

A Study of Śrīvijaya

By Rokurô KUWATA

In the seventh century, a Chinese Buddhist, I-ching 義淨, made a pilgrimage to India to study Buddhism. After leaving Canton in November of A.D. 671 by Persian ship, his journey took him to the country of Shih-li-fo-shih 室利佛逝國, where he spent six months studying the shêng-ming 聲明 or śabda-vidyâ; from there he continued to the country of Mo-lo-yü 末羅瑜國, and two months later to the country of Chieh-t'u 羯荼國, and passing by the country of naked people, he reached the mouth of the Ganges. In the country of Tan-mo-li-ti 耽摩立底國 he studied Sanskrit and shêng-lun 聲論, before continuing, in May of 673, to Na-lan-t'o 那爛陀 (Nālandā), where he spent ten years studying Buddhism and making pilgrimages to the sacred places of the Buddha. After collecting many Sanskrit sūtras, including 500,000 sung 頌 (odes), he finally started for home in 685. On the return route, he again stayed in Shih-li-fo-shih, as there were over one thousand Buddhists living there, including a high priest named Shih-chia-chi-li-ti 釋迦鷄栗底 (Śākyakīrti). He arrived at Canton in 689, and at Lo-yang 洛陽 in 695. His *Nan-hai-chi-kuei-nei-fa-ch'uan* 南海寄歸內法傳 was translated into English by J. Takakusu 高楠順次郎. Apart from this I-ching wrote the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-ch'iu-fa-kao-sêng-ch'uan* 大唐西域求法高僧傳 and also translated many Buddhist sūtras from the Sanskrit.

Stanislas Julien's restoration of Shih-li-fo-shih to Çrī bhodja was supported by many scholars in the latter half of the nineteenth century, being variously spelt in English as Śrībhodja,⁽¹⁾ Śrībhoga,⁽²⁾ and Śrī-Bhoja,⁽³⁾ but the breakthrough came with the publication of G. Coedès' *Le Royaume de Çrīvijaya*⁽⁴⁾ in 1918, which first introduced the new spelling. In the following year, his idea was supported by J. Ph. Vogel⁽⁵⁾ and G. Ferrand,⁽⁶⁾ and nowadays either Çrīvijaya or Śrīvijaya is used.

(1) *Livre des merveilles de l'Inde*, 1883-1886, p. 251.

(2) J. Takakusu, *I-tsing*, 1896, p. xl.

(3) G.E. Gerini, *Researches on Ptolemy's Geography of Eastern Asia*, 1909.

(4) *B.E.F.E.O.*, XVIII.

(5) *Het koninkrijk Çrīvijaya*, *B.K.I.*, LXXV.

(6) *Comptes Rendus in J.A.*, juillet-août. In 1922, G. Ferrand wrote 'L'empire sumatranais de Çrīvijaya' in *J.A.*, juillet-septembre et octobre-décembre, which was published in one volume in 1922.

In 1920, two more inscriptions were found near Palembang.⁽⁷⁾ The five inscriptions of Śrīvijaya are as follows:

(1) The Kota Kapur inscription—Dated Çaka 608 (A.D. 686), and found in 1892, it is a stele of an obelisk shape, 1.77 metres high. It was found on Bangka Island, between the R. Mënduk and Pangkal Mundo. The well preserved ten-line inscription was engraved as the army of Śrīvijaya was starting out for the expedition to Java.

(2) The Karang Brahi inscription—Dated Çaka 608 (A.D. 686), it was found in 1904 in the upper stream of the R. Mërangin, a southern branch of the Batang Hari, north of Sarolangun in Djambi Province. The inscription resembles that of Kota Kapur, warning of the disloyalty of the native people, but does not mention the sending of the expedition to Java.

