

## Lochac Revisited

by Paul Wheatley

(London)

Marco Polo's great work was not, as is sometimes supposed, exclusively an account of his travels but rather, as the title *Le Devisement dou Monde* straightforwardly implies, a description of the territories of the known world<sup>1</sup>. Although the separate descriptions of individual places and realms are strung along the thread of the celebrated journey to China and amplified by travels in the interior of that country, the book as a whole constitutes a systematic treatise of topographical description rather than an itinerary, and includes accounts of numerous cities, kingdoms, and events of which Marco had no personal experience. This means that the *Devisement* is an unreliable guide to the Polan journeys, a state of affairs which in turn exacerbates the already severe difficulties involved in the identification of the place-names mentioned in this unique account of medieval Asia. In his efforts to locate these toponyms the Polan scholar, deprived of the guidance and support afforded by the ordered sequence of a detailed and coherent itinerary, has to rely on phonetic correspondences and such incidental — and sometimes unrepresentative — evidence as the text provides.

One place-name which has occasioned a good deal of speculation occurs in the *Devisement*, in its most reliable reading, as *Lochac*, and is applied to a *grant e riches [sic]* "province" somewhere in western South-East Asia. The relevant passage as it appears in the fullest and, generally speaking, the most reliable of all extant manuscripts is as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> The true character of this work is somewhat obscured by the traditional titles foisted upon it in Italy (where it is usually known as *Il Milione*) and in Britain (where it has customarily been referred to as *The Travels of Marco Polo*). The difficulties inherent in the attempt to restore the original title of the work are discussed by A. C. MOULE in MOULE and Paul PELLIOR, *Marco Polo: the description of the world* (George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., London, 1938), pp. 31—33 and by PELLIOR in *Notes on Marco Polo*, *Ouvrage posthume publié sous les auspices de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres et avec le concours du Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique*, vol. 2 (Imprimerie Nationale: Librairie Adrien-Maisonneuve, Paris, 1963), pp. 625—626. *Devisement* is the form favoured by PELLIOR (*op. cit.*, p. 625), but in a subtitle prefixed to that part of his critical edition containing the actual text the Italian scholar BENEDETTO uses the version *Devisament* [Marco Polo, *Il Milione*, prima edizione integrale, a cura di Luigi Foscolo BENEDETTO. Comitato Geografico Nazionale Italiano, Pubbl. no. 3 (Firenze, 1928)]. Additional versions of the title occurring in sundry other recensions are listed by PELLIOR, *loc. cit.*

# CI DEVISE DE L'ISLE DE SONDUR ET DE CELLE DE CONDUR.

*Et quant l'en se part de ceste ysle de iaua et il naje entre midi et garbin DCC milles, adonc treuve l'en deus ysles, une grant et une mendre que s'appellent [le une] Sondur et l'autre Condur.*

*E de cestes ysles se part l'en, et ala por sceloc entor de D milles; et adonc treuvo l'en une provence que est apellé Locac que moul est grant e riches. Il hi a un grant roi et sunt ydres et ont langajes por elz. Il ne font treu a nelui, por ce que il sunt en tel leu que nul puet aler sor lor tere por maufer. Car, se il i se peust aler, le grant kan le soumeteroit tost sol sa segnorie. En ceste provence naist le be[r]çi domesce en grandissime quantité. Il ont or en grant abundance, si grant que nulz le peust croire qui ne le veist. Il ont leofant e chacejonz e venajonz asez. Et de ceste reigne vont toutes les porcelaine que s'espenent en toutes provences, com jeo vos ai contés. Autre couse ne i a que a mentovoir face, for que je vos di qu'il est si sauvajes leu que pou jens hi vont. Et le roi mesme ne vell que aucun hi aille, ne [que] nul saiche son tresor ne sa condision. Or adonc nos parliron de ci et vos conteron avant d'autre couse.*

# CI DEVISE DE L'ISLE DE PENTAIN.

*Or sachiés que quant l'en se part de Locac, et il ala D milles por midi, adonc treuve l'en une isle que est apellé Pentan, que mout est sauvajes leu<sup>2</sup>.*

A. C. MOULE's translation of this passage, with additions from a selected number of other good representative recensions incorporated in italics, is as follows<sup>3</sup>:

## HERE HE TELLS OF THE ISLAND OF SONDUR AND OF THOSE OF CONDUR.

And when one departs from this *great<sup>a</sup>* island of Java and he sails between midday and the south-west wind 700 miles, then one finds *these<sup>a</sup>* two islands, one large and one smaller, which are called the *one<sup>a</sup>* Sondur and the other Condur, *which islands are uninhabited, and so let it be passed over about them<sup>b</sup>*. And *then<sup>a</sup>* from these two<sup>a</sup> islands one sets out because there is nothing which does to mention<sup>a</sup>, and goes again *still sailing about<sup>a</sup>* 500 miles by the sirocco, and then one finds a province *which is on the firm land<sup>b</sup>*, which is called Lochac, which is very

<sup>2</sup> From BENEDETTO's transcription of a text written in the first half of the fourteenth century and now MS. *Français 1116* in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris [Marco Polo, *Il Milione*, pp. 169—170]. This text, now known as the *F* version, is the longest of all extant manuscripts and retains a good deal of the Gallicized Italian language in which the narrative was probably first recorded. It has also commonly been styled the Geographic Text since it was printed *literatim* by the Société de Géographie of Paris as volume 1 of *Recueil de Voyages et de Mémoires* (Paris, 1824). The most compendious statement of the filiation of the more than 150 extant recensions of Polo's text is that of BENEDETTO [*loc. cit.*, pp. xi-cxxxi], but there are many valuable collations in the Introduction and tables which accompany MOULE's variorum edition of the text in English translation: *Marco Polo. The description of the world*, vol. 1.

<sup>3</sup> MOULE and PELLIOU, *Marco Polo. The description of the world*, vol. 1, pp. 369—370.

great and rich. And in that province<sup>a</sup> there is a great king, and the people of it<sup>b</sup> they are idolaters and have a language for themselves. And<sup>b</sup> they pay tribute to none but to their own king<sup>c</sup>, because it is very strong<sup>c</sup> and they are in such a strange and out of the way<sup>a</sup> place that none in the world in any way<sup>a</sup> can go upon their land to do them<sup>a</sup> any<sup>b</sup> harm. For if he could go there in any way whatever<sup>a</sup> the great Kaan would very gladly and very<sup>a</sup> soon put them under his rule. For he has very often put himself to trouble and all the others with him to know how he could overcome them; but he could never do anything. And you may know that<sup>a</sup> in this province the cultivated brazil grows in very great quantities, which are like lemons and are very good<sup>d</sup> to eat<sup>e</sup>, and also much musk and ebony<sup>f</sup>. They have gold in very<sup>a</sup> great abundance, and<sup>a</sup> so great profusion<sup>a</sup> that none could believe it who did not see it. They have elephants, and chase and hunting enough. And from this kingdom go all the cowries which are spent in all the other<sup>b</sup> provinces of the world<sup>a</sup> as I have told you before<sup>a</sup>. There is no other thing that is worthy of mention, except only<sup>b</sup> that I tell you that it is so strong and out of the way and<sup>g</sup> mountainous and<sup>b</sup> wild a place that few people go there, and they can go there with difficulty<sup>g</sup>. And the king himself does not wish that any may go there nor that<sup>a</sup> any may know his treasure nor his condition. Now then we will depart from telling you of<sup>a</sup> this and will tell you onwards of another thing.

#### HERE HE TELLS OF THE ISLAND OF PENTAN.

Now you may know again<sup>a</sup> that when one sets out from the province of<sup>a</sup> Lochac and he goes sailing<sup>a</sup> five hundred miles by midday then one finds an island full of mountains<sup>b</sup> which is called Pentan which is in<sup>b</sup> a very wild place . . .

- (a) MS. 264 in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (FB). This is a translation into Court French made in about A. D. 1400.
- (b) The Zelada Codex (Z), a Latin translation of c. 1470 of a Romance text which is clearly superior to any of the others which have survived. It is now in the Biblioteca Catedral (MS. 49,20) at Toledo and is fully described by Moule in vol. 1 of the work cited in footnote 1.
- (c) MS. Reg. 14. C. xiii in the British Museum (P). This is a fourteenth-century version of Fra Francesco Pipino's popular Latin translation, itself based on a Venetian recension.
- (d) Bibl. Casanatense, MS. 3999, a Venetian rendering of the F version made early in the fourteenth century (VA).
- (e) An Italian version printed in vol. 2 of Giovanni-Battista Ramusio's *Nauigationi et Viaggi* of 1559 (R). Benedetto has shown that this text, of which there is no MS version, is based on the P recension.
- (f) MS. Donà delle Rose, 224, Museo Correr, Venice (VB), another Venetian rendering, dated 1446.

(g) 336 NB 5, Bibl. Pub., Ferrara (L), a Latin compendium compiled early in the fifteenth century.

(h) C. 32. m. 4 in the British Museum (S). This is a Spanish version, printed at Seville in 1503, of a Venetian recension of 1493 (VL<sup>1</sup>).

The precise significance to be attached to this passage will depend to a large extent on the view taken of the structure of Polo's text at this stage of his narrative. From *Zaitūn* (= *Ch'üan-chou*<sup>[1]</sup><sup>4</sup>) southwards as far as *Ciamba* (= *Campā*<sup>5</sup>) it is evident that the topographical description is following the supposed sequence of Polo's homeward voyage, but from that point onwards such a contention is difficult to sustain. Immediately following the account of *Ciamba* is the statement that,

*"Or sachiés que quant l'en se part de Cianba, et ala entre midi et sceloc MD milles, et adonc vient a une grandissime isle, que est apellé Jaua . . ."*

. . . when one leaves *Campā* he goes sailing<sup>b</sup> between midday and the sirocco 1500 miles, and then he comes to a very large island which is called Java . . .

<sup>4</sup> *çaiton et al.* in *F*, *çaytun, zaytun, et al.* in *Z*. The identification with *Ch'üan-chou* was first proposed by the Jesuit scholar Martino MARTINI in his *Novus Atlas Sinensis* (sub "Civencheu"), printed at Amsterdam in 1656. It was subsequently given other than circumstantial substance by J. H. KLAPROTH, who recognized in *Zaitūn* a transcription of \**ts'ie-d'ung*<sup>[2]</sup> (MSC = *tz'ü-t'ung*), a term by which the city was popularly known after trees of that name (probably here to be understood as *Acanthorhizan panax ricinifolium*, though some have thought *Erythrina Indica*) had been planted round its walls in about the middle of the Five Dynasties: vide "Renseignemens [*sic*] sur les ports de Gampou et de Zaithoum décrits par Marco Polo", *Journal Asiatique*, vol. 5 (1824), pp. 41—44; also "Description de la Chine sous le règne de la dynastie mongole, traduite du persan et accompagnée de notes", *Journal Asiatique*, vol. 11 (1833), p. 342. This conclusion has been contested on several occasions, both on general historical grounds (including alleged limitations of the barbourage facilities at *Ch'üan-chou*) and because of the obvious imperfection of the transcription, \**ts'ie-d'ung* implying a \**situn* (possibly \**sidun* if the transcription were pre-tenth century) rather than *zaitūn*. However, after an exhaustive review of the whole problem Paul PELLER could only conclude that, despite the apparent inexactness of the transcription, the arguments were overwhelmingly in favour of *Ch'üan-chou* [*Notes on Marco Polo*, vol. 1, pp. 583—597].

