

It is thus obvious that the term Po-se in Chinese records demands great caution, and must not be blindly translated "Persia." Whenever it is used with reference to the Archipelago, the chances are that Persia is not in question. The Malayan Po-se has become a fact of historical significance. He who is intent on identifying this locality and people must not lose sight of the plants and products attributed to it. I disagree entirely with the conclusion of HIRTH and ROCKHILL¹ that from the end of the fourth to the beginning of the seventh centuries all the products of Indo-China, Ceylon, India, and the east coast of Africa were classed by the Chinese as "products of Persia (Po-se)," the country of the majority of the traders who brought these goods to China. This is a rather grotesque generalization, inspired by a misconception of the term Po-se and the Po-se texts of the *Wei šu* and *Sui šu*. The latter, as already emphasized, do not speak at all of any importation of Persian goods to China, but merely give a descriptive list of the articles to be found in Persia. Whenever the term Po-se is prefixed to the name of a plant or a product, it means only one of two things,—Persia or the Malayan Po-se,—but this attribute is never fictitious. Not a single case is known to me where a specific product of Ceylon or India is ever characterized by the addition Po-se.

¹ Chau Ju-kua, p. 7.