(3) The Ligor inscription—Dated Çaka 697 (A.D. 775), it was found in 1910 at Vat Sema Müong in Ligor, on the Malay Peninsula.⁽⁸⁾ This stele has two faces; Face A belongs to Śrīvijaya and relates that the king of Śrīvijaya ordered his chaplain, Jayanta, to build three brick edifices; after the latter's death, his disciples built two more near the same site. Yet the building of these religious edifices does not denote the occupation of the area, since at the beginning of the eleventh century the king of Śrīvijaya also built a temple at Negapatam on the Coromandel coast of South India without occupying the land. Face B is undated but belongs to the Śailendra family, which may be that of Sumatra, i.e. the Śrīvijaya, and not that of Java. (We will explain later the Śailendra of Śrīvijaya). Written after A.D. 775, this face is of later date than Face A.

(4) The Kedukan Bukit inscription—Dated Çaka 605 (A.D. 683), and found in 1920 south-west of Palembang at the foot of Bukit Seguntang, along a branch of the R. Musi called the Sungei Tatang. The ten lines, engraved on a large stone, relate that a king of Śrīvijaya embarked with an army of twenty thousand soldiers and thirteen hundred followers to find a magic potion strong enough to make his country rich and powerful. This may be referring to a pilgrimage along a certain stream to a temple near Palembang.

(5) The Talang Tuwo inscription—Dated Çaka 606 (A.D. 684), and found in 1920 five kilometres west of Palembang. The fourteen lines tell that a king of Śrīvijaya named Çrī Jayanâça (by G. Coedès), Jayanaga (by R. C. Majumdar), and Jayawaga (by W. F. Stutterheim), planned a fruit

(7) G. Coedès, 'Les inscriptions malaises de Çrīvijaya', *B.E.F.E.O.*, XXX, 1930; G. Ferrand, 'Quatre textes épigraphique Malayo-Sanskrit de Sumatra et de Bangka', *J.A.*, oct-déc., 1932; H. Kern, 'Enkel aantekeningen op G. Coedès' uitgave van de Malaïsche inschriften van Çrīvijaya', *B.K.I.*, LXXXVIII, 1931.

(8) G. Coedès wrote 'the inscription of Vieng Sa' in his 'Le royaume de Çrīvijaya' in *B.E.F.E.O.*, XVIII, but afterwards he corrected it 'Ligor inscription' in his 'On the Origin of the Śailendras of Indonesia' in *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1934.

garden for the people, to which anyone might come to eat.

Kota Kapur, Karang Brahi, Ligor, Kedukan Bukit, and Talang Tuwo are all place-names, but not all are found in the popular maps.⁽⁹⁾

S. Beal was the first scholar to identify Śrībhodja with Palembang,⁽¹⁰⁾ which is clearly the capital of Śrīvijaya. But a gnomonical passage in the *Hsin T'ang-shu* 新唐書, v. 222, conflicts with this idea: "When at the summer solstice a gnomon is erected to a height of eight feet (八尺), the shadow (at noon) falls on the south side and is two feet five inches (二尺五寸) long." G.E. Gerini says that the latitude of Śrīvijaya must then be 5°50'N., and that of Ho-ling 訶陵 (Java), which has a shadow two feet four inches (二尺四寸) long, is 6°29'N.⁽¹¹⁾ Other figures are given by Japanese scholars. For example, T. Fujita 藤田豊八 has 6°48'N. for Java and 6°8'45" N. for Śrīvijaya,⁽¹²⁾ and these incorrect gnomonical data led some scholars to mislocate Śrīvijaya. J.L. Moens, for instance, located the capital in Kelantan on the Malay Peninsula at first, after which it moved to Palembang.⁽¹³⁾ He considered the gnomonical data to predate the voyage of I-ching, at which time Palembang was the capital of Śrīvijaya. This idea is impossible; we should ignore the unreliable passages in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*.

