

### III. NOTES ON IMPORTANT PLACES

#### 1. ZĀBAJ AND THE EMPIRE OF THE MAHARĀJA (including Sribuza, Jāba, Jāwa and Malāyur)

The most important name in the Arabs' description of South-East Asia is Zābaj. This name is inextricably mixed up with the name of the ruler, the Maharāja and his empire, although the term Zābaj does not seem to be the exact equivalent of this empire. The meaning and origin of the word are obscure: European scholars have found explanations of it in many of the Indian words containing the element of *Jawa* or *Yawa*, found to be connected with the Malay Archipelago.

Only one Arab ventures to give a derivation of the name. He is Dimashqī and his etymology is for a faulty reading of *al-Rānaj* and therefore useless.<sup>1</sup>

The Arabs were never sure of the exact reading of the word, and the resemblance to the word الزنج *Zanj* for East Africa, which I have mentioned several times before, has added to the confusion. On the whole, however, the two words can be recognised, although not always, by the presence of the *alif* in Zābaj. The *alif* is omitted in certain places by Dimashqī and Ibn Iyās, although not every time they mention the name. The most common form in which the name occurs in the texts is الزابج and other forms are الزابج, الزابج, الزابج, الزابج. Idrīsī introduces the form زالج or رالج and Ibn al-Baitār الزابج, probably comparing it with الرياحي camphor.<sup>2</sup> Forms without the article are found but are less common. The form al-Zābaj appears in the *Akhbār al-Šin*, the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* and *Abū Zaid*, so it has some of the more original texts in its favour. In addition it is

<sup>1</sup> الزنج. He says that it is derived from the word for coconut palm, which is grown there. I would, however, hazard a guess that Dimashqī has copied his source wrongly and should read, "The sea of Zābaj, nearby with the islands of Zābaj—and [the islands] of the Coconuts (برجيل)—so called from the coconuts which grow there". (Cf. Idrīsī's maps; the passage between dashes is not in Dimashqī's text.) See Mehren, p. 203; Ferrand, *Relations*, p. 378, n. 7.

Dr. S. M. Yūsuf in a curious article (*Islamic culture*, v. 29, 1955, pp. 77–103) regards al-Rānaj as the correct form, being equivalent to the "silver island". This he places in the Malay Peninsula. The result is a rearrangement of the Arab trading routes and new identifications for all the place names.

<sup>2</sup> Quoting Ishaq ibn 'Imrān under كانور in the *Kitāb al-jāmi' li-mufradāt al-adwiya wa'l-aghdhīya*; Leclerc translation. *Notices et extraits*, 26, 1883, p. 127. It is also possible that the well-known term for camphor الرياحي may have been originally الزابجي Zābaji camphor in spite of the change of the position of the *alif*.

quoted, obviously from Arabic sources by the Syrians, when the Patriarch Elias sent the bishops Thomas, Jabalaha, Jacob and Denha on a mission in 1503 "to the land of the Indians and the islands of the seas which are between Dābhaġh and Šin and Māšīn".<sup>3</sup>

In spite of the many references to this place in Arabic literature, much is repetition and there is surprisingly little original matter. The earliest existing text, the *Akhbār al-Šin wa'l-Hind*, gives no positive information about Zābaj, but it states that Kalāh(bār) is a "kingdom" of Zābaj and this is to the right of India. Abū Zaid adds more to this and shows us that it is opposite China and one month or less away from it depending on the wind. Also it is between ten and twenty days from Cambodia (Qmār). Ibn al-Faqīh says that it is the last of the islands to the extreme south in the neighbourhood of China, and Ibn Rusta says, in the far extremity of the External Ocean. In order to reach it, one sails east to Kalāh and then to Zābaj, but he has omitted to mention the direction in the latter part of the voyage.<sup>4</sup> Mas'ūdī is much clearer: according to him, Zābaj is on the borders of India; it divides China from India, but is included as part of the latter. Bīrūnī adds that it is nearer to China than India. In this last author's description of the lands on the equator, Zābaj comes first on the East, then the equator passes between Kalāh and Sribūza and then south of Ceylon (Sirandīb): "the Indians call it *Suwarna dib*". Among the later authors Ibn Sa'īd puts it (calling it the "Isles of the Maharāja") south-east of Larman (Pegu).

Zābaj is also situated in various seas; Ibn al-Fāqīh makes it in the sea of Šankhai, Mas'ūdī in that of Champa, it also appears in the sea of China, in the External Ocean, touches a sea whose limits are unknown, while Dimashqī produces both a "Sea of Zābaj" and a "Sea of the Maharāja".

The sum total of all this is that we have a land on the route between India and China, on the extreme edge of the world as known to the Arabs. It is further to the south than either India or China, and according to Bīrūnī, is actually on the equator. It also seems to be recognised as part of India, although it may be a little nearer to China which, according to two sources, it is facing. The only distances are those given by Abū Zaid which are very vague and a very late note by Abu 'l-Fidā that it is twenty *majrā* from Kalāh.

<sup>3</sup> Yule: *Cathay and the way thither*, v. 1, p. 127, n. 6. Colless: *Persian merchants*, pp. 43–4. Ferrand in his article on Zābaj in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* states that there was a Metropolitan of Dābaj, Čin and Mačin in 410 (quoting J. B. Chabot: *Synodicon orientale*, Paris, 1902, p. 620).

<sup>4</sup> See p. 31.

The term Zābaj seems to be used for several geographical features, different authors describe it as a town, an island, a bay (Mas'ūdī), a sea (Dimashqī), an archipelago and an empire. The *Akhbār al-Šīn* uses the phrase "near Zābaj" when describing a volcano, so presumably the compiler understood a fairly small and well defined area, although he also recognises the empire, for he makes Kalāh(bār) one of its dependencies. The other early geographers, always mention the land or the country of Zābaj, its king is the Maharāja and he rules over "the islands of the Eastern Sea". Abū Zaid once again is the first to be precise. There is a town called Zābaj, which has a king whose title is Maharāja. Later he talks about an island of the same name. Presumably the town is on the island and both are ruled by the Maharāja who also has a large number of other islands under his power. The palace of the king is probably in or near the town and is on the shore of a river estuary. Thus the town must have been similar to many of the seaports found on the shores of the East Indies, particularly down the east coast of Sumatra.

The island besides being mentioned by Abū Zaid appears several times in the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* where it seems to possess many cities, including one where the Maharāja resides and one called Maraqāwand.<sup>5</sup> Mas'ūdī states that Zābaj is one of the Maharāja's islands, and this leads us on to the more debatable question of the "empire".

Without any doubt the Maharāja is the figure around which the empire exists; it is the Empire of the Maharāja. But what is the relationship of Zābaj to all this? According to Abū Zaid; Zābaj is a town whose king is the Maharāja and he is the ruler of an empire comprising many islands. Mas'ūdī's definition is a little different: Zābaj is the empire of the Maharāja,<sup>6</sup> the King of the Islands, but later he talks of the Kingdom of "the Maharāja, the King of the islands of Zābaj and the other islands in the sea of China". It seems, then, except for the one sentence of Mas'ūdī where he equates Zābaj with the Empire, the general idea among earlier writers is that Zābaj is the name of one of the islands belonging to the Maharāja's empire; but it is the important island and the one where the Maharāja resides and has his capital, which is presumably a town also called Zābaj.

<sup>5</sup> مرقاوند in the text. Van der Lith corrected this to مرقاوند *Mozafāwid*, and equated it with Majapahit. But this is impossible as Majapahit was not founded at this time (A.D. 1000).

<sup>6</sup> The text actually reads ملك الجزائر ملك المهرج ملك الزابج وهي دار مملكة المهرج ملك الجزائر (v. I, p. 163) which could be read as if Zābaj was the capital territory of the Maharāja. The translation given above is that of Barbier de Meynard.

Later writers have many other versions, but none of these can be taken as at all trustworthy. The *Mukhtaṣar al-'ajā'ib* talks of the Islands of Zābaj, with the word "islands" in the plural, and then adds, "this is a large archipelago". Marwazī has a similar reading. These two texts are the first to actually mention Zābaj as an archipelago and in this are the forerunners of most of the later geographers. The *Mukhtaṣar al-'ajā'ib* also mentions the Island of the Maharāja as a separate island, but the description given for it is taken from the references of Abū Zaid and the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* to the Island of Zābaj. This text also adds that the Maharāja, the King of the Islands lives in the land of Wāq. Ibn Sa'īd produces two archipelagoes, the Islands of Zābaj and the Islands of the Maharāja. Abū'l-Faḍl 'Allāmī gives different latitudes and longitudes for them both.

The other islands included in the Empire of the Maharāja at various times are Kalāh, Sribuza, Rāmnī, Barṭāyil, Qāqulla, Wāqwāq, Harang, Anjāba and Šankhai. The first place is mentioned as being a kingdom of Zābaj by the *Akhbār al-Šīn*, it is also mentioned by Abū Zaid and Mas'ūdī as part of the Empire of the Maharāja. Sribuza and Rāmnī are included by both Abū Zaid and Mas'ūdī. Ibn Khurdādhbih mentions the semi-mythical island of Barṭāyil as a possession of the Maharāja and Sindbād also notes this fact when he visits this island in his first voyage.<sup>7</sup> Qazwīnī says that Barṭāyil neighbours the islands of Zābaj. Qazwīnī is also the source for including Qāqulla<sup>8</sup> and Wāqwāq as parts of the Empire, although in another place he says that the latter also neighbours the islands of Zābaj. Harang is ruled by the Chief of the Maharāja's army according to Ibn Rusta. Anjāba and Šankhai<sup>9</sup> (as we have mentioned before) are both adaptations of names from other regions which have been confused with Zābaj in later authors.

The extent of the islands is given by Mas'ūdī. The most rapid ship he says is not able to travel in two years to all the islands. The capital is nine hundred parasangs in area (?),<sup>10</sup> according to Abū Zaid. This can hardly be correct, it is probably a mistake for the size of the island. The only physical features of the island are moun-

<sup>7</sup> Disguised as Kāsīl كاسيل.

<sup>8</sup> Qāqulla is rather distant to be part of the empire, but Ibn Baṭṭūta states that it belongs to Mul-Jāwa.

<sup>9</sup> See p. 51 and p. 74.

<sup>10</sup> The term used (Abū Zaid, Reinaud p. ۸۹) is كمبر which really means "the area (of a circle)", but one would expect some measurement of square measure. The parasang does not seem to be used for square measure. The figures approach nearer, to the size of actual islands in South-East Asia if read as referring in these passages to the circumferences of the islands concerned.

tains containing camphor and the volcano which is mentioned by most authors, although some follow Ibn Khurdādhbih and state that the latter is near Jāba.

Of the political set-up and the historical side we are not told a great deal. The ruler of Zābaj is the Maharāja, which means the "King of Kings", and he is also represented as the "King of the Islands". Ibn al-Faqīh calls him the main king of the land of Zābaj as if there were other minor kings, and this is supported by the fact that kings are often mentioned of the islands which are described as part of the Maharāja's empire. Abū Zaid also writes of the "ملوك" kings of all the islands of his "مملكة" Empire". Although the term *malik* might be used for governor, it is much more likely that they were petty semi-independent rulers, who owed allegiance to the Maharāja. In addition, the chief of the army was also the governor of the island, Harang, which was also said to be his name.<sup>11</sup> It was possible of course that one of these petty kings had charge of the Maharāja's army in time of war, or that a former general had been given the governorship of the island as a reward for his services. The forces of the Maharāja, both naval and military, were large and had much equipment; the "most powerful" says Marwazī. According to Ibn Sa'īd, besides being the "most powerful", he was the richest of the kings of India and had the most elephants. His method of dealing with his revenue or part of it is described by Abū Zaid and then with variations by most of the later writers.

The long account of the attack on the kingdom of Cambodia, described by Abū Zaid, is the only historical event mentioned, but if this is a fact, it should be a very important one for helping to identify Zābaj. The *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* actually gives us the name of a king "Sri Nātā Kala", but the name looks mutilated and the reading may be wrong.<sup>12</sup>

The capital of the Maharāja was an important trading centre. Abū Zaid shows that there were large numbers of ships, and the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* talks of the streets of moneychangers. Besides being an important rendezvous for the ships of foreign traders, such as the Arabs, the Indians and the Chinese, the people of Zābaj themselves traded as far afield as Africa.<sup>13</sup> This last statement comes from Idrīsī who imagines Zābaj near to the African coast. According to him the people of Zābaj fetch iron from Africa and take it to the

<sup>11</sup> Or his title?

<sup>12</sup> Variant forms are *سر دانا كنه* and *سند دانا كنه*. See text p. 174 and Gerini, pp. 578-9 for explanations of the name.

<sup>13</sup> Idrīsī (Jaubert) p. 60 and *Mukhtaṣar al-'ajā'ib* (Ferrand: *Relations de voyages*, p. 156).

Asian mainland to sell. The foreign merchants were an important source of revenue for the state, and foreign trading officials were used. Sindbād was appointed Inspector of ports and registrar of shipping.<sup>14</sup>

The island of Zābaj itself was extremely fertile with continuous habitation and uninterrupted cultivated fields, except near the volcano where the land was deserted for the distance of a parasang. Free access was possible from one end of the kingdom to the other. The large population was swarthy<sup>15</sup> or black<sup>16</sup> and the people were fond of cockfighting, a pastime from which the Maharāja drew considerable revenue. The people were also a kindly people well disposed towards strangers, a characteristic which was useful for commercial reasons. There were aboriginal races in the inaccessible regions; Mas'ūdī speaks of tribes in the mountains with white faces and odd shaped ears and hair, an account which summons up a picture of natives decorated up for war or for dancing. Dimashqī talks of black dwarfs and Ibn al-Faqīh of beings having human form who speak an incomprehensible language. The latter of course might be orang-utan or even gibbons.

Customs mentioned by the Arab texts are the existence of ordeal by fire and the ceremony of *bērsila* before the Maharāja. Here we have the actual Malay term given. The people of subsidiary islands, at least from Cambodia, turned their faces towards Zābaj every morning and prostrated themselves as a sign of allegiance.

The country seems to have had a large animal population when compared with other islands mentioned by the Arabs. There were serpents capable of devouring men and animals (pythons?), talking parrots, peacocks, falcons (or cockatoos?),<sup>17</sup> *hawāri* birds,<sup>18</sup> flying cats, muskrats (imported from Sind), *nisnās*?<sup>19</sup> crocodiles, elephants and several varieties of monkey. The elephants belonged to the Maharāja and may have been imported.

The vegetable products were many, including almost everything mentioned by the Arabs as coming from South-East Asia. Of course many of these things may have been imported to Zābaj for re-export. Mas'ūdī's text is the most inclusive; he mentions camphor, aloeswood, cloves, sandalwood, areca nut, nutmeg, cardamom and cubeb. Camphor is the most important product, and several authors

<sup>14</sup> عامل على ميناء البحر وكتب على كل مركب عبر الى البر.

<sup>15</sup> Basanés. Idrīsī (Jaubert) p. 59. The new edition has *سمر جدا*.

<sup>16</sup> Noirs. Ferrand: *Relations de voyages*, p. 338.

<sup>17</sup> و بزة بيض لها قنارح حمير.

<sup>18</sup> Qazwīnī. الحوراءى unidentified.

<sup>19</sup> Yāqūt. نسناس unidentified.

mention its method of extraction. Cloves and nutmeg are also mentioned by Ibn al-Faqīh and must certainly have been re-exported. Idrīsī adds fruits, sorghum and sugar-cane to the list of products and Bīrūnī mentions gold, although only in connection with the word *Suvarna dīb*, which means the "Island of Gold" (Sansk. *Suvarṇadvīpa*). Ibn Sa'īd also finds excellent gold in the Isles of the Maharāja.

The identification of Zābaj from the Arab sources alone is virtually impossible. It is obviously somewhere in Indonesia. The early European scholars preferred Java, because of the similarity of the names and the knowledge of extensive ruins revealed the fact that a large empire had existed there. But their knowledge of the early history of Indonesia was very fragmentary. Lassen<sup>20</sup> and Van der Lith<sup>21</sup> both state that Zābaj was Java. Van der Lith even found the word Majapahit in the *Maraqāwand* of the 'Ajā'ib al-Hind. There is much in the Arab texts which suggests Java especially the fact that it was at the extreme limit of the External Sea. Reinaud identified Zābaj with Ptolemy's *Iabadiu* and the Chinese *She-p'o* and therefore with the standard location for this place of Ptolemy—Sumatra: the Land of Gold.<sup>22</sup> The Arab texts mention gold and camphor in connexion with Zābaj; both are products of Sumatra. Bīrūnī's other report that Zābaj was on the equator to the east of a line joining Kalāh and Sribuza (Kedah and Sri Vijaya-Palembang?) would suggest Borneo.<sup>23</sup> But other than the fact that Borneo was famous for its camphor there is nothing else to support this identification. Gerini too equates Zābaj with the Chinese Yeh-p'o-t'i and Ptolemy's *Iabadiu* and hence with the Java of Marco Polo and other early European travellers. But Gerini does not rely by any means on phonetic resemblances, he gives much sound explanation on why he places Zābaj in Sumatra and then suggests these similarities of name as further proof.

Ferrand, on the other hand, revelled in phonetics, and produced the Hindu term *Jāvaka* as the equivalent for Zābaj. He then shows that the Island of the Maharāja (= Zābaj) is the same as Sribuza because Abu'l-Fidā says so: although Abu'l-Fidā is a very late author whose information is certainly not original and who most

<sup>20</sup> *Indische Altertumskunde*, v. 4, p. 938.

<sup>21</sup> *Merveilles de l'Inde*, pp. 231-3.

<sup>22</sup> *Relations des voyages*, v. 1, p. lxxv. She-p'o 闍婆 is not now regarded as being in Sumatra, but in Java. See below. The characters for Yeh-p'o-t'i are 耶婆提.

<sup>23</sup> Bīrūnī: *Kitāb al-taḥḥīm*, when describing the equator. This identification is of course adopted by Van der Meulen (*Indonesia*, vol. 19 (1975) p. 18).

likely arrived at this conclusion by misreading earlier authors. Ferrand also takes Zābaj to be the equivalent of the Archipelago, an idea which we have seen is foreign to the earlier Arab writers and only appears definitely for the first time in *Mukhtaṣar al-'ajā'ib*. His final result is that Zābaj = Jāvaka = She-p'o = Sumatra.<sup>24</sup>

Following Ferrand most of the later writers therefore equate Zābaj equally with the Empire of Sri Vijaya and with the Archipelago in general, but Majumdar noticed that Zābaj was not the same as Sribuza.<sup>25</sup> Therefore he took Sribuza to be the same as Sri Vijaya and concluded that Zābaj was equal to Jāvaka and because of its close connexion with Kaṭāha, he placed it on the Malay Peninsula.

