

“The port where Ibn Batuta landed is called in the correct reading *Sumathrah*.....in Lee’s translation the name is given incorrectly as *Mul-Jáva*.”

h. P. 890. “Passing hence (from Sumatra) our traveller *visited some of the Moluccas*; this is rendered certain by the fact that the author of these travels gives a pretty accurate description of the spice plants.”

i. Ib. “On his further travels Ibn Batuta after *seven days* arrived at the kingdom of *Tualijeh* . . .

j. Ib. . . “By which name only *Tonkin* can be meant. The inhabitants of this kingdom, on account of their vicinity, had many relations, both hostile and peaceful, with the Chinese.”

k. Ib. “In the Middle Kingdom, next to Zaitun the most important place of trade was the Port of *Sin-ossin* or *Sin-kalan*; this name must indicate Canton, which city stands on the river *Tshing-Kuang*, the form of which is tolerably echoed in the second reading of the name.”

It may be said that these errors are of trifling moment, and belong to a mere appendage of the subject of the book. But *noblesse oblige*; a work of such reputation as the *Indian Archaeologia* is referred to with almost as much confidence as the original authorities, and instances of negligence so thickly sown are a sort of breach of trust. Those already quoted are, all but one, within two pages. Going further we find others as remarkable:

l. P. 896. The name of one of the pepper ports on the coast of

both those translators take for Java Proper, is called *Mul-Java*, and *Jaonah* is found *absolutely nowhere* except in Lassen’s page.

h. There is *not one word* in the narrative about any such visit, or anything that can be so interpreted. As for the accuracy of his description of the spice plants, look at it!

i. The time in the narrative amounts to *seventy-one days* from *Mul-Java*, the last point of departure, to *Tawalisi*. There is nothing about seven days, any more than there is about the visit to the Spice Islands.

j. It is easy to settle difficult questions with a “can only,” but there is nothing to make it clear that *Tonkin* is meant, and strong reasons arise against that view. And absolutely *nothing* is said in the narrative about vicinity to the Chinese. It is only said that the king had frequent *naval* wars with the Chinese, a fact which rather argues an insular position.

k. *Sinkilan* is indeed *Canton*, but it is by sounder reasons than this that it is proved to be so. One does not see why foreigners should call *Canton* by the name of its river, if *Tshing-Kuang* be the name; neither is there any great resemblance in the words. But we have seen that *Sin-kalan* is merely the Persian translation of *Mahá-chín*, and has nothing to do with Chinese words.

Moreover *Sin-kalan* is not an alternative reading (*Lesart*) of *Sin-ossin* (*Sin-ul-Sin*), but an alternative name.

l. The real name in *Cosmas* (as found in *Montfaucon*) is however not *Panda-*