

## II. THE ARAB GEOGRAPHERS' CONCEPTION OF SOUTH-EAST ASIA

I have mentioned in the Introduction that there are three Arab conceptions of the South-East: (a) Ptolemaic, (b) Classical Arab and (c) a modern conception. Only the first two belong to the works of the classical geographers and can be clearly perceived running through the whole of Arab geographical literature. The astronomer-geographers like Khwārizmī, followed a mathematical science which they inherited from the Greeks, based on measurements of longitude and latitude, and their idea of the world and hence of South-East Asia is based on the tables of longitude and latitude compiled by Ptolemy. The purely descriptive geographers on the other hand reveal a very different conception based on more or less contemporary tales of travellers and similar descriptive works of their predecessors. The idea of an overall picture of the world was in the first place entirely foreign to these writers, their accounts showed only detached stories of individual places, and, at the most, strings of places on a particular route. Thus although Arab sailors must have had a fairly clear idea of the nature of South-East Asia, no definite picture of the area can be obtained from those writers who supposedly used information extracted from the sailors. It is only with our superior knowledge of the topography of the Far East that the stories of the texts can be placed in true relationship with each other.

Gradually authors perceived that their predecessors lacked an overall picture and attempted to improve their own accounts by inserting material from the early descriptive writers into the maps of the astronomer-geographers (as these latter writers had inserted "modern" place names of the Middle East into the Greek maps). As we shall see their efforts were not very successful. In spite of continual copying of material, many individual theories appear. The form any particular author gave to South-East Asia was modified by that author's general conception of the Indian Ocean and that in turn depended on his conception of the world as a whole. Thus we often have to take in a wider field (often embracing the whole world) in order to comprehend what an author understood by his description of the South-East. It is also necessary to follow the development of the South-East corner of the Arab world map (as opposed to text) in order to understand these later texts which combined both

conceptions. A study of the maps often helps to reveal the origin of textual errors, and to extract the true information from some of the more impossible accounts of these later authors.

The earliest Arab literary conception of the world<sup>1</sup> is that of the astronomer-mathematician, Khwārizmī, who flourished in the reign of Ma'mūn and produced a set of maps of the world, a text belonging to which has survived and is known as the *Šūrat al-ard*.<sup>2</sup> This was virtually a translation of Ptolemy, but was edited and enlarged with much contemporary material. Although no contemporary information was forthcoming on South-East Asia, that part dealing with the south-eastern area of Khwārizmī's world differs considerably from Ptolemy, and it is essential to note the main points of difference. In the map of Ptolemy (Fig. 1a), after the Ganges, there appears the peninsula of Chryse Chersonesos, and after this a large gulf, Megalos Kolpos (Lat. *Sinus magnus*), on the eastern side of which the Chinese coast extends south to Kattigara below the equator. It then continues south and west to join up with Africa, completely enclosing the Indian Ocean or Prasodes Thalassa (the Leek-green sea, Lat. Prasodis Mare; Arab: al-Baḥr al-Akhḍar). Khwārizmī (Fig. 1b), perhaps in an effort to show an encircling Ocean, which Ptolemy seems to reject, has caused the coast of China to trend to the north again after Kattigara, producing two peninsulas in the east and opening his Baḥr al-Akhḍar to the limits of the earth. The new sea is called the Baḥr al-Muzlim, the Sea of Darkness, and this new area has several new non-Ptolemaic features. Of the smaller features of Khwārizmī's South-East Asia, the majority are transliterations or translations of Ptolemy's names; thus Chryse Chersonesos becomes Jazīrat Dhuhbaniya, and Argyre (*Argentea*) (actually Iabadiu) becomes Jazīrat al-Fiḍḍa.

The longitudes of Khwārizmī are all proportionately less than those of Ptolemy, but the difference in longitude increases slightly as one goes east. al-Farama at the mouth of the Nile has a longitude 8° 35' less than Ptolemy's Pelusion and at Kattigara the difference is 15° 30'.<sup>3</sup> More accurate measurements had been carried out by the Arabs before Khwārizmī's time, but whether he used the results of

<sup>1</sup> Excluding any that may be given in the Qur'ān and early poetry.

<sup>2</sup> *Kitāb šūrat al-ard*, ed. by H. von Mžik (*B.A.H.u.G.*, iii, 1926). Note also the work of Suhṙāb: *Kitāb šūwar al-Aḳālim* ed. by H. von Mžik (*B.A.H.u.G.*, v, 1930).

<sup>3</sup> Ptolemy's longitudes for Pelusion and Kattigara are 63° 15' and 177° 0' respectively. Khwārizmī's are 54° 40' and 161° 30'. The correct identifications of Ptolemy's place-names are irrelevant as the Arabs took contemporary versions of Ptolemy's text and used them at their face value. An interesting attempt to identify Ptolemy's South-East Asian toponymy can be found in Van der Meulen's articles in *Indonesia*, vol. 18 (1974) pp. 1-40 and vol. 19 (1975) pp. 1-32.

these experiments we cannot tell. In any case Khwārizmī had a spare  $18\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$  before the  $180^{\circ}$  meridian and this may be why he inserted the extra material; although he may have deliberately compressed Ptolemy's map in order to insert it. Mžik has shown that the extra material may possibly be connected with the Alexander Romances.<sup>4</sup> The Baħr al-Muħlim resembles the Land of Darkness and the Foetid Sea, which Alexander crossed, and Yājūj and Mājūj (Gog and Magog) also find a place in Khwārizmī. He may also have been trying to reconcile Ptolemy with the Qur'ān.

The other features of this new area are the Shining Castle, *al-Qal'at al-muḍī'a*, which has a definite connexion with Alexander in later authors,<sup>5</sup> and a second Jazīrat al-Fiḍḍa, which may be a duplicate of the first (Ptolemy's Argyre) or Khwārizmī may have had some more definite reason for inserting it. The Island of the Corundum, Jazīrat al-Yāqūt, also has similarities with part of Alexander's fictitious route. This island may reveal early rumours of a jewel-bearing Ceylon.<sup>6</sup> In addition Khwārizmī inserts a large river Suwās سواس flowing from a range called Urūs Akhrūsus<sup>7</sup> near Jazīrat al-Yāqūt and ending in the sea near Kattigara, in roughly the same place as Ptolemy's *Cutiarus Fl.* On this river is a town, called Sūsah, which may be original or could be either Coccoranagara, or Sarata of Ptolemy.

Slightly later than Khwārizmī is Ibn Khurdādhbih, whose *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik* introduces us to a completely different conception of South-East Asia. Ibn Khurdādhbih gives us a route from the Persian Gulf to China. We have no map this time, only a written description of the route with distances between places, and only very occasionally vague directions. It is thus impossible to reconstruct a map of his route unless, after producing identifications for some of the better known places, we invent hypothetical directions by comparing it with a modern map (Fig. 2a). Thus we can follow Ibn Khurdādhbih fairly accurately round the coast of Arabia and across the Arabian Sea to Daibul and the mouth of the Indus (Mīhrān), and then if we take Sirandīb to be Ceylon we can follow him round the coasts of India almost to the mouth of the Ganges. Of course, Ibn Khurdādhbih measures most of these sea routes in days, and the distance covered in a day's journey at sea can vary

<sup>4</sup> *Parageographische Elementen*, etc. *op. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> *Mukhtaṣar al-'ajā'ib*, pp. 46, 48 (Ferrand, pp. 148-9); Qazwīnī: *Kitāb 'ajā'ib al-makhlūqāt*, p. 112; Dimashqī, pp. 197, 215 and others.

<sup>6</sup> The island of al-Yāqūt is packed with detail and may have been derived from the Greek version of Taprobane, although there is no close resemblance to Ptolemy's map of the latter place.

<sup>7</sup> Ὀρος χρυσούν see Mžik: *Parageographische Elementen*, p. 194.

enormously with the weather and the type of ship used. For smaller distances, however, and distances in the vicinity of Arabia he uses parasangs, and although he explains what a parasang is in his introduction, he does not say how many parasangs there are in a day's journey at sea, so we are left to form our own opinions on this matter.<sup>8</sup> As far as the Ganges, Ibn Khurdādhbih's distances give us a fairly accurate picture of the coast of Arabia and India, although his distances north and south appear to be a little short compared with those in an east-west direction, and his dimensions for Sirandīb appear to be a little on the large size.

Now we must examine his routes in South-East Asia. From Sirandīb the route goes to Langabālūs or Alankabālūs and then on to Kalāh (Kilah).<sup>9</sup> He leaves Sirandīb on the right, which seems to indicate that the route went round the north of the island. This fact is further brought out by the statement that the Great Sea was two days past Bullīn,<sup>10</sup> and it is here that the routes divide, i.e. the coastal route up the east coast of India from the route to China. Bullīn is only one day from Sirandīb and therefore somewhere near the southern part of the Palk strait. From the northern point of Ceylon then it is ten to fifteen days to Alankabālūs and then six more to Kalāh. Kalāh (q.v.) we have suggested could be Kedah. From a combined study of all accounts this place must be on the western coast of the Malay Peninsula, and such a position shows the island of Alankabālūs to be in the Andaman-Nicobar group. Ibn Khurdādhbih's distances thus show a reasonable accuracy comparable to his other figures, although the ten to fifteen days between Sirandīb and Alankabālūs allow for much conjecture.<sup>11</sup>

The route from Kalāh onwards is very vague and does not make sense, and it is best to tackle it from China and work backwards. Khānfū to Lūqīn are four days by sea, Lūqīn to Ṣanf, one hundred parasangs; Ṣanf to Qmār, three days; and Qmār to "there" (either Tiyūma or Mā'īṭ, but most likely the former) is five days. Identifying these places as Canton, Lung-pien (Red river delta), Champa, Cambodia and Tioman, we have a fairly accurate representation of this part of the route on a similar scale to the earlier portion. But in

<sup>8</sup> For details of measurements see note 25, p. 18.

<sup>9</sup> De Goeje reads كالكابورس but the majority of the texts omit the initial *alif* and I have used the form Langabālūs throughout. See p. 152. Kalāh is كاله in Ibn Khurdādhbih, but I have used the more general form Kalāh كاله throughout.

<sup>10</sup> There are many different ways of spelling this name in the Arabic texts. Minorsky (*Hudūd al-'Ālām*, p. 243) says it is Balaipatam, but this does not agree with Ibn Khurdādhbih's position at all.

<sup>11</sup> Compare Ibn Mājid, who in the *Ma'āqīya* poem makes the distance from Kālikūt to the Nicobars, thirteen days. See p. 200.

between Kalāh and Tiyūma, things are not clear. To the left of Kalāh is Bālūs, two days away. This itself is confusing, for if Bālūs is on the left of the route which is aiming in a general eastwards direction, then it would be somewhere on the Malay Peninsula to the north of Kalāh. No likely place can be found here and the majority of scholars have insisted that Bālūs should be in Sumatra. The *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib*<sup>12</sup> quotes this passage of Ibn Khurdādhbih, but uses the word "to the right" instead of "to the left". This of course solves the difficulty for Bālūs in Sumatra and is one step nearer our goal—China. Also the context fits better. However, there is no reason to regard the rendering of the *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib* as more accurate than the other, unless we imagine that the *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib* obtained its information from a more accurate copy of Ibn Khurdādhbih than the one which has survived for us.