All of these accounts are based on the equal authenticity of all the Arab texts, not taking into account that most of the later ones are only very bad collations of the earlier writers. Coedès realises this fact and is on the right track when he says that Zābaj must represent, in Ibn Khurdhādhbih, the Sailendras of Java and only later comes to be equivalent to San-fo-ch'i of the Chinese (i.e. Sri Vijaya).<sup>26</sup>

All scholars have linked the Maharāja with the Buddhist Sailendra rulers of South-East Asia. These seem to have been the only rulers to call themselves by this title before the end of the tenth century, therefore it is probable that when the Arab texts speak of the Maharāja it is to this dynasty that they refer. Around this we must build all our hypotheses. The present theory with regard to the history of the Sailendras, is that they first appeared in Java, and became the dominant dynasty there, soon after the reign of the Hindu Sanjaya about A.D. 760. By about A.D. 860, a younger branch of the family established itself on the throne of Sri Vijaya centred at Palembang and perhaps in later times at Malayu (Jambi), a throne which they held for over three centuries, or at least, the title of Maharāja remained with this kingdom until its dissolution. The Sailendra dynasty in Java had lost their control of Java by the beginning of the tenth century hence all references originating after this time would refer to the Sumatran kingdom. Similarly all references before A.D. 860 would refer to Java. Any Arab writer therefore who uses sources dated before 860 referring to the kingdom of the Maharāja would be dealing with the Sailendras in Java, and any Arab writer using sources originating from the tenth century onwards would be talking about Sumatra. Thus the references of

<sup>24</sup> Compare this my note on Shih-li-fo-shih and San-fo-ch'i, p. 116.

<sup>25</sup> *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 212.

<sup>26</sup> 三佛齊 See pp. 116-18. Coedès: *The Indianized states*, 1968, p. 108.

Ibn Khurdādhbih and possibly those of the other early geographers would refer to Java. The *Akhbār al-Šin* does not refer to the Maharāja, but it is also possible that some of Abū Zaid's information and that of Mas'ūdī refers to the early period.

Is it possible to connect Ibn Khurdādhbih's information with Java? It is, but only with a stretch of the imagination. The Maharāja is king of Zābaj, and is called فنجب, but apart from this, his information is all rather vague—cockfighting and bricks of gold could apply to any Malay kingdom of any wealth, and most of the products given could come from any of the islands. The same applies to the texts of the other early geographers. Ibn Khurdādhbih however, makes camphor a product of Zābaj, and this is a problem for the camphor producing islands were Borneo and Sumatra. It is known that the Javanese Sailendras did extend their sway over parts of Borneo, Sumatra and the Malay peninsula, and camphor was probably re-exported from Javanese ports. It seems that Ibn Khurdādhbih has used Zābaj to mean the empire in this case although unwittingly. I do not believe that the Arabs went as far south at this time, hence their knowledge is secondhand. Arab sailors could describe camphor trees after visiting North Sumatra and Ibn Khurdādhbih could insert it here for convenience. The other name given by Ibn Khurdādhbih to the Maharāja has been rendered in various ways most of which may be applied to Java. The form as it stands is obviously a copyist's corruption. Ferrand rendered it *Pungawa* which he says is a title of nobility in Javanese, Malay and Sundanese (i.e. *punggawa*).<sup>27</sup> De Goeje after Kern made it *Pati-Jaba*.<sup>28</sup>

The connexion of Zābaj with the Maharāja at this stage shows that the original location of Zābaj was probably Java and the word itself originated as a Javanese place-name. During this early period it was essentially connected with the island or that part of the island where the Maharāja had his capital, although it might have been used in a vague sense for the dominions over which the Maharāja held sway. Thus the *Akhbār al-Šin* mentions that Kalāh was a kingdom of Zābaj much as we might say that it was a dependency of Java.

The big problem now is the identity of the place which Ibn Khurdādhbih calls Jāba. This passage is quoted in Idrīsī with further notes added especially on the question of the Buddhist religion. A garbled version also exists in the *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib* and the

<sup>27</sup> *Relations de voyages*, p. 23, n. 7.

<sup>28</sup> *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik*, 1889, p. 13, n. 1. S. M. Yusuf, pp. 96-7 reads التيجت and equates it with *Vijayapati*.

texts which quote it.<sup>29</sup> Ibn Khurdādhbih gives the position of this place as near Salāhiṭ, Harang and Mā'it, and it is fifteen days from the Spice Islands. The king seems to be a Buddhist. The products of the place are only those that might be expected from an undeveloped local principality; coconuts, bananas and sugar-cane, although the *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib* adds sandal, lavender (?) and cloves, all products of the extreme South-East.

If we read Ibn Khurdādhbih's text alone we can easily arrive at the solution that Jāba, and its neighbouring states, Salāhiṭ, Harang and Mā'it are near the southern tip of the Malay peninsula, for they fall on the China route in between the ports of Kalāh and Qmār (Cambodia) or Kadrang and as an alternative watering place to Tiyūma (Tioman). The awkward part however is that in both places where the *Akhbār al-Šin* mentions Zābaj, Ibn Khurdādhbih uses Jāba. Thus the *Akhbār al-Šin* states that Kalāh is a kingdom of Zābaj and Ibn Khurdādhbih says it belongs to the kingdom of Jābat al-Hindī; and when the former mentions the volcano near Zābaj, the latter puts it near Jāba. Of course there may be two volcanoes and the sources of both texts may differ in date and between their respective dates Kalāh may have changed hands politically; but the coincidence is rather strange. Idrīsī's text gives a full report of Buddhist rites in Jāba, and mentions that the country has minted money with the face of the king on it. Idrīsī must here be quoting from the lost and more complete account of Ibn Khurdādhbih. Whenever Jāba is spelt in this manner, it must be derived from Ibn Khurdādhbih or some contemporary source. Except for Idrīsī, no later text mentions new information about Jāba and Idrīsī's material is only an extension of that of Ibn Khurdādhbih.

Is Jāba, Java? Some of the information might agree with this location including the final sentence of Ibn Khurdādhbih saying that it was fifteen days from the Spice Islands. The fact which cannot be reconciled is that Jāba is near Salāhiṭ, Harang and Mā'it and is on the China route. If Java was on the China route, what can we make of the other places? Harang could be the Chinese Ho-ling, Salāhiṭ could be perhaps the land around the Sunda Strait (sēlat = strait) and Mā'it could be the Chinese Ma-i-tung (which it probably is in any case) in Billiton or in South-West Borneo.<sup>30</sup> But would the Arabs, sailing to China, carry out this great sweep to the south regularly, when there was obviously a shorter way and would they

<sup>29</sup> Qazwīnī, Bakuwī and Ibn al-Wardī.

<sup>30</sup> See sections on Salāhiṭ, Harang and Mā'it.

not have mentioned Sribuza (Sri Vijaya) which had been the centre of a prosperous trading kingdom for several centuries?<sup>31</sup>

I feel that all the geographical evidence for Jāba (except the volcano)<sup>32</sup> points to a place on the east coast of Sumatra. There is no reason why details of the court etc. should not fit a place here as well as in Java. Of course we could revert to the usual practice of scholars who cannot make all the evidence fit and say that there were two places called Jāba.

Ibn Khurdādhbih mentions Buddhism as the religion of Jāba, but on the other hand the phrase "Jābat al-Hindī" could be expected to refer to a Hindu king of Jāba. This looks like two Jābas, one Hindu and one Buddhist.<sup>33</sup> Ibn Khurdādhbih seems to have used the term Jābat al-Hindī solely to distinguish him from the king of the other Jāba who was a Buddhist and the former may have been quite a different ruler, perhaps from the Indian mainland.<sup>34</sup>

It must be noticed that this Jāba occurs in no other original texts, but only where it is quoted from Idrīsī or Ibn Khurdādhbih. This seems to indicate that this particular kingdom of Jāba was non-existent by the time of the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind*, if not by the time of Abū Zaid and Mas'ūdī. If Jāba is in Sumatra as the evidence seems to suggest, it cannot be the same as Zābaj if the latter at this early stage was located solely in Java, and we have to find an excuse for the *Akhbār al-Šin*'s substitution of the word Zābaj where Ibn Khurdādhbih has Jāba. Two excuses are possible: the first that the Arabs were so confused with their geographical names that their accounts cannot and never will make sense, and a less probable one that the two accounts are not quite contemporary. Probably Ibn Khurdādhbih's source is the older and Kalāh was for a time under the nominal allegiance of a Hindu ruler and then changed its allegiance sometime in the early part of the ninth century to the Sailendra kingdom in Java (Zābaj). If the Hindu ruler was from the

<sup>31</sup> Of course there is the possibility that the Arabs used the Sunda strait and that Kalāh was on the south-west coast of Sumatra. See p. 126. S. Q. Fatimi in his article *In quest of Kalah* says that he will be mentioning Jāba in a later instalment. On p. 96, n. 6, he leaves a suggestion that he may be going to equate the word with Vijaya (N.B. جايبة and جايبة). It could then easily be an earlier alternative to the more usual Sribuza. (Compare also نجابة with بجابة. See p. 120.)

<sup>32</sup> There are volcanoes in Sumatra, but not in the south east.

<sup>33</sup> The use of the term *بد* by the Arabs is very loose. Most dictionaries say that it means "an idol", but it is obviously derived from the word "buddha". Idrīsī actually gives the derivation as an Indian word for temple (Jaubert ed., p. 80). It always applied in these texts to an Indian religion. However when it appears in the plural, it is difficult to tell whether Hindu gods are meant or a number of images of Buddha.

<sup>34</sup> See under Kalāh, p. 120.

Indian mainland, then this shows the change, in the Malay peninsula, from direct Indian influence to Javanese influence. On the other hand, if Jābat al-Hindī did come from the Jāba in Sumatra, this shows us a decline in Sumatran power (possibly Hindu) in favour of the Buddhist Java. At the same time Jāba itself, must have become Buddhist to account for Ibn Khurdādhbih's second statement. However this is mere speculation. No more is heard of Jāba, unless its name is echoed in the later name of Jāwa.

The next two important Arabic texts, Abū Zaid and Mas'ūdī are dated about 950, i.e. from the period when the Sailendras ruled from Sri Vijaya only. The texts in this case probably show a mixture of early material and later material. Sribuza is mentioned as an island in the empire of the Maharāja but no real details are given about it. This information could come from the period when the seat of the Maharāja was still in Java, but the kingdom of Sri Vijaya was under his sway. Abū Zaid's account of the Maharāja's attack of Cambodia also obviously comes from the Java period. Cambodia was subject to attacks like this from Java during the latter part of the eighth century (767-87) but threw off all semblance of dependence under Jayavarman II who came to the throne about 802. Jayavarman, according to a Khmer inscription, visited Java before his succession, and it has been suggested that he was the king who was placed on the throne by the Maharāja after his attack.<sup>35</sup> Abū Zaid's account must therefore date from the former period but as he himself says that this story takes place "in former times", this raises no problem. The story of the golden bricks which is mentioned in Ibn Khurdādhbih is given in detail by Abū Zaid and in this story too he refers to "one of its former kings". This is all very well but the description of the palace of the Maharāja being on a tidal estuary, suits a description of Palembang rather than the capital of the Sailendras of Java. The patches of inhabitation succeeding each other without interruption and the country having no ruins and uninhabited places, I feel belongs to Java and not to Sumatra, but we do not know what the country around Sri Vijaya really looked like during the height of its prosperity. Abū Zaid's account does not stress the importance of maritime trade which one would expect for a description of Sri Vijaya, but rather of agricultural prosperity usually connected with Java.

Mas'ūdī's information sounds more up to date and deals with a Zābaj which by now could quite easily be in Sumatra. He stresses

<sup>35</sup> D. G. E. Hall: *A history of south-east Asia*, p. 91-2. Coedès: *États hindouisés* (2nd ed., 1947), p. 168, although in the latest edition he is doubtful (English ed., 1968, p. 93).

the importance of the sea trade, and mentions a Bay of Zābaj where crocodiles are found and that sailors from the Persian Gulf continually make the voyage to Kalāh and Zābaj. All this connects easily with Sri Vijaya, the later seat of the Sailendra Maharājas.

Thus the texts seem to suggest that Zābaj was formerly a toponym attached to the island of Java (whether it was the equivalent of Jāvaka, She-p'o, Yavadvīpa or anything else makes no difference). It then became attached by the Arabs to the Sailendra Maharājas as a kind of title (i.e. the king of Zābaj) and was then applied as a name for the Empire which he controlled. After the fall of the Sailendras in Java (about 907) and the main court of the Sailendras appeared in Sri Vijaya, the term still remained as a loose term for the Sailendra empire in general.

Almost contemporary with the transference of the name to the Sumatran empire, the Arabs begin to mention Sri Vijaya as Sribuza. سر بوزة Sribuza or Sarbuza has had many different readings in the various texts but since the importance of the Sumatran state of Sri Vijaya has been recognised by modern scholars, there has been very little disagreement and the two were almost unanimously equated.<sup>36</sup>

The majority of the texts point the word سر بوزة Sarīra, but the earliest one to mention the place, Abū Zaid, gives the correct reading سر بوزة and so does Yāqūt. Idrīsī has سر بوزة upon which Ferrand makes great play,<sup>37</sup> for this alone of all the texts has a *shin* and is hence much closer to the sound of the Indian *Sri*. However, I suspect that Idrīsī's *shin* is nothing more than a piece of scribal guesswork. Other forms are سر بوزة and سر بوزة.

The position of Sribuza is fairly obvious from the Arabs text. The 'Ajā'ib al-Hind places it at the extremity of the island of Lāmūrī and 120 *zām* from Kalāh, and the town stands on a bay, penetrating fifty parasangs into the island. This description applies easily to Palembang. Fifty parasangs is a slight exaggeration, but if part of the Bangka Strait is included in the bay, the discrepancy can be reduced somewhat.<sup>38</sup> Other descriptions only confirm the fact that Sribuza is a large town built partly on the edge of a large tidal river (or "bay") and partly on piles over the river itself. Its crocodiles seem to be famous. Sribuza itself besides being a town is also an island, like most of these places in the minds of the early Arab sailors.

<sup>36</sup> Even Gerini (p. 567) who keeps Sarīra and Sribuza as two separate names, locates both in the same place.

<sup>37</sup> *Relations de voyages*, p. 174, n. 2.

<sup>38</sup> An interesting account of the contemporary geography of the Palembang area occurs in O. W. Wolters: "Landfall on the Palembang coast in medieval times", *Indonesia*, 20 (1975), p. 1.

The island was probably the surrounding district although the statement of Ibn Sa'īd that it was the largest island of Zābaj may show that the name was used for the whole of Sumatra. Ibn Sa'īd however knew better than this. Sumatra in his time was known as جاوة Jāwa. Sribuza did not exist on this latter island, and I have mentioned below that by this time (c. 1270) the great days of Sri Vijaya were over. The size given to the island of Sribuza by the geographers could indicate that it was meant to apply to the whole island of Sumatra, but the Arabs make all the islands so excessively large that it is impossible to tell exactly what they mean by these dimensions.

Thus it will be seen from the time of Abū Zaid and Mas'ūdī but especially the latter, the Arabs seem to have two forms for the same thing: Sribuza and Zābaj. The trading properties of the empire are given to the form Sribuza, the political significance of which the Arabs do not seem to have been aware. They regard it as merely a province<sup>39</sup> of the Maharāja's empire<sup>40</sup> with only a governor or a petty king in charge, who levies taxes on ships going to China ('Ajā'ib al-Hind). The description of Sribuza and its products is just what we should expect of the port of Palembang at this time, but there is no indication of the might which subjected most of the Western Archipelago and parts of the mainland. It should be noticed too that the Cholas tend to regard the Sailendra as the ruler of Kidaram, while Sri Vijaya is only a province of the former, in the same way that the Arabs tend to regard it as a province of the Maharāja. But there the comparison ends for the Arabs also regard Kalāh (Kidaram?) as one of his provinces and not as his seat.

The term Zābaj on the other hand remains connected with the Maharāja and becomes more and more the name of the empire and less and less the name of a place, so that even Sribuza becomes "an island of Zābaj". The capital of the empire itself is nameless, but is obviously a Sumatran town on a river estuary. But for some reason Sribuza has never been connected with the seat of the Maharāja's government by the Arab writers. Whether or not the Arab sailors realised that the two were the same or not we cannot tell, presumably they did, but the writers themselves in the Middle East did not. The governor mentioned by the 'Ajā'ib al-Hind in Sribuza was not connected with the Maharāja, for the text does not say for whom he

<sup>39</sup> Mas'ūdī and Abū Zaid.

<sup>40</sup> Muhallabī writing in the last quarter of the tenth century and quoted by Abu'l-Fidā, says that Sribuza is a dependency of China, but this is not extraordinary, as all these states sent embassies to China, which were regarded by the Chinese as tokens of allegiance.

acted as governor. The 'Ajā'ib al-Hind also has a bay of Sribuza with crocodiles which compares with Mas'ūdī's bay of Zābaj. Only Abu'l-Fidā as late as the fourteenth century equates the two places and this is almost certainly an accident. Bīrūnī equates Zābaj with the Indian term *Suvarṇadvīpa* which is possibly Sumatra, although certainly not Java.

Thus it is only by studying non-Arab sources that we are able to show that the Arab Sribuza was the capital of the Maharāja's empire. If we follow Arab evidence alone, we might be persuaded that the capital was further north nearer the Straits of Malacca. This is where we have tentatively placed Jāba and a comparison of the *Akḥbār al-Šīn* and Ibn Khurdādhbih would suggest that the latter's Jāba could possibly be identified with the Zābaj of the former. It is possible that there were periods in the history of the empire when the capital was further north, and these sources may have an element of truth in them.

Yet a further development in the history of Zābaj can be noticed in the Arab texts. This first appears in Yāqūt (d. 1229) when he mentions جَاوَة Jāwa, spelt with a *wāw* instead of a *bā* as Ibn Khurdādhbih had spelt it. According to Yāqūt, Jāwa is the first part of China but resembles India, and is on the sea coast. Merchants do not go to China but only to Jāwa. This is likely to be Sumatra for several texts show that the Arab ships went only as far as Kalāh and Sribuza at this time because direct trade to China had been cut off. Unlike Ibn Khurdādhbih's Jāba, the products of Jāwa are numerous and of commercial importance, showing that this new Jāwa is an important trading centre. This new reference tallies with the report of Marco Polo and other European authors that the island we know as Sumatra was called Java (the Less), and Ibn Baṭṭūta and Rashīd al-Dīn both show that Sumatra is meant by the term جَاوَة. In the same paragraph Yāqūt mentions the land of *Malak*. Could this be Malacca?<sup>41</sup> Yāqūt could be using the term Jāwa and Malak to represent both sides of the Straits of Malacca.

Jāwa next occurs in Ibn Sa'īd (d. 1274) where there is a full description of the island, although he places it south of the islands of the Maharāja.<sup>42</sup> As this material is contemporary (13th century) and not recapitulation of earlier authors, it is interesting to compare his description of the island with that of Chao Ju-kua (A.D. 1225). Ibn Sa'īd places Lāmūrī and Fanšūr (Barus) at one end of the island and Malāyur and Kalāh at the other. This position for Kalāh is

<sup>41</sup> The only other possibility is the Moluccas.

<sup>42</sup> See pp. 94 ff.

obviously a mistake,<sup>43</sup> but the positions of the other three make it clear which island is being mentioned. It is interesting that Ibn Sa'īd gives a town of Jāwa in the centre of the island. This is the capital and the residence of the king of the island. There is no mention of Sribuza here. Ibn Sa'īd does mention Sribuza in other places, but there he is obviously quoting the ancient sources of his predecessors. In this section where he gives us an up-to-date conception of the island, Sribuza has vanished.