<sup>5</sup> *çinba* (erroneously) in *F*, *çamba* in *Z*, *ziamba/ziambi* in *R*. The Cham port-of-call for ships making the southward passage in Polo's time was on the site of present-day Quinhon, then known to the Chinese as Hsin Chou<sup>[3]</sup>. The precise date of Polo's presumed visit on his homeward voyage is uncertain. Aldo Ricci [*Travels of Marco Polo*, with introduction and index by Sir E. Denison Ross (George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., London, 1931)] and BENEDETTO [*Il Libro di Messer Marco Polo, cittadino di Venezia detto Milione dove si raccontano Le Meraviglie del Mondo* (Milano and Roma, 1932)] adopted the year 1285, Sir Henry YULE favoured 1288 [*The Book of Ser Marco Polo the Venetian concerning the kingdoms and marvels of the East*, 2 vols. (First edition, John Murray, London 1871). Citations in this paper are to the third edition, revised by Henri CORDIER in 1903, and to a third volume compiled by CORDIER in 1920: *Notes and addenda to Sir Henry Yule's edition of Ser Marco Polo*], and more recently PELLER has argued for a still later date, possibly 1290 [*op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 225], that is early in the reign of Jaya Sinhavarman III (1288—1307).

<sup>b</sup> BENEDETTO, *Il Milione*, p. 169.

After a eulogistic description of that island there follows the passage relating to *Sondur*, *Condur*, and *Lochac* which is quoted above, including the mention of *Pentan* some *D milles* (500 miles) to the southward. Clearly this series of passages can be held to constitute consecutively arranged stages in a voyage through the waters of South-East Asia only by postulating either egregious and repeated errors in direction, distance, sequence, and toponymic transcription of a magnitude and consistency found nowhere else in Polo's narrative, or — as some early Western cartographers did — the existence of land in the ocean to the south of Java<sup>7</sup>. Neither of these alternatives is acceptable, so that today there is no realistic alternative to the view that this section of the text is a schedule of topographical descriptions of places which Marco Polo had *either* visited or heard about, mainly, but not exclusively, during his homeward voyage<sup>8</sup>.

*Ciamba* is identified beyond all reasonable doubt, and the same might have been said of *jaua*<sup>9</sup> had not Professor BENEDETTO lent his authority to a location in Kalimantan (still known to the Western world as Borneo when he was writing)<sup>10</sup>. However, this scholar was unduly influenced by a preposterous theory of CHARIGNON who supposed that Qubilai's campaign of 1292/3 was directed against a *Chao-wa*<sup>11</sup> (= Java) in south-eastern Indo-

<sup>7</sup> Cf., *int. al.*, Linschoten's printed world map of Petrus Plancius of 1592 with its rubric *Lucach regnum* attached to a landmass far to the south of *Java Major*. Linschoten's printed map of eastern Asia (1596) preserved both the general concept of a *Terra Australis* and its presumed Polan toponymy, though on this occasion the cartographer had adopted a corrupt reading which stemmed ultimately from the Basle edition of 1532, namely *Beach* < *Boeach* < *Locach*. On a map of "Meridional India" included in Emanuel Godinho DE EREDA's *Declaração de Malaca e India Meridional com o Cathay* (Goa, 1613), between folios 51 and 53, the cartographer incorporated three versions of this name: *Lucac*, *Lucaveac*, and *Beach*. In this he was probably influenced by one of the maps of either the Mercators or Ortelius, where *Lucach* and *Beach* also occur in combination.

<sup>8</sup> It must be admitted, though, that this is not the view of Dr Colin JACK-HINTON, the latest author to attempt a reconstruction of POLO's South-East Asian toponymy, who has undertaken what in my opinion is the impossible task of trying to combine Marco's topographical descriptions into a coherent itinerary: "Marco Polo in South-East Asia. A preliminary essay in reconstruction", *Journal [of] Southeast Asian History*, vol. 5, no. 2 (1964), pp. 43—103. His view of the text as a consecutive sequence of voyages is explicit, when he writes in Note 4 on p. 49 of this paper, "To accept the direction as south-east is to identify *Lochac* with some kingdom in Borneo, and . . . it is unlikely that Polo would have wandered from what we know to have been the main maritime trade route between the Straits of Malacca and the China Sea. To accept the reading south-east as correct is to involve a whole sequence of later corrections in order to reconcile Polo's route with the topography of the area". And again on p. 82: ". . . if *Lochac* is sought in Borneo, then at least one succeeding direction and relative distance would have to be subjected to 'a deliberate distortion' in order to make any continued sense out of the itinerary".

<sup>9</sup> This is the reading of *F* and of several derivative recensions. *Z* has *caua*; *R* and *VL* [Biblioteca Governativa, Lucca, MS. 296, a Venetian text of 1465] read *giaua*. Other orthographies include *yaua*, *yana*, *zaua*, *jana*, *jauua*, and the obvious mislection *jajia*, but I have not been able to find the *Ciaua* which Colin JACK-HINTON attributes to *Z* ["Marco Polo in South-East Asia", p. 80].

<sup>10</sup> BENEDETTO, *Il Libro di Messer Marco Polo*, p. 443.



china<sup>11</sup>. PELLIO<sup>12</sup> has cogently refuted Benedetto's arguments, which hinge specifically on the relationship of Java to *Java la menor* (= Sumatra)<sup>13</sup> and which in any case appear to incorporate a misreading of the text<sup>14</sup>; and JACK-HINTON's subsequent suggestion that Polo's notion of Java may have been influenced by confusion with the Bornean toponym "Sabah" is not supported by an appropriate orthography in any extant recension<sup>15</sup>. There is, in fact, no reason to doubt that by "Java" Polo meant precisely what contemporary Chinese, Javanese, Malay, Arab, and Persian writers meant by the same word, namely the island of that name, and this conclusion is reinforced by the essential congruence of his description of the island with those in the literatures mentioned. The alleged distance of 1500 Venetian miles from *Campā* to Java is not wildly unrealistic given the manner in which nautical distances were calculated in the thirteenth century, and a direction of south-south-east not unduly inaccurate if Polo was attempting to indicate the relative positions of Quinhon and the heartland of the empire of Singhasāri in the Brantas valley of eastern Java. In any case there is no reason to suppose that he visited any part of Java, and most modern commentators since Sir Henry YULE<sup>16</sup> have concluded that this section of his book was a digression, a point of view with which I am in entire agreement<sup>17</sup>. Such digressions are extremely common in the work but, because they are masked by a uniformity of style, can often be distinguished only inferentially. Perhaps the most ambitious series of such passages is that in which Marco described the countries of the East African littoral, Arabia, Abyssinia, and Socotra, in none of which had he ever set foot. Nor, despite the lengthy descriptions included in his narrative, did he visit Baghdād or Mosul, or for that matter the Burmese capital of Pagan, whose gold- and silver-plated temple spires he described with evident enthusiasm. Nor, indeed, is it always

<sup>11</sup> A. J. H. CHARIGNON, *Le Livre de Marco Polo*, vol. 3 (Albert Nachbauer, Pékin, 1926), pp. 150–157.

<sup>12</sup> PELLIO, *Notes on Marco Polo*, vol. 2, pp. 755–756.

<sup>13</sup> One of BENEDETTO's reasons [*Il Libro*, p. 443, *sub Giava, la Grande*] for rejecting the equivalence *jaua* = Java was that the island of that name is not situated to the north-east of *Java la menor* (= Sumatra). The text nowhere provides an explicit statement of this relationship so that it is to be presumed that BENEDETTO arrived at this conclusion as a result of his emendations of the Polan directions and distances; but I have been unable to discover precisely how he manipulated them. BENEDETTO's concern that Sumatra (*Java la menor*) was in fact areally more extensive than Java can be discounted, as the notion that the island reached far to the southward was common to both Arabs and Chinese as a result of their failure to circumnavigate it (cp. also Footnote 7).

<sup>14</sup> BENEDETTO [*ibid.*] pointed out that Java was not located to the south-east [*la scirocco*] of *Campā* (but neither is Kalimantan): the text actually reads *entre midi et sceloc*, that is "between south and south-east" (but cf. Z: *inter leuantem & syroccum*).

<sup>15</sup> JACK-HINTON, op. cit., p. 80. William MARSDEN had made much the same suggestion in 1818, though without adducing the presumed orthographical influence of Sabah: vide *The travels of Marco Polo* (London, 1818). Re-edited by Thomas Wright (Everyman's Library: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., London, 1908 and E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1907), pp. xv and 334, note 1.

<sup>16</sup> YULE, *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, vol. 2, p. 274.

<sup>17</sup> RICCI and ROSS alone among recent authors include Java in Marco's homeward itinerary [*The travels of Marco Polo*, p. viii], although YULE thought that the traveller might have visited Java on a former occasion: *ibid.*

certain which towns in China Polo visited or if he actually saw with his own eyes Qara-qorum, the first capital of the Mongol empire. Similarly the topographical descriptions associated with his homeward voyage can be combined into a coherent itinerary only if the description of Java is regarded as an excursus dealing with an important country which he heard about but did not visit.

It follows from this interpretation that Polo resumed his narrative from *Campā*, and that *iaua* in the first sentence of the above paragraph should be emended to read *ciamba*. It is to be presumed that the text was originally corrupted by early copyists, possibly by Rustichello himself, who were attempting to disentangle from a series of topographical descriptions what they believed to have been the thread of an originally continuous itinerary. From this point of view the ensuing voyage of seven hundred miles in a south-south-westerly direction is wholly consonant with the *communis opinio* which, despite an anomaly in the distance involved, equates *Sondur et Condur* with the Kundur Islands<sup>18</sup>. However, at this juncture a second

<sup>18</sup> *sondur* in F, L, VL, Z, and R; *sandur* in FA (MS. 5631 of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris: a French text of the fourteenth century) and FB; *sendor* in VA; *sandii* in VB; *cenduz* in P; *sondus* in LT [MS. lat. 3195 in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris: a Latin text of the fourteenth century].

*condur* in F, FA, FB, L, VA, VL, Z, R, and TA<sup>1</sup> [the celebrated Crusca Text, MS. II. iv. 88 in the Bibl. Nazionale at Florence, dated to about 1305]; *condior* in VB; *condus* in LT; *conduz* in P. Other aberrant readings include *aira*, *chodur*, and *chondur*.

Although the identification with the Kundur Islands is beyond question, the rationale of Polo's nomenclature is still in doubt. Clearly *condur* = [Pulau] Kundur (Malay = Gourd [Island]: cp. Khmer *Koh Tralôch* (with the same meaning) and *Côn-nôn*, the Viêt vocalization of the characters pronounced in Modern Standard Chinese as *K'un-lun*, the transcription applied in the *Wu-pei-chih*<sup>[9]</sup> charts (offered to the Throne in 1628 but deriving ultimately from early in the fifteenth century) precisely to Pulau Kundur [chüan 240, folio 13 verso]. WANG Ta-yüan, in his *Tao-i Chih-lüeh*<sup>[9]</sup> of 1349, also uses the transcription *K'un-lun* but adds, under the influence of Chinese mythology, the alternative form *Chün-t'un*<sup>[7]</sup>, a corruption of *Hun-t'un*<sup>[9]</sup> < *Hun-tun*<sup>[9]</sup> with the primary meaning of "chaos", but also the name of a legendary animal alleged to have inhabited the slopes of the K'un-lun mountains in Central Asia.