"From 'there'", which presumably means Bālūs, although some scholars say Kalāh for their own convenience, "to the islands of Jāba, Salāhiṭ and Harang—two parasangs". This text looks terribly corrupt, and Idrīsī's quotation of this passage evidently gives a better rendering.<sup>13</sup> He places two parasangs between each of these islands but it is still not clear whether there is also two parasangs between Bālūs and Jāba. Jāba and Mā'iṭ are close together—one would think too close to warrant the actual distance being mentioned, although perhaps Ibn Khurdādhbih had no figure for this distance. Nor are we given figures for the Mā'iṭ–Tiyūma distance. Tiyūma is found to the left (of the route?) and then there are five days to Qmār. Perhaps the five days are from Mā'iṭ to Qmār. It is difficult to tell. In any case, at the most the distance between Kalāh and Tiyūma is a little over two days and six parasangs, by no means enough. The *Akhbār al-Šin* makes the distance ten days, although this text always has larger figures than Ibn Khurdādhbih and their figures can in no way be compared. The only explanation that I can offer is that the lengths of the islands are not taken into account. Thus the islands may be two parasangs apart, but they may be many parasangs long and ships will have to sail along them or round them, and of course the distances Bālūs–Jāba and Mā'iṭ–Tiyūma are not really stated at all. Working from the scale of days used by Ibn Khurdādhbih in the rest of the Indian Ocean, one would expect the distance between Kalāh and Tiyūma to be between eight and nine days.

In addition to this direct route Ibn Khurdādhbih mentions one other distance. "From these islands (Jāba, Salāhiṭ and Harang) to

<sup>12</sup> P. 49.

<sup>13</sup> P. 53.

the Land of Spices is fifteen days." I have argued about this elsewhere,<sup>14</sup> and I need only say here that fifteen days is by no means great enough by Ibn Khurdādhbih's standards to enable us to equate the Land of Spices with the Moluccas, but it must be noticed that this is the only reference amongst the early geographers to islands any distance east of the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra.

Apart from this, Ibn Khurdādhbih mentions several islands beyond Sirandīb, which must belong to South-East Asia, although Ibn Khurdādhbih does not associate them with the above-mentioned islands on the China route. Most of these are nameless, but the two named, Rāmī and Zābaj, we can associate with the Malay Archipelago. These nameless islands following Sirandīb show a close resemblance to a group mentioned in a similar way by the *Akhbār al-Šin*. We have an island of white people who exchange things for iron, an island of black curly-haired people, and a mountain where silver can be obtained from the soil by the action of fire. These can be identified from the *Akhbār al-Šin* as Langabālūs, Andamān and the Silver Island beyond, and show a knowledge of the Nicobars, the Andamans and perhaps as far as the coast of Burma for silver is obtained from the interior although not near the coast.

Altogether Ibn Khurdādhbih produces a surprising amount of information about South-East Asia, but it is doubtful whether he had as clear a picture of these islands as we can obtain from his text with our superior knowledge of the layout of this area. Ibn Khurdādhbih gives this group of islands beyond Sirandīb<sup>15</sup> without any direction or distances and he must have imagined them away from the China route and perhaps before one gets to Alankabālūs, and he does not realise that the route goes through them. He placed Rāmī and Zābaj among them with Rāmī possibly the nearest of them to Sirandīb. Beyond them again are Qmār and Šanf, this time with distances but with no directions.

The account of the *Akhbār al-Šin* has much in common with that of Ibn Khurdādhbih. The distances are quite incompatible, those of the *Akhbār al-Šin* being much greater than those of Ibn Khurdādhbih. The main difference however between the accounts is that the *Akhbār al-Šin* reads in a far less systematic way than Ibn Khurdādhbih's text, although this is what one might expect from the nature of the two accounts (a collection of tales and a catalogue of routes). The *Akhbār al-Šin* is certainly the more original of the two. It has no coastal detail in Arabia or India to give a preconceived notion of the accuracy of the author before we attempt to unravel

<sup>14</sup> *JMBRAS*, 1957, v. 30i, p. 34.

<sup>15</sup> The *Akhbār al-Šin* does the same thing.

the information given about the South-East. More imagination is needed in order to obtain a clear picture of what the text means (Fig. 2b).

The Ocean between Arabia and China is divided into seas of which four are definitely named, but later authors make a total of seven. The seas named are the Baḥr Lārwi, between Arabia and the Laccadives and the Maldives, the Baḥr Harkand from this sea to Rāmnī, Salāhiṭ on the other side of Rāmnī and Şankhai between Şanf (Champa) and the "Gates of China".

The route to China is also simpler than that of Ibn Khurdādhbih and has the advantage of continuing all the way without the awkward gaps which the other one has in the middle of the Archipelago. One month takes one from Muscat to Kūlam-Malay, and another to Kalāh. Sirandīb does not occur on the route although the author has much to say about it elsewhere. We have no means of telling whether the route goes to the north or to the south of the island. Kalāh is one month from southern India, Tiyyūma ten days from Kalāh, then Kadrang after another ten days, Şanf after ten more and Şundur Fūlāt after still another ten. From here China is one month, although the Gates of China are only a journey of seven days away, unless one reads this passage as if ships passed by the Gates of China for seven days out of the month. This long journey from Şundur Fūlāt to China certainly makes a fairly accurate route look a little odd and I think some mistake has crept in here. If, as I see it, Şundur Fūlāt is in the vicinity of Hainan, seven days to the islands around Hong Kong and the delta of the Shu-kiang (Gates of China) is a reasonable estimate on the same scale.<sup>16</sup> The month's journey may be to a port further north, by-passing Canton (Khānfū) although the *Akhbār al-Şin* does not mention any other Chinese ports.<sup>17</sup>

The speed with which ships pass through the Archipelago should be noted. There are only two stops, Kalāh and Tiyyūma and then Kadrang which is the equivalent of Ibn Khurdādhbih's Qmār. Like Ibn Khurdādhbih, the *Akhbār al-Şin* has another section after the description of Sirandīb—a long list of islands is given, which can be reached from there. The first is Rāmnī, which we can identify as the tip of Sumatra and which is washed by two seas, Harkand and

<sup>16</sup> Şundur Fūlāt has been equated with Poulo Condore and M. Polo's Sondur and Condur, which might be a month from Canton, but not en route from Şanf to China. See the discussion given in Sauvaget: *Akhbār al-Şin*, p. 45, note 4.

<sup>17</sup> Ibn Khurdādhbih has Khānjū خانجو; 8 days beyond Khānfū and Qānşū قانسو, 20 days beyond that.

Salāhiṭ.<sup>18</sup> The text then indicates two places on the west coast of Sumatra, Fanşūr and Niyān (Nias). Beyond this group is Langabālūs (Alankabālūs of Ibn Khurd), then Andamān, and after this there are the mountains with silver mines, and one of the mountains, used as a landmark, is al-Khushnāmī, which might be Burma if the author intends these last three places to follow on in geographical order.

This is the limit of the knowledge of the *Akhbār al-Şin*. Except for the vague reference to a volcano near Zābaj—Kalāh is also described as a kingdom of Zābaj—we have no clue to any islands to the south-east as we have in Ibn Khurdādhbih. As in Ibn Khurdādhbih the text gives us no indication that the China route passes through the group of islands which follows the description of Sirandīb. These two sets of stories could relate to islands in completely different directions, but a clue is obtained when we try to combine the two accounts. Langabālūs in the *Akhbār al-Şin* is one of the islands beyond Sirandīb, but according to Ibn Khurdādhbih is on the route to China. The white race selling things for iron in the text of Ibn Khurdādhbih dwells on Langabālūs in the *Akhbār al-Şin*. The only place between Sirandīb and Kalāh is Malḥan in the *Akhbār al-Şin* and Alankabālūs in Ibn Khurdādhbih. It is quite probable that these two islands are close together, although perhaps not so obvious to the early geographers as it is to us.

Salāhiṭ, the sea of the *Akhbār al-Şin*, washes the island of Rāmnī, but Salāhiṭ is an island beyond Kalāh in Ibn Khurdādhbih. Are these two connected? If they are, and the next generation of geographers connects them, then the China route with the islands of Langabālūs and Kalāh must circle round Rāmnī in some way. A further connecting link is Zābaj, although there is no sign at this stage of the large empire which welded these south-eastern islands together. Ibn Khurdādhbih places Zābaj with Rāmnī and states that the ruler is called the Maharāja, and elsewhere places him amongst the important kings of India.<sup>19</sup> The *Akhbār al-Şin* makes Kalāh part of the kingdom of Zābaj. All this helps to build up a primitive picture of the Bay of Bengal and the Straits of Malacca, which vaguely resembled its true shape. Arab geographers knowing both texts must have been aware of this rough picture, although one

<sup>18</sup> Harkand هرکند is the Bay of Bengal, the usual derivation being *Harikeliya* a name for Eastern Bengal, although Sauvaget (*Akhbār*, p. 35) gives another suggestion, a Tamil word, *arikandam*. Salāhiṭ, I have identified with the Straits of Malacca (see p. 145).

<sup>19</sup> Under the section on the "Kings of the world". *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik*, p. 13.

would hardly think so comparing it with the maps produced two or three centuries later.

Versions of these two texts persist more or less separately for the next century and a half. But the version of the *Akhbār al-Šīn* seems to have been the more popular. The division of the Indian Ocean into seas (usually seven) occurs in Ya'qūbī, Ibn al-Faḡīh, Abū Zaid and Mas'ūdī, although the seas are not always given the same names. It reappears in the *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib* (probably from Mas'ūdī) and from this text it finds its way into the works of most of the later geographers. The *'Ajā'ib al-Hind*, the second collection of tales, although it does not mention seven seas, uses a similar system calling seas locally after the country whose shores they wash.

The actual names given to the seas in order from Basra to China according to the *Akhbār al-Šīn* and Ibn al-Faḡīh<sup>20</sup> are Fāris, Lārwi, Harkand, Salāhiṭ, then an unnamed portion of sea, and finally Šankhai next to China. Ya'qūbī has the first three and then Kalāh-bār, Salāhiṭ, Kadrang and Šankhai, while Mas'ūdī has Kadrang and Šanf for the fifth and sixth and omits Salāhiṭ. The *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib* has the same as Mas'ūdī but substitutes Dawānjid دوانجد for Kadrang, most likely a misreading of Kadrang كدرنج for this is the only time it occurs. Also the *Mukhtaṣar* calls the Sea of Šankhai the Sea of China.

