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Satingpra, or Chatingpra, lies on the eastern coast of Southern Thailand, on the narrow peninsula that forms the three isthmian lakes or inland sea of the Malay Peninsula. Now only a coastal hamlet, it formerly flourished as an important trading kingdom, from the sixth to the thirteenth century. The archaeological research of Janice Stargardt has revealed that Satingpra traded extensively with Sung China (960-1280) and other regions of Asia (Stargardt 1983). Given the wealth of evidence testifying to the links between Satingpra and China during the Sung period, it is reasonable to expect that Sung Dynasty records would mention Satingpra. Thus, H.G. Quaritch Wales (1976: 141) doubted that «so important a place as Satingphra then was» could have «remained unknown» to such a «well-informed Chinese Commissioner of Foreign Trade» as Chao Ju-kua, author of the Chu fan chih (Description of the Barbarians), published in 1225 (Hirth and Rockhill 1911). For this reason, Wales surmised that Satingpra appeared in this book as Ling-ya-ssu-chia; and yet Wales acknowledged (1976: 62-70) that the name Langkasuka (of which Ling-ya-ssu-chia was clearly a transcription) belonged to a kingdom on the Patani River, about one hundred kilometers south-east of Satingpra (Wheatley 1961: 252-267). Wales has simply overlooked the numerous other names that Chao Ju-kua and his Sung colleagues have recorded as being situated on this coast; two of these toponyms, namely Jih-lo-t’ing and Fo-lo-an, are explicitly named as entrepôts by Chao, and they must therefore be considered for possible identification with Satingpra.

Before this investigation can be undertaken, the name Sating Pra needs to be examined. Stargardt (1973: 10) has pointed out that «Sating» is not Thai, and she suggests that it is connected with the Khmer word sretting,
which means «cutting, trench, canal». In support of this supposition three points may be adduced: the area has «over 150 kilometers of man-made canals» (Carey 1986: 193); there was continual Khmer influence on this region from the earliest centuries of the present era (Stargardt 1973: 18-28); roughly a third of the everyday vocabulary of the Thai spoken at Sating-pra is of Mon-Khmer origin, and the ancient inhabitants were presumably Mon (Stargardt 1979: 37).

The hypothesis that Sretting, or something very similar, was the name behind Thai Sating Pra or Chating Pra seems to offer a useful clue for exploring Sung Chinese texts relating to maritime trade.

1. Sha-li-t'ing

In the Sung hui yao (cited by Lo Hsiang-lin 1968: 515) there is a list of nine foreign countries which traded with China in the period 998-1003. One of the toponyms, Sha-li-t'ing, has defied identification.

Ta-shih: the Arab world (Hirth and Rockhill 1911: 114-124).
Ku-lo: the Kalak of the Arab geographers, presumably Kedah, where Sung pottery and West Asian glass have been found in abundance (Wales 1976: 133-137; not Kelang, as proposed in Colless 1969: 21-34).
She-p'o: Java (Hirth and Rockhill 1911: 75-82).
Chan-ch'eng: Champa, central Vietnam (Hirth and Rockhill: 47-50).
Ma-i: in the Philippines (Hirth and Rockhill: 159-160).
San-fo-ch'i: Shrivijaya, Palembang (and Jambi) in southern Sumatra (Hirth and Rockhill: 60-67).
Sha-li-t'ing: not identified.
Tan-liu-mei: presumably the Teng-liu-mei of Chao Ju-kua (Hirth and Rockhill: 57-58; Wheatley 1961: 65-66) and also the Tan-ma-ling of Chao Ju-kua (Hirth and Rockhill: 67-68; Wheatley 1961: 66-67), which represents Tambralinga, the name of a kingdom centred at Nakhon Si Thammarat (Ligor), one hundred kilometres to the north or Satingpra (Wales 1976: 148-156).

The mysterious Sha-li-t'ing of this list bears a striking resemblance to Sretting, the hypothetical original name proposed for Sating Pra.

2. Ch'ai-li-t'ing

In his description of Java (She-p'o), Chao Ju-kua mentions some trading kingdoms lying to its north (Hirth and Rockhill 1911: 76; Colless 1979: 22-26) (2).
P'o-ni: Brunei, in Borneo (Hirth and Rockhill: 155-159; Colless 1979: 24).
San-fo-ch'i: Shrivijaya, in Southern Sumatra (as noted above).
Ku-lo: Kedah, on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula (see above).
Ch’ai-li-t’ing: not satisfactorily identified (Hirth and Rockhill: 80).
There is a noteworthy similarity between Ch’ai-li-t’ing and Sha-li-t’ing, and once again the unidentified toponym in a catalogue of international trade centres may reasonably be attached to the entrepot at Satingpra.

