Malabar is quoted from Cosmas Indico-pleustes (with a reference to Montfaucon, p. 337) as Pandapattana, a form which is made the basis of an etymology (as from the Pandiya kings).

m. P. 911. Lassen quotes the name applied to the Chinese by Theophylactus Simocatta (see the Essay at the beginning of this volume) as *Tengast*, citing the Bonn edition, p. 288.

n. In the appended tract on the Chinese and Arab knowledge of India, we have at p. 31 a statement that Ibn Batuta acquired the high favour of the then reigning Emperor of India, Muhammed Toghrul, of the Afghan dynasty of Lodi.

o. P. 84. "I will not omit to remark that Wilhelm von Rubruck, Jean du Plan Carpin, and Benedictus Polonius establish the fact that also, during the wide sway of the Mongol Emperor Jingis Khan and his successors, a commercial interchange existed between several of their provinces and India. The first of these pious envoys of the Roman court visited the Emperor Mangu Khan, who in 1248 was recognized as Supreme Khan of the whole empire; the second visited Kublai Khan, who from 1259 to 1296 wielded with vigorous hand the sceptre of his forefathers; the third belonged to

pattana but Pudopatana (Πουδοπάτανα), which is much more likely to be "Newcity," from the Tamul Pudu, "New," as in Pudu-cheri, commonly called Pondicherry. The port existed by the same name for a thousand years after Cosmas; see List of Malabar Ports, infra.

m. The name at p. 283 of the Bonn edition is not Tengast, but Taugast (Tau. $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau$). I have no longer access to the book, and I cannot say whether it is so differently written at p. 288. This change again (if it is such) favours an identification. The identification may probably be right, but would stand better on a sound bottom.

In the Corpus Byzant. Histor. the word is written Tavγàs, though the Latin version of the same has Taugast.

n. (1) Sultan Mahomed's name was not Togrul but Tughlak. Neither (2) was he in any sense of Afghan lineage; nor (3) did he belong to the dynasty of Lodi, which came a century after his time, with the Deluge between in the shape of Timur's invasion.

o. There are six errors in these few lines. (1) The mission of Rubruquis followed and did not precede, as is distinctly implied here, that of John of Plano Carpini. The former took place in 1253. (2) Rubruquis was not sent by the Roman Court, but by St. Lewis. (3) Plano Carpini and Bennet the Pole did not visit Kublai Khan, but Kuyuk Khan, and their travels took place in 1245-47, not after 1259 as is here im-(4) All the three monks (and all other Franciscans), were Fratres Minores, and not Bennet only as is here implied. (5) Bennet did not join Plano Carpini on a journey to Rome, but was picked up at Breslaw as an interpreter by the latter when on his way from the Pope at Lyons to the Khan at