From Śrīvijaya, I-ching went on to Malayu or Malāyu, written Mo-lo-yü 末羅瑜 in the biography of Hsüan-ta 玄達 in the *Kao-sêng-ch'uan* 高僧傳, Bk. 2; and as Mo-lo-yü 末羅遊 in the *Chi-kuei-ch'uan* 寄歸傳, v. 1. He states that Malayu is now annexed by Śrīvijaya, which is fifteen days' journey away by ship. Its native name is Djambi, or rather Muara Djambi (suggested by F.M. Schnitger). In A.D. 852, Chan-pei 占卑 sent six emissaries to present tribute including an elephant to the T'ang court.⁽¹⁴⁾ According to J. Crawford, Jambi is the Javanese for areca palm, and is equivalent to pinang in Malay. We also find a Chan-pei country in the *Pei-hu-lu* 北戶錄 and a Pi-chan 畢占 in the *Ling-piao-lu-i* 嶺表錄異, both of which produce p'ien-ho-t'ao 偏核桃. As T. Fujita suggests, Pi-chan may really be Chan-pi 占畢.⁽¹⁵⁾ There is no record of the name Palembang in

(9) The archaeology of Palembang was written in N.J. Krom, *Antiquities of Palembang, Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology*, 1931, p. 29-33; D. Ghosh, *Early Art of Śrīvijaya, J.G.I.S.*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1934, p. 31-38, and F.M. Schnitger, *The Archeology of Hindoo Sumatra*, 1937. F.M. Schnitger was the leader of the archaeological expedition to Sumatra in 1935 and 1936. There were many Hindu relics and monuments found in the south-eastern part of Sumatra.

(10) *Livre des merveilles de l'Inde*, p. 251.

(11) *Researches*, p. 480 and 482.

(12) *Rôgashûkoku-kô* 狼牙脩國考 in the *Nankai-hen* 南海篇, p. 17-18.

(13) *Çrīvijaya, Yáva en Kaṭāha, T.B.G.*, LXXVII, 1937.

(14) *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要, v. 100; *T'ai-p'ing-huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, v. 177; *Yü-hai* 玉海, v. 154.

(15) *Shitsuribussei Sanbutsusei Kyûkô wa Doko ka* 室利佛逝・三佛齊・舊港は何處か, *Geibun* 藝文, Vol. IV, No. 4, 1913; *Nankai-hen* 南海篇, p. 62.

books compiled during the T'ang dynasty. Although Fêng Ch'êng-chün 馮承鈞 says that in A.D. 647 Sui-p'ò-têng 隋婆登, I-li-pi-lin-sung 乙利鼻林送, Tu-po 都播, Yang-t'ung 羊同, Shih 石, Po-ssü 波斯, K'ang-kuo 康國, T'u-huo-lo 吐火羅, A-hsi-chi 阿悉吉 and ten other countries sent ambassadors to the T'ang court as mentioned in the *Chiu T'ang-shu* 舊唐書, vol. 3, adding that Pi-lin-sung must be Palembang, peng 迸 being miswritten sung 送,⁽¹⁶⁾ we cannot agree with this theory, since I-li-pi-lin-sung is clearly Ta-ssü-li-fa-ch'ü-li-shih 大俟利發屈利失 of the Pa-yeh-ku 拔野古 tribe, who submitted to the T'ang in A.D. 647.⁽¹⁷⁾

In the *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要, v. 100, and in the *T'ai-p'ing-huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, v. 177, there is the following passage: "The country of P'ò-têng 婆登 is situated two months' voyage by ship to the south of Lin-i 林邑 (i.e. South Vietnam). It lies west of Ho-ling 訶陵 and east of Mi-li 迷黎. To the north there is a great sea." Ho-ling is Central Java, and P'ò-têng must be Taruma Nagara, whose the king Pûrṇavarman's stone inscription was found in the upper reaches of the Tji Aroeteun, a branch of the Tjiliwoeng, the river which runs through Batavia (Djakarta). P'ò-têng may be Mahâ Taruma Nagara. Both Sui-p'ò-têng 隋婆登 in the *Chiu T'ang-shu*, v. 247, and To-p'ò-têng 隨婆登 in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, v. 222b, are misprints, since in the *T'ung-tien* 通典, we find P'ò-têng and not To-p'ò-têng. This P'ò-têng is identical with the country of P'ò-ta 婆達, noted as Shê-p'ò-p'ò-ta 闍婆達 in the *Sung-shu* 宋書, v. 97, and which sent envoys to the Sung court of the Southern dynasties in the fifth century.