Abū Zaid when editing the *Akhbār al-Šīn* adds several things to the description of South-East Asia. His most important contribution is the account of the attack of the Maharāja, the king of Zābaj, against the King of Qmār (Cambodia). This story for the first time gives us the extent of the Maharāja's empire, and shows it to consist of a large archipelago, and gives the names and sizes of several "islands". The town of Zābaj is ten to twenty days to the south of Qmār, which faces Arabia (presumably the direction from which the Arab ships come). Zābaj itself faces China (i.e. the opposite direction) and is one month from it. Its area is 900 parasangs. The total extent (مسافة) of the empire is 1,000 parasangs. The islands named are Rāmnī with an area (تكبير) of 800 parasangs, Sribuza, exactly half as large and Kalāh which is considerably smaller, being only 80 parasangs in area.<sup>21</sup> No positions are given for these islands. We can only guess that Sribuza is a little further to the south and the east than the other places so far mentioned. Abū Zaid's only other additions to eastern topography are the mention of Khumdān as the

<sup>20</sup> The *Akhbār al-Šīn* does not actually name all seven, as the beginning of the text is missing. Ibn al-Faḡīh is obviously quoting from the same source as the former text and it is possible that the other seas were named in the missing section.

<sup>21</sup> See note 10, p. 103.

capital of China and a Chinese town Bamdū بمندو on the borders of Tibet.

The accounts of Mas'ūdī and Abū Zaid are so similar as to need no comment. Mas'ūdī adds more detail in the Indian peninsula, but not in the islands. In his *Murūj al-Dhahab*, like the preceding writers, he has seven seas in the Indian Ocean but he adds the complication of the Encircling Ocean, with which I will deal below.

The route of the traveller, Abū Dulaf, is very odd, and many scholars have doubted his journey. His return journey from China to Persia is chaotic, and so is the order of tribes visited in the journey across Central Asia. It has been suggested that he invented the journey, following some current but erroneous account of the Indian Ocean coast. As I mentioned earlier,<sup>22</sup> judging from his comments on the two South-East Asian towns of which he gives an account, Qāqulla (Jājullā) and Kalāh, I would hazard a guess that he obtained his material from Chinese sources while resident in China. The places mentioned in the order given in his route are thus: Sandābil (Kansu), Kalāh, Camphor country (perhaps Sumatra), Qāmrūn (Qāmarūba = Assam), Qmāriyān (Cambodia?), Šanf (Champa), the Land of Pepper (S. India), Šaimūr, Jājullā (Tenasserim?), Qashmīr, Kābul, Mandūrapatam<sup>23</sup> (Madura in India), Kūlam, Multan and Mansūra in Sind. After leaving Kalāh he attempts to reach the Land of Pepper, but arrives at the Land of Camphor (Sumatra). Here he mentions the towns of Qamrūn, Qmāriyān, Šanf and Šaimūr, so it is doubtful if he intends us to believe that he visited them, for he only seems to mention them in connection with camphor and aloeswood. They need not therefore be part of the route. He does not reach the Land of Pepper, for he next arrives at Jājullā (Tenasserim?) and after two more stops arrives on the east coast of India at Mandūrapatam and then continues round the coast to Persia. The two stops between Jājullā and Mandūrapatam are Qashmīr and Kābul, both of which could represent towns on the Bay of Bengal. Qashmīr is used by Ibn Mājid (1463) in error for Cosmīn, an early port near Bassein in Burma which appears on most early European maps. This is probably the origin of the mistake made by so many later geographers of placing Kashmir in the east of India. Abū Dulaf's description of Kābul on the other hand fits the real Kābul much better than a town in eastern India.

An alternative route for Abū Dulaf is from Kalāh to Sumatra and then to the Land of Pepper in South India. From there he could

<sup>22</sup> See p. 10.

<sup>23</sup> Nainar, p. 60 has equated this town with Madura. The identification of Qāmrūn with Assam (Kamarupa) is from Ferrand, *Relations*, p. 222.

actually go north to Şaimūr, then further north to some other place which he has called Jājullā, and then actually to Kashmir and Kābul and then south again to the Indus delta. This route does not take into account Kūlam and Mandūrapatam. Perhaps, Abū Dulaf really did invent his route. Nevertheless his route can be followed more easily on Idrīsī's map than it can on a modern one.

The later collections of tales, the voyages of Sindbād from the *Thousand and One Nights*, the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* and its successor the *Mukhtaşar al-'Ajā'ib*, all being in the main tales taken from sailors, have no clear idea of the South-East as a whole, and give only hints here and there which can occasionally be fitted together to show some topographical relationship. In such cases these routes and topographical details more or less fall into place in this literary conception of South-East Asia as well as on a modern map. In addition these texts add a few new names to the South-East Asian scene, such as Qāqulla and Şanfin.<sup>24</sup>

The *Mukhtaşar al-'Ajā'ib* follows Mas'ūdī as far as the general topography of South-East Asia is concerned, but includes stories of several mythological islands including the Shining Castle, which has also crept into Khwārizmī's *Şūrat al-arḍ* and other stories connected with Alexander. This text also gives the curious idea of the world likened to the shape of a bird, which appears in Ibn al-Faqīh and Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam.<sup>25</sup> This usually shows Arabia as the head of the bird, with one wing stretching out to the east and the other to the west with the tail in the north. No two authors put the same countries in the same place, but an idea of this may be obtained from one of Ibn al-Wardī's world maps reproduced in Miller.<sup>26</sup> This conception of the world is not detailed enough to affect South-East Asia.

At this stage (approx. A.D. 1000) it might be a good idea to look back and see what can be gleaned of the real South-East Asia from a combined reading of all the texts so far discussed, for we have already dealt with all those which I have relegated to the category of "primary sources" with the exception of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa and the navigational texts (Fig. 5). In the Bay of Bengal, Ibn Khurdādhbih shows that the Arabs had a knowledge of the Indian coast as far as Orissa and a little beyond.<sup>27</sup> Whether they visited any more of this coast we cannot tell from existing sources. The next place on the coast, again

<sup>24</sup> Other place names of minor importance only mentioned by the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* are Maraḡawand مرغاونده, Badfārkalah بدفاركاله and Lūlūbilank لؤلؤ بيلانك. The *'Ajā'ib* also has Lāmuri for Rāmmi.

<sup>25</sup> The latter quotes from 'Abdallāh b. 'Amr b. al-'Ās. *Futūḡ Mişr*, Cairo ed., p. 1.

<sup>26</sup> *Mappae Arabicae*, Bd. V, Taf. 75-79.

<sup>27</sup> To Abīna, four days beyond Orissa.

mentioned by Ibn Khurdādhbih, is Rahmā, usually identified with Rāmaṅya or Pegu. From here, several localities seem to have been known down the coast. Şanfin, Qāqulla and Kalāh, all appearing in the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind*, seem to be in this locality—perhaps the whole coast was known as far south as the limits of Kalāh, i.e. probably as far as Selangor and the Klang river in the Malay Peninsula. In the Ocean, both the Nicobar and the Andaman groups had been described fairly accurately. The north and west coasts of Sumatra were well known as far south as the islands of Barāwa.<sup>28</sup> Nothing on the northern part of the east coast has been mentioned, perhaps because the Arab ships sailed straight across to the Malay Peninsula at this point. Further south, from the latitude of Malacca, the Sumatran coast was again visited if we regard Ibn Khurdādhbih's trio of islands, Jāba, Salāhiḡ and Harang as existing here. The coast was probably known as far as Palembang where the Sri Vijayan (Zābaj?) empire had its capital. Apart from Sumatra no other islands of the Archipelago are really mentioned. Vague references to Bartāyil and Wāqwāq may show that the Arabs had heard of other islands. Ibn Khurdādhbih's report of the Spice Islands shows that they were not completely ignorant of the rest of the Archipelago, although they were by no means familiar with it. The coast of the continent they knew better. The end of the Malay Peninsula and the island of Tioman are described. The Pahang coast is vaguely suggested although nothing else from the Gulf of Siam, which Arab traders do not seem to have penetrated. The next stop after the Malay Peninsula was the coast of Indo-China or possibly the western mouth of the Mekong (Kampot). To the north, the whole coast of Indochina was known and a considerable portion of the Chinese coast perhaps as far as Korea.

So far, only a conception of South-East Asia obtained from reading the literary texts has been discussed. But all the time, attempts were being made by the more scientific Arab writers to combine this "pure" conception with the only scientific conception which they possessed of the area (the Ptolemaic version of Khwārizmī). At first only vague suggestions of Khwārizmī appear, but the two conceptions gradually become more and more mixed as time goes on, the process of mixing having three noticeable stages. The first stage is an attempt to introduce the Greek idea of an encircling Ocean and the Khwārizmian names of the oceans. The second is the prolongation of the African coast to meet China. The third is the equation of some of the ancient Greek names with modern ones and

<sup>28</sup> Perhaps the Batu Is., see p. 144.

the placing of ancient and modern names together in the same text or on one map. Of these stages, the first does not affect South-East Asia greatly but the other two are extremely important.

Khwārizmī's seas are the Baḥr al-Akhḍar (the Green Sea), and the Baḥr al-Muẓlim (the Sea of Darkness), representing the Indian Ocean and the Ocean of the Extreme East respectively. In addition, the Arabs use the name the Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ for the Encircling Ocean and the Baḥr al-A'ẓam (the Great Sea), for the Ocean in general east of Suez (Qulzum). Other names such as Baḥr al-Hind and Baḥr al-Ṣīn are used, although when Khwārizmī used these he used them locally. Ibn Khurdādhbih mentions only the Baḥr Fāris and the Baḥr al-A'ẓam, and the *Akhbār al-Ṣīn* mentions only the seven (?) divisions of the Indian Ocean by name. Ya'qūbī and Ibn al-Faqīh follow the latter, although Ibn al-Faqīh uses the term al-Baḥr al-A'ẓam for the Indian Ocean in general. Ibn Rusta introduces Khwārizmī's term al-Baḥr al-Muẓlim and uses it for the Encircling Ocean, which seems to be beyond the Indian Ocean (Baḥr al-Hind) although the text is not clear. Qudāma, who wrote about A.D. 922, although he has nothing about South-East Asia, does use Khwārizmī's seas in a different sense from that of Khwārizmī himself, and has thus possibly influenced several other writers. The Baḥr al-Akhḍar, he says, is the same as the Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ and is known to the Greeks as Uqiyānūs, and is to the west of Spain, i.e. the Atlantic. The Ocean to the east of Suez is the Baḥr al-A'ẓam. He does not use the term al-Baḥr al-Muẓlim. In fact, except in Ibn Yūnus and Muqaddasī, the Baḥr al-Muẓlim does not occur again until the *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib* where it represents the eastern part of the Encircling Ocean. But from this last text its use becomes more common in the later geographers. Mas'ūdī, as I have mentioned above, uses the Baḥr al-Akhḍar in the same sense as Qudāma in *Kitāb al-tanbih wa'l-ishrāf*, but he envisaged a complete encircling Ocean and the Green Sea appears in the extreme south and east as well.

The Balkhī school of geographers has yet another system. The maps of Ibn Ḥauqal are highly formalised and show a rather wedge-shaped Ocean between Asia and Africa. The three islands shown in this ocean are all islands of the Persian Gulf although the text of these authors includes Sirandīb,<sup>29</sup> and the sea itself is called Baḥr Fāris, as if they imagined the Persian Gulf to reach to China and the Encircling Ocean, which is given the most expressive name, al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ. Muhammad b. Aḥmad Muqaddasī places Sirandīb in the

<sup>29</sup> Sirandīb does appear as part of the mainland in the maps of the *Baḥr Fāris* in the *Islam Atlas*. Miller, Bd. III, III. Beiheft, Taf. 22-4.

