai-lan, Se-lang). Most likely Chalang or Chellang, near Rigas Bay, west coast of Sumatra. Otherwise it may be the River Silan, forming the boundary between Asahan and Batu-bara (3° 10' N. lat.); or else either the Penu-siran River (in Jambi), or the Besilam in Langkat. Professor Schlegel speaks (Toung-Pao, 1901, p. 133) of a Silan tribe in Deli; but this is probably Silau, and not Silan. There is, moreover, a Selan River and district on the west coast of Bangka (2° 24' S. lat.).

7. Fo-lo-an, lying at four days’ sailing from Lin-ya-sz, from which it can also be reached by the land route (op. cit.,
8. Jih-lo-t'ing, 日羅亭 (op. cit., pp. 128, 134). Gold and silver wares manufactured. Very likely Telatang on a small stream, a little to the south-west of the present Jambi town, in 1° 42' S. lat.

9. Ch'ien-mai, 潛邇 (op. cit., pp. 128, 135). Gold and silver wares manufactured. I take this to be Semawi or Semawii, vulgo Semoy, on the homonymous bight, the Telok Semawi, تلخ سماوي, 'Celestial Bay (or Harbour),' into which debouches the Pâsei River, North Sumatra. The dialectal pronunciations of the above Chinese characters are To'ym-mai, Sen-mai, etc.

10. Pa-t'ua, 披沓 (ibid.). Gold and silver wares manufactured. I am inclined to think this place to be Pedada or Pidada (which is, no doubt, the hitherto unidentified Pirada of De Barros), lying between Samalângan and Pasângan, North Sumatra; although it may be Bedâgê, East Sumatra, 3° 31' N. lat. See also p. 541. N.B.—There is another Pedada on Pedada Strait, Kateman district, 0° 15' N. lat., as well as a Pedava just below Perlâk.

11. Chia-lo-hai or Ka-lo-hei, 加羅希 (ibid.). A very puzzling name. Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 486) mentions (from Sung history, under a date corresponding to A.D. 1116) a Ka-lo-hai or Ka-lo-hei, 加羅希, very likely the same place, as lying to the south of Chên-la (Kamboja), but at what distance he does not state. I have thought about the country inhabited by the Charâi tribes, but this would not answer, it being situated to the east of Kamboja. Neither would the territory of the Charau and Churu, which is in the south-east. We shall probably have to look for the name Karagi, Krahai, Gargai, Gargei, or Galagi, either on the east coast of Sumatra or neighbouring islands. On the east coast of Sumatra we merely have Rawas, Karu or Karau, Kurinchi; Gâyu and Ala or Hala on the north coast; Juru in Malacca; Hala and Gargasî in Kodah. Finally, we have Chagalelegat, the Mantâwi islanders, off the west coast of Sumatra. The last term, which is at the same time the one that answers best on linguistic grounds, especially in its possible contracted forms Chalelegat or Galalegat, unfortunately belongs to tribes situated too far away for our purpose. Gold and silver ware is
manufactured also in the State of Ka-lo-hei, according to Chao Ju-kua. After all, the place in question might be Jirulu, Jilot, or Julaq, a petty State on the east coast of Sumatra above Perlak and immediately below the Arakundur River. The Kia-lo-hei lying south of Kamboja may be a distinct State; perhaps Kalâkah, an old district of West Borneo.

12. Pa-lin-fêng or Pa-lin-p'ing, 巴林莽 (op. cit., p. 136). Probably Berembang in Deli, 3° 42' N. lat., and not Palembang, the name of which is spelled Po-lin-pang, 淡林邦, by Ma Huan, A.D. 1416 (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 197).

13. Hsin-t'ou, 新拖 (ibid.). Barbosa's Zunda kingdom, South-West Sumatra, corresponding to the present Indrapura district. (See above, pp. 450 seqq.)

14. Chien-pi, 監罇 (op. cit., p. 138), or Kam-pi, Kam-pei. "A revolting colony of San-fo-ch'i with a warlike population, probably Malays, carrying on a trade in tin, ivory, and pearls" (Journ. Roy. Asiatic Soc., 1896, p. 487). Not likely to be Kampar, the name of which is spelled 甘巴, Kan-pa, in the Chinese map published by Phillips; nor Jempa or Jampa in Pasângan, North Sumatra. There is a Kampi promontory at the north point of entrance to the Banju Asin, and a Kumpai island at the north-east end of Aru Bay, either of which may be the place intended. Kumpai is, however, in the Chinese map just alluded to, spelled 甘杯, Kan-pei, which fact condemns the latter alternative. From the fact of tin being an article of trade in the country, some district on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula may be meant (Ghirbi).


Besides, Chao Ju-kua tells us the following interesting details:—China collects together the gold and silver wares manufactured and sold at Tan-ma-ling, Jih-lo-t'ing, Ch'ien-mai, Pa-t'ua, and Ka-lo-hei (Nos. 1, 8, 9, 10, 11 above), and offers them to San-fo-ch'i (T'oung-Pao, 1901, p. 128). Every year ships go from San-fo-ch'i, Chi-t'o (Kat-to=Telok Kruit, West Sumatra?), and Chien-pi (Kampi, Ghirbi?) to Nan-p'i
(Malabar). Products are carried from Nan-p'î to Sau-so-ch'i and Chi-Lo-ta-lung (=Kâla Terong, or Trong, on the Pêrak coast?), (Journ. Roy. Asiatic Soc., 1896, p. 486). This explains the influence that the Zâbej empire had succeeded in creating for itself in Southern India. For other countries in Sumatra producing pepper, see above, pp. 450-451.

1250. Malays (Javaus), undoubtedly from the Zâbej empire, Sumatra, led by prince Candra-bhânu, attack Ceylon, but are after some difficulty repulsed. (See p. 624.)

1270-1275. A second invasion of Ceylon by the same people, but with the assistance of Tamils from the Southern Indian mainland, takes place between these two dates. (Ibid.)

1274. Sârîrah is the largest of the Zâbej islands (read ‘districts’). The sovereign, the Mâhârâja, is one of the richest potentates of [Further] India. He has his residence on the largest of such islands [i.e. Sârîrah=Sarbaza] (Ibn Sa'id). (See p. 572.)

Here intervenes a gap of well-nigh a century in all records. Both Marco Polo and Odoric seem never to have heard of Śrī-Bhoja, or else they forgot all about it.

1371. Having been summoned to allegiance by the newly established Ming dynasty, King Ma-ha-la-cha Pa-la-pu, 马哈刺札八剌 卜 (Mâhârâja Prabhu, or Purba?), sends envoys with presents. This monarch may be the Sâmsapurba of the “Sejarah Malâyu,” who reigned for some time over Palembang. (See Leyden’s “Malay Annals,” pp. 23 seq.)

The country now becomes split up into three principalities, each with its own chief.

1373. King Tan-ma-sha-na-a, 恒那沙那阿 (Dharma-sena?), sends envoys with tribute. This is principality No. 1.

1374. King Ma-na-ha Pau-lin-pang, 马那哈巢林邦 (Manuha Pralamba, Balambang), despatches, in his turn, a mission with presents. This is principality No. 2, and the term Pau-lin-pang in the king’s name may, as Groeneveldt suggests (op. cit., p. 193), stand for Palembang.

1375. King Sêng-chia-lie-yü-lan, 僧伽烈字蘭 (Sangaliura?), sends tribute. This is principality No. 3.
1376. King Dharma-sena (principality No. 1) dies, and his son, Ma-na-chê Wu-li, 麻那者巫里 (Mahārāja Bhūri, or Balei?), succeeds him.

1377. The king last referred to sends tribute, and asks for investiture as ruler of San-fo-ch'î, which is granted.

An expedition from Java (very likely Mājapāhit) completely conquers San-fo-ch'î, and its name is changed (by the Chinese) to Chiu-chiang (Kau-kong or Ku-kang). From this period dates the subordination of Palembang to Javanese rule, and its decline as a centre of trade.

In dealing with subsequent events under the date A.D. 1406, when two Chinese chiefs are mentioned, of whom one ruled at San-fo-ch'î (?) and the other at Ku-kang, Groeneveldt (op. cit., pp. 195 and 200) argues that San-fo-ch'î and Ku-kang (i.e. Palembang) must have been two different places. Palembang, he proceeds to say, was called "Ku-kang, 'the Old River,' to distinguish it from Jambi, where probably the princes of San-bo-ts'ai [San-fo-ch'î] established their capital, after they had been driven away from the old one by the Javanese; this name, 'the Old River,' given by them to the river of Palembang, implies that they were familiar with it long since, and that it had been visited by them during their previous trade, which we know had always been carried on at San-bo-ts'ai." I feel bound to observe, however, that in the first place it does not appear at all clearly from the Chinese account translated by Groeneveldt that one of the chiefs in question ruled exactly at San-fo-ch'î; the context plainly shows that he merely ruled over "part of the country" (of San-fo-ch'î). Secondly, we have seen (p. 617) that the name Chiu-chiang or Ku-kang ('Old River' or 'Old Lagoon') was almost certainly also given to the Berba (= Pūreä, i.e. 'old,' 'ancient') branch of the Jambi River, the proper name for which—or at any rate for its upper portion—is Tambesi. In the case in point, therefore, Ku-kang may mean either the territory on the Berba, i.e. Jambi, or that on the Sung-sang, i.e. Palembang, although it most likely applies to the latter. The other chief may
have ruled over any other part of the country. But quite apart from this there seems to be no question that, as we have repeatedly pointed out, the capital of the country must have stood in the early days, and maybe even during later periods, on the Jambi River. First of all, we have the evidence of the ancient remains (images, etc.), to which we had occasion to call attention (p. 601), on that stream. Then various circumstantial indications, among which is the fact that gold, for which the Śrī-Bhoja State became so famous, is almost exclusively found, at any rate in largest quantities, in districts situated on or about the upper tributaries of the Jambi River, namely, Līmun, Bātang-Āsei, Pangkalan-Jambu, Kurinchī. Further, the peculiarity that the name itself of the stream, Tambesi, is not very dissimilar from the Chinese transcript San-fo-chʻi or Sam-bu-tai, to which it may, as likely as not, have given origin. And, last but not least, the statement, though by no means absolutely reliable, of the Ming historians, that at a later period the place where the first chief of the country (had) lived was called Chhan-pei (= Jambi?). ¹ If this identification is correct this would be the first instance in which the name Jambi, جمبي, appears in Chinese history, unless we consider the same toponymic to be alluded to several centuries earlier in what is represented in Sung annals to be merely a title for the kings of the San-fo-chʻi country. ² Apart from this still doubtful point, it seems strange that the name of a district which was, like Jambi, so important a centre of trade and civilization, should have been suffered to remain unrecorded for so long a period, not finding even a place in the detailed list of the fifteen districts subject to San-fo-chʻi drawn up by Chao Ju-kua. There is, of course, some justification to be found for this silence in the argument that Jambi, from its lying in such close proximity to Palembang, was likely to be confounded with the latter; but the real reason seems to be that the connection between the two States was very probably far more intimate than it has

¹ See Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 196.
² Ibid., p. 188.
been hitherto supposed. We are inclined to believe, in fact, from the various indications we have met with in the course of the present inquiry, that Jambi was in the early days the capital of the Śri-Bhoja State, or at any rate of the Zābej (Java or Javaka) Empire, which was later on—at what precise date is still to be ascertained—transferred to the territory of the newly rising, younger constituted district of Palembang. And at a still remoter period Jambi must have formed the advance post of Indū civilization towards the southern part of the Archipelago, and withal the southern limit of the territories settled by the Java or C’hawa race. Thus Ptolemy’s conception of a Iabadiū or Sabadiū stretching no farther southward than the Jambi district seems, in the light of all evidence now at hand, sufficiently justified.

It now remains for us to add a few words in explanation of the various forms that the name Java and derived or cognate terms have assumed in the records and traditions of different nations as applied to Sumatra or part of its territory. To the principal of these forms allusion has already been made; but it will be well to review them here all together. The prototypes of them are, as we have shown, Jave, C’hava, Sava, Yave, Dava, with their adjectival derivatives Javaka, Sava, Dava, and Javana, Yavana, etc.¹ All these correlated terms have been imported from the Indo-Chinese mainland to Sumatra by the nation that bore them as its names, the so-called Mōn-Annam—better to say Mōn-Khmer—race. The knowledge of these facts, for the first time brought to light in these pages, renders the toponymics we propose to examine quite easy of comprehension; whereas the ignorance of the same facts made such toponymics distressing puzzles to our predecessors.

¹ "Rigg says this [Jāve] Sundanese word [sic !?] is the same as Yavana, the Hindoo word for Greeks or 'foreigners'" (China Review, vol. xx, p. 156). We now know better.
INDO-MALAY ARCHIPELAGO.

Starting first with Ptolemy’s Iabadiū or Sabadiū, there can be no doubt that these terms represent the vernacular Indu forms Yaba-diū and Sab-a-diū of, respectively, Yava-dipa (or Yava-devpa) and Sae (or Java)-dipa (or -devpa).

Fa-Hsien’s Ya-po-t’i (Ya-ba-dei, Ja-ba-dai, Ya-ba-che) stands for either Yaba-diū, Jabadiū, or Yava-deś, Java-deś. In the last syllable t’i, di, che of the compositum, we already detect traces of a softening tendency towards a palatal ji, je, ja, if not of a guttural g or k, which we shall find later on in Zābej, Dabag, and Javaku.

We next come to the Arabic Zābej (Sulaimān, a.d. 851), which should perhaps be more properly read Zābaj. This may represent either Jaeva, Jaevjā (the Java race or people), or Jawaka, a derivative of the collateral prototype Davaša or Dāvaka, known since at least the fourth century a.d.,¹ which became in later ages exemplified in the Syriac Dabag² or Zabag, the Persian Javeka, and the Sīmhelese Javaku. Of the absurdity of the suggested connection between Zābej and Śrī-Bhoja I have already spoken; it absolutely cannot be entertained.

It is with Ibn Khurdādbih (a.d. 864) that we arrive at the fairly correct spelling Jābah, lost since Ptolemy’s time. His example is followed later on by Edrisi (a.d. 1154), Ibn Sa’īd (a.d. 1274), and others. Yākūt (a.d. 1218), Abū-l-Fedā (a.d. 1321), and Ibn Baṭūta (a.d. 1345–1346), however, go still further and present us Sumatra under the name of Jāwah, which had already been made known by Marco Polo (1292) under the form Java (the Less).

But it is not only in foreign literatures or traditions that we meet with such names for the island of Sumatra and

¹ See p. 57.
² The term Dabag occurs in the Syriac MS. published in the “Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementina Vaticana” by Joseph Simon Assemanus, vol. iii, pp. 99–999, with a Latin version. The MS. was written in a.d. 1533. It is therein stated that in 1503 the Patriarch Elias charged four Fathers to proceed to the country of the Indies and to the islands of the sea that are within Dabag, and Sin, and Masin. There can be no doubt that Dabag here stands for Davaša or Dāvaka, i.e. the ancient Zābej or Zābaj empire centreing in Sumatra.

In Rashidu-d-Din (a.d. 1310) occurs the form Zārebaj (= Dārea, Dāveaka), which we probably find exemplified in Sarawak (W. Borneo), and which is in any case a modification of al-Birūni’s Zabah or Zabaj (a.d. 1031).
its Mōñ-Khmēr descended, i.e. ‘Malay,’ population that immigrated to it during the old days. We find the same terms on the very soil of the island applied by the aboriginal tribes to the same ‘Malay’ population; and again we see them employed among neighbouring nations on the Indo-Chinese mainland and even farther, to designate the island itself as well as the race that early settled on its coasts. To the almost certain fact of Sumatra having been the birthplace of the legend as regards the origin of its name Yava- or Jawa-deipa, which passed on thence to Java and came to be applied even to other islands in that neighbourhood,\(^1\) reference has already been made. It is one link in

---

\(^1\) The first undoubted mention of the island of Java under the name Jawa that I have so far met with occurs in the chronicle of Pāsei (see Marre’s transl., pp. 87, 89 et seq.), compiled certainly not earlier than the fifteenth century. It also appears in a chronicle of the kings of Polo Percha (Sumatra, more properly Menangkabau) published in the “Malay Miscellanies,” vol. ii, Bencoolen, 1822. This second document is certainly of no earlier date than the one first referred to. The oldest local mention occurs in an inscription now in the Museum at Batavia, published by Mr. Holle, and dated Saka 654 = A.D. 732. The name here takes the form Yava: “Deipavarain Yavakkhaya,” i.e. “the noble island called Yava.” I strongly doubt, however, that the whole island of Java is here implied. Its eastern part alone is almost certainly meant.

As regards the application of the name Jawa to other islands besides Java, the following notes may be of interest:

A.D. 1440 eireo.—Nicolò Conti mentions two Javas which lie within one hundred miles of each other, and at one month’s sailing distance from the continent, towards the east. They are:

1. **JAVA MAJOR**, 3,000 miles in circumference. Usually identified with Java, but which I think undoubtedly to be Borneo, for the author says that thence he went his course “westward to a maritime city called Ciampa [Champa, i.e. Bah-Angwé or Kwi-nôn]”; see, moreover, next entry.

2. **JAVA MINOR**, 2,000 miles in circumference = Java. (See Major’s “India in the Fifteenth Century,” part ii, pp. 15-17.)

1450.—In Frà Mauro’s planisphere we find marked three large islands, viz.:

1. **SUMATRA**, with *Maro Toprobonce*.

2. **JAVA MAIOR** = Java the Greater = Borneo.

3. **JAVA MINOR** = Java the Less = Java. (See Zurla’s “Marco Polo,” etc., Venezia, 1818, facsimile of Frà Mauro’s plan.)

1516.—Duarte Barbosa mentions in his relation:

1. **SUMATRA**.

2. **BORNEO** = Borneo.

3. **JAVA MAJOR** = Java.

4. **JAVA MINOR**, so called, he states, by the Arabs and Persians, while by the natives it is termed Ambaba. N.B., a place called Ampanas is on the west coast of Lombok; but either Bālī (*Nusa Kambangan*) or Madura (*Nusa Antara*) may be meant here; see next entry. (Ramusio, vol. i, f. 318 verso and 319 recto.) I have since noticed, however, that Antonio Galvano (A.D. 1555), having mentioned Bālī beyond Java, proceeds: “and then
the chain of circumstantial evidence proving that, of all the islands of the Archipelago, Sumatra was the first one to bear the name Java, and the only one properly entitled to be recognized under such an appellation in all the accounts of the ancient travellers down to at least the end of the thirteenth century. The last links in the chain just referred to we are now going to give as a conclusion to our inquiry. They are the evidence of the population itself of Sumatra, as well as of their neighbours; the voice of over half a dozen nations and tribes, who unanimously bear witness that Sumatra was the original, the true Java, and that it was so even long after the present Java had borrowed

[they] came also unto other called Aujaut, Cambaba, Solor " (Hakluyt, iv, 423). Here a cedilla has doubtless dropped from Cambaba, which should thus read Çambaba, meaning Sambawai. Hence it is possible that Barbosa's Ambaba may stand for Çambaba, i.e. Sambawai.

1521.—Pigafetta, after mentioning Sumatra and Java Major, states:

Java Minor lies at half a league from Java Major, and is as large as the island of Madeira (Madeira). Hence, either Madura or Bali is meant here. (Ramusio, op. cit., fol. 369 recto.)

1576.—Girolamo Porro, in the map attached to Poreacchi's book, p. 189, marks:
1. Sumatra, which he does not name, although making it easily recognizable from the various kingdoms mapped there, viz., Çamatra, Pedir, Pazer (Pasai), etc.
2. IAVA MAJOR = JAVA.
3. JAVA MINOR = Borneo (Burna = Burnei, Brunei, is marked on it). This he makes smaller than Gilolo, owing to his following, I believe, Massimiliano Transilvano's views (see Ramusio, vol. i, p. 351).—Poreacchi's "L'Isole piu famose," etc., Venetia, 1576.

1595.—Prévost, quoting authors of the period, says the island usually called Java is sometimes styled the Great Java, in order to distinguish it from a neighbouring island termed the Little Java, or Bali. n Hist. gén. des Voyages," vol. viii, Paris, 1750, p. 154.

It will thus be seen that the terms Great Java and Little Java have been indiscriminately applied to different islands at various times, according to the views of the several travellers; or, putting the results in formula shape, we obtain:

1. GREAT JAVA = Java (M. Polo, 1292); Borneo (Conti, 1440, and Frà Mauro, 1450); Java (Barbosa, 1516, and Pigafetta, 1521).
2. LITTLE JAVA = Sumatra (M. Polo, 1292); Java (Conti, 1440, and Frà Mauro, 1450); Bali, Madura, or Sambawai (Barbosa, 1516, and Pigafetta, 1521); Borneo (Porro, 1576); Bali (1595).

It is not at all exact, therefore, to say, as Cordier sweepingly puts it, that "toute le monde sait aujourd'hui qu'il y a eu . . . . deux Java, Java mineure, cette même Sumatra, et Java majeure, Java même" ("L'Extrême Orient dans l'Atlas Catalan," p. 42). This is simply misleading for "toute le monde"; hence, the reason for the above little enquiry, which, though by no means exhaustive, will throw some light into this dark corner of medieval geography.
from it her name, along with the traditions attached thereto. Here, then, is the evidence in question, which, for facility of reference, I subjoin in a tabulated form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The 'Malays' of Sumatra are called</th>
<th>By whom.</th>
<th>Authorities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janijs (=Jânyjin, plural of Jâwë).</td>
<td>Themselves ... ...</td>
<td>De Barros, Decada iii, lib. v, ch. 1 (a.d. 1553).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jâw (=Jâvâ) ... ...</td>
<td>The Battak ... ...</td>
<td>Van der Lith, &quot;Merveilles de l'Inde,&quot; p. 238.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daena (=Đava) ... ...</td>
<td>The natives of Nias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javaku (=Javaka) ... ...</td>
<td>The Ceylonese ... ...</td>
<td>Sinhalese chronicles (circa a.d. 1270-1280).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'hevâ (Ch'HAVâ, Javâ) ... ...</td>
<td>The Khmërs ... ...</td>
<td>Leclère, &quot;Contes et Légendes,&quot; Paris, 1895, p. 306; and other writers on Kamboja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chheor (=Javaka) ... ...</td>
<td>The Annamese ... ...</td>
<td>Bonet's &quot;Dictionnaire Annamite Français,&quot; Paris, 1899, t. i, p. 66; and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'â-vâ (Ch'hâvâ, Jâvâ).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'â-vyâ (Jâvya, Jâvâ).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'heovâ (Jâvâ) ... ...</td>
<td>The Siamese ... ...</td>
<td>Khun Luang Hâwat's chronicle, p. 158 (circ. a.d. 1768); and other Siamese records.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I may add, moreover, that the Malays of Menang-kabau, Central Sumatra, are termed Ch'hevâ-kra bei by the Khmërs, whereas those of the Malay Peninsula are called, as with the Siamese, Malâyâ,¹ which is, as we have seen, the proper name of the territory they inhabit.

And the Javanese, it will now be asked, the fortunate inhabitants of the 'true Java' so dear to the imagination of Sinologists and Arabists, what are they designated? Well, I am sorry to say that until a very recent period the Indo-Chinese nations had no name for them, nor for their island either—a most ominous sign that they had not the honour, until very lately, of becoming acquainted with either the one or the other. It is only from the last two centuries or so that the Khmërs had to invent for them the distinctive designation of Ch'hevâ Yavâ.² As regards

² Leclère, op. cit., p. 306.
their delightful island, all they learned were the names of some of its paramount States, such as, for instance, Kalāpū (= Sunda-Kalāpa district), Jakatra (= Jakarta), later on Batavia, founded 1619, and Mataram.1 Intercourse between Champā and Java commenced somewhat earlier (cērcă a.d. 1380–1390),2 but it is very doubtful that the Chăm ever knew that island under any other name than that of the State—Mājapāhīt—with which those relations were established. In conclusion, I trust to have made it pretty clear that the Island of Java and the Javanese did not become known, if at all, to the neighbouring nations on the Indo-Chinese Peninsula until the end of the thirteenth century and later; and then not under the names of Java or Jāva people, but under those of the Javanese kingdoms to which they belonged. Further, that the terms Jāva, Javaka, Šava, Dava, Cavaka, C'havā, etc., have always been understood, not only by the people of Sumatra or of its borderlands, but by all nations of the Indo-Chinese Peninsula and even Ceylon, to mean the Mōn-Khmër descended inhabitants of Sumatra—the so-called ‘Malays’—and, by analogy, the Island of Sumatra itself, which, even by the Malays on the opposite coast of the Malay Peninsula, was, for that very reason,

1 Jakatra is first mentioned in the form Yaikatrā in the Siamese chronicle of Khun Luang Hāwat, p. 158 (date about 1750), as being then in amicable relations with the country. This was, of course, already the period of Dutch rule there. Mataram, the realm in the south-east of Jāva, is referred to a century earlier, a.d. 1653.

No mention of the former mighty empire of Mājapāhīt occurs in either Siāmese, Khmër, Peguan, or Burmese records, although, as we have seen, the Javanese poem “Nagara-kretāgama” of the fourteenth century tells us how that State was then in friendly relation with Ayuthia, Ligor, Kamboja, and other kingdoms on the Indo-Chinese continent. There may be a good deal of poetical fiction and exaggeration in this statement, although some measure of truth no doubt underlies it. All the same, the intercourse in question must have been very slight, since it left no trace in the history and traditions of these peoples. These last, no doubt, confused in their minds the Javanese with the Jāwas of Sumatra. As regards Siām, however, rather close relations must have existed between at least her possessions on the Malay Peninsula (Ligor, etc.), if not her capital Ayuthia and Mājapāhīt; for in 1397 China invites Siām to use her influence with Java (Mājapāhīt) to induce the latter to keep her newly acquired vassal San-fu-chî (Palembang) quiet. (See Gröneweldt, op. cit., pp. 194–195.)

2 See Leyden’s “Malay Annals,” p. 209. The date is my own rectified one.
called the 'Country of Jāwā,'\(^1\) To this day a Sumatra wind is called an Angin Jāwā, i.e. 'Jāwa [= Sumatra] wind,'\(^2\) by the Singaporeans and the natives of the Straits generally; and benjoin, which is certainly not a product of Java, but of Sumatra, is accordingly termed Lubān Jāwā.\(^3\) We thus see that from Ptolemy's days down to very modern, nay, even recent times, the name Java for Sumatra (but more properly for the race that very early settled on it from the Indo-Chinese mainland, can be traced in an almost uninterrupted sequel. It now remains for those who, after a perusal of the overwhelming mass of evidence we have adduced above, still hold a brief for that "Pearl of Islands, Java," to prove their own thesis—not by mere airy speculations, but by substantial and well-authenticated evidence, as we have been doing throughout the preceding pages.

Having thus endeavoured, to the best of our ability, to throw as much light as possible on the principal and perhaps most ancient appellation of Sumatra, it would seem to us to be guilty of an unpardonable omission were we not to say, by way of conclusion, a few words on the names after which

---

\(^1\) This designation appears in the Kedah Annals, ch. 13. Colonel Low (in the *Journal of the Malay Archipelago*, vol. iii) translates the passage where this allusion occurs: ""Country of Jāwā, otherwise Acheh,"" thus giving rise to the wrong impression that the Acheh district alone was implied under that connotation. But the true spirit of the sentence is evidently: ""the country of Jāwā, i.e. Acheh [and neighbouring districts]."" Acheh was at the time a very extensive State, embracing the whole coastline of the northern part of Sumatra.

\(^2\) In A.D. 1612, as evidenced by a letter of its Sultan (published in the *Journal Straits Branch R.A.S.*, No. 31, July, 1898, p. 123), its dominions extended as far down as Palembang on the east coast and Bengkulu (Bencoolen) on the western. Interpreted in such a spirit, the above allusion perfectly agrees with Ibn Batūta's statement calling Sumatra the ""Country of Jāwā,"" باذلجاودة، as well as the ""Island of Jāwā,"" جزيرة جاجراودة. (See Defrémery and Sanguinetti's transl., t. iv, pp. 224 and 228, text.)

\(^3\) See the *China Review*, vol. xx, p. 156. This wind Dr. Little—and Dr. Denny, quoting him (""Descriptive Dictionary of British Malaya,"" p. 167) —believe to be so called from the Island of Java, notwithstanding the fact that, as Denny himself acknowledges, it is a south wind, is unhealthy, and is felt at times even in Penang and Province Wellesley, thus having perforce to cross all over Sumatra to get there!!

\(^4\) Crawford explicitly declares (""History of the Indian Archipelago,"" vol. i, Edinburgh, 1829, p. 518) that ""Borneo and Sumatra are the only countries [in the Archipelago] which produce it."" Why, then, was the term Jāwā applied to it?
either the island itself or the most noted parts of it have been known at various times to its own people, as well as to the neighbouring Malays on the opposite coast of the Peninsula and to foreign nations, including those of the Western world. Such names, for the first notice of which the date could be ascertained, will be given hereafter chronologically arranged in a tabulated form; here we shall deal first with those the birth-date of which is so far either undetermined or but vaguely known.

The following are the designations applied by the Malays on the Peninsula to the various parts of Sumatra:—

1. Tānah Jāwī, تاناه جاوي = the 'Country of Jāwī' (Kedah Annals, ch. 13); a name, if not for the whole of the island, at least for the northern half, or more, of it. Date, c.ired fifteenth or sixteenth century A.D.

2. Pulu Andalas, پولو انداز, The Andhala, Andhaka, or Andhra Island'; or, simply, Andalas, Indalas (see p. 612). ("Sejarah Malāyū," and Leyden's "Malay Annals," p. 20.) Date, about fourteenth century. This is said to have been the name then, or before that, applied to the territory of Parakumbang or Perlambang, the present Palembang, نكرى تلمايه.

3. Pulo Percha, پولو فرچ, the 'Guttapercha (or, more correctly, Getah-Percha) Island'; from Percha, Fercha, the Persian word for a rag, a remnant of stuff.1 Dularier, in Journal Asiatique, 1847, p. 125.) Date, unknown.2 Newbold ("Straits of Malacca," London, 1839, vol. ii, p. 222) identifies Pulo Percha with the Jambi district.

---

1 On the still much discussed etymology of the term Pulo Percha Dr. Rost appends the following editorial note to p. 88 of the "Essays relating to Indo-China," 1st series, vol. i: "According to Van der Tuuk ('Malay Dict.,’ 1880), Pulo Percha, 'the gutta-percha island': according to the Abbé Favre and Professor Pijnappel, in their Malay Dictionaries, percha is i.g. morta, 'the inhabited world.' This opinion was first propounded by Van der Tuuk in his 'Batakseh Woordenboek' (1881), s.v. mora." Colonel Low, in the Journal of the Malay Archipelago, vol. iii, adheres to the first view, and adds that Pulo Percha is the name still applied, by the people to the eastward, to Sumatra.

2 The name Pulo Percha (for, apparently, the northern part of Sumatra) first appears, to my knowledge, in a Malay MS. on the kings of Pulo Percha in the possession of the Sultan of Indrapura (south-west coast of Sumatra), from which Sir Stamford Raffles compiled the account published in the "Malay Miscellanies," vol. ii, Bencoolen, 1822. The same name also occurs in the chronicle of Pāṣe (see Marre’s transl., pp. 99, 102), where it appears to apply to the territory of Menangkabau. The Kedah Annals (ch. 2), however, speak of "Achū ḫ on the sea-coast of Pulo Percha."
4. Pulo Mas, the 'Island of Gold,' and not 'Golden Island' as it has been lyrically suggested in order to identify it with the classical Suvarṇadīvīpa, which, we have shown, is far more probably the Malay Peninsula. This designation must refer in particular to the Jambi district, the most noted for the precious metal. Date, unknown.1 Newbold ("Straits-

1 I-tsing (A.D. 671-695) twice refers to Śrī-Bhoja (Palembang or Jambi, or both) as Chin-chou, 金洲, the 'Island of Gold,' and not 'Gold Isle,' as it has been hitherto assumed (see Chavannes, op. cit., p. 37, note; p. 181, n. 2; and p. 186). His commentator Kāśyapa (eighth century) identifies Chin-chou with 金ANDING, Chin-lin (Kam-tun) or Chin-ch'ên, 金陳 (Kim-chin), the silver-producing country situated at some 2,000 li (circular 400 miles) to the west of Fù-nan, that we have shown (p. 164) to correspond very probably to Hwên-tsang's Kāndalākā and to be therefore situated on the upper part of the Malay Peninsula. I should not think, after all, that Kāśyapa is right in his suggestion, for I-tsing refers unquestionably to Śrī-Bhoja by his term Chin-chou, and not to Chin-lin, with which he was acquainted, as evidenced by the fact that he mentions it by name (see Takaku, op. cit., p. 17). We must accordingly conclude that Palembang, more probably Jambi, was already known in I-tsing's time, i.e., the seventh century A.D., by some name meaning the 'Gold-bearing District' or 'Island of Gold.' The question is now to find out what such a name was like. Was it Pulo Mas? I hardly think this designation had already sprung up into being then, although it is possible. My impression is rather that the term Andala, Andara, Andhra, or something similar, which we are told was the old name borne by that district, is what means—or was taken to mean—'Gold-bearing District' or 'Island of Gold.' Let us remember that Conti distinctly states (circa A.D. 1440) Andamania (or Andâmân) to mean the 'Island of Gold.' He may have laboured under a misunderstanding, or he may be correct for all we know. We have noticed various legends as regards the connection of the Andâmâns with the precious metal (see pp. 389 et seq.), and we have already laid stress on early connecting links, historical and otherwise, that seem undoubtedly to have existed between the Andâmâns and the Śrī-Bhoja district on the east coast of Sumatra. We have even drawn attention to several striking homonyms detected between the toponymies of the two places, one of which is that of Andâmân or Anthôman with Andala or Andhalas, the old name of Palembang (see pp. 393, 395, and 612). It is therefore not altogether impossible that the root Andā, Anthô, Andal, Andar, etc. (man being but a suffix common to many a place-name in the Archipelago, see p. 419 above, perhaps identical with the Sanskrit mana or mâna occurring, e.g., in Varadhamâna), may have had, in some of the early languages prevailing in this region, the meaning of 'gold,' or was ascribed such a signification. It is worthy of notice that in the Môn tongue the word for 'gold' is precisely thô, the very second portion of the root anthô in Anthô-mân. Such being the case, there would be nothing strange if the actual form anthô were ultimately discovered in some of the Môn-derived dialects spoken on the Malay Peninsula, the Nikobars, or Sumatra. If so, the above suggestion would be confirmed in fact, and Conti shown to have been right.

Postscriptum.—Gold is Tsô in Red Karen speech; Tsô or Tô in allied dialects. It is very remarkable that it is called Halâwane in Asilulu (Amboyina) and Idrârama (cf. Idrâlas, Idrâlas) in Mâkâ (Eastern Africa). Crawfurd writes Halâwane, of which the term Lawang for cloves = gold fruit or flower,

5. **Serrang** (Sābrang, Sābārang) = ‘On the other side,’ ‘Across the Straits’; commonly applied to the part of the east coast of the island lying opposite the Malay Peninsula. Date, unknown. (See Swettenham’s Malay–English Vocabulary, London, 1887, p. 101.)

6. **Menang-Kabau** (or *Kerbau*), مَنْعِقْ كَرْبَو, the country of the ‘Vanquished Buffalo.’ This only applies to the Menangkabau State, the name being given to it in memory of a combat between a buffalo from Mājāpāhtit sent to challenge its congeners in Menangkabau, in which the Menangkabau came off victorious. This must have occurred in *circa* 1377–1380 A.D. The former names of Menangkabau are stated to have been successively: Tanjung Bunga, تَنجِوجَ بُنْغَا, the ‘Cape of Flowers’; and Pāgar-rāyang, ناَگُ رَوَيْعَ, the ‘Fence of Rāyang (trees).’

7. **Takon-Bāpis**? (Tekong-b.?), a very doubtful one given by Leclère (op. cit., p. 297), without quotation of his authority, said to be applied to Sumatra (more probably part of it) because “it emerges [or emerged?] from the sea.”

he says, is probably an abbreviation (‘Hist. Ind. Arch..’ vol. i, p. 498, Edinburgh, 1820). In Canarese ‘gold’ is *Honu*, whence the Hindi *Hīn* = a gold pagoda (coin); and this may have been connected, in the popular fancy, with *Humimān* or *Hanumān*, a supposed designation for the Andāmāns.

1 See the story in the second volume of the “Malay Miscellanies” above referred to; also in Marre’s “Histoire des Rois de Pasey,” Paris, 1874, pp. 103 and 125–127. Either this story is a fiction or the event must have taken place several years before A.D. 1375, for at the latter date the Catalan map gives *Magna Canalij* as an alternative designation for Sumatra, which puzzling term, we have pointed out (p. 422), is almost undoubtedly a corrupt rendering of *Menang-kerbau* or *Menang-kabau*. This State is moreover, as we shall see directly, mentioned in the Chinese map published by Phillips and drawn up *circa* A.D. 1399.

2 The other name *Saborna* referred to by the same author as being applied to Sumatra by the Arabs (here again without citing the source, which seems, however, to be Malte-Brun, t. iv, p. 255, or some compilation based thereon) is, no doubt, Edrisi’s *Sabornah*, *Sūmānah*, etc., Island (see above, p. 574), which, we have shown, can hardly be Sumatra. As regards the term *Takon* (or *Tekong*?), if not chimerical, it may be connected with the *Tekang* clan, one of the branches of the Simbiring tribe of the Battak, east coast of Sumatra. These *Tekang*, as well as the neighbouring *Pandiya* (or *Pändya*, *Pāṇḍu*, *Pāṇḍavā*?), I am inclined
8. Tānah Palembang, so called by the Javanese according to Crawfurd ("Hist. Indian Arch.," p. 323). This name, however, can only imply the Palembang district.

We must now turn to the term Sumatra. About the origin and first employment of it as a general name for the whole island there still exists no little misconception.\(^1\) It is beyond doubt that such a term sprang into being with the foundation of the city of Sumatra or Samudra in circa 1270 (see p. 613),\(^2\) which stood on the left bank of the Krung Pāsai (or Pāsei River), at some five miles from the sea (Telok Semawī Bay). The derivation of the name given in the "Ṣejarah Malāyu" from Semūt-rāja, سموث راج,

to identify with the Pen-t’ou or Pun-t’ou, 邾斗, 斐斗, and Tu-k’un, 都昆, or Tu-chūn, 都真, referred to in Sui history (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 511) as being situated across the Chin-lin Bay in a southern direction and at 3,000 li (circa 600-700 miles) from Fu-nan (Kamboja), and therefore on the east coast of Sumatra. See for further remarks infra.

---

\(^1\) Misconception undoubtedly, when in such modern and scholarly works as e.g. the "Essays relating to Indo-China" we find (2nd series, vol. ii, p. 50, n.) passages like the following: "Samudara, the ancient name of Pasey [? !], which occasioned the whole island to be called by the Portuguese [sic], who sailed with Arabic pilots, Sumatra, a name with which the natives, not used to mix with Europeans, are not acquainted." It must be admitted that this is distinctly misleading, for not only Samudara was not the ancient name of Pāsai (which was founded after it), but the name Sumatra is recorded for the whole island, nearly three-quarters of a century before the advent of the Portuguese, by Nicolò Conti, who states that the island "is called by the natives Siamuṭhāra [Shamudara]." (See Major’s "India in the Fifteenth Century," part ii, p. 8.) Reinaud says (Intr. to the Geogr. of Abulfeda, p. 409), but without quoting his authorities for his statement, that it was the Arabs who extended the denomination Sumatra to the whole island after Sumatra city had been founded. In the absence of evidence to that effect we must regard this as a mere guess.

\(^2\) As we shall see directly, Sumatra State already appears in the history of the Chinese Yuàn dynasty, under the names Su-mu-la and Su-mu-tu-la, with the date A.D. 1282. The city must have, accordingly, been founded some years before that; say, circa A.D. 1270. It must be remembered, in fact, that, according to the chronicles, after Sumatra city had been founded Islamism was introduced into the country. Then the king wedded the daughter of the Perlak ruler and had a son by her (i.e. Sultan Mālikū-l-Zaher), whom he set up in due course to reign in Sumatra city. But soon afterwards the old king founded Pāsai, and transferred his son to rule over Pāsai. Thus, an interval of at least twenty years must have occurred between the foundation of Sumatra and that of its sister city Pāsai. Now, if this is the Bama heard of by Marco Polo while at Samara (Samadra) in 1292, we get the date a.d. 1270 circa for the foundation of Sumatra city, which date must be a very close approach to the truth.
a ‘Large Ant’—from the legend of an extraordinarily big representative of the Formicidae family having been discovered there by the famous hunting dog of Marah Silu, the founder of the city, who, in duty bound, made a meal of it,—must, as a matter of course, be classed along with the other fanciful ‘etymologies’ of Eastern invention, of which we have already found so many edifying examples. It is perfectly certain that the true derivation is from Samudra, the original name being very likely Samudra-pura, as we have noticed in Kamboja (p. 220). Of such a term, meaning the ‘Oceanic’ or ‘Sea-city,’ Samundar, Samundra, Samundara are dialectical corruptions (occurring in the Urdu, or Hindūstāni, and Telugu Samundar, Sumundur, Sāmundri, Samundari), which explain the forms Samadra, Shamuthera, Su-mēn-ta-la, etc., met with in the Western as well as Chinese literatures of the time.

With these premises we may now proceed to give, chronologically arranged in the subjoined table, the principal forms of the name Sumatra met with in local as well as foreign literatures, exhibiting the process of its successive transformations; adding also the other names applied to the island at various times since the foundation of Sumatra city.

---

1 See Leyden’s “Malay Annals,” p. 65; and Marre’s “Histoire des Rois de Pasey,” p. 29. The term Semut-rāja (the second part of it has remained hitherto etymologically untraced) is Malay-Achinese. Semut = ‘ant’ in Malay, is from the Mōn Khmut, Khnot, សាំមិត្ត; whereas rāja (perhaps from Sanskrit rāja) is Achinese, and means ‘big,’ ‘large,’ ‘great.’ Rājut is a synonymous term. The ant is said to have been as large as a cat.

2 They probably also explain the hitherto unexplained—at least satisfactorily—names Simundu, Simudžou; Palai Simundu; and Simunda, recorded by Ptolemy (lib. vii, ch. 4, 1), the “Periplus” (§ 61), and the “Anonymi Geographiae Exposito Compendiaria,” respectively, for Ceylon. The last may stand for either Valaya-samudra = the ‘Encircling Sea,’ or Samudra-valaya = the ‘Sea-girt.’ The forms Samundar, Samundra, etc., assumed by the name of Sumatra city might, moreover, be usefully compared with Samundar or Saminder, Semender, سموندر, سمندار, etc., a city mentioned by Ibn Khurdadhbih and Edrisi (Jaubert, op. cit., pp. 175, 189), which Sprenger locates near the western mouth of the Ganges, although Edrisi puts it at only seven days’ distance from Kashmir.
CHRONOLOGICAL ONOMATOLOGY OF SUMATRA CITY AND ISLAND SINCE THE FOUNDATION OF SUMATRA CITY

A.D.

1270 circé. Samudra, سوردرا (Samadrä), city, founded by Marah Silu, مرة سيلو, a fisherman from Pasángan, تُساَنْجٌ (lying about half-way between the Pásai River and Samalángan). "(Sejarah Malāyu," ch. vii, pp. 70–71, Singapore ed., and Chron. Pásai.)

1270–1275. Samudra Dābu-l-Salām, دار السلام, the name assumed by Sumatra city upon the introduction of Islāmism. King Marah Silu becomes a convert to the Muslim faith and assumes the title of Māliku-l-Sāleh, ملك الصالح. Shortly afterwards he weds the daughter of the Perlak, پرلک, ruler, Ganggang Putri by name, by whom he has two sons, the elder being named Sultan Māliku-l-Żāher, ملك الزاهر. ("Sejarah Malāyu" and "Hikāyat Rāja-rāja Pásai").

1282. Su-mu-ta (= Samudra) State sends a Minister to Quilon, who meets a Chinese envoy there, and is persuaded by the latter to despatch, on behalf of his master, Takur, envoy to submit an address and to offer presents to the Chinese Court. (History of the Yuan Dynasty; E. H. Parker in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1900, pp. 131–132.)

1282. Su-mu-tu-la, 遠木都剌 (Su-h-muh-tu-la = Samudara), State; visited on his way home by the Chinese envoy above referred to, who persuades the chief of the country, Tuân Pātī (a mere title meaning the 'Lord Ruler,' important, however, in this connection as showing that Islām had not perhaps as yet obtained a foothold in that territory) to send to China two envoy named Hassan and Sulaimān. (Ibid., p. 132.)

1285. Su-mu-tu-la sends an envoy to the Chinese Court. (Ibid.)

1286. Sü-men-na (evidently a contraction of Sü-men-ta-na, see below, sends envoy). (Ibid.)

circé 1290. The kingdom of Perlak being invaded by the enemies opposite (from the Malay Peninsula), its people take refuge in Sumudra. Sultān Māliku-l-Ṣāleh sets up his elder son, Māliku-l-Żāher, as ruler in Sumudra. Then he builds Pásai city, فاسي, and instals him as king there. ("Sejarah Malāyu," ch. vii, and Chron. Pāsei.)
1292. Java Minor, island (= Sumatra).
1292. Samara or Samarcha (= Samudra; or else, Samakuruk district on the Päsai River, south from Samudra; or Samāwī Bay?); and Basma or Basman (= Päsai, Bāsaim) kingdoms. (Marco Polo, bk. iii, ch. 9.)

1293. Su-mu-tu-la, 速木都剌 (Suh-mu-tūra = Samudara); an envoy sent there from China to renew its allegiance. (Hist. Yüan Dyn., bk. 162; Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 155.)

1294. Su-mu-tu-la, id. Its envoy, who had been detained in China awaiting the result of Kublai’s war with Java, is sent back with presents. (Asiatic Quarterly Review, loc. cit.)

1309. Pah-si (= Päsai). A special envoy despatched there from China. (Ibid., see also p. 614.)


1300-1320. Päsai. The king Siām or Shaker-al-Nauv, Shahrnawi (‘Abdu-r-Razzāk’s Shahr-i-nau, see Major’s “India in the Fifteenth Century,” pt. i, p. 6; and the Sornaos, Xarnau of later writers = Nông Sanō city, later on Ayuthia; see for this identification my remarks in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1902, pp. 128-129), sends an armed expedition under Awh-Dichū, أوك دحور (= Ōk-yā Deechō [Tejo]), against Päsai. The city is taken, and King Máliku-l-Zāher is carried in captivity to the Siamese capital, where he is detained for some ten or fifteen years, after which he is allowed to return to his country a vassal of Siām. (“Sejarah Malāyū,” ch. viii, and “Hikāyat Rāja-rāja Päsai.” See Leyden’s “Malay Annals,” pp. 73-76; and Marre’s “Hist. des Rois de Pasey,” pp. 48-50 and 115-120.) N.B.—According to the Päsai chronicle the Siamese invasion occurred during King Māliku-l-Maḥmūd’s reign; but the account from the “Sejarah Malāyū” appears to be the most reliable of the two, in which case the event cannot be put down to much later than A.D. 1300–1310, owing to the fact that when the king was carried away captive he is stated to have left the son Aḥmad still a little boy. Aḥmad, however, was the son of Sultān Maḥmūd and grandson of Sultān Māliku-l-Zāher, and it was probably at the marriage of this Aḥmad that Ibn Baṭūta was present in 1346, who states this to be the wedding of Māliku-l-Zāher’s son. Owing to this confusion in the king’s names, it is possible that the Siamese invasion took place under Maḥmūd’s reign, and we would then
have to alter its date to a.d. 1320-1330, that is to say, at some fifteen to twenty years before Ibn Batūṭa's visit.

1323 Cireā. Sumoltra (= Samundra, Sumundra), or Smohora, Smohora, Sumoltra. The people, whether men or women, tattoo their face and other parts of the body; they are in constant war with those of Lamory (Lambri), which is an island (read 'district') to the north of it. (Friar Odoric, Ramusio, 1583 ed., vol. ii, f. 247 verso; De Backer, "L'Extrême Orient au Moyen-Âge," Paris, 1877, pp. 105-106 and 477-478.)

1345. Island of Jawah, جزيرة الجاوة, or Country of Jawah, بجان الجاوة (= Sumatra), with the capital Samatra, سمرتة. Its seaport, which is a large village on the seaside, lies at four miles from the city, and is called Sarha or Sarhi, سرحى, سرحى. (This, hitherto unidentified, must be Terlei, which in the chronicle of Pāsai is always mentioned as the anchorage; see Marre's "Hist. des Rois de Pasei," pp. 32, 62, etc.) The Sultan's name is Malikuf-l-Zāher, ملك الفاظير. (This must be a mistake for his son Malikuf-l-Mahmūd, for the particulars related by the author about the former apply to the latter, and Malikuf-l-Zāher could hardly be still alive at this time, since he was already of age at the time of the foundation of Pāsei, in cireā 1290, see above; see also Marre, op. cit., pp. 44-45, n.) (Ibn Batūṭa, "Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah," Paris, 1858, pp. 224, 229 seqq.)

1346 (Oct.-Nov.). Ibn Batūṭa, returns to Sumatra from China and stays there two months (op. cit., pp. 306-309).

1375. Ila Trapobana (for Tprobobana = Sumatra Island), called Magno-Caulij (= Menang-kaban). On some of its mountains live giants twelve cubits in height, very black, and insane (i.e. the Batta tribes); they eat all the white strangers they can lay their hands upon. It is the last island of India, and

1 Face-tattooing is mentioned in Chinese records as being practised in Na-ku-érh, a small State in the mountains, to the west of the Sumatra kingdom. The people there, says Ma Huan in his "Ying-yai Sheng-lan" (a.d. 1416), tattoo their faces with three pointed green figures, and for this reason their ruler is called the king of the Hua-mien ('Tattooed Faces'). Fei-Hsin states later on, in his "Hsing-ch'a Sheng-lan" (1436) of the same State: "The men tattoo their faces with representations of flowers and animals" (Groeneweldt, op. cit., pp. 218-219). Professor Schiegel translates part of the former passage thus: "all tattoo upon their faces triangular blue figures as a distinctive mark" (Tsoung Pao, 1901, p. 349). On face-tattooing see our remarks above, pp. 367-368. Of our identification of Na-ku-érh we shall speak in the next section.
abounds in gold, silver, and precious stones. It contains seven
cities:— (1) Melaro (on south-east coast = Mallaru, Malàyu?);
(2) Dinloy (= Deli?); (3) Monlay (on north-east coast
= Wên-lai, Malai, Ferlec, Perläk?); ¹ (4) Hormar (on north
coast = Ghürī or Hārū, Samara?); (5) Leroa (on north-west
coast = Lîde, Lûbôk, Lameri, or Lambri?); (6) Malao (in the
centre = Malabu?); ² (7) an unnamed city deserted on account
of snakes (on west coast = Telok-belong?). Catalan Map
(Cordier’s “L’Extrême-Orient dans l’Atlas Catalan de
Charles V,” pl. ii).

1375. Illa Iana (= Java, Jana, Zânej = Sumatra, or Borneo,
Island?). It produces eagle-wood and camphor, spices,
galanga, nutmegs, cinnamon, as well as maces. Regio
Fennarum (north coast); ² and cities of Malao (north coast
= Marudu Bay, the Malatu of Captain Bozorg’s “‘Ajâib,”
vide infra, Appendix II); Ausul (west coast); Semesera (on
west coast = Semerâhan, one of the old districts?, or else
Sarâwak, Samarcha, Samara?). Catalan Map (op. cit., pl. i).

circa 1377. Pâsai, conquered by the armies from Mâjapahit
(Java). The then reigning Sultan Ahmad takes to flight,
nobody knows where. (Pâsai Chronicle. See Marre, op. cit.,
pp. 91–95. As regards the date it can be deduced from that
of the Javanese conquest of Palembang, which took place at

¹ There was a Malàyu somewhere on the north coast of Sumatra, for in April,
1706, Sultan Jumâlî-îl-‘îlam, king of Achîn, is stated to have left the Acheh
citadel and to have established his seat at Malàyu (see Millies, op. cit., p. 99).
I concur with Millies’ view that here the Malay Peninsula is not implied, but
someplace in the Acheh district itself, or, at any rate, on the north coast
of Sumatra. We have seen that Ibn Sa‘id (1286) states, “the country of Malâinur
is near Lâmûr’ ”; but the southern portion of the Malay Peninsula is almost
certainly intended here.

² As regards this region, see what Tavernier says of Borneo (apparently of the
Sukadana district on the western part of the island in particular): “I shall be
asked, without doubt, why I only mention the Queen of Borneo, and not the
King. The reason is that in this kingdom it is the women who govern and not
the men . . . . they prefer to have a woman for their ruler, to whom
they give the title of Queen, her husband being her subject, and not having more
power than that which she chooses to confer upon him” (Tavernier’s “Travels
side, of course, obtained formerly in many countries of Further India and the
Archipelago, and legends about kingdoms of women have been current in both
Arabic and Chinese literature. There are traces of matriarchy extant even now
in Annam, Champa (Panrang district), Laos, Siâm, etc. But, from the fact of
an island of women being mentioned in Captain Bozorg’s “‘Ajâib” (op. cit.,
pp. 19–20) as lying in the Sea of Malâtu, which I have identified with Marudu
or Maludu Bay, North Borneo (see Appendix I), I should conclude that in the
case in point it is a question of that district.
about the same time, i.e. in a.d. 1376 or 1377, according to
the Hist. of the Ming Dyn., bk. 324, see Groeneveldt,
op. cit., p. 193.)

1383. Hsü-wên-ta-na, 須文達那 (Sumundala, Sumundara),
State. Sultăn Ma-lè Wu Ta-fên, 麻勒兀達凡 (Ma-lè-
wul-Tat-fên = Māliku-l-Zāher),1 sends an envoy named
An-pa-érh, 僥八兒 (Yam-pat-i, Am-bal-a), to the Chinese
Court with presents. The report of the audience granted him
by the Emperor remarks that Hsü-wên-ta-na is the same as
Su-mên-ta-la, the name being changed to the latter form in
the reign of Hung Wu (a.d. 1368–1398). (‘Pien-i-tien’ section
of the “T’u-shu-chi-chêng” cyclopædia. See T’oung-Pao,
1901, pp. 341–342; also Asiatic Quarterly Review for January,
1900, p. 135. The proper names have, however, more solito,
been mangled there, and their identifications are our own.)

circă 1399. Su-mên-ta-la, 蘇門答剌 (= Sumundara =
Sumatra city and State), marked on the Chinese map published
by Phillips (Journal China Branch R.A.S., vol. xx, 1885,
p. 221, and map). This is the first time this spelling—
introduced, as noticed in the preceding entry, during the
reign of Hung Wu—occurs in documentary evidence to hand;
it first appears in history in 1405, the date of Chêng Ho’s
initial visit to Sumatra.

1403. Su-mên-ta-la (as above). The Chinese eunuch Yin-ch’ìng,
being sent on a mission to Java (Chau-va), also calls, by
instruction, at this country, as it lies on his route. Its
ruler, Tsai-nu-li-a-pî-ting, 宰奴里阿必丁 (= Zeinu-l-
‘Abidin, زين العابدين),2 sends envoys along with Yin-ch’ìng

1 Our identification is corroborated by the fact that Zâher or Dhâher is
actually pronounced Tlaher by the Malays. (See Marré’s “Hist. des Rois de
Pasey,” p. 43, n.)
2 There can be no doubt as regards this identification, which is my own
everly. Schlegel, loc. cit., suggests Nur-Ab’eddin or Nur-el-Abidin; and
Parker Senur Abu’edin! And yet the Chinese characters clearly read Tsai-nu-
li-a-bid-ding, or Zai-nu-li-a-pit-ting, so that a mistake is impossible—except to
a Sinologist. It may interest both Professor Schlegel and Mr. (now also
Professor) Parker to know that there reigned at least one Sultăn Zeinu-l-Abidin,
if not at Sumatra city itself, at any rate at its sister foundation Pāseï. His story
is given in the “Sejarah Malâyu,” ch. iv (see Leyden’s “Malay Annals,” pp. 212–
219). It briefly is as follows: This ruler had a younger brother who, supported
by the populace, rebelled and supplanted him. Sultăn Zeinu-l-Abidin thereupon
fled to Malacca, where Maâşûr Shah was reigning. This prince sent an armed
expedition to reinstate him at Pāseï, which country was conquered by the Malacca
men, the usurping râja running away to the woods. No sooner had, however, the
to go to Court and carry presents. The Emperor bestows on the prince the title of 'King of Su-mén-ta-la.'—Hist. Ming Dyn., bk. 325; *T'oung-Pao*, 1901, p. 343 (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 211; * Asiatic Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1900, p. 135, for a cursory hint only).

1403. **Su-mén-ta-la (as above).** Envoys sent to this country in the beginning of the reign of the usurping emperor Ch'êng Tsu (A.D. 1402–1424), in order to inform its ruler of his accession and to summon him to Court.—Hist. Ming Dyn., bk. 325 (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 211).

1404. **Su-mén-ta-la.** The Emperor of China despatches envoys to present the chief of the country with velvets, silks, etc., and to bring him to the imperial Court.—Id. (ibid.).

1405. **Su-mén-ta-la.** The eunuch Chêng Ho, being sent to the Western Ocean, calls at this country. The father of the reigning king, having been attacked by his western neighbour, the *Na-ku-érh* ('Country of the Tattooed Faces,' *Hwa-mien*), was killed by a poisoned arrow. The king's son being still young, the widow swore to marry the first man who would avenge her. An old fisherman, having therewith taken up the endgels in her favour, attacked the king of *Na-ku-érh*, slew him, and married the Queen.—Hist. Ming Dyn., bk. 325; Ma Huan's 'Ying-yai Shêng-lan' (Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 208, 212). Parker, in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, p. 136, makes an anachronistic jumble. The king reigning at the time of Chêng Ho's visit was evidently the parvenu; and the ruler who had got killed in war was presumably Zeinu-l-'Âbidin.

1406. **Hsü-wén-ta-na.** Envoys from Champâ complain at the Chinese Court that Siâm has been molesting her mission thither (*Asiatic Quarterly Review*, No. cit., p. 135). The Malacca fleet left for their own country, than the fugitive râja returned and once more overthrew the rightful king, Zeinu-l-'Âbidin. These events are placed, as it has been seen, under the reign of the Malacca ruler Mansûr Shâh, which, according to the native chronology, extended from A.D. 1374 to 1447. It is notorious, however, that such a chronology cannot be relied upon, and that the reign of Mansûr Shâh must be altered to between 1458 and 1480, for in 1409 he is mentioned as having sent tribute to China and received his investiture. (See Hist. of the Ming Dyn., bk. 325, in Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 251, *Wang-su-Sha = Mansûr Shâh*). It is, therefore, scarcely possible that the Zeinu-l-'Âbidin of 1403 is one and the same person with the king of the same name dethroned in Mansûr Shâh's time. The latter was probably a grand-child of the former. All the same, it will have been now conclusively proved that our identification of the name in the passage referred to above is correct.
grievance really is that some ships from Champ期刊 (apparently bound for Sumatra State), having drifted over to Pahang, the Siamese authorities there had detained and molested them. Sumatra State also complains to China of Siamese violation and pretensions to exclusive sovereignty (China Review, vol. xxiii, p. 256). See above for Siamese conquest of Pāsai, under the date 1300-1320. Siām very probably still claimed suzerainty over that State.

1407. Su-men-ta-la. Its ruler, Sultān Han-nan-a-pi-chên, 罕難阿必鎮 (=Handāl Ābidīn?, this being evidently the old fisherman), sends his minister A-li, 阿里 (=‘Alī), to the Chinese Court to offer products of his country. Tribute is now being brought regularly every year.—“Ming-yi-T'ung-chih” (Great Geogr. of the Ming Dynasty) and “Kuang-tung T'ung-chih” (Gen. Topogr. of the Canton Prov.) for the date of the embassy. (T'oung-Pao, 1900, p. 344.)

1409. Su-men-ta-la. The quondam fisherman arrives at the Chinese Court with presents, and is favourably received by the Emperor.—“Ying-yai Shen-lan” (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 208).

1412. The parvenu returns to Sumatra, when the son of the former king, having now grown up, secretly leagues with the nobles, kills his stepfather the fisherman, and takes his throne. A nephew (another account says a younger brother) of the murdered fisherman, Su-kan-la, 苏幹剌 (=Sikandar, Sekander), by name, having assembled his followers with their families, runs away into the mountains and fortifies himself there, after which he soon begins attacks with a view to revenge the death of his uncle.—“Ying-yai Shen-lan” and Hist. of the Ming Dyn., bk. 325 (Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 208-9 and 212). The Hist. of the Ming Dyn., bk. 304, however, gives a somewhat different version, stating that “a pretended son of the king had killed that prince and put himself on the throne; being angry that he got no share of Chêng Ho's presents, he collected soldiers and attacked the Chinese army, but he was beaten and pursued as far as Lambri, where he was taken prisoner with his wife and children” (see Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 169). There must have been some oversight here on the part of the historiographer.

1412. Envoys are sent to the Chinese Court. Id. (ibid., p. 221).

1414-15. Su-men-ta-la. The eunuch Chêng Ho arrives there for the second time with his fleet. Sikandar, dissatisfied he did
not get a share in the imperial presents, attacks the Chinese, but is routed, pursued as far as Lambri, taken prisoner and sent to the Chinese Court, where he is condemned to death.—
"Ying-yai Shêng-lan," which puts the date of Chêng Ho's visit in 1415, and Hist. of the Ming Dyn., bk. 325, which puts it as in 1414 (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 209 and 212).

1414–15. The king sends envoys to present his thanks to the Chinese Court. (Op. cit., p. 212.)

1416. Su-mên-ta-la. The anchorage lies opposite a village on the sea-coast called Ta-lyo-mon, 苍 鲁 猢 (= Truban, Trumun? perhaps Terlei, see Ibn Batûta above). Thence, going south-east for about ten li (circa two miles), one arrives at the city, which is not walled. There is a large brook running into the sea (i.e. Pâsai River or Krong Pâsai).—"Ying-yai Shêng-lan" (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 208).

1417. Tâppobana Minor (= Sumatra Island, Tâppobana Major being applied to Ceylon).—Planisphere in Palazzo Pitti, Florence (Santarem's "Hist. de la Cosmographie," etc., vol. ii).

1426. Envoys reach the Chinese capital with congratulations for the accession of the new emperor.—Jên Tsung, 1424; or Hsüan Tsung, 1425–1435? (Loc. cit.)

1430. Chêng Ho, being sent out to the Archipelago and other countries, visits Sumatra State for the third time. (Loc. cit.)

1431. Su-mên-ta-la sends out envoys twice to bring tribute to China. (Loc. cit.)

1432. An armed expedition from China calls at Su-mên-ta-la on its way outwards to Ormuz.—Chuh Yûn-ming's "Ch'ien-wên-chi" (China Review, vol. iii, p. 329).


1433. Su-mên-ta-la forwards a tribute of dragon's blood.

1434. Su-mên-ta-la. The king's younger brother Ha-li (= 'Ali?), having gone on a mission to China, dies at the capital Peking. (Loc. cit.)

1435. Su-mên-ta-la. Wang Ching-hung, Chêng Ho's colleague, having called there, the king sends on another brother, Chih-han or Ha-ni-chê-han = 'Ali Jahân(?), to go with him to
This envoy states that the king is already old, and desires to abdicate in favour of his son, called A-pu-sai, 阿卜塞 (evidently Abū Zaid), who is accordingly appointed king of the country. From this time tribute to China becomes gradually more rare.—Hist. Ming Dyn., bk. 325 (Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 212–213). Parker (Asiatic Quarterly Review, No. cit., p. 137, has A-pu-sai-yih-ti for the name of the king’s successor, which makes it evident that Abū Zaid is the name intended.

circa 1440. Sciamuthera (Shamuthera = Shamatrak, Sammudara, see below, under entries dated 1520 and 1602), the island TAPOBANA, so called by the natives. There is a fine city. The men are cruel and their customs brutal. The ears of both men and women are very large, in which they wear earrings ornamented with precious stones. In one part of the island called Batech (= Battak) the inhabitants eat human flesh, and are in a state of constant warfare with their neighbours. They keep human heads as a valuable property, for when they have captured an enemy they cut off his head, and having eaten the flesh, store up the skull and use it for money.—Nicolò Conti. (See Major’s “India in the Fifteenth Century,” pt. ii, pp. 8–9; and Ramusio, 1563 ed., vol. i, fol. 339 verso.)

1486. Su-Mên-ta-la (Sumatra State). Envoys from this country reach Canton, but not being favourably received, no more missions are sent out.—Hist. Ming Dyn., bk. 325 (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 213). Parker says (op. cit., p. 137) that this mission was apparently a ‘bogus’ one.


1503. ZAMATORA ISLAND (= Samudara), also called TRAPOBANA; king of Pasze (= Pasé, Pásai).—Giovanni da Empoli (De Gubernatis, “Storia dei Viaggiatori Italiani,” Livorno, 1875, p. 114).

1505. SUMATRA ISLAND, anciently called TAPOBANA.—Barthema (Ramusio, vol. ii, f. 166 verso).

Parker, in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1900, p. 137, says: “In 1434–35 the King sent his brother (?) brothers) Ha-li-du-han (? and) Ha-ni-chê-han to Court—it is not clear whether there were one or two men.” However, from the account we follow above, it seems pretty clear that the brothers sent were two, of whom presumably one was ‘Aft, and the other Jâhân by name.
1506. The first Portuguese land on the Island of Sumatra; Achin is the leading State.—Kollewijn’s “Pekopte Geschiedenis,” etc. ( Asiatic Quarterly Review, January, 1900, p. 137).

1507. Ĉamatra, noted for fine long pepper. (Correa’s “Lendas da India,” vol. i, p. 739.)

1511. PACEM. “Porto de Pacem [= Pāsai, Bāsaim], que he o principal da illa de Ĉamatra.” Diego Lopez de Sequeira calls there to demand that Melagia, a refugee from Malacca residing with the king, be handed over to him, but the request is refused. (Op. cit., vol. ii, p. 216.)

November, 1511. PACEM. The king, having heard of the Portuguese conquest of Malacca, makes friendly overtures to the viceroy there. (Ibid., p. 267.)

1511. SAMOTRA, SAMATRA, ISLAND. Anonymous letter written by an Italian from Lisbon on the 31st January, 1513, telling how he had been at that island in 1511. (De Gubernatis, op. cit., pp. 374–375.)

1513. ZAMATRI, LAVANNI (= Javanese?), GORES (= people from Ghūry, جوری—in Malay Ngri—Ghore or Háru, Áru, east coast of Sumatra; and not ‘Guzerati,’ as De Gubernatis slovenly explains), nations trading at Malacca.—Letter dated from Lisbon, 6th June, 1513 (De Gubernatis, op. cit., p. 386).

March, 1514. PACEM. Jorge d’Albuquerque calls there; the king again assures him of his loyalty to the Portuguese. (Ibid., pp. 381–382.)

1515. SAMOTRA ISLAND, so called from an emporium on the same.—Valentin Moravia (De Gubernatis, op. cit., p. 391).1

1516. SUMATRA ISLAND and PACEM, seaport.—Barbosa (Ramusio, vol. ii, p. 318 verso).


September, 1520. PACEM, “que he na Ilha de Ĉamatra.” Antonio Miranda de Azevedo builds a fort there with the king’s consent and remains in command.

1 These two extracts prove that the city and emporium of Samudra still existed, although the Western travellers henceforth only speak of Pāsai. Very likely the capital was removed thither after 1520.

1521. Pacem. Attacked by Jorge d'Albuquerque, who carries with him one of the princes of Pacem, who had been, on a former occasion, deposed and expelled, when he submitted to the King of Portugal. The ruler in possession falls shot through the forehead, and the Portuguese being joined by the King of Aru, his followers are completely routed. Thereupon, the rightful prince is restored in great state and made tributary to the King of Portugal. (Danvers' "Portuguese in India," vol. i, p. 348.)

1521. Pacem. Antonio de Brito and Rafael Prestrello arrive there in a ship each to load pepper. They find that the king has died, and that his son, yet of tender years, is wholly in the power of a tutor, Melyquyadyr (i.e. Māliku-l-'Adl), who has been harassing Miranda, the commander of the fort, with vexatious requests. Thereupon the new Portuguese arrivals prepare to attack the city, which lay two leagues up river, but the king sues for peace, and things end smoothly. (Correa, op. cit., vol. ii, pp. 624–625 and 643–645. See also p. 613 for the mention of Pa-si this year in Chinese records.)

1522. War having broken out between the kings of Achin and Pedir, in which the former is victorious, the latter seeks protection from the Portuguese at Pacem. Accordingly, the King of Achin, 'Ali Mughayat Shāh by name (said in the Malay chronicles to have been the first Sultan of Achin, 1507–1522), attacks the Portuguese fort at Pacem, overruns all the country with fire and sword, and enters the city of Pacem with 15,000 men. (Correa, op. cit., vol. ii, p. 768; Danvers, loc. cit.; Millies, op. cit., p. 71.)

1524. Lopo d'Azvedo arrives at Pacem and dismantles the fort there, the Portuguese having decided to abandon this trading station on account of the hostility of the Achin king. This potentate, having made himself the master of all the territories of Pacem and Aru, the King of Pacem takes refuge at Malacca, where he is promised assistance in the recovery of his lost realm. (Correa, op. cit., vol. ii, pp. 780, 790.)

1 In the Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1900, p. 138, Parker turns his former 'Pestrello' into a vulgar and far too common 'Pedro,' and somewhat doubts that the Pa-si mentioned in this connection in Ming records really is Päsei, rather than Pasir, Pasig, etc. I think, however, from the evidence collected above, that there can scarcely be any more doubt as regards the identities of Pa-si with Päsei, and Piek-tu-lin with Rafael Prestrello or Perestrello.
1573–1619. **Su-mên-ta-la.** During this period the reigning family is changed, and at last their king is a quondam slave. Having slain the rightful king and put his own master on the throne, he ultimately murdered him also, taking his place. This slave king is very cruel; he kills people and washes his body in their blood, in order to prevent disease. After the murder of the king, the name of the country was changed into *A-ch'hî*, 齊 (A-ts'e, A-che = Achêh, i.e. Achën).—Hist. of the Ming Dyn., bk. 325 (Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 214). This is the last notice of Sumatra State in Chinese dynastical history. Apparently, Su-mên-ta-la is here already meant for Sumatra Coast, i.e. the northern portion of the island, and the events related apply to the kingdom of Achêh, of which the Sumatra district was, after 1522, a dependency. This will be made clearer in the next entry.¹

---

### 1602. Sammudara, نگر نجم‌دار (Negri Sammudara = Nagara Samudra). Letter of authority to trade given by the King of Achêh to an English captain (perhaps Sir James Lancaster, who was in charge of the first voyage to the Eastern Archipelago undertaken by the English East India Company, and visited Achêh in 1601–2). In this document the king states that he holds the throne of the "kingdom [lit. 'capitals'] of Achêh and Sammudara" ("Negri Achêh, dan Negri Sammudara," نگر اچه دان نگر نجم دار), thus evidencing that he had united on his head the two crowns, and that the "State of Sumatra" was not, even at this period, as yet an empty name, as our predecessors in the treatment of this subject have pretended. Hence, very likely, the confusion made by the Chinese historiographers of the period between Sumatra and Achêh. This is the last authentic mention I have so far come across of the State and city of Sumatra in local documentary records. (See for the text of the letter in question, *Journal Straits Branch R.A.S.*, No. 31, July, 1888.

¹ Professor Schlegel observes (*Young-Pao*, 1901, p. 344): "According to Valentijn (Sumatra, vol. v, p. 24), this slave was the father-in-law of the king of Atjeh, who reigned in A.D. 1512." But how can it be? The events here related undoubtedly apply to Sultan 'Alau-d-din Riahat Shâh, who, according to the pilot John Davis, who visited Achêh in A.D. 1599, was originally a fisherman. Gradually, he rose to the rank of Admiral (probably Lâknamâna), when he murdered Mansûr Shâh, constituted himself governor of the young heir to the crown, and at last killed him also, seizing the throne. He reigned in Achêh from A.D. 1588 to 1602. (See Prévost's "Hist. gén. des Voyages," vol. i, p. 373; and Millies, op. cit., p. 76.)
In a later letter from the Sultan of Achēla to King James I of England, dated A.H. 1024 = A.D. 1612, and published in the same number of that Journal (pp. 123 seqq.), mention is made of Pēdīr, Samarlāŋg, Pasāngan, Pāsai, Perlak, and many other places on the Sumatran coast, but no further reference to Sumatra city or State occurs. We must therefore conclude that from this date the rôle played by the famous city in local history ceases, nothing remaining of it except the shadow of its name, although it is quite possible that the village of Samudra still situate on the left (western) bank of the Krung Pāsai (or Pāsai River), at about three miles from the sea (vide Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 215), represents the last surviving remnant of that city and of its long declined glory.

Argyrē, the capital of Iabadiū or Sabadiū (No. 127).

We must now close this long discussion on Iabadiū with a few remarks on its northern coast, where Ptolemy locates the capital Argyrē (Ἀργυρῆ μητρόπολις). We are here confronted by the same name as that which we had to face in treating of Arakan (Ἄργυρᾶ χώρα). But the curious feature is, that most names given to places on this coast correspond to those of places on the Arakanese seaboard. Among such I may mention the following:

(1) Lambri, Rāmī or Ramni = Rambri, Ramri, Rāma-bari.
(2) Java, Toba = Jaba, Daba, Davaka; and Bakkara = Pokkhara (Puṣkara), Bokhārā, Bacala.
(3) Perlak = Plakṣa or Prak = Perak, etc.
(4) Rakan, actually written Arakan by Valentijn; Arakundur River.
(5) Katrea, Kertei, Kerti (= Kartri-pura?).
(6) Pāsai, Pacem = Vasai, Basaim, Bassein.
(7) Cape Sedu or Siddoh = Sada, Sedo, Sandoway.
(8) Cape Dahvai = Davāi, Tavoy.
(9) Chalang, Chellang = C'halāṅg, Salāṅg (Ujong Salāṅg, Junkceylon).

The list might be continued for a good while yet. This correspondence in toponymics between the Achinese and
Arakanese coasts would cause one to believe at first that there must have been not only a very close intercourse between the two countries but an actual immigration into Achin from Arakan. But, as a matter of fact, Arakanese colonies seem not to have extended in the Malay Peninsula below Tavoy, though from the remotest period Arakan and the Malay Peninsula, as well as Sumatra, were settled by branches of the Mōn-Khmēr (Ch’ieng Chēh, or Java, Javana) race, as is well shown by the language of the Achinese, in which distinct Mōn or Khmēr words can be detected in good numbers even at present. This early branch of the Ch’ieng race may have brought down to the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago the name Java or Daeva, and even its form Chēh, which may, for all we know, survive in Achēh, but not, seemingly, other characteristic toponyms which arose here from the same or analogous causes as in Arakan, and under the influence of a similar Dravidian element from Southern India.

First of all we have in Sumatra, as in Arakan, a legend as to the Rākṣasas having been the aboriginal inhabitants. In neither of the two countries, above all in Arakan, is now any trace of a Negrito element to be found; but we may well take it for granted that both were originally peopled by such a race as well as the other maritime countries of India and Indo-China. A tradition to this effect has been discovered by me in the Burmese account of the life and travels of Gavampati-thera already referred to in the opening sections of this paper. In “Dipavaṃsa,” i, 67–79,

1 We have them, at all events, both in pure and hybrid forms on the opposite coast of the Malay Peninsula (S meeting of Perak and Panggal of the Malacca uplands). As regards Sumatra, it is not yet quite certain that the Negrito element has wholly disappeared, for marked traces of it seem to exist in the Luba tribes, while the hairy dwarfs heard of from Siak on the east coast and Kroē on the western most likely will prove to be its legitimate representatives.

2 I have omitted to mention, in my previous brief account of this work (p. 114), that Gavampati, the subject of the story, is represented as being the son of Govinda-ṇaṭha, a rich citizen of Sudharmavati or Sudhammanagara (Sathōm or Thahunt) in the country of Ramaṇa (Pegu); but he is evidently the personage referred to in Mahāvagga, i, 9, as being one of the companions of Yasa and belonging to one of the richest families of Benares. He was ordained soon after Yasa, and thus early became one of the principal disciples of Buddha, whom he followed afterwards in all his real as well as supposed
and "Mahāvāma," ch. i, it is stated that when Buddha visited Laṅkā for the first time in order to expel from it the Yakṣas, he "then caused the delightful isle of Giri (Giri-dvīpa) to approach for them. As soon as they transferred themselves thereto he restored it to its former position." No explanation is given as to the whereabouts of this island, except that it was not far from Laṅkā and most similar to it, probably also in size ("Dipavaṃsa," i, 67, 72). But a commentator's note appended to the book of Gavampati, in referring to the same legend, gives the name of the island as "Samudra (or Sumātra)-giri-dvīpa," wherefore I gather that the island in question was supposed, or stated in some legendary tradition, to have been Sumatra, or at any rate its northern coast, where the city of Samudra afterwards arose (so named, perhaps, in deference to that legend?). This is not unnatural, since no other large island, sufficient to contain the enormous host of Rākṣasas alluded to, lies near to Ceylon. Another tradition is to the effect that Rāvaṇa, the Rākṣasa king of Ceylon, conquered some islands in the Indian Archipelago from the Nāgas, and established his son Mahirāvana to rule over them. We finally have the legend of Āji-Śaka referred to above, in corroboration of the tradition of Sumatra having been originally peopled by Rākṣasas. The name of Rakan, Rakkhaṅga, or Rākṣasa Land, may thus have arisen in this part of Sumatra in the same way and from the same causes from which the name of Arakan is said to be derived; and Argyrē as well as Achē or Achīn may be but corrupted forms of the local designation employed for Rākṣasa. If not so, it can scarcely be accounted for otherwise than, as in Arakan, a modified rendering of Balakṣa, Plakṣa, or Barakṣa, a term which would be represented here, as we pointed out, in the name of the Perlak district. It would thus have here, as

peregrinations.—Since writing the above I have noticed that our friend Gavampati and his doings in Pegu have been mentioned quite recently in the "Sāsanavaṃsa" (ed. Mabel Bode, Pāli Text Society, pp. 36-37 text), to which therefore I refer the reader desirous of further particulars.

1 The Chinese map of the fourteenth century published by Phillips in the Journal China Branch R.A.S., vol. xx, would seem to corroboreate to a certain
in Arakan, passed through the same modifications: Barakṣa, Barakura, Arkura, and Arakṣa or Akṣa, whence Argyrē and Achēh. This opinion appears to receive further support from the fact that Ptolemy (lib. i, ch. xiii, p. 1, and lib. vii, ch. i, p. 10) places on the coast opposite the northern part of Ceylon a bay which he calls Argaric Gulf and, on its shores, a city which he terms Argeirū or Ankheirū ('Άργειρος, 'Αγχείροπος), believed to be the same as the Argalu of the "Periplus." It was celebrated for a manufacture of muslin adorned with small pearls. Fra Paolino¹ calls it Arguropolis, and identifies it with Arampalli, adding that "it was formerly in high repute on account of its cotton stuffs, which were partly manufactured on the spot and partly brought thither for sale." The term may, of course, in the cases both of the Arakanese and Sumatran Argyrē, be traced besides to Kṣarjura = 'silver,' or Arjura = 'Silver Country' (perhaps, simply, 'White Country,' i.e. Balakṣa, Plakṣa), which would amount to the same thing.² These names, similar to those given by Ptolemy to Arakan and Achīn, well indicate, I should imagine, the place from which the early colonists and civilizers of these countries came. The connection of the people of Koromandel and Drāvida with Arakan is already amply demonstrated by other evidence based upon coins and medals;³ as to that with Achīn, I am confident it will become capable of demonstration as soon as thorough archaeological exploration in that extent this view; for at the north-western end of Sumatra, and at about the spot where Achīn is, I see noted 白土 (Pū-t'ū), which means 'White Earth' (or Land = Arjura?), unless it stands for Pulo Batu just opposite.

¹ "Voyage to the East Indies" (London, 1800), pp. 56, 110. Branfill, apud McCrindle's "Ancient India as described by Ptolemy," p. 331, identifies it with Āraṇākarai (pronounced nowadays Atraṅkarai), at the mouth of the Vagai.

² Silver-mines, as we have seen (p. 562), are known to exist in the interior of Sumatra. Masūdi locates them in the neighbourhood of Serirah (Palembang district); and Ibn Khurdādbih mentions silver in the mountains of Balūs Island (Barusae').

unsettled district will have been rendered possible.\textsuperscript{1} Several other names of places, etc., on the Koromandel coast deserve notice; for instance, those of the Rāmnād district; of the island of Ramisseram (Rāmēśvara); of the Marava race in the extreme south of India, which seems to be represented here in the denomination of the Maruvi of the Bānyak Islands; and, finally, of Ptolemy’s “Country of the Batoi,” a name apparently identical with that of the Battas, in Northern Sumatra.\textsuperscript{2} Among such names, those of

\textsuperscript{1} Ethnic affinities between the Acheul and the natives of the Koromandel and Malabar coasts have recently been noticed by Dr. Van Leent, who is therefore inclined to regard the Acheul as Malas (read Javas or Chouais), with a mixture of Indian blood. This statement corroborates the views I have expressed in these pages as to the racial nature of the populations of the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago.

\textsuperscript{2} Sir Stamford Raffles (“Memoirs,” p. 427), Dr. Leyden (“On the Language and Literature of the Indo-Chinese Nations,” reprinted from the \textit{Australasia Researches}, vol. x, in “Essays relating to Indo-China,” 1st series, vol. i, p. 113), and Newbold (“Straits of Malacca,” vol. ii, pp. 371-3), in describing the custom of the Batta tribes of eating their own relations when aged and infirm, have sought to connect them with Herodotus’ Padaioi or Padaio, who, as the “Father of History” tells us (bk. iii, ch. 99), were addicted to similar practices. Herodotus, it is true, locates the Padaio on the easternmost borders of India; but that is no sufficient reason for taking them to be exactly the Battas of North Sumatra. Hence I am inclined to the view that if any connection has ever existed between the Batta and other tribes on the mainland, it must have been with those branches of the so-called ‘Indonesian’ race from which the Battas seem to be descended, and among which the very identical form of cannibalism has subsisted until recent times, if indeed it does not even now sporadically survive. The ethnical branches just referred to are now confined to the wildest parts of central and northernmost Indo-China, or, to put it more precisely, to the upper valleys of the Salwin and Irrawati, although it is very probable they formerly occupied a far wider area, extending especially still more towards the south. It is then within such a compass that we must look for the seat of the Padaioi and perhaps also for the ancestral home of the Battas. The tribes within this area of whom the iniquitous practice above referred to has been recorded are, above all, the Kachins or Singphōs (Chingpōs), and the Wa or Lawā. The former, however, seem to be comparatively new immigrants into Burma, whether they came, apparently, from the headwaters of the Irrawati, if not from other Central Asian countries lying further to the north. In such a case they may have learnt and adopted the practice from offshoots of the old Massagetes, Kallitians or Kallantians, and correlated or neighbouring tribes, of whom Herodotus records the same horrible custom of feasting upon their aged relatives (see bk. i, ch. 215, and bk. iii, ch. 38). Megasthenes, according to Strabo (xy, 1, 56) ascribes the same iniquitous practice to the tribes inhabiting the Kankasos range (Hindū-Kush). As regards the Wa, Sir J. G. Scott considers the graphic stories told of them to that effect as mere inventions, and only admits head-hunting as the only Waë folible in that respect (“Upper Burma Gazetteer,” pt. i, vol. i, p. 498). It may be, and we sincerely hope it is, quite true that this people have now abandoned that nefarious practice, but as to their having followed it in the past there can scarcely be any doubt. For the same story now told on the page of the “Gazetteer” just referred to as coming from so-called ‘Shan’ sources, I find related with surprising
Rāmnūd and Rāmeśvara deserve special notice, since we find them transplanted to Arakan in the island of Ramrī correspondence in details in the oft-quoted book of Gavampati (lib. i, fol. 2), which is of Peguan origin and dates from at least a couple of centuries ago. The only difference lies in the fact that the scene is placed on the Yūnman borders (which amounts to the same thing, although the Wahs are not named), and the story is told in connection with a supposed visit of Buddha there, in consequence of which, it is added, the people became converted and abandoned the practice. As regards the substance of the remainder, it is identical with the story collected by Sir J. G. Scott, so I may give it in his own words. When their parents become old and feeble, so the tale runs, “the children tenderly and lovingly help them to climb into the branches of a tree. Then they shake the boughs until the old people fall down. The fruit is ripe, let us eat it,” they say, and proceed to do so,” of course, after having either boiled or roasted the flesh. It goes without saying that the conversion of the Wa and neighbouring tribes on the Yūnman–Indo-Chinese borders, although ascribed to Buddha’s intervention, must have taken place at no very ancient date. The very fact of the reference, in Gavampati’s book, to the cessation of such a practice is, in my opinion, fairly good evidence that it must formerly have been in favour.

Barbosa, A.D. 1516 (in Ramusio, vol. i, 1563 ed., f. 317 verso), mentions cannibalism exercised upon deceased relations as being prevalent in a pagan kingdom subject to Siām, and situated inland toward China, by which evidently the Wa country is meant. Those people justify themselves with the plea, he adds, that nowhere could the authors of their being find a grave so suitable and honourable as their own insides. Comparing now the above story with those told: (1) by Captain Fenton of the Kālang and Kamōn, or Kama branches of the Kachin tribes (“Upper Burma Gazetteer,” vol. cit., p. 436); (2) by Sir Stamford Raffles and Dr. Leyden of the Battas; (3) by Friar Odoric of the natives of Dandim, Dandyn, or Dadim in the Archipelago (Ramusio, vol. ii, ff. 248 verso and 254 recto); (4) by Barthema of those of Java (op. cit., vol. i, f. 168 recto); and (5) by Barbosa of the Wa (undoubtedly the Chung-keo of Kwei-chou would be too far away; and then this people, like the Issedones of Herodotus, only ate men after they had died, see Journal China Branche R. A. S., 1899–1900, No. 2), it will be seen that the correspondence is surprising. So surprising, in fact, as to argue an original connection, if not exactly racial, at least social as regards intercourse, customs, etc., between all these peoples. For, as we have seen, this very form of cannibalism can be traced almost uninterruptedly, and through fully twenty-four centuries, all the way from the Archipelago to Upper Burma, the seat of the present Lawá and very probably of the ancient Padaains, and thence to the original Kachin country, and to the Central Asian homes of the old Kallatians or Kallantians and Massagetes, or Tu-Tṣéch-chih of Herodotean and Sinological fame. The line along which we have traced the custom in question very probably marks also the track followed, in the inverse direction, by the parent stream of emigration from which most of the above-named tribes of the Indo-Chinese mainland and Archipelago are descended, or, at any rate, with which they have become blended. It should be remembered that as regards the Kachins, at least, a Tartar origin seems pretty well certain. “Their traditions point to a first home somewhere south of the desert of Gobi, and their movements have been always towards the south” (“Upper Burma Gazetteer,” pt. i, vol. i, p. 396). In view of these facts, their original proximity of homes and social intercourse with the forbears and relatives of the Massagetes and Kallatians can hardly be questioned.

Of the Semang tribes in the southern part of the Malay Peninsula Newbold says: “The Malays have an idea that when a Semang dies the body is eaten, and nothing but the head interred, a custom which, if it exists, reminds us of one prevalent among the Issedones, a tribe of ancient Scythians, who, after feasting
or Rambrī and on the seaboard opposite it; to Pegu under the form Rāmaṇṇa -deśa; to the Malay Peninsula as Rāman and Ramenia (Rāmaṇṇa?) Point; and, finally, in Northern Sumatra under the forms of Rāmī, Rambrī, or Lambri. A comparison of these terms, coupled with the knowledge of the source whence they were derived, enables us to easily identify names of places mentioned by ancient writers, which have proved hard nuts to crack for previous inquirers. Thus we can see, for instance, that Sulaimān’s kingdom of Rahmi, which Mas‘ūdī calls Wahman or Rahmi, and others spell Rahman or Rahma, can hardly be any other country than Rāmaṇṇa-deśa or Pegu, with its seaboard extended, perhaps, as far up as the old Rāmavati, opposite the island of Ramri; and we would never dream of locating it, on the mere strength of a coincidence of names, at Rāmnād; or, like Reinaud and Cunningham, at Vizapur (Bijapur) and Dharanikota respectively. But it is especially in Sumatra where we can reap the best results from the observations made above. Here we have a country which the Arab navigators called Rāmi or Rammi; the Chinese Lan-li, Lan-wu-li, 烏里, Nan-wu-li, 南巫里, or Nan-p‘o-li, 南浮利 (Ram-ri, Lamburi); the “Sejarah Malāyu” Lambri, لامبري, or Lamiri, امبرى; and Marco Polo, after them, Lambri. It is clear that Lambri and Rāmi or Rammi represent the term Rāmbri, meaning ‘Rāma’s on the body of the deceased, preserved the head, carefully removing the hair’ (“Straits of Malacca,” London, 1839, vol. ii, p. 379). Of the Udayi he states that the Jakūns “accuse them of devouring their own dead” (op. cit., vol. ii, p. 382). Thus, in origin the Semangs and Udayi were probably cannibals of the same type as the tribes referred to above.

1 Shortened form of Rāmaṇṇa, although modified by the Malays into Rāhmān, رحمان, or Rahmān, so as to suit Muhammadan tastes; in Siamese it is spelled Rāmā. It is a district in the southern part of the State of Patūni, tributary to Siām.

2 See Reinaud’s “Relation,” etc., t. i, p. cii, and Mas‘ūdī’s “Prairie d’Or,” trad. B. de Meynard, t. i, pp. 384, 386, 387. After Rahmi Mas‘ūdī places Ferequf or Ferequf, فکوف, which in a MS. is spelled Fakuh (op. cit., p. 403). Perhaps the true reading should be Fakuh, فکوف, in which case it would prove identical to Pagu, Peyu, and Rahmi would turn out to be Ramri.
country;' met with in Arakan, which is in its turn a corruption of Rāma-bar or Rāma-bāri, the form it would assume in Southern Indian vernaculars. How was this term introduced from the Koromandel coast into Sumatra and applied to its north-western seaboard? Evidently by emigrants from Rāmnād and Ramisseram. If we peruse the accounts of Chinese travellers, we shall see that the portion of the Indian Ocean stretching between the northern coast of Sumatra and the Koromandel seaboard was termed the Sea of Na-mo-li or Na-mu-ri, 那没黎, 那没黎, i.e. Lamori, Lambri.1 The Arab navigators called it the "Sea of Herkend" or Harkand, هرکند.2 Both these terms have never hitherto, as far as I am aware, been satisfactorily accounted for and explained. It will now appear evident, however, from the certain identity we have established of Lambri with Rām-bri, or Rāma-vāri, Rāmabāri, that the "Sea of Lambri" means either the "Sea of Rāma" or the "Sea which bathes Rāma's Land"; which was so called on account of Rāma having, according to the Indū tradition, crossed it on the legendary jetty (Rāma's Bridge) in front of the island of Ramisseram, when he marched his motley army into Ceylon. The term Herkend or Harkand is, I believe, but a synonym for Rāma, and can be traced to Hari-kāṇḍa, Hari-kāṃta, or some similar epithet given to Rāma on account of his being a portion or an incarnation of Viṣṇu.3

When we read, therefore, in Abū Zaid's account of

---

2 Reinaud, op. cit., t. i, pp. 4, 8, 11. No possible doubt can exist as to the identity of the Sea of Harkand. Sulaimān states (op. cit., p. 8) that the island of Rāmnī (Lambri or North Sumatra) is bathed by two seas, viz. those of Harkand and Shēlāhēt. Captain Bozorg mentions, in his turn, a passage from Fangūr (Bārūs), across the Sea of Harkand, towards Oman (see "Merveilles de l'Inde," p. 10). Nawāri may mean the Sea of Lamūri or Lambri when he says that the Lārēsvi sea consists of the seas of Kalah, Jāvah, and Fangūr.
3 Perhaps also Hari-candra instead of Rāma-candra? The epithets applied to Rāma are so many and varied that it will not be difficult to hit upon the right one corresponding to the Arab Herkend or Harkand. I may suggest also Hari-kūṇḍa. Edrisi distinctly states Harkand to be a word belonging to the Indū language (op. cit., t. i, p. 63).
Sulaimān’s travels, that the island of Rāmi or Rānnī is bathed by two seas, those of Herkend and Shelāhet, we understand at once that Lambri, the northern part of Sumatra, is meant, which is situated between the sea of Rāma or Indian Ocean and the Śri-Lohit Sea, or Sea of the Straits (Selat, Salahaj); and statements which formerly appeared as insolvable riddles and have often been still more confounded by commentators and would-be elucidators of the past two centuries, become quite plain and acquire a much greater interest for ourselves.¹

I shall now conclude the discussion as to the names of Āchīn and of the surrounding territory with the etymology which I found in the book of Gavampati-thera. It is there stated that Buddha, when his second visit to Ceylon came to an end, proceeded by aerial flight, with his suite of twenty thousand disciples, to the island of Samudra (the commentary says Sumātra-)–giri-dipa, where he imparted instruction to the Yakṣa population. Having then ascended a mountain called Kānṇīka–sela–giri,² a halo of six-coloured rays

¹ It has been suggested ("Merveilles de l’Inde," p. 235) that the old Lambri may be represented to this day by the village Lamreh situated in the Achēb district, near Tungkūb, in the xxi mūkīm. This is simply absurd, for the village in question lies entirely inland, and is inaccessible by any waterway. Surely, there are so many villages similarly named in that district, that it is a wonder Professor Van der Lith could not hit upon a more suitable one. In my opinion, if old Lambri, Lambri, or Rāmbri still has a representative nowadays, this must be the respectable stockaded village of Lam-barīh, which lies on the left bank of the Achēb River (Kali Achēb), not far above Kotarāja, the present capital, and no further than 22 to 23 miles (following the winding course of the river) from the river’s mouth; that is to say, at a spot where the river is still navigable for small craft, and was perhaps yet more so in bygone days. The next important place below is Lam-bāri; but as this term means ‘New village’ in the Acheinese dialect, we must discard the place entirely. Whether the present Lam-barīh corresponds to the old Lambri or not, it is almost certain that the latter must have borne the same or a very closely similar name. Of course, Lam in Acheinese (as Lang in Chăm) means a village; but I am of opinion that the original name was Rāma-puri, Rāma-vāri, or Rāmbāri, which became, in course of time, when the tradition of its origin was forgotten, corrupted into Lam-bāri, Lam-barīh, Lambri, thus acquiring a totally different meaning, as would better suit native notions.

² Mountain of the Kānṇīka or Premna spinosa shrub. I think it may be identified with Mount Abong-Abong, the well-known lofty peak of Northern Sumatra. Ambong-ambong is, in the Straits, the name for Premna cordifolia, Rox.; and Abong-Abong may possibly be a Sumatran modification of it. The fact of Ambong-ambong not being the spinosa variety of the shrub cannot constitute a great obstacle to the above identification, since the correct reading in Gavampati’s book is probably (as in Mahāvagga, v, 12, 13) Seta-kāṇṇīka, in which case it
emanated all round from his person. The celestial and human witnesses of this prodigy gave vent to their

would be a question of a white-flowered variety of the shrub, and the Premna cordifolia might be meant. Local inquiry in the Achin district is very likely to definitely settle the question as to which mountain the above designation applies to for certain. In connection with the legendary visit of Buddha to Achêh and to one of its mountain-peaks, as referred to above, it should be pointed out that Chao Ju-kua, in his account of Lan-yeu-li, 藍無里 (Lam-nu-ri, Lamori, or Lambri, circa A.D. 1240), says: "There is in this country a hill (or, an island) called Hsi-lun (lit. fine wheel), peaks rising over peaks, (on the top of which) there is the imprint, over seven feet in length, of the foot of a huge man, a like imprint being visible in the water within a distance of over 300 li (circa 60 miles) from that hill. The trees in the forests of the hills, whether high or low, all round are bent towards it (as if curtsying)" (Journal R.A.S., July, 1896, p. 481). Dr. Hirth, the translator of this account, think there can be little doubt as to the identity of the footprint in question with that on Adam's Peak in Ceylon. I am, on the contrary, of opinion that there is no connection whatever between the two. Professor Schlegel, in T'oung-Pao, 1901, p. 133, spells the name of the mountain Hsi-lun, 細輪; but this is the name of a State mentioned by Chao Ju-kua as subject to San-to-ch'î, which we have identified with Chalang or Chellang on the west coast of Sumatra. Judging from the explanation given as noted above by Dr. Hirth (i.e. 'fine wheel'), the text must have 細輪 (in which the second character means a wheel, a disc), the pronunciation thus being Hsi-lun, Se-lun, Si-lang. We would accordingly have here either the [Kampha-]Sele mountain alluded to above, or merely an alternative form of the name for the Chalang or Chellang (the Tjellang of Dutch maps) district. This lies to the south-east of Achêh and in the same direction of Abong-abong peak, which is not very far off. Hence the two accounts of Gavampati's book and Chao Ju-kua seem to tally; for the footprint can scarcely have been deemed to be other than Buddha's, and if so it was doubtless assumed to have been left by him on the occasion of his supposed visit to Achinese territory. These legends point to Buddhism being in favour in Achêh at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Islamism is said, in fact, not to have taken root in the country until A.D. 1205, with the arrival there of Johan Shâh. Chao Ju-kua's reference to another footprint in the water, some distance away, argues the tale to be but a repetition of that told about the two Buddhist footprints in Burma, of which one is on the Sacebándaha hill at Legaing, and the other on the sandy bank (left) of the Man River (Man Chaung, glibly identified by the natives with the Yamuná, some say the Narmadâ). But this is again a repetition of legends formerly current in India (see Spence Hardy's "Manual of Buddhism," 1869, pp. 209–210). Colonel Low ("Buddha and the Phrabât," London, 1831, pp. 8, 11) says: "The Siamese suppose that there was an impression of the divine foot opposite to Junkeeylon. . . . . The Siamese believe that this impression is extant on the coast of the peninsula of Malacca, opposite to Selan or Salang [C'hâlîng], as they term Junkeeylon." This is the footprint on the Suvânga-mâlî mountain referred to above (p. 80) as occurring in the province of Tenasserim. There may have existed another further down, opposite to C'hâlîng, for such impressions are easily multiplied. In the case in point it is quite probable that the legend was transplanted thence to the north-west coast of Sumatra and precisely to the Chalang district (which very likely came to be so named from the C'hâlîng Island or Junkeeylon), and a reproduction of the sacred footprint fabricated there ad hoc, so as to bear witness to the truth, so to speak, of the story about Buddha's visit thither. It would be
unbounded admiration by shouting out: "Acchëra vata!" (for Acchëram vata bho! = Oh, wonderful!). These Pāli words, corrupted afterwards into Acchë (Achēh), became henceforth the name of the country.1 Buddha proceeded thence towards the north-east, alighting next on the Malay Peninsula at Pallaṅka (p. 114).

Though this explanation of the events that led to the country being named Achēh, Ḥ̣ (Achin), is, of course, fanciful,2 it should nevertheless be noticed that the word

highly interesting if local amateur archaeologists would try and find out the exact spot where the footprint in question stood. Although every trace of it may have disappeared long ago, owing to Muḥammadan intolerance, some tradition as to its whereabouts should be still extant among the natives.

1 Van Duyl, in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1897 (p. 98, note), expresses the opinion that Achēh, or, as he writes it, "Atjēh," seems to be the name of a tree only to be found in that country. This view must, I think, be classed along with those of Marre ("Malākā," Paris, 1874, p. 6, note) and others on the same subject and on the etymology of the names of Malacca, etc. Many places in the Archipelago, as well as in Indo-China, have indeed been named after trees, shrubs, etc., found to be growing there; but in a number of instances their denominations possess a much more far-reaching meaning and interest than ascribed to them by ignorant natives, who have often altered those toponymics in order to adapt them to their fanciful notions of what they should represent.

2 It is, nevertheless, worth remarking that the district of Dala, near Rangūn, received its new name of An-gyi in a surprisingly similar manner. The "British Burma Gazetteer" (vol. ii, p. 61) thus narrates the event: "The old name of this tract was Dala. It was changed to An-khye (wonderful, admirable), of which An-gyi is a corruption, about fifty years ago when . . . . the headman had sent to the annual boat-races on the Royal Lake at Rangoon a boat so named, manned by men from Dala, which won all the races in which it competed." This coincidence in the renaming of Dala is all the more surprising, as the term An-khye is not very dissimilar in sound from Achēh. Since the above was in print I have come across the following passage in the Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 5 (June, 1880). The author, Mr. G. P. Tolson, after having pointed out how erroneous is the form Achen of the name Achēh commonly used by Europeans, proceeds as follows:—"Valentijn, however, writing as long ago as 1688, has exposed this misnomer. It is derived from the Hindustani word Achai, meaning fine, or lovely, and is so called on account of the exclamation alleged to have been uttered by the first visitors from India on sighting the coast in general, and Kampong Pandei [N.B. Pandei, = Pandita] in particular. This place, situated on the Aceh river, and not far from Kota Baja [the present capital], is remarkable for a grove of enormous trees of great beauty. In describing the land and what they saw, we may presume this epithet Achai was so repeatedly used that people came to speak of the newly discovered country as Negri Achai. This visit must have been paid centuries back, at any rate long before the Islam religion was introduced into the country, for we find the name recurring in the "Undang Undang" or laws and customs of Menangkabau, promulgated by Perpāti Sēbātang, and collected and transcribed by Mr. Van Ophuyzen. In them mention is made of the marriage of one of the Menangkabau princesses with a royal prince of Aceh . . . . Another
Acchēra (Acchariya) given as the origin of that denomination, is remarkably similar to the term Argyrē handed down to us by Ptolemy. We thus see Ptolemy’s transcript confirmed from an independent source, and are thereby enabled to trace with greater confidence than hitherto the name Achēh or Acchēra to the ancient Argari and the Argaric Gulf, in the Rāmnād district of the Koromandel coast, whence it was undoubtedly introduced. Whether the various forms Acchēra, Argyrē, and Argari, Argeirū or Ankheirū, have their modern representatives in Arṇāṅkarai, or ᴬᴛ_rāṅkarai,

legend has it that a Hīndū princess, having one day disappeared, was found by her brother in Sumatra. On their meeting he told the natives that she was his Achē, or sister. She was afterwards elected Queen, and hence this name was given to the country. This seems a very plausible story [??!!], and it is worthy of notice that the Hīndū practice of piercing and largely distending the lobes of the ears is prevalent up to this day among Achinese women; this custom is naturally attributed to the above-named princess. I have also heard it alleged that the name Achāi or Achēh is derived from a species of leech [!!], striped dark and light brown, small but vicious, which abounds in the jungle along the west coast of Sumatra.” [N.B.—This is the notorious land leech, plentiful in all jungles of Indo-China, the whole of which region should, on that score, be named Achēh.] Discarding the last two legends as unworthy of notice, it is plain that the first one is that which has been current for centuries past all over the Archipelago. It must have been well known also on the Indo-Chinese mainland if it could reach the ear of the author of Gavampati’s book in Pegu. It is in this work that we have it in one of its earliest variants, going back, no doubt, to the time when Buddhism was still the religion of Achēh and its rulers were of Indā lineage. For it is now admitted by all authorities on that country that the first dynasty that ruled over it was Indā, which was followed by a second one, Malay of Menangkabau origin, this in its turn by a pure Achinese one, and this again by an Arabic dynasty which began with Sultan Māmūd Shāh in 1760 and continues till now in Tunku Daud, the present-day ruler (see op. cit., pp. 42, 43). The name Achēh must then be very ancient, and the Chinese story of its having come into use during the period Wan-lī (1573–1620) is of course absurd. Already, as shown in the passage cited above, it has been traced back to the “Undang Undang” law-code (cirea thirteenth century). But I have pointed out that earlier than that Achēh is very probably mentioned by Dimashkī (cirea 1300) as Arshār, an island, he says, producing camphor of inferior quality to Fanṣūr (see Maschen, op. cit., p. 127). This may be one and the same with the island he terms elsewhere Arshār (ibid., p. 211). At all events Arshār is almost certainly Achēh, since it is referred to in one breath with Rībāh, also producing camphor, which we have seen is very likely the territory on the Raba River (Krung Raba, debouching into Raba Bay), just a little below Achēh on the west coast of Sumatra. (A district Rīah is, however, marked on some old maps in the place of the present Pāsāi district on the north-east coast of Sumatra, which may be the place intended, since the name is also spelt Ryāh, see p. 443.) The first European mention of Achēh I have so far met with occurs in Barboza, A.D. 156, the name being spelled Achem, after the Portuguese fashion (see Ramosio, 1563 ed., f. 318 verso). Barthema, A.D. 1508, only speaks of Pedir, just as preceding writers merely talk of Lambri, although the name Achēh was already in existence. I am confident, therefore, that under some earlier form, such as Arjāra, Acchēra, Acharē, etc., it was already known in Ptolemy’s time.
and Anaikarai (the ancient name of Rama's Bridge), on the Koromandel seaboard, or in some other old and forgotten place in that neighbourhood, it is not necessary for us to ascertain. Suffice it to know for the present that such toponymes once existed there and were thence introduced into both Arakan and Sumatra. But the essential point we should not lose sight of is, that those terms, or the original words from which they were derived, must have had the sense of 'white' or 'silver,' being thus connected with balakṣa, palakṣa, parak or prak, and other words for 'white' or the 'white metal,' such as, e.g., Arjuna, Arjara, Kṣaryura, etc., which we have noticed in the preceding pages and met with in several parts of Indo-China as well as in Sumatra. For we hear on the one hand, for instance, of Arakhosia being called by the Parthians 'White India'; and on the other of part of the Argyre or Achêh territory being termed Pê-tu, 白土, i.e. 'White Earth' or 'White Land,' by the Chinese travellers. The latter term may, it is true, be a simple transcript of the name of Batu Island (Pulo Batu), just off the southern entrance to Achêh harbour; but then we have on the northern coast of Sumatra the name Perlak once belonging to an important district, which seems to me undoubtedly connected with parak, prak, and balakṣa.

1 See McCrindle, op. cit., pp. 59, 60; and Appendix, note 3. There is an Achari on the west coast of India, but whether this name is etymologically connected with the above or not I am unable to say.

2 According to Isidora of Kharaq, quoted by McCrindle, op. cit., p. 319. The derivation suggested for the name of Arakhosia from Sarasvati (ibid., p. 317) seems to me rather fanciful. A more probable one is, in my opinion, that from Râkṣasa, which I find hinted at in Balfour's 'Cyclopaedia of India,' 3rd ed., vol. 1, p. 128, s.v., thus: 'In Indu mythology if [Arakhosia] is the country of the Rachos, with whom the immigrant Aryans came in conflict, and have been turned to the fearful Rakshasa of popular Hindu belief.'

3 Also the name of Rakun, a well-known district further down the east coast of Sumatra, which is, as we already remarked, actually noted down as Arakan by Valentijn. There is, further, a river Arakundur between Jambu-ayer or Diamond Point and Perlak.

On the strength of the connection of Parak with Arab, I would suggest that the country of Palakka, or Palakka, mentioned among the Southern Indian kingdoms conquered by Samudra Gupta (see Journal R.A.S., Jan., 1897, p. 28, note) may be Argari. I would also suggest, while I am on this subject, that Piśćapura, or Piśṭapura, with a king or district by the name of
Already in Arakan and Burma we have met with this term, which seems to have been probably introduced from Balakṣa or Badakshān, that is, from the precincts of the ancient Baktra. All evidence therefore points to the effect that there must have been a migration of the terms balakṣa and batta or baktra, with their derivatives palakṣa or prak and arakṣa or arakha, from the outskirts of the Pamirian plateau to the extreme south of India, and thence to Arakan and Sumatra.

As regards the legend of the peregrinations of the island Samudra- (or Sumatra-)giri to Ceylon, and back to its present position with a full cargo of Yakṣas, it is apparently based upon some old tradition of the separation of Sumatra from Ceylon through the subsidence of the so-called Lemurian continent, imagined by Sclater and believed to have once extended in unbroken succession from the Malay Archipelago to Ceylon and thence to Madagascar. If such be not the case, we might then assume that the legend referred to is simply an allegorical allusion to some emigration of Rākṣasas (Negrito-Dravidians) from Southern India and Ceylon to the northern coast of Sumatra. This version would appear to receive corroboration from the tradition of Rāvana's conquests in the Malay Archipelago; and, should it prove acceptable, we must conclude that Sumatra was originally a colony of the Rākṣasa empire. At all events the legend deserves consideration, as indicating the source whence Sumatra received her early settlers, or, at any rate, colonizers.

The term Argyrē, applied by Ptolemy to the capital of the northern portion of Sumatra, well indicates where the island of Argyrē of the ancients is to be looked for. We thus understand how in the early maps this island was so often located close to that of Khrysē, which I have in a former section (pp. 78, 80) identified with the southern part

Mahendragiri (see also Journal, April, 1897, p. 420) be identified with Ptolemy's Pityndra Météropolis, the capital of Maisolla. It seems to me that Pityndra may well be a syncopated form of Pista-minda, or something like it, of which the first part only has been preserved to us.
of the Malay Peninsula. Strange to say, the name under which Sumatra—together, perhaps, with the neighbouring

As briefly pointed out on p. 77 above, the island of Khrysé has been mentioned by various writers before Ptolemy's time. So was the sister island of Argyrë. Although no notice of either of them appears in what is left, preserved in fragmentary form, of the "Indika" of Megasthenes, it is very probable that the famous writer had spoken of these islands, for reference to them is made in a passage of Pliny (Hist. Nat., vi, 211, 8–23, 11), which is borrowed for the most part from him. Doubtless Eratosthenes had heard of them, although no allusion in that sense is likewise met with in the surviving fragments of his work. Pomponius Mela (circa A.D. 42) only refers to Chryse Island (iii, 7), asserting it to be near Zebis Promontorium; but probably it was the more southern headland of Tamarus (Tumarae or Tebran, the southern extremity of the Malay Peninsula) he had in view. It is with Pliny (A.D. 77) that we get anything like a full account of ancient notions about the two mysterious islands. Here is what he says: "Beyond the mouth of the Indus are Chrysé and Argyrë, rich, as I believe, in metals. For I cannot readily believe what is asserted by some writers, that their soil is impregnated with gold and silver." The last sentence may be compared with that in the Chinese cyclopædia "T'u-shu-chi-ch'êng" about the extraordinary abundance of both gold and silver in the kingdom of Po-huei-Kiu-lu, 都賀伽盧=
Pharnigara or Barakura (Arakan; see above, p. 44). The "Periplus Maris Erythraei" (circa A.D. 89), again, speaks only of Khrysé, but, for the first time in history, in a double form, that is both as part of the Indo-Chinese mainland and as an island. After having told us (§ 60) that for voyages from the west coast of India and further, to the Ganges and Khryse, large vessels are employed called kolandiophontas, the anonymous author of that treatise proceeds to say (§ 63): "You reach the Ganges and the extremity of the continent towards the east called Akrhéi." And then: "Near this river [Ganges] there is an island of the ocean called Khryse, which lies directly under the rising sun and at the extremity of the world towards the east. It produces the finest tortoise-shell that is found throughout the whole of the Erythraean Sea [Indian Ocean]." This product, we are elsewhere informed (§ 56), was sent to Máziris (Kranangur) and Nelkynda (Malabár coast), whence it was exported to the west. Here we already detect the influence of the sea voyages of Alexander and others of Ptolemy's informants to the Golden Khersonese and the South China coast,

* Burnell ("South Indian Palæography," 2nd ed., p. 126) explains the above puzzling term as derived from the two Tamil words kulinda (= 'hollowed') + ëdam (= 'boat'); but I am under the impression that the first part of the term must be somehow connected with Kolâ, Kolâm, Kolâmic, the names for Malabar and Koromandel (vide supra, p. 103); and the second with beñá, vedá = a 'boat'; the whole thus reading Kolânicus-beñá and, by dialectal corruption, Kolândyae-beñá or Kolândyae-bundá, i.e. 'Boat (or Ship) of the Kolâ Country,' N.B. that in Pahang there is a boat called kolâh, which is probably of the same style as the one called kulá (rùa kulá) in Siamese. Again, beñá becomes pibhëtrâ in Siamese, and buñhëra in Malay. Hence, our interpretation stands a good chance of proving correct. I may further suggest, as an alternative interpretation of the first part of the term, kalândân, which in Malay means a 'trunk' or a 'box,' being thus synonymous with kâpat, which had originally the same meaning, but is now employed to designate a ship or large sea-going vessel. Possibly the hitherto unexplained terms lantas and lanchara, both names for swift vessels in Further India and the Archipelago often recurring in the relations of the old travellers, are somehow survivals of the word which formed the prototype of Kolândîofontâ.
islands—is alluded to in the Purânas is Kuśa or Kuśa-deśpa, which is remarkably similar to Khrusē or Khrusē. The

which resulted in the final acknowledgment of the Χρυία Χερούναος or Malay Peninsula by Marinos of Tyre first, and then by his illustrious successor Ptolemy. On Dionysius Periegete's vague conception of the island of Chrysē we need not dwell, beyond noticing the particular passage in which he, a no mean poet, lets his imagination soar, and thinks it possible for a vessel in his time to anticipate Nordenskiöld’s feat of sailing from Thulé, across the Mare Pigrum or Arctic Sea, as far as the island of Chrysē. Solinus (cited A.D. 238) is, as usual, merely repeating Megasthenes and Pliny; hence there is nothing new in what he says (52, 6-17) about Chrysē and Argyrē, which, like his two model authors and in total ignorance of what Marinos and Ptolemy had written, he continues to locate “beyond the mouth of the Indus.” Later on, the Golden and Silver Islands, together with that of Ophir, play a prominent rôle in many medieval maps. Hence, probably, the Portuguese legend about the Ilha do Oro in the Bay of Bengal, to which we have adverted in a former section (p. 398).

It seems to me, as I have suggested above (pp. 64-65 and 77-80), that “the extremity of the continent towards the east” called Khrusē in the “Periplus” is no other land than Sweanabān, i.e. Ptolemy’s Χρυία Χάρα, on and inland from the Gulf of Martaban, while the Khrusē Island of the same treatise, and of Mela and Pliny, is what soon afterwards became with Marinos and Ptolemy the Golden Kheronesse (i.e. the Malay Peninsula, the southern part of which, I have tried to demonstrate, was very probably detached at no very remote time, forming an island). The explicit mention in the “Periplus” of the finest tortoise-shell coming from the Isle of Khrusē well evidences that this cannot be Sumatra, which is not at all noted for that article. The hawk’s bill turtle (Caretta imbricata), which yields the finest shell, is known, in fact, to inhabit only the seas round the southern part of the Malay Peninsula, Nikobās, Celebes, and Moluccas. As regards the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, the chief supply comes, according to Denny’s (“Descriptive Dictionary of British Malaya,” p. 414), from the Dindings. With respect to the east coast, I know it from my own personal experience to be peculiarly plentiful all the way from C’hump’hôn down to C’haiyâ and the neighbouring islands. All the Chinese records treating of Indo-China and the Malay Archipelago do not speak of tortoise-shell being produced elsewhere than in the Malay Peninsula and Eastern Islands. The countries referred to are: Ṣkê-pê, Po-li, and Ho-ling (see Grogneveldt, op. cit., pp. 144, 206, 139), all of which we have shown to lie on the Malay Peninsula; then, Malacca and Johor (ibid., pp. 245, 253, 254); and finally Borneo, Karimâta, Kau-lou (Gelam Island, south-west Borneo), Ma-yî-tung (Biliiton), Java (where, however, the shell is not a local product, but comes from the Spice Islands, etc.), Salu, and Kau-yê, a country near Sulu (ibid., pp. 230, 235, 202, 203, 175, 225, 226). It is quite possible that in the old days tortoise-shell was brought for sale by the Baju and Bugi from the eastern islands to the Straits; but then the chief marts for it would be found on the southern part of the Malay Peninsula, as they were in more modern times (i.e. at Malacca and Singapore, the latter being the present-day emporium for the article there, while Batavia and Manilla are the actual marts for it in the eastern part of the Archipelago). Edrisî (op. cit., vol. i, p. 63) mentions that the best tortoise-shell is found in the Sea of Herkeönd, meaning, no doubt, the east coast of Ceylon, the Nikobās, and the west coast of the Malay Peninsula. Khrusē Island cannot therefore be Sumatra, but the southern part of the Malay Peninsula, as we have suggested from the outset.

As regards the Silver or Silvery Island, Argyrē, I scarcely doubt it could be any other place than Arakan, out of which in after times Ptolemy made his Ἀργυρᾶ Χάρα. The tradition as regards the two wonderful islands was not of Greek but of Indā origin; they, in fact, correspond to the two islands Sweanra and Rûpyaka mentioned in the Râmâyana as thronged by gold (and, I think, also
resemblance may, however, be purely accidental. As regards the name Kuśa, it can, I think, be explained only by referring it to its synonym Darbha or Dabbha, which may have been adopted as closely approaching in origin to the form Daba or Dava of the term Java, by which the island, or the northern portion of it, was designated. The Rāmāyaṇa (Kiśkindhā-k.) speaks of a silver mountain by the name of Ansumat in the Kṣiroda Sea, which may correspond to some summit of the northern part of Sumatra where the ‘white’ or ‘silver district’ was situated. It then distinctly refers to volcanoes existing in the Sea of Ghṛta or Sarpis when it states that there is to be found a flame with a horse’s head called Baḍavānala. In connection with this passage I have to remark that another name for this sort of volcanic fire is Kāka-deva (‘Crow’s Banner’), which is remarkably similar to the name of Krakatoa, the famous volcanic islet in Sunda Strait; it would thus appear that the latter is meant, its eruptive character having probably become notorious from the earliest period. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa states that the object of worship in Kuśa-deva is Jātavedas, ‘Fire’; which is an allusion, I think, to the volcanic character of the Malay Archipelago, as well as to a form

silver) mines,* and it is, no doubt, from such legends current in their age that Megasthenes and other Greek writers obtained their notions about them. In course of time, however, it is possible that, owing either to the southern part of the Malay Peninsula having ceased to be an island, or to the legendary lore relating to the north coast of Sumatra and Arakan having somehow got mixed up, the location of the islands seems to have been shifted further away from the mouth of the Ganges to Achēb and Jambi or Palembang respectively, so that the last-named districts would become the Malay Pulo Mas and I-tsing’s Chin-chou. But that could not certainly have happened, in the case of Khrışe Island at any rate, before the time of the “Periplus,” for the reasons above stated.

Krakatoa is known to have been in eruption in A.D. 1680, after which it remained in a state of comparative inactivity until the famous outburst of May 20th, 1880. Before this last cataclysm the island was about five miles in length and three in breadth. These dimensions are now reduced to three by one and a half miles.

* N.B. that these two islands are, in that poem, Kiśkindhā-kāṇḍa, mentioned in connection with the Kūledaka or ‘Sea of Kalah,’ and before reaching the Sona or Lohita (Sri-lohita) Sea, or Sea of the Straits. This circumstance well indicates that the two islands were then really considered to be Arakan and the southern part of the Malay Peninsula respectively.
of worship still obtaining in it to some extent, but which was probably more marked of old. It is well known, in fact, how religiously up to this day the natives preserve the fire procured from volcanoes, and in what high veneration they hold the mountain-peaks that yield it.1

Gorresio, in his translation of the Bengal recension of the Rāmāyaṇa, has a passage in which the water of the Ghṛta Sea is stated to be of a green colour.2 I should think, then, that we have here the reason why Ptolemy terms Green Sea the southern part of the Indian Ocean stretching westward from the Malay Archipelago to the African coast. In the Suppāraka Jataka (No. 463), it should be observed, mention is made of a green and grassy sea called Kusa-māla or Kusamālī, which I take undoubtedly to be the sea encompassing Kuśa-dvīpa, as the connection is only too evident. I cannot afford to enter here into a minute discussion of the geography of Kuśa-dvīpa as laid down in the various Purāṇas, as it more properly belongs to a later period than the one treated on in the present volume, and would, besides, carry me to greater lengths with not always certain results. But I am satisfied as to the identity of Kuśa-dvīpa with, at least, Sumatra, as proved by the correspondence of several names of districts and tribes. Among topographical names we have, besides Kuśa or Darbha already noticed,3 those of Vasu, Vasudāna, and Lambana, which I take to represent, respectively, the long puzzling Chinese name Po-sz, applied to some place on the north coast of Sumatra (perhaps the

1 Dimashki (see Machren, op. cit., p. 213) mentions an island Kendālī (six parasangs in length by four in width) with a volcano in eruption, producing spices and other aromata, and peopled by a fire-worshipping race. The sea, he adds, throws large quantities of ambergris on its shores. The island here referred to may be one of the Banda group, perhaps Gunong Api, but not impossibly Krakatoa of the old days, when it was far more extensive than at present.

2 "Il gran mare ch’è s’appella Ghṛtāda... dove Viṣṇu, presso un di faccia di cavallo per l’ardore impetuoso nato in lui dall’ira, bevve poi sempre ippecepalo l’acqua di quel mare fatta verde" (Milan edition, 1870, vol. ii, p. 255). As regards the legends of the marine horse and of Kwan-yin’s birth with a horse’s head, see pp. 558 and 600.

3 Compare Darva or Darva and Darei or Darvīs as names, respectively, of a people and country, apparently not far from Baktra; in the Mahābhārata, Bhīma-parvam. (See Hall’s edition of Wilson’s Viṣṇu Purāṇa, vol. ii, p. 175.)
Lam-Besi River, west coast); Basitang, بسيط، on the east coast above Temiyang; and either Lambri or Lampong (if not actually Pralambana or Palembang). Among the names of tribes I think I can recognize the Kovidas (Kuba) and the Mandehas (= Mante tribe still existing in Achêh); while I feel pretty well certain as to the identity of the Damins and Šúsmins with the Ta-hwa-mien and Hsia-hwa-mien of Chinese writers. I have examined the site ascribed

1 Mentioned in Dr. Snouck Hurgronje’s “De Atjêhers,” vol. i, pp. 19, 51. (See Toung-foo, 1901, p. 121.) We have, besides, the Mantae tribes of the Mantawi Islands, off the west coast of Sumatra, bearing a similar name.