Mi-li must be Malayu, although we should note that the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, the *Chiu T'ang-shu* and the *T'ung-tien* all state mistakenly: "西與迷黎車接", which should read: "西與迷黎連接", or "on the west it connects with Mi-li." This country is clearly Mi-li and not Mi-li-ch'ê 迷黎車, since the phrase lien-chieh 連接 is often used in such circumstances.

In A.D. 644, the embassy of Mo-lo-yu 摩羅游 arrived at the T'ang court;⁽¹⁸⁾ this country is clearly identical with Mo-lo-yu 末羅遊, i.e. the Malayu of I-ching. Again, from the reign of Hsien-hêng 咸亨 (A.D. 670-673) to that of K'ai-yüan 開元 (A.D. 713-741), the embassies of Shih-li-fo-shih 室利佛逝 came often to China. Hence in 695 an imperial edict ordered that provisions be supplied to the foreign embassies then resident in the court. Six months' supply was given to the embassies of Nan T'ien-chu 南天竺 (South India), Pei T'ien-chu 北天竺 (North India), Po-ssü 波斯 (Persia), and Ta-shih 大食 (Arabia); five months' provisions were given to those of Shih-li-fo-shih 室利佛逝 (Śrīvijaya), Chên-la 真臘 (Cambodia), and Ho-ling 訶陵 (Java); and three months' were awarded to that of Lin-i 林邑 (South

(16) *Su-mên-ta-la-ku-kuo-k'ao* 蘇門答刺古國考, p. 95.

(17) *Hsin T'ang-shu* 新唐書, v. 217. B.

(18) *Hsin T'ang-shu* 新唐書, v. 221. B; *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要, v. 100; *Ts'ê-fu-yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜, v. 970.

Vietnam).⁽¹⁹⁾ In 701, the embassy of Fo-shih 佛誓 arrived with presents.⁽²⁰⁾

We can list the intercourse between Śrīvijaya and the T'ang court of the K'ai-yüan period as follows:

- (1) Marth of 716.⁽²¹⁾
- (2) 722: an embassy sent by a king named Po-shun 渤順 complained that he was insulted by the frontier officials.⁽²²⁾
- (3) July of 724: the ambassador Chiu-mo-lo 俱摩羅 (Kumâra) presented as tribute two chu-ju 侏儒 (dwarfs), a female chia-價 (correctly sêng-僧) ch'i 奢 (sô-ki in Japanese; i.e. the Persian zangi, meaning a Negro), a group of native musicians and a five-coloured parrot. Kumâra was appointed chê-ch'ung 折衝 and given one hundred pieces of silk.⁽²³⁾ Negroes are also mentioned as being presented by Ho-ling, but many misprints exist:—e.g. sêng-chih-nu 僧祇奴 for sêng-ch'i-nu 僧祇奴 (sô-gi-nu in Japanese); chin-chih-t'ung 金祇僮 for shê-ch'i-t'ung 舍祇僮. In August of the same year Shih-li-fo-shih-kuo-san 尸利佛誓國三 (i.e. ...kuo-wang 國王), shih-li-t'o-lo-pa-mo 尸利陁羅拔摩 (Śrī Indravarman) was appointed Tso-wei-wei-ta-chiang-chün 左威衛大將軍 and given a purple robe with a band decorated with gold.⁽²⁴⁾
- (4) October of 727.⁽²⁵⁾
- (5) December of 741: at this time a prince of Śrīvijaya came. A reception party was held for him at Ch'ü-chiang 曲江, south-east of the capital.⁽²⁶⁾ In the following January the king of Śrīvijaya, Liu-t'êng (?)-wei-kung 劉騰 (藤?) 未恭 was awarded the honourable title Pin-i-wang 賓義王 and appointed as Yu-chin-wu-wei-ta-chiang-chün 右金吾衛大將軍. On his departure, the prince was presented with eighty pieces of silk.⁽²⁷⁾