So much for *Condur*. But what of *Sondur*? YULE [The Book of Ser Marco Polo, vol. 2, p. 277] is surely correct in relating this name to the *Šundur-tūlāt* (= Sundur-Pulau) of early Arab authors [e. g. 'Akhbar as-Šin wa'l-Hind, Ibn al-Faqih, Al-Idrīsī, Ibn Sa'īd, Al-Dimashqī, all easily accessible in Gabriel FERRAND, *Relations de voyages et textes géographiques arabes, persans et turks relatifs à l'Extrême-Orient du VIII<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 2 vols. (Ernest Leroux, Paris, 1913—1914); PELLIER (Notes, vol. 1, p. 406) has cited other instances of Malay and Indonesian toponyms in which, despite the normal syntactical construction, *pulau* (= island) has been transferred to the end of a compound]. But all Arabic writers place *Šundur-tūlāt* AFTER *Campā* on the sea route from the Middle East to China, that is to the northward of Quinhon, so that it cannot have been one of the islands making up the Kundur archipelago. PELLIER (*loc. cit.*) eventually concluded that it was Cúlao Cham, a small island to the south-east of Da Nang. However, POLO sailed in a generally southerly direction from Quinhon to *Sondur*, so that he associated the name with the Kundur group.

digression is introduced, this time in the form of an account of the kingdom of *Lochac*<sup>18</sup>, which lay five hundred miles *por sceloc* [= sirocco], that is in a south-easterly direction. The grounds for postulating a digression here are perhaps less conclusive than in the case of Java but, in my opinion, provide the most realistic interpretation of an ambivalent section of the text. This was also the view expressed by Professor Paul Pelliot in what is still the most thorough discussion of the *Lochac* problem undertaken so far<sup>20</sup>.

The reconstruction of the original toponym which Polo (or rather Rustichello) transcribed as *Lochac*, as well as its location, have already occasioned considerable discussion. As early as 1886 George PHILLIPS had equated it with the \**Lâ-jjwnt* [<sup>12</sup>] (MSC = Lo-yüeh) = [Se]luyut at the southern extremity of the Malay Peninsula<sup>21</sup>, and this idea had not been entirely abandoned by N. M. PENZER in 1929, though he erroneously identified \**Lâ-jjwnt* with the whole of the Peninsula<sup>22</sup>. In 1897 TOMASCHEK had suggested that Polo's transcription *Lochac* had concealed a nasalized vowel and represented a form nearer to *Lôchac* < \**Lonšak*, which in turn he regarded as a contraction of *Langkasuka*, the name of a kingdom with a long history situated in the neighbourhood of Pattani on the Malay Peninsula<sup>23</sup>. There are several

---

PELLIOT cites certain ancient Việt and Chinese texts which tend to imply that the Chinese first applied their legendary name *K'un-lun* to Cùlao Cham but subsequently transferred it southwards to Pulau Kundur. It is certainly true that the Chinese referred to Kundur as \**Kundurung* (*Chün-tu-lung* [<sup>10</sup>]; cp. Arabic *Kundurung*) as late as the eighth century, but not in later times. Possibly the name *Sundur* also migrated southwards and had by Polo's time also become associated with the Kundur archipelago. PELLIOT (*loc. cit.*) suggested that it might have been a vague memory of *Sundur* as an old name for Cùlao Cham which caused Polo to describe it as the larger of the two islands. On the other hand the contrast in present-day nomenclature between Grand Condore and Petite Condore (*K'un-lun Shan* and *Hsiao K'un-lun* [<sup>11</sup>] on the *Wu-pei-chih* chart), both in the Kundur archipelago, should not be forgotten. None of this is entirely satisfactory but it does nothing to vitiate the patent fact that by *Condur* Polo intended to refer to the Kundur archipelago.

<sup>19</sup> *lochac* is the reading of the *F*, *Z*, *L*, and *R* recensions, *lochach* of *P* and *V*, and *locheac* of *LT*. *locac* occurs in *F* and *TA*<sup>1</sup>, and *lothac* as a mislection in *Z*. Other corrupt orthographies in less reputable texts include *alcay*, *chacho*, *locach*, *jocach*, *jocath*, *leochar*, *leocharde*, *leoar*, *soncal*, *tac*, and *thac*. Needless to say, these latter aberrations may be disregarded in the following discussion.

<sup>20</sup> *Notes on Marco Polo*, vol. 2, pp. 766—770.

<sup>21</sup> George PHILLIPS, "The seaports of India and Ceylon", *Journal of the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 21 (1886), p. 34, note. The identification of \**Lâ-jjwnt* with Seluyut was first proposed by J. L. MOENS, "Srivijaya, Yāva en Katāha", *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, vol. 77, pt. 3 (1937), p. 337.

<sup>22</sup> N. M. PENZER (ed.), *The most noble and famous travels of Marco Polo together with the travels of Nicolò de' Conti*. Edited from the Elizabethan translation of John Frampton (The Argonaut Press, London, 1929), p. lvii.

<sup>23</sup> W. TOMASCHEK in M. BITTNER, *Die topographischen Capitel des Indischen See-spiegels Mohit* (Wien, 1897). Subsequently Gabriel FERRAND added the weight of his authority to this identification ["Malaka, Le Malāyu et Malāyur", *Journal Asiatique*, 11th. series, vol. 12 (1918), pp. 139—140]. The most recent evaluation of the evidence relating to *Langkasuka* is by WHEATLEY, "Langkasuka", *T'oung Pao*, vol. 44 (1956), pp. 387—412.



arguments that could be adduced in refutation of this identification, but the most fundamental is the fallacy that a Polan -ch- has the value of a -š-. Nor, we may add, would \*Lonśak be a likely — or even a possible — contraction of *Langkasuka*. ROUFFAER introduced an even less tenable variation into the argument when he derived *Lochac* from *Lankā* < *Langkasuka*, which he took to be a name for the whole of the southern or Malay half of the Peninsula<sup>24</sup>. Another interpretation which has gained some currency was first put forward by GERINI, who identified *Lochac* with the ethnicon \**Lā-śat* [<sup>13</sup>] (MSC = *Lo-ch'a*)<sup>25</sup>. Subsequently this idea was elaborated by CHARIGNON<sup>26</sup>, and finally adopted by Benedetto who argued for a specific location in the vicinity of Trengganu<sup>27</sup>. However, \**Lā-śat* was the normal Chinese transcription of Sanskrit *rākṣasa* = "demon", and was applied in the seventh century A. D. to the primitive peoples of eastern Indonesia<sup>28</sup>, possibly under the influence of a misconstrued Buddhist legend that originally related to Pātaliputra<sup>29</sup>.

There have been other attempts to resolve the problem of *Lochac* but only one need concern us here. This was the suggestion by Sir Henry Yule that

<sup>24</sup> G. P. ROUFFAER, "Was Malaka emporium vóór 1400 A. D. genaamd Malajoer? En waar lag Woerawari, Mā-hasin, Langka, Batoesawar?" *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, vol. 77 (1921), p. 143.

<sup>25</sup> G. E. GERINI, *Researches on Ptolemy's geography of Eastern Asia (Further India and Indo-Malay Archipelago)* (The Royal Asiatic Society and the Royal Geographical Society, London, 1909), pp. 496—497.

<sup>26</sup> CHARIGNON, *Le livre de Marco Polo*, vol. 3, pp. 160—162.

<sup>27</sup> BENEDETTO, *Il libro di Messer Marco Polo*, p. 444.

<sup>28</sup> Vide O. W. WOLTERS, *Early Indonesian commerce* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New-York, 1967), pp. 198—200. The term *rākṣasa* was applied to those folk societies of eastern Indonesia unaffected by the diffusion of Indian culture by the Chinese envoy CH'ANG CHÜN [<sup>14</sup>] who travelled in South-East Asia between A. D. 607 and 610. His report is incorporated in the *Sui-shu*, chüan 82, ff. 3 recto — 5 verso; in the *Pei shih*, chüan 95, ff. 11 verso — 14 recto; the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, chüan 787, ff. 1 verso — 3 recto; and in the *Wen-hsien t'ung-k'ao*, chüan 331, ff. 2602—3. There is also a mutilated reference to the \**Lā-śat*, which evidently derives from the same source, in the *T'ang hui-yao*, chüan 99, 1769. Sundry other brief mentions of this name in Chinese histories and topographies relating to ancient times all stem from CH'ANG CHÜN's report, but in the seventeenth century the name was revived as a term of opprobrium for the Russians of Albazin: cf. PELLIOU, review of CORDIER's "Histoire des relations de la Chine avec les puissances occidentales" in *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient*, vol. 3 (1903), p. 686, and Lo-shu Fu, *A documentary chronicle of Sino-Western relations (1644—1820)*. Monograph No. XXII of the Association for Asian Studies (University of Arizona Press, Tucson, 1966), *passim*.

<sup>29</sup> Whereas in the *Tsa p'i-yü ching* [<sup>15</sup>], which was translated into Chinese in about A. D. 180, \**Lā-śat* demons are mentioned in connexion with the kingdom of \**Puā-lji-pjwāt* [<sup>16</sup>] (Mand. = *Po-li-fu* = Pātaliputra) [*Tripiṭaka* of Meiji, Tōkyō ed., *Sho*, VII, f. 32 recto], in the Chinese texts mentioned in Note 28 the \**Lā-śat* people are invariably associated with the country of \**Puā-lji* [<sup>17</sup>] (= Bali). This point is made somewhat hesitantly by PELLIOU, *Notes on Marco Polo*, vol. 2, p. 767.

the Polan orthography was Rustichello's transcription of Marco's vocalization of an aphetic contraction of [*Hsien-lo*]<sup>18</sup> combined with a South Chinese version of the word for "kingdom", probably in its Cantonese form of *kwok*<sup>19</sup> 30. *Lo* itself was an abbreviation of *Lo-hu*<sup>20</sup> (Ancient Chinese \**Lā-yuk*), the form into which Chinese authors customarily transcribed the name of the Mōn-Khmer state of *Lvo*, situated in what is today Central Thailand. After this state had been overrun by the *Hsien*<sup>21</sup> (= Thai) from the northward in 1349 its subordinate status was indicated in Chinese annals by the prefixing of the ethnicon *Hsien*. Hence the form *Hsien Lo-hu*, which was soon abbreviated by apocope of the last syllable to *Hsien-lo*. Yule's thesis was that *Lochac* = *lo* (Ancient Chinese \**lā*) combined with *kwok*, that is "the kingdom of \**Lā[-yuk]*". Yule also seemed to think that the syllable *lo* had an independent existence as the word which is now transcribed as *Lao*. In this form Yule's theory has not proved tenable. In the first place the Thai did not incorporate *Lvo* in their polity until 1349, so that Polo could not have heard the form *Hsien Lo-hu*. Secondly, only very rarely did Polo employ the termination *kuo* in reporting place-names outside the purely Chinese culture realm, and when, as in the case of *Çipingu* (< *Jih-pen Kuo* = Kingdom of Japan) and *Caugigu* (< *Chiao-chih Kuo*: an ancient Chinese name for Tong-King), he does use this form it is always as *-gu*, never as *-chac*. Moreover, the identification of *Lochac* with the state of *Lvo* committed Yule to a location in Thailand, which was totally inconsistent with Polo's direction of "500 miles by the sirocco" from the Kundur Islands. In an attempt to minimize this inconsistency, Yule sought a precise location in what was probably the southernmost territory of *Lvo* in the thirteenth century, namely the neighbourhood of Ligor<sup>31</sup>. Even so this meant that he had to postulate a gross error — approximately south-west (*garbin* or *aufriques*) instead of south-east — either in Marco's recollection or in the transmission of the text. Nevertheless, although Yule's thesis cannot be sustained in all its ramifications, its central idea was retained by Pelliot as the basis of a more sophisticated argument.