2 See Phillips in Journal China Branch R.A.S., vol. xx, p. 221. The name given in the Chinese map published therewith to this people is Ta-hsia-hwa-mien, 大小花面, meaning the ‘Greater and Lesser Tattooed Faces.’ It is more of a transliteration than a translation, and when decomposed into its two parts, Ta-hwa-mien and Hsia-hwa-mien, one will recognize at once in them the Damins and Šúsmins of the Visûru Purâna (bk. ii, ch. iv). Phillips reads the first name Tou-ko-bin according to the Amoy dialect, and identifies their country with Marco Polo’s Dragaoian or Dragaiam. This identification is only topographically (to a certain extent) but not etymologically, correct. The real source for Marco Polo’s puzzling term Dragaoian, Dragaiam, Dragaias, Dragonian, Dagarian, Dragorian, Dragroian, Dragroian, or Draguwyn, has yet to be found. I am confident, however, of having now solved the problem that has proved such a crux to many commentators for so many years past. The correct form of the term is undoubtedly, either Tinah-Gâyu (= Dan-gaan) or Orang-Gâyu (= Drangoian). Marco Polo does, in fact, locate his kingdom of Dragaoian between those of Samara or Sarma (Sulawesi, Samakuruk) and Lambri; that is to say, on the tract of the north coast of Sumatra corresponding, roughly, to the present Pasângan and Samabângan districts. Now, this tract of territory was, until well-nigh the time of Marco Polo’s visit, occupied by a Pagan population, refractory to Islamism, called Gâyu. This people, the Pâsi chronicle tells us, when the country of Samudra was converted to Islamism (i.e. in circa 1275-1280, see p. 644), “refused to embrace the new religion and retired towards the headwaters of the Pasângan River. It is for this reason that they were called Gâyu (Rowers?), a name which they bear until this day” (see Marre’s “Histoire des Rois de Pasey,” p. 34). At present they are still in occupation of the whole of the highlands extending from the north coast of Sumatra at Samalângan and Pasângan down to the Barisan range running along its west coast to the borders of the Sûsu and Târûmân districts, where they become conterminous with the Alas, by whom they are separated from the Koro or Kuru, a branch of the Battas further to the south-east. These Gâyu are the people whose name is variously printed Gâyo or Gajoei (= Gâyo, Gâyu) in Dutch books and maps. Whether they are or not racially connected with the Koro, Kuru, or Kuru Battas further south towards the Toba Lake, I am unable to say; but it is very likely they are, for the names are surprisingly similar, and it is not impossible that Gâyu was formerly pronounced Gâru or something similar. Gârang, گارنگ, in Malay,
to both the last-named people in the Chinese map published by Phillips, and came to the conclusion that it corresponds means 'savage,' 'ferocious.' The Karo are to this day cannibals, and Marco Polo tells us the same of the people of Dangroian, i.e. the Gayu or Gayo. He further states that this people were very savage and had idols, i.e. that they were pagan, not converted to Islamism, which particulars we know from the chronicle of Pasaí to have been at the same period equally true of the Gayu. There can thus be no further doubt that Marco Polo's Dangroian was Tanaah-Gayu (or Gayo, Gáro), i.e. 'Gayu Land.' Other possible interpretations are Orang-Gayu and Negri-Gayu. (N.B. that Orang-Gayu, owing to the initial O being easily mistaken for a D, may be quite possibly read Drang-Gayu. Besides, one text, the Veneto-Italian of Bern, has actually Groian, so that Da may be a pleonastic prefix, as in Daru for Aru, Dachem for Achem, etc.)

There can scarcely be any doubt that these Gayu were principally the people referred to by Friar Odoric in Sumoltra as tattooing their faces and bodies with various figures. This circumstance leads us to the identification of the Gayu with the 'Tattooed Faces' of Chinese literature. Their kingdom, first described by Ma Huan in A.D. 1416, is recorded under the name Na-ku-erh, 孩孤儿 (= Nakur, Nagur), which has, in its turn, so much puzzled our predecessors, but in which the reader will now be able to recognize a shortened form of [T]anah-Kar0, -Guru, or -Gayu; in fact, the same term as gave rise to Marco Polo's spelling [Da]-ngroian, [Da]-ngauan, [Da]-garion. The location assigned to Nakur in the Chinese literature of the period is exactly the same as Dagarion, i.e. to the west of Su-mên-ta-la (Samudra) and adjoining its frontiers. The country, it is added, only consists of one large mountain village, counting about one thousand families. The people tattoo on their faces triangular blue figures (as well as figures of flowers and animals), and for this reason their

* So state several accounts, whereas I find now asserted that according to Von Brenner ("Besuch bei den Cannibalen Sumatra," Würzburg, 1894) the Karo, or "gentle Karo," as this author calls them, alone appear amongst Batta tribes to be entirely free from cannibal practices (see Geographical Journal, February, 1896, pp. 181, 183). If this is true, so much the better for them and for those who happen to pass near their hamlets. Dr. Leyden says that the "Karrus," as he calls them, were in his time subject to Achin ("Essays rel. to Indo-China," 1st series, vol. i, p. 114).

† On face-tattooing, compare our remarks above, p. 367, to which I am now able to add the following from the "Upper Burma Gazetteer," pt. i, vol. i, pp. 466, 514, 543. The women of the wild Wahs of the north, about the sources of the Nam Mâ, are said to tattoo their faces and bosoms. The male Loi-lông (Döi-lúang) Kurens tattoo two black squares beneath their chins, and are exceedingly proud of these marks. As regards several Chin tribes the following facts have been recorded:— (1) The Chin-bôks cover the face with nicks, lines, and dots of a uniform design. The women's breasts are also surrounded with a circle of dots. (2) The Yindus tattoo in horizontal lines across the face, showing glimpses of the skin. (3) The Chin-bôns tattoo an entire dead black, and are the most repellent in appearance. The men are not tattooed at all. The beauty of a Chin woman is gauged by her tattooing. The tattooing of the face in lines is characteristic of the aborigines of Formosa, as well as of the Phû O and Nu-tse or Lu-tse (see pp. 367-368). Marco Polo, bk. ii, ch. Ivi, mentions face-tattooing as prevalent among the people of Cuangigu or Gemigu, who evidently are the Phû O, Pu-erh, or Pu-on (P'huen). The custom can therefore be traced all the way from the north coast of Sumatra, through the Malay Peninsula (Semang, Benua), to Northern Indo-China, and thence eastwards as far as Formosa, and westwards to Central Northern India (Kolarian tribes).
to the present districts of Sűsū, Damar, and Tarūmūn, or Trumun, forming, practically, the southern limit of the
country is also called 'Country of the Tattooed Faces' (Huê-nien Kuo, 花面國). They have simian faces and naked bodies, wrapping a single
cloth around their loins. In the neighbourhood is situated the mountain of
Nakur, which yields sulphur. When our (Chinese) fleet was at Su-men-ta-la men and ships were sent there to collect it. (Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 218-219; and Toung-Pao, 1901, pp. 348-351.) In connection with the last item of information I may point out that Beaulieu mentions a similar mountain in that
neighbourhood which may or may not be the very one referred to by Fei Hsin.
He says: "À six lieues de la Capitale [Achin], vers Pèder, s'élève une haute
montagne, en forme de Pic, d'où l'on reçoit quantité de soufre" (Prévost, Hist. gén. des Voyages, vol. ix, p. 340). However, old volcanic cones are not
scarce on that coast, and sulphur must be easily procured in various places.
It will thus be seen that Nakur is Marco Polo's Dougroian and Gāyu Land.
Chinese accounts of the period distinctly locate it along the mountains to the
west of Sumatra city and between this and Lambri. The map published by
Phillips marks it on the west coast below Lambri, which is not an error at all,
but a circumstance evidencing that Gāyu territory did then, as nowadays,
stretch across the north-western part of the island to its western seaboard.
The Gāyu have, of course, since retired from the shore, being at present confined to the
highlands at the back of it. I should add that there was another tribe in their
neighbourhood probably also connected with them. Their country is mentioned
in the Pāsāi chronicle (op. cit., p. 51; and Dulaquier in Journal Asiatique,
1847, p. 259), under the name of 'Nadami, ندي, Land,' and described as
situated at the headwaters of the Pāsāi River (cf. Nadami, Damī, and
Tu-[Huê]-nien).

It is surprising that even with such a clear statement of the location of
Nakur Sinologists have not been able to identify this country and their people,
to say nothing of Marco Polo's Dougroian. Phillips, we have seen,
is the only one that went anywhere near the mark, although missing it. For
Professor Schlegel, on the other hand, Nakur is Marco Polo's Neceuran or
Nucuran (i.e. the Nikobārs!! see Toung-Pao, 1901, p. 351). I regret to
notice that the industrious Professor is scarcely more fortunate than his learned
colleagues in Sinology as regards the identification of Chinese place-names in the
Archipelago. As we are just treating of Sumatra, I may point out for the
benefit of other students interested in such matters that Fei Hsin's
龍牙加貌, Luang-ya-ka-mau, out of which Professor Schlegel has
made (Toung-Pao, vol. ix, pp. 367 and 383) a teratological Linga Kama or
Linga Kambau, which, of course, does not exist, and which he consequently has
never been able to locate, is purely and simply a sufficiently clear transcript
of Menang-kabau, the famous kingdom in north-central Sumatra, marked
龍牙加兒, Luang-ya-kia-chih, in Phillips' map (Journal China Branch
R.A.S., vol. xxi, 1886, p. 38), and taken by this Sinologist to be Indrapura.
It will now be plain to every reader that both the above transcripts are simply
contracted forms of Ma- luang-ya-ka-mau = Menangga-kabau, Menang-kabau.
It will be gathered from the above examples and from the many others given in
the course of this work, that the Chinese geography of Indo-China and the
Archipelago as hitherto fancifully expounded by Sinologists is almost entirely
unreliable, and requires a good and thorough overhauling at the hands of those
who know something of the topography, history, and languages of those countries
ere it can be of any use for scientific purposes.
Gāyu and Ālas lands, on the west coast of Sumatra. Mount Kuṣeṣaṇa of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa is probably Gūnong (Mount) Lusė, लुसेई and लुसेळ being easily mistaken for one another when not clearly written or partly obliterated in the old MSS. Again, the Cakrä (‘wheel’) mountain referred to in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa as being in Kuṣa-deviṇa, may be the Hsi-lun (‘Fine wheel’) mountain of Chao Ju-kua’s account.

The Vāyu Purāṇa places Kuṣa-deviṇa among the islands, and states that it is also called Kumuda. Along with it it mentions Varāha, which may be Hog Island, near the west coast of Sumatra (see p. 448). The Bhāgavata and Padma Purāṇas have instead Ramaṇaka, which undoubtedly corresponds to Hsüen-chuang’s Yen-mo-na Chou,¹ to the Rāmī or Ramī of the Arabs, to the local Lambrī or Lam-barī, and to Marco Polo’s Lambri.

But I shall not further press for identities: the argument is quite novel and the antiquities of Sumatra still a sealed book; we must know more about them and the early history and geography of the island ere we can safely proceed. Sumatra, owing to its being so extensive and its coastline but little known up to quite recent times, has always been believed to consist of several islands which were designated by different names: hence the confusion that has arisen in the accounts of the island left us by the early travellers, and the difficulty in locating and identifying the names of places they give.

Confining our remarks to the Achēh district proper, we cannot afford to pass unnoticed a peculiar term applied to it to this day, namely Achēh Besar, اچه بسیار, literally ‘Great Achēh,’ commonly understood to mean ‘Achēh Proper,’ but which, in my opinion, should be more correctly taken to signify its original territory, that where the foundation of its greatness was laid; ‘Ancient Achēh,’ in fact. Its compass is now assumed to embrace “that corner of Sumatra formed by a line drawn from Pidir Point on

¹ N.B. that there is a Krung Jamuan (= Yamūnā or Jamūnā River) in the Sawang district, west of Pāssi, north coast of Sumatra.
the north, to Kuāla Lambesi on the west coast."\(^1\) It is, in fact, to all intents and purposes, the territory formerly otherwise known by the alternative designation of Lambri. We have already met with the term 'Great' as prefixed to toponyms in the case of Malacca (or at any rate the old territory corresponding to the latter medieaval State of that name), surnamed by the Chinese Ta Shé-p'ō, 大閩婆, or 'Great Java (Saba).’\(^2\) This coincidence suggests that the term 'Great Achēh' may also be of very ancient origin, and that analogously it may have found expression in the Chinese Ta-shīh, 大食, in which the first part of the name, Ta, 大, would then really have its proper sense of 'Great,' and the second would stand for Ashī, Achēh.\(^3\) We have pointed out (supra, p. 511) that as late as 1521, and even 1586 and after, the accounts of European travellers preserve a similar form in Dachem, Dacin, etc. If so, the term Ta-shīh would not be a transcript of Tājīk, Tājīka = Arabs, as has hitherto been supposed. Besides, I find it, when employed in the latter sense, sometimes written 達其, Ta-ch'i. It can be traced back, we have seen, until at least A.D. 960–1280, at which period Sung history informs us that from the southern coast of Shé-p'ō (central part of Malay Peninsula) Ta-shīh may be reached in five days' sailing. The "Tung-hsi Yang-k'a'u" (A.D. 1618), as well as Ming history and the "Kwang-tung T'ung-chih," distinctly state that Achēh, 哇齊, is the former Su-mén-ta-la, 蘇門答剌, or Su-wên-ta-na, 蘇文達那 (Sumatra), which, in its turn, was the old country of Ta-shīh (古大食國);\(^4\) hence the confusion that has so often been made in Chinese records between this Ta-shīh and the country of the Tājīks. It seems to me that to our

---

\(^1\) *Journal Straits Branch R.A.S.*, No. 5 (June, 1880), p. 41.

\(^2\) See pp. 519, 522, and 523.

\(^3\) I am, of course, aware that the name Achēh is commonly transcribed 亞齊, Ya-ch'i, or A-ch'i, 哇齊 (A-ts'ai, A-ts'ê, A-che); but this form merely dates from A.D. 1618, when it first appears in the "Tung-hsi Yang-k'a'u" Cyclopaedia, it being referred to later on in Ming history under the period Wan-li (1573–1620). See Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 214, 215.

\(^4\) See *T'oung-Pao*, 1910, pp. 338, 368, 369.
Sinologists the term Ta-shih, as applied to the north-west corner of Sumatra Island, has been no less deceiving than the contemporary name Po-sz, 波斯, which has led them to take it as a transcript of Fars, Pars, or Persia, because such is its widely known application. That there were of old both Arab and Persian settlements in the Achēh district and even at other places on either the northern or western coasts of Sumatra is very probable—nay, almost certain; for these coasts lie within close proximity to the Nikobārs, which, as is well known, formed one of the capital stations and landmarks on the Arab and Persian sea-route across the Bay of Bengal. Owing to this fact, the north-west seaboard of Sumatra must have been often touched at, especially when the southern drift of the currents in the Bay of Bengal compelled the vessels to pass within sight of it, or hurricanes eventually threw those vessels against that coast and forced them to seek a refuge there. A proof of such views is afforded by the accounts of the Arab travellers themselves, which show that not only Lambri, but Bārūs, were well known to their countrymen, who seem to have carried on a busy traffic at their seaports since at least the middle of the ninth century. Nevertheless, we are perfectly aware from evidence adduced in the preceding pages, that the country was above all Indū in belief and manners; it having

1 See p. 429. In connection with Po-sz, Ta-shih, etc., with the north coast of Sumatra, the following entry under a date corresponding to A.D. 1463 occurs in Ming history, bk. 325: "Su-mên-ta-la (Samudra) lies west of Malaca," etc. Some say that it is the Tiao-shih, 條枝 [a country on the coast of the Persian Gulf, identified by Dr. Hirth with Chaldaea], of the Han Dynasty, and the Po-sz, 波斯 [Fars, Pars, Persia], of the T'ang Dynasty [N.B. this term Po-sz is found in Chinese history as far back as about A.D. 450]: two countries of the Ta-shih, 大食 [Ṭūjīks, the Arabs of the Khalīf empire], and an important gathering-place in the west" (Ts'oung-Pao, 1901, p. 343). The explanations between brackets are my own.

2 Sufficient to recall the particulars about the footprint, undoubtedly Buddhist, mentioned by Chao Ju-kua as early at least as 1240. Other details in his account of Lan-wu-hs are interesting as being the oldest account we possess of the people of that country and their customs. I therefore summarize them here from Dr. Hirth's paper in the Journal R.A.S., July, 1896, pp. 480-482. The inhabitants are very dark-skinned, they wrap their bodies round with silk stuffs,
been settled and probably colonized from the remotest ages by Dravidian emigrants from Southern India, although there can be no doubt that even before that perhaps it had been partially civilized by the Phœncians. It cannot, therefore, seem credible that from the mere fact of the Arabs and Persians having had a few petty settlements there, the land could come to be called after them respectively the Tājīka or Parsi country. These terms must have other and more deep-grounded origins. If 'Great Aĉēh,' or Ta-Aslih, is not the prototype of the denomination Ta-shīh,

are bareheaded, and go barefoot. They use their hands in taking their food. They are warlike, and often use poisonous arrows. [Friar Odoric mentions that the people of Sumoltra are (sêred A.D. 1323) in constant war with those of the kingdom of Lamsor: that they go stark-naked, are bad and cruel, and addicted to cannibalism; but this seems to apply only to the wild tribes near by.] Household vessels are made of bronze. The king is black, with unkempt hair, and wears no covering on his head; he wears no regular clothes, but is merely wrapped in cloth of various colours, and his feet are protected by sandals of red leather (fastened) with gold thread. When going out he rides on an elephant or in a kind of litter. He eats every day a paste made of betel-nuts, burnt together with real pearl ashes. His palace is decked with jewels. There is an eastern and a western palace [read 'throne hall'] at each of which there is planted a golden tree [the bunga-mas of Malayas and kalavryka of Indus]. Underneath each of these trees there is a golden throne with partition walls of glass. When holding court the king ascends the eastern throne in the morning and the western throne in the evening [an Inda custom]. Two attendants constantly hold up a golden dish [read 'spittoon'] to receive the dregs of the betel-nuts chewed by the king. The king holds in his hand a jewelled [read 'ruby'] five inches in diameter, which will stand the test of fire and shine at night like a torch; by rubbing his face with it every day the king will keep his youthful looks, though he may be over ninety years old. [Neither the translator nor anyone else has, to my knowledge, noticed that Marco Polo and Friar Odoric state about the same thing of the kings, respectively, of Ceylon and Niscomar or Bakumaron. Says Messer Marco: 'And the king of this Island possesses a ruby which is the finest and biggest in the world. It is about a palm in length, and as thick as a man's arm... it is quite free from flaw, and as red as fire... You must know that the Great Khan sent an embassy and begged the King as a favour greatly desired by him to sell him this ruby... but the King replied that on no account whatever would he sell it.' Odoric repeats the same story, ascribing, through some confusion or oversight, the possession of the precious jewel to the chief of the Nikobârs.] The country sends yearly tribute to Sun-fe-chî' (Palembang). With the north wind [read 'north-east monsoon'] you come within a little more than twenty days to the country of Hsi-ian (Ceylon). Sailing from Lan-seh-li (Lammuri, Ramburi), you know that you are coming to Hsi-ian (Ceylon) by the flashing of lightning always visible.

There is nothing, it will be seen, suggestive of Islamism in this account; on the contrary, the evidence is totally in favour of our view that Induism was then widespread in the country, the dynasty itself being of real or pretended Indi descent. Even at the time of Marco Polo's visit (A.D. 1292-3) the people were still idolaters, although the local chronicles place the introduction of Islam into the country in A.D. 1205. This may be true as regards a portion of the people, but not of the great bulk of them. Hence the Ta-shīh = Tājīka theory as regards this country stands but little chance of proving correct.
we shall then very likely have to trace this, as already suggested, to a name Tarshish, transplanted here in the earliest days by the Phoenician navigators, and given to the country either in memory of an older Tarshish nearer home (perhaps Tarsia, the promontory on the Karmanian coast near which Nearkhos' fleet anchored); or in imitation of some epithet suggestive of silver, Rākṣasas, or the like, already applied to the principal town or seaport on that coast by the Dravidians from Southern India and Ceylon. The connection between Ceylon and Sumatra in legendary lore, as well as in history, is so considerable, we have seen, as to well justify the latter alternative, while the terms Argyrē, Ta-shih, Arshir, Dachem, Achēh, successively met with from the second to the sixteenth century A.D., are sufficient evidence in favour of either view. From the fact of Ptolemy applying the name Argyrē to the principal town of that coast, it would seem that this was merely the city designation, while Rāmbrī, Rāmnī, Lambri, etc., were the country's name, although perhaps becoming in course of time alternative appellations for the principal city or settlement to which the Kraton, citadel and king's residence, were successively shifted, for the seat of these continually varied. The terms Acchera, Achai, or Acchā would seem, however, if the legends accounting for them be true, to have been applied to the country and not to its capital. The question is complicated, and not easy of definite solution until more evidence is collected. The term Pūlok-Lamiri, वूलक लमिरि, appearing in the "Sejarah Malāyu," ch. viii, as the name of a city in Lamiri or Lamerī, लमिरि लमेरि, probably the capital, is not clear as regards its first portion, which we ignore, whether it stands for pulo, pulau, वूल, 'island,' or for some proper name, Puloš, derived from palakṣa, balakṣa, etc., 'white,' or 'silver,' 'silvery.'

As regards the other term, Po-ss, 波斯, which we have seen applied to this part of Sumatra Island (see p. 429), it can hardly mean Lambri or Achēh, because Chao Ju-kua,
who gives us a rather diffuse account of Lan-wu-li, refers to Po-sz separately,¹ so that Dr. Hirth has been led to consider it to apply to some unidentified country which is “probably not Persia.” As it reads Po-ssū, Pa-su, Ba-sa, Ba-shi, Bu-sū, I have already suggested its probable identity with the Vasu State located by the Bhāgavata Purāṇa in Kusā-dvipa. It may be Lambesi, i.e. Besi or Bāsi—Lam being merely the ordinary prefix meaning village—a petty State on the homonymous river on the west coast of Sumatra immediately below Achēh, upon which it borders. It doubtless is De Barros’ Lambrij, which adjoins Daya (Dāyā, دیا), which, in its turn, adjoins Achem. Dāyā lies, in fact, between the two mouths of the Lambesi River (also called Lambesoi).² The name Lambri for the Achēh district certainly did no longer exist at the time of the advent of the Portuguese in the Archipelago. The last Western author to mention it is probably Friar Odoric, while in Chinese literature the last reference to it occurs in Ma Huan’s work, a.d. 1416. Fei-Hsin, but twenty years later, although speaking of more States on North Sumatra than any other of his predecessors (to wit, Su-mên-ta-la, Temīyang, Nakur, and Menang-kabau—Professor Schlegel’s Linga-Kamau of immortal fame), has not a word about Lambri. It goes, of course, without saying, that whatever references may be thereafter found to that State in Ming history and the various encyclopaedias are merely retrospective, being based for the most part on Ma Huan’s account. But even then, 1430 is the last recorded date for intercourse with Nan-p’o-li in the annals.

¹ See Journal R.A.S., 1896, p. 479.
² De Barros’ Lambrij, I now notice, has a good deal puzzled Colonel Yule, who takes it to be the old Lambri (whereas it is undoubtedly Lambesi), and cannot therefore explain De Barros’ apparent inconsistency in placing it at first between Daya and Achem, and then between Maneopa and Daya (see “Marco Polo,” 3rd edition, London, 1903, vol. ii, p. 300). While I am on the subject of Yule’s famous work, to which I regret not having had access before this (the first copy I have seen of it is the third edition, just issued, too late in time to be of any avail for the purpose of reference in this work, which is now, September, 1903, already all in type or very nearly so), I may just as well remark that, as regards Indo-China and the Archipelago it still leaves many questions, especially about Marco Polo’s sea-route in this region, unsolved, which will be found settled in the preceding pages. I propose to soon revert to this fascinating subject more fully elsewhere.
of the Ming dynasty. After this such a State is no more heard of as a living entity. Nor is it in any local chronicle or in any account of travellers later than this period. We must then infer that the name must have disappeared between A.D. 1430 and 1436, the date of Fei-Hsin's book. But the change probably took place a little later, i.e. in 1471, when, as we shall see directly, a Chăm prince ascended the throne there. This fact of the disappearance of the name Lambrī from the map of the country is very important, and I have thought it worth the while to call attention to it, as it does not appear to have been noticed before this. There occurs, indeed, a mention in the sailing directions of the "Hai-kwo-Wên-chien-lu" (A.D. 1730) of a country or sea termed Lan-nī, 燉泥 (Lan-li, Lan-nai, Ran-nei, lit. 'broken or splashed mud' or mire), which Professor Schlegel innocently takes to be the old Lambri; ¹ but there is no shadow of a probability that such can be the case. The passage in question states in fact: "To the east Siam is connected with Kamboja (東 [read 東] 埔寨, i.e. Kan-pu-chih) . . . . Now, how is it that they are so far distant from each other? It is because the whole south of Kamboja belongs entirely to Lan-nī, for which reason it is called 'The End of Lan-nī,' 燉泥尾 [Lan-nī Wei; more properly the 'headland,' or 'promontory,' of Lan-nī]. Lower on it joins the great and the small Transverse Islands [the term is 横山, i.e. Greater and Lesser Hêng = Pulo Panjang and East Island with Table Rock]; and because one has to make the tour around its outside, it is so much farther." It is perfectly plain that here, by 'End of Lan-nī' the landspit of Khmau (Khmau Point) at the southern extremity of Kamboja is meant; and by Lan-nī the Khmau peninsula stretching southwards from the delta of the Mê-không River, which being yet in

¹ See Trung-Poo, vol. ix, p. 197. I need not point out that out of the eight or more toponymics given in the itinerary in question after leaving the Paracels, Professor Schlegel has not succeeded in identifying a single one, except the two which had been easily made out long before he wrote, viz. Pulo Condor and Trung-pu-chih, more correctly Kan-pu-chih, which is Kamboja. I cannot afford space to go here into this itinerary, but hope to be able to do so before long elsewhere. Suffice for our present purpose to establish the identity of the Hêng Islands and Lan-nī.
course of formation is but a mire, known as the 'still sea' ('Mer tranquille' of the French), a sea of mud, in fact, that has but in few places acquired anything like consistency. The dark colour of the waters, which through innumerable creeks flow to tinge the sea for a long distance all round, has caused the Khmërs to apply to them the name of Thúk Khmau, meaning the 'Black (or inky) Waters.' Now this is exactly represented by the Chinese term Lan-ni, which must therefore be taken in its literal sense, and not as a transcript of any local toponymic. Under such circumstances, the Chinese itinerary above referred to becomes perfectly clear; the concluding sentences simply mean that the distance from Siâm to Kamboja (its capital being intended) is so great because the Khmau peninsula, or mud-flat, intervenes, which must be given a wide berth, thus causing much loss of time in rounding it. There cannot absolutely be, accordingly, any connection between this Lan-ni and Lambri, which latter lies too far away to permit of such a wild idea being even for a moment entertained.

We must therefore turn to a similar place-name, Lan-li or Lam-li, mentioned in the annals of the T'ang and Sung dynasties as a station on the sea-route from Ch'üan-chou (Zayton?) to the Persian Gulf, which has been identified by Dr. Bretschneider with Lambri. Such an identification is undoubtedly correct, because the toponymic in question is spelled 藩里 (Lan-li, Lam-ri), which is evidently but a contraction of the fuller form, 藩無里 (Lan-wei-li, Lam-mu-ri,

1 I should not think there can be any etymological connection with the name "Lake of Śrī Rāma" (Rāma-daha, Rāma-sara?) applied, according to Crawfurd ("Embassy to Siam and Cochinchina," London, 1830, vol. ii, p. 248), by the Malays (Chăm?) residing in Kamboja to the Thalé-sôp or inland lake there. Nor can there be any relation with the 'Rāma mouth' (Pāknam P'hrāh Rām), the appellation formerly given by the Siamese to the mouth of a river about Rayóng, west of Chanthabûn, which may be the embouchure of the Rayóng River itself. This name seems now to have been forgotten; I merely gather it from the old Siamese map often previously alluded to. It is, however, possible that Lan-ni or Ron-ni may be a transcript of the Khmër word rāni, rāniam, which means 'low and submerged jungle' (i.e. flooded during high tides or inundations, also called prēi rāniam), although I do not know whether this term is in any way specifically applied to the muddy tract in question.

2 See Ts'oung-Pao, 1901, p. 338, for a passage concerning that quoted from the "Tien-i-ťien," ch. 78.

Ram-bu-ri), we have met with in Chao Ju-kua. Furthermore, the sailing distances given from it to the Chinese coast and the Persian Gulf respectively agree with the location of Lambri. In fact, the Persian ambassadors, say the texts, embarked at Ch'üan-chou and reached Lam-ri in some forty odd days. There they waited for the (north-east) monsoon and sailed the next year home to their country (達其, Ta-ch'i), which took again some sixty odd days. The embassy in question seems to belong to the Sung period (960–1278). There can be no doubt that the Arabic Rāmni is here meant. This is the oldest notice we have of Rāmbrī or Lambri from Chinese sources. Next to it comes the one in Chao Ju-kua already adverted to, and then no other mention of Lambri occurs in the Chinese records until A.D. 1416, the date of Ma Huan's work. Between the two authors last alluded to come several hints by Arab writers, which are, however, of but little value, owing to their extreme brevity and the more detailed accounts of Marco Polo and Friar Odoric. To these some reference has already been made, hence it only remains to notice Marco Polo's statement that "in this kingdom of Lambri there are men with tails; these tails are of a palm in length, and have no hair on them. These people live in the mountains, and are a kind of wild men. Their tails are about the thickness of a dog's." In commenting on this passage, Colonel Yule (vol. ii, p. 301) draws attention to the fact that Marsden was told of hairy people called Orang Gugu in the interior of the island (are these not perchance the Orang Gāyu referred to by us above?), who differed little, except in the use of speech, from the orang-utang. He further remarks that since Marsden's time a French writer, giving the same description, declares that he saw a 'group' of these hairy people on the coast of Indragiri, and was told by them that they inhabited the interior of Menang-kabau and formed a small tribe. His new editor, Professor Cordier, inserts here, in his turn, a reference to the "'Ajāīb" (Merveilles de l'Inde), which speaks of anthropophagi with tails at Lūlū-bilenk, on the west coast of Sumatra, between Fansūr and Lāmeri,
for our identification of which place see above, p. 431. Mr. Anderson, Yule proceeds, says there are a few wild people in Siak, very little removed in point of civilization above their companions the monkeys, but he specifies nothing about hairiness or tails. "Galvano heard that there were on the Island certain people called Daraque Dara (D'Arakundur ? = Arakundur district ?) which had tails like unto sheep." Kazwíní tells of the hairy little men that are found in Rʌmni, with a language like birds' chirping." For this information, I now notice, Kazwíní is indebted to Ibn Khurdādbih, who states: "The natives of these islands (Rʌmni, etc.) go naked, and shelter themselves in the midst of thickets. Their language is a sort of unintelligible hissing. They avoid intercourse with other people. Their stature is of 4 ṣhɪb or spans (about 36 inches, or 3 feet) . . . . their hair is red and crisp. They climb trees with the hands (i.e. without the assistance of their feet)." The passage is textually copied by Edrisí, who adds the missing sentence that the wild people in question are such swift runners that they cannot be overtaken. It is interesting, in connection with the stature of these pygmies, to observe how the tradition of the three and five spans height runs steadily through the interval of over fifteen centuries from Megasthenes, Strabo, and Pliny in the West, and from the oldest Chinese records in the Far East, to writers of even the post-medieval period. As regards red curled hair, we have noticed how it is ascribed to the clawed negro savages of Lo-chu, on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, since early

1 This name, it strikes me, somewhat resembles that of a promontory called the Point of Dairai-barra in the "Muhit" (A.D. 1554), and stated to lie somewhere between Malacca and Parcelar Hill (Bukit Jugra) on the north (see Reinard's Intr. to Absolóda, p. cxxxvii). I take it that Cape Rachado (Tanjung Tuan) is the headland meant, and if not, Tanjung Bidara or Tanjung Brús not far below. However, Daraque Dara above may stand for Darakundur, a pleonastic form of Arakundur, as e.g. Dará for Aru.

2 Journal Asiatique, 1865, p. 286. Also De Goeje's "Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum," pars vi, p. 44, where the wild tribes in question are exclusively located in the jungles of the Island of Rʌmni.


5 See above, pp. 258-262.
in the seventh century A.D. Language, like bird-chirping, was ascribed in general to the Man-I, 麓夷, a term which is explained as "barbarians whose jargon resembles the warbling of certain birds."  

1 Even in quite modern times one Huang Chung, whose work was published A.D. 1537, says of the K’ang, 砍, hill tribes of Northern Siäm (either Kachins or Khâ Kong) that "their language is like bird chirping, non-understandable";  

2 and a work of K’ang Hsi’s reign (1662–1723) adds besides that they resemble monkeys.  

3 As regards hairy and tailed men in Sumatra, a gentleman who lived for seventeen years on that island informed Dr. Meyer that "he heard of wild, hairy tribes in the interior of the Sultanate of Siak"; and a recent publication of Dalitz (in "Not. Batav. Genootsch.," 1893, p. 27) gives an account of hairy dwarfs in Kroë, Bengkûlen, south-west coast of Sumatra.  

4 There is, therefore, good reason to expect that the veracity of former reports may receive full confirmation. With tailed men the case is of course quite different, for such legends originated either from mere imagination, from the style of dress of some wild tribes presenting some appendage hanging down behind like a tail, or from teratological phenomena of which we have, even at the present day, an example in India.  

5 At all events, we

---

1 See Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 5.  
5 I mean the lineae nature occurring in the case of an infant recently born in the Gaya district, who is possessed of a caudal appendage about 3 to 3½ inches long. The authenticity of this case is beyond question, as the same was reported to the Indian Medical Gazette (for either June or July, 1903). On the Indo-Chinese mainland we have many accounts of tailed men. Leaving aside the Chiang, 羌, of Tibet, who claimed, as did others of their congeners, to be descended from a race of anthropoid apes, we may notice in Indo-China proper:  

1) The Wei-Pu, 尾濮, or 'Tailed Pu,' mentioned in the Sung Geography, which quotes from a work on the 'Customs of Pu-nan' (now lost). They are sometimes called the 'Arboreal Pu,' and located 1,500 li (circa 250–300 miles) south-west of Yünnan. Ma Tuan-lin says they have a tail from 3 to 4 inches in length, and adds that they are cannibals, regularly feasting upon their old relatives, except on their mother, for whom alone they feel respect (op. cit., pp. 298–299; also China Review, vol. xix, p. 293). Here we have the old story of the wild Wañ and Kachins, although these Pu may be the Pu-many, who call
may gather from the fact that such wild tribes, hairy or not, have been heard of from both the Siak and Achëh hinterlands, on respectively the east and west coasts of Sumatra, i.e. on either side of the Gäyu and Ālas territory, that they must belong to the stock of the latter, and are perhaps identical with these as yet little known people.

Later Chinese accounts of Lambri do not tell us much of value about the country and people. As already noticed, such accounts are mainly based on the well-known one of Ma Huan (A.D. 1416). This author informs us that in his day the people in the country were all Musalmāns in religion. The State, he adds, borders on the east upon the kingdom of Li-tai, 黎代, which is undoubtedly De Barros' Lide, and probably corresponds, in my opinion, to the present Rantei or Rantai Panjang, near Tringading. De Barros may very well, through a lapsus calami, have written Lide for Ridei or Rantei; or the fault is more likely attributable to the copyists or printers of his work.¹ Li-tai or Lide bordered on the east upon Nakur, the old Gäyu-country.

themselves Sautöm, and are known to the Lāu as Khā Dau (‘Black or Negrito-Savages’). As regards arboreal habits, etc., here is what a recent account I obtained from trustworthy Siamese sources tells us: “The Khā Wah (i.e. Wild Wah) are as agile and nimble as monkeys (khāng). In climbing trees they make use of a rope with a stag-horn tied at one end. This end they throw up on the tree until it becomes entangled to some branch; then they climb up the rope with extreme quickness. By such a method they are able to travel also from tree to tree without ever touching the ground.” (2) The Yau, 傘, or Yau-jen, of Yünnan are firmly believed to this day by the Chinese to have tails like monkeys. (See “Upper Burma Gaz.”, pt. i, vol. i, p. 598.)

For reports of tailed men in various parts of the Archipelago, see the next section, “Islands of the Satyrs.”

¹ It seems passing strange that several names of States mentioned by De Barros in the north part of Sumatra have not been identified as yet by our predecessors in this field. They are, southwards of Achin, Lambrij and Manceopa; and eastwards, Biar, Lide, Pirada. Some of these I have already located in the course of the preceding pages, viz., Lambrij (= Lambesi), Pirada = Pidada or Pedada, and Lide = Rantei. As regards Manceopa, I make it out to be Bakongan above Trūmum; Biar may be either the old Beruan and the present Beureukung, although it seems to correspond to Lūbok, a petty State further to the west, i.e. towards Achinese territory. Biar is, however, a Malay word, بيار (byar, ‘to grant’).
More interesting is Ma Huan’s reference to a lofty ‘Island of Peaceful Passage’ (or ‘Foreboding,’ as Professor Schlegel renders the epithet), T’ai-p’ing-yu-chün Shan, 太平預峻山, lying in the sea, to the north-west, at half a day’s sailing, and more specifically designated Mao Shan, 帽山, literally, ‘Hat Island.’ This name has puzzled all Sinologists, from Phillips and Groeneveldt to Professor Schlegel. The two former have identified the island in question with either Pulo Brās or Pulo Nāsi; while the latter, far more imaginative, is convinced that since the Chinese character with which the name of the island is represented means a hat, it might just as well be one of those large, broad-brimmed Spanish hats called ‘sombreros’ [why not a Chinese conical hat or slightly domed cap?]; ergo (reader, please notice the logical, or rather paralogical, process of reasoning here), the island in question must be the one which the Portuguese called Sombrero, and from which Sombrero Channel in the Nikobār archipelago (between Little Nikobār on the south side and Kachāl and Nankauri on the northern) got its name. Now, the Sombrero is Chauri Island, described as “generally low, but its south end rises almost perpendicularly in a rocky pinnacle to a height of about 343 feet, having the appearance, with the contiguous low portion, of a flap hat, whence it was named Sombrero by the early Portuguese navigators.” The homonymous channel is only used by ships proceeding from the Koromandel coast (Madras, etc.) to Malacca Strait, whereas the Chinese accounts distinctly tell us that Mao Shan served as a landmark for ships coming from the west, i.e. Ceylon; that it was flat-topped (while Sombrero is pinnacle-shaped); and that it could be reached in half a day’s sailing from Lambri. This presupposes a distance of fifteen to twenty miles at the utmost, considering that vessels must travel against wind and current in getting clear of the islands off Achēh Head,

2 See Young-Poo, vol. ix, p. 180. Mr. Parker, I notice (Ariatic Quarterly Review, January, 1900, p. 141), gives credence to the Sombrero theory.
3 “Bay of Bengal Pilot,” 3rd ed. (1901), p. 299. The italics are mine.
especially during the north-east monsoon. Hence, the
distance applies to either Pulo Brās, Wich, or Rondo, but
not at all to the Nikobārs, the nearest point of which
(Parsons Point, the southern end of Great Nikobār) lies no
less than 120 miles off.\(^1\)

It is amusing to notice the arguments brought forward
by Professor Schlegel in taunting Groeneveldt for having
suggested either Pulo Brās or Pulo Nāsi as the equivalent of
the mysterious Mau Shan. As they are a good specimen of
the Professor's dialectics, it would be a pity not to reproduce
them here. He says: "All these [Chinese] descriptions
agree in saying that this island [Mau Shan] had a high,
lofty, and big mountain, with a flat top. Now this is not
the case with the islands Pulo Bras and Pulo Nasi, which
are so low that the Dutch have been obliged to build a ligh-
thouse upon the former one, that the seamen may not be
shipwrecked upon them, when wishing to make either for
Achin or the Strait of Malacca."\(^2\) This, anyone who has
passed those islands (I did it some five or six times, and
Professor Schlegel must also have gone through that way,
although it might have been during the night) will see,
is utterly incorrect. Had the Professor only consulted
a Dutch map or chart of that part of Sumatra, he would
have found the figure 700 (metres) marked on the middle
of Pulo Brās, for indeed this island attains a height of
2,296 feet in Mount Chumo. If this is low, then nothing
short of Mont Blanc or Dhaulagiri could, according to
the Professor's views, be called high. The Willemstoren

---

\(^1\) As will be seen directly, Chinese itineraries reckon at ten watches (kēng, 
更) of 2-4 hours in time, or 60 li (10 to 12 miles) in distance, each; total
24 hours' sailing, or about 100 to 120 miles, the distance between Lung-yên Hsii
(Pulo Brās according to me) and Ta-wei-lan (the Nikobārs). This is remarkably
correct, and precludes all possibility as to Mau Shan, which is shown quite near
to Lung-yên Hsii in the Chinese map, being the Sombrero. It strikes me that
the sailing kēng must have been adopted from the Arabs, Persians, and Indús,
being thus the same as their zām or yâm (see above, p. 388). Hence it should be
reckoned on the same basis, i.e. at seven to ten miles.

lighthouse on the northern point of Pulo Brās (525 feet above sea-level) was erected, not because of the island being so low and invisible as the Professor thinks, but as a help to navigators in the thick weather that usually prevails in those parts during the south-west monsoon. Great Nāsi is not very high, but its sister island (Nāsi Kechil, or Kersik) is lofty.

However, it is not either of these islands that correspond to the Mau Shan of the Chinese. This can be plainly seen from the Chinese map printed by Phillips, where to the west or south-west of Mau Shan is marked the other famous island, Lung-yen Hsū, 龍涎嶼 (lit. 'Ambergris Island'), which Groeneveldt and all his followers have to this day confidently considered to be Pulo Wēh. A glance at the map just referred to, printed since 1885, would have convinced them of their error; but our Sinologists do not need to look at native maps in interpreting Chinese geography, their imagination is quite sufficient for the purpose. Now, since Lung-yen Hsū cannot possibly be Pulo Wēh, it must be the other principal island to the west (in reality south-west) of it, i.e. Pulo Brās. And that such is the case I have not the slightest doubt, for the alternative, and apparently older, name of this island is Lam-puyang, from some village of this name that must have existed, and perhaps is still extant, on its coast. On the map in Mandelslo's work, 1727, the island already appears as Lampiang. It is therefore clear to me that Lung-yen is but a contracted transcript of Lam-[pu]-yang, and has nothing to do with 'Dragon's spittle,' i.e. ambergris, although this produce may very well be found in the sea around it. Fei Hsin's description of the island (1436) is as follows: "This Island has the appearance of a single mountain [which is, no doubt, Mount Chumo of Schlegelian towness, 2,296 feet]. . . . . It

3 Amsterdam, 1727, between pp. 7-8 and 9-10, t. i. I may observe, en passant, that the Lampuyang of Admiralty charts and directories is merely the Dutch form of the name, which in English should be transcribed Lampuyang, in order to make the two pronunciations agree.
rises abruptly out of the sea, which breaks on it with high waves."¹ In the sea-routes described on the Chinese map above referred to, and translated by Phillips,² Lung-yén Hsü [i.e. Lampuyang or Pulo Brās] is referred to as lying on the course from Su-měn-ta-la (Samudra harbour) to Ceylon. The sailing directions given are: (1) "A vessel leaving Su-měn-ta-la bound to Ceylon steers a course N.W., a little W., for twelve watches, until she is off Lung-yén Hsü; thence across the ocean to Ceylon, the course is W., a little N., for forty watches." (2) "The route from Su-měn-ta-la via the Ts‘ui-lan Shan (Nikobārs) is the same as far as Lung-yén Hsü, from which point the course is N.W., a little north, for thirty watches, and due west, a little north, for fifty watches." We thus see that Lung-yén Hsü, i.e. Lampuyang, now Pulo Brās, was the last land seen on leaving Sumatra, as is, for that matter, clearly shown by the course marked on the map in question. We become apprised thereby that Chinese vessels of that period used, when bound westwards from Malacca Strait, to pass to the northward of Pulo Wēh and Brās, perhaps also of Pulo Rondo, and between these islands and the south end of the Great Nikobārs, exactly as sailing-vessels do nowadays during the north-east monsoon, the favourable season for that voyage.

We have, accordingly, left the option of finding the equivalent for the Chinese Mau Shan in either Pulo Wēh or Pulo Rondo. As regards the latter, also known as Tepurong, it is but an uninhabited rock, only some 2½ cables in length, although 426 feet high, and therefore conspicuous, so that it "is often the first land seen by those entering the Strait in the thick weather of the south-west monsoon period."³ But Ma Huan's account of Mau Shan says this island is inhabited: "at the foot of the mountain live some

¹ Groeneweldt, loc. cit.
² Op. cit., p. 218. Of course, Phillips renders the term Lung-yén Hsü as Pulo Way, which identification I have not adopted here, leaving the name as it stands in the Chinese text.
20 to 30 families, every man of whom calls himself a king. In shallow water sea-trees grow, which are collected by the people, and used as a valuable article of trade, it being coral."¹ It follows, therefore, that Mau Shan must be Pulo Wēh, a far larger island (about 11 by 2 to 6 miles in size), and populated withal, although but sparsely, just as the Chinese account says. It is besides very conspicuous, rising in Lemoh Māti, its highest peak, to an elevation of 2,395 feet (730 metres according to recent Dutch maps, or some 100 feet higher than Pulo Brāś). Günong Merdu, a prominent dome-shaped peak close by on the south, is also pretty high, as well as Újong Bahu, the north-western point of the island, which falls steeply from the mountain to the sea. I should accordingly think that either Újong Bahu, Günong Merdu, or Lemoh Māti (the last more likely) is the lofty mountain described by the Chinese. Whether Lemoh Māti be flat-topped or not I do not now remember, but very probably it is. In any case, as the island is very mountainous, and its west coast clifffy, there is great likelihood that it appears flat-topped to those coming from the west. Moreover, Mau, 帽, pronounced Mou, Moa, Mo in the southern Chinese dialects, is most probably but a mutilated would-be transcript of Lemoh; unless, indeed, the whole term Mau Shan is meant for Masam, or Mason Point, which edges the entrance to Sabang Bay, on the north coast of the island, where the principal settlement is situated (Sabang village).

It is thus almost absolutely certain that Mau Shan is Pulo Wēh, just as Lung-yên Hsū is Lampuyang or Pulo Brāś, and not the reverse or otherwise as some Sinologists have been telling the world for the last quarter of a century or so. The evidence in favour of our identification is overwhelming; for not only resemblance in names, but also the Chinese map itself, where the course is laid down as first running close to the northern coast of Mau Shan and then rather aloof from an unnamed island (perhaps Pulo Nāsi) and Lung-yên Hsū, confirm the conclusion we have arrived at.

¹ Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 220, 221.
We may therefore confidently pass to a brief consideration of the epithet T'ai-p'ing-yu-chün Shan, 'Lofty Island [or Mountain] of Peaceful Presage,' already noticed as applied by the Chinese to Mau Shan. This recalls both the Ptolemaic Agathodaimonos, the island of 'Good Fortune,' and the Jibal Khushnāmi, 'the Auspicious Mountain' of the early Arab navigators, although, judging from our preceding considerations, there can be no connection with them, except in the similarity of the sense conveyed by such epithets. For seafaring men crossing those seas, known but imperfectly in the old days, the first landmark sighted after a long sea passage on the boundless expanse must naturally have been a matter of no little rejoicing, and regarded as a fortunate event presaging their safety. Hence, I think, the origin of the Chinese term above referred to, which need not be sought in more recondite causes. As regards Pulo Wēh being used as a landmark in coming from the west, there is nothing extraordinary in the fact, for owing to its conspicuousness and position northwards of the western extremity of Sumatra, it is usually the first land looming in sight for those coming from the west via the Great Nikobār, as the Chinese used to do. In the thick weather of the south-west monsoon period, we have had occasion to notice, Pulo Rondo is often the first land seen, and with it, naturally, Pulo Wēh, which lies close by, and is a yet more prominent object.¹

The ocean stretching boundless to the west of Mau Shan, the Chinese accounts inform us, is called the ocean of Na-mo-li, 那没哩, Na-mei-li or Na-mu-li, 那没黎. This name, though differently spelled from those employed to represent Lambri, sounds Na-mul-lei, La-mul-lai in the

¹ The earliest mention I can find of Pulo Wēh in European accounts occurs in Beaulieu's voyage, 1621, wherein it is stated that Pulo-Quay, one of the islands in the roadstead of Achêb, yields sulphur in abundance. Dampier's narrative later on, 1688, merely contains a passing reference to it. (See Frévest's 'Hist. Générale des Voyages,' vol. ix. p. 340, and vol. xi. p. 428.) Wēh or Wē is said to mean 'water,' so that the sense conveyed is that of 'Water Island.' But the old name of the island may have been different. Pulo Wēh is nowadays a pepper-producing island; but formerly it was of more importance from being the place to which criminals were banished.
southern dialects, and is evidently a transcript of Lamuiri, Lämëri, Rämëri, Rämërbëri, or Rämbrëri, thus corresponding to Nowairi's (A.D. 1332) Sea of Læreći, formed, as he tells us, by the seas of Kalah, Jávah, and Fansur (see p. 432 ante).

The enumeration of the embassies successively sent to China by Lambri from A.D. 1284 to 1423 does not call for special notice here, except in the particular that in 1412 the king as well as the people are spoken of as Musalmâns, the ruler's name being recorded as Ma-ha-ma Sha, 马哈麻沙, which evidently means either Mahmud or Muhammed Shâh, and that of his son as Sha Chê-han, 沙者罕, which is clearly Shâh Jehân. In about 1200-40, judging from Chao Ju-kua's account referred to above, Indûism must still have been the prevailing religion, and even in 1292-3 Marco Polo has not a word about Islâmism having as yet acquired a foothold in Lambri, although he mentions this faith as well established among the townspeople (and those only) in Perlee (Perläk), whither it was introduced by "the Saracen merchants." The hill-people, he tells us, were pagan and cannibals. Of Basma he states the people are just like beasts, without laws or religion; and of Samara that they are wild idolaters. West of this kingdom was that of Dagroian, i.e. the Gâyu country, where, we have seen, the natives refused to embrace Islâmism even when it had been adopted in Samudra. The people of Lambri and Fansur are spoken of as idolaters, so that it is difficult to reconcile his statements with those of the Achinese chronicle ascribing the introduction of the Muslim faith to a Johan Shâh represented to have arrived at Achêh in A.H. 601 = A.D. 1205. Of course, this Johan Shâh cannot possibly be the Shâh Jehân still heir-apparent in A.D. 1412, because the former is referred to in the local chronicle as the founder of the Muslim dynasty in the country, whereas the latter evidently was not. Accordingly, Johan Shâh must have been one of the ancestors of this Shâh Jehân of A.D. 1412, and his advent, together with the introduction of Islâmism through his agency, may be safely put down between, say, A.D. 1300 and 1380. Perhaps A.H. 701 =
1302 is the correct date, assuming that an error of 100 years has crept in the native chronicle through a slip of the copyists in taking the figure 7 of the centuries for a 6. In any case, there can be no doubt that Islam reached Achēh later than Perlak and Samudra, although in the "Sejārah Malāyū" we are told (ch. viii) that the conversion to Islamism of the States on the northern coast of Sumatra was effected in the order: 1, Faṣūrī (Būrūs); 2, Pulok Lamīrī (Lambri); 3, Ḥāru (Āru); 4, Perlak; and 5, Samudra. But then the name recorded for the legendary apostle of Moslem alleged to have operated such a feat is Sultān Muḥammad of Mātabar, and not Johan Shāh. The Pāsai chronicle ascribes the deed to the same personage, but it makes him proceed directly to Samudra, without mentioning the other countries alluded to above. It is thus evident that the whole story is open to serious doubt.

Before closing these observations on the early history of Achēh it seems worth while to briefly notice another important event which, in so far as I am aware, has not yet received attention. The event I mean is that recorded in the "Sejārah Malāyū" (part ii, ch. iii), where it is stated that upon the downfall of the city of Bal, the capital of Champā, one of the royal princes of that country, Poling by name, fled with his retinue to Achi (Achēh), of which he became the original rāja. Poling is, of course, meant for Pō Ling, i.e. Prince Ling, Pō being the usual Chām title we have met with several times already. As a brother of his, Indra Brahma (we should probably read Indra-varman), took refuge at the same time at Malacca, where he found a favourable reception at the hands of Sultān Mansūr, whom we know to have reigned between A.D. 1458 and 1475 circa,1 it is evident that the downfall of the Chām capital alluded to is that of Bal Angwē, which took place, as noticed above (p. 276) in 1471. We thus obtain a date

1 The "Sejārah Malāyū" informs us further that Sultān Mansūr made a mantri (counsellor or minister) of Prince Indra Brahma (Indra-varman) after having brought about his conversion to Islam. This is another important bit of information, as it evidences that the Muslim faith had not as yet been adopted in Champā in 1471, at any rate by the royal family.
for the advent of Pô Ling in Achês and the rise of a dynasty of Châm extraction there, as well as a clue to the chronology of other hitherto undatable events in Châm history referred to in both the “Sejarah” and the Châm chronicles.\(^1\) To the fact of a Châm prince having reigned in Achês during the last quarter, or thereabouts, of the fifteenth century the local dialect is no doubt indebted for the introduction of many comparatively modern Châm words which could not very well be accounted for before this, such as, e.g., pô, prince; gle (Glai), hill, cliff; lam (Lang), village, etc.

The Châm dynasty, if any, founded in Achês by Pô Ling, seems, however, to have been short-lived, for in A.D. 1507 began the rule of Sultan ‘Ali Mughayat Shâh, who seems to have come from Kemangan, near Pedir, and is reckoned upon as the founder of that native monarchy which continued in power until A.D. 1760. It is exhilarating to notice how the “Bustanu-s-salatin” naïvely tells us that before Sultan ‘Ali Mughayat Shâh—who, it states, first adopted Islamism—there had been no kings at Achês, but only chiefs (Marah, ʒr̥ː), who ruled each in his own district, and were elected to that office among the elders of the people.\(^2\) Such are

\(^1\) The name of the Châm king reigning at the time Bal Angwê was finally taken and destroyed by the Annamese is given in the “Sejarah Malâyu” as Pogopoh (Pô Gopoh or Gopa), whereas the Châm chronicle, published by Aymonier (Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 31, pp. 88, 89), calls Pô Parichan the last king of Bal Angwê. Probably Pô Gopa and Pô Parichan are one and the same personage. The dates 1373–97 adopted by Aymonier (op. cit., No. 32, p. 166) for the reign of Pô Parichan thus seem to need considerable amendment, provided the succession is rightly given in that chronicle, which is very doubtful. The chronological milestone we have set up will help to clear up many other riddles of contemporary Châm history, into which we cannot afford here to enter upon. Sufficient to notice merely that I have recognized in the Fomalang of the “Sejarah” the Pô Klang-[Garai] of the Châm chronicles who founded Bal Hangov. Similarly, the “Sejarah” represents Fomalang as having built the great city of Bal (i.e. Bal Hangov or Hinguv), “which included seven hills within its bounds.” The succession given is, of course, very defective, several kings being skipped over; but this contribution to Châm history from an independent source is nevertheless important for various details it supplies us which cannot be found elsewhere.

On p. 98 above, misled by a statement of Colonel Low in the Journal of the Indian Archipelago to the effect that Pô Ling came from Mansjug (Pérak), I mentioned that this country gave Achês its first king. I take this opportunity of correcting that mistake. No doubt Colonel Low confused Pô Ling with Mansur Shâh, who really did come from Pérak, but who reigned far later on (circa 1568–85).

\(^2\) Millies, op. cit., p. 71.
the tricks recklessly resorted to by native historians in order to palliate their ignorance of past events. It is therefore pretty certain that henceforth a Chăm monarchy will have to be added to the number of those so far known to have ruled over Achêh. The order of them will thus be: (1) an Indû dynasty (until at least A.D. 1305); followed by (2) a Muḥammadan one, probably also originally from India (with Johan Shûh, A.D. 1305–80 circâ); (3) a Malay from Menang-kabau (circâ 1380–1470); (4) a Châm (1471–1507); (5) a local Achinese (1507–70 circâ); (6) a Pêrak one (circâ 1570–88); (7) an Achinese again (1588–1760); and, finally, (8) an Arab dynasty (1760 to the present day). The above and such sundry other details as I have been able to collect on Achinese history and onomatology will be found recapitulated and chronologically arranged in the following table, which I subjoin by way of conclusion to this chapter.¹

OUTLINE SKETCH OF ACHINESE ONOMATOLOGY AND HISTORY.

(SECOND TO SEVENTEENTH CENTURY A.D.)

100–50. Argyrê, 'Ἀργυρὴ μητρόπολις, capital of Iabadiû or Sabadiû (= Arjara, Kesarjura, Arjuna, Arkura, Rakkhura, etc.).—Ptolemy (p. 656).

631–40. Yen-mo-na (or Yen-mo-lo) Chou Kwo, 閘摩那 (or 羅)洲國; or Ye-mei-ni, 野寐尼 (= the island kingdom of Yamana or Yamani, Yamana-devipa-pura; perhaps Yamunâ or Janmâ, Yâminî; Yavana, Yavani; Javana, Ramana, etc.). Hwên-tsang (p. 463). Cf. Ramañaka Island of Bhâgavata and Padma Purûnas; Yama-devipa of Vâyu P.; Râmî, etc.

¹ As I have no access to the publications of Dutch scholars on Achinese history, etc., I entirely ignore whether any of the conclusions I have arrived at have already been anticipated by them in their works. Should this prove to be the case I trust they will bear no grudge against me, as my treatment of the subject has been done quite independently, and without knowledge whatever of the results they may have attained by their labours. Works of general reference I have consulted are singularly meagre in details about Achêh, and only treat of its history from the sixteenth century downwards. I venture, therefore, to hope that my summary will prove valuable, as it goes back to a far earlier period and some of its features are certainly new to the public.
Also M. Polo's and others' Gavenis-pola or Jāmis-, Jāmanis, Javanis-pola = Yavanasya- or Yavanasa-pura, Yavanaspur or Javanaspur = the 'City (or Island) of the Yavanas (or Javanas) = present Pulo Nāsi Besar or Dedap; but more probably Achēh Head, the 'Ponta de Gomespolla' of the Portuguese.¹ Cf. also the legend as regards the footprint in the water (bank of Narmada, or Yamunā?, River) (p. 665, note).

674. Ta-shih, 大食 (Dachi, Dacheh, Achēh, and not seemingly Tajik = Arabs in such cases). Its king, afraid of the power of Queen Simā of Ho-ling (west coast of Malay Peninsula), dares not attack her (p. 505).

851. Rāmī (رامي) Island, var. lect. Rāmī, Rāmin, رامس, رامسن (=Lambri, Achēh district, and part of west coast of Sumatra). Extent, 800–900 parasangs (=1920–2160 miles); bathed by two seas, Harkand and Shelāhēt; with gold-mines, plantations of Fānsūr camphor, elephants, and an anthropophagous population. — Sulaimān (Reinaud's "Rel. des Voyages," pp. 6, 8).

864. Rāmī (رامي) Island. Rhinoceroses and tailless buffaloes are found there. The natives go naked, are four spans in stature, and have red and crisp hair; their language is an unintelligible hissing.—Ibn Khurdašbih (Journal Asiatique, 1865, p. 286, and De Goeje, op. cit., p. 44).

¹ I reconstruct the original name of Gavenis-pola as Yavanaspur, Javanaspur, or Yamunaspur, from the variae lectiones occurring in different authors from Marco Polo downwards, viz.: (1) Gavenis-pola, Gaveaspol, Ninispola (M. Polo, 1292); (2) Ganispola (Correa, "Lendas da India," t. ii, p. 792, 1524); (3) Ganespol (Castanheda, "Historia da India," lib. v, ch. 18, c. 1540); (4) Jāmis-fulak (Muhīt, 1554); (5) Gomispola (De Barros, 1550–60, and Linschoten, 1587); (6) Gomem-pola or Gomos-pela (Lancaster, 1592); etc. Gavenispola of M. Polo, Jāmis-fulak (Jāman-pola) of the Muḥīt, Gomispola of Correa, and Gomus or Gomnis of Hamilton, are the typical forms which presuppose an original Jāmanis, Jāvanis, Jāmanis. I feel therefore unable to accept Colonel Yule's suggested derivation from a hypothetical Malay term gamas = 'hard, rough'; nor the form Pulo Gaimur he found in the map to Yeth's "Achin" and the restoration he proposes as Pulo Gomus ("Marco Polo," 3rd ed., vol. ii, p. 307). Gaimur must be a mistake for Jamir, as a bay bearing this name still exists on the north-east coast of Nāsi Besar Island. The name may have formerly been Jāmis, whence perhaps the Jāmas of the Muḥīt and the other forms, Gomus, Gomis, etc. M. Polo's Gavenis or Gavens, being the oldest, is undoubtedly the representative of the earliest name which we have restored as Javanas, Javanas. The term pola, pula, etc., stands for pura, 'city,' from which the Malay pula = 'island' is known to be derived. Hence, the compositum argues the existence, at a remote period, of a settlement of Javanas or Javanas (7 Greeks, Phoenicians) on that island, but more probably on the opposite coast of Achēh (Point of Gomispola), whence the island seems to have got its name. The term may, of course, owe also its origin to some early establishment of the Java or Chānā race there, whence Achēh came to be named the 'Country of Jāwī,' and afterwards the whole island of Sumatra acquired that designation.
880-916. Rāmī Island. Extent, 800 parasangs (1,920 miles); produces camphor, etc. It belongs to the King of Zābej.—Abū Zaid (Reinaud, op. cit., p. 93).

943. Rāmīn Islands. Distant about 1,000 parasangs (2,400 miles) from Serendīb (Ceylon). Well populated, and governed by kings; some inhabited by cannibals. Many gold-mines lie near the country of Kānsūr (Fansūr), celebrated for its camphor, and are also at a short distance from the Elenjmālās Islands (Nikobārs).—Masīʿūdī (“Prairies d’Or,” t. i, p. 339).

955. Lāmerī (لا مري) Island (= Lambri). In its valleys one sees large monkeys in troops, each headed by a chief; also zarāfīs (snakes) and large ants. The natives are anthropophagous, but only eat their enemies. Between Fansūr and Lāmerī, among which communication by land exists, there is the bay of Lūlā Bileṅ (Teloṅ Belong), inhabited by a race of caudate man-eaters. Serīrah (= Śrī Bhūjā) lies at the extremity of the island of Lāmerī and at 120 zāms (900 miles) from Kalah.—Captain Bozorg (“Merveilles de l’Inde,” pp. 66, 125, 176).

circā 960. Lan-li, 藍里 (= Rāmī, Rāmbrī, Lambri). Persian envoys having embarked at Ch‘üan-chou (Zaitun?) reached it in some 40 days. After awaiting there the N.E. monsoon they sailed homewards, reaching their own country (Ta-ch‘i, 達其) in another 60 odd days more.—T‘ang and Sung histories (“Pien-i-tien,” ch. 78).

976. Ta-shīn (= Achēh?). An envoy from this country brings a negro slave from K‘un-lun (Malay Peninsula) to China, who causes much sensation at Court. (China Review, vol. viii, p. 189; see also p. 506 ante.)

992. Ta-shīn Country (Achēh). Lies at five days’ sailing from the southern coast of Shē-p‘o (Jaba or Saba, west coast of Malay Peninsula).—Hist. Sung Dyn., bk. 489 (p. 511).

?11th century. Po-sz, 波斯 (= Vasu, Vasudāna, i.e. either the Besi or Bāsi [Lam-Besi], or the Basitang districts, west and east coast of Sumatra). Doubtful if so called from Pars, Fars, or Persian colonies established there as suggested (see p. 679).

c. 1220-50. Country called 

Achekh on the sea-coast of the island of Percha.—"Kedah Annals," ch. iii; see Journal Indian Archipelago, vol. iii, p. 162.

1240. 

Lan-wu-li, 藍無里 (Lamburi, Rambri, Lambri). A State sending yearly tribute to San-fo-ch'i (Sri Bhoja). On a hill called 

Hsi-lun, 細輪 (= Se-lun, Chalang), is a sacred footprint, and a like imprint is visible in the water within about 50 to 60 miles distance from the hill (= footprint on the banks of the Yamuná or Narmadá = Yen-mo-na?). 

Hsi-lun, 細輪, a State also tributary to Sri Bhoja, is probably the same place, and seems to correspond to Chalang or Chellang, west coast of Sumatra.—Chao Ju-kua (see pp. 665, 683).

1263-75. 


1274. Lāmīrī City (= Lam-bari, Achēh district). Lies near 

Malāyur, and like this and Fānsūr is situated on a bay.—Ibn Sa'id ("Merveilles de l'Inde," p. 158).

c. 1280. 

Lāmīrī or Pūlāy Lāmīrī, لامري تولى لامري, Island (= Lambri). Converted to Islāmism by a fakir from the Koromandel coast.—"Sejārah Malāyu," ch. viii (see p. 696). N.B.—The name is spelled also Lāmbrī, لامبري, in the Singapore edition of the same work, p. 73.

1284. 

Nan-wu-li, 南巫利 (Namburi, Lamburi, Lamri, Lambrī). The Fuh-kien Government (i.e. 'Zaitun') sends an officer to summon this and three other States to do homage. (Asiatic Quart. Rev., Jan., 1900, p. 132.)

1286. 

Nan-wu-li sends envoys to the Chinese Court, together with those of Sumu-tu-la or Hsiu-mên-na (Samudra). (Op. cit., l.l.)

1292. 

Nan-wu-li. An envoy from China despatched to call it into submission.—Hist. Yüan Dyn., bk. 131 (Groeneveldt, p. 155).

1292-3. 

Lambri Kingdom. Produces sapanwood, camphor, and spices (cf. Dimāšḵī below). In its mountains are tailed men (cf. Captain Bozorg above).—Marco Polo, bk. iii, ch. 11.

1294. 

Nan-wu-li. Its envoys who have been detained in China together with those of Su-mu-tu-la (Samudra), awaiting the
result of Kūblai’s war with Java, are sent back with presents and an official safe-conduct tally. (Asiatic Quart. Rev., loc. cit.)

circa 1300. Rāmni Island. Has a circumference of 500 miles; it produces sapanwood, camphor, pepper, cloves, and cinnamon (cf. M. Polo, above).

circa 1300. Arshir Island (Achēh?). Produces camphor of a quality inferior to that from Fanṣūr.—Dimashḵī (Maehren, pp. 127, 205).

circa 1305. Arrival of Johan Shāh, who is alleged in the native chronicles to have been the first Muḥammadan king of Achēh, his date being placed as far back as a.h. 601 = a.d. 1205, which we cannot accept (see p. 695).

1310. Lāmūrī, a very large island, lying beyond Ceylon, and adjoining the country of Śūmūtra.—Rashūdū-d-dīn (Yule’s “M. Polo,” vol. ii, p. 300).


circa 1323. Lämori Country. Lies north of Sumūlṭra on the same island; the natives are naked, cruel, and cannibals.—Friar Odoric (Ramusio, 1583 ed., vol. ii, f. 248).

1345–6. Lāmbri. Ignored by Ibn Baṭūta, who, however, speaks of the northern part of Sumatra as the island of Jāwah.


circa 1400. Acheh was a celebrated place for its numerous stone-cutters and gravers.—“Kedah Annals” in Journal Indian Archipelago, vol. iii, p. 259.

1405. Nan-wu-li. A seal and letter sent to it from China through some lieutenant of the famous eunuch Čhēng Ho. (Young-Pao, 1901, p. 359, and Asiatic Quart. Rev., Jan., 1900, p. 140.)


1411. The king sends an envoy to the Chinese Court, who goes on along with those of Kayeli (Cail, India) and Kelantan. (Asiat. Quart. Rev., loc. cit.)
1412. *Nam-p'o-li*, 南浿利, 南渤里 (or 利) (= Nam-bur-ri, Lamburi, Lambri), lies west of *Su-men-ta-la* (Samudra), whence it can be reached in three days' navigation. The king and people are all Muḥammadans, and scarcely amount altogether to a thousand families. North-west of this country is the lofty island of *Mau Shan*, 師山 (= Pulo Wēh with Lemoh-mati mountain), and west of this stretches the ocean called *Na-mo-li* or *Na-mei-li*, 那沒黎 (or 喔黎) (= Lamūri).

This year the king, *Ma-ha-ma Sha*, 馬哈麻沙 (= Māhmūd, or Muḥammad, Shāh), sends an envoy, along with an envoy of Samudra, to bring tribute to China. The Emperor bestows upon them court-dresses, and to the king a seal and an investiture, whilst Chêng Ho is commissioned to transmit the imperial instructions to this country. The latter continues to send tribute yearly until the end of Ch'êng-tsu's reign (A.D. 1424).

The son of the king, Shâh Jehân, 沙者罕, also despatches an envoy to bring tribute.—Hist. Ming Dyn. (*T'oung-Pao*, 1901, pp. 357-8).


1416. *Nam-wu-li*, 南巫里, sends an envoy with tribute. Chêng Ho is ordered to take him back to his country.—Hist. Ming Dyn. (*T'oung-Pao*, 1901, p. 359).

1430. Chêng Ho goes on his last voyage, bringing presents to all countries, among which is *Nam-p'o-li*, which gets her share of the imperial gifts. (Op. cit., p. 358; Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 221.) N.B.—This is the last mention of either *Nam-wu-li* or *Nam-p'o-li* in the records of the period.

1471–2. *Achêh*. Upon the Châm capital, Bal Angwê, being taken and destroyed by the Annamese, Pô Ling, a royal prince of Champā, takes refuge in Achêh, of which country he becomes "the original king."—"Şejārah Malāyu," ch. iii (Leyden's "Malay Annals," p. 211).

1516. Achem, a kingdom on the northern extremity of Sumatra Island.—Barbosa (Ramusio, vol. i, 1563 ed., f. 318 verso).

1521. Dachem.—“Tombo do Estado da India” (p. 511).

1522. Sulțan ‘Ali conquers Pedîr, Samudra, and other places on the north coast of Sumatra. He dies the same year, being succeeded by Sulțan Şalâh-ud-din.—“Bustanu-s-salatin” (Millies, loc. cit.).

1540. Sulṣân ‘Ala-u-d-dîn, brother of the preceding, deposes him, owing to his incapability of ruling the kingdom. The dethroned Şalâh-ud-dîn dies nine years afterwards. (Ibid.)


circa 1569. Perak is conquered by the Achinese, who make prisoner, amongst others, the son of the king there. This prince is set up as king of Achîh, over which he reigns under the title of Manşür Şâh, making himself very formidable to the Portuguese of Malacca. (Op. cit., p. 75; Newbold’s “Straits of Malacca,” London, 1839, vol. ii, p. 24, etc.)

1585. Manşür Şâh is murdered by General Marah Tîsa, a quondam fisherman, who places on the throne Sulțan Bûyung, the young son of the murdered king, of whom he becomes the governor.


1588. ‘Ala-u-d-dîn Râ‘ayat Şâh, the quondam Marah Tîsa, having murdered the young Sulțan Bûyung, ascends the throne; he is very cruel and sanguinary. It is of this wicked ruler that the Chinese accounts say: “During the period Wan-li (1573-1620) the reigning family was twice changed, and at last their king was a slave. . . . He slew the rightful sovereign; . . . having obtained command of the army, not long afterwards he killed his master and put himself in his place. . . . He is much given to cruelty; every year he kills more than ten people and washes his body with their blood, saying that this may prevent disease.” After the murder of the king the name of the country was
-Hist. Ming Dyn., bk. 325. (See Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 213, 214; also Toung-Pao, 1901, pp. 344, 345 and 367, 368, the accounts of which events have been misunderstood by both Professors Schlegel and Parker. See for the latter's mistake the Asiat. Quart. Rev., Jan., 1900, p. 137. About the king's origin and his sanguinary crimes see Davis, 1599, who states that Sultān "Aladin," i.e. 'Alāu-d-dīn, was originally a fisherman, and rose in rank gradually until he became admiral, when he murdered the heir to the throne; also Beaulieu, vide Prévost's "Hist. Gén. des Voyages," vol. i, p. 373, and vol. ix, pp. 350-2.)

1602. Sultān 'Ali Mughāyat Shāh, son of the preceding, succeeds to the throne. (Millies, op. cit., p. 84.)

1607. Sultān Iskander Mūda succeeds to the crown. Under his rule the kingdom of Achēh attains the climax of its splendour. (Op. cit., pp. 84, 85.)

1612. Letter of Sultān Iskander Mūda of Achēh to King James I of England. In this valuable document the former claims the following possessions:—

A.—EASTERN SIDE OF ACHĒH.

1. Lūbok, لوبق.
2. Pidir (Pedir), تدير.
4. Pasāngan, فاسانغ.
5. Pāsai, فاساي.
6. Perlak, فالت.
8. Tamiyang, تمييڠ.
9. Delt, دلن.
10. Āsāhan, اساهن.
11. Tanjong, تنجم.
12. Pāni (Pānei), فاني.
13. Rakan, ركان.
14. Bātu Sāwar, بات ساور, and all dependent countries.
[16. Pāhang, فلانغ]
17. Indragiri, اندرکیری.

B.—WESTERN SIDE OF ACHĒH.

1. Chalang (Chellang), جلڠ.
2. Dāyā, دايا.
4. Pasaman, فسم.
5. Tiku, تيوكو.
6. Priaman, دویرامس, where he says, are gold-mines in the mountains.
7. Salida, سليدا.
8. Indrapura, اندرتوور.
10. Salibar (Selebar), سليبار.


(Journal Straits Branch R.A.S., No. 31, pp. 123-30.)

N.B.—I have thought it useful to reproduce this as yet little known list, far more complete as regards the northern part of Sumatra than De Barros', not only for the historical interest it presents, but also for the spelling of many place-names it gives, which are often vainly looked for in Malay dictionaries and similar works of reference.

1613. Sultan Iskander Muda makes war upon Johor. (Millies, op. cit., p. 85.)

1618. A-ch'î, 亞齊 (= Achêh). Formerly it was [called?] the 'Ta-shî Country,' 大食国 [= Tarashih, Tăjîk, Dachi?]. Ambergris costs 12 golden coins the tael, which makes 192 golden coins a kati . . . . During the Sung dynasty [A.D. 960-1280] this country had the reputation of possessing much gold, silver, and silk, whilst the skill of its artisans was highly praised.—"Tung-hsi Yang-k'au," bk. iv (see Young-Pao, 1901, pp. 367, 368, and Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 215, 216). N.B. that since A.D. 1505 Barthema mentions silk as being produced in large quantities in Pedir (see Ramusio, vol. i, f. 166 verso). The reference to silver in the Chinese account is furthermore interesting, in view of the connection of Achêh with Ptolemy's Argyrê, as well as with a possible Phœnician Tarashih.—From this period the history of Achêh is sufficiently well known, from both local and Western sources, as not to present any more special features falling within the scope of the present inquiry; hence it is needless to go on summarizing its principal events any further.

1619. Sultan Iskander Muda conquers the States of Kedah and Perak on the Malay Peninsula (according to the letter quoted above, however, Perak was already part of his dominions in 1612). (Op. cit.)

1621. Sultan Iskander Muda conquers Padang, Singkel, and other portions of the west coast of Sumatra (see, however, the letter cited above). (Op. cit.)
D. The Great Anambas or Siantan Group.

Islands of the Satyrs (No. 125).

Ptolemy reckons three of them and reports:—"The inhabitants are said to have tails like those with which Satyrs are depicted." Legends of savages with tails are current in several parts of Indo-China and the Malay Archipelago; but the reference here seems to be rather to some large species of monkeys than to human beings. The centre of this group of islands falls, as shown in the tables and maps, in long. 107° 15' E. and lat. 3° 40' N., corrected; that is, just midway between the Anambas and Natunas. I have, however, reason to believe that the Anambas alone are meant, both for linguistic arguments which I shall hereafter bring forward, and because they lie more directly in the track of ships sailing from the Straits to Kamboja or Champā. Speaking of this insular group Crawfurd says: "The islands called by European navigators the Anambas, a name not known to the Malays of the country, are properly called by the various names of Siantan [Syāntan or Śyātan], Jamajah [more correctly, Jamāja, جمّاج], and Sarasan [Sarāsan, سراسن], which make the northern, middle, and southern Anambas of our charts. They are, in all, about fifty in number . . . . hilly and sterile, and inhabited by true Malays, always poor, and commonly inoffensive." 1 The correct names and Malay equivalents that I have inserted within brackets actually occur in the Pāsai chronicle in the list of countries conquered by the Javanese army from Mājapāhīt in A.D. 1377 or thereabouts. 2

1 "Embassy to Siam and Cochin-China," 2nd ed. (London, 1830), vol. i, p. 455.
2 See Dulaurier in Journaht Asiaticque, 1846, pp. 554, 555, and 561. Dulaurier was at a loss to identify Jamāja, Syātan, Sarāsan, and several other names in that list, which have been, however, subsequently located by Marre (see "Histoire des Rois de Pasey," Paris, 1874, pp. 97, 107). The list is invaluable, as it undoubtedly goes back to several centuries and supplies us with the forms that such toponyms had then. It is important to notice that the terms Anamba and Natuna do not at all occur in the list, the principal islands of such groups being each named separately. The Natunas mentioned therein are: (1) Pulō Lāūt,
Among such names I desire to lay special stress on that of Siāntan, which is not so spelled as in the present day, but is written Syātan or Siātan, a fact upon which we are going to base the etymological discussion directly. As regards Sarāsan, Crawford was of course mistaken in making it a southern Anamba; it belongs to the South Natuna group. It should indeed be added, in justice to him, that on pp. 89, 90 of the same volume he classifies it correctly as the most southern island of the Natunas.\(^1\) Groeneveldt has,

\[\text{(North Natuna); (2) Bangūran, (Great Natuna); (3) Suvēbi or Śābi, (the northernmost of the South Natunas); and (4) Sarāsan, (the Sirhassen of our charts, in the South Natunas group), spelt Sarān, Sarān, in Dulaurei (op. cit., p. 554), which is worth noting.}\]

\(^1\) The passage here referred to is interesting as recording two names for the same island, that have now disappeared from our charts. He says: "High Island or Sapata, so called in the maritime charts, and the most southern of the group denominated the Natunas . . . . Sapata is the island called Sarasan by the Malays; and the Great Natuna, a very large island, they denominate Bangoran. The name Natuna is not known in their language, and, it is probable, was imposed by the Portuguese." The name High Island we find entered in Horsburgh's charts and directory. As regards Sapata, it is undoubtedly a term of Portuguese origin, Sapata; Malay Spātu, "a shoe.'

But, concerning the names Anamba and Natuna, it is difficult to say how they have originated. Probably Crawford is right in ascribing their invention to the Portuguese. However, the second one, Natuna, seems to be derived from an older term, tung, tung, dong, or tan, which occurs, as we shall see, in the designation Tung-Tung applied by the Chinese to the Great Natuna, and which may have been borrowed, in imitation, from Syātan or Siātan. Otherwise, Tung-Tung may be but a travesty of Datu (Tanjong Datu), the cape forming the northern extremity of the Great Natuna. For it is to be noticed that its homonym, Cape Datu, the nearest headland of Borneo, appears in some old maps as Tanjong Dotu (see e.g. the map at end of vol. i of Sonnerat's voyage, published A.D. 1781). From Dotu to Dotun, Notun, and Natun the gap is not very wide. As regards the term Anamba I am at a loss to suggest a derivation, except from, perhaps, the Malay Ānām, ānām = 'six.' However, this is a mere conjecture. Neither group of islands appears in European maps until the end of the seventeenth century; neither are they spoken of, in so far as I am aware, by any Western traveller before that period. Valentijn is one of the very first authors to have them on his map, 1726, where they appear as Anamba and Noima (for Natuna). Next year, in the map appended to Mandelslo's travels (Amsterdam, 1727, pp. 8, 9), they are marked Anamba and Natuna. Hamilton speaks of them since about 1729 in the following terms: ' . . . there are two
contrary to his wont, not gone far wrong in suggesting, this time, wisely followed by interrogation marks, Natuna and Anamba respectively as the equivalents of the Tung-tung, 東 董, and Hsi-tung, 西 董, Islands mentioned in the account of the Chinese expedition to Java, A.D. 1292–3.¹ He is, however, certainly mistaken in pedantically rendering the second toponymic as 'Western Tung,' for there can be no question that this is a mere transcript of Syatan, the name of the island in the Northern Anamba group, which may, at best, be meant for that particular group only, and not for the whole of the Anambas. As regards the first toponymic, Tung-Tung, it is yet doubtful whether it should be taken as meaning 'Eastern Tung,' according to Mr. Groeneveldt's view, or as a transcript of some local name (perhaps of Datu Point at the north end of Great Anamba as suggested in note 1 to p. 708). For it is plain to me that this term Tung-Tung merely designates the Great Natuna or Bangûran, and not at all the whole group of the Natunas, or even the more tiny cluster of the northern of such islands. Although Sinologists have hitherto rested perfectly satisfied with such vague, generic identifications made grosso modo like this, our intention in the present inquiry is to push our investigation to the utmost of our ability, in order to arrive as accurately as possible at identifications of ancient toponymics, thus supplying our readers with genuine, instead of imaginary, fabricated geography, as has hitherto too often been done. This aim, to which we have kept throughout, we intend to adhere to in this section also, which is the last one of the present volume.

That Tung-Tung, then, simply meant the Great Natuna is amply evidenced by Chinese itineraries from Champâ to Java, as well as by the Chinese map of the period published

clusters of islands ... One is called Anamba and the other Natuna, but by the natives Sciantan is the common appellation for both clusters. Their inhabitants are called Bougies” (Pinkerton’s Collect. of Voyages, vol. viii, p. 460). Therefore, Siantan, Syatan (Chinese Hsi-tung) was their common name.

¹ See Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 151; and in China Review, vol. iv, p. 249.
by Phillips. Starting with this first, I have been enabled to recognize in it two hitherto unidentified islands of the Natuna group, besides Tung-Tung, viz., Sha-niu-pi, 沙吳皮 (Sa-wu-bi = Suwobi or Subi), and Tung Shê-lung, 東蛇籠, or Eastern Shê-lung (She-lung, Sha-rong = Sarān of the Pāsai chronicle, i.e. Sarāsan or Sirhassen). Turning now to the itinerary from Champā to Java translated by W. F. Mayers from the chronicle of the Yüan dynasty, and prudently omitted by Groeneveldt, we again find the latter island mentioned, along with two others of the Northern Natunas, which we shall presently identify. The itinerary runs as follows:—

"Sailing from Champā [the capital, i.e. Bal Angwē at Kwi-nōn], the course is steered for Ling Shan, 靈山 [= Linga-parvata, i.e. Cape Varella]. Thence fifty watches [= 500–600 miles] are required to reach:

1. Wu-kung Hsū," 蜿蜒 (Wu-kong, lit. 'centipede') [= Sto-kong or Stu-kung, the northernmost of the Natunas, situated above the north end of Pulo Laut. Its distance from Cape Varella is about 485 miles, which, allowing for slight detours in sailing, fairly corresponds with that given in the text]. "Five watches [50–60 miles] westward from the rocks at the point of this island bring the vessel to:

2. Mau Shan" [? 帽 = 'Hat Island.' Evidently Tokongboroso, i.e. the Pyramidal rocks, west of the Great Natuna, which lie at 63 miles south-west of the northern end of Sto-kong Island]. "Again ten watches [100–120 miles] and the Eastern Shê-lung Shan ['Serpent and Dragon' Headland] is sighted." [This must be:

3. Tung Shê-lung, 東蛇籠, referred to above, which, with the third character but slightly altered, means instead the 'Eastern Serpent-cage'; to us, Sarāsan Island]. "After this the vessel passes between:

4. Round Island [? Yuan (or Luan?) Hsū, 圓 (or 圓?) 島] and

---

Footnotes:

3. It goes without saying that with the exception of Ling Shan, rightly located by Mayers, none of the other toponyms here mentioned have been, so far, correctly identified either by him or others.
5. Double Island" [？Liang Shan, 雨山. No sailing distance being stated, it is difficult to say whether South Haycock, St. Pierre, or Marundum are the two islands meant on the one side; or Saddle Island and Camel's Hump on the other. No native names being besides entered in our charts and directories for these islands, identification becomes doubly difficult. It would appear from the sequel, as well as from the Chinese names applied to the two islands in question, that Round Island is Camel's Hump (so named from its configuration), and that Double Island is Saddle Island (so called on account of two hills forming its saddle). Otherwise, Double Island may be meant for the two St. Pierre islands, which appear to be connected by a reef].

"Passing by:

6. Lo-wei Shan" [？羅尾山, no doubt Pulo Wai, the northwesternmost island of the Tambelan group], "where there are 18 fathoms of water, five watches more [50–60 miles] bring the vessel to:

7. 'Bamboo Island'" [evidently 竹山, Chu Shan, which must be Temaju off the west coast of Borneo (Manpāwa district). This island lies at some 90 miles S.E. from Pulo Wai. If, however, Chu or C'hu is not a transcript of any indigenous name, Direction Island (Pulo Pengiki Kechil), which lies at but 70 miles S.S.E. from Pulo Wai, may be meant]. "Thence in five watches [50–60 miles]

8. Ki-ling Hu ('Hen-coop' Island) is reached." [The original characters are evidently 鸚鵡, Ke-ling, Ke-rung, and Gurong is the island intended; at any rate one of them, for there are two rocky islets of that name, situated north-eastward of Karimāta, and about half-way between Meleidung and Pelapi Islands. Their distance from either Temaju or Direction Island is, however, close upon 120 miles, and as there are no other islands lying half-way between them, we must conclude that the sailing distance has been understated, or that some slip has occurred in the text, which should read ten, instead of five, watches.] "From this point it is ten watches [100–120 miles] to:

9. Kau-lan Shan, 旬栞山 [or 卯栞山, Ko-lan, Keu-lan Shan], where wood and water may be procured." [This, despite Groeneveldt and, after him, Professor Schlegel, is unmistakably Gelam Island, as the sensible Phillips long ago
doubtfully suggested. The truth of my assertion can be easily ascertained by a glance at the Chinese map published by Phillips, where Kau-lan is marked immediately below Karimāta and an hitherto unidentified island named 十二子, Shih-érh-tsé, which, I am glad to state, is Scrutu, which lies south-westwards of Karimāta, although mapped by mistake south-eastwards in the cartographical document in question. Westwards of Karimāta the map shows Ma-li-tung, i.e. Belitong or Billiton, and westwards of this again 彭加, Pieng-ka, i.e. Bangkā, so that it clearly follows that the latter is not Ma-li-tung, nor Billiton Kau-lan, as Groeneveldt would have us to believe. Kau-lan is therefore most certainly Gelam (now also called Laag) Island, the largest of a group lying ten miles north-westward of Sambar Point, the south-west extremity of Borneo. And under the said denomination of Kau-lan the Chinese probably included also the neighbouring Bauwal or Kumpal Island, lying but six miles northward of Gelam, for it is stated that Bauwal or Kumpal "was, in former times, the rendezvous for the China convoys in case of separation, and then known as Rendezvous Island." This circumstance, as well as the fact that both islands are thickly wooded,

1 See Journal China Branch R.A.S., vol. xxi, p. 40. In the Chinese map published therein the name is written slightly differently, viz. 交關, Chiao-lan, Kau-lan, which matters very little, as the sounds are very nearly the same in both transcripts, although the former one, K'ow-lan, better conveys the phonology Galam or Gelam of the original term. The wild attempt of Groeneveldt to identify this island with Billiton (despite the discrepancy in names) in order that he may connect Ma-li-tung (which is no other than Blitung or Billiton) with the Bangka of his heart, excites a feeling of commiseration for the poor historical geography of the Archipelago which he has so ruthlessly mangled, and this time, it would seem almost deliberately, perverted (see Groeneveldt, op. cit., pp. 151, 157, 201). However much we may appreciate the boon he has conferred upon us by placing within our reach, ready translated, so many Chinese accounts of Archipelagian geography, we would be indeed still more thankful had he given us fewer incorrect identifications. For, when critically examined, as we have done in the course of the present inquiry, the equivalents he gives for such place-names, often with much self-assurance, prove, with but rare exceptions, hopelessly wrong. But what are we to say when, simply because he did not find the name of Bangka Island in the texts he worked upon (although it most plainly appears on the Chinese map published by Phillips since 1886, and is also mentioned by Ma Huan, a.d. 1416), he makes the statement that this island is what the Chinese called Ma-li-tung, when it is clearly no other than Billiton; and then, being in want of a term for the latter, gives it the impossible name Ko-lan? A moment's consideration would have avoided this and saved the reader much unnecessary loss of time and inconvenience in his researches. On the other attempt made by Professor Schlegel of connecting Ma-li-tung or Ma-yih-tung with Bintang (see T'oung-Pao, vol. ix, pp. 365–83) I need not dwell.

agrees remarkably with the account of the rôle played by Kau-lan in the Java expedition of 1292–3. So does its sailing distance from Ki-lung, given in the text under examination, accord with the distance Gurong–Gelam, which is about 105 miles.] "Thirty watches farther on [=300–60 miles] lies Ki-li-mén Shan, 吉里門山, i.e. Krimun or Karimon Java." [The distance from Gelam to Karimon Java is only about 180 miles; hence there must be some clerical error in the text, which should read 'fifteen watches."

We need not follow this itinerary any further, since our object for having introduced it here—which was to show that the Chinese had separate names for each of the principal Natuna Islands, and that Tung-tung to them merely meant the largest of these, i.e. the Great Natuna or Bangoran—is now fully attained. Another important result attained is the determination of the sea-route followed by the Chinese expedition to Java, and, no doubt, long afterwards by Chinese junks. Of this sea-route the translations and publications hitherto made by Sinologists gave but the very haziest idea; the Anambas and Natunas are mentioned as passed on the way, but whether through the middle, eastwards, or westwards of them it was left for the reader to conjecture. Thanks to the above inquiry, we are now certain that the Chinese sea-route to Java lay south by west from Cape Varella on the Champā (Cochin-China) coast, straight for Setokong or Stokong, near the northern extreme of Pulo Lāut or North Natuna; after which the course was shaped towards the south-west, in order to clear the Pyramidal Rocks and other dangers, when it was again altered to due south, thus passing between Bangoran (Great Natuna) and the North Anambas (Siāntan group), the Tung-Tung and Hsi-Tung of the Chinese respectively. Sirhassen

1 Gelam is the Malay name for *Melaleuca leucodendron*, the Kājapūt oil-tree. Fei-Hsin (1436) describes Kau-lan Island as high and covered with trees, affording ample building materials; and adds that the Chinese expedition to Java in 1292–3 being driven by a storm on this island many ships were lost, whereupon the crews landed and constructed new vessels. Both Gelam and Bauwal are low, but in the centre of the latter are two hills.
or Sarāsan (the Eastern She-lung of the Chinese), with, no doubt, either Seraga (West Island) or Brian Island (probably the unnamed Western She-lung), being all conspicuous, were then sighted, evidently from afar; and the vessel proceeded between either Camel’s Hump and Saddle Island, or the latter and St. Pierre, to the Tamberlans. Here, after having passed Pulo Wai, it steered south-east towards Temaju, and continued her course along the west coast of Borneo.

The same itinerary is laid down, although with far less wealth of particulars, in the History of the Yüan dynasty, where it is stated that the expedition in 1292, after having passed Champā, came in the first month of the following year (1293) to the Tung-Tung and Hsi-Tung islands (i.e. Bangor and Siāntan, the meaning being that the course lay between them), after which it entered the Hwén-tun (lit. ‘Chaotic,’ or ‘Turbid’) Ocean, 混 池 大 洋, i.e. ‘Archipelago,’ so called, no doubt, by the Chinese, on account of the innumerable islands with which it is studded, forming so many channels, which, naturally, confuse the navigator. Assuredly, ‘Labyrinthian’ is what the Chinese intended by Hwén-tun. Proceeding, the expedition reached the Kan-lan1 Island or Islands, 橄 榆 嶝 (Kom-lam, Kam-lam, Kan-ran), by which, no doubt, the Tamberlans (a name easily corrupted into Kambelan, Kamblan) are meant. Next, the fleet came to Karimāta and Kau-lan (Gelam).2

On Phillips’ map—where, by the way, but few of the places named in the above itineraries are shown—a different route is laid down, passing between Tung-Tung (Great Natuna) on the one side, and Sha-wu-p’i (Suwobi or Subi) and Tung She-lung (Sarān or Sarāsan) on the other, thus showing that at the period the map was drafted (circa A.D. 1399) the channel between the Great Natuna and Subi had come to be used instead of the earlier one between the

---

1 This is the name for the so-called Chinese olive, the fruit of various species of Canarium (albim, pimela, etc.).
2 See Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 151, where he renders, of course, Hwén-tun Ta-yang by ‘Indian Sea (?),’ Kan-lan by ‘Olive Islands (f),’ Kau-lan by ‘Billiton,’ and so forth; with how much profit to the reader I leave it to be imagined.
form er and the North Anambas. On this route we need not to dwell any further. What concerns us and is most important for the point at issue are the two facts elicited in the course of the present inquiry, viz., (1) that the Chinese term *Tung-Tung* merely designated the Great Natuna (Bangoran), the other chief islands in the Natuna group being known by different names peculiar to each of them; and (2) that the early Chinese sea-route to the southern part of the Archipelago lay between the Natunas and the Anambas. This was no doubt the course taken during the north-east monsoon, the favourable time for such a passage, and is the very course followed to this day, and during the same monsoon, by sailing-vessels bound from the China Sea to Sunda Strait. We thus have a continuity of tradition for this sea-route extending over the space of six centuries (i.e. from 1292 to the present day). And, as we may well assume that the Chinese did not discover that route themselves, but learned it from either Arab or Persian pilots who had received the knowledge from their predecessors of, say, six or more centuries before that, we can conclude without fear of exaggeration that such a route was already known and followed in Ptolemy's time and even earlier.

Turning now to the next point, namely, the term *Hsi-tung* applied by the Chinese to the Anambas, it is quite possible that, contrary to what we have noticed in the case of the Natunas, this term not only specifically designated Siaantan Island, but probably included the whole group of the Northern Anambas, for these islands (Siaantan or Terampah; Mata, Yang, or Niuluan; Mubur; Kelong or Tabiyan; Mentala or Cocos, etc., to speak only of the largest) lie so close together as to look like one single island to ships passing even within a short distance of them. Moreover, in the Chinese map above referred to, no other island is marked which could in any measure correspond to either these or

---

1 There is, besides, a course marked between the Southern Natunas and the Borneo coast, i.e. by Api Passage, which must, however, have been known and used long before that by junks proceeding from the southern part of the Archipelago to Brunei or Cochin-China, and vice versa.
any other of the Anambas (Siāntan, of course, excepted), a remarkably strange fact, because Jemāja and Riābu, which are somewhat separated from the rest, might reasonably be expected to have attracted attention and won a place in the Chinese maps and itineraries. Perhaps they failed to do so merely through some oversight; in any case, it is a fact that no other name but Hsi-tung appears there to represent the Anamba group. Notwithstanding this, we shall not jump at once to the conclusion, which well might be a rash one, that Hsi-tung was the Chinese generic term for the whole of the Anambas. The most reasonable course, I think, is to hold that this was the designation for Siāntan, and at best for the other islands lying immediately close by, forming collectively the group now known as the Northern, or Great, Anambas. As to the West Anambas, of which Jemāja forms the principal feature, and the South Anambas, which are but islets of almost insignificant size, we must conclude for the present that the Chinese either had no term for them or omitted to put it on record.

With respect now to the term Hsi-tung, there cannot be the least shadow of a doubt that, as already suggested, it is but a transcript of Syātan, the old form of the name for the island presently known as Siāntan.¹ The characters 西董 have, in fact, the sounds Sai-tung, Si-tung, Sae-tung, Sē-tong in the dialects known to be the best representatives of the old Chinese pronunciation, and the difference between such sounds and that of Syātan is very trifling, being easily accounted for by the Chinese desire to transcribe names foreign to them in such a manner as to elicit some meaning out of them in their own language, even at the cost of sacrificing accuracy of rendering in such a process. From the form Syātan occurring in the Pāsai chronicle in,
say, the fifteenth century or later, but traditionally handed down from about 1377, the date of the Javanese conquest, and very likely from far older ages; and from the Chinese factitious transcript Hsi-tung, or Sai-tung, Sé-tung, already appearing in the Chinese map of 1399, we acquire the absolute certainty that the toponymic in question is no modern invention, but must have existed under a very similar form for centuries prior to that period.

Such being the case, it is easy to see that from Syātan, Saitun, and Satun the transition to the Ptolemaic Satyrôn is easy. Already we have had occasion to notice that the early Greek, or maybe Alexandrine, navigators, were not a wht behind travellers of later ages in 'making up' toponymics in such a way as to extract some

---

1 To give but a few instances for this 'striving after meaning' at the hands of comparatively modern Western travellers, Damān, on the coast of Gujarāt, is converted into Demou ("The First Letter Book of the East India Company, 1600-1619," London, 1893, p. 247). Lân-ch'âng (vide supra, p. 149) becomes Lan John in the "Calendar of State Papers of the East Indies," vol. ii (1617-1621), p. 90. The Mé-nam River of Siâm assumes the oracular form Memnon with Hamilton ("A New Account of the East Indies," London, 1744, vol. ii, p. 160). Skijang Island in Singapore Strait and Shang-ch'üan Island in the approach to the Canton River become both St. John Islands in our charts and the accounts of European travellers (e.g. Dampier, vol. i, p. 406). Ré (Burmanic Yay) on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula rises to the dignity of a Cidade do Rei in the early Portuguese maps, and Cité des rois in Duval's map, 1686. Old Tavoy, otherwise known as Mro-houng, is transformed into a Cidade de los Moros in an anonymous Portuguese map of cireá 1588; and an island in front of it is accordingly marked I. de Moro. Ayuthia, the old Siamese capital, is turned into a Far Eastern Juda in Cocks' "Diary," 1617 (Hakluyt Soc., vol. i, p. 272), and other papers of the period ("Calendar of State Papers, East Indies," vol. ii, 1617-21, p. 90). Balbi, 1680, mentions (p. 66) an island Mazacouan near the Indian Bassein (probably Mazagong, Bombay), and Valentine Moravia, 1615, applies the name Mossaco to the Moluccas.

Many other instances of amusing perversions of toponymics in Further India at the hands of travellers and geographers have fallen under our notice in the course of the preceding pages; and an exhaustive list of all of them would occupy many pages. The amusement would, however, reach its climax were such a list supplemented by another one exhibiting the extraordinary changes that other names or native words in the same region have undergone whilst passing through the pen of Western book-writers on these countries. Suffice to point out as fairly good specimens the following:—A Mugo-saye, or town clerk, bailiff, is called a Meugerry by Symes ("Embassy to the Kingdom of Ava," 1795); and Uparâja is playfully converted into Upper Rodger in a letter dated 1755 from Captain Jackson at Syriam in Pegu (Dalrymple's "Oriental Repertory," vol. i, p. 192). Again, a Malay gadis or 'virgin' becomes, mirabile dictu, apostrophized into a 'goddess' in the parlance of old British residents in Malaya! Thus even the famous Swiftian All-eggs-under-the-grater pales before these achievements, so true it is that truth is stranger than fiction.
amusing meaning out of them in their own language whenever they got a chance for so doing. Hence, it should not be surprising that, having heard the term Syatun, Saitun, Satun, or something similar, as being the name of the Northern Anambas, and having noticed at the same time the simian features and habits or the apparel of the natives, who at that time must have been of a Negritic type akin to that of the present Samang of the Malay Peninsula, they thought it a good joke to call the islands they inhabited by the name of Σατύρων νήσοι. From such a stage to the growth of the legend that the inhabitants had tails like the Satyr demigods of Greek mythology it is but a brief step, so easy indeed inasmuch as fabulous stories of tailed men are no less current in the Archipelago than they are on the Indo-Chinese mainland, and have no doubt been repeated by mariners from the remotest period. 1

1 The stories current on the Indo-Chinese Peninsula and Sumatra about tailed men have already received attention above (p. 637, note 5). Here it remains to briefly notice those concerning the parts of the Archipelago situated within tolerable proximity of the Anambas and Natunas. Colonel Yule has already given several of them, covering a very wide field (see "Marco Polo," 3rd ed., vol. ii, pp. 301, 302), but the subject is by no means exhausted. Here we shall add a few that have escaped his notice, as well as that of his last editor, connected with the area now under consideration.

1. Ma Tuan-lin, quoting from the "Nan-t'u-hsiu-chuan," an older work (op. cit., p. 299), tells us that eastwards of the Kou-li, 囍利 (Kou-li, Ku-ri), country there is a land called P'u-lo, 濟羅 (Buru, Buro), where the natives all have a tail from five to six ta'sun [i.e. Chinese inches = 1.41 English inches each] in length, and feed themselves upon human flesh. These people, under the name of P'u-lo Chung, the P'u-lo Race or Tribes, are again mentioned in the "Yüen-chien-lei-han" cyclopædia as living in a country which was a dependency of Fu-nan (Kamboja). It strikes me that the term Kou-li may very well be a mere apheresis of 投拘利, T'ou-kou-li (Tou-kau-lei, Dau-kau-li, T'u-ku-li), the name for a seaport of Fu-nan, which we have already met with above (p. 93). Again, Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 515) mentions a country, Chü-li, 拘利 (K'ou-lei, Ki-ri, Kii-lei), situated to the north of a bay on which lies the kingdom of Po-li, 濟利 (Puk-lei, P'uk-li, Bak-li), where the natives are black-skinned, go stark naked, and have red eyes. Further, he mentions (p. 511) a kingdom, 九離, Chiu-li (Kau-lei, Kiu-li, Ku-ri), also called Chüi-k'ou, 拘利 (K'ou-hou, Ki-k'an, Kii-k'ang), which latter transcript seems to be a clerical slip for Chü-li. 拘利. Along with it he enumerates the States of Pan-t'ou or Pien-t'ou, 班斗, 連斗 (Pan-tau,
early as the end of the fifth century B.C., in fact, Ktēsias already hands down a story about a caudate people inhabiting

Ban-duān, Bien-duān; 都毘 or 都軍, Tu-k’un or Tu-chūn (Tu-k’un, Du-k’u̯n); and 比巌, Pi-sung (Pei-sung, Bi-sung); all of which, he says, have been known since the Sue dynasty, and lie at about 3,000 li (500 miles) southwards from Fu-nan, across the Bay of Ch’in-lu (Kém-lun, Kam-run, Kamalañka, or Gulf of Siám? vide supra, p. 164). Now, Pi-sung, if not exactly Pulu Pisan, west of Singapore Strait, must be either the homonymous island at the entrance to the Indragiri River, east coast of Sumatra, or the territory on the Pasāngan River, termed Pasāngan in the Pāssai chronicle, westwards of Pāssai, north coast of Sumatra. Both this river and territory (or village) on its banks are called Pisan by Hamilton (“New Account of the East Indies,” London, 1744, vol. ii, p. 125). Pan-ťou or Pien-ťou may be Bantau in Sungei Ujong, on the Lingi River (west coast of Malay Peninsula), but it may as well refer to the Pandiya tribe, a branch of the Sambiring division of the Battak. Tu-k’un or Tu-k’un, Du-k’u̯n, I would not, of course, identify with the little Dokan Island, or Menali, northwards from Bangka, but rather with the two islands of Tekong lying in the entrance to Johor River, Singapore Strait. Otherwise, the place Tokun, in the centre of Province Wellesley (almost directly east of Pinang town), where the ancient inscriptions mentioned on p. 98 ante occur, may be meant. (See, however, supra, p. 641, note 2.) Finally, Chiu-li, Kau-li, Ki-k’un (Koli or Guri), is, as likely as not, either Ghāri or Hāri, or Jerei, Cherei, Jerai (Kedah Peak), the original site of Kedah. Bākit Chereh, or False Elephant Mountain, rises but a few miles to the north. In conclusion, all the countries just named were doubtless situated on Malacca Strait. So must have been Po-li, which, although a quite distinct place from Po-lo, 妾利 (see above, pp. 473 seq.), may correspond to the territory on the Pulai River, south-west end of the Malay Peninsula, in case the latter does not; or else to Bālei, the chief town in Assāhan, east coast of Sumatra. It remains to deal with 拱利, Kou-li, which, if not connected with T’ou-kou-li as suggested, may or may not be the same as 拱利, Chū-li, which it considerably resembles in spelling. However, the situation of the latter to the north of a bay on which lies the kingdom of Po-li would argue for it a position on the Malay Peninsula, thus making it more probable that Chū-li is Cherei or Jerai, and Kou-li is either T’ou-kou-li or Ghāri (Hāri). As regards F’u-lo (Bulu, Buru), there are many places to choose from (Bulu Bay, north-west coast of Bangka; Bulu Island, north coast of Billiton; Buru Island, Durian Strait; Bālah islet, the southern Semblian; Kota Buru, an old place in Malacca; Burn Island in Malacca Passage, off north coast of Sumatra); but none seems to answer better than Pulu village (Pulo besar) in Bātā Bāra, east coast of Sumatra (about 3° 9’ N. lat.), which lies eastwards (according to Chinese notions, but south-eastwards according to ours) of Ghāri (Hāri), our supposed Kou-li. This identification appears the more tempting from the fact that Galvano, as we have seen (supra, p. 685), calls his sailed men Daraque Dara, which term, if not Arakundur as suggested, may be Bātā Bāra, where Pulu village is. In any case the two places would not be very far distant from each other, and they both lie on the east coast of Sumatra.

2. In the History of the Ming Dynasty, bk. 323, it is stated that far in the
an island in the Indian Sea. Moreover, it is very likely that, in the old days, the Anambas were inhabited by a race similar to the present Semang of the neighbouring seaboard of the Malay Peninsula, and still more so to the Tambusu and Brû tribes of Pulo Tingi and adjacent islands off the Johor coast, which lie quite close by. All these tribes are very ill-favoured; simian, in fact, in appearance and habits, while Semang or Syâmg is the Malay word for a baboon, and Brû (although probably connected with Prû, Brû, Brao, etc., see above, pp. 73, 129, 130) is the name of a large ape in Pahang and Kelantan. Hence it is easy of comprehension

interior of Banjar-masin, South Borneo, there is a village called Wu-lung-li-tan, 烏龍里 BinaryTree, where the people all have tails; when they see other men they cover their face with their hands and run away; their country is rich in gold-dust, etc. (See Groeneveldt, op. cit., p. 228.) It does not require great perspicacity, even for a Sinologist, to see that Wu-lung-li-tan, or, as it is pronounced in the southern dialects, O-lang-li-tan, is merely a clumsy transcript for the well-known term Orang-utan, meaning 'wild man' or men. It could scarcely signify Orang Iden, for this tribe dwells far away on the northern part of the island. As the Mai-wa-jou, 買哇柔 (Be-oe-ziu), i.e. Beajã, are mentioned, with their head-hunting proclivities, as living in the neighbourhood, we see at once that the caudate tribe of the story cannot have any connection with the Dayaks and head-hunting Kayans; but must belong to the stock of those Negrito or Negrito-descended aborigines whose presence on the island has been so often talked about and equally as often denied. They may be Punan (Orang Punan), a forest race noticed in the interior of Kutai, a territory adjoining the country at the head-waters of the Banjar-massin River. The Punan wear a headdress and a waist-cloth of bark, and eat monkeys; whence, I think, the legend as to their having tails like those remote ancestors of ours. Meyer asserts that the Punan are pure Malays ("Negritos," p. 25); but this yet remains to be seen, and 'Malay,' as we are well aware, is a very elastic term, still more indiscriminately used by our anthropologists, who, I much doubt, hardly know what they mean by it. While awaiting for further inquiries, we cannot help drawing attention to the similarity of the term Pa-nan with Pa-nan or Po-nan, and the Phnom, Penong, Banar, Panara, etc., i.e. wild or monkey-like) tribes of Kamboja (see above, pp. 207, 208).

Colonel Yule ("Marco Polo," 3rd ed., vol. ii, p. 302) relates that a "Mr. St. John in Borneo met with a trader who had seen and felt the tails" of a caudate race inhabiting the north-east coast of that island. "The appendage was 4 inches long and very stiff; so the people all used perforated seats." This Borneo story, he adds, "has lately been brought forward in Calcutta, and stoutly maintained, on native evidence, by an English merchant." We now see, from the passage referred to above from Ming history, that the existence of tailless men in Borneo was credited by the Chinese from at least the fifteenth or sixteenth century; and perhaps it had been current for a long time before that among their teachers in navigation and legendary Archipelagic lore, the Arabs.

how the legend of the tailed men or satyrs in the Anambas originated.

Passing now from ethnological to geographical considerations, I must hasten to point out that the Ptolemaic mention of these islands discloses to us a very important fact, namely, that the sea-route followed by western ships in Ptolemy's time, on their return journey from China during the north-east monsoon, must have been close to the Great, or Northern, Anambas, thus practically coinciding with the present European sea-route to the Archipelago; hence the reason why the mariners of that remote period became acquainted with such islands. For it can hardly be supposed that the passage between the Anambas and Natunas was then, as nowadays, used on outward journeys made during the north-east monsoon. Navigation was, at that stage, far from perfect, and its main principle consisted in following the trend of the coast, keeping within sight of land as far as possible. Accordingly, the outward journey from the Straits to China would be accomplished during the south-west monsoon, the most favourable time for it, and the course would lie along the east coast of the Malay Peninsula as far north as the Ligor and Bandon bights, or, in Ptolemaic parlance, the Περιμούλικος κόλπος, whence it is easy to sail across the Gulf of Siam to either Akadra or Zabai, i.e. Ha-tien or Saigon. Thus, while out on this journey, the Anambas would not be seen at all, or hardly at all, on the dim and distant horizon. But, on the return journey, made, naturally, during the north-east monsoon, the adherence, in inverse order, to the above route, would make it impossible for a sailing-vessel to reach the Straits. Necessity would, therefore, compel those navigators to pass close to the Anambas, whether westward of them in making Pulo Aor, or close by their eastern borders in endeavouring to reach the Straits; however, the former course, i.e. westward of them, would be the most advisable, and probably was the one most often followed. In either case, our mariners would have a chance of getting a full view of the islands, and might eventually be forced by stress of weather
to seek shelter in the channels between the northern islands of that group, where Siāntan, above all others, would offer them good sheltered anchorage in the bays and inlets of its north coast. Hence the acquaintance of the early navigators with the Northern or Great Anambas, and more especially with Syātan or Siāntan, after which they came to give the name of Satyrōn Islands to that group. The three islands reckoned in it by Ptolemy may correspond to—

(1) Mobur; (2) Niulūan, otherwise called Māta and Yang; and (3) Syātan or Siāntan, now also known as Terampah, from the village and bay of that name on its north coast. However, as these three islands, together with those immediately adjoining of Kelong or Tabiy'an, Bajau or Nyāmok, Panjang, Mentala, Tānah-puniat, Ākar, etc., form a surprisingly compact group, so as not to appear as distinct members of the cluster except after a very close inspection of their coastline, I would not be altogether disinclined to assume that the three Ptolemaic islands correspond to—(1) the Siāntan group, or Great Anambas; (2) the Jamāja group, or West Anambas; and (3) the Riābu group, or South Anambas. Nevertheless, for the reasons above specified, I prefer to identify them with the Siāntan group, which itself already includes three large islands, or exactly the number mentioned by the great Alexandrian geographer.

The corrected position obtained for the Satyrōn cluster on the basis of the data Ptolemy has supplied us with does, indeed, fall, as already noticed, just midway between the Siāntan group and the Great Natuna; but such a result should not be relied upon, as it is quite conceivable there may yet be a slight error in excess in longitude. It would prove at best that the navigators of that period availed themselves at times of the passage between the Anambas and Natunas, which we already know they sometimes did. But it should be borne in mind that the fairway

---

1 The two best anchorages of the whole group of the Northern Anambas are, in fact, to be found in two inlets of Siāntan Island itself, viz., in Terampah cove on its northern and Telok Ayer-bini on its southern coast.
in this passage lies on the side of the Anambas, and not of the Natunas; so that Chinese vessels proceeding to the west coast of Borneo were obliged, as we have pointed out, to take a detour to the west of the North Natuna in order to clear the Pyramidal rocks and other dangers, thus getting within no great distance of the Great Anambas. To the navigators of the Ptolemaic period, moreover, the object being to reach the Straits and not West Borneo, their course lay entirely by way of the Anambas, so that their object, after passing Pulo Sapatu and Pulo Condor, must have been to make any point within the channel between the Anambas and Pulo Tyūman or Pulo Aor as their imperfect methods of navigation would enable them to reach. Under such circumstances, the sighting of the North Anambas would be of paramount importance for them in directing their further course to the Straits, because these islands, from the fact of possessing peaks upwards of 1,300 and 1,800 feet high, form very conspicuous landmarks. It would then depend on whether chance had brought them eastward or westward of them as to which they availed themselves of. For these reasons, I very much doubt if they ever caught sight of the Natunas at all; but even admitting they did, they must have had but a very hazy idea of them, and consequently I have been led to exclude this group of islands altogether from the range of their 'Islands of the Satyrs.'

I deem it unnecessary to dwell upon the absurd identifications that have been from time to time propounded for this mysterious insular cluster. The author who most sensibly treated of them is certainly the one who, in Smith's "Dictionary of Classical Geography," surmised that they were perhaps the Anamba group, and the Satyrs who inhabited them apes resembling men. Colonel Yule's passage, still occurring in the third edition of his *magnum opus*, suggesting their possible identity with Marco Polo's

1 "Marco Polo," vol. ii, p. 277, where it is quoted from the same author's "Oldest Records of the Sea-route," etc., p. 657.
Sondur and Condur, and of these again with the Sandar-fūlāt of the Arabs, is in every way unfortunate.

In conclusion, I trust to have demonstrated that the two terms, to wit, the Ptolemaic Satyrōn as well as the Chinese Hsi-tung, 西董, are both intimately connected with the group of the Northern or Great Anambas; and more especially with the most accessible, populated, and hospitable one of them, formerly known as Syātan, and nowadays as Siāntan. Owing to these islands being, in Ptolemy’s time, inhabited by some large species of apes, but more probably by some aboriginal race not far different to them in features and habits, the name Syātan readily suggested to the good-humoured Greek or Alexandrian mariners the term Σάτυροι, and Σατύρων νῆσοι for the islands themselves. It is not at all unlikely, however, that either monkeys or simian-like aborigines had nothing to do with the matter; but that the epithet Satyrōn for the islands in question simply occurred to those navigators as a felicitous improvement upon the original toponymic, Syātan already bearing such a striking resemblance to it; and that the legend of tailed men inhabiting these islands was a sailor’s yarn fabricated upon such a coincidence. Aut ex re nomen, aut ex vocabulo fabula.
APPENDIX I.

ON THE SEVEN SEAS OF INDIA AND FURTHER INDIA.

In order to demonstrate that my identifications of the Seven Seas of Indu, Arab, and even Far-Eastern tradition, referred to above on pp. 80, 91, 164–5, 201, 237, 243–9, etc., are not merely conjectural, I here subjoin the results I have arrived at in a tabulated form, so that one may be able to see at a glance the impossibility of denying the correspondence I have asserted to exist on the whole between the names and locations respectively assigned to the seas in question by different Eastern nations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rāmāyāna</th>
<th>Purāṇas</th>
<th>Buddhist Literature</th>
<th>Arab and Malay Literatures</th>
<th>Chinese, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(from Bengal eastward:)


---

1 Suppāraka Jātaka (No. 463). The enumeration in this text starts from Bharukaceha (Bharuch or Bharoach, on the north side of the Narmadā River in Western India).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>5. Dadhi, Dadhimāṇḍa, sea of curds or whey, surrounds Kraunca dvipa (South China).</td>
<td>3. Dadhimāla, Dadhimāli, sea, gleaming like milk or curds. * Dadhi-māli.</td>
<td>7. Saṃjī sea, or Sea of China.</td>
<td>Chin-lin (or Kōm-lau) sea [= sea of Kāmalakhā ?].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yen Hai, the 'Blazing Sea' (Annan Chih-kio, A.D. 1291).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow Sea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuro-shivo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See note 1, p. 725.
APPENDIX II.

ON INDO-ChINESE TERMS IN THE PTOLEMAIC GEOGRAPHY OF EXTRA-GANGETIC INDIA.

One of the convincing proofs that the Ptolemaic extra-Gangetic toponomatology is by no means fanciful, as some of our geographer's captious critics have been pleased to insinuate—in order to palliate their inability either to decipher or locate his place-names—is to be found in the fact that many of such toponyms contain terms traceable to the languages of the nations that are, or were in our author's time, settled in the regions he treats of.

On the other hand, the sweeping statement made by some writers that all, or most, of the toponyms mentioned by Ptolemy in extra-Gangetic India are Sanskrit or Sanskrit derived, must be considerably discounted. For, albeit many of the place-names in question owe their origin to the influence of Indian civilization, or to Indu immigrants who transplanted them here from their fatherland, a considerable proportion of them are of genuine local growth and belong to the language of the country, as we have been showing in the course of the preceding pages. The importance of this second class of toponyms cannot be passed over, for in more than one instance they supply us with an ethnographical clue to the sort of language then spoken and the race of people then settled in a particular district, thus throwing glimmers of light into the darkness of the unknown early history of those nations.

1. Mōn terms.

Foremost in number come the toponyms derived from the Mōn (Peguan) language, which extend from the coast of Arakan down to the Malay Peninsula, thus evidencing that the coastline and some inland tracts of that region were then occupied by Mōn-speaking populations, a fact which explains the considerable proportion of Mōn words surviving to this day in the languages of the wild tribes of the Malay Peninsula and North Sumatra, as well as in the place-names on the north coast of Sumatra (see p. 656 above).

The Ptolemaic place-names in this region which in our opinion may be traced to the Mōn language are the following:—

No. 44. Katabėda (river), a term connected with Kutubdia (=Kutub-diva?) island. It looks like a hybrid Mōn-Indū compound of katu, kathu (a junk in Mōn) + beḍā, reḍā (a boat
in Sanskrit-Pāli). If so, its second part would be merely the translation, made by the early Indi navigators, of the initial one. No wonder, then, that the foreign rendering was dropped in the course of time and the native one alone, Katu, K athu, preserved. Kutubdia would thus mean 'Boat Island,' and Katabēda the 'River of Boat Island (Kutub-diva).'  

No. 46. Tokosanna (river). This term may represent either of the Mūn compounds: T'kō San, T'kō-sōn (San Island, or 'Silver Island'), or T'kō-saín, T'kō-sān ('Elephant Island'). N.B.—'Saín means 'elephant' in Arakanese, and is merely the local pronunciation of the Mūn saín, chōiín, ching. Otherwise, the Sakaen River, a branch of the Lemru debouching in Hunter Bay, may be meant. T'kō-Sakaen = 'Sakaen Island' may have been the name of some island in the bay, after which the river was usually designated.

No. 48. Sados (river).

No. 49. Sada (city).

Thate (Sate) or Thaday (Saday) River, immediately to the north of the Sandoway River. Cf. Sedu, Siddoh, on north coast of Sumatra (vide supra, p. 656).

No. 79. Takola (a mart), now Takopa. The etymology is probably Taik-kulā = 'brick (or laterite) building of the Gola or Chola people of Coromandel.'

Even more interesting are the following toponyms of the Bē or Bēr class, from Bī, the Mūn word for 'river,' variously misspelled Bē, Bēr.

No. 50. Bēraborona. The first part of this name might be traceable to either bī, bēr = 'river,' or to para = 'mouth' in Naga; and if not to the Bengalese Bara and the Sanskrit-Pāli Bara, Varā. Cf. Ibn Baţuţa's Barah-nagār (pp. 400–2, note). I have also pointed out (above, pp. 400–3) a possible connection with the Bharu kingdom of the Phyū or Phrū.

---

1 This toponym might, on the other hand, be traced, though very doubtfully I should think, to the Mūn k' Dop = 'head.'

2 To St. Andrew St. John belongs the merit of having first recognized the Mūn word Bī in Ptolemy's place-names of the Bē class. I am furthermore inclined to include in the same category such Ptolemaic toponyms as begin with Bēr or Pēr. This on the strength of the fact that Balbi (op. cit., f. 133 verso) mentions a place at the mouth of the Martaban river, called Cadaperpain, as meaning 'head of the sea (or river) mouth.' The correct Mūn form of the name should be K' Dop-bī-pain, hence we see that Balbi transcribes bī by per, which would tend to show that in his time bī may have been pronounced somewhat like bēr, bēr. As a matter of fact, 'sea-mouth' or 'river-mouth' is rendered in Mūn by 'pain-bī,' and not 'bi-pain,' and the genuine native form of the toponym recorded by Balbi was probably Patri K' Dop-bī = 'Mouth of the sea-head,' or else K' Dop Patri-bī, 'River-mouth head.'
In this region exists a village bearing a similar name, to wit, Barrebam, and Mraboong river, a branch of the Lemro further up the coast.

Nos. 57, 58. Bēsingga (a mart and a river).

No. 243. Bēsyngeitai (people).

In both these names one can unmistakably recognize the Mōn words Bi-ching (ṣing, sain, choiñ) = ‘Elephant River,’ i.e. the Iravatī (Irawaddy), as connected with the Singuttara or ‘Elephant Hill’ of local legend (see pp. 76–7 above). N.B.—The land’s point bounding the western entrance to the Rangūn River preserves a relic of this name, it being known to this day as the Elephant Point.

No. 77. Bērabai (a town). Similar considerations apply to the first part of this toponym as made above for the initial portion of Bērabbonna. In the second part, bai, we may have either the Mōn païn = ‘mouth,’ or the Chin p’ayo, and, yet better, the Tamil vāy with the same meaning. On the other hand, a similar term, paračei, exists in Tamil meaning ‘bird.’ On the whole, I am inclined to regard the toponym as entirely Mōn, and to restore it to the form Bi-beit (Biter-bait), where beit, biek, etc., represent the Mōn name of Mergui, corrupted probably from mrit, mārit (see above, pp. 82–3). I have now no further doubt that this Beit or Bait (i.e. Mergui) is the hitherto unidentified seaport of Māit or Mābit, mentioned by Ibn Khurdādhbih (A.D. 864), Captain Bozorg (A.D. 955), and Edrisi (A.D. 1154). Bi-beit or Biter-bait would thus mean the river of Mṛit or Māit, i.e. Mergui, nowadays better known as the Tenasserim River.