The Chinese Annals mention no embassies to China between the years 1178 and 1370 from San-fo-ch'i, although the Ming Annals say that San-fo-ch'i continued to send embassies up to the end of the Sung dynasty. After 1370, however, San-fo-ch'i again sent embassies to China although no Arab texts notice its return to power. It is possible that during the thirteenth century Sri Vijaya lost its important place in the commercial affairs of South-East Asia, while the state of Malayu on the Jambi river seems to have taken its place. Sri Vijaya is not mentioned in *Nagarakṛtagama* which, although written about 1365, deals with the period at the end of the thirteenth century. Hence this absence is obvious from other sources besides the Arab texts. Of course Ibn Sa'īd, whose information on Sribuza came from earlier sources, could not fit this into his new island of Jāwa, so he mentioned it separately in another place.

His information for the other places on the island of Jāwa is also out of date, but as he had positions for them on the island, he was able to insert the older information into this new conception. It is interesting to note that when listing the countries dependent on San-fo-ch'i, Chao Ju-kua like Ibn Sa'īd, mentions four places which can be located in Sumatra; two of which may be in the north and two in the south. They are Lan-wu-li (Lāmūrī); Pa-t'a (Batak) a country in north Sumatra and a possible equivalent of Fanšūr which never seemed to be an organised state; Chien-pi (Jambi = Malayu?) and Pa-lin-fēng (Palembang).<sup>44</sup> The latter seems to be mentioned separately from Sri Vijaya by the Chinese both as Pa-lin-fēng and as Chiu-chang. It does not seem to be mentioned by the Arabs until the time of the navigational treatises of the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth centuries, when it occurs as Palibang.

<sup>43</sup> But see note 31 above.

<sup>44</sup> Hirth and Rockhill, p. 62. These are 藍無里, 拔查, 監籠, 巴林馮 respectively. The latest identifications of Chien-pi and Pa-t'a are Kampé (Aru Bay) and Bata (from Tomé Pires), places much nearer to Lāmūrī (Wolters: *The fall of Srivijaya*, p. 43) and this rather upsets the comparison. Chiu-chang 蘇港 occurs in the Wu-pei chih charts with P'o-lin-pang 沙淋邦 as alternative names for Palembang.



Malayu first appears in the Chinese texts in the seventh century, where it is mentioned by I-ching. However it was later swallowed up by Sri Vijaya and next appears in the inscription of Rajendra I Chola in 1025 as "the ancient Malaiyūr with the strong mountain for its rampart".<sup>45</sup> This is only a little later than the reference to the "Sea of Malāyū in the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind*. The text of the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* actually has ملائو Malātū, but although Ferrand read this ملائو and equated it with Melanu, a race in North Borneo, it is obviously the same as Ibn Sa'īd's ملاير. <sup>46</sup> Ferrand would read all the Arab references as ملايو Malāyū, reading *w* for *r*. This is possible but it does not help us to account for Malaiyūr in Rajendra Chola's inscription nor for Marco Polo's Malaiur or the Chinese, Ma-li-yū-êrh. Gerini accounted for the *r* with a possible Malaya-vāra. It does not matter a great deal whether we read the Arab renderings ملايو or ملاير, they must refer to the same place and also to the place mentioned by Marco Polo and the Chinese texts. Ferrand and Gerini would see this place in the southern part of the Malay peninsula and not in Sumatra.<sup>47</sup> I do not see why we cannot follow later scholars and locate it on the South-East coast of Sumatra. Ibn Sa'īd's directions fit in very well with this. If we imagine Sumatra as an elongated rectangle lying horizontally, Malāyū(r) would then appear in the top right hand (i.e. the north-eastern) corner which is where he puts it. Ferrand used, as part of his proof, the text of Dimashqī which places Malāyū(r) in the north-eastern corner of the island of Kalāh, according to Ferrand the north-east coast of the Peninsula. Of course, Dimashqī is only copying a source based ultimately on Ibn Sa'īd, and has mistakenly put Kalāh for Jāwa as the name of the island.

#### SHIH-LI-FO-SHIH AND SAN-FO-CH'Ī

These two terms are both used for the empire of Sri Vijaya by Chinese authors. European scholars have been at a loss to find a satisfactory explanation for the use of both terms for one and the same place, although at different periods. *Shih-li-fo-shih* 室利佛逝 was the original term and is obviously the closer of the two to the Indian term *Sri Vijaya*, but the last reference to it occurs in A.D. 742

<sup>45</sup> Nilakanta-Sastri: *Sri Vijaya*, p. 286.

<sup>46</sup> *Relations de voyages*, p. 575, n. 1. Another Arab spelling of Malāyūr is ملاير. Ibn al-Wardī's ملائو is obviously the same as Idrisi's ملاي Malā'i or Malāya which does not seem to have any connexion with ملاير. See p. 86.

<sup>47</sup> "Malaka, le Malāyū et Malāyūr", *JA*, xi sér., t. 12, p. 89-91. *Researches*, p. 528-539. The characters for Ma-li-yū-êrh are 麻里予兒.

and at the beginning of the tenth century, the term San-fo-ch'ī appears in its place.<sup>48</sup>

Most scholars have grasped the equation, *Shih-li-fo-shih* = *Sri Vijaya* = the Arab *Sribuza*. On the other hand the relationship between the words *Sri Vijaya* and *San-fo-ch'ī* has caused a great deal of speculation. Majumdar<sup>49</sup> has seen the origin of *San-fo-ch'ī* in the Arab *Zābaj* and has attempted through this to see in it the Indian term *Jāvaka*. Moens<sup>50</sup> on the other hand sees *Zābaj* in the Chinese term *She-p'ō* and produces the equation, *She-p'ō* (*Sho-wah*) = *Zābaj* = *Yawa*. Ferrand insists on the connexion between *She-p'ō* (orig. *Shu-pak*) and *Jāvaka*.<sup>51</sup>

I think that perhaps my explanation for the word *Zābaj* may solve this question. *Zābaj*, I have said was originally connected with the island of Java and then became attached to the empire of the Sailendras and finally came to belong to Sri Vijaya, the later Sailendra empire based on Sumatra.

It is possible therefore to see the following equations correct; *She-p'ō* = *Zābaj* = *Jāvaka*, a Javanese kingdom, and *Shih-li-fo-shih* = *Sribuza* = *Sri Vijaya* the Sumatran empire.

Now the use of *San-fo-ch'ī* 三佛齊 dates from about A.D. 900 and at that time as we can see from Chinese sources, the Arabs were the paramount sea traders in South-East Asia. The Arab texts show that this was also the period when the term *Zābaj* was beginning to be used for the Sumatran empire. I, therefore, see in *San-fo-ch'ī* the Chinese rendering of the Arab term, *Zābaj*. The new Chinese name for the South-East Asian empire is taken from the lips of Arab sea traders whereas the old name was taken from Indian or local Indonesian traders, who were the former masters of China's sea trade with the south. Thus we see that although *San-fo-ch'ī* has the

	The Javanese kingdom and empire	The Sumatran empire
Indian name	Jāvaka (Yawa)	Sri Vijaya Sribuza
Arab name	Zābaj	Zābaj
Chinese name	She-p'ō (Shu-pak)	San-fo-ch'ī Shih-li-fo-shih

<sup>48</sup> Majumdar: *Swarnadvīpa*, p. 218.

<sup>49</sup> *Swarnadvīpa*, pp. 209-21.

<sup>50</sup> *JRASMB*, v. 17, pt. 2, pp. 21-57; *TBG*, v. 74, pp. 383, 389, 403.

<sup>51</sup> Article on *Zābaj* in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.

same meaning as the earlier *Shih-li-fo-shih*, it has a different derivation, coming from the same word as the older Chinese *She-p'o*, but by a different route, for the word *She-p'o* was presumably also derived via Indian or Indonesian traders.

## 2. KALĀH

After Zābaj, Kalāh كلاله is the place most frequently mentioned in South-East Asia by the Arab texts. The name as *Qlh* appears probably from as early as A.D. 650 in accounts of the Nestorian Christians, although the earliest of the Arab texts was not to mention it for another two hundred years.<sup>52</sup>

The *Akhbār al-Šin*, the earliest of the texts, shows Kalāh—called here كلاله بار Kalāh-bār (Kalāh-vāra, according to Sauvaget)—as a stopping place on the way to China between Kūlam[-Malay كورم [ملي] (or هر کند Harkand, according to Sauvaget's reading) and تيؤما Tiyūma (Pulau Tioman).<sup>53</sup> Following the reading I have adopted, Kalāh appears to be one month or thirty days from Kūlam which is Quilon in South India and ten days from Tiyūma; that is three quarters of the way between the two places if similar sailing conditions are encountered on both parts of the voyage. The only other direct clue given by this text as to the whereabouts of Kalāh is that it is situated to the right of India. This is not much help: the "right" usually means the south to the Arabs, so that this probably indicates that Kalāh was somewhere beyond India to the south or the south-east.<sup>54</sup>

Ibn Khurdādhbih gives the distance from Ceylon (Sirandīb) as 16–21 days (10–15 from Ceylon to Langabālūs and 6 from the latter place to Kalāh) but as he gives no distance to Tiyūma, it is impossible to compare these two texts. Beyond Kalāh he places Bālūs at two days, but as the identity of Bālūs (q.v.) is not fixed, this does not help.

Abū Zaid gives no distances but only the information that the area (?) of the island is eighty parasangs. If this word for area تكسير could be used for circumference, this would make a maximum circumference for Kalāh of 280 miles. It would then rank in size

<sup>52</sup> Colless: *Persian Merchants*, p. 21.

<sup>53</sup> I have translated this passage as Ferrand would have it. Sauvaget (pp. 8–9) inserts the word كلاله into the text and produces, "le distance entre Koulam (Malaya) et (cet endroit) n'est pas longue; de Harkand à Kalah-vāra, une mois". This seems to be stretching the text too far and produces an incomprehensible result.

<sup>54</sup> Fatimi (*op. cit.*, p. 76) talks about the confusion of scholars here and quite simply states that South-East Asia is to the right of the Indian mainland on a map; but he overlooks the fact that classical Arab maps had the north at the bottom and South-East Asia would be to the left of India.

somewhere between Bangka and Billiton (Belitung), if it were really an island as he says it is. This is roughly the size of the present-day Kedah.<sup>55</sup> However, if an area of eighty square parasangs is meant (840 square miles) this is probably more in keeping with the size of a small maritime state.

Abū Dulaf places Kalāh three hundred parasangs (1,050 miles) from the "City of China". This is obviously a very round figure, for a thousand miles from Canton, the most southerly port of China, leaves one still off the coast of Indo-China. Sindbād's six days from الناقوس Nāqūs is also useless unless this is a restatement of Ibn Khurdādhbih, Nāqūs being the Nicobars (usually called by the Arabs لنجبالوس Langabālūs).

The *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* gives the distance from Sribuza as 120 *zām*. A *zām* is three hours sailing, so that the distance would be 360 hours or fifteen days. According to the alternative reckoning, there are 448 *zām* in 90 degrees of arc, then 120 *zām* come to just over 24 degrees, or nearly 1,700 miles, which is far too great a distance, being almost equal to the distance from Palembang to Ceylon. Sulaimān al-Mahrī has 94 *zām* from Ceylon to Penang.<sup>56</sup>

The later geographers do not add a great deal to elucidate the position of Kalāh. Birūnī places it on the opposite side of the equator to Sribuza. Idrīsī, obviously quoting two different sources, gives two different times for the journey from the Nicobars to Kalāh. Yāqūt in spite of his attempt to summarise all previous Muslim geographical knowledge, places Kalāh at the extremity of India on the equator, a position where it had not yet appeared up to his time. Ibn Sa'īd places it in the south-east corner of Jāwa, by which he means the southern part of the west coast of Sumatra. Dimashqī goes a step further, by calling the whole island Kalāh and not Jāwa. Finally Abu'l-Fidā states that it is twenty *majrā* from the Isles of the Maharāja, but what this means we cannot tell. It is probably another conversion of the 120 *zām* of the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind*.

Politically according to the Arab writers, Kalāh is under the King of Zābaj, the Maharāja, the Sailendra ruler of Sri Vijaya. Abū Zaid indicates that Kalāh is a subsidiary state of this larger empire, ruled over by the ruler of Zābaj, but Mas'ūdī seems to put Kalāh on an equal footing with Zābaj as a possession of the Maharāja, and even places Kalāh first, but it is doubtful if this has any significance. Dimashqī uses "kings" in the plural which could mean that by his day (A.D. 1325) the country had split up into several principalities,

<sup>55</sup> Or Selangor, if Dr. Fatimi wishes it this way.

<sup>56</sup> These two reckonings are explained in note 25, p. 18.

but he is not a very original writer on matters relating to the Far East, so that his plural is very probably a mistake of his own or of a copyist.

Ibn Khurdādhbih and those authors who follow him have a different version of the political picture. Kalāh belongs to the empire of Jābat al-Hindī, who does not appear to be the same person as the Maharāja. I have mentioned in the previous section,<sup>57</sup> that Jābat al-Hindī was probably a Hindu ruler of a place in central Sumatra or perhaps from the mainland of India itself, and Kalāh may have been under the sway of this ruler before the spread of the power of the Sailendras. Ibn Khurdādhbih does mention a king called Jāba among the kings of India. Ibn Rusta and Marwazī also mention him under the form Najāba (النجابة for نجابة?). The former identifies the people of this monarch with the Chalukyas (according to Ferrand's rendering), and the possibility of their influence on this part of South-East Asia should be noted.

Abū Dulaf's version (c. 950?) of the political situation on the other hand mentions no large empire and is reminiscent of the small states which existed in Indonesia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The king is not too powerful and is easily swayed by the will of the people. Kalāh seems to be definitely under Chinese influence but as I have shown before, Abū Dulaf stresses the Chinese element in his material on South-East Asia.

Little is said about the inhabitants of Kalāh except that they dressed in a single piece of material. The Arab word is فوطة *fūṭa* which would be the Malay sarong. Nobles and common people all dressed alike, as did both men and women, and the *Mukhtaṣar al-'ajā'ib* states that they were Indians. Abu'l-Fidā goes further and says "Muslims, Hindus and Persians (i.e. Zoroastrians or Parsis)". These must be the members of the trading community and not the native inhabitants. The *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* groups the people of Kalāh with the other tribes of the area as cannibals, but one suspects that this text is generalising or referring to surrounding tribes.

Abū Dulaf comes forward again with his Chinese information, but as his text could only be understood by Muslims, he has evidently adapted his material.

Dimashqī, who normally copies his material on South-East Asia, has here introduced a long discourse on the capturing and taming of elephants, which is probably general material, not essentially connected with Kalāh. It has no special relevance to this place, except that he says that they were trained for the kings of the country.

<sup>57</sup> See Zābaj, p. 110.

A list of the products of Kalāh is given by Abū Zaid; to these Mas'ūdī adds gold, Idrīsī rattan, and several others bamboo.<sup>58</sup> Some of these may be imports re-exported, so that it is difficult to say which are the native products. Those actually named as being produced in Kalāh seem to be camphor, bamboo and rattan, while Kalāh has mines of tin and gold.

A summary of all the information gleaned from the texts shows that Kalāh was an "island" or kingdom situated on the sea route from India to China, some twenty or thirty days sail from south India and Ceylon and six days from the Nicobars, ten days from Tiyūma, 120 *zām* from Sribuza and two days from Bālūs. Its main products were bamboo, camphor and rattan, which can be found in many places over the East Indies, and the metals tin and gold. Tin in large quantities is only found in the Malay Peninsula and its continuation, the Lingga and Riau Archipelagoes, and in the islands of Bangka and Billiton, but not in Sumatra. The deposits in Bangka and Billiton were not mined until comparatively recent times. Gold can be found in the Peninsula, in the mountains of Sumatra, and in several other places in the East Indies. The importance given to tin as a product of Kalāh, and its position as the first stopping place after Ceylon on the route to China, causes us to place it somewhere on the west coast of Malaya.

The figures for the sailing times to and from Kalāh are the only real criteria for finding the actual position of the place on the coast. Unfortunately it is impossible to compare all the distances, as they are given by different authors and usually in different units of measurement. Ratios of distances too are impossible as no author other than Ibn Khurdādhbih and the *Akhbār al-Šin* gives more than one distance, and these two authors cannot be satisfactorily compared because they do not present us with the distances between the same places. But although these figures must be unreliable, they seem to indicate a place on the west coast somewhere near the modern Kedah and the Langkawi islands. The farther one goes from this area to the north or south, the less likely is one to find these sailing times agreeing. Therefore to make them agree one must limit the location of Kalāh to the coast between Junk Ceylon and Kelang.

If we compare these routes with those of the navigators of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, whose travels are much better documented, one sees that the main route to the Far East was

<sup>58</sup> Abu'l-Fidā mentions lead الرصاص as a product of Kalāh, but this is probably a mistake for tin الرصاص القلعي.

through the Strait of Malacca and was reached by sailing due east after rounding Ceylon, sighting the southern point of Great Nicobar, and then aiming for Penang or Butang and sailing south from here. Sailing due east from the Little Basses off the coast of Ceylon brought one directly between Great Nicobar and Sumatra (through the Great Channel) and brought one up against the west coast of Malaya at the Langkawi islands. There is plenty of evidence in the texts of these navigators that if possible they preferred to sail due east when crossing large areas of ocean. This enabled them to maintain the Pole Star at the same height above the horizon for the whole voyage so simplifying their navigation enormously. There is also some indication in these texts that these latitudinal voyages were more common in earlier times and they must have been almost obligatory before the magnetic compass was introduced—although methods of sailing on a rumb did exist.

Distances were given by the navigators for these journeys and I will give them for the sake of comparison with our classical texts. Once again they do not correspond exactly with the distances given by the classical authors so it is difficult to compare them. Rāman kūta (Little Basses) to the end of Sumatra was 66 *zām* and from there to Penang (thought to be on the same latitude) 28 *zām*. Further north Ceylon to the Nicobars was 62 *zām* and the Nicobars to the Malayan coast was still 28 *zām*. Kālikūt (not Kūlam) to the Nicobars was 100 *zām*, obviously a classical round figure. These were the only figures given: all due east and west across the Bay of Bengal.<sup>59</sup>

The *Akhbār al-Šin* must be relating just such a route as the one given above and would expect to reach the Malayan coast off the Langkawi islands: thus following these instructions a location in present day Kedah would be ideal for Kalāh.

Ibn Khurdādhbih produces a curious route by appearing to take his sailors north of Ceylon. This is certainly unusual and is not implied in any of the other Arabic texts and the navigators sail south of Ceylon even to reach Chittagong. However if the Arabs did use this route there is the possibility that by sailing due east from the Palk Strait, they passed between the Andamans and the Nicobars (Ten degree channel) and arrived at the Malayan Peninsula opposite the Pakchan estuary. This would agree with the decisions of Ferrand and Wheatley<sup>60</sup> that Kalāh was further north. It would also conform

<sup>59</sup> These measurements can be found again on pp. 208 except for the last which is given on p. 200. These figures appear again in my *Arab navigation*, p. 359 and an explanation given for them in the preceding pages.

