

Āin-i-Akbarī. Finally, the Chinese transcriptions are not what FERRAND makes them to be, and this obliges me to enter into a more detailed examination of them than I should otherwise have wished to do in the present notes.

FERRAND's reasoning is based on the Ming forms Hsü-wên [文]-ta-la, Hsü-wên-ta-na, Su-mên [門]-ta-la, where he says *wên* and *mên* fundamentally contain the vowel sound *-a-*; this is extremely doubtful; *wên* and *mên* are not *wan* or *man*; at such a late date, the vowel of *wên* and *mên* would sound somewhat like *u* in Engl. *pun*, and may represent both short *a* and short *u*. But, what is more important, FERRAND has left out of account all the older transcriptions, namely those of the Mongol period, beginning in 1282, in which the second syllable is always rendered by 木 *mu* (cf. BEFEO, IV, 327); the form is almost always Su-mu-tu-la, once Su-mu-ta-la (YS, 12, 4 a; 13, 8 b; 14, 4 a; 18, 4 a; 131, 8 b; 134, 8 a; 210, 8 b; *Yüan wên lei*, 41, 20 b). There can be no doubt that all these represent Sumudra, not Sumatra. As to the later forms, beginning with the Hsü-wên-ta-la of 1349-1350 (cf. TP, 1915, 151, 152, 156; add the Chinese map of the early 15th cent. and *Ming shih*, 325, 5 b), they seem to represent *Sumundara or possibly *Sumandara (but I doubt the existence of a Skr. *sāmundri* quoted in *Hobson-Jobson*², 977; for a form Samundar of Samudra, as a name of the lower Brahmaputra, cf. *Fe*, 354; *samundar* is the Hindī form of *samudra*). It may be that the transcriptions beginning with *hsü* = *sü*, *s'u*, not *su*, have something to do with Conti's « Sciamuthera » (Šamutra), Barbosa's « Çamatra » and the Šumuṭrah of late Arabic authors. The late Chinese transcriptions, on the other hand, are in agreement with the late Malay legend giving for the state of Samudra a would-be etymological form « Samandara » (Y, II, 294). The vowel *-u-* in the second syllable of the name is so evident that FERRAND himself, speaking of the Arabic vocalization of Šumuṭrah, says most inconsequently (*JA*, 1922, II, 81) that it agrees with these very Chinese transcriptions Hsü-wên-ta-la and Su-mên-ta-la, which he had asserted in 1919 to have an *-a-* in the second syllable.

It is thus plain that we must start from a form Sumudra as being the usual one in the 13th cent.; but it also occurs with a hardening of *-d-* into *-t-* in Polo's « Sumatra », in Rašidu-'d-Dīn's « Sūmūtrah » and in the later Arabic transcriptions. Eventually the form « Sumatra » prevailed. CÆDÈS (BEFEO, XXIII, 469) thought of a metathesis *samudra* > *sumadra*; I am myself more in favour of the retroaction of a labial on a preceding vowel, *samudra* > *sumudra*, and this is perhaps also to be considered for double forms like Tumihang < Tamihang (Tamyang), Tumasik < Tamasik (Tēmasik); for other similar cases, cf. BEFEO, II, 3; *Rec. des inscr. du Siam*, I, 123. Finally, I can but concur with ROUFFAER that Sumudra and Sumatra are derived from Samudra.

This conclusion is corroborated by the identification of the state of « Sumatra » or Samudra. In 1933 (TP, 1933, 275, and *passim*; 1934-1935, 293-294) I was mistaken when I repeated an old identification with the Achin territory (cf. BEFEO, IV, 327; TP, 1915, 151 sq.); it is « Lambri » (Lamuri) which afterwards became Achin. Already in 1886, YULE (cf. *Hobson-Jobson*², 865) considered that the old city of Samudra must be represented by the present village of Samudra on the river Pasei (Pasè); we must abide by this conclusion, for which the Dutch scholars have found fresh evidence (cf. ROUFFAER, in *Bijdragen*, Vol. 74 [1918], 138). As I explain under « Basman », the Dutch scholars speak of the old state of « Samudra-Pasè »; both names may have been used concurrently, even if at one time they were applied to two neighbouring cities, so that the name