3. Jih-lo-t’ing

In his account of Shrivijaya (San-fo-ch’i), Chao Ju-kua enumerates the dependencies of that empire (Hirth and Rockhill 1911: 62). The last five are Pa-lin-feng (Palembang, southern Sumatra), Hsin-t’o (Sunda, western Java), Chien-pei (Kampe, north-east Sumatra), Lan-wu-li (Lambri, north-west Sumatra), Hsi-lan (Ceylon, Sri Lanka). The remaining places seem to belong to the east coast of the Malay Peninsula. The first is certainly the most southern, and the last is in the north, but it seems unlikely that the intervening toponyms are in geographical order.
Teng-ya-nung: Terengganu (Hirth and Rockhill: 65; Wheatley: 71).
Chi-lan-tan: Kelantan, which actually lies between Terengganu and Patani (Wheatley: 71).
Fo-lo-an: not absolutely identified, but possibly either Patalung (near Satingpra) or Kuala Berang (in Terengganu), and given a separate description (Hirth and Rockhill: 69-70, Wheatley: 68-70).
Jih-lo-t’ing: not yet identified (Wheatley: 71).
Ch’ien-mai-pa-t’a: not identified (Wheatley: 71-72), possibly Chumpon (Jumbara).
Tan-ma-ling: Tambralinga, Nakhon Si Thammarat, elsewhere described in detail (Hirth and Rockhill: 67-68; Wheatley: 66-67).
Chia-lo-hsi: Cantonese Ka-lo-hei, representing Grahi, now Chaiya, on the Bay of Bandon (Wheatley: 72).

From this collection of place-names, Jih-lo-t’ing emerges as the closest to Sha-li-t’ing and Ch’ai-li-t’ing. Chao Ju-kua does not single it out for a special account, but he mentions it at the end of his section on Tan-ma-ling (Nakhon):
Jih-lo-t’ing, Ch’ien-mai-pa-t’a, and Chia-lo-hsi are similar to this country. Tan-ma-ling makes a collection of vessels made of silver and gold, and the other countries make similar collections, to be presented to San-fo-ch’i (Shrivijaya) as tribute (3).

Thus, Jih-lo-t’ing was located in the vicinity of Nakhon, on the isthmus of the Malay Peninsula, and it was a tributary of Shrivijaya. The influence
of Shrivijaya in this general region is manifested in the archaeological record, at Chaiya (Wales 1976: 101-113), Nakhon (Wales: 148-156), and Satingpra (Wales: 141-145).

4. **Māyirudingam**

It has been plausibly conjectured that Jih-lo-t'ing corresponds to Māyirudingam, a name found among the overseas conquests of the Chola king Rajendra I in the eleventh century (c. 1025), as recorded in a Tamil text inscribed on a temple wall in Tanjore, south India (Wheatley 1961: 199-201). The inscriptions seems to provide an inventory of the dependencies of Shrivijaya at that time, although only three of its names have a clear counterpart in the list compiled by Chao Ju-kua. Fortunately the three matching pairs are precisely the ones that concern us most:

- Ilaṅgāsāka = Ling-ya-ssu-chia = Langkasuka (Patani)
- Mādāmalingam = Tan-ma-ling = Tāmbralinga (Nakhon)
- Māyirudingam = Jih-lo-t’ing.

The prefix Mā- means ‘great’, and the suffix m is the typical south Indian noun-ending. Notice that the s of Langkasuka is represented by sh, and possibly the s of the hypothetical Sretting (Sating Pra) appears as yi in Māyirudingam. The series now runs:

(Sretting) = Sha-li-t’ing = Ch’ai-li-t’ing = Jih-lo-t’ing = Yiruding.

Each place named in the Tanjore inscription has a descriptive label attached to it. The general opinion is to see no significance in these accompanying phrases, and to dismiss them as merely ‘a play upon words’ (Wheatley 1961: 201). Nevertheless, the case for identifying Māyirudingam as Satingpra receives considerable support from the words applied to it here: ‘surrounded by the deep sea as by a moat’.

