Supplementary Jottings

To the "Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca, Compiled from Chinese Sources"

By

W. P. Groeneveldt.

This little work, published by me in 1876 in the Transactions of the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences, has been repeatedly noticed in the columns of the T'oung-pao, and, I am happy to say, always in a friendly spirit. Questions were put, where I had been obliged to leave uncertainty; solutions were proposed, where I had been unable to suggest them. Though I saw with extreme satisfaction that others interested themselves in a subject on which I had bestowed some pains, I could not take a part in the discussion, because my time was completely taken up by official duties.

Even when in 1887 these Notes were reprinted by Dr. Reinhold Rost for the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, I had to limit myself to a few corrections and rectifications, but could not attempt to go further into the matter 1).

Having now a period of leisure before me, I gladly return to the old task, though I can hardly add anything to what I gave

1) When further on I shall have to refer to my Notes, the two editions will be distinguished by the numbers I and II.
before, as no new materials have been discovered by others or by myself; I am indeed prepared to think that I have exhausted the subject in this respect, but I say this without any feeling of exultation, for nobody would rejoice more than myself, if new sources were discovered to supply our scanty information on so interesting a subject.

In Vol. IV, pag. 81 ff. of the T'oung-pao Dr. F. W. K. Müller has made a few remarks, which I would answer as follows.

It cannot be denied that the characters 彭坑 p'ang-k'ang give a very defective transcription of the name Pahang (Notes I, pag. 136 and II, pag. 255), and as Dr. Müller informs us that there is a tribe in that locality of the name Panggang, it is indeed quite probable that this was the old name of the place, for which the two characters, mentioned just now, were correctly used.

In the second place Dr. Müller suggests that the word Mau-su, used for the pirates of Northern Borneo (Notes I, pag. 102 and 138, II, pag. 224 and 257), and which I have been unable to identify, may be the Malay word musul = enemy. I think this is a case of accidental homophony, unsupported by any other evidence and which should not be noticed therefore.

This is even more so with the third observation of Dr. Müller suggesting that the word so-fu (Notes I, pag. 141 and II, pag. 260) may mean stuffed skins of birds of paradise (Ternatan: sofu, Malay: sopo). Dr. Hirth (Toung-pao V, pag. 391) has already pointed out that so-fu is undoubtedly used for a woven stuff throughout the old geographical literature and reminds of the Arab word suf = wool.

I must acknowledge, however, that my description of the article is neither quite correct, as I did not take it for a woven stuff, but called it a dress or quilt of feathers, on no other authority than a passage from the Tung-Si-Yang-K'au: 以鳥毳为之,