No. 77. Bēpyrrhos (mountain range, corresponding to the Patkoi mountains). While not venturing to suggest a Mōn equivalent for this place-name, I tentatively enter it here along with the above-mentioned ones of the Bē or Bī class, on the supposition that it may belong to the same category as might be inferred from its initial syllable. If not Mōn, it might stand for Vaiḥrāja or Vēhrāja, the name of a mountain in Plakṣa-dvīpa, according to Indū cosmology.

2. Malay terms.

We may notice the following:

No. 84. Palanda (an inland town on the Golden Khersonese).

No. 85. Palandas or Palandos (river).

Both these toponyms embody, as I have but lately discovered, the name of the Bēlandas, Blandas, or BeLandas,
a tribe now still surviving in the Sungei Ujong and Negri Sembilan districts, on the Malay Peninsula, not far from Perak (between Selangor and Malacca). This tribe, of the Mentra or Sakei family, non-Negrito, may have been so named from the Pulindas of India.

As Palanda and the Palandos River are, in De Donis' map, located further along the coast beyond Sabana, the Palandos may, after all, be either the Klang or the Langat River, unless it is meant for the Pahang on the east coast of the Peninsula.

Nos. 88, 184. Attaba (river). Here we have the Malay word attap (átap) = roof, thatch. The name may have been given to this stream from attap palms growing on its banks. See, however, p. 105 above for another possible raison d'être of the name. Although in Kamboja a similar toponym exists, viz. Attapū (in maps Atltopoeu), which is in reality a corrupt form of the Khmēr Āch-krabū, 'buffalo dung,' I but little incline to see a repetition of the same here, on the Malay Peninsula, in the Ptolemaic Attaba.

No. 86. Sabana (a mart). This name suggests either of the Malay terms: Sābah, Sapang, and Saban. The first two occur as toponyms, while the latter is the Malay corruption of the name of the well-known ancient Indu potentate Śālavāhana. Ptolemy mentions another Sabana among Indo-Skythian towns, but the correct original of this may be Savana or Sravana.

3. Tamiḻ terms.

A number of Chola settlements of immigrants from the Coromandel coast had grown on the seaboards of the Malay Peninsula, as evidenced by many a place becoming known as Taik-kulā (Chola brick buildings), viz. in the neighbourhood of Tathōn, at Tagala, at Takōpa, etc. Accordingly, we find many place-names transplanted from the Coromandel coast to the Malay Peninsula, among which I believe may be reckoned the following ones recorded by Ptolemy:

No. 83. Tharrha (an inland town or village on the Golden Khersonese). The word meant is probably Tarangam; cf. Tarangam-bādi = 'Wave Town,' the name of Tranquebar, Skr. Tarama = a wave. We have identified it with Trāṅgānū, Malay Treng-ganū, of the present day.

No. 87. Maleu-kōlon (a cape) = Malai-kūṟram or Malai-kollam. In Tamiḻ malai means 'mountain,' and kollam = 'western.'
Hence Malai-kollam = 'Mountain of the West.' The view adopted in "Hobson-Jobson" (2nd ed., p. 545) that Malâyunkulon means 'Malays of the West' in Javanese is therefore, to say the least, very strange. On Malaiikkûram or Malu-kûta see Burnell, op. cit., p. 127, note.

No. 90. Perimûla and Perimumâk Gulf.

Cf. the Perimu'da of Aelian in the south of the Coromandel coast; also the Perimu'la of Pliny = Ptolemy's Symilla (Tiamula), now Chaul. The location corresponds, on the whole, to the one we have assumed for the Mula-Jawâ of Ibn Ba'tûta, in which the first portion, mula, of the name is, as likely as not, a survival of either of the two Ptolemaic toponyms forming the object of this paragraph (see p. 444, note 2, and p. 517).


No. 96. Akadra = Kâ-trâl ('Shuttle Island'), or Kâ-Trang ('Trang Island,' as opposite to the Trang district on the main).

No. 123. Zabai, Zaba (a city) = Svâi ('mango-tree'), or Svâithâp ('dwarf mango-trees,' the name to this day of a district in Kamboja). The term Svâi probably still survives in the name Soi-râp (Svâi-râp?) of the Saigon River.

We have, furthermore, some terms of the Bâ or Pa class, where this syllable stands for bâ, pâ, bah, meaning 'great,' 'chief,' 'noble' in Khmër, Châm, and some of the Malay dialects, especially Javanese ('abundant'); and 'river-mouth,' 'confluent' in the Bahnar and other dialects of the semi-wild tribes in the interior of Kamboja.¹ To such a class presumably belong the following toponyms:—

No. 91. Balongka (an inland town on the Golden Khersonese) = Bâ-laâkâ ('Large Island,' or 'Noble Island')? Probably the capital of the Laâkâ or Kâmâlaâkâ State mentioned in this region by Hwên-tsang (Yüan Chwang).

No. 93. Pagrasa = Bâ-krâs ('Great Krat,' or else 'Krat river mouth').

An example of a Sanskrit-Pâli name in Khmër form is:

No. 95. Pithônobâstê (a mart) = Bânthâi-mâś or P'thai-mâś ('Golden Citadel').

N.B.—In Malay pantei, pantai, means 'coast,' 'beach,' 'shore,' and Pantai-mâś occurs as the name of a village on the west coast of Pinang Island; but the etymology is, as in the Khmër toponym above referred to, traceable to Sanskrit bhikti.

¹ Cf., however, the Môâ paiñ, the Tamil voy, and the Chin p'ayô.
FURTHER INDIA AND

(Pāli bhitti) = ‘wall’ + Skr. māsa (Pāli māsa) = ‘gold,’ ‘golden.’ Pithonobaste is, nevertheless, a transcript of the Khmer form of this Sanskrit-Pali expression, and not of the Malay one.

5. Chām terms.

No. 125. Balonga (metropolis). Here we assuredly have the Chām bal (‘palace,’ ‘capital,’ ‘royal residence’) + Anguś (the Chām corrupted form of Anu, the adopted Indu classical name for the Champa kingdom). 1

No. 117. Pagrasa. Prakan or Pakan. Chinese, Pi-king; Annamese Ti-kain. Hence it may be seen that the toponym is neither Chinese nor Annamese. It might at first sight appear to be of Khmer origin, like the seemingly etymologically identical one, Pagrasa (No. 97), on the coast of Kamboja (= Bā [or Pā]-[krāś], Pā-grāś). But we have noticed that the same prefix Bā or Pā occurs in Chām as well. I might suggest, as nearer the mark, Pā-Kazēh (‘mouth of the Kazēh [River],’ see above, p. 310).

A trace of tampering through Chām lisping of the s has been noticed by us in:

No. 122. Thagora, which we believe to be meant for Thāgara, in Sanskrit Sāgara.

6. Terms from other languages of Indo-China.

No. 76. Lasippa, Lassypa, or Lasypa = Si-poḥ (Thibo), or else [Wieng] Sipu-kai, Lā-sīp, Lā-sīt (?); probably a Thai term.

No. 74. Doana (town).

Nos. 118, 182. Doanas (river).

No. 226. Doānai (people).

From the Tuan or Thuāng tribes. The Doans, or Doānai, are the Tuan, of the Chinese, one of the original ten families of the Ai-Lao, mentioned since before the Christian era.

No. 75. Bareukora (var. lect. Bareuāra), or Bareuathra. The first form of this toponym is probably connected with the name of the P'hu-or, P'hu-ō, or P'huen tribes (see next paragraph). If not, we must assume a derivation from Bharu-vara, Bharu-vāsa.

No. 224. Barrhai (people) = the P'hu-ō or P'huen tribes, in Chinese: P'u-érh, P'u-'rh.

1 To C. O. Blagden belongs the merit of having first discerned the Chām name Bal-Anguś in the Ptolemaic disguise of Balonga (see the Journal R.A.S. for 1899, p. 665).
No. 172. Damassa (var. lect. Damasa), or Dobassa (mountain range).

No. 218. Dabasai, or Damassai? (people).

The name assuredly survives in that of the Tamansai of the Indaw-gyi lake valley, Mogaung (Upper Burmā), evidently a tribe of Lawā. Either may, moreover, be traceable to Dava, Ōvāka, Lāu, Lawā; or to Dārea, a people in the north-east region according to the Bṛhat Samhitā.

No. 220. Kakobai (people). Seemingly the Kiu-ku Miao of West Kwei-chou. Possibly also the Khakhu or northern branch of the Kachins. Khakhu means 'head of river,' 'up-river man.' There seems to be no possible etymological connection with the Kokabakas of Sanskrit texts (cf. Wilson's "Viṣṇu-Purāṇa," vol. ii, pp. 179, 341)."

No. 216. Indaprathai (people). Evidently meant for Sindaprathai = the Sinphos or Chingpaws, i.e. the Southern Kachins.

No. 223. Kudutai (people). The K'at-ō or Kāu who are probably the Kuluta mentioned by the Bṛhat Samhitā in the north-east region. With them might also be connected the modern Lo-tē, whose country lies on the border of China proper near Sz-mao (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, pp. 595–6).

No. 73. Lariagara = Müang Lēm, originally a Lawā town. The Ptolemaic designation, though traceable to a Sanskritized form Lāri-gāra, Lāragāra, seemingly contains in its initial portion Lāri, the name of the Lawā tribe in north-east Burmā, formerly known to the Chinese as La-wu or La-lu (=La-ru?). 1 Less probably the Lāhu of Upper Burmā are implied, who appear to be ethnographically connected with the Kui or Mu-Hsō, whom the Chinese term Lo-heir or Lo-hē, i.e.'niggers,' according to the "Upper Burma Gazetteer" (part i, vol. i, pp. 576, 578–9). The same work relates (p. 608) that the Panthay or Hui-hui of Yūn-nan claim to be descendants of men from the Lērru country. Have we here a dim traditional reminiscence referring to the ancient La-ru or Lāri country alluded to above?

No. 39. Tugmā (metropolis) = Tummu or Tamu in the Kubo valley. The Ptolemaic toponym might be the transcript of a Sanskritized form, Tugāma, or Tugrāma, of the name,

which seems, however, to belong to the language of the country, whether Môn or other. There exist, in fact, similarly named villages in several parts of Burma, among which are: a Tokamā (Tawkama) in Bhīlū-gyun Island; a Tokma or Tawkma in Kāma township, Thayetmyo; and again in Sinbaungwè, Myedè. See, however, Addenda below, note to p. 471, for a possible form Tumigāma.

No. 54. Arisabion = Shenbo, or Sinbo. The name may be, however, Sanskrit-derived (see p. 63 above), or else it may be native in origin and Sanskritized afterwards.

7. Sanskrit and Pāli terms.

The outcome of the above cursory examination is that the proportion of genuine Sanskrit or Pāli terms in the Ptolemaic lists of toponyms of his extra-Gangetic India is very small indeed, especially if it be taken into account that some of his place-names which at first sight would be thought to be Sanskrit in origin turn out, after a diligent inquiry, to be merely Sanskritized forms of some native name. These facts well evidence that Indian influence, though already considerable in Further India in Ptolemy’s time, had not yet spread so widely and deeply in that region as it did in the subsequent centuries.

It would be beyond the scope of the present appendix to deal with the Sanskrit and Pāli derived toponyms occurring in the Ptolemaic geographical lists of this region, especially as they have been already thoroughly noticed and discussed in the foregoing pages. Suffice it to summarily subjoin here the principal of them:

No. 47. Sambra = Sambrā (or Šambhu?).

Nos. 51, 52. Tēmala or Tamala (a river and a town) = Tamala, Timira (Ch'i-mi-hla).

No. 55. Marēura or Malthūra (metropolis) = Mayūra, Moriya; or Mathura.

No. 56. Sabara = Sabara, Šavara.

No. 59. Adeisaga = Vidiśa, Vaidīśa, or Vedisa; perhaps Vaideha, Videha, or [Pubba-]Videha.

No. 72. Rhingibēri = Ramiga-vāri, or Ramga-pura (Ch'ieng Rung).

No. 74. Dasana = Dašārna.

No. 89. Kōli = Koli, Koli (Kelantan).

No. 92. Samaradē = Sāma-ratthē, Sāma-ratthā, Śyāma-rāṣṭra.

No. 93. Sōbanos (river) = Sōhana (Kap'horn Sōm River).

No. 41. Trillingon = Tri-[Ka]-linga, Telingana.
No. 113. Séros (river) = Sarayû, Sarjû (Chinese Hoi-yu).
No. 114. Aganagara = Agganagara, Agranagara (or Náganagara, Uraga-nagara?).
No. 115. Sinda (town)
No. 225. Indoí (Indoí?) tribes = Sindhu, Sindh.
No. 117. Kortatha (metropolis) = Kûthâra, Kaúthara (Kûu-dûk).
No. 120. Throana = Torana, Turâna, Tûrân (Turân, or Touron).
No. 122. Thagora = Sâgara, Sagara.
No. 129. Aspithra (a river and a town) = Vanaspati (Ho-p'û, Hiêp-phô).
No. 242. Zamirai (people) = Samira (Zabaing, Sa-mi, Sa-me).

8. Hellenized terms.

I cannot conclude this review without devoting a word of notice to Hellenized terms, that is to say, to sundry attempts to render into Greek the meaning of Further Indian toponyms, and at times to disguise them in a Greek garb so as to express a meaning therefrom when their real purport proved to be unintelligible. There can be no doubt that this process of Hellenization was in most instances the work of the Greek-Alexandrine navigators and travellers who, for many years before Ptolemy's time, had been journeying to the Further Indian region, and should by no means be ascribed in toto to our geographer. To this desire of striving after meaning, which, being general in travellers of all times and countries, cannot very well be held to form an exception in the case of the Greek ones, we have already made allusion on p. 412 above, quoting in support of our view several Ptolemaic toponyms which appear to exhibit unmistakable traces of Hellenization. We shall here revert only to such as belong to Indo-China proper, of which the following is a list:—

No. 41. Triglypton. If this is to be read, as Lassen does, Triglyphon = 'a trident,' in Sanskrit Tri-sâla, it would prove to be a translation of the term Triśāla occurring in ancient records as a name for Burmā (see above, p. 31, n. 1, and p. 467, n. 7), and still surviving in Andrea Corsali's *Disuric* (1515, *vide supra*, p. 468, note). Otherwise it must be referred to a form Trikalipti as surmised above (p. 31, n. 1).

1 As regards those pertaining to the Indo-Malay region, to wit, Agathodaimonos and Satyrōn Islands, they have been discussed in full on pp. 412 et seqq. and pp. 716–17 respectively.
No. 43. **Pentapolis.** Seemingly a translation of the Sanskrit *Pañca-palli = 'five cities' (vide supra, pp. 35, 36).

**Argyra Khòra,** ‘the Silver Country’ = Arakan.

No. 127. **Argyrè** (the capital of Iabadios, or Sabadios, Island).

I have coupled with the continental toponym the second one from the insular region, in order to show that ‘Silver’ is very probably out of the question for both places, and that its introduction into the two toponyms is merely the outcome of Greek fancy, struck, as it must have been, by the impressive resemblance of the corresponding native place-names to the Greek word for the white metal. On pp. 40–1 and 658–9, 667–8 above, I have tried to demonstrate the linguistical identity of **Argyra** with *Parakṣa, Arakṣa, Arakkha = Arakan,* and of **Argyrè** with *Acephà, Achevira, Acheera, Acheh = Achhín.*

Nevertheless, I do not absolutely exclude a possible connection with *plakṣa, pulakṣa, ‘white,’* from which *parakṣa, arakkha, rakkha,* as surmised above (pp. 39–40 and 658–60, 668), in which case both Arakan and Acheh would mean ‘the White (or, Silvery?) Region,’ of which meaning the Ptolemaic toponym would be a Greek rendering.

**Khryśē Khòra,** ‘the Gold Country.’

**Khryśē Khersonēsos,** ‘the Golden Khersonese.’

Nos. 81, 186. **Khrysoána** (river).

I also group together these three toponyms, which evidently have analogous derivations. They are, in fact, either translations of the Sanskrit and Pàli terms *Suvanna-dvīpa, Suvannabhūmi, Suvanna-nadī,* etc.; or mere Greek travesties of place-names sounding more or less like the Greek word *Khryśē.* What such place-names might be it is not easy to determine; but, arguing from the fact that Valentijn has disguised into *Chrysoront* the name of the Kesang River (see Addenda and Corrigenda, infra, note to p. 97), Ptolemy’s **Khrysoana** not unlikely is a rendering of some similar local name: *Kusang, Kassom, Kusan, Kṛṣṇā,* etc. On the possible etymological connection of **Khryśē or Khrusē** (Island and Peninsula) with *Kusā or Kuṣā-dvīpa (= Sumatra), see pp. 670–672 above. As regards **Khryśē (Khòra)** in Lower Burmā, cf. the [*Tsing-Kutsā* district about Rangūn (see p. 76 above), and the *Katha (Kasa)* district west of Tagaung.

No. 222. **Khalkitits** (people). Though at first sight the Ptolemaic designation of this people appear to be based upon *Khalkos or copper,* the metal which, according to our author, was mined
in large quantities in their country, there seems scarcely any doubt as to the real derivation being from the name Kālakā (= 'squirrel'), or Kara (Kāla?)-laka, i.e. Black Laka (or Laka-Lolo), of the Black Lolos inhabiting the same country (Eastern Yunnan), the Kara-jang of Marco Polo. Their name Kālakā or Kāla-Laka, coupled with the information that their country produced copper (khalkos), naturally suggested the connotation Khalkitis for them to the Greek travellers, and, if not, to Ptolemy himself. See pp. 356 and 358, n. 2.

No. 227. Lēstai (people). The conjecture put forward on p. 156 above that this Ptolemaic ethnonym may really be meant for 'robbers,' being possibly at the same time the transcript and rendering of some term current in the country (such as e.g. latta or lataka) and having the same purport, seemingly receives further corroboration from the fact that Chou Ta-kuan in the account of his travels in Kamboja (A.D. 1296–7) refers to the Ch'ōng as Chwang Tsei, i.e. the 'Chong (or Ch'ōng) Robbers' (see Bulletin de l'École Francaise d'Extr.-Or., t. ii, No. 2, p. 156). It is, of course, possible that by 捕賊, Chwang Tsei—in Cantonese pronunciation Chong-ts'ak—this writer may mean both the Ch'ōng and Suk tribes. If not, it seems pretty certain that Ptolemy's ethnonym Lēstai should really be taken in the sense of 'robbers,' and that the people meant are principally the Ch'ōng, as I have on other grounds inferred above (pp. 157–9).
APPENDIX III.

On the date to which Ptolemy's information on Further India is to be referred.

I thought it might be interesting to see whether the approximate date at which the information on Further India embodied in Ptolemy's work was collected can in any way be deduced from the indications he gives, or ascertained by way of inference from certain of the capital towns he names of which the date when they became the seat of government happens to be more or less accurately known from historical sources and falls not far earlier than Ptolemy's time. Such an inquiry as this presents a two-sided advantage, for in cases when the dates supplied to us by Oriental records are reliable they afford a clue wherewith to determine the approximate date to which Ptolemy's information goes back; whereas when they are doubtful they may be to some extent checked and rectified by the mere fact of the event to which they refer being alluded to or not in Ptolemy's work. It may, indeed, in such cases be possible to class the event as a pre- or a post-Ptolemaic one.

Subjoined are the few results so far obtained from the inquiry, which, no doubt, are capable of further extension when the ancient history of the less advanced Eastern countries shall be better known and the chronology of events shall have been more accurately fixed.

1. Ptolemy mentions a Marêura (or Malthûra) Métropolis as the capital of Pegu-Burmâ, which I have shown (p. 67) should be identified with either Old Prome or Mengdûn on the Ma-hînûn (= Mathurā?) River. Now, according to Burmese tradition, Old Prome ceased to be a capital in 95 A.D., the last of its kings having fled to Mengdûn, which he founded in circa A.D. 100. But in 108 A.D. he founded Lower Pagan, to which he transferred the seat of government. If these dates be correct, we must conclude that the sources of information to which Ptolemy had access must have been fresh enough for his times of no telegraphs, 'iron horses,' and motor-cars, ranging down, as it seems, till the dawn of the second century.

2. He locates Séra Métropolis on a site which we have shown (pp. 15, 16) to correspond to Lo-yang, wheroeto the seat of government for the East Han dynasty was removed in A.D. 26 (i.e. in the second year of Kwang Wu Ti's reign).

3. If the Ptolemaic toponym Aganagara (located by us at Hà-nôî) is to be taken in the sense of 'Chief City,' i.e. of Kiao-chi,
now Tonkin, as we have suggested on p. 332; and furthermore, if the seat of government for the Kiao-chi district was really removed in cireé a.d. 25 thence to Mê-liên as some historians assert (see pp. 323, 324), it would follow that Ptolemy's information on Tonkin would date from some time prior to that removal—say, from the first quarter of the first century a.d.

4. Ptolemy mentions, in W. Yünnan, a town Posinara which I have identified with the capital Pêh-ngai of the Pêh-tez State (b.c. 109–a.d. 225), corresponding to the present Hung-ngai about 20–5 miles south-west of Chao-chou in the Ta-li prefecture (see below, Addenda and Corrigenda, note to p. 121). Now in a.d. 69 the Yung-ch'ang prefecture was formed by the East Han, with the modern Chao-chou (in Ta-li Fu) as its capital, out of eight neighbouring districts mostly belonging to the ancient Ai-Lao country (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 176). As Ptolemy seems to ignore this large Chinese circumscription of Yung-ch'ang, his information on this part of the country must date back to some time prior to a.d. 69.

In conclusion it may be inferred from the above indications that Ptolemy's information was based upon data which go back—

(a) To the first quarter of the first century a.d. for Tonkin and Southern China, and these were probably taken from Alexander, whom he quotes from Marinos on the subject of the passage from Zaba to Kattigara (see p. 221 above).

(b) To the second quarter of the first century a.d. for Northern China, the information in this case being presumably derived from the actual data collected by his predecessor Marinos.

(c) To the dawn of the second century a.d. for Burma and Southern Indo-China in general, the fresh knowledge in this case being obtained first-hand by Ptolemy himself.

Subsequent inquiries may somewhat confirm or disprove the above deductions; while a similar investigation regarding Farther Asia, not dealt with in the present volume, may lead to novel and important disclosures.
ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

p. 6, bottom. Our subsequent investigations have proved that even such a connection suggested by Yule of Zabai with Campā is inadmissible. See article s.v., pp. 213 et seqq.

p. 9, l. 18. Kambērikhon. It strikes me that the last syllable of this toponym may stand for gaon, the local (Bengalese) corruption of Skr. grāma = a 'village.' If so, the name might be a loose transcript of Kāma-vari-grāma, Kamberi-gaon, or something similar. This being the case, it is worthy of remark that a village Kewari (Kewari-gaon?) exists near the left bank of the Haringhāta River, on the Delta, after which this outlet of the Ganges may have been anciently termed the 'Kewari-gaon' (River), whence Ptolemy's Kambērikhon. In the event of this conjecture proving from local inquiry to be well founded, Ptolemy's Kambērikhon, or middle mouth of the Ganges, would become identical with the lower course of the Haringhāta River, the true longitude of which is 89° 50' E.; and a corresponding correction would have to be made to our Kambērikhon base meridian, for which we have adopted a longitude of 89° 30' E. only.

p. 35. Pentapolis. The Catalan Atlas has a town Penta below Bangala, which might have been the historical continuation of the Ptolemaic one. The northern entrance point of the Chittagong (Karṇaphūli) River still bears a similar name, to wit, Patunga Point. Furthermore, a somewhat similar toponym, Patikkara, identified with Chittagong, occurs in a Burmese inscription of a.d. 1184 (see "Inscriptions of Pagan," etc., Rangoon, 1899, p. 4). See for other linguistic remarks Appendix II, section 7, above.

p. 36, l. 8 from bottom. Kutubdia. In recent maps this name is spelled Kutubdia, a still closer approach to Ptolemy's Katabēda. The correct form may be Katabdia, if not Katabaida, as Wilford wrongly suggested for Cheduba. The river Ptolemy had in mind was apparently the Mamuri, which debouched by several outlets abreast of Kutubdia Island. For other linguistic considerations see Appendix II, section 1, above.

p. 39, note 1. As regards silver in Arakan, the "Sommario dei regni e popoli Orientali," translated from the Portuguese by Ramusio (vol. i, p. 334 verso), says of Araquam (Arakan) that "vi si trova anche qualche argento." Numerous are the silver-mines in the adjoining Burmese territory, for which see the "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. ii, pp. 301, 302, 304, and part ii, p. 527. McLeod, in his Journal, p. 79, mentions one in Müang Lėm, and Dr. Richardson likewise in his "Journal," p. 143,
speaks of an old silver-mine lying abandoned since A.D. 1780 near Ye-ngan. Silver-mines in the Patkoi range, between Assam and Burmā, have been noticed by Colonel Woodthorpe (Proc. Geol. Soc., Jan. 1887).

I may further call attention to the fact that the Irāvati (Erāvati), the continuation of the Chindwin, in the valley of which exist several old silver-mines, is in the “Sāsanavamsa” (p. 108 of Mrs. Bode’s transl.) called Rājata-vāluka, i.e. ‘River of Silver Sand.’ To the Chinese it was known instead as the Great Kin-sha (Gold Sand River), for the sake of contradiestinction, however, from the Upper Yang-tsz, termed simply Kin-sha (Kaṅcana-vāluka). See, however, on this debatable point my remarks on p. 286 above, note. p. 39, note 2. Balas rubies. From Balukshān, a form of the name of Badakshān (see Ibn Baṭūta, in Defrém. & Sang. transl., vol. iii, pp. 59, 394; Barbosa in Ramusio, etc.). The stones from that district, which is on the banks of the Shignān, a tributary of the Oxus, are said, however, not to be rubies, but spinels; and the term balas seems to have been transferred to true rubies of a particular shade of colour. Chardin in his “Voyages” (t. iv, p. 70, Amsterdam ed. of 1711) says in fact—“On l’appelle aussi Balacehani, Pierre de Balacehan, qui est le Pegu, d’où je juge qu’est venu le nom de Balays qu’on donne aux Rubis couleur de rose” (see Ball’s “Tavernier,” vol. i, p. 382, and Yule’s “Hobson-Jobson,” 2nd ed., 1903, p. 52, s.v.).

p. 40. Balakṣa, Balassia, Baluchin, etc., as names for a part of Upper Burmā. Traces of them may survive in the [Nam] Phīlu or Balu-chaung stream flowing west of the In-le Lake, south of which latter spinels occur (in the west of Nam-mē-kōn State, see “Upper Burma Gazetteer,” part ii, vol. i, p. 310, and vol. iii, p. 381). Again, there is the Maw-li-hsat River, a little to the north of the Yōng Hwe Lake, of which Richardson in his “Journal,” p. 137, speaks as the “Bora-that [Borassat] or Neaung Eue River.” This is also called the Ta-Yaw or Taw-Yaw-chaung; the lake once extended up to Maw-li-hsat or Ta-Yaw village, and there are traces of a large fortified town in the neighbourhood (see “Upper Burma Gazetteer,” part ii, vol. iii, pp. 381 and 392). It will thus be seen that Barbosa did not make such very bad geography as he is taunted with in “Hobson-Jobson” (new ed., p. 52), when locating Balassia or Balaxayo in Upper Burmā. I may add that the Chinese records mention a kingdom Po-lo-so or P’o-lo-so, 波羅娑,

婆羅娑（= Pa-la-sa or Ba-la-sa），lying to the west of C'hīh-t'ū (Sukhada, Siām, see p. 182, note 1), which evidently corresponds to Dr. Richardson's Borathat (Borasat), now Maw-līhaut, and to Barbosa's Balassia, district. These terms, if not derived from the Sanskrit or Vedic Plaṅga, Balakṣa, and Palakṣa, meaning 'white,' as surmised by us on p. 39 above, may somehow be connected with Palāsa or Parāsa, the well-known name of Magadha (derived from the Palāsa = Butea frondosa tree), which may have been of old introduced and applied to the district in question. It is interesting, nevertheless, to remark that the "Bṛhat Samhītā" mentions a people Purusāda in the eastern region.

p. 44. Tokosanna River. See Appendix II, s.v., for further linguistic remarks.

p. 45. Sambra (city). A not very dissimilar toponym is that of the Surma Mountain on the coast below Rāmri harbour. It may, on the other hand, be observed that Sambrā is the name of the tutelary deity of the Chauhān Rājputs (see Crooke, i, 55). Other possible etymologies of the toponym may be found in Śambhu, Śambhura, Śamba(-pura).

p. 45. Sada (city) and Sados (river). The name, better than in Sandoway and its river, appears to survive in that of the Thate (Sate) River (Thate-chaung), flowing immediately to the north of the Sandoway River and connected with it near the mouth through one of its branches.

As regards the legend told of Sandoway, see for ampler details the "Monograph on the Pottery and Glassware of Burmā," Rangoon, 1895, pp. 9, 10. I have since discovered that the whole story has been borrowed from the Ghata Jātaka (No. 454), q.v. Therein the city Deāravatī is described as having on one side the sea and on another the mountains. By goblin magic it used to rise in the air and deposit itself on an island in the midst of the sea; when the foe was gone it would come back and settle in its own place again. Therefore it was bound with iron chains, etc. There can thus be no doubt that the legend was, by local simple-mindedness, transferred to the credit of Sandoway merely from the possible fact of this city having at some time or other been named after the Indian Dvāravatī. If such a name was really borne by Sandoway, it must have been after Ptolemy's time, for our author mentions it and its river by names similar to the common ones they bear to this day. N.B. that the Mōn name it bears is commonly pronounced Sandōa. There exists, moreover, a circle in South Sandoway district called Satthea, సాత్ఠీ. As to the
identity of the Thate-chaung or Sade River with Ptolemy's Sados, there seems to be but little doubt, considering the fact that the latitude our author assigns to the mouth of the latter suits the embouchure of the former better than the entrance of the Sandoway River (see our remarks already made in this sense on p. 47).

p. 47, ll. 7–9. Palūra or Pakūra (a town). This name, I have since discovered, still survives in Paloor (Palūr) village, marked in sheet 107 of the Indian Atlas in long. 85° 11' and lat. 19° 27', just above the mouth of the Ganjām and close by Palur Bluff, better known to navigators of the Bay of Bengal. It is, in fact, already mentioned by Linschoten as Serra de Palura, a name evidently applied to it by the Portuguese since the dawn of the sixteenth century, after the neighbouring Paloor village. There can thus be no doubt as to this village being the historical continuation of Ptolemy's Palūra town. His Aphetērion, or point of departure for ships bound for Khrysē, must, accordingly, be located at Gopālpur, just a little below the mouth of the Ganjām.

p. 47. Bērabonna. See Appendix II for further linguistic remarks on this toponym.

pp. 48–51. Tēmala. A people Ḫamara are mentioned in the "Byhat Sāhhitā" and located in the north-eastern region. Dr. Leyden ventured the hypothesis of a derivation of Tēmala from "the Malay vocable tema [timah], which signifies tin," and he accordingly inclined to identify this supposed 'tin country' with the Malay Peninsula, which is, of course, inadmissible (see "Essays relating to Indo-China," 1st series, vol. i, p. 88). For further remarks and its identification with the Chou-mei-liu or Tān-mei-liu of Chinese records, see p. 523, note 2.

p. 52, l. 7. Cape Negrais. This name has also been conjectured to be derived from Nāga-rāsi; but I now think it was borrowed from Nāgarāsa, the famous lake of Nepāl, where dwelt the serpent king Karkotaka (see Crooke, vol. i, p. 42). The derivation from Nāgarāstra proposed in "Hobson-Jobson," p. 623, is inadmissible, as this word would become Nāgarāṭ in the vernacular, and not Nāga-rāsi, Negrais.

p. 52, l. 17. Yaw (Yo) tribes. From the fact that the Karens call the Shans Yō (see China Review, vol. xvi, p. 380) these tribes may be inferred to be of Thai stock. Yō is, however, also the name by which Northern Chins call themselves (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, p. 454); whereas the Yaw or Yō proper claim descent from the Palaung (op. cit., p. 569).
p. 53. List of peoples. I have now to offer the following additional remarks on the subject:—

(1) *Tiragrahas* as onomatologically connected with Ptolemy's *Tilogrammon*, identified by Yule with Jessore. I have since discovered that such an identification is untenable, for Ptolemy locates *Tilogrammon* but 20' of his longitude ( = about 9' true) west of the *Pseudostomon* mouth of the Ganges, and one half-degree of his latitude ( = about 18' true) further to the south of such an embouchure which, I am now pretty certain, corresponds to the mouth of the Tetulia River flowing to the east of Bakarganj. It should be noted that a branch of this river, detached but a short distance to the east of Bakarganj, bears the name Dhulea, and flows into the Radnabad, which debouches into the Bay behind Radnabad Islands. Now, this name Dhulea (if not that of the Tetulia River itself) forcibly recalls the Ptolemaic one *Tilogrammon* ( = *Tila-grāma*, 'Sesamum Village', or, more likely, *Tira-grāma*, 'Shore Village?'); hence its position must be sought for somewhere between Bakarganj and the Radnabad islands.

(3) *Ījikas* or *Īkās*. These are evidently the *Ījakās* of the Mahābhārata (vi, 360) and the *Īśi* of Pliny; perhaps also the *Anīkās* or *Īkās* of the Vāyu Purāṇa. I strongly incline to identify them with the *Īśi*, *Sāi*, or *Īthi*, a Lepai (Kachin) sub-tribe now settled south of Mogaung in Upper Burma (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, pp. 336, 374, 376-8).

(4) *Kanjakāguṇas* = the Khakhu (Chingpaw)?

(5) *Tilabharas* = Ptolemy's *Tiladaī* and Pliny's *Thalutā*? According to Loughena these would be the Kuki of North Kachar and of the hills near Manipur, who have the god *Thila* among their deities. Kuki is one of the terms by which the Chin-Lushai tribes are collectively designated, whereas they call themselves Zhō (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, p. 452).

(6) *Samiras* = Ptolemy's *Zamirai*. Rather than with the *Zabaing* or Yabein I now somewhat incline to identify this people with the *Thama* (*Sama*) Lepai, a branch of the Kachin, who are partly cannibals and are settled near the Chinbwin River. The *Thama* and *Sāi* (see above) are the most powerful and prominent of the Lepai sub-tribes (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, p. 377).

As to the Yabein, they are referred to in a recent monograph on "Silk in Burma" (Rangoon, 1901, pp. 11, 14, 56, 57) as a curious race of misty origin, and believed to be a relic of the many broken clans like the Danus and the Danaws, of whom little is known. In 1891 they numbered 2,197 persons in Lower Burma (chiefly in the Tōngū and Pegu districts).
With their name may be connected the term *Jabrung*, applied, according to Balfour's Cyclopedia (vol. ii, p. 393), to "a coarse description of silk, made by a wild tribe, who are the only people in Pegu that rear the silkworm and cultivate the mulberry." Evidently the Yaboin or Zabaings are the tribe here alluded to.

p. 56, l. 17. *Tu-lo-shu* = *Trisālikā*, *Tulākṣetra*? See pp. 31, note 2, 468, note, and Appendix II, section 7, s.v. *Triglypton*. Andrea Corsali's letter therein referred to is dated January 6th, 1515, and says (Ramusio, vol. i, p. 180): "Pegu confina per la costa col regno di Bengala & Liqī (= Arakan?) ... Tiene dalla parte della costa Malachā, & da quella di terraferma il *Disurīc* ... il quale è signore infra terra, fino alla Cina." Evidently, *Disurīc* or *Disurīc* = *Tu-lo-shu*, *Trisālikā*. Furthermore, *Tu-lo-shu* and *Shē-p'o* suggest, respectively, the *Tharshish* and *Sōpher* of Biblical fame (cf. our remarks on p. 598, note).

p. 57. *Dava*, *Daṅkā*. The "Bṛhat Samhitā" mentions a people *Dareva* in the north-east region. *Darev* as the name of a region occurs in both the Mahābhārata and the Viṣṇu Purāṇa. The terms *Thapec* and *Tafun* referred to on the same page should be more scholarly spelled *Tafek*, *Tafun*, or *Tūban*. Cf. *Dāwēk*, *Lāwēk*, *Lavaka*, on p. 163, note. Not only *Dava*, but also *Đāva* means a 'forest,' in both Pāli and Sanskrit. For other and like forms *Đābag* (= *Đābag*?), *Zābag*, *Jāvaka*, etc., see pp. 624, note 1, and 633, note 2.

p. 58. *Dabasai* or *Damassai* (people) = the *Tamansai* tribe of the Lawā, or the *Dareva*? see Appendix II, section 6, s.v. Cf. also this and the name of the *Damasa*, *Damassa*, or *Dobassa* range with *Dumai*, *Tamai*, the term by which the Khamti Shans denote the eastern branch of the Iravati (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, pp. 7, 391).

p. 61, l. 20. *Kia-t'o*. Cf. the *K'ia-t'o*, Kado, or Kado tribes on p. 357. In the *Katha* (= Kasa) district are Kados and Kachins. Tagaung is in the Katha district; but according to an inscription of A.D. 426 (see below), this territory was called *Brahmadeśa*.

p. 61, last line of text. Shenbo. Spelled *Sin-bo* in the "Upper Burma Gazetteer" (part ii, vol. iii, p. 170, q.v.), which says it was founded over 100 years ago by a Shan (p. 171); but I doubt the correctness of this statement.

p. 62, l. 15. Tagōng or Hastināpura. According to the Burmese Royal Chronicle ("Mahārājavanaṇa"), Dhajarāja, a king of the Sākya race, settled at Manipura about 550 B.C., and later on conquered Tagaung (Old or Upper Pagān). In 416 A.D. 300,
a Gopāla of Hastināpura, on the Ganges in India, left his original home, came to Burmā, and after various successful wars with the semi-civilized natives founded New Hastināpura on the Irawaddy, apparently on the same site as the earlier Tagaung, or close to it. This is related in an inscription dating from A.D. 426, discovered among the Tagaung ruins, the author of which is King Jayapāla, a lineal descendant of Gopāla, the town founder, of the Candravamsa or Lunar dynasty of New Hastināpura. This, in the inscription, is stated to be in Brahmadēsa, on the Erāvati (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. ii, p. 193). In A.D. 610 Hastināpura still existed, as evidenced by an inscription of that date found at Pagān (op. cit., p. 186); but the seat of power was evidently already at Pagān (Arimaddana-pura).

This later capital is already referred to in an inscription discovered in one of its ancient Buddhist monasteries, dating from A.D. 481, and recording the erection of the temple of Sugata by Rudrasēna, the ruler of Arimaddana-pura. In the later inscription of A.D. 610, already referred to, the reigning king’s name is given as Adityasēna.

As to the term Pagān, more properly Bhukām or Bukām, cf. Vugama or Bugamati in Nepāl (see Foucher, op. cit.). A Pagān inscription of A.D. 1242 gives, however, an ad usum Delphini interpretation of the term, as follows: "This kingdom of Pagān is so called because it is the most pleasant and beautiful of all kingdoms [Bhū-kāma?]. It is also called Arimaddana because it is inhabited by people who are warlike and brave and are able to vanquish their foes" (see "Inscriptions of Pagan," etc., p. 134). Evidently the derivation of the name is here assumed to be from Kāma-bhū, by inversion: Bhū-kīma. Cf. Kāmalāṅkā.

p. 62, n. 2. The classical name Cinarattha for Bhāmō already occurs in an older inscription dating from A.D. 1387 (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. ii, p. 194). The Kaung-hmu-daw inscription of about 1636 states that: "all within the great districts of Bhan [= Bhāmō?] and Khwelaun [= Kwe-lōn village, on the right bank of the Taping River] is the kingdom of Zein [Cina]" ("Upper Burma Gazetteer," part ii, vol. i, p. 340). At a short distance to the north of Bhāmō are the ruins of Sampanago (Campanagara?), and at about sixteen miles further to the east the remains of the old town of Kōktha (Kōkṣa), the rival of Sampanago in its flourishing days. Furthermore, at some ten miles to the

---

1 According to the "Thayet-myo Gazetteer," p. 30, the classical name of Old, or Upper, Pagān, was Saṅkassa-rattha; but on what evidence this statement is based does not appear.
south-south-west of Bhāmō lies the town of Sawadi (= Sāvatthī?), and below this are the ruins of Old Kaungtōn or Koungtaung, which I identify with the Kadunaw (Kantunaw)-gyī mentioned in a 1284 inscription of King Narapati of Pagan as then bounding his kingdom on the north.¹

Again, near Myothit up the Taping are the ruins of an old town which might be identified with old Bhāmō or Man-mō (Bān-mō), according to the "Upper Burma Gazetteer" (part i, vol. ii, p. 194).

p. 63, n. 2. Thamien or Thaman-gyi. The "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part ii, vol. iii, p. 275, spells this toponym Thamayang-gyi, and states it to be a Shan village of twenty-nine houses.

p. 64, l. 4. Yung-ch'ang. This name was applied to the district under the Ming dynasty, when Pao-shan, its prefectural city, was established. Old Yung-ch'ang of the Han dynasty, a prefecture founded in A.D. 69 on Ai-Lao territory (see pp. 59, 60), is now Chao-chou, south-east of the Ta-li Lake.

p. 64, ll. 5–10. Videha as the western part of Yünnan seems more particularly to mean Pubba-Videha or Pūrea-Videha (= 'Eastern Videha'), the supposed fabulous continent of Buddhists. That it was not altogether mythical appears from the statement, occurring in Paramārtha's (499–569) Life of Vasubandhu, to the effect that Pindola, the famous Arhat, was in Pūrea-Videha in Vasubandhu's time (see Toung-Pao, 1904, p. 273).

Otherwise, Ptolemy's Adeisaga may be a clumsy rendering of Ahikṣatra (or Ahihechatra, Ahihechatrā), the name of the ancient capital of Uttarā-Pancāla north of the Ganges, in India, transplanted here.²

As regards the other suggested derivation from Vaiḍīśa, compare also Vedīsa in India, where the famous Bhilsa Topes have been lately found. If not in Yi-hai as suggested on p. 64, line 11, local traces of the name may be found perhaps in Yüeh-hai, 越析 (or Yūt-sik, Wiesz-shak), the name of one of the ancient six Chaos of

¹ See "Inscriptions of Pagan," etc., Rangoon, 1899, p. 4, where the date of the inscription is wrongly made out to be A.D. 1184. By turning to the printed Burmese text of this inscription, p. 13, I found out, however, that the date is given as 646 of the Burmese Civil Era = A.D. 1284; while the name Kadunaw reads, literally, Kantunaw. It is, probably, the Kiang-t'ou of Chinese records, though this may, on the other hand, correspond to Kantaw, a place on a tributary of the Iravati flowing further to the north of the Taping, in Chinese territory.

² The chiefs of Chieng Tung and Chieng Cheng (Keng Cheng) are described in their titles as Pañcāla-rattha governors (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, p. 290). Their territory may have been likened unto Southern Pancāla, in which case the region to the north of it may have become known as Northern (Uttara) Pancāla.
the Nan-Chao kingdom, also called Mo-hsie, and occupying part of the territory of the present prefecture of Li-kiang (see Sainson's "Nan-tchao Ye-che," Paris, Leroux, 1904, pp. 10, 11). In this part of North-West Yunnan is also a district bearing a similar name, to wit, Wei-hsi (for which see T'oung-Pao, 1904, p. 500).

p. 65, l. 6. Suwannabhumi. Cf. Suvarna-bhu, a region in the north-east of India according to the "Bṛhat-Saṁhitā," xiv, 31. "Suvanabhumi is, in the Atṭhakathā, identified with Sudhammapura, that is Thāṭōn" (Mrs. Bode's "Sāsanavannya," Introd., p. 4); but this does not seem to be quite correct.

p. 65, l. 12. Timira. A Timirā is mentioned in the "Kathā Sarit Sagara" (see Tawney's transl., vol. i, p. 117).

p. 65, ll. 16, 17. Sunāparanta. More correctly, Saṇaparantaka, Śrōṇaparantaka = 'west of (or, beyond) the Śrōṇi River, in India.' Cf. the Aparanta-rattha or Aparantaka of classical (canonical) Buddhist texts. When transplanting this name to the tract west of the Irāvati in Burmā, the latter river was seemingly assumed to be the Śrōṇi, not improbably from a likeness of its Mōni name Bi-sing (or Soïn) to Śrōṇi, Soṇi. The Kaung-hm-daw inscription of about 1636 gives a somewhat different list of the districts comprised within Sunāparanta, to wit: Sāgu, Salin, Lēgaing (Minbu district), Paunglin, Kale, and Thaugnthwut (Chindwin); see the "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part ii, vol. i, p. 340.

p. 66, ll. 2, 3. As to gold in Burmā, it is found in slight and unpayable quantities in most of the rivers; but washings of it from sands are "carried on fitfully in many parts of the country, especially in Katha [about Tagōng] ... in several streams of the Ye-u subdivision, as well as in many parts of the Shan States" ("Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. ii, p. 304).

p. 66, l. 13 from bottom. Mareūra, Mayūra. A Mayūra-pura was on the Ganges, above Hastināpura (cf. Tagaung), and another in South India, i.e. Meliapur (St. Thomé). N.B. that the peacock, mayūra, is called merāik, m'raik in Mōni, the ancient language of Pegu and Burmā.

p. 66, ll. 1-7 from bottom. Maurya, Moriya. Moriya still appears in the titles of the chiefs of Kalē and Sōng-sop (Thaungthut or Sumjok) on the Upper Chindwin (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, p. 291). This shows that the Maurya or Moriya region comprised most of the Kubo and Chindwin valleys, from Mwē-yin and Kalē on the south, up to Song-sop (Thaungthut or Sumjok) on the north; and that it thus lay above Sunāparanta. On p. 65 we have pointed out that Kalē and Teinnyin were mentioned as part of Sunāparanta in the
Po-U-Daung inscription; but from the fact that the chief of Kalé and Teinnyin bears in his title the qualification of Moriya, we think ourselves justified in locating the northern limit of Sunā-paranta below, not only Kalé, but also Mwē-yin (= Moriya), which lies yet further to the south.

p. 68, l. 2. The derivation of Marammā or Mrāmnā, the name of Burmā,¹ from Brahma, may be accepted only provided it can be proved that the term Brahmadeśa, which we have seen applied in the fifth century to the Tagōng district, has been subsequently extended to the whole country. This does by no means seem to have been the case, especially if the Brahmadeśa district be identical with the P'ol-o-mén (= Brāhmaṇa, Brahman) of Chinese records, as we have suggested on p. 471; for in A.D. 802 these records speak of P'iau (Lower Burmā) bordering on P'ol-o-mén (= Brāhma-deśa, i.e. Tagaung?).

p. 68, l. 14 et seqq. Marai, Mro, Mru (see also p. 55). It should be noted that a race of people bearing the name of Maru (so called by the Chingpaws; they speak of themselves as Lōng-teō) are still living at the present day in the basin of the Nmai-kha River or eastern branch of the Upper Irāvati. They are similar to the Burmese, so much as to suggest to Captain Pottinger the theory that both these races originally migrated from Tibet by the valley of the Nmai-kha. Are these people in any way connected with the older Mro or Mru of Arakan and the Chindwin valley, who seem to have been the pioneers of the Burmese race?

p. 72, l. 2 from bottom. Sabara, Śabara, Śavara. Cf. the town of Savāracatī in India, to the south of the Middle Country (see Journal R.A.S., 1904, p. 538).

p. 73, l. 13. Śabara or Śavara tribes. The "Brāhat Samhītā" mentions a people Śava-giri in the eastern region, and Nagnaparṇa-śavara (= naked and leaf-wearing—and not, I believe, 'leaf-eating' as has been said—Śavaras) in the south-eastern.

p. 74, l. 16. The correct date of the conquest of P'iau by Koh-lo-fēng (= Kalavarna?) is A.D. 763 (see Chavannes in Journal Asiatique, 1900, pp. 388, 430-1). On that occasion he conquered also the Hsin-fu tribes (= Sinphos, or Kachins), and the Lo-man or Yue-man settled further west in the mountains (= the Nāgas).

¹ Houghton, in his "Essay on the Language of the Southern Chins" (p. xi of Appendix), gives the etymology Myamma = Myō-ma, the great tribe or race, which does not seem very tenable.
In A.D. 832, says the Nan-chao Chronicle, Feng-yü abducted back with him from Piāo 3,000 people, and established them near the present Yun-nan Fu (see Sainson, op. cit., p. 64).

In A.D. 858 Feng-yü, yielding at last to the entreaties of Mien, which, having been already several times invaded by Ceylonese forces, implored assistance, sent his general Tuan Tsung-pang to bring relief (op. cit., p. 66). Here, it should be noticed, the term Mien or Mien-tien begins to make its appearance in lieu of Piāo hitherto used.

In A.D. 1103 Mien, along with Po-su and Kun-lun, sent white elephants and perfumes as presents to the Nan-Chao king (op. cit., p. 101).

Another attack by Ceylon seems to have taken place in A.D. 1153.

In circ. 1165 (or in 1180 according to the Mahāvamsa), "two ships [from Ceylon] arrived at the harbour Kusuma [harbours Kusumi and Paphāla according to the Mahāvamsa] in Aramana [Rāmañña], and took in battle and laid waste country from the port Sapattota, over which Kurtāpurapam was governor" (Journal A.S. of Bengal, vol. xlii, pt. 1, p. 198; quoted in "Hobson-Jobson," 2nd ed., p. 259). Whether Paphāla and Sapattota represent here two distinct places or a single one, Sapaphhata, Sapa-pabbata (?), which would be suggestive of the doubtful Shē-p'o-p'o-ta or Shē-p'o-ta of Chinese records (see pp. 469, 470 above), I cannot say. In any case, it seems legitimate to connect the toponym Sapattota with the Chinese Shu-po as part of the Piāo kingdom, and with Ptolemy's Sabara.

Indeed, the already quoted 1284 inscription of King Narapati mentions that his realm was then bounded on the east by Cāpipati (reading Sapipati in Burmese), which is to some extent suggestive of the puzzling Chinese Chu-po or Shu-po; but I do not think that a connection between the two districts can be seriously maintained. According to an old Chinese account Chu-po was on the Ch'ih-shuei (Ch'ik-, or Shak., sui) = 'Red-water' or 'Red River' (see China Review, vol. xiii, p. 342, No. 84), by which the Sitt-tang (Chit-taung) or some other stream debouching in the Gulf of Martaban may be meant. Compare, however, with Ch'ih Hai on p. 248.

p. 75. Bèsynga (river). For the linguistical identification of this term with the Môñ Bi-ching, Bi-sing, etc., i.e. 'Elephant River' = Airâvatti, Erâvatti (Irawaddy), see Appendix II, section 1, s.v.; and as to the legend concerning it, see pp. 76, 77 and remarks in next paragraph.

p. 77, ll. 3-4. Another legend relates that in 470 B.C.
Along-sithu, king of Pagan, on his return from a journey to Ceylon and various parts of India, saw a huge white object near the sea-shore. On approaching he perceived it to be a mound of ivory, which a gigantic centipede had erected for its residence. Such was the size and strength of the monster that it was in the habit of catching and devouring elephants, the tusks of which it used to form a wall around its place of abode. (See H. S. Pratt’s “Monograph on Ivory-carving in Burma,” Rangoon, 1901, p. 1.)

These legends of the elephant and centipede appear to have an old origin. The germ of them is to be found in the Milinda Pañha, where there is a hypothesis of a sālaka (some unknown sort of kimi, insect, or vermin, whose name puzzled the eminent translator Rhys Davids, see vol. ii, p. 180), attempting to drag the elephant towards itself with a view to swallowing it. As the simile was evidently widely employed in Eastern literature and folklore, the sālaka is very probably a sort of centipede or millepede.

At all events, the above legends sufficiently explain the name of ‘Elephant River’ (Bi-ching, Erāvatī, etc.) given to the Irawaddy, and perhaps also why the western point of entrance to the Rangoon River is called to this day ‘Elephant Point.’

p. 79, ll. 5, 6. Travelling by boat between Pāk-lān and Bān-Dōn is absolutely impossible at any season, as I have more recently ascertained. In the “China Sea Directory,” vol. ii, 4th edition, p. 338, it is stated that the watershed between Trang and the eastern main branch of the Bān-Dōn River is so low as to allow of a boat being taken across with a very short portage. I now believe, however, that the old water communication between both sides of the Malay Peninsula was between Trang and the inland sea of Singora.

“Many of the legends of the Pérak Malays refer to a remote period when what is now dry land was covered by water, and when the lofty mountain peaks were islands divided one from another by the sea. Miles up country, at Changkat Rambian, in the Batang Padang district, a rock is pointed out which is declared to be the petrified hull of an Indian ship which came trading to those parts in the ancient days, and in explanation of her fate the following story is told. In the day when Changkat Rambian was a seaport, Indian traders came across the Bay of Bengal to barter their gay chintzes and cottons for the tin of the Malays . . . in those days Bukit-Tunggal, which now stands far inland on the left bank of the Pérak River, was an island,
and men called it Pulau, not Bukit, Tunggal” (“Notes and Queries,” No. 1, Straits Br. R.A.S., pp. 19, 20).

p. 81, l. 1. Garuda’s abode. See p. 487, note, as to the legends about the home of the bird Garuda being on Langkawi Island.

p. 82, last line. Mëttikā. This is also the name of the earth deity of the Indus, worshipped in the form of a snake of clay, or as a clay image of Kṛṣṇa or Ganesa (see Balfour’s Cyclopedia, vol. ii, p. 1000).

p. 83, l. 9. Ch‘ih-t‘u is not mentioned by the Chinese as a seaport, but as a kingdom (see pp. 178, 179).

p. 83, l. 2 from bottom. Bërhabai. See further linguistic remarks in Appendix II, section 1, s.v.

p. 84, l. 18 et seqq. Mergui is, we have shown (Appendix II, section 1, supra), already mentioned since A.D. 864 by Ibn Khur-dābibh as Mātī. In about 1250-1300 the Kedah Annals refer to it as a seaport, the port of Mrit (see Journal Indian Archipelago, vol. iii, p. 6). A possible reference to it is contained in the Chinese records dating from the T‘ang dynasty, as Mi-li-ch‘é or Mi-li-ku (see p. 490). So much for the antiquity of the name.

Turning to modern times, we may notice the etymology given by Gervaise, who says (“Histoire du Royaume de Siam,” Paris, 1688, p. 14) that the harbour of Myrguin, or Mygri, “tire son nom d’une petite Isle voisine, que les Siamois appellent Mygri, et nous Myr quy, laquelle le met à couvert des vents.” Whether the small island meant is, as it seems, Madramakan, or the larger one of Pari-gyūn, it is difficult to say.

As regards the possible connection of Mergui with the mythical country called by the Siamese Mé-mài (see p. 384, note), I should point out that this country is evidently meant for Mûang Mé-mài (the ‘Country of Widows’) or Mûang Lab-le Mé-mài (the ‘Seesaw

1 Madramakan is the form of the name appearing in Horsburgh’s map of the northern part of the Mergui Archipelago, February 1st, 1830. The small island is by the natives now called Patau, Pauta, or Pa-thau, after the peak of that name. Its two prominent points are Pauta and Petit.

It is noticed by Céberet, who arrived at Mergui overland from the Gulf of Siam on January 1st, 1688, as Badraean. He says in his journal of Mergui: “Ce port est fermé par une petite ile nommée Badraean qui est vis-à-vis de Mergui” (Revue de Géographie, Paris, Dec. 1883, p. 426).

As to the spellings Banda-makhon, Buddha-makhon, and legends about a Buddha image and footprint on the north-east side of the island, see Anderson’s “English Intercourse with Siam,” pp. 338, 339. Major-General J. G. R. Forlong mentions a Budr or Budhā (sacred rock or Badstone) called Madra (a favourite name for the old Dravidian Siva) near Mergui, upon which Major Temple remarks that on the Mergui coast he found Budhā-y Makāma called ‘Madra Makāma’ (see Journal R.A.S., 1905, p. 205). This evidently refers to the Madramakan islet alluded to above.
Country of Widows'), which is the hidden or vanishing city of Siamese folklore and works of fiction, inhabited only by women. In Khmer folklore it is called Srok Lovā, and described as a legendary and fairy country where are only women, and where nothing can float on the waters (see Conte d'Alév in Aymonier's "Textes Khmers"). Whether this legendary country was supposed to be at or about Mergui as located in the map referred to on p. 384, and reputed besides to be the home of Hanumān, I am unable to say. According to Marsden's "Sumatra," the people of Sumatra believe that the inhabitants of Engano (see pp. 409, n. 2, and 422, n. 1, supra) are all females, and, like the mares of ancient story, are impregnated by the wind. Friar Jordanus ("Mirabilia Descripta," Hakl. Soc., 1863, p. 44) speaks of islands of women. So Marco Polo, who represents them to be fully 500 miles out at sea, south of Mekrân. Captain Bozorg in his "Ajāib," in cired 955 (Van der Lith's transl., pp. 19, 20), also refers to an 'Island of Women' in the sea of Malāta, which we have identified with Maludu Bay, N. Borneo. In more recent times an 'Island of Amazons,' inhabited only by women, is mentioned as being not far from Samar, Eastern Philippines (see Prévost's "Hist. Gén. des Voyages," t. x, p. 394).

p. 84, n. 2. A connection between Varavārī and Mergui is very doubtful: see p. 495, n. 2.

p. 85, ll. 14, 15. Kháu Môn or Kui pass. The correct name of this pass was Śiūkhōn (= śikharā, a 'peak'). It is recorded as Singkhor-tep in Leal's account (see Anderson's "English Inter-course with Siam," p. 397). Cébéret crossed this pass—to which he simply alludes as "la montagne d'où on peut découvrir les deux mers, savoir celle de Siam du costé de l'est, et celle du golphe de Bingalle du costé de l'ouest"—on December 24th, 1687 (see Revue de Géographie, Paris, 1883, p. 423). A village named Müang Singkhōn stood in this neighbourhood in the eighteenth century (it being mentioned in Khun Lüang Hāwat's Memoirs, p. 308), and perhaps even earlier, though not noticed by Cébéret.

p. 85, n. 1. Taik, I furthermore discovered, is used also to denote laterite. Its related word Tika, Teka (likewise derived from māttikā) has the same meaning in Perak (see Journal Straits Br. R.A.S., No. 16, p. 320). Analogously Tuk in Siamese means both a brick and a laterite building.

p. 86, ll. 2-4. Kula (see also p. 34, ll. 7-10). Under the form Kala, which this term has assumed in Burmese, it already appears in epigraphic evidence in the twelfth century in the word Kala-kyawng used to denote a brick (or laterite) monastery built
by Dravidians from India. (See Pagán inscription of 1170 in "Inscriptions of Pagan," etc., Rangoon, 1899, p. 26.)

The 古剌, Ku-la, people and country of Chinese records (see Parker's "Burma," p. 60, and Journal Asiatique, 1878, pp. 142-4) are evidently the people and country of Ayethema and Thàton alluded to on p. 86, l. 4 et seqq., being described as settled to the south of Taungu on the sea, and divided into Tu Ku-la = Taik-kulā on the coast of Pegu, and Hsiao, or Little, Ku-la.

p. 87, ll. 10 et seqq. Takola, etc. The Pāli takkolā = Sanskrit kakkola is a "drug so called from its colour, which is black like that of the crow" (Balfour's Cyclopædia, s.v. Kakkola). It, or the plant from which it is derived, is the Lavanga scantens, Hesperideæ (see Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extéreme Orient, t. iii, p. 466), and is called kakor, gagar (= bastard cardamom) in Kamboja.

Further, tagara in Kanareese is a tadbhava corruption of the Sanskrit tamara, trapu = 'tin' (see Journal R.A.S., July, 1901, p. 540, note). But we have in India the town Tagara-pura = Kola-pura or Kōlā-pur; whence the equation kola, kōlā = tagara = 'tin.'

p. 87, n. 1. In Chinese also we have Ch'ien-lien (K'an-lien, K'a-lien), a metal frequently mentioned in connection with the alloy of copper money (China Review, vol. xxiv, p. 101). Kalien means a 'mine' (more properly, 'tin-mine') among the Chinese of Pékak (Journal Straits Br. R.A.S., No. 16, p. 316). In Manchu sakhaliien = 'black.'

According to Dozy & Engelmann's "Glossaire," p. 245, the Portuguese calain = 'tin' is from the Arabic qalî, which comes from the Malay kalang = 'tin,' according to Newbold (vol. i, p. 426). Certain Arabic writers state that qala'i, 'tin,' was so called from a mine in India called Kala. "In spite of the different initial and terminal letters, it seems at least possible that the place meant was the same that the old Arab geographers called Kalah, near which they place mines of tin (al-qala'i)" ("Hobson-Jobson," 2nd ed., p. 145, s.v. Calay).

There can be no doubt that the Malay kalang, as well as its congener karang (used to express the lower beds of the tin-bearing drift in mines), are both loan-words or, at any rate, derived also from kola, kale, kakkola, takkola, tagara, etc., as above, which plainly are all related together.

p. 89, l. 2. According to Kazwini (a.d. 1263-75), who reports a statement from the traveller Misar, "le port de Kalah serait tombé au pouvoir des Chinois, qui y auraient introduit leurs croyances et leurs usages" (Reinaud, op. cit., p. lxiv). It does
not seem at all unlikely that Chinese immigrants had already settled on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula in the thirteenth century, without, however, holding sway there. In A.D. 1511, we know for certain, the alluvial tin-mines in the Malay Peninsula were already worked by Chinese labourers (see E. H. Parker in the China Review, vol. xxiii, p. 258).

p. 90, note. On Mi-ch'én, etc., I subjoin translated the following extract, dating from A.D. 802, given in the Bulletin de l'École Française d’Extr.-Or., t. iv, pp. 222, 223: “From Mi-ch'én one reaches K'un-lang, where is the tribe of the Hoiao K'un-lun. Their king's name is Mang-hai-yüeh (Mong Saigar?). From K'un-lang one arrives at Lu-yü, 露 (Luk-vo), where is the realm of the Tu K'un-lun. The king's name is Ssu-li P'o-nan-to-shan-na (Śri Bhavānandaśāna?). The plain is larger than at Mi-ch'én,” etc., etc.

On the K'un-lun people and kingdom see further: pp. 103, 260, 507-9, and 574, n. 3. In 1103 it offered, along with Burma and Po-sz (a state bordering on it, see p. 471), white elephants and perfumes to the king of Nan-Chao; a fact showing that K'un-lun must have been a continental (and not an insular) country, situated almost certainly on the Malay Peninsula. This view finds further corroboration in the fact recorded in the Manuscript of Nan-Chao having waged at one time war against K'un-lun (see Bulletin Ec. Fr., t. iv, p. 226).

On Lu-yü, or Luk-vo (Nago, Nagor), where is the Tu-k'un-lun (Takkola) kingdom (according to the Bulletin above quoted), see p. 525, n. 1. According to Ma Tuan-lin's translator, however, Ta-k'un-lun (Takkola) lies between K'un-lang and Lu-yü (see Hervey de St. Denys, op. cit., p. 231, note).

p. 93, l. 13. For further particulars as to Takopa or Kopa, its magnificent harbour, antiquities, etc., see Supplementary Note to my article on "Siamese Archæology," published in the Journal R.A.S. for April, 1904, pp. 242-7.

p. 93, l. 21. Tau-kiao-le. I now find that the Chinese characters for this are 托拘利, which more correctly read Tou-kou-li (Dau-kau-li, Tu-ku-ri), making it very improbable that Takkola is meant. Some port of Fu-nan proper on the Gulf of Siam is evidently intended; not unlikely the mouth of the Rach-gia or Kien-giang River, which lies opposite Takere, or Tekere Island. The embassy despatched by the Fu-nan king went to India between 240 and 245 A.D. (see Bulletin Ec. Fr., t. iii, p. 271). For a possible identity of Tou-kou-li with Kou-li, see p. 718 above, note, section 1.
p. 94, l. 10 from bottom, add:—This notwithstanding the clause in Article 10 of the British Treaty with Siâm concluded in 1826, which was retained in the new treaty of 1856, with the further addition that “traders under British rule may cross from the British territories of Mergui, Tavoy, Ye, Tenasserim, Pegu, or other place, by land or by water, to the Siamese territories, and may there trade with facility,” etc.

Captain Forrest, in the Introduction to his “Voyage from Calcutta to the Mergui Archipelago,” London, 1792, says (p. iii): “the country about Kraw [Kraň] was well inhabited, and the road across the isthmus much frequented, before the wars which, thirty years ago, between the Peguans and Birmahs or Burmals, had greatly depopulated this quarter.”

The account by Messrs. Harris & Leal (1835–6) reproduced in Anderson’s “English Intercourse with Siam” says of C’hump’hôn (p. 305): “It was formerly the entrepot of a very valuable trade with the coast of Tenasserim, but subsequently to the subjugation of Tenasserim by the Burmans, Ch’oomphon has been little else than a military post, where a force was stationed to watch the proceedings of the Burmans.”

p. 97, ll. 16, 17. Kokanagara. Cf. Kokkonage or Kokrah = Chutiă Nagpur in Tavernier (Ball’s transl., vol. ii, pp. 457–9). The northern point of entrance to Girbi Bay is called in Siamese Lêm Hiă-Nâk = Nāga-Head Point. As regards Kukkuras, the “Byhat Samīhitā” mentions Kālakoti-kukkuras in the Central region. The name may be connected with the worship of Bhairava, who is said to be represented with a dog’s head. Dog appreciation, if not worship, seems to survive in Indo-China among the Karens only, who still have prize-dogs. As regards Ibn Baťâţa’s Hôtel, which, he says, lay in Mūl-Jāvah, see p. 444, n. 2, and p. 518, n. 1, where I have given my reasons why it should preferably be identified with Ligor.

p. 97. Khrysoana (river). If a rendering of some local term meaning ‘Gold River,’ such as e.g. Sungei Mās in Malay, no such name now occurs, so far as my knowledge goes, in the tract where Ptolemy locates his Khrysoana, although it may have once existed and be now forgotten. The northernmost watercourse named Sungei Mās is a small stream falling into the old channel of the Mūda River, where buildings for a capital of Kedah began to be erected of old (fourteenth century or beginning of the fifteenth); see Kedah Annals in Journal of the Indian Archipelago, vol. iii, pp. 256, 258.

However, Khrysoana may represent some local river-name
disguised by the Greek navigators in Hellenic vesture in order to express a meaning in a similar manner, as was done by Valentijn with his Chrysortant (see Journal Str. Br. R.A.S., No. 13, p. 50), which I take to be the Kesang just below Malacca, the Caçao of Portuguese writers (see Danvers' "Portuguese in India," vol. ii, p. 529, where, however, Kesana is incorrect for Kesang). Further up the Malay Peninsula we have a similarly named river, the Kasom, in the Takâa-thûng district, where is also Kasom town, the governor's residence. It is not unlikely that in or about the Trang district a river may have existed with a somewhat similar name, which Ptolemy transformed into Khrysoana.

p. 97. Palanda (city) and Palandas or Palandos (river). See Appendix II, section 2, for these toponyms, which survive to this day, as I have pointed out, in the name of the local Bêlanâ, Blanda, or Belanda tribes, about which see the Journal Str. Br. R.A.S., No. 33, p. 250, and No. 34, p. 35. Cf. the Pulindas of India. Their correspondence to Pahang and its river is not altogether improbable, judging from the location assigned to them in De Donis' map.

p. 97, n. 1. Péarak, prak = 'silver.' The word is found as far as the Philippines in the slight disguise of Pilak (see Dennys' "Descriptive Dict. of Brit. Malaya," p. 347).

p. 98, l. 8. The Achiē or Achiñ king here alluded to as having come from Péarak is Sultan Mansûr Shâh, who was murdered in about 1585. See note 1 to p. 697 above.

p. 98, l. 11. 1030–50. These dates must be corrected to something like 1330–50, if Râja Sûran of Bijnagar is, as I take it, the same personage as Buka I, the founder of Vijaya-nagara (Bijanagar) in India, in 1354.

According to local native tradition, the district of Brûas, on the coast of Lârut, was the place where a kingdom and a râja were first established in Péarak. Temong, a few miles above Kâwâ Kangsa, on the Péarak River, was afterwards the seat of government (see Dennys, op. cit., p. 287).

p. 98, note, l. 5. P'o-li. Not Péarak, but the Pulai River (Sungei Pulai), near the western entrance to the old Singapore Strait (see p. 495 and my article in Journal R.A.S., 1904, pp. 719, 720).

pp. 99, 100. Tharrha (town). See Appendix II, section 3, s.v., for further linguistic remarks on this toponym. Not very dissimilar names occur on the Malay Peninsula, viz.:

(1) Sungei Thara, a petty western affluent of the Kinta River, south-central Péarak (see Dennys, op. cit., p. 395).

(3) Tahan River and Günung Tahan Mountain (ibid., No. 23, pp. 67-76).

None, however, suits as well as Tarānganā or Tringano, in the immediate neighbourhood of which we have, moreover, such place-names as Kampong Tirot, K. Lubok Tirot, K. Pan Tari, the Trengan and Tarong Rivers, with K. Tarong, now destroyed, on the latter, etc.

p. 100. Sabana (a mart). See also Appendix II, section 2. Similar toponyms in this tract are—

(1) Sapang River, a small northern affluent of the Bernam River (Dennys, op. cit., p. 391).

(2) Sepang, Bukit, a hill in North Sungei Ujong (op. cit., p. 63) and a small river in extreme South Selangor (ibid., p. 393).

(3) Sempang (= ‘cross-roads’), a hamlet in Sungei Ujong (ibid., 343), on the Bernam River, Selangor (p. 393), and on the east bank of Selangor River (pp. 343, 344).

(4) Sembah River, a petty northern affluent of the Bernam River (p. 392).

(5) Sabba, an important village (ibid., p. 332), apparently the same as Sabah; besides a host of similar names: Sapetan or Sapatang, Sabatang, Sebang, Sipang, Subang, Semanda, Sapan, Sembilan, etc., in neighbouring districts. Samawa also, the old (Bena?) name of the Lingi River, according to Newbold (op. cit., vol. ii, p. 376), who says the name Selangor is not to be found in the early Malay records, the old name of the country being Negrí Kaling, 'Land of Tin' (ibid., vol. ii, pp. 30, 376). Finally, we might mention Sabon or Sabong Strait at the east entrance of the Straits of Malacca, recorded as Saban by Galvano (1511, p. 115), and as Sabam by Teixeira (see my article on "Some unidentified Toponyms," etc., in Journal R.A.S., 1904, p. 723).

p. 101. Cape Maleu Kûlon. See Appendix II, section 3, s.v. For a probable survival of the name in Tanjung Gelang, see below, note on p. 104.

p. 103, ll. 17 et seqq. For K'ûn-lun see pp. 89, 90, 260, 507-9, and 574, note 3.

1 Salâng, Chalâng, Chellang are, however, congeneric forms which occur on the west coast of both the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra; possibly connected with the name of the Selam or Salam tribes (see my "Historical Retrospect of Junkyeylon Island" in Journal Siam Society, vol. i, pp. 123-6); and not unlikely with that of the Chadâng, Salang, etc., in the west of Campâ (see pp. 262, 272 above).
p. 104, ll. 19–23. In the more recent map of the Malay Peninsula, issued in 1898 under the auspices of the Straits Branch of the R.A.S., Tanjong Puling, or South Cape, is called Tanjung Gelang, and located in 4° N. lat.; while the Tanjong Kuântân of older maps is called Tanjung Tembeling, and located further to the south, just above the mouth of the Kuântân River. Such being the case, I think that Ptolemy’s Cape Maleu Kölon should be identified with Tanjung Gelang, so called from Bukit Gelang, the hill forming the promontory, which seems to preserve in its present name the old Tamil and, withal, Ptolemaic designation. In fact, Bukit, a ‘hill’ or mountain = Tamil Malai = Ptolemaic Maleu; while Gelang resembles well enough, allowing for secular corruption, both Kurram (or Kollam) and Kölon. Thus: Bukit Gelang = Malai-kurrum (or Malai-kollam) = Maleu Kölon. If Malai kollam be its correct original name, meaning ‘Mountain of the West’ in Tamil, this may have been applied to it from its lying in the western part of the Gulf of Siâm, where it probably formed a landmark, pointing out to navigators the almost unique place of refuge on that coast. In fact, the neighbouring port of Kuântân, a short distance below the cape, “is about the only safe port on the east coast [of the Malay Peninsula] during the north-east monsoons, the high promontory which stretches into the sea to the north of the Kuala forming a most efficient protection against the wind” (Straits Times, 1902).

There is further up the coast (in 4° 14’ N. lat.) Tanjung Guliga, bearing a similar name, but I should think Tanjung Gelang to be almost certainly the cape Ptolemy had in view. See p. 535.

p. 105, ll. 1–10. Malacca. A Punic name (?) ; see p. 598, note. In Malay Malaka is the Phyllanthus pectinatus (Hook.). Cf. alsoMALAVAKA = the country of the Mâlavas; also, its inhabitants.

p. 105. Attaba (river). See for further linguistic remarks Appendix II, section 2, s.v. In De Donis’ map this stream is marked between Tharrha (i.e. Tringano) on the south and Köli (i.e. Kelantan) on the north; hence it must be, as pointed out by us, either the Trengan (Tringano River) or the Kelantan with its principal tributary the Lebeh or Libih, which takes its rise in the northern watershed of Mount Bâtu Atap. Between the two abovenamed large streams we have on the coast but petty watercourses, such as the Tarong and the Besut, which are absolutely ineligible.

p. 106, l. 3. As to Kola-budara = Kâkula, Kâkola = Ligor, see p. 444, n. 2, and p. 518, n. 1. As to Köli = Kelantan, see p. 518, n. 1.

p. 106, l. 16. Two places Ku-lo are mentioned. One is
古羅, mentioned since A.D. 971 (see p. 515, n. 1) as lying midway between San-fo-shih and Ch'ai-lih-ling (Hervey de St. Denys, op. cit., p. 496). This I have identified with Gūroh village in Rhio Strait (see p. 514).

The other one is 古羅, mentioned in A.D. 1015 as the name of a high mountain and a kingdom called after it (op. cit., p. 514). This may be some place on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula (Krař, Kuran River above Lārut, etc.?); in any case it has, like the first one, nothing to do with Kelantan. N.B.—Kuran in Pèrik is nowadays denoted with the characters 古樓 by the Chinese settled in the Straits (see Journal Str. Br. R.A.S., No. 42, p. 186).

There is, finally, a doubtful mention of Kelantan as 訥羅旦, Ho-lo-tan, in the account of Ch'i̍h-t'u (Sukhôthai) at the dawn of the seventh century (op. cit., p. 466); but as Ho-lo-tan is said to be located to the south of Ch'i̍h-t'u, whereas the sea is placed to the north, a clerical error has probably crept in here, so that the location intended may be quite the reverse. Cf., at all events, the State of 吳羅奪, Ho-lo-tan, located on the island of Shé-p'o, and mentioned A.D. 430 and 452 (see p. 469, n. 3).

p. 107, ll. 19 et seqq. Ligor. For other particulars on its history, antiquities, etc., see pp. 444, n. 2; 518, n. 1; and, above all, my article "The Nāgarakrītāgama List of Countries," etc., in Journal R.A.S., July, 1905, p. 487, s.v. Dharma-nagara.

p. 110, ll. 13 et seqq. Perimula, etc. For further linguistic remarks see Appendix II, section 3, s.v. On Permātang see Dennys' "Descriptive Dict. of British Malay," p. 299 s.v., also p. 309. There is further a (Malay?) term Pemudā occurring in names of reefs, etc., e.g. Karang Pemudā (see "China Sea Directory," vol. i, p. 289). On P'o-li (＝Pulai River) see p. 495 and above, Addenda to p. 98; and on P'o-lo (Bara, Baru) and Po-lo see p. 366, note; and p. 493, note.

On Lo-yū, or Lo-la, and Lu-yū (Lungu River?) see p. 525, n. 1.
On Lo-yūsh see pp. 525, 526, note.

Neither of the above names seems to be in any way connected with Ligor.

p. 111, after line 2, add:

Perimulik Gulf, Head of (97).

The figure for the longitude (169° 30') given in Nobbe's edition, tom. ii, p. 162, and presumably misprinted (as 168° 30') in McCrindle (op. cit., p. 198), is evidently a clerical slip for 162° 30' that has crept in some of the Ptolemaic MSS. For, not only in the Ptolemaic list of lib. vii, ch. 2, § 5, the Perimulikos Kolpos comes in between Perimula (long. 163° 15', lat. 2° 20') and Samaradē
(long. 163°, lat. 4° 50''); but in De Donis' map the head of the gulf is actually placed in long. 162° 30' (= 101° 6' true) and made to bend in bow-wise, towards the west, between Perimula and Samaradê.

Such being the case, and the rectified latitude as found in our Tables (see Table IV, No. 97) being 9° 52' N., it will be seen that the head of the Perimulik Gulf almost exactly corresponds to the deep indentation of Bân-Dôn Bight stretching between the mouths of the Bân-Dôn and Ch'haiyâ Rivers, the most pronounced incavation of which lies in latitude 9° 12' to 9° 18' N., just below Ch'haiyâ. This is the region of Mulâ-Jâvak of Ibn Baṭûta (see pp. 444, n. 2, and 517, n. 1); and the Perimulik Gulf is unquestionably the Gulf of Siâm, while its head corresponds to what is now called Bân-Dôn Bight.

p. 111, l. 11. Balonga, being an inland town, corresponds more exactly to Kraḥ on the homonymous isthmus, and not to Ch'umps'hôn. As regards the old name of the latter, Udumbara, it is worthy of remark that it still appears in K. L. Hâwat's Memoirs, p. 307 (list of provinces of the south; date, shortly after the middle of the eighteenth century). In A.D. 1675 it was already known, however, to Europeans as Champone (see Anderson's "English Intercourse with Siâm," pp. 125, 126).

p. 111, l. 24–6. Kraḥ is the Siamese name for the hawk-bill turtle, and not for the land-tortoise; I must therefore correct this gross mistake.


p. 113, l. 9 et seqq. Kamalaṅkâ. Cf. the name of Pagân, Bu-kâm, explained as Bhû-kâma (Kâma-bhû), see above, in these Addenda, note to p. 62. Eitel, in his "Handbook of Chinese Buddhism" (2nd ed., p. 69, s.v.), locates Kamalaṅkâ at Chittagong! It should be observed that the Cantonese pronunciation of the Chinese transcript is Ka-mo-long-ka, which comes considerably near to Kraḥ-palânga or Kraḥ-palaṅka. In the "Sāsanavaṁsa" (Mrs. Bode's transl., p. 71) occurs the toponym Pōlōṅka [Pallaṅka?]-desa, which, however, probably is meant for the country of the Palaungs or Paloungs. In the Hamsâvati and Pegu districts are circles now called Kamakuluk (Kamakalôk) and Kamâce (Kamâši), whereas there is a Kamâke in Bhûṅ-gyun (Balûgyun) Island. This shows how names similar to Kamalaṅkâ are not uncommon in this region.

p. 113, l. 18. Pian-p'ân. I have since shown how this State, P'ian-p'ân or P'ian-p'ûn, is to be identified with the Sup'han-p'hum
(Suvaṇṇabhūmi) of the Sukhōthai inscription of 1306, more commonly known as Sup'hān. (See my articles on "Siam's Intercourse with China," in the Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review for January, 1902.)

p. 113, n. 3. Camelon. Being described as a province lying on the coast (v. loc. cit.), it very likely corresponds to Kamanlay. Cf. this Camelon with Chin-lin, Kin-lin, or Kam-lan of Chinese records (see p. 164, n. 1).

p. 115, l. 7. After 'spoken,' add: 'supra, pp. 93, 94.'

p. 115, ll. 5-8 from bottom. Both the old "India Directory," by Thornton, and Capt. Forrest ("Voyage from Calcutta to the Mergui Archipelago," London, 1792; Introduction, p. iii), call 'Larchin Islands' the islands in front of Ch'ump'hōn. Evidently Lar-chin stands for Lank-chiu, Lankkachiu, of which it is a mere corruption and partly lapsus calami (i.e. chin for chiu).

p. 119, n., l. 6. C’hēng. See in China Review, vol. xxi, p. 56: "瞎 [Shan, Sieng] (generally miswritten 瞟) in Chinese histories, stands for a Shan sound shien or xieng [C’hieng], and practically means 'state,' 'town,' 'province,' etc." Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 92) and Sainson (op. cit., p. 17) have 瞄, chien, kien, for 'department,' which Sainson (loc. cit., n. 17) pretends is the same as Keng or Xieng (C’hieng) in C’hieng T’ung (Keng Tung), etc.

p. 120, n., l. 4. See also Richardson’s "Journal," p. 115. Further, on the bronze drums of Indo-China, see Dr. Hirth’s article in Toung-Pao, 1890, No. 2; De Groot (in Toung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 363); and Dr. Heger’s valuable monograph, "Alte Metalltrommeln aus Südost-Asien" (Leipzig, 1902).

p. 121, l. 5 and n. 1. Posinara. It is not a question here of the 豫子, P’u-tsz, Peh-tsz, or Fu-tsz, that they, being settled in A.D. 769 at T’ēng-yūeh or Mo-mien, where the Jwan-hwa prefecture was established that year by Imousūn, the Nan-Chao conqueror, do not at all appear to have been the ruling Nan-Chao tribe (see Parker in China Review, vol. xx, p. 393; also p. 130, n. 1, above.) I think, on the other hand, that Posinara is meant for 白子, Pēh-tsz (or Puk-tsz as it is locally pronounced), the name given by the Han emperor Wu Ti to Jēn-kwo’s State (see pp. 123, 291) when investing him king over it in n.c. 109 (see "Nan-chao Ye-shih," Sainson’s transl., pp.28, 29). Now, as Pēh-tsz (Ba-tsz, P’ak-tsz) means ‘White Sons (or Gentlemen)’ it will be seen that Posinara is merely the gross transcript of the Sanskrit-Vedic Balakṣa-nara or Palakṣa-nara = ‘White People,’ ‘White Men,’ or of their locally corrupted forms Prakṣa-nara, etc. It should not surprise to find Sanskrit-derived toponyms in this part
of Yün-nan at that period, since Jên-kwo claimed descent from the dynasty of Magadha in India (see p. 123). Jên-kwo's capital was at 白崖, Pêh-yai or Pêh-ngai (= 'White Cliff' or 'White Precipice'), 90 li, i.e. about 30 miles, south-west of Chao-chou in the Ta-li prefecture, and is nowadays called Hung-ngai. Jên-kwo appears, later on, to have transferred his residence to Chêng-chiang, south-east of the Yün-nan Lake (see Sainson, op. cit., p. 28), which is, as likely as not, Ptolemy's Pandasa. However, as in A.D. 225 the capital of the State was again at Pêh-ngai (op. cit., p. 30), the above change was only a temporary one, and Ptolemy's Posinara must, from its geographical position, be identified with Pêh-ngai. See above, Appendix III, No. 4.

p. 124, ll. 4-7 from bottom; p. 121, first top l.; and passim; Doânai=Ts'wan. I have since recognized that this is a mistake, that the Ts'wan were really Lolas, and that the Doânai must be identified with the Tuan, 段, or Duan, a people of Thai stock (see p. 126, n. 3), and one of the ten original clans of the Ai-Lao descended, with Kiu-lung, from Mêng-chü Tu, long before the Christian Era (see Rocher in Tsoung-Pu, vol. x, p. 13).

This family reigned, later on, over Yün-nan from 938 to 1094 A.D. As regards the term Duania in Assam, it is employed to denote half-breeds (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, p. 371).

p. 124, last line, and p. 125, ll. 1, 2. Kâu, Lâu-Kâu. This tribe apparently settled at first in the Nän district in Siâm, for the Nän king is styled Kâva-râja in the "Jinakâla Mâlini." The Kâu are also mentioned in the A.D. 1306 Sukhôthai inscription, in a list which runs: "P'hamâ [Burmâns], Kâu, Lâu, Thai Yiâi [the so-called 'Shans' of Burmâ], Thai Nôi [the Thai of Sukhôthai]." etc.

p. 125, ll. 8-10. Sui-shu. The Sui-shu embraces the period 581-617 A.D.

p. 125, l. 5 from bottom. Huang-dông. In Chinese 黃洞, Huang-tung. Also Huang-chia-tung, the 'Yellow people of Caves,' according to the "An-nan Chih-lüo" (Sainson's transl., p. 365), where it seems to be a question of an individual and not of a people.


p. 126, n. 3. Besides the Tuan, cf. also the Thuang (Khâ Thüang or Chüang), a vanished tribe, to which are ascribed the large stone jars employed as receptacles for rice-wine (Lâu Uṳ), found in groups in the country of the P'hüen, on high plateaux (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., 1903, pp. 89, 90; Raquez "Pages
Laotiennes"; and McCarthy, op. cit., pp. 186, 187). The jars were probably originally intended for burial. Jars are, in fact, used by the Yau tribes to keep the ashes of their deceased chieftains (see China Review, vol. xix, p. 165).

p. 127, ll. 1–4. I must here correct a gross mistake. The first character in the name of Diên Bien-phú is neither Tien nor Tiên, but 離, in Annamese Diên.

p. 127, l. 18. Ho-ché. In Ann. Hak-ja; referred to in the "An-nan Chih-lüo" (Sainson's transl., p. 443) as the name of a district (?) in a.d. 1011, on the Tonkin borders which they had invaded.

p. 128, l. 3. See Marini (op. cit., p. 456), who says that monarchy in Laos dates from about 600 A.D. Formerly the country was ruled after the manner of a republic (more correctly, of a federation of petty states) in which the Siamese (read Thai) element gradually predominated. Shaking off the yoke of China (Yín-nan), a king of Siamese (Thai) race was then elected.


p. 128, n. 2, l. 9. Khach. The Annamese khach, 客, is the Chinese kē, and the Siamese khék = a stranger, guest, visitor, or new arrival. It is a polite term by which the Annamese designate the Chinese. Cf. Hsin-kē, new guest, greenhorn, etc. It is, on the other hand, used in China to designate the Hakkas (Kē-chia or Kē-kia = 'the guest families' or the 'recent arrivals'), who, in Siâm, are similarly called Khē (or Chek-Khē, Chin-Khē). Shans call the Chinese Ke or Kieh (China Review, vol. xvi, p. 380).

In Annam Chêk, 歐 (in Chinese Chih, Cantonese Chek), is the impolite nickname employed to designate the Chinese. So in Siâm, where the latter are in polite speech called Chin (i.e. Chinas).

p. 130, last three lines. Nguyễn. Read 阮, Nguyễn, in Chinese Juean, a name most spread among the Annamese, and that of the reigning dynasty. The name Yuan, Ywian (Yavana) for the Annamese apparently originates from the fact that a large part of them bears the name of Juean, i.e. Nguyễn (= Javana, Yavana). See the China Review, vol. xvi, p. 380. The term Ywian, Yuan, or Yavana, already occurs in an inscription of 987 A.D. in Eastern Kamboja (see Aymonier's "Le Cambodge," t. i, p. 283), and makes its appearance in Chăm inscriptions in A.D. 1159. See, for more particulars, my article, "The Nâgarakretâgama List of Countries," etc., in Journal R.A.S., July, 1905, pp. 486, 487.

p. 130, n. 1, l. 4. Och'ang. These are the 峨昌, O-ch'ang;
or 阿昌, A-ch’ang (see Devéria, op. cit., p. 167; and Chinese Recorder, vol. xv, p. 386, where they are noticed near Nan-tien). They evidently are the same tribe as the Asong now at P’hu Pāng, Lai-chou district.

p. 131, l. 2. Tai-nguyén. Read Tói-nguven, 西原, Hai-Yuăn. A district of this name was in Southern Kwang-hsi and is now called Hsin-ning Chou. Yüeh-hsi (see l. 10) is the literary name for Kwang-hsi.

p. 131, n. 2, ll. 1, 2. Moreover, the Karens call the Chinese Si, which reminds one of the Miao-tsz word She (China Review, xvi, p. 380).

p. 131, n. 2, l. 11. Siá-po, or ‘Heterodox Females,’ said to be the descendants of the ruling race of the Mongol dynasty of Yüan, A.D. 1280–1333 (see China Review, vii, p. 350). Their name is written 邪婆, Hsie-p’o (ibid., x, p. 74). An aboriginal race not far from Hui-chou Fu, near Canton, is similarly called Ping-p’o (ibid.).

p. 134, l. 7 from bottom. Dahan or Thuăn-an River. Read Dâ-hân (‘Coral, or Rocky, Bank’) and Thuôn-ân. Kúa Thwôn-ân is the port of Hwię.

pp. 135, 136. On the names of the Mê-Không River, see again p. 286, n. 1. As regards the Chinese characters for Lan-ts’ang given in n. 1, l. 1, on p. 135, I notice that in the “Nan-chao Ye-shih,” the second one is written 濃, which means an ‘expanse of water’ (see Sainson, op. cit., p. 50, n. 15). The same work thus accounts for this name of the river (p. 208): “It [the Mê-Không] enters the country of Tien [Yün-nan] by the Li-kiang prefecture, in the now suppressed chou of Lan-chou [蘭州, which lay to the south-west of Li-kiang]; accordingly the river has been called Lan-ts’ang, and still nowadays it is erroneously termed Lang-ts’ang and Pêh-li-kiang [白麗江].... It is stated in the ‘Shan-hai-king’: ‘The Êrh-hai [Ta-li Lake] flows westwards towards Lo [洛, Lok, Lâk = the Red River; 1] or else 獠, Lo, Lâk, the ancient name for Tonkin? see above, p. 321], wherein it enters; thence it is called Lo-shuwei.’” But the Lan-chou district only dates from the Yüan dynasty, whereas we know the name Lan-ts’ang to be much older; and the same work adds that the river is, in its upper course

1 In the Journal China Br. R.A.S., vol. xxv, p. 487, it is stated that the Êrh-Hai or Ta-li Lake is drained by two streams into the Hei-Kiang or Black River! The mistake is here probably caused by the fact alluded to on p. 286 above, n. 1, of the Mê-Không being above the Käu-lang Hills called Hôh-Sâvei, i.e. the ‘Black Water.’
in Tibet, termed Lu-ts'ang, 鹿澗, presumably from the Lu-shih Shan range, in which it is believed to rise (see op. cit., pp. 50, 208).

The name Khara-nadi, alluded to on p. 136, l. 15, also occurs in the Jinakāla Mālinī, fasc. iv.


p. 140, last three lines. For further linguistic remarks see Appendix III, section 6 above, s.v. Lariagarā. As regards a possible Sanskrit derivation of this toponym, cf. the following similar ancient ones in India:—

(1) Lauriyā-Ararāj and Lauriyā-Nandagarā, on the road from Pāṭaḷiputra to Nepāl (see Journal R.A.S., April, 1902, pp. 270, 271).

(2) Lāra, Laśa = Mālava (South Lāra) and Vallabhi (North Lāra).

(3) Laśa = Kāṇasuvāra, an ancient kingdom in Gundwana, near Gangpoor.

(4) Lari (or Lāri?), in East Tibet.

p. 141, l. 11 from bottom. Muang P'hông. More correctly Müang P'hông T'ai (= South P'hông) or P'hông-T'ai; it was founded in A.D. 1311.

p. 141, l. 7 from bottom. Rajaγhrā. A Rajaγhrā, commonly Yazagyo, village exists also in West Burma in the Kalē township and Upper Chindwīn district. The "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part ii, vol. iii, p. 393, speaks of it as having been "the ancient capital of almost forgotten kings, as it was in more recent years of the Saucbua." Rajaγhrā is a name, however, applied to both Legya and Kassay (Kaseh, i.e. Manipūr).

p. 142. Lasippa, Lassippa, or Lasyppa. A similarly named village, Lo-si-pa, is mentioned by Lefèvre (op. cit., p. 60) between Müang Ha-hin and M. Ngai, in the Ü River Valley, lat. 22°, and described as inhabited by Khā Halos, a variety of Khās much resembling the Lolos.

The present capital of Si-poḥ, Thibo, or Hsi-paw, was founded only in A.D. 1636; but an older one some two miles to the northward or westward called Ōng-Pōng or Unhaung is said to have been built in 1210. Local chronicles, however, pretend to trace the existence of Ōng-Pōng and Si-poḥ as far back as B.C. 58 and B.C. 423 respectively (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part ii, vol. i, pp. 217–22). Si-poḥ is rendered in Chinese by 錫箔, Hsi-poḥ (see China

1 It is, however, in my opinion, probably already referred to in 1280 under the form 思摽, Sz-poḥ, Shi-poḥ, in the account of the Mongol campaign against Burma (see Sainson, op. cit., p. 116).
Review, xvi, p. 379). The classical name Siri-ratttha occurs in the
titles of the Chiefs of Sén-wi and Thong-c'hai Thônźè or Hsun
Hsui), see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, pp. 290, 291;
whereas the Si-poḥ Chief bears in his title the term Kamboja
(op. cit., p. 291), which evidences that his district is part of the
tract so called (which includes also Yawng-Hwe, Müang Pai,
M. Pan, Legya, M. Pu, and Mawk-mai). The classical designation
Kamboja for this tract can be traced back to at least the twelfth
century, for the Kamboja-saṅgha, which was named after it, took
its rise in modern Legya towards 1300 A.D. (see Forchhammer's

Arguing from the fact that Lasypa is, in De Donis' map,
located immediately westward of the northern spurs of the un-
named mountain ridges which, according to Ptolemy, overhang
the Golden Khersonese (and which evidently correspond to the
mountain ranges dividing Siām from Burma), it seems logical
to identify it with Sī-poḥ (Thibo) rather than with any similarly
named town on the Siāmese watershed. On this latter we find
mentioned in the Chinese records, as far back as 1280 A.D., the
State of Pa-pē-hai-fu, which corresponds, however, to Ch'ieng Sēn
(Jayapavara-nagara, Pavara-jaya-pura [or Jayaena-pura], whence
the Chinese transcript, hitherto unexplained and unidentified),¹
and therefore does not suit. On the other hand, the A.D. 1284
inscription of the Pagān king Narapati-sithu mentions that the
latter's realm was bounded on the east by Sapipati (Cepipati),
which may be Sī-poḥ, and may somehow be historically connected
with Ptolemy's Lasypa or Lasippa.

p. 144, ll. 10–12. Lakṣa-guhā, Lakṣa-grāhā. Perhaps a corrupted
form (through Lāu faulty pronunciation) of Rājagaha, Rājagṛha,
so called from its being the capital of Eastern Magadhā, i.e. the
part of Yūnnan about the Ta-li Lake (cf. p. 123 above).

p. 144, n. 2, ll. 4–5. Ho-chê. This name appears in the
Lūang P'hraḥ Bāng Chronicle under the form Hô-te, and is made
equivalent to Nông-Sê, i.e. the Ta-li Lake or Ėrk-Hai (see p. 64
above), the Aravana-daha of the "Sāsanavāma" (see Mrs. Bode's
transl., pp. 164, 165).

p. 146, n. 1, ll. 1–9 from bottom. Buffaloes are sacrificed also

¹ It is quite unreasonable to continue to identify it, as Sinologists do, with
Ch'ieng Māi, for the town of this name was not founded until A.D. 1296, and it
was only in 1367 that it became the definite capital of Western Laos. If in the
Yüan-shih-lei-pien Pa-pē-hai-fu is stated to be Kīng-mai, i.e. Ch'ieng
Māi (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 244, n. 4), this must refer to a later date
than 1367.
by the Wa tribes (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, pp. 505, 506) and in Kamboja.

p. 148, ll. 17, 18. The forms hsıang, ch'hang, ds'ing, etc., may be linguistically connected, if not actually derived, from the Sanskrit-Pāli Sīndhura. The Khmer language forms an exception, for an elephant is in Kamboja called Damrei or Tamrei.

p. 149, n. 1, l. 16. "The sacred Bang statue." Bang means 'hidden,' and the statue is so-called from its having had to be hidden many times in order to save it from being stolen by invaders. In Khmer Bang has the same sense.

p. 149, note 1, ll. 19-23. Wan-hsiang, 萬象 (= a 'Myriad Elephants'), also occurs as a name for the Luang Phra Pha Bang-Wieng Chan State, and should not invariably be applied to Wieng Chan alone, as is done in the Bulletin École Fr. (t. iii, p. 473). This transcript shows that the Chinese had also heard of the wrong interpretation put by foreigners upon the term Lăn-ch'äng. Teixeira, in his turn, mentions this State under the name of kingdom of Olanion (= O Lanjão), producing benjoin (see my article on "Some unidentified Toponyms," etc., in Journal R.A.S., October, 1904, p. 719).

p. 150, ll. 6-8. Muang Ch'awā. Luang Phra Pha Bang is already mentioned under this name of Muang Ch'awā in the A.D. 1306 Sukhothai inscription, as a dependency of the Sukhothai kingdom.


p. 152, ll. 12-15. Daśaśan, Daśan, Daśārya. Cf. the Daśārya country and people of India, the name of which is said to be derived from daśan = 'ten' + ra = 'a fort,' thus meaning 'the ten forts.'

p. 152, n. 1, l. 2. Daśa-rāja. Here Daba, as I subsequently discovered, is merely the Burmese corruption of Dhaṇa; hence the correct Sanskrit form of the name is Dhaja-rāja.

p. 154, n. 1, ll. 17-20. The seat of the Kin-ch'iāh or 'Golden Teeth' Province was originally (A.D. 1271) 2,000 li from Yung-ch'ang, near Pa-pē-hai-fu, i.e. Ch'iheng Sén (see above, in these Addenda, note to p. 142). Proving untenable, the 'Golden Teeth' public offices were transferred to Yung-ch'ang (in 1274 or rather later); which has thus been falsely supposed to be the original seat of the 'Golden Teeth' government (see China Review, vol. xxi, p. 54).
p. 155, ll. 9–12. **Bareukora**, Barikan. The district now known as Barikan or Borikhan was formed only in about A.D. 1860 at *Nā-Nē* (Bān Nā-Nē) village; it cannot, therefore, be Ptolemy’s **Bareukora** or **Bareuaóra**, which I have more aptly identified with Miäng P’hāën or P’hā-or (see above, p. 295, n. 3; and p. 364, n. 2). See also Appendix II above, section 6.

p. 155, l. 6 from bottom. **Po-lo-la**. In Chinese characters, 波羅刺. Cf. the *Palola, Bhilla-palola, or Apalola*, a people located by the Brhat-Saúhitā in the north-east region, presumably Pliny’s *Uberæ*, Ptolemy’s **Barrhai**, and the present-day P’hāën or P’hā-or. Cf. also the *Vřilah, Bilā, Bhil*, etc., on pp. 163 and 257, n. 1, above; and the *Pu-la, Pi-ja* in these Addenda, infra, note to p. 364.

p. 156. The **Lëstai Country**. Porcacchi (1576) mentions (op. cit., p. 196) the kingdom of ‘*Lettuoro*’ or Siām, a term evidently borrowed from Ptolemy’s **Lëstai, Lëstôn**. J. Schoutsen (1636) names (op. cit., p. 28) ‘*Lydure*’ among the principal cities of Siām, but this information is probably culled from Mandelslo, who writes ‘*Lidure*’ (op. cit., p. 306), and who in his turn has possibly drawn in this instance upon Mendez Pinto. This famous traveller refers, in fact (op. cit., pp. 275–6), to a fortified town, ‘Lautor’, in A.D. 1545, situated about Bišnulók and C’haināth, which I take to be *Lakhōn-thai* (Lacontai). For **Lëstôn**, see again p. 258 above, note, ll. 1, 2.

p. 157, ll. 1–12 from bottom. **C’hōng**. These people have been fortunately recently studied by my late friend Dr. J. Brengues, whose premature death has been a sad loss for Indo-Chinese ethnology. In his most valuable paper upon them (published in the *Journal of the Siam Society*, vol. ii, Bangkok, 1905, pp. 19–47), he has proved them identical with the tribes termed *Porr* in Kamboja, and says they name themselves *Tamrēt*, often transcribed *Samret, Samrēk, Samrel, and Samrē*. He has also shown that they actually occupy the whole tract from the Kampōt district, on the east coast of Siām, to the mountains lying westward of the great inland lake of Kamboja. But by far the most important result of Dr. Brengues’ researches is the ascertainment among the C’hōng or Chong of a remarkable proportion of individuals (about one-twentieth) of unmistakable Negrito type: low stature (1.595 m. on the average), flat nose, very dark skin (Nos. 41–3 of Broca’s scale), and crisp, frizzly, almost woolly hair and mesaticephalic skull (maximum index 79, or 78–82); all characters which forcibly differentiate them from the taller, lank-haired, and subbrachycephalic Khmērs. My conclusions as to a Negrito population
occupying of old the Kambojan coast have thereby received a most ample confirmation, and there can be now no further doubt that the forbears of these dusky robber (and perhaps also to some extent piratical) tribes are in the main the population described by Ptolemy as being in occupation of his Ἀγριάτων χώρα, i.e. 'Robber Country.'

p. 157, ll. 3-5 from bottom. Such traditions can be correct only in so far as they refer to the immigrated non-Negrito element now forming so large a proportion of the present Ch'ông. Other traditions state, on the other hand, that the Radê have been the first batch of immigrants that reached Kamboja from the north.

p. 157, n. 1, ll. 3, 4. As regards the origin of the name Kamboja, cf. Kâmboja in the Mahâbhârata, etc.; and Kâmâvâja, a country and a people in the south-west region, according to the Brhat Samhitâ.

p. 158, l. 6 from bottom. Cuirasses seem to have been almost generally employed of old in Indo-China, and are yet the fashion in some parts even nowadays, as may be gathered from the following evidence I have collected:—

(1) "Au Nan-tchao, tout homme arrivé à l'âge adulte et suffisamment robuste est soldat . . . Ils portent des jambières et des casques rouges, des cuirasses en peau de rhinocéros et des boucliers de cuivre. Ils marchent pieds nus" ("Nan-chao Ye-shih," composed in 1550, Sainson's transl., p. 19). This refers to the period 649—1382, during which the Nan-chao kingdom in Yün-nan lasted, and probably applies also to an earlier epoch.

(2) "Cuirasses faîtes de janes d’ivoire" were taken by the Chinese from the Châm at the time of the latter's defeat in A.D. 808 (Bouillevaux in Annales de l’Extrême Orient, t. iii, p. 79).

(3) The cannibal and caudate P‘u, 激, "portent des cuirasses de cuir cru" (Ma Tuan-lin’s "Ethnography," published 1319, Hervey’s transl., p. 299). In the China Review, vol. xix, p. 293, it is stated that these tribes "were clad in coats of mail." The above extracts refer to a period going as far back as the third century A.D.; and these caudate P‘u or arboreal P‘u, located at 1,500 li south-west of Yün-nan, were evidently Lawâ or Wah.


(6) The Li-su employ hides hardened in the sun as cuirasses (E. Roux' "Aux Sources de l'Irraouaddî," p. 27).
(7) The Brōh, Brōh, or Lākū, a tribe of Karens, "a generation or two back carried shields made of plank covered with buffalo hide and studded with brass nails" ("Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, p. 533).

p. 159, l. 3. "Inland sea of Kamboja." This is an oversight on my part, and must be corrected into "inland sea of Singore," to which the generic term Thatē Sab is also applied. On its cave-dwellers, see Annandale’s criticism of Warington Smyth in the Scottish Geographical Magazine, vol. xvi, 1900, pp. 519-520.

p. 159, ll. 7, 8, and n. 1, on cave-dwellers. Add, furthermore, the following evidence:—

(1) According to a Chinese account, the "inhabitants of Pulo Condor subsist by fishing and gathering fruits. They have their abodes in nests and holes. Their appearance is monstrous and their colour black" (China Review, vol. iii, p. 325). This troglodytism of the Pulo Condor people is further confirmed by Dampier in his account of that island.

(2) It is stated of the old kingdom of Ai-Lao on the coast of Annam (corresponding to the territory of the present Mūangs Kham Kôt and Kham-Mūen on the Lāu-Annamese watershed): "Les habitants de ces territoires habiteaent pour la plupart dans des grottes, et ces troglodytes cultivent les rizières sans instruments aratoires" (Dumontier’s "Un Portulan Annamite du XVe Siècle," Paris, 1896, p. 50).

(3) In the Wu-ko, 島戈, country, whither Méng-hu proceeded for assistance against K’ung-ming (in a.d. 225), according to the "San-kuo Chih," were no houses, every one living in caves or holes (see China Review, viii, p. 49). This country of Wu-ko, U-ko, U-ka (lit. ‘Black Spear’ or ‘Crow Spear’), the name of which at first sight would seem to be the transcript of some Sanskrit-Pāli toponym (e.g., Utkala, Ukkala, Ukka, see p. 94 above), was probably on the upper waters of the Red River not far from modern Yüan-chiang, judging from the fact that the San-ko Chih locates a river, Tāu-hwa Shwei, 桃花水, in the said Wu-ko country, which strikes one as identical to the Tāu-chiang or Red River (see p. 317 above). N.B., moreover, that there were then Wu-ma tribes settled about Yüan-chiang, and Ko Man (probably Ko or Aka) quite close by to the westward. Hence, Wu-ko, U-ka, may mean country of the Akas (Akhā, Akhô). The original home, or at any rate the last centre of emigration, of the Akas is, in fact, believed to have been at, or round about, Ta-lang, which lies but a short distance to the south-west of Yüan-chiang (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," part i, vol. i, p. 590).
(4) On the cave-dwellers of Eastern Sz-ch’wan, see Parker’s "China," p. 9, where it is further stated (loc. cit.) that "some of these tribes still exist to the extreme south-east, near the Kwei Chou frontier."

(5) At Long-Po, on the Red River, on the Yün-nan frontier; and at Tu-yên-quan and elsewhere in Upper Tonkin, prehistoric stations have been discovered in caves.

p. 159, n. 2, l. 1. Kan-chō. Read Kon-chō, which appears to be but the Khmēr-Annamese detractive corruption of their name Kan-c’ho, or Kañja as Aymonier prefers to write it (see his "Cambodge," t. i, p. 296). They don’t seem, however, to be so uncouth and brutalized as Moura described them.

p. 160, l. 7. On the possible identity of the C’hông or Chong with Chou Ta-kuan’s Chwang Tse (A.D. 1296-7), i.e. ‘Chong Robbers,’ see Appendix II above, section 7, s.v. Lēstai. But I have my doubts as to whether the expression Chwang Tse or Chong-t’vak really should be so interpreted, or else taken to mean the C’hông and Sak tribes as I have already observed (loc. cit.). It should be noticed, in fact, that the C’hông and Sak are often spoken of together in popular ditties, as, e.g., to point out an instance which may easily be verified, in the extract from the versified story of Mahā Janaka, quoted by Leyden, "Chong-sak nā-lai" (see "Essays relating to Indo-China," ser. i, vol. i, p. 146), which means, "the Chong and Sak with tattooed faces." For the Sak tribes see p. 165 above, last five lines at bottom. Chou Ta-kuan actually says: "The savages are people of the mountainous solitudes. They form a separate race called Chwang-tse [or, Chong T’vak]; without adding any further comment as to their possessing robbing proclivities or not. This seems to me almost an indication that what he means is, the ‘Chong and Sak tribes,’ and not ‘Chong Robbers.’ Of course, if the latter interpretation could safely be maintained, it would establish a most valuable historical and ethnographical link in the connection between Ptolemy’s Lēstai and the present Chong of unhybridized Negrito blood.

p. 162, note, ll. 10-14. Bá-lōi. This is the Annamese way of reading the Chinese 彌利, P’sō-li, the name of the State which I have since identified with the territory of the Pulai River, north of the old Singapore Strait (see p. 495, and Addenda to pp. 98 and 110 above). It has therefore nothing at all to do with Campā: this is a pure fancy of the author of the "Gia-dinh Thungkin-chi."

p. 163, l. 2 Vlās. These people are mentioned in a Po-Nagar
inscription of King Vikrāntavarman. Finot ("Album Kern," p. 383) renders the expression  \( Vṛlāh-kīrāta-vṛta \) as "sauvages montagnards appelés \( Vṛlās \)." On these, see further, p. 257, n. 1; and these Addenda, note to p. 155, above).

p. 164, n. 1, l. 4. \textit{Kim-trān}. This is the Annamese way of pronouncing the Chinese characters 金陳, \textit{Chin-chét} (Kém-chên, \textit{Kim-chin}), constituting an alternative name for \textit{Chin-lín}, according to Chinese records. \textit{Kim-chin} may be an attempt at rendering the Sanskrit  \( kāncaṇa = \) ‘gold’ = \textit{Suvarṇa[-bhūmi]}? Kaśyapa, the commentator, lived in the eighteenth century. For a possible identity of \textit{Chin-lín} (Kam-lan) with Camelan, see p. 113, n. 3; and these Addenda, note to p. 113, above.


p. 168, lls. 10–12. \textit{Chên-la}. The Chinese characters for this toponym, 真臘, \textit{Chôn-la}, represent, in my opinion, allowing for differences inherent to old Chinese pronunciation, a form \textit{Chôn-ra}, \textit{Chôn-raí}, or \textit{Sôn-raí}, evidently intended to render the name \textit{Sôrâi} by which the Stiengs to this very day designate Kamboja. I have good reason to suppose that this name for Kamboja, which appeared in the seventh century A.D., originated from the \textit{Charâi} or \textit{Jarâi} tribes which must have invaded it and held it under their sway, and which to this day hold the privilege of possessing Fire kings (see pp. 342, 343 above). I cannot here dilate any more on this subject, which I am working at and fully developing in a paper I am preparing for the press.

p. 175, l. 13, and p. 176 passim. \textit{Syâm-kak}. M. Finot, who has again verified these inscriptions, says that \textit{Syâm-kak} is a misreading, and that \textit{Syâm-kut} is the correct one for both (see \textit{Bulletin Éc. Fr.}, t. iv, p. 236, n. 2).

p. 175, n. 2, lls. 9–12. On face-tattooing of the \textit{Li} of Hainan. The \textit{Tan-érh} (people of North Hainan) tattooed their ears, according to a Chinese writer of the sixth century (see \textit{Bulletin Éc. Fr.}, t. iii, p. 281). As regards the \textit{Liau}, the "An-nan Chih-lūo," p. 96 transl., states that some of them "tattoo the forehead and file their teeth."

p. 177, n. 2. The original expression for the ‘Great Black Mountains’ in I-tsing’s text is, as I found out elsewhere, \textit{Ta-hēh Shan}. 大黑山. These are also mentioned by Kia Tan in one of his itineraries, compiled during the period 785–805 A.D., as lying between \textit{Pīào} (Lower Burma) and Kāmarūpa (Assām). (See \textit{Bulletin Éc. Fr.}, t. iv, p. 371.) They must correspond, therefore, to the Lushai Hills bounding on the west the Kubo valley.
p. 178, ll. 1-5. **Śyāma.** Cf. on this term:
(1) **Śyāmāka,** a people in the Northern region, according to the Brhat Saṁhitā.
(2) **Sāmagāma,** one of the townships of the Śākya clan mentioned in the most ancient Buddhist texts.
(3) **Śayam = the black One,** Skr. **Śyāma,** is the godling of the land and soil (**Bhumiya**) in the hills of North India (Crooke, vol. i, p. 105).
(4) **Dāng-thō = Black Earth** (**Śyāma-bhū**). An Annamese expression at times employed to designate Kamboja and her people (see Bonet's Diet. Annamite, vol. i, p. 134).

p. 181, ll. 7-10 from bottom. The countries of **Leo (= Lavô), Deār** (for **Dvārapūri, Dvāravati?**), etc., are mentioned in a **Lop'hburi** (**Lavô**) inscription of **circa 950-1000 A.D.** (see Aymonier's "Cambodge,” t. ii, p. 83).

p. 181, l. 3 from bottom. **Siem.** Cf. **Sim** of Hayton the Armenian, who states it to be a kingdom lying between China and India (see De Backer, op. cit., p. 127). This may, however, refer to **Chin** (Pegu).

p. 183, ll. 18-20. The designation **Śyāma-padesa** for the Sukhōthai kingdom occurs under the date of about 1360 in the "**Jinakūla Malini**" (composed A.D. 1516).

p. 184, l. 3. **Thai.** The terms **Thai** and **Mūang Thai** ("Country of the Thai, or Freemen") already occur in the oldest Thai inscription of A.D. 1306 found at Sukhōthai.

p. 185, n. 1, ll. 7, 8 from bottom. **Thai** has been thought to be represented by **れ, Ch'ai or Ta'ui, in Shan Ch'ai,** **し, Mountain Thai (?),** the name applied to themselves by the Mān Kao-lan tribes, who speak a modified Thai jargon (see *Bulletin Éc. Fr.,* t. ii, p. 268).

Add **Thōi (thây) = a 'master,'** in Annamese.

p. 190. For a much fuller treatment of the historical questions connected with **ancient Siām** which have been hardly touched upon in this section (pp. 169-90), I must refer the reader to several of my publications quoted in the foregoing pages, and chiefly among them to my articles on "**Siam's Intercourse with China,**" which appeared in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for 1900-2; also for January, 1898, and January, 1899.

p. 190, ll. 9-14 from bottom. As regards the **Vijaya** of **Chām** inscriptions, see, however, below, note to p. 281.

p. 190. **Pagrasa.** For further linguistic remarks on this toponym, see p. 309 above. **Krās** in Khmēr means 'thick,' 'dense,' 'hard'; **sat-krās = 'sea-turtle' (Siām. krah), and a 'shell.'**

p. 192, ll. 12-14. The form **Sōbannahs** also occurs in some of
the Ptolemaic MSS., which argues a derivation from Sovana. Cf. also Suparnā River in India (Wilson’s “Viṣṇu Purāṇa,” vol. ii, p. 154). Suparnā, Suparnā, Suban, is an epithet of Garuḍa. As to its identity with the Kap'hung Som River, it is worthy of remark that Hamilton, in 1720, refers to this stream, even though by mistake, as the Coupang Soap (see Pinkerton’s “Collection of Voyages,” vol. vii, London, 1811, p. 477).

p. 193, ll. 2, 3. P’thāi and Banthāi mean in Khmēr, besides a ‘wall,’ a ‘citadel.’

p. 193, ll. 1–5 from bottom, and p. 194, ll. 1–6 from top. In a separate paper, now in the press, I have gathered all necessary information and historical references to prove that a branch of the Western Mē-Khōng, detached a little above Chaudoc, flowed through an old channel (corresponding roughly to the present Ch’ōng Kanch’um canal) into the Banthai-mās River, thus discharging its waters into the Gulf of Siām. Suffice here to point out that in 1544 and 1595–6 Siamese fleets proceeded from Banthai-mās to Lawēk, the then capital of Kamboja, through the above-mentioned old channel of the Mē-Khōng, as recorded in the “Ayuthia Annals,” vol. i, pp. 161 and 194. The dates I have given are corrected ones. The discovery I have made of the existence of the old channel is likely to help in the better understanding of the hitherto obscure routes followed by ancient sea-trade in those parts.


p. 197, l. 16. Phu-Kuok. This name came to be given the island from Phu-Kuok (Phu-quoć) village, founded thereon by Māk-Kūu, 勝ắ, in about 1700–15. It is therefore a modern one. Māk-Kūu also founded Kampōt, Rach-ja, and Kamau villages.

p. 198, l. 2. Trol, or trāl; hence, Kā-trāl or Koh Trol = ‘Shuttle Island.’ N.B. that in Mōn darā, dharā = a ‘spool’ such as put into a weaver’s shuttle, and that this term even more approaches in sound to the final syllable of Ptolemy’s Aka[dra]. Thus, in Mōn [T‘]kā-darā or [L‘]Kā-darā (Aka-dra) would mean ‘Spool Island.’ Garnier, in Journal Asiatique, 1872, p. 144, spells the name of the island ‘Ca Tron.’

p. 199, l. 12. Jakarta, or Jakarta; but both are a corruption of Skr. Jaya-karta.

p. 199, l. 4 from bottom. Ujong Tānah corresponds to Johore territory, and is distinct from Tamasak, the old name of Singapore Island. For the identity of this with the Tanesik of the “Nāgarakretāgama” (circa 1380), etc., see more fully my paper “The Nāgarakretāgama List of Countries,” etc., in Journal R.A.S., July, 1905, pp. 500–11.
p. 200, note, last 5 lines. Cf., however, the Strait of Chih (Cheik or Sik), mentioned by Kia-tan in one of his Itineraries (A.D. 785-805, see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 231), which seems to be somewhat onomatologically connected with the [Tuna]sik of the Nāgarakretāgama, although it may be intended to be an abbreviation of Chih-li, Sik-lit (Selat).

p. 201, ll. 10-20 from bottom. Komār, more correctly Kmar. De Barros (Dec. iii, lib. ii, ch. 5) has a curious passage as follows: "There are two kingdoms adjacent to each other, and both of them maritime, which have each a peculiar language; the first is termed Como, and the second Camboja" (see Leyden's Essay in "Essays relating to Indo-China," ser. 1, vol. i, p. 150). Here Como (unless intended for Klōm, another name for Kamboja, which is unlikely) presumably corresponds to the territory of the Khman district; and, taken in a more extensive sense, to the western part of the Mē-Khong Delta; and thus to the Kmar of the Arabs which we have located in the same position. N.B. that although in a preceding note (to p. 197) the foundation of Khmāu village is put, after the "Gia-dinh Thung-chi," to the credit of Māk-kūu, and does not go further back than A.D. 1700-15, the name Khmāu for the district, the river flowing through it, and the cape, is far older.

Another name similar to De Barros' Como is that of the Kramān Sō (now Rach-jā) district, spelled Kramonsa by Garnier in his translation of the "Chronique Royale du Cambodge," and Kar-mun-sa by Crawfurd (op. cit., vol. ii, p. 235). Its river, now called the Tek-sia, or Rach-ja, I have elsewhere identified with the Man-shan, 蠻山, River of Chinese records (A.D. 1015; see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 578). But I think that De Barros' Como is really Khmāu, as I have hinted at above.

p. 202, ll. 7-11. Compare Mas'udi's passage here with the following one from Aubaret's "Gia-dinh Tung-chi," p. 86: "Les Chinois avaient autrefois l'habitude de donner le nom de sa-nu-pieds aux habitants de Gia-dinh [Lower Cochin-China], et cela tenait à ce que les mandarins seulement ou les personnes fort- riches, ou bien les grands marchands, portaient seuls des chaussures."

p. 202, l. 6 from bottom. Kih-miē. In Chinese characters: 吉 米, Chi-mie (Kit-met, Keik-mie, Kil-miel; Ann. Kiel-miet), which is the spelling made use of in the "Ti'ang Shu," both old and new recensions, compiled during the ninth and eleventh centuries respectively (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. ii, p. 125). This seems to represent the form Kmīr (for Khmēr) appearing in some
of the Chăm inscriptions, but certainly neither Keir nor Kur, which have quite another origin (i.e. from Kuru, the Kuru people of the Indo-Chinese Indraprastha, the mediæval capital of Kamboja), as I shall more fully explain elsewhere.


p. 217, l. 11 from bottom. To-ppei. In the Sung Annals (see extract in Toung-Pao, vol. ix, p. 380) this toponym is spelled Shihe-pei, Sz-bei, a form yet more approaching to Ptolemy's Zabai (Zahi, Zabei). Cf. with Dimashki's T'ubā, one of the cities of Sanf (Campā). See Mehren, op. cit., p. 228.

p. 220, l. 12 from bottom. The stela here referred to has since been (1902) transferred to Hanoi, into the Museum of the École Française d'Extrême-Orient.

p. 221, l. 14. Johor. This is not the Betamah of the old Arab navigators, which must be identified instead with Singapore Island, as I have more recently shown (see these Addenda, note to p. 199).

p. 225, n. 1, last line. See further Toung-Pao, May, 1903, p. 140, where a Chinese official, author of a voyage to Tonkin, scouts the usual interpretation put upon the term Kiō-chi. See also Chavannes in "Se-ma Ts'ien," vol. i, p. 38, quoted there. On Kochi, Kuchi = Cochin-China as derived from Kiō-chi, Kau-chi, and not from K'un-chon, see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 299. See also Koki, Kochi, p. 95 above; and p. 321 for other remarks. In the "An-nan Chih-luo," Yuan-chi, 阮陸 (in Annamese, Zien-chi), and Nan-chiao, 南交, are given as ancient names for Tonkin (see Sainson's transl., pp. 11, 12, 50, 51, 131, 182), date A.D. 975–80. The first one is, I think, connected with the Chu-Yuan, 朱鷯 (in Ann. Chou Zien), tribes, said to have been settled of old on the slopes of Mount Bai-vi (see Dumontier's "Étude hist. et archéolog. sur Cô-loa," Paris, Leroux, 1893, pp. 3, 4). The same writer, p. 3, states that the Kiō-chi (J'ai-chi) tribes occupied the territory of the modern districts of Ha-noi, Hùng-yen, and Nam-dinh. Cf., anyhow, Senji and Chenchij on pp. 245-6, note, supra; and remark, moreover, that the second character 陆 in Yuan-chi is the same as employed betimes in writing the term Kiō-chi, thus: 交陆.

As regards the term Yueh (Viet), this occurs in Yueh-shang, 越裳 (Ann. Viet-thuong), or Yueh-shang Shih' = 'Yueh-shang tribe'), the name of a people and district mentioned in history from B.C. 214, which Dumontier (op. cit., p. 4) renders as "Those beyond
Viet' (i.e. the Yüeh country = South China, but more precisely Chehkiang in South-East China; in my opinion, however, Yüeh-nan, 越南 [Viet-nam] = Annam, 'Southern Yüeh'). He places the Yüeh-shang tribe in Kwang-biǔ and Kwang-trí, whereas Chinese writers variously identify it with Nung-nai, 農耐 (i.e. Dông-nai = Bien-hwâ, a term which hopelessly puzzles Mr. E. H. Parker), and even with Lâu Chua, i.e. Lûang Phrañ Bâng or East Laos, probably on account of a faint resemblance between Yüeh-shang and Wieng-Chan (see China Review, vol. xviii, p. 38). See, however, my remarks on p. 227 above; although it is possible that the name survived in that of the old seaport of Viet (Yüeh), which is the embouchure of the modern Kwang-trí River (see Dumoutier's "Portulan Annamite," dating from 1477 A.D., p. 53).

