

## 274. LOCHAC

<i>alcay</i> G	<i>locac</i> F, TA <sup>1</sup>	<i>loear</i> TA <sup>3</sup>
<i>chacho</i> VB	<i>lochac</i> F, Z, L, R	<i>lothac</i> Z
<i>Iocach, locach</i> VL	<i>lochach</i> P, V	<i>soncat</i> FA
<i>jocach, jocath</i> S	<i>locheac</i> LT	<i>tac, thac</i> FB
<i>leochar, leocharde</i> VA		

Rustichello's spelling seems to have been « Lochac » or « Locac », but I am almost tempted to suppose that Polo said « \*Logac ». All sorts of explanations and identifications have been proposed. Some, like PAUTHIER's « Borneo » and MARSDEN's « Cambodia », may be left out without further discussion. The others are:

(1) 羅越 Lo-yüeh (\*Lâ-jj<sup>w</sup>et). This name occurs at the end of the 8th cent., in Chia Tan's itineraries, as a designation of the southern extremity of the Malay Peninsula; we meet it a century later in a Japanese account; it occurs once in the *Hsin T'ang shu*, and finally twice c. 1000 A. D. in the *Sung shih* (cf. *BEFEO*, IV, 231-234). Its identification with « Lochac » was suggested by PHILLIPS in 1886 (cf. *Y*, II, 278); it has been partly retained by BLAGDEN (in *Pe*, lvii), who supposed that « Lochach » may be « Lo + kok », « Lo » being the first syllable of Lo-yüeh, and « kok » or « kwok » the Chinese 國 *kuo* (\*k<sup>w</sup>ək), « kingdom ». Geographically, I have already refuted this hypothesis in *BEFEO*, IV, 237. Linguistically, *lo* of the T'ang period can only represent *la* or *ra*; and we have no examples outside of China of names ending with the Chinese *kuo*, except, in the Mongol period, of « Çipingu » and « Caugigu », that is, with the modern pronunciation of *kuo*, and in the case of countries which, being within the pale of Chinese civilization, could be designated under a Chinese name. CÆDES (*BEFEO*, XXIII, 470) proposes to see in Lo-yüeh the Malay « Laut » (< Lawat), « the Sea » (cf. « Orang Laut », for the Johore region), a designation analogous to that of Samudra, « Ocean » > Sumatra; phonetically, this is unimpeachable. In any case, « Lochac » cannot be Lo-yüeh.

(2) Ligor. PHILLIPS proposed this etymology (*Y*, II, 279), and GERINI, though preferring another solution, had thought of it too (*Researches into Ptolemy's Geography*, 497). YULE, while rejecting any etymological connection, was of opinion that « Lochac » must be at Ligor or in the neighbourhood, and I was formerly inclined to accept that view (*BEFEO*, IV, 237). It is needless to repeat here the phonetic objections to Nagara > Ligor and Lakhon being « Lochac ». YULE's purely geographical identification resulted from his idea that « Lochac » was Siam, and he chose Ligor as being the southernmost place under Siamese rule in Polo's time; but it will be seen below that « Lochac »'s identification with Siam does not entail any similar deduction, at least in my opinion.