<sup>60</sup> Ferrand: "Le K'ouen-Louen", Appendix I, *JA*, 1919, p. 230; Wheatley: *The Golden Khersonese*, p. 224.

more with the implication made by Lamb that pottery and other remains in the Takuapa area show an entrepôt covering approximately the same period of time as the Arab Kalāh (i.e. the period of the T'ang dynasty) whereas finds in Kedah (Pengkalan Bujang) are later and contemporary with the Sung and Yuen dynasties.<sup>61</sup>

It must be noted however, that all this is based on Ibn Khurdādhbih's statement that the Arab route went through the Palk Strait and north of Ceylon. There is no other evidence for such a route from the Arab texts and Ibn Khurdādhbih's text is not precisely clear on this point. Furthermore the Arab sources always approach the Andamans from the Nicobars, whereas if they were used to sailing through the Ten degree channel, this sequence would not be necessary. The later navigators used the Ten degree channel, but to reach Martaban and Tenasserim after travelling round Ceylon. This was a complicated voyage definitely requiring a compass. The navigators used the Palk Strait only to reach the Coromandel coast. The early texts reached Burma by sailing from the Nicobars to the Andamans and then northwards to the mainland. The Cholas must have reached Malaya from north of Ceylon, but they did not need to navigate the Palk Strait and the Arabs had a far simpler route south of Ceylon. Finally a position for Kalāh near the Pakchan estuary and the isthmus of Kra takes one too far from Tiyūma to allow the ratios given by the *Akhbār al-Šin* to apply: even Kedah stretches this figure somewhat.<sup>62</sup>

The Arab writers do emphasise the importance of Kalāh as a trading centre and a focal point for shipping routes. Several times they mention that it is half way between China and Arabia (Oman) both when a direct route to China is indicated and later when Kalāh becomes the meeting place for Arab and Chinese ships. The *Akhbār al-Šin* does not say anything more than that it is a stopping place for obtaining fresh water, but by the time of Mas'ūdī it is the end of the Arab route and already a general rendezvous.

Abū Dulaf seems to indicate that it was the limit of Chinese navigation at that time, for the Chinese sailors were afraid of shipwreck if they ventured further. He also says that it was well populated and Sindbād adds that it was itself a great empire. None of these writers give precise information which would help us localise the

<sup>61</sup> In *Malaysia: a survey*, p. 109 and in *Malayan and Indonesia studies*, p. 83.

<sup>62</sup> At the southern end of the strait which separates the island of Penang from the mainland are two islands known as Pulau Kra. These are mentioned by the navigator Sulaimān al-Mahri (see Part II of this work) and must have been of some importance to Arab sailors in the sixteenth century. The word was written كرا whereas the isthmus was قرا.

place. Abū Dulaf's description of the ruler and the people could apply to almost anywhere in South-East Asia.

Wheatley has concentrated on Abū Dulaf, but I feel that this is an error for his whole voyage to the east has been doubted and we only read of it at second-hand. Wheatley feels that the presence of a tin mine in the fortress of the town might be such a characteristic feature that this could identify the place with certainty.<sup>63</sup> Of course it would if such a feature could be found on one of the many entrepôt sites in this area. But in the absence of such a feature (or lacking any site with such a feature), Wheatley's attempt to find a source of tin right on the coast still cannot prove that Abū Dulaf's description is any more authentic. The connexion between the fortress and the tin mine lies in the Arabic word *qal'a* قلعة "a fortress" and the adjective coming from the same root *al-qal'i* القلعي which is the classical Arab word for tin, understanding the noun *raṣāṣ* "lead" i.e. *al-raṣāṣ al-qal'i*, literally "white lead" or tin, although *qal'i* only occurs once in this sense. This word is sometimes taken by the Arab writers as a derivative of the word Kalāh (it will be seen that the form Kalāhī كلالهي also exists). Modern scholars think that it may be Malay in origin, perhaps similar to the word *kaling* which means tin-plate or tinned iron-plate. This resembles the place name Klang or Kēlang on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula. However the word *kaling* has never been known to adopt the form *kēlang*.<sup>64</sup>

The navigators use the form جبال القلعي "Tin mountains" for the hills of the Malay Peninsula; Sulaimān al-Mahrī specifically in the latitude of Kelang, but Ibn Mājid uses the term for all the Malayan mountains visible to a ship sailing the Malaccan Strait.<sup>65</sup>

References to Kalāh ought to be found in the works of other peoples who frequented South-East Asia at this time and we would expect to find accounts by the Chinese and the Indians. The Chinese texts do mention a place by the name of 哥羅 Ko-lo also called Ko-lo-fu-sha-lo 哥羅富沙羅, but their description has little in common with the Arab accounts of Kalāh. No tin is mentioned at all. In the list of provinces of San-fo-ch'i given in Chao Ju-kua's *Chu-fan-chih* we are given 加囉希 Chia-lo-hsi which is usually taken to be Grahi on the Bay of Bandon. It is not possible for the Arab Kalāh to be here, but the Chinese characters are a possible rendering of it. The voyage of Kia Tan, the celebrated cartographer of the T'ang dynasty, mentions Ko-lo in connexion with Ko-ku-lo

<sup>63</sup> *Th: Golden Kheronese*, p. 223.

<sup>64</sup> According to Streck in the article on "Kalāh" in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.

<sup>65</sup> See pp. 226 and 201. For Colless and Fatimi, and their connexion of al-Qal'i with Klang see below.

(see Qāqulla) and the *Sung-shu* and the *Wen-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* quoting the same journey from Coromandel to Canton, mention 占羅 Ku-lo in connexion with Chan-pin (see Şanfin). Ptolemy mentions a place called Kole[polis].

An astonishing amount has been written comparing the Arab Kalāh with the Indian forms: Kaṭāha, Kaḍāram, Kiḍāram, Kaḷaham and Kaḷaga, all of which seem to represent an important place in South-East Asia contemporary with Kalāh. Suggested Malay equivalents are Kedah, Kra, Kelang and Kora, the last of which Groeneveldt and Schlegel claim to be Malacca.

European scholars have been making attempts to locate Kalāh ever since Renaudot published his translation of the *Akhbār al-Şin wa'l-Hind* in 1718.<sup>66</sup> He placed it in Malabar, which word he thought to be the equivalent of Kalāh-bār. Gildemeister in 1838 equated it with Coromandel<sup>67</sup> and Reinaud (1845) with Galle in Ceylon. Alfred Maury (1846)<sup>68</sup> was the first to see that it must be somewhere in the East Indies, and he suggested Kedah. After this the text was neglected by Arab scholars (except Ferrand) and left to the mercy of Chinese and Indian specialists who failed to recognise the weaknesses of Arabic texts and the untrustworthiness of certain authors. Groeneveldt compared Kalāh with Ko-lo of the T'ang histories and came to the conclusion that it represented Kora, and in this he was followed by Schlegel. Gerini compared Kalāh-bār with Takua-pa and placed it in the neighbourhood of this place, north of Junk Ceylon making it the equivalent of Takola. Ferrand and Van der Lith<sup>69</sup> have also compared the name of Kedah with the word Kalāh by showing on the authority of Kern that the Malay and Javanese *d* is lingual and might easily be changed by the Arabs into *l*. It was also shown that the Indian terms Kaṭāha and Kaḍāram had variant forms with an *l* in Tamil poems, Kaḷaga and Kaḷāham. Ferrand in a lengthy and detailed article,<sup>70</sup> quoted numerous examples from the later Jawi script to prove that the Javanese and Malay *d* always became *ḍ* in the Arabic script, and the Javanese and Malay *r* was often reproduced by *ḷ*. On the strength of this, he equates Kalāh with Kra. But Arab sailors, unlike Ferrand, were not philologists and could hardly be expected to render Malay names

<sup>66</sup> *Anciennes relations des Indes et de la Chine, de deux voyageurs mahometans qui y allèrent dans le neuvième siècle*. Paris, 1718.

<sup>67</sup> *Scriptorum arabicorum de rebus Indicis, lois et opuscula in edita*. Bonnae, 1838.

<sup>68</sup> "Examen de la route, qui suivaient, au IXe siècle de nôtre ère, les Arabes et les Persans pour aller en Chine." *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie*, 1846, pp. 203-38.

<sup>69</sup> In Ferrand's article, see note 70. Also Van der Lith, *Merveilles de l'Inde*, p. 308.

<sup>70</sup> "Le K'ouen-Louen", Appendix I, *JA*, 1919, pp. 214-33.

with philological exactitude. The fact that Ibn Mājīd and Sulaimān al-Mahrī, five hundred years later, render Kedah by *قدهح* and *كيدا* does not prove that Kalāh is not the same place. Neither is the accent a criterion. The forms Kalāh *كَلَاه* and Kilah *كِلَاه* show that the accent was on the second syllable, as it was on Kiḏāram and Kaṭāha. The Arabic form *كَلِه* on the other hand, has the accent on the first syllable.

A theory which was once suggested, that the Arabs used the Strait of Sunda for sailing to China and that Kalāh was on the south-west coast of Sumatra is also untenable. A position in Sumatra is supported by Ibn Khurdādhbih's statement that Bālūs is two days from Kalāh "to the left" (presumably of the route from India to Kalāh). Scholars have originally connected Bālūs with the camphor port of Barus on the west coast of Sumatra, although nowadays it is equated generally with the northern end of the island. In any case such a position for Kalāh would fit the context.<sup>71</sup> Also as I have mentioned above, Ibn Sa'īd actually places Kalāh in this spot in his description of the island of Jāwa (Sumatra). But apart from these two references and the Chinese report in the *History of the Sung dynasty* of an Arab colony five days to the west of Java, we have no other evidence of a prosperous trading settlement in this area and all the Arab evidence points to the use of the Malacca Strait with a slow penetration to the South and East during the succeeding centuries.

Streck, under Kalāh in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, mentions other Arabists who give an opinion. The earlier ones suggest Kedah, while the later ones follow Ferrand, who adheres to his hypothesis of Kra in his own article in the *Encyclopaedia* on Zābaj. Since that time Sauvaget in the latest translation of the *Akhbār al-Šin* leans towards Kedah, while Nilakanta Sastri<sup>72</sup> would make Kedah equal Kaṭāha-Kiḏāram simply on the basis of its relative importance. The two most important places in this area in the Indian accounts are Sri-Vijaya and Kaṭāha-Kiḏāram, and this pair of names can be compared with the two Arabic names Sribuza and Kalāh.

Professor P. Wheatley in the *Golden Khersonese*<sup>73</sup> on reviewing the Arab evidence wishes to equate Kalāh with a port further north than either Kra or Kedah and suggests the Mergui estuary, placing the Chinese Ko-lo in the same position. He places the Indian Takkōla well to the south in Trang, although why the Arabs do not

<sup>71</sup> See Bālūs, p. 141.

<sup>72</sup> *Sri Vijaya*, p. 272.

<sup>73</sup> Other articles by Prof. Wheatley can be found in the bibliography.

mention this is difficult to see. This position is given partly because Wheatley wished to emphasise the importance of the trans-isthmian routes which appear to have been mentioned frequently in Chinese sources—although not at all in Arab classical texts.<sup>74</sup> He bases himself almost entirely on Abū Dulaf's mention of a tin mine in the citadel of Kalāh and also on Mas'ūdī's definition of the sea of Kalāh-bār as a sea of islands and narrow channels. I have shown earlier that Abū Dulaf is the least trustworthy of the Arab texts and that his tin mine in the citadel is based mainly on lexicographical coincidence. The sea of Kalāh-bār was anywhere between the Bay of Bengal (i.e. east of the Andaman-Nicobar chain and the shoals opposite Kelang, so that the islands and straits could be either the Mergui archipelago, Junk Ceylon, the river estuaries at Dindings, Penang or Kelang or even the shoals themselves. Kalāh from which the sea was named does not have to be immediately opposite these islands and channels and they can never be a criterion for placing the actual commercial entrepot.

Finally the identification of Kalāh with Kelang itself has been proposed by Dr. S. Q. Fatimi in his *In quest of Kalāh* on the basis of the Arab texts alone and by Dr. B. Colless in the most recent article on the subject.<sup>75</sup> Dr. Fatimi's criteria for his identification are (i) philological comparison of the two names and the *Kalāhi-kaling* words for tin, (ii) latitude measurements and (iii) the fact that the Arab navigators of the fifteenth century mention the Jibāl al-Qal'ī specifically in the Kelang area. I have earlier mentioned the difficulty of using philological comparisons. Dr. Fatimi's list of rules for the phonetic transposition of Malay place names into an Arabic form together with his alternatives and exceptions make a formidable deterrent to anyone wishing to follow this method: it must also be pointed out that there are numerous exceptions not quoted by Dr. Fatimi. Finally a look at the Arabic versions of modern Malay place names in a modern Arab pilot guide written by an educated Arab nakhoda ought to be enough to convince even Dr. Fatimi that sailors are not necessarily philologists.<sup>76</sup> The latitude of Kalāh was never given before the time of Birūnī and as the later geographers produced no original information about Kalāh, one can have little faith in their actual measurements of its position. The possibility must not be ruled out—especially if one uses Arab evidence alone—that the place had ceased to exist by the time of Birūnī (d. 1048).

<sup>74</sup> Unless we follow the reasoning of S. M. Yusuf.

<sup>75</sup> *Journal of South-East Asian history*, v. 1, no. 2, pp. 62–101. Colless in *JMBRAS*, v. 42, pt. 2, pp. 10–47.

<sup>76</sup> Qutāmi: *Dalīl al-muhtār fī ilm al-bihār*. Kuwait, 1964 (3rd ed.).

The reference to the Jibāl al-Qal'ī in the work of Sulaimān al-Mahrī was mentioned by me in my former note on Kalāh,<sup>77</sup> where I stated that the phrase was in apposition to the Jibāl Mul al-Siām "the mountains of the mainland of Siam".<sup>78</sup> However I did not mention—indeed the text had not been published—that in the Leningrad poem *al-Ma' aqīya* Ibn Mājid refers to the Jibāl al-Qal'ī again as the mountains of the whole mainland but in this case he mentions them in connexion with the area around Kedah Peak.<sup>79</sup>

Dr. Colless' article was intended to present the evidence of Nestorian Christian sources and as such is a very important contribution for it gives the earliest use of the form Kalāh as used by western Asiatic writers. However he adds his own opinions on the identification and appears to be definitely in favour of the Kelang area. He uses Dr. Fatimi's authority to show that the Arab texts support this identification and adds confirmation from archaeology and other sources.

In spite of any of these definite identifications in many cases based on Arabic evidence, I am still of the opinion that the Arabic classical texts as they stand cannot be used to pinpoint Kalāh exactly and I stand by my former statement that the most definite we can hope to be is somewhere between Junk Ceylon and Kelang. Other literary evidence does not help greatly.

The Arabic texts can only give the relative importance of the place as Nilakanta-Sastri shows and the approximate position taking into account the standard Arab trade routes. Exact identification must be left until we can find another Arab<sup>80</sup> or non-Arab source which is more precise to allow further comparison or until we find suitable archaeological evidence to compare with the texts.

### 3. QĀQULLA

There are two different readings of this name in the Arab texts; with a Q ق and with a J ج; i.e. قاقلة Qāqulla and جاجلة Jājulla, or possibly Gāgulla. The former is the more usual while the latter appears in Abū Dulaf and is copied by several later writers. Among these is Qazwīnī, who mentions both Qāqulla and Jājulla, quoting some unknown source for the former.

<sup>77</sup> *Malayan Journal of Tropical Geography*, v. 9 (1956), pp. 21–60.

<sup>78</sup> See p. 226.

<sup>79</sup> I cannot go into the reasoning of Dr. S. M. Yusuf in the article mentioned above (*Islamic culture*, v. 29) who places Kalāh in the Irrawaddy delta.

<sup>80</sup> Mas'ūdī mentions a work *Kitāb akhbār al-Qala* by 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-Madā'īnī (d. 840) which may be about Kalāh, but is no longer known. *Murūj*, v. 2, p. 326–7; De Goeje's *Tanbih*, p. 358.

The description given by Abū Dulaf shows a coastal town built on a promontory; and he places it beyond Kalāh on the sea route coming from China. The next stop after this is Qashmīr.<sup>81</sup> This topography agrees surprisingly with that which is given on later Arabic maps such as those of Idrīsī, and the texts of Idrīsī and Ibn Sa'īd are again in agreement. It would appear that this information was taken by these authors from Abū Dulaf rather than from more reputable sources, unless Abū Dulaf copied it from a prototype of this sort of map.<sup>82</sup> The distances given by Idrīsī are totally inadequate. That Lūqīn (Lung-pien in the delta of the Red river, near Hanoi) could be only 7 days from a place obviously close to India on the other side of the Malay Peninsula is fatuous, whether the journey was by land or sea. The *Akhbār al-Ṣīn* makes it forty days from Ṣanf to Kalāh. Ibn Sa'īd's account is taken from Idrīsī, but is easier to follow on Idrīsī's map than is Idrīsī's own text.<sup>83</sup> It does leave, however, an impression of the parallel mountain ranges of the Burmese and Indo-Chinese area. Therefore nothing from these authors helps to locate Qāqulla except to suggest a coastal port on the mainland. Qazwīnī nevertheless does add something original for once. This is the mountain of الجادور Jādūr, and he also states that Qāqulla is part of Zābaj.

A different and much more comprehensible topography is produced by the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind*. The itinerary of the sailor mentioned by Muḥammad b. Bābīshād is one of the most detailed accounts that we have of the eastern part of the Bay of Bengal. Qāqulla (or a bay less than ten miles from it) is twenty *zām* from the islands of ارمانان Armanān, a difficult voyage for a small boat. The figure of 20 *zām* is usually reckoned as 2½ sailing days (i.e. 60 hours) in the books of Ibn Mājid.<sup>84</sup> ارمانان Andamān but the form does appear elsewhere. Ibn Rusta has الارمن (of which ارمانان is the dual form, or a doubtful misprint) which De Goeje and Ferrand suggest is Pegu.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>81</sup> Ibn Mājid says Kashmir when he means Cosmin, a place near Bassein in the Irrawaddy delta, but I do not think that this is meant here. Besides, Abū Dulaf spells the word كشمير. Ibn Mājid has كشمير.

<sup>82</sup> Abū Dulaf's journey took place about A.D. 940, but the earliest detailed maps that we possess are reputed to be the work of much later geographers. Note too, that the first detailed account of his voyage occurs in a work of Yāqūt about 1200.

<sup>83</sup> K. Miller: *Mappae arabicae*, Bd. 1, Stuttgart, 1926, 2. Heft; Die Weltkarte des Idrīsī von Jahre 1154 n. Chr.

<sup>84</sup> See note 25, p. 18 for methods of reckoning the value of the *zām*. By the alternative reckoning, twenty *zām* would be 257 miles. This system however appeared faulty before and it may not be wise to use it.

<sup>85</sup> Sanskrit *Rāmaṇya*; Ferrand suggests al-Rāman. Ibn Khurdādhbih has رهمى Rahmā for Pegu.