Judging from the fact that in the Chinese transcript Yu-tan-yüeh of Uttara-kuru (see Eitel, op. cit., p. 189), the term Yüeh = Kuru, it is not improbable that Yüeh-shang stands for Kuru-jângala. We would have, furthermore, the equivalence Yüeh = Viet = Kuru = Kur, Keir (see in these Addenda, note to p. 202). Among the other one I have earlier put forward (pp. 134 and 221, note), of Yüeh = Yavana (Yuan, Yôna) = Javana (Javan, Jiva, Jún, etc.), cf. the Hebrew Javan (Genesis x), in which v is w as in Yavana, = (in Greek) Ion, Ionía (the scholiast on Aristophanes remarks that "omnes Graecos barbari Ionis appellabant").

p. 228, 1. 1. In A.D. 347 the northern limit of Lin-i and Jih-nan was at the Huōh Sôn (Hêng Shan) Range, in 18° N. lat. (according to the Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 196).

p. 228, 1. 17. Huan-wang. The character 璀, Huan, in this name, meaning a "ring" or "bracelet," and being variously pronounced wăn, guăn, kwăn, may be a transcript of Skr. valaya (= a "ring," "bracelet"), or else of vana, bâya, bala, bal (= Isvara in India), or even bal (= a "palace," "capital," "royal residence" in Châm). Huan-wang might thus mean Vana-rája, Bula-rája, Vanaspati (cf. the Vanaspati region in Kraunca-deipa (see "Viśnu Purâna," vol. ii, p. 198), etc.; or even "King of Bal (the Châm capital)," and Valaya-rája or Valaya-rástra. (Cf. Śrī-Banôi, the old Châm capital = Śrī Vanâya, Śrī Valaya?) As regards the sound guăn, guă, cf. Gwala-gårh, a town in the Indian Chamba.

There was a Huan River up the coast at Hà-tiũ, which district has borne (A.D. 581-650) the name Huan Chou, 鄱州; and a little further down a Ron River in North Kwang-biǔ, just below 18° N. lat. Either name may be the historical continuation of
the old Huan-wang. The Huan River, 琶江 (the first character being identical to the one employed to denote the Huan kingdom, i.e. Campā), referred to above is mentioned in the Annamese records in A.D. 1008 in the neighbourhood of Viên (see Dumontier's "Hoа-lү," p. 53), and probably corresponds to the present Vanchiuyang, between Viên and Hà-tiên.

p. 228, ll. 1–8 from bottom. Chan-ch'êng (the 'City of Chan') = Campā-pura.

The name Campā appears in local inscriptions since A.D. 479–577.

p. 228, n. 3, ll. 4, 5. Bal-Hangov. This must be the Chām citadel existing at about two miles south-west of Hwè, on the right side of the river, just opposite the Trūak-lam village. Between this and Hwè, on the same side of the river, are the ruins of brick buildings (An-kieu and Thần-p'ḥū). Other ruins are to be seen at Giam-biên, south-west of the Hwè citadel (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. ii, p. 105).

Bal Hangov (or, Hingue) was "ainsi appelée, parait-il, des pins qui abondent encore aujourd'hui aux environs de la capitale actuelle des Annamites [Hwè]" (Aymonier in Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 32, p. 155). It appears to have been founded in A.D. 1007.

A yet more ancient capital is mentioned in Chām tradition, to wit: Bal Thou (or Sruh) Bal Lai (Excurs. et Reconn., No. 31, p. 153), which may correspond to Bal Śrī Banöi (Vanaya, Valaya, Sivālaya, i.e. Huan-wang?). N.B. that the Ron River is not far to the north of Đông-hội, the supposed site of Śrī Banöi or Śrī Banöi.

p. 229, l. 3. Đông-Hội. The ramparts of Đông-Hội, or Đông-Hài, 洞海 ( = 'Sea Grotto'), were built, according to an Annamese Geography, in the reign of Hsiao Wên-ti (B.C. 179-56): see Dumontier's "Portulan Annamite," p. 52.

p. 229, l. 6. P'ḥöt-thē. Père Cadière writes 佛逝, P'hōt-thē (= P'hōt-thē, in Chinese Fo-shih), in the Bulletin Éc. Fr., 1903, p. 204; and adds that it was taken in 1044 by Li-thái-tôn, it being then the capital of Campā, thus confirming what I had written in antecedence on p. 229 above. N.B. that 佛逝, Fo-shih, as it is spelled in Ma Tuan-lín, means 'Buddha's death,' and may thus allude to Kusinārā, where the Buddha died. On the other hand, it may be a transcript of some term like Bhoja, Bhojiya, etc. Again, as the Chām inscriptions mention a city or district Amarāvati in the north, as Finot makes it out (quite the reverse of Aymonier, who understands it to have been in the south), the term Fo-shih may be a clumsy rendering of it (as Marāvati, 'Death's abode'), or
a simple attempt to phonetically transcribe the last part ẻti of the name, perhaps more accurately represented in the Annamese form Pｈọṭ-thे or Pｈọṭ-thē. On an ancient capital Fu-ch’un, 富春 (Ann. P’hù-ch’uⁿ), founded before Hsin Wu-ti’s reign (A.D. 373–97) near Hwék (west or south-west) and on a site apparently corresponding to that of Pｈọṭ-thē, see Dumoutier’s “Portulan Annamite,” p. 55. However, according to the Bulletin de l’École Française, t. iv, p. 199, this information cannot be traced further back in history than the period of the Annamese Ngwięn (Nguyễn) dynasty, seventeenth–eighteenth centuries.

p. 229, n. 1, l. 3. Direccion  = 全. This is incorrect, for Direccion is actually represented by the characters 洞 海, Zông Hái (in Chinese, Tông Hải = ‘Sea Grotto’), and sometimes spelled 洞 海, Zông Hái (in Chinese Tông Hâcei = ‘Eddy Cave’), see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 180. These are, presumably, mere clumsy attempts to render an old Chăm name; unless 回, H'i, is intended, which is used to designate Muhammadans and also Mongols.

p. 230, l. 2. In 1371 the Chăm king Chê Bông-ngá attacked and totally destroyed Hwék, the then capital of Annam (see Dumoutier’s “Portulan,” pp. 54, 55), which was not rebuilt until two centuries later. Châ-bân, or Bal Ángvē, the Chăm capital of the time, is presumably “the city of Bal, called Metakat,” of the “Malay Annals” (Leyden’s transl.).

p. 230, l. 5. Bal Batthinông became the seat of government after 37 years’ interregnum, according to Chăm tradition, i.e. in circa 1508. But this date probably requires a correction of some 100 years less. From the Chinese records we learn of the death, in A.D. 1505, of the Chăm king Ku-lai, who had been deposed some time prior to A.D. 1481 in favour of his elder brother, and driven out to seek refuge at Chhi Khrām and Pānrang. On the other hand, the Annamese Portulan of 1477 A.D. already locates the Chăm capital at Pānrang, which evidences that the latter already stood there since at least some years, say from 1467 or even earlier (see Dumoutier’s “Portulan,” p. 64).

p. 231, l. 19. Hsi-t’tu. These tribes are by some Chinese writers identified with the Hê ch’īk, 黑齒, or ‘Black Teeth,’ so-called from their habit of staining or lacquering their teeth black (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 281). This custom is common to the Annamese, Khmēr, Lâu, Siamese, and in general to all betel-chewing populations of Indo-China; hence the difficulty of identifying the Hsi-t’tu, who may have been, however, part of the forbears of the present Khmērs.
p. 231, l. 12 from bottom. The "An-nan Chih-lüo" (p. 213 transl.) states that the Chinese expedition of A.D. 603 (605?) landed at the seaport of Pi-king (Ti-küan, see p. 311 supra), and ferried the She-li or Tu-li Küang (in Bō-châu = modern Kwâng-bîn and Kwâng-trî), where the frontier of Campâ then stood (p. 63). This must have been either the Song-kâ at Viên or else the Song-giang River. A battle here ensued, in which the Châm king was worsted. Thereupon, the Chinese invaders proceeded onwards to the Tâ-yüan (= the Song-giang or the Kwâng-bîn River?), where they again defeated the Châm who had taken position there. The army then passed Ma-yüan's brass pillar, and eight days' march further it reached the Châm capital.

p. 233, ll. 13–15. The contemporary inscriptions of Chô-din, Mî-sôn, and Hon-kuk, belonging to circa A.D. 400, all three mentioning the name of the same Châm king (Bhadravarman), and coming, the first one from the district of Twî-hvâ just above Cape Varella (18° N. lat.) and the other two from places in the south-west of Turân (16° N. lat.), prove that at any rate the region comprised between Cape Varella and Turân obeyed a single ruler (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. ii, p. 191).

p. 234, l. 19. Since this passage was written there has been discovered the stela of Sambhuvaraman at Mî-sôn in South-West Turân, which is the oldest dated inscription hitherto brought to light in the whole of Indo-China (A.D. 479–577). In it the name Campâ already occurs. The earliest mention hitherto found was on the stela of Yang Tikub, A.D. 799 (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii). As regards the term Mahâ Campâ, this reappears, brought to light in the Annamese form Đại C'hien, 大 古 (Chin., Tai-Cán), in the Annamese Portulan of 1477, as the name for the seaport of Fai-fo (present Kwâng-nam below Turân), see Dumontier's "Portulan," p. 57.

p. 239, l. 3. Chang Shêng, the author of the revised edition of Ma Huan's "Ying-yai Shêng-lan," in noticing the seaport called Hsin-chow says that on its shores a stone pagoda was erected as a beacon. Ma Huan mentions it as well (see Toung-Pao, 1901, p. 374; and, for a fuller description, the China Review, vol. iii, pp. 321, 322).

p. 243, n. 2, last line. Flowered Pê-tiê cloth is woven by the women of Tu-po Island (= Borneo, see p. 245 above) according to Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 513.

p. 245, l. 11. In the "An-nan Chih-lüo" (Saison's transl., p. 228) in 1291 A.D. the Sea of China is called Yen-Hai, 炎 海, the 'Blazing Sea,' with reference perhaps to Yen-ti (the 'Fiery
God’) or Shên-nung, the fabulous China emperor (B.C. 2838), called also the ‘Red God’ in the ‘Lu-shih’ (see China Review, vol. xiv, p. 27), and to volcanoes in its eastern part. Cf. (see pp. 248, 249 above) the Jan-ho (‘Fire Island,’ which I identify with Gunong Api in the Banda group) and Ho Shan (‘Fire Island’ = Gunong Api, east of Sumbawa?) islands located by Chinese writers in the Chang-Hai Sea, east of Tu-po Island, i.e. Borneo (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., pp. 449 and 518, 519). The Yen-Hai Sea is, accordingly, probably another name—or rather epithet—for the sea of Chang-Hai.

p. 246, n. 1, 5. Ortelius, in his map of South China (A.D. 1560–70), marks a place Chêntsi, a short distance up the Liîhi (=Lei-chou) River, which does not seem to be Shih-chêng (Shek-shen) in the east corner of the Tonkin Gulf. With Șenji cf. also Șuan-chih (Ann. Zien-chî), an ancient name for Tonkin (see above in these Addenda, note to p. 225, n. 1).

p. 246, note, l. 20. For these pearl fisheries see also Mendez Pinto, who visited them in 1540, and says they were to be found at the Bay of Camoi (=Cape Kami, see note below) or Guamboy (“Travels,” 3rd ed., London, 1692, pp. 52, 53).

p. 247, note, ll. 10–16 from bottom. In A.D. 868 Kao-Pien had many submarine rocks removed (apparently by means of mines), thereby making navigation safer between Canton and Tonkin (see Des Michels, op. cit., p. 208, and “An-nan Chih-lûo,” pp. 81, 217, 374). According to the “An-nan Chih-lûo” (pp. 379, 380) the dangers in the Gulf of Tonkin were:

(1) The fire-pit of Sung-tung Sha (sandbank?).
(2) The large fish with stone horns of Lo-lien-nû Bay.
(3) A terrific whirlpool.

Such dangers could thenceforth (A.D. 868) be avoided by passing through the new maritime channel opened out by Kao-Pien.

N.B.—In A.D. 851 Sulaimân still makes it understood that it was no easy job to get out of Sandar-fulât (see note on p. 248 above). Cape Kami and its little bay is, as already observed above, Mendez Pinto’s Camoi or Guamboy Bay (A.D. 1540).


p. 249, n. 2. Tan-sun or Tien-hsun. The original word may be Dàsun = an ‘orchard’ in Malay, occurs in the names of several places on the Malay Peninsula, besides being applied to several tribes in North Borneo calling themselves Kadasan.
As regards Tenasserim, the oldest recorded form of its name is Tunasari, DisplayName, which appears in the A.D. 1248 Pagān inscription of King Narapati-sithu (see text of the "Inscriptions of Pagan," etc., p. 260, l. 6). So much for those writers who pretend (like, e.g., in the Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, pp. 407 and 475) that the right name for Tenasserim is Naṅkasī, which is by the Peguans pronounced Naṅkasi. This is a mere faulty transcript for which the Rev. A. O. Stevens is responsible (see "Vocabulary English and Peguan," Rangoon, 1896, p. 138, ll. 5–7). The real Mōn (Peguan) name for Tenasserim, as ascertained by myself, is T’ang-sī, DisplayName, pronounced Tnang-sōi or Tānang-sōi, and occurs in the Mōn Annals called the "Rājadhīrāj." It well enough agrees, it will be seen, with the Tanang-sari of the 1248 Pagān inscription, which in its turn quite agrees with the Ta-na-sū-li of the Chinese map of about 1400 published by Phillips (see p. 426 above).

I have no objection against its identification with Tāranātha's Dhanasrī-dīpa (A.D. 1608), proposed in the Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 407, note 5.

The Mōn form, Tānain-sī, of the name looks much like a rendering of the Pāli Tūṇa-simā (Skr. Trāṇa-sīmā) = 'shelter boundary,' or 'defence-limit,' mayhap from its forming in old times the southernmost limit of the Pagān kingdom (tenth to thirteenth centuries), and of the Peguan one which the former absorbed at the beginning of that period. For in Mōn DisplayName, thāna = tāna, sthāna, 'place,' 'land'; but may also stand for tāna, trāṇa, as DisplayName, tānain, for tānain; and DisplayName, sī, is a contraction of simā. Thus, on the basis of Mōn, Tānain-sī may be explained as equivalent to either Tūṇa-simā or Thāna-simā (= 'frontier land'). From either of these forms may easily have originated the corrupt ones, Tūṇa-srīmā, Tūṇa-serima, Tanaserim.

The Siamese Tunāvārī, Tanāv, presupposes a derivation from Tūṇa-vāri, or from Tanāva, Tanāv, which latter would still survive in the name of the Danu, Danau (Tānū, Tanū) tribes of East Burma, which are thought to have come from Tenasserim (see "Upper Burma Gaz.," pt. i, vol. i, p. 563). There is, finally, the Hindu-Malay form Tunak-sarī ('land of delight') to take into account, which argues an original name Thāna-sīrī ('land of prosperity') or Sthāna Śrī. This interpretation would find some slight corroboration in Pyrard de Laval's statement (A.D. 1610) that
some Indians call Ceylon "Tenasirin, signifying land of delights, or earthly paradise" (see "Hobson-Jobson," 2nd ed., p. 914). This epithet may easily have been transplanted from Ceylon on to Tenasserim. Anyhow, it will be seen that it is incontestably Indihan, borrowed by the Malays, and not Malay as incorrectly stated by the editor of the new issue of "Hobson-Jobson," at the outset of the article "Tenasserim."

It is not uninteresting to add that the Chinese of the Straits write the name 丹荖, Tan-lau, lit. 'Red Sirih (betel)' [leaf], see Journal Str. Br. R.A.S., No. 42, p. 201, which shows that they mistakenly interpret it as Tanah-Sirih. But Tan-lau purports very likely to be a transcript of Tanū.

In conclusion, whether we take the name of Tenasserim as derived from Täna-simā, Thäna-simā, or Thäna-sirī, it is incontestably of Indihan origin, even in the case it should really prove connected with the Danu, Danae, Danōu, or Tanū tribes of East Burma, as tradition has it. The only exception would be if it could be proved to embody the term Danū, Dānau = a 'lake,' a 'marsh,' occurring in many a language from the Indo-Chinese Peninsula to Melanesia, e.g.: Dōnāu in Bahnar, Danau in Malay, and Danau in the Eastern Archipelago, as far as [Min]-danào Islands, of which one lies off the west coast of Billiton and the other in the Philippines.

In any case, Thäna-simā, Thäna-sirī, Tanāva-sirī, etc., cannot, except by an extraordinary stretch of imagination, be made identical with the Chinese Tun-sun or Tien-hsun. On this toponym see my remarks in the Journal R.A.S., July, 1905, p. 502, n. 1. p. 249, l. 4 from bottom. Dele the words "Batam, Bentan, or." p. 250, n. 1. Nowairi (civitā 1320 ; † 1332) has Sandābulāt and Sidābulāt (see "Merveilles de l'Inde," p. 282). N.B.—Arabic ṣ = z = ch; hence, probably, Chandāpura, Chandamapura.

There existed two more Fu-lu, but on the coast of Annam, to wit:

1. 福祿, in Annamese P'hōc-lōk, a district a little above modern Kwâng-bîn, mentioned in the "An-nan Chih-lüo" (pp. 86 et seqq.) since A.D. 679, and called also Lu-fu;

2. 扶歴, on a river, op. cit., p. 183, date 1257.

A fortified city and chief-lieu of district, named Hsi-fu-lieh, 西扶烈 (Ann. Tôi-p'hum-liet), lying three or four miles south of Hâ-nôi and on the right bank of the Red River, is referred to during the period 946-50 A.D., and said to have been a very old place. It was probably then the seaport for Lung-pien (Hâ-nôï). See Dumoutier's "Hoa-lu," Paris, 1893, pp. 4, 5; also Des Michels'

p. 251, note, § 3. Shang-ching. According to the Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 188, n. 1, this is a misprint for Pi-king, for which see p. 312 above.

For other ancient seaports in this region see "An-nan Chih-lîu," pp. 178, 207, 219; Des Michels, op. cit., pp. 198, 200, 219, 220; also p. 311 above for Lu-jung, which was the principal seaport for Jîh-nan, whence ships sailed southward bound.

p. 252, ll. 1–3. Hô-tôn. The name of this people is spelled 狐孫 (in Chinese Hû-sun), or 狐孫精, Hô-tôn Tiû (Chin. Hû-sun Ching), and in Annamese legend they are identified with the Simian nation, which assisted Râmâ in conquering the demons of Lânkâ. They are believed to be a monkey race from which the modern Châms are descended (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. v, p. 168). Their country is thus thought to be the Indian kingdom of Kiśkindhyâ, where, in Râmâ's time, reigned Sugriva. The transference of this legend to Campâ probably arose from a tradition as to the primæval inhabitants of the country being Negritos, as we have already inferred from other indications (see pp. 256, 257 above).

p. 255, ll. 12, 13. With Ita, hitam, etc., cf. also the Persian Ind (whence Hind, Hindâ), which is synonymous with 'black' according to Balfour's Cyclopædia, vol. ii, p. 56.

p. 256, ll. 8–13. For Tiao or Trao read Uhrav; for Kan-chô read Kon-chô, and as regards true Negritos see what has been said above in these Addenda (note to p. 157) of the Chong, Porr, or Samrâ.

p. 256, n. 1. Add also Vyāghra-mukha (= 'tiger faces'), a people in the eastern region according to the Brhat Saûhitâ, which may be compared with the Hu-t'ou or Hô-dao ('tiger heads') tribes on the Black River in Tonkin (see p. 395 above). The Osthakaranka tribe may also be compared with the [Kên] Üt. As regards ikhthyophagi it is well to call attention to the fact that fish- and shell-eating populations occupied the lacustrian stations of the Neolithic age discovered in Kamboja, as proved by the sort of detritus of which the strata of their Kjökken-möddings are composed.

The raw-fish-eating, attributed in the Râmâyana to eastern islanders, and ascribed in the Catalan Atlas to the populations of the Formosan channel, is by no means a myth, for it is yet
exemplified not far away in Tonkin, whose people are wont to
eat certain small fish, raw and alive, while they are swimming
in a dish filled with water (see Bissachière’s “Exposé statistique
du Tonkin,” London, 1811, p. 180. This writer, p. 53, terms the
Annamese and Tonkinese “un peuple ichtiophage”).

The “An-nan Chih-lüo,” p. 316, states with reference to the
period 25–56 A.D. that the inhabitants of Tonkin only knew fishing
and hunting, and ignored the cultivation of the soil. Agriculture
(husbandry) was introduced by the Chinese governors into upper
Tonkin (p. 257) and lower down in the Chiu-chén (now Thaṅ-
hwā) district.

The Orang Akhyē, or Beuat Laut, a seafaring race of the islands
of the Linga group (between the east coast of Sumatra and Borneo),
live on fish. They are said to be of Jakun stock and very dusky
(see Balfour’s Cyclopaedia, vol. ii, p. 309, and vol. iii, p. 375).

p. 257, n. 1, last three lines. Compare also the Bhilla-
[palola], a people in the north-east region according to the Byhat
Śāṁhitā (see these Addenda, note to p. 155). The term Bhilā is
still applied to the Taru Karens, according to Judson’s Dict.,
As regards the Bila of the Malay Peninsula (settled in Kedah,
Pērak, Pahang, and Tringanu), they are nowadays considered to be
identical with the Semang Negrito, and by some writers described
as civilized Semangs.

p. 258, note, ll. 1–3. Blū. Cf. the terms B’lai, B’lē, etc.,
employed by the Loi of Hainan when speaking of themselves
(see China Review, vol. xii, p. 115).

p. 258, n. 1, ll. 1, 2. Chiau = ‘burnt,’ ‘black.’ Cf. the name
of the Panggang tribe on the Malay Peninsula; Panggang in Malay
means ‘roasted’ (and by inference also ‘black,’ ‘burnt’).

p. 259, n. 3, l. 2. P’an-mu = Bhamō. I now think this is
wrong, for the name of Bhamō is usually transcribed by different
characters, viz. 八募, Pa-mu, and sometimes 曼音, Man-mu,
when Old Bhamo is meant (see China Review, vol. xvi, pp. 122,
379); and, further, because Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 163) locates the
P’an-mu in west and south-west Sz-ch’wan.

As regards the name of the Chiau-yau, it is spelled also 周饗,
Chou-juau (see China Review, vol. xv, p. 157). Anent the mention
of them by Hwai-Nan Tsz, Edkins in his “Ancient Navigation,”
etc., p. 25 (see Journal R.A.S., vol. xviii, pt. 1), says that the
Shan-hái King, at the beginning of the 16th chapter, contains
a passage which Hwai-Nan Tsz (second century n.c.) quotes from
Lé-tsz (fourth century n.c.). “In the fifteenth chapter a kingdom
of dwarfs is mentioned in the south. Its name is Tiau-nau [i.e. Chiau-yaou]. The dwarfs are, says Kwo-pu, 3 feet high, the height given in the Shi-ki [n.c. 100]. Lie-tsz says the same people are one foot and a half high, and he states that their country is 400,000 li distant." "According to the Hill and Sea classic [i.e. the 'Shan-hai King'], sect. iii, 4, the Chiao Yao or Chow-jao were a tribe of cap-wearing pigmies 3 cubits high whose country was situated to the east of the country of the 'three-headed men'" (China Review, vol. xv, p. 157). I scarcely doubt that this 'Country of Three-headed Men,' or 'Triple-head Kingdom,' hitherto unidentified and which presumably is denoted in Chinese by the term San-t'ou, 三頭, in Cantonese San-t'au (= 'Three Heads'), is the Sām-thāu district north-east of C'hiēng Tung, inhabited by the Khā Sām-thāu, the Plang, etc.; wherefore the habitat of the Chiau-yaou pygmies would become fixed eastwards of the Mē-Khōng at C'hiēng-Khēng and Mūang Sing in the tract now occupied by Yau tribes, who are short in stature and may after all be the long sought for Chiau-yaou pygmies.

pp. 259, 260. K'ang, 獭. In West Burmā, beyond the Chindwin, exists a tribe so named (Khang), which seems to be a branch of the Chins (see "Upper Burma Gaz.", pt. i, vol. i, p. 389). The Shans call the Kachins Khang or Hang, according to the China Review, vol. xvi, p. 380. But as 獴 is pronounced Kōng and K'ōng in Cantonese, it is more probable that the Khā Kōng or Khōng of extreme north-east Siām (i.e. west of the Black River at Lai Chau) are meant, who are of Onī (hybrid Melanesian?) stock. Some of them, termed Kōng-men, inhabit the I-pang district not far away (north-east) from the Sām-thāu tribes.

I think Dumoutier is wrong when he states ("Hoa-lu,'", p. 71) that the K'ang were presented to the Chinese court under the reign of Ming Ti (A.D. 58-76); evidently he confuses them with the Chiau-yaou. But he is interesting in the particulars he gives on the same page as to an ancient race of pygmies whom the Annamese term Phōng. According to Annamese tradition, these dwarfs were two cubits high, i.e. about 84 cm.; from their body emanated a delicious perfume; they paid their dues in camphor, rhinoceros horns, and elephant tusks; they were cave-dwellers and hunters. The camphor here referred to as a produce must have been derived from the Blumea balsamifera, which we know to be still the case in the Mūang Het district near the Lāo-Tonkinese frontier and in some hill-tracts near the Black River (see above, p. 438, n. 1). It will thus be seen that the mysterious country of pygmies—the Chiau-yaou, Phōng, etc.—must be located in the
tract between the Mê-Không and the Black River under the 21st parallel of N. latitude. Whether these people should be racially identified with the You, the Khá Không, or other tribe settled in that tract, is a question which must be left to future ethnologists. It should be noticed, however, that north of this, on the Red River, is the habitat of the dark and dwarf P'uo-la tribes, which seem to be the remnants of an extensive pygmy race (see below, note to p. 364). The Pu-mang or Khá Dam, calling themselves Sautôm, and recognized by all the surrounding populations as being the true aborigines of Yûn-nan and Lâos, are also a very dwarfish race, described as "very small in size, with flat faces, noses without bridges, and black skin... One of their peculiarities is their rounded forehead and their protruding lips" (see "Upper Burma Gaz.,” pt. i, vol. i, p. 620).

p. 260, l. 15. Ku-lun, K’un-lun. See pp. 89, 90, 103, 261 (n. 1), 507-9 above. Cf. :

(1) The Kallar, Kallan, Colleri, the sylvestres homines, monkey-faced tribes in South India (see Balfour’s Cyclopaedia, vol. ii, p. 274).

(2) The Kulan, Kallang, or Gelang tribes settled in the old days on Singapore Island and in the Riau-Lingga Archipelago, possessing affinities with the Semang, Minkopi, and Aeta, who have thence also emigrated to Java. Meyer ("Negritos," pp. 40-1) thinks they might have come to Java from India via Celebes (?!), and asserts they are not Negritos.

(3) The Karon or Karun, a Negrito race in North-West Guinea.

From the above it would appear that Kulan, Kallang, Karon, Karun, etc. (=Ku-lun, K’un-lun, Chueh-lun of the Chinese), is a pretty general term in South-East Asia for Negritos or very dark tribes, and was probably imported there from Chola or Choromandel.

p. 262, l. 10. Odoric of Friul says of his pynan, bidun, budin, or bidini, pygmies from Kanshū (Kan-chou district), that they have a stature of three spans (see De Backer, op. cit., p. 118). Carletti speaks of zinzin pygmies and hairy men, by which he seems to mean (if not Zenji) the Sing-sing, 猩猩, apes of Chinese legendary folklore.

p. 262, ll. 11-15 from bottom. Gi-hâng, Salâng. See pp. 272-273 supra, and note thereon in these Addenda infra.

p. 265, ll. 13-19. The name Sâgara (Ptolemy’s Thagora) probably still survived in that of the now forgotten seaport Thai-kôn or Thu-kôn, 苍 苹 (in Chinese Shu-ch’în, J. Shugon = Sangor, Sâgara?), of the Annamese Portulan of A.D. 1477, situated at one day and one night’s sailing south-east of Đài Chiem
(Mahā Campā), i.e. Fai-fo (see Dumoutier’s “Portulan,” p. 7). This sailing distance fully agrees with that from Fai-fo to Nā-trāng Bay.

p. 269, ll. 17, 18. Bal. This term Bal, like the Malay Bāleś (a ‘hall,’ a ‘platform’) and Bāleś-rong (a ‘court,’ a ‘hall of State’), and the Khmer Banīē (a ‘belvedere,’ a ‘pavilion’), may be derived from Skr. vālaya = a ‘ring,’ an ‘enclosure’; in any case, the Malay Bāleś-rong is almost certainly the corruption of Skr. Vālay-[r]-āngā. At the same time it should be noticed, as regards the Chăm Bal especially, that in India Bal is a synonymous term for Iśvara, i.e. Śiva (see Journal R.A.S., July, 1899, p. 545; and cf. the Phœnician Bal, Baal = the ‘Sun,’ the ‘Sun-god’); and that Bāleś may just as well be derived from Bal-ālaya = Iśvara’s Mansion, the ‘Lord’s Abode,’ i.e. the ‘capital’; mayhaps also Śiva’s (i.e. the king’s) dwelling,’ kings being in Indo-China likened, as a rule, to Śiva.

p. 271, l. 2. Pāndurāṅga. This term, corrupted into Pāndaram, is used in India to denote a Śaiva devotee, and means ‘light-yellow (or pale) complexioned,’ “from these individuals smearing themselves with ashes,” according to Balfour’s Cyclopædia, vol. iii, p. 103.

p. 271, l. 19. In a.d. 1170 the capital of King Jaya Hari-varman of Campā was very probably at Bal Angwē (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 639).

p. 273, ll. 12–20. Salāng. These were evidently the Hsū-lang, 徐蜑 (called also 徐蜑, Lang-hwang, and 徐蜑, Lang-yen), described as occupying the headwaters of the rivers of Lin-i, i.e. the hill-tracts west of Campā (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, pp. 280–2). Cf. the names Lang-hwang and Lang-yen with those in note 4 to p. 272 and note 1 to p. 273.

p. 273, n. 1, ll. 9, 10. For cannibalism in Fuh-kien see Marco Polo. Cf. also the name of the Tung-jen and Yau-tung savage tribes of Kwang-hsi with the 捶, Cheuang, or Chong of Kamboja (see these Addenda, note to p. 160, and Appendix II, section 7, s.v. Lēstai). N.B.—That the character 捶, Tung, is read Cheuang by Beauvais (in Tuang-Pao, ser. ii, vol. iii, 1902, p. 69), who locates the Cheuang near Lièn-chou Fu in Kwang-hsi.

p. 275, n. 3, l. 8. Chou Ta-kuan (the author of the account of Kamboja here referred to) speaks, however, of a recent war with Siām which had laid Kamboja waste (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. ii, p. 173), which argues that the country had been, at any rate, temporarily under the sway of Siām. As regards the employment of human gall to sprinkle royal elephants, the custom is mentioned
also by Marini (1663) as being likewise in honour among the Lāu of Lān-ch'āng. A drop of the gall, mixed with wine, was used to rub on the head of elephants (op. cit., p. 453).

p. 280, ll. 9–12. Turān. Cf. the Turān of Albirūnī, Edrīsī, etc. = Jhalavān, and also a name of the province immediately east of Makrān (see Geographical Journal, June, 1896, pp. 670–1). The “An-nan Chih-lüo” (transl., p. 96) mentions, among neighbouring states and dependencies of Annam, a country Tau-lan, 道 覽, or Tau-ram, which may be Turān or Turon.

p. 280, n. 2, ll. 6–12. To-nang. Dumoutier in “Hoa-lu,” p. 40, spells this name 沱囊 (which would literally mean ‘water flowing in bygone days,’ whereas the other form would convey the sense of ‘muddy flowing water’); but evidently these transcripts, which may also be pronounced Du-lang, Du-long, are mere phonetic renderings of Tu-rān, Tu-ron. The Annamese Portulan of A.D. 1477 already mentions To-nang Môn, 沱囊門 (in Ann. Dâ-nâng Môn), i.e. the seaport of Turān, which name is by Dumoutier (“Portulan,” pp. 30 and 56) translated ‘Port du Grand courant.’ The same “Portulan,” we have already observed, calls Fai-fo 大占門, Dâi-Chiên Môn, i.e. ‘Port of Mahâ-Campâ’ (and not, as Dumoutier translates on p. 31, ‘grand port du Tchampa’; he is right, however, on p. 57 in his other rendering ‘Port du Grand Tchampa’). This is to me conclusive evidence as to an old capital of Mahâ-Campâ having stood in the neighbourhood, and precisely between Fai-fo and Turān, as attested by many ancient remains scattered about this tract, for which see below. As to Fai-fo, it is (or rather was) a comparatively new foundation; in fact, Tosi (“Dell’ India Orientale,” vol. ii, p. 165) says it was built by the Japanese (?).

The earliest European mentions of Turān that I know of are—

(1) In 1615 as Turam. On the 6th January, 1615, two missionaries (i.e. Diogo de Carvalho, a Portuguese, and Duzomi, an Italian), appointed on the Annam mission, sailed from Macao and landed on the 18th of the same month at Turam, a seaport of Cochín-China. There they established a church, but were soon ejected. Nevertheless, they came back in 1631, from Kamboja, to Turān (see “Noticias summarias das perseguições da missam da Cochinchina,” etc., Lisboa, 1700, quoted in Excursions et Reconnaissances, No. 15, pp. 482–3. See No. 12 of the same publication, pp. 509 et seqq., for events at Turān and its bay in 1635 and later).

(2) In 1669 as Turone by Tosi (op. cit., vol. ii, p. 166), who speaks of it as being already a very frequented place in his time.
p. 281, l. 2. Ancient remains have been noticed so far, according to Lajonquière’s “Atlas Archéologique de l’Indo-Chine,” Paris, 1901—

(1) South of Turān, near its river, at Phong-lê (a building with sculptures), Bo-mang (stela), Marble Mountains (sculptured grottoes), Qua-Giang (brick building).

(2) West and south-west of Fai-fo: Bang-an (three brick buildings), Hon-kue (rock inscription, for which see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. ii, p. 185), My-Sōn (about twenty-five brick buildings, sculptures, eight inscriptions), Chim-Sōn (brick building), Tra-kiên (vestiges of Siñhapura, a Châm citadel, numerous sculptures).

Basing his opinion upon an inscription (A.D. 1170) of the Châm king Jaya Harivarman, in which he mentions his conquests of “Yavana, Vijaya, in the north, Amarāvatī, in the south, Pāṇḍu-āṅga, in the west, the Raḍē, Mada,” etc., Finot reads “in the north, Amarāvatī” (quite the reverse of Aymonier), and identifies Amarāvatī with Mi-sōn (south-south-west of Turān), or at any rate with the modern province of Kwâng-nam (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 639). But I have shown above in these Addenda (note to p. 229, l. 6) how Amarāvatī very possibly corresponds to modern P’hōt-thē, the Fo-shih of the Chinese (A.D. 1007), situated some two to three miles south-west of Hwē, which was in A.D. 1044 the capital of Campâ, and thus probably is the Châm Bal Hangov. Otherwise, we must identify Fo-shih (i.e. P’hōt-thē and Bal Hangov) with Vijaya, which alternative would be linguistically supported by the fact that Fo-shih may also be pronounced Fot-shai, Vai-zi = Bu-jei, Vai-zi = Vijaya. In such a case Amarāvatī must be shifted far to the south, perhaps to Umbr, the modern Kan-thô, on the Mē-Không Delta. Be it as it may, the position of Ptolemy’s Throana, if not actually identical with that of Mi-sōn (south-south-west of Turān), must have been not far away from the present Turān and its bay, especially if it be considered that in De Donis’ map Throana be located quite on the seashore, which fact argues it to have been a seaport.

p. 284, n. 1, last two lines. Fresh-water dolphins (Planistidæ) inhabit the rivers of tropical countries. The Irāvatī possesses a dolphin, the Orcella fluminalis, which perhaps exists also in the Mē-Không. Chou Ta-kwan says of Kamboja (1296-7): “There are crocodiles as big as ships, which have four paws and quite resemble a Dragon, except that they have no horns,” etc. (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. ii, pp. 169, 170).

p. 286, n. 1, l. 16. ‘Black Water.’ Above, in these Addenda (note to pp. 135, 136, q.v.), we have seen that the Chinese words
for this expression are 黑水, Hēh-Shuei, as recorded in the "Nan-chao Ye-shih," 1550 (Sainson's translation, p. 208). The Hei-kiang, or 'Black River,' into which the Érh-hai (Ta-li Lake) is drained by two streams (Journal China Br. R.A.S., vol. xxv, p. 487), can hardly mean the Black River of Tonkin, as we have already noticed, but the Mè-Không, which at this point (and from 22° to 25° N. lat.) was called the Hēh Shuei (as both the "Nan-chao Ye-shih" and Colborne Baber inform us). All the same, it should be noticed that Hu Wei, the reviser of the "Nan-chao Ye-shih" in 1775, makes the Lan-ts'ang (Mè-Không) River flow by way of Ch'ing-tung T'ing (on the Black River) and Yüan-chiang (on the Red River) to the Tonkin Gulf, thus confusing it with both the Black and the Red Rivers of Tonkin. According to him, in fact, the Mè-Không would, from the Yung-ch'ang prefecture, turn eastwards towards Mêng-hwa T'ing, follow the course of the Yang-pi to Shun-ning Fu, then cross again eastwards to Ch'ing-tung T'ing, follow the course of the Black River (Pa-pien) to Yüan-chiang, and thence flow through the Red River to the Tonkin Gulf. This is an instructive specimen of geography as understood by the Chinese till recent times, and readily explains how Ptolemy could, at a more remote period, fall into a similar error. However, as the stream identified by Hu Wei with the Hēh-shuei or 'Black Water' is in this case the tract of the Lan-ts'ang west of Ch'ing-tung T'ing, the Mè-Không is evidently meant. Anyhow, see also the last part of the note on p. 287 above, where it is pointed out that the term Hēh-shuei is likewise applied to the Ta Kin-sha (Iravati, or this confounded with the Brahmaputra). See, again, n. 1 on p. 314 above for the name Hēh Ho, 'Black River,' applied to the Black River of Tonkin before it joins the Red River, which is, however, apparently of modern growth.


p. 293, l. 13. Kasēh. Cf. Kasēh (Kassay), the term applied to Manipur and Assim in general. Manuel de Faria-y-Souza, in his "Asia Portuguesa" (t. i, p. 82), terms Kachô the natives of Tonkin (see China Review, vol. iii, p. 328).

p. 293, n. 1. According to the Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extr. Or., t. iv, p. 190, Jih-nan under the Han occupied a more southern position than under later dynasties. In A.D. 347, it is asserted, the northern limit of Jih-nan was at the Hêng-Shan.
(Hwan Son), i.e. 'Thwart, or Transversal, Range,' forming Cape Bung-kL-hwa, in 18° N. lat. This is a little more reasonable. On Pi-king see our further remarks below (note to p. 311, line 14).

p. 294, n. 2. Min, Men. The Men tribes and a Muang Men (country of the Men) are mentioned in Khun Liang Hau-wat Memoirs, pp. 157, 159. In the Ch'ien Mai Chronicle, under the date 1751, the natives of Ch'ien Tung are termed Khun Men. Meng or Hmung is said by Warry and others to be the real name of the so-called Miao-tsz tribes; also Muang, 'Meng' (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," pt. i, vol. i, p. 597). In the China Review, vol. ix, p. 341, Parker states that the Miao-tsz call themselves Hmung. Meng-shih, Mu'ei, the Meng clan or tribe that built the old city or Pu-t'ou,步頭, or Pa-tien, 巴甸 (= modern Lin-an Fu, southeast Yunnan), close to the Tonkin frontier (see China Review, vol. xvi, p. 301), is certainly not Manzi, but the Meng or Muang clan of the Nan-Chao State (less likely the Meng or Miao-tsz). See, however, also n. 5 on p. 299 and n. 1 on p. 300 above.

p. 296, l. 19. Hsiang-lin. There was, however, an 'Elephant River,' Hsiang Shuei, 象水, or Hsiang-pu, 象浦 (see Bulletin Ec. Fr., t. iii, pp. 273, 274), mentioned in A.D. 446, which flowed probably within Lin-i territory. I think it might be the same as the Song Voi ('Elephant River') of the Annamese Portulan, in 19° 5' N. lat. Hence, the Hsiang-lin district must be located here, i.e. about Cap Falaise in North Ngan.

p. 297, n. 2, l. 11. Between A.D. 336-47 King Wen, 文, of Lin-i is stated in the "Ts'in-shu" to have conquered several countries, among which Ch'ü-tu-chi'en, 屈都乾 (Kut-tu-kan) = Kattaha, or Kortatha (?) (see p. 570 above, note). Cf.乾 harbour (Kan Mon) in the Annamese Portulan (Dumoutier's "Portulan," pp. 18, 44), mentioned in Annamese records since A.D. 569. It is now called Baap Harbour, and lies in 19° N. lat., not far below the northern limit of modern Ngan.

p. 297, n. 2, ll. 20, 21. Mahosadha-Jataka. This is better known as the Mahâ Ummagga J. (No. 546). Cûlani Brahmadatta was, according to this story, reigning over the kingdom of Kampilla, in Uttarapâñcâla city.

p. 298, ll. 2, 3 from bottom. In the "An-nan Chih-lu" (transl., p. 317) the name of Ch'u-lien is spelled 阮 禄, and this personage described as a brigand of Mân race. Order was restored in A.D. 138.

p. 299, n. 5. Tang-ming. The name of this kingdom is spelled 堂 明, characters which may also be pronounced Tang-ming.
Tung-mang, etc. The correct date in which it first sent tribute to China, together with Lin-i (Campâ) and Fu-nan (Kamboja), is A.D. 243 (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, pp. 251 and 303). In the history of the T'ang dynasty T'ang-ming is made conterminous with Chên-la (Kamboja) on the north and with Huan-chou (= modern Hâ-tîn district) on the north-east (see Rémusat's "Nouveaux Mélanges As.", vol. i, p. 84). This, coupled with the information already collected by us to the effect that T'ang-ming was situated on the seabord, would argue for it a position in modern Kwâng-bîn (17° to 18° N. lat.). Now, it should be observed that the Annamese Portulan of A.D. 1477 locates just below the southern limit of Kwâng-bîn the seaport Ming-ling (= Manrang ?), in Annamese Miên-liên Môn, 明靈門, which corresponds to the present Kua Tung (or Tung) in 17° N. lat. (see Dumoutier's "Portulan," pp. 28, 53). This term Ming-ling looks much like a survival of the ancient T'ang-ming or T'au-ming, the full name of which may have actually been T'ang-ming-ling or T'au-ming-ling = Tamalaînqa, Tamalînqa, Tamaraînqa, Tamra-ranga, Tamra-laînka. It should be observed, however, that the character 靈, lîng, which occurs in Ming-ling, is the same as employed in Ling-Shan (the transcript of Liṅga-parvata = Cape Varella, as I have elsewhere demonstrated) in the Chinese map of 1319, published by Phillips (see Journal China Br. R.A.S., new series, vol. xxi, p. 40). Hence, Ling = Liṅga, and as T'ang denotes a 'hall,' 'court,' or 'shrine,' it is just possible that some sacred liṅga shrine existed at Kua Tung (or Tung), which seems somehow to preserve in its name (Tung) a relic of the old T'ang-ming or [T'ang]-Ming-ling. Ming-ling was, furthermore, from 1075 the name of the modern Viên-liên district near the Kua Tung; prior to that period it was called Ma-ling. The Ling-kiang, 澜江, River of Annamese records is, therefore, the river debouching here, and not the Sông-jâng as stated in the Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 166.

p. 303, n. 1, ll. 8–10. See also the Journal R.A.S., 1896, p. 66, Dr. Hirth's article.

p. 304, l. 4 from bottom. Viên. Read Viṅ, 永 (Chinese Yung), and see the Annamese Portulan of 1477 (Dumoutier's "Portulan," p. 48).

p. 305, l. 10. According to the "An-nan Chih-lîu" (transl., p. 209), in A.D. 446 the Chinese took the fortified city Kiu-siu, or Ch'ü-su, 区粟 (Ann. Khá-tuk), or Ch'ü-sú Ch'êng (p. 347), from the Châm. This might be Kortatha or Katâha (see pp. 569, 570 above), albeit the name Ch'ü-sú (Ku-sok) suggests something
like Kuśaka, Kuśaja, or Gujaka(-nagara); Kuśā(-vatī), Khaśa,
Khaśaka, Kuśika, Kuṭaka, etc., thus arguing a possible connection
with Kazēh, i.e. [Pa]-grasa.

In A.D. 43, according to the same work (p. 206), Ma Yüan
reached Chū-feng Hsien, 居風 縣, in Ann. Kū-p'īng, which we
know to have been situated in Chiu-chén, i.e. in North-West
Thān-hwā (20° N. lat.).

p. 305, n. 2. Lō-dzung. Lu-jung, also a seaport; see note to
p. 311 infra.

p. 308, l. 6 from bottom. Krās. Krās in Khmēr means 'thick,'
'dense,' as we have already observed (see these Addenda, note to
p. 191); but in the present instance it evidently stands for Kazēh,
Khaśa, Kuśa, Kāśi (see above and also note below).

p. 309, n. 2, 1. 2. Bā-shēh. This may be a corruption of the
Pāli Upājīhaya. If so, the same applies to the Sīamese Bā-ji.
The Khmēr Bā-ku = Sīamese Bā Khrū = Varā-Guru. Ban-
chie, 班 詰, Ban-ch'ī, in Chou Ta-kuan's account of Kamboja,
cannot mean Paṇḍīt, as is queerly surmised in the Bulletin Éc. Fr.,
t. ii, p. 148, n. 4, but Bā-ji, Bā-shēh, i.e. a Brāhman teacher.

p. 309, n. 4, last line, add: Chou Ta-kuan in his account of
Kamboja (1296-7) says: "In this land it is women who under-
stand trading" (Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. ii, p. 167).

p. 310, last nine lines. Kazēh. See p. 293 and note thereon
(l. 13) in these Addenda; also above, remarks on pp. 305
(l. 10) and 308 (l. 6 from bottom). The term, as already observed,
is the same as applied to Kasa, Kraśa (Kassay), i.e. Manipur and
Asām in general. Evidently this latter is somehow connected with
Khaśa, or, at any rate, with the Khasia Hills separating Manipur
from the Asām valley. But the former (if not both) may be
perhaps more logically referred to Kāśa, Kāśi, in India, whence it
was seemingly transplanted into Tonkin.

p. 311, l. 4. Khā-lōt. This is a clerical error for Khā-tuk or
Chū-su, 区 履 (see next note below), originating in the fact that
in some Chinese texts this name is misspelled 区 履, Chū-li
(Khā-lōt), see Bulletin Ec. Fr., t. iv, p. 192, n. 2.

p. 311, ll. 4, 5. I now somewhat incline to identify Pagrasa
with the old Chū-su (Kusok) or [Pa]-kāsa stronghold, mentioned
since A.D. 446 by the "An-nan Chih-lōo" as belonging to the
Chăm (see above, note to p. 305, l. 10). See, however, below,
note to p. 334, l. 17.

p. 311, ll. 8, 9. Lō-dzung. This is Lu-jung, 盧 容, a seaport
and the embouchure of an homonymous river in Jih-nan, mentioned
since about 250 A.D. in the "Fu-nan Chi," "From this seaport ships bound for Fu-nan and other countries in the south used to sail; it was always from this harbour that they set out" (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 278). As to the location of Lu-jung, we read in the "An-nan Chih-lüo" (transl., p. 209) that in A.D. 446 the Chinese general T'an Ho-chih, having entered Châm territory, took the Ch'ü-su (K'u-tuk, Pagrasa?) stronghold, which lay on the northern bank of the Lu-jung River. Yang-mai, the Campâ king, thereupon withdrew to Hsiang-p'u,象浦, or Hsiang-shuei, 象水 ('Elephant River,' which we have proposed to identify with the present Sông Voi, 'Elephant River,' in 19° 5' N. lat.). Again, according to the "An-nan Chih-lüo" (p. 345), in A.D. 347 the king of Lin-i (Campâ) had conquered Jih-nan, and after destroying the Chinese troops despatched thereto against himself, had attacked Chiu-chên (Thaⁿ-hwa district), and later on had defeated the Tonkinese and Cantonese at Lu-jung. The foregoing evidence argues for Lu-jung and its river a location at about Cape Butong (19° 11' N. lat.), just on the present boundary between Ngê-an on the south and Thaⁿ-hwa on the north, and Ch'ü-su (K'u-tuk, Pagrasa?) would have accordingly to be located there also.¹ The Lu-jung River would thus correspond to the present Sông Mai. Here (at Cape Butong), then, would have been the northern frontier of Châm territory from 347 to 446 A.D.; whereas before A.D. 347 the frontier appears to have stood much farther to the south, i.e. at the Hêng Shan range (Cape Bung-kî-hwa) in 18° N. lat. (see these Addenda, note to p. 293, n. 1). The name Lu-jung is seemingly one of the toponyms imported from India; cf., in fact, the Leujong River north-west of Dhakka.

p. 311, l. 14 et seqq. Pi-kin. This toponym is variously spelled 比景, Pi-ching (Pei-king, Pi-kin, Ann. Tî-kâû); 上景, Shang-ching, etc. (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 188, where it is suggested that it should be pronounced Pi-ying, by a reasoning which fails to convince me, as there stand against it the local

¹ In Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 192, the extract is given, from Chinese records, of a gnomonical observation taken in A.D. 446 at Chî-su, presumably during the Summer solstice. A gnomon 8 feet (ch'i-hk) high cast a shadow 8 inches long. There is probably an error in excess in the figure for inches (ts'-mu) here, for the result is, according to my calculations, lat. 17° 30' N. cirea. It should be observed, in fact, that in a similar observation taken in the eighth century in Lin-i territory (referred to in op. cit., p. 187, n. 2), the gnomon cast a shadow only 5½ inches long, which yields a latitude of 19° 7' N. cirea, i.e. just the latitude of the Sông Voi ('Elephant River'), and the one we assign to the Chî-su stronghold which stood on its northern bank. On the other hand, in A.D. 721, the famed monk-astrologer I-hsing (Y-hang) found the latitude of the Lin-i capital to be 17° 10' (or 17° 24' according to other texts (see loc. cit.)).
Annamese and Lâu pronunciations of the second character, which are kän and kan, käng, respectively). The location of this seaport, mentioned since A.D. 605 as being then formed into a châu by the Sui, has been the object of much speculation. In Chinese itineraries it is described, however, as lying south of Huan Chou, 雲州, a district of the T'ang period, the capital of which is located at modern Đúc-thô, near the Song-kâ River and southwest of Vin (in about 18° 37' N. lat.). On the other hand, according to the "An-nan Chih-lüo" (p. 213), in A.D. 603–5, the Chinese fleet was sent with an army against Campâ. The expedition, having landed at Pi-king, proceeded on foot and crossed the Shê-li or Tu-li Kiang in Bô-chânh, where the frontier of Campâ was (p. 63). This river is, no doubt, the Sông-jãng (Song-giang of maps), the mouth of which (lying in 17° 42' N. lat.) is termed Bô-chinh Môn in the Annamese Portulan (see Dumoutier's "Portulan," p. 51). We would thus obtain for the Pi-king seaport a position between 17° 42' and 18° 37' N. lat. But as the distance on foot from Huan Chou to Pi-king is stated to be about a fortnight, and by sea only five or six tides, it will be seen that, making due allowance for exaggerations, the position of Pi-king should become fixed about Cape Bung-kî-hwâ in 18° lat. Pi-king might thus be identified either with the ancient seaport of Hêng Shan at that Cape itself, or with the mouth of the Rong River (Kúa Ron) immediately below.

It should be observed, however, that there is a 景, King or Kân, Hill, near the Song-kâ River, in the Nam-dzûang district west of Vin (see Dumoutier's "Portulan," p. 48), on the summit of which stands a temple built, it is said, by an Annamese army. The Annamese Portulan mentions furthermore a Kân Bridge in Thaâ-hwâ (op. cit., p. 16, No. 101); but this would be too far north to be in any way connected with Pi-king. Finally, there was a Kân district (Kân Chou), 景州, during the T'ang and Sung periods, which corresponded to the modern Hwê province (see Dumoutier's "Hoa-lu," p. 40); but this lies too far south for our purpose.


1 "It was at Hêng Shan that for a long time past (in A.D. 347) the precious wares, brought in by ships from far-lying countries for barter, had been landed" (Ma Tuan-lân, op. cit., p. 427). It is well, therefore, to take note of this entrepôt for ancient oceanic trade.
p. 315, n. 1, after No. (7). Add:

p. 316, note, l. 8. Pé-t'êng. This is the Bâch-jâng (actual Thai-bâh) River of the Annamese (see op. cit., p. 178). It was also called Vôn-kû (see Des Michels, op. cit., p. 221, and cf. with Vân-kiêp at end of same note).

p. 317, ll. 4, 5, and n. 1. The river T'au-hwa Shwei, 桃花水, mentioned in the "San-kwo Chih" as being in the Wu-ko country (= country of the Akas or Khâ Kô, south-west of Yüang-chiang on the Red River; see these Addenda, note to p. 159), is evidently the Red River.


p. 321, note, l. 4. Ou-lâk. In Dumoutier, op. cit., p. 8, this name is spelled 懿駒 (Ou-lo), and Lâk-viet (Lo-yûeh) is spelled 越 (Ho-yûeh), these being the forms, he says, which obtained during the (Chinese) Chou dynasty (till n.c. 255); under the next one of the Ts'ìn (n.c. 255-206), the country came to be called Tôi-Öu, 西甌 (Hai-Ou), or Ou-lâk, 觀貉 (Ou-ho).

p. 322, l. 2. Cities built in a form which it is fancied resemble a conch-shell are by no means rare in Indo-China. Two more instances occur in Siâm, viz. Sukhothai and Lamp'hûn (see my "Siam's Intercourse with China" in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for October, 1900, p. 373). Dumoutier, op. cit., p. 9, says the name of Kô-lwa was due to the elliptical outline of its walls, which recalled the shape of a Lwâa shell (i.e. a saîkha shell).

p. 323, ll. 11, 12. Since writing the lines here referred to, I have had an opportunity of paying a personal visit to the vestiges of Kô-lwâ or Lwâ-thân, in December, 1902 (see the brief account I have given of that visit in the Asiatic Quarterly Review for July, 1903). The remains of the ancient triple enceinte of earthen walls with vestiges of a royal palace, etc., lie in the Dong-ân district, at ten kilometres as the crow flies almost due north of Hà-nôï, six kilometres almost due east of the junction of the Canal des Rapides with the Red River, and five kilometres north-west of the Hà-nôï-Bak-niû railway line. On their site rises the present Kô-lwâ village as a memento of the ancient and famed Kô-lwâ.
city. It is the only spot uncovered with jungle. The geographical position is about long. 105° 50' E., lat. 21° 6' N.

p. 325, n. 1. "Hanoi, s'il faut en croire les annales chinoises, était un port de mer vers l'an 600 de notre ère. Il y a deux siècles à peine le golfe du Tonkin, beaucoup plus rétréci, présentait sur le littoral la ville de Hung-yén où les Hollandais avaient établi des comptoirs : puis, successivement, grâce aux apports du Songkoi, émergèrent des eaux les vastes territoires de Nam-dinh, de Ninh-binh, de Hai-duong, de Haiphong, de Quang-yén¹. . . La génération actuelle, écrivaient MM. Bouinais et Paulius, 'a été témoin dans la province de Ninh-binh de la formation du canton de Kim-son depuis 1831.' . . . Le minimum des dépôts limoneux [du fleuve Rouge] . . . serait de 1728 millions de mètres cubes [par an]" (L'Indo-Chine Républicaine of Dec. 11th, 1902). The delta of the Red River would gain about 30 metres seawards each year, if we are to judge from the actual site of the stela commemorating, in a.d. 1010, the erection of a temple at Bô Hái, 布海 (Pu Hai), which stood then, as declared in the inscription, on the seashore, whereas it is now about 30 kilometres inland (see Dumoutier's "Portulan," p. 40). Bô-hái arose on the site of the present Kí-bô village, in the Vú-tien district (see Dumoutier's "Hoa-lu," p. 3), just a couple of miles due east of the present Nam-diên, and on the opposite (eastern) bank of the Red River. Hence, the seashore in Ptolemy's time must have been quite close to Hā-nōi and Kó-lwá, stretching thence almost due south in the direction of the present Nin-biên and Chiên-zúi, which latter, as we shall see directly, is not improbably Ptolemy's Sindā. No wonder, then, that in De Donis' map Aganagara (Hā-nōi or Kó-lwá) is marked close by the seashore.

p. 327, l. 4. According to the "An-nan Chih-lüo," p. 211 transl., Tā-kiuen, son of Lī-p'hōt-tū's elder brother, re-established the capital at Long-bien.

p. 328, l. 12 from bottom. According to the "An-nan Chih-lüo," p. 216, in a.d. 862 Hā-nōi was called Ying-ch'ēng, 嬢城.

p. 329, ll. 10, 11. According to the Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 473, Hā-nōi was called Thang-long, 昇龍, under the Lè, this name being changed to 昇隆, Thang-long, at the time of Jā-long (first quarter of the nineteenth century). Dumoutier says the first form was adopted when the capital was transferred thither from Hwā-lū, i.e. in a.d. 1010 (see "Hoa-lu," p. 59).

¹ This is far too sweeping an assertion, and only applies to parts of such territories, except Nam-dinh and Hai-phong.
p. 331, ll. 14, 15. Lă-thăn and Dăi-lă stood on a site corresponding to the present north-western part of Hă-nôi town, as I have personally ascertained on the spot itself.

p. 334, l. 10. According to the "An-nan Chih-lü," p. 89, however, in A.D. 1284–5 Lo-ch'êng (i.e. Lwâ-thăn or Kô-lwâ) was retaken by the Annamese, which means that at this period it had again become the Chinese seat of government.

p. 334, ll. 17 et seqq. Sinda

It was only after this section had been in print that I discovered that the latitude of Sinda given in Ptolemy’s text, after the Nobbe edition, as being 16° 40’ is almost certainly an error for 13° 40’ or thereabouts. For not only is Sinda placed in Ptolemy’s list between Kortatha (lat. 12° 30’) and Pagrasa (lat. 14° 30’), but it is also marked in such a position in De Donis’ map (see p. 346 above). Such being the case, the rectified Ptolemaic latitude of Sinda would be 16° 40’ = 19° 25’ true; and, bearing in mind that in De Donis’ map this town is located near the seashore, its position would become fixed at the Kúa Băng Bay, within Cape Băng (Cap Rond of French maps).

If, however, Pagrasa is the old Chü-su stronghold on the northern bank of the Sông Voi (‘Elephant River’) in 19° 5’ N. lat., as we have suggested (see these Addenda above, note to p. 311, ll. 4, 5), the site of Sinda would have to be sought for nearly half a degree more to the south, i.e. somewhere about Vîn, close by the mouth of the Song-kâ River. Here no ancient name similar to Sinda is recorded, except the very ones of the ‘Elephant River’ (Hsiang-shuei, Hsiang-p’u), and of the adjoining territory (Hsiang-lin), provided the term Hsiang, ‘Elephant,’ in these can be proved to be the translation or transcript of a local toponym Sindhura (= Sinda). But this is very doubtful, nor is any evidence at hand as to the Song-kâ River bearing of old the name Sindhu or any other similar one.

On the other hand, it is interesting to notice that not far north of the rectified position (19° 25’ N. lat.) which we have found in the Tables for Sinda, and precisely in 20° 4’ N. lat., an old seaport existed called Shên-t’ou, 神投 (Shên-t’ou, Sin-t’u; Ann. Thôn-dôu), mentioned in Annamese records since A.D. 1005. Under the Annamese Lê dynasty its name was changed to 神符, Shên-fû (Ann. Thôn-p’hû), while more recently it came to be called Chêng-tai, 正大 (Ann. Chiên-dài or Chiên-zài); it is the Chinh Dai of French maps, in the Yên-Mô district, province of Ninh-bĩn (see Dumoutier’s “Hoa-lu,” p. 49). It may, or may not, be the Shên- i-can, 神灣, seaport mentioned by I-tsing in the seventh century
(see above, p. 250, n. 1). In any case, its name Shên-t'ou looks much like a transcript of either Sindhu or Sindhava, and forcibly suggests not only Ptolemy's Sinda, but also the Sender-fālit of the Arab navigators (vide supra, p. 248, note, and p. 346). It should be observed that Shên-t'ou (and its historical continuation Chiñ-dāi of the present day) lies in proximity to the spurs of the low hills bounding on the south the deltaic plain of the Red River, and close by the Kúa Dāi, its westernmost outlet into the sea. It must thus have been a very important seaport and centre of trade in the old days.

If, however, we locate Sinda at Shên-t'ou or Chiñ-dāi, we must look for Pagrasa further to the north, where there are no ancient places on the low deltaic plain towards the seaboard except Hái-duong (ancient Yang-ch'üen, 陽泉, Ann. Zuang-tvien) and Kwâng-yen (ancient Ning-hai, 宁海, Ann. Niê-hâi), both mentioned since B.C. 200. The only toponym resembling Pagrasa lower down is that of the Bích, 碧, Pi (Pek or Poy) seaport, mentioned since 208 B.C. (see Dumontier's "Portulan Ann.,," p. 42), corresponding to the present Lach Tran outlet of the Sông Chu in 19° 53' N. lat. This place, which would suit very well for Pagrasa, would prove too far south if Sinda is to be located at Chiñ-dāi.

In conclusion, it is very difficult, nay, well-nigh impossible, to settle the location of Sinda until the figures for its latitude as given in the Nobbe edition of Ptolemy are critically corrected by referring to a certain number of reliable old manuscript copies of Ptolemy's work.

p. 336, l. 12. Sun-ch'i-chiang. In the "An-nan Chih-lüo," pp. 72, 467, and 472, occurs a mention of a 三 帶 江, Sun-tai-chiang, district or territory and river, which latter is formed by the union of the Red, Clear, and Black Rivers (To-shuei) with the Lung River. This refers to A.D. 1300.

p. 342, n. 1, l. 3. See the more recent account of these potentates by Capt. Cupet (in "Mission Pavie, Géographie et Voyages," t. iii, pp. 297 et seq., and also map on pl. xv). The 'Water King,' termed Patao Īa by the Jarāi and Sadet Lūm by the Lāu, resides on the Lāu slope of the Campā-Kambojan mountain range, in long. 107° 59' E., lat. 13° 32' N.; he can, by means of his charms, cause a universal flood. The 'Fire King,' called Patao Ngo by the Jarāi and Sadet Fāi by the Lāu, resides near by, but on the Campā side of the same range, in long. 108° 5' E., lat. 13° 32'-5 N.; he can, by means of his magic sword, destroy by fire and slaughter the whole cosmos.
An Annamese work written at the end of the eighteenth century locates the two dreaded sorcerers at fourteen days' march west of Cape Varella (i.e. in about the same position as above), in the kingdom of Nan-p' an, 南蠻 (Ann. Nam-ban), in the west of the Biñ-diñ province, and adds that in the same country is a mysterious city Pêh-shih, 白石城 (Ann. Bak-thak) = Ba-sak, perhaps Basak in North Kamboja? (see Dumoutier's "Portulan Ann.," p. 61).

The above references prove that the 'Fire' and 'Water' Kings of both Châm and Annamese tradition were the same personages as are found down to the present day among the Jarai.

p. 344, n. 3, l. 3. Tăn-wien. The first character of this name is 織 in the "An-nan Chih-lüo," p. 63, but it is practically equivalent to the other.

p. 346, ll. 16 et seqq. See above, note to p. 334, l. 17, in these Addenda, as regards the ancient port Shen-t'ou (Sindhu or Sindhava) which existed on this tract of sea-coast.

pp. 348, 349. Indoï, Sindoi. Cf. Sindhu-sauvira, a people in the north-east region according to the "Bṛhat Saṁhitā"; and see p. 346, ll. 10, 11 from bottom, as regards the location of the Sindi in De Donis' map.

p. 351, n. 1. According to the "An-nan Chih-lüo," pp. 96 and 102 (date 1267), some of the Liau on the Tonkin borders (Shan Liau, etc.) filed their teeth (like the Jarai and Radé of East Kamboja nowadays).

p. 352, l. 2. Hsi-t'u. Their identification with the Hê-ch'ih, 黑齒, or 'Black Teeth' tribes, put forward in the Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, pp. 280, 281, leaves us as wise as before, for tribes who stained or lacquered their teeth black were, and still are, numerous, as Annamese, Khmers, etc., even to the Bré or Lakû (a tribe of Karens) in Upper Burma (see the "Upper Burma Gazetteer," pt. i, vol. i, p. 534). For the Hsi-t'u tribe see, again, above, p. 355, note.

p. 352, note, l. 11. 'Sea Liau.' This may mean the Orang Laut, 'men of the sea,' of the Malay Archipelago (Liau = a transcript for Laut?).

p. 357, ll. 15-18. Kudu. Houghton, in the Indian Antiquary, vol. xxii, 1893, pp. 129-36, says that the Kudu people are chiefly found in the Katha district of Upper Burma, but that they are comparatively recent immigrants into Burma from North-East Tibet, viai the passes north of Bhamo. "The Kudós would seem to have been an advance guard of the Kachin race." Linguistically he
found them allied to the Sak or Sek (Thek) of the Kulådan valley in Arakan, their speech belonging to the Kachin-Näga sub-group.

The K'na-to are, on the other hand, by several recent writers connected with the Lo-lo, but this view seems to me hardly plausible, for, though they speak dialects derived from the Lo-lo, they have been distinct from the Lo-lo for centuries, and racially belong to the dark-complexioned Wah-Ho-ni group. A clan of the Palaungs (who are practically Wah) round Nam Sän, the Palaung capital, bears, in fact, the name Kadu (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," pt. i, vol. i, p. 486).

p. 358, n. 2, ll. 13, 14. See also Ko-Kuo-lo, 葛窟猊 (for Kā-la-kā), in the "Nan-chao Ye-shih" (p. 168 transl.).

p. 359, l. 2. 'Tiger-Heads.' Cf. the Vyāghramukha ('Tiger Face') people in the east region, according to the "Bṛhat Samhitā."

p. 359, ll. 4-6. Kulāṭa becomes Kolūka in the Rāmāyana, iv, 43, 8, of Gorresio's edition. The "Bṛhat Samhitā" locates the Kulāṭas in the north-western region, and a people Kulāṭa in the north-eastern; these latter are seemingly Ptolemy's Kudutai, unless they are to be identified with the Kolita or Kulta tribes in Western Asām and northward of Sadiya.

p. 359, n. 2, l. 4. But the alternative form Coloman appearing likewise in some MSS. of Marco Polo's work would apply, on the other hand, to the Kwo-lo-Mān, 獠落蠻 (see "Nan-chao Ye-shih," p. 168 transl.), who are a branch of the Loços.

p. 362, ll. 6-8. That means, roughly, between Lao-kai and Lang-sön (or Kao-bang). Longhena connects them with the Uberae of Pliny (see Pullé's "Studi Italiani di Filologia Indo-Iranica," vol. iv, Firenze, 1901; Appendices, p. 30, n. 1). A tribe calling itself Khuai-B'rrō, and termed Khā Mong-khon by outsiders, dwells on the western watershed of the Annam range, in the Lān provinces of Kham-mān and Song-khon (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 544).

p. 364, ll. 9-14. P'ul-la. In the "Nan-chao Ye-shih" (p. 176 transl.) the name of this tribe is spelled 獠喇, which hardly makes any difference. The Ma-la are therein (p. 177) said to be a distinct, albeit akin, tribe, and are located in the hill tracts of the Wang-nung, 工弄都, district (south-west of Mongtzê).

Recently Mr. A. Henry found that in one of the P'ul-la villages, isolated among the mountains to the north of Mēng-tsz (Mongtzê), the stature of women was but little above 4½ feet and that of men just a trifle over 4½ feet, all being otherwise well shaped.
They seem to be the remnants of an extensive pygmy race (see *Journal Anthrop. Inst.*, vol. xxxiii, 1903, pp. 96-107). The *P'un-la* may be, then, the present-day representatives of the *Chiu-yau* and *Phong* pygmies of Chinese and Annamese tradition (see above, in these Addenda, remarks on p. 259, n. 3).

With the *P'un-la*, etc., cf. the *Palola* tribe mentioned in the "Bṛhat Saṁhitā" (see above, in these Addenda, note to p. 155, l. 6 from bottom).

p. 366, note, l. 6. *Biaju*. This name is written also *Bajow*, *Bajou*.

p. 367, n. 3. On face-tattooing see, moreover, p. 175, n. 2, and p. 675, n. †, above. The custom is also in favour among Wild Waḥ, in the north, about the sources of the Nam Ma, whose women tattoo their faces and bosoms (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," pt. i, vol. i, p. 514), among the Chin of Burmā (op. cit., p. 466), and among the Loi-lông Karens, whose men tattoo two black squares beneath their chins (op. cit., p. 543). In the "Nan-chao Ye-shih" (p. 174 transl.) it is stated of the *Pei-chū*, 比苴 (Pē-k-tsōu or Pet-tes), tribe: they tattoo on their foreheads, as an ornament, a moon crescent. This is the *Ché-li* (= Ch'ien Rung) custom, termed *Tiao-t'ī*, 表題 ("Tattooing of the Forehead"). Tattooing of the forehead is in the "An-nan Chih-lüo" (p. 96 transl.) ascribed to some of the *Liau* tribes. There can be no doubt, in both instances, that Wild Waḥ are the people implied, who are settled to the north and west of Ch'ien Rung, and are certainly the *Pu* or *P'ū* of the Chinese.

p. 368, ll. 1-12. *Pu*. The "Nan-chao Ye-shih" (p. 163 transl.) states that it is by mistake that the character 濮, *P'ū*, has been employed to write the name *P'ū-jén*, instead of 濕, *Pu*, which is the correct one occurring in the records of the Chou dynasty (b.c. 1122-255). Such being the case, the 濕, *Pu*, *P'ū-jén* or *P'ū-rén*, and the *Wei-lu* ("Little Niggers") or *P'ăng Pu*,

1 "All the women have their faces tattooed, unlike the Chins of the Chin-Hills proper, who do not tattoo . . . the pattern differs with the tribes."
2 "The Chin-bōks cover the face with nicks, lines, and dots of a uniform design. The women's breasts are also surrounded with a circle of dots."
3 "The Yindus tattoo in horizontal lines across the face, showing glimpses of the skin."
4 "The Chin-bōns tattoo an entire dead black and are the most repellent in appearance . . . The men are not tattooed at all.
5 "The beauty of a Chin woman is gauged by her tattooing. The origin of the practice is still uncertain, but from the fact that it is only the tribes near the Burmese who practice it, it would appear probable that the first intention was to protect the women from being carried off, or to enable them to be easily discovered if they were carried off." (Op. cit., loc. cit.)
of the commencement of the Chou dynasty would be racially identical. There can be no doubt as to the people now called Pu, P'iu-jen, arboreal and caudate Pu, being Wah or Law, for the habitat assigned to the Pu or P'iu (west of Ch'ien Tung and P'u-ehr) corresponds to the Wah territory, while the somatic characteristics (very dark complexion, etc.) ascribed to the Pu or P'iu also agree. The P'iu or Pu may, and very likely are, at the same time racially connected with the P'u-ehr or P'hua-Ü, as I have suggested on p. 369 above.

p. 368, note, l. 6. E. Roux, in his "Aux Sources de l'Irraouaddy," p. 62, speaking of their kinsmen, the Kiu-tsê, living about the headwaters of the Kiu Kiang or Nam Kiu (the western branch of the Upper Iravati), says that their women have blue designs tattooed round the mouth and on the tip of their noses. The Kiu-tsê are, in reality, the tribe more properly known as Turong.

p. 369, ll. 1, 2. Palaung. The Palaungs, says Colonel Woodthorpe in the Geographical Journal (June, 1896, p. 596), are scattered all over the Shan States. They are Buddhist, and are the gunmakers of Ch'ien Tung. In the "Upper Burma Gazetteer" (pt. 1, vol. i, pp. 483 et seqq.) they are also termed Rumai, and described as being both linguistically and racially connected with the Wah, as well as with the Khá Muk (Kh'mu) and Khá Met (Lamet). The name Parauk or Paroña for one of their clans (see Journal R.A.S., July, 1897, p. 456) occurs, in fact, also among the Wah (see "Upper Burma Gazetteer," pt. 1, vol. i, p. 494). It is from the former that the Yô, Yôga (Roga) claim descent (op. cit., p. 569). Another clan of the Palaung is termed Kadu (op. cit., p. 486), but this seems to have no connection with the Kadu of the Katha district in Upper Burma, who, as we have seen, are classed with the Kachin-Naga sub-group. It must, on the contrary, be attached to the Ka-to and Ho-ni group (Ptolemy's Kudutai).

p. 375, l. 8 from bottom. A Nyen-nan Kiang is, however, mentioned in the "An-nan Chih-lüo," p. 190 transl., under a date corresponding to A.D. 1284–5.

p. 384, note, ll. 7, 8 et seqq. See these Addenda above, note to p. 84, l. 18 et seqq. In "Hobson-Jobson," new ed., p. 29, I find the bewildering statement that the Arabic dual form Andamân "is said to be from Agamites, the Malay [?] name of

1 The Pu of the Chou period were settled in Hupeh, and assisted Wu Wang against Chou Hsin (the last emperor of the Shang dynasty) in a.c. 1122.
the aborigines'!! The originator of this etymology positively deserves a *prix de rosière*.

p. 388, note, l. 4. *Batu Berhala*. This is also the name, according to Balfour’s *Cyclopaedia*, vol. i, p. 299, of “a stone idol highly venerated by the Dyaks.” One, called *Batu Ka va*, was discovered at a point of the Sarawak River, North-West Borneo, at about six miles above Sarawak town. Another one occurs “on the Samarkand river, near Ledah Tanah,” and is called by the Malays *Batu Berhala*, or the ‘Idol Stone.’

p. 388, note, ll. 13 et seqq. *Zâm*. In “Hobson-Jobson,” 2nd ed., p. 448, the value of the *zâm* is given as 12’ of a geographical degree, or 12 nautical miles, and also as a nautical watch of three hours. The former estimate is, certainly, purely theoretical in point of actual sailing distance. In this respect we are unable to assign to the *zâm* a practical value of anything above 10 miles, but should think that 7 to 8 is nearer the mark. Example: Distance *Serirâ–Kalah* (Palembang–Takôpa), 120 *zâm*. Actual distance about 900 miles. Value of the *zâm* = 7½ miles. This is taken from “Hobson-Jobson,” loc. cit. The value of the *zâm* should furthermore be compared with that of the *Kêng* or Chinese nautical watch, which, as we have seen above, is equal to 60 *li* (i.e. about 10 miles), or to 2½ hours.

p. 391, l. 17. In *circa* 1330 Friar Jordanus (Hakl. Soc., 1863), p. 30, speaks of an island where all the men and women go absolutely naked, and have in place of money comminuted *gold* like fine sand.


p. 396, l. 8 from bottom. *Tîlan-chong*. Capt. Hamilton, in 1709–20, speaks of it as “*Tallang-jang*, the uninhabited island.” Further on he refers to “*Chitty-andeman*, which is the southernmost of the Andemans.” And he adds: “The middle cluster is . . . all but one, well inhabited. They are called the *Somereva* islands, because on the south end of the largest island is an hill that resembles the top of an umbrella or *somereva* [read *Sumbreiro, Sombrero*]” (Pinkerton’s “Collection of Voyages,” vol. viii, p. 431).

p. 397, note, l. 16. In the “*Voyages of Sir James Lancaster*” (Hakl. Soc.), p. 12, the *Pulo Sambilam* referred to (in 1592) are those in Malacca Strait, and not, as the editor remarks in a footnote, the Nikobârs. He adds: “Little Nicobar Island is so called [Sambelang].”

p. 397, note, l. 16 from bottom. *Shom-ben*. Cf. the *Carma-
deīpa people alluded to in the "Bṛhat Samhitā." Carman (Pāli Canma) = 'shield,' 'buckler,' 'leather.'

p. 398, n. 1, ll. 6–10. Correa ("Lendas da India," vol. iv, p. 306) tells of an expedition having been also sent to the 'Island of Gold' by governor Afonso de Sousa, in 1543. See, moreover, the story he relates about the Ilha do Ouro in vol. iii, pp. 240, 241 (A.D. 1528). Mendez Pinto ("Voyages," London, 1692, pp. 15–25) locates the 'Island of Gold' near the east coast of Sumatra, in 5° S. lat., and refers to several unsuccessful expeditions sent on its discovery.

p. 399, ll. 21, 22. 'Island of Cocadoon Trees.' "The cocadoon palm was brought into India from Ceylon, and originally most probably from the Nicobar Islands. In the Tamilian languages it has no name except Tenna-maram, 'the southern tree.' Its fruit is called Ten'aankai and Te'ukai" (Asiatic Quarterly Review, July, 1897, p. 100).

p. 400, n. 2, l. 18. Nālikera Islands. The "Bṛhat Samhitā" locates a Nālikera people in the south-eastern region, thus leaving no doubt that the inhabitants of the Nikobārs are intended. It also mentions a people Carma-deīpa, inhabiting a shield-shaped island (see these Addenda above, note to p. 397, l. 16 from bottom). In A.D. 645 Hwén-tsang refers to a Nālikera-dīpa. In the "Kathā-sarit-sāgara" (Tawney's transl., vol. i, pp. 525, 527, 551) a large and beautiful island, Nārikela, is alluded to, in which are four mountains named Maināka, Vṛṣhabha, Cakra [= Sombrero?], and Balāhaka.

p. 400, n. 2, l. 20 from bottom. Cape Negrais. Probably from Nāga-rāsa; see above in these Addenda, note to p. 52, l. 7. Tārāntaḥ's Balgu (1608) may be either Baragū or Bhīla-gyūn, but certainly not Pegu proper, which he terms Hamsavatī (q.v. in "Hobson-Jobson," p. 184).

p. 400, n. 2, ll. 1–13 from bottom. Barahmagār. In "Hobson-Jobson," 2nd ed., p. 623, this toponym is conjecturally connected with Barra de Negrais, as in Balbi (1583), Fitch (1586), and Bocarro (1613).

p. 401, note, ll. 7–19. In the "Voyages of Sir James Lancaster" (Hakl. Soc., 1877, p. 72) the natives of the Nikobārs are described as follows (date, 1602):—"The people of these islands goe naked, hauing only the pruinities bound up in a pece of linnen cloath, which commeth about their middles like a girdle, and so between their twist. They are all of a tauny colour, and annoint their faces with divers colours; they are well limmed," etc. Their priests or sacrificers (devil dancers?) wore a pair of
painted horns on their heads, and behind them a tail was hanging down.

p. 402, note, ll. 19–24. Barahnagar. Cf. Bar-nagar, Baranagar, or Vijaya-nagar in Assam, in 1580. If so, Barahnagar = the old Bijanagar or Binsagar kingdom on the east coast of India (?). This is not altogether improbable, while tribes of people in the undress style, described by Ibn Batūta, are settled in the neighbourhood. “In the Chânda district of the Central Provinces of India the women in the wilder tracts wear no clothes at all, but only a string round the waist, to which they suspend a bunch of leaves before and another behind. The same practice is reported to exist in the Kol country, and also in Orissa” (Journal of the Anthropological Institute, vol. iv, 1875, p. 376, note). Cf. the Nagna-parañ Śavāra people, mentioned in the “Brhat Saṁhitā” as settled in the south-east region. This term I take to mean ‘naked and leaf-wearing Śavāras,’ and not ‘leaf-eating Śavāras,’ as has been conjectured by other writers.

p. 402, note, l. 3 from bottom. Narkondam. In “Hobson-Jobson,” p. 617, the strange etymology Naraka-kundam, ‘Pit of Hell,’ is recorded and endorsed with the suggestion that it better applies to Barren Island. I feel unable to accept it, and prefer mine till proof of the contrary.

p. 406. To the list of names relating to the Nikobārs add the following entries:


A.D. 1514. Nicobar (Giov. da Empoli), ibid.


A.D. 1592–1602. Nicobar Islands (“Voyages of Sir James Lancaster,” Hakl. Soc., 1877, pp. 10, 15, 27; the people are Muḥammadans (p. 27) and go naked (p. 72)).

See also infra, remarks on p. 506 in these Addenda, for a Chinese reference to Kar-Nikobār and to the Nikobār Archipelago in general, in the eighth century A.D.

p. 410, ll. 11–14 from bottom. The “Muhit,” A.D. 1554 (see Reinaud’s Introduction to Abū-l-Fedā, p. 436), refers to an island Sarjal as one of the Najbari (Nikobār) group. It was sighted on the route from Ceylon to Malacca. Reinaud thinks it may be the Great Nikobār. Cf. the island of Zolore touched by Giovanni da Empoli (1503) on his way from Caruspa in Malabar (= Carhula ?) to Malacca (see De Gubernatis’ “Storia dei Viaggiatori Italiani,” Livorno, 1875, p. 114).

p. 421, n. 2, ll. 7–11. I have since discovered that the
Philippines—or, at any rate, Luzon—were already known in A.D. 982 to the Chinese under the name Ma-yi, Ma-yit,麻逸,摩逸, and probably also to the Arabs as Mānid or Mānd, which forms occur in Dimashqi, in circa 1300. I propose to offer the full demonstration of this at an early opportunity.

p. 423, ll. 6 et seqq. Cf. the names of the mountains in Narikela Island as given in the "Kathā-sarit-sāgara" (see these Addenda above, remarks on p. 400, n. 2, l. 18): Maināka (= Malhan (?), cf. Mānyak, Maniolai), Vṛṣabha, Cakra (= Chauri, i.e. Sombrero ?), and Balāhaka.

p. 423, n. 1, l. 17. In my "Nagarakretāgama list of Countries," etc., in the Journal R.A.S., July, 1905, pp. 505-511, I have shown that the date of the foundation of Singapore must be put down between 1280 and 1320, and is possibly 1284.

p. 426, table, third entry on left side. Pei-p’ing-t’ou Shan, lit. 'North-level-head Island.' I now think this is Chauri, i.e. Sombrero, which is low on the north and rises steep with a rocky pinnacle on the south end.

p. 435, ll. 7-19. The term occurs likewise in Khmēr in the form Phumār, Bumār (pron. Pumsān), where it designates the Betonica or betony plant. Pumsān-tis (Bhimsān-deśa) is refined camphor (exotic), whereas common camphor is termed KARBōur (written Kārpūr). In the "Āin-i-Akbarī" (circa 1590) occurs the passage: "Of the various kinds of camphor the best is called Ribāhi or Kaisūri ... In some books camphor in its natural state is called ... Bhimsni." On this the editor of "Hobson-Jobson," new ed., p. 152, remarks: "Bhimsni is more properly Bhimseni, and takes its name from the demigod Bhimsēn [Bhīmasēna], second son of Pāṇḍu." In Yule’s Marco Polo, 2nd ed., vol. ii, p. 304, Bhimseni is explained as meaning Sumatran camphor, so known to the Indūs. A view of Abū-l-Fazl, the author of the "Āin," is moreover quoted, according to which Bālus is the worst camphor.

p. 438, continuation of n. 3 on p. 436, l. 5. Edrisī (op. cit., pp. 80, 81) names Herīj, Harīj, or Haranj (as he severally spells this toponym) along with Jābah and Salābāt (Sumatra). Cf. Hamilton’s (1720) "Bocca de Carangera" = the Bāsak mouth of the Mē-Khōng in South Kamboja, termed Charachina by Mendez Pinto (1540).

Teixeira (Sinclair & Ferguson’s transl., p. 2) refers to camphor in Achīn (1600).

According to the "Mahāvaṃsa" (ch. 58; Wijesīhā’s transl., p. 98), camphor was sent in circa A.D. 1065 by the king of Rāmaṇīṇa (Pegu) to Ceylon.
See Yule’s “Marco Polo” for mentions of camphor in the Andāmāns, etc.

p. 439, n. 1, § (3), ll. 2-5. Mansūrah. In “Hobson-Jobson,” p. 152, Mas’ūdī’s passage on camphor in the country of Kānsūr (vol. i, p. 338, transl.) is commented upon in the following strain: “The same work at iii, 49, refers back to this passage as the ‘country of Mansūrah.’ Probably Masūdī wrote correctly Fansūrah.” I do not see my way to agree with this view, for the difference in spelling between Fansūr and Mansūrah is not so trifling. Besides, the same view is contradicted in the very passage quoted lower down from the “Āin” (circa 1590): “The camphor tree is a large tree growing in the ghaunts of Hindostan and in China. A hundred horsemen and upwards may rest in the shade of a single tree.” This confirms the evidence we have gathered from earlier sources as to the presence of camphor in India in § (1) of n. 1 on p. 439 above, and proves, furthermore, that (besides Blumea shrubs) real camphor-trees (Dryobalanops?) existed in the mountainous tracts (Ghāats) of Southern India. A camphor was, moreover, extracted in Malabar from the roots of the ‘wild cinnamom’ (probably some Cassia sp.), having several of the properties of real camphor and more fragrance (see “Hobson-Jobson,” p. 543).

p. 439, n. 1, ll. 4-6 from bottom. The first western mention of camphor is believed to occur in the Greek medical writer Aētius (circa A.D. 540, see extract in “Hobson-Jobson,” p. 152), who terms it caphra, seemingly from the Arabic kāfūr, representing the Sanskrit karpūra. Imrū-l-Kais (sixth century) writes, in fact, kāfūr, as we have seen. In Malay (not only in Javanese as stated in “Hobson-Jobson,” p. 151) kāpur (pron. kāpor), means ‘lime,’ ‘cement,’ ‘mortar,’ ‘plaster for building,’ and ‘camphor’ in the compositum kāpur bārūs, etc. This is likewise the case in Mōn (ఫుస్ఫుస్, kh’pōs), in Khmēr (kombōr, kumbōr), and in Siamese (pūn = pūr), which are one and all corrupted forms of Skr. karpūra, and mean ‘lime.’ It is, therefore, impossible that one could accept the suggestion referred to in “Hobson-Jobson,” loc. cit., that the word karpūra “was originally Javanese”!! The above meaning of ‘lime,’ ascribed to karpūra and its Further-Indian derivatives, should be compared with the significations ascribed to pāṃśuḥ of ‘dust,’ ‘dirt,’ etc. (see p. 435 above).

p. 440, n. 1, l. 8. Camphor oil. P’ō-lū Kau (Bā-lūt balm) is mentioned as early as A.D. 515 in the history of the Liang dynasty as being an abundant product in Lang-ya-hsin, i.e. C’hump’hōn; see above, pp. 112-115 (vide Groeneveldt, in “Essays relating
to Indo-China," ser. ii, p. 135). Again, it is mentioned in the New History of the T'ang dynasty, bk. 222, as having been sent in tribute between 627 and 649 A.D. by the State of To-yuän or Nou-t'o-yuän (= Dagūn, now Rangoon, or else Dun-wun?—v. p. 831 infra). (See Young-Pao, vol. ix, p. 283, n. 37, text.)

p. 441, n. 1, l. 17 from bottom. Hardolah. Yule, in "Hobson-Jobson," new ed., p. 430, connects this term with Haritāl= 'yellow arsenic,' 'orpiment,' saying that Ibn Baṭūṭa "seems oddly to confound it with camphor." But probably yellow (or strong) camphor is what is meant.

p. 443, n. *. l. 3. This may be the Batai camphor (from the Batt'a country?) referred to in "Hobson-Jobson," p. 151.

p. 444, n. 2. In 1589 Ralph Fitch (see J. H. Ryley's "Ralph Fitch," London, 1899, p. 189) says that Borneo camphor "growth in canes." This may be explained (as done in "Hobson-Jobson," p. 152, with regard to Ibn Baṭūṭa's version) "by the statement of Barbosa, that the Borneo camphor as exported was packed in tubes of bamboo." But Ibn Baṭūṭa's case is somewhat different, although the same practice may have been observed on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula (Mulā-Jāvah) with regard to camphor collected from Dryobalanops trees. These, it may now be confidently asserted, were to be found of old even further north than Pérak and Kemāman (see p. 436 above, n. 3), perhaps as far up as the Kraḥ Isthmus, since Lang-yu-hsien (i.e. the Kraḥ-Ch'umphōn State) produced, we have seen (supra, in these Addenda, remarks on p. 440, n. 1), camphor oil in the sixth century A.D., and To-yuän State (probably Dagūn, now Rangoon) sent the same article in tribute during the century next following. These facts further confirm our location of Ibn Baṭūṭa's Kakula at either Kelantan or Ligor. N.B.—An islet Koḥ Kraḥ (Kakura), the Cara of old maps, lies just off Ligor bight. It will, moreover, now be seen that Serapion's statement as to camphor being exported from the Kalāh country (see above, p. 437, note), i.e. the west coast of the Malay Peninsula about Takōpa (Takkola or Kakkola), was perfectly correct in his time (ninth—tenth century). It may be interesting to notice, in connection with I-tsing's Ka-ko-la or Ka-ko-ra, that kakaras is the Malay name for the gharu tree or gaharu producing eagle-wood. Chia Tan in his itinerary, compiled A.D. 785—805 (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 373), refers to a kingdom Ko-ku-lo, 哥谷羅, on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, which, if not Kwāla Kurau, or Kwāla Gula, in North-West Pérak, may be Takkola or Kakkola (Takōpa). See below, in these Addenda, remarks on p. 506.
p. 451, l. 7. Shun-ta. Chao Ju-kua also mentions a piratical State Sun-t'a, 孫他, evidently Sunda, among the piratical States of the Archipelago (see T'oung-Pao, 1903, pp. 239, 240).

p. 451, note. Ta-pan and Jung-ya-lu. In another passage, referred to in T'oung-Pao, 1903, pp. 238, 239, Chao Ju-kua says that the Ta-pan State borders to the east on Ta Shé-p'o, called Jung-ya-lu, 戎牙路, also termed Chung-ka-lu, 重迦廬 (Jângala or Jakola = Malacca, see pp. 519–21 above). The same writer, moreover, enumerates both Ta-pan and Jung-ya-lu among the States bordering upon Chao-va, i.e. Java. All this shows that neither of them could be situated on Java Island.


p. 460, li. 1–14. The views I have here expressed find confirmation, I now notice, in the following passage occurring in "Hobson-Jobson" (p. 868): "The Sunda country is considered to extend from the extreme western point of the island to Cheribon, i.e. embracing about one-third of the whole island of Java. Hinduism appears to have prevailed in the Sunda country, and held its ground longer than in 'Java,' a name which the proper Javanese restrict to their own part of the island."

p. 463, l. 4. Friar Jordanus (1330), in his "Mirabilia Descripta" (Hakl. Soc., 1863, pp. 30, 31), evidently includes the whole of the Archipelago under the denomination Jana (Java), for he says that there "are produced cubeb[s] [which grow in Java proper], and nutmegs and mace [as well as cloves], and all the other finest spices [which are all produced in the Moluccas and not at all in Java] except pepper."

p. 463, n. 1, l. 3. This embassy of 433 was sent by Ho-lo-tan (on Shé-p'o or Tu-p'o Island?), which had already appeared at the Chinese Court in 430 (see Ma Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 505). The "Sung-shu," quoted in the Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 255, gives the date as the 11th year Yuan-chia = A.D. 434, instead of the 10th year (= A.D. 433). On this Ho-lo-tan State see our further remarks on p. 469 above, and n. 3 to same.

p. 463, n. 1, li. 10–12. P'o-ta. Two similar toponyms occur in the Chinese records, viz.: (1) 婆遮, P'o-ta (see China Review, vol. xiii, p. 337); (2) 披遮, Pa-t'a, a dependency of San-jo-ch'i (Palembang) according to Chao Ju-kua, 1205–58 (see T'oung-Pao, 1901, p. 135). This last may be the Batta or Battak country.

De Barros (in Ramusio, op. cit., vol. i, p. 391) mentions a Pedam (Padang?) between Quedam (Kedah) and Pera (Pérak). This may be meant for Cape (Tanjung) Piandang, on that coast just below Krian.

p. 467, ll. 6, 7. Tu-lo-shu. The Peguan Annals ("Rajadhiraj") mention a town and province, OOOO, Tulac'hi (Dhalaji), conquered along with Prome, etc., by King Rajadhiraj in a.d. 1397 during his war against Burma. This Tulac'hi can hardly be Thayet-myō (written Tharet, Saret), though it seems difficult to suggest another equivalent for it.

p. 469, n. 3, l. 9 from bottom. Ko-lo-tan. The first character should be read either Ho or Ko, and not Ko as done by Ma Tuan-lin's translator (op. cit., p. 466), and its Sanskrit equivalent is Ha, as in Ho-li Tsu (the 'Hari Plant,' i.e. the Haritaka = Terminalia chebula), Harivarman, etc. The Sanskrit and Indo-Chinese equivalents of Ho-lo-tan would thus be: Ha-la-ta, Ha-rā-ta, Araṭṭa (Hairat, Airat, the local vernacular name of Gujarāt), Haryāta, Aradhā, Hala-tānāh (country of the Hala or Aia tribes in central North Sumatra?), etc. The most agreeing toponyms would, therefore, be Krut and Gurōt, as I have pointed out above (p. 469, n. 3), while Aru, Hāru, or Ghore (as it is severally spelled in Malay records), on the north-east coast of Sumatra, seems to be out of the question, even in the possible compositum Aru-tānāh or Hāru-tānāh (Hāru-sthāna).

p. 471, ll. 2-8, and n. 2. On Po-lo-mén = Brahmadesa, i.e. the Tagōng district(?), and Po-sz State, which with Mien (Burmā, Mën, Mara [-mma]) and K'un-lun sent white elephants and perfumes to the king of Nan-Chao in Yün-nan, see these Addenda above, note to p. 68, l. 2, and remarks on p. 90, note.

There were, however, two Po-lo-mén States in the west of Burma, to wit:—

(1) Ta-ts'īn Po-lo-mén, 大秦窾羅門, a kingdom located in Chia Tan's itinerary, a.d. 785-805 (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 371), at 1,000 li west of the Mi-no, 彌諾, River (i.e. the Man-kathē or Manipur River) and at 300 li from Kāmarūpa (i.e. Asām), from which it was separated by a large mountain range. I, therefore, identify this kingdom with Sylhet (Siratha, which name the Chinese seem to have anagrammatized into Ta-sir = Ta-ts'īn).

(2) Hsiao Po-lo-mén, 小窾羅門 (lit. 'Little Brāhmaṇs'),
a kingdom in which the Mi-no, i.e. Manipur River, rises according to the "Man-shu," c. 860 (quoted in Bullet. Éc. Fr., t. iv, pp. 171, 172). Flowing thence in a southward direction, this river comes to Tou-mi-chia-mu, and separates into two branches encircling it. It is quite clear to me that the State here referred to is Manipur, while Tou-mi-chia-mu, or Tu-mi-ka-muk, Tumi-gàna (?), is Tummu or Tamu, Ptolemy's Tugma (see p. 33 above, and Appendix II, section 5, where we have conjecturally suggested Tugâna as an equivalent). Also vide infra, note to p. 568.

On this kingdom of the 'Lesser Brâhmaṇs' the "Man-shu" remarks that there no beef is eaten and that future events can be predicted (see Bulletin, vol. cit., p. 180), a description which well agrees with the one given in other Chinese records of the Po-lo-mên State lying in the neighbourhood of Shé-p'o (see p. 470 above). There can thus be no doubt that in the latter instance Hsiao Po-lo-mên, i.e. Manipur, is meant, and that Shé-p'o, its neighbour, cannot be Sumatra, and much less Java, but Upper Burmâ (Davāka, Shwebo ?); see p. 467 above.

After the above considerations the conjectural connection we have ventured to suggest between Brahmadesa (Tagōng district) and Po-lo-mên is no longer tenable; evidently the Chinese in the eighth and ninth centuries a.d. ignored such a designation, which very likely was already forgotten in the land itself, or else its range, which probably originally comprised the whole tract to the west of Tagaung to Āśām, may have become restricted to the westernmost portion of it (Sylhet, Manipur, Kāchār, and other States which remained longer and more intensely under the influence of Hinduism).

As regards Po-sz, it may not be altogether useless to recall that Pasuluka was a name for Burmā, or part of it (see p. 40 above). Whether this term is in any way connected with Paśupāla, a people in the north-east region, mentioned in the "Bṛhat Saṃhitā," xiv, 29, I am unable to judge.

p. 478, note, ll. 12, 13. Herbert, in his "Voyage de Perse," p. 409 (a.d. 1627), already suggested that Malacca was part of Ophir.

p. 482, ll. 5-9. The "Nan-Man Chuan" is simply the chapter on the Southern Barbarians in T'ang history. Chun-t'ū-lung Shan is, before this, mentioned in Chia Tan's itinerary (a.d. 785-805) in the form Kūn-dur-rung, and located at two days' sailing from Pânduranga (Phnang on the Cochin-China coast). Thence, in another five days' sailing the Chih, or Strait is reached (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 217). This, as we have already
seen, is the Singapore Strait, and Chia Tan adds, in fact, that on its northern shore lies the kingdom of Lo-yueh, 罗越 (i.e. Lagor or Ligor), or possibly M. Polo's [Ma]-la-vir, the Lareci of Arab navigators, while on the southern shore is the kingdom of Fo-shih (Bhoeja, i.e. Palembang). Chun-t'uo-lung cannot, therefore, be Kundur Island in Durian Strait, as I had conjectured before the translation of Chia Tan's itinerary had appeared in the Bulletin É. Fr., but is, most assuredly, Pulo Condore (Kundur) off the Lower Cochin-China coast, alluded to under the form K'un-lun by other Chinese writers.

p. 482, l. 18. The value $2'10''_r$ here given within parentheses should be corrected into $2'10''_t$ or 2·5, for it is a question of Chinese ch'i, 'feet,' of 10 ts'un, 'inches,' each. The gnomonic data referred to would yield by calculation, after rectification as just pointed out, a latitude of about $5^\circ$ N., which evidences that the gnomonic observation was made on the north coast of Sumatra, either at Achin or in the neighbourhood of Pasei.

p. 495, ll. 3 et seqq. Po-li, or Po-lo (= Pulei, Pulai), has been subsequently identified by me with Teixeira's Polê River and with the Pulai River (Sungei Pulai), flowing from the homonymous mountain range (Günong Pulai) to the Sea of the Straits, into which it debouches between Tanjung Bulus Cape and the western entrance to the Old Singapore Strait. See my paper on "Some unidentified Toponyms," etc., in the Journal R.A.S., October, 1904, pp. 719, 720.

p. 497, n. 1, ll. 13-16. Lo-ch'at. Cf. also Nuchi, Nunchit, Kwâla Nuchi or Nochi, below Chanah on the same coast, on a western branch of the Patani River, which formerly was the main river (see Journal Str. Br. R.A.S., No. 11, pp. 123, 124). Nuchi or Nunchit is the local Malay form for the Siamese Nông-chik district.

p. 498, l. 20. Ch'ang-yau Island. This, I have afterwards found, is very likely Pulo Senang, better known as Barn Island, and not Singapore Island, which, as I have shown, is marked Tan-ma-hai (Tamasak) in the Chinese map referred to (see Journal R.A.S., July, 1905, p. 501).

p. 499, ll. 7, 8. Cf. also Semujong, an alternative designation for the Sungei Ujong district above Malaca, according to the Journal Indian Arch., vol. v, p. 322. In Leyden's "Malay Annals," p. 88, it is termed Semang-ujong.

p. 505, l. 15. Lang-pi-ye, Lang-pi-ya. A Lampiya village exists in the tin-works tract of Jala or Jalor on the east slope of the Malay Peninsula, in about 6° 30' N. lat. (see Bangkok
Calendar for 1873, p. 118). The phonetic equivalent of Lang-pi-ya should therefore be Lampa ya, Lampya, or other similar term.

p. 506, l. 12 et seq., and n. 2. Sêng-chih. Chia Tan actually mentions in his itinerary (A.D. 785-805) a Ku-ko-sêng-chih, 葛葛僧, kingdom, situated west of Chih Strait, on a [rocky] island off the north-west corner of Fo-shih, and adds: "Men in this kingdom are plunderers and cruel: they are feared by navigators. On the north coast [of the Strait?] is the Ko-lo,葛羅, kingdom, west of which lies Ko-ku-lo, 哥谷羅. From Ko-ko-sêng-chih the Shêng-téng, 勝 доп, Islet is reached in four or five days' sailing. Thenee, five more days' sailing in a westward direction bring one to the Po-lo, 婆露, country. Next, in another six days one reaches the Chia-lan, 伽藍, Islet of the Po, 婆, kingdom. Beyond that, after four days' navigation in a northern direction, one comes to the ‘Lion Kingdom' (Ceylon)" (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 373). I shall attempt to locate the above toponyms, which puzzle and mislead the translator of Chia Tan's itinerary.

Ko-ko-sêng-chih is the Chi-ku or Ki-ku, 鶴骨, Island (Chi-ku Hsu) of the Chinese map of A.D. 1400 circled published by Phillips (see Journal China Br. R.A.S., vol. xxi, 1886, p. 38, No. 16), wherein it is marked south-west of Malacca in a position corresponding to Pulo Medang and its southern counterpart, Pulo Rupat or Segaro (west of the mouth of the Stak River, east coast of Sumatra). On the north-east coast of Pulo Medang still exists a hamlet Koko-Burung (the Kuku Burung of the "China Sea Directory," vol. i, 4th ed., 1896, p. 107), the name of which means, in Malay, 'bird-crow.' This signification is almost identical with that of the term Chi-ku, which is, in Chinese, 'cock-crow.' I have but little doubt that Pulo Medang is one and the same with the hitherto unidentified Pulo Kukor mentioned in the Pasei chronicle translated by Marre ("Histoire des Rois de Pasey," Paris, 1874, pp. 97, 107). Kukor was thus the old name of Pulo Medang still represented in the Koko (or Kûkû, كوك) Burung hamlet standing on its coast. (N.B.—The name Medang comes to this island from Medang village, lying at its northern extremity; this is no doubt a modern settlement, and the name for the island a new-fangled one.) The old designation Kukor for Pulo Medang explains (the first part, at any rate, of) Chia Tan's Ko-ko-sêng-chih, and the Ki-ku of the Chinese map referred to above.¹

¹ There is a cape and an island Kokôb or Kukub just off the south-west extremity of the Malay Peninsula, and a Krung Kûhû on the north coast
Shéng-téng is the Serdang district on the same coast, further north, towards Deli. P'o-lu is possibly Perlak, still further up the coast.

Chia-lan (Ka-ran, Kara) Island is Kar-Nikobár. It may be noticed that the second character in this name is one and the same as employed in Ts'wei-lan, i.e. Tilan-chong, another island of the Nikobár group (see pp. 385 and 396 above).

P'o simply stands for bär, vär, and is thus a contraction of Nikobár, if not actually meant for Bharu, in which case Chia Tan's P'o kingdom would recall the ancient Bharu kingdom (see p. 399 above).

This mention in the eighth century A.D. of Kar-Nikobár and of the Nikobár Archipelago is both very instructive and interesting.

But no less important is the reference to the Ko-ko-séng-chih Island, if this should prove to be the full form of the name of a district Séng-chih where the homonymous slaves and dancers were recruited. In such a case Siak, of which Séng-chih is possibly a clumsy transcript (Ko-ko-séng-chih = Kükor Siak, 'the Kükor Island of Siak'?), would be the district in question, along with the neighbouring islands, among which Kundur in Sabong Strait, whence perhaps the alternative designation Kun-lun Ts'éngh-ch'i and Séng-chih Nu for the same class of menials. It is known that there are wild and hairy tribes in Siak, while the islands off the coast of the same district are inhabited by Orang-laut, known locally as Rawah, but termed Sika, Sekah, or Sekat farther south in the Archipelago (e.g. in Bangka and Billiton). This very term Sekah may be the one transcribed Ts'éngh-ch'i or Séng-chih by the Chinese; its old local form may have been Sengka or Sinki (as in Salat Sinki, the channel of the strait south of Singapore Island). But all this is by no means certain, and we must await further information from Chinese sources ere these terminological riddles can be satisfactorily solved.

For Chia Tan's Ko-ko-lo see above, in these Addenda, remarks on p. 444, n. 2. His Ko-lo, or Ka-la, lying on the coast of the Malay Peninsula north of Ko-ko-séng-chih (= Pulo Kükor, now Medang), may be Kala-pang near the Umbai River, just below Malacca, or else Ja-kola (Malacca or Kwála Jugra ? see p. 521 above), or, but less probably, Selan-gor.

pp. 507, 508, note. Syangka, etc. See my paper "The of Sumatra, just west of the old Samudra town, but neither place suits. The same objection applies to Kuku Islet close by the north-east corner of Pulo Bintang in the east part of Singapore Strait, and to the islet Kekker in Penuba Strait, between Singkep and Linga Islands. 52

As regards the term Sêng-chih, 僧祇, M. Pelliot observes in the Bulletin École Franç., t. iv, pp. 290, 291, that this is a misspelling for 僧祇, Sêng-ch’i, Sêng-k’i (= Zanggi), due to the almost perfect similarity between the second characters in both names, as evidenced by the best editions of the Chinese texts where the name occurs, wherein it is spelled Sêng-ch’i (Sêng-k’i). In the whole of the Malay Archipelago, he adds, Negroes are still termed Zanggi or Janggi (which is also pronounced Jënggi, in Battak Jonggi), and ‘Jënggi’ already occurs in a Javanese inscription of 860 A.D. All this, however, does not quite explain the terms K’un-lun-Tsêng-sz or K’un-lun-Tsêng-ch’i (or Tsêng-k’i), which may also denote Zanggi (Niggers), but which he deftly skips over. As a matter of fact these, as we have seen, were dancers and musicians, more especially dancing girls. I may now add to what I have said in the note on p. 508 above, that the term Srengkâa (which is quite similar to Sêng-k’i (in Cantonese Sêng-kêi)) denotes in Khmêr a lady of the royal harem (see Aymonier’s “Cambodge,” t. iii, p. 646, and his “Dict. Khmêr-Français,” s.v.), and that such ladies often take part in theatrical exhibitions. Again, in old Khmêr, Tai is a word for female slaves, ‘bayadères’ (see Aymonier’s “Cambodge,” t. iii, pp. 546, 547; ii, p. 291). This may be compared with the Cantonese pronunciation, Sêng-tai, of Sêng-chih. As Khmêr was the language prevailing in the south of the Malay Peninsula and adjacent islands from the time of the extensive conquests of Fu-nan in the third century A.D. (see my paper on “The Nagarakretâgama list of Countries,” etc., in Journal R.A.S., July, 1905, p. 502, n. 1) till well-nigh the end of the thirteenth century (see op. cit., p. 508), while Môn, its sister tongue, still held its own during the same period in the remaining portions of the Malay Peninsula and the northern half, at least, of Sumatra, it is not altogether unlikely that both terms Sêng-chih and Sêng-k’i denoted not exactly dark-complexioned or Negrito people from that region, but more particularly female dancers and musicians.

p. 509, note, l. 10. K’un-lun. In the Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 226, it is stated that, according to the “Man-shu” (published in circâ 860 A.D.), the Nan-Chao kingdom (in Yûn-nan) made an expedition against the K’ûn-lun country. Thereupon the K’ûn-lun people let the enemy’s host advance well into their country, then they cut through a dam and thus drowned most of the Nan-Chao forces. They cut off at the wrist the right hands of the survivors.
before sending them back to their country. The "Nan-chao Ye-shih" wisely refrains from mentioning such a defeat, but puts on record a little later that in A.D. 885 the K'un-lun kingdom sent a very handsome girl to the Nan-Chao king (Sainsou's transl., p. 78), a fact which evidences that the two enemies had by this time become reconciled. Again, the same work mentions in 1103 that the three kingdoms of Mien (Burmá), Po-sz (a neighbour of Burmá on the west, see p. 471 supra and note thereon in these Addenda), and K'un-lun offered white elephants and perfumes to the king of Nan-Chao (ibid., p. 101). The perfumes here alluded to seemingly included a large portion of Costus, the best of which came from K'un-lun according to Chinese writers (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 226). The K'un-lun State alluded to was evidently the Lesser (or Hoiao) K'un-lun, i.e. Taik-kulā (Gola-mattika-nagara, the present Ayethéma), on the coast of Pegu (see pp. 89, 90 above), which lies in a region where the multifarious waterways permit the sort of warfare described above. Cutting of dams and skilful taking advantage of bores and tidal waves formed later on a feature in the wars between Pegu and Burmá (thirteenth to fifteenth century), described in the "Rājādhirāj" or Peguan Annals of this period.

In proof of the identity of the K'un-lun kingdom above referred to with the Taik-kulā State, I may adduce the itinerary translated from the "Man-shu" in the Bulletin Éc. Fr., loc. cit. According to this, from the Liang Shoewi valley (probably west of Ning-chou in South Yün-nan) one came to the Lung River (龍河, Lung Ho, evidently the Mē-Không or Chiū-lung Kiang at Ch'hieng Rung, following the well-known T'ung-hai - P'u-érh - Sz-mao route). Then, further south, one took the route of the T'sīng-mu-hsiang (Costus) Mountains (i.e. the Ch'hieng Tung-Moné route across the Mē-Không-Salwin watersheds), and straight southwards (vid Shwē-gyin and Sittang) the K'un-lun State was reached (i.e. Taik-kulā or Ayethéma, south-east of Sittang town). In another passage of the "Man-shu" the Costus Mountains are located three days' south of Yung-ch'ang, that is to say, in the region west of P'u-érh and Ch'hieng Rung.

On this and other K'un-lun States see also pp. 89 (n. 5), 90, 103, 260, 261 (n. 1), 507-9, 574 (n. 3), and supra in these Addenda, remarks on pp. 74 (l. 16), 90, and 260 (l. 15).

p. 514, ll. 1-6 from bottom. Ku-lo. This is Gūroh; see above in these Addenda, note to p. 106.

p. 517, n. 3. Java. The Po-saḥ stela of A.D. 1306, discovered in Chám territory, mentions a Java kingdom and a quite distinct
Yava-dvipa or Insular Java (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 641, n. 1). The first one of these countries, i.e. Java, was evidently the Shē-p'ô on the Malay Peninsula, and withal Ibn Batūta's [Mul-]Javah visited in 1345.

p. 521, n. 1, ll. 2 et seqq. Jakola. Nieuhoff possibly intended to connect Malacca with Ptolemy's Takola, after Herbert, who, in his "Voyage de Perse" (1627), says (p. 493) that Malacca is probably Ptolemy's Lacola (sic). He often follows Castaldi in such fanciful Ptolemaic identifications. See, nevertheless, above in these Addenda, remarks on p. 506, concerning the Ko-lo kingdom referred to in Chia Tan's itinerary (A.D. 785–805). If the name Jakola really existed locally in Nieuhoff's time, it must have meant, not Malacca proper, but the Jugra territory near by, the Ch'ung-ka-la (Jungara, Jugara) of Chinese accounts. For the appearance of this term as early as the first half of the thirteenth century under the forms Jung-ya-lu and Chung-ka-lu in Chao Ju-kua's work, see above in these Addenda, remarks on p. 451.

p. 525, n. 1. Lo-yüeh. Chia Tan's itinerary overland states that from Water Chén-lâs, i.e. Lower Kamboja, after crossing a small sea (Gulf of Siâm) in a southern direction, one comes to the Lo-yüeh country (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 372). On the other hand, in his itinerary by sea, Chia Tan locates Lo-yüeh on the northern coast of the Chih (Sik, Sak, i.e. the Singapore) Strait, which is only 100 li (about 20 to 30 miles) wide, and on the southern shore of which is the Fo-shih (Bhoja, i.e. Palembang) kingdom (op. cit., pp. 372, 373).

The "Hsin T'ang-shu," in its turn, states that Lo-yüeh, on the north, lies at 5,000 li (i.e. from 900 to 1,300 miles) from the sea; south-west of it is Ko-ku-lo. It is a meeting-place for merchants that go and come. Every year junks sail thence for Canton. Customs are there the same as at T'o-lo-po-tî (Dvāravati in Lower Siâm, see pp. 176–80 above). (Op. cit., p. 232.)

It is legitimate to infer from the above indications that the Lo-yüeh State extended from the north of the Malay Peninsula at the Krañ Isthmus, or even further up at about Mergui, down to its very southern end, i.e. to the shore of the Singapore Strait. If so, this State could not be other than the Ligor or Lugor kingdom, which included many petty principalities now and then mentioned, as if they were separate or independent States, in the Chinese records.

Otherwise, we must assume the existence of several places Lo-yüeh, viz., one near Mergui (which may be Lenya or Lanyâ) on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, one at Ligor on the east
coast, and one on the northern shore of the Old Singapore Strait (which would then have to be identified with [Ma-]lavir, the Chinese [Mo-]lo-yu, and the Arabic Lūrevī or Lārevī).

But this second hypothesis seems less plausible than the first one of a single Lo-yūeh State holding hegemony over well-nigh the whole of the Malay Peninsula. (On the paramount rôle played by Ligor in the Malay Peninsula, see my monograph "Historical Retrospect of Junkceylon Island," in the Journal of the Siam Society for 1905, pp. 130–5.) Cf. anyhow note to p. 110, l. 13, on p. 760 above.

p. 528, l. 4 and n. 1. Kā-ch'a. There does, indeed, exist a tiny islet Pulo Kacha just off the mouth of the Kedah River in 6° 4' N. lat.; but Old Kedah lay much further down the coast in 5° 42' N. lat. Both by reason of Pulo Kacha being, so to speak, merely a "geographical expression," and because of its lying out of the usual ship-route from the Straits to the Nikobars and the Koromandel coast, I find it necessary to maintain my identification of Kā-ch'a with Kerti or Katrea on the north coast of Sumatra. On Kā-ch'a and Kedah see, furthermore, my paper on "The Nagarakretâgama list of Countries," etc., in Journal R.A.S., July, 1905, pp. 495–500.

p. 533, ll. 19, 20. Pentam. Despite the existence of a village Bentan on the north shore of the Old Singapore Strait, I have in my paper on the "Nagarakretâgama List of Countries," etc., in the Journal R.A.S. for July, 1905, preferred to identify (pp. 508, 509) Marco Polo's Pentam island with Be-Tūnah, i.e. the Tamasak, or Singapore, Island. On Malavir and Malāyu see also the same paper, pp. 492, 493.

p. 535, synoptical table, add the following entry:

End of 644 or beginning of 645. The Mo-lo-you, 摩羅游, kingdom sent an ambassador to China to offer products of the country (Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 324).

pp. 536, 537, synoptical table, add the following entries:

1275. Haji Kértanagara, king of Java, undertook a war against Malāyu. He died the same year, but the war did not end until 1293.—"Pararaton" (Bulletin Éc. Fr., iv, 333, n. 1). This is presumably the Cheva (Javanese) invasion of the southern Siamese provinces (on the Malay Peninsula), repelled in about 1279–80 by the Sukhôthai king Rûang (see p. 548 above, and my paper on the "Nagarakretâgama," etc., Journal R.A.S., 1905, p. 492).

Beginning of 1281. Su-la-man (=Sulaimân?) was charged by the Chinese Court with a mission to the Mu-la-yu, 木剌由,
and other kingdoms. Six months later Chan-sz-t’ing (= Shamsud-din?), sent on a mission to Mu-la-yu, when reaching Champâ was shipwrecked (Bulletin Éc. Fr., iv, 326).

1299. Mo-la-yu, 没剌由, despatched an embassy to China, contemporaneously with Hsiien (Sukhôthai) and Lo-hu (Lavô, i.e. Lop’hburi in South Siâm). (Op. cit., loc. laud.)

1301. Mu-lai-hu, 马来忽, and other Sea Islands sent ambassadors to China (ibid.). Whether Malâyu is here implied I somewhat doubt.

p. 539, ll. 10–15. On a somewhat earlier Chinese hazy knowledge of Java see my remarks below in these Addenda, note to p. 586, ll. 4–7.

p. 541, synoptical table. Po-ta. In my paper on “Some unidentified Toponyms,” etc., in the Journal R.A.S., October, 1904, I have preferred (p. 722) Patanor (Bân-Dôn) as an equivalent for both Tavernier’s Bata and Teixeira’s Pate. See, however, p. 543 above, n. 1, for a possible faint indication in favour of Bardia. On a Pa-t’a State, name spelled with different characters, see p. 627 above, No. 10.

p. 545, synoptical table, l. 5 from bottom. The armies of Java here referred to must have been from the [continental] Java kingdom, as distinct from the insular Java, which, we have seen, is termed Yava-devpa in another Châm inscription discovered in the Panrâng district itself (see above in these Addenda, remarks on p. 517, n. 3).

p. 545, n. 1, l. 3. In the Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 223, the name of the king of Lesser K’un-lun (Taik-kulâ) is given as Mang Hai-yüeh, 范悉越 (= Mông Sagô (?), but more probably the Môn H’môîn Chaghû), and that of the Tu K’un-lun (Takkola = Takôpa) ruler is recorded as being Sz-li Po-p’ö-nan-to-shan-na (= Śrî Bhavânandaśâna ?). This relates to the time when the first account of P’iao (Lower Burma) reached China (A.D. 802); see p. 467, n. 7, above.

p. 548, synoptical table, add the following entry:—

1274–1306. Java kingdom (i.e. continental Java), as distinct from the realm of Yava-devpa (i.e. insular Java). Po-sah inscription discovered near Panrâng, South Champâ (see above in these Addenda, remarks on p. 517, n. 3).

p. 568, n. 2, sec. (1), ll. 3–6. In a Burmese inscription of A.D. 1767, a Tamalatti is mentioned among the tributary States of Burma. This may be Tamu or Tummu, q.v. supra, p. 33; also above, in these Addenda, remarks on p. 471, ll. 2–8.

p. 570, note, ll. 11–13. Kaṭāha. Cf. also Ch’u-su (Khu-tuk),
the fortified city, supra, p. 305, and note thereon in these Addenda, as well as remarks in the same on pp. 311 and 334.

p. 574, n. 3, l. 10. Krung. In Môn ைை, Krung, pron. Krông, where it means a small river and also a creek, a canal, whether natural or not. This word Krung occurs also in Châm and in the language of Achâm; in both these tongues it means a 'river.' It does not occur in any other language of the Archipelago. In the parlance of the Bahnar tribe of Kamboja it is pronounced Krong. M. Pelliot, in the Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iv, p. 230, n. 3, begs to doubt my assertion (in the Asiatic Quarterly Review, January, 1902, p. 135) that Krung is a Môn-Khmër word, and is somewhat sceptical as to my having met it in Môn. As regards this last point, I may easily refer M. Pelliot to Steven's "Vocabulary English and Peguan," Rangoon, 1896, p. 24, s.v. 'creek'; while concerning the Môn-Khmër origin of the word, I hope the evidence I have given above of its wide application in the Indo-Chinese Peninsula, and even North Sumatra, will suffice to establish its paternity. But what has hitherto escaped lexicographers is the fact that Krung, though originally denoting a 'small river,' came in the course of time to be employed in the sense of 'lord of the river,' or 'lord of the basin (or valley) of a particular river,' i.e. 'king,' and this meaning it still retains, at least, in Khmër, and in Siamese, into which it has been introduced.

p. 581, n. 3. Lancaster (1592) mentions ambergris among the chief exports of Junkceylon Island ("Voyages," Hakl. Soc., 1877, pp. 14, 15), and Gervaise (1681–5) says this commodity is therein to be found in small quantities ("Hist. Naturelle et Polit. du Royaume de Siam," Paris, 1688, p. 32). Amber and ambergris were sent by Tonkin to China, a.d. 220–30, according to the "An-nan Chih-liuo" (Sainson's transl., p. 328).

p. 582, n. 1. Lancaster (1592) speaks of amber occurring in the Nikobârs (op. cit., p. 71). Amber was found in the country of the Hê-tsa Pu, south-west of Yung-ch'ang, according to Ma Tuan-lin (op. cit., p. 304). This evidently refers to the amber mines of North Burma.

p. 585, note, list of countries. Mo-ho-sin (3) and Tan-tan (5) occur in an itinerary, probably of the seventh century a.d., of a journey from Chin-li-p'i-shih, or Chin-li-p'i-chia, to Canton, translated in the Bulletin Ec. Fr., t. iv, pp. 324–6. This country, Chin-li-p'i-shih, 金利毗逝 (or 迦, chia), is located in the same extract at 1,500 li (250 to 500 miles) east of Ch'ih-t'u.
(Sukhòthai), and at 3,000 li (500 to 1,000 miles) north of P'o-li (Pulai on the Old Singapore Strait), which indications argue for it a situation on the east coast of the Gulf of Siàm, either at Bàng Plà-sōi (Chonlaburī, Jalapuri) or lower down at either Pasē or Chanthabūn. This location is further confirmed by the trend of the itinerary, which proceeds thenceforward by way of the following places: Tan-tan (= Tantalam?), Mo-ho-hsin (Mahāsin?), To-long (= Kwāla Tarong in North Tringano?), Ché-mài (= Kemā-man?), P'o-lou (= Kwāla Baloh in North Pahang?), To-lang (= Kwāla Tembeling in Pahang?), P'o-hwang (= Pahang?), Mo-lo-shih or Mo-lo-yū (Malāyu State, south end of the Malay Peninsula), Chén-la (south-east coast of Kamboja), Lin-i (Campā), Kwung-chou (Canton). If the above toponyms are correctly recorded in the itinerary, Tan-tan, Mo-ho-hsin, etc., would all appear to be places on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula. But the sea-route laid down is, to say the least, a very odd one, and it is not improbable there is an error in the position ascribed to Chin-li-p'ti-shih in respect to Ch'ih-t'u (Siàm), which may have to be corrected to 1,500 li west, instead of east. In such a case Chin-li-p'ti-shih would have to be sought for on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, perhaps at Ghirbi(-Kāsai); see p. 95 above.

