

apart from all other considerations, the name of Lañkā never occurs as such in the nomenclature of the late Middle Ages (but for « Lung-ya-mên », see « Pentan »). S. LÉVI's remarks in *JA*, 1923, II, 36-45, must be read in connection with ROUFFAER's memoir; cf. also *JA*, 1918, I, 140-141.

(5) 羅斛 Lo-hu (*Lâ-γuk), Southern Siam. This is YULE's phonetic equivalence, and I think it is the only one which deserves to be retained; but we must leave out of account YULE's subsidiary ideas about *lo* representing the same name as Laos, or about the final *-c* of « Lochac » being a trace of the southern pronunciation of Ch. *kuo*, « kingdom ». I have dealt at length with the kingdom of Lo-hu in *BEFEO*, IV, 233 sq. The name appears in the 11th cent. as that of the Mon-Khmêr kingdom of the Lower Menam, with its capital at Lopburī, which was finally destroyed by the Thai Siamese of the northern kingdom of Hsien in 1349; hence the new double name of Hsien-Lo-hu, which was soon shortened to Hsien-lo and has remained the Chinese name of Siam down to our day. The ancient Cambodian inscriptions give to the Lo-hu people the name of Lvo, which must be identical with Lavo, the ancient Siamese name of Lopburī, called Louvo by the early missionaries. The difficulty is only with Polo's final *-c* (= *-k*). The Cambodian city of « Lawék » (Lovék), which has been mentioned in connection with « Lochac », is of late origin and must be left out of account, unless its name was suggested by the name of the former Mon-Khmêr capital of Southern Siam. But I have already given indications for a possible form in *-k* of the name of Lavo or of Lo-hu: the King Mahā-Mongkut raised objections against the popular form Nokburī of Lopburī; the pre-Sung or early Sung pronunciation of 斛 *hu*, particularly in the south, was *γuk*; above all, the *Āīn-i Akbarī*, in 1595, speak of an aloes *lawākī*, the name of which YULE supposed to have been derived from the name of the Kingdom of Lvo (Lavo) or Lo-hu (not from Lovék in Cambodia as in *Y*, III, 105). We can now go one step further. The name of the aloes *lawākī* goes back at least to the end of the 10th cent. (cf. *Fe*, 52, 285, 547), and this leads us to suppose that the Chinese coined their « Lo-hu » earlier than the known texts quote it, and at a date when it really sounded *Lawāk. The « aloes » *lawākī* is probably eagle-wood, and the Chinese also knew the Lo-hu sort of eagle-wood (cf. *TP*, 1933, 385-386). It may even be that, in Polo's time, there was a form of the name nearer to his spelling than Lo-hu (which was then certainly pronounced in « Mandarin » as it is to-day). The Buddhist chronicle *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai* of 1333-1344, *Tripit.* of Meiji, Tōkyō ed., 致, ch. 32, 41b, says that, in 1278, the Sung pretender escaped to the kingdom of 落鶴 Lo-hao by way of Champa, and, again by way of Champa, returned in 1279; Lo-hao does not occur elsewhere. But the Buddhist chronicler must have used a contemporary document of southern origin, and in the South, Lo-hao must have then sounded something like *Lok-hok, which is not far from « Lochac ». I am tempted to explain in the same way the name of the state of 路貉 Lu-mo or Lu-ho (ancient *Luo-γāk; more correct than « Lu-mo ») which, according to Annamese history, asked in 1149 for the right to trade at the mouth of the Red River, together with Siam and Java (cf. *BEFEO*, IV, 254); the names used here for Java and Siam are later than the forms used in 1149; but that does not prevent *Luo-γāk from being another spelling of Lo-hu, « Lochac ». The only difficulty is that *Lâ-γuk (ancient pronunciation of Lo-hu), Lawāk (which is supposed by *lawākī*) and even Lvo (= Lavo, perhaps > *Lavok) do not show a *-k* (*-c*, *-ch*) in the middle of the name; that is my reason for supposing that, in Polo's original dictation, the word may have been « Logac », with