

of Chinese transcriptions of the 8th cent.; in spite of FERRAND (*Fe*, 14-17), I still believe that *Kundurung is the old name of Pulo Condor, not of Cape Saint-Jacques. Polo's Condur simply shows that the modern Malay form was already current at the end of the 13th cent.

So much for Polo's Condur, but what of Sondur? It occurred already to YULE that Sondur must be the same name which appears as *صندر فولات* *Şundur-fülât* in the early Arabic narratives, and I think he is right, but the case is complex and requires some explanation.

FERRAND considers that *Şundur-fülât*, which for a long time he transcribed *Čundur-fülât*, is Pulo Condor, and, although he never said so, I think that is what prevented him from admitting that Kundurung was Pulo Condor. The fact is that the Arabic relations first speak of Kundurung, then of Champa, and afterwards of *Şundur-fülât*, so that *Şundur-fülât* cannot be for them the same as Kundurung. As to *Şundur-fülât*, FERRAND has explained it as a Persian plural of an arabized *Şundur-pūlāu*, *Şundur* itself being the outcome of *Kundur* > *K¹undur* > *Čundur* > *Şundur* (*Fe*, ix, 2; *JA*, 1919, i, 328). But he did not explain why *k* became *č* in *Kundur*, but remained *k*, at the same time, in *Kundurung*.

In *JRAS*, 1914, 496, BLAGDEN raised several objections to FERRAND's solution. 1. That in Malay *k*- does not change to *č*- in the initial position; 2. that in Malay and in Indonesian languages generally, *pulau* ought precede the name of the island, and not to follow it; 3. that, if *Şundur-fülât* is Pulo Condor, there is no reason why the Arabic travellers, on their way to China, should go to *Şundur-fülât* after leaving Champa.

On the first point raised by BLAGDEN, I am not in a position to make any definite statement. To the second, some answer can be given. It is true that the usual Malay, and generally Indonesian, construction requires *Pulau Kundur*, but we know of other cases when *pulau* has been transferred to the end of the compound. The name of the island off the coast of Annam called *Culao Cham* on our maps means «Cham island», *culao* being Cham *palau*, *kalău*, *kulau*, «island» (Annamese *cù lao* is borrowed from the Cham), identical with Mal. *pulau*; but the name is *Chan-pu-lao* (= *Čam-pulau*) in Chinese texts of the 8th cent., *Chan-pi-lo* (**Cam-pilo*) in the Ming period (cf. *BEFEO*, iv, 198-201; *JA*, 1919, i, 323); I may add «*Champiloo*» in F. M. Pinto (cf. COLIN-PASTELLS, *Labor Evangelica*, i, 364³). Another example is provided by Polo's «**Gaumispolā*», the «*Gomispolā*» of other travellers, and the *Jāmis-fulah* (= *Gāmis-pulā*) of Arabic texts, which is «*Pulo Gomme*» etc. of ancient maps. So the order of the words is not an obstacle to the explanation of *fülât* in *Şundur-fülât* with the Mal. *pulau*.

The geographical objection is of much greater weight. All Arabic texts place *Şundur-fülât* after Champa on the way to China, while Pulo Condor is passed before reaching Champa. FERRAND himself seems to have later yielded tacitly to this argument since in his *Instructions nautiques*, III, 166-167, speaking again of the same Arabic texts, he gives the island of Hainan as the equivalent of *Şundur-fülât*. I also think that *Şundur-fülât* is not Pulo Condor, so that nothing more stands in our way to identify with Pulo Condor the *Kundurung* of the 8th-10th cents.

But that does not mean, in my opinion at least, that *Şundur-fülât* is Hainan. Without being dogmatic about it, I think that *Kundurung* is Pulo Condor, that the early Arab travellers mean by Champa the coast of Binh-dinh with Quinhon harbour, that their *Şundur-fülât* is *Culao*