From Armanān it is seventy *zām* (210 hours, 900 miles) to بدفاركاله Badfārkalah, from which the sailor seems to have known the way to Kalāh. Badfārkalah means nothing as two separate words in either Arabic or Persian, nor does it have any significance in Malay. Sulaimān al-Mahrī, who gives a detailed account of these seas in the sixteenth century, mentions Buttum Bāshkalā,<sup>86</sup> which is an island in the Mergui Archipelago. The Bāshkalā element باشكالا may be the same as the بدفاركاله of the 'Ajā'ib al-Hind, but it is much too far to the north of Kalāh, if we have to locate Qāqulla and Šanfīn (q.v.) also on this coast.<sup>87</sup> Badfārkalah seems much more likely to be Pulau Butang, which is a group of islands a little to the north of the Langkawi group, and a certain landmark for Kalāh if that place is to be located south of Junk Ceylon.

If the ratio of the two parts of the journey (2:7) is applied to this part of the Bay of Bengal it is possible to produce a suitable route by placing Qāqulla at Tavoy and Armanān in the Irrawaddy delta. Although these may seem satisfactory identifications, the resulting voyage looks very unlikely, especially as a boat sailing from the Irrawaddy delta to Butang is almost certain to strike land before it reaches the latter place. Another suitable route can be obtained by placing Qāqulla in the Irrawaddy delta and Armanān in North Andaman. But the description of Qāqulla does not fit this area of Burma and the Arabs already had a name for it.

The difficulty about using these sailing figures is that they are those of a single sailor navigating (or even drifting) in a small boat. We cannot compare them with the standard times given by our writers to the main parts of the trade route. Andaman is a very likely rendering of the name of the middle place and I feel that the most plausible route is from somewhere in Tenasserim to Andaman, and then to Pulau Butang and Kedah.

Little is told us of the political set up in Qāqulla. Abū Dulaf says that it has a king similar to the king of Kalāh; that is, another small maritime state sending tribute to China. The information about Alexander (Iskandar) is probably a misquotation. The traditions relating to Iskandar now prevalent in many Malay states are Muslim in origin, brought much later from Gujerat and Persia. Qazwīnī includes Qāqulla in Zābaj, but whether politically or geographically one cannot tell. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, at a much later date, makes it part of the territory of the king of Mul-Jāwa (see below).

<sup>86</sup> See pp. 213 and 236.

<sup>87</sup> This would be the only real clue that could enable Wheatley to place Kalāh in the Mergui area. Badfārkalah could be read بلد فرلك "the land of Perlak" according to Van der Lith (*Merveilles de l'Inde*, p. 264).

Aloeswood is the most important product of Qāqulla and is mentioned by other writers besides geographers and travellers. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa gives us an idea how common it was in the land itself. The aloeswood of Qāqulla seems to have been one of the better kinds and Avicenna, starting with the best and most important, puts it fourth in his list. Besides *Qāqullī* aloeswood, Ya'qūbī mentions *Qāqullī* ambergris as an important product and Idrīsī, *Qāqullī* silk or cloth. None of these products is limited to any one part of South-East Asia, so that they do not help us to locate Qāqulla. Silk does not even come from this part of the world in its natural state, although it is possible that it was exported from certain places in a made-up form. Abū Dulaf's statement that cinnamon is exported from Qāqulla is just as useless, for this spice usually came to the West from South India.

It is interesting that the Arabic word for cardamom is قاقلة. The word is also Persian and appears in Pehlevi (Pazand?) as *kākura*,<sup>88</sup> and is, therefore, an old Indo-Aryan word and unconnected with the town. Although this substance and its substitutes are natives of South-East Asia, and are often mentioned by the Arabs, it is never connected by them with the place of the same name. The Sanskrit *kakkōla* is a kind of plant with aromatic berries, possibly *Pimenta acris*. *Takkōla* is a variant form of this. Colless has drawn attention to this as a possible proof of the connexion between the Arab Qāqulla and the Ptolemaic Takōla.<sup>89</sup>

Of the animal life of this place, the texts mention elephants, a species of tall monkey living in troupes, mentioned by the 'Ajā'ib as being common in several places on the western side of the Archipelago; and two species of monkey and a white falcon (cockatoo?) which Qazwīnī says dwell on Mount Jādūr.<sup>90</sup>

Of the people, the 'Ajā'ib remarks that they are cannibals, but groups them with the peoples of most other places on the western side of the Archipelago. On the other hand, Abū Dulaf and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa show the civilised town one would expect to find, with walls of hewn stone and inhabitants wearing clothes, and with an organised religion, according to Abū Dulaf based on the stars. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa notes that they are addicted to piracy, a characteristic activity of Malay states.

<sup>88</sup> B. Laufer: *Sino-Iranica*, Chicago, 1919, p. 193.

<sup>89</sup> R. L. Turner: *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages*, 1966, no. 2586. B. Colless: "Persian merchants", p. 31.

<sup>90</sup> Ludovici di Varthema mentions a brightly coloured bird seen during the visit made by him to Tenasserim. This has been identified as the Helmet-Hornbill. See Hakluyt Society edition, p. 200.



Qāqulla remained in existence after most of the other towns mentioned by the early geographers had disappeared or changed their names. It seems to have been flourishing in 1346 when Ibn Baṭṭūṭa visited the East, so that it is worth while examining his account separately. Although he says that he called at Qāqulla, his route after leaving Samuṭra is very hazy. He writes, "We sailed along the coast of his kingdom for twenty one nights". "His kingdom" means that of the Sultan of Samuṭra, on the north-west coast of Sumatra. Therefore he sailed down the Sumatran coast for twenty one nights. "Then we arrived at Mul-Jāwa", which must consequently have been on the east coast of Sumatra, or what is most likely, the island of Java itself. "This land produces all sorts of spices and excellent aloes called Qāqullī and قماری Qmārī: Qāqulla and قمارة Qmāra are part of his [the king of Mul-Jāwa] land". قمار Qmār (but not usually the feminine form قمارة), always means the kingdom of the Khmers, which is certainly not reached by sailing down the coast of Sumatra, and therefore hardly in the land of Mul-Jāwa. There is no need, therefore, to put Qāqulla in that land. It seems that the ruler of Mul-Jāwa claimed to be the overlord of both these states, one in Indo-China and the other presumably in the northern part of the Malay Peninsula. But Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, after writing for some time on various articles of commerce, follows up with a section beginning, "We arrived at the port of Qāqulla", and when he comes to the end of that, goes on to describe the king of Mul-Jāwa. He does not say that Qāqulla is the capital of Mul-Jāwa, nor does he ever mention the king of Mul-Jāwa in his section on Qāqulla. The only connexion between the two places appears in the sentence quoted above. The section on Qāqulla can be lifted out and set down anywhere in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's text, and could even be placed before his arrival in Samuṭra. It could be a passage slightly out of order, or, what is more likely, some of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's original material is missing.

Thus, our Arab authors really give us very little information to help us place Qāqulla on the map. It is a town with stone walls, built on a rock jutting out to sea, and a little further on from Kalāh on the way from China to India. The *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* confirms that it is on the western side of either the Malay Peninsula or Sumatra, but it was certainly not a regular port of call on the Oman-China route. It was also an important commercial centre for aloeswood.

The Chinese sources shed a little more light here for the itinerary of Kia Tan mentions that on the northern coast of the strait of Malacca is the kingdom of Ko-lo, which I have earlier mentioned in connexion with Kalāh; and to the west of Ko-lo (i.e. to the north-

west) and presumably on the same coast is the kingdom of 哥谷羅 Ko-ku-lo. The relative position of these two places reiterates the account of Abū Dulaf and does not disagree with anything that the *'Ajā'ib* has to say. Unfortunately the Chinese do not give a description of Ko-ku-lo.<sup>91</sup>

Ptolemy<sup>92</sup> produces several names which might be the equivalent of Qāqulla. There is Kōkala which is very close to the Ganges delta; Kokonagara, a little to the south of Takōla, and the last place itself, which is obviously the Takkola of the *Milindapañha* and the Talaitakkōlam of the Tanjore inscription.

Gerini in discussing these names, came to no definite conclusion, but suggested that both Kalāh and Qāqulla were in southern Siam (Takuapa), the same area being represented in Ptolemy by Takōla and Kokonagara. Ferrand<sup>93</sup> had already placed Qāqulla in eastern Indo-China, basing himself mainly on the text of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. On discovering the Ko-ku-lo of Kia Tan, he stated that there were two Qāqullas, one on the east coast of the Bay of Bengal and another on the coast of Annam, but there is no evidence in favour of this second location. Ferrand<sup>94</sup> would locate the Qāqulla of the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* somewhere in Tenasserim, for it is obviously north of Kalāh, which he places at the Isthmus of Kra.

The texts lead us to seek two ports on the west coast of Siam, one (Qāqulla) situated to the north of the other (Kalāh), while a third may exist to the north of these (Şanfin). There are four or five likely positions on this coast; Tavoy, Mergui and Tenasserim, the Pakchan river (Kra), Takuapa and Kedah. None of these places has anything to compare with the mountain which juts out to sea or Mount Jādūr. Ibn Sa'īd's description suggests Mergui, with the great city of طراغا Ṭarāghā as Tenasserim;<sup>95</sup> Hanaba would then be across the range on the Siamese side, but I always regard Ibn Sa'īd's accounts with suspicion. I have shown how Mergui would agree with the sailor's voyage as described in the *'Ajā'ib*. If Şanfin were to the north of this it could be placed in Tavoy, and the Fawfal of Ibn Sa'īd in Pegu. Ferrand has drawn our attention to the resemblance between Fawfal and the Mappapalam of the Tanjore inscription while Nilakanta-Sastri states that some have identified Mappapalam with Pegu.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>91</sup> Wheatley in *Desultory remarks* (see Bibliog.) thinks this resemblance between Arab and Chinese texts is too much of a coincidence to be true.

<sup>92</sup> L. Renou: *La géographie de Ptolémée, l'Inde* (vii, 1-4), Paris, 1925, plate A.

<sup>93</sup> "Le K'ouen-Louen", *JA*, v. 14, 1919, p. 43, n. 1.

<sup>94</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

<sup>95</sup> See p. 95 and note 68.

<sup>96</sup> Sulaimān al-Mahrī mentions a place Fawfal on the coast of Orissa. This may be the same place. Fawfal according to Nainar, is on the west coast of India, at

Finally what is the relationship between Takōla and Qāqulla? Since I first wrote this sentence in the *Malayan Journal of Tropical Geography* in 1956,<sup>97</sup> several other scholars have touched on the subject. In particular Dr. P. Wheatley in his *Golden Khersonese* and elsewhere.<sup>98</sup> But with no more evidence one is still no nearer a solution. Ptolemy's Takōla suggests a fairly early site, although if Talaitakkolam in the Tanjore inscription is the same name it must have survived to at least the eleventh century. The earliest Arab text to mention Qāqulla is Abū Dulaf in the tenth century and it still existed in the fourteenth century when Ibn Baṭṭūṭa mentioned it. Several authors placed Takōla at Takuapa on the west coast of Siam, and some have placed Qāqulla here and some have identified it with Kalāh. The question still remains that if Takuapa is Takōla should this be equated with Qāqulla, Kalāh or neither. If Kalāh were placed in Kedah, the Takuapa area would still be free to take the name Qāqulla, but then the voyage of the seaman in the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* would be a much more local affair and Armanān would have to be placed much nearer to the mainland.

Wheatley however has placed Takōla in the neighbourhood of Trang on evidence he has deduced from Ptolemy, i.e. that it is between two capes on the west coast of the Peninsula. As I have mentioned before he has placed Kalāh in the Mergui area, and therefore cannot place Qāqulla to the south of this. "Ptolemaic Takōla," he says, "is plainly meant to be located south of that point (Phuket Island). Takōla can be equated with Ko-ku-lo and Qāqulla only by impugning the accuracy of the Ptolemaic data".<sup>99</sup> But what is the accuracy of that Ptolemaic data compared with the information given by the Arab and Chinese texts? Wheatley gives the impression that although he can see the philological relationship suggested by other scholars between Qāqulla, Ko-ku-lo and Takōla, he wishes to reject this and all other evidence if it clashes with his preconceived locations for Ptolemaic Takōla and Arab Kalāh. However in the end he shelves the problem as do all other scholars

the modern Bekal. Colless ("Persian merchants", pp. 35-6) has more to say about the identification of Ḥanaba, Fawfal and Ibn Sa'īd's geography of this area. See also note 68, p. 95.

<sup>97</sup> *Malayan Journal of Tropical Geography*, v. 9, 1956, p. 38.

<sup>98</sup> See also his "Takola emporion; a study of an early Malay place name". *MJTG*, v. 2, 1954, pp. 35-47. Dr. B. Colless, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-5 gives opinions and points out that Kakhao I., near Takuapa, has archaeological evidence to show that it was once an entrepôt and the name has echoes of the Arabic name Qāqulla. Van der Meulen also has ideas on Takola in *Indonesia*, v. 18, p. 28 (1974).

<sup>99</sup> *The Golden Khersonese*, p. 270.

for lack of sufficient evidence. As in the case of Kalāh, further literary evidence or definite archaeological evidence is the only way the problem can be solved.

#### 4. ŞANFİN

This place صنغين is mentioned three times in the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* and would seem, from the context in each case, to be situated on the west coast of either Sumatra or the Malayan Peninsula. The first time it appears it is mentioned in connexion with the valley of Lāmūrī and the valley of Qāqulla as the habitat of an extraordinarily tall species of monkey (see under Qāqulla). The text could be read as if "the shore of Şanfīn" were in the valley of Lāmūrī, but this is doubtful, for it seems too precise a location for the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* and also a rather restricted area for the home of a certain species of monkey, which also inhabited the Peninsula (Qāqulla).

The second notice of Şanfīn couples it again with Lāmūrī and Qāqulla. The text reads, "All the people who live in Faṣūr, Lāmūrī, Kalāh, Qāqulla, Şanfīn and the neighbouring places are cannibals [etc.]". If the places are in order geographically from south to north (and the first four seem to be), this would locate Şanfīn to the north of Qāqulla on the Peninsula.

The last reference states that in Şanfīn a sailor met a man who was the sole survivor of a ship which had been attacked by cannibals at Andaman, again showing a possible position on the west coast.

The Chinese *History of the Second Sung (Sung shu)* and the *Wen hsien t'ung k'ao*, describing a journey from Coromandel to Canton, both mention a place called 占賓 Chan-pin between Coromandel and 古羅 Ku-lo, 77 days from the former and 61 from the latter. The times taken for the various parts of the voyage are so odd as to be useless. Ferrand,<sup>100</sup> who discusses the voyage suggests no identifications, except that Chan-pin is on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula. Nor does he give any identifications for the other places between Coromandel and Chan-pin, Na-wu-tan and P'o-li-si-lan, or for the island of Yi-ma-lo-li, which is placed between Chan-pin and Ku-lo. I have above mentioned Tavoy as a suitable place,<sup>101</sup> but Şanfīn may be looked for anywhere on the coast of Tenasserim or Siam, remembering that it is probably north of the site of Qāqulla.

A district of Siam at the present time, on the east coast of the Peninsula and opposite Pakchan, goes under the name of Chumphon

<sup>100</sup> "Le K'ouen-Louen", *JA*, t. 14, 1919, pp. 39ff.

<sup>101</sup> See p. 133.

(Champawn). This is placed at the end of an important early trade route across the Isthmus of Kra. Was it possible that the name covered both sides of the Isthmus at this time?<sup>102</sup>

### 5. TIYŪMA

Two places which are closely connected with Kalāh are Tiyūma and Panhang. Tiyūma is important as the next stopping place on the China route after Kalāh.

Tiyūma is the reading given by a manuscript of Ibn Khurdādhbih's work; the other manuscripts have قيومة and قيومة; the *Akhbār al-Šīn* has قيومة, while Idrīsī has قيومة when quoting Ibn Khurdādhbih, but also شيرمة, سيومة and similar forms. The products of the island do not seem to be very important but camphor and aloeswood are mentioned. Idrīsī (under قيومة) mentions sandalwood and rice, and talks of people wearing a *fūta* (sarong), but the text is very confused and it is most likely that this refers to Qmār. Later (this time under شيرمة) Idrīsī mentions edible birds and coconuts.

It was first identified as Pulau Tioman by Maury in 1846,<sup>103</sup> and the identification seems fairly stable.<sup>104</sup> Pulau Tioman has a small creek on the west coast where ships can obtain fresh water. This was utilized by the Portuguese from the early sixteenth century when en route to China, and there is no reason why the Arabs should not have used it in the ninth century. The summit of the peak of the island is 3,383 ft., which makes it a suitable landmark for ships.

The many small islands around Tiyūma, some inhabited by Panhang people, are reminiscent of that part of the coast of Malaya, and give us confirmation of both the positions of Panhang and Tiyūma. The king called Qamrūn could only have been the village headman, but except for the confused statement of Idrīsī mentioned above, Tiyūma seems to have been uninhabited. Qamrūn قمرון is a word used by copyists for any word remotely resembling it, in the same manner as the word فننج in the next section. But it is usually associated with Africa or Assam (as قروب i.e. Kamarūpa).

The distances of Tiyūma from other places may be significant for the locations of those places. Kalāh (ten days) has been dealt with

<sup>102</sup> S. M. Yusuf has the ingenious idea that Šanfīn is the dual from Šanf and means Šanf and Qmār together, hence it is the equivalent of the قماريان of the *ʿAjā'ib al-Hind*.

<sup>103</sup> *Examen de la route, qui suivaient, au IXe siècle de notre ère, les Arabes et les Persans pour aller en Chine*, p. 203-38.

<sup>104</sup> S. M. Yusuf in his effort to use overland routes uses the form Battumah and equates it with Martaban. Jāba, Mā'iṭ = Mand, Shalahit (Sylhet) and Harlaj are all in the Assam-Burma area according to him.

above; كدرنج Kadrang or كندرنج Kundrang (q.v.) a point in Cochin-China, is also ten days, but Ibn Khurdādhbih puts Qmār قمار at five days. Idrīsī puts مائط Mā'iṭ at one day in one place (المائد شيرمة) and in another, four (المائد شيرمة), while it is two from موجة Muja and four from الأيام al-Ayām.<sup>105</sup>

### 6. PANHANG

Mas'ūdī is the only author who tells us anything about this place, or rather people, who are obviously a branch of the primitive sea dwellers of the coast of Malaya known as the *Orang Laut*. Idrīsī repeats the same story but adds that their hair is black and that each person wears a collar of iron, copper or gold.

The Sea of Kadrang where they exist is the South China Sea, and Mas'ūdī's description would seem to put them on the same land-mass as Kalāh, i.e. on the Malay Peninsula. Idrīsī's text adds nothing that will help identify the people. Ibn Sa'īd describes the people of Bintan in the same words. This statement of Mas'ūdī is perhaps the best description of the Peninsula that we have in these early Arab texts for it shows a wild people on the east divided from the more civilized west by a range of mineral-bearing mountains.

Mas'ūdī's text actually reads فنجب (i.e. Punjab), which must be an example of a copyist reading a well-known name instead of a correct rare form. I prefer to read this word as فنحن (i.e. Panghang or Panhang). Perhaps it could be read فنحن (i.e. Pangpang) but this is rather unlikely. These two forms resemble the Chinese forms P'eng-heng and P'eng-feng which have been taken by most scholars to represent the modern Pahang.<sup>106</sup> There is a possible objection to my rendering in that the Arabs rarely use the consonant ح h, when transliterating names in South-East Asia; but whichever way we read the word, there seems little doubt that a people in Pahang are meant here.