Pelliot, influenced by his intimate acquaintance with the literatures of South and East Asia, based his identification of *Lochac* primarily on etymological arguments<sup>32</sup>. Taking up the theory of Sir Henry Yule mentioned above, he elaborated in considerable detail the phonetic equivalence of *Lochac* and

<sup>30</sup> YULE, *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, vol. 2, pp. 277—279.

<sup>31</sup> PHILLIPS ["The seaports of India and Ceylon", p. 34] and GERINI [*Researches into Ptolemy's geography*, p. 497] had already contemplated this possibility on what subsequently proved to be spurious phonetic grounds: *Nāgara* [Śrī Dharmarāja] > *Lakhon* > *Ligor* > *Lochac*.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Note 20 above.

\**Lâ-yuk*, this latter being a Chinese transcription of *Lavo*, the ancient Thai rendering of the name of the old Môn-Khmer kingdom of *Lvo* (cf. Pāli = *Laba[pura]*) with its capital on the site of present-day Lopburī. There are two main objections to this interpretation, which Pelliot attempted to counter in an ingenious series of arguments. In the first place the phonetic equivalence is imperfect with regard to the final velar plosives of both *Lochac* and the reconstructed Chinese morpheme \**yuk* <sup>[22]</sup>, so that Pelliot was forced to postulate an earlier Thai form \**Lavok*. This expedient in fact could be held to receive somewhat unexpected support from several Arabic texts which employ the epithet *lawāqī*, presumably derived from a toponym closely akin to \**Lavok*, to denote a particular type of gaharuwood <sup>33</sup>. One of these texts, the *Kitāb al-Buldān* of Ya'qūbī, dates from as early as 891.

In the second place the equation *Lochac* = \**Lâ-yuk* holds only for pre-Sung, or at best early Sung, times. By the thirteenth century the latter word had acquired in North Chinese speech more or less its Modern Standard Chinese pronunciation of *Lo-hu*, so that Pelliot perforce had to bolster his interpretation with two additional conjectures: (i) that the Chinese had adopted the transcription \**Lâ-yuk* during an earlier period in the evolution of their language than that in which it is first attested by extant texts; and (ii) that Polo had modelled his pronunciation of *Lochac* on a South Chinese vocalization which had preserved the ancient sound into the thirteenth century. Neither of these suppositions is inherently unreasonable and the second is somewhat strengthened by a reference in the Buddhist chronicle *Fo-tsu li-tai l'ung-t'ai* <sup>[23]</sup> <sup>34</sup> of 1333—1344 to a kingdom known by, in MSC form, the name of *Lo-hao* <sup>[24]</sup>, whither the Sung pretender had escaped by way of *Campā* in 1278. In some South Chinese speech *Lo-hao* would have sounded something like \**Lok-hok*, and it is Pelliot's contention that the Buddhist chronicler was drawing on "a contemporary document of southern origin" for information about the same place as that which Marco Polo knew under the name *Lochac* <sup>35</sup>. The form *Lok-hok* is certainly very close to *Lochac* if, as indeed invariably happens, Rustichello's *-ch-* (or *-c-*) has the value of a velar plosive before an *-a*.

On phonetic grounds, then, Pelliot has made a reasonable case for equating *Lochac* with the Môn-Khmer kingdom of *Lvo*, but there is a serious impedi-

<sup>33</sup> E. g., Ya'qūbī, Ibn al-Bayṭār, and Abū'l-Faḍl, all conveniently accessible in Gabriel FERRAND, *Relations de voyages et textes géographiques arabes, persans et turks relatifs à l'Extrême-Orient du VIII<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles traduits, revus et annotés*, vol. 1 (Ernest Leroux, Paris, 1913), pp. 52 and 285, vol. 2 (1914), p. 547.

<sup>34</sup> *Tripitaka* of Meiji, Tōkyō edition, *Chi*, XXXII, f. 41 verso.

<sup>35</sup> It is also possible that it was the same state which appeared in Viêt annals (in Sincized form) as \**Luo-yāk* (*Lu-ho*) <sup>[25]</sup>. In 1149 it sought permission to trade at the mouth of the Red River [Vide PELLIOU, *Notes*, vol. 2, p. 768].

ment to a too ready acceptance of this identification. Not even Pelliot's ingenuity could explain away Polo's direction of south-east from Pulau Kundur: "it is a mistake", he said, "whatever solution one may adopt for 'Lochac'". In fact *Lvo* lay almost precisely in the opposite direction, in the Venetian seamen's terminology *por maistre* or "by the plough-beam", that is to the north-west. While directions are frequently recorded inaccurately in Polo's text as it has been transmitted to us, there are few, if any, instances which involve an error of 180°. And such an error was not all that likely to have slipped in as a result of careless copying, for the Polan terms for north-west and south-east, unlike the conventional European abbreviations, have nothing in common from the point of view of graphics. It would be much more probable that a conscientious editor had deliberately altered the direction in an attempt to render Polo's topographical descriptions in the form of a continuing itinerary.

There is, however, one way in which the difficulty of this apparently anomalous direction might be resolved without recourse to textual emendation. A voyage of 500 miles in a roughly south-easterly direction from Pulau Kundur would presuppose a landfall in western Kalimantan, and it was here that just over two centuries later Tomé PIRES was to locate the "island of *lane*"<sup>36</sup>. According to Pires, who was describing Kalimantan (under the rubric *Burney* < *Brunei*) from the point of view of a Malakan trader and who consequently approached it by way of the Kampar channel and the island of Lingga, *Lane* was four days' journey beyond *tamJompura* (= Tanjungpura), so that CORTESÃO was undoubtedly correct in regarding the version of the name in the extant text as a transcriber's mistake for *Laue*, a toponym which early Western chroniclers and cartographers located, under divers orthographies and with varying degrees of accuracy, in western Kalimantan. Antônio FIGAFETTA, for example, placed "a large city named *Laoë* . . . at the end of (*in capo de*) this island [Kalimantan] toward Java Major"<sup>37</sup>. João DE BARROS<sup>38</sup> and Fernão Lopes DE CASTANHEDA<sup>39</sup> in the sixteenth century mentioned a town whose name they wrote respectively as *Lave* and *Laue* among the principal trading ports of Borneo (Kalimantan). At some time between 1597 and the end of 1600 Godinho DE EREDIA cited the Sukadana and *Laue* as "two abundant Rivers in the Southern country of Borneo, wherein

<sup>36</sup> Armando CORTESÃO (ed.), *The Suma Oriental of Tomé Pires*, Hakluyt Society, Second Series, No. XC (London, 1944), vol. 1, pp. 224–225 and vol. 2, p. 450. PIRES regarded Kalimantan as made up of a number of islands: cf. *Burney sam mujtas Jllas grandes & pequenas* [loc. cit., vol. 2, p. 461].

<sup>37</sup> *Premier voyage autour du monde par le Chevr. Pigafetta, sur l'escadre de Magellan, pendant les années 1519, 20, 21 et 22*. Transl. from the Italian by Charles AMORETTI (H. J. Jansen, Paris, 1801).

<sup>38</sup> João DE BARROS, *Asia. Decadas I–IV* (Lisboã, 1552, 1553, 1563; Madrid, 1615).

<sup>39</sup> Fernão Lopes DE CASTANHEDA, *História do descobrimento & conquista da Índia pelos Portugueses* (Coimbra, 1551–1561 and 1933; The Hague, 1929).

large quantities of Precious Stones are found"<sup>40</sup>, and in 1608 the Dutch merchant BLOEMAERT referred to the settlement of Teyen (present-day Tajan) on the River of Lauwe<sup>41</sup>. In the cartographic traditions of the sixteenth century this same name occurs under a variety of forms such as *Laue* (often misread as *Lano* or *Lane*), *Lao*, *Llaue*, or *Lave*<sup>42</sup>. The general impression left by the maps of the time is of a port lying close to the equator, and the frequent inclusion of some such phrase as *dôde foi dom manoell de lima*<sup>43</sup> must be

<sup>40</sup> Emanuel Godinho DE EREDIA, *Informação da Aurea Chersoneso, ou Peninsula, e das Ilhas Auríferas, Carbunculas, e Aromaticas*. Translated from the Portuguese, with annotations, by J. V. MILLS, "Eredia's description of Malaca, Meridional India, and Cathay", *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 8, pt. 1 (1930), p. 245.

<sup>41</sup> *Begin ende Voortgang*, vol. I (1646), 15th Voyage (Verhoeven), pp. 98–107.

<sup>42</sup> E.g., *int. al.*, *laue* or *lane* on an anonymous manuscript chart of the East Indies, c. 1545 (the Penrose Map); *lano* on the manuscript world charts of Pierre Desceliers, 1546, 1550 and 1553; *la/ue* on Lopo Homem's world map of 1554 and on Diego Homem's manuscript charts of southern and eastern Asia, 1558 and 1568; *llaue* on Fernão Vaz Dourado's manuscript charts of eastern and south-east Asia of c. 1568 and 1580 respectively; *lao* on Giacomo Gastaldi's printed map of southern Asia of 1561, on Gerard Mercator's world chart of 1569, and on Abraham Ortelius's printed map of Asia of 1570; *lave* on Arnoldus Langeren's delineation of Jan van Linschoten's material printed in 1596, on a reproduction of the Kalimantan section of this map in the *Caert-thresoor* of 1598, and on Bartolomeu Lasso's manuscript chart of southern Asia of 1590; *Laue* on Willem Lodewycksz's printed map of the East Indies of 1598. It is probably this same name which occurs as *Laban* on Pedro Berthelot's map of Borneo, dated to 1635, and as late as 1727 Alexander Hamilton inscribed *Lava* to the south of Sukadana [map reproduced in Mansel Longworth Dames, *The Book of Duarte Barbosa*, vol. 2 (Hakluyt Society, London, 1921), p. 207]. There is no basis for the identification by Andrea DA MOSTO [*Il primo viaggio intorno al globo di Antonio Pigafetta* (1894) and subsequent writers of *Laue* with Laut Bumbu off the south-east coast of Kalimantan. Professor Jan O. M. BROEK ["Place names in 16th and 17th century Borneo", *Imago Mundi*, vol. 16 (1962), p. 135] seems disposed to regard as an early mention of this name the form *lawai*, which was included by Rakawi PRAPAŃCA in his *Nāgara-Kērtāgama* (1365). It is there listed as a dependency of Majapahit, and mentioned in the same stanza as Sampit, Kota-Waringin, Sambas, and *kūtaliŃga* (the neighbourhood of present-day Kuching) [Theodore G. Th. PIGEAUD, *Java in the fourteenth century. A study in cultural history* (Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde Translation Series, IV, vol. 1 (1960), p. 11, vol. 3 (1960), p. 16, and vol. 4 (1962), p. 31]. ROUFFAER and PIGEAUD [both in PIGEAUD, *op. cit.*, vol. 4, p. 31] also associate *lawai* with PIGAFETTA's Laoe, but I doubt if this is a valid equation. Phonetically *lawai* is more likely to have been a Javanese transcription of Labai, the name of a tributary of the Mendawak river in Western Kalimantan. My own earlier contention [Albert HERMANN, *An historical atlas of China*. New edition: general editor Norton Ginsburg (Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago, 1966), pp. xxv–xxvi] that the *Iloucam* mentioned by Francisco RODRIGUES was another Portuguese transcription of the same indigenous toponym must be abandoned. It is, in fact, a transcription of the name which we now know as Luzon. The confusion between Kalimantan and the Philippines which is betrayed by this name is also evident in the remark of Rui DE BRITO that, "Borneu is a large island, it lies between China and the Moluccas, in the open sea of the islands; the people of the island are called *lucoēs* (= Luzons) [*Cartas*, III, 92–93; quoted in CORTESÃO, *The Suma Oriental*, vol. 1, p. 132, note 1]. That RODRIGUES himself was far from clear about the geography of eastern Kalimantan appears from the inscription on one of his maps (folio 36) which labels that island as *A grande Ilha de maquaçer* (The great Island of Makasar) [CORTESÃO, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 226, note 1].

