

compared to the face of a *zāngi* (113, 3, and 177, 20). The meaning is confirmed in the second case by the variant Ḥabaš, « Abyssinian », of the Cairo ms.; the Uighur spelling *sānggi* or *sāngi* given in RADLOV's edition in Uighur letters (p. 131, 216) and in his dictionary (iv, 448) is a misreading, or a wrong form due to the late scribe who had to use the unfamiliar Uighur script. The transcription in Latin letters accompanying Radlov's translation gives *zāngi* (p. 337) and *sānggi* (p. 514); I have no doubt that the Cairo ms., written in Arabic script, correctly gives in the first passage *zāngi*, which RADLOV adopted; but RADLOV retained in the second passage the wrong form, *sānggi*, of the Uighur ms. (it ought, however, to be *sāngi* according to his edition of that ms. in Uighur script) because this time the ms. in Arabic script had *ḥabaš* instead of *zāngi*. We may safely conclude that in the 11th cent., the Turks of Central Asia had at least a scholarly knowledge of *zāngi* as a word meaning « negro ».

The same word occurs in Chinese sources. In 1904 (*BEFEO*, iv, 289-291) I called attention to a few texts mentioning slave boys and girls called 僧祇 *sēng-ch'i* (**səng-g'jie*) or 僧耆 *sēng-ch'i* (**səng-g'ji*) who had been sent as tribute by some Indonesian kingdoms: two *sēng-ch'i* girls in 724 by Śrīvijaya (= Palembang, or Palembang-Jambi; cf. *Hsin-T'ang shu*, 222 C, 4 a; *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, 971, 6 a; 975, 4 b); four *sēng-ch'i* boys in 813 (*Hsin-T'ang shu*, 222 C, 3 a; *T'ang hui yao*, 100, 2 b; in 815 according to *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, 972, 7 a) and two *sēng-ch'i* girls in 818 by Ho-ling (= Kalinga, Java; *T'ang hui yao*, 100, 2 b; *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, 972, 7 b). Already in 1904, I had identified these *sēng-ch'i* as *zāngi*; the solution has been accepted, and I do not think it can be doubted. There are, however, two difficulties. The first one is of a phonetic nature, which I failed to notice in 1904: *sēng-ch'i* normally renders an original **sāngi*, not *zāngi*. To account for such an anomaly, I can only suggest either that the Persian term reached China through intermediaries who had no *z* and pronounced it as *s*, or that the transcription was contaminated by the earlier existence of 僧祇 *sēng-ch'i* as a ready-made Buddhist term transcribing *sāṅghi*[ka] and entering into transcriptions based on Prakrit forms of *saṅkākṣika* and *asaṅkhyeya* (cf. ODA Tokuno's dictionary, 1072). But both explanations are mere hypotheses.

I alluded to the second difficulty in 1904: 僧耆 *sēng-ch'i* occurs in the 蠻書 *Man shu* of c. 860 (6, 6 b) as the name of a « tribe » which there is no apparent reason to locate as far away as Africa (cf. *BEFEO*, iv, 291). But in the *Études asiatiques* published in 1925 by the École Française d'Extrême-Orient (II, 261-263), I have since translated another text which must be mentioned in connection with that of the *Man-shu*. In one of the notes of his *I-ch'ieh ching yin-i*, completed in 817, Hui-lin speaks of the 崑崙 K'un-lun (**Kuən-luən*) or 骨論 Ku-lun (**Kuət-luən*) barbarians of the southern islands, very black, naked, capable of taming rhinoceroses and elephants and adds: « They are of several sorts: there are the 僧祇 *Sēng-ch'i*, the 突彌 T'u-mi (**D'uət-mjie*), the 骨堂 Ku-t'ang (**Kuət-d'âng*), the 閩蔑 Ko-mieh (**Kâp-miet*) and others; all are vile people, without rites or laws, living by pillage, and fond of eating men... Their language is irregular and different from that of the [other] barbarians. They are accomplished in going into water (= for diving into it) and [can remain in it] a whole day without dying ».

Of the different names occurring in Hui-lin's text, T'u-mi and Ku-t'ang are unknown, but Ko-mieh transcribes the name of the Khmêr or Cambodians, and K'un-lun is a general designation