Liu-t'êng-wei-kung has been identified with Rudra Vikrama by J.L. Moens,⁽²⁸⁾ but wei-kung may be a miswriting of mo-mang 末莽, in which case Rudravarman may be the true name of this king. In the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, we find the following passage: "The royal title is Ho-mi-to 曷密多", which has not been restored. It may be the Sanskrit amṛta, or 'immortal', since the kings of Śrīvijaya called themselves 'amṛta'.

After 742, that is, in the latter half of the T'ang dynasty, there was

(19) *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要, v. 100.

(20) *Ts'ê-fu-yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜, v. 970-971.

(21) *Ibid.*, v. 971.

(22) *Ibid.*, v. 997.

(23) *Ibid.*, v. 971.

(24) *Ibid.*, v. 975.

(25) *Ibid.*, v. 975.

(26) *Ibid.*, v. 971; *Hsin T'ang-shu* 新唐書, v. 222. B; *Chiu T'ang-shu* 舊唐書, v. 9.

(27) *Ts'ê-fu-yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜, v. 965.

(28) Śrīvijaya, Yâva en Kaṭâha, *T.B.G.*, LXXVII, 1937.

no embassy from Śrīvijaya to China, although in the itinerary of Chia Tan 賈耽, prime minister during the Chên-yüan 貞元 period (A.D. 785–804), Fo-shih 佛逝 is mentioned as lying south of Chih 質 (the Malayan sēlat, meaning 'strait').⁽²⁹⁾ Thus, while we cannot find any details of Śrīvijaya during the late T'ang, it is clear that the country was not forgotten.

In contrast to this loss of contact, the ambassadors of Java came frequently to the T'ang court during this period. We may tabulate the tributary relations of the two countries with the T'ang as follows:

Malayu (摩羅游)	Śrīvijaya (室利佛逝, 佛誓)	Central Java (訶陵, 闍婆)
644		647
		648
		666
		670
	683: Palembang inscriptions	
	686: Bangka (Java expedition)	
	ca. 695	ca. 695
	701	
	716	
	724	
	727	
	742	
	(CASE A)	
		767
		768
		769
	775: Ligor inscription (Face A)	774–787: Javanese expeditions to Champa
		778: Kalasan inscription (Śailendra dynasty)
	(CASE B)	
		813
		818
		820
		831
		844–848: Ibn Khordādzbeh
		851: Sulaymān
852 (Djambi 占卑)	ca. 860: Balaputra, king of Suvārnadvīpa (Śailendra family)	850–873
	904	
		916: Abū Zayd

In the above table, 'CASE A' denotes the ascendancy of Śrīvijaya and descendancy of Java, while 'CASE B' denotes the opposite condition. We can, moreover, suggest that in each case certain political and diplomatic conditions changed in the relations between the two countries. While we cannot assert subjugation or occupation by one country of the other in CASE A, we can suggest the take-over of Śrīvijaya by the Śailendra family of Java. This suggestion has already been made by W.F. Stutterheim,⁽³⁰⁾ who refuted the old theory that the Śailendra family of Java was of Sumatran origin. G. Coedès goes further, saying that the family came from Funan 扶南 (Cambodia).⁽³¹⁾ R.C. Majumdar, however, places their origin in

(29) Ti-li-chih 地理志 of the Hsin T'ang-shu 新唐書.

(30) *A Javanese Period in Sumatran History*, 1929.