As regards the toponym Tan-tan, it may have been employed by the Chinese to denote a number of similarly named places. Besides those already referred to on p. 585, I may mention the following:

(1) Tū-tang River (= Musi (?), east coast Sumatra, supra, p. 530, n. 4).
(2) Tu-tan River below Brunei, north-west coast of Borneo.
(3) Hamilton's "Pullo Tetang" (= Pulo Tenggol, near Pulau Berhāla, off the Tringano coast, west part of Gulf of Siàm); see Pinkerton, op. cit., vol. viii, p. 463, etc.

p. 586, ll. 4–7. It behoves me to slightly amend the views expressed both here and on p. 539, ll. 10–15, as regards Chinese ignorance of Java before a.d. 1292–3. When they were written and sent to print there had not yet appeared Chao Ju-kua's account of Chao-ya (Java), published in the Tu'ong-Pao for 1903, pp. 233 et seqq. This shows that some hazy knowledge of Java had, indeed, reached China in the first half of the thirteenth century. But the information is so muddled and shallow as to justify the inference that it was acquired second-hand from foreign merchants trading at the Chinese seaports. According to Javanese tradition, it is stated (see Tu'ong-Pao, 1903, p. 233), the Chinese traded with Japara (north coast of central Java) as early as the tenth
century. Even granting this, the fact remains that the first substantial knowledge of Java was not obtained by the Chinese until 1292-3, on the occasion of an unsuccessful expedition sent thither by Kūblāi Khān, while the earliest mention of the island occurring in Chinese literature is to be found in Chao Ju-kua’s work, in circd 1240.

p. 598, note, ll. 9-12. Turshish. See p. 681, ll. 2-6, and p. 706 above.

p. 599, l. 2 and n. 1. Lin-ya-ssū-ka. Possibly the same as Lin-ya-ssū-ka, which I have more recently identified with Langka-suka, the earliest capital of Kedah. On this and the topographical questions connected with the location of Fo-lo-an and neighbouring States, see, for a fuller treatment, my paper on the “Nagarakretagama,” in the Journal R.A.S. for July, 1905 (pp. 495-8). Vide also p. 626 above, and infra in these Addenda, remark on p. 626.

pp. 615, 616. Sambhoja, Śambhuja, Kambuja, etc. In Gavampati’s book I have met the form Kambojara for Kamboja, which may or may not be meant for Kamboja-raṭṭha. In Burmese records the term Sambujara occurs for the part of Burma classically styled “Kamboja,” as exemplified in the following extract: “When Alaung-sithu of Paukkkan (Pagan) was on his way back from the Sambuthara country (Kambawsa), he arrived in Tawng Peng on his magic barge” (Translation of Tawng Peng State history in the “Upper Burma Gazetteer,” pt. ii, vol. iii, p. 251). From the foregoing evidence it is legitimate to infer that Kamboja (or Kambuja, Kambojara, Kambu-jaya) and Samboja (or Śambhuja, Śambhujara, Śambhu-jaya) were interchangeable terms, or, at any rate, were considered to be so in Further India.


p. 624, n. 1, ll. 10-15 from bottom. Javaku. Jávaka is the Pāli form according to Professor Kern, who considers, naturally, the people so called to be Javanese. We have, indeed, seen (above in these Addenda, remarks on p. 536) that in 1275 Haji Kērtanagara, king of Java, undertook a war against Malāyu, but it is difficult to conceive that his exploits did extend as far as Ceylon.

p. 626. Dependencies of San-fo-ch’i. On Tan-ma-ling (= Temiling or Tembeling, on east coast of the Malay Peninsula), Ling-ya-sz (= Ling-ya-sz-ka = Langkasuka, the original capital of Kedah on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula), and Fo-lo-an (= Beranang on the Langat River, west coast of the Malay

p. 627, l. 4. Jih-lo-t'ing. There is a Jelutong district on the south-eastern end of the Malay Peninsula (above Ramenina Point), and a place Jelutong, as well as a Sungei Jelutong, near the mouth of the Sepang River, Selangor (west coast Malay Peninsula).

p. 627, l. 15. Pa-t'a. See also p. 541 above, n. 1, for another Pa-t'a State, the name of which is spelled with the second character different (= Batta, Battak?).

p. 633, ll. 17, 18. Add also Pali Jāvaka, and cf. Dabag (Dâbag?) with Tefak, Tāfan, on p. 57 above.

p. 641, n. 2. The second term Bāpis recalls Māṭi, Mābiṭ, Māfiz (see “Merveilles de l’Inde,” p. 253), which we have shown to be meant for Beit, Bait = Mergui. The transition from Māfiz to Bāpis, and vice versa, is, philologically, quite possible.

p. 643, ll. 8–10. Samudra. Cf. also Deva-Ramudra, the capital of the Belâla dynasty in India till 1354 or thereabout. In the Burmese inscription of about 1636, extant at the Kaug-hmu-daw temple, 6 miles north of Sagaing town, a province Thamodaya (Samudara, Samudra) is mentioned as forming part of maritime Burmā and comprising the great districts of Mayi and Madeik (see “Upper Burma Gazetteer,” pt. ii, vol. i, p. 341).

p. 653, l. 1. According to Herbert (“Voyage de Perse,” p. 506), Alvaro Telezso (a Portuguese) was the first European Christian to land on Sumatra.

p. 661, note, ll. 27, 28. Dondim, etc. Spelled also Dadin and Diddi in some MSS. of Friar Odoric’s work. I am now pretty certain that the final syllable din of the name is a clerical slip for diu, diu (the u having been by oversight misread n), meaning an ‘island.’ From the fact that Ramusio (op. cit., vol. iii, f. 248 verso) explains Dadin as signifying “immondo e brutto” (impure and ugly), I am led to conclude that the term intended is Timai-ttive (Timai-diva), ‘Island of Impurity,’ the name under which the Andâmâns are mentioned in the great Tanjore inscription of the eleventh century (see “Hobson-Jobson,” p. 29). The islands are therein said to be inhabited by cannibals, which statement agrees with what Friar Odoric tells of Dadin or Diddi. It is not difficult to conceive how Timai-ttive could become transformed, both by corruption and contraction, into Ti[ma]-tti[nu] = Titti, Diddi, or into Ti[ma]-ttic[nu] = Tittic, Titticu, whence Diddiu, Diddin, Dadin, etc. But the doubt remains: is Friar Odoric’s Diddi or Dadin ‘Island’ the Andâmâns group of islands, or else some island in the Malay Archipelago named after the Andâmâns owing to the fact
of its inhabitants being reputed to be cannibals? I incline to believe, in view of the motley state in which Friar Odoric's narrative has come down to us, that it is really a question of the Andâmãns, for the vocable Diddi or Dadin is unquestionably a corruption of the Tamil name Timaittivu of the Andâmãns, and there is no reason for its existence in the Malay Archipelago, unless it can be proved that it was transplanted thither by the Tamils, or else that the term Timaittivu of the great Tanjore inscription applies to some island in the Malay Archipelago rather than to the Andâmãns.

pp. 661, 662, note. On cannibalism in Further India and the Malay Archipelago the following additional information may prove of interest:—

(1) In the neighbourhood of Martaban. Beyond Tun-sun (or Tun-hswâin, see p. 249 above, n. 2, and note thereon in these Addenda), on a large island, according to the "Liang-shu" (compiled in circa 650, but treats of the period 502-56), is the country of Pi-k'ien, 毛賽 (= Bi K'rang or Gyaing River, less probably Bhilâ-gyûn Island), which lies at 8,000 ǐ (1,600 miles) from Fu-nan (Camboja). The law of the country is that the guilty are eaten in the presence of the sovereign as a punishment. In this country no foreign merchants are admitted; should they come, they are killed and eaten. Accordingly no merchant dares to proceed to this country (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 264). N.B.—The above information originally comes from the account of K'ang T'ai's mission to Fu-nan, circa 245-50 A.D.

(2) In Camboja. Cannibalism was occasionally practised in Fu-nan towards the middle of the third century A.D. (op. cit., p. 268).

(3) In Cochin-China. The Sdang or Salang (= Halang) tribes eat, quite raw, the lungs and liver of their dead foes, according to Leclère ("Les Phnongs," p. 192).

(4) In Annam. The emperor Já-long (Gia-long) "a fait couper en morceaux des rebelles et des traitres, et en a fait manger les corps à ses soldats" (Bissachère, op. cit., p. 230, A.D. 1811).

(5) In Tonkin. The assassin of the Hwâ-lû king Diñ, in A.D. 981, was, according to some annalists, handed over to the populace and eaten (see Dumoutier's "Hoa-lù," p. 21).

(6) In China. The Wu-hu barbarians of the south dwell in deep valleys. When anyone of their clan is killed, they wait in ambush for the murderer on the spot where the crime has occurred. If the murderer happens to come that way they kill
him in revenge and then eat his body (see Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. iii, p. 281). This information refers to about 250–80 A.D. In the tenth century the Wu-hu tribes are again described as cannibals. The possession of a human victim was an occasion for great festivals, with music from bronze drums, songs, and dances (op. cit., loc. laud.).

Among the Chung-kia or Chung Miao tribes of Kwei-chou (originally Thai, now admixed with Chinese blood), in ancient funerals the family of the deceased apportioned the corpse among them and ate it. A bullock is now sacrificed instead. (See Betts' "Social Life of the Miao-tsi" in Journal N. China Br. R.A.S., 1899–1900, No. 2, pp. 1, 2; also Bulletin Éc. Fr., t. ii, p. 215.)

For an instance of cannibalism in Kwang-tung, a.d. 22, see Faber's "Chronological Handbook," Shanghai, 1902, p. 51. The same work mentions, also, instances of cannibalism in other parts of China, caused by famines in B.C. 204, 138, and 114. See, likewise, Dennys' "Folklore of China," Hongkong, 1876, pp. 67–8. The emperor Wên-kung of the North Ch'i dynasty (a.d. 565–76) requested his cook to prepare human meat for him, which he found delightful (Excursions et Reconnaissances, vol. xi, p. 92). Cannibalism in China is also mentioned by Sulaiman (see Reinand, op. cit., p. 52; also the same author's transl. of Abū-l-Fedā, p. cniv introd.), Marco Polo, etc.

The Wa-chich-tsu, who lived in the mountain regions of Tungusia, "ate the men raw and alive who fell into their hands" (China Review, vol. xix, p. 287).

(7) In Formosa. See the China Review, vol. xvi, p. 377.


p. 674, n. 2, l. 6. Damin. Cf. the T'o-min tribes of Ning-po in Chêh-kiang.

p. 675, note, ll. 5–7 from bottom. Marco Polo also mentions face-tattooing in Fuh-kien. On this practice, elsewhere, see our remarks above, p. 175, n. 2; p. 367; and these Addenda, observations on p. 175, n. 2, and on p. 367, n. 3.

p. 681, ll. 2–6. On Tursish, see, moreover, p. 706 supra. On other possible ancient Phœnician settlements, see pp. 596–8, 699 n., and 759 above.

p. 688, continuation of n. 5 to p. 687, on tailed men. On this subject the following additional items should prove of interest:—

(1) The Môi tribes of the Champâ hill-tracts are credited with tails by the Annamese. Capt. Rey, in the Journal of his second
voyage to Cochin-China, 1819, says two tailed men had been brought some years before from the mountains in the interior of Champā to Hwē, and presented to the emperor, who, after having regaled them, sent them back to their homes. Their tails were stated to have been 7 Annamese inches = about 8½ French inches long. The Chinese had long before spoken of such wonderful men. Owing to their tails, these people could never sit, but had to remain content with crouching down on their hams (see T'oung-Pao for 1904, p. 553).

(2) In Formosa, tailed men have been mentioned by John Struys, who visited that island in 1650. Recently a child with a tail was seen there by the Rev. Wm. Campbell. (See "Formosa under the Dutch," London, 1903, and the Journal R.A.S., January, 1904, pp. 120, 121.)

---

APPENDIX OF ADDITIONAL NOTES.

pp. 28–9 and 41 (n.). Airrhadoi. Wilford traces this term to Hradana (Hlādini?), which, he states, is the name of the Brahmaputra (McCridle, op. cit., p. 192). I incline to think that the Ptolemaic ethnonym may survive to this day in the name of the Doiing-nak (pron. Daing-net by the Burmese) tribes of the Chittagong Hill tracts and Akyab district, which are variously described as (1) a sub-tribe of the Chakmā of Chittagong, of Mongoloid features, probably of Arakanese origin, speaking a corrupted Bengali; and (2) a probably hybrid people that broke away from the main tribe a century ago and fled to Arakan (see the "Imperial Gazetteer of India," 1908, vols. v, p. 194, and x, p. 320).

pp. 28, 51, 52, 154, 768. Kirrhadia. Kirata was, according to the "Rājamāla," the ancient name of Tripurā (Tipperah), see Proceedings As. Soc. of Bengal for January, 1874. It may be noticed in this connection that the Gāro tribes of the hills not far away to the north call themselves Achikrang = 'hill people,' i.e. Kiratā (see the "Imperial Gazetteer of India," vol. xii, p. 175). But I have since observed that the Ptolemaic Kirrhadia is, in De Donis' map, located due west of Anina (= Yung-ning, No. 67), and far away to the north of Arisabion (= Shenbo, No. 54), i.e. in N. lat. 28° eird, which argues for it a situation at the headwaters of the Irāvati and Chindwin, in the present Khamti country and up to the borders of the Tibetan Kham district. The Kiratās,
if any, here implied would thus be Kiu-tsz, Kachins, Kadūs, and perhaps also Chins of the hills in the south-west.

South-west of Kirrhādai and north of Alosanga (= Shillong, No. 37) are, in De Donis' map, located the Bēseidai, by which name the populations of Bisa and Sadiyā (in modern Lakhimpur, North-East Assām) are evidently meant, i.e. probably the Mishmis of the adjoining hills, albeit under their alternative appellation of Tiladai Ptolemy presumably means the Chin-Lushai tribes of Sylhet, Silchar (Kachār), etc. (see pp. 53 and 744 supra).

pp. 30-2. Triglypton or Trilingon, capital of the kingdom. "In this part the cocks are said to be bearded, and the crows and parrots to be white" (Ptol., lib. vii, ch. 2, § 23). This statement has given rise to much discussion. McCrindle (op. cit., p. 233) quotes Lassen's statement that, "according to Blyth (J.A.S. Bengal, vol. xv, p. 26), there is found in Arākān a species of the Buceinoridae, which, on account of their beards, are called by the English 'barbets,' and on the same authority we learn that what is said of the ravens and parrots is likewise correct." On the other hand, St. Andrew St. John retorts that there are no white parrots (cockatoos) or ravens (crows) in Arakan ("Actes XIème Congrès Int. des Orientalistes," Paris, 1897, Sect. Extrême Orient, p. 220).

I shall, in my own turn, call attention to an interesting fact recorded in the New History of the T'ang dynasty about a State T'o-yuán or Nou-t'o-yuán (陀洹 or 諸陀洹), an embassy of which is stated to have reached the Chinese Court between 627 and 649 A.D., offering camphor oil (P'o-lu Kau = Bā-lut balm, see p. 440 above) and white parrots (cockatoos) having on their heads ten red feathers as long as their wings (see Mu Tuan-lin, op. cit., p. 531, and T'oung-Pao, ix, p. 283). Now, T'o-yuán is, in the same History, described as forming, with another district T'an-ling, 曂陂 (situated on an island in the sea), a dependency of To-ho-lo or Tu-ha-lo (壘和羅 or 獨和羅), with which it is conterminous on the west. To-ho-lo is, in its turn, said to be conterminous on the south with P'an-p'ān (= Sup'han, see pp. 113 and 761-2 above), on the north with Ch'ia-lo-shē-fu (= Kalaśāpu, see p. 569, n., supra), on the west with the sea, and on the east with Chén-la (Kamboja); it is noted for fine rhinoceroses, which thus became known as "To-ho-lo rhinoceroses." T'o-yuán, on the other hand, boasts of white elephants, but there is no rearing of silkworms, nor are there mulberry-trees (op. cit.).

1 Cf. the Kirrhādai mentioned by Ptolemy in Sogdiana along the Oxus, bk. vi, cap. 12, § 4, meant almost certainly for Kirātas.
It will thus be seen that T'o-yüan, from its position to the west of To-ho-lo (= either Tagala or Thagara on the Tavoy River, or else Deoravati in Siâm, see pp. 86, 177, 180, and 569 n. supra), was unmistakably a district on the Gulf of Martaban. The old Chinese pronunciations, Da-vien, T'a-van, or T'a-wūn, of the name suggest a probable identity with the ancient Peguan town and district of Dong Wun, better known from European publications as Dong-wun or Dun-wun. It lies on the eastern bank of the Bilin (Bi Lom River), a little below Bilin. Less probable guesses are Dagûn (i.e. Rangoon, but see Ta-ku-ma on p. 523, n. 2 supra), Dong-yin (more correctly Dong Yom or Dông Mi-yom), Taungu (in Môn Tong-nû), and Tavoy (Davai or Twię), which I therefore discard.

As regards the island T'an-ling (T'am-ling, Dam-lang), it is presumably not Syriam (Thanlyeng, Sarleng), but Pun-zaling islet between Martaban and Maulmain (see p. 510 n. above). The name cannot, therefore, be in any way connected with Telinga, Talaing (names of Pegu), and still less with the Ptolemaic Trilingon.

At the same time, the mention of white parrots offered by T'o-yüan, i.e. Dun-wun, tends to show that the same kind of birds may have been indigenous in Trilingon as well, unless we are to assume that both they and the camphor oil offered at the Chinese Court were procured from States lying further south on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula.

pp. 39 and 741. Balassia. I now notice that this name actually appears in the Catalan map of the Modena Estense Library¹ (dating from about 1360) in the form Ballazia (corresponding to the Balçia of the Paris Catalan Atlas, 1375), immediately north of the coast of Burma and west of Aociam (Vocian, Yung-ch'ang). It has evidently nothing whatever to do with Badakhshân, which is marked Baldacia (Balassia in the Paris map), much farther north. I do not hesitate, accordingly, to take this hitherto unidentified Ballazia or Balçia to be a district or city of Upper Burma, which is one and the same with Barbosa's Balassia. It will thus be seen that this place-name can be traced back to the fourteenth century in European records, and still further to the beginning of the seventh, under the form P'o-lo-sa = Balasa (see pp. 741-2 supra), in the Chinese annals of the Sui dynasty (A.D. 518-618; see, for more particulars, my paper on "Siâm's Intercourse with China," in the Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review for October, 1900, p. 384).

¹ Published by Professor Count F. L. Pullé in "Studi Italiani di Filologia Indo-Iranica," Supplement to vol. i, Bologna, 1908.
p. 41, n. Irāvati. It is also the old name of the Rāvi River in India.

pp. 45, 742. Dvāravati. "In the tenth century the pressure of the rulers of Prome upon Southern Arakan compelled a change of capital from Dvāravatī (near the existing town of Sandoway) to Myohaung, farther north" ("Imperial Gazetteer of India," vol. v, 1908, p. 391). If this be correct, Dvāravatī was not precisely Sandoway but a distinct city near by.

p. 47. Antibolē. This is the name given by Ptolemy to his fifth and easternmost mouth of the Ganges, by which he evidently means the Meghā estuary. The toponym suggests a native term Anda-palli or something similar. According to Wilford, "Antibolē was the name of a town situated at the confluence of several large rivers to the south-east of Dhakka and now called Feringibazar" (McCrimindle, op. cit., p. 192). How and on what sort of historical evidence he came to this conclusion I do not at all know.

p. 51. Maiandros. This toponym possibly still survives in Mahudaung, the mountain range running north and south between the Pondaung mountains on the west and the lower Chindwin River on the east. In some maps it incorrectly appears as Maladaung, but in the "Imperial Gazetteer of India," vol. x, p. 228, the name is spelt Mahudaung, this being presumably the modern Burmese corrupted form of an older toponym—Mahendra, Mandara, or Mahyuttara—recorded by Ptolemy as Maiandros. In De Donis' map this mountain range is made to stretch north-westwards almost as far as Alosanga (= Shillong, see No. 37), passing close to the east of Tugma métropolis (= Tummu, see No. 39), which, if correct, would make it to include, besides the Mahudaung, the Pondaung range, as well as a portion of the Arakan Roma further to the south.

p. 106, ll. 1, 2. P’án-p’án and Wén-tan. The former is Sup’han in South-West Siäm (see pp. 113, 190, 761–2), whereas Wén-tan was the name applied by the Chinese to ‘Fire’ (i.e. Upper) Kamboja (see p. 343 n. supra), and cannot therefore correspond to Bān-Dōn.

p. 109, n. 1, add: Dharmarāja is also the name by which Yudhiṣṭhira is known in Malay tales (see "Essays relating to Indo-China," ser. ii, vol. ii, p. 5, n. 1).

p. 205, ll. 13, 14, 17. Mabed = Bā-việt. I should have rather said = Māk-việt (Mak-bet), as improvingly suggested on p. 321, n., l. 2; for Bā-việt as a name for An-nam does not appear to possess any respectable antiquity.

p. 387, n. 4. Kākola. Cf. the Ko-ku-lo kingdom of Chia Tan's
itinerary (see Addenda, note to pp. 444 and 506, which, even though scarcely suitable, shows the utter absurdity of Van der Lith's suggested identification of the former toponym with Akkola.

p. 575, n. Rhinoceros in Asām. I was utterly wrong, through reliance upon misleading publications, to deny the presence of this pachyderm in Asām. For I now find it stated in the "Imperial Gazetteer of India," vol. vi, p. 20, that there are three kinds of rhinoceroses in that country, viz. in the swamps which fringe the Brahmaputra and in the hills south of the Surmā valley. So, again, in the marshes of the Kāmrūp district (op. cit., vol. xiv, p. 331). No eaglewood appears, however, among Assamese productions.

p. 609, n. 2. It is interesting to notice, in connection with the Chōla embassy which reached China in A.D. 1015, that Rājendra Chōladeva I (who reigned from 1011–12 to 1052) sent, according to Vincent A. Smith, "an expedition by sea against a place called Kadāram, situated somewhere in Lower Burma or the Indo-Chinese peninsula" ("Early History of India," Oxford, 1904, p. 346). Is this expedition the embassy above referred to, or the second one of 1033 (see ante, loc. cit.)? If so, the toponym Kadāram, if not meaning China (Kathyay, Kitan?, see p. 569, n., supra), must anyhow apply to one of its seaports (Kattigara, Canton?). If, on the other hand, it is a question of an armed expedition in the Eastern Archipelago, it is not easy to identify the place-name, which may be Kortatha (Ku'nduk), Kaṭāha, or Kahtāha-deśa (see ante, loc. cit., Akadra (Kadranj, Ku-Trang), see pp. 195–8 and 741 above), or even Kerti, anciently Katarai or Katre, on the homonymous river on the north coast of Sumatra (vide supra, p. 528), in view of the probable fact of Chōla having become subject to the Sumatran empire but a few decades later (see pp. 89 and 624 ante). Cf. also Kuṭhāra, the ancient name of Nha-trang on the Champā coast (p. 266); Kundur or Pulo Condor, the Kun-dur-rung or Kudurang of Chia Tan’s itinerary (A.D. 785–805, vide p. 482 supra and note thereon in the Addenda above); and Kanturi or Kun-t'ō-li (= Khanthuli, Katarei, Kerti?, p. 602). Dimashki (circa 1300) mentions an island Kēndalātū in the Eastern Archipelago (see p. 673, n. 1, above), which seems, however, to be entirely out of the question here.

In the absence of more particulars the final solution of the puzzle had best be left to Indianists, who, after an examination of all the information available in Southern Indian records on Kadāram, should be able to decide with which of the places we have suggested above it should be preferably identified.
p. 647. The Catalan map of *circá* 1360 in the Modena Estense Library, referred to above, presents far more improved spellings on Sumatra Island, here correctly styled Jawa, viz.: Mallao, and a mutilated . . . *nu* on the north coast, *Argulj*, *Semestra*, and *Lamori* (Lambri) on the west coast, for, respectively, *Malao, [Regio Femenar-]*un?, *Antul* (or *Ar[r]zul*), and *Semestra* of the Paris Catalan Atlas. *Argulj* is extremely interesting in connection with the Ptolemaic *Argyrē* city in the extreme west (read 'northwest') of *Iabadiū*, and *Acchera, Acharē* or *Achēh*, with the position of which it admirably corresponds. With *Argulj* and *Arzul* cf. also *Arjara* and the Arabic *Arshir*, *Agrār*. *Samara*, *Lasman* (for Bzaman), and *Forlono* (for Ferlee, Perlaʔ?) are, on the contrary, transferred to the 'Illa de Silam' (i.e. Ceylon) further west; whereas the 'Yla apellada Trapobana' is relegated in the form of a square intersected vertically by three undulating lines presumably meant for streams, and no place-name whatsoever is marked on the four bare vertical strips thus formed.

The comparison of the two Catalan cartographic documents above referred to conclusively convinces me that the 'Illa Iana' and 'Illa Trapobana' of the Paris one, and the 'Jawa' and 'Yla apellada Trapobana' of the Estense Library, are but the double of one another, and that a single island is implied, viz. Sumatra, Ibn Batūtā’s island of *Jawah* (1345); Java proper and Borneo being entirely out of the question. As regards *Malao* or *Mallao*, it is presumably meant, as I already have observed (see p. 647, n. 1, above), for *Malāyu* on the north coast of Sumatra, while the mutilated . . . *nu* of the Estense map may very well be the terminal syllable of some term *Auru*, or similar, designed to represent Āru, Hāru. We thus have, in both the islands represented in the two maps in question, a set of toponyms which can all be traced to Sumatra.

p. 702, table, add the following entry: *circá* 1360. *Lamori*, on the west coast of *Jawa* Island (= Sumatra), and *Argulj* (= *Argyrē*, *Achēh*) towards the north-west corner of the same.—Catalan map in the Estense Library, Modena (see preceding note).

pp. 729, 134. *Bēpyrrhos*. I notice that the two unnamed streams which Ptolemy (lib. vii, cap. 2, § 9) makes rise in this mountain range and discharge into the Ganges are in De Donis’ map marked *Bepirus flu*. The more northern of these passes by *Sēlampura* (No. 34), *Kassida* (No. 22), and *Kanogiza* (No. 18), joining the Ganges in E. long. 84° 9’ rectified, between *Sagala* (= *Sāketa* by Oudh) on the west and *Sambalaka* II (No. 19 = Champārān District), i.e. near Ballia. This stream seems to correspond on the whole to the Gandak, including its upper
tributary the Buria Gandak and its lower ancient bed now known
as the Būrhi Gandak. The other tributary of the Ganges from
Bēpyrrhos is made to rise in long. 91° 58' E., lat. 27° 25' N. (both
rectified), to pass by way of Athēnagūron (No. 27 = Dinajpur),
and to join the Ganges in long. 87° 26' E. rectified. It would thus
appear to include part of the courses of the Brahmaputra from
Gauhāti to Dhūbri, and of the Pūrnabhabā which flows past
Dinajpur.

Whether the Ptolemaic term Bēpyrrhos for the mountain range
in which these streams rise is in any way connected (as in De Donis'
map) with the name of the streams themselves is questionable; at
any rate, it may be noticed that a certain resemblance exists between
it and the names Buria, Burhi[-Gandak], and even more so with
the name of the Pūrnabhabā, especially in its anagrammatized form
Bhabapūrna (cf. Bēpyrrhos, Bapurros). With a little stretching
it would not be difficult to discern in it even the name of the
Brahmaputra in a contracted form (Baputros, Bēraputos); in any
case, there can be no doubt that part of the course of this river
corresponds to the upper course of Ptolemy's southern tributary of
the Ganges from Bēpyrrhos. With this Colonel Yule's view that
Ptolemy shows no conception of the Brahmaputra valley proves to
a large extent incorrect (see also p. 282 above), while the possibly
equivalent Vīpula ('vast,' the name of one of the Indū mythical
cosmic ranges), which the same authority has suggested for
Bēpyrrhos, does not appear very satisfactory. On the western
branch of the Doanas, made by Ptolemy to rise in Bēpyrrhos,
see pp. 134 and 282 ante.

pp. 733, 745. Tamansai tribe. In connection with this term it
may not be uninteresting to notice that a similarly named place,
Tamanthi or Tamanthe (Tamansi, Tamansē), exists in the Upper
Chindwin district (see the "Upper Burma Gazetteer," pt. ii, vol. iii,
p. 209). Furthermore, Dimasa occurs as the name of the Hill
Kachāri tribes, as distinguished from the Bodo or those of the
plains of Kachāri.

p. 762. Posinara. Cf. the tribes called Narā in Upper Burmā,
which occupied the country round Mogaung (see the "Imperial
Gazetteer of India," vol. vi, p. 27).
INDEX.

N.B.—For the sake of greater accuracy, tribal names, etc., are, as a rule, put in the singular form.

A
A-ch'i, city, identical with Achēb, 655. A-lo-t'ó, kingdom, an unidentified Buddhist kingdom, 29 n. 2; its identity with Airrhadoi discussed, 29 n. 2; identity with Araṭṭa improbable, 29 n. 2.
A-šan, island, identification of, 584 n. 3.
A-yü, of Magadha, 290 n. 1.
Abang, island, 499.
Abong-Abong, mountain, identification of, 664 n. 2.
Abor, the, people, face-tattooing among, 367 n. 3.
Aborigines, 58, 120 n., 131 n. 2, 158, 173; of the coast of the Airrhadoi, 28, 29; of Formosa and the Pescadores, account of, 256 n. 1; of Yün-nan and Laos, 788.
Abū Zaid, appointed king of Su-men-ta-la, 652; other forms of the name, 652.
Acharé, on the west coast of India, 668 n. 1.
Achēb, Achin, city, 39; the Argyre of Ptolemy, 40 n. 3, 458, 590; Buddha's visit to, 114; the capital of Sumatra, 457, 590.
Achēb, Achin, kingdom, the first king of, 98, 697 n. 1; a kingdom of Sumatra, 455 n. 1, 638 n. 1, 653; a letter from the Sultan of, to James I of England, 455 n. 1, 513 n. 1, 656; also designated Ta-shih, 511, 511 n. 2; other designations of, 511 n. 2, 655, 667 n., 678, 681; Johor captured by the king of, 534; war between Pedir and, 654; king of, attacked and captured Paeem, 654; letter of authority to trade from the king of, 655; the name discussed, 658, 659, 665, 666 n. 2, 677, 678, 678 n. 3; the capital of, 666 n. 2; story respecting the queen of, 666 n. 2; custom of the women of 667 n.; name connected with Argyre, 667, 681, 706; the dynasties of 667 n., 698; the name known to Ptolemy, 667 n.; connected with various toponyms, 667, 668, 834; settled by Phoenicians and Dravidians, 680; successive designations of, 681; last reference to, under the name Lambri, 683; introduction of Islamism into, 693, 696; synoptical table of the history of, 699-706; nomenclature of, 699-706; the sea-coast of the island of Percha, 701; celebrated for stone-cutters and gravers, 702; the first Muḥammadan king of, 702; Pō Ling, a refuge in, 703; kings of, 703-5; Perak conquered by, 704; prince of Perak made king of, 704; productions and manufactures of, 706, 809, 812.
Achēb Besar, city, a form of Achēb, 677; extent of, 677, 678; the name discussed, 678.
Achēb Head, 699.
Achem, kingdom, a designation of Achēb, 704; on the north of Sumatra, 704.
Achikrang, the, people, a designation of the Gāro tribes, 829.
Achin. See Achēb.
Adam, Mark Twain's suggested statue to, 345 n.
Adamites, Andāmān the country of the, 418.
Adam's Peak, other designations of, 357; footprint on, 357 n. 1, 419; Buddhist temple at, 357, 419; the real body of Buddha at, 390 n. 1; connected with the name Andāmān, 419.
Adeisaga, town and district, identified with Yung-ch'ang, 60, 64; derivation of the name, 734, 747.
Adhyapura, city, possibly a capital of Komar, 204; location of, 204 n. 2.
Aditya-dharma, king, the ruler of the 'First Land of Java,' 461 n. 1.
Adityasāna, the ruler of Arimaddana-pura, 746.
Aeng. See An, river.
Aetas, the, people, 255; of the Philippines, account of, 254 n. 1.
Affixes, added, etc., 69.
Africa, coast of, 26.
Agallochum trees, worship offered to the deities of the, 278.
Aghanagara, city, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 264; identified with Hā-nōi, 10, 319; fundamental station of Ptolemy, 16, 17, 23; identification of, 331, 332, 334; origin of the name, 332, 333; connected with Ou-lâk and Uruga, 348; derivation of the name, 735; location of, 738; suggested connection with Tonkin, 739; other designations of, 799.

Agast, an illustrious person, 492 n. 2.

Agathodaimonos, island, 694; location of, 411; connected with Sumatra, 411, 419; identified with the Great Nikōbar, 411, 416, 421; the name discussed, 416-19; connected with So-tu-man, 416; Andamān erroneously connected with, 417.

Agathodaimonos Nāsos, 419 n. 1.

Aghama. See Andāmans.

Aginattai, the, people, inhabitants of Bazakata, 379; term probably synonymous with Bazakata, 382, 383; derivation of the same discussed, 384, 385; connected with Aryawto, 393 n. 1.

Aghkeiron. See Arakan.

Agra-nagara, town, a designation of Hā-nōi, 122.

Agriculture, introduced into Tonkin by the Chinese, 786.

Ahi-dipa, the 'Isle of Snakes,' a designation of Kāra-dipa, 408; application of the name, 413.

Ahikasatra, town, ancient capital of Uttara-Pancala, 747.

Ahmad, Sultan, marriage of, 645; flight of, 647.

Ahom, the, people, 154.

Ai Cheh, prince of Ch'ieng Rung, 139 n.

Ai-Lao state, the, in Western Yunnan, 59-61; associated with Meng-chia-ch'wo, 123; account of the inhabitants of, 771; location and identification of, 771.

Ai-Lao, Ai-Lâu, the, race, 124, 125; identified with the Lâu, 59; extent and habitat of, 59, 60, 117; trade relations of, with Ta-ta'ın, 60; founders of the kingdom of Sein, 117; tattooed their bodies and wore tails, 126; nickname of, 126; fought against the Luh-to, 160.

Ajendra, district, name applied to the eastern part of India, 29; the region to the east of the Ganges, 29 n. 2.

Aindras, the, people of Lower Bengal, 29.

Ainut-desa, identified with Gujarath, 29 n. 2.

Airrhadoi, the, race, 29; erroneously identified with the Kirātās, 28; connection suggested between the Andāmānese and, 402 n.

Airrhadoi, the Coast of the, 37; identified with the Coast of the Andhras, 28, 29, 34; aborigines of, 28, 29; its identity with A-la-t'o discussed, 29 n. 2; named after Areia, 41 n.; derivation of the name, 829.

Aji Katang, 581 n. 1.

Aji-Saku, king of Hastināpura, the first Indā adventurer to reach Java, 591; subdued the Rākṣasas, 592; acts attributed to, 592; connected with Sālivāhana, 592; legend of, 658.

Aka-Beatu. See Bōjingi, the, tribe.

Akadra, town and district, 9-13, 21, 22, 24, 25, 833; identified with the Bay of Ko: Tron, 7, 23, 193, 195; a fundamental station of Ptolemy, 16, 17, 23; identification of, 23, 193, 731; derivation of the name, 199; part of the kingdom of Komar, 201.

Akadra, town, an interior town of the Sinai, 199.

Ākar, island, one of the Anambas, 722.

Akas, the, people, habitat of, 771.

Akkola, not connected with Kākola, 833.

Akvab, district, 49.

Al-Neyān, island, probably identical with Pulo Nias, 427, 427 n. 2.

Al-Ramni, island, camphor from, 431, 431 n. 1.

Alas, the, people, conterminous with the Gavū, 674 n. 2.

Alāu-d-dīn, Sultan, king of Acheb, 704; deposed his brother and succeeded him, 704.

Alāu-d-dīn Rā'īyūt Shāh, Sultan, murdered Mansūr Shāh, 655 n. 1, 704; seized the throne of Su-men-ta-la, 655 n. 1; account of, 704, 705; governor of the king of Acheb, 704; king of Acheb, 704; murdered Sultan Bāvung, 704; wicked character of, 704, 705.

Alang-situ. See Along-situ, king.

Alavi, Ātavi, district, 59; identical with the Mogauga and Mohnya districts, 57; may be identified with Ta-wī, 57; synonymous with Davaika, 57, 58.

d'Albuquerque, Jorge, calls at Pacem, 653.

Alexander, kings of Palembang descended from, 597 n. 1; death of,
INDEX.

Anambas, West, also designated the Jamája group, 722.
Ancient India, Colonel Yule's map of, 4; as described by Ptolemy, 6.
Ancient knowledge of the world, limits of, 5.
Angra, the term discussed, 393, 394.
Andalas, Andhalás, the ancient name of Palembang, 603, 612; connection of the name with Kan-t'o-li improbable, 604; origin of the name, 612.
Andalas, Pulo, a designation of Palembang, 630.
Andámán, term synonymous with Nikobár, 383 n.; erroneously connected with Agathodaimonos, 417; suggested connection with other names, 418, 419 n. 1, 612; derivation of the word, 805, 806.
Andáman, Great, identified with Ptolemy's Bazakata, 379; the tomb of Sulaimán on the, 387.
Andáman, Little, suggested as the site of Barah-nagár, 403 n.; connected by Ptolemy with Bazakata, 407.
Andámán, Middle, included in Ptolemy's Bazakata, 379.
Andámán, South, included in Ptolemy's Bazakata, 379.
Andaman Islands, the. See Andámáns, the.
Andámán-Nikobár Archipelago, the, 379; the two insular groups considered as one archipelago, 396; designations of particular islands applied to the whole, 396-404; alternative designations for, 397, 398, 413, 700; identification with Barahnagár discussed, 401 n., 403n.; synoptical tables of the nomenclature of, 404-6; confused with Ceylon, 419; erroneous location of, 424, 425, 427.
Andámani, the, 38, 72; their connection with the Andhras discussed, 29 n. 2; reputed oviaparous origin of, 393; connection suggested between the Airrhadoi and, 402 n.
Andámáns, the, islands, 38; relics of stone age found in, 254 n. 1; manufactures of, 234 n. 1; other designations of, 379, 383 n. 1, 389, 389 n. 2, 640 n. 1, 826; the name discussed, 383 n., 391; inhabitants of, 384 n., 389, 826; account of, 389; a sacred relic of, 390; connected with Bazakata and Aginnatai, 392; synoptical tables of the nomenclature of, 404-6; connection between Sri-Bhoja and, 640 n. 1.

597 n. 1; voyages of discovery ordered by, 597 n. 1.
Alexandria, 92.
Alguada Reef, lighthouse at, 49.
'Ali, Sultan, conquests of, 704.
'Ali Mugháyát Sháh, Sultan, king of Achék, 654, 697, 703, 705; attacked and captured Pacem, 654.
'Ali R'âyát Sháh, Sultan, king of Achék, 704.
Alkait, 88, 89.
Allahabad, pillar inscription of, 57.
Aloes, collected by pygmies, 261, 262.
Along-sithu, king of Pagán, 751, 823.
Alosanga, identified with Shillong, 830, 832.
Áma, district, identified with Canton, 244; included in Kraunca dvípa, 244.
Amárravati, city and district, 779; conquest of, 791; identification of, 791; location of, 791.
Amazonas, Island of; location of, 753.
Ambaba, identification of, discussed, 634 n. 1.
Amber, places noted for, 582 n. 1, 823; worked at Ava and Mandalay, 582 n. 1.
Amber, red, 582 n. 1.
Amber Hills, location of, 582 n. 1; famous for amber, 582 n. 1.
Amber mines, 582 n. 1, 823.
Ambergris, 414 n. 1, 581 n. 3, 673 n. 1, 706; from Sumatra, 581, 581 n. 3; from Junkceylon, 823.
Ambergris Island. See Lung-yên Hsi.
Amiga, the, people of Campá, 51.
Amie, district, connected with Arishbion, 63.
An (Aeng), river, connected with the Sados of Ptolemy, 47.
Anakkarai, the ancient name of Adam's Bridge, 668.
Anambas, islands, other designations of, 707, 708 n. 1, 709, 722; account of, 707; account of the inhabitants of, 707, 718-21; connected with the islands of the Satyres, 707; names of the, 707, 707 n. 2; origin of the name, 708 n. 1.
Anambas, Great, also designated the Siántang group, 722.
Anambas, North, islands, names of the largest of the, 715; appear as a single island to passing ships, 715, 722; landmarks for sea-navigation, 723.
Anambas, South, islands, also designated the Riábu group, 722.
Andārae. See Andhras.
Andhaka, Andhala, island. See Andalas, Pulo.
Andhaka, the people, probably settlers in the Andāmāns, 395 n. 1; a West Indian tribe, 612; related to the Bhojas, 612; term connected with Andāmān, 612; a branch of the Yādava, 612 n. 3.
Andhra Island. See Andalas, Pulo.
Andhras, the, race, 28; where located by Megasthenes, 28; their habitat, 29; extent of their kingdom, 29, 30, 32, 34; probable derivation of the name, 29 n. 2; the Airrhodoi of Ptolemy, 29; their extraction, 29.
Andragide. See Indragiri, kingdom.
Andramania, 'Island of Gold,' designation of the Andāmāns and Nikobārs, 391 n. 2, 398.
Andre-Indi, probable derivation of, 29 n. 2.
'Andre-Indi.' See Andhras.
Andripoivre. See Indrapura.
Anfūjāh, Ankūjāh, town, capital of Anjabbah, 571; location of, 573; possibly identical with Zanzibar, 577, 577 n. 1.
An-gyī, district, 72; the ancient Dula, 666 n. 2; anecdote respecting the name of, 666 n. 2.
Ang Chumnik. See Bā P'ihnöm.
Ang Chumnik inscriptions, 209, 212, 235.
Ānga, district, the name of the southern part of Tonkin, 235; also designated Mālinī, 235.
Anja Isle, possibly connected with Angaman, 395.
Angaman, Angamanam, possibly connected with Anja Isle, 395; derivation of the name discussed, 395; designations of the Andāmāns and Nikobārs, 383 n., 398.
Angami, the, tribe, a hill tribe of Upper Asām, 395 n. 3.
Angapuri, town, the capital of Ānga, 235 n. 1.
Angkor, capital of Kamboja, 526 n.
Angkor-buri, P'ihnöm, 206.
Angkor-wat, inscriptions collected at, 174, 175.
Anima, identified with Yung-ning, 829.
Anjabbah, island, capital of, 571; a designation of Zanzibār Island, 571.
Ankeirū. See Argeirū, city.
An-kieu, ruins of, 779.
Annam, kingdom, 111, 121, 122, 123, 134; Ptolemy's error in the coastline of, 13, 14, 17, 23; coast of, 22; early settlers in, 131; identical with the Great Gulf, 225; tonal marks of, 226 n.; place-names of, 226 n.; king of, captured P'hōt-thē, 229; Ch'ā-bān captured by, 230; war with Campū, 275, 276; forces of, routed by the Chām, 276; origin of the name, 327; Hwē, the capital of, 780; cannibalism in, 827.
Annam River, identical with Ngannan-kiang, 372.
Annamese, the, 128 n. 2, 130, 132; names applied to the, 225 n. 1.
Annamese Annals, the, 227, 227 n. 1, 227 n. 5, 228 n. 3, 299, 305, 350, 351 n. 1, 373.
Annamese language, words and terms, 40 n. 2, 55, 56, 72, 126, 128 n. 2, 131, 135 n. 1, 148, 159 n. 2.
Annamese records, etc., 126, 147, 153.
Anouk-ngay, estuary, 44.
An-pa-érh, an envoy sent to China, 648.
Ansumat, mountain, identical with Rṣabha, 164; a silver mountain, 164, 672.
Ant, legend respecting an, as large as a cat, 643, 643 n. 1.
Antedated events, 63, 69.
Anthropophagi. See Cannibals.
Anthofoe, a river port, 47; identified with the Meghnā estuary of the Ganges, 832; Wilford's identification of, 832.
Anuruddha, king of Pagan, 74, 75, 190.
Aor, Pulo, 721, 723.
Apes, Chinese, of legendary folk-lore, 788.
 Aphéterion, location of, 743; port for ships bound for Khrysê, 743.
Āpi Passage, sea route through, 715 n. 1.
Arab geographers, travellers, etc., 57, 80, 88, 91, 113.
Arab settlements, 679.
Arabic words and terms, 88, 89.
Araguan, 38.
Arakan, kingdom, 28, 29, 33, 36, 39, 41, 42, 45, 54, 68, 68, 69, 90 n., 121, 129, 155; Ptolemy's error regarding the coast of, 5, 11, 13; annals of, 30, 39; Triglypton located in, 30; early kings of, 30, 31; other designations of, 32, 38, 38 n. 2, 39, 40 n. 3, 425, 670 n. 1; centre of Kalinga rule, 34; silver-mines of, 37, 39 n. 1, 40 n. 3, 51, 740; the Argyra of Ptolemy, 37, 40 n. 3; inhabited by Negritos, 38; derivation of the name, 40, 40 n. 3; independence of, in Ptolemy's time,
chief kingdom of Sumatra, 590, 669, 681; the name discussed, 658, 659, 736; position assigned to, in old maps, 669; successive designations of, 681; possibly connected with Tarshish, 706; silver of, 706; connected with Argulj, 834.

Ari-mardana-pura, kingdom, the ancient name of Pagán, 63, 746; kings of, 746.

Ari-samanam, Ari-śambala, district, term connected with Arisabion, 63.

Arian, Ariano, district, corresponds to Shenbo or Bhamo, 63; connected with Arisabion, 63.

Arisa-mien, Ari-sein-myo, the probable local name of Arisabion, 63.

Arisabion, district, identified with Shenbo and Sein, 61-3, 754, 829; connected with Arian, Amie, and Mien, 63; connected with the Tau State, 182.

Arkung, district, connected with Arakan, 38, 90 n.

Armanān, island, possible identification of, 387 n. 4, 422.

Arana (the king), 492 n. 2.

Arakan, 37, 127, 134, 138, 140; Thai invasion of, 154; also designated Kamarpūpa, 773, 813; three kinds of rhinoceroses in, 833.

Asama, the people, 154.

Asamese words and terms, 154.

Asia, Central, 4-6, 14, 159, 160.

Asiknī. See Chināb, river.

Asiu, river, identical with the Hainan, 617 n. 2.

Asita. See Chinabakeer, river.

Ashoka, king of Magadha, 123, 123 n. 2; date of, 299 n. 1; conquered Van- lāng, 291; exploits of, 297 n. 2; conquests of, 320 n. 1; miracle worked by, 320 n. 1. See also Dharmasoka.
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Aśoka-vardhana. See Thūk-P'han, 765.
Asong, the, people, identical with the Och'ang, 765.
Aspitra, town, identified with Luchau, 26, 251 n. 1, 377; derivation of the name, 735.
Aspitra, river, McGrindle's erroneous longitude of the mouth of the, 6.
Aśūr, island, possibly Ašūr, island, 667 n.
Assi, king of, 704.
Astagiri, meaning of the name, 177.
Astina, city, alleged capital of Java, 592 n. 1.
Athēnagōrou, identified with Dinājpur, 835.
Aṭjēh. See Ačēb, kingdom.
Attaba, river, Ptolemy's stream in the Malay Peninsula, 81; identified with the Lābih River, 105; connected with the Trinagano, 105; origin of the name discussed, 730; location of, 759; identification of, 759.
Auru, kingdom, a kingdom of Sumatra, 455 n. 1.
Austin Strait, between the North and Middle Andāmāns, 379.
Auzul, city, on Illa Jana, 647.
Ava, city, also designated Shwē-va, 56; identical with LawŚ, 162 n. 1; amber-works at, 582 n. 1.
Ava, kingdom, 58; a designation of Burma, 56.
Ava. See Iravatī, river.
Avalokiteśvara, statue of, 599.
Avatrana, district, possibly a prototype of Shē-p'o-ta, 464 n. 2.
Awī-Dīchā, a Śiāmese leader, 645; captured Passed, 645.
Axes, offered to the genius of Mount Bā-vi, 341 n. 1.
Ayer Tāwar, district, gold obtained from, 477 n. 1.
Ayer-tawar, Pulo, the residence of the Rāja of Kalungi, 509 n. 2; identification and location of, 509 n. 2.
Ayethēma, Ayethēma, 86, 90 n. 1; identified with Goja-mattika-nagara, 83, 85; other designations of, 819.
Ayodhyāpura, city, identified with Ayuthia, 508 n.
Ayuthia, city, 111 n. 1, 151 n. 2; the law code of, 84 n. 2; the former Dvāravatī, 176, 177; foundation of, 181, 183, 531; capital of Siem-lo, 184; identified with Ayodyāpura, 508 n.; the old Śiāmese capital, 508 n., 717 n. 1; other designations of, 645; perversion of the name, 717 n. 1.
Ayuthia, chronicles of, 532 n. 1, 449, 775.
de Azevedo, Antonio Miranda, a fort built and commanded by, 653, 654.
d'Azevedo, Lopo, fort at Pacem dismantled by, 654; mastered Pacem and Aru, 654.

B
Bā, discussion of the term, 308, 309, 309 n. 1, 310.
Bā-dên, Mount, remains of an Indu temple on, 220.
Bā-du, an inscribed stella found at, 280, 281, 281 n. 1.
Bā-hung. See P'o-fêng, district.
Bā-lang. See Ho-ling, state.
Bā-Loi, country, probably the Lēstōn Khora of Ptolemy, 161 n. 2; the Annamese form of P'o-li, 772.
Bā P'hnom, city, other designations of, 294 n. 2; capital of Komar probably transferred to, 294; Buddhist monastery at, 294 n. 2; probably the ancient capital of Fu-nan, 209.
Bā-Sak. See Campasak, kingdom.
Bā-shēkh, 309 n. 2; Chăm term applied to the priesthood, 309, 309 n. 2; a Brāhmaṇ teacher, 795.
Bā-Tē Śūn, mountain, identical with Nui Bā-Tē, 159 n. 1.
Bā-vi, Mount, Ou-ki settled at, 340; offerings made to the genius of, 341 n. 1; the chief of the Šūn-tih resided on, 343, 344; description of, 344 n. 3; legend respecting, 345 n.; a statue of St. Michael to be erected on, 345 n.; three temples on, 345 n.; to become a place of pilgrimage, 345 n.
Bā-viêt, kingdom, designated Maved, 205.
Babi, Pulo, erroneous designation of Si-Malur, 446.
Bāh-hāk, village, on the site of P'hoing Chou, 798.
Bāch-jāng, river, other designations of the, 798.
Bach-ma, mountain, 201.
Bacumeran, islands, designation of the Andāmāns and Nikobārs, 397.
Badakhshan, district, 39 n. 2; a designation of part of Upper Burma, 40 n. 3; spinels obtained from, 741.
Badakānala, a sort of volcanic fire, 672.
Badracan, island, a designation of Madramakan, 752 n. 1.
Bahmar, the, people, probably the Barrhai of Ptolemy, 130.
Baizāk, the term discussed, 393, 394.
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Bajau, the term discussed, 503 n. 1.
Bajau, Bajo, Baju, the, people, other forms of the name, 366 n. 1, 804; of Borneo, 366 n. 1, 395 n. 1, 612; description of, 503 n. 1; probably tortoise-shell traders, 671 n.
Bajau, island, one of the Anambas, 722.
Baju, village, location of, 584 n. 2.
Bajur Bay, location of, 584 n. 2.
Bak-nin, district, connected with Yö-bi Napoleon, 350.
Bakara, kingdom, location of, 541 n. 1; other designations of, 656.
Bakarganj 744.
Bakawan, village, location of, 583 n. 2.
Bakongan, state, connected with Manila, 688 n. 1.
Baktra, 669; derivation of, 40 n. 3.
Baktiari, the, people, inhabitants of Arakhosia, 40 n. 3.
Bakumurun. See Nichomuran, islands.
Bal, derivation and meanings of the term, 789.
Bal, city, other designations of, 780.
Bal-Angwa. See Bal-Angwe, city.
Bal-Angwe, city, identical with Ch'â-bân, 229, 780; the Balanga Metropolitan of Poltomy, 238 n. 1, 242, 265, 269, 277; other designations of, 268, 271, 274, 508 n.; the capital of Lower Campâ, 269-71, 696, 710; derivation of the name, 269; the derivations of names applied to, 271, 272; probably Mura-râja's royal city, 270; stormed and captured, 275, 276, 696, 703; renamed Kwî-noun, 276; the last king of, 697 n. 1.
Bal-Batthinung, city, seat of government of Campâ, 230, 780.
Bal Hangow, city, 228 n. 3; Châm term, designating Hwê, 229; the foundation of, 697 n. 1, 779; location of, 779; origin of the name, 779; identification of, 791.
Balâhaka, mountain, on Nárikela, 807, 809.
Balâksa, district, 39 n. 2; connected with Badakhshân, 40 n. 3; other forms of the name, 741; location and identification of, 741.
Balarama, god, copper axes offered to, 341 n. 1.
Balas rubies. See Rubies, Balas.
Balasa, district, identified with P'o-lo-sa, 831.
Balassia, district, 39 n. 2, 42, 741, 742; not connected with Badakhshân, 831; a district or city of Upper Burma, 831; connected with P'o-lo-sa, 831. See also Burma, Upper.
Balcha. See Balassia, district.
Balghu, identification of, 807.
Balhara, state, 57.
Balî, island, 98 n.; P'o-tâng wrongly identified with, 473.
Baling, village, location of, 506.
Balkh, 40 n. 3.
Ballazia. See Balassia, district.
Balon. See Belum.
Balanga Metropolis, must be distinguished from Balangka, 111; identified with Châ-bân, 233, 277; identical with Bal-Angwe, 238 n. 1, 242, 265, 269, 277, 732; other designations of, 268, 271, 277, derivation of the name, 269, 270; present account of the ancient site of, 277.
Balangka, town, 17, 21, 22, 40 n. 1; Ptolemy's Golden Khersonese ends at, 81; an inland town of the Golden Khersonese, 111; distinct from Balanga Metropolis, 111; identified with Ch'umph'hon, 111; other designations of, 112, 761; legend of Buddha connected with, 114; location of, 731; probably the capital of Kâmalâkâ, 731.
Balus-chaung, stream, 741.
Balûs Island, productions of, 430; suggested identification of, 430; inhabited by cannibals, 430. See also Nalûsh, island.
Bamboo, camphor produced from, 444, 444 n. 2.
Bamboo Island, identification of, 711.
Bân Châwâ, village, designated also Mûang Xâva, 461 n. 1; noted for turtle-doves, 461 n. 1.
Ban-shua. See Hwang-ch'ao, rebel leader.
Bannas, 387 n. 4, 551, 555.
Bandama-ceti. See Prathama-ceti, monument.
Bandèn, country, sent tribute to Java, 581 n. 3.
Bandas, islands, connected with the Island of Spices, 555.
Bandhuma-pura, town, a chief town of Siâm, 176; name changed to Suvarna-puri, 190, 192; connected with P'an-p'an, 830, 832.
Bândon, village and district, 78, 79, 470 n. 1, 832; identical with Wanta, 106; height of, 721, 761; connected with Patanor, 832.
Bâng, cape, 800.
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Bāng, or P'hraē Bāng, statue of Buddha, 149 n. 1; explanation of the name, 768.
Bang-an, ancient remains at, 791.
Bāng Plā-sōi, other designations of, 824.
Bangka mines, the, discovery of, 470 n. 1.
Bangkaru. See Bānyak, West, island.
Bangklis, island, location of, 577.
Bāngkōk, the royal temple in, 107.
Bangoran, Bangoran, island, a designation of Great Natuna, 707 n. 2, 708 n. 1, 709, 713, 715.
Banong. See Penong, the, people.
Banthai, meaning of the term, 775.
Banthāi-mās, district, 7; location of, 193; the ancient ruins of, 193; wrested from the Annamese, 195 n. 1.
Banthāi-mās, a mart, 7; the chief seat of trade on the Gulf of Siām, 8; the Pithōnōbstē of Ptolemy, 192, 731; derivation of the name, 193; an important trade centre, 193; erroneous account of its destruction, 194, 195; other designations of, 195 n. 2; probably the capital of Komor, 202, 203.
Banthāi-mās, river, 775; connected with the Pāsak, 193, 194; defeat of the Siamese fleet in the, 194, 195
Bānyak, islands, connected with the Maniolai, 421; probably correspond to the Berāwā Islands, 448.
Bānyak, Great, island, included in Ptolemy’s Barusai, 446.
Bānyak, Little, island, included in Ptolemy’s Barusai, 446.
Bānyak, West, island, included in Ptolemy’s Barusai, 446; other designations of, 448, 448 n. 2.
Bap Harbour, connected with Kān Mōnh harbour, 793.
Banbangā estuary, the Kambērikhon of Ptolemy, 9.
Barago Point, connected with the Sarabarik Gulf, 71 n.; name connected with Bharu, 400 n. 2.
Baragu, 807.
Barahngār, port, description of the inhabitants around, 400 n. 2; identification of, discussed, 401 n., 402 n., 403 n., 808; probable site of, 402 n., 403 n.; connected with Po-lo, 403 n.; possible origin of the name, 807.
Barakura, a mart and state, 37, 42, 48, 49 n. 1; ancient capital of Arakan, 42, 155; derivation of the name, 42; represented Arakan in Ptolemy’s time, 42, 43, 400 n. 2, 670 n. 1; probably identical with Dhaññāvatī, 43; identified with P’o-hui-kia-ju, 58, 467; erroneously connected with Bareuthra, 155; connected with Bharu, 400 n. 2.
Barata Bay, on Narkondam, 403 n.
Bārātān Island, 392, 400 n. 2; included in Ptolemy’s Bazakata, 379.
Barbarians, 124.
Barbarous states, the states outside the Chinese border described as, 123; Ptolemy’s account of the, 123.
Barberyn, the Nubartha of Ptolemy, 12.
Bardia, town, also called Chumb’hon, 470 n. 1; possibly connected with P’o-ts, 822.
Bareuthra, city, identified with Barikan, 155; erroneously identified with Barakura, 155; connected with Pāripātra, 155; derivation of the name, 155. See also Bareukora; P’hūen, Mūang.
Bareukora, city, 295 n. 3; probably connected with Mūang P’hūen, 364 n. 2, 769; derivation of the name, 732; identification of, 769. See also Bareuthra; P’hüen, Mūang.
Bārīā. See Saigon, town.
Barikan, Borikan, city, the Bareuthra of Ptolemy, 155; formation of, 769.
Barkān, island, 577; connected with Prakan, 577 n. 2.
Barmāvar, Barmapura. See Varmpura, town.
Barn Island, a designation of Pulo Senang, 815.
Barrebeam, village, 729.
Barrebeam. See Bārebonna, mart.
Barrhai, the, people, probably identical with the Bahmar, 139; habitat of, 356, 362, 803; identified with the P’u-črh, 363, 365, 366, 732; a probable foundation of, 364 n. 2; suggested racial connections of, 365, 372, 732, 803; other designations, 769.
Bartay, Bertayl. See Dhūṭāll, island.
Bārūs, district, on the Sunhātra coast, 427, 590; the Barusai Islands named from, 428; confused with the islands near, 428; described as an island, 431; other designations of, 434, 445, 584 n. 3, 611, 619; names of places connected with, 445; well known to Arab travellers, 679; a possession of Achēr, 705.
Bārūs, term for camphor, or camphor-oil, 440, 440 n. 1.
Barusai, islands, 587; identification with the Fanṣūr or Pi-su Islands,
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427; inhabited by cannibals, 428; a favourite haunt of the Batia, 428; origin of the name, 428; noted for the Fansur camphor, 428; confused with the district of Bari, 428; names of islands included in Ptolemy's, 446, 458.

Barwan. See Beruan, state.
Basai. See Bassein.
Basak, city or village, possibly connected with Peh-shih, 167 n., 892.
Base stations in Ptolemaic geography, 3-5, 16-19, 21.
Basim. See Bassein.
Basitang, location of, 674; a possession of Achreb, 705.
Basma, Basman, kingdom, 834; connected with Pasai, 613 n.1, 642 n. 2, 645; the people of, 695.
Bassec. See Campassak, kingdom.
Bassein, city and district, 52, 65, 77, 90 n.; other designations of, 50, 50 n. 1; foundation of, 50; the thirty-two cities of, subject to the Muns, 51; erroneously connected with Ptolemy's Bawanga, 51, 70; also designated Chou-mei-liu, 523 n. 2; identified with Pasai, 656; ships from Ceylon arrived at, 750.
Bassein, city (Indian), 48, 49.
Bassein, river, 48, 49, 77; erroneous position given to the, 50.
Bata, probably identical with P'oa-ta, 470 n. 1; tin-mines at, 470 n. 1.
Batahun, district, campbored at, 437 n.
Batai camphor, 811.
Battang, district, identified with Matung, 450 n. 2.
Battang-Asei, district, gold produced at, 631.
Batavia, a state of the Island of Java, 637; foundation of, 637; a mart for tortoise-shell, 671 n.
Batech. See Battak, district.
Bati, the people connected with the Batta, 660.
Batta, Battak, the people, 646; face-tattooing among, 367 n. 3; a remnant of, in Bakara, 541 n. 1; form of writing among, 595; connected with Ptolemy's Batoi, 660; descended from the Indonesians, 660 n. 2; habitat of, 660 n. 2; cannibalism of, 660 n. 2; doubtfully connected with the Padaties, 660 n. 2.
Battak, district, the cannibal inhabitants of, 655; human skulls used as currency in, 655.
Battak writing, 595 n. 2.

Batti Malv, island, 421; probably corresponds to Malhan, 401, 402.
Batu, islands, identified with Ptolemy's Sabadeibai, 446; inhabitants of, 448.
Batu Atap, mount, the source of the Attaba River, 165; the source of the Lebeh, 759.
Batu Berhala, 388 n.; a stone idol, 806.
Batu Kawa, a stone idol, discovery of, 806.
Batu Sawar, a possession of Achreb, 705.
Bauwal Island, probably included with Kau-lan Shan, 712; other designations of, 712; rendezvous for Chinese convoys, 712.
Bayang, village, 211; inscription of, 211.
Bazakata, island, 411; identification of, 379, 427; murex shell-fish on, 379, 379 n. 3; inhabitants of, 379; name probably synonymous with Aginnatai, 382, 385; derivation of the name discussed, 384, 393, 393 n. 3; name connected with Bhoja, 613.
Beacon at Hsin-chou, 781.
Benj, Biau. See Bajau, the people.
Bedfarkalah, island, identification of, discussed, 387 n. 4.
Beduanda Jawa, the tribe, a chief tribe of Rembau, 516 n. 3.
Belala dynasty, 826.
Belandas, the people, habitat of, 729, 730; connected with the Pulindas, 729, 730.
Belawan, river, location of, 661 n. 1.
Beligam, village, 387 n. 1; identical with Pich-lo-li, 386 n. 3; seaport and fishing village, 386 n. 3.
Beligama, footprint and temples at the foot of the, cliff, 390 n. 1.
Beltong. See Billiton, island.
Belum, gold-mines at, 477 n. 1.
Ben-nga. See Saigon, town.
Benares, city, 45.
Bengal, kingdom, 9, 29 n. 2, 39 n. 2, 46, 85; names applied to, 53, 92, 466 n. 2.
Bengal, Bay of, 30, 73, 93, 94; difficulty of identifying Ptolemy's places on the, 1; the Magnus Sinus of Ptolemy, 2; eastern side of the, lengthened by Ptolemy, 14; islands in the, 23, 24, 28, 38 n. 2; identification of Ptolemy's islands in the, 24, 25; also designated the Gangetic Gulf, 47; table of places opposite the east coast of the, 426.
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Bengali place-names, 44.
Bengkülen, residency, 452-4; hairy dwarfs in, 687.
Bengku-üle, residency, a designation of Bengkülen, 706; a possession of Acheh, 706.
Benjoin, a product of Sumatra and Borneo, 638, 638 n. 3.
Bentuan, village, location of, 533, 821.
Benua, the, people, 254 n. 1; face-tattooing among, 367 n. 3.
Beipurus flu., streams, two unnamed Ptolemaic streams, 834; the northern corresponds to the Gandak, 834, 835; the southern to part of the Brahmaputra, 835.
Bépyrrhos, mountains, 54, 834; a stream of the Doanas comes from, 134; a designation of the Patkoi Mountains, 729; the name discussed, 729, 835.
Bérabai, city, 81, 83, 98; identified with Mergni, 24, 70, 82, 384 n.; connected with Pa-lo-p’ei, 84; identification of, discussed, 84 n. 2; the name discussed, 729.
Bérabai, cape, identified with Boyce’s Point, 81.
Bérabonna, a mart, 743; erroneously identified with Sandoway, 46, 47; probably identical with Pienus-geon-raw, 47, 48; name of, connected with Bharu, 400 n. 2; site of, 401 n.; derivation of the name, 728.
Bermanang, state, connected with Fo-lo-an, 825; location of, 825.
Bérawa, islands, inhabitants of, 447; identification of, 448; the name discussed, 448; probably belong to the Barusai, 448.
Berba, river, probably the ancient name of the Chin-chiang, 617 n. 2.
Berhala, Pulo, possibly identical with San-jo Heü, 617.
Bernam, river, 100; position of, 522.
Bersergh, village, 518 n. 1.
Bertayl Island. See Dhûtjâil, island.
Beruán, state, 608 n. 1; probably identical with Fo-lo-an, 600, 601 n.
Bejaidai, the, people, habitat of, 830.
Bejilam, river, 626.
Besynga, a mart, 51, 71, 90 n.; erroneously connected with Bassein, 50 n. 1, 51; connected with Thah-tun, 76; identified with Rangün, 72, 76, 77; identification with Bassein impossible, 77; derivation of the name, 729.
Besynga, river, derivation of the name, 75-7, 750; its identity discussed, 76, 76; probably identical with the Hlaing, 75; identified with the Iravati, 609 n. 2; other designations of, 509 n. 2.
Bésygeitai, Coast of the, a designation of the Gulf of Martaban, 64, 70; identified with Râmaññadesa, 65.
Bésygeitai, the, people, of Ptolemy, 64, 70; described as cannibals, 70, 71; derivation of the name, 729.
Betel-chewing populations of South China, 750.
Bétumah, island, 199 n. 4; identified with Tumasak, 199, 199 n. 3; probably represented the Johor district, 200, 221; connected with Singapore, 200, 533, 777; identical with Pentam Island, 536; location of, 536; connected with Sùmah, 575; identification of, discussed, 576 n. 1; other designations of, 821.
Beureuën, state, 688 n. 1; probably the ancient Fo-lo-an, 600, 601 n. 1.
Bghâi Karen, the, people, litholatry among, 120 n. (3).
Bhadrâhipatiśvara, temple dedicated to, 545.
Bhadravarm, king, 781.
Bhâgâlpur, kingdom, the Amgas, people of, 51; identical with Campâ, 51.
Bhârvâ, worship of, 756.
Bhâmo, town, 61, 66, 786; derivation of the name, 42 n.; formerly designated Campânagara, 42 n.; chief city of the Shen state, 62; position of, corresponds to Arián, 63; country round, formed the ancient state of Shen, 370; other designations of, 747; ruins, possibly of Old, 747.
Bhâratavarṣa (India), 29, 381 n.
Bhargha, the, people (India), 141.
Bharru, kingdom, location of, discussed, 400 n. 2; connected with Barakâria Emporion, 400 n. 2; name of, connected with Bèrâbonna and Barago Point, 400 n. 2; a designation of the Andâmân-Nikobâr Archipelago, 403 n.
Bhârarnaga, town, capital of Bharu, 400 n. 2.
Bharuch, port, identical with Bhârakaccha, 382 n.
Bhârakaccha, port, a designation of Bharuch, 382 n.; a seaport in Bharu, 400 n. 2.
Bhâskâra Acârya, calls Eastern India Aindrâ, 29.
Bhâva-varman, king, 167, 169, 169 n. 1, 206; inscriptions of, 212.
Bhàyya. See Bhâva-varman, king.
Bhūkṣus, over a thousand in Bhoja, 619.
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Bhiktimāsa. See Pithonobaste, mart.
Bhilasa Topes, found at Vedasa, 747.
Bhilū, the, people, 257; connected with the Bila, 257 n. 1; name applied to the Taru Karens, 786.
Bhīlū-gyun, island, 38, 761, 807; inhabited by cannibals, 71; suggested identification with Bālos Island, 430.
Bhimas, the, people, writing among, 595 n. 2.
Bhīmasena, Bhīmsen, demigod, 809.
Bhoja, kingdom and town, country about Hwê known as, 229 n. 2; connected with Palembang, 229 n. 2, 612; capital of Sīr-Bhoja, 619; an important port, 619; a centre of Buddhist learning, 619; trade between China and India and, 619.
Bhoja, the, people, related to the Andhaka, 612; a seafaring race, 612; of Palembang, 612; the name discussed, 612, 618; a branch of the Yādava, 612 n. 3.
Bhoja-pura. See Fo-shih-pu-lo, district.
Bhojakula, the, people, descendants of the Bhoja, 612 n. 3.
Bhojakata, city, foundation of, 393 n. 3, 611; connected with Bazakata, 393 n. 3.
Bhrāja. See Bhoja, kingdom.
Bhukām. See Bakam, kingdom.
Bhūma Varti. See Mungdun, city.
Bhāpu-deva, king of San-to-ch'é, 623.
Bi-srīga, river, a possible designation of the Hlaing, 77.
Baiju. See Baijau, the, people.
Biar, state, identification of, 688 n. 1.
Bich, seaport, 801.
Bien-hoa, Bien-hwa, district, 215; identification of, 778.
Bien-Hoa, river, identical with the Dong-nai, 215.
Bijnagar. See Vijaya-nagara.
Bīla, the, tribe, habitat of, 237 n., 786; possibly the Bhilū, 257 n.; their identification discussed, 257 n., 786.
Billiton, island, other designations of, 167 n., 712; erroneous identifications of, 712, 712 n. 1.
Biū-diū, town and district, the centre of Lower Campā civilization, 237; name applied to Kwī-hōn, 238 n. 1, 277; capital of a Chām kingdom, 263; reduced by famine, 277; second city of, built by Ja-long, 277.
Biū-thūn, district, the Chām driven to, 226, 268, 269.
Biū-thvōn. See Biū-thūn, district.
Biū-dinh. See Biū-diū, district.
Bintang, island, probably identical with Dhūtagāl, 558, 620; other designations of, 558.
Birnī, state, 513 n. 1.
Bisa, district, inhabitants of, 830.
Biserat, Siamese headquarters in Java, 518 n. 1; caves and Buddhist shrines at, 518 n. 1.
Bīgulōk, 769.
Black River, 153; connected with the Red River, 125; a stream of the Hā-nōi, 314; other designations of, 314, 314 n. 1, 765, 792.
'Black Teeth.' See Hā-ch'īh, the, people.
'Black Water,' river, a designation of the Mé-Khong, 287 n.; other designations of, 792; course of the, 792.
'Blacks,' the, term applied to the Negrito tribes, 255.
'Blazing Sea,' the, 781.
Biū, term applied to hill people, 257 n.
Blue Mountain, source of the Kulādān River, 30.
Bīmar hainnifer, a camphor-tree, 435, 437; powers attributed to the, 436 n. 1; distribution of the, 438, 438 n. 1.
Bō-chān, district, identification of, 781; the frontier of Campā, 797.
Bō Hāi, the temple at, 799; location of, 799.
Bo-mang, stela discovered at, 791.
Boar, wild, in the Andāmān-Nikobār Archipelago, 401 n.
Boutrances, at Rangūn, 662 n. 2.
Boats, built entirely of wood, 424.
Bodhi inscription. See Wat Phō inscriptions.
Bodhirasā Mahāthera, a Lāu headpriest, 184 n. 1.
Bodhisatta, images of, found, 219 n. 1.
Bogindo Bong-kit, king of Eastern Java, 540 n. 2.
Boja-nagara, district, erroneously connected with Fo-shih-pu-lo, 584.
Bojig-ngijida. See Bojiringi, the, people.
Bojigs, the, people, of the Andāmāns, 612.
Bojiringi, the, people, living near Port Blair, 392; other designations of, 392.
Bojo, island, location of, 584 n. 2.
Bojur, islet, location of, 584 n. 2.
Bombax Malabaricium, the silk-cotton tree, 80.
Bompoka, island, 421.
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Bora-that, river, other designations of, 741, 742.
Bordelon, tin-mines at, 470 n. 1; identification of, 470 n. 1.
Borneo, island, 2; probably identical with Tu po, 245, 248; the best pepper procured from, 454 n. 1; P'o-ni erroneously identified with, 512; other designations of, 634 n. 1; governed by women, 647 n. 2; queen of, 647 n. 2; noted for tortoise-shell, 671 n.; tailed tribes in, 718 n. 1.
Borongo, island, 43.
Bougies, the, people, inhabitants of the Anambas and Natunas, 708 n. 1.
Bovée's Point, the Cape Bêrêbêl of Pôloymy, 81.
Brahma, Marammâ not derived from, 68, 69; Burmese claim descent from, 70.
Brahmadatta. See P'hâm-bô-dât, king.
Brahma-desa, district, 471 n. 2; probably identical with P'o-lo-mên, 471 (see Corrigenda, 813, 814); a designation of Taguung, 745, 746, 749; application of the name discussed, 749.
Brahman priests, employment of, 122.
Brahmap settlement at Ligor, 108.
Brahmapa-râstra (India), 471.
Brahmani kite, 139 n. 1.
Brahmans, account of the, in Ligor, 108; of Campã, in Panrang, 309; places largely settled by, 471 n. 2; inhabiting Ya-p'o-tî, 541.
Brahmaputra, river, 28, 85, 122, 138, 140; identified with the Lauhitya, 51; connected with the Dyardanes and Oidanes, 282, 285; alterations in the channel of, 282 n. 1; other designations of the, 282, 287 n., 829.
Brahmaputra, Lower, river, 28.
Brahmaputra, Old, river, mouth of the, 35.
Brai-nagar, town, connected with Köï-Mâi, 219 n. 2; meaning of the name, 219 n. 2; connected with Zabai, 219 n. 2.
Brao, Brâ. See P'hýu, the, people.
Bras, Pulo, identified with Lung-yên Hsû, 581 n. 3, 691-3; erroneously identified with Mao Shan, 689, 690; a lighthouse erected on, 690, 691; account of, 690, 691.
Bratail, island, a designation of D'hûtalî, 558 n. 4; petrified prawns at, 558 n. 4.
Brau. See P'hýu, the, people.
Breb' the, people, shields carried by, 771.
Brian Island, identification of, 714.
de Brito, Antonio, pepper merchant, 634.
Brû. See P'hýu, the, people.
Brûás, district, the first kingdom and râja of Pêräk established at, 757.
Brûnai, river, 498 n. 3.
Brûnai, not connected with P'o-ni, 513.
Buddha, 33, 94, 159; his peregrinations in Indo-China, 40, 40 n. 1, 114, 115; images of, 43, 44, 219, 219 n. 1; footprints of, 80, 115, 382 n. 1, 390 n. 1, 665 n.; statues of, 96, 128, 149 n., 193 n. 1; relics of, 107, 108, 188, 188 n. 1; epipheth of, 109 n. 1; legends respecting, 108, 109, 114, 385, 658, 664-6; the native land of, 184 n. 1; his visits to Ceylon, 381 n., 664; his clothes stolen while bathing, 385; other names applied to, 387; gilded figures of, 390 n. 1; the real body of, said to be at Adam's Peak, 390 n. 1; his visit to Lângkâ, 658; the Isle of Giri moved and replaced by, 658; conversion of the Wãhã, etc., by, 660 n. 2; aerial flight of, and 20,000 disciples, to Sumatra, 664, 665 n.; trees bowing to, 665 n.; his visit to Pâlãnakâ, 666; death of, at Kurínã, 779.
Buddhaghosa, a famous Buddhist, 193, 193 n. 1.
Buddhagupta, a shipowner, 98.
Buddhism, establishment of, 65 n. 2; in Burma, 69; in Siâm, 109; imported into China, 124; at Luang Phârah Bâng, 146 n. 1; extirpation of, from Kamboja, 203; in Palembang, 604 n. 1, 610, 619; in Kan-t'o-li, 604 n. 1; little practised at Ya-p'o-tî, 609; ruins of, at Java, 610 n. 1; in Acheh, 665 n., 667 n.
Buddhist cosmology, 136.
Buddhist priests, inventive genius of the, 37, 38, 77, 82.
Buddhist Temple Hill. See Fo-t'âng Shan.
Buffalo fight, 641, 641 n. 1.
Buffaloes, sacrificed, 146 n. 1, 767, 768; in Kamorta, 401 n.; tailess, 699.
Bugi, the, probably tortoise-shell traders, 671 n.
Buka I, the founder of Vijaya-nagara (India), 757; identification of, 757.
Bukâm, kingdom, name applied to Pagán, 55, 62, 63, 152 n. 1, 625.
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Bukit Cherating, hill, 514 n. 2.
Bukit Gelang, probably Ptolemy's Maleu Kolo, 476 n. 1.
Bukit Mertajam, an inscribed slate-stone found near, 98.
Bukit Sepang, location of, 758.
Bukit Timah, the highest hill on Singapore Island, 498 n. 3.
Bukit-Tunggal, once an island, now far inland, 751; location of, 751; also designated Pulau Tunggal, 752.
Bulang, island, 475.
Bullocks, sacrificed in China, 146 n. 1.
Bung-ki-hwa cape, 793, 796.
Burmä, kingdom, 5, 29, 34, 41 n., 54, 55, 58, 64-6, 69, 122, 127; chronicles of, 53, 62, 63, 125; early designations of, 40, 67, 68, 467, 814; designated Ava, 56; the national emblem of, 67; the early kings of, 67, 70; origin of names for, ascribed to the Mâi-Khmer race, 70; the dominions of, 75, 82; the people of, 103, 129, 130; date of Ptolemy's information regarding, 739; gold found in, 748; wars with Pegu, 819.
Burmä, Lower, 144; the Golden Country of Ptolemy, 54; other designations of, 54, 55; ancient Pião, 56, 78, 75, 467; identification of, 61; included in Suvarnavarānata, 65; subject to the kings of Prome and new Pagān, 65; Marewra, the capital of, 70.
Burmä, Upper, 30, 39 n. 2, 42 n., 52, 54, 59, 63, 73, 74 n. 3, 75, 127; called Balassia, 39; export of rubies from, 39, 39 n. 2; other designations of, 40 n. 3, 55, 57, 152 n. 1, 467, 524 n.; derivation of the name, 41 n.; part of, known as Tu-po, 55; dynasty founded at, 60, 61, 122; the chief source of supply of amber, 582 n. 1.
Burmä, Western, 54; the Kalinga in, 32.
Burmänaka, a district of Tripura, 32; ancient name for Arakan, 32.
Burmah, the, Tenasserim subjected to, 756.
Burmesse, the, 31, 70, 130; tribes connected with, 52, 69; kings of, 67; other designations of, 68.
Busong, gold obtained from, 477 n. 1.
Butong, island, connected with Poteng, 489.
Báying, Sultan, king of Achôb, 704; murder of, 704.

Byraeally, village, probably identical with Kamberikhon, 11.
Byzantium, 19.

C
Cacan, other designations of, 757.
Caderaipaim, location of, 728 n. 2.
Caicul. See Ko: Tron, island.
Caidu. See Ghaidu, district.
Cakra, mountain, probably the Haisun, 677; on Nârikela Island, 807, 809; possibly identical with Sombrero, 807, 809.
Cakras (quites), used as weapons, 491; description of, 491 n. 2.
Calamak. See Malamasm, kingdom.
Calim, calim, term designating tin, 87, 88.
Calincus, river. See Katabeti and Kuladân, rivers.
Câm. See Châm, the people.
Câm inscription, 68.
Cam, the, people of Cam, 234.
Camæ-devā, the founder of Lā-slep, 143; the first queen of Lamp'ho, 143, 184 n. 1.
Camatra, state, a form of Sumatra, 653; noted for pepper, 653.
Camboja. See Kamboja, kingdom.
Camel, province, 115, 113 n. 3; probably corresponds to Kamanlay, 762; other designations of, 773.
Camel's Hump, island, 714; identification of, 711.
Camoi, Bay of, pearl fishery in the, 782; other designations of, 782.
Campâ (India), kingdom, location of, 42 n.; the present Bhâgalpur, 51.
Campâ (Indo-China), kingdom, 8, 113, 121, 122, 779, 781; connected with Zabâi, 6 (see Corrigenda, 740); connected with Câlamansi, 127, 146 n., 298; known as Hsiang-liin, 146 n., 147; the people of, invaded Tonkin, 268; identical with Hô-tön, 227; afterwards named Lîn-i, 227, 298, 794; other designations of, 228, 234, 269, 297, 298, 508 n., 563; letter from the king of, 229 n. 2; kingdom of, broken up, 230; erroneous beliefs as to Chinese rule in, 230, 231; two states comprised under, 233; the date and extension of the name discussed, 234, 235, 297; capital of, transferred to Chanch'eng, 234; unification of the various divisions of, 234; war with Kamboja, 241 n. 3, 274, 275; identification of the term Senef with, improbable, 243, 243 n. 3; temple
of the goddess of, 265, 267; discovery of the oldest inscription of, 265; war with Annam, 275, 276; the eaglewood forests of, 278; camphor produced at, 438 n. 1; alleged unity of the empires of Zabez and, 463; conquered by King Le-Hang, 563 n. 3; capital of, 563 n. 1, 779, 780; earliest mention of, 783; conquests of the king of, 796.

Campā, Central, kingdom, identified with the kingdom of the T'ai-dô, 233.

Campā, Lower, kingdom, identical with Cochin-China, 237; the civilization of, is of South Indian origin, 237; Châ-bân, the capital of, of 241 n. 3.

Campā, Northern. See Campā, Upper, kingdom.

Campā, Southern. See Campā, Lower, kingdom.

Campā, Upper, kingdom, the early civilization of, introduced from Northern India, 236, 301; historical resume of, 301; high state of civilization and trade in, 301; capital of, 302.

Campā-pura, town, 779; former capital of Campā (in India), 42 n.; identified with Chamba, 42 n.; connected with Chêm-thân, 234; the derivative of Campā, 236.

Campā. See Chan-chéng Kwo, city.

Campāmalîni, 297.

Campānagara, town, 746; ancient name of Bhamo, 42 n.; origin of the name discussed, 297.

Campar, a kingdom of Sumatra, 455 n. 1.

Campā-śak, Campāśaka, kingdom, founded by the Châm, 166; mentioned in the Po-U-Daung inscription, 166 n. 1.

Campāśak, town, other designations of, 166, 167 n.

Camphor, 430, 482, 572, 576, 625, 787; procured from Takola, 58; from the Fausîr Islands, 428, 431, 554; the cultivation and production of, 432 n. 2, 438 n. 1, 439 n. 1–3, 810; Bûrûs, 434, 435; Chinese, 435, 435 n. 3; terms designating, 435, 435 n. 3, 439 n. 3, 440, 441, 441 n. 1, 809, 810; places where once obtainable, 437 n., 810; export of, 437 n., 809, 811; table of comparison of the names for, 442, 443; produced from a kind of bamboo, 444, 444 n. 2, 811; from Acheh, 699–702, 809; first western mention of, 810; extracted from cinnamon roots, 810.

Camphor Cove, 436 n. 3, 576 n. 1.

Camphor-oil, 437; terms designating, 810; product of Ch'umph'nôn, 810, 811; used as tribute, 811.

Camphor-trees, 436, 437 n., 438 n. 1; distribution of, 437 n., 810; native names of, 436, 437 n., 438 n. 1; huge size of the, 810.

Canal, possibility of a, across the Malay Peninsula, 79.

Candana-pura, city, identical with Chanthabûn, 524 n.

Candra Sûrya, king of Arakan, 43; image of Buddha cast by, 43, 44.

Candrabhânu, prince, leader of the Malays in attacking Ceylon, 624 n. 1; his attack on Ceylon repulsed, 629.

Candrâpurî, city, identical with Wîeng Chan, 149 n. 1.

Cangigu, Cauqugu, the, people, face-tattooing among, 675 n. 1.

Cannibalism, account of, among the Waûhs, etc., 660 n. 2; the same form of, traceable for twenty-four centuries, 660 n. 2; of the Kâro discussed, 674 n. 2, 675 n. *; of the Gâyû, 674 n. 2; in Pûh-kien, 789; instances of, 827, 828; guilty eaten as a punishment, 827; foreign merchants eaten, 827; portions of dead foes eaten, 827; rebels and traitors eaten, 827; an assassin eaten, 827; murderers eaten, 827, 828; deceased persons eaten by the family, 828; caused by famine, 828; raw and living persons eaten, 828.

Cannibals, 64, 273 n. 1, 289 n., 447–9, 664, 652, 660 n. 2, 693, 700, 784; the Zamirâi a race of, 52; the Bêsyngreetî described by Ptolemy as, 70, 71; in the Martaban district, 71, 72; in existence on the Salwin, 72; the Châm, 253; the Papuâ-Negritos, 253 n. 1; on the Maniolai Islands, 420; on Malihan Island, 422, 423; on the Andâmâns, 826.

Canton, city and district, 129, 131 n. 2; connected with Ama, 244; identical with P'an-yû, 230 n. 2, 291, 321 n. 1, 322; its identity with Kattigara suggested, 303 n. 1; many Indo-Chinese in, 352 n.; other designations of, 230 n. 2, 377, 378, 824; a Superintendent of Trade established at, 515 n. 1; cannibalism in, 828.

Canton, island, identical with Wai-lo Shan, 238 n. 4.

Cantonese, the, defeat of, 796.

Cape Rachado. See Tanjong Tuan.

Cara, islet, a designation of Kôb Krâh, 811.
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Carangera, Bocca de, other designations of, 809.

Carbuncles, procured from P'o-li, 491; description of, 491 n. 1; obtained from Lo-ch'a, 491 n. 1.

Cardamon, production of, 444 n. 2.

Carma-dvīpa, the, people, derivation of the name, 806, 807; habitat of, 807.

Carnauba, island, a designation of Kar-Nikobār, 399.

Carol, Caol. See Ko: Tron, island.

Caruspa, 808.

Cartographers, old, their errors and ignorance, 75, 135 n. 1, 375.

Casmi, Casmin, Cosmin. See Kusima, district.

Catalan maps, comparison of the two, 834.

Catur-grāma. See Chittagong, city.

Catur-tūdra. See Cheduba, island.

Caturamukha, town, 216 n. 1.

Caucasian race, the Stein possibly a branch of the, 159, 160.

Caudate tribes. See Tailed tribes.

Cave-dwellers, 158, 159, 257 n., 771, 772, 787.

Cave dwellings, 158, 159, 169 n. 1.

Caves, limestone, on the Malay Peninsula, 79; stalactite, 485.

Cāv-Mai. See Kōl-Māi, hill.

Cedi rájas, 35.

Celates, the, people, inhabitants of the western shores of the Malay Peninsula, 80.

Centipede, legend of a, devouring an elephant, 77, 751.

Central Asia, 6, 14, 159; Ptolemy's geography of, 4, 5.

Cetaceans of the Mē-Khōng, 284.

Cevion, kingdom, 38, 79, 81, 92 n. 3; Ptolemy's latitude of, 12; a base for fixing the position of Ptolemy's islands, 24, 25; the first recorded king of, 76 n. 1; expeditions from, 95, 176, 750; a relic-casket of Buddha at, 108; thrice visited by Buddha, 381 n.; also designated Hsi-lan, 339, 679 n. 2; confused with the Ardāmān-Nikobār, 419; other designations of, 422, 423 n. 1, 497 n. 1, 589 n., 651, 700, 816, 834; envoy from, imprisoned, 555, 536; account of Fa-Hsien's voyage to China from, 604, 605; attack of the Malays on, repulsed, 629; second attack on, 629; tradition of the separation of Sumatra and, 669, 681; account of the ruby owned by the king of, 679 n. 2; P'ínó attacked by, 750; country of P'ínó laid waste by ships from, 750.

Ch'ā, the, people, connected with the P'un-ch'a, 363.

Ch'ā-bān, city, capital of Campā, 229, 233, 238 n. 1, 240, 780; identical with Bal-Angwē, 229, 242, 780; situation of, 230; capture of, 230; the Balonga Metropolis of Ptolemy, 233, 277; known later as Kwi-ūn, 233; designated Kwi-ūn by the Annamese, 238 n. 1; the name discussed, 271, 272; identification of, 780.

Ch'ā-lāng, city, a designation of Bal-Angwē, 271, 277; the term discussed, 272-4.

Ch'a-li Yāka, name of kings of the Liang dynasty, 492, 492 n. 2.

Chā-vā, Ch'ā-vā, the, people, the Malayas of Sumatra, 636.

Ch'ā-vā. See Dā-bā, kingdom.

Ch'ā-vā Kwok, kingdom, 468.

Ch'hadāng, the, people, 788; probably identical with the Salāṅ, 262; wild tribes near Bal-Angwē, 273.

Ch'ai-lī, the, river and district, identified with Cheringat, 512 n. 2, 514, 514 n. 1; location of, 514.

Ch'aināth, 769.

Ch'aiyā, river, 761.

Chakmā, the, people of Chittagong, 829.

Chalang, state, location and identification of, 626, 656, 656 n., 701; a possession of Achē, 705.

Ch'alāng. See Junkceylon, island.

Chaidoa, district, connected with Tiao-chih, 679 n. 1.

Chām, the, people, 55 n. 2, 128 n. 2, 130; fought for the coastline of the Great Gulf, 225; driven to Bifāthān and Komboja, 226, 227; former occupants of Cochin-China, 227; raids on Chinese territory, 228; heavy reverse to the, 229; vassals of Annam, 230; disappearance of their rule, 230; their growth and civilization, 239, 252, 253; designated Rāksasas, 253; extent and declension of their rule, 269, 271; pioneers of, 272; twice defeated by the Chinese, 781; descended from a monkey race, 785.

Champa. See Campā (in India), kingdom.

Champaran, district, also designated Sambalaka II, 834.

Champone, town, a designation of Chumpāhūn, 761.

Chan. See T'an, state.

Ch'ang, kingdom and city, 297,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>779</td>
<td>identical with Cochin-China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>a designation of Campā, 228, 297; the capital of Campā, 234, 235, 237; dress of the people of, 243; also designated Shang-yüan, 280 n. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan-ch'êng Kwo, city, identical with Ciamba, 240.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan-li-p'o, city, identical with Chên-li-fu, 524 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan-peî, the place where the first chief of Palembang lived, 564 n. 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan-peî, a title used in Palembang, 564 n. 4; the term discussed, 564 n. 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan-p'ô, Chan-pu-lao, state, identified with Shenbo, 62; once tributary to P'iao, 62; identical with Campā, 228, 254.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan-sz-t'ing, sent on a mission and shipwrecked, 822; also known as Shams-ud-din, 822.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chânda, district, account of the women of, 808.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang, district, part of Kraunca-dvîpa, 244.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang, the Chinese camphor-laurel, 441 n. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Hai, Sea of, 782; the Chinese name for Dadhi Ocean, 244; location of the, 245, 245 n. 3; identified with the China Sea, 247-9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ang-lisin, Chinese ambassador, 497 n. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ang Kiang, deposition of, 290 n. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang-sha, district, part of Kraunca-dvîpa, 244.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ang-yau Island, 498 n. 3; a designation of Singapore Island, 498, 498 n. 3 (see Corrigenda, 813).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changkat Rambian, town, the petrified hull of an Indian ship at, 751; location of, 751; once a seaport, now far inland, 751.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changgong, river, identical with the Iravati, 509 n. 2; other designations of, 509 n. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanthabûn, city, inhabited by the Ch'ông, 157; connected with Chên-li-fu, 524 n.; identified with Candana-pura, 524 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ao-chou, town, capital of the Yung-ch'ang prefecture, 739, 747; location of, 739.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Ju-kua, 397 n.; inspector of foreign trade and shipping at Fuhkien, 389, 391.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao-t'o, a Ta'in general, overthrew Van-lâng, 230 n. 2, 291; king of Nan-yüeh, 291; conquered Ou-lûk, 322; declared himself king, 322.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao-wa, state, other designations of, 451 n. 1; a designation of Java, 480 n. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ao-yüeh Wang, emperor, 330 n. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Char-dhuba, See Cheduba, island.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charachina, other designations of, 809.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charagia, See Kâraâng, district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charâi, the people, 627; litholatry among, 120 n. (3); invasion of Kamboja by, 773; fire kings possessed by, 773; teeth-filing among, 802.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charan, Chhâu, the, people, 627; savages of South Cochin-China, 612.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chasm, a fathomless, on Harnaj Island, 551.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattala, a district of Tripura, 32.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chh'au-chou, port, a ship from Sans-to-ch'u with perfumes, etc., arrived at, 622.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chân Khan-dêng, founder of Mùang Lân-nâ, 295 n. 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chau-lang, a designation of Highland Java, 466.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chh'au-wa, Chh'au-wa Kwo, Chhâwa, designations of Java, 464, 465, 539 n. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaudoc, 775.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhâuân Râjputs, deity of the, 742.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chau, town and point, 48; the Timula of Ptolemy, 48, 731.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauri, island, 399, 421; identical with Sombrero, 689, 809; account of, 689; other designations of, 809.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhâwa, state, early designation of Lùang P'hraâ Bâng, 131, 149-51, 768; connected with the Chêh, 150; tributary to Ayuthia, 461 n. 1; tributary to Siâm, 532 n. 1, 549; location of, 549; connection with Jâwah, 553; a dependency of Sukhôthâi, 768.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhâwa, the, people, 460 n. 1; troops of, repelled by the Siamese king, 548, 821; the Malays of Sumatra, 636.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chê-bông-ngâ, king of Campâ, 276; styled the Châm Hannibal, 276; destroyed Hwô, 780.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Che-hwan, the, people, face-tattooing among, 367 n. 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ê-li, territory, the Chinese name for C'hîeng Rung, 135 n. 1, 138 n. 2, 804.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chê-mai, location of, 824.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chêdâbâ, island, 36; erroneously identified with Bezekata, 427.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chêh, the, race, 129, 131 n. 2, 138 n. 2; meaning of the name discussed, 128 n. 2; in the district of Lùang P'hraâ Bâng, 132, 150; description of, 132, 133; the founders of Eastern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mālava, 133; decline in civilization of, 133; driven away by the Lāu, 150; connected with the Pʻu-chʻa, 363, 364.

Chēb, Müang, a division of the Chʻiang Rung kingdom, 138 n. 2.

Chekkiang, district, location of, 778.

Cheila, city, identified with Hsie-lo, 467, 467 n. 1; capital of the Thai Māu, 467 n. 1; superseded by Sê-Lân, 467 n. 1; location of, 467 n. 1.

Chek, term designating the Chinese, 128 n. 2.

Chellang. See Chalang, state.

Chūn-la, kingdom, 824; identified with Kamboja, 61, 73, 158, 168, 203, 233, 241, 465, 497, 773, 794, 820; description of the natives of, 171; application of the name, 202, 203; subject to Fu-nan, 202; known also as Khī-mieh, 202, 203; also designated Jala, 203; location of, 497, 498; origin of the name, 773.

Chēn-li-fu, city, identified with Cha-thabùn, 524 n.; other designations of, 524 n.

Chūn-nan, kingdom, a designation of Annam, 327.

Chenchij, district, 782; identified with Haiman, 246 n.

Chendras, gold-mines at, 477 n. 1.

Chʻeng-chiang, town, the capital of, Fē-hī-tsê, 763; location of, 763; connected with Ptolemy's Pandass, 763.

Chēng Ho, his visits to Sumatra, 648, 657; famous Chinese eunuch, 649, 702; visits Su-mèn-ta-la with the Chinese fleet, 650; visited Nan-wu-li, 702, 703.

Chēng-tai, seaport, 800.

Chʻeng-tʻien-wan-shou, the name given to a Buddhist temple, 623 n. 2.

Chʻeng-tsʻu, emperor, 649; Nan-po-li sent tribute to, 703.

Chʻeng Tsung, king, 532.

Chērating, river and district, identical with Chʻai-lih-ting, 512 n. 2, 514, 515.

Chet-chʻhiang, founder of Phʻuʻen, 295 n. 3.

Cʻhi Khram, King Ku-lai sought refuge at, 780.

Chi-ku, island, connected with Ko-koseng-chih, 816.

Chi-li Tʻien-men, island, 520 n. 1; identified with Timor, 519, 520, 520 n. 1.

Chi-lo-ta-lung, trade of, 629; suggested identification of, 629.

Chʻi-mí-hla, city, the seaport of Chou-méi-liu, 524 n.; situation of, 525.

Chʻi-mí-hla, district, identified with Chou-méi-liu, 523; other designations of, 523 n. 2.

Chi-pʻi-mi, title of an envoy to China, 523 n. 2.

Chi-to, trade of, 628; identification of, 628.

Chi-yen, Ki-yen, king, 472, 472 n. 2, 472 n. 3.

Chʻia-chʻi-lan-tan, state, identification of, 599 n. 1, 626; subject to Sanfo-chʻi, 626.

Chʻia-lan, islet, 816; identified with Kar-Nikobár, 817.

Chʻia-lo-hai, state, subject to Sanfo-chʻi, 627; identification of, discussed, 627, 628; manufactures of, 628. See also Ka-lo-hai.

Chʻia-lo-ho-fu, identical with Kala-sapura, 830.

Chʻia-tʻa. See Kia-tʻo, kingdom.

Chiamde-Chu, river, a designation of the Mê-Không, 135.

Chʻiang, the people, claimed descent from aper, 687 n. 5.

Chiao-chih. See Tonkin, province.

Chiao-lan, island. See Kau-lan Shan.

Chʻiao, Chiao-chih. See Kēu, the people.

Chiao-chih, town, a designation of Tonkin, 225 n. 1.

Chiao-yao, the, race, a cannibal race, 72; description of, 288, 786, 787; wrongly identified with the Negritos of New Guinea, 258 n. 1; identification of, discussed, 259, 787; the habitat of, 259, 787; connected with the Wild Wa, 259; traditional pyramids, 804.

Chiem, Chiem-thān, 'the city of Chan,' capital of Chan-chʻeng, 228, 229; other designations of, 228, 229, 229 n. 1, 297; destruction of, 229; identified with Campāpura, 234; identified with Līn-i, 237.

Chiem-bā, Chiem-būt-lāu, identical with Campā, 228.

Chʻien-chih-fu. See Pan-chih-pa, islands.

Chʻien-lien, a metal, 754.

Chʻi-en-mai, state, subject to Sanfo-chʻi, 627; manufactures of, 627; suggested identification of, 627.

Chien-pʻi, state, subject to Sanfo-chʻi, 628; trade of, 628; identification of, discussed, 628.

Chʻieng, application and meaning of the term, 118, 118 n. 1, 119, 134, 134 n. 1.
C'hien, the, race, 226 n. 1; early derivation of the name, 118; country occupied by, 128 n. 2; cave dwellings of the, 159; the Sakai belong to the, 159 n. 2.

C'hien Chêb, the, people, settlers of Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula, 657.

C'hien Chuang, C'hien Ch'ang, the royal city of the Lawas, 119 n. 1.

C'hien Dong-C'hien Thong, city, the first name of Lâng P'hrâb Bâng, 145.

C'hien Hung. See C'hien Rung, city.

C'hien-Khân, 116.

C'hien Kêng, identical with Keng-Cheng, 133.

C'hien Khung, town, 128; on the Mé-Không, 287 n.

C'hien Khwang. See P'huen, kingdom.

C'hien Lap, 133.

C'hien-mai, state and town, 116, 132, 143; Western Laos comprised Nân and, 116; spoken of as the Mâl country, 116; Chinese invasion repelled by, 139; on the site of Lamng, 143, 144; Lasippa in the district of, 144; foundation of, 767 n. 1; capital of Western Laos, 767 n. 1.

C'hien Râi, connected with Menamwae, 151 n. 1.

C'hien Rung. See Chiu-lung Chiang, river.

C'hien Rung, city, 118, 134, 804; the Rhingiberti of Ptolemy, 138, 142; the capital of the twelve Phan-nâ townships, 138; other designations of, 138, 139; the Wild Wâh settled north and west of, 804.

C'hien Rung, territory, 119, 122; sometimes designated Alavi, 57; three divisions of, 138 n. 2, 139 n.; divided into twelve districts, 139 n.; connected with Raing-pura, 140.

C'hien Sên, district, identification of, 767, 768.

C'hien Sên Chronicle, 129, 171.

C'hien Thong, city, name applied to Lâng P'hrâb Bâng, 152, 153.

C'hien Tung, town and district, 118, 819; names applied to the natives of, 793; gun-maker of, 805.

Chih, Strait of, 776; identified with Singapore Strait, 814, 816, 820.

Chih Hai, a branch of the China Sea, 248; other designations of, 248.

Chih-han, brother of the king of Su-men-ta-la, 651; other names applied to, 651.

Chih-Rosei, two ancient statues dug out at, 220.

Chih-shwei Ho, name applied to part of the Red River, 315 n. 1, 750.

Chih-t'u, town and district, 752; identity of, discussed, 83, 161 n. 2; identified with Sukkothai, 155, 178, 178 n. 1; 179, 469 n. 3, 497 n. 1, 742; a designation of Siâm, 170, 469 n. 3, 742; description of the natives of, 171; may represent Sawankhalok, 178, 178 n. 1, 507 n.; meaning of the term, 178; Chinese envoys acquainted with, 179; divided into two kingdoms, 179; ancient capital of Northern Siâm, 182; name superseded by Hsien, 183.

Chim-Sên, ancient remains at, 791.

Chin, kingdom, a designation of P'egu, 90 n., 774.

Chin, the, people, tattooing customs among the various, 675 n. †, 804.

Chin-bôks, the, people, tattooing among, 675 n. †.

Chin-bôns, the, people, black tattooing among, 675 n. †.

Chin-ch'i. See Khmiti, the, people.

Chin-chou, kingdom, identification of, 640 n. 1.

Chin-dài, Chinh Dai, town, connected with Shên-t'ou, 801.

Chin-li-pi-shih, country, location of, 823, 824.

Chin-lin, kingdom, other designations of, 164 n. 1, 773; silver in, 164 n. 1; identity with Camelan suggested, 773.

Chin-lin, Great Bay of, the 'Sea of Milk,' 164 n. 1; corresponds to the Gulf of Siâm, 164 n. 1; other designations of, 248.

Chin-t'o-li. See Kan-t'o-li, state.

Chinh-Zai, town, probably identical with Sinda, 799.

China, 6, 29 n. 2, 31, 63, 65 n. 1, 92, 122, 127, 148, 160; Ptolemy's geography of Western, 4, 5; ancient capital of, 16; identification of Ptolemy's places on the coast of, 25, 26; trade with, 60, 62, 88; Indu dynasties in, 123, 124; trade between Sanfo-ch'i and, 628; date of Ptolemy's information regarding, 739; other designations of, 778; cannibalism in, 827, 828.

China, 'gates' of, 245.

China, Southern, original occupants of, 130, 131 n. 2, 160; identification of, 778.
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China Sea, names applied to branches of the, 248; corresponds to the, Chang Hai, 249; sea route to the, opened by the Dravidians, 302; other designations of the, 781.

Chināb, river, 41 n.

Chinaheker, river, derivation of the name, 41 n.

Chindwin, river, 31, 33, 40 n. 3, 34, 65, 66; name Imius applied to the, 41 n.; silver exported from, 44 n.; silver-mines in the valley of the, 741.

Chindwin, valley, 68; silver-mines in the, 39 n. 1; formerly inhabited by the Zamirai, 52.

Chinese, the, 123, 124, 146 n. 1, 160; names applied to, 55 n. 2, 63, 64, 128, 131, 131 n. 2, 764, 765; repelled by Prince Khán Sên, 139 n.; conquests of, 147; settlements formed by, 621; ruled in Ku-kang, 630; ruled in San-to-ch'î, 630, 631; the Châm defeated by, 781; agriculture introduced into Tonkin by, 786; expeditions of, 781, 797, 825, 833; knowledge of, and trade with, Java, by, 824, 825.

Chinese aboriginal race, 131 n. 2.

Chinese civilization received from India, 124.

Chinese Emperor, homage paid by the P'iao to the, 75.

Ch'ing-Ho. See Lu Kiang, river.

Ch'ing Kiang, See Lu Kiang, river.

Ch'ing-tung Ting, location of, 792.

Ch'ing-yuan, district, a designation of Chung-su, 199.

Chingpaw, the, people, other designations of, 744, 749.

Chisor, temple of, 296.

Chitrang, river, 41 n.

Chittagáon, the coast of, 31.

Chittagáon Hills, Triglypton located on the, 30.

Chittagong (Chittagáon), city, 11, 155; connected with the Pentapolis of Ptolemy, 30, 36; identified with Catur-gráma, 35; connected with Patikkarâ, 740.

Chittagong River, 36; known also as the Kurmasuli River, 36, 740; erroneously identified with the Katabéda River, 36; identified with the Mori River, 36.

Chittông. See Sittang, river.

Chittáy-andeman, island, the southernmost of the Andámâns, 806.

Chin-chên, district, introduction of agriculture into, 786; attacked by the king of Campâ, 796; identified with Thân-hwâ, 796.

Chiu-chiang, town and kingdom, the capital of Palembang, 564 n. 4; a designation of Palembang, 566, 617 n. 2, 630; identification of, discussed, 617 n. 2.

Chiu-chiang, Chiu-kiang, river, identified with the Sung-sang, 617 n. 2; other designations of, 617 n. 2.

Chiu-lung Chiang, river, other designations of, 135 n. 1; name of part of the Mê-Không, 135 n. 1, 288; meaning and application of the name, 135 n. 1.

Chiu-mi, Chiu-mo, kingdom, 202; absorbed in the Kambojan Empire, 204.

Chiu-tê, district, the ancient name for Hsiang-lin district, 148; history of, 288; inhabited by the Liâu barbarians, 285; the Kortatha of Ptolemy, 288, 289, 292; the name discussed, 296, 297; other designations of, 298; suggested identity with Kattigara, 303 n. 1.

Ch'ü-ming-chou, department, 246 n.

Ch'ü-ming-shan, territory, a description of Chu-yai and Chu-in, 246 n., 247 n.; meaning of the names, 246 n.; identical with Hoi-how, 248 n.; connected with Sôna-parvata, 250 n. 1.

Ch'ü-ming-shan, mountain, on Hainan, 246 n.

Ch'ü-ming-ying. See Ch'ü-ming-shan, territory.

Chô-dîn, inscriptions of, 781.

Chô-lîn, a famous Chinese mart, 219.

Chôk. See Jôk, the people.

Chôla, kingdom, a designation of Koromandel, 624; tributary to Zâbej, 624 n. 1; embassy to China from, 833; probably subject to Sumatra, 833.

Chôm-Sri Hill, a ridge running through Luang P'hrab Bâng, 145; founders of city worshipped on, 146 n. 1.

Chông, the, people, 160, 789; the inhabitants of Chanthabûn, 157; consist largely of outlaws, 157; the remnants of the ancient population of Kamboja, 157; probably a remnant of Ptolemy's Léstai, 159, 757, 772; a semi-barbarous tribe, 139; other designations of 769; habitat of, 769; description of, 769; identification of, 772.

C'hông Kânh'num Canal, 775.

Chong Ts'euk. See Chwang Tsei, the, people.

Chonlaburi, other designations of, 824.
Chordemucuo. See Caturamukha, town.
Chöm, meaning of the term, 588 n. 1.
Chou-mei-liu, kingdom, 523; identified with Bassein, 523 n. 2; location and identification of, discussed, 523, 523 n. 2; other designations of, 523 n. 2.
Chou-ngô, a district of Jih-nan, 311 n. 2.
Chruí Khamaun. See Kamboja, cape.
Chryssé (island), a form of Khryssé, 670 n. 1; rich in metals, 670 n. 1.
Chryssé Chôra. See Khryssé Khôra, district.
Chryssé Insula. See Khryssé, the 'Gold Country.'
Chrysorant, river, identification of, 757.
Chü-fêng Hsien, location of, 795.
Chu-ju, Chû-yû, a pygmy state, 247 n.; connected with Sikijor, 247 n.
Chüu-lan-wu, village, 386 n. 3.
Chü-hi, district, account of the natives of, 718 n. 1; identification of, 718 n. 1.
Chu-lien, kingdom, contributory to Palembang, 89, 624, 624 n. 1, 625; identified with Koromandel, 89, 609, 609 n. 2, 624; identification of, discussed, 609 n. 2, 623, 624; mission to China from, 623.
Chü-lien, a native rebel leader, 227, 230, 793; rebellion and enthronement of, 230, 232, 298, 299; his date and identity discussed, 233, 233 n. 1, 297, 298; the alleged founder of Lin-i, 289, 298.
Chü-lin. See Mêng Chü-lin.
Chu-lu, district, 246 n.; designation of Hainan, 250 n.
Chu-po, kingdom, connected with Kiu-t'a, 61; early notices of, 74; location of, 245, 248, 750; connected with Sabah, 245; identification of, 750.
Chu-po, the people, early inhabitants of P'imio, 73, 74, 75.
Chu Shan, island, identification of, 711.
Châ-sông. See Mêng Chü-sung.
Chû-su, city, captured from the Cham, 794; connected with Kortatha, 794; possibly connected with Pagrass, 794, 795, 800; a Cham stronghold, 795; location of, 796; gnomonical observation taken at, 796 n. 1; a fortified city, 822, 823.
Chü-t'an Hsin-pa-t'o-lo, king, 692 n. 1.
Chü-tu-ch'ien, country, other designations of, 793; conquered by King Wên, 793.

Ch'üii-tu-K'un, kingdom, suggested identification of, 570 n.
Chu-yai, territory, meaning of the term, 246 n.; name changed to Chiüng-shan, 246 n., 247 n.; pearl fishery at, 246 n.; name applied to the east of Hainan, 250 n. 1.
Chu-Yüan, the, people, habitat of, 777.
Ch'üan-ch'ou, port, 685; made the terminus of the San-fo-ch'i missions, 625; identified with Zaitun, 625; Persian envoys from, 700.
Chieh-lun. See K'un-lun, the, people.
Ch'ui-râp. See Sôi-râp, estuary.
Chukoh-liang, 144 n. 2.
Chumo, Mount, 691.
Chümp'hôn, town, 93; the Balongka of Piolemly, 21, 111; the terminus of the overland route across the Malay Peninsula, 111; other designations of, 111, 470 n. 1, 544, 761, 810, 811; trade route from Pâk-chân to, 115; account of, 756; camphor oil from, 816, 811.
Chin-t'u-lung Shan, island, probably identical with Kundur Island, 482, 482 n. 2 (see Corrigenda, 815); location of, 815.
Chung-jên, the, people, 364 n. 1; connected with the P'ü-ch'a, 363.
Ch'ung-ka-la, kingdom, a designation of Malacca, 519, 520 n. 2, 521; erroneous identification of, 603; connected with Jugra, 820.
Ch'ung-ka-la, district, identified with Sumbâwa and Sangar, 520; suggested identification of, 520 n. 2; a description of Shë-p'o, 549.
Chung-ka-lu, state. See Jung-ya-lu, state.
Chung-kia, the, people, cannibalism of, 661 n., 828.
Chung-su, district, a designation of Ch'ing-yuan, 199.
Chura, the, people, 627.
Chuvár, Ch'huva, the, people, 460 n. 1; the Malays of Sumatra, 636. 
Ch'huva-krabie, the, people, the Malays of Sumatra, 636.
Ch'huva Yava, the, people, a designation of the Javanese, 636.
Chwa-kia, state, a designation of Luang P'hra Phâng, 132, 150.
Chwang. See C'hông, the, people.
Chwang-jiên, the, people, designation of the Lang-ping, 273 n. 1.
Chwang-k'iao, a Chinese general, 64 n. 1; conquered Yunnan, 290 n. 1; conquered Tien, 321 n. 1; declared himself king, 321 n. 1.
Chwang Tsei, the, people, a designation of the Ch'ông, 737; identification of, 772.
Ciamba, Ciamba, port, 242 n. 1; identical with Chan-ch'êng Kwo, 240.
Cin. See Sein, state.
Cin, cape, name altered from Cape Cui, 85.
Cina-rāṭha, state, name applied to Sein, 62, 63; a designation of Bhamá, 746.
Cinaba, port, alternative name for Senef, 242 n. 1.
Cinnabar, 482.
Cinnamon, camphor extracted from roots of, 810.
Civilization of Java travelled through Sumatra, 596, 597, 598, 598 n. 1; of Sumatra, from India and Ceylon, 598 n. 1; antiquity of Sumatran, 601.
Clear River, the, a stream of the Há-nô, 314.
Clothing ordered to be worn by natives of Fu-nan, 158.
Cochin, the best pepper produced at, 454 n. 1.
Cochin-China, 90 n., 156; Ptolemy's geography of, 5, 7, 8; Ptolemy's error in the coastline of, 17, 22, 23; formerly occupied by the Chám, 227; identified with Chan-ch'êng, 227; Lower, also designated Giardin, 776; cannibalism in, 827.
Cocks, bearded, from Triglypton, 830.
Cocoanut Island. See Oung-gyun, island.
Cocoanut-palm, 807; the Tamil name of, 807.
Cocoanut Trees, Island of, 807; location of, 399.
Cocoanuts, 399, 399 n. 2, 400, 424 n. 1, 551, 554, 555; grown on the Nikobars, 380 n. 1; other names for, 807.
Cocos, island, a designation of Mentala, 715.
Cocos Islands, cocoanuts abound in, 400.
Cola. See Kola, the, people.
Cola. See Koromandel, country.
Colani. See Cūjāmālini, kingdom.
Colas. See Kolas, the, people.
Collars of metal worn by natives, 502, 502 n. 4.
Colleri. See Kalian, the, people.
Comolaman, the, people, 803.
Colombo, town, 92 n. 3.
Colombogām, port, possibly identical with Jambūkola, 381 n.
Colupe, the, people, a designation of the Kudutai, 356, 361; other designations of, 359; derivation of the name, 359, 360.
Como, kingdom, identification of, 776.
Conch-shell, cities built in the shape of a, 264, 798; Lwá-thai shaft shaped like a, 322, 322 n. 1.
Condor, Pulô, 723; called also Hsiao-k'ûn-lun, 90 n.; cannot be identified with Sender-fûlát, 250 n. 1, 724; inhabited only by convicts, 507 n.; account of the inhabitants of, 771; identified with Chùn-t'u-lung, 815; other designations of, 833.
Convéveram, city, also designated Kāmpēpur, 501 n. 1.
Conora, probably the Pûlara of Ptolemy, 47.
Copper-mines, 358 n. 2.
Coral obtained from Po-li, 493.
Coral-trees, 145.
Corol, Coroll. See Ko: Tron, island.
Coromandel. See Koromandel, country.
Costus, mountains, identified with the Twîng-mu-hsiang Mountains, 819; location of, 819.
Costus, perfume, sent from K'ûn-lun, 819.
Cotton manufactures, 659.
Country, Oriental term denoting, 588 n. 1.
Couvadism, the practice of, 289 n. and n. 4, 792.
Cremation practised in Kámârin island, 574.
Crocodile, 281, 284, 561; charmed and harmless, 564; resembling dragons, 791.
Crows, white, from Triglypton, 830.
Cūdāma-nagara, Cūdāmâla-nagara, city, connected with Lûâng Phraha Bâng, 146 n.; probably identical with Cûlana, 146 n.; a variant of Chûn-tâ, 296, 297.
Cui, cape, name changed to Cape Cui, 85.
Cuiras, use of, in Indo-China, 770.
Cūjāmâlini, Cūjîmâni, Ćulaṇî, Culla-mâlini, kingdom, 147, 361; foundation of, 127, 292; identified with Campâ, 127, 146 n., 292; possibly connected with Lûâng Phraha Bâng, 146 n.; other designations of, 292, 296; origin of the name, 297, 300; nomenclature of, discussed, 300, 301, 305-8.
Cûlana Brahmadatta, king of Pañehálâ, 297 n. 2; reigned over Kampilla, 793.
Cûlana Brahmadatta, kingdom, a designation of Campâ, 297, 297 n. 2.
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Culao Ray. See Kū-lâu Rê, island.
Cupang Soap River, 775.
Currency, human skulls used as, 652; comminuted gold used as, 806.
Customs, peculiar trading, 493, 493 n. 8.
Cuttaick, city, formerly called Kațaka, 307 n. 1.
Cyclones, 606.