<sup>43</sup> This is the phrase as it appears in Vaz Dourado's atlases. On Lopo Homem's world map of 1554 it reads, *onde foi dō manoel de lima*; on Linschoten's printed map of eastern Asia (drawn by Langeren) of 1596 and in the *Caert-thresoor* of 1598 as *donde ioÿ Don Manoel: de lima*; on Bartolomeu Lasso's manuscript chart of southern Asia of 1590 *donde ioÿ dō manoell de lima*.



held to imply that it was a voyage of D. Manuel DE LIMA which brought this place to the notice of European cartographers. Cortesão notes that, although this particular voyage is apparently not confirmed by extant Portuguese chronicles, Castanheda does mention the presence of D. Manuel in Malaka in 1537<sup>44</sup>, so that there is no reason to doubt the likelihood of his having visited Laue.

Professor Jan BROEK, in the course of a thorough examination of the evidence both cartographical and literary relating to the location of Laue, has demonstrated conclusively that the river of that name was the present-day Kapuas<sup>45</sup>. The territory of the state presumably occupied the valley of that river, but the precise site of the capital is still a matter of conjecture<sup>46</sup>. Nor is the indigenous form of the name known with certainty. There is a strong presumption that it was Malay, in which case an original *Lawa* or *Lawak* would suggest itself<sup>47</sup>. In fact there is a Lawak river which flows into the Mendawak just below its confluence with the Kapuas. The final -k in the transcription of such names represents a glottal check, and as such was frequently omitted by early European writers whose ears were untuned to the subtleties of Malay speech and who were, by virtue of their callings, unskilled in the niceties of phonetic transcription. There is thus a strong probability that the name of this river, an affluent of the Kapuas — which was itself known to Bloemaert as the River of Lauwe — preserves the old Malay form which earlier authors and cartographers rendered by *Laue* and related orthographies<sup>48</sup>. Moreover, in view of the easy phonetic interchange between -g- [Rustichello's -ch- before -a] and -v- (-w-), *Lawak* provides an acceptable phonetic equivalent to the Polan *Lochac*. The correspondence is at least as good as that between *Lochac* and Pelliot's reconstructed Thai form \**Lavok*,

<sup>44</sup> CORTESÃO, *Suma Oriental*, vol. 1, p. 224, note 1, quoting CASTANHEDA, *Historia do descobrimento*, Book IX, p. clxxviii.

<sup>45</sup> BROEK, "Place names in 16th and 17th century Borneo", pp. 135—137. Cf. also L. C. D. VAN DIJK, *Neerland's vroegste betrekkingen met Borneo...* (Amsterdam, 1862): not seen but cited from BROEK, *op. cit.*, p. 135; P. A. TIELE, "De Europeërs in den Maleischen Archipel van 1509 tot 1623", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, 4th series, vols. 1—8, 5th series 1—2 (1877—1888), p. 338; and R. A. KERN, "Lawai, Lawe", *Tijdschrift Kon. Ned. Aardr. Gen.*, 2nd series, vol. 54 (1937), pp. 391—392.

<sup>46</sup> G. P. ROUFFAER considered that the Kapuas river formerly reached the sea by way of the channels of the present-day Mendawak and Simpang Lida, and he placed Laue at the point where the Mendawak (that is the former Kapuas) was joined by the Labai river. His argument was based primarily on a comparison of the topographical descriptions of BLOEMAERT, who was in Sukadana early in the seventeenth century, with the present-day drainage pattern ["Tochten (Oudste Ontdekkings-) tot 1497", *Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch Oost-Indië*, vol. 4 (First edition, 1905), pp. 363—395]. This interpretation also offers an explanation of the reason why, on a printed map of the East Indies of 1598, Willem LODEWIJCKSZ should have referred to Laue "on the river of Succadana" when other authors unequivocally located that city in the Kapuas valley.

<sup>47</sup> Cp., for example, PIRES's transcription of Somali *Barawa* as *braua* (CORTESÃO, *The Suma Oriental*, vol. 2, p. 333).

<sup>48</sup> One implication of this argument is that the *lawāqī* gaharuwood mentioned above was a product of Kalimantan rather than of Thailand, as is customarily supposed.

and, because it obviates the need to introduce supporting hypotheses based on phonetic change, offers the desideratum of logical parsimony. However, despite this possible attraction, the linguistic argument is by no means conclusive, and we must now turn to such supplementary information as is available in search of more decisive evidence.

The only extant account of *Laue* which has so far come to light is that penned by Tomé Pires, who probably acquired his information during his residence in Malaka from 1512 to 1515. Armando Cortesão's transcription of the relevant passage runs as follows:

*Ylha de esta Ilha De laue he quootro dias he quootro dias [sic]  
lane damdadura alem de lam Jompura hee tamanha como a de cima  
tem pates tem mujta Jemte todos sã Gemtios tratam com  
Jaõa & com malaq<sup>a</sup> he tanto do Jaõa case como de malaq<sup>a</sup>  
tem diamantes tem Juncõs ouro em mais camtidade que  
lam Jompura tem mercadores hee terã De mujtos mamtimentõs  
he de boa gente valem nela as mercadarias q̃ sam ditãs em  
cima valem panos quelijs he terra De bõo trato nom  
hobedeçe a nemguẽ sam estes homeẽs casy da maneira dos  
Jaõs Rebastos valemtes homes de suas p<sup>as</sup> tem mujta çera<sup>49</sup>*

Cortesão translates this account as follows:

*Island of This island of Laue is four days' journey beyond Tanjompura.  
Laue It is as large as the one above [i. e. Tanjompura = Tanjungpura].  
It has pates [= Javanese patih]; it has many inhabitants; they are  
all heathen. They trade with Java und Malacca, and almost as  
much with Java as with Malacca. They have diamonds; they have  
junks; gold in greater quantities than Tanjompura; they have  
merchants. It is a country with many foodstuffs. The people are  
good. The merchandise mentioned above [chiefly textiles: vide  
Cortesão, *Suma Oriental*, vol. 1, p. 224 and vol. 2, p. 450] is of  
value here; Kling cloth is of value. It is a good trading country.  
It does not obey anyone. These people are almost like the Java-  
nese, robust, valiant, manly. They have a great deal of wax<sup>50</sup>.*

When comparing this passage with that relating to *Lochac* on page 86 it must be remembered that neither Polo nor Pires had visited the particular countries about which they were writing, and that in any case the two travellers were separated in time by something over two centuries. One fact which impressed both writers was the autonomous status of their respective kingdoms. Late in the thirteenth century Polo wrote that, because of their situation remote from the foci of political power in South-East Asia, the people of *Lochac ne font treu a nelui*, and attributed supreme authority to *un grant roi*. Two centuries later Pires remarked that *Laue nom hobedeçe a nemguẽ*. Elsewhere in his book, however, he partially contradicted this statement by including *Laue* among the fifteenth-century conquests of Pate Unus, ruler of

<sup>49</sup> CORTESÃO, *Suma Oriental*, vol. 2, p. 450.

<sup>50</sup> CORTESÃO, *Suma Oriental*, vol. 1, pp. 224—225.

the North Javanese kingdom of Japara. This is, in fact, more consonant with his subsequent vague reference to the existence of *patih*, a Javanese term denoting high officers of state. Probably the truth lay somewhere between these two statements. Although *Laue* was nominally subject to Japara, it is likely that Javanese rule did not weigh too heavily on the peoples of the Kapuas valley.

Polo and Pires agree in their statements that, despite their remote situations, *Lochac* and *Laue* both contributed valuable commodities to the stream of South-East Asian trade, but their respective schedules have only a single item in common. That is gold: in such great abundance, according to Polo, that *nulz le peust croire qui ne le veist*, and *em mais cantidade que tam-Jompura* according to Pires. The implications of these remarks will be examined in a subsequent paragraph. The impression left by both accounts is of a fairly prosperous kingdom which took advantage of its location remote from the political highways of South-East Asia to maintain either complete, or a substantial degree of, independence.

The ultimate question to be faced, of course, is whether the description of *Lochac* is more consonant with a location in central Thailand or in western Kalimantan. The phonetic evidence has already been examined at some length, and our conclusion is that, although it is not decisive, it inclines, mainly because it requires fewer supporting assumptions, towards the equation *Lochac* (vocalized as *Logak*) = *Lawak* > *Laue*, etc. rather than *Lochac* = \**Lá-yuk* < \**Lavok*. From the point of view of Marco Polo's reconstructed itinerary and its incorporated digressions a Kalimantan location is also preferable since it accords more closely with the prescribed distances and directions than does the locality of *Lvo* in the Chao Phraya valley. In particular it removes the necessity of practically reversing one of Polo's directions. The only item among the locational data which might be held to favour a site in central Thailand is the clause in the Zelada Codex<sup>51</sup> and derivative recensions (but not in the Franco-Italian version) which places *Lochac* "on the firm land" (*que est de tera [sic] firma*). The Zelada recension derives from a tradition older than the Franco-Italian text and any addition or emendation it contributes to the narrative deserves careful scrutiny. The implication of a site on the mainland of Asia is not to be lightly dismissed, but must be weighed against the cumulative weight of evidence for a location in Kalimantan. The most that can be urged against it are the possibilities either that Polo, or at least the author of the Zelada Codex, was using the phrase *terra firma* in the general sense of a large landmass, or that a copyist inserted the expression in an attempt to make sense of a text whose structure he did not fully comprehend.

The meagre roster of cultural characteristics recorded by Polo affords an inadequate basis on which to decide between these two locations. Not even the imputed religious affiliations seem to have much significance for our present enquiry, for the inhabitants of *Lochac* were assigned to the inclusive category of European religious thought known as "idolaters" (*ydres* in *F*,

<sup>51</sup> MOULE and PELLISOT, *Marco Polo*, vol. 2, p. lxiv.