Baḥr Harkand, and also mentions al-Yāqūt (from Khwārizmī), Jazīrat al-Kalb with Gold mines, al-Rām(n)ī and Socotra in that order towards the Baḥr al-Muẓlim. The *Ḥudūd al-Aflām* strikes an original line here by using the Baḥr al-Akhḍar for the Eastern Ocean, or China Sea and the Baḥr al-A'ẓam for the Indian Ocean.

The prolongation of the African coast which appears so complete in Ptolemy as to actually join China has never reached this extent among the Arabs. They have always insisted on an outlet for the Indian Ocean, similar to the Straits of Gibraltar for the Mediterranean. But the proximity of Africa to China in some accounts has affected the arrangement of South-East Asian material, particularly as the word al-Zābij الزابج so closely resembles Zanj الزنج, the name of the inhabitants of East Africa.

Khwārizmī does not follow Ptolemy here and makes his coast of China fade out to the north-east, showing no inclination to bring the African coast to meet it. He marks an island al-Zanj to the east of Ṭabrūbanā (Ptolemy's Taprobane). Later Arab geographers were to rediscover this peculiarity of Ptolemy with regard to the African coast and attempt to correct Khwārizmī. Ibn Khurdādhbih does not mention the African coast, nor does the *Akhbār al-Ṣīn*, but an early sign of confusion may be the treatment of Ibn Khurdādhbih's land of Wāqwāq. Ibn Khurdādhbih has placed Wāqwāq to the east of China, and stated that from Qulzum (Suez) to Wāqwāq was 4,500 parasangs. This statement also appears in one of Sindbād's voyages, so it probably comes from an early and fairly common travel tale of the Indian Ocean. Later writers have ignored Ibn Khurdādhbih's easterly position of Wāqwāq, and have taken the second statement and applied it either to the Asian or the African coast indiscriminately. Thus Ya'qūbī only a quarter of a century later places Wāqwāq in the Baḥr Lārwi, i.e. the Arabian Sea. Hence we must assume that he means it to be placed at the African extremity of this sea, although he nowhere assumes that the African coast turns east. Ibn al-Faqīh, confused, makes two Wāqwāqs, one in the south and one in the east. Mas'ūdī places Wāqwāq beyond Sofala. It may be that this confusion of the position of Wāqwāq encouraged the Arabs to bring the African coast eastwards, for by the time of Idrīsī, when the extremity of Africa and the extremity of China were in the same place, one Wāqwāq was sufficient for both theories and no one could be confused.

The early descriptive geographers, however, show no inclination to stretch Africa eastwards. Ibn al-Faqīh makes his Baḥr al-A'ẓam bend round to the west to reach the Maghrib. Ibn Rusta produces a new theory of the Indian Ocean, which also appears in the work of

Muṭahhar b. Ṭāhir al-Maḡdisī,<sup>30</sup> and the influence of which can be seen in Idrīsī's larger map.<sup>31</sup> This theory divides the Indian Ocean (Baḥr al-Hind) into an eastern and western part, derived from the fact that ships leaving the Gulf of Aden and the Persian Gulf sail in two directions (to Africa and to East Asia). In the eastern half is India, with Sind to the north, Qashmīr and China to the east and the "Islands burned by the sun" in the south. In the western half of the ocean, we have Yemen, Zābaj, and Zanj, in that order. This is obviously an example of the confusion of Zābaj and Zanj. In fact Ibn Rusta appears so confused over the forms of his names that his sailing directions for reaching Zābaj are completely incomprehensible. It is obvious that he imagines Zābaj close to Kalāh like the other texts and also imagines Zanj close by, but Zanj is definitely in the west and there is no indication of the African coast approaching China.

Except for placing Wāqwāq near Sofala, Mas'ūdī clearly separates the two coasts of the Indian Ocean. Abu Zaid enlarges on the account of the *Akhbār al-Šin* by mentioning Aden and the African trade. He calls the two coasts the left and right sides of the Ocean but goes no further.

It is the Balkhī school who first mention that the various provinces of Africa are "opposite" certain lands in Asia and that Africa continues until it is opposite China. The world maps of Iṣṭakhri and Ibn Ḥauqal on the whole give the Indian Ocean the wedge shape mentioned before, but their maps of the Baḥr Fāris make it rectangular, one side of the rectangle being open to the Encircling Ocean. This is the system which reaches its climax in Idrīsī, although for a long time the idea of the sea with an open side remains. Bīrūnī, in spite of Lelewel's reconstruction of his world map<sup>32</sup> gives no indication of an African coast opposite China. In the list of latitudes and longitudes given in the ninth section of *al-Qānūn al-Mas'ūdī*,<sup>33</sup> the whole of Africa remains to the west of the 65° meridian including Sofala, the farthest district known to the Arabs. In the map in the Arabic MS. 5666 in the Preussische Staatsbibliothek<sup>34</sup> he shows the Indian Ocean open, and Zābaj on the Chinese side of India separated from the Jazā'ir al-Zanj by the Jazā'ir al-Dībajāt (the Maldives and the Laccadives). Zeki Validi gives another schematic picture of

<sup>30</sup> *Kitāb al-bad' wa'l-tarikh*, edited by Cl. Huart. Paris, 1907, t. 4, pp. 57-8.

<sup>31</sup> See Fig. 3.

<sup>32</sup> See pp. 83-4.

<sup>33</sup> See p. 83.

<sup>34</sup> Reproduced in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (1st. ed.) *Supplementary volume*, under the article *DJUGH RĀFIYA*.

the world from an MS. of the *Tahdīd nihāyat al-amākin litashīh masāfāt al-masākin*<sup>35</sup> where Zanj and Zābaj are put in the same section with India (Hind) and Sind, but this means very little for they are all separated from Arabia by the Persian Gulf and from China and Tibet by Kashmir.<sup>36</sup> Even Qazwīnī, as late as the thirteenth century, in spite of the primitive ideas about the Indian Ocean given in his text, has a map with an open ocean. In fact his map, as drawn by Wüstenfeld,<sup>37</sup> is similar to that of Bīrūnī (MS. 5666) except that Zābaj is written Zanj, making the term Jazā'ir al-Zanj appear twice. It is from Idrīsī and his followers that we get the closest link-up between Asia and Africa and a narrow opening to the Indian Ocean.

The mixing up of Ptolemaic material with "modern" material began with Khwārizmī himself. As he had no material for South-East Asia itself he used entirely Ptolemaic data for this area. The introduction of modern material from Ibn Khurdādhbih and the *Akhbār al-Šin* into this setting must have begun at an early stage, although it does not appear in existing texts until near the end of the tenth century. It is possible that the missing work of Jaihānī used this process or at least attempted to identify modern names with Ptolemy's. Kharaqī (c. 1132) quoting Jaihānī gives the dimensions of the Indian Ocean, showing it to be long and narrow with the large island of Tabrūbānā or Sirandīb, surrounded by nineteen other islands, including Zābaj, Dībajāt, Qmair, Kalāh and Sribuza. Muḥammad b. Mush'ir al-Muḡaddasī, one of the Ikhwān al-Šafā also mentions Sirandīb in a Ptolemaic setting. He divides the world into climates and places in the first climate Jazīrat al-Yāqūt, then China, then Sirandīb with Central India.

The *Hudūd al-Ālam* produces from some unknown source a new conception of the islands in the Indian Ocean which is surprisingly close to Idrīsī. This is probably derived from Jaihānī for it agrees in principle with the version given by Kharaqī above. In describing the Indian Ocean (al-Baḥr al-A'zam) the system of Ibn Rusta is used with Zābaj near Zanj (here Zanjistan), at the southern limit of the Ocean, although Ibn Rusta places them in the western part of the Ocean. Presumably this means that an Indian Ocean shaped as in the maps of Ibn Ḥauqal and Iṣṭakhri is to be imagined. In the *Discourse on the islands*<sup>38</sup> the Khwarizmian "Island of Silver"

<sup>35</sup> "Bīrūnī's Picture of the World", *Memoirs of the Indian Arch. Soc.* 53, p. 61.

<sup>36</sup> Bīrūnī knew a great deal about northern India and would not have placed Kashmir between India and Tibet. This map is only in diagram form. It is possible that the influence of Ibn Rusta and Abū Dulaf has crept in here.

<sup>37</sup> Reproduced in Miller, Bd. V, p. 129.

<sup>38</sup> § 4, p. 56.



appears in the Baḥr al-A'ẓam, followed by Ṭabarnā (Taprobane) around which are fifty-nine large islands (cf. Jaihānī-Kharaqī). Ṭabarnā is not linked with Sirandīb—the latter is not given a position here, but later in the work it is said to be south of China. The islands which follow Ṭabarnā, however, are given positions relative to Sirandīb, so it may be that the author understands Ṭabarnā to be the same as Sirandīb (like Kharaqī). Next comes Rāmī (Rāmnī), which lies near Sirandīb and southwards of it; then صریح, which Minorsky reads Zābaj, west of Sirandīb, thus adopting the Ibn Rusta position for the island. The fifth island in the Great Sea has two names, Jāba and Salāhiṭ, and no position is given for this, but the remaining islands take their positions from it. Bālūs lies to the west of it with Kalāh, south of Bālūs, then Bankālūs (Langabālūs) west of Kalāh. Harang, the only other island mentioned which is important to us, is placed near Sindan, i.e. on the northwest coast of India.

This grouping of the islands is very important for it shows the intermediate stage between the "natural" conception of Ibn Khurdādhbih and the artificial one of Idrīsī. Nevertheless it is still very close to the latter author, and what is required is another intermediary text between the *Hudūd al-Ālām* and Ibn Khurdādhbih for there is a great gulf between these two. Was this intermediary text, Jaihānī; or did Ibn Khurdādhbih himself in his more complete text attempt to produce an overall picture of the Indian Ocean? The latter seems unlikely. The highest common factor of the *Hudūd* and Idrīsī seems to be Jaihānī.

The *Hudūd* does give us the distance between Bālūs and Jāba which is not clear from either Ibn Khurdādhbih's text or from that of Idrīsī. But the lateness of the *Hudūd*, and the fact that unlike Idrīsī it does not quote verbally from Ibn Khurdādhbih, makes this fact suspicious.

The actual positions of the islands should be noticed and compared with Ibn Khurdādhbih's directions or lack of them. Ibn Khurdādhbih places Rām[n]ī beyond Sirandīb and Zābaj might be included by him among the islands in the same sea. The other islands are given as a group but separately from the first two. The arrangement of the *Hudūd* is therefore possible, although one might expect Zābaj and Rām[n]ī to be in the same direction. It is the confusion of Zābaj with Zanj and the conception of Ibn Rusta which has caused Zābaj to move round to the west and has left Rām[n]ī by itself in the south. The other group of islands are the islands marked by Ibn Khurdādhbih along the China route, but here shown in reverse. We must imagine the route to run latitudinally; thus Bālūs

is west of Jāba, Kalāh is south of Bālūs (Ibn Khurd. has Bālūs left of Kalāh), Langabālūs again west of Kalāh, perhaps Sirandīb west of this, although the text does not say so. The position of Harang is quite inexplicable.