(31) Origin of the Śailendras of Indonesia, *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1934.

the Gāṅga dynasty of Kaliṅga in India,⁽³²⁾ while J. Przyluski locates it in the cosmic mountain.⁽³³⁾

Whatever their real origin was, the Śailendra family of Central Java was a strong kingdom able to build the Buddhist temple of Borobudur in the centre of the island, and to send fleets to Champa and to Khmèr. Thus we read, in the 784 inscription of Satyavarman in Po-nagar, that the ferocious, pitiless dark-coloured people of other cities, took away the Mukha-liṅga of the God and set fire to the temple. The 799 inscription of Indravarman I. in Yang Tikuh also relates that the Bhadrâdhipatisvara temple was burned by the Javanese army in 787. These two attacks are mentioned in R.C. Majumdar's *The Śailendra Empire*.⁽³⁴⁾ As for the expedition to Khmèr, Jayavarman II. after returning from Java established his authority over Cambodia at the beginning of the ninth century. He set up his capital upon Mt. Mahendra (Phnom Kulên), instituting at the same time the cult of devarâja. Thus we see from the following inscription of Sdök kâk thom: "Kambujadeśa was no more dependent on Javâ, and there was no more than one single sovereign who was *cakravartin*."⁽³⁵⁾

In Abû Zayd's *Accounts of India and China*, we find the curious story of the subjugation of Komar (Khmèr) by the Mahârâja of Zâbej. Zâbej comes to be Java and the Mahârâja to be a king of the Śailendra family of Java. In the *Book of Routes and Kingdoms*, Ibn Khordâdbeh (Khurdadbeh, Khordadbeh, Khordâdbeh) mentions Djabah al Hind (Djabah of India) and the Mahârâja of Zâbedj in the middle of the ninth century (844-848), saying: "The island Kalah or Kilah belongs to the Kingdom of Djabah of India." Sulaymân also notes (in 851) that Kalâh-bâr is a dependency of Zâbej. Kalah, Kilah, and Kalâh-bâr are all Kedah, on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, as we shall show later. Since the Djabah subjugated Kalah in the middle of the ninth century, Java is obviously the Java of the Śailendra family, and since Java is not in India, we suggest that 'Djabah of India' is in fact 'Java Hindouisé', and the latter term was indicated by the Hindu as 'Zâbej' (Zâbag), especially by the Ceylonese Buddhists, to show endearment. The word 'Zâbej' is z-a-b-j in Arabic, although the fourth letter of the Arabic alphabet, 'jeen', is pronounced hard, as 'g' in garden. Again, the spelling of zanj or zanjî (a Negro) is z-n-j-y in Arabic, but z-n-k-y in Persian, while in the Chinese we find sêng-ch'i 僧祇 (sô-gi in Japanese), sêng-ch'i 僧著 (sô-ki in Japanese), and K'un-lun-ts'êng-ch'i 崑崙層期 (Kon-ron-sô-ki in Japanese).⁽³⁶⁾ Obviously,

(32) Les rois Śailendra de Suvarṇadvîpa, *B.E.F.E.O.*, XXXIII, 1933, p. 140. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri's opposition, 'Origin of the Çailendras', *T.B.G.*, LXXV, 1935.

(33) The Śailendravamśa, *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1935, p. 25-36.

(34) *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. I, No. 1, 1934, p. 19; *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 158.

(35) Origin of the Śailendras of Indonesia, *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. I, No. 2, 1934, p. 69-70.