D
Dé-bâ, kingdom, location of, 466; other designations of, 466; identified with Highland Java, 466; eighteen kingdoms subject to, 467; boundaries of, confused with Pian, 467; a designation of Shê-p'oo, 468; attacked by the king of Tonkin, 468.
Dā-nan-dông, district, inhabited by the Ts'wan, 125; location of, 152; name transferred to the banks of the Mê-Không, 153.
Dāba, Dabassa, 272 n. 1; Ptolemy's country of the Dabasai, 55, 57.
Dabag, state, a designation of Sumatra, 635, 633 n. 2.
Dabasai, the, people, 52; connected with the Dabasa Mountains, 54, 59; connected with the land of Daba or Dabassa, 54, 57, 59; the origin and habitat of, discussed, 54, 58, 59, 60; belonged to the Lâu race, 61; derivation of the name, 733; identification of, 745; the name discussed, 745.
Dabassa, mountains, 54, 59, 177, 733; one stream of the Doanas comes from the, 134; other designations of, 181 n. 1.
Dachêb, Dachi, kingdom, a designation of Achêb, 511, 511 n. 2, 597 n. 1; other designations of, 512 n. 2.
Dachem, town, identical with Argyrê, 681; a designation of Achêb, 704.
Dacoits, the Bach-ma Mountain a refuge for, 201.
Dadh, Dadhimanda, ocean, encompasses Kraunca-divipa, 244; known to the Arabs as the Sea of Sanju, 244; other designations of, 244.
Dadin. See Dondim, the people.
Dadin Island, identification of, discussed, 826, 827.
Dagroian, the term discussed, 674 n. 2.
Dagroian, Dangroian, kingdom, location of, 674 n. 2; identification of, discussed, 675 n.; the Gâyu country, 695; Islamism refused by the natives of, 695.
Dagûn, town, 831; a designation of Rangûn, 425, 523 n. 2, 811.
Dahah, river, 137, 765; the supposed outlet of the Doanas River, 134, 135, 281.
Dahvûi, cape, other designations of, 656.
Dâi C-hien, port, identification of, 781; other designations of, 788, 789, 790.
Dâi-lâ, city, ancient designation of Hà-nôi, 316 n., 330; a designation of Lâ-thân, city, 328, 329, 330; capital of the Li dynasty at, 329; name changed to Thang-long, 329; connected with Long-bien, 330; situation of, 330 n. 1, 800.
Dakhan, district, 101.
Dala, district, 41 n. 72.
Dala, city and district, 523 n. 2; name changed to An-yi, 666 n. 2; anec-
dote respecting its change of name, 666 n. 2.
Dâm Ćông, a rivulet, 145.
Dâm-mong. See Trê, island.
Damang Lebar Daun, king, reigned in Palembang, 530 n. 4.
Damar, district, 676.
Damasai, state, may be the Tan State, 181 n. 1.
Dumasai. See Dabassa, mountains.
Dumasai. See Dabasai, the people.
Dami, kingdom, location of, 408 n. 1.
Damins, the, people, identity of, 674.
Damrei, P'nom, designation of the Elephant Range, 200, 201.
Dan. See T'âm, state.
Dân, the equivalent of Sthâsa, 34.
Dancing slave-girls, 500 n. 2; employment of, 506; as presents to China, 506.
Dâng-thâo, a term designating Kamboja and her people, 774.
Danta-kumâra, prince, the traditional founder of Lagor, 107; wrecked on the Diamond Sands, 107, 108.
Dantapura (India), relies from, 107, 108, 112.
Dâo-giang. See Dân-jâng, river.
Dâo-miñ, kingdom, location of the, discussed, 299 n. 5.
Daroque Dura, the, people, 686 n. 1; tailed, like sheep, 686.
Darbha, 673.
Dârva, the, people, 733.
Darvi, region, 745.
Dasâ-râja, founder of Old Pâgân, 152 n.; a corrupt form of Dhâja-
râja, 768.
Dasâna, district, derivation of the name, 734.
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Dasana. See Doana, city.
Daśārūpa, country and people, 126, 152; a designation of Eastern Mālava, 117, 121; term identical with Ptolemy's Dasana, 117; an Indā monarchy, 122, 124; designation of the State of Lōang Ph'rāh Bāng, 133; derivation of the name, 768. 
Datū Point, 708 n. 1, 709.
Dāū, river, an ancient name for the Red River, 316 n., 317, 317 n. 1, 318.
Dāū-jāng, river, other designations of the, 125; the Dōrīn of Ptolemy, 125; the Red River, 314, 315, 317; source of the, 316 n. 1.
Dāva. See Java, Highland.
Dāva, Dāvāka, Davāka, state, corresponds with the present Upper Burma, 55, 56, 57, 467; a 'frontier country,' 57; a tributary state of Magadhā, 57, 60, 61; synonymous with Aśāvī, 57; derivation of the name discussed, 58, 59, 745; other designations of, 656.
Davies, John, a pilot who visited Acheī, 655 n. 1.
Davvan, 55.
Dawa, the, people, the Malays of Sumatra, 636.
Dāvyā, a petty state of Sumatra, 529, 529 n. 2; location of, 62; a possession of Acheī, 705.
Dayang Bunting, island, a fresh-water lake on, 487 n., 488.
Dead man as a sacred relic, 390, 390 n. 1.
Dedap. See Nāsi Besar, Pulo.
Deer in Great Nikobār, 401 n.
Delegore, district, tin-mines in, 470 n. 1; identification of, 470 n. 1.
Delī, a possession of Acheī, 705.
Dennak, city, alleged capital of Java, 592 n. 1.
Demon, a perversion of the name Damān, 717 n. 1.
Deoban, the highest mountain in Little Nikobār, 396 n. 2, 414; name of, connected with So-tu-man, 414.
Devadaha, city, a designation of Koli, 491 n. 3.
Devī, goddess, alluded to as Pō-Nagar, 260.
Dhājarāja, king, settled at Manipura, 745; conquered Tagauung, 745.
Dhakkā, river, 47.
Dhalaji. See Talach'ī, town and province.
Dharmaceti, king of Pegu, institutes the Kalyāṇi inscriptions, 65.
Dhammaceti-dvīpa, a designation of Tenasserim, 783.
Dhaññāvati, 39; ancient capital of Arakan, 43.
Dharanikota, relic casket of Buddha's remains enshrined at, 108.
Dharma-sena, king of San-fo-ch'i, 630; death of, 630.
Dharmanagara, kingdom, identified with Śrī Dharma-raja-nagara, 508 n.
Dharmarāja, kingdom, meaning of the epithet, 109 n. 1; a designation of Līgar, 544; a name of Yudhiṣṭhira, 832.
Dharmāsaka, king of Magadha, 264; conquest of Toukin by, 320 n. 1.
Dhubri, 835.
Dhulea, river, a branch of the Tetalua, 744; connected with Tilogrammon, 744.
Dūhältāl, island, belonging to Zābej, 558, 620; identification of, 558, 600 n. 3; other designations of, 558 n. 4, 620; the legend of the marine horse connected with, 600 n. 3.
Diamond Island, 48; origin of native name of, 49; probably the Tēmala of Ptolemy, 49.
Diamond Point, 12.
Diamond Sands, 169; Prince Danta-kumāra wrecked on the, 107; the site of Līgar, 107, 108; king of Magadha wrecked on the, 108.
Diamond Sands (India), legend respecting the, transferred to the Diamond Sands at Līgar, 108.
Dība-jāt, island, a rendering of Ibadidi, 465.
Didī Island. See Dadin Island.
Dien Bien-phū. See Ðêîn, Mūng.
Dihong, river, a designation of the Brahmaputra, 282.
Dimasa, the, people, 835.
Diṅ, king, assasin of, eaten, 827.
Dimāpur, connected with Athēnāgūrou, 835.
Dinding River, 98.
Dinding's, islands, tortoise-shell from the, 477 n. 1, 671 n.
Dinlov, city, on Sumatra, 647.
Dipāṅkara, statue of, at Yava-dvīpa, 547; the primeval Buddha, 547.
Direction Island, location and identification of, 711.
Do-bān, Do-bāng, city, a designation of Bāl-Angwā, 268, 271, 274; the name discussed, 271, 272, 274; an ancient district of Kūn-ebōn, 274 n. 2.
Doan, the, people, 153; other designations of, 126; the Doanai of Ptolemy, 126; a non-tattooing
people, 126; habitat of, discussed, 237. See also Ts‘wan, the, people.
Doana, Doanai, city, the early name of Wieng-Chan or its capital, 117; the name superseded by Savaka Mala, 177; identified with Luang Phrab Bang, 144, 148, 153, 155, 356; derivation of the name, 152, 732.
Doanai, the, race, 125, 127, 137; termed also Drohaka, Ts‘wan, and Pa‘i, 120, 121, 124 (see Corrigenda, 763); overthrew Luang Phrab Bang, 124; inhabitants of the country about Luang Phrab Bang, 155; derivation of the name, 732; connected with the Tuan, 732, 763. See also Doan, the, people.
Doanai, the country of the, 116, 153; identified with Lower Si‘am, 149.
Doanas, river, description of the course of the, 134; Ptolemy’s ignorance of the lower course of the, 134; identified with the Me‘Khong, 134, 135, 137, 155, 282, 287, 356; other designations of the, 134, 135, 137, 281; derivation of the name, 135, 732; the name originated by Ptolemy, 137; its identity with the Dyardanes discussed, 281, 282, 282 n. 1; means of identifying the, 283.
Doania, the, people of the Sibagar district, 154.
Dobassa Range, 745.
Dog, image and footprint of a, at Junkeyleon Island, 96.
Dog-worshippers, 97, 298 n. 1, 756.
Dogs trained for tortoise-hunting, 112.
Doli, the, people, 118; designation of the Lawa, 58.
Dong-nak, the, people, account of, 829.
Dolphins, 281, 283, 284, 791; of the Iravati and Me‘Khong, 791.
Domea, river, identification of, 318 n. 2.
Don-sun, a headland, formerly an island, 249 n. 2.
Don-dim, Don-dyn, the, people, cannibalism of, 661 n.; other forms of the name, 826; the name discussed, 826.
Dong-dö, name applied to Thang-long, 329.
Dong-Hoii, city, 229 n. 2; identical with Sri-Bani, 229, 779; a Cham seat of government, 223 n. 1, 236; the ramparts of, 779.
Dong-kiai, name applied to Thang-long, 329.
Dong-nai. See Bien-Hoa, river.
Dong-ngan, district, in the Ba-k-nan province, 373.
Dong-phô, river, not identical with the Hsin-chou, 239; the delta of the, 240.
Dong-Wan, town and district, probably identical with To-yuan, 831; location of, 831.
Dong-yin, district, 831.
Dorins, river, identified with Dangiang, 125; the river of Ha-noi, 318; identified with the Red River, 317, 318, 356; its etymological identification considered, 318, 318 n. 2; derivation of the name, 735.
Dut-tâ, a designation of Highland Java, 466.
Double Island, identification of, 711.
Dragon, the term for, 140 n.; legends connected with a, 322, 325, 326, 339, 339 n. 1.
Dragon’s blood sent to China as tribute, 651.
Dragon’s brain perfume, 441.
Dragons, the, A‘I-Lau tattooed with, 126; crocodiles resembling, 791.
Drangianâ, the derivative of Sando-way, 41 n., 46 n. 1.
Dravida, people of, connected with Arakan, 659.
Dravidian kingdom, the, 33.
Dravidians, the, people, 32, 34, 81, 86, 90, 101; invasions of, 28; the descendants of, were pioneer colonizers, 81; the Taungtho subject to, 86; colonies founded by, 101, 392; sea route to the China Sea opened by, 392; Acheb settled by, 680.
Dress, of the people of Chau-e‘ch‘eng, 243; of the people of Campa, 243 n. 2.
Droga stupa, 188 n. 1.
Drohaka, the, people, 126, 144 n. 2; probably identical with Ptolemy’s Doanai, 120, 121, 124.
Drum, the Maharadika. See Mahorandika drum, the.
Drum, the Then Lô. See Then Lô, the.
Drums, bronze, of Indo-China, 762.
Drubalasagos, a camphor-tree, 436, 437 n.; districts where found, 456, 456 n. 3; now almost exterminated, 437 n.
Dük-thô, city, the capital of Huan Chou, 797.
Dula. See An-gyi, district.
Dun-wun. See Dong Wän, district.
Durian, group of islands, 499 n. 3.
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Duttağamani, king, 108.
Dvādasah, Dwādaśa, one of the founders of Lōuang P'hrabh Bang, 145, 152.
Dvār, country, 774.
Dvāra-Sumudra, town, the capital of the Belā dynasty, India, 826.
Dvāraravi, city, a designation of Sandoway, 45 n. 2, 742 (see Corridgenda, 832); a chief town of Siam, 176; the modern Ayuthia, 176, 177; legend regarding, 742; connected with T'o-lo-po-uí, 820; Arakanese capital removed from, 832.
Dwarfs, 620; account of the black, of Cochín-China, 261, 262; of Serirah, 573; account of a kingdom of, 786, 781; of Yūn-nan and Laos, 788.
Dwarfs, hairy, 687; of Siak and Kroc, 657 n. 1.
Dyaks, the, a stone idol of, 806.
Dyaradanes, river, its identity with Ptolemy's Doana discussed, 281, 282, 282 n. 1; connected with the Oidanes, 281, 282, 282 n. 1; connected with the Brahmaputra, 282, 285; connected with the Mē-Không, 283, 284, 285.
Dynasties, the, of Achėh, 698.

E

Eagle-wood, 576, 811; from Ko: Tron and the mainland, 202; a production of Campā, 278, 279; exploitation of, 278.
Ears, lobes of, pierced and distended by the women of Achēh, 667 n.
East Island, 683.
Egg-showing village, the, 386 n. 3, 393.
Egu-belong, island, a designation of the Little Andāmān, 389 n. 2, 392.
Eisō, P'nom, the Isāna Mountain, 205; remains of a temple on the, 206.
Elenjimâls, islands, a designation of the Nikobârs, 700.
Elephant, legend regarding an, 751.
Elephant country, the district known as the, 147, 148, 149; origin of the name discussed, 148.
Elephant Hill. See Gumong Geriang.
Elephant Point, 751; location of, 729.
Elephant Range, known as P'nom Damrei, 200, 201.
Elephant River, 793; explanation of the name, 751; name applied to the Iravatti, 751.
Elephants, 116, 370, 699; in Barahnagar, 401 n., 402 n.; sprinkled with human gall, 789, 790; white, 819.
Elias, patriarch, 633 n. 2.
Embassies and missions, 29 n. 2, 62, 652, 821; from Piao to China, 75; from Nan-Chao to China, 75; from Fu-nan to India, 93, 755; from Lang-kia to China, 112; from China to India, 124; from Ceylon to Kambuja, 535, 536; envoy from China, 536, 649, 821; from P'o-ta to China, 541; envoys from Ho-lotan, 542, 543; from Shé-p'o, 542, 544, 547; Ho-ling, 546, 547; from the Palembang kingdom, 620-5; from Su-nu-ta, 644; from Su-mu-ta, 645; from Hsiu-wên-ta-nan, 648; from Su-miên-ta-la, 648-51; from Champâ, 649; Pro-Hwang seeks investiture, 543; from Hsien to China, 822.
Emerald statue of Buddha, 193 n. 1.
Emigrants from India to Indo-China, 122.
Emporia of ancient trade, Akadra and Pithônobastē, 7, 8, 212; Takôle, 92-4; Kalantam, 106; Malavir, 536; Ch'ump'hôn, 756; Hêng Shan, 797 n. 1; Shên-t'ou, 801; Lo-vieh, state, 820.
Endō, island, a designation of Flores, 589 n.
Engano, island, 422 n. 1; other designations of, 409 n. 2; possibly included in Ptolemy's Sindai, 449; natives of, 556 n. 2; alleged to be inhabited only by women, 753.
Equator, Ptolemaic, 12.
Erh-Hai, the Tali Lake, 64, 765, 765 n. 1.
Erh Ho, part of the Red River, 315 n. 1.
Ethnic affinities between the Achiinese and the people of Koromandel and Malabar, 660 n. 1.
Euphrates, river, 19.
Expeditions, 651; against Râmañña, 95; Chinese, 539, 709, 781, 797, 825, 833; against KmAr, 620; against Pâsai, 645; from Java, 713 n. 1; to the "Island of Gold," 807; against the K'ũn-lun country, 818.
Ezata, connected with Sada, 46.

F

Fa-Hsien, account of his voyage, 604, 605; probable route taken by, 606.
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Fā-ngum, king, 295 n. 3.
Fai-fo, town, the port of Turán, 280 n. 2; other designations of, 781, 785, 789, 790; foundation of, 790; ancient remains near, 791.
Famine, cannibalism caused by, 828.
Famūsà, island, under the sway of the Kāmān king, 574, 575.
Fan Ch'êng-ta. See Fan Shih-hu.
Fan-man, king of Fu-nan, 570 n.
Fan Shih-hu, appointed Imperial Chief Commissioner at Kwang-hsi, 241 n. 1.
Fana, island, identification of, 537; connected with Malavir and Pentam, 537.
Fanjab, Fanjat, the, tribe. See Fanjab.
Fanjab, Islands of, probably identical with Pan-chih-pa, 502, 502 n. 1.
Fansūr, 810; name applied to the district of Bārūs, 431.
Fansūr, city, its probable identity, 432 n. 1, 432 n. 2; located on Kalah Island, 553; identity with Pennchur suggested, 553.
Fansūr, islands, the Baruwas of Ptolemy, 427; other designations of the, 427; the famous Fansūr camphor probably from, 428, 431; various references to, 432; people of, alleged to be idolaters, 695.
Fansūr, Sea of, 663 n. 2, 695.
Fān-sṳr, a designation for camphor, 434, 436; the origin and history of the term discussed, 434 ff.; meaning of the word, 435; variants of the name, 436 n. 2.
Fā-sṳr, district, a designation of Bārūs, 434; Islamism introduced into, 696.
Fèng, river, a designation of the Mê-Không, 135 n. 1.
Fèng-yú, king of the Nan-Chao, 74, 750; abducted people from P'iao, 750; assisted P'iao against Ceylon, 750.
Fenjab, the, tribe, description of, 502, 502 n. 4; connected with the Sekah, 503 n. 1.
Feringhabazar, town, connected with Antibol, 832.
Feltec. See Perák, kingdom.
Festivals of floating offerings in streams, 493, 493 n. 1.
Fīg-tree, Indian, 39.
Fiji, face-tattooing among the women of, 367 n. 3.
Fire produced by friction, 233 n. 1.
Fire-god, the Chinese, 339.
Fire Isles, 249.
Fire King,' the, names applied to, 801; residence and powers attributed to, 801, 802.
Fire Kings, 342, 342 n. 1, 773.
Fire-worship, 340, 341 n. 1, 673 n. 1; in Kuśa-dvīpa, 672, 673.
Fish, with stone horns, 782; raw and alive, eaten in Tonkin, 786.
Fish-eating populations. See Ikhthyophagi.
Flat Islands. See Pulo Tāpak.
Floating houses, 564.
Flores, island, designations of, 589 n.
Flowered Faces,' tribe, the, a face-tattooing tribe of the Liao, 175 n. 2, 367.
Fo-ch'ī, town, the birthplace of Kwan-yin, 600; a designation of Bhoja, 600.
Fo-lo-an, a Sumatran state, 598, 825; account of, 599; legend respecting two brass statues at, 599; location of, 599 n. 2; identification of, 599 n. 2, 600, 601, 601 n. 1, 627, 825; subject to san-fu-ch'ī, 626.
Fo-shih, town, identical with P'bō-thē, 229 n. 2; derivation of the name discussed, 229 n. 2; a form of Shih-li Fo-shih, 481; other designations of, 779, 791; identification of, 791; location of, 815.
Fo-shih-pu-lo, district, 584 n. 3; identification of, 584; erroneously connected with Boja-nagara, 584.
Fo-t'ang Shan, island, 386.
Footprint of Buddha, 390 n. 1; on the Suwanna-malî Mountain, 80, 115; in Ceylon, 382 n. 1, 386, 387; on Hsi-lun, 665 n., 701; in the sea, 665 n., 701; in Burma, etc., 665 n.
Forlono, kingdom, a form of Perlak, 834.
Formosa, island, account of the aborigines of, 256 n. 1, 829; face-tattooing among the natives of, 675 n.; cannibalism in, 828.
Formosan Channel, Ptolemy's Gulf of the Sinai, 255.
Fortune Island, 419 n. 1.
'Frog-drum,' the. See Mahoradhika drum, the.
Fu-chou, 131.
Fu-ch'un, town, foundation and site of, 780; an ancient capital of Campā, 780.
Fu-hu, the, people, probably of Hainan, 367 n. 1.
Fu-liang Chiang, part of the Red River, 315 n. 1; narrative respecting the, 316 n.
Fu-lu, 784.
Fü-nan, kingdom, embassy from the king of, 93; a designation of Kam-
boja, 93, 794; corresponds to Léstai, 158; description of the natives of, 158, 171–3, 827; conquest of, 204, 206; origin and meaning of the name, 207; term synonymous with C’hìeng, 207; earliest mention of, 208; the people of, invaded Tonkin, 208; boundaries of, 209; site of the capital of, discussed, 209, 210; king of, pays tribute, 299, 794; visited by merchants, 302; conquests of, 818.

Fuegos, island, inhabited by Aeta Negritos, 247 n.

Further India, 24; deficient geographical knowledge of, 3, 26; place-names in, whence derived, 40 n. 3, 101, 117; maps of, 84 passim.

G

Ga-taha-bha, river, the local name of the Kulând River, 36, 41.

Gâlang, island, 475.

Gall, human, exacted as tribute, 275 n. 3; used to sprinkle royal elephants, 789, 790.

Galungí. See Kalungi, kingdom.

Gama, Don Stefano da, governor of Goa, 398 n. 1.

Gama, Vasco da, 398 n. 1.

Gambling farm managed by Mak-kú, 195 n. 2.

Gandak, river, 834, 835.

Gandhára, district, 121; connected with K’iung-tu, 62 n. 4.

Gandhára (India), 62 n. 4.

Gandhára-ráththa. See Yünnan, territory.

Ganesá, clay image of, worshipped, 752.

Ganfu. See Khánfú.

Gângâ-nagara, a chief city of Pêrák, 98; brief account of, 98.

Ganges, river, 9, 19, 28, 32; difficulty of identifying Ptolemy’s places on the east of the, 1; delta of the, 7; Ptolemy’s distance errors between Kânóje and the, 20; Ptolemy’s error in the course of the, 20; Meghna estuary of the, connected with Antibólo, 832.

Ganges, Old. See Dhakká, river.

Gangetic Delta, 53.

Gangetic Gulf. See Bengal, Bay of.

Gangétkos kolpes. See Bengal, Bay of.

Ganggang Putrí, marriage of, 644.

Ganjam, river, 47.

Garo, the, people, also called Achíkrang, 829.

Garo Hills, 53.

Garuda, mythical bird, abode of, said to be Kûta-sálmali Peak, 80, 81, 487 n., 752; also designated Vainateya, 80; other epithets applied to, 775.

Gaudas, the, people, the foundation of Takóla by, discussed, 85.

Gauháti, 286 n. 1, 835.

Gavampati-théra, a disciple of Buddha, 114, 657 n. 2; account of, 657 n. 2.

Gaya, district, child born in the, with a caudal appendage, 687 n. 5.

Gáyo, Gáyu, the, people, other forms of the name, 674 n. 2; cannibalism of, 674 n. 2; origin of the name, 674 n. 2; Islámism refused by, 674 n. 2; habitation of, 674 n. 2, 676 n.; account of, 674 n. 2; identification of, 675 n.

Gáyu, district, identical with Dagroian, 695; Islámism refused by the natives of, 695.

Gedròsta, 41 n.

Gelam Islán, connected with Kau-lan, 671 n., 711, 712; location of, 712; other designations of, 712.

Gelang. See Kalang, the, people.

Gelang, cape, a designation of South Cape, 476; connected with Ho-ling, 476.

Gelang Hill. See Bukit Gelang.

Gemenchih, river, tributary of the * Muár, 477 n. 1.

Genii-worship, 341 n. 1.

Geographers, errors of, 792.

Geographical nomenclature, explanation of many errors in, 588 n. 1.

Geriang. See Günst Geriang, a hill.

Geriang, river, the present Kedah River, 485; connected with Ho-ling, 485.

Ghaindu, district, identified with K’iung-tu, 62 n. 4.

Ghárwood, 478 n.

Ghee, Sea of. See Sênf, Sea of.

Ghirbí. See Korbie, city.

Gurta, Ghârtoda. See Sênf, Sea of.

Gia-dinh, a designation of Lower Cochin-China, 776.

Gia-long. See Já-long, emperor.

Giam-biéu, ruins of, 779.

Giants, account of the, of Sumatra, 646.

Giava Maggiore, a designation of Borneo, 634 n. 1.

Giava Minore, a designation of Java, 634 n. 1.

Gili, meaning of the term, 520 n. 2.

Gili Timor, a designation of Timor, 519.
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Giling West, alleged capital of Java, 592 n. 1.

Giri, island, other designations of, 658; moved and replaced by Buddha, 658; the Yava transferred to, 658; connected with Sumatra, 658.

Giri-dvipa. See Giri, island.

Gimmar inscription, the, date of, 237.

Gnomonical observations, 482, 796 n. 1, 815.

Godavari, river, 35, 107, 108; the Maśgīlos of Ptolemy, 25.

Goja, the, people, 85; houses of, 83.

Goja-mattika-nagara, city, identified with Ayethema, 83, 85; capital of Suvarpa-dvipa, 569 n.; identification of, 569 n.; other designations of, 819.

Gold, 41, 44, 476, 477 n. 1, 482, 485 n. 2, 523 n. 2, 640, 640 n. 1, 706; at Timira, 51, 65; terms designating, 154, 640 n. 1; search organized for an island of, 398 n. 1; in the Andamans and Nikobar, 398 n. 1; from Sumatra, 458, 647; abundant in Sīr-Bhaja, 619; Sumatran districts noted for, 631; plentiful in Khrēsē, 670 n. 1; from Burma, 748; comminuted, as currency, 806.

Gold, Island of, name applied to the Andamans, 398 n. 1; connected with Surendib, 568; the application of the name discussed, 640 n. 1; expeditions to the, 807; location of, 807.

'Gold-bars Pond.' See Gold Ingots, the Pond of the.

Gold Country, the present Lower Burma, 54, 64, 65; identified with the Khrēsē of Ptolemy, 64.

Gold Ingots, the Pond of the, 560, 561; the throne of the king of Zābej overlooked, 561; legend respecting, 621.

'Gold Islands,' the, 398.

Gold Land, the, of Ptolemy. See Khrēsē Khōra, district.

Gold-mines, 671 n.; in Khrēsē Khōra, 66, 80; description of, at Selensing, 477 n. 1; near Kalah and Sērīra, 562; in Sumatra, 562 n. 2; in Acheb, 699, 790.

Gold Sand River. See Kin-sha, Great.

Gold-ware manufactures, 627, 628.

Gold Country, the, identified with Lower Burma, 54; description of the inhabitants of, 54.

Gold Island, 670 n. 1.

'Golden Isle,' the. See Golden Khersonese, country.

Golden Khersonese, the, country, 65, 82, 95, 97, 101, 111; identified with the Malay Peninsula, 77, 80, 222; Ptolemy's hydrographical errors in, 81; connected with Takoāi, 222; overhung by mountains, 767.

Golden plate, Siamese royal letters of state inscribed on a, 532 n. 2.

Golden Region, the, 65; the lower valley of the Iravati, 51; the habitat of silkworm breeders, 51.

'Golden Teeth' province, original seat of government of the, 768; offices transferred to Yung-ch'ang, 768.

'Golden Teeth,' the. See Khanti, the, race.

'Golpho Pernudo.' See Sām, Gulf of.

Gomespolla, Ponta de, 659; various forms of the name, 699 n. 1.

Gongs, sickness cured by the use of, 120 n.

'Good Fortune Island,' a mistaken translation, 411, 412, 417.

Gopāla, founder of New Hastinapura, 746.

Gopālpur, location of, 743.

Gotama Buddha, 33; the father of, 491 n. 3.

Gotama Subhadra, king, 602 n. 1.

Govindasētī, 657 n. 2.

'Great Black Mountain,' identified with the Sāmaya Mountain, 177, 178; partly corresponds to Ptolemy's Damascus Range, 177; connected with the Ta-hēh Shan, 775.

Great Cape, the, identified with Cape Ti-wōn, 214, 214 n. 1, 215, 222, 225.

Great Fortune Island, 419 n. 1.

Great Gulf, the, identified with Magnus Sinus, 225; struggle for the coastline of, 225; identification of, 377.

Green Sea, the, of Ptolemy, 26; connected with the Sea of Ghiṭa, 673.

Grotti, inscriptions in a, 237.

Guā Cherita, 'Legend Cave,' a noted cave on Langkāwī Island, 485, 486; inscription in, 486, 486 n. 2; other designations of, 486 n. 1; a refuge of Garuḍa, 487 n.

Guamboy. See Camoi, Bay of.

Gueudesville, inaccuracy of the maps of, 75, 76.

Gujarāth identified with Āraṇṭa, 29 n. 2.

Gulā, derivation of the term discussed, 86; name applied to the Tungthūs, 86, 90 n.

Gulāmattikā. See Taik-kulā, city.

Gūmarā, islet, possibly part of the Manōlai, 421.
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330, 799: the capital of Tonkin, 319; identical with Long-bien, 323, 328, 330, 330 n. 1, 784; formerly a seaport, 799.


Ha-tông. See Hồ-thôn, the, people.

Hải-duông, connected with Yang-chüen, 801.

Hai-k'ou. See Hoi-how, seaport.

Hai-phong, district, formation of, 799, 799 n. 1.

Hainan, district, connected with Chenchij, 246 n.; pearl fishery at, 246 n.; designations of, 250 n. 1; origin of the name, 250 n. 1; Persian settlement in Southern, 471 n. 2.

Hainan Strait, dangerous navigation of, 247 n.; connected with the Sea of Sanji, 248 n.

Hair-cutting Hall, ruins of, at Kam-phêng P'het, 171.

Hairro races, 556, 556 n. 2, 685-7; in Siâk, 817.

Haji Hêrtanagara, king of Java, 821; warred against Malayu, 821, 825.

Hak-de, emperor, an Annamese, rebel against China, 164 n. 1.

Hakks, the, people, 131 n. 2.

Hala, the, people, a tattooing branch of the Sakai, 468 n. 1.

Halâng, the, people, 758, 788; probably identical with the Ha and Ch'hadâng, 262; wild tribes near Bal-Angwê, 273; cannibalism among, 827; other designations of, 789; habitat of, 789.

Halhan. See Malhan, island.

Hañsa-giri, mountain, city founded near the, 203.

Hañsavati-mañdala, a province of Râmaññadesa, 65; a designation of Pegu, 65, 897.

Han Dynasty, in China, 16; date of the, 106; invasions of the, 231.

Han-nan-a-pi-chên, sultan of Su-mênta-la, 656.

Han-Yü, an anti-Buddhist statesman, exiled, 603 n. 1.

Hàng, Muâng, an Indâ monarchy, 122.

Hang-chou, town, other designations of, 244; included in Krauena-dvîpa, 244; the Kattigara of Ptolemy, 302.

Gulavarmen visited Shê-p'o, 464 n. 1, 469, 541.

Gunong Api, island, connected with Jan-ho, 782.

Gunong Cheral, account of country around, 485 n. 2.

Gunong Geriang, Geriyang, a hill, a noted cave on, 477 n. 1; connected with Holing, 485, 510, 584 n. 3; famed for stalactite caves, 485; other designations of, 485, 485 n. 2; traditionally surrounded by sea, 485 n. 2.

Gunong Gredong, an active volcano on Sumatra, 553.

Gunong Kurinchi, a high mountain peak, 449.

Gunong Ledang, noted for gold, 477 n. 1.

Gunong Lusé, probably identical with Mount Kusésaya, 677.

Gunong Merdu, a peak on Pulo Wêh, 693.

Gunong Pulai, identity with P'ô-li suggested, 494.

Gunong Tahan Mountains, 758.

Gupta characters, inscriptions in, 61.

Gupta Era, date of, 60.

Gûrà, district, 95-7.

Gûrôh, village, 515; location of, 514; identified with Ku-lo, 819.

Gurong, island, connected with Ki-lung Hsü, 711.

Gûrôt, district, 95, 97; location of, 469 n. 3; connected with Ho-lo-tan, 469 n. 3.

Gutta-percha Island. See Percha, Pulo.

Gwa. See Khwá, river.

Gwala-gurh, town, 778.

II

Ha, the people, probably identical with the Salâng, 262.

Ha-lak, kingdom, also known as Shê-p'o, 468; other designations of, 468.

Hâ-lang. See Ho-ling, state.

Hà-li, death of, at Peking, 651.

Hà-li-du-han, 652 n. 1.

Hà-mi-chê-han, 651, 652 n. 1.

Hà-nô, river, the Dorais River of Ptolemy, 313; also designated Song-koi, 313.

Hà-nô, town, 10, 17, 122; the Agranagara of Ptolemy, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 21, 319, 331; suggested identity with Kattigara, 303 n. 1; the capital of Annam, 316 n.; other designations of, 316 n., 319 n. 1,
INDEX.

Hanumān, the home of, 753.
Hanuman, islands, the Andāmāns, 384 n.
Haraj, Herenj, 809; best camphor exported from, 436 n. 2; suggested identification of, 436 n. 2; connected with Ho-lo-tan, 469 n. 3.
Hardālah, state, connected with Ho-lo-tan, 469 n. 3.
Hardālah, a species of camphor, 441 n. 1; meaning of the term, 811.
Hari-Hara, worship of, 211.
Harrij. See Haranj, island.
Harimghāta, river, 740.
Harkund. See Herkend, Sea of.
Harraj. See Haranj, island.
Harnaj, island, a notable chasm on, 551; the name discussed, 551 n. 1, 552 n. 3.
Harro, river, a tributary of the Indus, 41 n.
Harū, state, introduction of Islamism into, 696.
Hassan, an envoy for China, 644.
Hassan, prince, 121 n. 1, 130 n. 1.
Hasinapura, kingdom, 746; a designation of Tagaung, 62, 471 n. 2; other designations of, 745; foundation of new, 746.
Hat Island. See Mao-Shan.
Hatchets, brass, discovered, 219.
Hatien, town, position of, 7; the Akadra of Ptolemy, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 23, 193, 195; attacked by the Siamese fleet, 195; corresponds with Kdranaj, 195; formerly an excellent harbour, 195; good anchorage in the bay of, 195, 196; governors of, 195 n. 2; reason for the name of, 196 n.; decay of trade at, 213.
Hawk's Beak Hill. See Ying-kow-tsewe Shan.
Hawk's bill turtle, finest tortoise-shell procured from the, 671 n.; habitat of, 671 n.
Haycock, South, island, 711.
Hē-ch'ih, the, people, habit of the, of blackening their teeth, 780; identification of, 802.
Head-hunting tribes, 72, 360, 652, 660 n. 2, 720 n.
Hē-Ho, a designation of the Black River, 792.
Hē-Hswei, river, a designation of the Mē-Khāng, 792.
Hei-kiang, river, 792.
Hemamāla, princess, wrecked on the Diamond Sands, 107.
Hēng, Greater and Lesser, the, islands, identification of, 683.
Hēng Shan, seaport, connected with Pi-kin, 797; an ancient entrepôt for trade, 797 n. 1.
Hēng-Shan, mountains. See Hwa-n Sūn Range.
Henzada, a township of Lower Burmā, 144.
Herkend, Sea of, 664; identical with the Sea of Lambri, 663, 663 n. 2; derivation of the name, 663, 663 n. 2; best tortoise-shell found in the, 671 n.
Het, Mùang, camphor-trees at, 438 n. 1.
Hicunara, islands, a designation of the Andāmāns and Nikobarās, 397.
Hiête-p'ō. See Lun Chau, town.
High Island. See Sārāsan.
Hill tribes, 131, 132, 289 n.; the C'hiing, 118-20; of Kamboja and Camba, 161, 163, 172, 173; of Negroto descent, 256; language of the, of Northern Siam, 687.
Hindu images, 691 n. 2.
Hiranya, river, a designation of the Brahmaputra, 287 n.
Hiranyadāma, a learned Brāhmaṇ, 546.
History, outline, of the Palembang kingdom, 619-30.
Hlaing, a township of Lower Burmā, 144.
Hlaing, river, 41 n.; probably the Bésyoga of Ptolemy, 75, 76; possibly known as the Bī-sīrga, 77.
Hlay-tshiep, town, a designation of Lāsippo, 144.
Hmēng, Hmung, the, people, a designation of the Miao-tz, 793.
Ho, the, people, 144 n. 2; face-tattooing among, 387 n. 3.
Hs, Mùiang, kingdom, founded by the Lāu, 127; probably identical with Nan-chao, 127; a designation of Yümmān, 144 n. 2.
Ho-chê, district, 764; connected with the Ta-li Lake, 767.
Ho-chê, Ho-shih, the, people, a designation of the Nan-chao, 127, 144 n. 2.
Hō-dao. See Hu-t'ou, the, people.
Ho-ling, state, a designation of Shē-p'ō, 464, 478, 504, 544; other designations of, 472, 472 n. 1, 504; capital of, 472; location of, 473-5, 478-80, 481 n. 1, 483, 504, 509, 544; productions of, 476, 671 n.; erroneous identification with Java, 480; connected with Gerfang, 485, 510, 584 n. 3; toponymics similar to, 488, 488 n. 1; twenty-eight states subordinate to, 505; anecdote
INDEX.

Hor, the people of Sing Bhûm, 141.
Hormar, city, location and identification of, 647.
Horse, a mythical marine, 558, 559, 673 n. 2; Kwan-yin assumed the form of a magic, 600; the marine, of Arabic legend, 600, 600 n. 3.
Houses, description of the, of Serîrah, 564; description of the, of Palembang, 564 n. 4.
Hradâna, river, a name of the Brahmaputra, 829.
Hsi-ch'üan. See Tôi-kwien, district.
Hsi-chê-hai. See Ta-li, lake.
Hsi-chê-ho, river, legend respecting the, 137.
Hsi-fu-lieh, city, location of, 784; the seaport for Hâ-nôi, 784.
Hsi-ho, Hsi-ho-Hsien, the Solana of Ptolemy, 15.
Hsi-kiang, river, identified with the Asin, 617 n. 2.
Hsi-lan, state, a designation of Ceylon, 389, 679 n. 2; subject to San-to-ch'î, 626, 701; suggested identification of, 626; identical with Chalang, 655 n.; other designations of, 701.
Hsi-li, Chinese name for Singapore, 199 n. 4.
Hsi-li Hu-ta-hsia-li-t'ân, king, identified with Ser-Nâtâkalah, 578, 579, 621; death of, 579, 621; other renderings of the name, 579; king of San-to-ch'î, 621; sent tribute to China, 621.
Hsi-li Ma-hsia-lo-shê, king, sends tribute to China, 625.
Hsi-lun, mountain, a footprint of Buddha on, 665 n., 701; probably the Cakra Mountain, 677.
Hsi-mo (Simâ), queen of Ho-ling, 505, 544; anecdote respecting, 505 n. 2; probably identical with Queen Simâ-devi, 505-6, 544; feared by the king of Ta-shih, 699.
Hsi-ou, province, an ancient designation of Tonkin, 351 n., 374.
Hsi-paw. See Si-poh, town.
Hsi-tu, the people, identified with the Tôi-dô, 233; habitat of, 352, 353; suggested connection with the Sindoi, 352, 353, 356; alleged descent of, 353; self-styled Mu-liu, 353; their origin discussed, 354 n. 1; identification of, 780, 802.
Hsi-tung Islands, identification of, 708 n. 1, 709, 713, 714, 715, 716; the origin of the name discussed, 716, 717; connected with Ptolemy's Satyrön, 717; connected with the Anambas, 724.
Hsi-yü. See T'ai-yü, district.
Hsi-yü, river, identified with the Seros of Ptolemy, 372, 374, 377; other designations of, 372; the name discussed, 373, 374, 377.
Hsi-yuan-man, the, people, 125, 153; inhabitants of Tonkin, 131; a race on the borders of Nan-chao, 152.
Hsia-chiang, district, designation of Chao-wa, 451 n. 1.
Hsia-chü, king of Palembang, 622; envos sent by, 622.
Hsia-chih-Ma-lo-ye, title of the king of Shu-p'o, 547.
Hsia-ch'i, the Su-wu-ch'a-p'u-mi, king of San-fo-ch'i, 623; sends presents to China, 623.
Hsia-hwa-mien, the, people, connected with the Danins and Susmins, 674, 674 n. 2.
Hsia-chang, district, 149 n. 1; corresponds to the present Ha-tinh province, 147, 230 n. 2; connected with Luang Prabang, 147, 148; included in the kingdom of Nan-yueh, 230 n. 2.
Hsia-chang-chou, district, 148.
Hsia-lin, district, a name given to the Lin-i district, 146 n., 147, 227; connected with Luang Prabang, 146 n., 147, 148; identified with Ptolemy's Kortatha, 148; rebellion of, 227; re-established as Lin-i or Lam-ap, 227, 228; other designations of, 232 n. 1, 311 n. 2, 352; a district of Jih-nan, 311 n. 2; location of, 793.
Hsia-p'u, district, connected with Hsia-lin, 232 n. 1.
Hsia-pu. See Hsiao Shwei, river.
Hsia Shwei, river, possibly connected with the Sông Voi, 793; other designations of, 793, 796.
Hsiao-chien, the, people, inhabitants of Hainan, 247 n.
Hsiao Ku-la, the, people, 754.
Hsiao-k'un-lun, state, name applied to Ta-kulā, 89, 90, 90 n., 113, 819; location of, 90 n.; other designations of, 819.
Hsiao-k'un-lun (Cochin-China), name applied to Fulo Condor, 90 n.
Hsiao-k'un-lun, the, people, term meaning "the Little Kolas," 89 n. 5, 90; habitat of, 755; king of, 755.
Hsiao Po-lo-mên, state, identified with Manipur, 814; description of, 814.
Hsiao Wên-ti, emperor, reign of, 779.
Hsiao-wu, emperor, Kan-t'o-li paid homage to, 602; reign of, 780.
Hsiao-lo, city, identified with Cheila, 467, 467 n. 1.
Hsien-man, the, tribes identified with Ptolemy's Sennanthainoi, 376.
Hsien, state, 774; part of Ch'ih-t'u, 179; unsuitable for cultivation, 180; represents Syāma, 180; corresponds to Siām, 180, 183; conquest of, 181; the name discussed, 178-83, 181 n. 1; may be Ptolemy's Samaradē, 181 n. 1; the name of Ch'ih-t'u succeeded by, 183; embassy to China from, 822; identified with Sukhōthai, 822.
Hsien-lin, kingdom, a designation of Palembang, 566, 612; sent tribute to China, 567; other designations of, 577, 580, 621; term equivalent to Serirah, 621.
Hsin, territory. See Hsiao-chou, seaport.
Hsia-ch'ang, district, connected with Son-toi, 350.
Hsiao-chou, "New Islet," seaport, other designations of, 238, 240, 249, 278; the settlement of, 240; identity with Turān improbable, 241 n. 3; scented wood from, 241; formerly belonged to Kamboja, 241; later taken by Tonkin, 241; derivation of the name, 241-3; a chief centre of the elephant-wood industry, 279; the territory about Bal-Angwē, 279; a stone pagoda erected at, as a beacon, 781.
Hsia-chou, river, 238; identified with the Lăng-song, 239.
Hsiao-fu, the, people, conquest of, 749; other designations of, 749.
Hsiao-ning Chou, district, identical with Tai-nguyên, 765.
Hsin-t'o, state (Sumatra), dependent on San-fo-ch'i, 450, 628; port, and productions of, 450; erroneously connected with Sunda (Java), 450; identification of, 450 n. 2; best pepper procured from, 450 n. 2, 454; location of, 451, 452; probably identical with Zunda, 454, 628; origin of the name, 455, 456; connected with Indrapura, 455, 483, 628.
Hsin-tu. See Sinda, town.
Hsi, meaning of the term, 588 n. 1.
Hsiu-lang, the, people, other designations of, 789.
Hsū-wèn, a seaport, 251 n.
Hsū-wèn-ta-ku, state, a designation of Sumatra, 448, 649; identified with Su-men-ta-la, 448; complaints of, against the Siamese, 650.
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Hsüan, emperor, 592 n. 2.
Hsüan Tsung, 651.
Hăn-Kêng, output of the amber mines at, 582 n. 1.
Hu-lan-na-p'oo, personal name of the Liang kings, 492, 492 n. 2.
Hu-nan, 59.
Hu-peh, 59.
Hu-P'oo, the, people, other designations of, 339; habitat of, 785.
Hua-mien. See 'Flowered Faces' tribe.
Huan, kingdom, a designation of Campá, 779.
Huan River, 778; probably corresponds to the Van-ch'üang, 779.
Huan-ch'ou, district, 797; location of, 308 n. 1; designation of Hâ-tihn, 778, 794.
Huan-wang, kingdom, name applied to Lam-ap, 228; renamed Chan-ch'êng, 228; the name discussed, 778, 779.
Huang-ch'êng, district, 125.
Huang-dong, Huang-tong, the, tribe, 763; attack Tonkin and kill the governor, 125; tribes on the borders of Nan-chao, 152, 153.
Hudei, the, wild tribes in the Malay Peninsula, 163 n. 1.
Höei Khai. See Kharn-nadi, river.
Human gall. See Gall, human.
Human sacrifice, 264 n. 1.
Hùng, king, founder of Van-lâng, 339.
Hùng Chiang, part of the Red River, 315 n. 1.
Hùng-ngai, town, corresponds to Pêh-ngâi, 739, 763; location of, 739.
Hung Wu, king, 648.
Hùng-yen, district, connected with Vô-biên, 350; a Dutch settlement, 799.
Hwa-li, city, capital of Tonkin, 334, 563 n. 3; foundation and location of, 563 n. 3; removal of capital from, 799.
Hwa-mien, king of the, a designation of the king of Na-ku-érh, 616 n. 1.
Hwân Son Range, 796; the northern limit of Lin-i and Jih-nan, 778, 792, 793; other designations of, 792, 793.
Hwang-ch'ao, rebel leader, rebellion of, 563, 563 n. 2.
Hwang-chih-tung, the, people, 763.
Hwê, city and province, 229, 779, 780; identical with Bal Hangou, 229; known as Bhoja or Bhrâja, 229 n. 2; connected with the kingdom of Tô-ô-dô, 233; capital of Annam, 780; destruction of, 780; rebuilt, 780; identified with Kân, 797.
Hwê, river, probably the Donnas of Ptolemy, 281.
Hwei-an-p'oo. See Fai-fo, town.
Hwên-tun Ocean, 714.
Hco-Chênh-la, explanation of the term, 342 n. 1.
Hwe Shan, identical with Volcano Island, 520 n. 2.
Hwa-shê, suggested explanation of the term, 342 n. 1.

I

I-tsing, patronized by King Ho-mi-to, 620; travels from Bhoja to China, 620.
Ibadios, 218.
Ibadin, 'Island of Barley,' 411; identified with Sumatra, 458, 590, 593; erroneously connected with Java, 458; the capital of, 458; gold plentiful in, 458; the name discussed, 458, 459, 490, 591, 653; other designations of, 459, 499 n. 1, 596; connected with Ya-p'o-t'i, etc., 465, 540 n. 1, 541; its identification discussed, 465; limits of, 587, 632; Ptolemy's mistaken idea of the size of, 587; corresponded to the Sri-Bhojan territory, 611; places in, correspond to places in Arakan, 656; list of places on the coast of, 656.
Iambulus, Greek traveller and writer, 593; adventures of, 593, 594; carried to Polibothra, 594; the island of, identified as Sumatra, 595, 595 n. 1.
Iana, Illa, 834.
Ibn Batîţa, present at Aḥmad's wedding, 645; again visits Sumatra, 646. Identification of places opposite the east coast of the Bay of Bengal, 426.
'Idol Stone,' the. See Bâtu Berhala.
Ijikas, the, people, not identified, 53; other designations of, 744.
Ike Mese, an envoy to Pa-lo-p'ei, 84 n. 2.
Ikththyophagi, the, 785, 786.
Ikththyophagi Aithiopes, the, people, habitat of, 255; derivation and meaning of the name, 256; identification of, 256, 256 n. 1, 263.
Ilehi. See Khoten.
Ilha das Naus, an islet off Malacca, 516 n. 3.
Ilha do Ouro, 670 n. 1, 807.
Ilha Iana, a designation of Sumatra, 647; production of, 647.
Ilha Trapobana. See Taprobana, island.
Imousin, the Nan-chao conqueror, 130 n. 1, 762; established the Jwanhwa prefecture, 130 n. 1.
Indraprathai, the people, connected with the Southern Kachins, 733.
Indau, district, camphor from the, 436 n. 3.
Indi, Inthi, the people, connection with the Indoi discussed, 348, 349; the habitat of, 349; a branch of the Ta-ôî, 349, 349 n. 1.
India, 1, 4, 17, 19, 33, 35, 45 n. 2, 47, 65 n. 1, 81, 84, 87, 92, 96, 168, 104, 113, 117, 123 n. 2, 140, 145, 152; legend respecting a prince from, 31; Kalininga driven to the south of, 32; term applied to natives of, 34; names translated from, to Indo-China, 39 n. 2, 48, 121; trade route from, to the Gulf of Siâm, 79, 94; embassy to, 93, 124; people of, 101, 102; Prince Dunta-kumâra’s flight from, 107; traditions transplanted from, 108; Diamond Sands of, 108; emigrants from, 122; China civilized from, 124; camphor produced in, 439 n. 1, 439 n. 3 passim.
India, further, toponyms of, discussed, 41 n., 42 n.
India, Northern, 40, 105, 121; emigrants from, 122.
India, Southern, 32, 81, 101, 122; populations of, 89, 97, 101, 102, 103, 104.
Indo-China, 32, 34, 38, 40, 49, 58, 65, 95, 102, 114 n. 1, 120, 126, 130, 148, 150, 159; difficulty of identifying Ptolemy’s stations in, 5; Ptolemy’s fundamental stations in, 17; civilization of, 48, 123, 124; the pioneer colonizers of, 81, 128 n. 2, 129; the toponyms of, 113, 121, 122; emigrants from India to, 122; people of the frontier of, 160; tribes of Thai and Môn-Annam, race throughout, 160; coast of, little known in Ptolemy’s time, 222; southern part of, of recent formation, 222, 223; a peculiarity of the bare-footed population of, 225 n. 1; the commencement of empire-making in, 234.
Indo-China, Northern, under the sway of the Thai empire, 75.
Indo-China, Southern, date of Ptolemy’s information regarding, 739.
Indoi, the people, 130, 264, 802; location of, 346, 348; connected with the Sûn-tiû tribes, 347; probably an error for Sindoi, 347, 348; their connection with the Indi discussed, 348, 349; derivation of the name discussed, 349, 735; of Môn-Annam race, 350.
Indonesian race, cannibalism of, 660 n. 2; possibly connected with the Battas, 660 n. 2.
Indra, a god of the Indus, identified with Pô-hya Thên, 127; a visit paid to, 145.
Indra Brahma, prince, probably identical with Indravarman, 696; took refuge at Malacca, 696, 696 n. 1; converted to Islam, 696 n. 1.
Indra-dvîpa. See Anindra, district.
Indra-rája, the founder of the Phraô Thôn pagoda, 189.
Indrabhadraśvara, temple rebuilt under the name of, 545.
Indragiri, kingdom, pepper produced at, 454 n. 1; in Sumatra, 454 n. 1; hairy people on the coast of, 685; a possession of Achêh, 705.
Indraprastha, city, the medieaval capital of Kamboja, 777.
Indrapura, town and district, various applications of the name, 449; possibly the capital of Zunda, 454; pepper produced at, 454 n. 1; also designated Hsin-t’o, 483, 628; a district of Sumatra, 590, 639 n. 2; a possession of Achêh, 706.
Indravarman I, king, 459 n. 3.
Indâ civilization, 48, 101, 123, 124, 135, 267; introduction of, to Kamboja, 8, 206; checked by Chinese conquests, 264.
Indâ colonies, 8, 41 n., 89, 107, 109, 122; in Kamboja, 101.
Indâ dynasties, 31, 60, 61, 66; extent of the sway of, in Indo-China, 122.
Indâ foundations, 66, 67; Bhamô, 42; Sada, 45; Takôla, 85, 89; Ligor, 107, 108; Lâung Phraô Bang, 133, 144.
Indâ lineage, kings of, at Tagâung, 70; Achêh rulers claimed, 667 n.
Indâ monarchies, list of, in Further India, 122, 123.
Indûism, the prevailing religion in Lambri, 695.
Indus, river, 19, 49 n. 2, 62 n. 4; Ptolemy’s distance errors between Kanoje and the, 20; transference of
names in the valley of the, to the Iravati district, 41 n.  
Inscriptions, 68, 212; of the Trang and Bā Ph'nom districts, 211, 212; Burmese, at Kaung-hmudaw temple, 826.  
Insula Bonae Fortune, 411.  
Insula Nudorum, the Andamān-Nikobār archipelago, 399.  
Intermixed tribes, 120 n., 131, 132.  
Ipoh, a noted cave, 477 n. 1.  
Iravati, river, 33, 39, 41 n., 42 n., 48, 49, 51, 54, 62, 63 n. 2, 65, 66, 93, 117, 287 n.; names transferred from the Indus valley to the district of the, 41 n.; delta of the, 71, 72; merged into the Salwin by cartographers, 75; possibly the Bēṣagya of Πτολεμα, 75, 509 n. 2; other designations of, 56 n. 1, 58, 509 n. 2, 741, 792; the continuation of the Chindwin, 741; ancient name of the Rāvi River, India, 832.  
Irawaddi. See Iravati, river.  
Īṣa, Hill of. See Īṣāna, mountain.  
Īṣāna, mountain, identified with Ph'nom Eiso, 205.  
Īṣāṇa-pura, city, the capital city of Komar, 204, 205; founded by Īṣānavarman, 204, 205; location of, 205.  
Īṣānavarman, king, conquered Kamboja, 169 n. 1, 206; founded Īṣānapur, 204, 205; conquered and annexed Fū-nan, 204, 206, 213; mentioned in the Wat Phō inscription, 211; mentioned in the Bā Ph'nom inscriptions, 212.  
Iskander Mūḍa, Sultan, king of Acheh, 705; letter of, to James I of England, 705; possessions claimed by, 705, 706; war made upon Johor by, 706; war made upon Pāhang by, 706; conquests of, 706.  
Islāimīn, the introduction of, into Sumatra, 434, 642 n. 2, 644, 665 n., 695, 696, 701; refused by the Gāyu, 674 n. 2; among the townspeople of Perak, 695.  
Island, Oriental terms designating, 588 n. 1.  
Islands, the, of Trans-Gangetic India, 379 ff.  
Isle du Pic. See North Pirate Island.  
Iserdones, the, people, a tribe of ancient Scythians, 661 n.; cannibalism of, 661 n.  
Īsvara, a designation of Śiva, 789.  
Itikas. See Īyikas, the, people.  
Itineraries, 527, 658 n. 2, 819, 820; of I-tsing and Wu-hing, China to India, 475, 475 n. 2; from Shē-p'o, 511; Chinese, 511, 512, 515, 520 n. 2, 710-13; accuracy of Chinese, 513, 514; between India and China, 606, 606 n. 4, 607, 607 n. 1; between Chin-hi-p'ı-shih and Ceylon, 823, 824.  
Ivy, Takōla a mart for, 88.  
Izi, the, people, identification of, 744.  

J  
Jā-long, emperor, captured Kwi'-fōn, 238 n. 1, 277; built the second city of Bin-diñ, 277; cannibalism ordered by, 827.  
Jaba, state, account of, 469 n. 3; in North Sumatra, 597 n. 1.  
Jaba, Java, island. See Zaba, island.  
Jaba, Java, place-names connected with the terms, 517 n. 2.  
Jābāh, island, 555; ruled by a Prince Jābāh, 551; productions of, 551; connected with Tāmāh Jawa, 552; doubtful identity with Prathama Yva, 552; location of, 555; volcano on, 556; inhabitants of, 556; connected with Sumatra, 556, 633.  
Jābāh, the, people, inhabitants of Shelāhēt, 552.  
Jābāh, prince of, temple erected by, 551; likeness of, impressed on his coins, 551; Buddha worshipped by, 551.  
Jābāh and Shelāhēt, Island of, 809; account of the, 555; identified with Zābej, 558.  
Jābāh of Indru, the, Kālah belonged to, 550.  
Jābāh of Shelāhēt, the, personal title of, 550.  
Jābrang, a coarse description of silk, 745.  
Jaci, district, included in K'iung-tu, 62 n. 4.  
Jade-mines, 523 n. 2.  
Jakān. See Rayut Utan, the, tribes.  
Jakarta. See Jakatra, state.  
Jakatra, state, 775; a state on Java, 637, 637 n. 1; Dutch rule in, 637 n. 1.  
Jakola, city, afterwards called Malacca, 521 n. 1.  
Jakola, district, a designation of Ch'ung-ka-la, 520 n. 2; the capital city of Malacca, 521, 521 n. 1; derivation of the name discussed, 521 n. 1; error in the identification of, 603; location of, 817; possibly
connected with Ka-la, 817; identification of, 817, 820.

Jakun tribes, the, 496, camphor collected and sold by, 436 n. 3.

Jala, district, tin-works at, 88; a designation of Chén-la, 203; name applied to the Mê-Không delta, 224.

Jala, Sea of, 249.

Jala-dvīpa, a designation of Sumatra, 568 n. 2.

Jalāda, prince of Śāka-dvīpa, 167; district named after, 167.

Jalapuri, other designations of, 824.

Jamája, Jamajah, islands, a designation of the Anambas, 707, 707 n. 2, 716, 722; conquered by the Javanese, 707.

Jamáin-l-śalam, king of Achūn, 647 n. 1.

Jambi, district, pepper produced at, 450 n. 1; meaning of the name discussed, 566 n.; gold from the districts of, 631, 640; a centre of trade and civilization, 631, 642; probably the capital of Zubej, 632; other designations of, 639, 640; a possession of Achūb, 706.

Jambi, river, identified with the Pe-pi River, 617 n. 2.

Jambukola, seaport of Nāgadipa, 381 n.; connected with Colombogam, 381 n.

James I, king of England, letter from Sultan Ikander Māda to, 513, 705.

Jan-ho, island, identified with Gunong Api, 782.

Janadapa, 546.

Jānamaka, 521; a celebrated kingdom of Java, 521 n. 1.

Jānga. See Ch'ōng, the, people.

Jangalā, city, alleged capital of Java, 592 n. 1.

Janil, Sultan, king of Achūb, 704.

Janpa. See Ciamba, port.

Japara, location of, 824; Chinese trade with, 824-5.

Jarāi. See Charāi, the, people.

Jarawa, the, tribe of the Andamān-Nikobārs, 396 n. 2.

Jars, for rice-wine, 763, 764; ashes of deceased chieftains kept in, 764.

Jātravedas, 'fire,' object of worship in Kuśa-dvīpa, 672.

Jau, Jáu-chi. See Kēu, the, people.

Java, the region designated, discussed, 466 ff., 634 n. 1, 812; kings of, 540 n. 2; confusion respecting the name of, 550; distinction between two places called, 550, 555, 557; term applied to the people and country of Sumatra, 637, 638.

Java (Malay Peninsula or Sumatra), state, 272 n. 1, 819, 820, 822; a name applied to Lūang Ph'hrab Bāng, 131, 133, 149, 150; the name derived from the original occupiers of the country, 150; part of the Malay Peninsula, 432 n. 2, 556; produced the worst pepper, 454 n. 1; wrongly connected with Ibadān, 458; extended application of the name of, 459 n. 2, 459 n. 3, 462, 463, 634 n. 1; the term is properly a racial name, not a toponymie, 469; name applied to Sumatra, 461 n. 1, 517 n. 2, 557, 596, 632, 633, 635, 637, 638; name must not be confined to the island of, 462; other forms of the name, 462 n., 463, 632; other designations of, 463, 464, 466; Tonkin attacked by, 466; the armies of, burn the temple of Śiva, 545; the dependency of, on Ramboja discussed, 545, 546.

Java, Great, indiscriminate application of the name, 634 n. 1.

Java, Highland, 545; connected with Dā-bā, 466; identified with Dāvāka, 467.

Java, Island of, 459, 460; other designations of, 465, 480 n. 1, 516 n. 3, 539 n. 1, 557, 592, 592 n. 1, 634 n. 1, 822; early mentions of, 539, 634 n. 1; Chinese expedition sent to, 539, 709, 825; unknown to the Chinese prior to 1292 a.d., 539, 539 n. 1, 825; apparently unknown to the Arabs, 555, 557; its identification with Zubej refuted, 578, 586; spread of the domination of, 586; conquest of Palembang by, 586, 630, 647, 648; first Indā adventurer who reached, 591; list of alleged successive capitals of, 592 n. 1; foundation of the kingdom of, 592 n. 2; identification with Yā- P'o-ti erroneous, 607 n. 1, 608; ruins in, mainly Buddhist, 610 n. 1; names of states in, 637; San-fo-ch'i tributary to, 637 n. 1; Chinese knowledge of, and trade with, 824, 825; cannibalism in, 828.

Java, Insular, location of, 539.

Java, Little, indiscriminate application of the name, 634 n. 1.

Java, the, people, the name of the Mōn-Annam race, 460; term applied to the people and country of Sumatra, 637, 638, 657; settlers of the Malay Peninsula, 637.

Java Island, an islet off Malacca, 516 n. 3.
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Java Major, probably identical with Borneo, 634 n. 1; identification of, discussed, 634 n. 1.
Java Minor, Island of Java, 634 n. 1; a designation of Sumatra, 645.
Java-ñema, 822; a name applied to Sumatra, 634.
Jávaka, the term discussed, 825.
Javaku, the, people, a designation of the Malays, 624 n. 1, 629, 636.
Javanese, the, people, no early names known for, 636, 637; also designated C'hvēa Yavā, 636; confused with the Jáwak of Sumatra, 637 n. 1; cannibalism of, 681 n.
Jāu, Jaujis, the, people, the Malays of Sumatra, 636.
Jāwa, town, situation of, 432 n. 2.
Jāwa, village, location of, 517 n. 2; in Borneo, 517 n. 2.
Jáwāh, city and island, an island famed for spices, 553; a city on Kalah island, 553; its identity discussed, 553; identity with Sumatra suggested, 517 n. 2, 554, 556, 633, 646, 834; location of, 555; the capital and seaport of, 646; sultan of, 646.
Jáwāh, the, people, the country of, 460 n. 1; application of the name, 460 n. 1.
Jāwāḥ, Sea of, 663 n. 2, 693.
Jāwī, country of, a designation of Sumatra, 637, 638, 638 n. 1, 699 n. 1.
Jāwī-þa-wī, island, location of, 517 n. 2.
Jaya Harivarman, king of Campā, 789; Bal Angwē probably the capital of, 789; conquests of, 791.
Jaya Indravarman III, identified with Tsou-yā-no, 279 n. 1.
Jaya Simhavarman V, king, descendant of the Brašu-va-mśa, 229 n. 2.
Jāyakesīn I, claimed to have subdued Chola, 624 n. 1.
Jaya-pala, king, 746.
Jayaśīnhā II, claimed to have subdued Chola, 624 n. 1.
Jaya-vādika, city, capital of Ceylon, 390 n. 1.
Jaya-varman II, king of Kambuja, 210, 459 n. 3, 545; reigned at Nagara Indrapura, 546.
Jaya-varman VII, king, 175 n. 3.
Jelatang, 627.
Jelutong, district, location of, 826.
Jelutong, Sungei, location of, 826.
Jēn-kwoh, king of Yūn-kan, 123, 291; a descendant of Mēng Chū-sung, 290 n. 1; king of Pēh-ngai, 291, 762; capital cities of, 763.
Jën Tsung, emperor, 651.
Jesore, town, identified with Tilogrammou, 53.
Jhalavan, kingdom, identified with Turān, 790.
Jih-lo-ha-chih, district, identification of, 552 n. 2.
Jih-lo-t'ing, state, subject to San-fou-chi, 627; manufactures of, 627, 628; identification of, 627, 826.
Jih-nan, department of, 227, 227 n. 4; foundation of, 227; name changed to Pi-kin, 292; extent of, 293 n. 1, 792, 793; visited by merchants, 302; the districts of, enumerated, 311 n. 2; conquered by the king of Campā, 796.
Jivula. See Zibala, island.
Juñānḥadra, a Buddhist monk, 597.
Johān Shāh, introduced Islam into Achēh, 695; an ancestor of Shāh Jehān, 695; arrival of, in Achēh, 702; the first Muḥammadan king of Achēh, 702.
Johol, district, 97; extent of, 522 n.*.
Johor, city, capture of, 534.
Johor, district, 777; probably designated Bētumah, 200, 221; known later as Ujong Tanah, 200, 777; forests of lignum aloes in, 478 n.; identical with Malāyu, 534, 538; noted for tortoise-shell, 671 n.; war between Achēh and, 706.
Johor River, fort of black stone on, 576.
Jōk, name applied to the Annamese, 130.
Jotana-pura, town, 766; a designation of C'hieng Rong, 138, 139; name possibly connected with the Me-Khōng, 284.
Jotinagara, town, the name occurs in the title of the C'hieng Rong chief, 766. See also Jotana-pura, town.
Juāng, the, people, face-tattooing among, 367 n. 3.
Juđa, a perversion of the name Ayuthia, 117 n. 1.
Jugra, district, connected with Jakola, 820; other designations of, 820.
Jujube-tree, Kolf named after the, 105; names applied to the, 106.
Jumbara. See Ch'ump'han, town.
Jung-ya-lu, state, identification of, 450 n. 2; pepper procured from, 450 n. 2; other designations of, 812.
Junkevōlon, island, 23, 91, 758; possibly identical with Kalah, 89; image and footprint of a dog at, 96;
identification of, 97; other designations of, 274, 274 n. 1, 406, 656; erroneously identified with Kühlin, 406; only half a mile from the mainland, 407; strait fordable for elephants at low tide, 407; footprint of Buddha opposite to, 665 n.; "Historical Retrospect of Island," 821; ambergris exported from, 823. Júrálú, state, suggested identity of, 628. Jwan-hwa, establishment of the prefecture, 130 n. 1, 762.

K
Ka-k'o-la, Ka-k'o-ra, suggested identity of, 444 n. 2. Ka-la, Ko-lo, identification of, 817. Ka-lo-hei, Ka-lo-hsi, state, location of, 627; possible identification of, 628. See also Chia-lo-hsi.
Ka-lo-shè-fu, kingdom, 569 n.
K'a-to, the, people, derivation of the name discussed, 357-9; identical with Ptolemy's Kudutai, 357, 362; habitat of, 357; other designations of, 357, 372; tribes connected with, 733, 803. Ka-Trol. See Ko: Tron, island.
Kabul, valley, 41 n.
Kach, Gulf of, 46 n.
Kachúl, island, 421.
Kachur, district, part of Ptolemy's Kirrhadla, 52.
Káchari, the, people, 835.
Kachins, the, people, cannibalism of, 660 n. 2, 744; the Tartar origin of, 660 n. 2; the Indraprathai connected with, 733; other designations of, 733, 749, 787; habitat of, 744.
Kacho, Katha, kingdom, connected with Kia-t'o, 61.
Kadáram, a Chinese expedition sent against, 833; identification of, discussed, 833.
Kadasan, the, people, tribes in North Borneo, 782.
Kado, Kadu, the, people, 371, 863, 805; suggested connection with the K'a-to, 357; habitat of, 802; immigrants from Tibet, 802.
Kadránj, town, 209; identification of, 7; the Akadra of Ptolemy, 195; corresponds with Hätien, 195; derivation of the name, 194, 199.
Kadú, the, people, 371; little known and often ignored, 371; suggested connection with the K'a-t'o, 372, 805; probably connected with Ptolemy's Kudutai, 372; a clan of the Palaung, 805.
K'ai-feng Fu, city, identical with Pien-lin, 580.
Káka-đenaga, a species of volcanic fire, 672.
Káka-dvipa, city, possibly the Kokkonagara of Ptolemy, 95; the Ceylonese expedition landed at, 176.
Kákavadda, Kákavatra, ruled at Tak-saši, 180; name compared with the term Svámkák, 180.
Kakkola, a plant, perfume made from the berry of the, 93.
Kakobi, the, people, identification of, 733; other tribes connected with, 733.
Kakola, city, identification of, 95, 387 n. 4, 444 n. 2, 549, 811, 832, 833; location of, 387 n. 4, 444, 444 n. 2, 811; other designations of, 518 n. 1, 549; the walls of, 518 n. 2; seaport and capital of Mul Jávar, 548; description of, 549; identified with Ligor, 756, 759.
Kákula, Kákulah. See Kakola, city.
Kálá, erroneous identification with Kedah, 91.
Kala-pung, possibly connected with Kálá, 817; location of, 817.
Kalan, state, possibly identified with Kamalanga, 113.
Kalabár, Sea of, identified with the Kálolaka Sea, 91.
Kalab, Kaláh-bár, island and town, 91, 551, 555; identified with Takópa, 88, 89, 90 n., 806; a centre of trade, 88; possibly the island of Junkejyou, 89; a dependency of Zabedi, 89; other designations of, 113, 469 n. 3; situation of, 432 n. 2, 560; cities on, 432 n. 2, 553, 554; camphor exported from, 437 n., 811; a meeting-place for Bráhmans, 471 n. 2, 556 n. 1; belonged to the Jábah of India, 550, 551, 620; part of Zábej, 550 n. 1, 558, 560, 620; Mussalmán, Indú, and Persians dwell in, 556 n. 1; ruled by the Mahrájá of Zábej, 621; tin-mines near, 754.
Kalab, Kaláhbar, Sea of, 663 n. 2,
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695; identified with the Kālodaka Sea, 91, 672 n.*.

Kalākah, district, of West Borneo, 628; connected with Ka-lo-hei, 628.

Kālamukha. See Lohamukha, the, people.

Kalang, Klang, district, 488 n. 1; sulphur obtained from, 477 n. 1; a dependency of Malacca, 488 n. 1; on Singapore Island, 488 n. 1; founded by the Benūa tribes, 488 n. 1.

Kalang, the, people, 255; habitat of, 788; tribes connected with, 788.

Kalanța, Kelantan, city, the Kōli of Ptolemy, 105; derivation of the name, 105; natural resources and mineral wealth abundant at, 106; a great trading centre, 106; suggested identification with Ho-lo-tan, 469 n. 3; gold obtained from, 477 n. 1; dancing-girls from, 508 n.; identification of, 518 n. 1, 549, 759.

Kalāpā, a state on Java, 637.

Kalapanzin, village, location of, 433 n. 3.

Kalāsā, village, location of, 569 n.

Kalasa, village, 484 n. 1.

Kalaśapura, city, on Suvarna-dvīpa, 568 n. 2; suggested identification of, 568 n. 2; identified with Chio-lo-shē-fu, 580.

Kālaśvaratissa, son of King Kāka-vadda, 180; founder of Lop'haburi, 180.

Kalē, district, in Sunāparanta, 748.

Kalē, hill, in the Kubo valley, 30, 31.

Kalē, town, 75; Kan-rāja-gi's capital at, 31; the probable triglypton of Ptolemy, 31, 33; former capital of the Drahidian kingdom, 33, 34; Kulā, the correct form of, 34; other designations of, 41 n.; Arakan not subject to, 43; the headquarters of the Zabaings probably at, 52; included in Suvaṃparanta, 52; kings of, 70.

Kālī, goddess, other designations applied to, 168.

Kālī, temple of. See Kumārī, temple of.

Kalinga, kingdom, country on the west of the Gulf of Bengal, 20; called also Kolāmca, 34, 103; Siṃhā-pura, the capital of, 76 n. 1; other designations of, 509.

Kalinga-rāṣṭra, Kalinga-rattha, kingdom, ancient name for Pegu, 32 n. 2, 509.

Kalingas, the, people, 28, 29, 37, 52; where located by Megasthenes, 28; triglypton, capital of the eastern kingdom of the, 30; extent of their rule, 32, 34, 35, 53; expulsion of the, to the south of India, 32; dispersion of the, 33; connected with the term Kulā, 34; their country also called Kolāmca, 34, 103; derivation of the name, 34; the probable founders of Taik-kulā, 86.

Kallān, Kallar, the, people, monkey-faced tribes in South India, 788.

Kallantians, Kallatians, the, people, cannibalism of, 660 n. 2.

Kālodaka Sea, identified with the Sea of Kalabhār, 91, 672 n.*.

Kālungi, kingdom, a designation of Kalinga, 509 n. 2; noted for pottery, 509 n. 2; residence of the Rāja of, 509 n. 2.

Kālyāni, district, the, inscriptions, 65, 74 n. 3, 81, 83, 85, 141, 538; the present Kelān, 380 n. 4; visited by Buddha, 381 n.

Kāmācē, 761.

Kāmakaluk, 761.

Kāmē, location of, 761.

Kamalanga, Kāmalangkā, state, identified with K'un-lang, 89 n. 2, 113; other designations of, 113, 115; location and extent of, 113, 114; Balongka the probable capital of, 731; the name discussed, 761.

Kāmalangkā, Bay of, corresponds to the Gulf of Siām, 164 n. 1; other designations of, 248.

Kamanlay, district, possibly identical with Kammalani, 114; connected with Camelā, 762.

Kāmarūpa, kingdom, a designation of, Asām, 773, 813.

Kambala, a soft stone used for carving, 492; doubtfully identified with marl called Nāpāl, 492 n. 1.

Kambērikhou (mouth of the Ganges), 10, 12, 14, 20, 21; connected with the Barahangā estuary, 9; probably identical with Byraclea, 11; fundamental station of Ptolemy, 16, 17; origin of the name discussed, 740; suggested connection with Haring-hāt River, 740.

Kamboja, kingdom, 7, 8, 101, 122, 123 n. 2, 129, 135, 136, 158; called also Chān-lā, 51, 73, 158, 241, 466, 497, 794, 820; other designations of, 93, 157 n. 1, 205, 616 n. 1, 683, 683 n. 1, 773, 774, 776, 794, 832; litholatry in, 120 n. (3); comprised in the region of the Lēstāi, 149, 156; coasts of, noted for piracy, 156; the Ch'ōngh are the remnants
of the ancient population of, 157; the cave-dwellings of Southern, 159, 159 n. 1; the tribes and cities of, 160, 162; included in Saka-dvīpa, 164, 165, 167, 169; teak-trees abound in, 165; conquered by Isāna-varman, 169 n. 1; ports of, 194; the unification of, 203, 204; Komar absorbed into, 204; ancient route to, from the Gulf of Siām, 213; the Chăm emigrated to, 227, 230; war been Campā and, 274, 275; Brāhmaṇas in, 471 n. 2; influence of, on the Malay Peninsula, 546; its dependency on Java discussed, 546; homage paid by the kings of, to Zābeh, 546; amber from, 582 n. 1; the name discussed, 204, 615, 615 n. 3, 616 n. 1, 770, 825; attacked by the Mahārāja of Zābeh, 620; dependent on Sri-Bhoja, 620; wild tribes of, 720 n.; districts included in, 767; invasion of, 773; capital of, 773, 777; war with Siām, 789; people of, 789; women traders of, 796; a trip to the ruins of, 825; cannibalism in, 827.

Camboja, cape, 222.

Camboja, Sea of, inland, identified with Thalā Sāh, 159, 711.

Camboja plant, 616 n. 1.

Cambojara, a form of Kamboja, 825.

Kambā, Sanskrit term for thief, 156.

Kambu, Land of, a designation of Kamboja, 157 n. 1, 616 n. 1.

Kambu Svāyambhuva, 204; a mythical ancestor of the Khmers, 157.

Kambuja, the, people, inhabitants of Siām and Kamboja, 156, 157; meaning and derivation of the name, 156, 157; accustomed to forming autonomous groups, 158.

Kambuja, Kambujay, Kambu-jaya. See Kamboja, kingdom.

Kami, cape and bay, identified with Camoi, 782.

Kamilā, a district of Tripura, 32.

Kammlān, kingdom, possibly the present Kamanlay, 114; conquered by Warērū, 114.

Kancorta, group of islands, 421; suggested identity with the Mamiela Islands, 421; islands forming the, 421.

Kampai, island, location of, 628.

Kamphei Phat, city, 143; the boundary of Western Lāos and Lopphasari, 171; the Hair-cutting Hall at, 171.

Kampī, promontory, location of, 628.

Kampīla, kingdom, Cūjani Brahma-datta reigned over, 793.

Kampōng Jáwa, village, location of, 516 n. 3.

Kampōng Paudī, noted for its grove of enormous trees, 666 n. 2.

Kampōt, town, a port of Kamboja, 194; harbour of, became silted up, 194; foundation of, 775.

Kampōt, river, celebrated for scenery, 192; identification with the Sōbanas probably inaccurate, 192.

Kāmrūn, island. other designations of, 574; productions of, 574, 574 n. 3; account of, 574, 575; natives of, 575.

Kāmrūn, king, reigned over Kamboja, 574 n. 3.

Kān, or King, Hill, temple built by an Annamese army on, 797.

Kān, district, corresponds to Hwē, 797.

Kān Bridge, 797.

Kan-chō, the, people, 772; probably a remnant of Ptolemy's Lōstai, 159; a semi-barbarous tribe, 159; representatives of the aboriginal Negrito element, 159, 261; description of, 159 n. 2; meaning of the name, 159 n. 2; corresponds to Sakai, 159 n. 2; of Eastern Kamboja, 255.

Kan-issiuang, president, highest dignitary of Ho-ling, 305.

Kan-lan, islands, probably the Tambelans, 714.

Kān Mōu, harbour, early mentions of, 793; identified with Bap Harbour, 793.

Kan-pō-chō, Kan-pu-chhā, a designation of Kamboja, 615 n. 3.

Kan-pu. See Kjuanfū.

Kan-rāja-gyi, king of Arakan, 30, 31.

Kan-thi, connected with Umōr, 791.

Kan-to-li, state, possibly identical with Khaonthli, 602, 833; envoy sent to China from, 602; identification with San-fo-chhī discussed, 602, 603, 603 n. 1, 603 n. 3.

Kanagara, identified with Kanoje, 17, 18, 21.

Kanauj. See Kanoje.

Kāndkipura, city, a designation of Con-jeveram, 501 n. 1.

K'ang, the, people, their identification discussed, 259, 787; nīr-kname of, 259 n. 1; description of, 259, 260, 687; they act as slaves to the Lao, 260; hill tribes of Northern Siām, 687; the language of, 687; habitat of, 787; at the Chinese court, 787.

K'ang T'ai, his mission to Fu-man, 827.

Kangar, village, 484 n. 1.

Kanjab. See Fanjab, islands.
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Karajang, the, people, 737; other designations of, 356, 358 n. 2; derivation of the name, 358 n. 2.
Karaka, the, people, 192 n. 2.
Karakhodjo, manufacture of, 243 n. 2.
Karas Islands, possibly identical with Ku-lo, 515.
Kardanj, state, connected with Ho-lo-tan, 469 n. 3.
Karens, the, people, 74 n. 3; 119 n. 1, 771.
Kārimāta, country, noted for tortoise-shell, 671 n.
Karimon, Krimun, Java, connected with Ki-li-mén Shan, 713.
Kariphon, Ptolemy's central mouth of the Indus, 19, 20.
Karkota, identification of, 92.
Karkotaka, the serpent king, dwelling-place of, 743.
Karmada, Karmadat, island, identification of, 571.
Karmasuli. See Chittagong River.
Karpaprāvaraṇas, the, people, description of, 257 n.
Karnapuri, town, identical with Angapuri, 255 n. 1.
Karṇasuvāraṇa, kingdom, 766.
Karō, Karu, the, people, a branch of the Battas, 674 n. 2; probably connected with the Gāyu, 674 n. 2; cannibalism of, discussed, 674 n. 2, 675 n. *.
Karon, Karun, the, people, a Negrito race in North-West Guinea, 788.
Karpūra Island, suggested identification of, 568 n. 2.
Karpūrikā, princess, 439 n. 3.
Karun, the, people, 255.
Kāṣa, Kāśi (India), 795.
Kāsai, creek, other renderings of the name, 95.
Kaseb, state, a designation of Manipur, 766, 792, 795.
Kasō. See Khā Kān, the, people.
Kasan, river and town, a noted cave at, 477 n. 1; location of, 757.
Kassav. See Kaseb, state.
Kaseida, 834.
Katābāndā. See Cheduba, island.
Katabāda River, 35; erroneously identified with the Chittagong River, 36; identified with the Mori River, 36, 37; named from the island of Kutubdīa, 197, 727, 728, 740; the name discussed, 727, 728, 728 n. 1.
Katāhū, island, 794, 822; a mart for jewels, 568 n. 2; identity with Cathay refuted, 569 n.; suggested identification of, 569 n.
Katāka, town, former capital of Orissa,
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307 n. 1; the modern Cuttack, 307 n. 1.
Katarai. See Kerti.
Katha. See Kacho, kingdom.
Katrea. See Kerti.
Katrea, river, the palace of the Pāsei king on the banks of the, 528 n. 1.
Kattigara, town, 302; connected with Kesho in Tonkin and Kottawaringin in Borneo, 2; visited by merchants, 302; identified with Hang-chow, 302; former vain attempts to locate, 303; various suggested identifications of, discussed, 303 n. 1; situation of, 304.
Katubdin, island, connected with Katabda, 197, 727, 728, 740; forms of the name, 740.
Kāu, the, people, 124, 125; their identity discussed, 126; first settled in the Nān district, 763.
Kau-chên. See Ku-chên, district.
Kau-lan, island, noted for tortoise-shell, 671 n.; location of, 671 n.; identified with Gelam Island, 671 n., 711, 712, 714; erroneously connected with Billiton, 712, 712 n. 1, 714 n. 2; other designations of, 712, 712 n. 1; description of, 713 n. 1; Javanese expedition driven on to, 713 n. 1.
Kau-lung Hills, 763.
Kau-Pien, founder of Lâ-thanh fortress, 328 n. 2, 330 n. 1.
Kau-té, Kau-têk. See Chin-tê, district.
Kau-yoh, noted for tortoise-shell, 671 n.
Kaulam. See Quillon, town.
Kāu-qiânya. See Ko̱qâhâña.
Kanng-hmu-daw temple, Burmese inscription at, 826.
Kaug-sin, 62.
Kaungh-tun, Old, ruins of, 747; identification of, 747.
Kāva-râja, the Nān king, 763.
Kaveri River, 101.
Kavêripatam, Kâvēripatâna, town, 408.
Kâwi writing, 595 n. 2, 598.
Kāya Orang, island, 498 n. 3.
Kazêb, city, suggested as Ptolemy's Pagrassa, 310, 795.
Kā-chê, town, 2; a designation of Hà-nôi, 319 n. 1.
Kechan, ancient gold-mines, at, 477 n. 1.
Kedah, state, 78, 821; proposed railway between Singora and, 79; wrongly connected with Kalâ, 91; a prince from, took possession of Pêrâk, 98; dancing-girls from, 508 n.; conquered by Achêbô, 706; the earliest capital of, 825.
Kedah Peak. See Günong Cheri.
Kedah River, formerly designated Geriang, 485.
Kedie Ang. See Bā Pîhnôm, city.
Kedrendj, bay, a designation of Ko-Tron, 205.
Kedrendj, Sea of, 201; corresponds to the Gulf of Siâm, 164 n. 1; other designations of, 248.
Kekker, islet, location of, 817 n.
Kelantan. See Kalantan, city.
Kelása, city, identification of, 568 n. 2; pagoda at, 568 n. 2.
Kelása pagoda, two mentioned, 568 n. 2.
Kelása Peak, 569 n.
Kelásaabha - pabhala - cetija, pagoda, 569 n.
Kelong, island, one of the Annabas, 715, 722; also designated Tabiyân, 715, 722.
Kemânam, district, camphor producer in the, 437 n.
Kendulai, island, 833; a volcano on, 673 n. 1; peopled by fire-worshippers, 673 n. 1; possible identification of, 673 n. 1.
Kêng, a measure, the value of a, 806; compared with a sån, 806.
Kêng-Cheng, identical with Chiêng Khêng, 133.
Kerian, Krian, river and district, 488 n. 1.
Kermân, Great, island, possibly identical with Karmada, 571.
Kerrhâdia, the, people, 830 n. 1.
Kersik. See Nâi Kechil, island.
Kerti, connected with Ka-ch'â, 528, 530, 821; other designations of, 556, 583.
Kesho in Tonkin connected with Ptolemy's Kattigara, 2.
Kêu, the, people, 58, 120, 132, 134 n. 1; fought for the coastline of the Great Gulf, 225; occupants of Tonkin, 225, 225 n. 1; conquered by China, 225; term applied to the Annamese and Tonkinese, 225 n. 1; derivation of the term discussed, 225 n. 1; other designations of, 225 n. 1; the yoke of, shaken off by the king of Campâ, 229 n. 2.
Kêu, application of the term, 132.
Kēu, Mūang, a designation of Tonkin, 263, 320 n. 1; death and resuscitation of the king of, 320 n. 1.
Kēu Ch'ông - báu. See Cūlāmālinī, kingdom.
Kēu Kót-thē Thiên-báu. See Cūlāmālinī, kingdom.
Kewari, village, location of, 740.
Khu, the, tribes, 58 n. 2, 785; of the Ch'iang race, 128, 128 n. 2.
Khā Chè. See Chèh, the, people.
Khā Dam, the, people, other designations of, 788.
Khā Döl. See Döl, the, people.
Khā Halos, the, people, inhabitants of Lo-si-pa, 766.
Khā Hōk, the, people, 358; alternative name for Khā Hāc, 358 n. 2; nicknamed Lo-lo, 358 n. 2; derivation of the name, 358 n. 2; connected with Ptolemy's Kudutai, 358 n. 2; description of, 358 n. 2.
Khā Hōc. See Khā Hōk, the, people.
Khā Khu, Khā Khu, the, people, 132; name applied to the Kusu, 128, 133.
Khā Khuong, the, people, 788.
Khā-lu-thān, city, a designation of Lwā-thān, 322.
Khā Met, the, people, 805.
Kha Mong-khong, the, people, also denominated Khwai - Brrró, 803; habitat of, 803.
Khā Muk, the, people, 805.
Khā O. See P'u-čhēh, the, people.
Khā Ut, the, tribe, 358; little-known hill tribes, 257 n.
Khabang, village, on the site of Kapungā-nagara, 72, 523 n. 2; pagoda built by the king of, 72; other designations of, 523 n. 2; a former seaport, 523 n. 2.
Khach, meaning of the term, 764.
Khakk, the, people, connected with the Kukobai, 733.
Khalem, islet, 488 n. 1.
Khalinē, island, erroneously identified with Junceylon, 406; probably identical with Kār-Nikobār, 407, 410, 411; alternative term, Salinē, discussed, 408, 409.
Khalkitis, the, people, other designations of, 356; connected with Ptolemy's Kudutai, 358 n. 2; derivation of the name, 736, 737.
Khams, term signifying gold, 154 n.
Kham Kōt, Muang, corresponds to the A-Lao kingdom, 771.
Kham - Muēn, Muang, 803; corresponds to the A-Lao kingdom, 771.
Khami, the, race, 44; probably of the Mōi-Khmer race, 52; connected with the Zamrāi of Ptolemy, 53, 54; description of, 54; habitat of the, 54; driven to the Arakan Roma, 54, 129.
Khanti, the, race, the Donias are allied to the, 154; derivation of the name, 154, 154 n.
Kham, the, people of Luang P'hrāh Bāng, 128 n. 2, 129, 132.
Khañ-hwā, district, centre of Lower Campā civilization, 257; emporium for eagle-wood, 263; formerly called Nā-trāng, 265 n. 2.
Khānū, other designations of, 215.
Khansah, town, a designation of Hang-chou, 244.
Khantuli, district, identity with Kan-tō-li suggested, 602, 603 n. 1; location of, 602, 602 n. 2; derivation of the name, 602 n. 2; other designations of, 833.
Khāra, river, identified with the Nām Khān, 145.
Kha-ra-ma, river, 766; name applied to the Mé-Khong, 136, 284.
Khari-Nāga, the, people, a tribe of Nāgas in Asām, 407 n. 1.
Khariya, the, people, face-tattooing among, 367 n. 3.
Khasias Hills, 795.
Khān Mōn Pass, brief account of, 85; other designations of the, 753; Cébrét's mention of, 753.
Khelong, Khelung, bay, on Junceylon Island, 488 n. 1.
Khemāvatī, kingdom, identified with Arakan, 39.
Khlang, Muang, an ancient district above Takōpa, 488 n. 1.
Khmāu. See Kumāra, state.
Khmāu, a designation of the goddess Kāli, 168.
Khmāu, cape, 201.
Khmāu, village, foundation of, 775, 776.
Khmāu Point, connected with the end of Lu-ñi, 683, 683 n. 1; location of, 683.
Khmērs, inscriptions, 157, 220, 459 n. 3, 777.
Khmēr, language, 97 n. 1, 135 n. 1, 157; in the Malay Peninsula, 40, 818.
Khmēr, the, people, 159, 173, 780; country occupied by, 129.
Khmēr - dōm, 'primitive Khmers.' See Kui, the, people.
Khm, the, people, connected with the P'ú-ch'á, 363, 364.
Khōm, a designation of Kamboja, 776.
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Khôm, the, race, 119 n. 1, 173; driven from the Mê-Không by the Lâu, 171; description of, 171.

Khôma-ngara, city, foundation of, 203; King Khôma-râja reigned at, 203.

Khôma-râja, king, his capital city at Khôma-ngara, 203; the dynasty of, 203.

Khôn Mên, the, people, 793.

Không, Mường, an island town on the Mê-Không river, 136; also designated Sidantara, 136.

Khoten, the 'Stone Tower' of Ptolemy, 18, 19, 21.

Khryse, 'the Gold Country,' district, connected with Suvaṇṇabhūmi, 64, 671 n.; identical with the Malay Peninsula, 78, 80, 669, 670, 671 n.; the gold-mines of, 80; connected with Kuśa-divipa, 670, 671; ancient notices of, 670 n. 1; gold and silver abundant in, 670 n. 1; the Golden Kheros of Ptolemy, 670 n. 1; good tortoise-shell procured from, 670 n. 1; on the Gulf of Martaban, 671 n.

Khryse Khersonésos, the Golden Kheros of, derivation of the name, 736.

Khryse Khôrn, district, identified with Suvaṇṇaparaṇa, 65; extent of, 65 n. 1; derivation of the name, 736; in Lower Burmâ, 756.

Khrysoanmas, river, 71; connected with the Langu or Trang River, 97; derivation of the name, 736, 756, 757.

Khû-lien. See Chü-lien.

Khû-lôt, fortress, captain of, 232 n. 1, 306; unconnected with Kortatha, 305; suggested as Ptolemy's Pagrasa, 305, 311, 312; situation of, 311; in Chinese hands, 313; an error for Khû-tuk, 795.

Khû-tuk. See Chü-su, city.

Khûn Bôrum, 295 n. 3; legendary king of the Lâu, 127; his seven sons, 127; a son of the god Indra, 145.

Khûn Châwâ, king of Luang Phrab Băng, 150.

Khûn Chêt-chhuang, 363; established the Phùten kingdom, 295 n. 3.

Khûn Chüang, king of the Lawâs, 119 n. 1; king of Cochín-China, 294 n. 2.

Khûn Lô, 290 n. 1; leader of the Lâu, 150.

Khûn Sên, prince, repelled the Chinese, 189 n.

Khu-n-tâi, ancestor of the Thai race, 286 n. 1.

Khu-ra-mâ, a half mythical sea, 286 n. 1.

Khu-raûga - mâli - nādi, river, name applied to the Mê-Không, 136.

Khûshâmâmi, mountain, probable identification of, 424 n. 2.

Khûwâ River, 47.

Khûwâ-Bîrrâ, the, people, habitat of, 803.

Khûwân, Mûng, an Índu monarchy, 122.

Khûwelaum. See Kwe-lûn, village.

Ki-bô, village, on the site of Bô Hái, 799.

Ki-ku, See Chi-ku, island.

Ki-li-mên Shun, identified with Karimmon Java, 713.

Ki-lung Hsû, island, identification of, 711.

Ki-yan, lived at P'o-lu-ka-sî, 504.

Ki-mo-lang-kia, state, a designation of Kamalanga, 113.

Ki-t'o, kingdom, identical with Magadha, 69; other possible designations of, 61; identification of, 745.

Kiáng Hung. See Chieng Rung, city.

Kiào-chao, Kiâu-chi, district, part of King-chao, 244.

Kiào-chôi, Kiào-chhou, city, 95; a designation of Tonkin, 132, 264, 321 n., 327, 466; its identification with Kaṭtagara suggested, 303 n. 1; capital of Annam, 327; probably identical with Long-bien, 327.

Kiào-chi, kingdom, 297 n. 2; a district of Nam-yûchî, 291, 291 n. 1, 292; alleged founder of, 291, 292; also designated Mûng Kêu, 297 n. 2; designations of the name discussed, 324 n. 2; location of the capital of, discussed, 331.

Kiào-chî, the, people, the name discussed, 777; habitat of, 777. See also Kêu, the, people.

Kiâu. See Kêu, the, people.

Kie-t'o, one of the eighteen kingdoms tributary to P'iao, 61.

Kien-chung, district, part of Kraunca-dvipa, 244.

Kîh-miêh, king, 206.

Kîh-miêh, kingdom, 776; a designation of Chên-la, 202, 203; absorbed into the Kombevan Empire, 204.

Kîlim, island, 488.

Kim-trân, kingdom, an alternative name for Chin-lin, 773.
K'in-chau. See Ch'in-chou, kingdom.
Kin-ch'ih, the 'Golden Teeth' province, 768.
Kin-sha, river, a designation of the Upper Yang-tzê, 741.
Kin-sha, Great, river, a designation of the Iravati, 741.
'King,' 'ruler,' terms designating, 566 n.
King Hill. See T'ain Hill.
King-chao, territory, included in Kraunca-dviap, 244.
King-mai, state, a designation of Pa-pê-hsi-fu, 767 n. 1.
'Kingdom,' Oriental terms denoting, 588 n. 1.
Kinsay. See Khansah, town.
Kinta, district, sulphur obtained from, 477 n. 1.
Kio, the, people, inhabitants of Cochin-China, 294 n. 2.
Kiô Kezêb, province, name given to Tonkin, 293; probably intended for Kortatha, 294.
Kiô-pagan, province, term applied to Tonkin, 293.
Kirana, the, people, 119 n. 1.
Kiráta, city, the ancient name of Tripurâ, 829.
Kirátas, term for mountaineers, 72, 163.
Kirátas, the, people, generic term for mountaineers, 28; extent of their colonies, 28; supposed to be the Airrahadoi of Ptolemy, 28; people of Tipperah and Silhet, 51; account of, 256 n. 1; tribes included under the name of, 829, 830.
Kirrhadia, country, 28; corresponds to Silhet, Tipperah, and Kachar, 51, 52, 53; location of, 829.
Kiskindhâya, kingdom, Sugriva reigned at, 785.
Kite, the celestial, 139 n. 1.
Kiu-ku Miao, the, people, connected with the Kakobai, 733.
Kiu-Liau, the, people, 351 n. 1.
Kiu-lung, the progenitor of the Mao Shans, 286 n. 1.
Kiu-lung Kiang. See Ch'i-lung Chiang, river.
Kiu-siu. See Ch'i-su, city.
Kiu-tê. See Ch'i-tê, district.
Kiu-tzê, the, people, habitat of, 805; tattooing among, 805; also known as the Turong, 805.
K'iung-tu, district, now designated Yüeh-sui, 62 n. 4; connected with Gandhara, 62 n. 4.
K'ai, the, people, 358 n. 2.
Klang. See Kalang, district.
Klang. See Kalang, the, people.
Klong-kob. See Mahoradhika Drum, the.
Kmar. See Kamboja, Komar, kingdom.
Kmir, a form of Khmér, 776.
Ko-ko-seng-chib, kingdom, location of, 816; account of the natives of, 816; identification and location of, 816, 817.
Ko-ku-lo, kingdom, 817; location and identification of, 811, 820.
Ko-Kuo-lo, the, people, 803.
Ko-lo, Ko-lo Fu-sha-lo, kingdom, designation of the Kalantan country, 105; probably identical with Ptolemy's Koli, 106; identification of, 444 n. 2, 518, 518 n. 1, 519, 549; capital of, 519; other designations of, 519, 549; location of, 816.
Ko-lo-feng, king of the Nan-Chao, 74; P'iao conquered by, 749; tribes conquered by, 749.
Ko-lo-tan, state, 469 n. 3; the name discussed, 813.
Kô-lwâ, city, a designation of Lwâthanh, 322, 333, 798; capital of the Thûk king, 373; origin of the name, 798; ancient remains at, 798; location of, 798, 799; formerly a seaport, 799; other designations of, 799, 800.
Kô-lwâ, village, 798.
Ko-Man, the, people, 771.
Ko: Tron, bay, the Akadra of Ptolemy, 7; identification of, with Hatien, 7, 8; corresponds to Kadranj, 7; named after the island, 196, 197; a base point for interpreting Ptolemy's trans-Gangetic geography, 197; the principal port of Fu-nan, 210; trade of, developed by Trang settlers, 210.
Ko: Tron, island, identification of, 7; a great emporium of trade, 8; Ptolemy's error in the position of, 196; other designations of, 197, 199; fresh-water streams on, 201; derivation of the name, 775.
Kamlut, the, tribe, a predatory and head-hunting people, 360.
Kob Dót. See Ko: Tron, island.
Kob Krah, island, location of, 811.
Kob Lantar, island, 83, 83 n. 2, 85.
Kob-trol. See Ko: Tron, island.
Kob Tron. See Ko: Tron, island and bay.
Kôi-Mái, hill, a Buddhist temple on the, 219; antiquities of, 219, 219 n. 2, 220.
Kôi-Mài, town, Ptolemy's Zabai located on the site of, 220, 221.
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Kokarit, district, 176.
Kokarit Hills, 176.
Kokkonagara, city, 96, 97; identity with Ukka or Kakula suggested, 94, 95; probably identical with Kakā-īvīpa, 95; an inland town of the Golden Khersonese, 111; inhabited by Kukkuras, 159 n. 2; identical with Korbie, 159 n. 2; the name discussed, 756.
Kokob, island, location of, 816 n.
Koktha, town, ruins of, 746.
Köl, country, account of the women of, 808.
Kola, the, people, 34, 86, 90, 103; the probable founders of Takōla, 89; colonies established by, 89.
Kola-budara, kingdom, a designation of Ligor, 518 n. 1, 759.
Koladyn. See Kuladān, river.
Kolānâca, alternative name for the country of the Kalingas, 34, 103.
Kolanuotphanta, the term discussed, 670 n.*
Kolasapattana, a seaport on the Coromandel coast, 103.
Kolarian race, 73, 75; language of the, 73.
Kolathāna. See Kuladān, river.
Kölī, town, identified with Kelantan, 105, 491 n. 3, 759; probably the Chinese Ko-lo, 106; other designations of, 518 n. 1; derivation of the name, 784.
Kölī (North India), the reputed birthplace of Māya, 105, 491 n. 3; other designations of, 491 n. 3.
Kolita, the, people, suggested identity with the Kûlûta, 803.
Kolla-malai Hills, 101, 103.
Kollam. See Kulam-malai, town.
Kolūka. See Kulûta, the, people.
Komār, kingdom, 776; the west coast of Kamboja, 200; eagle-wood a product of, 201, 202; location of, 201, 202; origin and history of, 203, 204; foundation and growth of, 206; also designated Kumāra, 210; expedition sent against the king of, 212, 213.
Komar, king. See Khî-mieh.
Komar, king of, 201.
Kôn-lon-thañ, city, a designation of Iwā-thañ, 322; reason assigned for the name of, 322.
Kópḍaññā, the family name of Liang kings, 491; a Brāhma named, became king of Kamboja, 491 n. 3; name of the Kambojan kings, 491 n. 3; kings of Indo-China, 491 n. 3.
Kong-men, the, people, habitat of, 787.
Kontani, the chief town of the Trang district, 79; route between Ligor and, 79.
Köpa, Kopah. See Takuna-pā, district.
Korbic, city, 78; derivation and meaning of the name discussed, 95, 96; possibly settled by dog-worshippers, 97; identical with Kokkonagara, 159 n. 2.
Koromandel, country, 34, 40 n. 3, 86, 103, 104, 122; coast of, 24, 92; identical with Chu-lien, 89, 609, 609 n. 2, 624; other designations of, 624; people of, connected with Arakan, 659.
Kortatha Metropolis, 300 n. 1, 308, 833; identified with, Hsiang-lin, 148; identified with Kiu-duk, 231, 232 n. 1, 233; the capital of Campā (Lam-ap), 232, 301, 302; identified with Chu-tê, 288, 289, 292, 303 n. 1; other designations of, 288, 294, 570 n., 794; now termed Hâ-tin, 292, 305, 306; an entrepot of trade with China, 304; situation of, discussed, 304; site of, coincides with Vīn, 304; unconnected with Khâ-lot, 305; nomenclature of, discussed, 305-8; derivation of the name, 785; connected with Chu-tu-chien, 793; connected with Kiu-siu, 794.
Kôt Mountierabân, the Palatine Law of Siâm, 631.
Kota Bātu, an artificial bar in Singapore River, 489 n. 3.
Kota Meligei, fort or city, on the site of the present Patâni, 490 n. 2.
Kotârâja, capital of the Acheh district, 664 n. 1, 666 n. 2.
Kotârî, city, connected with Yānpunagara, 266.
Kottawaringin (Borneo), Ptolemy's Kattigara connected with, 2.
Kou-li, district, suggested identification of, 718 n. 1.
Kou-lo-tan, state, possibly connected with Ho-lo-tan, 469 n. 3, 813; location of, 469 n. 3.
Kovidas, the, people, identity of, 674.
Kra, village, 113; probably the ancient name of C'hump'hon, 111; other designations of, 112; probably a former capital city, 115; ancient remains near, 115.
Kra Isthmus, the, 86, 90 n., 91, 93, 113; difficulties of forming a canal at, 79; the best point for crossing the Malay Peninsula, 94; important point for transshipment, 94; mottled land-tortoise plentiful about, 111.
Kra Pass, 756; the route across the,
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111; from Pák-chăn to C’hump’hôn, 115.
Kráchêb, district, connected with
Purojava and Zabai, 218 n. 1.
Kráh, town, corresponds to Balongka,
761.
Krakátoa, island, volcanic island in
Sunda Strait, 553, 555, 672; eruptions of, 672 n. 1; decrease in
the size of, 672 n. 1, 673 n. 1.
Krákó, district, suggested identification
of, 444 n. 2.
Krámsa. See Krámsen So, district.
Krámsen Sô, district, identification of,
776; names applied to the rivers of,
776.
Krangnàr, identical with Muziris,
670 n. 1.
Krá or Krása. See Krá, Míaang.
Krás, the term explained, 779.
Krá, Míaang, 308, 795; the Pagrasa
of Ptolemy, 24, 190, 191.
Kratón, the citadel and king’s residence
on Sumatra, 681.
Kraunca-dvipa, territory, identification of,
244, 249; origin of the name, 244.
Krão, district, hairy dwarfs of, 556
n. 3, 657 n. 1.
Kràsá, city founded by, 45 n. 2; a
city founded by a brother-in-law of,
611; clay image of, worshipped, 752.
Kràsá, river, 35, 108.
Kráng, meaning of the term, 574 n. 3,
823.
Krang Jamuan, river, location of,
677 n. 1.
Krang Kükás, island, location of,
816 n.
Krut, district, location and identification
of, 469 n. 3.
K, Sea of.
Ku-kang. See Chiu-chiang, river.
Ku-kang, kingdom, a designation of
Palembang, 630; identification of,
discussed, 630; Chinese chief ruled
at, 630.
Ku-Kuo-lo, the, people, a tribe of
Lolos, 770.
Ku-lai, king, deposition and death of,
780.
Kòa-lâu Rê, island, identical with
Wai-lo Shan, 238 n. 4.
Ku-li-Pan-tsu, district, unidentified,
433, 433 n. 3.
Ku-lo, village, its identity with Ko-lo
doubtful, 106; location of, 514;
identification of, 514, 515, 760, 819;
people of, traded with China, 515 n. 1.
Ku-lo, kingdom, identification of,
760. Ku-lun. See K’un-lun, the, people.
K’u-lun, island, identification of,
584 n. 3.
Ku-lung, king of Fu-nan, 574 n. 3.
Kü-phông, district, the southern
limit of Ma-Yüan’s conquests, 232
n. 1.
Kü-bàng, bay, 800.
Kü-Dài, estuary, 801.
Kü Ron, river, 797.
Kü Thái-biĩ, river, the Dorna River,
319 n.
Kü Thwôn-án, a port of Hwô, 765.
Kü Tâng, seaport, connected with
Ming-ling, 794.
Küántän, town, a safe port, 759.
Kü-hâ, river, a tributary of the Indus,
41 n.
Küblai Khan, expedition sent to Java
by, 539, 548, 825.
Kübo, river, 31, 32, 33, 773; a tributary
of the Chindwin, 41 n.; part of the
valley of the, called Maurya, 66.
Ku-bu, the, people, 494 n.; connected
with the Koidas, 674.
Kúdū Thâ-khâm, inscription of, 212.
Kudōs, the, people, 802.
Kudurang, Kun-dur-rung, island,
designations of Pulo Condor, 833.
Kudutai, the, people, 130, 805; the
habitat of, 356, 357; other designa-
tions of, 356, 357; identified with
the K’u-to and No-pí, 357, 362,
372; tribes connected with, 358 n. 2;
733, 803.
Kui, the, people, probably a remnant
of Ptolemy’s Léstai, 159; a semi-
barbarous tribe, 159.
Kui. See Cui, cape.
Kui Pass. See Khâu Môn Pass.
Kuki, the, people, other designations of,
744.
Kukkurás, the, people, 97, 102 n. 2;
of Kokkonagara, 139 n. 2.
Kükô Bû-ông, hamlet, location of, 816;
identification of, 816.
Kûkor, Pulo, connected with Pulo
Medang, 816, 817.
Kuku Islet, location of, 817 n.
Kukub. See Kokob, island.
Kukura, the, people, a branch of the
Yâdava, 612 n. 3.
Kulâ. See Kalé, town.
Kulâ, application of the term discussed,
34, 86, 753; term synonymous with
Malaya, 103.
Kulâ, the, people, 90 n.; people from
Southern India, 103; location and
division of, 754.
Kula-deva. See Kulottungga Coidadeva, king.
Kula-sthâna. See Kulâdân, river.
Kulâdân, river, 28, 31, 32, 33, 54; the Tokosanna of Ptolemy, 30, 44; name applied to the Arakan River, 34, 36, 37, 43, 44; derivation of the name, 34; boundary of Ptolemy's coast of the Airrhadoi, 37; local names for the, 37, 44.
Kulam-malâ, town, 88, 101, 103.
Kulâmattikâ. See Taik-kulâ, city.
Kulottungga Coidadeva, king, 609 n. 2.
Kulta. See Kolita, the, people.
Kûlûta, the, people, name changed to Utûla, 359; location of, 803; connection with other tribes, 803.
Kumâra, kingdom, named after a prince of Sâka-dvîpa, 157; also designated Komârî, 210; founded by settlers of Trang, 210; Como corresponds to, 776.
Kumâra, Kumârita. See Gûmara, island.
Kumârî. See Khmau, cape.
Kumârî, temple of, 206.
Kumbhâ na stûpa. See Drosa stûpa.
Kumpal. See Bauwal, island.
Kumuda, island, a designation of Kuśâ-dvîpa, 677.
K'un-lang, kingdom, identified with Kamalangna, 89 n. 5, 113.
K'un-lun, island. See Condore, Pulo.
K'un-lun, kingdom, 90, 507 n., 574 n. 3; inhabitants of, 755; location of, 755, 819; tribute sent to Nan-Chao by, 755, 819; war between Nan-Chao and, 755; a designation of Hsiao K'un-lun, 819; kings of, 545 n. 1, 822.
K'un-lun, the, people, 89 n. 5; of the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago, 103, 755; description of, 103, 260, 507 n.; identification of, 260; name derived from Kolum, 261 n. 1; name applied to I-wâ-thân, 333; Tonkin attacked by, 466; slaves sent as tribute, 507 n., 700; location of, 545; kings of, 545 n. 1; divisions of, 755; Nan-Chao forces drowned by, 818, 819; survivors of enemy mutilated by, 819.
K'un-lun slaves, 507 n., 623, 700.
K'un-lun Ts'êng-ch'î, a name for Sêng-chî slaves, 817, 818.
K'un-mi, the, people, habitat of, 64 n. 1.
K'un-ming, district, inhabited by the Ts'wan, 125; location of, 125.
Kundur, island, probably identical with Chûn-t'u-lung Shan, 482, 482 n. 2 (see Corrigenda, 815); in Durian Strait, 815.
Kundur, island, off the Lower Cochinchina coast, 815; a designation of Pulo Condore, 815.
K'un-ming, 771.
Kurinehi, district, gold produced at, 631.
Kuri, city, alleged capital of Java, 692 n. 1.
Kurti purânam, governor of Sapattota, 470 n. 1, 750.
Kuru, the, people, 776.
Kusa, Kuśâ-dvîpa, district, identified with the Sunda Archipelago, 237; a designation of Sumatra, 670, 671, 673; connected with Khryse, 671; the name discussed, 672; fireworship in, 672, 673; surrounded by the Kusa-mala Sea, 673; also called Kumudu, 677.
Kusa-mala, Kusa-mali, sea, surrounded Kusa-dvîpa, 673.
Kuśesaya, mount, probably Günong Lusê, 677.
Kusim. See Bassein, district.
Kusima, district, ancient name of Bassein, 50.
Kusima-mapâla, province of Râmañâdesa, 65.
Kusima-nagara, the ancient chief town of Bassein, 50.
Kusima-râthâ, district, ancient name of Bassein, 50.
Kusinâra, town, place of Buddha's death, 779.
Kusuma. See Bassein, district.
Kusuma-pura, 'the city of flowers,' the ancient name of Patna, 50.
Kâta-sâlmali, peak, 487 n.; identified with Suvarnamâli Mount, 80; the abode of Vainateya, 80.
Kuthâra, city, connected with Yânpunagara, 266; originally known as Sâgar, 267; the ancient name of Nha-trang, 833.
Kutubâia, island, 36, 37; connected with Katabâia, 197, 727, 728.
Kiu-ch'un, district, the present Tânhwâ, 232 n. 1, 351; incursions of the Châm into, 232 n. 1; part of Kraunca-dvîpa, 244; a district of Nan-yüeh, 291, 291 n. 1, 292; had jurisdiction over thirty districts, 351.
Kiu-dûk, 148; a district of Tonkin, 227; corresponds to Hà-tîn, 227, 350; the Kortatha Metropolis of Ptolemy, 231, 232 n. 1, 233; identified with Chiu-tô, 232, 298; the capital of the Ngâ-an territory, 232 n. 1;
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finally lost to the Chăm, 232 n. 1; the capital of North Campâ, 233; one of the early seats of civilization in Campâ, 236; other designations of, 298; dangerous and impenetrable, 350.

Kwâh, principal village on the Lang-kâwî, 486 n. 2.

Kwâla Besut, village, location of, 518 n. 1.

Kwâla Chering, river-mouth, 512 n. 2, 514 n. 2.

Kwâla Gula, district, possibly identical with Ko-ku-lo, 811.

Kwâla Kangsa, town, seat of government, 97, 99; connected with Palanda, 99.

Kwâla Klang, river, other designations of, 488 n. 1.

Kwâla Kurau, district, possibly identical with Ko-ku-lo, 811.

Kwâla Lampor, a noted cave, 477 n. 1.

Kwâla Lârut, 97.

Kwâla-Panchur, village, location of, 433 n. 3.

Kwâla Sâwa, situation of, 516 n. 3.

Kwâla Sembah, town, connected with the Sabana of Potoleny, 100.

Kwâla Tarung, connected with Tolung, 824.

Kwâla Trong, inlet, 99.

Kwân, town, possibly identical with Hsin-chou, 240.

Kwan-yin, a god, statues at Fo-lo-an identified as, 599, 600; connected with Ma-tsu-p'o, 600; birthplace of, 600; connected with Vîsu, 600; legend regarding, 600; account of, 600; Sinhala saved from shipwreck by, 600; birth of, 673 n. 2.

Kwâng-bin, district and river, limit of the Han conquests, 227, 231; corresponds to Hô-tõn, 227; other designations of, 781.

Kwâng-chou, city, a designation of Canton, 378, 824.

Kwâng-hsi province, 125, 129, 130, 131, 148, 153; cave-dwellings of, 159; appointment of an Imperial Chief Commissioner at, 241 n. 1; also designated Yüeh-hsi, 765.

Kwâng-hsin, town, seat of government removed from, 322.

Kwâng-nam, seaport, other designations of, 781, 791.

Kwâng-trî, district, 134; corresponds to Hô-tôn, 227.

Kwâng-trî. See Dâ-hân, river.

Kwâng-tung. See Canton.

Kwâng Wu'Ti, 290 n. 1.

Kwâng-yen, connected with Ning-hai, 801.

Kwe-lôn, village, location of, 746.

Kwei. See Kui, the people.

Kwei-chou, province, 128, 130; cave-dwellings of, 159.

Kwei-hwa kiang, the Red River, 798.

Kwî-nîn, city, name applied to C'hâ-hân, 233, 238 n. 1, 276; renamed Bi-nîn, 238 n. 1, 277; destroyed by Jâ-long, 238 n. 1; name erroneously given to Thi-nâi, 238; no place of the name existing, 238 n. 1; the capital of Nâks dominions, 277; captured after two sieges and five assaults, 277.

Kwo-lo-Mân, the people, a branch of the Loles, 803.

Kwo-kêng system of transcription, 226 n. 1.

Kyauk-taw, hill, 43.

Kyêndwen. See Chindwin, valley.

Kyauk-pân Hills, early inhabitants of the, 30, 30 n. 2.


Kyûma, island, connected with Sûmah, 575.

La, La-kia, the people, description of, 358 n. 2.

Lâ-sîèp, Lâ-siet, an islet and city on the Mê-P'ching, 143; foundation of, 143.

Lâ-thân, term applied to earthen mounds round Hâ-nôï, 328.

Lâ-thân, citadel, outside the walls of Dài-lâ, 328; seat of government transferred to, 328; ruins of, 330 n. 1.

Lâ-thân, city, foundation of, 327, 328; identification of, 328-30; other designations of, 328; connected with Hâ-nôï, Dài-lâ, and Long-bien, 328, 330; location of, 800.

Lâ-thân, fortress, founded by Kau-P'ien, 328, 338 n. 2.

Lang Island, a designation of Gëlam Island, 712.

Lab-lê Mê-mâï, Miûang. See Mê-mâï, Miûang.

Labô, Lavô. See Lop'hâburî, city.

Labong. See Lamp'hûn, city.

Lach Tran, outlet of the Sông Chun, 801.

Lacquer, black, applied to teeth, 780, 802.

Lada, Lâra, identification of, 766.

Lâda, Pulo, 487 n.
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Lágêh, Legeh, state, possibly corresponds to Lo-ch'a, 497, 497 n. 1.
Lahó, Lahôt. See Lop'haburi, city.
Lahor (India) founded by Lava, 180 n. 1.
Lái-khâ, town, a form of Legya, 141.
Laja-balús. See Lanje-balús, islands.
Lak-hûn, the, people, 321 n.
Lak-long, prince, kingdom of Vânlâng founded by, 339; account of, 339; legend respecting, 339, 340.
Lak-nêt, province, a designation of Tonkin, 320 n. 1.
Lake-dwellers, 120.
Lakhimpar, district, 830.
Lakhôn, kingdom, the vernacular name of Lágôr, 111, 508 n.
Lakhôn, a term denoting dancing-girls, 508 n.
Lakhôn actors, 547.
Lakhôn-thái, town, connected with Lautor, 769.
Lakkihya-pura, town, wrongly identified with Legya, 141.
Laksa-grhâ, Laksa-gubhâ, town, 767; a designation of Mùâng Hô-wông, 144.
Lakû, the, people, a Karen tribe, 771.
Lakwe, island. See Letwe-gyun, island.
Lam-ap, kingdom, 297; Hsiang-lin re-established under the name of, 227, 228; capital of, twice captured, and twice re-occupied, 228; capital of, abandoned by the Châm, 228; renamed Huan-wang, 228; conquest of, 232, 232 n. 1; Kortatha-Métropolis probably the capital of, 232; state re-established, 233; other designations of, 297.
Lam-barhî, village, probably identical with Lambri, 664 n. 1; location of, 664 n. 1.
Lam-bâru, village, 664 n. 1.
Lam-Bârûs, state, identical with Lang Po-lo-su, 482; a state of Shih-li Po-shih, 482.
Lam-Besi, river, 674.
Lam-li, Lambi, district, identified with Lambri, 684.
Lam-puyang, island, identified with Pulo Brâs, 691, 692, 693; alternative name for Lang-yên Hsü, 690 n. 1, 691, 691 n. 3, 692.
Lambana, 673.
Lambesi, state, possibly connected with Po-sz, 682; identical with Lambri, 688 n. 1.
Lambri, district, a designation of Lanwu-li, 389, 628, 665; camphor found in, 437 n.; possibly connected with Mu-li, 537; other designations of, 656, 667 n., 684, 685, 700, 701, 702; location of, 662, 663, 702; identification of, discussed, 664 n. 1; probable ancient form of the name, 664 n. 1; other toponyms connected with, 673, 674, 677, 678; limits of, correspond to ancient Acheh, 677, 678; well known to Arab travellers, 679; a designation of Sumatra, 681-3, 700: inhabitants of, 685, 695, 700, 701, 702; the earliest Chinese mention of, 685; wild men of, with tails, 685; the ruler of, 695; Islassin in, 696; monkeys in, 700; Islamism introduced into, 701; productions of, 701, 702.
Lambri, Sea of, other designations of, 663; meaning of the name, 663.
Lambrij, district, 682 n. 2; identified with Po-sz, 682; identical with Lambesi, 688 n. 1.
Lâm-erî, city, situation of, 432 n. 2, 701; on Kalah Island, 553. See also Lambri, district.
Laming, district, the ancient site of C'h'ieng-mâi, 143, 144.
Lâmiri, Lamori. See Lambri, district.
Lamory, 834; a district of Sumatra, 646; a designation of Lambri, 646.
Làmp'hûn, city, chronicles of, 107, 143; the first queen of, 143, 184 n. 1; built like a conch-shell, 264, 798.
Lampaun. See Lam-puyang, island.
Lampaun, village, location of, 815.
Lampaung, other toponyms connected with, 673, 674.
Lamphe, village, location and identification of, 664 n. 1.
Lâmri, Lamûri. See Lambri, district.
Lan-bu-ri, district, a designation of Lambri, 389, 628, 665.
Lân-ch'âng, state, 119 n. 1, 151, 152; identical with Eastern Lâo, 116; a name given to Luang Ph'rah Bâng, 146-9; other designations of, 149 n.
Lân-ch'âng. See Lân-ts'âng, river.
Lan-chou, district, location of, 765.
Lan John, a perversion of Lân-ch'âng, 717 n. 1.
Lan-lî. See Lambri, district.
Lân-nâ, Mûang, city, foundation of, 295 n. 3; subsidence of, 295 n. 3.
Lân-ni, state, identification of, discussed, 683; the south of Kamboja belonged to, 683; the Khmou Peninsula, 683 n. 1; meaning and origin of the name, 684, 684 n. 1.
Lân-ni, end of, identified with Khmou Point, 683.
Lan-ts'âng, river, 135 n. 1, 149 n. 1;
meaning and derivation of the name, 116, 135 n. 1, 765; identified with the Mé-Không, 116, 135, 137, 765; named after the Lân-ch'ăng State, 135; other designations of, 765, 766.

Lan-wu-li, district, other designations of, 389, 679 n. 2, 701; subject to San-t'ou-chi, 628, 679 n. 2, 701; account of a hill in, 665 n.; account of the people of, 679 n. 2; description of the king of, 679 n. 2; a designation of Achęb, 701; sacred footprints at, 701.

Lancaster, Sir James, visited Achęb, 655.

Land, Oriental term denoting, 588 n. 1; gradual emersion of, 79, 109.

Lang, the, tribe, 272, 272 n. 4, 273 n. 1.

Lang-chia-hsi. See Káma-laákā, kingdom.

Lang-hwang, the, people, other designations of, 789.

Lang-jên. See Lang-ping, the, people.

Lang-ka-hsi, identification and location of, 527, 544.

Lang-kia, Lang-chia-hsi, district, connected with Kra, 112; other designations of, 112; located near P'an-p'an, 113; established as a state, 115; identified with Ch'un-k'ph'on, 810, 811.

Lang-k'üang, the, 272 n. 4.

Lang-mu, Lang-muik, island, a designation of Lombok, 520 n. 2.

Lang-pi-ya, Lang-pi-ye, district, 815, 816; terms similar to, 505, 505 n. 1.

Lang-ping, the, people, ancient name of the Lang, 273 n. 1; other designations of, 273 n. 1, 789.

Lang-p'o-lu-sz, district, erroneously identified with Perlak, 429; corresponds to Bárás, 430; also designated Lam-Bárás, 482.

Lang-song, river, identified with the Hsín-chou, 235; anchorage near the mouth of the, 240.

Lang-ya-hsiu. See Lang-kia, district.

Langsa. See Kamalanga, kingdom.

Langçia, name applied to Lân-ch'ăng, 149 n.

Langsa-suka, town, connected with Lin-ya-sü-ka, 825; earliest capital of Kedah, 825.

Langkachiu, islands, 115; location of, 577; connected with the Larchin Islands, 762.

Langkāpu, Langkāvi, Langkāvari. See Langkāvi, islands.

Langkāvi, islands, caves on the, 477 n. 1, 485, 486, 486 n. 2; other designations of, 486 n. 3; account of, 486, 486 n. 3, 487; productions of, 486 n. 2; legends respecting, 487 n.; trade of, 487, 488.

Langksa, river, probably identical with Lin-ya-sz, 601 n. 1.

Langjád, Lankálás, island, identification of, 577.

Langjao, state, identified with Lân-ch'ăng, 149 n. 1.

Langje-bálu, islands, 383 n.; designation of the Andámáns and Nikòbárs, 397, 424 n. 1; productions of, 424 n. 1.

Lán-ká, district, Buddha’s visit to, 658; Yaksá expelled from, 658; conquest of the demons of, 785.

Lán-káchíu, Lánkáhüa. See Káma-lán-ká, kingdom.

Lankchú. See Langkáchíu, islands.

Lanping. See Lam-puyang, island.

Lanyá, Leiya, district, 115; connected with Lo-yüeh, 525 n. 1.

Lao, mountain, derivative of Ai-lao, 59; situation of, uncertain, 59.

Lao Chua, city, a designation of Lùng P'híg'ai Băng, 131, 150, 778.

Lao-lung, town, a designation of Lùng P'híg'ai Băng, 151 n. 1.

Lào, country, 151; dynasty founded at, 61; chronicles of Upper, 68; origin and meaning of Ptolemy’s terms connected with, 116–34; Lân-ch’ăng connected with Eastern, 116; Ch’ieng-mai and Nán included in Western, 116; other designations of, 131, 150; maintain the K’ang as slaves, 260; mode of government in, 764.

Laouk, island. See Man, Isle of.

Lár, Lár-sa, 140.

Laragari, 140.

Laraka, the, people, name of the Hor of Sing Bhám, 141.

Larantuka, country, sent tribute to Java, 518 n. 3; a designation of Flores, 589 n.

Larchin, islands, identification of, 762.

Larevi, kingdom, 815.

Lárewi, Sea of, names of seas forming the, 432 n. 2, 605; corresponds to the Sea of Na-mo-li, 694, 695.

Lari, in East Tibet, 766.

Lariagar, town, probably identical with Múang Lém, 140, 142, 733; derivation of the name discussed, 140, 141, 733, 766.

Lárut, district, 97, 99; noted for silver and tin, 477 n. 1.

Lasio, town, doubtful connection with Lasippa, 142.
Lasippa (Lasypa), town, 766; difficulty of identifying, 142, 144, 732; identity with Si-pop or Lashio discussed, 142, 767; possibly identical with Wieng Sipou-kay, 143, 144; located in the Ch'ieng-mai district, 144.

Lâsnah, island, under the sway of the Kamrân king, 674, 575.

Lasman, location of, 834; a form of Basman, 834.

Lasông. See Ch'ông, the, people.

Lastien. See Pulastya.

Lâta, kingdom, 140; identification of, 766.

Latcha, stream, its suggested identity with Lo-ch'â, 496; other designations, 533.

Lâu, the, race, 55 n. 2, 58, 61, 118, 130, 131, 150, 152; derivation of the name discussed, 59; formerly in possession of Western Yümnan, 59; area inhabited by, 59, 117; their name for the Burmese, 68; the Eastern, or White-bellied, 116, 120 n., 132, 133; Mâlava-desâ, the country of, 116; conquests of, 119 n. 1, 129; chronicles of the Eastern, 125; their ancestors settled at Mûng Thêân, 126; division of, into seven branches, 127, 128; received a king from heaven, 127; traditions of, 137, 139, 145; customs of, 146; the Chîch conquered by, 150; other designations of, 153.

Lâu, Mûng, 118.

Lâu States, present lack of information regarding, 144.

Lâu-Ch'êng. See Thai-Ch'ieng, the, people.

Lâu-Kâu, the, people, 125, 126.

Lâu Phûien. See Phû-êrh, the, people.

Lauhiyâ, river, identified with the Brahmaputra, 51.

Lauriyya, 140.

Lauriyyâ-Ararâj, location of, 766.

Lauriyyâ-Nandangâr, location of, 766.

Làuít, Pulo, a designation of North Natuna, 707 n. 2, 713.

Lautor, town, location and identification of, 769.

Lava. See Daba, country.

Lavâ. See Lawâ, the, race.

Lava, son of Râma, founder of Lahor, 180 n. 1.

Lavaka. See Lawa, town.

Lavapura, Lavapuri. See Lop'haburi, city.

Lavô. See Lop'haburi, city.

Lawa, town, tradition regarding the foundation of, 162 n. 1.

Lawâ, the, race, 55, 117, 161, 161 n. 2; derivation of the name discussed, 58, 59; repelled by the Lâu, 58; extent of the country of, 118, 143; known as the Ch'âieng, 118; conquered by the Thai, 119; traditions of, 119 n. 1; settled along the Mê-Không, 119 n. 1; terms connected with the name, 162.

Lawék, town, identical with Ava, 162 n. 1; originally named Lawa, 162 n. 1; a Kambojan capital, 220, 775.

Laws, a collection of Siamese, 191.

Lâi-Dái-Hân. See Le-Hang, king.

Le-Hang, king, conquered Campê, 563 n. 3.

Le-mâo, river, 44.

'Lead,' terms designating, 87, 87 n. 88.

Lebêh, a tributary of the Kelantan, 759.

Ledda, Ledoa. See Sandoway, city.

Ledesh. See Legya, town.

Leeches, plentiful in the jungles of Indo-China, 667 n.

Lêgaing, district, in Sunâparanta, 748.

Legeb, district, 490 n. 2; gold obtained from, 477 n. 1, 497 n. 1; other designations of, 533.

Legends, 96, 487 n.; of the building of Dwâravatî, 45, 742; of a centipede devouring an elephant, 77, 751; respecting the Diamond Sands, 108, 109; of Buddha, 107-9, 112, 114, 188, 188 n. 1, 385, 658, 664-6, 752 n. 1; of the Lâu king, 127; of the Khâ Chich tribes, 133; of the waters of Sidantara, 136 n. 1; of the foundation of Lâng Phraab Bang, 145, 146 n. 1, 152; of a black image in Po-lo temple, 366 n.; of the inhabitants of So-tu-man Island, 385; of loadstone rocks, 420, 423 n. 1, 424; of the abode of Garuda, 487 n.; of statues at Po-lo-an, 599, 599 n. 2, 600; of the magic horse, 600, 600 n. 3; of the foundation of Pâsai, 613 n. 1; of the 'Gold-bars Pond,' 621; connected with the naming of Sumatra, 643, 643 n. 1; regarding the moving of Sumatra, 669; of footprint in water, 699; of the tailed inhabitants of the Anambas, 718; of Rama's conquest of the demons of Lânkâ, 785.