Other authors who claim to have used Jaihānī are Bīrūnī and Marwazī, but the pictures of the world given by the texts of the former bear little resemblance to that of the *Hudūd al-Ālām*. In *al-Qānūn al-Mas'ūdi* (5th Maqāla, 10th chapter) where longitudes and latitudes are given for the islands of the South-East, there is no comparison at all. The positions given to the islands seem to be mere guesswork; perhaps they are based on one of the early descriptive works, although the choice of place names seems arbitrary. The use of Sribuza suggests Mas'ūdi rather than Ibn Khurdādhbih—Jaihānī, and Lāmūrī has only occurred in the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* before this time. Both Mas'ūdi and Ibn Khurdādhbih use Rām[n]ī.

The *Qānūn's* description of South-East Asia is very short. First we have Sirandīb off the southern end of India (120° 0', 10° 0') also called Sankaldīb; and to the south-east in a line, Qāmūrī on the border between India and China (Kamarupa 125° 0', 10° 0'), Lāmūrī (127° 0', 9° 0') and Kalāh (130° 0', 8° 0') with Kahkand (?), a kingdom of monkeys where human beings serve them with food, a little to the north (130° 0', 10° 0'). Some way to the south-east again and south of the equator is Sribuza (140° 0', 1° S.). Away to the east to the south of China is Silā (170° 0', 5° 0'), and finally at the eastern end of the equator (190°) "Jāmkūt or Jamākird according to the Persians, or Tāra (Nāra, Bāra) according to al-Fazarī and Yāqūt b. Ṭariq".<sup>39</sup> To the west of Sirandīb and again on the equator is Lanka, "the Cupola of the Earth" (100° 50'), and nearby is Langabālūs (99° 0', 2° 0').

The odd position given to Langabālūs is obviously due to the similarity between these two names. In the *Ta'rikh al-Hind*, Bīrūnī confuses Langabālūs with لَنْكَا Langa from which he says cloves come (لَنْكَا Skt. lavaṅga). Langa has possible connections with Laṅka, the native name for Ceylon, and Bīrūnī suggests that لَنْكَا Lanka, "the Cupola of the Earth", is the same as Langa in spite of differences in description.

The map drawn by Lelewel, and reproduced as Plate 5 in his "Géographie du moyen-âge" as Bīrūnī's world map,<sup>40</sup> is not Bīrūnī's map at all. The positions were taken from Abu'l-Fidā's tables. Bīrūnī nowhere shows the eastern extension of Africa which

<sup>39</sup> Zeki Validi: "Bīrūnī's Picture of the world", p. 10. A long note of explanation is given by Minorsky in *Hudūd al-Ālām*, pp. 188-90.

<sup>40</sup> Reproduced in Miller, Bd. V, p. 126, Bild 5.

Lelewel draws, and Bīrūnī's shape for the Peninsula of India, of which he knew far less than he knew of the northern part, is most odd, and Abu'l-Fidā has attempted to correct it. Lelewel also adds the islands of Zabadzi (Zābaj) and Kamair (Qmair) and a town in Sarīra (Sribuza) called Maharadzi (obv. Maharāja) none of which are mentioned in extant versions of the *Qānūn*.<sup>41</sup>

The account given by Bīrūnī in his *Ta'rikh al-Hind* is even shorter and more general. We have the islands of Zābaj, which are nearer to China than to India and are called سورن ديب, i.e. Suvarṇadvīpa or the Islands of Gold. Then the islands of Zanj which are the most westerly in that Ocean, and between them the islands of Dībajāt and Ramm which he mentions in more detail. There is also the island of Wāqwāq. All of these, at least Dībajāt, Ramm and Wāqwāq, belong to the islands of Qmair. Qmair according to his explanation seems to be Khmer, the Qmār of everyone else. By the islands of Qmair he seems to mean practically the whole of the Indian Ocean.<sup>42</sup>

Marwazī presents no definite picture of South-East Asia, but gives disjointed accounts of several of the islands. His account of China can be followed fairly easily on Bīrūnī's map (drawn from *al-Qānūn al-Mas'ūdī*) although Marwazī has much more detail than the latter author. It is therefore likely that Marwazī understood his islands to be in similar positions.

The conception of Idrīsī, the first author to leave a large and detailed map of the South-East (Fig. 3), is, as I have indicated above, the direct descendant of the conception of Kharaqī and the *Hudūd al-'Ālām*. In his map we are able to see for the first time how this conception really looked and although there were many other ideas of the shape of the Indian Ocean in existence, the influence of this particular conception was to gain considerably in the future.

In actual fact Idrīsī leaves us three pictures of the Indian Ocean, for the versions of his large maps from the *Nuzhat al-mushtāq* which have survived do not agree exactly with the text, which is meant to be a conspectus of these maps. It would probably be impossible to

<sup>41</sup> Bīrūnī has made the longitude of Kanksā'ir at the mouth of the Ganges, 110° 50', which is west of many places given by him in Southern India. Abu'l-Fidā does not give any longitude for the mouth of the Ganges but makes Qanūj 131° 50' (Bīrūnī has 104° 50'). All the extra islands are in Abu'l-Fidā who quotes Bīrūnī for their longitudes in some cases.

<sup>42</sup> This may be the first sign of the Qumr-Qmār relation which results in the large island of Qumr in Idrīsī, although Bīrūnī shows no sign of this large island himself, in spite of the fact that Lelewel places Kamair off the extended coast of Africa, where one might expect Madagascar. This, I suggest, like the whole of Lelewel's map, is full of touches of Idrīsī which appear in Abu'l-Fidā, from whom Lelewel obtains his information, but not in the work of Bīrūnī himself.

draw a map to agree exactly with the *Nuzhat* for the directions and distances are often confusing, and in some cases they are left to be guessed by the cartographer. For instance, Idrīsī gives all Ibn Khurdādhbih's distances and a glance at his map will show how impossible it is to chart Ibn Khurdādhbih's route on it. In addition Idrīsī has left another world map, *Raud al-furāj* or Miller's *Kleine Idrisikarte* (dated 1192)<sup>43</sup> which differs considerably from the previous one. In the larger and earlier of the two maps, the one which goes with the text (the Roger map; Fig. 3), Idrīsī divides the world into climates like Muḥammad b. Mush'ir al-Muqaddasī, although he does not leave a large space between the Equator and the first climate like Bīrūnī. He shows the Indian Ocean as a long narrow sea, similar in dimensions to those given by Kharaqī,<sup>44</sup> occupying the sixth to the tenth divisions of the first climate. The African coast is made to run latitudinally south of the equator until it almost touches the Chinese coast in the tenth division of the first climate. This gives the whole a rather Ptolemaic look, although this is about the end of the resemblance between Idrīsī and Ptolemy. In actual fact Idrīsī is following the directions of Ibn Ḥauqal, although in the map he goes further than Ibn Ḥauqal, for the latter did not close the end of the Indian Ocean by bringing China down towards Africa.

The next innovation of Idrīsī is the introduction of the large island of قمر Qomr or Qumr which he says is also called Malāi, and which he places diagonally across the eastern part of the Ocean. In spite of allegations to the contrary,<sup>45</sup> this belongs to the African side of the Ocean and not to South-East Asia. al-Qumr, is the Arabic name for Madagascar, and Idrīsī is the earliest reference we have which mentions this name which still survives in the Comoro Islands, off the north-west coast. Besides persons who quote Idrīsī, Qumr is mentioned also by Yāqūt (1224) and by Ibn al-Mujāwir in the thirteenth century<sup>46</sup> and by Ibn Mājid in the late fifteenth century.

This late reference to Madagascar seems to suggest that the Arabs did not know of its existence before this time, for none of the earlier authors mention it unless we consider Ferrand's theory that the "African" Wāqwāq was this island. Ferrand also confuses this

<sup>43</sup> *Mappae Arabicae*, Bd. I, 3. Heft.

<sup>44</sup> Kharaqī's figures for the Indian Ocean are; length, 8,000 miles; width, 2,700 miles.

<sup>45</sup> Miller identifies it with the Malay Peninsula, although he suggests confusion with Madagascar.

<sup>46</sup> *Descriptio arabica meridionali ... Ta'riḥ al-mustabshir ...* ed. O. Löfgren. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1951, p. 117.

name with Khwārizmī's *Jabal al-Qamar* جبل القمر or "Mountains of the Moon", which name derives from Ptolemy, although other Greeks had the idea of shadowy mountains at the source of the Nile.<sup>47</sup> I do not think there can be any connexion between these names for Idrīsī himself does not confuse them. The similarity of the name, however, in Arabic script would make it possible for the Island of Qumr to be read as the "Island of the Moon", and Ibn Sa'īd and later authors do confuse them.<sup>48</sup> Another theory of Ferrand which I do not consider watertight is that of a general migration from China through Indonesia to Madagascar, based on the similarity of the Arab Qmār and Qumr and the Chinese word K'un-lun.<sup>49</sup> The Malayan races who visited Madagascar were certainly not of the same main group as the Khmer peoples. Idrīsī is the cause of all this, for it seems to me that he identified Qumr with Qmār probably because of the absence of the former in all his sources. Idrīsī actually has a town of Qmār on the island, although he has a separate island of Qmār to help elucidate his quotation from Ibn Khurdādhbih.

The name Malāi, ملاي both as the name of the island and of the town on the island is another important but insoluble question. That Malāi represents the Malay people is extremely doubtful, for this latter term is absent in all the Arab texts except in the conjectural reading Malāyu ملايو of the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* and in the term ملاير Malāyur, which is kept distinct from Malāi by Ibn Sa'īd who first mentions it. There are two alternative theories on the origin of this world. The first and the most likely is that it represents the name of some contemporary town or region in the island of Madagascar,<sup>50</sup> although it does not appear in any other text independent of Idrīsī. The second is that it represents the Malay of Ibn Khurdādhbih in South India which is usually written ملى not ملاي, and Idrīsī already has it in the form Kūlam-Malay. It is obvious that Idrīsī confuses it with India, for he makes its King *Malik al-Juzr* and quotes Ibn Khurdādhbih here from a section which Ibn Khurdādhbih meant to apply to Gujerat (*al-Juzr* in Arabic).

The only other place which appears on this island of Qumr is Dīlamī, which occurs twice on the map but does not occur in the

<sup>47</sup> It has been suggested that this is a later addition to our texts of Ptolemy and derived from Arab sources.

<sup>48</sup> Maqrīzī (1365–1442) in *al-Mawā'iz wa'l-ītibār* has a note on the sources of the Nile (p. 219 in the Cairo, 1911 edition) which derives the Nile from the island of Qumr. This mistake is also found in many of the later maps reproduced in Miller.