This admirably portrays the situation of the old town of Satingpra, located ‘about twenty miles north of the tip of its narrow sandy peninsula’, and lying ‘only about 300 yards from the old coast line on the east, and about two miles from the Inland Sea on the west, to which it was connected by canal’; moreover, the small enclosure itself had ‘a ten-yard wide moat with right-angle corners, inside which was a brick wall’ (Wales 1976: 142). Thus the Satingpra entrepot was not only surrounded by an actual moat, but was also ‘girt by the deep sea as by a moat’, as stated in the Tanjore text.

5. **Fo-lo-an**

Surprisingly, there is no Sha-li-t’ing or Jih-lo-t’ing in the other Sung topography, namely the Ling wai tai ta, published in 1178 by Chou Ch’ü-fei (Netolitzky 1977). Fo-lo-an is the trading kingdom that Chou singles out on this coast. In describing the countries lying south of China, he names
Shrivijaya (San-fo-ch’i) as the trade centre for lands in the south, and Java (She-p’o) as the centre for those in the south-east (Netolitzky: 35; Hirth and Rockhill: 25). Then, enumerating significant countries lying to the immediate south of Chiao-chih (Tongking), he names Chan-ch’eng (Champa), Chen-la (Kambuja), and Fo-lo-an (Netolitzky: 36).

This puts Fo-lo-an on the same coastline as Vietnam and Kampuchea, that is, on ‘the Upper Coast’. Thus, when describing Fo-lo-an, Chou states that it produces aromatics which are superior to those of ‘the Lower Coast’, by which he means the Indonesian Archipelago (Netolitzky: 39). Chou gives the impression that Fo-lo-an is the northern entrepot of Shrivijaya, which is itself ‘the most important meeting point of the sea routes’ between east and west (Netolitzky: 39). Fo-lo-an is the only dependency of Shrivijaya that Chou singles out, and he notes that its ruler is appointed by Shrivijaya, and that the emperor of Shrivijaya goes to Fo-lo-an regularly to offer incense to a holy Buddha image (Netolitzky: 39; Wheatley 1961: 69) (4).

In this connection, Chao Ju-kua tells of two notable Buddha images in Fo-lo-an (which ‘came flying into this country’), one with six arms and the other with four arms, both presumably representing Avalokiteshvara (Chinese Kuan-yin); these were credited with providing winds to drive pirates away from the port (Hirth and Rockhill: 69; Wheatley 1961: 68). A few small Avalokiteshvara images have been found at Satingpra (Wales 1976: 144-146), and there are numerous Buddhist shrines along the peninsula (Stargardt 1973: 12-17). It is therefore at least feasible to connect Fo-lo-an with the hydraulic and commercial civilization which flourished during the Sung era at Satingpra.

This raises the possibility that the Fo-lo-an of Chou Ch’ü-fei is the same place as the Jih-lo-t’ing of Chao Ju-kua. However, the objection to this hypothesis is that Chao Ju-kua has both Fo-lo-an and Jih-lo-t’ing side by side in his list of Shrivijaya dependencies, as noted earlier. One possible explanation for this would be that Chao has combined two or more different sources, in which variant names for Satingpra were used. There is evidence to support this view.

In one place Chao says that Arabs (Ta-shih) take their merchandise (including not only pearls, frankincense, and ivory, but also cloves and nutmegs, which could not be grown in the Arab world) to San-fo-ch’i (southern Sumatra) and to Fo-lo-an (Hirth and Rockhill: 116).

Elsewhere Chao speaks of the Arabs’ ivory trade in particular, stating that Arabs’ ship elephant tusks to San-fo-ch’i and to Jih-lo-t’ing for barter’ (Hirth and Rockhill: 232). Yet it is Fo-lo-an, not Jih-lo-t’ing, which receives a detailed description, and ivory is included in the catalogue of its exports, as is also the case with Tan-ma-ling (Nakhon) and Ling-ya-ssu-chia (Patani), the immediate neighbours of Satingpra, to its north and south respectively.
As already noted, Chao Ju-kua includes Jih-lo-t’ing in his account of Tan-
ma-ling (Nakhon), and this is understandable if Jih-lo-t’ing is Satingpra. But Fo-lo-an has its own chapter, and there Chao links it with Pahang, Ter
ggangan, and Kelantan, all to the far south of Satingpra: Fo-lo-an adjoins
Pahang. Terengganu and Kelantan are of similar character.