Legya, town, doubtful connection with Lariagar, 141, 142; wrongly identified with Lakhkhiyâ-pura, 141.
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Lehri (India), 140.
Lei-chou, Lui-chau, peninsula, 25, 26, 250, 250 n. 1.
Lém, Múang, 119 n. 1, 141; probably the Lariagara of Ptolemy, 140, 142, 733; a Lawá town, 733; a silvermine in, 740.
Lém Húu-Nák. See Nágä-Head Point.
Lemoh Mátí, the highest peak of Pulo Weh, 693.
Lemurian continent, subsidence of, 669.
Lenje-bálús. See Lanje-bálús, islands.
Lerá, Padre, 342, n. 1.
Leroa, city, location and identification of, 647, 702.
‘Lesser Bráhmans.’ See Hsiao P'o-lo-mén, state.
Léstai, district, 156, 769; the Gulf of Siám, 81; identified with Kamboja, 149.
Léstai, the, people, 81, 116, 156, 160, 169; inhabitants of Lower Siám and Kamboja, 149, 156; identity of, discussed, 156, 172; extent of the region of, 156; meaning of the name discussed, 156, 157, 160, 737; description of, 158, 159 n. 2; possible reason for Ptolemy’s name of, being applied, 158; identified with the Tan-árh, 257 n.; origin of, discussed, 258 n.; connection with the C'hông discussed, 737, 772.
Léstön Khúra, probably the Bái-Loï country, 161 n. 2.
Let-tha, the, people, 160.
Letters, description of imperial, from China, 624.
Lettroo, kingdom, 769.
Lëtwyà, gyun, island, connected with Lo-yüeh, 525 n. 1.
Li, the, people, 161, 161 n. 2; tattooing among, 173.
Li-bón, emperor, 357 n. 1; revolt headed by, 326; Long-bien seized by, 326; proclaimed himself king, 326; defeat and death of, 326.
Li-hsién Kiang, a designation of the Black River, 314 n. 1.
Li-hwa Chiang, part of the Red River, 315 n. 1.
Li-jên, mountaineers of Hainan, 161 n. 2.
Li-kiang prefecture, 765.
Li-p'hot-tú, 329, 799; proclaimed himself king, 326, 327; subdued by the Chinese, 327.
Li-shè Chiang, part of the Red River, 315 n. 1.
Li-t'ai, kingdom, identification of, 688.
Li-thài-tó, the founder of the Li dynasty, 329; P'hot-thë captured by, 779.
Liang Shwe valley, 819.
Liang-t's-wan-man, the, people, 126.
Liao, the, people, account of, 288 n. 4.
Lihau, the, people, dangerous barbarians of Chiu-tê, 288, 350; not connected with the Lâu, 288 n. 4, 351; the habitat of, 350; the application of the term discussed, 351 n. 3; tattooing among, 773, 804; tooth-filing among, 802.
Libih, river, identified with the Attaba of Ptolemy, 105.
Lích, river, 782.
Lide, state, identified with Rantei, 688 n. 1.
Lídure, Lydure, city, a principal city of Siám, 769.
Liên-thô, town, seat of government removed from, 322.
Lignum aloe, 476; plentiful on the Malay Peninsula, 478 n.
Ligor, kingdom and city, 90 n., 112, 115, 444 n. 2, 760; appearance of the country around, 78; route between Kontani and, 79; has gradually become an inland town, 79, 107; an ancient seaport, 106, 107; an independent kingdom, 107; king of, attacked Lavapura, 107; foundation of, 107, 111 n. 1; subject to the kings of Sukhothai, 107; built on the ancient Diamond Sands, 108; account of the Bráhmans in, 108, 471 n. 2; the classic name of, 109; the Perimula of Ptolemy, 110, 540; erroneously identified with Samaradé, 169; other designations of, 444 n. 2, 497 n. 1, 508 n., 518 n. 1, 756, 759, 820; dancing slave-girls trained at, 506, 506 n. 2, 525 n. 1, 544, 549; the habitat of the Ta K'ún-lun, 755.
Ligor, Bight of, 721.
Lima, Pulo, 501 n. 2.
Limestone caves, 79.
Limun, district, gold plentiful at, 631.
Lin-an Fu, city, identified with Pu-t'ou, 793.
Lin-i, kingdom, 148, 824; identical with Campá, 227, 298, 794; name changed to Hsiang-lin, 227, 230; a new kingdom of, set up, 227, 228; foundation of, 230, 289, 290 n. 1; alleged capture of the capital of, by Ma-yüan, 231, 232, 232 n. 1, 289;
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included in the kingdom of Nan-yüeh, 250 n. 2; discrepancy as to the site of the capital of, discussed, 231; extent of, 253, 293 n. 1; nomenclature of, discussed, 235-7, 296, 297, 300, 301, 305-8; king of, pays tribute, 299, 794; an independent state, 300; amber obtained from mines at, 582 n. 1. See also Campá, kingdom.

Lin-kao, district, 250 n. 1.
Lin-ya-ssü-ka, town, identified with Langka-suka, 825.
Lin-ya-szu, state, 599; identification of, 601, 626, 825; subject to Sanfo-ch'ü, 626; productions of, 626.

Lin-kiang, river, 794.
Lin Shan, identified with Cape Varella, 710.

Linga, island, 501 n. 2.

Linga Kamau. See Menancabo, kingdom.

Lingga, hill of, 618 n. 2.

Lingi, river, also designated Samawa, 768.

Lion Kingdom, the, a designation of Ceylon, 816.

Lisu, the, tribe, 130 n. 1, 160; cuirasses used by, 770.

Litholatry among the Lāus, 119 n. 1.

Little Fortune, island, 419 n. 1.

Lo, river, identification of, 765; also called Lo-shwei, 765.

Lo-ch'a, Lo-ch'at, state, 815; location of, 473 n. 3, 474; carbuncles obtained from, 491 n. 1; description of the natives of, 493 n. 3, 554 n. 2, 686; peculiar trading customs at, 493, n. 3; its identification discussed, 496, 497, 497 n. 1; erroneously identified with the Nikobārs, 497 n. 1; origin of the name, 497 n. 1; connected with Rājapura, 508 n.

Lo-ch'a. See Rākṣsa, the, people.

Lo-ch'a-lo-cha, a Chu-lien king, 609 n. 2.

Lo-ch'eng. See Lwā-thān, city.

Lo-dzung, river and district, location of, discussed, 311; a district of Jih-nan, 311, 311 n. 2.

Lo-dzung, seaport, identical with Lu-jung, 795.

Lo-hsing, designation of the Andāmāns and Nikobārs, 397.

Lo-huh, Lo-huk, city and kingdom, part of Ch'ih-t'u, 179; a productive tract, 180; identified with Lop'ha-buri, 180, 183, 822; description of, 180; conquest of, 181; other designations of, 822; an embassy to China from, 822.

Lo-jen, designation of the Andāmāns and Nikobārs, 397.

Lo-k'ang, town, erroneously identified with Rangūn, 425.

Lo-k'ē. See Arakan, kingdom.

Lo-kwo, designation of the Andāmāns and Nikobārs, 397, 527, 528 n. 1.

Lo-lien-nū Bay, the fish with stone horns of, 782.

Lo-pe, the, people, 359, 360.

Lo-shwei, river, 765.

Lo-si-pa, village, location of, 766; inhabitants of, 766.

Lo-tē, the, people, habitat of, 733; connected with the Kudutai, 733.

Lo-wei Shan, island, identification of, 711.

Lo-yang, town, ancient capital of China, 16; the Sēra Metropolis of Ptolemy, 16, 738; seat of government of Kwang Wu Ti, 738.

Lo-yü, state, 110, 760.

Lo-yüeh, state, 110, 760; location of, 525, 820, 821; identification of, discussed, 525 n. 1; suggested identifications of the two places called, 525 n. 1; a trading centre, 820; probably identical with the Ligor kingdom, 815, 820.

Lo-yung, a Chinese capital, 302.

Loa-thanh. See Lwā-thān, city.

Loadstone rocks, 422 n. 4; legend regarding, 423 n. 1, 424.

Locat, province, other designations of, 533; identified with Legeb, 497 n. 1, 533.

Lohanukha, the, people, description of, 156 n. 1.

Lohāvara. See Lābor (India).

Lohit, Lohita, sea, identical with the Selat Sea, 91.

Loi, race, 225 n. 1.

Lōi-krathong, a festival of floating offerings in streams, 493 n. 1.

Loi-lông Karens, the, people, tattooing among the, 675 n. 1, 804.


Lōi-sthān. See Léstōn Khrā.

Loi-cloth, 243, 243 n. 2.

Lok-belang. See Telok-belang, city.

Lolo, the, people, 126 n. 3, 358; a nickname of the Khā Hok, 358 n. 2; their taste for squirrels as food, 358 n. 2; origin of the name, 358 n. 2; connected with Ptolemy's Kudutai, 358 n. 2; identified with the Ts'wan, 763; their connection with the K'a-to discussed, 803.

Lolo, Black. See Karajang, the, people.

Lōm-dāu, district, 336, 336 n. 2.
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Löm-üp. See Lam-ap, kingdom.
Loman, the, people, conquest of, 749; other designations of, 749.
Lomapāda, Lomapaten. See Romapāda, district.
Lomapādapuri, town, identical with Angapuri, 235 n. 1; capital of the Indu Cumpā, 235 n. 1.
Lombok, island, designations of, 589 n.
Long-bien, city, 324; seat of government at, 322, 324 n. 2, 325, 326, 799; connected with Hā-nōi, 322, 323, 328–30, 330 n. 1, 784; probably identical with Kiao-chow, 324 n. 2, 327; defences of, 324–6; importance of, 325; the key of Tonkin, 325; position of, 325; fable connected with, 325, 326; meaning of the name, 326; identified with Lā-thăn, city, 326–35; name changed to Thang-long, 329; capital of Nam-viet, 330 n. 1; probably the capital of Kiao-chi, 331, 544; identified with Ptolomy’s Aganagara, 331, 332, 334; plundered by people from Sê-p’o, 544.
Long-bien, district, captured by Li-bôn, 326; renamed Nam-viet, 326.
Long-pi-ya. See Lang-pi-ya, district.
Long-Po, location of, 772; prehistoric stations discovered in, 772.
Long-wien. See Long-bien, city.
Lop’haburi, city and kingdom, 774; attacked by the king of Ligor, 107; a chief town of Siâm, 176; identified with Lo-huh, 180, 183, 822; foundation of, 180; the chief city of Sawankhalok, 180; derivation of the name, 180 n. 1.
Lotus - flowers, golden, containing pearls, 625.
Lou-wen River, identification of, 768.
Loc, term used to designate the Chinese, 55 n. 2.
Low, Captain, discoveries of, 98.
Lư, Lư Shans, the, people of C’hieng Kung, 138, 139 n. 2.
Lu-fu, a designation of Fu-lu, 784.
Lu-jung, town, seaport for Jih-nan, 785; connected with Lo-dzung, 795; Tonkinese and Cantonese defeated at, 796; location of, 796.
Lu-jung, river, corresponds to the Song Mai, 796.
Lu Kiang, the Clear River, 314.
Lu-shwei, river, cartographers’ errors regarding the, 375.
Lu-ts’ang, river, a designation of the Lan-ts’ang, 766.
Lu-tsz, the, people, face-tattooing among, 367 n. 3, 675 n. †.
Lu-yü, the, tribe, 90 n.
Lu-yü. See Ligor, city.
Lu-yung. See Lo-dzung, district and river.
Lüang Phraha Bâng, kingdom, 120, 125, 127, 128, 269; spoken of as Savaka-Mâla, 116, 117; overthrown by the Doanai, 124; chronicles of, 129; other designations of, 131, 132, 135, 356; origin of the name of, 149 n.; capital removed to Wieng Chun, 151; its identification with Manojava discussed, 169; connected with Nan-Chao, 296; other designations of, 356.
Lüang Phraha Bâng, town, 122; the foundation of, 133, 144, 145, 146 n.; identified with Ptolomy’s Doana, 144; the capital of Eastern Laos, 144; configuration of the city, 145; other designations of, discussed, 145–55, 768; connected with Hsiang-hin, 146 n.
Lûboûk, state, location of, 688 n. 1; claimed as a possession of Achiéh, 705.
Lubu, the, tribes, 657 n. 1.
Luh-to, the, people, fought by the Ài-Lâu, 160.
Lui-Chau, town, a base for correction of Ptolomy’s coast of China, 25, 26; the Asphira of Ptolomy, 26, 231 n., 377; ancient names for, 26; connected with the north coast of Hainan, 246 n.; a port and prefectural city, 251 n.; superseded by Pak-hoi, 261 n.
Lük-thû, district, 355 n.
Luk-to, Lu-to, the, people, 360, 361; meaning and origin of the name discussed, 360 n. 5.
Lûkin, kingdom, king of, conquered Sânt, 563 n. 3; a designation of South China, 563 n. 3.
Lûlu-bilenk, bay, its identification discussed, 431 n. 3; derivation of the name, 431 n. 3; anthropophagi with tails at, 685; the inhabitants of, 700.
Lung, river, identification of, 819.
Lung-khe, village, ruins of Lwâ-lhû near, 323.
Lung-mên, river, identical with the Yû-kung, 372, 373.
Lung-p’sen. See Long-bien, city.
Lung-see, meaning of the term, 126; nickname of the Nan-Chao, 126.
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Lung-ya-ka-mau, kingdom, identified with Menang-kabau, 676 n.
Lung-ya Mên, the Linga Strait and Island, 617.
Lung-yen Hsi, island, identification of, 518 n. 3; description of, 691, 692; identified with Pulo Brâs, 690 n. 1, 691, 693; erroneously identified with Pulo Weh, 691, 692 n. 2; other designations of, 691, 692.
Lungu, river, 525 n. 1; connected with the Khrysosan, 97.
Lushai Hills, location and identification of, 773.
Lushih Shan Mountains, 766.
Luzon, island, also designated Manila, 421 n. 2. See Addenda, 809.
Lwâ-louî, city, location of, 323, 323 n. 3; seat of Han government at, 323, 324; possibly identical with Lwâ-thân, 323; possibly the capital of Kiao-chi, 331; identifications of, 331; connected with Ptolemy's Aganagara, 331, 332.
Lwâ-thân, city, built by King Ph'an, 321; configuration of, 321, 322, 322 n. 1, 322; other designations of, 322, 333, 800; possibly identical with Lwâ-louî, 323, 331; capital of Ou-lâk, 331; Ngô-k'wân set up his capital at, 333; historical traditions of, 333; connected with Kô-lwâ, 798; a Chinese seat of government, 800.
Lythimos Pyrgos. See 'Stone Tower.'

M

Ma-ha-la-cha Pa-la-pu, king of Sanfo-ch'î, 629; suggested identification of, 629.
Ma-hûn, river, 66, 67, 738; connected with Ptolemy's Malthura, 66.
Ma-Huan, the journal of, 38 n. 2.
Ma-i, river, connected with the Sados of Ptolemy, 47.
Ma-la. See P'u-la, the people.
Ma-lai-hu, kingdom, ambassadors to China from, 822.
Ma-le Wu Ta-fên, Sultan, identical with Mâliku-l-Zâher, 648, 648 n. 1.
Ma-li, state, a designation of P'o-li, 491.
Ma-li-tung, island, identified with Billiton, 712, 712 n. 1.
Ma-li-yü-erb, the Siamese ordered not to molest, 532; other designations of, 533, 533 n. 1; identification of, 537.
Ma-ling, district, connected with Viên-lân, 794.
Ma-liu, the, people, doubtful connection with the Hsi-t'ü I, 353; the alleged descent of, 353, 355 n.; origin of the name discussed, 353.
Ma-na-chê Wu-li, king of Sanfo-ch'i, 630; accession of, 630; investiture granted to, 630.
Ma-na-ha Pau-lin-pang, king of Sanfo-ch'i, 629; suggested identification of, 629; name connected with Palembang, 629.
Ma-ngû. See Ma-wu, islands.
Ma-tsu-p'ô, patroness of Chinese sailors, 600; identified with Kwan-yin, 600.
Ma-tung, district, identification of, 450 n. 2; pepper procured from, 450 n. 2.
Ma-wu, islands, 248.
Ma-yi-tung, island, noted for tortoise-shell, 671 n.; a designation of Billiton, 671 n.
Ma-yuan, said to have captured the capital of Lam-ap, 231, 232, 289; the Han invasion under, 231, 313; pillars of, 231, 232, 232 n. 2, 781.
Maked, kingdom, 832; identified with Bâ-viêt, 205.
Mâbit, Mâit, city, identified with Mergui, 729.
Machaim. See Mi-ch'îen, kingdom.
Madeik, district in Thamodaya, 826.
Madra, a name of the old Dravidian Siva, 751 n. 1.
Madramakan, island, location of, 752 n. 1; other designations of, 752, 752 n. 1; Buddha image and footprint on, 752 n. 1.
Magadha, kingdom, 32, 57, 60, 61, 70; the Khâstriya kingdom of, 33; other designations of, 60, 742; enigration of princes of, 60; Maurya monarchy of, 66; king of, wrecked, 108; prince and king of, 123, 123 n. 2; the native land of Buddha, 184 n. 1; location of Eastern, 767.
Mâgadha, Magassa, the, people, of Saka-adîpa, 123 n. 2.
Magnu-Caulîj, island, 422 n. 1; a designation of Tâprobana, 422; connected with the Manolai, 422; variants of the name, 422 n. 1; a designation of Sumatra, 641 n. 1; other designations of, 646.
Magnus Sinus, 25; connected with the Gulf of Bengal, 2; identified with Tonkin, 26; the Great Gulf of Ptolemy, 226.
Mahâ Campâ, port, a designation of
the Châm empire of Campâ, 234; identification of, 781; location of an old capital of, 790.

Mahâ-Muni pagoda, sacred image of Buddha kept at the, 43, 44.

Mahânadi, river, name applied to the Mê-Không, 136.

Mahârâja, the title of the Jâbâh of Shelâheet, 550.

Mahâ, river (India), 136.

Mahirâvâna, king of some Indian Archipelago islands, 658.

Mahiyangana - nagara. See Yong, Muûang.

Mâlûmûld Shâh, Sultan, first ruler of the Arabic dynasty of Acheb, 667 n.; king of Lambri, 695; king of Nan-p'oo-li, 703; sent tribute to China, 703; received investiture from China, 703.

Mahoradîka drum, the, worshipped by the Lâu-Chhieng, 119 n. 1; description of, 119 n. 1.

Mahudaung, mountains, identified with Ptolemy's Maiandros, 832.

Maiwa-jou, the, people, head-hunters, 720 n.

Maiandros, Mount, 52, 53; identified with Mandara, 51; also known as Arakan Roma, 51; location of, 832; other forms of the name, 832.

Mainâka, mountain on Nârikela, 807, 809.

Maisôlia, district, the capital of, 668 n. 3.

Maislos, river, identified with the Godâvari, 25.

Mâî, city, a designation of Mergui, 752.

Mâjapâhit, city and state, king of, 507 n.; a famous kingdom of Java, 580, 637, 637 n. 1; erroneously connected with Markâwand, 580; foundation of, 581, 581 n. 1; alleged capital of Java, 592 n. 1.

Mâjapâhit, city and village on Sumatra, 583, 583 n. 3.

Majerika, 113, 382 n. 3; a gorgeous stûpa on the sands of, 108.

Mak family, career of the, 196 n.

Mak-kong-binh, governor of Hatien, 196 n.

Mak-kùi, Mak-kùi, founder and governor of Hatien, 195, 195 n. 2; account of, 195 n. 2; villages founded by, 775, 776.

Mak-tôn, governor of Hatien, 196 n.

Mâk-viet, kingdom connected with Mabled, 832.

Makawan, district, identification of, discussed, 583.

Malâ, Mâlava, Mâlava-deśa, Malva, kingdom, 35, 121, 132, 136; the country of the Lâu, 116, 117, 118; a designation of Lâos, 131; the term discussed, 461.

Malâ-pradesa, meaning of the name, 118 n. 1.

Malabar, country, 34, 86, 88, 91, 101, 103, 122; other designations of, 102, 439 n. 2, 670 n. 1; Dravidian emigrants came from, 461.

Malacca, city, formerly called Jakola, 521 n. 1.

Malacca, state, 98 n., 114, 532, 532 n. 1, 759; derivation of the name discussed, 105; sulphur obtained from, 477 n. 1; forests of lignum aloes in, 478 n.; saponwood abundant in, 478 n.; foundation of, 488 n. 1; peculiar trading customs at, 494 n.; its identification with Ko-lo Fu-sha-lo discussed, 518, 518 n. 1, 519; the capital city of, 521, 521 n. 1; other designations of, 548, 549, 812; ambergris from, 818, 3; a refugee from, at Sumatra, 653; noted for tortoise-shell, 671 n.; suggested as part of Ophir, 814.

Malacca Strait, measurements of the, 525 n. 1; other designations of, 552, 571; countries situated on, 718 n. 1.

Malâi, island, 495, 495 n. 4; location of, 535; identification of, 535 n. 2; connected with Malaya-dipa and Malâyur, 536.

Malai-kollam. See Maleu-kolun, cape.

Malai-Kurram, city, 101, 103, 104.

Malâir, town, situation of, 432 n. 2.

Malâkâ, state, a designation of Malacca, 532; tributary to Siâm, 532, 532 n. 1.

Malâka, the, people, a tribe from Southern India, 105.

Malamasmi, island and kingdom, other designations of, 837; identification of, 837 n. 2.

Malanga, identified with Vêngî-pura, 108; the capital of the Nâgas of Majerika, 113; confused with Palanga, 113.

Malao, city, location and identification of, 647, 647 n. 1, 834.

Mâlátâ, Sea of, identification of, 753.

Malava, Eastern, kingdom, founded by the Chêb, 133; conquered by the Lâu, 133. See also Malà, kingdom.

Malâva, the, people, inhabitants of the Vindhya Mountains, 156.

Malavir, city, 821; location of, 533, 536; other designations of, 533,
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537; suggested identification of, 533 n. 1, 815; a city on Pentam Island, 533, 536; a notable emporium, 536.

"Malay Annals," the, 98, 434 n. 2, 490 n. 2, 517 n. 1, 528 n. 1, 530 n. 4, 613 n. 1, 618 n. 2, 629, 637 n. 2, 639, 643 n. 1, 645, 648 n. 2.

Malay Archipelago, 8, 150; designated

Zabedi, 89; map of the, 110, 110 n. 1. See also Malay Peninsula.

Malay Peninsula, the, 23, 25, 39, 83, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 99, 103, 107, 113, 121, 122, 159 passion; Ptolemy's coast of Sinai connected with, 2; Ptolemy's geography of, 5, 6, 8, 101; shortened by Ptolemy, 13, 81; Ptolemy's error in the western coast of, 23; its connection with Ptolemy's Khrysa discussed, 65, 78, 80; the Golden Khersonese of Ptolemy, 77, 95, 222; formerly an island, 78; general contour of the country, 78; most of, an old sea-bed, 78, 79; boat-travelling across, 79, 115, 751; possibility of a canal across, 79; the land still rising, 79; gold and tin found in, 80; other designations of, 80, 81, 84, 102, 517, 517 n. 1, 556; routes across, 85, 91, 93, 94, 106, 109, 111; Ptolemy's displacement of the towns and coast of, 99; phenomenon of, 109, 110; Buddha's legendary visit to, 114; recent formation of the southern end of, 222, 223; description of, in Ptolemy's time, 223; settled by the Môn-Khêmr, 637.

Malay settlements, 90 n., 98.

Malaya, country, 34, 81; meaning of the term, 101, 102; applied to the Malay Peninsula, 102; term synonymous with Kula, 103; Ceylonese envoys imprisoned in, 535, 536; other forms of the name, 537 n. 1; identical with Mo-lu-yo, 619.

Malaya, the, people, 90, 91, 101; the inhabitants of the Malay Peninsula, 102; distinct from the modern Malays, 102.

Malaya-dipa, Malava-dërpa, 538 n. 2; a designation of the Malay Peninsula, 81, 102; instruction given to the king of, 81 n. 1; derivation of the name, 81; name connected with Malai or Malayu, 536, 538.

Malaya-vära. See Malayo, state.

Malayálam, part of the Malay Peninsula, 102.

Malayo, Malayu, Malâyû, state, its identification discussed, 529, 529 n. 2, 530, 530 n. 4; location of, 532, 538, 647 n. 1; tributary to Siam, 532, 538; conquest of, 534; identical with Johor, 534, 538; other designations of, 533, 534, 535-9; outline history of, as a topographical and ethnical term, 535-9; war against, 821.

Malâyû. See Malâyû, district.

Malays, the, people, 31, 99 n., 96, 720 n.; distinct from the ancient Malayas, 102; attacked Ceylon, 624 n. 1, 629; immigrants of Sumatra, 634; names applied to, 636; inhabitants of the Malay Peninsula, 636, 636 n. 1.

Malayu, island, identification of, 538; connected with Malaya-dipa, 538.

Malayu, the, people, modern Malas, 102.

Malayu, river, identification of, 530 n. 4.

Malâyûr, district and city, location of, 536, 537; connected with the island of Malai, 536; on Kalah Island, 553.

Malayas, See Malayas, the, people.

Maleu-kollon, cape, 101, 758; identified with Tanjong Kuántân, 104; erroneously connected with Rama Point, 104; the eastern end of Ptolemy's Malay Peninsula, 104; probably identical with Bukit Gelang, 476 n. 1, 759; situation of, 535, 759; origin of the name, 730, 731, 759.

Malbhn, island, possibly connected with the Andâmân-Nikobârs, 401; location and inhabitants of, 401, 402, 422; suggested identification of, 402-4, 422, 422 n. 4; possibly part of Ptolemy's Manilaw, 401, 404; derivation and meaning of the name, 422 n. 4.

Málíku-l-Malbûnûd, king of Sumatra, 645, 646.

Málíku'l-Mânsûr, sultan of Sumatra, 617 n. 1; transportation of, 617 n. 1.

Málíku-l-Sâleh, Sultan, the founder of Sumatra city, 613 n. 1; founded Pâsai, 613 n. 1; title assumed by Marah Sîlu, 644.

Málíku-l-Zâher, king, 646; of Sumatra, and then of Pâsai, 642 n. 2, 644; carried captive to Siâm, 645; a vassal of Siâm, 645; identification of, 648; other designations of, 648.

Málíni, district, 297; identical with Aânga, 235.
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Malirur. See Malavir, city.
Malivan, tin-ore abounds at, 91.
Malla, the, people in North India, 355 n. 1.
Mallayo. See Malayo, state.
Malthura. See Mareura, city.
Malva. See Malá, kingdom.
Manuri River, 740.
Man, words designating, 68, 69.
Mán, Shán name for the Burmese, 68.
Mán, Mán, the, people, 55, 56 n. 2; a name applied to the Burmese, 68.
Mán. See Móh, the, people.
Man, Isle of, possibly corresponds to Malhan, 401, 404.
Man River, Buddha’s footprint on the bank of the, 665 n.; identification of the, 665 n.
Man-1, the, tribe, the language of, 687.
Mán Rao-lan, the, people, 774.
Man-kham, village, on the site of Haseen, 195 n. 2.
Man-lah-kia, state, a designation of Malacca, 98 n.
Mán-Liaw, the, people, 351.
Man-oung. See Cheduba, island.
Man-shan, river, other designations of, 776.
Manchu, the, people, Burmese name for, 64.
Mancopo, state, probably identical with Ragonan, 688 n. 1.
Mánd, Mánid, islands, probably the Philippines, 509.
Mandalay, town, amber worked at, 582 n. 1.
Mandara, Mount, the Maandros of Ptolemy, 51.
Mandehas, the, people, identity of, 674.
Manch, islet, position of, 422 n. 2.
Mangeral, island, a designation of Flores, 589 n.
Mango-trees, 216, 216 n. 1.
Mangoman, islet, location of, 583 n. 2.
Man-dvipa, 589 n.; a fabulous island, 423 n. 1.
Manila, town and bay on the Island of Luzon, 421 n. 2.
Manilla, a mart for tortoise-shell, 671 n.
Manillas, islands, a designation of the Philippines, 421 n. 2; connected with the Manilai, 421.
Maniolai, islands, identical with the Nikobars, 382 n.; a group of ten islands, 420; magnetic power of the, 420; location of, 420; connected with the Philippines, 421 n. 2; suggested identification of the, 421; Si-Malur possibly included in Ptolemy’s, 446.
Maniolai, the, people, cannibal inhabitants of the Maniolai Islands, 420; derivation of the name, 423.
Manipur, river, other designations of the, 813; source of the, 814.
Manipur, state, 33, 66; under Brahmanic rule, 33; the, route to Burma, 140; other designations of, 766; connected with Hsing P’o-lo-mén, 814.
Manipura, city, King Dhajaräja settled at, 745.
Manjong, Manjung, district, 697 n. 1; early designation of Përuk, 98, 499, 517 n. 1; Mâliku’l Mansur transported to, 517 n. 1.
Mankathë, river, a designation of the Manipur, 813.
Manojava, district, situation of, discussed, 169; a division of Saka-dvipa, 218; probably corresponds to Lûang, P’hab Bang, 169, 218 n. 1.
Manšür Shãh, king of Malacca, 648 n. 2, 696; reinstated Zeinul-Áhidín, 648 n. 2; date of, 648 n. 2; murder of, 655 n. 1, 704.
Manšür Shãh, Sultan, showed favour to Indra Brahna, 696, 696 n. 1; prince of Përuk, 704; king of Achèh, 704; proved formidable to Malacca, 704; murder of, 757.
Manšür-râba, province, 810; identical with Middle Sindhi, 439 n. 3; camphor produced in, 439 n. 3.
Mantañ, the, people of the Mantawi Islands, 674 n. 1.
Mantawi, Mentawi, islands, 419; correspond in part to the Sindai, 449; natives of, 556 n. 2, 674 n. 1.
Mantawi, Mentawi, the, people, habitat and account of, 448, 449; derivation of the name, 449 n. 3.
Mante, the, people, still existing in Achèh, 674; connected with the Mandehas, 674.
Manu, n, 157.
Mao-Shan, island, 385.
Maps, Portuguese, 46, 60; errors in, 75, 115, 135 n. 1; European, 84; old, 90 n., 94, 110, 110 n. 3; the two Catalan, compared, 834.
Marn, the, people, 55, 55 n. 2; a designation of the Burmese, 68; their race discussed, 69, 70; connected with other tribes, 749; similar to the Burmese, 749.
Mära-räja, ancient name for the king of Burma, 68.
Mara-ţtha, kingdom, 69; ancient name for Burmā, 55, 68, 70.
Marah Silu, marriage of, 642 n. 2, 644; founder of Sumatra, 643, 644; a fisherman from Pasāngan, 644; converted to Islamism, 644; title assumed by, 644.
Marah Tiza, General. See ‘Alāu-d-dīn Rāyāt Shah.
Marai, Marai Maţ, the term discussed, 55 n. 2; natives of Burmā, 68. See also Mara.
Marakand, identified with Samarkand, 19.
Marammā, district, name applied to the country about Prome, 55; ancient name for Burmā and its people, 67, 749; derivation of the term, 68, 69, 749, 749 n. 1.
Marammā, the, people, 67; derivation of the name, 68-70.
Marava, the, people, of the South of India, 660.
Marawa, Maruvi, the, people, 448 n. 2; inhabitants of the Bānyak Islands, 422; name also applied to West Bānyak, 448, 448 n. 2.
Marble Mountains, sculptured grotoes at, 791.
Marco Polo, the visit of, to Perlaţ, 613 n. 1.
Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, embassy sent by, 392.
Mare Pigrum, the Arctic Sea, 670 n. 1.
Mareura, city, 748; city of the Ka-lingas, 33; identified with old Prome, 33, 66, 67, 70; the capital of the Maurya, 66, 67; explanation of Ptolemy’s alternative name for, 67; its identification with Mengdān or Lower Pagan discussed, 67, 738; connected with Marammā, 67; origin of the term, 69, 734; the capital of Lower Burmā, 70, 738.
Marinos, his distances corrected by Ptolemy, 18, 19.
Mārīt. See Mṛit, city.
Markāwand, a city of Zābeţ, 580; erroneously connected with Mājā-pāhit, 580; location of, 582; probably identical with Martaban, 582.
Markets, held at night, 493, 493 n. 3; held by women, 494 n.
Maros, island, a designation of West Bānyak, 448 n. 2.
Martaban, city, 65, 71, 86; site of, originally covered with forests, 71; Warēţa, the king of, 75, 114; identified with Mo-ti-p’o, 90 n.; Kammalani conquered by the king of, 114; other designations of, 508 n.; identification with Markāwand, 582; existed in early times, 582 n. 2; cannibalism about, 827.
Martaban, Gulf of, 22, 28, 34, 38, 41 n., 47, 86, 91, 93, 121; the Sarakāīk Gulf of Ptolemy, 64, 70; tribes of the Kolarian race on the, 73; erroneous geography of the, 76; a market for amber and ambergris, 582 n. 1.
Marts, old. See Emporia.
Marundum, island, 711.
Marutma, city, identical with Mergui, 508 n.
Maruvi, the, people, inhabitants of the Bānyak Islands, 660.
Mas, Pulo, the ‘Island of Gold,’ identification of, 640, 641.
Masuward, state connected with Davāku, 57.
Massinga, king, defeated by Ribeiro, 113 n. 3.
Masulipatam, town, 35, 108.
Mata, island, one of the Anambas, 715; other designations of, 715; included in Ptolemy’s Satyroń, 722.
Mataram, a state of Java, 637, 637 n. 1.
Mathura, 67.
Mau Shan, island, identification of, discussed, 689-94; erroneously connected with Sombrero, 689, 690 n. 1; other designations of, 689, 693, 694, 710; account of, 692, 693; coral obtained from, 693; identified with Pulo Wīh, 693, 703; the name discussed, 693, 694.
Mau Shan. See Thai Mau, the, people.
Mau-sz, the, people, a piratical tribe, 366 n.
Maulmain, 114 n. 1.
Mauro, Frà, the planisphere of, 634 n. 1.
Mauyu, district, name given to the Northern Kubo Valley, 66, 748; settled by the Maurya monarchy, 66, 67.
Maurya dynasty, early kings of Burmā descended from the, 70.
Mauryas, the, kings of Burmā; 66, 67; their capital, 67.
Maw-li-hesat, river, other designations of, 741, 742.
Mava, builder of the three cities of Tripura, 45 n. 2.
Maya, the mother of Buddha, 105, 491 n. 3; reputed birthplace of, 105, 491 n. 3.
Mayi, district, in Thamodaya, 826.
Mayi-Yayit, islands, a designation of the Philippines, 809.
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Mayūra, peacock, 67.
Mayūra. See Maurya, dynasty.
Mayūras. See Mauryas, the, people.
Mē- Khōng, river, 54, 88, 117, 118, 119 n. 1, 125, 127-9, 132, 133, 138, 140, 145, 147, 149, 151 n. 1; connected with the Lan-ts'ang, 116; Ptolemy's account of the Doanas applied to the, 134; other designations applied to the, 135, 135 n. 1, 136, 284, 286 n. 1; tradition respecting the, 137; the Ch'ōng settlers in the valley of the Lower, 157; navigation of the, 213; between Akadra and Zabai, unknown to Ptolemy, 224; account of its delta, 224; identified with the Doanas, 282-4, 356; compared to the Nile, 283 n. 1; trade route along the old channel of the Western, 775; Siamese fleets proceeded along the, 775; inaccuracy as to the course of the, 792.
Mē-hūi, city, alleged to be the Han seat of government, 323, 324, 739.
Mē-Hái, Mūang, connected with Bērābī, 384 n., 752; identification of, 752; the vanishing city of Siamese folklore, 752, 753; inhabited only by women, 753; other designations, 752, 753; account of, 753.
Mē-nam-Khōng, river, 116, 129, 143; the Siamese name for the Mē-Khōng, 136.
Mē-P'ing, river, branch of the Mē-Nam, 143.
Mē-Yom, river, 143.
Medang. See Panchur, island.
Medicinal bulbs, 119.
Mega Akrēṭerion. See Great Cape.
Megasthenes, his mission to Palibothra, 28; his reference to the Kalingas and Andhras, 28, 29.
Meghavatī. See Cheduba, island.
Meghā, estuary of the Ganges, connected with Antibolē, 832.
Melagia, a refugee from Mαlakka, 653; his surrender demanded, 653.
Melaro, city on Sumatra, 647; identification of, 647.
Meleidung Islands, 711.
Meliyquaydyr, tutor of the king of Pacem, 654.
Menmon, river, a perversion of Mēnam, 717 n. 1.
Mēn. See Min, the, people.
Mēn Tā-tōk, king, 296 n.
Menancabo, Menangkabau, kingdom, 453; a kingdom of Sumatra, 456 n. 1, 634 n. 1, 682; pepper produced at, 454 n. 1; other designations of, 641, 676 n.; account of the giants of, 646.
Menchál, island, 421; possibly corresponds to Malhan, 401, 404.
Mendang Kamulan, city, alleged capital of Java, 592 n. 1.
Mēng, Mēng-Sīh, the, people, builders of Pu-t'ou, 793; other designations of, 793.
Mēng-chia-ch'wō, son of Aōka, associated with the Ai-Lao state, 123.
Mēng Chū-lin, 290 n. 1, 298; a leader of Thai immigration, 291; alleged founder of the kingdom of Kiao-chī, 291, 292; Culaṇi founded by, 292.
Mēng Chū-sung, 290 n. 1, 298; foundation of Lin-i ascribed to, 289; founder of the P'ai-tsz kingdom, 291.
Mēng-chī Tu, the family of, reigned over Yün-nan, 763.
Meng-hwa, city, a designation of Mūang Hō-wōng, 144 n. 2; chief city of the Nan-Chao, 144 n. 2.
Mēng-hwa T'ing. See Mēng-shē.
Mēng-ko, 771; a chief of Yünnan, 144 n. 2.
Mēng-shē, empire and town, 792; the Thai empire of, 125; ancient designation of Mēng-hwa, 144 n. 2; seat of the kings of Nan-Chao, 272; chief town of the Ai-Lao and Nan-Chao, 317 n.
Mengduń, city, named Bhūmavati, 66; connected with Ptolemy's Malthura, 66; its identity with Mareura discussed, 67, 738; capital of the Mauryas removed to, 67; foundation of, 758.
Menlay, city, location and identification of, 647.
Mentala, island, one of the Anambas, 715, 722.
Merad, Sultān, king of Aćeb, 704.
Meran Langkāwī, princess, legend respecting, 487 n.
Merapi, an active volcano on Sumatra, 553.
Merchants, foreign, eaten in Pi'-k'i-ien, 827.
Mergi. See Mergui, city.
Mergui, city, 49 n. 1, 70, 384 n.; the Bērābī of Ptolemy, 24, 82, 384 n.; seaport of Tenasserim, 82; derivation of the name discussed, 82-5, 752; probably identical with Raka-nurtikā, 83; identified with Mṛt, 83, 490 n. 2; probably the
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Pāribhadra district, 84; other designations of, 84, 598 n., 729, 752, 826; trade route at, 94; connected with the legendary Mē-māi, 752, 753.

Mermaids, 283.

Meroe, island, 421; possibly corresponds to Malhan, 401, 403.

Mero, the mythical sea around, 136 n. 2.

Meruda Hill, famous pagoda on, 72.

Messagetas, the, people, the cannibalism of, 660 n. 2.

Metal-merchants, the hill tribes of the Chiang race, 341.

Mi, country, the territory round Tali Lake, 64 n. 1.

Mi, the people, habitat of, 64 n. 1.

Mi-ch'ēn, kingdom, 755; identification of, discussed, 89 n. 5.

Mi-hai. See Tali, lake.

Mi-li. See Mi-li-ch'ē, city.

Mi-li-ch'ē, city, location of, 473 n. 3, 474; connected with Mergui, 490, 490 n. 2, 752; other suggested identifications of, 490 n. 2.

Mi-no, river, a designation of the Manipur, 813; source of the, 814.

Mi-niāng, a Hūng princess, 343; her marriage caused the destruction of Van-lāng, 343; legend respecting, 345 n.

Mi-sūn, city, inscriptions of, 781; ancient remains at, 791; connected with Amārāvati, 791.

Mi-tho, river, 221 n. 1.

Miao, the, people, the P'u-ch'a connected with, 363.

Miao-teze, the, people, 131 n. 2; other designations of, 793.

Mien, Mien-tien, state, 69; connected with Arissabon, 63; a designation of Piao, 750; sent presents to Nan Chao, 750, 819; attacked by Ceylon, 750.

Milk, Sea of, 672; the southern part of the China Sea, 164; other designations of, 164, 164 n. 1.

Millet, grown in Sumatra, 459 n. 1.

Mīlā Pulo, 421; possibly corresponds to Malhan, 401, 403.

Min, the, people, 299 n. 5; inhabitants of Cochin-China, 294 n. 2; tribes connected with, 793.

Min-chia, Min-kia, the, people, claim descent from Sukhładhānā-rāja, 123, 123 n. 1.

Mincopies, Minkopies, the, people, 253 n. 2, 379 n. 3; of the Andāmāns, 38; manufactures of, 254 n. 1; nickname applied to, 393.

Ming-ling, seaport, identified with Kūa T'ung, 794; possibly connected with T'ang-ming, 794; name also applied to the Vīn-līn district, 794.

Ming-ti, Chinese emperor, embassy sent to India by, 124.

Miranda. See de Azevedo, A. M.

Mirgin, Mirgin, Mirgin. See Mergui, city.

Mishmis, the, people, 830.

Mithilā, district, 121; a name given to Western Yünnan, 64 n. 1.

Mitho, town, absorbed by Annam, 215.

Mo-chia-man, state, 583 n. 2; connected with Markāwand, 583; identification of, 584 n. 3.

Mō-dong, 'Tired Hill.' See Khāhu Môn.

Mo-ho-sūn, island, 823; identical with Pakersang, 584 n. 3; location of, 824.

Mo-k'ān-t'ē, kingdom; identical with Magadhā, 60.

Mo-lo-chū-ta, state, camphor produced at, 439 n. 2; connected with Malabar, 439 n. 2.

Mo-lo-jē, a P'aiau king, 467.

Mo-lo-shih. See Mo-lo-yū, state.

Mo-lo-yū, state, a designation of Malayo, 476, 584 n. 3, 619; location of, 475, 476, 531, 535, 619, 824; identification of, discussed, 476, 529, 529 n. 2; possibly connected with Lu-yieh, 529 n. 1; annexed by Palembang, 531, 535; other designations of, 533; an ambassador sent to China by, 821.

Mo-no-t'o-nan, king of Shē-p'o, 540, 549.

Mo-so, the, people, 160.

Mo-ti-p'o, city, identical with Martaban, 90 n.; a dependency of Piao, 90 n.

Mobur, Mubur, island, one of the Anambas, 715; included in Ptolemy's Satyrōn, 722.

Modi monastery, the, 538.

Modu-palli, 'three cities.' See Mudupalli, city.

Mogau, district, identical with Ājavī, 57.

'Mogau Annals,' the, 369.

Moguls, Karajâng named by the, 62 n. 4.

Mohān, a village on Kachal Island, 421.

Mohnin, district, identical with Ājavī, 57.

Mōi people, said to be tailed, 828, 829.

Moi-kwōng. See Orang Glai, the, people.
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Mōi-Kī-nām. See Orang Glai, the, people.
Mōlī, island, a designation of Bālī, 520 n. 2.
Moluccas, connected with the Island of Spices, 555.
Monmien, 59; prefecture established at, 130 n. 1, 762; identified with T'êng-yueh, 762.
Mōn, the, people, 51, 129; the country of, 30, 662, 662 n. 1; other designations of, 74; their advent into Indo-China, 129.
Mōn language, affinity of, with Kolarian, 73; place-names traceable to, 727-9; in the Malay Peninsula, 818.
Mōn-Annam, the, race, 129, 148, 150, 153; other names applied to, 128, 128 n. 2; occupiers of Siam and Burma, 130; originally from Southern China, 130; tribes of, 130, 160, 161.
Mōn Khmer, the, race, 73, 74, 102; former inhabitants of the Chindwin Valley, 52; the Mra suggested as belonging to the, 69, 70; ancient names for Burma ascribed to, 70.
Monaco, island, a perversion of Moluccas, 717 n. 1.
Monastery, Buddhist, at Bā P'hnom, 204 n. 2.
Monê, town, other designations of, 141.
Monghur, city, capital of Balhara, 57.
Mongolia, 14.
Monkey City. See Korbie, city.
Monkey tribes, 96, 785.
Monosyllabic tendencies in languages, 68.
Mōns. See Talens, the, people.
Monssoons, 564 n. 3, 564 n. 4.
Monuments at Sri-Vijaya-rājadhani, 188.
Mori, river, the Kataboda of Ptolemy, 36.
Moro, town, identical with Tavoy, 525 n. 1.
Motapalli. See Mudu-palli, city.
Mou-lai. See Mu-li, state.
Mountaineers, 120, 161 n. 2, 163; terms denoting, 58, 72, 118 n. 1.
Mra, district, ancient name for Burma, 68; how developed into Maramma, 69; survival of the name, 69.
Mra. See Mara, the, people.
Mraboong, river, 729.
Mrāmā, Mrammā, Mrānmā. See Maramma, district, people.
Mrit, harbour, 82, 85; identified with Mergui, 83, 490 n. 2, 752.
Mritta, Myittu, once a flourishing town, 490 n. 2. Mro, Mrū. See Mara, the people.
Mro-houng, city, connected with Old Arakan city, 43; a designation of Old Tavoy, 717 n. 1. See also Arakan, Old.
Mṛtikā, the earth deity of the Indās, 752.
Mṛtikā. See Mṛt, harbour.
Mu-ha-ma-Sha. See Muhammed Shāh.
Mu-lai-yu, state, summoned to submit to China, 536; identification of, 536, 537; missions from China to, 821, 822; embassy from, to China, 822.
Mu-li, state, a letter on a golden leaf sent to China by, 537; suggested identification of, 537.
Mu-lo-ch'ā, king of Shēp'o, 468, 547.
Mu-su, the, people, a branch of the Mo-so, 160.
Mu Tsung, king, 469, 469 n. 1, 547.
Mūang, Thai term for city, district, etc., 119.
Mūang, 'city.' See specific names.
Mūang principalities, the three, 139 n. 2.
Mūang Yōng Chronicles, 136, 139 n., 320 n. 1.
Muār River, gold found in the upper waters of, 477 n. 1.
Mūda River, 765; in Southern Kedah, 503.
Mudja, kingdom, identified with Kamboja, 205.
Mudu, tribe, 31.
Mudu, Mudusitta, son of Kan-rāja-
Mūang, Thai term for city, district, etc., 119.
Mūang principalities, the three, 139 n. 2.
Mūang Yōng Chronicles, 136, 139 n., 320 n. 1.
Muār River, gold found in the upper waters of, 477 n. 1.
Mūda River, 765; in Southern Kedah, 503.
Mudja, kingdom, identified with Kamboja, 205.
Mudu, tribe, 31.
Mudu, Mudusitta, son of Kan-rāja-
gyi, 31; ruler of tribes in the Kalē district, 31.
Mudu - Kalinga. See Trikalinga, empire.
Mudu-palli, 'three cities,' city, identity of, discussed, 35; probably the Pentapolis of Ptolemy, 35, 36.
Mudugrāna. See Mudu-palli, city.
Muhammad of Mātabar, Sultān, the alleged founder of Islamism in Sumatra, 696.
Muhammad Shāh. See Māhmūd Shāh.
Muhammadanas, of Nan-p'o-li, 703.
Māl-Jawah, district, identification of, 461 n. 1, 537, 549; identified with the Malay Peninsula, 517, 517 n. 1, 556; submitted to China, 537; seaport and capital of, 548; products of 549; cannibalism in, 549.
Māl-Jawah, island, submits to Kūblai Khān, 548; pays homage to China, 548; suggested identification, 548.
Mula-Jawah, district, 731; location of, 444 n. 2, 517 n. 1, 761.
Māla-Prābū, king of Western Java, 540 n. 2.
Mulai, the, people, a term for the Malais of Kambuja, 537 n. 1.
Mulaibār, a form of Malabar, 537 n. 1.
Mura-rāja, king, an historical Chām king, 234, 237; discovery of the inscription of, 265; probably reigned in Bal-Angew, 270.
Murex shell-fish found on Bazakata, 379, 379 n. 3.
Musī, river, identical with the Palém-bang River, 530 n. 4.
Musicians, female, presented to China, 506.
Musk, 119.
Muslin adorned with pearls, manufacture of, 659.
Muttima-maṇḍala, province of Rāmaṇ-fādesa, 65.
Máziris, tortoise-shell sent to, 670 n. 1.
Mwéyin. See Maurya, district.
Myatmyo, the district of Mergui, 82; derivation of the name, 82.
Mygri, Myrguim. See Mergui, city.
Myo-houng, identical with Tavoy, town, 86.
Myohaung, city, Arakanese capital removed to, 832.
Myonk-ū, city, the old capital of Arakan, 96.
Myrobalan, Emblic, 105.

N
Na-ku-érh, state, face-tattooing in, 646 n. 1; the kingdom of the Gāyu, 675 n.; identification of, 675 n.
Na-ku-érh, the, people, the king of Su-mên-ta-la killed by, 649; king of, slain, 649.
Na-mo-li, Sea of, 703; a designation of the Sea of Lambri, 663, 694, 695.
Na-mú-ri. See Na-mo-li, Sea of.
Na-Né, village, Barikan district formed at, 769.
Nā-trāng, district, inscription of the granite boulder of, 234; noted for its temple and city, 265; renamed Khan-hwā, 265, n. 2; an excellent harbour, 267; destruction of the temple of, 645.
Nā-trāng, river, 265.
Nadami Land, location of, 676 n.
Naf, river, 28, 32; its suggested identity with the Tokosana untenable, 44.
Nägo, the term discussed, 382 n. 1.
Näga country, Prince Lāk-long settled in the, 340.
Näga people, inhabitants of Masulipatam, 108; Malanga, the capital of, 113; other designations of, 749.
Näga-Head Point, location of, 756.
Näga-vāra, Nagga-vāra, a designation of the Nikobārs, 382 n. 1, 399.
Nagadibha, town, location of, 381 n., 382 n.
Nagadibo, the, tribe, habitat of, 381 n.
Nägadipā, district, the seat of Nāga kings, 380 n. 4; seaport of, 380 n. 4; visited by Buddha, 380 n. 4; confused with Naggadípa, 380 n. 4; location of, 380 n. 4; a designation of part of Ceylon, 589 n.
Nägadipā, Naggadipa, island, 380, 382 n., 399; identical with Seruma Island, 382 n., 410, 415; probably the Great Nikobār, 382 n.; also designated Nagadibha, 382 n.; one of the Maniolai Islands, 382 n., 421; Buddha's legendary visit to, 385; original application of the name, 413.
Nagara Indrapura, the city of Jayavarman II, 546.
Nagara-puri, mountain. See Angkor-buri Phnom.
Nagara Śri Dharmarājā. See Ligor, city.
Nagara Vanaṁ. See Nakhon Phanom.
Nāgarāsa, lake, the famous Lake of Nepal, 743.
Nāgarēsvāra. See Negrais, cape.
Nāgas, serpent gods, worshipped by the Lāu, 145; Luang Phrabang committed to the care of the, 145; meaning of the word, 146 n.; islands taken from the, 658.
Nagana-parpa-savara, the, people, 749; meaning of the name, 808.
Naima, island, a designation of Natuna, 708 n. 1.
Najbari, islands, a designation of the Nikobārs, 808.
Najran, the Christian monk of, 563 n. 5.
Naked People, Archipelago of, name applied to the Andamāns and Nikobārs, 379, 380, 382, 383 n.
Naked populations, 158.
Nakhon Phanom, identified with Nagara Vanaṁ, 209; once the chief city of Fu-nan, 209.
Nakkāvāram, islands, name relating to the Nikobārs, 808.
Nakur, country, connected with Nakku-érh, 675 n.; consists of one large village, 675 n.; account of the people of, 675 n.; location of, 675 n., 676 n.; identified with Dungroian
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and Gâyû Land, 676 n.; a state on North Sumatra, 682.
Nakur, Mount of, sulphur yielded by, 676 n.
Nâlkèra, island, 807; connected with the Andâmân-Nikobârs, 399, 402 n.
Nâlkèra, Nâlkèra-dîpa, the, people, 807; inhabitants of the Nikobârs, 807.
Nalini, river, connected with the Mê-Không, 168.
Nâlûsh, island, 555; connected with Ptolemy's Barussi, 430; productions of, 430. See also Bâlûs Island.
Nâm Chan, a tributary of the Mê-Không, 165.
Nâm-chieu. See Nâm-Chao, the, people.
Nâm-Chu, river, a designation of the Mê-Không, 135.
Nâm-dinh, district, formation of the, 799, 799 n. 1.
Nâm-Dông, rivulet, 145, 152.
Nâm-duçang, district, 797.
Nâm-khâi, river, the Lâu name for the Mê-Không, 135.
Nâm Khân, river, 146 n.; identified with the Khâra, 145.
Nâm-Không, river, the Lâu name for the Mê-Không, 136.
Nâm Lêm, river, a tributary of the Mê-Không, 140.
Nâm Mâu, 63; a designation of the Shwê-li River, 467 n. 1.
Nâm P'hâ, river, location of, 133.
Nâm-Tâu. See Dâu-jâng, river.
Nâm-Thê, the Black River, 314.
Nâm Ü, river, 125, 128.
Nâm-Vêt. See Nâm-viêch, kingdom.
Nân, state, 143; Western Lào comprised Ch'ien-mâi and, 116.
Nan-chang. See Lân-ch'âng, city.
Nan-Chao, the, tribe, 125, 131, 142 n. 1, 153; other designations of, 60, 121 n. 1, 126, 130 n. 1, 144 n. 2; conquer P'iaô, 74, 130 n. 1; kings of, 74; a branch of the Thai race, 170 n. 4; also designated the Nâm-chieu, 467.
Nan-Chao, state, 73, 125, 152; embassy to China sent by the king of, 75; governed by the Tuan, 126 n. 3; probably identical with Muâng Hô, 127; seat of the kings of, 272; origin of the, 286 n. 1; connected with Lûâng P'hrâb Bâng, 290; date of the, in Yûn-nan, 770; forces of, drowned or mutilated, 818, 819; presents sent to, 819.
Nan-Chao Chronicles, 290.

Nan-chiao, province, an ancient name for Tonkin, 777.
Nan-chung, 125.
Nan-hai, district, identical with Canton, 230 n. 2, 377; included in the kingdom of Nan-yüeh, 230 n. 2.
Nan-ling Mountains, location of, 148.
Nan-mê-kôn, state, 741.
Nan-ning, 125.
Nan-p'an, kingdom, 802.
Nan-p'i, country, trade of, 628, 629; a designation of Malabar, 628-9.
Nan-wu-li, kingdom, 682; a designation of Lambri, 599 n. 1; a designation of Achêlî, 701, 702, 703; summoned to do homage to China, 701; envoys sent to China, 701, 702, 703; a letter from China to, 702; Chêng Ho visited, 702; account of, 703; king of, received a seal and investiture from China, 703; imperial gifts from China sent to, 703; last mention of, 703.
Nan-yüeh, kingdom, 321 n.; foundation of, 230 n. 2; kings of, 230 n. 2, 291, 326; districts of, 291, 326 n. 1, 292; other designations of, 326.
Nâng Khumau. See Kumâri, temple of.
Nàng-pi-ya. See Lang-pi-ya, district.
Nâning, district, sulphur obtained from, 477 n. 1.
Nânkasi, province, a name of Tenasserim, 783.
Nankauri, island, 399, 421; one of the Nikobârs, 402 n.; connected with the term Nâlkèra, 402 n.
Napat, a marl, doubtfully identified with Kambala stone, 492, 492 n. 1; account of, 492 n. 1.
Nara, the, people, 126 n. 3; in Upper Burma, 835.
Narapati, Narapati-sithu, king, 767; of Pagân, 747; inscription of, 747, 750, 783.
Nârikela, island, mountains on, 807, 809.
Narkondam, island, volcanic, 399; cocoonut-trees on, 402 n.; derivation of the name, 402 n., 808.
Nâsi, Pulo, erroneously identified with Mau Shan, 689, 690.
Nâsi Koelii, island, 691.
Nats, spirits of Burmeese. Dvâravatî built by the, 45.
Natuna, Great, island, other designations of, 713.
Natuna, North, island, also designated Pulo Haut, 713.
Natuas, the, islands, 707, 708; names of the, 707 n. 2; origin of the name, 708 n. 1; other designations of, 708 n. 1, 709, 713.
Nearhchus, voyage of, 597 n. 1.
Neaung Eue, river, other designations of, 741.
Necaran, islands, a designation of the Andamãns and Nikobãrs, 398.
Necuveram. See Necaran, islands.
Negrais, cape, 11, 22, 41 n., 48, 49, 50, 65, 523; the Cape Têmala of Ptolemy, 12-17, 21, 23, 52, 70; depicted as an island, 50; name connected with Ngá-dvipa and the Nikobãrs, 400 n. 2; probable derivation of the name, 743, 807.
Negri Sembilan, district, 83 n. 2; forests of lignum aloes in, 478 n.
Negrillos, African, pygmies compared to, 247 n.
Negrito pygmies, cannibals, 72.
Negrito-Dravidians, the, people, 102, 103.
Negritos, the, race, 32, 58, 72, 101, 102, 159 n. 2; of the coast of the Airrhadoi, 29 n. 2; original inhabitants of Arakan, 38; formerly lived on the shore as fishers, 155, 256; retrograde civilization of, 254, 254 n. 1; account of the, 254 n. 1, 255, 256, 769; have now become hill tribes, 256; identification and location of, 263, 769, 770, 785.
Negumbo, connected with Nikumbha, 92 n. 3.
Nelkynada, district, the Malabar coast, 670 n. 1; tortoise-shell sent to, 670 n. 1.
Neolithic implements, discovery of, 478 n.
Nga-won, river, 50; name applied to the Bassein River, 48, 49; the Têmala of Ptolemy, 48, 49.
Ngân-hwui, 59.
Ngan-nan Kiang, 805; the Annam River, 372; a fabulous river, 372 n. 1; cartographers' error regarding the, 375.
Ngé-an, territory, reputed subjugation of, by Ma-yuan, 232.
Ngieu, meaning of, the term, 126; nickname of the Ai-Lâu, 126; other designations of, 763.
Ngö-kwien proclaimed himself king of Tonkîn, 333.
Ngû, Mûang, 143, 144.
Ngû. See Ngieu.
Ngûak, mermaids, 284; meaning also crocodiles, 284 n. 1.
Ngwien dynasty, 786.
Nha-trang, city, identified with Kuthâra, 833.
Nias, Pulo, probably identical with al-Neýân Island, 427, 427 n. 2; one of the Barusai Islands, 427, 446.
Nichomeran, islands, designation of the Andamãns and Nikobãrs, 398; account of the ruby owned by the king of, 679 n. 2.
Nickname, of the Ai-Lâu, 126; of the Nan-Chao, 126; of the Minkopies, 393.
Nieubar, islands, name relating to the Nikobãrs, 808.
Nikobãr, derivation of the term, 380, 380 n. 2; synonymous with Andamãn, 383 n.
Nikobãr, Great, probably Ngâdipá Island, 382 n.; identified with Ptolemy's Agathodämonos, 411.
Nikobãr, Little, island, also called Sambelông, 806.
Nikobãrs, the, islands, 817; other designations of, 379, 380, 381 n. 1, 382 n. 1, 527, 528 n. 1; the Mânicolai of Ptolemy, 382 n.; the name discussed, 383 n.; nomenclature of, 404-6; erroneously identified with Lo-ch'a, 497 n. 1; ambergris obtained from, 581 n. 3; account of the natives of, 807, 808.
Nikobãrs and Andamãns, the, islands, 379 ff.
Nikumbha, may be identical with Negumbo, 92 n. 3.
Nîlé, river, compared to the Mê-Không, 283 n. 1.
Nimba-tree (Malia Azadirachta), 105.
Ning-hai, identified with Kwâng-yen, 801.
Niulân, island, a designation of Mata, 715, 722.
Nmaî-kha, river, a branch of the Irâvati, 749.
No-pi, the, people, other designations of, 359, 360; the Kudutai of Ptolemy, 362.
Nocueran, islands, a designation of the Andamãns and Nikobãrs, 398; natives of, 422.
Nomenclature, of the Andamãns-Nikobãr Archipelago, 404-6, 808; explanation of many errors in geographical, 588 n. 1.
Nông-chih, district, other forms of the name, 815.
Nông Sanô, city, a designation of Ayuthia, 645.
Nông Sé, a designation of the Ta-li Lake, 64 n. 1, 137, 767.
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North Cape, 381 n.
North Indian immigrations, 118, 122.
‘North-level-head Island.’ See Pei-p'ing-t'ou Shan.
North Pirate Island, 201.
North Star invisible, 594, 594 n. 2.
Nou-t'o-yuan. See T'o-yuan, state.
Nu-jen. See Lu-ts'z, the, people.
Nu-ts'z. See Lu-ts'z, the, people.
Nubahra, 381 n.; identified with Barberyu, 12.
Nuchi, Nunchit, district, location of, 815; a form of Nong-chih, 815.
Nui Ba-Tê, mountain, identified with Ba-Tê Son, 159 n. 1.
Nung-nai, district, identified with Bien-hwa, 778.
Nusa Horo-horo, a designation of Java, 592 n. 1.
Nieu Jâva, a designation of Java, 592; legendary origin of the name, 592.
Nusa Kendeng, a designation of Java, 592 n. 1.
Nusa Mendang, a designation of Java, 592.
Nút-nâm. See Jih-nam.
Nyâmsok, island, a designation of Bajau, 722.

O

O-shan. See A-shan, island.
Och'ang, the, people, 130 n. 1; other designations of, 764, 765.
Oidanes, river, suggested identity with the Doanas, 281; connected with the Dyardanes, 281, 282, 282 n. 1; connected with the Brahmaputra, 282; connected with the Mê-Không, 284.
Olanion, state, a designation of Wanhsiang, 768.
Old Pugán, kingdom, founded by Dusa-raja, 152 n.; identified with Tagau, 745.
Old River. See Chiu-chiang.
Onesicritus, voyage of, 597 n. 1.
Ong-Pông, city, ancient capital of St-poh, 766; foundation of, 766.
Ophir, identification of, 597 n. 1.
Ophir, Mount, noted for gold, 477 n. 1.
Orang Akhyê, the, people, a seafaring race, 786; account of, 786.
Orang Glai, the, people, account of, 261, 262; engaged in exploiting eagle-wood, 262; other designations of, 262; habitat of, 262; names of tribes included in, 262.
Orang Gugu, hairy men called, 685; possibly connected with Orang Gâyû, 685.
Orang-laut, the, people, 80, 802; other designations of, 817.
Orang-selat, the, people, 80, 80 n. 2.
Orang-titan, ‘wild man,’ 729 n.
Orang-utang, the, people differing little from the, 688.
Orion, the, people, face-tattooing among, 367 n. 3.
Orissa, district, the Andhras of, 29; the probable derivation of, 73; account of the women of, 808.
Ornêon, cape, on Ceylon, 381 n.
Oṣṭakarnākas, the, people, 785; description of, 257 n.
Ou-jen, the, people, the, inhabitants of Hainan, 321 n.
Ou-ki, a girl of celestial lineage, legend respecting, 339, 340.
Ou-lâk, kingdom, 798; name applied to Van-lâng, 320, 321, 321 n.; conquered by Chao-t'o, 322; king of, ordered the destruction of Van-lâng, 343.
Ouay, Pulo. See Wêh, Pulo.
Oung-gyûm, ‘Coconut Island,’ a designation of the Nikobârs, 399.
Ouro, Ilha do, 807.
Outlaws, the Ch'ông consist largely of, 157.
Oxus, river, 741.

P

Pê, term. See Bê.
Pâ-hsi, 614 n.
Pa-i, Pai-i. See Dropaka, the, people.
Pa-lin-fêng, Pa-lin-p'ing, state, a designation of Palembang, 483; subject to San-fô-ch'i, 628; suggested identity of, 628.
Pa-lo-p'ei, city, connected with Bérabai, 84 n. 2.
Pa-pê-hsi-fu, state, identification of, 767, 767 n. 1, 768.
Pa-pien Kiang, a designation of the Black River, 314 n. 1.
Pa-reo-kyvon, island of the Mergui Archipelago, 84; the origin of the name Bérabai, 84.
Pâ-Sâk. See Campásak, town.
Pa-si, district, identical with Pâsei, 654 n. 1.
Pa-t'a, district, a dependency of San-fô-ch'i, 812; possibly the Batta country, 812.
Pa-t'a, state, subject to San-fô-ch'i, 627; manufactures of, 627, 628; suggested identification of, 627.
Pa-tien. See Pu-t'ou, city.
Paecem, a kingdom of Sumatra, 455 n. 1, 653; friendly overtures made by, to the Portuguese, 653; fort built at, 653; attacked by D'Albuquerque, 654; ruler of, shot, 654; rightful prince of, restored, 654; made tributary to Portugal, 654; attack on, threatened by Portuguese, 654; abandoned by Portuguese, 654; fort at, dismantled, 654; king of, a refugee at Malacca, 654.
Padaians, the, people, cannibalism of, 660 n. 2; doubtfully connected with the Batta, 660 n. 2; habitat of, 660 n. 2.
Pādɑ̃g, pepper produced at, 454 n. 1; conquered by Achēb, 706.
Paddy-fields, 265.
Pagai. See Pageh, island.
Pağān, kingdom, 55, 62, 63, 67, 122, 152 n. 1; Sanskrit inscription found at, 60; foundation of, 62; destruction of, 62, 63; other designations of, 62, 524 n., 625, 746, 746 n. 1, 761; anciently called Ari-mardana-pura, 63; reigning dynasty at, 60, 67; kings of Indā lineage reigned at, 70; king of, conquerors Pegu, 74, 75; Along-situ, king of, 751.
Pağān, Lower, town, early capital of Central Burmā, 55, 625; designated Bukām or Pukān, 55, 625; foundation of, 66, 735; its identity with Marieura discussed, 67.
Pağān, New, Lower Burmā subject to the kings of, 63.
Pağān, Old. See Pagān, kingdom.
Pağān, Upper. See Pagān, kingdom.
Pağar-rúyung, district, identified with Pai-hua-yuān, 450 n. 2; a designation of Menanao, 641.
Pağar-rúyung inscriptions, 459 n. 2, 461 n., 517 n. 2, 544, 586, 610.
Pageh, island, 446; inhabited by the Mantawi, 448; probably included in Ptolemy's Sindai, 449.
Pago, possibly connected with Pō-hwang, 541.
Pagoda, 568 n. 2; ruins of an ancient Kambojan, 219; ruins of an Indā, at Thāp-Māai, 220; a stone, at Hsin-chou, 781.
Pagrasa, city, on the Gulf of Siām, identified with Krāt, 24, 190, 191, 731; derivation of the name, 191, 308.
Pāh-sih, state, a designation of Sumatra, 649; also known as Pāsai, 645.
Pāhanging, state, 104; salt obtained at, 477 n. 1; ancient gold-mines at, 477 n. 1; forests of lignum aloes in, 478 n.; its identification with P'o-fēng suggested, 499, 500 n. 1; nomenclature of, discussed, 500 n. 1; possibly connected with P'o-hwang, 541; a possession of Achēb, 705; war between Achēb and, 706; conquest of, 706.
Pāhrō, discussion of the term, 365, 366 n. 4.
Pai-hua-yuān, district, identification of, 450 n. 2; pepper procured from, 450 n. 2.
Pai Ts'wan, the, people, the western Ts'wan, 126.
Pai-tsē, kingdom, founder of, 291; capital of, 291; Jen-kwo, king of, 762; connected with Posinara, 762.
Pajajaran, city, alleged capital of Java, 592 n. 1.
Pāk-chān, inlet, 86, 113, 461 n. 1; a splendid harbour, 91; terminus of land route across the Kra Isthmus, 91; tin-ore abounds near, the, 91; trade route from Chumphhon to, 115.
Pāk-chān, river, probably identical with the Tau-kiao-le, 93.
Pak-hoi, port, superseded Ho-p'u, 251 n.
Pāk-lān, village, 79.
Pāk-nam Banthāl-mās, the great port of Kamboja, 194.
Pāk-p'hrah. See Praha Strait.
Pāk-P'hrah Point, 515.
Pakersang, island, identical with Mo-ho-sin, 584 n. 3.
Palakka, meaning of the term discussed, 39, 40, 40 n. 2, 42, 97; connection of, with Arakan, 43.
Palānā, Palānā, port and district, Sanskrit term for tortoise, 112; the original name for Kra, 112; confused with Malanga, 113.
Palanda, town, 757; an inland town of the Golden Khersone, 97, 99, 111; corresponds to Pērak, 97, 99, 101, 110; connected with Kwala Kangsa, 90; the western end of Ptolemy's Malay Peninsula, 104; name connected with the Bēlandas, 729, 730; location and identification of, 730.
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Palandas, Palandos, river, 99, 757; Ptolemy’s stream in the Malay Peninsula, 81; name connected with the Bélandas, 729, 730; location and identification of, 730.
Pålàngna. See Balongka, town.
Palása, district, a designation of Magadhâ, 742.
Palaung, the people, 761; connection suggested with other tribes, 368, 805; other designations of, 369, 805; account of, 805; the gun-makers of Chüeng Tung, 805.
Palei, village in Malaca, 495 n. 1.
Palembang, kingdom, the suzerainty of, 89; identical with San-fo-ch’i, 89, 470, 512, 547, 580; other designations of, 89, 200, 429, 483, 527, 560, 580 n. 1, 566, 567, 580, 603, 612, 613 n. 1, 674, 806; connected with Bhoja, 229 n. 2, 500; Ptolemy’s knowledge of, 457; King Deunng Lebar Daun reigned in, 530 n. 4; the Mahârâja of Zâbej resided at, 560 n. 1; the creeks and bridges of, 564 n. 2; description of Serirah applies to, 564; account of, 564 n. 4; the houses of, 564 n. 4; kings of, descended from Alexander, 597 n. 1; the natives of, a great seafaring race, 612; changes in the names applied to, 615; named after the River Chiu-chiang, 617 n. 2; derivation of the name, 618, 619; outline history of the, 619–30; conquered by Java, 647; a possession of Achêb, 706.
Palembang River, branches of, the, 617 n. 2.
Pâli, language and words, 47, 68, 69, 82, 83, 85, 93, 106, 123 n. 2, 132, 138, 144, 146 n. 1; used in official documents and inscriptions, 122 passion.
Pâli chronicles, 136; discovered in Siâm, 167.
Pâli inscriptions, 96; discovered at Tokûn, 98.
Pâli place-names, 47, 57, 71, 77, 82.
Pâli stanza, 96.
Pâlian, district, 484 n. 1.
Pâlibothra, Megasthenes’ mission to, 28.
Pâlit, Polit. See Perlis, district.
Pâllânka, town, origin of the name, 114; applied to Balongka, 114; Buddha’s visit to, 666.
Palm-leaf manuscript, a, 76.
Palm-wine, 424 n. 1.
Palola, the, people, 804.
Paloor, village, identified with Palûra, 743.
Paloung, village, 43; discussion of the nomenclature of, 43 n.
Palur Bluff, 743.
Palûra, village, identification of, 47; connected with Paloor, 743.
Pâmîr Mountains, 39 n. 2.
Pâmûsbub, district, name applied to Bûrsû, 445.
Pâmûnû, the term for camphor imported from the Malay Peninsula, 440. See also Fansur.
Pâmûrûsûrûśtra, 445; the name of a people and country, 434.
Pan-chû-pan, islands, 474; identification of, 500, 501, 501 n. 1, 502, 504; meaning of the name, 501 n. 1, 501 n. 2; connected with the Fanjûr Isles, 502.
Pan-mû, the, people, 259, 259 n. 3; habitat of, 786.
Pan-p’ân, state, identified with South-West Siâm, 106, 113, 574 n. 3; other designations of, 761, 762; identified with Sup’han, 830, 832.
Pan-sok. See Pin-su, islands.
Pan-t’ou, state, location and identification of, 718 n. 1.
Pan-tsu-erh, Pan-tsu-rh, district, connected with Bûrsû, 433; probable identification of, 433, 433 n. 2.
Pan-yû, city, capital of Nan-yüeh, 230 n. 2, 291; identical with Canton, 230 n. 2, 291, 321 n. 3, 322; Chao-t’o’s capital city, 322; seat of government removed from, 322; seat of government at, 378.
Pâncâ-janva, island, 501 n. 2.
Paščâ-pâlî, ‘five cities.’ See Pentapolis, city.
Paščâagraama. See Pentapolis, city.
Pâncâlû, Northern and Southern, 747, 747 n. 1.
Panchur, city, suggested identity with Fansûr, 553; location of, 555.
Panchur, island, probable identification of, 433, 433 n. 2, 816, 817.
Panchur, villages, locations of, 432 n. 1, 432 n. 2; probably identical with Fansûr, 432 n. 1.
Pândaram. See Pândurângâ, town.
Pandasa, town, connected with Ch’êng-chiang, 763.
Pându, father of Bhimaën, 809.
Pândurângâ, town, an ancient Châm foundation, 271; temple of Siva at, burnt, 545; meaning of the name, 789; conquest of, 791; location of, 814; identified with Phanrang, 814.
Pâni, Pâni, state, 513 n. 1; identified with Po-nû, 513; location of, 513, 597 n. 1; a possession of Achêb, 705.
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Pang-gang. See Pangan, the, people. Pang'an, the, people, descendants of the Pākṣas, 260; inhabitants of Malacca, 657 n. 1.

Pāngdarang, city, last resort of Chăm chiefs, 230; Brāhmaṇas of Campā found in the valley of, 309; attacked by Java, 546; King Ku-lai sought refuge at, 780; a Chăm capital, 780.

Pangelap, island, 501, 501 n. 2.

Pangkalan - Jambu, district, gold plentiful at, 631.

Pānjab, territory, the names of the five rivers of the, transferred to Pegu, 41 n.

Pānjang, Pulo, identification of, 683; one of the Anambas, 722.

Pānurang. See Pāngdarang, city.

Pānsūr. See Pānsūr, islands.

Pantaimeus. See Bantāi-mās, district and mart.

Bantuám-mās. See Bantuám-mās, district and mart.

Pānyā, town, foundation of, 569 n.

Pao-shan, the prefectural city of Yung-ch'ang, 747.

Pāpān, district, its identity with P'o-feng suggested, 499.

Pāpān, island, 499.

Papera Strait. See Papra Strait.

Papphāla, harbour, 750.

Papra, cape, the Cape Takōla of Ptolemy, 22, 23.

Papra Strait, 86, 90 n., 91; other designations of, 94.

Parakēsarivaran, king, 609 n. 2.

Paras. See Khūn Borom.

Paraneśvara, king. See Jayavarman II.

Parāśa. See Palāśa, district.

Pārasang, the valuation of a, 559 n. 3.

Pāruak, Pārōga, the, people, a clan of the Palaung, 805.

Pari, Island of. See Pāri-ree-kwyon, island.

Pāri-gyūn, island, 752.

Pāribhadrā, district, probably identical with Mergui, 84.

Pāriṣa - nigma, Parikhanda - nigma, city, the Siamese name for Barikan, 155.

Pāripātra, Pāriyātra, name applied to the northern part of the Vindhyā chain of mountains, 155.

Parisara, 6.

Parivastha, connected with Barānatha, 156.

Pārlēs. See Perlis, district.

Pārrots, white, in Triglypton, 830; in T'o-yuān, 830.

Parsons Point, location of, 690.

Parthians, the, 40 n. 3.

Pāruṣa, the, people, 446.

Pāsai, Pāsēi, city and district, camphor produced in, 437 n.; legend as to the origin of the name, 613 n. 1; the foundation of, 613 n. 1, 642 n. 1, 642 n. 2, 644; identity with Basma doubtful, 613 n. 1; connected with Bhoja, 614 n.; a designation of Sumatra, 645, 647, 656; captured by the Siamese, 645; conquered by Java, 647; Siām claimed suzerainty over, 650; other designations of, 652, 656; a possession of Achēb, 705. See also Pāsēi, district.

Pāsēi River, 651.

Pāšak, river, connected with the Bantuám-mās, 193, 194; unsafe navigation of the, 194.

Pasaman, district, pepper gardens at, 454 n. 1; a possession of Achēb, 705.

Pasāngan, on the Sumatran coast, 656; a possession of Achēb, 705.

Pāsēi, chronicle of, 517 n. 1, 581 n. 3, 634 n. 1, 639 n. 2, 645, 696.

Pāsēi, district, position of the palace of the king of, 528 n. 1; identical with Pa-si, 654 n. 1. See also Pasēi, district.

Pasēm, Pasin, Pasin. See Bassein, district.

Pasuluka, kingdom, a designation of Burma, 40, 814.

Pāspālā, the, people, 814.

Pātaliputra. See Patna, city.

Pātang, island, a designation of the Little Andāmān, 389 n. 2, 392.

Pātāni, city, 88; foundation of, 490 n. 2; dancing-girls from, 508 n.

Pātāni, river, 816.

Patanor, state, a designation of Bān Dōn, 822; probably identical with P'o-t'a, 822.

Pathiu, location and identification of, 470 n. 1.

Pathikārā, city, identified with Chittagong, 740.

Putko, mountains, 54; silver-mines in the, 741.

Patna, city, identified with Kusumapura, 50; connected with Polibothra, 594.

Patungo Point, 740.

Pauhung, district in Sunāparanta, 748.

Pāyān inscription. See Bayang, village.

Pāyān, Pāyānhār, term applied to the peak and legendary king, 211.

Pāyānhār, town, ancient ruins at, 193;
probably the capital of Komar, 202, 203.
Payentaung. See Amber Hills.
Pé-pi, river, location and identification of, 617 n. 2.
Pé-t'äng, river, other designations of the, 798.
Pé-tiê, Pé-t'ie, cloth, 243, 243 n. 2; woven by the women of Tu-po Island, 781.
Pé-t'ou, state, location of, 209, 209 n. 1; the Pithônobastê of Ptolemy, 210.
Pé-t'ou, district, location of, 658 n. 1; a designation of part of Achêb, 688.
Peacock, the national emblem of Burmá, 67.
Pearl fishery, at Hainan, 246 n., 250 n. 1; in the Bay of Camoi, 782.
Pedada, Pidada, state, identification of, 627, 688 n. 1; location of, 627.
Pedam, location of, 813; identification of, 813.
Pedir, a kingdom of Sumatra, 455 n. 1, 655; war between Achîn and, 654; king of, sought Portuguese protection, 654; other designations of, 667 n.; conquest of, 704; claimed as a possession of Achîb, 705; noted for silk, 706; pepper from, 812.
Pedro Point on Sumatra, 483.
Pegu, kingdom, 33, 39 n. 2, 46, 60, 65, 77, 89, 92, 94, 141; connected with Ptolemy's Sêrika, 2; Ptolemy's error regarding the coast of, 11, 13; other designations of, 32 n. 2; 57, 63, 73, 74, 90 n., 509 n. 2, 524 n., 535, 662, 807, 809; chronicles of, 33, 51, 71, 81, 114; centre of Kalinga rule, 34; rivers of, 41 n.; a powerful kingdom, 73; subject to the Shâns, 74; the ancient Trikalinga empire, 74; people of, 74; expedition against, 1, 25, 470 n. 1; former terrestrial connection with Sumatra, 402 n.; wars with Burmá, 819.
Pegu River, 89 n. 5, 90.
Pegu Romans, mountains, 51, 52, 65; inhabited by the Zabaing, 54.
Peguans, of Môh-Khmer blood, 74.
Pêh-li-kiang, river, a designation of the Lan-ts'ang, 765.
Pêh-ngai, city, the royal city of Jenkwo, 123; the capital of Pai-ts'z, 291, 763; identification of, 739; location of, 763; connected with Ptolemy's Posinara, 763.
Pêh-shih, city, identification of, 802.
Pêh-tsê. See Pai-tsê, kingdom.
Pêh-tsê. See P'u-tsê, the people.
Pêh-yai. See Pêh-ngai, city.
Pêi-chi, the, the people, face-tattooing among, 804; other designations of, 804.
Pêi-p'ing-t'ou Shan, island, identification of, 809.
Pekingese dialect, 40 n. 2.
Pelapi Islands, 711.
Pêng-p'ên, island, identification of, 584 n. 3.
Pêng-fêng, state, suggested identification of, 599 n. 1, 626; subject to San-fô-ch'î, 626.
Pêng-ku. See Bangkâ, island.
Pêng Pu, the, people, 804.
Penjambung Island, probably identical with Pan-chî-ha, 500, 504.
Penjait Lâyár, Pulo, situation of, 501 n. 2.
Penjaleh, Pulo, situation of, 501 n. 2.
Penjengat Island, situation of, 501 n. 2.
Penong, the, people, connected with the P'hanom, 207; other designations of, 207, 207 n. 1, 207 n. 2; the expansion of the territory of, 203; characteristics of, 261.
Penta, town, 740.
Pentam, island, location of, 533; identified with Betûmah, 536, 821; other designations of, 537.
Pentapolis, city, 36, 501 n. 1, 501 n. 2; connected with Chittagong, 30; probable identification with Tripura, 35, 36; myth of the three cities of Tripura, 40 n. 2; name connected with Paânea-palli, 736; place-names possibly connected with, 740.
Pentopolis, Petopolis. See Mudu-palli, city.
Penu-siran River, 626.
Penna Islands and Straits, 500, 501.
Pepper, 486 n. 2; places producing, 450 n. 2, 452, 454 n. 1, 653, 812; from Zunda and Hsin-t'o, 452, 454; the worst, procured from Java, 454 n. 1.
Pepper gardens at Pasaman, 454 n. 1.
Pepper Islands. See Lâda, Pulo.
Pêrak, district, derivation of the name, 39; language of, 40, 40 n. 2; tinworks at, 88; the Palanda of Ptolemy, 97, 99, 101, 104, 110; supposed meaning and origin of the name, 97, 98; also designated Manjong, 98, 499; former extent of the kingdom of, 98; the camphor-tree grown in, 437 n.; sulphur obtained from Upper, 477 n. 1; neolithic implements found at, 478 n.; identity with P'o-li suggested, 494;
other designations of, 656; conquered by Achêb, 704, 705, 706; son of the king of, made king of Achêb, 704; the first kingdom and raja of, established at Brâñas, 757.

Pârak, river, 99, 102, 159.

Percha, Pulo, a designation of Sumatra, 634 n. 1; the Jambi district, 639; etymology of the term, 639, 639 n. 1; Malay M.S. on the kings of, 639 n. 2.

Perdana Prabû, king of Central Java, 340 n. 2.

Perimûla, town, 760; location of, 106, 731; identified with Ligor, 109, 110, 548; derivation of the name of, 110; possibly connected with Mûl-Jâwah, 548; identification of, 731.

Perimulik, gulf, identification of, 731; location of, 760, 761; the head of, corresponds to Bân-Dón Bight, 761; identified the Gulf of Siâm, 761.

Perlak, kingdom, places erroneously identified with, 429; visited by Marco Polo, 613 n. 1; invasion of, 644; on the Sumatra coast, 656; identical with Pârak, 636; derivation of the name, 668; Islamism among the townspeople of, 695; introduction of Islamism into, 696; a possession of Achêb, 705; possibly connected with Pâo-lu, 817.

Perlis, district, taken from Kedah and placed under Siâm, 484; account of, 484 n. 1.

Perlis, town, capital of Perlis, 484 n. 1; a resort of trade, 484 n. 1.

Perlis, river, 484 n. 1.

Permatang, 110.

Perrem. See Bêrabonna, mart.

Persian settlements, 679; in South Hainan, 471 n. 2.

Persian names of toponyms and native words, 717 n. 1.

Pescadores, the, account of the aborigines of, 256 n. 1.

Pestilence, in Râmaâña-dêsa, 74 n. 3; in Magadha, 108.

Pestrello, 614 n.

Pet-tsz, the, people, a designation of the Po-chû, 804.

Petam, islands, suggested identity of, 533, 536.

Petroleum, 622, 622 n. 1.

P'hâ-hê-tse, the loin-cloth worn by Indo-Chinese hill tribes, 243 n. 2.

Phalgun, village, identified with Pâloung, 43 n.

Phâm-hô-dít, king, raids of, 297 n. 2.

Phân, king of Thûk, 319; overthrew Van-lâng, 319, 320, 320 n. 1; built Lwâ-thûhâ, 321.

Phân-nâ, districts, 138, 138 n. 2.

Phân-thít, district, doubtful connection with Viñana, 190.

Phâng-nâ, See Takâ-fu-thông, district.

Pham oum stûpa, the, foundation of, 297 n. 2.

Phã-nrang, town, in Lower Cochinchina, 337 n. 1; identified with Pângdurang, 814.

Phâriâgar. See Barakura, state.

Pharusa. See Parûsa, the, people.

Phâtthalung, district, inland sea of, 79; largely settled by Brâhmans, 471 n. 2.

Phâtthalung, town, 109; gradually becoming an inland town, 79; formerly an important seaport, 106, 107; can be reached through the inland sea, 107.

Philippines, the, 86; other designations of, 809.

Phîlu-chuang, stream, 741.

Phnom. See Penong, the, people.

Phnom Empire. See Fu-nan, kingdom.

Phnong. See Penong, the, people.

Phnômic writing, connected with Rejang, 597 n. 1.

Phônicians, the, settlements of, 596, 699 n., 828; as shipwrights, 597 n. 1; as navigators, 597 n. 1; trading for Solomon, came to South India, 597 n. 1; their commercial intercourse with India, 597 n. 1.

Phông, the, people, a race of pygmies, 787, 804; description of, 787.

Phông, Múang, town, identified with Monê, 141; foundation of, 766.

Phông-chôu, town, capital of Van-lâng, 319, 327, 336, 339; capital of Nam-Viet, 327; location of, 336, 798; connected with Sôn-tôi, 350; a village still on the site of, 798.

Phông-kê, city, residence of King Phân at, 320 n. 1, 321; configuration of the city, 320 n. 1, 321.

Phông-kê, district, a division of Toûc-vû, 375; part of the present district of Đồng-ngân, 373.

Phông-lô, ancient remains at, 791.

Phôt-thông, town, capital of Campâ, 229, 229 n. 2, 779, 791; identical with Foo-shih, 229 n. 2; captured by the king of Annam, 229, 779; a town built on the site of, 779; other designations of, 791.

Phrah Bâng, the famous statue of Buddha, 149 n.
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P'hrah Prathom, stūpa of, in Lower Siām, 109.
P'hrah Thammūn, a collection of Siāmese laws, 191.
P'hrah Thōn pagoda, the, legend respecting, 188, 188 n. 1; date and founder of, 188, 189.
P'hrayā Čampādhirāja, king of Campā, 297.
P'hṣā-dēk. See Sādēk, town.
P'hū-Chāng-lāng, hill, 147 n. 1.
P'hū Čāng-nǒi, hill, 147 n. 1.
P'hū Khā, district, 128.
P'hū-khe, city, suggested as Ptolemy's Pagrasa, 310.
P'hū-Kuok, village, foundation of, 775.
P'hū-Kuok. See Ko; Tron, island.
P'hū Lāu, district, 128.
P'hū Ngū, 'Snake-mountain' Range, 155, 156.
P'hū-ō, P'hū-ōr. See P'ū-érh, the, people.
P'hū-hái Dam, the, people, called also Thō-dēn, 354 n. 1.
P'hūen, kingdom, establishment of, 295 n. 3; annexed to Lāng P'hrah Bāng, 295 n. 3.
P'hūen, Muang, district, amalgamated with Prakan, 296; also designated Trōn-nûn, 363, 366; connected with Ptolemy's Bareukorna, 364 n. 2, 769.
P'hūen. See P'ū-érh, the, people.
P'hūmāndin, a term for crude camphor, 435.
P'hūck-lōk, district, a designation of Fu-lū, 784.
P'hu-thai-mās. See Banthāi-mās, district and mart.
P'hwon, the, people, 369, 371 n. 2; habitat of, 369, 370; legend respecting, 370; tradition as to their ancestors, 370; may be a branch of the Phyū, 370; suggested connection with other tribes, 370, 371 n. 2, 371 n. 4; probably allied to the Kadh, 371; little known and often ignored, 371; probably connected with Ptolemy's Bārhārī, 372.
P'hỹā Kosā, destruction of Siāmese fleet under, 195, 195 n. 1; Hatien alleged to be taken by, 195 n. 1.
P'hỹā Tāk, king, 196 n. 1; king of Siām, 195 n. 1; wrested Banthāi-mās from the Annamese, 195 n. 1.
P'hỹ Thēn. See Indra, a god.
P'hỹū, the, people, 31, 70; erroneously located at Prome, 69; other designations of, 69, 73, 130, 365; a branch of the Mōn-Khmer race, 73; early inhabitants of Burmā, 128, 129; a tribe of the Mōn-Annam race, 130; settled at Old Prome, 365, 370.
P'i, seaport, 801.
P'i-chên-hisie Pa-mo, king, 602 n. 1.
P'i-ching. See Pi-ki, seaport.
P'i-ki'en, country, identification of, 827; cannibalism as a punishment in, 827.
P'i-ki, seaport and district, name of Jih-nan changed to, 292; incorporated with Campā, 292; extent of, 292, 293, 293 n. 1; erroneous area allotted to, 293 n. 1; under Chinese domination, 313; a famous port, 313; Chinese expedition landed at, 781; the Annamese Tī-kān, 796; location of, 797; connected with Hêng Shan, 797.
P'i-sung, state, location and identification of, 718 n. 1.
P'ian-dang, cape, location of, 813.
P'iao, state, 89, 90 n. 1; kingdoms tributary to, 46 n. 1; corresponds to the present Lower Burma, 56, 73, 75, 467; connected with Kā-lo, 61; Ch'ān-p'o tributary to, 62; position of, 73; earliest notices of, 74; boundaries of, confused with Dā-bā, 467; other designations of, 467, 750; king of, 467; conquest of, 749; people of, settled near Yun-nan Fu, 750; Fêng-yü assisted, against Ceylon, 750.
P'iao, the, people, their identity with the Phỹū discussed, 73; conquered by the Nan-Chao, 74; paid homage to the Chinese Emperor, 75; vassals of the Thai empire, 75; habitat of, 130 n. 1.
P'iao-ku, kingdom, identified with Pegu, 74.
P'iao-kuo, kingdom, probably identical with Pegu, 73.
P'ieh-lo-li, village, the port of Ceylon, 386; identified with Beligām, 386 n. 3.
P'ieh-tu-lu, a Portuguese sea-captain, 614 n.; identical with Rafael Prestrello, 654 n. 1.
P'ien-liang, city, the Chinese capital, 580; the modern K'ai-fêng Fu, 580.
P'ienne-goon-rwa, village, mayrepresent Ptolemy's Bārābonna, 47, 48.
P'illars, the, of Ma-yuian, 231, 232, 232 n. 1, 353.
Pillow-mount Pass. See Khâu Môn, pass.
P'iu-sū, islands, the Barusai of Ptolemy, 427; other designations of, 427.
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Pinang, island, 731.
Pinang, town, 98.
Pinotto, the famous Arkat, 747.
Píng-p'o, the, people, an aboriginal race near Canton, 765.
Pínggran, district, possibly connected with P'o-hwang, 541.
Pioneer colonizers, 81.
Piracy, 502 n. 4, 503, 503 n. 1; tribes addicted to, 156.
Pirada, state, probably identical with Pedada, 627, 688 n. 1.
Pištápura, Pištápura, city, connected with Ptolemy's Pityndra Môtpolôsis, 668 n. 3.
Piþhônobastê, a mart, identification of, 7, 731; identified with Banthai-máš, 192; connected with Pê-t'ou, 210; the great entrepôt of trade with the Fu-nan empire, 212; etymology of the name, 731, 732.
Pityndra Médopolis, the capital of Mâsâliá, 668 n. 3; connected with Pištápura, 668 n. 3.
Plá Bûk, a kind of sturgeon, 283, 283 n. 1.
Plá Rôm, 283 n. 1; a large edible fish, 283.
Place-names, transformations undergone by, 3, 55; Further Indian, 41 n., 121; of India proper, 41 n., 48; Indo-Chinese, 48, 103, 121, 143; American and Australian, 48; connection between Indian and Indo-Chinese, 121, 138; the course adopted by Ptolemy in transcribing, 412 passim.
Plâkê, 43; meanings of, 39.
Plâkśa-dvîpa, 46; identified with Arakan and Burma, 29, 39.
Plum-tree Hill. See Kôi-Mái, hill.
Plumbago, 88.
Plumbun, town, a name applied to Quilón, 88.
P'o, kingdom, 816; a contraction of Nikobár, 817; possibly stands for Bharu, 817.
Pô, p'u, meaning of the word, 352 n., 555 n.
Po-ch'i, state, 614 n.
P'o-fêng, district, 474; identification of, discussed, 499, 500 n. 1; possibly identical with Pînán, 499.
Pó Gôpa, king of Campâ, 697 n. 1.
P'o-hui-ki-a-lu, P'o-hui-chia-lu, kingdom, 44 n.; the Barakura of Ptolemy, 58.
P'o-hwang, state, sent tribute to China, 500 n. 1, 503; connected with Pahang, 503 n. 1; suggested identification of, 541; title conferred on the ruler of, 543; king of, obtains investiture, 543; location of, 824.
P'o-hweï-ka-lu, kingdom, identified with Pharúigara, 467; a designation of Arakan, 670 n. 1; gold and silver abundant in, 670 n. 1.
P'o-la, P'o-na, the, people, 295 n. 3.
P'o-li, P'o-lo, state, 98, 757, 760; terms applied to the island of Bali, 110; probably refer to Perimûla or Palamûda, 110; connected with Sumatrâ, 473; also designated Ma-li, 491; ponies and carbuncles obtained from, 491; inhabitants skilled in throwing quoits, 491; coral obtained from, 493; peculiar trading customs at, 493, 493 n. 3; description of the inhabitants of, 493, 493 n. 3; cessation of Chinese intercourse with, 494; location of, 494; identification of, discussed, 494, 495, 495 n. 1, 584 n. 3, 772, 815; extent of, 496, 496 n. 1; noted for tortoise-shell, 671 n.
P'o-li, state, location of, 496, 496 n. 2; description of the natives of, 496 n. 2; identification of, 718 n. 1, 815.
Pó Ling, 697, 697 n. 1; a prince of Campâ, 696, 703; became râja of Acheb, 696, 697, 703.
P'o-ling, state, an alternative name for Ho-ling, 472; toponymies similar to, 488 n. 1.
P'o-lo, P'o-lo, town, legend respecting an image in the temple at, 366 n.; connected with Barah-nagâr, 403 n.
P'o-lo-la, kingdom, 155.
P'o-lo-la, the, people, 769.
P'o-lo-mên, state, 470; probably corresponds with Brâhma- desa, 471 (see Corrigenda, 813, 814); suggested identification of, 547, 749, 813, 814. See also Ta-ts'in P'o-lo-mên; Hsiao P'o-lo-mên.
P'o-lo-sa, P'o-lo-so, kingdom, location and identification of, 741-2, 831; other designations of, 831.
P'o-lo-lou, location of, 824.
P'o-lo-lu, country, 816; possibly identical with Perlák, 817.
P'o-lo-chia-sz, town, early capital of Ho-ling, 472; possible derivation of, 472 n. 3; possibly connected with Prákâsi, 472 n. 3, 505; the residence of King Ki-yen, 504.
P'o-lo-ka-si, Polukiasze. See P'o-lo-chia-sz, town.
P'o-lo-shih, island, erroneously identified with Perlák, 429; corresponds to Bûrûs and the Barusai.
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Islands, 430, 584 n. 3, 619; a dependency of Śrī-Śhōja, 619.
Pu-la-see, island, location of, 429.
Pō-Nagar, the temple of, 265, 267, 545; the tutelary goddess of Čampā, 265; the goddess Devī, 266; inscription, 772.
Po-naun, district, established, 59.
P'ō-nu, state, identification of, 512, 513; identified with Pānei, 513; unconnected with Brūneī, 513; traded with Canton, 515 n. 1.
Pō Parichan, king of Čampā, 697 n. 1.
Pō Romē, a deity or hero worshipped by the Chām, 236; identical with Vṛah Romapāda, 236.
Po-sz, kingdom, 813, 814; identification of, discussed, 471 n. 2, 679, 679 n. 1, 681, 682, 700; other toponymies connected with, 673; probably an old Arab and Persian settlement, 679; connected with Su-mēn-ta-la, 679 n. 1; a designation of part of Sumatra, 681, 700; sent presents to Nan-Chao, 819.
P'ō-ta, state, 541 n. 1, 542, 812; possibly connected with Battea, 470 n. 1, 540 n. 1; tributary to China, 500 n. 1, 543; location of, 541; other designations of, 541; ruler of, 543; title conferred on the ruler of, 543; last mention of, 543; identification of, 822.
P'ō-tēng, district, erroneously identified with Bāli, 473, 490 n. 1; location of, 473, 473 n. 3; probably an abbreviation of To-pō-tēng, 489, 490; possibly a designation of Pulo Butong, 489; suggested identification of, 489, 489 n. 1.
Po U Daung inscription, 57, 62 n. 2, 65, 65 n. 3, 66, 138; a translation of the, corrected, 166 n. 1.
Pōdukē, town, identified with Pondicherry, 25.
Pogalang, founder of Bal Hangov, 697 n. 1.
Poggy Islands. See Poge, island.
Pōen, trees bearing, 599 n. 4.
Pokhara, district, a designation of Dala, 41 n.
Pōler, river, connected with Po-li, 815.
Pōlībōthra, city, also designated Pātaliputra, 594; Iambulus carried to, 594.
Pond of the Gold Ingots. See Gold Ingots, the Pond of the.
Pōondaung Mountains, possibly included in Ptolemy's Maiandros, 832.
Pondicherry, town, the Podukē of Ptolemy, 25.
Ponyes from P'o-li, 491.
Pōntain Islands. See Petam Islands.
Pōntameas. See Banthāi-mās, district and mart.
Pōntēay-mēas. See Banthāi-mās, district and mart.
Pōntiang. See Asin, river.
Pōntian. See Banthāi-mās, district and mart.
Pōr, Poru. See P'hyū, the people.
Pōrr, the people, identified with the Ch'ōng, 769.
Portuguese, 94, 113 n. 3; maps, 46, 50, 85; Sumatra tributary to the, 653, 654.
Pōru, the people, identification of, 129, 130.
Posina, town, 835; connected with the P'ūn-tse, 121; identification of, 739, 762, 763; the name discussed, 762, 763.
Prāgyotis-pur, Prāgyotisa, district, 286; the ancient name of Asām, 138; now called Gauhati, 286 n. 1.
Prahū, mountain, ruins of Saiva temples found on, 610 n. 1.
Prakan, a district of Pi-kin, 292; probably the Pagrasa of Ptolemy, 295, 731; two princesses from, invade P'hu'en, 295 n. 3; a designation of Čulāni, 296; amalgamated with Muāng P'hu'en, 296; also designated Pi-kin, 312, 313.
Prakan, city, a synonym of Kōt-the or Kortatha, 294.
Praksāi, city, 95; the original seat of government in Perak, 472 n. 3; probably identical with P'o-lu-ka-si, 505; capital of Shē-p'o, 544.
Prākṛt words and terms, 106, 118, 140.
Prālambara, kingdom, a designation of Palembang, 674.
Prasben, cape, 26.
Prasuluka - nagara. See Pasuluka, kingdom.
Prathama Yava, island, possibly identical with Jābah, 552.
Prathama-ceti, monument, a gigantic spire, 188; date of erection of, discussed, 189; discoveries made during excavations at the, 189; position of the, 189.
Prathom-cedi, 188.
Prawns, petrified, found at Brațail, 558 n. 4.
Pre-Āryan population of India, 101, 102, 103.
Pre-Chinese populations of China,
chiefly of Mōn - Annam race, 131 n. 2; a designation of the, 153.
Precious stones of Sumatra, 647.
Prestrello, Rafael, 654 n. 1; a person in China, 614 n.; pepper merchant, 654.
Priāman, pepper produced at, 454 n. 1; a possession of Achēb, 706; gold-mines in, 706.
Priest, Brahman, employment of, 122.
Prome, district, 62, 69, 70; identified with Marammā, 55; Lower Burma subject to the kings of, 65; other designations of, 113.
Prome, Old, city, 69, 70, 73, 75, 115; the Mareura of Ptolemy, 33, 66, 67; capital of the Talaing kingdom, 33; destruction of, 33; foundation of, 66; ancient name of, 66; ceases to be a capital, 67; the Maurya's capital, 67; the Pḥyū settled at, 365, 370; identification of, 738.
Prong, district, included or identical with Kra, 112.
Promubial Hill. See Kōi-māi, hill.
Prosaika, the, people, 120; name connected with P'u-tsə, 121.
Prū. See Pʰyū, the, people.
Pseudomon, a mouth of the Ganges, 744.
Phāthāi, definition of, 775.
Ptolomey, the commentators of, 2, 51, 70, 81, 104, 138; erroneous treatment of his trans-Gangetic geography, 2, 3; reasons for differences of opinion among his commentators, 2, 3; difficulties in identifying his place-names in Further India, 3, 4; his geography of Western China and Central Asia, 4; method adopted by the author in the solution of his trans-Gangetic geography, 6-8; rectification of his measurement errors, 9-27, 81, 99; formula for correcting his latitudes and longitudes, 10-27; correct proportion of his latitudes, 20; errors in his longitudes, 20, 21; fundamental stations of, 21; reasons for his error regarding the China coast, 26; reasons for treating his work under a new system, 26, 27; editions of his geography, 60, 155 n. 1; date of his geography, 67, 738, 739; his limited geographical knowledge, 76, 81, 104, 134, 457; his record of the so-called barbarous states, 123; his hydrography ahead of modern geographers, 376; his original MS. not now available, 410; the course adopted by, in transcribing place-names, 412; his error regarding Jābādiū, 587, 588 passim.
P'u, the name of an influential family in Canton, 352 n.
Pu, the, people, habitat of, 142 n. 1.
P'u the, people, face-tattooing among, 367; tribes allied to, 369, 369 n. 4, 804, 805; a cannibal and caudate tribe, 779; identification of, 779, 804; habitat of, 805. See also P'u, the tribe.
P'u-ch'a, the, people, habitat of, 363; other designations of, 363; of Mōn-Annam race, 363, 364.
P'u-chia-lung, state, a designation of Chao-wa, 451 n. 1.
P'u-č'h, P'u-č'ēl, P'u-č'h, the, people, 295 n. 3, 732; formation of the prefecture of, 362 n.; the Bahrani of Ptolemy, 363, 365, 366, 769; the habitat of, 363, 366, 367; other designations of, 363, 769, 805; offshoots of, 365; scattered by the Doanai, 366; face-tattooing among, 397, 675 n. 1; suggested relation with other tribes, 369.
P'u-č'h, Fu, prefecture of, formed, 364 n. 2.
P'u-č'ēn, the, people, 368; suggested connection with other tribes, 369, 804, 805.
P'u-ťan, kingdom, reception of envoys from, 625; a designation of Pagan, 625.
P'u-la, the, people, 364 n. 2, 368, 368 n. 1, 369, 785; description of, 364; other designations of, 364, 364 n. 2; identical with Ptolomey's Bahrani, 365; connected with Ma-la, 368 n. 1; a pygmy race, 803, 804; habitat of, 803.
P'u-la-kia, country, a designation of Pērak, 98 n.
P'u-lo, district, inhabitants of, 718 n. 1; a dependency of Kamboja, 718 n. 1; suggested identification of, 718 n. 1.
P'u-lo Chung, the, people, cannibal tailed tribes, 718 n. 1; inhabitants of P'u-lo, 718 n. 1.
P'u-lang, the, people, connection suggested with the Paluang, 368.
P'u-mang, the, people, possibly the Wei-Pu, 687 n. 5; other designations of, 687 n. 5, 788.
P'u-na, See P'u-la, the, people.
P'u-ni, See P'o-ni, state.
P'u-t'ou, city, other designations of, 793; the builders of, 793.
P'u-tsə, the, tribe, 121 n. 1; connected
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with Posinara, 121; connected with Nan-Chao, 121 n. 1.
Pualing, village, in North Malacca, 488 n. 1.
Pugniatas, name given to the island and inhabitants of Engano, 409 n. 2.
Puh, the, tribe, 130 n. 1; the ruling Nan-chao clan, 142 n. 1. See also Pu, the, people.
Puh-lin-pa, kingdom, possibly Palembang, 613 n. 1.
Pukam. See Bukam, kingdom.
Pullai, river, 772; location of, 815.
Pulastya, the mythical ancestor of the Rakasusas, 160 n. 2.
Pullau Chermin, island, 498 n. 3.
Pullau Tunggal. See Bukit Tunggal, island.
Pulludas, the, people, connected with the Belandas, 729, 730.
Pulaing Cape, other designations of, 476, 476 n. 1.
Pulo = island. See under specific names.
Pulok Lamiri, city, 681; introduction of Islamism into, 896.
Punan, the, people, account of, 720 n. 1.
Punjam, ancient gold-mines at, 477 n. 1.
Pantis, the, people, natives of Kwangtung, 131 n. 2.
Punzaiisang, Paenca-long, 'Five Rivers,' island; situation of, 41 n., 831; identical with Pulo Ayer-tawar, 509 n. 2; connected with Tan-ling, 831.
Purlis. See Perlis, district.
Purnabhasi, river, 835; connected with the name Bepyrros, 835.
Purojava, a division of Saka-divipa, 218; probably corresponds to Ptolemy's Zabai or Krachéh, 169, 218 n. 1.
Purushada, the, people, 742.
Puskulavati, Puskaravati. See Kalé, town.
Puskara, district, the Sérica of Ptolemy, 249.
Puskara-divipa, district, name of North China and Mongolia, 249.
Puyan inscription. See Bayang, village.
Puyan temple, the, position of, 211.
Pygmies, 245 n. 3, 247 n., 256, 258, 303, 804; account of, 261, 262, 686; description of the Chian-yau, 787; habitat of, 787, 788; identification of, 787, 788; from Kanchon, 788.
Pygmies, Negrito. See Negrito Pygmies.
Pyramidal rocks, 713, 723.

Q
Qua-Giang, ancient remains at, 791.
Quan-to, the, people, an ancient race inhabiting Kau-lang, 356 n.
Quang-binh. See Kwang-bin, district.
Quartz, 40 n. 3, 485 n. 2; worship of, 120 n. (3); crystals, 491 n. 1.
Quedah, seaport, other designations of, 485 n. 1.
Quilon, town, called Plumbun, 88; connected with Kulam-malai, 101, 103.
Quinhon. See Kwí-nóo, city.
Quinhone Harbour, identified with Thi-nái, 238.
Quoits, the people of Pu-o-li skilled in throwing, 491. See also s. v. Cakras.

R
Races, movement and distribution of, in Indo-China, 118-30.
Rach-já, district, other designations of, 776.
Rach-já, river, other designations of, 776.
Rach-já, village, foundation of, 775.
Racha. See Arakan, kingdom.
Racha, city, former capital of Arakan, 58.
Rachado, cape, 686 n. 1.
Rade, the, people, immigrants to Kamboja from the north, 770; teeth-filing customary among, 802.
Radén Vijaya, founder of Mäjakühit, 581 n. 1.
Radí, Raki, island, 577.
Raduhabad, river and island, 744.
Rafael Prestrello. See Prestrello, Rafael.
Rahéng, 143.
Rahman. See Rámashà, kingdom.
Rahmí, kingdom, identified with Pegu, 662; other forms of the name, 662.
Ráhulathérä, a Buddhist priest, 81 n. 1.
Railway proposed between Kedah and Singora, 79.
Rainbow, the, 139, 140; popular belief explanatory of the, 139 n. 1.
Raja Chulan, 261 n. 1; reigned over the south of the Malay Peninsula, 576.
Raja Súra, identification of, 757.
Rajadhíraja, king, conquests of, 813.
Rajagrha, city, name applied to Legya, or a city near, 141, 766.
Rajaghrá, village, 141; location of, 766; an ancient capital, 766.
Rajakesarivarman, king, 609 n. 2.
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Rājapura, kingdom, identification of, 508 n.
Rājarāja the Great, 624 n. 1; of Chōla, 609 n. 2; identical with Lo-ch'a-lo-cha, 609 n. 2.
Rājata-vālua, river, a designation of the Irāvati, 741.
Rājavrāsa, the, captured by the king of Acheb, 554.
Rājburi, kingdom, also designated Rājapura, 508 n.
Rājendra-Chola I, Rājendra-Choladeva I, king, 609 n. 2, 624 n. 1; reign of, 833; an expedition sent by, against Kadāram, 833.
Rājendra Chola II, king of Vēngi, 624 n. 1; seized the Chola crown, 624 n. 1.
Rājendradeva. See Rājendra-Chola I, king.
Rakan, district, other designations of, 656; a form of Arakan, 668 n. 3; a possession of Acheb, 705.
Rakhaing, Rakhhaing, Rakkōng, kingdom, name of, not associated with the Rākṣasa, 37, 38; a designation of Arakan, 39, 425.
Rakkhāhanga, Rakka-pura. See Arakan, kingdom.
Rākṣas, the, people, description of, 269; ancestors of the Rākṣasas, 266, 261; location of the kingdom of, 260 n. 3; descendants of, 260, 261; survival of the name discussed, 261 n. 1.
Rākṣasa, application of the term, 38; various derivatives of the name, 688.
Rākṣasa-dvīpa, a designation of Ceylon, 497 n. 1.
Rākṣasas, the, people, 32, 669; inhabitants of Rakhāing, 37–40; conquered by Rāma, 38; said to be cannibals, 71; as pioneer colonizers, 81; colonies founded by, 101; description of, 103 n. 1; the mythical ancestor of, 160 n. 2; name applied to the Chām, 253 n. 1; location of the kingdom of, 260 n. 3; subdued by Aji-Saka, 592; inhabitants of Java, 592; legendary aboriginal inhabitants of Sumatra and Arakan, 657, 658, 669.
Raktā-mūrtīka, seasport, 98; probably identical with Mergui, 83.
Rālej. See Zālej, islands.
Ram, Rāmī, Rāmīn. See Rāmī, island.
Rāma, 341 n. 1; the Rākṣasas conquered by, 38; legend respecting, 663; carried his army into Ceylon, 663; an incarnation of Visṇu, 663; epithets applied to, 663, 663 n. 3; the demons of Jānāka conquered by, 785.
Rāma, Sea of, a name of the Sea of Lambri, 663; explanation of the name, 663.
Rāma mouth, 684 n. 1.
Rāma's Bridge, a legendary jetty across the Sea of Lambri, 663.
Rāmabāri, Rāma-vāri, district, designations of Lambri, 663, 664 n. 1.
Rāmānī, Rāmaññas. See Mōn, the, people.
Ramanāka-dvīpa, district, 698; may correspond to Yen-mo-na, 464 n. 2, 677; connected with Armanān, 464 n. 2; other designations of, 677, 700; a designation of Acheb, 700.
Rāmānī. See Rāmī, island.
Rāmañña, kingdom, identified with Pegu and Arakan, 57, 63; 524 n., 535, 662, 809; the country of the Mōn race, 70; Ceylon expedition sent against, 93; envoys from Ceylon imprisoned by the king of, 535, 536; camphor sent to Ceylon from, 809. See also Rāmaññadesa.
Rāmaññadesa, kingdom, 74, 81 n. 1; Ptolemy's coast of the Bāsyangeitai, 65; extent of, 65, 65 n. 2; subdivision of, 74 n. 3; conquered by the Seven Kings, 74 n. 3. See also Rāmañña.
Rāmāsura, a form of Rāma, 341 n. 1.
Rāmāthibodi, king, 181; a city founded by, 182; reorganized Kamboja, 195 n. 1.
Rāmāvati, city, the Sambra of Ptolemy, 45; location of, 662.
Rambai, various places designated, 505, 506 n. 1.
Rambra. See Sambra, city.
Rambri. See Lambri, district.
Ramenia Point, 662; erroneously connected with Ptolemy's Cape Maleu-kālon, 104.
Rāmeśvara, island, identical with Ram Island, 568; on the Koromandel coast, 660; name transplanted to Arakan, 661; various forms of the name, 661–4.
Raṅga-pura, town, a designation of C'hieng Rung, 138; identical with Ptolemy's Th'ingibēri, 140.
Raming. See Laming, district.
Ramissaram. See Rāmeśvara, island.
Rāmānī, district, on the Koromandel coast, 660; name transplanted to Arakan, 661; various forms of the name, 661–4.
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Ramni, island, 424, 561; identification of, 464 n. 2, 568, 568 n. 1, 681, 699; camphor from, 559; a designation of Lambri, 559, 662, 663 n. 2, 664; a possession of Żabęj, 559, 561, 621; ruled by the Mahärāja of Żabęj, 621, 700; other designations of, 662; account of the natives of, 686, 686 n. 2, 699, 701; productions of, 699, 700, 702; extent of, 699, 700, 702; animals of, 699; account of, 700.

Ramri, island, 45.

Ramū, 36, 155.

Rânej, term applied to the Cocos Islands, 570.

Ranej. See Żabęj, kingdom.

Rangabari, 286; other forms of the name, 138; now called Gauhati, 286 n. 1.

Rangēch. See Legech, district.

Rangūn, town, 41 n., 75; erroneously connected with Lo-k'êng, 38 n. 2; the Shwe Dagon pagoda of, 46, 76, 77; the Bésynga of Ptolemy, 72, 76, 77; other designations of, 425, 523 n. 2, 811; boat races at, 662 n. 2.

Rangūn River, 72.

Rangoon, district, also designated Takña-thai, 87; tin-ore abounds at, 91.

Ransang. See Panchur, island.

Rantei, state, identification of, 688, 688 n. 1.

Rāsān. See Barmānsak, district.

Ratna-dvīpa, 639 n.; a designation of Ceylon, 423 n. 1.

Raub, ancient gold-mines at, 477 n. 1.

Rāvana, the Rākṣasa king of Ceylon, 688; islands taken from the Nāgas by, 658; conquests of, 669.

Rāvi. See Irāvati, river.

Rayat Saut. See Orang Akhyē, the people.

Rayat Utan, the tribes, 261 n. 1.

Re, Rê, city, a seaport, 86; versions of the name, 717 n. 1.

Red God, the, 782.

Red River, the, 152, 153; connected with the Song-kōi, 125; other designations of, 125, 314, 315, 315 n. 1, 316 n., 798; land on the, occupied by the Te'wan, 125; the chief stream of the Hā-xōi, 314; the Dories of Ptolemy, 317, 318; enlargement of the delta of, 799.

Rejang writing, ancient bamboo tablets in, 597 n. 1; connected with Phœnician writing, 597 n. 1.

Relic, a sacred, of the Andāmāns, 390.

Relic - casket of Buddha's remains, enshrined at Dharaṇikota, 108; enclosed in a great stūpa at Ruanweli, 108.

Rēm. See Lēm, Mūng.

Remains, ancient. See Ruins.

Rendezvous Island, a designation of Bauwal Island, 712.

Rheingibêri, city, identified with C'hieng Rang, 138, 140, 142, 734; wrongly located in Assām, 138; other designations of, 138; derivation of the name, 734.

Rhineoceros, 699, 830; three kinds of, in Assām, 833.

Rhineoceros horns, 476.

Rhio-Lingga Archipelago, 475; tribes inhabiting the, 503.

Riāhu, island, one of the Anambas, 716.

Rīāhu group, a designation of the South Anambas, 722.

Rīāhu, district, location of, 443.

Rīau. See Dhūtāil, island.

Ribāb, district, camphor found in, 437 n., 667 n.; location of, 667 n.

Ribeiro defeated King Massinga, 113 n. 3.

Rice, 486 n. 2.

Rice-wine, jars used for, 763.

Rikkon, Rokkon. See Ligor, kingdom.

River-serpents, 283 n. 1.

Rizala, city, connected with Sirisa-vatthu, 381 n.

Robber tribes, 770.

Robbers, the Country of the. See Lēstai, district.

Rochor, river, 261 n. 1, 496.

Rock-crystal, 622.

Rohmy. See Rahmann, kingdom.

Rolling Gold, dead man received in the bed of, 390.

Roma. See Arakan Roma, mountains.

Romapāda, king of the Indō Campā, 335 n. 1.

Romapāda, Romapattan, district, the name of the southern part of Tonkin, 235, 235 n. 1, 236.

Ron River, 779; location of, 778.

Rond Cap. See Bang, cape.

Rondo, Pulo, description of, 692; also designated Tepurong, 692.

Rong River, identified with the Kia Ron, 797.

Ron Island, identification of, 710.

Routes, overland, 60, 140; across the Malay Peninsula, 79, 85, 91, 93, 94, 106, 109, 111, 115. See also Sea routes; Trade routes.

Rṣābha, hill, term connected with Arisabion, 63; identified with Anṣumat, 164.
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Rûang, king of Sukhôthai, the C'hâwâ repelled by, 521.
Ruanwelli, 108.
Rubies (balas rubies), exported from Upper Burma, 39, 39 n. 2; origin and application of the name, 741.
Ruby, a wonderful, owned by the king of Lan-wu-li, 679 n. 2.
Rudrasâna, temple erected by, 746; the ruler of Arimaddana-pura, 746.
Ruins and ancient remains, 218–21; on Kyauk-pâu-daung, 30; about the Korbie district, 96; in Province Wellesley, 98; in the Krah district, 115; near Legya and Monê, 141; of Miang Sôi, 143; of Hair-cutting Hall, 171; at Bânthâi-mâs, 193; at Thang-bâi, 280; at Bâ-dû, 281; of Lwâ-lâu, 323; at Argapura, 458 n. 2; of Sampangago, 746; at An-kieu, etc., 779; at Mi-sôn, Bang-an, etc., 791; at Kô-lâw, 798; a trip to the, of Kamboja, 925.
Rukmin, founder of Bhojakâta, 393 n. 3; king of the Vidarbhas, 393 n. 3.
Rûm, prince from, the founder of Kedah, 487 n. 1; shipwrecked on Langkâwî, 487 n.
Rumai, the, people, a designation of the Palaung, 805.
Rumenia Point. See Rumenia Point. Rûng-kia-n̄am, 'rainbow,' 139.
Rapat Pulo, location of, 816.
Râpyaka, island, gold and silver-mines in, 671 n.; identification of, 672 n. *.
Ryâh, king, 443.

S

Sa, Francisco de, expedition of, to Sunda, 452 n. 1.
Sa-chi-tan, district, identification of, 450 n. 2; pepper procured from, 450 n. 2.
Sa-p'u Ho, a branch of the Black River, 314 n. 1.
Saha, Sava, district, place-names connected with, 517 n. 2; a district of Sumatra, 590.
Sabadeibai, islands, 587; identified with Si-Berût and the Bātu group, 446; meaning and origin of the name, 447; inhabitants of, 447; term compared with Sabadiû, 447 n. 2.
Sabadiû, 218.
Sabadiû, island, name compared with Sabadeibai, 447 n. 2; an alternative name for Iabadiû, 458, 459, 590; other designations, 458, 596.
Sabah, village, connected with the Sabana of Ptolemy, 100, 516, 522, 549, 553; identical with Chu-po, 245, 248; possibly connected with Shê-p'o, 522, 526, 549.
Sabana, a mart, probably identical with Selângor, 100, 101; may be identical with Yen-mo-na, 464 n. 2; probably the modern Sabah, 516, 522, 553; possibly connected with Shê-p'o, 522, 549; connected with Jawah, 553; the name discussed, 730; toponyms similar to, 758.
Sabana, an Indo-Skythian town, 730.
Sabang, bay and village on Mau Shan, 693.
Sabara, city, 750; erroneously identified with Syria, 72; position of, coincides with Twantê, 72; derivation of the name, 72, 73, 754; its site discussed, 72, 75; probably founded by the Savaras, 75; also called Suavarpabhumi, 597 n. 1; connected with Sapattota, 750.
Sabara, the, people, 258; the name discussed, 72, 749. See also Savara, the, people.
Sabarâ, Ptolemy's name for the Savaras of Orissa, 73.
Sabba, village, 758.
Sabon, Sabong, strait, location of, 758.
Saborna, island, a possible designation of Sumatra, 641 n. 2.
Sacccândhâ Hill, Buddha's footprint on, 665 n.
Sacrifice, 120 n. (3); of buffaloes in Luang P'hraë Bâng, 146 n.
Sada, city, 49; identified with Sandoway, 45, 46; an important port in Ptolemy's time, 47; identification of, 725; name survives in Thate River, 742.
Sadang. See C'hâdáng, the, people.
Saddhamma-nagara. See Tha-htûn, mart.
Saddle Island, 714; identification of, 711.
Sadêk, town, formerly noted for hardware, 213 n. 1; reasons against its being Ptolemy's Zhabâ, 214.
Sadiyâ, inhabitants of, 830; location of, 830.
Sados, river, 45, 728; identification of, 47, 742, 743; derivation of the name, 47.
Saging, town, a temple near, 826.
Sagala, 894.
Sagantung Mahâ-Muru, mountain, 630 n. 4.
Sagara, king. See Vicitra Sagara.
INDEX.