<sup>49</sup> "Les migrations des Komr", in "Le K'ouen-louen", *JA*, XIe sér., t. 14, p. 201–13.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Moheli, one of the Comoro Islands which is ملاي in Sulaimān al-Mahrī.

text at all. Ibn Sa'īd has Dīmalā and Dahmā, both of which are given by Miller as alternative readings for this word.

The island of Qumr stretches from near the last African town on the southern coast almost to the most southerly point of China and forms a convenient division for describing the rest of the Indian Ocean.

Inside this limit the detail of the Ocean bears a close resemblance to that of the *Hudūd al-'Ālām*, with Sirandīb (Ṭabarnā in the *Hudūd*) surrounded by a cluster of fifty-nine islands. Idrīsī does not have the exact number, but has approximately sixty. The island of Sirandīb approaches quite close to the African coast and so divides these islands into two groups. The most important of the islands to the west are Zābaj, called al-Rānaj الرانج in Idrīsī's text and map;<sup>51</sup> the largest of these is Sribuza.<sup>52</sup> I have mentioned this western position of Zābaj earlier, for it occurs in the *Hudūd al-'Ālām*, and the earliest author to place Zābaj here seems to be Ibn Rusta. It might have originated in Jaihānī. Also in this group Idrīsī places the volcano of the *Akhbār al-Šin*, a Jabal Wabra, and two towns Kahūa كهوة (Karmūa كرموة or Karimada كرمدة) and Unqūja انفوجة.<sup>53</sup>

Also west of Sirandīb are the Dībajāt (Maldives), the Coconut Islands (Maldives or the Laccadives) and three large islands representing three of Ibn Khurdādhbih's ports on the west coast of India. These are Sindān, Kūlam-Malay, and Bullīn (Balabaq بلباق and Balanq بلنق in Idrīsī).

East of Sirandīb and between this island and Qumr we have the islands of South-East Asia proper. Here are all the old names from Ibn Khurdādhbih, somewhat resembling the picture given by *Hudūd al-'Ālām*. The relative positions of the islands, however, differ considerably from what one would expect from reading this section of Idrīsī's text, which is solely taken from Ibn Khurdādhbih. Rāmī is a large island with Niyān (Binamān بنعمان) to the south, then to the east come six small islands, five in a circle with Jāba in the centre. The five islands starting in the north and going clockwise are Salāhiṭ, Harang, Tiyūma, Mā'iṭ and Kalāh; each one is marked with a town and the words لجاية *li-Jāba*, i.e. [belonging] to Jāba (although the usual preposition for this is *min*). The Paris Ms. from which Miller draws his map omits the central Jāba, while one

<sup>51</sup> Miller marks these wrongly as Zanj.

<sup>52</sup> شربوة Sharbūa in Idrīsī's text.

<sup>53</sup> The text has الانفوجة perhaps for الانقوية for Angazidiya, a name belonging to the Comoro Islands at the present day. See also Ferrand: *Relations de voyages*, p. 176, n. 4. For Unqūja see note 20, p. 51.

Oxford Ms. (Miller's O<sub>2</sub>) differs considerably, having a very small Rāmī, omitting Harang, changing over Jāba and Kalāh and omitting the phrase *li-Jāba*. It also has the island of Sindān to the north of Rāmī.

To the south of this group on all the Mss, is Jālūs جالوس, standing for Ibn Khurdādhbih's Bālūs, and to the south-east of the group is Langabālūs. To the north and to the east are the islands of Šanf and Qmār with the towns of Lūqīn and Šanf on the mainland. Lūqīn appears again further west near Auršīn اورشین (Orissa) and once again on the African coast. Slightly west of the coastal town of Šanf is Ptolemy's Kattigara (Qaṭīghūrā قطيغورا).

Further to the east are the two islands of 'Āshūrā عاشورا and Šāmal شامل and then Šund Fūlat صند فولات, which is Ibn Khurdādhbih's Šundur Fūlat (Hainan) and al-Mā'id المايد which I shall mention later.

Outside the island of Qumr are an odd collection of islands, first Qāmrūn قامرون, a group of islands which originated in Ibn Khurdādhbih in Assam, but which is also regarded as an island by Bīrūnī; then Shabarma شبرمة, a second version of Tiyyūma (q.v.); Mūja الموجة which is usually connected with al-Mā'id, but has somehow become separated here; Ayām الأيام, a new island, and Šankhai, originally a sea but converted into an island by the time of Ibn al-Faqīh. Further out in the Ocean we have the islands of Silā (Korea), the Island of the Clouds, and several islands called Mājūs ماجوس which are not mentioned by Idrīsī in his text. Scattered about in this neighbourhood are the islands called Wāqwāq, and this last name occurs again on the coast of Africa. Mājūs is probably derived from Idrīsī's description of the inhabitants of Wāqwāq as infidels who know no religion.<sup>54</sup>

Among the many oddities mentioned on the map but not accounted for in the text is the duplication of three important ports of China on the African coast, to the east of the African material. They are grouped together between the African material and the Arḍ al-Wāqwāq and are Lūqīn, Khānfū and Jānkū جانكو from west to east. Jānkū is the Khānju خانجو of Ibn Khurdādhbih. On the Chinese side of the sea each of these ports is fitted with two parallel sets of mountains in the sea to represent the "Gates of China".

Among the islands which appear for the first time in Idrīsī, 'Āshūrā occurs in no other author, except that Ibn al-Faqīh describes the feast of 'Āshūrā which takes place at Kanām on the western coast of India. Šāmal seems to be connected with 'Āshūrā, although there is no similar name anywhere near the note on 'Āshūrā in Ibn

<sup>54</sup> Mājūs really means Zoroastrians or Persians.

al-Faqīh. Of course these islands could be actual places, but it is difficult to identify anything from Idrīsī alone. Ayām, too, is something belonging entirely to Idrīsī. Ferrand has suggested that a variant form<sup>55</sup> الإنام Anām is more correct and locates it on the coast of Indo-China (i.e. Annam). I have suggested below that it might be the Anambas.<sup>56</sup> The islands of Mūja, Mā'id and Qāmrūn are all mentioned by the *Akhbār al-Šin* as lands between India and China, but are obviously on the mainland. Qāmrūn represents Kāmarūpa (Assam) and Mūja and Mā'id, kingdoms on the Burma-Yunnan border. They have all slipped into the Indian Ocean on Idrīsī's map and there they remain for future geographers. Qāqulla, on the other hand, has slipped inland. Kashmir, Idrīsī has placed on the east of India, like Ibn Rusta; and slightly to the east of it, following Abū Dulaf's directions in reverse, is Qāqulla near the unidentified river of Bihank (al-Hindī). Idrīsī obviously has some new information about this place which we have not seen before, but his interpretation of it has ruined its value for us.<sup>57</sup>

The smaller Idrīsī map (*Rauḍ al-Furāf*) differs considerably from the earlier and cannot be followed from the text of *Nuzhat al-mushtāq*. It is not of great importance for the Indian Ocean because it is not used by later geographers; they all base their works on the earlier map. The coast of the Indian Ocean is almost rectangular except for the Arabian peninsula; the Indian peninsula has completely vanished and the peninsula of China has become sharp and square-cut, approaching so close to Africa as to surround the Indian Ocean except for a very narrow channel. Outside in the main Ocean are Khwārizmī's Yāqūt and Island of Silver, but the detail which Khwārizmī gives to the former island has been omitted, although two towns which were originally on it have been transferred to the latter. Inside the Indian Ocean the most obvious difference is the complete absence of the island of Qumr. Its place is taken by several unnamed islands and others the origin of whose names is obscure. The largest island in this area is Samdūn, around which are the smaller islands of Būḍa بوضة, Lāsha, Šankhai, 'Āshūrā, Asrū, an unnamed island where they eat human beings, and Tarmīd, while a little to the south is the island of Ansba. The first two are probably the islands of Lāshmah and Famūšā which

<sup>55</sup> *Relations de voyages*, p. 191.

<sup>56</sup> See p. 137.

<sup>57</sup> The last person to write on this place is Maqbul Ahmed in *India and the neighbouring territories*, 1960, pp. 110-11, but suggestions only are made: no definite identification. There is obviously no real connection between Qāqulla, Lūqīn and Bihank.

are mentioned in the text as belonging to Qāmṛūn, but omitted in the larger map. They probably represent the two halves of the word Laksmipūra mentioned in the *Akhbār al-Šin*.<sup>58</sup> The other names I cannot explain.

To the west of these and immediately to the east of Sirandīb are the islands of South-East Asia proper. Mā'it, Kalāh (طلمة Ṭalma), Salāhiṭ, Harang and Jāba in a circle, but Tiyūma in the form فنونه has gone further to the east, south of Šaf (Šanf) in the former position of Qmār which has disappeared with Qumr. Rāmī (راعى Rā'ī) and Binamān (سلمان Salmān) are smaller and Bālūs (كالوس Kālūs) has crept to the south of them. West of Sirandīb are the "Islands of Zābaj", now a long way from the African coast, one large island and eleven smaller unnamed ones, presumably the Maldives. North of them is Sribuza (سربوطة Sarbūa) and to the west a large island of Karmūa (كرموة or Karimada, formerly a small one attached to the Zābaj group. Also in the west is the Island of the Clouds (off Mombasa) which has moved from one extreme end of the Ocean to the other.

In the next hundred years between Idrīsī and the appearance of the next important writer to utilise him, Ibn Sa'īd, two great geographers existed in the east who based themselves upon the earlier texts. These were Yāqūt and Qazwīnī. Yāqūt was really a lexicographer, so that his works, which are in dictionary form, are quotations from other authors and reflect the opinions of those authors rather than those of Yāqūt. But under some of the larger headings, for example "*Baḥr al-Hind*", Yāqūt has obviously given a general impression of the views of his time. These views are based on Bīrūnī and Mas'ūdī. For instance, he says that the Baḥr al-Hind joins the Baḥr al-Muḥiṭ over a large expanse and not in a narrow strait like the Mediterranean, thus disagreeing with Idrīsī. There are also one or two innovations; Silān (Ceylon) is kept separate from Sirandīb, which is still the most important island in the Indian Ocean. He confuses Kalāh with the Arabic word *qal'a*, a mistake which comes to stay. Kūlam strangely enough is an island, and here he agrees with Idrīsī. Most important of all, however, is the fact that he is the first person to mention Jāwa (الجاوة), as opposed to the Jāba (جابه) of Ibn Khurdādhbih. Thus he heralds the age of Ibn Sa'īd and Marco Polo. He also mentions a place called Malak (مالك) which Ferrand has suggested might be Malacca,<sup>59</sup> but Yāqūt is wary of it for he knows of no one who has been there. He had read about it in

<sup>58</sup> Laksmipūra has been restored to لکشپیوره although no text has this. The *Akhbār al-Šin* has لكاشين and Abu'l-Fidā كشميون; Idrīsī's forms are فموصا and لاسمة.

