

of Pasè is possibly much older than the date at which it first appears in native texts. The practical equivalence of the two forms would seem to be further illustrated by the fact that the Chinese texts name, in the beginning of the 15th cent., a king of Samudra (Su-mên-ta-la, Sumundara) Zaynu-'l-Ābidin (cf. *TP*, 1933, 275-276; 1934/1935, 293-294, 312-314), almost surely identical with the king of Pasè whom VALENTIJN mentions at the same time as «Sainalabdin», correctly restored by FERRAND into Zaynu-'l-Ābidin (*JA*, 1918, I, 465). There is nevertheless a difficulty, since VALENTIJN speaks of a war between the king Zaynu-'l-Ābidin and Manšūr-šāh of Malacca, and we know for certain that Manšūr-šāh died as late as 1477 (cf. ROUFFAER, in *Bijdragen*, Vol. 77, 574, 588; on Zaynu-'l-Ābidin, cf. also *Rapporten v. d. Oudheidk.* for 1913, Batavia, 1914, 8). There must have been at least two kings Zaynu-'l-Ābidin (cf. also H. K. J. COWAN, *Bijdrage tot de Kennis der geschiedenis van het rijk Samoedra-Pasè*, in *Tijdschrift v. Ind. Taal-, Land- en Volkenk.*, Vol. 78 [1938], 204-214). The duality of names for one and the same country explains also the apparent silence of Albuquerque and other early Portuguese travellers about the state of Samudra; they speak of it, but under the name of Pasè («Pacem»).

We cannot trace the real history of Samudra-Pasè far beyond the date of Polo's visit. The first mention of Samudra occurs in 1282 (in Chinese texts), and its first Mussulman king died in 1297; it seems that the importance of the place, under this name, dates only from the conversion of its kings to Islam.

347. TAGACIAR

tagaciar L

tagatiar F

Our only source here, F, writes «Tagatiar», an evident clerical error. Polo's form represents Mo. Tayačar, and is absolutely correct. This Tayačar was one of the principal officers in Persia before and still more after Arčun's accession (cf. *Ha*¹, II, 541). Waššāf (*Ha*², 262) writes طناچار, and so it is with Rašidu-'d-Dīn when he mentions one of the many who have borne that name. In *Bl*, II, 236, etc., BLOCHET always transcribes «Toghatchar», and explains it (App., 36, 46) by *toγoγan* (> toγōn) + *čar*, «who resembles a kettle». But there is no notation of *o* in the Arabic writing of the name, and BLOCHET himself mentions that the Chinese transcription is 塔察兒 Ta-ch'a-êrh. This cannot be for *Toyačar, which would have given *Tōčar. Ta-ch'a-êrh is obviously Tāčar < Ta'ačar. We have here an example of the double value of -γ- in Mongol writing, which is either -γ- or -'-; even in the living language, there were some hesitations, perhaps of a dialectal character; for a similar example with -g- = -g- and -'-, see «Sogatu». Tayačar is the addressee of a letter written by Pope Nicholas IV in 1291; although the name is altered in the Pontifical Registers, its form «Tagharzar» confirms *a* in the first syllable; cf. CHABOT, *Hist. de Mar Jabalaha III*, 247; GOLUBOVICH, *Bibliot. bio-bibliogr.*, II, 474-475. The wrong form «Tugháčar» is also to be corrected in BROWNE, *Hist. of Pers. lit.*, III, 35-39; the Persian form of p. 35 gives in reality