Salāh-ud-dīn, Sultān, king of Acheh, 704; deposed, 704; death of, 704.
Salahuyi, district and river, connected with Shelahet, 552; identification of, 552 n. 2.
Salahat. See Shelahet, island.
Salan, Salim. See Salīnē, island.
Salāng. See Junkceylon, island.
Salāng. See Halāng, the, people.
Salapārāng, island, a designation of Lombok, 589 n.
Salōh. See Upang, river.
Saqet, Selat. See Celates, the, people.
Sailbar, a possession of Acheh, 706.
Salīdā, a possession of Acheh, 706; gold-mines in, 706.
Salin, district, 65; in Sunāparanta, 748.
Salinē, island, alternative name for Khasilīnē, 406, 408; identical with Tsvī-līan, 409; derivation of the name, 409; 410; name applied to Kār-Nikohar, 410; possibly identical with Tilan-chong, 410; name connected with Seruma, 414.
Śālivāhana, a mythical Indī king, 592, 730; connected with Aji-Saka, 592.
Śāmali-dvīpa, the Malay Peninsula, 80, 81, 84, 91; derivation of the name, 80.
Salt, from China, 278, 278 n. 3; obtained by boiling sea-water, 477, 477 n. 1.
Salvin, river, 39, 41 n. 1, 54, 58, 65, 76, 91, 93, 113, 114, 118, 119 n. 1; ancient names for the, 71; cannibal tribes on the, 72; merged into the Iravatī by cartographers, 75; may be the Bēṣyanga of Ptolemy, 75.
Śām Sing, prince of Chieng Rung, 139 n.
Śām-thau, district, the Country of the Three-headed Men, 787; inhabitants of, 787.
Śāma-ratthē. See Śrī Vijaya Rāja-dhāni, town.
Śāmāgāma, township, 774.
Samakuru, district, location of, 645.
Śāmala. See Tśemala, city.
Samapa Gotama, an epithet of Buddha, 357.
Samandār, Samindar, city, location of, 643 n. 2.
Samang, the, people, 174, 494 n.; savage Negrito tribes of the Malay Peninsula, 192, 192 n. 2, 159 n. 2.
Samarga, the, people, 102.
Samanta-kūta, a designation of Adam’s Peak, 387.
Samara, Samarcha, district, forms of Sumatra, 645; identification of,
645; the people of, 635; location of, 834.
Samaradé, town, 8, 42, 156; identified with Sri Vijaya Rājadhāni, 24, 170, 188, 190; erroneously identified with Ligor, 169; connected with Hsien, 181 n. 1; location of, 187; derivation of the name, 734.
Samarkand, the Marakanda of Ptolemy, 19; Ptolemy's error in distance between the 'Stone Tower' and, 20.
Samarlāng, Semerlāng, district, 575, 575 n. 3; on the Sumatran coast, 656; claimed as a possession of Acheb, 705.
Samatra, town, capital of Sumatra, 646.
Samatra, Samotra, forms of Sumatra, 653.
Samawi Bay, 645.
Sambalaka II, district, identified with Champārān, 834.
Sambaur, Sambor. See Sambhu, district.
Sambelang, island, the largest of the Nikobars, 395 n. 2 (see Corrigenda, 806); derivation of the name discussed, 395 n. 2.
Sambojoa. See Swayambhoja, kingdom.
Sambhor, island, 618; a derivative of Palembang, 618.
Sambhu, Sambhu-pura, district, 618; connected with Ts'an-pan, 209, 210; a name of Siva, 615; also applied to Kamboja, 615–7, 618 n. 1; derivation of the name, 617, 618.
Sambhuvarman, discovery of the stela of, 781.
Sambilam, Pulo, location of, 806.
Samboja. See Kamboja, kingdom.
Sambor, Straits of, 618, 618 n. 2.
Sambra, city, identified with Rāmavati, 45; derivation of the name, 734; name connected with the Surma Mountain, 742.
Sambrā, the name of a deity, 742.
Sambujara, kingdom, a name of Kamboja, 825.
Sam, Samira, Samirs. See Zamirai, the people.
Samiddho, Samith. See Mitho, town.
Samudara, state, a designation of Sumatra, 655; king of Acheb and, 655.
Sammuti Deva, founder of Sandoway, 45.
Sampanango, ruins of, 746.
Samapurba, king, possible identification of, 629.
Samudra (a form of Sumatra), city, 644; foundation of, 644.
Samudra, village, location of, 656.
Samudra, Samudra-giri, island, a designation of Giri Island, 658; possibly a designation of Sumatra, 658; supposed origin of the name, 658; Buddha's visit to, 664; legend of the peregrinations of the, 669; introduction of Islamism into, 696; conquest of, 704.
Samudra Dāru-1-Salām (a form of Sumatra), city, 644; name assumed upon the introduction of Islamism, 644.
Samudra Gupta, king of Magadha, 57, 60, 61; conquests of, 668 n. 3.
Samudra-pura, town, its identity unknown, 220; possibly connected with Mi-tho, 220, 221 n. 1.
San-bo-tsa. See San-fu-ch'i, kingdom.
San-chi-chiang, district, an alternative name for Son-tōi, 336; identification of, 801.
San-fu-ch'i, kingdom, a designation of Palembang, 89, 470, 512, 547, 568; location of, 470, 602; title of the king of, 565 n., 566 n.; sent tribute to China, 567, 621, 624; other designations of, 580, 614, 621; productions of, 591 n. 1, 624; identity with Kan-t'o-li doubtful, 602, 603, 603 n. 3; kings of, 621–30; list of merchandise from, 622; ships from, sent to China, 622; invaded by Shē-p'o, 622; envoy from, honoured in China, 623; Chun-hien tributary to, 624, 624 n. 1, 625; a dignitary from, arrives at Canton, 624; a letter from the king's daughter at, 624; the palace of the king of, to be roofed with copper, 625; investiture accorded to the king of, 625; expensive presents in return for tribute from, 625; missions from, no longer to come to the Chinese Court, 625; fifteen states subject to, 526–8; trade of, 628–30; divided into three principalities, 629; Chinese rule in, 630, 631; location of the capital of, 631; conquered by Java, 630; name changed to Chiu-chiang, 630; a vassal of Java, 637 n. 1; Lan-wu-li tributary to, 679 n. 2.
San-fu-Hsiu, island, location of, 617; identification of, 617.
San-ho, cape, connected with Hsinchou, 242.
San-weng, explanation of the term, 139 n.
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San-t'ai-chiang, district and river, 801.
San-ťo, city, identified with Sandoway, 46 n. 1.
Sandabulaät. See Sender-fulät, island.
Sandal-fulät. See Sender-fulät, island.
Sandal-wood, 38, 576.
Sandar-fulät. See Sender-fulät, island.
Sanding, Pulo. See Sandion, island.
Sandion, island, possibly included in Ptolemy’s Sindai, 449; also known as Pulo Sanding, 456; inhabitants of, 456.
Sandoway (Sandw), city, derivation of, 41 n., 45 n. 2, 46, 46 n. 1; the Sada of Ptolemy, 45; legend respecting, 45, 45 n. 2, 742; founded by Sammutu Deva, 45; erroneously identified with Bérabouna, 47; its connection with Tripura discussed, 45 n. 2; other designations of, 656; possibly named after Dvaravati, 742.
Sandoway, river, 47.
Sands, 49, 109, 110.
Sandstone, worship of, 120 n. (3).
San, kingdom, a designation of Campã, 563; conquered by the king of Lâkin, 563 n. 3.
Sangar, district, identified with Ch'ung-ka-las, 520.
Sangore, tin-mines at, 470 n. 1; identification of, 470 n. 1.
Sangasapura, king, 618 n. 2.
Sanh, governor of Hatien, 196 n.
Sanji, Senji, country and town, 245 n. 3; account of the men of, 245 n. 3; location of, 245 n. 3; connected with Pigafetta, 247 n., 248 n.; the present Hoi-how, 247 n., 248 n.; hitherto unidentified, 248 n.
Sanji, Senji, Sea of, the Arabic name for the Ïadhi Ocean, 244; location of the, 245, 245 n. 3, 249; dangerous navigation of the, 245 n. 3; connected with Haiman Strait, 248 n.
Sánkassa-ratha, kingdom, a designation of Old Pagán, 746.
Sânkhâla, Sûnkâla. See Singora, town.
Sanlieng. See Syriam, island.
Sanlunen. See Salwen, river.
Sanskrit, 42 n., 45, 58 n. 2, 63, 82, 84, 87, 88, 95, 96, 97, 98 passion; used in official documents and inscriptions, 122; generally used on epigraphic monuments, 211.
Sanskrit inscriptions, found at Pagân, 60; discovery of, 45 n. 1, 83, 98, 265 n. 1, 610 n. 1.
Sánta-bhayâ, district, identified with Dvâravati, 46.
Santôm, the, people, other designations of, 788.
Sapan-wood, 477, 478 n.
Sapang River, an affluent of the Bernam River, 758.
Sapata. See Saràsän, island.
Sapattota, port, 470 n. 1; governor of, 750; connected with Ptolemy’s Sabara, 750.
Sapatu, Pulo, 723.
Sapipati, district, 767.
Sarabakie Gulf, identified with the Gulf of Martaban, 64, 70, 71.
Sarabaric Gulf. See Sarabakie Gulf.
Saracen merchants, the, Islamism introduced into Perlak by, 695.
Saran. See Saràsän, island.
Saràsän, island, erroneously connected with the Anambas, 707, 707 n. 2; conquered by the Javanese, 707; other designations of, 707 n. 2, 708 n. 1, 710, 714; one of the South Natunas, 707 n. 2, 708; identification of, 714.
Sarasvati, river, 41 n.
Sàrava, Sàrâvati. See Tharrawaddy, district.
Sarawari, Sarawari, Saravati, Pali name for the Salwin River, 71.
Sarawa, Sarawi, the, people, inhabitants of Palembang, 567, 567 n. 3, 612.
Sarawak in Borneo, 612.
Sarawi. See Sarirah, district.
Sarbaça, Serboza, district and city, 567; identical with Sri-Bhoja, 559; belonging to Zabej, 569; the Island of Zabej, 561, 562; a designation of Palembang, 566, 577, 580, 613; circuit of, 571; camphor exported from, 572; the capital of Zabej, 577; other designations of, 577, 580, 584, 613, 629; ruled by the Maharâja of Zabej, 621; the residence of the Maharâja of Zabej, 623.
Sarâ, Sarbi, village, a seaport of Sumatra, 646; identified with Terlei, 646.
Sarieng. See Syriam, island.
Sarirah, Serira, Serirâh, district and town, noted for good camphor, 437 n.; other designations of, 562, 621, 629, 700; a designation of Palembang, 566, 806; terms connected with, 567; a dependency of China, 567, 623; a residence of the Maharâja, 567; the capital of Zabej, 572; identical with Sarbaça, 577, 580; description and identification of, 621; a possession of the
Mahârâja of Zâbej, 561, 621; the largest district of Zâbej, 629; location of, 700.
Sarjal, island, probably Ptolemy's Khalînî, 607 n. 1; one of the Nikobârs, 808.
Sarpis Ocean. See Šenef, Sea of.
Šatdrâ. See Satlej, river.
Sathôm. See Thà-hûn, mart.
Satlej, river, 41 n.
Sâtûl, Satan, district, placed under Siâm, 484.
Saturn, Sanskrit names for the planet, 88.
Satyavarman, king, rebuilt the temple of Pî-Nagar, 267; naval victory of, 545.
Satyrön, islands, connected with Hsi-tung, 717; a designation of Siântûn, 722; islands included under Ptolemy's, 722; name applied to the Anambas, 722, 724; probable origin of the name, 724.
Satys, Islands of the, inhabitants of, 707; location of, 707; identified with the Anambas, 707; the Natunas probably not included in the, 723; unfortunate identifications of, 723, 724.
Savá. See Jává, state.
Sava-giri, the, people, 749.
Savages, 158, 612; description of the, of Lo-ch'â, 554 n. 2.
Savaka-Môla, Savaka-Malâva, kingdom, 132; states comprised in, 116, 117; a name applied to Eastern Lào, 150; a designation of Lâung P'hrah Bàng, 150.
Sâvarâ, the, people, 749, 808; habitat of, 73; called Sabarâ by Ptolemy, 75; the probable founders of Sâbarâ, 75. See also Nagna-parna Šavara; Šavara, the, people.
Savâravati, town in India, 749.
Sawddi, town, 747.
Sawankhalok, city, 178 n. 1; capital of Northern Siâm, 176; the name Chîh-t'ûn may apply to, 178, 178 n. 1, 607 n.; Chinese envoys to Siâm acquainted with, 179.
Sâyam, 'the black One,' the godling of the land and soil, 774.
Sciamuthera, island, a form of Sumatra, 594 n. 3, 642 n. 1, 652; the island of Taprobana, 652; account of the natives of, 652; human skulls used as currency in, 652.
Ściantânt, islands, native name for the Anambas and Natunas, 708 n. 1.
Slach-Phâng, term meaning 'Fire-King,' 342 n. 1.
Slach-Tâk, term meaning 'Water-King,' 342 n. 1.
Sî dok Tok Thom temple, 545.
Sê Lake. See Tali Lake.
Sê-Lân, city, superseded Cheila, 467 n. 1.
Sê-Rân. See Sê-Lân, river.
'Sea of Sands,' the, 109.
Sea-passages, ancient, 47.
Sea routes, old, 47, 78, 79, 88, 93; of the Arab navigators, 290; from Takôla to Kattigara, 221, 222; false theories regarding the Arab, 252 n.; from India to China, 476, 475 n. 2, 606, 606 n. 4, 607; Arab and Persian, across the Bay of Bengal, 679; of Marco Polo, 682 n. 2; from Su-mên-ta-la to Ceylon, 692; from China to Java, 715-15; through Api Passage, 715 n. 1; from China to the Straits, in Ptolemy's time, 721; between the Anambas and Natunas, 722-3.
Seaports, ancient, 47, 60, 86, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 106, 107, 112, 115.
Seas, mythical, 136.
Sebangka, island, 501 n. 2.
Sebrand, east coast of Sumatra, 641.
Secondary stations, Ptolemae, 17.
Sedon. See Sandoway, city.
Sedu, cape, identification of, 656.
Segaro, Pulo, 816.
Sebi, district, on Si-Berût, 446.
Sein, state, other designations of, 62; identified with the Arisabion of Ptolemy, 62, 63; term applied to the territory about Shenbo, 62; Old Pagan probably destroyed by people from, 62; established by Thai invaders, 63; founded by the Æi-Lâu, 117, 127.
Sek. See Sak, the, people.
Sekab, the, people, description of, 503 n. 1; connected with the Fenjab, 503 n. 1; alleged descendants of the Bajau, 503 n. 1; other designations of, 817; possibly connected with Sêng-chih, 817.
Selama, Seluma. See Seruma, island.
Selâmît. See Shelâhet, island.
Selampura, 834.
Selan, river and district, location of, 626.
Selângor, district, probably the Sahana of Ptolemy, 100, 101; ivory and lignum aloes exported from, 478 n.; also designated Negri Kulang, 758; possibly connected with Ku-la, 817.
Selat Sea, 672 n. *; derivative of the Celates, 80; other designations of, 80, 91, 165, 248, 664.
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Selat Tebrau. See Singapore Strait, Old.
Selensing, description of ancient gold-mines at, 477 n. 1; race of the ancient miners at, unknown, 477 n. 1.
Selung, the, people, 262; remnants of the Sâbaras, 258; population of the Mergui Archipelago, 274.
Semang, the, people, 255; face-tattooing among, 367 n. 3; of Pêrak, 657 n. 1; probable cannibalism of, 661 n.; identified with the Bîla, 786.
Semang-ujong. See Semujong, district.
Sêmanthínoi, the, people, connected with the Hsie-man, 376.
Sêmanthinos, mountains, the source of Ptolemy's Sêros, 376, 376; connected with the Shih-wan Shan, 376.
Sembah, mart, connected with Sabana, 100.
Sembah River, an affluent of the Bernam, 758.
Semburâni, a mythical horse, 600 n. 3.
Sembilam, island, 518, 538.
Semesera, city, on Illa Iana, 647; identification of, 647.
Semestra, 834.
Sempong, hamlet, location of, 758.
Semujong, district, a designation of Sungel Ujong, 816.
Sen-oï, language of the Ch'hieng, 159 n. 2.
Sen-oï, the people, 159 n. 2; nothing known of the origin of, 349 n. 1.
Sên-wî, 122; the Shan State of, 142, 142 n. 1.
Senang, Pulo, connected with Ch'ang-yau Island, 815; also called Barn Island, 815.
Sencaza, harbour, its identity with Syangka suggested, 608 n.
Sender-fûlât, island, location of, 248 n.; dangerous navigation at, 248 n., 782; possibly identical with Hâiman, 248 n., 250, 252 n.; derivation of the name, 250 n. 1; cannot be identified with Pulo Condore, 250 n. 1; its identification discussed, 250 n. 1; identification discussed, 250 n. 1; possibly the shipping port for Sinda, 346; connected with Sundara-pura, 782; other designations of, 784, 785.
Sêneß, Gâneß, port, identified with Thâ-ni, 238, 249; a harbour for Arab ships, 238; connected with Hsin-chou, 241, 242, 249; exportation of eagle-wood from, 242; inhabitants of, 242; the identification of the terms Campâ and, improbably, 243, 243 n. 3.
Sênf, Sênf, Sea of, corresponds to the Gulf of Tonkin, 165; identical with the Ghyta Sea, 237; other designations of, 237, 238, 239, 240; identified with Thê-nâi harbour, 238; erroneously identified with Touron harbour, 238; volcanoes in the, 672; connected with Ptolemy's Green Sea, 673.
Sêng-ch'i Ch'êng, city, location of, 178 n. 1.
Sêng-chia-lie-yü-lan, king of Sang-fo-ch'i, 629.
Sêng-chih, district, 816; suggested identity with Ko-ko-sêng-chih, 817; identification of, discussed, 817.
Sêng-chih slaves, 620, 817; presents of, 506, 506 n. 2, 547; the meaning of the term discussed, 506 n. 2, 818; dancing-girls, 818.
Sêng-chih Nu, a name for Sêng-chih slaves, 817.
Sêng-chi. See Chenchih, district.
Sêpong, a hill and river, 758.
Sequera, Diego Lopez de, calls at Pacem, 653; letter written to, 653.
Sêr-rui. See Hsien-lin, kingdom.
Sêr Metropolis, 21; identified with Lo-yang, 16, 16; Ptolemy's reliable data concerning, 17; a fundamental station of Ptolemy, 19; site of, corresponds to Lo-yang, 738.
Seraga, island, probably identical with Sârâsan, 714.
Serang, district, identified with Shêng-teng, 817.
Serendib, island, a designation of Ceylon, 422, 700; a rendering of Tabadiû, 465.
Sêres, land of the. See Sêrike, district.
Sêrika, Sêrike, district, erroneously connected with the Peguan coast, 2; identified with Pusakara, 249.
Sêrîra. See Sarîra, island.
Sêrirah, bay, description of, 564, 573; the houses of, 564.
Sêtô, river, its identification with the Hsi-yü discussed, 372, 374, 377; source of, 375, 376; derivation of the name, 735.
Sêrâp, worship, 146 n., 340.
Serpentine-mines, 522 n. 2.
Seruma, island, discussion of the term, 394 n. 1, 409; the Nagarîpa Island, 409, 410, 413, 414, 415; later extended application of the name, 410; names connected with, 414, 417.
Serutu, island, connected with Shih-ch'eh-tes, 712; location of, 712.
Settlements, Phoenician, 596, 699 n., 828; Arabian and Persian, 679.
Sevâla, Sivâla. See Zibala, island.
Seven Kings, the, conquer Râmañindaesa, 74 n. 3; their identity discussed, 74 n. 3.
Seven Seas of India and Further India, table of identifications of the, 723, 726.
Sha Chê-han. See Shâh Jehân.
Sha-ma. See Puntis, the, people.
Sha-uu-p'î, island, identified with Swobi, 710.
Sha-wu-p'î. See Swobi, island.
Shâh Jehân, 703; son of Muhammad Shâh, 695; a descendant of Johan Shâh, 695; Islamism introduced into Acheh by, 665 n.
Shaher-al-Nawi, king of Siâm, 645; identification of, 645.
Shamratrah, a form of Sumatra, 653; letter from the lord of, 653.
Shams-ud-din, also called Chanszting, 822.
Shan, district, 60.
Shân, the, race, 31, 68, 120 n. 1, 121 n. 1, 127, 128 n. 1; probably driven by Chinese into Yunnan, 63; the State of Sein established by the, 62, 63; origin of the name, 70; Pegu subject to, 74; derivation of the name, 186, 187.
Shân, meaning of the term, 588 n. 1.
Shan Ch'ai, the, people, 774.
Shan-jên, the, people, designation of the Lang-ping, 273 n. 1.
Shan-po. See Chan-po, state.
Shandu, the, people, 84.
Shang-ching, 785; a well-known seaport, 261 n.
Shang-lu. See Hsi-ho.
Shang-yuan, district, name of part of Chan-ch'êng, 280 n. 2.
Sharbühah, island, 571.
Shê-ri, river, 797; identification of, 781.
Shê-lung, island, a designation of Sarasâsn, 714.
Shê-lung Shan, Eastern, island, connected with Tung Shê-lung, 710.
Shê-p'o, state, 58, 272 n. 1, 463 n. 1, 467 n. 1, 543; a name applied to Upper Burma, 55; one of the eighteen kingdoms once tributary to Pino, 56; a form of the term Java, 464; other designations of, 466, 467, 468, 504, 516, 517, 526, 541, 542, 544; identified with Ha-lak, 468; identification of, 468, 472, 516, 517, 526, 544, 545; incidents connected with, 468, 469; discrepancies in accounts of, 469 n. 3; location of, 470, 471, 472, 510, 511, 516, 517, 521, 525; productions of, 476, 477; traded with Canton, 515 n. 1; identified with the Malay Peninsula, 516, 517; limits of, 516; also designated Ho-ling, 526, 544; the last mention of, 540; not connected with the Island of Java, 540, 540 n. 2; visited by Guvavarman, 541; an embassy sent to China by, 542; Ho-lo-tan located in, 542; Tonkin plundered by the people of, 544, 545 n. 1; defeated by Chinese troops, 544; temple destroyed by the people of, 545; Sun-foo-ch'i invaded by, 622.
Shê-p'o, other representations of the name, 461 n. 1; the three kingdoms of, 466-8, 469, 472; other designations of, 468; noted for tortoise-shell, 671 n.
Shê-p'o (i.e. Sumatra), pepper producing districts, 540 n. 1; history of, 547-9; trade between Canton and, 547; Sun-foo-ch'i invaded by, 547; embassy sent to China by, 547; investiture conferred on the ruler of, 548; king of, 549; other designations of, 549.
Shê-p'o, city, capital of Ho-ling, 472; probably identical with the Ha-lak Shê-p'o, 472; a capital city, 504; connected with the Jâwah, 553.
Shê-p'o, the island of Java, 480 n. 1.
Shê-p'o Chou, capital of Ho-lo-tan, 469 n. 3.
Shê-p'o-kuo. See Tu-p'o-kuo, kingdom.
Shê-p'o-Pro.ta. See Shê-p'o-ta.
Shê-p'0-ta, 469; a form of the term Java, 463, 463 n. 1; connected with Labadiu, 465, 542, 543; the name discussed, 465; other designations of, 542, 543.
Shelâhet, island, description of, 550, 554; productions of, 550, 550 n. 1, 551; the island of the Jâbâf of, 550, 551; a volcano on, 551, 552; identification of, 552, 589; curious man-like animals on, 554, 554 n. 2.
Shelâhet, a designation of Malacca Strait, 552.
Shelâhet, Shelâheth, sea, 663 n. 2, 664; identical with the Lohita Sea, 80, 91, 248.
Shén. See T'an, Sein, states.
Shen State, the, Bhamo, the chief city.
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of, 61, 62; Yung Yu-tian, the king of, 62; probably a Shan kingdom, 62; origin of, 62; identical with the country round Bhāmō, 370. Shin invasion, the, 370. Shin-fu, seaport, 800. Shen-k'ung Chiang, river, a designation of the Mō-Khōng, 135 n. 1, 286 n. 1; explanation of the name, 286 n. 1.

Shen-nung, fabulous Chinese emperor, 337, 781, 782. Shen-si, district, 15.

Shen-t'ou, Shen-tu. See Sinda, town. Shen-wan, seaport, 527 n. 4, 800; an important seaport, 256 n. 1.

Shenbo, city, identified with the Arisabion of Ptolemy, 61, 63, 734, 829; probably the chief city of the Shen state, 62; position of, corresponds to Arian, 63; foundation of, 745.

Shēng-téng, islet, 816; identified with Serdang, 817.

Shields, carried by the Brev, description of the, 771.

Shignān, river, a tributary of the Oxus, 741.

Shih-ch'ēng, district, 782.

Shih-ch'iang, tsz, island, identified with Serutu, 712.

Shih Huang-ti, the pretended founder of Lin-i, 230.

Shih-Lang, the, tribe, 272 n. 4.

Shih-li Ch'a-ta-lo, district, identical with Prome, 113.


Shih-li Fo-shih, a designation of Palembang, 429, 927, 566; location of, discussed, 481, 482, 483; fourteen cities and two states in, 482; identified with Sumatra, 483; other designations of, 611, 619; origin and meaning of the name, 613, 614; names connected with, 613, 614; disappearance of the name, 614; capital of, 619; trade of, 619; gold abundant in, 619; dependencies of, 619.

Shih-li P'o-ta T'o-a-lo-pa-mo, king, 470, 470 n. 1.

Shih-li Tien-hwa, king of San-fo-ch'i', 623.

Shih-li U-ya, king of San-fo-ch'i, 622; other names attributed to, 622.

Shih-nai. See Thi-nai, port.

Shih-p'o-lo-na-lin-t'o, king, 662 n. 1.

Shih-wan Shan, mountains, location of, 376; connected with Ptolemy's Sēmanthinos, 376.

Shi Wan-sui, commander-in-chief of Chinese forces, 125.

Shillong, identified with Alosanga, 830, 832.

Shinnio Taka-oka, prince of Japan, 525 n. 1.

Shom-ben, the, tribe, 806; of the Andamān - Nikobārs, 389 n. 4, 396 n. 2.

Shōng-ts'ym. See Shwang-chien, the, tribe.

Shu, state, annihilated by the Ts'in, 320 n. 1.

Shu-chiang, river, the Sōbanas of Ptolemy, 192; a designation of the Kap'hōng Sōm, 192.

Shu-po. See Chu-po, the, people.

Shu-po. See Chu-po, kingdom.

Shun-ta, state, identification of, 451 n. 1; a designation of Chao-va, 451 n. 1.

Shunning-Fu, 792.

Shona, term applied to the Chinese, 131 n. 2.

Shwang-chien, the, tribe, the clothing of, 246 n.

Shwē Dagon Pagoda, at Rangoon, 46; the origin of the, 76; legend connected with the, 77.

Shwē-thandaw pagoda, the, 72; by whom built, 72.

Shwē-va, city, a designation of Ava, 56.

Shwēgyin, district, 85.

Shwe-Chau-lā, explanation of the term, 342 n. 1.

Shwe-šē, suggested explanation of the term, 342 n. 1.

Shweĩ, valley and river, identified with Nam Mâu, 63, 467 n. 1.

Si-berūt, Si-biru, island, identified with Ptolemy's Sabadeibai, 406; off the coast of Sumatra, 419; inhabited by the Mantawi, 448.

Si-Boga, city and district, location of, 554 n. 2.

Si-Jāwī-jāwī, settlement, 517 n. 2.

Si-Kabau. See Si-Porah, island.

Si-Malandan, a bay on Si-Malur, 422.

Si-Malur, islands, connected with the Manoiolai, 421; possibly included in Ptolemy's Barusat, 446; incorrectly designated Pulo Babi, 446.

Si-niu, river, 15.

Si-pan, river, an affluent of the Mē-Yom, 143.

Si-Pāsei, the alleged name of a dog after whom Pāsei was named, 613 n. 1.

Si-pol, town, doubtful connection with
Lasippa, 142, 767; other designations of, 766, 766 n. 1, 767; location of, 767.
Si-porah, island, inhabited by the Mantawi, 448; probably included in Ptolemy's Sindai, 449.
Si-shê-li, city, 471.
Si-you. See Hsi-yü, river.
Si-po, the, people, 765; of Fu-chou, 151 n. 2.
Siak, district, wild hairy tribes of, 656 n. 2, 657 n. 1, 686, 687, 817; possibly the district of the Sêng-chih slaves, 817.
Siâm, kingdom, 8, 34, 73, 83, 84 n. 2, 103, 116, 122, 129, 131; early history of, 1, 70, 94, 101; Sýama-raštā, a designation of Lower, 55; included in Fu-nan, 93; the southwest, of, identical with P'ân-p'an, 106, 113; Pâli MS. chronicle of Lamp'hūn discovered in, 107; inscriptions and chronicles in, 109, 114, 151; Ligor subject to, 111 n. 1; other designations of, 113, 123; Ptolemy's country of the Doânai identified with Lower, 149; the region of the Léstai included Southern, 156; south coasts of, noted for piracy, 156; Sâka-dvīpa identical with Kamboja and, 164, 165, 169; palm trees abound in, 165; the Samarâdi of Ptolemy, 170; meaning and derivation of the name, 170, 174, 178; three principal states included in, 176; threw off their subjection to Kamboja, 176; the oldest city of Southern, 190; camphor produced in, 438 n. 1; other designations of, 469 n. 3, 532, 574 n. 3, 742; the Palatine Law of, 531; states tributary to, 532; method of writing royal letters of state from, 532, 532 n. 2; Sukkhvat of the capital of, 532; king of, repelled the C'hawâ, 548, 821; Pâsai captured by the king of, 645; complaints made to China against, 650; suzerainty over Pâsai claimed by, 650; language of the hill tribes of Northern, 687; British treaty with, 756; sources of information respecting, 774; Kamboja laid waste by, 789. See also Siama, kingdom.
Siâm, city, a designation of Ayuthia, 187; identified with Sri Vijaya-râjadâñi, 188.
Siâm, Gulf of, 8, 22, 79, 85, 94, 99, 101, 113, 156, 157, 160; Ptolemy's geography of the, 6, 7; Ptolemy's error in the coast of the, 23, 24, 81, 188; the Léstai of Ptolemy, 81; ancient name of the, 102, 110; connected with Ch'îh Hai, 248; identified with the Perimulik Gulf, 761.
Siâmese, the, origin of the name, 70; description of, 170, 171; camphor made by, 435 n. 3; fleets of, proceeded along the Mé-Kông, 775.
Siâmese records and monuments, 107, 108, 151.
Siâmese tones, 226 n. 1.
Siâm-Burmese wars, trade stopped by, 94.
Siântan Group, islands, a designation of the Great Anambas, 722.
Siâtan, Siântan, island, 708; also transcribed Hsi-tung, 709; also designated Terampah, 715; included in Ptolemy's Satyrôn, 722; good anchorage at, 722; one of the Anambas, 707, 707 n. 2, 715; conquered by the Javanese, 707.
Sib-sông P-hân-nâ Lôu, townships, 138, 139 n.
Siba, district, 154.
Sidábûlât. See Sênder-fûlât, island.
Sidántara, town, identical with Mùâng-Không, 136; cannot be connected with Sî-p-hân-dôn, 137.
Sidántara, Sidántara-sâgara, river, name applied to the Mé-Không, 136.
Siem. See Hsiien, state.
Siem-kwok, kingdom, a designation of Siâm, 532.
Siem-lo, kingdom, a designation of Siâm, 181; capital of, at Ayuthia, 184.
Siêu-lwâî, district, formerly called Din-lou, 323.
Siguîjor. See Sikijor, state.
Siha, district, 589 n.
Sibhîm statue of Buddha, the, 136.
Sika. See Sekah, the, people.
Sikijor, state, probably identical with Ch'u-jî, 247 n.
Silagiri. See Kyauk-taw, hill.
Silam, Illâ de, a designation of Ceylon, 894.
Silan River, 626.
Silhet, district, 32, 33, 53; part of Ptolemy's Kirrhadia, 51; identification of, 52. See also Silhet.
Silk, from Acheh, 706; manufactured by the Zabungs, 745.
Silk-cotton trees, abundant in the Malay Peninsula, 80.
Silkworms, the breeding of, 51, 52, 53, 745.
Silva, Dom João da, Spanish governor of Manilla, 534 n. 1.

Silver, 98, 476, 477 n. 1, 502; of Argyrē, 37, 706; terms designating, 39, 97, 97 n. 1; imported into Arakan, 43 n. 1; legend of the silver city of Tripura, 45 n. 2; plentiful in Khrysē, 670 n. 1.

Silver Island, 670 n. 1; a designation of Argyrē, 671 n.; probably Arakan, 671 n.

Silver-mines, 424 n. 2, 671 n., 740, 741; of Arakan, 37, 39 n. 1, 40 n. 3, 51, 424; in the Tenasserim district, 164 n. 1; near Kalah and Serira, 562; in Sumatra, 562 n. 2, 647, 659 n. 2; in Balûs Island, 659 n. 2; in Burma, 740.

Silver Sand, River of. See Râjatavâluka, river.

Silver ware manufactures, 627, 628.

Silver wares, 628.

Sim, kingdom, 774.

Simā. See Hsi-mo, queen.

Simā-devi, queen of North Tavoy, 506; probably identical with Queen Hsi-mo, 506, 544.

Simhā-pura, city, tradition regarding, 423 n. 1; a designation of Singapore, 423 n. 1; foundation of, 423 n. 1; connected with Singhanagara, 508 n.

Simhā-rāja, Simhā-rājā, founder of Sathôm, 76.

Simhala, king of Ceylon, saved from shipwreck by Kwan-yin, 600.

Simübla, 'a beautiful lamp-fire.' See Diamond Island.

Simmudu, kingdom, a designation of Ceylon, 643 n. 2.

Sinnula, 49; mart and headland, 48; identified with Chaul, 48.

Sin. See Sein, state.

Sin-liâo Fu, a seaport, 251 n.

Sinai, kingdom, connected with the Malay Peninsula, 2; Ptolemy's coast of, 26; identified with Kraunea, 249; districts included in Ptolemy's, 377.

Sinai, the, people, inhabitants of China north of the Yang-tzê, 377.

Sinai, Gulf of, the Formosan Channel, 255.

Sinhuyûin, king of Burma, 65 n. 3; tribute sent to, 538.

Sinda, town, other designations of, 334, 800; identified with Sûn-tōi, 251 n., 264, 335, 348; location of, 335, 801; connected with Sind, 338, 801; Senderfulat the shipping port of, 346; connected with the Sûn-tōi tribes, 347; a chief city and mart, 348, 801; derivation of the name discussed, 349, 735; connected with other place-names, 799, 800; latitude of, discussed, 800; a seaport, 801.

Sinda, Islands of, identical with Ptolemy's Sindai, 450.

Sinda, Sunda, a district of Sumatra, 590.

Sindai, islands, 687; corresponds to part of the Mantawi Islands, 449; the name discussed, 449, 450; names of islands constituting the, 449; identified with the islands of Sinda, 456; country included under the name of, 458.

Sindang, name applied to a village and tributary, 450.

Sindh, Sindhu, state, 41 n.; connected with Sinda, 334, 338; a derivation of Sindai, 450; identified with Hsin-t'ou, 450 n. 2.

Sindhabas, Sindhus, the, people, 347.

Sindhu. See Indus, river.

Sindhu-sangama, 346, 347.

Sindhu-sauvira, the, people, identification of, 802.

Sindi. See Indoi, the, people.

Sindoi, the, people, correspond to the Sûn-tōi, 356; races connected with the, 356.

Sing, Mûang, 133; a division of the Chiang Kung kingdom, 139 n.

Sing-Sing, apex of Chinese legendary folk-lore, 788.

Singapore, state and town, known also as Hai-li, 199 n. 4; identity with Kattigara suggested, 303 n. 1; other designations of, 498, 498 n. 3, 559, 775, 775, 815, 821; probably identical with To-mo-ch'ang, 498, 499, 499 n. 2; connected with Singhanagara, 508 n.; foundation of, 548 n. 2, 809; an emporium for tortoise-shell, 671 n.; not connected with Ch'iang-yûn Island, 815.

Singapore Strait, 94; discovery of the, 534 n. 1; the velocity of currents through, 537 n. 2; also designated Chih Strait, 814, 815, 820.

Singapore Strait, Old, 534, 575; description of, 534 n. 1.

Singhanagara, town, identification of, 508 n.

Singkep, island, connected with Panch-pa, 500, 501 n. 1, 504; extensive and populous, 501 n. 2; identification of, 617.

Singkhôn, Mûang, village, near the Khâu Môn pass, 753.
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Singora, Sea of, 751; the term Thalé Sab applied to, 771.
Singora, town, 78, 470 n. 1; proposed railway between Kedah and, 79; formerly an important seaport, 106, 107.
Singp'hões. See Kachins, the, people.
Singu Min, king, a Burmese inscription of, 538.
Singuttara. See Śrāga, hill.
Singuttara-cti, the original of the Shwē Dagon pagoda, 76.
Sīnhabāhu, king of Kalinga, 76 n. 1; founder of Śīnhabāha-pura, 76 n. 1.
Sīnhabāha-pura, town, connected with Saddhamma-nagara, 76; founded by Sīnhabāha-rājā, 76; the old capital Kalinga, 76, 76 n. 1; a Cham citadel, 791.
Sīnhabāha-rājā, a prince, founder of Sīnhabāha-pura, 76.
Sinkel, district, camphor found in, 437 n.; conquest of, 706.
Śīkbon, pass, a designation of the Khān Māś pass, 753.
Sinologists, work done, and errors made by, 608 n. 1.
Śīpou-kay, Wieng. See Wieng Śīpou-kay, township.
Śrānu, country, sent tribute to Java, 581 n. 3.
Śrātha, kingdom, identical with Sylhet, 813; other designations of, 813.
Śirhasan. See Sarasan, island.
Śīr-ratṭha, town, a designation of Serirah, 621; connected with Śīpoub, 767.
Śūrālā. See Rizala, city.
Śūrāsavathu, Surivatha, city, connected with Rizala or Sputana, 381 n.
Śūsumāra. See Sūsumār, island.
Śithandūn, the mythical sea around Meru, 136 n. 2.
Śittang, river, 41 n., 52, 65.
Śiva, 29; temple of, at Pāṇḍurāṅga, burnt, 545; dedication and location of the temple of, 545; temple of, rebuilt, 545; also designated Śaṁbhū, 615; known also as Īśvara, 789.
Śiva, Hill of. See Īsāna, mountain.
Śivi-rāṣṭra. See Śęu-wéi, state.
Skulls, human, used as currency, 652.
Slaves, employed for menial work, 494 n.; sent as presents, 506, 506 n. 2; traffic in, 509 n.
Snake, 145; guarding a sacred relic, 390.
*Snake, Essence of the, term designating the king of the San-fo-ch’i, 566 n.
Snakes, a city deserted on account of, 431 n. 3.
Snakes, Isle of. See Ahī-dipa, island.
So. See Sak, the, people.
So-tu-mān, island, a designation of the Nikobārs, 385, 396 n. 2, 413; description of the inhabitants of, 385; legend respecting, 385; derivation of the name, 396 n. 2; the largest of the Tīlān-chōng Islands, 413, 414; probable identification of, 413; the name discussed, 413, 414, 416, 417, 418; connected with Deoban, 414; alternative renderings of the name, 414; connected with Ptolemy’s Agathódaimonos, 416.
Sōhanas, Sōhanos, river, probably identical with the Kap’hōng Sōm, 191, 192; possible designations of, 192; identity with the Kampôtel criticized, 192; identification with the Sup’ch’uun untenable, 192; derivation of the name, 734, 744.
Sodra. See Chitrag, river.
Sofala, camphor from, 439 n.*
Sō, Mūang, an ancient Lawā city, 143.
Sō-rāp, estuary, 215.
Solana, identified with Hái-ho, 15.
Solomon, Phenicians trading for, came to South India, 597 n. 1.
Soma. See Kap’hōng Sōm, river.
Sombbrero Channel, location of, 689.
Sombbrero Islands, erroneously connected with Mau Shan, 689, 690 n. 1; identified with Chauri Island, 689; origin of the name, 689, 689; the middle Andāmāns, 806; other designations of, 809.
Somercara. See Sombbrero Islands.
So’n-tāy. See Sōn-tōi, town.
Sōn-thāi, Sōn-thāi Trōu, district, a designation of Thān-hwā, 346 n. 1.
Sōn-tōi, the, hillmen, 344 n. 1; chief of, residing on the Bā-ví Mountain, 344; the chief of the Mountainers, 344; mythical impersonation of mountain tribes, 344, 344 n. 2; derivation of the term discussed, 347, 349.
Sōn-tōi, river, 346.
Sōn-tōi, town and district, the Sinda of Ptolemy, 251 n., 264, 335, 348; meaning of the name, 334 n. 3; territories embraced by, 334 n. 3; the chief trading centre of the Sōn-tōi near, 345; victorious over the Thwē-tōi, 346; derivation of the term discussed, 347; other designations of, 336, 340.
Śōn-parvata, territory, connected with Ch’iung-shan, 250 n. 1.
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Souargon, town, 53; riverine port of Bengal, 400 n. 2.
Souathera, first Buddhist missionary to Burmah, 65 n. 2.
Sondur, island, connected with Sundar-
fālāt, 724.
Song, term denoting hands of the Ch'ong, 157.
Song-bo, river, identified with the Black River, 125.
Sóng Chú, river, 801.
Song Dài, branch of the Red River, 251 n.
Song-giāng, river, 781.
Sông-jăng, river, 794.
Song-kā, river, 781; valley of the, occupied by the Ts'wan, 125.
Song-kā route from Northern India to Tonkin, 235.
Song-khon, a Lâu province, 803.
Song-kōi, river, identified with the Red River, 125, 315; a designation of the Dōrias, 313.
Song-Lu. See Clear River.
Sông Mai, river, identified with the Lu-jung, 796.
Sông Mi-tho. See Mi-tho River.
Sông Voi, river, possibly the Hsiang Shwei, 793.
Songkhā, district, other designations of, 532 n. 1; tributary to Siām, 532 n. 1.
Songpāraṇa. See Suvaṇṇapāraṇa, district.
Sopheir, 745.
Soccerers, the 'Fire King,' 801, 802; the 'Water King,' 801, 802.
Sousa, Afonso de, expedition sent to the Island of Gold by, 807.
South Cape, other designations of, 104, 476, 476 n. 1, 759.
South Chinese races, 129, 131 n. 2.
Savira, country or port, 92.
Spatana, city, connected with Sirisa-
vatthu, 381 n.
Spices Islands, noted for tortoise-shell, 671 n.
Spices produced in the Moluccas, 812.
Spices, Island of, 555; connected with the Bendas and Moluccas, 555.
Spinels, 741.
Spirit worship, 146 n.
Spring, a, which turns gravel, etc., into gold, 390, 391.
Springs, 485 n. 2.
Squat-bodied races, 64.
Squirrel used as food, 358 n. 2.
Sravana. See Samana Gotama.
Srī Alaṃ, Sūltān, king of Acheh, 704; ex-king of Priāmaṇ, 704.
Srī Bala-varman, king, 543.
Srī-Bani, Srī-Banōi, city, identification of, 229, 779; the capital of Campā, 563 n. 3, 778; destruction of, 563 n. 3; Dong-hōi on the site of, 779.
Srī-Bhoja, town and kingdom, a designation of Palembang, 59, 429, 560, 566, 615, 619; other designations of, 429, 566, 577, 580, 584, 611, 640 n. 1, 700; an ancient toponymic, 584; the capital of Zābej, 611; places connected with the name of, 611; origin of the name, 611, 612; the name discussed, 619; mention of, omitted by some historians, 629; Jambh probably the early capital of, 632; the term, cannot be connected with Zābej, 653; connection between the Andāmans and, 640 n. 1.
Srī Dharmarāja. See Ligor, kingdom and city.
Srī Dharmāsoka, king of Magudha, 123; wrecked, 108; the Min-chia claim descent from, 123.
Srī-Huta-halīdana, identical with Srī-Nātakalah, 579, 580; king of San-
to-ch'i, 580; the Mahārāja of Zābej, 580.
Srī Jaya Paramēśvara-varman II, a Chām king, 275.
Srī-Kṣetra, city, ancient name of Old Prom, 66; other designations of, 113.
Srī-Johit. See Selat Sea.
Srī-Nātakalah, king of Zābej, 578, 579, 580, 621; other forms of the name, 578, 579, 621; death of, 579.
Srī-pāda, term denoting a holy foot-
print, 115.
Srī Pādu-dvāra-varman, king, 542.
Srī Pāla-arendra, king, 602 n. 1.
Srī Pulung-varman, king, 543, 543 n. 1.
Srī Rajendra Cola. See Rajendradera.
Srī Rāma, Srī Rāma Vikrama, king of Mūl-Jawah, 548, 548 n. 2; reigned on Singapore Island, 548 n. 2.
Srī Rāma, Lake of, name of an inland lake, 684 n. 1.
Srī Sattanāgahuta, city, 149 n. 1; a name given to Lūang Phraḩ Bāng, 146, 151; derivation and meaning of the name, 146 n.
Srī Tribhuvana, founder of Singapore, 548 n. 2.
Srī Vijaya Rājadhānī, town, other designations of, 24; the Samarādē of Ptolemy, 24, 188, 190; ancient capital of Lower Siām, 24; name
applied to Lower Siam, 55; a chief town of Siam, 176; probably Syama- kut, 177; description of the remains of, 188; ancient situation of, 189, 190; causes of its decay, 190; the oldest city of Southern Siam, 190; connected with Vijaya, 190, 569 n.
Srāga, meaning of the term, 77.
Srāga, hill, 77; the derivative of Besyoga, 75, 76; an ancient shrine on the, 76.
Śrūtavarman, king, instituted worship of Brahmanic deities in Kamboja, 204.
Stalactite caves, 485.
Statues, legend respecting two brass, at Fo-lo-an, 599; identification of, at Fo-lo-an, 599, 600; in Sumatra, 601.
Sti'en, Stieng, the, people, litholatry among, 120 n. (3); a semi-barbarous tribe, 159; connected with the Lestai, 159, 160; the probable origin of, 160, 163.
Sto-kong, island, the northernmost of the Natunas, 710; location of, 710.
Stone Age, relics of a, found, 254 n. 1.
Stone implements discovered, 219.
'Stone Tower,' the, of Ptolemy, 20, 21; identified with Lythinos Pyrgos, 17, 18; a fundamental station of Ptolemy, 18; erroneous identification of, 19; distance of, from Sera Métropolis, 19.
StraitS, Sea of the. See Selat Sea.
'Striped-face Pu.' See Pu, the, people.
Stüng-trêng, city and district, 136.
Stūp[a, a, on the sands of Majerika, 108; of P'hrah Prathom, 109.
Su-kan-la, the fisherman king, 650; attacked the Chinese, but was defeated, 650, 651; condemned to death, 651.
Sū-mén-na, Sū-mén-ta-na, state, a form of Sumatra, 644.
Sū-mén-ta-la, state, a designation of Sumatra, 425, 581 n. 3, 648, 678; ambergris sent from, 581 n. 3; the fisher-king of, 645, 650; the ruler of, designated king, 648, 649; the ruler of, summoned to China, 649; death of the king of, 649; a fisherman married the queen of, 649; tribute sent annually to China, 650; revolutions in, 650, 655; Chinese fleet at, 650, 651; crimes of the slave-king of, 655; name of, changed to A-ch'i, 655; identification of, 679 n. 1; a state of North Sumatra, 682.
Su-mu-ta, Su-mu-tu-la, state, forms of Sumatra, 642 n. 2, 644; allegiance of, to China renewed, 645.
Sukan. See Suparna.
Sūbī, Suvobi. See Swobi, island.
Subidence, supposed, of the Lemurian continent, 669.
Subterranean passage, river said to pass through, 137, 137 n. 1.
Sudama, Sulama. See Seruma, island.
Sudarsana, lake, 164.
Suddhohana, 491; father of Gotama Buddha, 491 n. 3.
Suddhaman. See So-tu-man, island.
Suddhamapura, district, identification of, 748.
Sugar, 486 n. 2.
Sugata, temple of, the erection of the, 746.
Sugriva, reigned at Kiskindhāya, 785.
Sui Annals, 491.
Sui dynasty of China, 112.
Sui-lam, Sulam. See Saliné, island.
Suk. See Sak, the people.
Sukādāna, district, identified with Su-chi-tan, 450 n. 2.
Sukhada. See Sukhōthai, kingdom.
Sukhodaya, king, 182 n. 1.
Sukhōthai, kingdom, Ligur subject to the kings of, 107; inscriptions, 107, 146 n. 1; connected with Ch'ih-4'yu, 155, 182, 182 n. 1, 469 n. 3, 497 n. 1, 742; capital of Siam, 176, 181, 182, 183, 184, 532; configuration of the city, 178 n. 1, 264, 798; Chinese envoys to Siam acquainted with, 179; identical with Sukhada, 179, 182 n. 1, 742; also designated Syama-padeśa, 774; identification of, 822.
Sukitan, district, connected with Su-chi-tan, 450 n. 2.
Sukladhānya-raja, prince of Magadha, 123.
Sukumāra, prince of Śaka-dvīpa, 167; district named after, 167.
Sulaiman, the Arab traveller, 204.
Sulaimān, an envoy for China, 644; mission entrusted to, 821.
Sulaimān (Solomon), the son of David, legendary tomb of, on the Great Andāmān, 387; pilgrimage made to the tomb of, 387.
Sulaman. See So-tu-mān, island.
Sulau. See Talang, volcano.
Sulphur, 477, 477 n. 1; yielded by Mount Nakur, 676 n.; collected by the Chinese, 676 n.
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Sulu, country, noted for tortoise-shell, 671 n.
Sâm háh, island, identification of, 574, 575; connected with Kyûmâ, 575.
Sumana-kûta, a designation of Adam’s Peak, 387.
Sumatra, city, foundation of, 642, 642 n. 1, 642 n. 2, 643.
Sumatra, state, 22, 89, 634 n. 1; difficulty of identifying Ptolemy’s islands off, 24, 25; Buddha’s visit to, 114, 664, 665 n.; former terrestrial connection with Pegu, 402 n.; connected with Ptolemy’s Agathodaimonos, 411, 419; other designations of, 425, 453, 483, 517 n. 2, 552, 554, 556, 568 n. 2, 594 n. 3, 634 n. 1, 642 n. 1, 643 n. 2, 651, 652, 654, 658, 670, 671, 675, 676, 809, 834; islands off the west coast of, 427 ff.; campor from, 437 n.; the best pepper produced at, 454 n. 1; list of the kingdoms of, 455 n. 1; Ptolemy’s limited knowledge of, 457; islands off the coast of, confused with the mainland, 457; name of Java applied to, 461 n. 1, 635; salt obtained at, 477 n. 1; sulphur obtained from, 477 n. 1; lignum aloes from, 478 n.; sapan-wood in, 478 n.; identical with Shih-li Fo-shih, 483; sixty-seven volcanoes on, 552, 553; identified with Zâbej, 580; Sarzaba the capital of, 580; the centre of the ambergris trade, 581 n. 3; Chinese tradition as to the limits of, 586; early lack of information concerning, 588; districts on, regarded as islands, 589 n.; districts of, mentioned by Ptolemy, 590; Ptolemy’s Iabadiâ corresponds to Northern, 593; ear-ornaments worn on, 594 n. 3; the alphabet in use on, 595; civilization of, 596-8, 598 n. 1; probably settled by Phœnician traders, 596; discussion of the various terms used to designate, 632-56; the Malays of, 636; history of, 639-56; table of names applied to, 639-42, 644-56; the application of the name to the whole island, 642, 642 n. 1; the origin and derivation of the name, 642, 642 n. 1, 643; marriage of the king of, 642 n. 2, 644; Chêng Ho’s third visit to, 651; the first Portuguese landing on, 653, 826; Achin the leading state of, 653; last mention of the state of, 655; settled by the Môkh-Khômr, 657; traditional connection of Ceylon and, 669, 681; possibly a colony of the Râkhasa empire, 669; geographical misapprehensions regarding, 677; hairy and tailed men of, 687; the introduction of Islamism into, 695, 696; names for, in the Catalan maps, 834.
Sumbawá, district, identified with Ch‘ung-ka-la, 520.
Sumbreiro Islands. See Sombrero Islands.
Sumoltra, state, a form of Sumatra, 646; tattooing at, 646, 646 n. 1; account of the people of, 679 n. 2.
Sumûsmûra. See Sûshâra, island.
Sûmûtra, state, a form of Sumatra, 645.
Sun-t‘a, a piratical state, 812; identical with Sunda, 812.
Sunanda Kumâra, Mûông Yong overthrown by, 119 n. 1; son of the Thai chief of Ch‘ieng Rung, 119 n. 1; murdered the Ch‘ieng chiefs, and mastered their country, 119 n. 1; prince of Yong, 139 n.
Sunâparanta. See Suvaññâparanta, district.
Sunda, island, location of, discussed, 452 n. 1, 453; expedition of Francisco de Sào to, 453 n. 1.
Sunda, kingdom, connected with Hisin-t‘o, 450 n. 2; account of, 452 n. 1; a piratical state, 812; location and area of, 812.
Sunda Archipelago, identified with Kusa-dvipa, 237.
Sunda Land, Sanscrit inscriptions found on, 610 n. 1.
Sunda Strait, 650, 672; route through the, probably unknown in Ptolemy’s time, 607, 608 n. 1.
Sundara-pra, possibly identical with Sender-fûlat, 782.
Sung dynasty of China, 106.
Sung-ka-la. See Ch‘ung-ka-la, district.
Sung-tung Sha, the fire-pit of, 782.
Sungei Asam Jawa, location of, 516 n. 3.
Sungei Baling, stream, 488 n. 1.
Sungei Cherating, river, 514 n. 2.
Sungei Jamur-mas, river, in Pêrak, 97.
Sungei Kling, an affluent of the Pêrak River, 488 n. 1.
Sungei Malâyû, river, 530 n. 4.
Sungei-mas, river, location of, 97, 756.
Sungei Thara, affluent of the Kinta River, 757.
Sungei Ujong, district, other designations of, 815.
Sungseg, river, connected with the Chia-kiang, 617 n. 2.
Sunkhâla, town, ancient name of Singora, 106, 519 n. 1.
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Supanā. See Suparnā.
Suparṇa, an epithet of Garuda, 775.
Suparṇā, river, in India, 775.
Sup'han, Sup'han-buri. See Bandhuma-pura, town.
Sura Sea. See Solat Sea.
Sūrān, Raja, of Bijnagar, Pérak taken by, 98.
Sūrasena, the, people, connected with Suratan, 53.
Surat, city, 92.
Suratan, Sūra-sthāna (?), district, probably identified with Sonargāon, 53; the name applied to Eastern Bengal, 53.
Surma, mountain, connected with the Sambra, 742.
Surmā, river, 33.
Susūmins, the, people, identity of, 674.
Sāsā, district, 676.
Susu-susu Bay, 448 n. 2.
Sūsāna, islet, possibly part of Maniolai, 421.
Suvaṇṇa-mālī, mountain, holy footprint on the, 116, 665 n.
Suvaṇṇabhumi, kingdom, 569 n.; connected with Khryes, 64; ancient name of Rāmāñña, 70; location and identification of, 671 n., 748, 761, 762; other designations of, 762.
Suvaṇṇaparanta, district, the hinterland of Rāmāñña-desa, 65; extent of, 65, 749; the name discussed, 748; list of districts in, 748.
Suvaṇṇa-dvīpa, island, the Malay Peninsula, 78; erroneously connected with Zābēj, 568, 568 n. 2; identification of, discussed, 568 n. 2, 672 n. *; gold and silver-mines in, 671 n.
Suvaṇṇa-mālī-dvīpa, district, connected with Malayā-dvīpa, 81.
Suvaṇṇa-purī. See Bandhuma-pura, town.
Suvaṇṇabhumi, city, identical with Sabara, 597 n. 1.
Suvaṇṇamālī-giri, mountain, 569 n.; Buddha's footprints on, 80; identified with Kāṭa-sālmai peak, 80.
Śvāl-thāp, province, a division of Kamboja, 216; derivation of the name, 216, 216 n. 1.
Śvarga-loka. See Sawankhalok, city.
Śvāmabhōja, kingdom, a variant of Bhoja, 615.
Swankhalok. See Sawankhalok, city.
Swing-festival at Ligor, 108.
Śwōbi, island, 714; a designation of one of the South Natunas, 707 n. 2; other designations of, 710.
Śyām. See Śrī Viṣaya Rājadhāni, town.
Śyāma, kingdom, 774; origin and application of the name, 178, 179, 180, 181, 183; the name not derived from Shan, 186, 187; the antiquity of, 190. See also Siām, kingdom.
Śyāma, mountain, identification of the, 177, 178.
Śyāma-kuta, kingdom, 773; location of, discussed, 176, 177, 178; probably Śrī Viṣaya, 177, 178; meaning of the word, 177.
Śyāma-padesa, kingdom, a designation of Sukhōthai, 774.
Śyāma-raṣṭra. See Śrī Viṣaya Rājadhāni, town.
Śyāmāka, the, people, 774.
Syangka, district, 507 n., 818; identification uncertain, 507 n., 508 n.
Śyātan, Śyāntan. See Śiātan, island.
Śyilhet, kingdom, connected with Ta-tsin Po-lo-men, 813; other designations of, 813. See also Silhet.
Symbols, insignia of royalty, 67, 151.
Śyilla, identification of, 731.
Synoptical tables. See Tables, synoptical.
Śyrīa, a designation of Ta-tsin, 60, 302.
Śyrīam, island, 72; origin of the name, 71; other designations of, 831.
Śz'chuen, Sz-ch'wan, district, 62 n. 4, 159; cave-dwellings of, 159, 772.
Śz-li Chu-lo-wu-ni Fu-ma-t'iau-hwa, king of San-fo-ch'i, 623.
Śz-li Ma-lo-p'i, king of San-fo-ch'i, 623; sends tribute to China, 623.

T

Ta-Chang Hai. See Chang Hai, Sea of.
Ta-hēn Shan Mountains, location of, 773; other designations of, 773.
Ta-ho, Tai-ho, state, the ancient Tali, 64, 64 n.
Ta-hwa-mien, the, people, connected with the Damins and Susūmins, 674, 674 n. 2.
Ta Kīn-sha, river, a designation of the Trāvatī, 792.
Ta-kī-uen, capital at Lông-bien re-established by, 799.
Ta-ku-ma, title of an envoy to China, 623 n. 2.
Ta-k'ūn-lun, kingdom, the Takūla of Ptolemy, 89, 90, 90 n., 110, 113, 755; location of, 755.
Ta K'ūn-lun, the, people, 90; habitat of, 755; king of, 755.
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Ta-la, title of an envoy to China, 523 n. 2.
Ta-li, state, 64, 121; the Tuan ruled over, 126 n. 3.
Ta-lu-man, village, anchorage at, 651; identification of, 651.
Ta-na-ssŭ-li, province, a form of Tenasserim, 783.
Ta-pan, state, 812; identification of, 450, 450 n. 2; good pepper procured from, 450 n. 2.
Ta Shê-p'o, state, 658; a designation of Malacca, 508; identification of, considered, 522; other designations of, 522, 812; possibly connected with Sabah and Sabana, 522.
Ta-shih, kingdom, a designation of Achêb, 511; 511 n. 2, 597 n. 1, 699; other designations of, 511 n. 2; the barbarians of, traded with Canton, 515 n. 1; connected with Tarshish, 597 n. 1; the name discussed, 678, 680, 681; probably an old Arab and Persian settlement, 679; connected with Su-mên-ta-la, 679 n. 1; identical with Argyre, 681; Queen Sima feared by the king of, 699; a Kun-lun slave sent to China by, 700; location of, 700.
Ta-tan River, location of, 824.
Ta-Ti, a Wu emperor at Nan-king, 299; tribute received by, 299.
Ta-ts'in, country, trade relations of, with the Ai-Lao, 60; curiosities of, sent to China, 60; identified with Syria, 302; embassy of, 313.
Ta-ts'in P'o-lo-mên, state, location of, 813; identified with Sylhet, 813.
Ta-wai, Ta-wi, district, may be identical with Alavi, 57.
Ta-Yaw, river and village, 741.
Ta-yuan, river, the Cháam defeated at the, 781.
Tabiyan, island, a designation of Kelong, 715, 722.
Table, of comparison of the names for camphor, 442, 443; of the various designations of the Malays of Sumatra, 636; of identifications of the Seven Seas of India and Further India, 725, 726.
Table Rock, 683.
Tables, synoptical, 821; of the Andaman-Nickbar Archipelago, 404-6; of the history of Maláu, 535-9; of the history of Shê-p'o, 541-2; of names applied to Sumatra, 639-42, 644-56; of Chinese history, 698-706.
Tafan. See Thahec, district.
Tagal, town on the north coast of Java, 86.
Tagala, a people and language in the Philippines, 86.
Tagala, seaport, probably identical with Thagara-myo, 86.
Tagalla. See Taik-kulá, city.
Tagala, the people, writing among, 593 n. 2.
Tagaung, kingdom, foundations of, 62; superseded by Old Pagan, 62, 745; the overthrow of, 62, 370, 745; also designated Hastinâpura, 471 n. 2, 745, 746; king of, 591, 592; location of, 745; inscription found in the ruins of, 746.
Tagong dynasty, 122; reigning in Upper Burma, 30, 67; overthrow of the, ascribed to the Lâu, 59; kings of the, 70.
Tahan River, 758.
T'ai-lo-ch'êng, town, connected with Hâ-nûi, 330 n. 1.
Tai-ngüê, district, location of, 765; now called Hsin-nung Chou, 765.
Tai-nguyên, Tô-nngiên. See Hsi-yuan-man, the people.
T'ai-p'ing-yu-chiûn Shan, island, a designation of Mau Shan, 699; origin of the name discussed, 694.
Taik, meaning of the term discussed, 85 n. 1, 753.
Taik-kulá, Takkula, city, 92; foundation of, connected with the Gandhas, 85; other designations of, 85, 86, 89, 819; probably founded by the Kalingas or Kolas, 86; referred to as Hsiao-k'un-lun, 90, 90 n. 1, 113, 819; various places known as, 730.
Taik-kulá, the people, 754.
Tailed tribes, 431 n. 3, 701, 718 n. 1; account of, 685, 686, 687, 687 n. 5, 828, 829; explanation of, 687, 687 n. 5; in the Anambas, 718-21; cannibalism among, 718 n. 1; description of, in Borneo, 720 n.
Tails worn by the Ai-Lâu attached to their clothes, 126.
Tâjik. See Ta-ših, kingdom.
Tâjika, a designation of Arabia, 597 n. 1.
Tâk, Muang, the ancient Taksašlât, 150.
Takkala, Takkula. See Takóla, mart.
Takkola, town, the Takóla of Ptolemy, 92, 93; noted before Ptolemy's time, 92.
Takóla, cape, 8, 17, 21, 22, 25; identified with Cape Papsa, 23.
Takóla, a mart, 8, 110, 755; Ptolemy's Golden Khersonese begins at, 81, 222; derivation of the name discussed, 85-93, 754; identified with
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Takòpa, 86, 93, 728, 811; other designations of, 86, 88, 89, 89 n. 5, 90, 90 n., 113, 513, 755, 806, 811; extent of, in Ptolemy’s time, 86, 87; meaning of the name, 85; meaning of, applicable to the Malay Peninsula, 88; probably founded by the Kolas, 89, the importance of, 89, 90, 90 n.; a thriving emporium and harbour, 92-4; etymology of the name, 728; location of, 755.

Taken-Bâpis, probably a designation of Sumatra, 641.

Taköng, Takum. See Dağûn, town.

Taköpa. See Takôla, cape.

Taköpa, town, the Taköla of Ptolemy, 86, 728.

Takásilâ, identified with Mûang Ták, 180.

Takíis, meaning and derivation of the term, 87.

Tákia-pâ, district, 95 n. 1; identified with Taköpa, 86, 87, 89, 513.

Tákia-thai, district, part of Taköla, 87; called also Rañgöng, 87.

Tákia-thông, district, part of Taköla, 87; statue of Buddha found at, 96; possibly settled by dog-worshippers, 97; connected with To-p’o téng, 489.

Talasc’hi, town and province, conquest of, 813; identification of, 813.

Talaing. See Taleng, the people.

Talaing empire. See Triâkinga.

Talang, an active volcano on Sumatra, 553.

Talang Islands, 499 n. 3, 771.

Talang River, 530 n. 4.

Talânjang, island, a designation of Eagnan, 409 n. 2; the natives of, go stark naked, 409 n. 2.

Taleng, the race, 74, 174; country of, 30, 70, 72; people of Peru, 32, 33, 34; Bassein subject to, 51; of Môn-Khmer blood, 74; harassed by the Taunghâs, 74 n. 3; the builders of Thagara-myo, 86.

Taleng language, 73.

Tali Lake, 123, 125, 134; other designations of, 64, 64 n. 1, 137, 765, 765 n. 1, 767; name of, connected with Adeisga, 64 n. 1; the Mê-Không supposed to flow through the, 137.

Taluma, state, location of, 524 n.; a designation of Têng-liu-mei, 524 n.; connected with Tanûmah, 524 n.

Tâm-tháp. See Tháp-bà-mùó-thiên Hill.

Tam-yongs, Tan-yang. See Tamiang, state.

Tama, Tamasa. See Dabassê, moun-
tains.

Tamal. See Têmal, city.

Tâmali, state, tributary to Burmâ, 822; possibly connected with Tamu, 822.

Tamasai, the, people, connected with Tamanthê, 835.

Tamanthê, Tamanthi, location of, 835.

Tamarus, Tamus. See Tamasak, state.

Tamasak, state, 776, 815; identical with Bûtumâ, 199; other designations of, 199, 532, 815, 821; tributary to Siám, 532, 532 n. 1; identification of, 670 n. 1, 775; the old name of Singapore Island, 775.

Tambapannin, district, 589 n.

Tambelan Islands, 714.

Tambesi River, a tributary of the Jambi, 687, 630.

Tambilang River, 825; possibly identical with Tan-ma-ling, 601 n. 1, 626.

Tamiang, Tamlyang, Teming, state, 674; identity of, with To-mô-ch’ang improbable, 493; location of, 517 n. 1; Mâlik’u’ Mansûr transported to, 517 n. 1; a state on North Sumatra, 682; a possession of Achiêb, 705.

Tamil, the, people, assisted the Malays to attack Ceylon, 629.

Tamluk, city, also designated Támralipti, 527 n. 3.

Tâmralîptip, city, 568 n. 2.

Támralipti, district, location of, 527, 527 n. 3; identified with Tamluk, 527 n. 3.

Tâmraliptikas, the people of Lower Bengal, 29.

Tâmret, the, people identified with the Ch’hông, 709.

Tamsansai, the, people, habitat of, 733.

Tamu. See Tugma, town.

T’an, state, trade relations between Ta-ts’în and, 60; Southern barbarians in, 181 n. 1; may be Ptolemy’s land of Tamassai, 181 n. 1; identified with Arisabon, 181 n. 1; location of, 181 n. 1.

Tan-chou, district, connected with Tan-êrh, 250 n. 1; corresponds to West Hainan, 250 n. 1.

Tan-êrh, district, identified with Tan-
chou, 250 n. 1.

Tan-êrh, the, people, description of, 257 n.; the Léstai of Ptolemy, 257 n.; tattooing among, 773.

T’an Ho-chîh, a Chinese general, 796; captured the Ch’üi-su stronghold, 796.
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Tan-lau, province, a designation of Tenasserim, 784.
T' an-ling, district, a dependency of To-ko-lo, 830.
T' an-ling, island, probably identical with Punzalasing, 831; not connected with Trilingon, 831.
Tan-liu-mei. See Teng-liu-mei, state.
Tan-lwai, river, probably the Sados of Ptolemy, 47.
Tan-ma-hsi. See Tamask, state.
Tan-ma-ling, state, identification of, 601 n. 1, 626, 825; subject to San-fo-ch' i, 626; capital of, 626; productions and manufactures of, 626, 628; location of, 825.
Tan-ma-sha-na-a, king of San-fo-ch' i, 629.
Tan-me- liu, city, 52 n. 1, 743; identified with Temala, 110. See also Chou-mei- liu.
Tan-tan, district, 823; identification of, 584 n. 3, 824; location of, 824.
Tan-Vien, Tan-wien, mountain, a designation of Bâ-vi, 344 n. 3.
Tan-Malayu, state, identification of, discussed, 629, 529 n. 2, 530, 530 n. 4.
Tañah-Gayu, kingdom, identified with Dangroan, 675 n.
Tañah Jáwa, a district and tribe, near Pânei, 517 n. 2; connected with Jâbah, 522.
Tañah Jáwi, district, the northern part of Sumatra, 639.
Tañah-merah, headland, 83.
Tañah - Palembang, the Palembang district, 642.
Tañah-puniat, island, one of the Anambas, 722.
Tañah-Sâsak, island, a designation of Lombok, 589 n.
Tanah Sunda, a designation of Western Java, 459, 460.
Tañan-si. See T'ang-si, province.
Tanang-sari, Tanânsari, province, an old form of Tenasserim, 783.
T'ang dynasty of China, 105.
Tang-ming, kingdom, king of, pays tribute, 299, 794; location and extent of, 299 n. 5, 794; possibly connected with Ming-ling, 794.
Tanjong, a possession of Archipel, 705.
Tanjong Dundang, district, thermal springs near, 487 n.
Tanjong Guliga, cape, 476 n. 1. 759.
Tanjong Kuântân, cape, the Maleu-kolôm of Ptolemy, 104, 476 n. 1 (see Corrigenda, 759) location and identification of, 759.
Tanjong Puling, cape, a designation of South Cape, 104, 476, 476 n. 1; connected with Ho-ling, 476; other designations of, 759.
Tanjong Tuan, Cape, probably the site of Lower Lo-yüeh, 529 n. 1; identified with Cape Rachado, 529.
Tanjore inscription, 826.
Tanjung Bânga, state, a designation of Menangkabau, 641.
Tanjung Cherating, cape, 514 n. 2.
Tanjung Gelang, cape, name superseding Tanjong Puling, 476 n. 1; other designations of, 759; the Maleu Kolôn of Ptolemy, 759.
Tanjung Kling, point, 488 n. 1.
Tanjung Sâwah, promontory, location of, 488.
Tanjung Tembeling, cape, name superseding Tanjong Kuântân, 476 n. 1, 759.
Tanka, the boat population of Canton, 394 n. 2.
Tantalum, island, 107; the formation of the island of, 109.
Tanton Velho, location of, 493 n. 2.
Tânâmah, state, connected with Taluma, 524 n.
Tànyî, island, a designation of Dhûtâil, 558 n. 4; noises on, issue from a high mountain, 558 n. 4.
Tao-hwang, a Wu general, 288.
Tào-mêng. See Dào-minh, kingdom.
Tâpak, Pulo, 448; possibly included in Ptolemy’s Barusai, 446; identical with the Flat Islands, 446.
Tapeng, valley, 63.
Taprobana, island, identical with Sumatra, 422, 453, 594 n. 3, 646; also designated Magno-Cauli, 422; other designations, 646, 652, 654; account of the giants of, 646; productions of, 647; the seven cities of, 647.
Taprobana Major, a designation of Ceylon, 651.
Taprobana Minor, a designation of Sumatra, 651.
Taptien, Taptiing, district, a form of P’o-téng, 489, 489 n. 1.
Taràgânû, Taràngana. See Trángano, town.
Taring, the people, 262.
Tarshish, possible identification of, 597 n. 1, 706.
Tarsh, Taruy, term applied to the Chinese and Manchu, 64.
Tarum, the people, 262.
Tarûman, district, 676.
Tash-Kurghan, erroneously identified with Ptolemy’s ‘Stone Tower,’ 19.
Tāshkand, erroneously identified with Ptolemy's 'Stone Tower,' 19.
Tātāng River, connected with the Talang, 530 n. 4; location of, 824.
Tathēak, the, people, 262.
Tattooed races, Country of the, a designation of Na-ku-érh, 676 n.
Tattooing, 132, 646, 676 n. †, 804; of the Āi-Lāu and Nam Chao, 126; among various native races, 175 n. 2, 674 n. 2, 675 n. †, 804, 805; of the face, 175 n. 2, 367, 367 n. 3, 646, 646 n. 1, 674 n. 2, 675 n. †, 773, 804, 805, 828; of the body, 175 n. 2; forms of, described, 676 n. †; designs, 804.
Tāu. See Dāu, river.
T'au-chiang, river, identification of, 771.
T'au-hwa Shwei, river, location and identification of, 771, 798.
T'au-hwang, a Chinese general, 350.
T'au-kiao, river, term probably denoting Takūla, 93 (see Corrigenda, 755); name applied to the Pak-chān River, 93.
Tāu-lan, Tāu-ram, country, possibly identical with Turān, 790.
Tāukma. See Tokma, village.
Taungthūs, the, people, chiefs of the, known as the Seven Kings, 74 n. 3; habitat of, 86, 90 n.; other designations of, 86, 90 n.
Taungthūs, the, people, called Guilā by the Siamese, 86; subject to the Dravidians, 86.
Taungu, district, 831.
Tvāv, seaport of the Malay Peninsula, 86.
Tvāv, river, 86.
Tvāv, town, 87 n. 1, 831; identified with Myo-houng, 86, 717 n. 1; identification of, 656; perversion of the name, 717 n. 1.
Tvāyors, the, people, camphor made by, 435 n. 3.
Tāwang, in Assām, 134.
Tāwālis, island, identified with Tu-pe, 248 n. 2.
Tawaran River, 758.
Teeth, tribes accustomed to blackening their, 780.
Teeth-filing, 802.
Teeth-staining, 802.
Teninnin, district, included in Suvānpāranta, 65.
Tek-Nāf. See Nāf, river.
Tek-sia, river, other designations of, 776.
Telezzo, Alvaro, the first European Christian on Sumatra, 826.
Telinga. See Trikalinga, empire.
Telingāna, kingdom, the Andhras of, 29; derivation of, 30; name applied to Kalinga proper, 30.
Telok Ayer-bīnil, island, good anchorage at, 722 n. 1; a Siāntan island, 722 n. 1.
Telok-belong, city, 647; possibly identical with Lūlū-bilenk, 481 n. 3. See also Lūlū-bilenk.
Telubin River, situation of, 524 n.
Teluk Kāpur, an old camphor mart, 456 n. 3.
Temajo, Temaju, island, off Borneo, 499; connected with Bamboo Island, 711.
Temala, cape, 20, 25, 77; identified with Cape Negrais, 12, 13, 23, 52, 70; position of, how determined by Ptolemy, 17; fundamental station of Ptolemy, 23.
Temala, city, 49; its site identical with Bassein, 50; identified with Timira, 51; noted for gold and silkworm breeding, 512; connected with Tan-maō-liu, 110, 523; derivation of the name, 734, 743.
Temala, river, identified with the Nga-won, 48, 49; derivation of the name, 48, 49, 734.
Temanjug, village on Sumatra, 499, 499 n. 1.
Tembling, Temiling. See Tan-maling, state.
Tembru. See Tumeras.
Temiang, Temiyang. See Tamiang, state.
Temiang, island, 498 n. 1.
Temiang, strait, 498 n. 1.
Temong, town, location of, 757; a Pērak seat of government, 757.
Temple, 122; a Buddhist, on Kōi-Māi, 219; ruins of an Indu, on Mount Bā-dān, 220; the, of Pō-Nagar, 265, 267; a, to the goddess of Campā, 265; of Sok Tok Thom, 545; a name and bells solicited for a Buddhist, 623, 623 n. 2; a, built by an Annamese army, 797; a, at Bō Hái, 799; the, of Kuang-hmudaw, 826.
Temples, tablets bearing inscriptions found among the ruins of, 61; three, on Mount Bā-ōi, 345 n.; dancing-girls attached to, 551; discovery of remains of Saiva, 610 n. 1.
'Ten-myriads' Peaks.' See Shih-wan Shan, mountains.
Tenarririn, kingdom, a designation of Ceylon, 784.
Tenasserim, province, 80, 82; absorption of, by the British, 94;
subjugated by the Burmans, 756; other designations of, 783; forms of the name discussed, 783, 784.

Tenasserim, river, identical with Mergui, 729.

Têng-liu-mei, state, identified with Taluma, 524 n.

Têng-ya-nêng, state, identified with Trieng-gading, 599 n. 1, 599 n. 2, 626; subject to San-to-ch'i, 626.

Têng-vüeh. See Momien.

Tenggôl, Pulo, connected with Pullo Tetang, 824.

Tepurong, island, a designation of Pullo Rondo, 692.

Terampah, island, a designation of Siântan, 715, 722.

Terampah Cove, good anchorage in, 722 n. 1; on Siântan Island, 722 n. 1.

Teressa, group of islands, 421; suggested identity with the Mamiolai Islands, 421; islands included in, 421.

Terkolei, islet, possibly identical with Ku-lo, 515.

Terlei, village, identical with Sarba, 646.

Terms, denoting land, island, etc., 588 n. 1; generic, not used in Further India, 688 n. 1.

Testudo elongata, the mottled land-tortoise, 111.

Tetang, Pullo, location and identification of, 824.

Tetulia River, 744.

Thâ-bê, Thâ-bê. See T'o-peî, district.

Tha-hûn, mart, connected with Bésynge, 76; ancient names for, 76.

Thafee, district, corresponds with the present Upper Burma, 57; identical with the Delabassa country of Ptolemy, 57; connected with Dayâka, 57.

Thagara-myo, seaport, probably identical with Tagala, 86; built by the Talengs, 86.

Thagora, city, term represents Sàgara, 265, 268, 732, 788; identified with Yampu-nagara, 265; the first Indù outpost in Southern Campû, 267; derivation of the name, 735.

Thai, the, race, 42 n., 58 n. 2, 59, 73, 121, 123 n. 2, 148; conquests of, 63, 119, 129, 154, 155; why called Shans, 70; the P'iao were vassals of, 74, 75; Northern Indo-China under the sway of, 75; a valley-dwelling population, 120; other designations of, 120, 153; their empire in Yûn-nan, 123, 152; tribes of, throughout Indo-China, 126 n. 3, 160, 161, 161 n. 2; derivation and meaning of the name, 184, 184 n. 1, 185, 185 n. 1; extensive application of the term, 184, 185, 185 n. 1; appearance of the name in ancient inscriptions, 774.

Thai-bûn, river, other designations of, 798.

Thai-Chieng people, the Thai conquerors of the Lawas, 119; objects of worship of, 119 n. 1; meaning of the name, 120 n.

Thai-kôn, seaport, identification of, 788; location of, 788.

Thai Lûang. See Thai Mâu, the people.

Thai Mâu, the, people, 127; ancient capital of, 467 n. 1.

Thai States, 73; organization of the early, 361 n.; consistent division into groups of six districts, 361 n.

Thai Yay, the, people, 140.

Thalang. See Junkoylon, island.

Thalé Sâb, lake, 160; the former inland sea of Kafooja, 159, 771; name applied to the inland sea of Singora, 771.

Thalé-sai, 'Sea of Sands,' the sandy plains above Lâgor, 109.

Thama, the, people, connected with the Zamrâi, 744.

Thamee-hia Kywon, island. See Diamond Island.

Thamien-gî, 63 n. 2; a Shan village, 747.

Thamodaya, province, part of Burma, 826.

Than dwai. See Sandoway, city.

Thai-bwa, district, connected with Kuûn-chên, 332 n. 1; also designated Sûn-thai, 346 n. 1; a designation of Chiu-chên, 786, 796.

Thân-p'hu, ruins of, 779.

Thang-bûn, ancient remains at, 280.

Thang-long, city, name applied to Dài-la and Long-bien, 329; connected with Hâ-nôi, 316 n., 329, 799; other designations of, 329; capital of Tonkin, 334.

Thâp, name applied to the three towers of Thî-mâi, 239; derivation of the term, 239 n. 1.

Thâp-bà-mâu-thiên Hill, the three towers on the, 239.

Thâp-Mûai, district, ruins of an Indû pagoda discovered at, 220.

Thâp-thiên, district, a form of P'o-têng, 489 n. 1.

Tharrawaddy, district and town, 71.

Tharrha, town, its identity with Tringano discussed, 99, 100, 101;
an inland town of the Golden Kher-sonese, 111; identification of, 739, 757; the name discussed, 739.
Tharashish, 745.
Thât Hâi, the, people, 58 n. 2.
Thomas-chaung, river, identified with the Sados, 742, 743.
Thai-tôn, 86; a possible royal residence, 90 n.
Thâm Yi, married two princesses of Prakan, 295 n. 3.
Thaungthwut, district, in Sunâparanta, 748.
The-khoyang, Theyk-chaung, Theykkhoyang, river, a branch of the Kaladâàn or Le-nâro, 44.
Theînnee. See Siên-wî, state.
Theik. See Sak, the, tribe.
Thên, Mùaâ, district, 153; identified with Tîen, 125; first settlement of the Lâu of Luâng Phrrâh Bàng, 126; derivation of the name, 127.
Thên Lô, the, a kettle-drum, worshipped by the Lâu, 119 n. 1.
Thibo, town, a designation of Si-poê, 766, 767.
Thila, a god of the Kuki, 744.
Thî-nal, port, identified with the Ghrta Sea, 238; other designations of, 238; the three towers of the village of, 239; connected with Sênt, 249; blockaded by Annamese fleet, 276.
Thinai, country of the. See Sinai, kingdom.
Thô, the, tribe, their origin discussed, 354 n. 1; of North Tonkin, 770.
Thô-thân, the, people, called also Phu-Thai Dam, 354 n. 1.
Thông, 'gold,' one of the founders of Luâng Phrrâh Bàng, 145.
Thông, term meaning gold, copper, or yellow metal, 154 n.
Three-headed men, country of the, identification of, 787; also designated San-t’ou, 787.
Three Towers Hill. See Tháp-bảm-mùơ-thiên Hill.
Throama, town, identified with Turân, 13, 279; probably connected with T’o-huan, 280; derivation of the name, 280 n. 2, 733; location of, 791.
Thu-kôn. See Thai-kôn, sea-port.
Thuân-an. See Dahan, river.
Thuàng, the, people, a vanished tribe, 763; makers of large rice-wine jars, 763.
Thuàng-ngwien. See Shang-yûan, district.
Thûk. See Ou-lâk, kingdom.
Thûk Khmau, 'Black Waters,' 684.
Thûk-P’hân, king, invasion of, 337; Van-lâng destroyed by, 343.
Thwart Range, 793.
Thâi-tîn, the chief of the people of the delta, 344; mythical impersonation of plain-dwellers, 344, 344 n. 2.
Thî-wôn. See Ti-wôn, cape.
Ti-kân, district, of Jih-nan, 311 n. 2; connected with Pagras, 312, 731; identical with Prakan, 312; identified with Pi-king, 781.
Ti Mêng-chu, king, identification of, 123 n. 2; sons of, leaders of Yün-nan tribes, 128 n. 1.
Ti-wa-kâ-lo, king, 699 n. 2.
Ti-wôn, cape, the Great Cape of Ptolemy, 214, 214 n. 1, 215, 222, 225.
Tiao, the, people, pygmies of Negrito descent, 256.
T’iao-chhî, district, identical with Chaldêa, 679 n. 1.
Tiao-t’î, term = tattooing on the forehead, 804; a Ch’ê-li custom, 804.
Tibet, 20, 130.
Tibeto-Burmân races, 54, 69, 79; their advance into Burmâ, 130.
Tien, T’ien, territory, 123; connected with Mùaâ Òhân, 125; the ancient name of Yün-nan, 127, 291, 765.
T’ien-chu, a designation of Bengal, 466 n. 2.
Tien-Lî Nam-dô, emperor, 330 n. 1.
'Tiger Face,' the, people, 803.
'Tiger Heads,' the, people, 803.
Tigers, 116.
Tîkû, Tikû, district, pepper produced at, 454 n. 1; a possession of Acheb, 706.
Tilabhârâs, the, people, the Tilâdai of Ptolemy, 53; identification of, 744.
Tilâdai, the, people, identified with the Tilabhârâs, 53; other designations of, 744; identification of, 830.
Tilam-chong, islands, 806; the Nikobârs, 396, 421; also designated Ts’wei-lân Shan, 396, 409; possibly the Salînê of Ptolemy, 410, 421; So-tu-man the largest of the, 413; origin of the name, 415.
Tîlin, district, 65.
Tîllâng-jang, island, a form of Tilam-chong, 806.
Tûlagrammon, city, identified with Josore by Yule, 53 (see Corrigenda, 744).
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Timai-ttiou, islands, a designation of the Andamans, 826.
Timira, city, 748; the Témala of Ptolemy, 51; location of, 65; gold at, 65.
Timor, Island of, also designated Gili Timor, 519, 520; identical with Chi-li Ti-mên, 519, 520, 520 n. 1.
Timula. See Simylla, mart.
Tin, tin-ore, tin-works, 89, 91, 199 n. 4, 477 n. 1, 488 n. 2, 492 n. 1, 628; terms designating, 87, 87 n. 1, 88, 88 n. 1, 88 n. 2, 97, 754; of Jala, 815.
Tin-mines, 88, 88 n. 2, 89, 470 n. 1, 754; traces of ancient, 478 n.; worked by Chinese labourers, 755.
Tiona. See Tiao, the, people.
Tionuan, Tionuane. See Ti-wen, cape.
Tipuru, Tipperah. See Tripura, city.
Tipperah. See Tripura, city.
Tiragrahas, the, people, 744; connected with the Tilogrammon of Ptolemy, 53.
Tiju. See Tiao, the, people.
Tnal Puyán, an embankment leading to the Puyán temple, 211.
T'ung-si, province, the Moi name for Tenasserim, 783.
T'o-chan, leader of an embassy to China, 547.
To-ho-lo, boundaries of, 830; noted for rhinoceroses, 830; identification of, 831.
T'o-huan. See T'o-dô, kingdom.
T'o-huan. See T'o-dô, the, people.
T'o-lang, location of, 824.
T'o-lo-po-ti. See Drâvarati, city.
T'o-lung, island, 474, 499 n. 3; possibly identical with Pulo Tulang, 499; location of, 499, 824; identification of, 824.
T'o-min, the, people of Ning-po, 828.
T'o-mo-ch'ang, an insular state, 473, 474; boundaries of, 474, 498; identification of, discussed, 498, 498 n. 1; probably identical with Singapore Island, 498, 499, 499 n. 2; the name discussed, 498, 499.
T'o-nang. See Turán, kingdom.
T'o-pei, district, the south of Campã, 217, 218; connected with Ptolemy's Zabia, 218; other forms of the name, 777.
T'o-p'o-têng. See P'o-têng, district.
T'o-shwei, river, 801.
T'o-yuan, city, identified with Rangûn, 811.
T'o-yuan, state, white parrots sent by to China, 830; a dependency of To-ho-lo, 830; white elephants in, 830; location of, 831.
Tocapa. See Takôpa, cape.
Tôi-dô, city, a Li capital, 329.
Tôi-dô, kingdom, connected with T'o-huan, 233; corresponded to Hwê and Turán, 233, 280.
Tôi-dô, the, people, connected with the Hsi-tu I, 233.
Tôi-kwien, a district of Jih-nan, 311 n. 2.
Tôi-sôn revolt headed by Nák, 277.
Tôi-vi, district, suggested location of, 373, 374; also called Hsi-yü, 373; subdivided, 373.
Tokamá, village, location of, 734.
Toko, village, location of, 734.
Tokong-boro, island, other designations of, 710; location of, 710.
Tokosanna, river, 745; identified with the Kulâdân, 30, 44; the name discussed, 728; identification of, 728.
Tokân, Paiji inscriptions, found at, 98.
Tôn-an. See Đông-phô, river.
Tôn-binha. See Saigon, river.
Tôn-ch'üang, territory, connected with Sôn-toi, 350; dangerous and impenetrable, 350.
Tông-n. See Taungthás, the, people.
Tông, district, connected with Tulakšetra, 467 n. 7.
Tonkin, province, 116, 119 n. 1, 122, 127, 132; Ptolemy's error respecting the coast of, 5, 11, 13, 14; attacked by the Huang-dông, 125; governor of, killed by the Huang-dông, 125; early inhabitants of, 131, 133; conquered and included in Hsiang, 147; other designations of, 147, 227, 235, 241, 263, 264, 293, 321 n., 327, 374, 466, 468, 508 n., 777, 782; occupied in part by the Châm, 227; districts of, 227; protector general of, chastises the Châm, 228; erroneous beliefs as to Chinese rule in, 230; conquests made by, 241 n. 3; seven prefectures of, 245; tribute missions from, 245; visited by merchants, 302; the administrative residence of, 324; independence recovered by, 326; derivation of the name, 329, 330; attack upon, 466; date of Ptolemy's information regarding, 739; fish, raw and alive, eaten in, 786; agriculture introduced by the Chinese into, 786; an assassin devoured by the populace of, 827.
Tonkin, Gulf of, 122, 123, 129, 148; the Magnus Sinus of Ptolemy, 26; corresponds to the Sea of Šenf, 165;
identified with the Great Gulf, 377; dangers in the, 782; new maritime channel opened in the, 782.

Tonkinese, the, names applied to, 225 n. 1; defeat of, 796.

Tooth-relic, of Buddha, 107, 390 n. 1; enshrined in the city of Ligor, 107, 108.

Topographical tables, of the history of Malayu, 535-9; of the history of She-p’o, 541-9.

Toponymic mimicry, striking example of, 121.

Toponyms, common to Arakan and Sumatra, 656; transference of, 660-4, 730, 731; instances of perversions of, 717 n. 1; Ptolemaic, discussed, 727-37; derived from the Môn language, 727-9; Malayau, 729-30; Tamil, 730-1; Khatier, 731-2; Châm, 732; Indo-Chinese, 732-4; Sanskrit and Pali, 784-5; Hellenized, 735-7.

Tortoise plentiful about the Kra Isthmus, 111.

Tortoise-hunting, account of, in the Kra Isthmus, 112.

Tortoise-shell, 476, 477 n. 1; a production of Khayyû, 670 n. 1; places whence obtained, 670 n. 1.

T’ou-kou-li. See Tau-kiao-le, river.

Tou-mu-chia-mu, town, encircled by the Manipur River, 814; identified with Tugma, 814.

Toung-gâp, river, connected with the Sados of Ptolemy, 47.

Tourane. See Turân, Bay of.

Touron, cape, erroneously identified with Wai-lo Shan, 238 n. 4.

Touron Harbour, erroneously identified with the Ghat Sea, 238.

Towers, the three, of Thi-nâi, 239; one of them demolished, 239; of the Thâp-hâ-mûn-thien Hill, 239.

Townships, the twelve P’han-nâ, of the Lû-Shans, 138, 139 n.

Toyân-budhi, Sea of, 249.

Trâ-kieu, town, ancient remains at, 791.

Trade, Hêng Shan an ancient entrepôt for, 797 n. 1.

Trade marts east of the Ganges in Ptolemy’s time, 7. See also s.v. Emporia.

Trade routes, in Ptolemy’s time, 5, 8; between India and the Gulf of Siam, 94; across the Malay Peninsula, 115; from Kampôt to P’ham-p’ên and Udông, 194; between Manipur and Hà-nâi, 264; between Bantam-mâi and Lawêk, 775.

Traditions, 79, 125, 128 n. 1, 158; of the Diamond Sands, 108; of the Lawâs, 119 n. 1; of the Ta-li Lake, 157.

Trang, province, 751; the chief town of, 79, 201; supposed sea-passage between Ligor and, 115; other designations of, 198; included in the kingdom of Komar, 201; trade of Ko: Tron developed by the settlers of, 210; Kumâra founded by settlers of, 210; a noted cave at, 477 n. 1.

Trang, river, connected with the Khrensoams, 97.

Trâng-anh. See Tringa, town.

Transversal Range. See Thwart Range.

Trâo. See Tiao, the people.

Trâpobana, Ills, 834.

Travellers, ignorance and mistakes of, 151 n. 1.

Trê, island, protects Nâ-trang Bay, 267.

Trêng-gân. See Tringa, town.

Trênggan Valley, 100.

Tri-kalinga, Trilinga, empire and city, 33, 35; extent of, 30; early capital of, 31; corruptions of the name of, 31 n. 2; located in the Kubo Valley, 32; founded by the Andras and Kalingas, 29, 30, 32; derivation of, 31 n. 2; probably identical with Kalé and Triglypton, 31; three places of the name of, 35; early names for, 74; other designations of, 509.

Trieng-gading, Tringading, state, connected with Têng-ya-nêng, 599 n. 1, 599 n. 2; location of, 599 n. 2; identification of, 626.

Trîeu-Vlet-vuang, proclaimed himself king at Long-bien, 326; defeated and dethroned, 326.

Triglypton, city, the capital of the eastern kingdom of the Kalingas, 30, 35; location of, by various writers, 30, 31, 32; its probable site on the Kulâdan discussed, 30; connected with Kalé, 31, 33; a former Dravidian capital, 33; derivation of the name, 734, 735; cocks, crows, and parrots of, 830.

Trîlinga. See Trikalinga, empire.

Trîlingon. See Triglypton, city.

Trîngo, river, connected with the Attaba of Ptolemy, 105.

Trîngô, town, 104; probably the Tharha of Ptolemy, 99, 100, 101, 758; derivation of the name considered, 100; dancing-girls from, 508 n.

Trînkômalay, Bay, designated Trînkômanalai, 381 n.
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Trinkóna-malai, bay, a designation of Trinkomalee Bay, 381 n.
Trinkut, Trinkúta, island, 421.
Triple-head Kingdom. See Three-headed men, Country of the.
Tripura, city, 51 ; connected with Triglyptton, 30, 31, 32, 830 ; composed of three districts, 32 ; possibly identical with Pentapolis, 35, 36 ; legend of the three cities of, 45 n. 2 ; other designations of, 829.
Trišulika, 31 n. 2.
Troglydye tribes. See Cave-dwellers.
Trôn-nín, district, name applied to Múang P'hien, 363, 366.
Trong, village, its identity with Tharrha doubtful, 99.
Triuk-łam, village, 779.
Triuang Sap, emporium for eagle-wood, 262.
Trumun. See Tarúman, district.
Tsai-nu-li-a-pî-ting, king, identified with Zeinu-l'-Abidín, 648, 648 n. 2.
Te'ân-pun, state, identified with Sânhhu, 209, 210.
Tsenbo, Tehenbo. See Shenbo, city.
Ts'êng-ch'î, the name discussed, 306 n. 2.
Tsiau-yau, Tsiau-nau. See Chiau-yau, the race.
Tsín, Ts'sin, dynasty of China, 74, 147.
Tsín, Ts'sin, the, race, 74, 227.
Ts'êng-mu-hsiang, mountains, identification of, 819.
Tsíng-kútsê. See Sríga, hill.
Tsou-yau-no, king of Campã, 279 n. 1 ; identified with Jaya Indravarman III, 279 n. 1.
Ts'wan, the, people, 121, 148 ; other designations of, 124, 133, 135 ; occupants of land on the Red River, 125 ; inhabitants of K'un-ming, 125 ; extent of their territory, 125, 126 ; account of, 126 ; identical with Ptolemy's Doñai, 126 (see Corriegenda, 763) ; a name applied to Lâu occupiers of Indo-China, 152, 153, 154 ; identified with the Lolos, 763. See also Doñ, the, people.
Ts'wan Wan, a Nan-ning barbarian, 125.
Ts'we-li-yan, islands, a designation of the Nikobârs, 382 n. 1, 413 ; meaning of, 396, 396 n. 1 ; the Talanchong Islands, 396, 409 ; identical with Ptolemy's Sâlné, 409.
Tu, Tu'-jên, the, people, remnants of Chinese military colonies, 353, 354 ; their origin discussed, 354 n. 1.
Tu-ho-lo, identification of, 569 n.

Tu-ho-lo-po-ti. See Dvârnâvati, city.
Tu-li-chwo. See T'ù-lo-shu, kingdom.
Tu-li Kiang, river, identification of, 781.
Tu-lo-shu, T'ù-lo-shu Shê-p'o, kingdom, 813 ; a native designation of P'íao, 56, 467 ; identification of, 461 n. 1, 467 n. 7, 745.
Tu-long-thân, city, a designation of Lâwâ-thân, 322.
Tu-mi-ka-muk. See Tou-mi-chia-mu, town.
Tu-po, island, probably identical with Borneo, 245, 248, 781 ; state of Chun-po on, 245 ; connected with Tâwâlî, 248 n. 2 ; cloth woven at, 781.
Tu-p'o. See Shê-p'o, state.
Tu-p'o-kuo, name applied to the kingdom of Ava, 56.
Tu-p'o-t'â. See Shê-p'o-ta.
Tu Wên-sin, sultan of Ta-li, 121 n. 1.
Tuan, the, people, ruled over Nan-cho and Ta-li, 126 n. 3 ; connected with the Doñai, 732, 763 ; an original Ai-Lao clan, 763.
T'a-n Pât, title of the chief of Sumatra, 644.
T'iang-lâm. See Hsiau-lin, district.
T'iang-p'hô, district, identified with Hsiau-lin, 232 n. 1.
T'ubâ, a city of Campã, 777.
Tuba, Pulo, 488.
Tuban, state, connected with Japan, 480 n. 2.
Tugma, metropolis, city of the Kalingas, 33 ; chief city of Manipur, 33 ; identified with Tummu, 33, 832 ; identification of, 733, 814 ; the name discussed, 733, 734.
Tui, ancient gold-mines at, 477 n. 1.
Tulaksetra, district, identification and location of, discussed, 467 n. 7.
Tulang, Pulo, possibly identical with To-lung, 499.
Tumasik. See Tamassak, state.
Tumeras, a designation of Old Sianapore Strait, 575.
Tumi-gâma. See Tou-mi-chia-mu, town.
Tumios, the, people, descendants of the Râksas, 260.
Tummu, city, the Tugma of Ptolemy, 33, 832 ; situation of, 33 ; chief city of Manipur, 33 ; possibly connected with Tâmalittî, 822.
Tun-hsin, district, location of, 249 n. 2.
Tun Jana Khateb, a noted Pâsei champion, 487 n.
Tun-shun, Tun-sun, 827.
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Tung-hai-chu, salt obtained by boiling sea-water at, 477 n. 1.
T’ung-jên, the, people, 789; designation of the Lang-ping, 273 n. 1.
Tung-kiang, river, identified with the Upang, 617 n. 2.
Tung-Ou, kingdom, capital of, 321 n.
Tung-p’u-chai. See Kan-p’o-chê, kingdom.
Tung Shê-lung, island, identified with Sarasän, 710, 714.
Tung-Tung Islands, identification of, 708 n. 1, 709, 713, 715.
Tunku Dand, ruler of Achêb, 667 n.
Turam. See Turân, kingdom.
Turân, Bay of, probably the Throana of Ptolemy, 13, 280, 280 n. 2.
Turân, kingdom, 781; corresponds to the kingdom of T’o-i-dô, 233; also designated T’o-nang, 280, 790; identification of, 790; early mentions of, 790; other designations of, 790; church established at, 790; ancient remains in, 791.
Turân Harbour. See Touron Harbour.
Turone. See Turân, kingdom.
Turong, the, people, a designation of the Kiu-tsz, 805.
Turtle, finest tortoise-shell from the hawk’s bill, 671 n.
Turtle-doves, Bân C’hâwâ noted for, 461 n. 1.
Tuwangku. See Bânyak, Great, island.
T’wan. See Ts’wan, the, people.
Twantê, city, position of, coincides with Sabara, 72; on the site of Ukkalâbs, 72, 94.
Twi-hwâ, district, 781.
Typhoon, 606.
Tyre, town, destruction of, 597 n. 1; sailors deported to India from, 597 n. 1.
Tyûmâh, identification of, discussed, 576 n. 1.
Tyûman, mountain, 576 n. 1.
Tyûman, Pulo, 723; suggested identification with Betûmâh, 576 n. 1.

U

U-kan, U-ko. See Wu-ko, country.
U-lei, a seaport, 251 n.
Uberae, the, people, the Barrhai connected with, 803.
Udai, the, people, a tribe of Negrito extraction, 163; probable cannibalism of, 661 n.
Udaya, the term discussed, 182, 184, 184 n. 1, 184 n. 2, 190.
Udong-méan-chêi, the capital of Kamboja, 615 n. 3.

Udumbara, town, a designation of C’hump’hon, 761.
Ujong Bahu, a high point of Pulo Wêh, 693.
Ujong-bâtu. See Bânyak, Little, island.
Ujong Indrapura, a headland, 449.
Ujong Salang, island, a designation of Junkéyolon, 274 n. 1, 406.
Ujong Tanah. See Tamasak, state.
Ukkalâbs, city, capital of a Taleng kingdom, 72; the present Twantê, 72, 94.
Umôr, identified with Kan-thô, 791; location of, 791.
Unbuang. See Ông-Pông, city.
Upang, river, connected with the Tung-kiang, 617 n. 2.
Uraga, kingdom, a designation of Ôulûk, 345; connected with Aganagara, 348.
Uru, river, tributary of the Chîndwin, 41 n.
Ush, erroneously identified with Ptolemy’s ‘Stone Tower,’ 19.
Ut, the, people, 785; tribes in Eastern Siâm, 163 n. 1.
Utkala, Orissa named after, 73.
Utkalâpa. See Ukkalâbs, city.
Uttara, Uttara-théra, first Buddhist missionary to Burma, 65 n. 2.
Uttarapâñcâla, city, capital city of Kampilla, 793.
Uttunga-dêva, king of Java, said to have reigned at Májapâhit, 681 n. 2.
Utâla, the, people, name changed to Kulûtâ, 399.

V

Vagaru, seaport, 86.
Vah. See Lawâ, the, people.
Vaidheha, Videha, district, 297 n. 2; ancient name of part of Yûman, 64, 121, 297 n. 2, 747; identified with Ardandan, 64; connected with Ptolemy’s Adesigaya, 64.
Vakanka, mountain range, 487 n.
Vaimatýa. See Gauruda.
Vaisít, city, a designation of Arakan, 39; replaced Dhaññhâvatî as capital of Arakan, 43.
Vallabhí, 766.
Valley-dwelling populations, 120, 120 n. 1.
Van-ch’üang, river, probably the Huan River, 779.
Van-kiep, river, 316 n.
Van-lâng, kingdom, name applied to Tonkin, 227; foundation of, 288,
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337, 338, 339; conquered by Asoka, 291; overthrown, 291, 320, 321, 343; death of the king of, 320 n. 1; name changed to Ön-lák, 321; origin and meaning of the name, 337, 337 n. 1; eighteen kings of, 337, 338.

Vănara, the, people, monkey-tribes, 96.

Vanaspati, district, in Kraunca-dvīpa, 778.

Vañga, 92.

Vara-dhātu. See Wat Nā P’hraḥ Thát.


Varāṇasī, ambassador, 543.

Varāhāya, 84 n. 2.

Varāha, a designation of the Tāpak Islands, 448; possibly Hog Island, 477.

Varavāra. See Worsawāra, state.

Varuddhamāna, identification of, discussed, 467 n. 7.

Varella, cape, 781; other designations of, 710, 794.

Varmapura, town, former capital of Campā (India), 42 n.

Vasā (West of India), also designated Bassein, 48, 50, 614 n.

Vasu, state, 673; possibly connected with Po-si, 682.

Vasudāna, 673.

Vedic words and terms, 39, 40 n. 2, 97 n. 1.

Vedisa, the Bhilasa Topes found at, 747.

Vendi characters and inscriptions, 109.

Vėngi-pura, town, the Malanga of Ptolemy, 108, 113.

Vessantara, prince, 219 n. 1.

Victria Sagarā, a mythical king, 265; monuments erected by, 266, 267.

Videha. See Vaideha, district.

Vjet, seaport, 778.

Vjet-thuāng, district, corresponds to Há-tīn, 227; district of Tonkin, 227.

Vijaya, the first recorded king of Ceylon, 76 n. 1.

Vijaya, state, 184 n. 1, 774; name applied to part of the Gulf of Siam, 102; absorbed by Lop'haburi, 183; doubtful connection with Phạm-thit, 199; conquest of, 791; possibly connected with Fo-shih, 791.

Vijaya, the, people, 102.

Vijaya-nagā (India), founder of, 757.

Vijayapura, town, foundation of, 569 n.; identification of, 569 n.

Vikrāntavarman, king, 773.

Vīn, city, 779, 794; identity with Kortatha Mētropolis suggested, 304, 306; terminus of the overlaid route from India, 304; a designation of Há-tīn, 305, 306.

Vīn route. See Song-ka.

Vīn-liṅ, district, other designations of, 794.

Vīn-tūāng, district, 336.

Vindhyā Mountains, called also Pāripātra, 155; inhabited by the Mālava people, 156.

Vinh-té, canal of, 193, 213; captured by the Annamese, 194.

Vinh-té River, 196 n.

Vipula, probably unconnected with Bēpyrrhos, 835.

Viṣāṁsau-Varman, king, 602 n. 1.

Visu, statue of, 599; connected with Kwan-yin, 600.

Viṣva-varman, king of Ho-lo-tan, 542.

Vizagapatam, town, 47.

Vō-bīn, territory, corresponds to the Bak-nin and Hūng-yen districts, 350; dangerous and impenetrable, 350.

Vō-kan, village, ancient inscription found near, 265.

Volcano, account of, on Shelábēt Island, 551, 552, 555; in the Sea of Ghīta, 672.

Volcano Island, 573; also designated Hwo Shan, 520 n. 2.

Volcanoes, 562.

Vōn-kū, river, other designations of, 798.

Vōn-hài, a division of Tōi-vō, 373.

Vrah Dōpa pagoda. See Phraḥ Thōn.

Vrah Romanpāda, identical with Pō Romā, 236.

Vrālbs, the, people, 163, 772, 773.

Vṛṣabhā, mountain, on Nārikela, 807, 809.

Vṛgū, the, people, a branch of the Yādava, 612 n. 3.

Vṛśaghra-mukha, the, people, 785, 803.

Vṛśhagrapura, city, a designation of Kōli, 491 n. 3.

W

Wa. See Lawā, the, people.

Wa-chieh-tsū, the, people, people raw and alive eaten by, 828.

Wāb, the, race, habitat of, 118, 140; terms connected with the name, 162; present description of, 172, 173; compared with the natives of Po-nan, 172, 173; cannibalism of, 660 n. 2; converted by Buddha and cannibalism abandoned, 660 n. 2. See also Wāb, Wild.

Wāb, Wild, the, people, 159 n. 2, 172, 288 n.; cannibals, on the
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Salwin, 72; the Chian-yau connected with, 259; tattooing among, 675 n. 1, 804; the climbing powers of, 687 n. 5; identified with the Pu, 804; habitat of, 804.

Wab-Ho-ni, the, people, 803.

Wai, Pulo, 714; connected with Lo-wei Shan, 711.

Wai-lo Shan, island, wrongly identified with Cape Touren, 238 n. 4; identified with Kū-lâu Rê or Pulo Canton, 238 n. 4.

Wallah. See Mu-li, state.

Wan, river, Chinese name for the Mê-Không, 135 n., 137 n. 2.

Wan-hsiang, state, application of the name, 765; also called Olanion, 768.

Wan-tan, district, identical with Bândon, 106.

Wang Ching-hung, a colleague of Chêng Ho, 651.

Wang-nung, district, 803.

Wang-su-Sha. See Mansûr Shâh.

Warârû, king of Martaban, 75, 114.

Waris, the, tribe, 495, 495 n. 3.

Wars between dwellers of the plains and hillmen, 344, 345 n.

Wat Chakret inscriptions, 209, 212.

Wat Chîeng-thông, a Buddhist monastery, 145.

Wat Mahâyong, inscription at, 492 n. 2.

Wat Kedie. See Bâ P'nom, city.

Wat Nâ P'hrañ That, tooth-relic enshrined in the, 107, 108; one of the oldest Siamese monuments, 108; the chief Buddhist monastery in Ligor, 518 n. 1.

Wat P'ho inscriptions, 211.

Wat P'hrañ Kêu, the royal temple at Bângkêk, 107.

Water, of Buddha, 390 n. 1; story of a spring of gold-producing, 398 n. 1.

Water Chê-n-la. See Chê-n-la, kingdom.

'Water King,' the residence of, and powers attributed to, 801, 802; names applied to, 801.

Water Kings, 342, 342 n. 1.

Wèn, Pulo, island, erroneously connected with Lung-yên Hài, 691; identified with Mau Shan, 693, 703; account of, 693; peaks on, 693; earliest mention of, 694 n. 1; sulphur from, 694 n. 1; meaning of the name, 694 n. 1; pepper produced on, 694 n. 1; formerly a convict station, 694 n. 1.

Wei, the, race, 74.

Wei-hsi, district, in North-West Yunnan, 748.

Wei-lu, the, people, 804.

Wei-Pu, the, people, account of the, 687 n. 5; tailed cannibals, 687 n. 5.

Wellesley, province, inscriptions and early remains found in the, 93, 98.

Wên, king of Lin-i, conquests of, 793.

Wên-chou, 131 n. 2; capital of Tung-Ou, 321 n.

Wên-kung, emperor, human meat ordered by, 828.

Wên-tan, kingdom, a designation of Upper Kamboja, 832; not connected with Bân-Dôn, 832.

Wên-ti, emperor of China, 545.

West Island, also designated Seraga Island, 714.

Whirlpool, in the Gulf of Tonkin, 782.

White-creeper River, other designations of, 316 n.

'White India,' a designation of Arakhösia, 40, 668.

White-lead mines, 592.

Wiang Chau, state and city, also designated Savaka Mâla, 116, 117; identical with Candrapura, 149 n. 1; capital of the state of Lâm-châng, 149 n., 151; people from, known as Lân Wieng, 161 n. 1; name changed on becoming a capital, 162.

Wiang Sipou-kay, township, 143; possibly the Lasippa of Ptolemy, 144.

Wild tribes, 163 n. 1, 278, 556 n. 2, 685, 686 n. 2, 687, 688; of the Malay Peninsula, 159 n. 2; of Kamboja, 207, 720 n.; term applied to, 297 n.; silk manufactured by, 745; in Siak, 817.

Wild Wab, the. See Wab, Wild, the, people.

Willestoren lighthouse, the, on Pulo Brâs, 690, 691.

Women, market held by, 494 n.; Borneo governed by, 647 n. 2; Engano alleged to be inhabited only by, 753; islands of, 753.

Women, Island of, location of, 753.

Women traders, 399, 399 n. 4, 494 n., 795.

Worawârî, state, 753; tributary to Siâm, 84 n. 2, 495, 532; possibly identical with Pro-li, 495; suggested connection of, with Bârâbî, 495 n. 2; derivation of the name discussed, 495 n. 2; also designated Varavârî, 532.

Writing, form of, used on Sumatra, 595; Battak system of, 595, 595 n. 2; the, of Java, 595 n. 2; use of the Kâwi, 595 n. 2; ancient bamboo tablets in Rejang, 597 n. 1.

Wu, dynasty of China, 93.
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Wu-hu, the, people, cannibalism among, 827, 828.
Wu-ko, country, troglodyte inhabitants of, 771; location of, 771, 798; the country of Khâ Kû, 798.
Wu-kung Hsü, identification of, 710.
Wu-lei. See U-lei, seaport.
Wu-lung-li-tan, village, location of, 720 n.; account of the tailed inhabitants of, 720 n.; identification of, 720.
Wu-mo, the, people, habitat of, 771.
Wu-Ti, emperor, 290 n. 1, 324 n. 2, 500 n. 1, 762.
Wu Ts'wan, the, people, the eastern Ts'wan, 126.

X

Xa Lâng, city, designation of Bal.-Angwê, 274.
Xâva, Miâng, village, location of, 461 n. 1; identical with Bân Ch'âwâ, 461 n. 1.
Xieng-hai. See Ch'hieng Râi.

Y

Ya-ch'i kingdom, a designation of Achêb, 765.
Ya-p'o-ti, district, a form of the term Java, 463; connected with Ibadâhû, 465, 540 n. 1; the name discussed, 465, 633; identification of, 541; inhabitants of, 541; a designation of Eastern Sumatra, 604; Fa-Hsiien arrived at, 605; identification with Java erroneous, 608; Brahmanism and Buddhism in, 609.
Yabaing, Yabein. See Zabaing, the, people.
Yabens, the, people, 74 n. 3.
Yabrang. See Zabaing, the, people.
Yâdavas, the, people, branches of, 612 n. 3; dispersion of, 612 n. 3.
Yâkatrâ. See Jakarta, state.
Yâkhas, the, people, 609; transferred from Lankâ to Giri, 638; instructed by Buddha, 664.
Yam-pang. See Kulâdān, river.
Yama, god of the dead, 109 n. 1.
Yama-dvipa, kingdom, may correspond with Yen-mo-na, 464 n. 2.
Yamani, district, location of, 544.
Yânpu-nagara, city, 306; probably the first capital of Khan-hwâ, 265; the Thagora of Ptolemy, 265; other designs of, 266; an ancient royal city, 270.
Yânpu-nagara, goddess of Campâ, 211.
Yamunâ, Yamuna-nâdi, river, designation of part of the Mê-Khong, 136, 282 n. 1, 287; the chief channel of the Brahmaputra, 282 n. 1, 287.
Yang, island, a designation of Mata, 715, 722.
Yang-ch'üen, identified with Hai-duong, 801.
Yang-mai, king of Campâ, 796.
Yang-pi, river, 137, 792.
Yang Tikub, stela of, 781.
Yang-tsê, Upper, river, 160; also designated Kiu-sha, 741.
Yaru Tsang-hu, Yaru Ts'ang-po, river, a designation of the Brahmaputra, 282; application of the name, 287 n.
Yasu, a disciple of Buddha, 657 n. 2.
Yasovarman, king, 211.
Yau, Yau-jen, the, people, believed by the Chinese to have tails, 687 n. 5; ashes of deceased chieftains preserved by, 764; possibly identical with the Chau-yau pygmies, 787.
Yau-t'ung, the, people, 789.
Yava, Yava-dvipa, 'Island of Barley,' 55, 150, 459 n. 1; identified with Ibadân, 459, 596; a designation of Shê-p'o, 547; statue of Dipâṅkara at 547; location, 547, 548; meaning of the name discussed, 596.
Yava, the, people, 150.
Yere, term denoting barley, 593, 593 n. 1.
Yavan, the, race, 58.
Yavana, the, people, 58, 128 n. 2, 132, 133, 134 n. 1, 150; habitat of, 120 n. 131; other designations of, 153.
Yavana-dêsâ, district, 58.
Yavanas, island of the, 699.
Yaw, district, 65.
Yaw, Yo, the, tribe, 58, 743; inhabitants of the Chinâwû valley, 52.
'Ye-dhammā,' 'Ye-dharmā' stanza, 45 n. 1, 96, 98.
Ye-ngan, a silver-mine near, 741.
Yellow River. 40.
Yen-Hai, a designation of the Sea of China, 781; the Sea of Chang-Hai, 782.
Yen-mo-na, kingdom, a form of the term Java, 464; identity of, discussed, 464 n. 2; other designations of, 698; a designation of Achêb, 698. See also Yen-mo-na Chou Kwo.
Yen-mo-na Chou Kwo, kingdom, other designations of, 544, 698; identification of, 544.
Yen-ti, the 'Fiery God.' See Shen-nung.
Yen-to-man, islands, a designation of the Andamans, 389.
Yi-hsi, district, name of part of Yunnan, 64.
Yi-li-ch'i. See Khoten.
Yii Yong, prince of Ch'cheng Ryng, 139 n.
Yin-ch'ing, a Chinese eunuch, 648.
Yindus, the, people, tattooing among, 675 n.
Ying-ch'eng, town, a designation of Hâ-nôi, 799.
Ying-k'o-tswe Shan, island, 386, 386 n. 2.
Yolo, ambergris from, 581 n. 3.
Yon Shan, the, people, 120 n.
Yona. See Yavana, the, people.
Yonakadesa, district, 58; designation of Western Lâo, 119 n. 1, 132.
Yong, Ming, traditionally founded by the Lawas, 119 n. 1; overthrown by Sunanda Kûmara, 119 n. 1; a division of the Ch'ieng Ryng kingdom, 139 n.; prince of, 139 n.; visited by Buddha, 381 n.
Yong Hill, stupa on the, 297 n. 2.
Yông Hwe Lake, 741.
Yü-chou, village, location of, 372.
Yü-chou chiang, corresponds to the Ñeros River, 372, 376.
Yü-hung, river, also designated Lung-mien, 372, 373.
Yü-chih, a term designating jadeite, 523 n. 2.
Yuan, the, people, 153; name applied to the Annamese, 130, 764; the name of the Môn-Annam race, 460; origin of the name, 764.
Yuan, Yiêen, the term and its application, 131, 132, 133, 461; suggested connection with Java, etc., 150, 461.
Yuan-chi, province, an ancient name for Tonkin, 777, 782.
Yuan Chiang, river, part of the Red River, 315 n. 1, 771; location of, 792.
Yüan-man, term denoting some pre-Chinese tribe, 153.
Yudhisthira, kingdom, also called Dharmaraja, 832.
Yue-man, the, people, conquest of, 749; other designations of, 749.
Yüeh, meaning of the term, 128 n. 2; 134 n. 1, 777, 778.
Yüeh. See China, Southern.
Yüeh-hai, province, the literary name of Kwang-hai, 765.
Yüeh-shang, Yüeh-shang-shih, kingdom, 777, 778; part of the Hâ-tiâi district, 227; location and extent of, 304 n. 2.
Yüeh-shang, the, people, 777; habitat of, 778.
Yüeh-sui, district, formerly designated K'iuang-tu, 62 n. 4.
Yuen. See Kêu, the, people.
Yule, Colonel, map of Ancient India, 4.
Yün-nan Fu, district, influence of the Ta-wan in, 126; people from P'iao settled near, 750.
Yung-ch'ang, town and district, 61, 72, 73, 123, 134 n. 1, 792; the Adiisaga of Ptolemy, 60, 64; the chief city of Marco Polo's Andamans, 64; formation of the prefecture of, 739; foundation of Old, 747; Old, identified with Chao-chou, 747; the 'Golden Teeth' public offices at, 768.
Yung-ning, also designated Anina, 829.
Yung Yu-tian, 181 n. 1; the king of the Shen state, 62; rarities sent to China by, 62.
Yün-nan, territory, 61, 116, 117, 120 n. (2), 121, 122, 138 n. 2; the Lâu in possession of Western, 59; dynasty founded at, 60; Tagaung overthrown by tribes from, 62; Chinese expeditions into, 63; other designations of, 64, 144 n. 2, 291, 297 n. 2; identical with Tien, 123, 127, 765; inhabitants of, 126, 128 n. 1, 130, 153; amber from, 582 n. 1.
Ywan. See Yuan, the, people.

Z

Zaba, islet, possibly part of the Maniolai, 421.
Zaba, Zabei, kingdom, 8, 169, 267 n. 2, 777; connected with Campã, 6 (see Corregida, 740); probably corresponds to Purojava, 169, 218 n. 1; the ancient bay of, 215; derivation of the name, 216, 217; its identification discussed, 217, 219, 220; probably identical with T'o-peii, 218.
Zaba, Zabei, town, its identification discussed, 213, 220; reasons against its identification with Sadêk, 214; location of, discussed, 214, 215, 217; an important port, 215, 221; name now forgotten, 215; ancient remains found near, 218, 219; located in the vicinity of Kói-Mai, 219, 219 n. 2, 220, 221; meaning of the name, 731.
Zabaing, the, people, noted for silk-worm breeding, 51, 51 n. 1; probably
of the Mê-khmer race, 52; limits of the present habitat of, 52; description of, 52, 54, 744, 745; former inhabitants of the Chindwin valley, 52; connected with the Khami, 52; connected with Ptolemy’s Zamirai, 53; driven to the Pegu Roma, 54.

Zâbaj. See Zâbaj, kingdom.
Zábedi, kingdom, identical with the Malay Archipelago, 89.
Zábej, city, identified with Palembang, 578.
Zábej, kingdom, 237; other designations of, 200, 562, 566, 567, 568, 568 n. 2; camphor exported from, 437 n.; identification of, 465, 558, 561, 568, 568 n. 2; location of, 557; its identification with Java erroneous, 557, 557 n. 1, 578, 586; identified with Sumatra, 557, 559; Dhâûtâil Island belonged to, 558; extent of, 559; possessions of, 559, 709; crocodiles in the bay of, 561; productions of, 562; volcanoes on, 562; situation of the capital of, 562; names associated with, 562; Campâ and, alleged to form a single empire, 563; Chinese settlers in, 563; description of the capital of, 564, 564 n. 2; mercantile and political influence of, in India, 624 n. 1; discussion of the term, 633; connection with the term Śri-Bhûja is impossible, 633.

Zâbej, Mahârâja of, expedition sent by, the, 212, 213, 546, 560 n. 1, 561, 620; homage done by the kings of Kamboja to the, 546; account of the island of, the, 560, 561, 572, 573; legend respecting, 560; his palace located at Palembang, 560 n. 1, 620, 621, 629; possessions of, 561; extent of his sway, 562; productions of the territories of, 562; account of, 572; islands ruled by, 621.
Zainu-l-Abidîn, Sulğan, king of Achêb, 704.
Zâmân, port, connected with Ch’üian-chou, 625.

Zâlej, islands, identification of, 570, 571; islands mentioned among the, 571.
Zâmàn, a measure, 388 n.; its value discussed, 806; compared with a king, 806.
Zamatora Island, a form of Sumatra, 652; other designations of, 652.
Zamâtri, a form of Sumatra, 653.
Zameng. See Zabang, the people.
Zamirai, the, people, 66; cannibals of the Chindwin valley, 52; connected with the Zabang, 53; and with the Khami, 54; habitat of the, in Ptolemy’s time, 54; derivation of the name, 735; identification of, 744.
Zampa. See Ciamba, port.
Zanj, Zanj, island, owned by the Mahârâja of Zâbej, 561, 621; a clerical slip for Zâbej, 562, 570, 571; the name of Zanzibar and Sufâla, 570; the transoceanic trade of, 570.
Zanzibar Island, other designations of, 571; connected with Anûjah, 577, 577 n. 1.
Zapa, district, its identification discussed, 217.
Zein, kingdom, 746.
Zainu-d-dûn, lord of Shamañrah, 653.
Zeinu-l-Abidîn, king of Su-mênta-la, identification of, 648, 648 n. 2; twice supplanted by his brother, 648 n. 2; reinstated by men from Malacca, 648 n. 2; death of, 649.
Zetta, port, connected with Sada, 46.
Zhô, the, people, 744.
Zîbala, islet, possibly part of the Manoilai, 421.
Zîk’-abu, the, people, 131 n. 2.
Zôlore, island, 808.
Zôn Hôi. See Dong-hôi, city.
Zunda, kingdom, 452; location of the capital of, 453, 454; located on Sumatra, 453 n., 455 n. 1; extent of, 454; probably identical with Hsin-t’ô, 454, 628; pepper from, 454; other designations of, 628.