<sup>59</sup> Malaka, le Malāyu et Malāyur, *JA*, XIe sér., t. 11, p. 393.

an "old book". As it does not occur in any of the "old books" that we have mentioned, it is probably a corrupt and therefore unrecognisable rendering of some other word, and we ought to be as wary as Yāqūt of using it. Yāqūt also mentions Qumr, but connects it with Africa, and in no way indicates that it is such a large island that it covers half of the Indian Ocean.

Qazwīnī on the other hand, gives us nothing of importance at all. His work is copied from all and sundry and has much in common with Yāqūt. His world map (Pertsch Nr. 1507) and other climate maps given by Miller show that his conception of the Indian Ocean was based on that of the Balkhī school. But his map of the seven seas shows the Indian Ocean open to the south and resembles Bīrūnī's map (Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Arab Ms. 5666).<sup>60</sup>

Ibn Sa'īd gives longitudes and latitudes throughout his text and it is therefore possible to produce a detailed map on the same lines as that of Idrīsī (Fig. 4). The map which appears in the Paris manuscript (Ar. 2212)<sup>61</sup> bears no resemblance to this at all. The Indian Ocean on this map compares with the Baḥr Fāris, on the map of that name produced by Iṣṭakhrī, but has a few extra islands including Sarīra (Sribuza) and Qmār.

In the text, his description of the Indian Ocean is basically the same as that of Idrīsī, although the influence of Khwārizmī is stronger in the Far East, and at times other authors appear whom Idrīsī neglected. Ibn Khurdādhbih—Jaihānī which occurs so much in Idrīsī is hardly noticeable here.

On the whole the Indian Ocean bears a closer resemblance to the small Idrīsī map of 1192, but Ibn Sa'īd has re-inserted the island of Qumr and makes it the most prominent feature of the South-East. He has placed it, however, further from Asia, south of the equator, in that part of the world where Idrīsī, in the 1192 map has a blank coast of Africa. In order to do this he has cut off the African coast at about the 110th meridian, dividing it from Qumr by the Canal of Qumr, three hundred miles wide. He has also confused all places with the root قمر. Thus the people of Qmār, the Mountains of the Moon (قمر) which are the source of the Nile, Qāmṛūn and Qumriya are all mixed up together near the island of Qumr. Therefore the Nile has to be bent round to the east to meet the Jebel Qamar or J. Qumr which is as close as he can get it to the Island of Qumr. This placing of the Jebel Qumr at the extreme east is an early feature,

<sup>60</sup> Pertsch Nr. 1507 appears in Miller, Bd. V, Tafel 80, 2. The map of the seven seas is reproduced in Bd. V, Bild 6 and 7, p. 129 and Bīrūnī's map in the *Encl. of Islam*, Suppl. under article DJUGHRĀFIYA.

<sup>61</sup> Reproduced in Miller, Bd. V, Bild 3 and Tafel 71.

visible in Qazwīnī's maps and in those labelled in Miller as of Jaihānī.<sup>62</sup> Whether or not Ibn Sa'īd intended the coast of Africa to follow the south of the island of Qumr to reach China is not clear from the text, but most probably not.<sup>63</sup>

Other features of Ibn Sa'īd's Ocean are the extension of the Chinese coast, well south of the Equator to cover very roughly the same area as Khwārizmī's Peninsula of China, and his odd conception of India. There is a complete absence of any data on the Indian coast between 93° and 117° longitude, the mouth of the Indus being near the former figure and Kanbāya at the latter. This gap is as large as the whole of the remaining part of India, and causes a very empty space between Arabia and Silān. Silān is the new term appearing first in Yāqūt and this is the first time it appears in this setting. Ibn Sa'īd has placed it where one would expect Idrīsī's Sirandīb, showing that he had an idea of its true position in the south of India. Sirandīb has not, however, been omitted; it has crept to the south into a bay in the north coast of Qumr and has taken with it the island of Balanq (Bullīn) and the Coconut Islands. Balanq has actually become a town on the coast of Qumr. Zābaj has become completely identified with Zanj, meaning Zanzibar, but it has dragged with it to the far west—even farther west than in Idrīsī's map—the island of Sribuza (Sarīra), the volcano and perhaps Karimada (q.v.). East of Silān there is little left that resembles Idrīsī. There is the large island of Jāwa, another innovation of Yāqūt, Qāmrūn, Ṣanf, Qmār, a duplicate volcano, the island of the Maharāja, Mā'id, and Mūja, which have retreated further from their original position in Yunnan and are now south of the equator between Qumr and Qatīghūrā. On the island of Jāwa are the old names of Kalāh, Fanṣūr and Lāmūrī, and a new one Malāyur. Langabālūs appears south of Silān; a position probably derived from Bīrūnī, who had placed Langabālūs not far from Lañka (the native name for Ceylon).

The new detail must have been acquired by Ibn Sa'īd during the latter part of his life when he spent some years at the court of Hulagu Khan. There he met traders from the new ports of Hurmuz who knew the Indian Ocean and the ports on the route to China. The ports had names which were not known to the geographers of the Arab world who had been out of touch with developments in this part of the world for two and a half centuries. Ibn Sa'īd did not know or did not think it important that these names had in the

<sup>62</sup> Bd. V, Taf. 66.

<sup>63</sup> Ferrand: *Relations de voyages*, p. 327. Later however (p. 333), Ibn Sa'īd gives a point for the mixing of the waters of the Indian Sea with the Ocean, as if he envisaged a narrow entrance. The map of Ibn Sa'īd mentioned above is useless on this point.

main replaced the old ones which Arab geographers had used for centuries, and like his predecessors he inserted the new material amongst the old. It is rather ingenious, however, how he clears the old information into the corners to make way for the new. In fact the whole central portion of the ocean is given over to new material.

The more important places such as Silān, Jāwa and Qumr were known to the Arabs in the previous century. Thus Yāqūt and Qazwīnī mention them, but this is the first time they are given places in relation to other islands. Silān becomes as it should be, a large island at the southern end of India, and two days from Kūlam. Ibn Sa'īd has, however, imagined the Rāmnī<sup>64</sup> of the earlier geographers to be the same as Silān; therefore he still has Sirandīb as a separate island and some of the old information about Rāmnī; for example the story of the rhinoceros he incorporates in his account of Silān. Beyond Silān he has Nakwāra and Andamān with two days of sea between them. Nakwāra he places at one and a half days from the Indian coast at a place called Barqalā.<sup>65</sup> The lengths of these islands are a little exaggerated as is his estimate for the size of Silān. To the east of these places Ibn Sa'īd places the Gulf of Larman with two towns. This is most certainly Pegu, and the word *Larman* stands for the *Arman* of the earlier geographers and for the Indian name for the Pegu area, *Aramana* or *Rāmaṇya*. This name seems to have been still in use in the thirteenth century. After a section on the island of the Maharāja, in which he repeats Abū Zaid, Ibn Sa'īd continues with the island of Jāwa which he describes in some detail. He makes the island appear rectangular with the longest side (800 miles) from east to west. Thus he adopts an error of many early writers by ignoring the change in direction taken by ships on reaching the northern point of Sumatra. At this point (the north-west corner of his rectangle) he places Lāmūrī, the Rāmnī of the earlier writers, although this form does occur in the '*Ajā'ib al-Hind*'. In the south-west of the island he places Fanṣūr, the camphor country from which mountains bearing camphor trees, *Jebel al-Kāfūr*, stretch to the far end of the island. The town of Jāwa, the capital of the island, is placed in the centre. All this is substantially correct if we imagine Sumatra lying in an east-west direction. Then at the other end of the north coast, i.e. down the east coast of Sumatra, is the town of Malāyur, a completely new word. In the south-east, where one might expect the Sunda straits, Ibn Sa'īd has placed Kalāh: a bad attempt to insert old information in a new setting. He is certainly

<sup>64</sup> Spelled الرامن in his text. This name he claims from Ibn Fātima.

<sup>65</sup> Ferrand (*Relations*, p. 341, n. 6) says this is probably Pālakollu at the delta of the Godavari, but I wonder if it is not an error for بنغلى Bengal.

wrong here, for he mentions tin in Kalāh and tin is not found in the south-west of Sumatra. It is doubtful if Kalāh was still in existence at this time, although this is possible for Indian inscriptions mention Katāha as late as A.D. 1265 and that kingdom probably lasted until the time of Kṛtanagara.<sup>66</sup>

After this, to the east of Jāwa, Ibn Sa'īd describes a narrow strait, two miles wide, through which ships must go to reach China. This place is known as Bintan (q.v.) and must obviously be the Singapore Strait. The rest of this section is confused, but a description follows of the islands of Qāmṛūn also situated to the east of Jāwa. This is an attempt to link up Idrīsī's islands of Qāmṛūn with the actual islands of Karimon. There is also confusion here with all the other places containing the root قمر. Between Qāmṛūn (Karimon) and Jāwa are some small tin-bearing islands together with a volcano and an island called al-Mahūk or al-Mahwī.<sup>67</sup> Beyond the northern end of Qāmṛūn are more mountains of Camphor, around which ships go to reach China, surely Cape Romania. This section is a fairly detailed account at second-hand of what must have been a very important section of the sea route; every small place had an importance as a landmark, and as such is remembered by sailors and related to scholars at court.

After this Ibn Sa'īd describes Ṣanf and Qmār in the terms of his predecessors. The only other new detail is his mention of the new termination of the China route, Zaitūn.

Interesting points in this conception of Ibn Sa'īd are, first of all, the position of the island of the Maharāja, right between Burma and Sumatra, whereas most of his other antique material is tucked out of the way. Another thing is the sending of ships round the Jebel al-Kāfūr in order to reach Zaitūn in China. This is obvious to us with our knowledge of South-East Asia, but was it obvious to Ibn Sa'īd? If his coast of Asia runs straight on like the coast in both of Idrīsī's maps from Fawfal, Larman to Zaitūn, Lūqīn and Khānfū, then why was it necessary to go through a narrow and possibly dangerous gap ten or more degrees to the south? Could not ships have sailed from Sīlān, past the island of the Maharāja straight to Zaitūn? Did Ibn Sa'īd imagine a peninsula stretching down into the Indian Ocean from Larman and Zaitūn as far as the Jebel al-Kāfūr around which the ships had to sail? He does not mention this peninsula anywhere, but he had Khwārizmī's peninsula (Jazīrat Dhuhbanīya) before him to serve as a guide. Admittedly he mentions a long range which divides the river Ṭarāghā from the rivers of

<sup>66</sup> Majumdar: *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 216.

<sup>67</sup> See also under Bintan, p. 150.

China; this could continue to the south in the form of a peninsula.<sup>68</sup> Ṭarāghā then becomes the Salween or, more likely, the Tenasserim river; the rivers of China could begin with the Menam (Chao Phraya) and the range could be the mountains of the Malay peninsula. In this case Ibn Sa'īd would be the first Arab writer to recognise Malaya as a peninsula, and thus with the Island of Jāwa by the side of it would produce a tolerable view of the Straits of Malacca. But even without these refinements the account of Ibn Sa'īd shows a great advance in the ordinary Arab geographers' idea of the Far East.