The Chinese texts represent Pahang by the terms 彭亨 P'eng-heng, 彭坑 P'eng-k'eng and 蓬豐 P'eng-feng (Chao Ju-kua). The first two forms come from texts of the Ming dynasty and are thus much later than the Arab accounts. They show a cultivated Pahang, which the Arab accounts do not, perhaps because the Arabs never reached the cultivated parts of the east coast. Schlegel states that P'eng-heng represents the word *Panggang*, a name given to aboriginal

<sup>105</sup> According to Ferrand: *Relations de voyages*, p. 191, n. 2, a variant form is انام al-Anām, for Annam or possibly the Anambas.

<sup>106</sup> Schlegel: "Geographical notes", *TP*, v. 10, 1899, p. 39ff; Groeneveldt: *Notes on the Malay Archipelago*, p. 136; Ferrand: *Le K'ouen-Louen*, *JA*, v. 13, 1919, p. 282.

tribes to the north of Pahang.<sup>107</sup> This agrees more with the Arab description and leads Ferrand to adopt the reading فنجن (i.e. Pagan) for the Arabic name.<sup>108</sup>

Another reading for the Arab فنجن is قنجب Qanjab, which is surprisingly like Kanjap a name placed in the Riau Archipelago by Nilakanta Sastri in the map in his article.<sup>109</sup> P. E. de Jong<sup>110</sup> mentions the same name as a doubtful alternative reading for the name Kanjapiniran found in the *Nagarakṛtagama*. He places it in Singkep. This might be the true explanation of the Arab word. The primitive sea people were in evidence among all the islands of the Riau and Lingga Archipelagoes as well as on the east coast of Malaya. Ibn Sa'īd's description of the people of Bintan must again be stressed, although he presumably heard rumours of such people in the neighbourhood of Bintan and connected them with the literary accounts of Idrīsī and Mas'ūdī.

However, the extreme uncertainty of the readings of both the Arab and the Javanese words makes it undesirable for us to rely completely on one of these terms to prove the location of the other. Also Mas'ūdī's statement exerts considerable weight in favour of a location in the Pahang area.

#### 7. LĀMURĪ AND RĀMNĪ

The term Rāmnī occurs in several forms in the Arabic texts الرامي (Ibn Khurdādhbih and Abū Zaid), الرامين (Akhbār al-Šin), الرامين (Mas'ūdī and Birūnī, the former of whom also has الرامين). Birūnī also has الرام which is obviously the same thing. The term Lāmūrī is usually written لاموري but Rashīd al-Dīn spells it لاموري. That both forms represent the same place is not doubted.<sup>111</sup> Lāmūrī is a well-known name in the literature of several races. The Indian inscription of Rajendra I Chola mentions Ilamuridesam. Lāmūrī appears in the *Nagarakṛtagama* and in Malay texts in the form of Lamuri and Lamiri. Marco Polo knows it as Lambri and it is also mentioned by

<sup>107</sup> From Grünwedel: *Die wilden Stämme von Malaka*, Berlin, 1892, v. 2, 3-4 fasc., pp. 97-8.

<sup>108</sup> *Relations de voyages*, p. 99, n. 2.

<sup>109</sup> *Sri Vijaya*, plate 1.

<sup>110</sup> "Malayan and Sumatran place-names in classical Malay literature", *Malayan Journal of Tropical Geography*, v. 9, 1956, pp. 63-6.

<sup>111</sup> Dr. S. Q. Fatimi (*op. cit.*, pp. 94-5, note 8) doubts it. He agrees that Lāmūrī is in North Sumatra but equates Rāmnī with Ramree off the Burmese coast following a note in the *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Atlas, 1931, p. 47. This according to him is not the same as Rahmā رهمن or رحمان Rahmān which is Pegu.

Friar Odoric.<sup>112</sup> In the Chinese texts it appears as Lan-li, Lan-wu-li, Nan-wu-li and Nan-p'o-li.<sup>113</sup>

The identification of the place has never really been disputed; it is obviously an area or a town at the extreme north-west point of Sumatra near the modern Aceh. The name seems to have survived throughout the period covered by the Arab texts and appears in the navigational treatises of the sixteenth century although Ibn Baṭṭūṭa does not mention it. It is last heard of in the Chinese Annals about 1430. Sulaimān al-Mahrī makes it quite clear where it is situated, and mentions the Mountain of Lāmūrī which also appears in Chinese texts, as standing over the port of Pedir.

Lāmūrī first appears as such in the Arab texts in the '*Ajā'ib al-Hind*' where it appears on the same land mass as Faṣṣūr. The same text seems to use the word Lāmūrī for the whole island for it says that Sribuza is at the extremity of the Island of Lāmūrī. Both Ibn Sa'īd and Rashīd al-Dīn place it at the western end of Jāwa (i.e. Sumatra) although the latter seems to refer to it as a separate island.

Rāmnī in its various forms is mentioned by all the earlier Arab writers, and according to most of them it is the first island arrived at after leaving Ceylon. It is also bathed by two seas, Harkand (or the Bay of Bengal) and Salāhiṭ (the Strait of Malacca). Its size is given by the *Akhbār al-Šin* and from this and one or two other statements it is possible that the earlier Arab writers included the whole of Sumatra in Rāmnī. Mas'ūdī says for instance that it is governed by many kings and that the people are neighbours of Faṣṣūr, while the *Akhbār al-Šin* says that Faṣṣūr are plantations in Rāmnī where camphor is grown. Nias too was dependent on it.

That the form Rāmnī was only a version of Lāmūrī was first suggested by Dulaurier in 1847.<sup>114</sup> It is possible that it is a copyist's corruption but the same error occurs in so many texts it is most likely that the error is due to the Arab traders themselves, the earlier name being produced from the correct one by permutation of the liquid consonants. Gerini<sup>115</sup> on the other hand, thought Rāmnī to be the original form, being derived from *Rama-bari*, "Rama's country", and Lāmūrī was a derivative of this. Cowan has suggested that the name represented an Indian *Lampuri*.<sup>116</sup> Ferrand

<sup>112</sup> Marco Polo. Yule-Cordier ed. 1926, v. 2, p. 299; Friar Odoric from Yule's *Cathay and the way thither*, v. 2, pp. 146ff.

<sup>113</sup> 藍[無]里, 南淳利, 南巫里; Hirth and Rockhill, pp. 72-5.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibn Bathoutha*, 35, n. 26, according to Sauvaget (*Akhbār aṣ-Šin*, p. 27) *JA*, 4 ser., t. 9.

<sup>115</sup> *Researches*, pp. 662-4.

<sup>116</sup> H. K. J. Cowan: "Lāmūrī—Lambri—Lawrī ...", *BTLVNI*, v. 90, 1933, pp. 421-4.

cannot find philological agreement between Rāmnī and Lāmūrī and finds it hard to imagine that all those Arab authors were wrong when they wrote Rāmnī. But he manages to prove that the two names refer to the same place by comparing similar forms of the word in a Malagasy legend.<sup>117</sup>

Apart from the fact that both places appear to be situated in the north of Sumatra, the Arab texts give us little to show that they were identical. No products of Lāmūrī are given, only a species of monkey, a large ant and of course the "zarāfa", which Van der Lith identifies with the two-horned rhinoceros of Sumatra.<sup>118</sup> The products of Rāmnī are given by the *Akhbār al-Ṣīn* and Ibn Khurdādhbih. The inhabitants of both places were cannibals but so were most of the inhabitants of South-East Asia. Abū Zaid and Mas'ūdī include the place in the empire of the Maharāja.

#### 8. FANŠŪR

Although the name no longer occurs as a place-name in Sumatra, there are many references to it in the literature of all the races who visited the area up to the early part of the 15th century. It was famous for its camphor, which ranks as one of the best varieties. This camphor is the one and only product given by the Arabic texts other than Qazwīnī's reference to fish which become hard as stone when they leave the water. The location given in Sulaimān al-Mahrī is fairly clear, it is definitely on the west coast of Sumatra between the ports of Sinkel and Pariaman, opposite Niḥā (Nias) and a little to the south of Pulau Banyak.<sup>119</sup> It also has the same latitude as Rokan on the east coast. There is no doubt that it is the same as the modern district of Barus with which most scholars have identified it. It is of course the same as Marco Polo's Fansur, the فصورى Pasuri of the Malay Annals and perhaps the Pin-su, Pan-tsu and Pan-tsu-êrh of the Chinese texts.<sup>120</sup> The origin of the name is doubtful, although some have suggested that it is a phonetic variant of Barus. The *Akhbār al-Ṣīn* seems to indicate that the name was used for the "plantations" where the camphor grew.<sup>121</sup> Gerini<sup>122</sup> sees the connexion with camphor and suggests a derivation from the Sanskrit

<sup>117</sup> *JA*, t. 10, 1907, pp. 434-50.

<sup>118</sup> *Merveilles de l'Inde*, p. 236.

<sup>119</sup> See p. 224.

<sup>120</sup> 賓宰, 班卒 [兒] Gerini: *Researches*, pp. 432-3. Wheatley in the *Golden Khersonese* places Pan-tsu on the Malay Peninsula.

<sup>121</sup> Presumably "areas of jungle". The Arabic text has معادن "mines".

<sup>122</sup> *Researches*, p. 434.

word *Pāmsūh* meaning a special variety of camphor. Schlegel says that the Malay word is *Panchur*.<sup>123</sup>

The inhabitants are described by the Arabs, like those of most other places in Sumatra, as cannibals and according to Ibn Rusta they practise ordeal by fire. The story that the inhabitants have tails ('*Ajā'ib al-Hind*'), is a common one for this part of the world. Marco Polo states that men with tails are found in the mountains of Lambri, and many other references are given by Gerini.<sup>124</sup>

لؤلؤبيلانك Lūlūbilank which is mentioned by the '*Ajā'ib al-Hind*' as a bay in the sea between Fanšūr and Lāmūrī appears on modern maps as Telok Balang, or in Achinese as Lho' Belang Raya, south of Acheh.

#### 9. BĀLŪS

Bālūs is one of the most tricky problems left by the Arab geographers. It only occurs in one original source, Ibn Khurdādhbih, who gives nothing but a list of products and says that it is two days from Kalāh and "to the left". The last phrase is changed to the "right" by the *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib*. Idrīsī's reference is longer, but adds nothing of importance even if his information did originally refer to Bālūs.

The various readings of the word in the texts are بالوش, بالوس, نالوش, نالوش, نالوش while the *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib* has نالوش. There is no real reason for adopting the form بالوس as the original form, but as our copies of Ibn Khurdādhbih's text have been usually more useful than most texts in producing correct forms of names, it is probably safer to use his.

Van der Lith<sup>125</sup> reckoned that Ibn Khurdādhbih's بالوس was the same as the نالوش of the *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib* and came to the conclusion that the latter gave the correct direction and that Bālūs was to the right of Kalāh and hence to the south of it. He then equated it with Barus in Sumatra. In this he is followed by De Goeje.<sup>126</sup>

Ibn Khurdādhbih has already mentioned Langbālūs (Nicobars) in the previous paragraph, so this is not likely to be the same as this

<sup>123</sup> "Geographical notes", *TP*, 2 series, v. 2, (1901), p. 113.

<sup>124</sup> *Researches*, pp. 685-8.

<sup>125</sup> *Merveilles de l'Inde*, p. 263.

<sup>126</sup> De Goeje edition of Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 46, n. 3. Dr. Colless used Ibn Khurdādhbih's "to the left" to help prove that Kalāh was further south in the Malay Peninsula (i.e. Klang). He has the advantage that Ibn Khurdādhbih's version is probably the original and hence more correct than that of the *Mukhtaṣar*.

place, although this has been suggested as another identification. He also says that it produces excellent camphor, which is certainly not true of the Nicobars. Admittedly Dimashqī mentions this passage of Ibn Khurdādhbih under the heading of Langabālūs, but Dimashqī is only misquoting his sources, a common habit of his when dealing with South-East Asia.

Most of the European scholars have regarded Bālūs as the equivalent of Barus on the west coast of Sumatra, basing their arguments on the fact that Barus was famous for its camphor and Bālūs has "excellent camphor". Idrīsī also puts it two days from Nias. It must be noted however, that the Arabs have a perfectly good equivalent for Barus in Fanṣūr and in no case is Bālūs mentioned by the Arabs as an equivalent of Fanṣūr. Fanṣūr is renowned for its camphor and the Arabs give no other products; but Bālūs has a string of other products besides camphor (all of which could also come from Barus!). Fanṣūr was a name found in the literature of several races from the eighth century to about 1430, so there seems no reason to doubt that it is a genuine name. After this time the form Barus is used for the place although Arab navigational treatises still use the term Fanṣūr at the end of the fifteenth century. The word Barus appears in the *Nagarakṛtagama* which, although it is meant to refer to a period at the end of the thirteenth century, is dated 1365. It also occurs in the Chronicle of Pasai.<sup>127</sup>

As Ibn Khurdādhbih's position would place it on the north coast of Sumatra, it has been suggested that this name applies to the whole area of north Sumatra including Barus on the west coast. Lāmūrī and Fanṣūr are then two specific places in the region. This is supported by the Chinese term P'o-lu which Wolters suggests is on the north coast of Sumatra rather than round on the west coast.<sup>128</sup> Both place names are connected with jungle products. This would account for the place appearing in different parts of North Sumatra in different texts, and the contemporary use of both Fanṣūr and Bālūs. It would also help in identifying it with Ptolemy's Barussai and perhaps also with the Chinese terms Lang P'o-lu-sz and P'o-lu-shih.<sup>129</sup> Schlegel is the only scholar to have variations on this, placing all of the Chinese terms in the Palembang area.<sup>130</sup>

Any identification of Bālūs must remain conjectural for the Arabs

<sup>127</sup> *Histoire de rois de Pasey*, trad. et annot. par A. Marre. Paris, 1874, p. 27.

<sup>128</sup> 婆露 *Early Indonesian commerce and the origins of Sri Vijaya*, 1967, pp. 187-93.

<sup>129</sup> 郎婆露斯, 婆魯師 See also Gerini: *Researches*, pp. 445-6. Gerini regards Fanṣūr always as an Arabism and its use in the Malay Annals as Paṣūrī as a corruption of the Arabic relative adjective فنصوري. This is probably true.

<sup>130</sup> "Geographical notes", *TP*, 2 series, v. 2, (1901), p. 111, n. 10.

tell us so little about the place. It is essential to remember that the Arabs did not identify it with Fanṣūr, but we really have only one Arab reference to the place (Ibn Khurdādhbih) for all the others are copies or embellished versions of that text. Thus we cannot even be definite that the name was Bālūs which is the fact on which all scholars seem to have based their arguments.

There is one other identification which might be regarded as a possibility. Ibn Mājjid and Sulaimān al-Mahrī both mention a place on or near the west coast of Sumatra known as ماروس Mārūs. The name Mārūs covers a multitude of toponyms over the north western area of Sumatra and may be a regional or ethnographic name, and was probably the name of a primitive people of this area and as such is mentioned by Marsden in his *History of Sumatra*. They were also known as Maruwi. The island of Simalur and some of the islands to the south of it and between it and Nias, were known to the Arab navigators as Mārūs; Simalur itself being called Manqāmārūs منقماماروس.<sup>131</sup> Early European maps apply the name of Marus to Pulau Babi and some of the Banyak islands and in the nineteenth century it was still applied to a small island or archipelago off the west coast of Nias.<sup>132</sup> It is possible that here we have the origin of Bālūs and perhaps the proper explanation of Ptolemy's *Barussai*.<sup>133</sup> Gerini sees in Barawa, the islands mentioned by the 'Ajā'ib al-Hind as south of Nias, the word Maruwi.<sup>134</sup> If Barawa is Maruwi there is all the more reason to see Marus in Bālūs.

#### 10. NIYĀN (*Nias*)

This island appears in the Arabic texts almost exclusively as النيان al-Niyān, other spellings being البينمان and البنان, the last originating from a manuscript of Idrīsī. The navigational texts of the sixteenth century have نجا and this seems to be a perfect representation of the local name, *Tanah niha*, "the land of the people". The Dutch form is Nias and the early Arab form could quite easily be a transliteration of this النياس although the form ending in *n* seems to be as correct as that in *s*. Rashid al-Dīn actually uses the form Nias نياس.

The Arab descriptions give an extremely good account of the primitive islanders. Although they were not cannibals, they were

<sup>131</sup> See pp. 246-7.

<sup>132</sup> E. E. W. Schröder: *Nias*, v. 1, p. 349.

<sup>133</sup> A completely different identification of Barussai (i.e. Bangka and Billiton) is given by Van der Meulen in "Ptolemy's geography of mainland Southeast Asia". *Indonesia*, v. 18, 1974, p. 22, etc.

<sup>134</sup> *Researches*, p. 448.

head hunters similar to the Dyaks of Borneo. Gold was extremely common among them for ornamental uses. Copper was used too, although there is nothing to show that copper was valued more than gold. Both metals were imported.<sup>135</sup> The islanders are considerably lighter in colour than the Malays and this may account for Qazwīnī's description of them as a white race.

The position of the island is confirmed by the '*Ajā'ib al-Hind*' which places it one hundred parasangs (about 300 miles) from Fanšūr on the Sumatran coast. Sulaimān al-Mahrī makes it eight *zām* (120 miles?) from the mainland. It is actually 70 to 80 miles. Idrīsī says it is south of Rāmnī and three days from Sirandīb, which is rather an understatement.

The three islands of *برأوة* Barāwa to the south with similar inhabitants could be the Batu Islands whose inhabitants are of the same stock as the natives of Nias, although they might be the larger Mentawi islands. Whether the two long broad islands of Qazwīnī occupied by a race of black giants are the same islands or two others we cannot tell. This passage may have strayed from its context. The Mentawi islanders are certainly not giants and tend to be fair skinned. Gerini prefers to see in Barāwa, the three Banyak islands and suggests it may be a modification of Maruwi or Marawa, a name given by the natives to one of these islands (see Bālūs).

The *Akhhār al-Šin* and Rashīd al-Dīn make Niyān a dependency of Rāmnī and Jāwa respectively. In both cases, I think this only shows that Nias was regarded as belonging to the Sumatran mainland.

## II. SALĀHIṬ

Most of the Arab texts have *سلاط* or *شلاط* for this place, so there is very little dispute over the form of the name. The *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib* has *سلاط* which results in the same transliteration. Only Dimashqī varies with *سلامط*.

This place is one of the three islands which according to Ibn Khurdādhbih occur close together on the China route between Kalāh and Qmār, and according to Idrīsī's version are ruled by a king called Jāba. The products are numerous but the main ones seem to be sandalwood and nard (the Indian variety). The ambergris of Salāhiṭ is also said to be famous and details are given by Ya'qūbī

<sup>135</sup> Loeb states that (p. 136) copper was originally mined in Nias, but he is only quoting a Middle Eastern source.

and Ibn al-Baiṭār, while Ibn Rusta says simply that it is the best. Camphor is only mentioned as an afterthought by Qazwīnī. Salāhiṭ seems therefore to be a place of jungle products, like most places in Sumatra, in spite of the fact that Qazwīnī in his second work says it has villages, fruit trees and cultivated fields.

