

« Facfur »], and then semantic, and due to the influence on \*Mansūr of the true Mansūrah of III, 378-379). Down to the 16th cent., Fansūr is regularly mentioned as the place from which the best camphor, called *fansūrī*, came (cf. *Hobson-Jobson*<sup>2</sup>, 152; *Fe*, 696, 702; as usual with him, FERRAND read ص *ś* as *č*, which is an interpretation, not a transcription; *JA*, 1922, II, 72-73, 95; also *Hudūd-al-Ālam*, Pers. text, 14 *b*; *Mi*, 240-241). Fansūr is an arabicized form, and it is the one which has been used by Polo. Owing to errors in diacritical points, Fansūr and *fansūrī* have been variously altered, mostly into *qaīsūrī*, which has remained in use in India almost until our day (cf. *Hobson-Jobson*<sup>2</sup>, 151). But the fault has been long denounced, and ought not still to occur in GAY, *Glossaire archéologique*, I, 269; II, 256.

In 1904 (*BEFEO*, IV, 341), I considered as identical with Fansūr Chinese transcriptions of the 13th-15th cent. beginning with a *p*-. YULE (*Y*, II, 302) has quoted a form « Pansor » from Ibn Serapion, but this proves nothing, since the same letter is used both for *p*- and *f*- in Syriac; and in the Arabic translation of Ibn Serapion, the word is written « Faiśūr », a misreading instead of Fansūr (cf. *Fe*, 142). As to the identification of these forms in *p*- with Fansūr, FERRAND (*JA*, 1922, II, 72) has expressed doubts from a geographical point of view, and I have yielded to his arguments in *TP*, 1933, 331; but I think, at least in some cases, I must come back to my former opinion. With Chao Ju-kua's 賁 卒 Pin-su (*su* had a final *-t*; *HR*, 193, 194), the case is perfectly plain, since Pin-su is given as a great source of camphor; we must restore \*Pānsur = Pansur, the Fansūr of the Arabs. In 1349-1350, the 班 卒 Pan-tsu of the *Tao-i chih-lío* is more embarrassing, since the author represents it as a mountain «behind Lung-ya-mên» and, for him, Lung-ya-mên is the Straits of Singapore. ROCKHILL, while restoring the name into «Panchor?», thought of an identification with Batam of Bintan, south of the Straits (*TP*, 1915, 66, 133). On account of the name, I accepted in 1933 FERRAND's idea of the island («île»; «état» is a misprint in my note, and also «1413» for «1415») of Pančur on the north-eastern coast of Sumatra. In 1613, Godinho de EREDIA still knows another «Panchor» on the mainland, in the region of Malacca (L. JANSSEN, *Malaca*, Brussels, 1882, 11). The only characteristic feature in the *Tao-i chih-lío* is that the author, Wang Ta-yüan, ascribes to the inhabitants of Pan-tsu a wine of fermented rice called 明家 *ming-chia*, left without explanation by ROCKHILL. It recalls to some extent the *pao-lêng-chio* rice wine mentioned by Chou Ta-kuan in Cambodia, the second part of which must be Khmer *rañko*, now *añka*, «unhusked rice»; cf. *BEFEO*, XVIII, IX, 9; though the partial analogy may be fortuitous. But much in Wang Ta-yüan's notices is open to doubt; and here his Lung-ya-mên may be quite different from the Straits of Singapore, and refer to the south-western coast of Sumatra. There is in the *Ming shih* (324, 9 *b*; 326, 1 *a*) a mention of a state of 班 卒 兒 Pan-tsu-êrh, about 1415, and of a state of 古里 班 卒 Ku-li Pan-tsu, which sent an embassy in 1403-1424; nothing shows where they were located. But, on the Chinese map of the beginning of the 15th cent., we find on the south-western coast of Sumatra a place and a river Lung-ya-chia-mao, in which PHILLIPS has seen the city and the river of Indrapura, but they seem to be more to the north-west (Lung-ya-êrh-shan and Lung-ya-shan in PHILLIPS are misreadings; cf. *TP*, 1915, 127; 1933, 330), and still more to the north-west, north of the southern coast and about where we should place Baros, there is on the map a name Pan-tsu, written with the same characters as in the *Tao-i chih-lío* and in the *Ming shih*. Here \*Pantsur = Fansūr is surely meant, and the Lung-ya-mên of the *Tao-i chih-lío* has perhaps, in the present case,