*cuius gentes adorant ydola* in Z). However, Marco's descriptions of some of the ethnic groups of Central Asia make it abundantly evident that this term was broad enough to subsume Buddhists. Indeed, Polo seems to have attributed all forms of Asian idolatry to a common founder whom he identified with Sagamoni Burcan (= Śakyamuni Burqan<sup>52</sup>). By the end of the thirteenth century, when Polo presumably acquired his information about Lvo, the state religion there was, in fact, Theravāda Buddhism, diluted with animism no doubt among the mass of the people. The situation in Laue at this time was obscure, and two centuries later Pires, a devout adherent of the Church of Rome, predictably classed its population simply as heathen (*Gentios*). On general grounds it may be premised that at the time of Polo's homeward voyage Laue shared in the amalgam of religious tenets current in the kingdom of Singhasāri, namely Bhairava Buddhism in court circles and the ever-present blend of Hindu, Buddhist, and animistic beliefs among the populace at large. In any case the superficiality of Marco's understanding of Buddhist doctrine would have prevented him from disentangling the eclectic, and often syncretistic, characteristics assumed by this religion in

<sup>52</sup> *Sagamoni Burcan* is the form, restored by PELLIOU (*Notes*, vol. 2, p. 823), which POLO must have dictated. Although it does not occur in any extant recension of the *Devisement dou Monde*, it is very close to the transcription *Shākāmūni-Burkhān* used by Rashīdū'd-Dīn in the so-far unpublished part of his work which relates to the history of China. *P* reads *sergamoni borcain*, *sergomon saint*, and *sergomoni borcan*; *Z* *sogomoni burchan* and *sogomoni burghan*; *VB* *santo brachan*, *sogomor barchan*, and *sogomor barcon*; *LT* *sergamon borchaym*; *L* *sergarmoni borcain*; *TA*<sup>1</sup> *serghamon borghani*; and *R* *sogomombar can* and *sogomonbarchan*. *Sagamoni* is a transcription of *Śigāmuni*, the colloquial Mongolian rendering of Śakyamuni = Sage of the Śakyas = Gautama Buddha. The etymology of *Burqan* presents difficulties. The commonly adduced derivation from North Chinese \**b'juat* [<sup>26</sup>] (MSC fo: = Buddha) combined with Altaic *khan* (= sovereign) is not entirely satisfactory [This view was first propounded by Sir E. Dennison Ross in Ricci, *The travels of Marco Polo*, p. 432; cp. also Louis HAMBIS, "Notes préliminaires à une biographie de Bayan le Märkit", *Journal Asiatique*, vol. 241 (1953), p. 224]. Marco himself translated the term to mean "saint": cf. *sergamoni borcain*, que vaut a dir *sergamoni saint* [BENEDETTO, *Il Milione*, p. 194]. Berthold LAUFER ["Burkhan", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 36 (1917), pp. 390 *et seq.*] and P. K. KOZLOW [Mongolei, *Amdo und die tote Stadt Chara-choto*. Transl. from the Russian (Berlin, 1925), p. 50] assert that the Mongols also used the term in the sense of "idol". In any case *burqan* occurred at an early date in both Uighur and Mongolian, and by Polo's time had come to constitute part of the name of what Leonardo OLSCHKI has called "a transcendent miracle-worker who was obeyed by gods and devils alike, natural and occult forces, and the spirits of the departed" [Marco Polo's Asia (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960), p. 256]. Marco's remark on Sagamoni Burqan as the founder of all idolatries is as follows: *e de cestui sunt descendue lutes les ydres* (BENEDETTO, *Il Milione*, p. 194). RAMUSIO's recension also incorporates an alleged statement of Qubilai's beliefs by the Emperor himself in which he refers to "sogomonbarchan who was the first god of the idols" [MOULE and PELLIOU, *Marco Polo*, vol. 1, p. 201]. It is noteworthy in this connexion that just over half a century earlier, in 1225, CHAO Ju-kua had referred to a Buddha called \**Ma-ya-mjuat* [<sup>27</sup>] (= Muhammad) [Chu-fan-chih [<sup>28</sup>], pt. 1, (Feng Ch'eng-chün's [<sup>29</sup>] edition, Shanghai, 1938), p. 48].

the several realms of Asia. The most that can be said is that Marco's brief reference to the religion of *Lochac* is inimicable neither to a location in the lower Čhao Phraya valley nor to one in western Kalimantan.

Nor, despite emphasis on autonomy, is Marco's information relating to the political status of *Lochac* at all conclusive. Although *Lvo* and *Laue* may have enjoyed effective independence at the close of the thirteenth century, there can be no doubt that in both instances it was a fortuitous and temporary status. In the case of *Lvo* it was the result of the disruption of the traditional pattern of political authority in the Čhao Phraya valley consequent on the consolidation of Thai power and the establishment of a new state at Sukhothai; in the case of *Laue* such limited autonomy — if, indeed, it existed at all — was probably incidental to the weakening of central authority towards the end of the reign of Kērtanagara of Singhasāri (1268—1292). More to the point, perhaps, is the unlikelihood that Polo would have comprehended the concept of multiple political allegiance as it was commonly practised in South and East Asia, and which may well have led him, acquiring his information as he did at second-hand, to confuse political opportunism with absolute independence. Polo's insistence on the remoteness of *Lochac* may be held to favour a situation in Kalimantan rather than in the lower Čhao Phraya valley, but his comments on the immunity of that state — or of any other in South-East Asia for that matter — ring rather hollowly when we recall Qubilai's dispatch of a punitive expedition to Java in 1293. In any case \**Lā-yuk* (*Lvo*) did contrive to send tribute missions to the Chinese court in 1289, 1291, 1296, 1297 and 1299<sup>53</sup>, a record which accords poorly with Polo's tale of the ruler of *Lochac*'s reluctance to engage in foreign relations. There is no record of *Laue* ever having sent envoys to the Dragon Throne.

It was to be hoped that in Marco's list of *Lochac* products there would have been one which would have proved diagnostic of a particular location. Although in the event this hope was not realized the implications of the several items still merit consideration. The emphasis on gold in both *Lochac* and *Laue* has been remarked on above. Placer deposits of this metal occur in considerable quantities in the coastal zone north of the Kapuas river, that is within the area where Pires and sixteenth century European cartographers located *Laue*<sup>54</sup>. In Thailand, by contrast, although placer gold has been reported in twenty-eight of the seventy čhangwats, generally speaking resources are rather limited. Moreover, as far as I have been able to ascertain,

---

<sup>53</sup> *Yüan Shih*, chüan 15, f. 10 recto; chüan 16, f. 9 verso; chüan 19, f. 4 recto and 5 verso; chüan 20, f. 1 recto.

<sup>54</sup> The extent of these deposits was amply attested in the nineteenth century when some thirty thousand Chinese, who were exploiting not only the placer gold but also the reefs in the hinterland of Pontianak, took over control of the countryside and constituted themselves an *imperium in imperio*.



there is no extant tradition associating Lopburī (*Lvo*) with gold production<sup>55</sup>. The nearest significant deposit is the Krabin lode in Changwat Pračhinburi<sup>56</sup>, but there is no evidence of this having been worked in early times. The only possible conclusion is that the Polan emphasis on the abundance of gold in *Lochac*, while not conclusive, favours a location in western Kalimantan.

The mention of *porcelaine*<sup>57</sup> in connexion with *Lochac* deserves special comment. The basic meaning of the term, and the one intended in the present context, is "cowry"<sup>58</sup> and, not surprisingly, Pelliot did not fail to recall the long history of cowry currency in Thailand. Some fifty years after Polo dictated his account of *Lochac* Wang Ta-yüan (1350) remarked that the people of \**Lâ-yuk* "conducted their trade with cowries (*pa-tzū*)<sup>[30]</sup> instead of coins"<sup>59</sup>. A century later Ma Huan, perhaps influenced by Wang's remark, wrote in his *Ying-yai sheng-lan*<sup>[32]</sup> that the inhabitants of *Hsien-lo* "used cowries in their trade transactions just as [we use] copper cash"<sup>60</sup>, and FEI Hsin in 1436 copied Wang's sentence with only minor variations into his *Hsing-*

<sup>55</sup> The corpus of legend which associates the city of Uthong (= Source of Gold) with the Suwanp'umi (= *Suvannabhūmi* [Pāli] = Land of Gold) of earlier times is of no significance. *Suvannabhūmi* (or *Suvarṇadvīpa* [Skt.]) was a legendary name claimed by many South-East Asian cities and polities and, in any case, myths pertaining to the precious metal are so interwoven into the folklore of the region that early writings which mention it can hardly ever be accepted at their face value. Of course, it is not impossible that Polo's informants were repeating myths which they had heard from the local inhabitants rather than reporting an attested mineral occurrence.

<sup>56</sup> Glen F. BROWN, Saman BURAVAS, Jumchet CHARALJAVANAPHET, Nitipat JALICHANDRA, William D. JOHNSTON, Jr., Vija SRESTHAPUTRA, and George TAYLOR, Jr., *Geologic reconnaissance of the mineral deposits of Thailand*, Geological Survey Bulletin 984 (United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1951), pp. 69—70.

<sup>57</sup> *porcellane* in Z, L, and LT; *porcelane* in Z and LT; *porcellana* in R; *pourcelaines* in FA<sup>1</sup> [MS. fr. 5631 in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, a fourteenth-century text], FA<sup>2</sup> [MS. fr. 2810 in the same library; c. 1400], FA<sup>3</sup> [MS. 3511 in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal; c. 1500], FA<sup>4</sup> [M. 723 in the J. Pierpont Morgan Library, New York; c. 1400], and FB; *porzelane* and *porzellana* in various Venetian recensions (V, VA, VB); *porciellane* in two Tuscan recensions (TA<sup>1</sup> and TA<sup>2</sup>); and *porzellane de mar* in VA<sup>1</sup> [an early fourteenth-century Venetian text, now MS. 3999 in the Bibl. Casanatense in Rome].

<sup>58</sup> Vide PELLIOU's two magnificent expositions in *Notes on Marco Polo*, vol. 1, pp. 531—563 and vol. 2, pp. 805—812. Derivative meanings of *porcelaine* included "chinaware" and "mother-of-pearl vases", and, presumably by etymological convergence, "purslane".

<sup>59</sup> WANG Ta-yüan, *Tao-i chih-lüeh*, edited and annotated by FUJITA Toyohachi in *Hsiieh-t'ang Ts'ung-k'e*<sup>[31]</sup>, f. 32 verso.

<sup>60</sup> W. W. ROCKHILL, "Notes on the relations and trade of China with the Eastern Archipelago and the coasts of the Indian Ocean during the fourteenth century", *T'oung Pao*, vol. 16 (1915), p. 102.

*ch'a sheng-lan*<sup>[33] 61</sup>. This in turn was copied into the *Shu-yü chou-tzū lu* by YEN Ts'ung-chien<sup>[34] 62</sup> and more or less similar remarks on the cowry currency of Thailand found their way into CHENG Hsiao's *Huang-Ming ssü-i k'ao*<sup>[37] 63</sup> of 1564, MAO Jui-cheng's *Huang-Ming hsiang-hsü lu*<sup>[38] 64</sup> of 1629, WANG Ch'i's *Hsü Wen-hsien t'ung-k'ao*<sup>[39] 65</sup>, and Lu Ying-yang's *Kuang-yü chi*<sup>[40] 66</sup> of 1600.