In addition there is a sea of the same name which, according to the *Akhhār al-Šin*, washes the shores of one side of Rāmnī, while the sea of Harkand (Bay of Bengal) washes the other side. Ya'qūbī makes it the next sea after Kalāh-bār on the China route and it is followed by Kadrang, although Mas'ūdī allows the two latter seas to meet without anything in between.

The name Salāhiṭ recalls the Malay word *sēlat* meaning "strait", and most scholars have connected the two. *Sēlat* in particular means the Strait of Malacca and it is to this part that we must attribute the name Salāhiṭ.<sup>136</sup> The fact that this word is in the form of an Arabic plural may have no significance, it is probably only the way it has reached the Arab writers and is perhaps an attempt to increase the length of the second vowel in order to accentuate the shortness of the first. The fact that the sea washes the shores of Rāmnī (N. Sumatra) and follows Kalāh-bār confirms the fact that the Sea of Salāhiṭ must be the Strait of Malacca. The island is therefore presumably part of the coast which is washed by the Sea, i.e. part of Sumatra between Acheh<sup>137</sup> and Indragiri or the coast of the Malay Peninsula opposite. In the area of Bengkalis on the Sumatran coast there are several swampy islands divided one from the other by straits each of which is termed *sēlat* followed by a proper name. It may be that one of these islands is our island or perhaps the whole district was known as Salāhiṭ. This latter hypothesis may also account for the Arabic plural form.

Gerini who regards the coast of Sumatra, although further north, as the Arabic Salāhiṭ has discovered a place called Salahaji, which is the name of a village and a river on the Bay of Aru.<sup>138</sup> He also goes into the derivation of the word in great detail, deriving it from the Indian, *Śri Lohita*, the *Śri Lohit* of the Ramayana which he supposes to be the origin also of the Malay *sēlat*.<sup>139</sup>

<sup>136</sup> According to Sauvaget, p. 38, n. 9. Wilkinson's dictionary states that the Malays recognise this as a sea (*laut*) and not as a strait. The word Salāhiṭ and also *sēlat* may be connected with the name Cellates given by early Portuguese writers to the proto-Malays. See Winstedt: *History of Malaya*, 1935, pp. 4, 35.

<sup>137</sup> Or more definitely Diamant Pt.

<sup>138</sup> *Researches*, p. 552.

<sup>139</sup> *Researches*, p. 80.

## 12. HARANG

This place occurs in many different forms in the various texts. The earliest text to mention it is that of Ibn Khurdādhbih who writes *هولج* with *هولج* and *هراج* as variants. Idrīsī, presumably quoting the fuller version of Ibn Khurdādhbih, uses the form *هرج* although a variant form exists *هرنج*. This latter form is that used by the medical writers. Ibn al-Wardī has *هرنج*. Jaubert in his translation of Idrīsī used the form Harnaj and De Goeje used Harlaj.<sup>140</sup> Gerini later adopted the form Haranj, which Ferrand also uses in places,<sup>141</sup> suggesting an original reading Harang. The last form sounds much more like a Malay place-name than any of the preceding forms and I have used this. But although this is probably the correct reading for the Arabic texts, it may still be a corrupted form of the original place-name.

The medical writers mention this place as a source of the best camphor, and add a note that Harang is also Little China. According to this, Harang ought to be somewhere in Southern China or even Indo-China. The obvious place with which to equate it is Kadrang of the *Akhbār al-Sīn* (*كلنج* with the top stroke of the *ك* omitted can look very much like *هرنج* in a badly written manuscript), which must be somewhere in the southern part of Indo-China.<sup>142</sup>

The great argument against this is the fact that our earliest text, Ibn Khurdādhbih, shows Harang to be very near Salāhiṭ and Jāba and in the Idrīsī version they are ruled by the same king. Hence Harang is most likely in the neighbourhood of the Strait of Malacca perhaps in the Riau or Lingga archipelagoes or on the coast of Sumatra itself.<sup>143</sup> The only place with a name anything like it is Kalang or Galang, an island of Riau mentioned by Sulaimān al-Mahrī in the sixteenth century under the form *كالنج*. Ibn Rusta says that Harang is governed by the chief of the Maharāja's army and this is another reason for placing it nearer to the centre of the Maharāja's empire. He also adds that this is not its real name, but the name of the governor. If we take this at its face value, it is possible that its real name has survived and this title disappeared. What the title really was is a mystery but Gerini, never at a loss for such things, suggests *Hiranyakṣa*.<sup>144</sup> This may also be the reason why no suitable equivalent has been suggested from Indian and Chinese

<sup>140</sup> In his edition of Ibn Khurdādhbih, B.G.A. VI, p. 46.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. *Relations de voyages*, p. 112, 186, 288.

<sup>142</sup> See Kadrang, p. 157.

<sup>143</sup> S. Q. Fatimi equates Harang with Aru, but his reasons have not yet been made public.

<sup>144</sup> *Researches*, p. 551, n. 1.

sources. The nearest Chinese equivalent is Ho-ling 訶陵, which has been equated with the central Javanese state of Kalinga, which is most unlikely to be the same as the Arab Harang.

The only product mentioned is camphor, which is almost ubiquitous in South-East Asia and so does not help; nor does the report of the bottomless precipice given by Idrīsī.

Ibn Rusta also mentions that the chief of the Maharāja's army also possesses an island nearby called Ṭawārān,<sup>145</sup> in which the camphor tree has been grown since A.D. 835. The *Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib* has the strange story about a king with 4,000 wives, and adds that trees are found there the fruit of which has aphrodisiac properties. The most well-known tree bearing such properties in South-East Asia is the Durian, whose name is remarkably similar to the name of the island. There is a small group of islands south-west of Singapore known as the Durian islands, which although small and not mentioned very often, stand right in the path of ships bound for Palembang and not far from the China route. We have no evidence that these islands bore this name at that date, they are not even mentioned by Sulaimān al-Mahrī or Ibn Mājid, but if these islands are the ones mentioned by Ibn Rusta as Ṭawārān, then we have a little further proof that Harang was situated near the southern end of the Strait of Malacca.

## 13. MĀ'IT

*ماوط* Mā'it, Māyit or Māyaṭ (other variants are *ماوط* and *ماوط*) is mentioned only by the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* and Ibn Khurdādhbih (and by those who quote the latter). The location of the *'Ajā'ib* for it is rather vague: between Ṣanf (Champa) and Sribuza. Ibn Khurdādhbih's location is more detailed. On his route to China it comes between his group of islands, Jāba, Salāhiṭ and Harang, which I have placed at the southern end of the Straits of Malacca and Qmār (Cambodia). This points to a place in the Riau Archipelago or in South Malaya. Tiyūma would then be to the left of the route from Mā'it to Qmār, as Ibn Khurdādhbih says. The Arab term "to the left" sometimes means "to the north" and Tiyūma is also to the north of these places. There is also the possibility that Mā'it was in Borneo in the neighbourhood of Sambas, but Ibn Khurdādhbih says that the journey from Jāba to Mā'it was short: Idrīsī makes it one day's journey.

<sup>145</sup> *طوران* Other forms are *طوران* and *طوران* (*Mukhtaṣar al-'Ajā'ib*) and *طوران* (Qazwini and Ibn al-Wardī).



The products of Mā'it are gold, cotton and honey ('*Ajā'ib al-Hind*), together with coconuts, bananas, sugar-cane and rice (Idrīsī). Idrīsī's list could be the products of almost anywhere in South-East Asia. If Jāba is in central Sumatra, the dependence of Mā'it on its king would be credible for a country either in the Malay Peninsula or in the Riau Archipelago, but as we have no details of the political history of Jāba, this fact does not help in pinpointing the location of Mā'it.

Later, Idrīsī mentions the island of المائد al-Mā'id in connexion with شبرمة Shabarma which is the same as Ti'yūma. المائد usually stands for المايد, which, according to others, is a kingdom in the neighbourhood of Yunnan usually connected with الموجة Mūja. Idrīsī also places Mūja in the Ocean. Idrīsī's island is a strange place, for he puts it in the farthest east near Silā (Korea). It does not seem to fit into the South-East Asian setting, but it has gold mines, coconuts and sugar-cane as above. The rest of its story, however, resembles the more legendary material similar to that connected with the name Wāqwāq.

Khwārizmī, the Arabic editor of Ptolemy, also has an island called ماید Maidh, which Ibn Sa'id throws into the confusion. Ibn Sa'id is so mixed up with his Ptolemaic geography that it is difficult to sort out anything of significance. "المابط is north of الموجة and is a smaller island than the latter; between them is a passage half a degree in width. The inhabitants take honey and wax to China. Here begins the Indian Ocean, and the Encircling Ocean بحر المحيط begins at 164° 31' long. and 12° 30' lat. (South). The town of ماید Mā'id is at 163° long. and 4° lat. Travellers sometimes reach here, when they turn away in order to reach Jāwa. At the place where the two seas meet is the river of Khumdān, the greatest river in China ... to the west is the town of Qatīghūra."<sup>146</sup>

Later Ibn Sa'id speaks of جزائر المند Islands of al-Mand, but the remainder of the passage mentioning it contains only African material except for the island of Karimada (see the next section).

There seem to be three distinct places all inextricably mixed up in these later accounts; مند Mand or ماید Maidh, which originated in Khwārizmī, المايد the neighbour of Mūja and originally on the Mainland and مابط which is definitely an island in South-East Asia. Only the references in Ibn Khurdādhbih and the '*Ajā'ib al-Hind* can be definitely taken as dealing with the last-named place.

The Chinese sources mention a place called 麻逸凍 Ma-i-tung which has been connected with the Arabic Mā'it by Schlegel,<sup>147</sup>

<sup>146</sup> قيطغور in the text for قطغور, the Kattigara of Ptolemy.

<sup>147</sup> "Geographical notes", *TP*, v. 9, 1898, p. 365ff.

and which he compares with the Chinese account of Pahang. He thinks that it should be placed in the Riau Archipelago, while M. Sprenger identifies it with Bintan. The products of Ma-i-tung include cotton, yellow wax (would this be the honey of the '*Ajā'ib*?) and sugar-cane. Cotton only grows in a few places in the East Indies, so it is significant that both Mā'it and Ma-i-tung produce it. This is the only place in the Arab texts where cotton is mentioned as a product of the East Indies. It is not cultivated either in Riau or Malaya at the present time, but only in Java and South Sumatra. Some scholars would place the Chinese Ma-i-tung in the Philippines but this is certainly too far afield for the Arab Mā'it.<sup>148</sup>

There is no Indian name which corresponds to Mā'it, unless it is Māyirūḍingam of the Tanjore inscription, but Nilakanta Sastri would identify this with Ji-lo-t'ing in the north-eastern part of the Peninsula.<sup>149</sup>

#### 14. KARIMATA

The references to this group of islands are extremely vague and it is quite possible that they do not represent Karimata at all but some islands near the African coast. The name occurs in manuscripts of Idrīsī in four forms, كرملة, كرموة, كرنوة, and كرمية, none of which resemble the form given later by Ibn Mājid.<sup>150</sup> Jaubert uses the first form, although on what grounds is not known. All later Arab authors use the form كرموة. The only location that we have is that the island is near Zābaj, hence Karimata is most likely although the Karimons must not be overlooked as an alternative. The piratical tendencies of the islanders of Karimata have been well-known throughout history, but the description can apply to any of the peoples of the area. The size is no guide to identification. The Island of Monkeys may be Asiatic or African, Kilwa is certainly to be located in East Africa.

There seems to be no identification of the word نرهين Narhīn or بوميين Būmiyīn. It only occurs in this passage of Idrīsī and these two versions of the name leave us with a wide variety of forms from which to choose for a correct version.

The '*ushar* is the usual Arab name for *Calotropis syriaca*, which is a large plant of the Asclepias (milkweed) family found in Africa and

<sup>148</sup> Liu Ti Chen in A. Felix (ed.): *The Chinese in the Philippines*, vol. 1 (Manila, 1966), pp. 269-70.

<sup>149</sup> *Sri Vijaya*, p. 287, n. 1, although Rouffaer locates it in the south-eastern part of the Peninsula (*BKI*, v. 77, 1921).

<sup>150</sup> كرمياتا. See p. 198, note 24.

the Middle East. It grows to about 10 feet high with a twisted gnarled trunk and has large baggy seed-pods filled with a fine silk. It is a tree of the dry Savannah and not the sort to appear in South-East Asia, but because of its seed-pods it has been connected with the legend of the tree of Wāqwāq (q.v.). Ferrand would make this South-East Asian 'ushar, a *Pandanus*, but there is no botanical connexion between the two trees.<sup>151</sup>

#### 15. BINTAN

Ibn Sa'īd's reference to *البنين* Bintan is the only place where it occurs in the Arab texts. This report seems to be part of the new thirteenth century Arab concept of South-East Asia. The text gives a fairly good description of the area near Singapore, although certainly not that of an eye-witness. Like the whole of Ibn Sa'īd's description, there are a few references to Africa among the Asian material. The connexion of Qāmrūn with Qumr (Madagascar) and the genealogy of the king is material originally connected with Africa, and inserted here because of the similarity of the names. The two capes between which the sea is only two miles wide are the southern end of the Malay Peninsula and some point in the Riau Archipelago, most likely on the island of Bintan as the strait seems to have this name. The actual width of the Singapore Strait is approximately ten miles.

Qāmrūn could be the Islands of Karimon. The transposition of the consonants is due to the frequent occurrence of the former form, and is perhaps the error of some scribe, obviously before Ibn Sa'īd's time or he would not have connected it with Qumr. The size of these islands is fantastic, but exaggeration of this sort is a common occurrence in Arabic geographical literature. The islands which contain tin must be part of the Lingga Archipelago, or P. Mendol.

The mountains of Camphor mentioned here are certainly not the same as those which Ibn Sa'īd places down the centre of his island of Jāwa. It is possible that they represent Cape Romania, the south-western cape of the Malay Peninsula as this is the point where ships turn towards China. The "coasts of China" often means all the mainland past Singapore, i.e. including the sea coast of Malaya, Siam and Indo-China. In the navigational texts of Sulaimān al-Mahrī, this east coast of Malaya is known as part of Māh-al-Šin or Šin-al-Šin, i.e. Great China.

The identity of the island of al-Mahūk (the ms. has *المهوك* or

<sup>151</sup> See the article on Wākūq in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.

*المهوى*) cannot be solved; it may be the name of one of the islands in the vicinity of Karimon or it may have strayed from the African coast.

#### 16. MUL-JĀWA

The majority of scholars have placed this place (*مل جاوة* or *مول چاوة* according to Waṣṣāf) somewhere in the Malay Peninsula in a vain attempt to explain Ibn Baṭṭūta's text, and at the same time make Qāqulla the capital of Mul-Jāwa. I have shown under the section on Qāqulla that Ibn Baṭṭūta does not state that Qāqulla is the capital of Mul-Jāwa and that his sections on the two places have probably become intertwined. I have also shown that it is possible to understand Ibn Baṭṭūta's text if we put Qāqulla on the north-west coast of the Peninsula where the other texts indicate it to be, and identify Mul-Jāwa with the island of Java itself. This location for Mul-Jāwa is supported by the text of the thirteenth-century Persian historian Waṣṣāf, who is obviously describing the attack of Kublai Khan's army on the island of Java. The word *مل* or *مول* *Mūl* is most probably derived from an Old Iranian word, and becomes more common in later Persian and Arabic navigational works where it has the sense of being on the edge or frontier, especially the seashore.<sup>152</sup> Van der Lith<sup>153</sup> gives another derivation from the Sanskrit, *Mūla* "origin" or "root" and hence reads Mul-Jāwa as the "first Jawa". It is doubtful which applies here, but the word was probably used by Arab geographers to distinguish the island of Java from Central Sumatra which seems to have gone under the name Jāba or Jāwa, in much the same way as the early European cartographers called them Java Maior and Java Minor.

Yule's objection to the identification of Mul-Jāwa with Java was the abundance of elephants and aloeswood. Both of these can be explained away because they are in the section on Qāqulla and do not apply to Mul-Jāwa itself. The king of Mul-Jāwa certainly has elephants, but this is covered by Yule's statement: "There are no elephants in Java, except such few as are imported to swell the state of the native princes".<sup>154</sup> The only fact that remains to be explained is the allegiance of a town on the northern part of the west coast of the Peninsula to Java. But as Khmer, if *قمارة* is Khmer, is also mentioned it is probably a fiction of the Javanese court. The

<sup>152</sup> Ferrand: in *Journal Asiatique*, t. 204, 1924, p. 222-230.

<sup>153</sup> *Merveilles de l'Inde*, p. 238.

<sup>154</sup> Yule: *Cathay and the way thither*, v. 4, pp. 155-7.

Javanese rulers have often claimed to be the overlords of Cambodia, and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's voyage coincided roughly with the career of Gajah Mada, and the greatest period of Javanese expansion.

#### 17. LANGABĀLŪS AND ANDAMĀN

The islands called in the Arab texts, Langabālūs and Andamān can easily be recognised as those of the Andaman-Nicobar Archipelago by the position given to them. They are always shown between Sirandīb (Ceylon) and Kalāh (on the Malay Peninsula). Ibn Khurdādhbih's times for the journey, 10–15 days from Sirandīb and 6 days from Kalāh, are fair proportions for the distances from the Nicobars to the two sides of the Bay of Bengal. The *Akhbār al-Šin* puts Langabālūs after Rāmnī, showing that boats made for the tip of Sumatra first, and then if they wished to visit the islands sailed north first to the Nicobars and then to the Andamans. The *Akhbār* takes the route still further, to Khushnāmī and a place with silver mines; obviously the Burmese mainland.<sup>155</sup>

The name Andamān presents no problem. The Arabic form is اندامان in the earlier texts (changed to اندميان by Dimashqī) and اندمان in the 'Ajā'ib al-Hind, Ibn Sa'īd and the navigational texts. A possible variant form appears in the 'Ajā'ib al-Hind as ارمنان, but this may not be Andamān, and this problem has been discussed under Qāqulla.

Langabālūs on the other hand has a complicated history, and is a difficult form to analyse. There is little doubt however that the Arab authors were talking about the Nicobars. European scholars recognised this long ago although they disagreed as to the origin of the Arab word. The Arab authors spell Langabālūs in two ways. The first لنگبالوس with a ك appears in Ibn Khurdādhbih and Ibn al-Faqīh (once this author has لنج when quoting the *Akhbār al-Šin*) and the second لنجبالوس with a ج found in the *Akhbār al-Šin* and Mas'ūdī. Idrīsī recognised and used both of these ways of writing the guttural and after him they were used indiscriminately. In addition there is a form with a prefixed *alif* which occurs with both the ك form and the ج form. Actual forms found are extremely numerous: examples are لنخ يالوس, لنجبالوس, ليكالوس, النكبالوس, لنكالوس, كيجاليوس, كيكالوس, لنكاوس, النجالوس, لنكياليوس, النجباليوس, فتجاليوس.