It might be worth while at this stage to compare the new material of Ibn Sa'īd with the contemporary account of the European Marco Polo, who visited Hulagu's court some twenty years later. The resemblance is very close, much more so than between Polo and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa whose routes have often been compared. Friar Odoric also has similarities. He visited South-East Asia some thirty years after Marco Polo. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa was still another generation later.<sup>69</sup>

Marco Polo sailed from Čaiton which is the Zaitūn of Ibn Sa'īd, from there after mentioning Cheynam, Ciamba, Java, Sondur and Lochac he arrived at Pentan, Ibn Sa'īd's Bintan. Ibn Sa'īd, of course, has no details between Bintan and Zaitūn. He does mention Ṣanf and both this term and Polo's Ciamba represent the kingdom of Champa on the Annamese coast, but Ibn Sa'īd's position for Ṣanf places it a long way from the route between Bintan and Zaitūn.

It is immediately after Bintan that the two routes are so similar. Polo here has a narrow strait between two islands sixty miles long and so shallow that ships have to haul up their rudders in order to pass. Ibn Sa'īd has two capes which are so close that the sea is only two miles wide—that place is called Bintan. Thirty miles to the south-east, according to Polo, is an island which is called Malaiur and its capital has the same name. Ibn Sa'īd gives no distances here, but in the sentence before he mentions Bintan, he speaks of the city of Malāyur, which is well known and which is situated on the island of Jāwa, which he has just described. Polo then goes on to mention Java the Less, which is 2,000 miles round. He then describes six kingdoms on the island bearing the names of Ferlec, Basman, Sumatra, Dagroian, Lambri and Fansur. Ibn Sa'īd mentions two of these on the island of Jāwa, Lāmuri and Faṣūr. Both authors

<sup>68</sup> Colless' identification of Ṭarāghā (Persian merchants, pp. 35–6) with the Trang river on philological and geographical grounds I do not regard as very likely. The philological evidence is possible but most unlikely and certainly not provable. The geographical evidence is far from convincing. I have no further comments on his identification of Hanaba with Ch'ien-mai-pa-t'a or Langashuka.

<sup>69</sup> The actual dates of the travels are, Marco Polo, 1292–4; Friar Odoric, 1322–3; and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 1346–7; while Ibn Sa'īd died in 1274 (or 1286).

state the importance of Fanšūr as a camphor producing country. Lāmūrī to Malāyūr is 800 miles according to Ibn Saʿīd, but this is the only part of his journey for which Marco Polo does not give the distance. Lāmūrī is the nearest part of Jāwa to Silān and it is from here that Polo leaves to travel west. But 150 miles to the north is Necuveram with Angaman 73 leagues to the west.<sup>70</sup> Here Ibn Saʿīd has no distances but he has the name Nakwāra with Andamān two days to the south. From Nakwāra it is half a day's journey to the continent (there must be a mistake here) at Barqalā which is a place on the coast next to Maʿbar. Polo on the other hand now goes 1,000 miles to Ceilan, and then 60 miles to Maabar, both in roughly the same direction, although this could not be in actual fact. From the last place he goes 500 miles to Coilum. Ibn Saʿīd shows no connexion between Silān and Nakwāra nor between Maʿbar and Kūlam, but gives a single distance; Kūlam is two days from Silān. Those are the main points of comparison between the two routes. They are not many, but one or two are quite striking. This is the first time that it has been possible to compare the texts of the Arab geographers with the writers of any other race to such an extent. Actually from this time there is a much closer resemblance between the writers of different nationalities on the subject of South-East Asia. It shows that the Far East is becoming more familiar to the West than ever before.

Other writers from the court of Hulagu Khan also mention towns which are referred to by Marco Polo, especially the historians of the court who do not tie themselves down by attempting to make sense of the geographical conceptions of the early Arab writers. Thus Rashīd al-Dīn, one of the greatest of Persian historians, gives an account of the kingdoms of the Indian Ocean. He gives Lāmūrī لاموری with Sūmūtra beyond it and the island of Nias beyond that. He also gives among the islands of South-East Asia, Arū, Barlak, Dalmyan, Jāwa and Barkudoz. Nias was a dependency of Jāwa. Thus Rashīd al-Dīn who was a contemporary of Marco Polo confirms the names of three places mentioned by Polo but not by Ibn Saʿīd. Opposite Lāmūrī he places Lākawāram or Nākawāram, which is closer to Polo's Necuveram. He also mentions Champa in the form Janpa.

On the other hand some Persians, especially geographers and astronomers, and certainly all Arab writers, both in Spain and Egypt, clung to the old ideas. The Persian tables of longitude and

<sup>70</sup> This last figure only occurs in certain Mss. Ricci's translation (London, Routledge, 1931) of Benedetto's text says, "100 miles to the west". See *Marco Polo: the description of the world*, ed. A. C. Moule and P. Pelliot. London, 1938, p. 378.

latitude of Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī and Ulubeg show no signs of contemporary information on South-East Asia or China. The Syrian Abu'l-Fidā stands above other writers for mentioning by name his sources for practically each measurement, and also he gives variations. Most surprisingly his text agrees with those of the sources he quotes. But his sources are old and his information on the South-East is a conglomeration of Idrīsī and Ibn Saʿīd. Abu'l-Faḍl 'Āllāmī, the Indian who wrote at the end of the sixteenth century, also takes Birūnī and Ibn Saʿīd as his models, but his figures do not agree with either.

Of the later geographers and cosmographers of Egypt, Syria and Spain no one stands out. Qazwīnī seems to be the model for all as far as the Indian Ocean is concerned, although some authors know Idrīsī and Ibn Saʿīd. Thus Dimashqī quotes Ibn Saʿīd on the island of Jāwa, although he quotes him wrongly. Ibn al-Wardī too has nothing to offer. His world maps are copies of Qazwīnī. Bakuwī and Ibn Iyās in the sixteenth century copy Qazwīnī too. On the other hand, the encyclopaedists like Nuwairī seem to revert to even earlier material, and prefer the ideas of Mas'ūdī and Ya'qūbī.

Mention must now be made of the work of the traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, for he is the first Arab to leave us a literary account of his travels in the Malay Archipelago. In spite of the importance of the fact that an Arab should travel in South-East Asia and write an account of what he saw, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's narrative is disappointingly lacking in geographical material on the Far East. The west and north of India he covers well and here his information is of some importance, but in South-East Asia he does not supplement our knowledge at all. In fact he leaves us to supplement his text with information we already have from other writers, in order to read his account intelligibly.

Although he visits Kūlam, Ceylon, Maʿbar and the Maldives, he arrives in South-East Asia from the direction of Bengal, an unaccustomed approach and difficult for us to compare with other writers. He does sail back from Sumatra to Kūlam, but he leaves no details of this voyage. The first place that he mentions after leaving Bengal is Barahnakār البرهنكار which has been identified both as the Andaman-Nicobars and as part of the Burmese coast. The description contains material which would suit both countries, for the primitive dog-faced people are mentioned by Marco Polo in the Andamans and the description of the Sultan with his elephants seems more like Burma. Ibn Saʿīd also mentioned elephants in the Andamans. Then Ibn Baṭṭūṭa reaches Sumatra, but there is a possibility that after Burma he visited the Tenasserim area, where I would



put the city of Qāqulla (q.v.) and then sailed on to Sumatra. The section on Qāqulla appears in the middle of that on Mul-Jāwa, but it has probably been placed here because he states that Qāqulla and Qmāra were part of the domain of the Sultan of Mul-Jāwa. Sumuṭra سُمُطْرَة is a town on the island of Jāwa; this we know already. The only topographical addition that he gives is that the port of Sumuṭra is called Sarḥā السَّرْحَى.<sup>71</sup> From Sumuṭra he sails down the coast of Jāwa (Sumatra) to the kingdom of Mul-Jāwa, which I would place in Java itself.<sup>72</sup> From here he begins a long and difficult voyage to the land of Ṭawālīsī طَوَالِيسِي.

The land of Ṭawālīsī is such a problematical place that practically all Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's commentators have placed it in different places. The whole account of the country points to something extracted from the land of the Turks and this is what some editors have suggested. Others have attempted to find a name in South-East Asia resembling Ṭawālīsī and have produced Tawal in the Moluccas.<sup>73</sup> Yule suggested the Sulu Islands.<sup>74</sup>

It is most likely that this place was somewhere in Indo-China. So far no Arabs have mentioned a route further east, although Ibn Mājid vaguely indicates a route through the Moluccas. The Indo-Chinese have often been described by the Arabs as being like the Turks—in fact, any Mongoloid race with a fair skin is described by them as “like the Turks”. The use of the Turkish language of course cannot relate to Indo-China, unless, as one editor suggests, the Mongol rulers of the Chinese empire placed a governor from Central Asia over these southern provinces. The fact that the king was a rival of the king of China and frequently made war on him recalls Ibn Mājid's account of al-Ghūr (Formosa).<sup>75</sup>

There are also several semi-mythical stories in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's account of South-East Asia. The Amazon queen of Ṭawālīsī and her female followers is reminiscent of Idrīsī's account of Damhara, the queen of the Maldives<sup>76</sup> and of Qazwīnī's Amazon island in the Western Ocean, not to mention Greek legends. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's account of the camphor tree is far from true, although he does ex-

<sup>71</sup> Ferrand: (*Relations de voyages*, p. 4, n. 7) thinks that the reading is faulty, “car le  $\tau$  n'existe pas en malais” (?).

<sup>72</sup> See under Mul-Jāwa, p. 151.

<sup>73</sup> This identification is derived from Walckenaer: *Cathay and the way thither*, v. 4, p. 157.

<sup>74</sup> *Cathay and the way thither*, v. 4, pp. 157–160. He also gives here a list of other places produced as possibilities.

<sup>75</sup> See p. 211.

<sup>76</sup> *Nuzhat al-mushtāq*, Jaubert ed. p. 67. For Qazwīnī's island see Ferrand (*Relations*, p. 607).

plain the clove fairly accurately. Then there is his encounter with a Rokh, although this may have been a superstition of the crew with whom he was sailing.

After Ibn Baṭṭūṭa no one seems to have utilised his text for geographical purposes: authors preferred to follow the ideas of the older writers. 'Abd al-Razzāq, the Persian historian of the fifteenth century was more original and might even have adopted the methods of the tenth century writers and actually inquired of sailors in the ports, for he gives a list of places to which sailors go from the port of Hurmuz and includes such names as Tenasserim (طناصري) and Shahr-i Naw.<sup>77</sup>

But we have now reached the time when the first Europeans arrive in the Far East, and the importance of Middle Eastern shipping declines. The Arab idea of the South-East apart from a few enlightened authors remains substantially where Idrīsī and Ibn Sa'īd had left it until new information is brought in from European sources in the early eighteenth or perhaps the late seventeenth century. The Turks and the Persians now lead the way. The Turks incorporate material from the West. Šādiq Iṣfahānī represents the Persian effort around the middle of the seventeenth century. He had lived in India, and in those days European trade had created a new list of important ports which Šādiq Iṣfahānī recorded.

<sup>77</sup> شهرنو the New city, a Persian rendering for the new capital of Siam. It becomes Sarnau on early European maps. See p. 242.