Pelliot incorporated this Thai tradition of cowry money into his theory of the location of *Lochac*<sup>67</sup>, but I think that he may have been a little hasty in adducing such evidence in support of his argument. It is perhaps worth while to examine the precise wording of Polo's text. The *F* recension reads simply, *Et de ceste reigne vont tou//tes les porcelaine [sic] que s'espenent en toutes provences, com jeo vos ai contés* (And from this kingdom go all the cowries which are spent in all the provinces, as I have told you). These previously mentioned "provinces" are *Toloman* (< T'u-lao Man<sup>[41]</sup> or T'u-la Man<sup>[42]</sup> = the T'u-lao or T'u-la barbarians of north-eastern Yün-nan)<sup>68</sup>, *Caugigu* (< Chiao-chih Kuo = the Vietnamese State centred on the Tong-King lowland)<sup>69</sup>, *Amu* (= An-nam > \*Annā > \*Aman > \*Amau > \*Amu)<sup>70</sup>, and *Bangala* (= Bengal)<sup>71</sup>, and patently reflect the extent of territory intended in Polo's original dictation. However, in some of the Court French recensions a copyist has changed the sense to make *Lochac* a supplier of cowries to "all the other [Z: an addition which does not significantly change the sense of the passage] provinces of the world [FB]", which is clearly nonsense. Pelliot interpreted Marco's presumed original phrasing as a statement to the effect that the cowries used in Yün-nan and neighbouring territories came

<sup>61</sup> ROCKHILL, *op. cit.*, p. 105. There is a probable clerical error in FEI Hsin's text when he equates 10,000 cowries with 20 taels (*liang*)<sup>[34]</sup> in *Chung-t'ung*<sup>[35]</sup> paper money, whereas WANG Ta-yüan had written 24 taels. There is a discussion of the real value of this coinage in PELLIOU, *Notes*, vol. 1, p. 552 *et seq.*, where later European references to the Thai cowry currency are also examined.

<sup>62</sup> Chüan 8, f. 12 recto.

<sup>63</sup> Kuo-hsüeh wen-k'u edition, chüan 1, f. 63.

<sup>64</sup> Edition of the National Library of Pei-p'ing, chüan 4, f. 16 verso.

<sup>65</sup> Chüan 236, f. 2 verso.

<sup>66</sup> Chüan 24, f. 11 recto.

<sup>67</sup> PELLIOU, *Notes*, vol. 1, p. 552.

<sup>68</sup> BENEDETTO, *Il Milione*, p. 127.

<sup>69</sup> *op. cit.*, p. 125.

<sup>70</sup> *op. cit.*, p. 126.

<sup>71</sup> *op. cit.*, p. 125.

- |                      |         |        |                |
|----------------------|---------|--------|----------------|
| 33. 費信, 星槎勝覽         | 34. 兩   | 35. 中統 | 36. 嚴從簡, 殊域周咨錄 |
| 37. 鄭曉, 皇明四夷考 (國學文庫) |         |        | 38. 茅瑞徵, 皇明象胥錄 |
| 39. 王圻, 續文獻通考        |         |        | 40. 陸應陽, 廣輿記   |
| 41. 禿/土老蠻            | 42. 禿刺蠻 |        |                |

mainly from *Lochac*, which he located in the lower Čhao Phraya valley<sup>72</sup>. Even if *Lochac* had been situated in present-day Thailand there could be no question of the shells having been produced there in quantities sufficient to sustain a currency. Such a currency can only be operated in areas which are fairly distant from sources of supply, in other words where new coin does not lie ready for the picking on local beaches. Several different species of *Cypraea* have on occasion been pressed into service as counters of exchange but only two, *C. moneta*, Linn. and, to a lesser extent, *C. annulus*, Linn., have ever constituted fully operative currencies. These species occur in adequate quantities in only three regions: on the Maldive coasts, on the shores of equatorial East Africa, and in the eastern sectors of the Malay world. In fact, Thailand has traditionally imported her cowries from the Maldives (*Cypraea moneta*), and occasionally from the Moluccas and the Philippines (*Cypraea annulus*)<sup>73</sup>. Pelliot was aware of this fact, and argued that *Lochac* was merely the transshipment point for cowries from the Indian Ocean and the islands of South-East Asia which were then traded northwards to Yün-nan. But, as we have seen, cowries have been collected in quantity round the Philippine and Indonesian coasts. Both Schneider and Jackson, authors of detailed monographs on the occurrence and use of cowries, associate them specifically with Kalimantan<sup>74</sup>. Moreover, the latter writer observed, without citing his source, that they were taken as ballast by vessels sailing from Kalimantan to Ayutthaya<sup>75</sup>. Finally, it must surely be significant that the Thai word for *Cypraea* (*biā*: cp. Lao *biā hói*) is closely related to the Malay name (romanized by English students as *bea*, but written *biya* in the modified Arabic script). It is *a priori* unlikely that the Malays, inhabiting a region which was

<sup>72</sup> PELLIOU, *Notes*, vol. 1, p. 552. For a variety of reasons PELLIOU discounted the other countries mentioned above. There is, for example, no independent confirmatory evidence that a cowry currency ever existed in *Caugigu* or *Amu*, both of which names related to the Viêt territories of the time, so it is to be presumed that POLO was in fact referring to the cowry money which circulated in Yün-nan (including the T'u-lao Man territories) and along its southern borders. Bengal was grouped with these regions only because Marco had acquired his information about that country when he was in Yün-nan and at the same time as he had heard about the other cowry coinages.

<sup>73</sup> SIMON DE LA LOUBÈRE, *Description du Royaume de Siam*, vol. 2 (first published in 1691: Amsterdam reprint, 1714), pp. 222–223; DOMINGO NAVARRETE [*Tratados historicos, politicos, ethicos y religiosos de la monarchia de China* (Madrid, 1676), p. 61]; and NICOLAS GERVAISE, *Histoire naturelle et politique du Siam* (Paris, 1688), p. 152. At an earlier date, 1609, ANTONIO DE MORGÁ had noticed that *siguei* (= Tagal *sigay* = cowry) were exported from the Philippines to both Siam and Cambodia [*Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*. Translation by H.E.J. STANLEY, (Hakluyt Society, London, 1868), p. 285]. Mgr. PALLEGOUX did remark that, "Les petits coquillages appelés *porcelaine* . . . se trouvent en abondance sur les bancs de sable" bordering the Gulf of Siam, but made no reference to their transshipment northwards. In any case his statement must, in the light of Siamese imports of cowries from the Maldives and the Malay world, be understood in a comparative context [Vide *Description du Royaume Thai ou Siam*, vol. 1 (Violet et Cie., Lagny, 1854), p. 196].

<sup>74</sup> OSKAR SCHNEIDER, *Muschelgeld-Studien*. Nach dem hinterlassenen Manuskript bearbeitet von CARL RIBBE (Ernst Engelmann's Nachfg., Dresden, 1905), pp. 102, 107, 110, and 118; J. WILFRID JACKSON, *Shells as evidence of the migrations of early culture* (at the University Press, Manchester, 1917), p. 171.

<sup>75</sup> *ibid.*

a major source of cowries, would have borrowed the name used by the Thai in territories where the shells occurred in much reduced quantities. Presumably the loan was from Malay to Thai, following the direction of the cowry trade. In short, Polo's remarks on the importance of cowries in *Lochac*, while not diagnostic of a specific location, do not exclude a site in Kalimantan. Pelliot's argument, which relates all the cowry references to Yün-nan and neighbouring territories and which plausibly views a state in the lower Chao Phraya valley as the intermediary between producing and consuming regions, is, like so many of Pelliot's theses, rendered intellectually attractive by reason of its parsimony and coherence, but this inherent reasonableness is achieved by construing Polo's phrases as referring exclusively to what we may call the northern Indochinese cowry complex. But the phrases themselves are neutral and may be adduced in support of the production of cowries in *Laue* (*Lawak*) equally as readily as of their transshipment through *Lvo*.

The other natural products of *Lochac* afford even less reason for dogmatism. The *berçi domesce* (no doubt correctly as *berçi* in *F*, *L*, and *Z*)<sup>76</sup> is the *verzino dimestico* or "cultivated brazil-wood" which PEGALOTTI distinguished from *verzino salvatico* (lit. = wild brazil-wood)<sup>77</sup>. Brazil-wood (modern trade-name = sappan[wood] < Malay *sěpang*: cp. Khmer *sbañ* and Thai *fang*) is a small, prickly dye-bearing tree, which ranges from India throughout South-East Asia, and it is this commodity to which Pelliot, Moule, and virtually all previous investigators have considered Polo to have been referring. In Malabar in recent times brazil-wood has been both cultivated and exploited in its wild state<sup>78</sup>, and Marco himself is usually considered to have described a process of cultivation in *Lāmuri*<sup>79</sup> in north-west Sumatra (see below). However, these authors have all been puzzled by the *addendum* in a Venetian version (*VA*) of the *F* recension that the fruits of the *berçi* "are like lemons and are very good". RAMUSIO's Italian translation is more explicit, adding that these fruits are good to eat. By common consent Marco was in grievous error in making this reference to the alleged edibility of the fruits of brazil-wood. Nevertheless, I doubt if we are here dealing with an

<sup>76</sup> Also *berci* in *TA*<sup>1</sup>, *Z*, and *R*; *berer* [*de mastica*] in *LT*; *berzi* in *VA*; *birci* and *lurci* in *P*; *oro dimesticho* in *TA*<sup>1</sup>; *verçi* in *L*; *verzi* in *L*, *V*, and *VB*; *verzin* and *verzino* in *R*.

<sup>77</sup> Allan EVANS, *La pratica della mercatura*. Medieval Academy of America (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1936), pp. 295 and 296.

<sup>78</sup> YULE, *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, vol. 2, p. 380; but in connexion with the following argument note that the trees required some fourteen or fifteen years to reach maturity.

<sup>79</sup> Polo's dictation was probably *Lambri*, which occurs in *L*, *LT*, *P*, *TA*<sup>1</sup>, *VL*, *Z*, *R*, and some other recensions. *VB* reads *abraan* and *lanbren*, *F* and *VA* *labri*, *VA* and *Z* *lanbri*. For recent succinct summaries of references to this kingdom see PELLIOU, *Notes*, vol. 2, pp. 761—762, and WOLTERS, *Early Indonesian commerce*, pp. 178—179.

instance of textual corruption<sup>80</sup>, and certainly not with a misunderstanding by Polo himself. At the conclusion of the passage on *Lāmūrī* already mentioned he remarked,

*Et si vos di tout voiremant que nos en aportames de celle seme[n]se a Venese et le seminares sor la terre; si vos di qu'il n'i nasqui noiant. E ce avint por [le] leu froit<sup>81</sup>.*

Moreover I tell you quite truly that we brought away some of that [said: FB] seed [of the brazil: FB] to Venese and sowed it on the ground. Yet I tell you that it did not grow there at all; and [I believe: VB] this came about through the cold position, [because they had not hot ground, even very hot: VA] [and the seeds died: VB]<sup>82</sup>.

It is evident that, although the attempt to grow the seeds in Venice was unsuccessful, Marco was not unfamiliar with the plant and was certainly likely to have known if its fruits were edible or not. And, despite the use of the dye culinarily as a colouring agent and medicinally as an emmenagogue, there is no question of any part of *Caesalpinia sappan* being eaten. The clue to the resolution of this apparent paradox lies, I think, in Polo's account of the cultivation of this so-called brazil-wood in *Lāmūrī*.

*Et de[ll] berçi vos di que il le seminent; e, quant il est nes en petite verge, il le cavent; e le plantent en autre leu. Et iluec le laissent por trois anz et puis les cavent con toute // les rais<sup>83</sup>.*

And of brazil I tell you that they sow it and when it is grown into a little twig they dig it up and plant it [again: VA] in another place; and there they leave it [to grow: FB] for [the space of: VB] three years, and then they dig it up with all the roots [and plant it again several times: VB]. [And so they sell it: L]<sup>84</sup>.