<sup>155</sup> Silver is mined in the Shan states and Gerini mentions several times that silver was mined in the Chindwin valley (*Researches*, p. 37–40). S. M. Yusuf (p. 83, n. 1) says that Khushnāmī الخشنامي might be read الخشامي and could represent Kusumi. See p. 234.

The difference between the two gutturals does not seem to be important but the prefixed *alif* has caused some speculation. Sindbād's form الناقوس is even more corrupt, if it represents the same place, and introduces yet a third guttural.

The Indian name for the Nicobars is Nakkavaram and first appears in the Tanjore inscription in A.D. 1050, two hundred years later than the first Arab references. Chinese references to these islands go back before those of the Arabs and mention a land called 裸國 Lo-kuo (I-ching), Lo-hsing-kuo and 裸人國 Lo-jen-kuo, that is the Country of the Naked People, which is also the meaning of the Indian word. De Goeje reads the form with an *alif*,<sup>156</sup> Alangabālūs, but it is possible that the first two letters represent the Arabic article, which is quite often prefixed to proper names of places (cf. الزايح and الصنف). Therefore النكبالوس represents al-Nakabālūs, which corresponds to the Indian Nakkavaram. This, I feel, is the most acceptable theory. The form with *alif* is used by the more original authors (e.g. Ibn Khurdādhbih in one version, Mas'ūdī and Ibn Sa'īd) and the 'Ajā'ib al-Hind has نجبالوس with the first letter unpointed, which appears to be of the form Nakabālūs without the article although the first letter could be a badly written ل (lām). A more recognisable form of the name of the Nicobars first occurs in Ibn Sa'īd's Nakwāra which occurs alongside the term Langabālūs as if the two were separate places. Rashīd al-Dīn has لا كوارم which Ferrand treats as a variant of Nakkavaram<sup>157</sup> showing the confusion again between the *n* and the *l*. The navigational texts have نالكباري and ناجباري showing the initial *n* and the two forms of the guttural.

The majority of the texts, however, have the form without the initial *alif*, and this has given rise to the form Langabālūs in European translations. Reinaud has a version of this in his translation of the *Akhbār al-Šin* when he uses Lendjebalous, but he does not identify the name with the Nicobars. Ferrand clung to the form Langabālūs, making the *n* into a nasal velar *ŋ* and equating the first part of the name with the Indian word Lan̄kha.<sup>158</sup> There is little support for this theory, although Ferrand equates Langabālūs with the Chinese 郎婆露斯 Lang P'o-lu-sz which occurs in the *Sui-t'ang-shu* and the *Nan-man-chuan* as the western division of the state of Sri Vijaya.<sup>159</sup> This latter however is probably a place in Sumatra and

<sup>156</sup> Edition of Ibn Khurdādhbih, B.G.A. VI, p. 45, ٦٦.

<sup>157</sup> *Relations de voyages*, p. 361, n. 10.

<sup>158</sup> Bīrūnī uses Lanka لنگ for Lankabālūs.

<sup>159</sup> "Le K'ouen-Louen", *JA*, v. 14, p. 57, n. 1. See also p. 142 above.

not in the Nicobars. Gerini<sup>160</sup> mentions both Langabālūs and Lang P'o-lu-sz but does not equate the two and I see no reason for Ferrand's identification other than a vague similarity of names. Lang P'o-lu-sz seems to be the same as the Chinese 婆魯師 P'o-lu-shih which is certainly in Sumatra.

If the form without the *alif* is correct, it is possible that the initial لām stands for an original نūn and this would correspond to a form Nangabālūs of which the first part would represent *Nanga*, the Indian vernacular of *Nakka* "naked". Finally it must be noted that Langabālūs and Alangabālūs have a parallel in Langasuka and the *Ilangāsōka* of the Tanjore inscription.

Whatever explanation we give to this name it is clear that the Nicobars are meant. The more original accounts of these islands come from the earlier texts and very little is added by the later ones as if the islands were not visited in later times. The later authors quote from the earlier ones and mix up the information given by them with other material given for several unidentified islands which complete most accounts of South-East Asia, whereas the earliest texts keep Langabālūs and Andamān separate and give them a precise location. Dimashqī was one of these later authors who mixed the stories, and the fact that he places material under the heading Langabālūs which was formerly part of the description of Bālūs has led to the assumption that Langabālūs and Bālūs are the same place and both represent Ptolemy's *Barussai*. The identification of the Chinese Lang P'o-lu-sz with P'o-lu-shih has furthered this theory.<sup>161</sup>

The description of the inhabitants of the two groups and the differences shown between them, corresponds well with the descriptions given by European travellers. The Andaman islanders are the more primitive; they are black with curly hair (Negrito); they have no boats and are cannibals.<sup>162</sup> The latter fact is said to be unfounded but is included in practically all early European descriptions of the islanders. The men and women of the Nicobars are noted for their nakedness (hence the origin of their name, although they actually wear a few scanty rags). The women are rarely seen for the men come out in long canoes to barter with the ships. The Arab accounts state that they bartered for iron, but the Europeans say that they took almost anything in exchange for the fruit which they brought.

The Arab accounts make them white and rarely hairy. The colour

<sup>160</sup> *Researches*, pp. 424, 430.

<sup>161</sup> This question I have discussed under Bālūs, p. 141.

<sup>162</sup> The *'Ajā'ib al-Hind*, when mentioning Armanān states that the fishermen bring down canoes to the water, but it is by no means certain that Andaman is meant here.

of the Nicobarese is hardly white but certainly much lighter than that of the Andaman islanders or even the inhabitants of Southern India. Ibn Sa'id's ugly black people of Nicobar may be all part of his general muddle unless they represent the more primitive tribe of Shom-pen in the interior of Great Nicobar. The products mentioned by the Arabs are mostly the same as those mentioned by the Europeans, although I have found no mention in western sources of sugarcane. Ships called mainly for fruit and water. Both sources mention the ambergris: both reveal the lack of coconuts in Andaman.

The island of Malḥan mentioned by the *Akhbār al-Ṣīn* is obviously one of this group of islands, but one probably standing alone, like Car Nicobar or Little Andaman. Although the description of the inhabitants resembles that given for the Andaman islanders, the mention of coconuts shows that the Nicobars is intended. The name itself is reminiscent of the منجل فولة Manjal Fūla of Sulaimān al-Mahrī and Ibn Mājid which I have identified with Little Nicobar.<sup>163</sup> ملحن is an easy corruption of منجل and فولة is only the Malay word for *island*. This name survives in the form Menchal, the name of a small island off the east coast of Little Nicobar. The ملحمان of the *Hudūd al-'Ālām* is possibly a corruption of this name, but the Maharāja would certainly not have chosen this place for a summer palace.

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, when on route from Bengal to Sumatra, called at a place called البرهنكار Barahnakār. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's description of the people corresponds quite well with other Arab descriptions of the Andaman islanders and the Nicobarese, and it was once thought that he landed in these islands. But his account of an organised state and a country with elephants does not fit in at all. Yule has suggested that some port in southern Burma in the area of Cape Negrais must be meant here.<sup>164</sup> The men with faces like dogs are very similar to the Andaman islanders of Marco Polo's description.

The mention of Andamān al-Kabīr and its famous temple in the *'Ajā'ib al-Hind* is very strange. Andamān al-Kabīr is the name given more than five hundred years later by Sulaimān al-Mahrī to the northern Andaman group (i.e. North, South and Middle Andaman).<sup>165</sup> The story says that no one had been to this island, but this fact is contradicted by the *Akhbār al-Ṣīn* much earlier. There is no other mention of the temple but as the sailor who told the story was supposed to have heard it at second hand, it can hardly

<sup>163</sup> See p. 244.

<sup>164</sup> *Cathay and the way thither*, v. 4, p. 92.

<sup>165</sup> See p. 243.

be regarded as at all reliable. Gerini connects this story with Ceylon and Adam's Peak. This is certainly the most likely explanation.<sup>166</sup>

### 18. QMĀR

Cambodia is usually found in the early geographical texts under the form قمار Qmar (i.e. Khmer). In spite of the occurrence of many names in these texts containing the letters of the root قمر q.m.r., Qmār usually remains quite distinct by reason of the infixed *alif*. Although the first syllable is pointed in various ways, e.g. قَمَار, قَمَار, قَمَار, one can be certain that Cambodia is meant if the *alif* appears. This form sometimes has the article (as in the 'Ajā'ib al-Hind) and sometimes not (as in Ibn Khurdādhbih). In the fifth voyage of Sindbād the phrase used is جزيرة القمارى which Ferrand reads Jezirat al-Qmārā,<sup>167</sup> but it is probably the remains of a relative adjective qualifying an omitted product, such as aloeswood, for the phrase العود القمارى was as common as the name of the country itself. Ibn Baṭṭūta adds the feminine ending to the name of the country قمارة.

A certain amount of confusion was caused by Bīrūnī, who, perhaps because of his greater knowledge of Indian affairs, produced a form قمبر nearer to the actual word Khmer. Unfortunately this was taken to be a diminutive from the root قمر and Bīrūnī's contribution has been mixed with material on Qumr (Madagascar). Thus Kharaqī quotes Bīrūnī, once using قمبر and once قمر; beginning the confusion which then appears again in Idrīsī, Ibn Sa'īd and many later writers. Ibn al-Wardī places all his material under القمر no matter under which heading it originally came.

The early texts, however, are very clear and the position of Qmār on the China route makes the identification of it with Cambodia a certainty. The fact that it was not an island but on the continent is noticed by a number of writers, although Abū Zaid's statement that it was facing the land of the Arabs caused much trouble amongst early nineteenth century scholars in Europe,<sup>168</sup> who confused it with Comorin.

Politically there is little said except for the attack of the Maharāja of Zābaj but I have dealt with this under the latter place.<sup>169</sup> Qmār appears from the Arab texts to have been a fairly important and stable monarchy, apart from this attack by the Maharāja. Much is

<sup>166</sup> *Researches*, p. 387.

<sup>167</sup> *Relations de voyages*, p. 568, n. 4.

<sup>168</sup> E.g. Reinaud: *Relation des voyages*, p. 97.

<sup>169</sup> See p. 111.

said about the character and social life of the king but very little about the actual politics of the state. The most important and practically the sole product of Qmār was its Qmāri aloeswood, a product for which Indo-China has always been famous.

The greater part of the Arab section on Qmār is devoted to the religion of the people, and the social customs emanating from the religion. The people, white and resembling the Turks, that is of Mongoloid type, are Hindu. Thus they have pierced ears and abhor adultery and wine, although the king being rich did not mind keeping a large harem.

Ibn al-Faqīh and Ibn Rusta both indicate that the culture of Qmār was connected with India. They state that the books of India came originally from Qmār, and that in Qmār were the original Hindu temples. It is only the Arabs who suggest that Indian culture originated in Indo-China. The legends of the Khmers themselves indicate that their culture came originally from India and was not indigenous. The Indians have no theories of their religion coming from the East.

Ibn al-Nadīm has reference to Buddhas in the temples in Qmār. These of course may be Hindu gods, for the term *id* is used for a Hindu god as well as for Buddha himself. Mas'ūdī's worshippers of Adam may also be Buddhists for the Arabs connected Buddhists with the worship of Adam's footprint on the peak in Ceylon. There were Buddhists in Cambodia before A.D. 1000. Buddhism began to spread from the north during the fifth century, but did not obtain much hold in the land until the fourteenth century, that is later than most of our Arab texts.<sup>170</sup>

The cockfights mentioned by Ibn Rusta probably do not refer to Qmār at all. This is a passage extracted from some other author's section on Zābaj (q.v.).

### 19. KADRANG

All reports of this place are quotations from the *Akhbār al-Šīn*: no other author adds anything to the account of this text.

It is obvious when comparing the China route of the *Akhbār al-Šīn* with that of Ibn Khurdādhbih that Kadrang is a substitute port of call for Qmār and is hence most likely some particular location in the land of Qmār. The latter place is not mentioned by the *Akhbār* at all.

<sup>170</sup> A. Cabaton: Article on Cambodia in Hasting's *Encl. of Religion and Ethics*, v. 3, p. 156a.

The *Akhbār* gives the position of Kadrang ten days from Tiyūma and ten from Šanf, while according to Ibn Khurdāhbih, Tiyūma to Qmār is five days and Qmār to Šanf, three. Therefore, if anything, Kadrang should be slightly nearer to Tiyūma than Qmār, i.e. a little to the south of Qmār.

Ferrand<sup>171</sup> with the aid of much philological wrangling and by inserting an extra letter into the Arabic word states that Kadrang is really Kundrang (i.e. كندرنج not كدرنج) which is the equivalent of Kuṇḍuraṅga and of the Chinese 軍突弄 Chiun-t'u-lung which occurs in Kia Tan's itinerary<sup>172</sup> and is two days south of 奔陀浪 Pen-t'o-lang, i.e. Pāṇḍuraṅga, the modern Phan-rang and at that time a small state tributary to Champa.

Sauvaget<sup>173</sup> makes Kundrang the equivalent of Pāṇḍuraṅga itself but this cannot be so. Pāṇḍuraṅga was far too near Champa itself to fit into the scheme given for the China route in the *Akhbār al-Šin*. Furthermore Pāṇḍuraṅga was always regarded as part of Champa, whereas Kadrang was most likely part of Qmār and was certainly not on the Champa side of Cambodia.

Ferrand, in another reference,<sup>174</sup> regarded it as a place in the neighbourhood of Cap St. Jacques. This is much more likely. Pelliot<sup>175</sup> made Chiun-t'u-lung into the Condor Islands. Gerini<sup>176</sup> equated Kadrang, without the extra letter, with the bay near Hatien and the old town of Kampot, on the west coast of Cochin China; he even gives identifications for the mountains containing robbers. Here there is an island called Koh Tron. A little to the south-east of this is Oc Eo near the modern town of Rachgia where the remains of the old port of Fu-nan, the predecessor of the Khmer empire, have been discovered. This is more or less in the same bay and is the most likely place for a port between Šanf and Tiyūma. Furthermore it supports the fact that Kadrang is the alternative given by the *Akhbār al-Šin* for Qmār of the other writers, so it is quite possible that this text mentions the port by name, instead of mentioning it by the name of the country.

If we read the Arab texts alone, forgetting that there are such places as Pāṇḍuraṅga and the Condor Islands, we would come to the conclusion that Kadrang was only another name for Qmār or a location in the land of Qmār. The only argument against this place

<sup>171</sup> *Relations de voyages*, pp. 14-17.

<sup>172</sup> Pelliot: *Deux itinéraires*, p. 372.

<sup>173</sup> *Akhbār al-Šin*, p. 44.

<sup>174</sup> "Le K'ouen-Louen", *JA*, t. 14, p. 52.

<sup>175</sup> *Deux itinéraires*, p. 218.

<sup>176</sup> *Recherches*, pp. 200-1.

being the main port of Qmār is the fact that the description makes it a deserted place where robbers hide and only fresh water can be found. This might suit some isolated place like the Condor Islands or Cap St. Jacques but then the *Akhbār* says almost the same of Kalāh and very little about Champa. Of course Oc Eo may have decayed already by the time of the *Akhbār al-Šin*.

## 20. ŠANF

The Arab form for this name is always صنّف, the only variation being the addition of the article by Ibn Sa'īd and Dimashqī, who write جزيرة الصنّف. Rashīd al-Dīn has جنّف,<sup>177</sup> and the navigational texts of the sixteenth century, شنبّا.

A large number of stories appear about this place but the only real facts given are its position and that it produced a superior type of aloeswood. The Arabs place Šanf on the China route between Qmār and China, or between Qmār and Lūqīn (Lung-p'ien), which was a port at the mouth of the Red River (Song-Kla). This is enough to identify it as Champa, the Hindu state which occupied the area of Annam from before the seventh until the fifteenth centuries. Champa was famous for its aloeswood.

The religion of Champa was Hindu, and Idrīsī gives a long list of Hindu customs in connexion with Šanf. Ibn al-Nadīm mentions temples with Buddhas, but as in his reference to Qmār, he must mean the idols of the Hindu temples. Ibn al-Nadīm also mentions an invasion of Šanf by Lūqīn, which probably represents one of the long series of invasions by the Annamese from the north, which finally put an end to the kingdom of Champa. His source, the Monk of Najrān, according to Ferrand,<sup>178</sup> was a man who was sent on a mission to China by the Catholikos and Ferrand dates this text, 980-986, in which case the invasion would correspond to that of Lê Hoàn who defeated Parameçvaravarman I between 979 and 982.<sup>179</sup>

The king لا جين Lājīn has no equivalent in Cham king lists; it is possible that it might be a title or a fabrication of Abū Dulaf or his Chinese informers. Idrīsī writes this word ريد which Ferrand<sup>180</sup> states is a corruption of the ريبيل of Ibn Khurdāhbih and ريبيل of other writers, but this latter form always applies to a ruler of India.

<sup>177</sup> Perhaps originally, جنّف.

<sup>178</sup> *Relations de voyages*, p. 123, and note 5.

<sup>179</sup> G. Coedès: *Les états hindouises*, p. 212.

<sup>180</sup> *Relations de voyages*, p. 187, n. 8. Idrīsī has a variant ريد, although the new edition of his text has ريد.

Of course Ibn al-Nadīm may have misquoted and this sentence may not apply to Ṣanf at all.

Dimashqī's reference to Muslims in Ṣanf is not an original reference to the actual Muslim population in Champa, in spite of the fact that Islam came early to Champa and still exists there in a corrupt form. It is really a misquotation of an early passage which is also found in the Persian geography of Marwazī where it applies to a refugee family of Alids who founded a colony on an island in a Chinese river.

## APPENDIX

## LEGENDARY PLACES

## 1. WĀQWĀQ

## 'AJĀ'IB AL-HIND

According to a story which Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan bin 'Amr told me that a captain of a ship who was setting out for Zābaj on a ship which belonged to him, told him; the wind took them towards Wāqwāq where they managed to stop not far from a village. On seeing them the inhabitants fled into the country, carrying with them all their belongings. The men of the ship, who did not know the land and did not understand the cause of the flight of the inhabitants, did not dare to disembark. The ship stayed there for two days, without anyone coming to them or without either of them attempting to make contact. At last a sailor, who knew the language of the Wāqwāqis, disembarked in order to reach the village and search the country. He discovered a man hiding in a tree, spoke to him and made friends with him, offered him dates and questioned him on the reason for the flight of the inhabitants, promised him safe conduct and a reward if he would co-operate. The man replied that on seeing the ship they believed that they were going to be attacked, and they and their king had gone for safety into the country and the jungle. He agreed to follow the sailor to the ship. They sent with him three companions to give a friendly message to the king, assuring safe conduct to the king and his followers, sending him also a present of two pieces of material, some dates and several trinkets. The ruler having been reassured came back with all his people. They then lived with them and exchanged wares with things that the ship contained. On the twentieth day, they had not finished selling all that they had when a second people with a chief came to attack the first. "Know", said the king of the village, "that these are coming to attack me and to plunder my goods, for they imagine that I have acquired a good part of the vessel's cargo. That is why you must lend me your help; in defending me you are defending yourselves." About daybreak, said the narrator, the other tribe came to begin the attack on the gate of the town, and the king came out with his people to meet them supported by the sailors and the soldiers of the ship, as well as by those of the merchants who were inclined to fight.