(36) Chou Ch'ü-fei 周去非, *Ling-wai-tai-ta* 嶺外代答, v. 3, 1178.

then, the letter 'jeen' was read as 'g' in garden during the T'ang and Sung periods. Thus G. Ferrand claims that 'Zâbag' is the old pronunciation, 'Zâbaj' the new, and thus restored Zâbag to Djawaga or Jâwaga < Skt. Ĵâvaka.⁽³⁷⁾

Now, Jâvaka or Ĵâvaka was the name of a country whose king Čandrabhanu twice invaded Ceylon, in 1236 and 1256, and who was driven back by the Ceylonese king Parâkramabâhu II.⁽³⁸⁾ In the inscription of Jatâvarman, Vîra-Pânđya (1264), we read that the Pânđya king took the country of Chôla, Ceylon, and the crown and the crowned head of the Čâvaka.⁽³⁹⁾ G. Ferrand's writings on the subject are ambiguous. We find in various places "Čâvaka (i.e. Ĵâvaka)"; "Conquête du Ĵâvaka=Çrîvijaya, qui fit prisonnier le souverain sumatranais"⁽⁴⁰⁾; and "le roi du Zâbag < Ĵâvaka qui est un autre nom de l'empire de Çrîvijaya."⁽⁴¹⁾ Yet elsewhere, he says that Zâbag < Ĵâvaka is the 'île de Java'⁽⁴²⁾ and Jâwaga (Java).⁽⁴³⁾ We do not get a clear idea from his work.

In fact, there were two Jâvakas in the thirteenth century. One was the country which invaded Ceylon, as we have seen, and the other was Tâmbraļiᅅga, of which the inscription of Čandrabhânu has been found at Caiya (Chaiya, or Jaiya), near Ligor on the Malay Peninsula. The inscription is dated 1230,⁽⁴⁴⁾ and by comparing the dates G. Coedès has shown that the king Čandrabhânu of Tâmbraļiᅅga (Ligor) must be the same as that referred to in the Ceylonese chronicle.⁽⁴⁵⁾ Yet, G. Coedès does not identify Zâbaj with Jâvaka, despite their phonetic similarity, which he acknowledges. His identification of two Jâvaka has been disputed by Nilakanta Sastri,⁽⁴⁶⁾ while R.C. Majumdar claims that Đavâka (in Samudragupta's inscription), Śâvaka, Sâvaka (in South Indian literature), Jâvaka (in the *Mahâvaᅅsa*), Čavaka (in the inscription of Caiya), and Zâbaj (Djâwaga or Jâwaga) of the Mohammedans are all the same country, that is, Tâmbraļiᅅga (Ligor) on the Malay Peninsula.⁽⁴⁷⁾ This we cannot agree with, and Zâbag of the Mohammedans cannot be Jâvaka of Tâmbraļiᅅga.

(37) L'empire sumatranais de Çrîvijaya, *J.A.*, XX, 1922, p. 162, 165; *Voyage du marchand arabe Sulaymân en Inde et en Chine*, 1922, p. 41.

(38) *Mahâvaᅅsa*, LXXXIII, LXXXVIII; G. Ferrand, L'empire sumatranais de Çrîvijaya, *J.A.*, XX, 1922, p. 172-173.

(39) *Ibid.*, p. 48.

(40) *Ibid.*, p. 170.

(41) *Ibid.*, p. 162.

(42) *Ibid.*, p. 54.

(43) G. Ferrand, *Voyage du marchand arabe Sulaymân en Inde et en Chine*, p. 95, and *Relations*, p. 111. "Zâbag < Djawaga = Java".

(44) R.C. Majumdar, *Suvarᅅadvîpa*, p. 216.

(45) *Ibid.*; G. Coedès, A propos de la chute du royaume de Çrîvijaya, *B.K.I.*, LXXXIII, 1927.

(46) Śrîvijaya, Candrabhânu and Vîra Pânđya, *T.B.G.*, LXXVII, 1937.

(47) *Suvarᅅadvîpa*, p. 215.

