

of Lung-ya-mên came in 1325 (YS, 29, 9 b). Lung-ya may be a semantic adaptation of a native name, although ROUFFAER did not bring it in when discussing the ancient names of Singapore and Johor in *Bijdragen*, LXXVII, 156, and seems to have considered it to be purely Chinese. The kingdom of 賓丹 Pin-tan (= Bintan) is named under 1323 in YS, 23, 4 b.

Polo, after a digression to « Malaiur », starts his account again from « Pentan ». On the probably wrong repetition of « Pentan » in the middle of this chapter, cf. « Malaiur ».

Odoric speaks of « Paten » (var. « Pantem », etc.; Maundeville, « Pathen », etc.), also called « Malamasimi » (var. « Talamasim », etc.; Maundeville, « Talamassy », etc.; cf. HALLBERG, 413; Y<sup>1</sup>, II, 155; *Wy*, 447). The names are so uncertain and the data so vague that no safe conclusion can be reached for the present as to the place Odoric intended to describe. By reading « Talamasi », we should not be very far from Ibn Baṭṭūṭah's « Ṭawālisī »; that does not help much however, as « Ṭawālisī » is otherwise unknown.

### 314. PIANFU

*panfa* TA<sup>3</sup>

*paymphu* VL

*pianfu* F, FA, FB, L, TA<sup>1</sup>, VA, VB; R

*piansu* LT, VB

*pufun* V

*pyanfu* P, Z

*zianfu* VB

All commentators agree that this is 平陽府 P'ing-yang-fu in Shan-hsi. As in the case of Taianfu, of Saianfu, etc., « Pianfu » must be the form used by Persians in China. Rašidu-'d-Dīn, in *Bl*, II, 181, is made by BLOCHET to speak of تونك پنگ فو Tung-ping-fu, that is to say 東平府 Tung-p'ing-fu in Shan-tung (see « Tundinfu »), which is irreconcilable with the trend of the narrative; but the real reading is پونك پنگ فو Pung-yang-fu = P'ing-yang-fu. The vowel of *p'ing* has often been labialized in Central Asia, and in Chinese Turkestan, one hears regularly Taipung for 太平 T'ai-p'ing; in Mongolian, K'ai-p'ing has given Käibung (see « Chemeinfu »); the title *p'ing-chang*, transcribed فنجان *fnjān* in Persian, is perhaps to be vocalized *funjān*, instead of the generally adopted *fnjān*. The identification is made certain by the comparison of *Ber*, III, 21 (and Persian text, 32), with the corresponding passage of the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu*, 53 a. In both cases, Rašid mentions side by side (in « scholarly » transcription) T'ai-yüan-fu and P'ing-yang-fu, and names the Qara-mörän, just as we have the three names given in succession by Polo. As has been surmised long ago (cf. Y<sup>1</sup>, I, 285), it probably was P'ing-yang which was transliterated بگان Bigan or بگان Bingan in 1421 by Šāh-Ruḥ's envoys. But the form is not certain; in THEVENOT's *Relations de divers voyages curieux*, 4th part, p. 14, it is written « Nikian », and I suspect that it is the « Sigaan » of WITSEN's *Noord en Oost Tartaryen*, 1785, I, 494; a critical edition of the original of WITSEN's list is badly needed.