The transplanting of a crop in this manner is a typical legacy of the agricultural techniques of the Old Planter culture of South-East Asia but it is quite unsuitable for the propagation and exploitation of *Caesalpinia sappan*. In fact, what is here described is almost certainly the garden cultivation of *Morinda citrifolia*, Linn., var. *bracteata*, known in the Malay-speaking parts of Sumatra as *mēkudu* (cp. Peninsular Malay *mēngkudu*). It is a small tree grown in villages throughout both mainland and archipelagic South-East Asia and bearing fruits of ellipsoidal shape and greyish white colour, which

<sup>80</sup> Except in the case of three fifteenth-century Latin texts [MS. *barberiniano lat.* 2687 in the Bibl. Vaticana (LA<sup>1</sup>); MS. *lat.* 18770 of the *Staatsbibl.*, Munich (LA<sup>2</sup>); MS. 121 in the Bibl. Civ. of Luxemburg (LA<sup>3</sup>)], in which the so-called brazil is confused with cowries:

(LA<sup>1</sup>) *ibi nascantur quedam animalia que domesticantur et sunt similes hominibus . . . nascantur etiam ibi portulace tante grossitudinis in stipite, quod in ligni duritiem conversi stipites earum fiunt ex eis pulcerime scutelle utiles ad pulmentum ministrandum* (LA<sup>2,3</sup>: ad comedendum). *Ex his etiam portulacis siccat* (LA<sup>2,3</sup>: *secatur*) *et scinditur ad formam denarii moneta pluribus provinciis usualis* [from MOULE & PELLIOU, *Marco Polo*, vol. 1, p. 369, note 4].

<sup>81</sup> BENEDETTO, *Il Milione*, p. 174.

<sup>82</sup> MOULE and PELLIOU, *Marco Polo*, vol. 1, p. 376.

<sup>83</sup> BENEDETTO, *Il Milione*, p. 174.

<sup>84</sup> MOULE and PELLIOU, *Marco Polo*, vol. 1, p. 376.



presumably conjured up for Marco a memory of lemons. Although they have a rancid smell, especially when ripe, it is reported from Indochina that they are eaten with a flavouring of salt<sup>85</sup>. In the Malay world the fruit, often in an over-ripe state, is, as far as I have been able to ascertain, used only for medicinal purposes, notably as an emmenagogue<sup>86</sup>. The point is that the fruit is eaten for one purpose or another. Moreover, the root bark yields a dye which gives permanent shades of red, purple, and chocolate and which was formerly much used in the Javanese batik industry. The indigenous names for *Morinda* are everywhere distinct from those for *Caesalpinia*, so we must assume that it was Marco himself who regarded the plant — with which, as we have seen, he was familiar at first-hand — as a species of brazil-wood. It is interesting, though, that Pegalotti also subscribed to this botanical error, which was apparently common among early European travellers in South-East Asia. Where and how it originated is unknown. In any case, like the true brazil-wood, *Morinda* is so widely diffused throughout South-East Asia that it is of no diagnostic value so far as the location of *Lochac* is concerned.

In one of the Venetian recensions (*VB*) musk and ebony (*muschio et ha[haj]no*) are added to the list of natural products of *Lochac*. In view of the restriction of this reference to a single manuscript tradition Benedetto is probably correct in regarding *muschio* as a mislection of *domesce* carelessly copied as *do mesce*<sup>87</sup>. If so, then it was an error which had become an integral part of the recension by the middle of the fifteenth century, for *VB* was written in 1446. Even if the reference were authentic it could not have been concerned with true musk, the secretion of an accessory sexual gland of the male of *Moschus moschiferus*, Linn., a deer of Central Asian habitat. Central Thailand lies well beyond the southernmost range of this animal, though there is evidence that musk was traded southwards from Yün-nan at least as early as the ninth century A. D.<sup>88</sup> If the Polan text be interpreted at its face

<sup>85</sup> I. H. BURKILL, *A dictionary of the economic products of the Malay Peninsula*, vol. 2 (Crown Agents for the Colonies on behalf of the Governments of the Straits Settlements & the Federated Malay States, London, 1935), p. 1493.

<sup>86</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>87</sup> BENEDETTO, *Il Libro di Messer Marco Polo*, p. 433.

<sup>88</sup> In the *Man Shu* (chüan 6, p. 162 of Hsiang Ta's edition, Pei-ching, 1962), compiled between A.D. 860 and 865, FAN Ch'ö<sup>[43]</sup> mentioned a mart called \**D'ai-ngiën K'ung*<sup>[44]</sup> (Ta-yin K'ung) at which southern traders from regions such as Java (\**Dz'ja-b'ua*: She-p'ö) and Kalimantan (\**B'uat-niei*; *P'o-ni*)<sup>[45]</sup> obtained gold and musk. The location of \**D'ai-ngiën K'ung* would have remained very uncertain had not the Sung encyclopaedia *T'ai-p'ing Yü-lan* [chüan 981, f. 5 verso] preserved a passage from an earlier work, the *Nan-i Chih*<sup>[47]</sup>, which ascribed the same market, though without assigning it a name, to \**Nâm-tsjäu*<sup>[48]</sup> (Nan-Chao). Note: the *Man*

43. 樊綽, 蠻書

44. 大銀孔

46. 勃泥

47. 南夷志

48. 南詔

value the substance in question was most likely to have been civet-musk, obtained from one of the civet-cats. In *Lvo* this could have been *Viverra zibetha*, Linn., and in *Laue V. tangalunga*, Grey. Just over half a century earlier CHAO Ju-kua, Superintendent of Maritime Trade (*Shih-po Shih* <sup>[50]</sup>) in Fu-chien, had reported that *P'o-ni* <sup>[51]</sup> (= Brunei) was "the only foreign country in which *wu-na ch'i* <sup>[52]</sup> (= civet) was very abundant". In view of the dubious reliability of the VB recension in this matter we shall not elaborate on the implications of this remark <sup>89</sup>.

It is difficult to explain away as a copyist's error the reference to ebony which is bracketed with musk in VB, but its occurrence in a single manuscript tradition is not such as to inspire confidence. In 1225 Chao Ju-kua had listed *wu-men tzü* <sup>[53]</sup> (= ebony) among the products of *Tan-ma-ling* <sup>[54]</sup> (= *Tāmbra-līṅga*), a territory on the isthmian tract of the Malay Peninsula <sup>90</sup>, where it would have been obtained from *Diospyros clavigera*, C. B. Clarke or *D. lucida*, Wall. It is probable that during the eleventh and twelfth centuries the territory of *Lvo* had extended southwards to include part of the Malayan isthmus, so that an apologist for a peninsular location for *Lochac* might be tempted to argue that Polo had picked up a fragment of popular information from the past and applied it uncritically to his own century. However, ebony from one or other species of *Diospyros* is found throughout South-East Asia and any argument applicable to Thailand is equally applicable to Kalimantan. The character and reliability of the sole text to mention this wood does not justify an extended discussion of this point.

The mention of elephants (*leofant* : F; *elephantes* : Z) in *Lochac* deserves comment for the natural range of this very distinctive animal did not extend to Kalimantan or Java. But I do not think great importance should be attached to this fact for there are numerous records of elephants being imported into both those countries for use in the rulers' courts.

---

*Shu* was apparently lost during the Ming dynasty, but the substances of its contents was preserved under discrete rubrics in the *Yung-lo Ta-tien*, a massive encyclopaedia compiled under the direction of Hsien Chin in 1407. In 1773 an anonymous scholar attempted to reconstitute the original work by recombining the relevant passages from the *Yung-lo Ta-tien* which, in accordance with the information preserved in the *Literary Catalogue of the New Tang History*, he arranged in ten chapters. The reconstituted work was printed by the Wu-ying Tien <sup>[49]</sup> in 1774.

<sup>89</sup> It is just possible, though much less probable, that the musk-like substance referred to was *gaharu laut* (Malay) or "sea gaharu" the product of *Excoecaria agallocha*, Linn., that is muskwood, or as RUMPF called it, bastard aloes-wood, a small tree found on the coasts of the Indian Ocean from tropical Africa to Australia. Although formerly used locally wherever it occurred, it is doubtful if the diseased aromatic wood of this tree (as opposed to the sound wood which was used for general carpentry purposes) occurred in sufficient quantities to sustain a regular trade.

<sup>90</sup> Vide O. W. WOLTERS, "Tāmbra-līṅga", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 21, pt. 3 (1958), pp. 587—607.

---

49. 武英殿

50. 市舶使

51. 勃泥

52. 臘納騰

53. 烏楠子

54. 單馬令

In seeking a location for *Lochac* I think that, in the light of our present knowledge of South-East Asian history, it is necessary to evaluate only two of the numerous hypotheses so far advanced, namely Pelliot's identification with *Lvo* in present-day central Thailand and the alternative site in western Kalimantan suggested in the preceding pages. Phonetically there is not much to choose between these theories, though the latter requires fewer supporting assumptions. From the point of view of locational data a Kalimantan location accords more closely with Polo's sailing direction of *por sceloc*, but it requires that the description of *Lochac* be regarded as a digression. A site in southern Thailand, by contrast, would allow *Lochac* to be fitted into a coherent itinerary, but only at the cost of a gross distortion of the text. As a matter of fact Pelliot did not adopt this expedient but also supposed the *Lochac* excursus to be a digression<sup>91</sup>, so that he and I are in agreement in regarding Marco — or perhaps more likely Rustichello — as having taken up the narrative from the Kundur Islands. This necessitates the assumption that a well intentioned but ill informed copyist has at some time substituted *Lochac* for *Sondur et Condur* at this point in the text in the same way as he has substituted Java for *Campā* after the previous digression. The stipulated course of *D milles por midi to l'isle de Pentan*<sup>92</sup> (= Bintan) is then not too gross a distortion of the required direction, although the true distance is somewhat underestimated. The possibility of amending *por sceloc* to read *por garbin* in order to sustain the argument for a location on the Malayan isthmus would be gratuitous unless it could be supported by virtually incontrovertible phonetic or cultural evidence, and such an expedient is explicitly rejected in both interpretations. So far as Polo's list of natural products is at issue, none is diagnostic of a specific site, but the references to gold and cowries in my opinion tend to favour Kalimantan rather than Thailand. The mention of musk is of dubious authenticity but, for what it is worth, would also seem to point to Kalimantan. Ebony, *berçi*, and elephants are of indeterminate significance in the present context. On this accounting the balance of probability would seem to incline in favour of a location for *Lochac* in western Kalimantan. However, when the available evidence is so meagre and ambivalent an arithmetical totting up of probabilities cannot lead to definitive certainty, and this paper does not attempt to prove a Kalimantan site. Rather it is designed to introduce a new element into, and consequently to re-open, a problem which has come to be considered as solved, and the reader is left to balance the probabilities and imponderables in his own mind.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. PELLIOU'S explicit statement to this effect in *Notes*, vol. 2, p. 769.

<sup>92</sup> This is the reading of VB, Z, and R: *pantayn* and *plantayn* occur in FB; *pantein* and *pontain* in FA; *penta* and *pitam* in TA<sup>4</sup>; *pentai* in VB; *pentaim* in VA; *pentain* in F and L; *pentam*, *petain*, and *petam* in TA<sup>1</sup>; *pentay*, *pentayn*, and *pontauich* in LT; *pentera* and *pepetan* in VL; *pentham* in P.