

(3) 羅刹 Lo-ch'a (*Lâ-tš'at). According to GERINI (*Researches*, 496-497), the kingdom of Lo-ch'a of the Chinese is to be looked for on the eastern side of the Malay Peninsula, and represents possibly either « Rochor », or « Latcha », or « Legeh » (also « Lagëh », and « Rangëh », « Ranga »). As to « Lochac », « if not actually *Latcha* in Chanah, it is undoubtedly *Legeh* or *Lagëh* ». GERINI's identification of « Lochac » with Lo-ch'a has been taken over and developed in *Ch*, III, 160-162, and is quoted with some sort of approval in *B*¹, 444, with an attempt at a more precise localization in the direction of Trengganu. But the only texts mentioning a kingdom of Lo-ch'a relate to Ch'ang Chün's mission to Ch'ih-t'u (« Red Earth ») in 607, and it is very doubtful whether Ch'ih-t'u can be located in Siam; Lo-ch'a is said to be to the east of P'o-li which I think is the island of Bali (cf. *BEFEO*, IV, 281-282, 406). Moreover, *lo-ch'a* is the usual transcription of *rakṣasa*, « demon », and the name of the kingdom probably means « Demons' Kingdom », and was given by the Chinese to some savage tribe. In view of its association with P'o-li, I even suspect that there might be here some influence of a Buddhist legend, since, in the *Tsa p'i-yü ching* translated about A. D. 180, « *rakṣasa* demons » (*lo-ch'a kui*) are mentioned in connection with the kingdom of 波利弗 Po-li-fu (Pataliputra?) or Po-li (*Tripit.* of Meiji, Tōkyō ed., 暑, VII, 32 a). In any case, the more or less legendary kingdom of 607 can have nothing to do with Polo's « Lochac ».

(4) Lëngkasuka. In 1904, I first connected the Lëngkasuka of the *Nāgarakrētāgama* of 1365 with the Ling-ya-ssü-chia of Chau Ju-kua (1225), but could not decide on its position (*BEFEO*, IV, 325, 407). More documents have come to light since that time, and FERRAND has devoted a special study to the name (*JA*, 1918, II, 134-145), in which he comes to the conclusion that Lëngkasuka was on the eastern coast of the Malay Peninsula, near Ligor. But this position is too northern, and derives from an identification of Lëngkasuka with the Lang-ya-hsiu, etc., of the 6th-7th cents., an identification which, I think, must be abandoned. A document hitherto unnoticed in Western researches leaves no doubt as to the location. On the Chinese map of the early 15th cent., there appears, between Sungora and Kelantan, a name omitted in PHILLIPS's notes; this is 狼西加 Lang-hsi-chia (*Langsika; cf. also the « Lung-ya-hsi-chio », with semantic adaptation, of the *Hsing-ch'a shêng-lan*, in *TP*, 1915, 127; 1933, 330). Hence, in FERRAND's Arabic sources of c. 1500, we must read, with the Turkish version, لاج ساك Lanj-sakā (= Lang-sakā), not Lanj-šakā. Its exact position must have been at the entrance of the Patani river, and I think that Lëngkasuka is the old name of Patani; this last name does not occur, so far as I am aware, before the 15th cent. (the identification of Lëngkasuka with Patani, based on the 15th cent. map, is already in FUJITA's commentary on the *Tao-i chih-liao*, 55 b). Now, in 1897, TOMAŠEK had supposed that Polo's « Lochac » stood for « Lōchac » and phonetically represented « *Lonšak »; this has been accepted as certain by FERRAND (*JA*, 1918, II, 91, 138, 144) and is quoted without objection in *Y*, III, 104. But, apart from the fact that the reduction from Lëngkasuka to *Lonšak is not so easy, a fundamental error lies in the belief that Rustichello's *ch* has the value of *š*; for him, *ch* or *c* before *a* always has the value of *k*. TOMAŠEK's idea must therefore be abandoned. Nor can I agree either with ROUFFAER (*Bijdragen*, LXXVII, 86-103, 144-145), who sees in « Lochac » the ancient name Lanḱā, identified by him with Lëngkasuka, and referring, in his opinion, to the whole southern half of the Malay Peninsula;