This is the interpretation of Wheatley (1961: 68-70), and he goes on to
suggest that Fo-lo-an might be Kuala Berang, a market town situated some
twenty miles up the Terengganu River. This is where Malaysia’s oldest Isla-
mic inscription was discovered, the Terengganu stone, a document which
clearly indicates that Terengganu had become a Muslim kingdom by the
fourteenth century. Wheatley plausibly argues that if Kuala Berang was
in fact Fo-lo-an (said to have been an entrepot for Arab merchandise), then
the town would have been frequented by Muslim traders, who would have
brought about the conversion of Terengganu to Islam.

In proposing this solution Wheatley rejected the idea of some of his pre-
dedecessors that Fo-lo-an represents Patalung (5). Known also as Bordelon
and Bradlun, Patalung is situated inland from Satingpra (6). Wheatley
affirms, however, that Patalung ‘can hardly be said to adjoin Pahang’
(Wheatley: 70). Nevertheless, Chao’s statement about Fo-lo-an becomes less
of a problem to the Satingpra case if the interpretation of Hirth and Rock-
hill is followed (1911: 69): «Its neighbours Pahang, Terengganu, and Kelan-
tan are like it».

This allows the following explanation to be formulated: Chao Ju-kua deci-
ded to describe in detail only three of the Shrivijaya tributaries on this coast,
namely Tambralinga, Langkasuka, and the place he knew as Fo-lo-an; Chao
chose to mention the remaining countries in the course of describing these
three; the northern states (Jih-lo-t’ing, Ch’ien-mai-pa-t’a, Chia-lo-hsi) he con-
ected with Tan-ma-ling (Tambralinga, Nakhon); and while it would be more
natural to connect the southern states (Kelantan, Terengganu, Pahang) with
Patani (Langkasuka), Chao has simply appended them to the last of his three
descriptions, that of Fo-lo-an. In so doing, Chao did not realize that Jih-lo-
t’ing and Fo-lo-an were the same place. An analogy for such confusion on
his part is the possibility that his Tan-ma-ling is the same place as his Teng-
liu-mei (as suggested in section 1 above). Similarly, Chao seems to have
Kedah in one place as Chi-t’o (Hirth and Rockhill: 89; Wheatley 1961: 72)
and in other places as Ku-lo (Hirth and Rockhill: 76, 118).

Notice that whether Fo-lo-an is Kuala Berang in Terengganu (which
Chao includes as Teng-ya-nung in his account of Fo-lo-an), or Patalung (or
some other town) near Satingpra, there is in each case a duplication by Chao.
Thus both proposals suffer from the same apparent weakness.
Which of the two, Kuala Berang or Patalung, suits Chao's sailing instructions? Chao places Langkasuka (Patani) at a distance of six days and nights by sea from Tambralinga (Nakhon); and he has Fo-lo-an four days away from Langkasuka (Patani):

« One can sail from Tan-ma-ling to the kingdom of Lang-ya-ssu-chia in six days and nights. There is also a land route.» (Wheatley 1961: 68).

« The kingdom of Fo-lo-an can be reached in four days from Ling-ya-ssu-chia; one can also travel by land.» (Wheatley 1961: 687).

Because no compass directions are provided, these two statements do not indicate whether Fo-lo-an lies between Nakhon and Patani (in support of the case for Satingpra) or beyond Patani to the south (in the direction of Kuala Berang and Terengganu). But they do imply that the distance between Patani and Fo-lo-an is four sixths (two thirds) of that between Patani and Nakhon.

It is remarkable that the major trading ports along this coast (Chumphon, Chaiya, Nakhon, Satingpra, Patani, Kelantan, Terengganu) are all about one hundred kilometres apart. Patani is therefore equidistant between Nakhon and Terengganu, and this would disqualify Kuala Berang. If we apply the instructions strictly, then Fo-lo-an should be situated about thirty kilometres to the south of the Kelantan river mouth or to the north of Satingpra. In the latter case it is the mouth of the Kok Tong Canal, which gives access to the Ranot River, the inland sea (Thale Luang), and Patalung.

The problem with identifying Fo-lo-an as Patalung is that this town, as also Songkhla to the south, does not appear to be older than the fourteenth century (Wales 1974: 28-33). While it is true that large deposits of Buddhist votive tablets from the Shrivijaya period have been discovered in caves behind Patalung, the town itself is relatively recent; Wales was shown two ramparted enclosures in the vicinity, which might have been earlier sites of Patalung, but he thought that neither of these was older than the Ayudhya period, which began in 1350 (Wales 1976: 146-147). Local tradition certainly tells of a succession of Patalungs, with the original Patalung being situated at Satingpra, and the frequency of pirate attacks on coastal towns as the reason for moving Patalung inland (Wavell 1964: 196).

