

owing to the encroachments of the river, is disappearing (cf. *Ta-Ch'ing i-t'ung chih*, 67, 3 a; *Ch*, III, 63). The *Yung-lo ta-tien*, 19426, 7 a, 9 b, names our Kua-chou, but, in the list of relays which I have translated elsewhere (see «Cingiu»), writes 瓜步 Kua-pu. There have been two *chên*, one of Kua-chou, the other of Kua-pu, but I am not prepared to discuss the more or less conflicting data which have been collected about them in *Tz'ü yüan* (cf. *Ch*, III, 63) and in *Timing ta-tz'ü-tien*, 237, 238.

Stan. GUYARD (in REINAUD, *Géogr. d'Aboulféda*, II, II, 125) identified Abū-'l-Fidā's خاجو Hājū with Polo's «Caigiu» = Kua-chou. This is certainly wrong, but Abū-'l-Fidā's data are contradictory. The name may be borrowed from the Hājū of the *Hudūd al-'Ālam*, and this actually is a Kua-chou or «Gourd District», but the well-known one of western Kan-su (*Mi*, 85, 233).

97. CAIL

cael R

cail F, Fr, t, FA, FB, VB, Z,
V, Lcauer TA³cayl FA^t
chail Vchauer TA¹, TA³

ciail LT

Now the poor village of old Kāyal, Palayakāyal, on the Tāmraparnī river, about a mile and a half from its mouth; cf. *Y*, II, 372-373; *Y*¹, III, 231; *Hobson-Jobson*², 140; ELLIOT, *Hist. of India*, I, 72-73; DAMES, *Barbosa*, I, 190; II, 122-124; *Fe*, 530. The name is said to represent the Tamil *kāyal*, «lagoon», «backwater».

Polo's form is in agreement with Conti's «Cahila» (Latin form, hence the Genoese Map's «Caila»; HALLBERG, 93), V. da Gama's «Cael», Giovanni da Empoli's «Gael» (read «Cael»?), Varthema's «Chayl», Barbosa's «Cael», Canerio's «Cailo» (1502). Rašidu-'d-Dīn, 'Abdu-'r-Razzāq, Sulayman al-Mahri, Sidi 'Alī Čālābī write قایل Qāil (cf. *Fe*, 530), which there is no reason to read Qāyal as is done by FERRAND in *JA*, 1922, II, 93 («Kāyāl», given there twice, is wrong in any case). And the spelling «Koil» of the Ordnance Map of India, denounced by CALDWELL, is perhaps not so wrong. There must have been a pronunciation *kāil* of *kāyal*, or the modern form Kāyal may be due to popular etymology.

The pronunciation Kāil, established by Mussulman and Western sources, is moreover confirmed by Chinese transcriptions. It is said in *YS*, 210, 7 b, that in 1281, the Sultan (*suant'an* = **soltan*) of Ma'abar and his four brothers, intending to invade Quilon, «assembled on the territory of Chia-i» (Kāil; 皆聚加一地; the name has been misunderstood in *Pa*, 604, and *TP*, 1914, 431). The kingdom of 加異勒 Chia-i-lo (Kāil) was visited by Chêng Ho in 1409-1411, and its king, in 1411, is called Ko-pu-chê-ma (cf. *TP*, 1933, 289; 1934, 294). The names of Ko-ku-lo and Ku-lo, mentioned in *Y*¹, III, 118, have nothing to do with Kāil.