

the Ta-li kingdom. On the whole, MÜLLER's hypothesis finds, up to the present at least, no real support in the historical texts or in the vocabularies.

Rašidu-'d-Dīn speaks of the province of Qara-Ĵang which is called in Chinese 大呂 Dai-liu, meaning « Great Realm »; the Indians and Cashmirians call it كندار Kändār, which has the same meaning, and the Mussulmans قندهار Qandahār (cf. QUATREMÈRE, *Hist. des Mongols*, lxxxix, xciv; KLAPROTH, in *JA*, I [1828], 112-116; *Oh*, II, 317; *Y*, II, 72; *Y*<sup>1</sup>, III, 127). QUATREMÈRE and YULE felt that « Dai-liu » must have some connection with Ta-li. BLOCHET (*Bl*, II, 376), on the faith of Rašid's explanation « Great Kingdom », corrected Dai-liu to 大呂 Dai-kiu, which he interpreted as 大國 Ta-kuo, « Great Kingdom ». I do not favour this solution. In Rašid's nomenclature the Chinese *kuo*, « kingdom », occurs as *-gu* in Ĵimingu, « Japan », and as *-guh* (? or *guäh*) in KäfĴiguh (or *KäfĴiguäh*), Chiao-chih-kuo, Tonking, so that, even with BLOCHET's correction, the *-i-* of *kiu* in the would-be Dai-kiu is not accounted for. Moreover, Ta-kuo cannot be the specific name of any country in Chinese. I rather incline to see in Dai-liu a weakened pronunciation of \*Dai-li-gu = Ta-li-kuo, « Kingdom of Ta-li ». Rašid's explanation is true only so far as the *ta* of Ta-li means « great » in Chinese.

The « Indian » (*hindī*) name of Qara-Ĵang is written « Kandar » and « Qandar » by Rašid. It is certainly wrong to correct those forms to « Kandū » and « Qandū », as was done by BLOCHET (*Bl*, II, 365, 376). BLOCHET saw in « Kandū » Polo's « Gaindu » and, through an impossible jumble of Thai and Burmese forms, tried to explain « Gaindu » as also meaning « Great Kingdom ». But the latter meaning, given in QUATREMÈRE's translation, does not occur in BLOCHET's own text (*Bl*, II, 376, n. a) and seems to be a wrong reduplication of the gloss on Dai-liu. What Rašid really refers to is Kandar (or Gandar), the Indian form regularly derived from Gandhāra, and this is confirmed by what follows when he says that « we » (*i. e.* the Moslems) call it Qandahār. The name Qandahār has three main meanings (cf. YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*<sup>2</sup>, 154; HALLBERG, 109; *Mi*, 502) : (1) the port of Ghandhār in the gulf of Cambay; (2) Gandhāra, the well-known region of the upper Indus; (3) Candahar in western Afghanistan (in Fra Mauro's map, two at least of these « Candar » or « Chandaar » appear, one being « Chandaar mazor » and the other « Candar menor »; but owing to repetitions by a later [?] hand there are in fact five mentions of the name). A fourth must be added, which Rašid occasionally mixed up with the real Gandhāra, and that is the Ta-li kingdom (cf. YULE, in *JRAS*, NS, IV [1870], 354-356). In *BEFEO*, IV, 157-169, I have shown that not only the name of Gandhāra, but also many other names and legends had been carried from India to the Ta-li kingdom in the early Middle Ages and found pious, though fictitious, identifications in that region of south-western China. The Ta-li kingdom was a Buddhist kingdom, but it owed its Buddhism as much to direct propaganda from India and Burma as to the influence of Chinese Buddhism.

Under such circumstance, it is not surprising that the king of Ta-li should have borne an Indian title. Curiously enough, we do not find it, at least beyond question, in the documents referring to the history of the ancient Nan-chao kingdom, nor to that of the Ta-li kingdom before the Mongol conquest of 1253-1254. (For a possible mention under the rule of the Mêng family, cf. *BEFEO*, IV, 164; *TP*, 1904, 470; CHAVANNES's objections are weakened by the fact that the complete form *mo-ho-lo-ts'o*, and not only *mo-ho-ts'o*, is given in the 1880 edition of