If in fact the name Patalung was once found on the coast, then a likely place for it would be on the waterway formed by the Ranot River and the Kok Tong Canal. At the mouth of the canal is U Tapao, said to signify ‘the Port of the Sampao’, that is, the anchorage for vessels engaged in the China trade (Stargardt 1973: 12). The silt of the canal has yielded an iron anchor chain, presumably from an ocean-going ship (Stargardt 1973: 12). Along the Kok Tong Canal are the remains of seven monumental buildings, and there must have been a substantial settlement here in the Sung era (Star-
gardt 1973: 12-17). The seven brick buildings could be related to the Buddhist temples, ‘tiled with bronze and ornamented with gold’, which were mentioned by Chao Ju-kua in his description of Fo-lo-an; and one or more of these may have housed the Buddhist images which kept pirates at bay (Wheatley 1961: 68). According to the San ts’ai t’u hui of 1607, foreigners who were intent on plundering the temples of Fo-lo-an were repelled by storms as soon as they arrived at the mouth of the river (Wheatley 1961: 69). If Fo-lo-an was in fact this Kok Tong settlement, then the river in question would be the Kok Tong Canal (now silted up and at present unusable).

Thus, the hypothesis has been expanded to encompass both Jih-lo-t’ing and Fo-lo-an as names associated with archaeological sites on the Satingpra Peninsula. The evidence presented in the following section seems to support this linking of Fo-lo-an with Jih-lo-t’ing and its variants Sha-li-t’ing and Ch’ai-li-t’ing.

6. Sha-li-fo-lai-an

In 1349 Wang Ta-jüan published his Tao i chih lioh (Description of the Barbarians of the Isles), after having travelled and traded in South-East Asia. In his section on Tan-ma-ling (Tambralinga, Nakhon, as in the Chu fan chih of Chao Ju-kua in 1225) Wang states that Tan-ma-ling adjoins the country Sha-li-fo-lai-an (Wheatley 1961: 77). Wheatley notes (77, n. 2) that this is possibly the Fo-lo-an of Chao Ju-kua, but he makes no attempt to test this hypothesis; he simply assumes that Sha-li-fo-lai-an would be Kuala Berang (his proposed identification for Fo-lo-an) and maps it in the Terengganu region (76, fig. 14). However, Terengganu seems too far away from Nakhon to be described as a neighbouring state; it is Satingpra that is the nearest neighbour of Tan-ma-ling, and in those days they were joined by a waterway (river and canal), along which merchandise was doubtless carried (Wales 1976: 154-155).

Sha-li-fo-lai-an thus fits neatly into the pattern being woven here.

The Fo-lai-an portion of Wang’s fourteenth-century Sha-li-fo-lai-an corresponds to the Fo-lo-an of Chao Ju-kua in the thirteenth century and of Chou Ch’ü-fei in the twelfth century.

The Sha-li of Sha-li-fo-lai-an goes with Sha-li-t’ing, mentioned in the Sung hui yao; and it would also be related to the Ch’ai-li-t’ing and Jih-lo-t’ing of Chao Ju-kua in the thirteenth century, and the Mäyirudigam of the Cholas in the eleventh century.

As suggested at the outset, Sha-li-t’ing might represent Sretting, a presumed Mon-Khmer basis for the Thai name Sating Pra. Its connotation of ‘cutting’ could refer to the vast network of canals on the Satingpra Peninsula (8).
Fo-lo-an might be a transcription of Patalung (or some Mon-Khmer or Malay form of this Thai name), but this involves assuming that this name was once applied to a town on the coast and was then transferred to a new settlement founded to the west of the inland sea, after the fall of Shrivijaya (9).

One possible interpretation of the combined archaeological and written evidence is that Sha-li-t'ing referred particularly to the old town of Sating-pra, 'girt by the deep sea as by a moat' (Tanjore inscription), while Fo-lo-an meant the trading port to its north. The ruler would have resided in the fortified city; the port was where the merchants thronged for trade.

NOTES

The ideas presented in this article were first delivered as part of a paper entitled 'The Extent of the Srivijayan Empire', at the Sixth International Conference on Asian History, International Association of Historians of Asia, Yogyakarta, August 26-30, 1974.

1. At the time of writing this I have not been able to obtain a copy of Stargardt's book on Satingpra (1983), but I had her earlier reports at my disposal (e.g. 1973, 1979).

2. This list functions as an itinerary, but the sailing times it gives are problematic; cp. Colless 1979: 22-23. It allows 7 days for the voyage between San-fo-ch'i and Ku-lo, and likewise between Ku-lo and Ch'ai-li-t'ing. This is reasonable for Jambi to Kedah (Jambi being the capital of Shrivijaya at that time), but impossible for Kedah to a port on the other side of the Malay Peninsula (except by an overland route). The second 7 may simply be a scribal error.

3. In the fourteenth century and later, Nakhon was collecting tribute from neighbouring states, including Kedah, to send to the Thai suzerain of Ayudhya; this tribute was known as 'the gold and silver flowers' (cp. Wales 1976: 182).

4. Wheatley: 'There is here a Holy Buddha before which the princes of San-fo-ch'i annually burn incense'. Netolitzky: 'Hier steht auch ein Heiliger Buddha, zu dem der Herrscher des Reiches Srivijaya alle zwei Jahre zieht, um (vor ihm) Duftölzer zu verbrennen'.

5. The equating of Fo-lo-an and Patalung was made by Otto Blagden in a letter to W.W. Rockhill, who quoted it in T'oung Pao 16 (1915), 123, n. 1. It was presented by George Coedes in Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie (Paris 1948), 308, but rejected in the 1964 edition, 334, in favour of Wheatley's identification, namely Kuala Berang; also accepted in Netolitzky 1977: 39 and 228.

6. The form Bradlun appears in a list of places along this coast, provided by Antonio Pigafetta in his account of the Magellan circumnavigation of the globe (1519-1522): Cinghapola (Singapura), Pahan (Pahang), Calantan (Kelantan), Patani, Bradlun, Benan, Lagon (Nakhon), Chereqigharan (Chaiya?, Terengganu?), Tumbon (Chumphon?), Phran, Cui, Brami, Bangha, India (read India, Ayudhya). At least three of these names invite comparison with Fo-lo-an. For the Italian text see James Alexander Robertson, Magellan's Voyage around the World, 3 vols (Cleveland 1906), II, 171-173.

7. It is perhaps worth noting that the port of Shrivijaya used an iron chain to prevent pirate ships entering, and this was lowered for merchant vessels; Chao Ju-kua says that it was eventually left unused on the shore, and there it was offered religious devotion, like a Buddha; see Hirth and Rockhill 1911: 62.
8. A local explanation of the name Satingpra (Chatingpra) is that a legendary prince, seen walking towards a well while carrying a Buddha relic, was asked: ‘Jating Pra’ (‘Are you throwing it away?’); the name of the governor of the city is said to have been Chao Phya Krung Sating Paranasee (Krung is Thai for ‘capital city’, and the last name, reputedly ‘added to show the city’s Buddhist character’, is presumably equivalent to Banaras, Varanasi); Wavell 1964: 203.

9. It should be added that Chou Ch’ü-fei (Netolitzky 1977: 117), in his section on gharuwood, names Teng-liu-mei (Tambralinga? Nakhon?) and P’o-lo-man as good sources. Wheatley (1959: 70) supposes that P’o-lo-man (which he or his printer has written as P’o-lo-an) is ‘a mislection’ for Fo-lo-an; Netolitzky accepts this opinion: ‘P’o-lo-man ist eine VerSchreibung für Fo-lo-an’ (1977: 261). If there is a connection between Fo-lo-an and P’o-lo-man (Buddha-chattering-peace and Dame-net-barbarian) it seems more likely that they are alternative transcriptions of the same toponym (the lo characters are the only ones that share a close resemblance). The approximate ancient pronunciation of Fo-lo-an was Bud-là-an. The term P’o-lo-man might rather be related to P’o-lo-men (Brahman country?), apparently applied in the T’ang era to the west coast of India; see Hirth and Rockhill 1911: 12, and 97, a description of the kingdom of Nan-ni-hua-lo, taken over from Chou Ch’ü-fei, possibly Nepal, Netolitzky 1977: 237; there many people ‘are called Brahmans (P’o-lo-men), being genuine descendants of the Buddha (Fo)”.
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