G. Ferrand identified Java with Chu-po 諸薄, mentioned in K'ang T'ai's 康泰 *Fu-nan-t'u-su* 扶南土俗.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Now, Tu-po 杜薄⁽⁴⁹⁾ was a misprint of Shê-po 社薄⁽⁵⁰⁾, and both Chu-po and Shê-po equal Shê-p'o 闍婆, or Java. From the ancient pronunciation of po 薄 i.e. *b'âk*⁽⁵¹⁾ (haku in Japanese), we can identify Chu-po and Shê-po with Jāvaka, but there are some instances in which the 'k' ending is omitted, as in Ni-fu-chü-lo 泥縛矩羅 (Devakula), A-shih-fu 阿濕縛 (aśva), Sa-fu-hsi-ti 薩縛悉底 (svasti) in the *Fan-yü-tsa-ming* 梵語雜名 (Chinese vocabulary of Sanskrit) compiled in the T'ang period; it is also omitted in Ta-shih 大食 (Tāj), which was popularly used in the same period. The ancient pronunciations *b'î^wak* 縛 and *dziak* 食⁽⁵²⁾ end in 'k'. Ta-shih was written To-shih 多氏 by I-ching. Hsi-mo 悉莫 in the description of Ho-ling in the *Hsin T'ang-shu* can be read as Śiva, by omitting the 'k' ending of the ancient pronunciation. We can find no trace of Jāvaka in the first half of the third century, although 'Jabadiu' of Ptolemy's *Geography* (second century) was certainly Java. Zābag (i.e. Jāvaka) was first mentioned by Ibn Khordābeh in the mid-ninth century.

We can now turn to the Nālandā copper-plate. This has an inscription bearing the date of the thirty-ninth year of King Devapāla of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal (A.D. 860). This king granted five villages to the Buddhist monastery built by Mahārāja Bālaputradeva, king of Suvarṇadvīpa. The inscription relates the genealogy of Bālaputradeva, and contains the following important passage: "There was a great king of Yavabhūmi (Yavabhūmi-pāla), whose name signified 'tormentor of brave foes' (Viravairimatthan-ānugat-ābhīdhāna) and who was an ornament of the Śailendra dynasty (Śailendra-varṇsa-tilaka). He had a valiant son (called) Samarāgravīra (or, 'he who is the foremost warrior in battle'). His wife, Tārā, daughter of King Śrī-Varmasetu of the lunar race, resembled the goddess Tārā. By this wife he had a son Śrī-Bālaputra, who built a monastery at Nālandā."⁽⁵³⁾ From this inscription we know that Mahārāja Bālaputradeva of Suvarṇadvīpa (i.e. Śrīvijaya) was a prince of the Śailendra family of Java. The names Suvarṇadvīpa (gold-island) and Suvarṇabhūmi (gold-land) as applied to overseas countries were familiar to Indians from a very early period. They can be found in old popular stories such as have been preserved in Jātakas, Kathākośa and Bṛhatkathā, as well as in more serious literary works, mainly Buddhist.⁽⁵⁴⁾ 'Chryse' of Periplus and 'Chryse Chersonesus'

(48) *T'ai-p'ing-yü-lan* 太平御覽, v. 787.

(49) *T'ung-tien* 通典, v. 188; *T'ai-p'ing-yü-lan*, v. 788; *Wên-hsian-t'ung-k'ao* 文獻通考, v. 332.

(50) *T'ai-p'ing-huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, v. 177.

(51) B. Karlgren, *Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese*, 1923, p. 231.

(52) *Ibid.*, p. 50, 262.

(53) *B.E.F.E.O.*, XXXIII, p. 123; *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 14; *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 152-153.

(54) *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 37.

or 'Golden Peninsula' refer to the same.⁽⁵⁵⁾ Chin-chou 金洲 (gold-island) was mentioned twice by I-ching in his *Kao-sêng-ch'uan*, v. B, as a synonym for Śrīvijaya.⁽⁵⁶⁾ A. Foucher later produced an illustrated Nepalese manuscript of the tenth to eleventh centuries which contained a picture entitled 'Suvarṇapure Śrī-Vijaya-pure Lokanātha' or '(the image of) Lokanātha (Avalokiteśvara) in Śrī-Vijaya-pura in Suvarṇapura'. G. Ferrand opposes G. Coedès' opinion that Suvarṇapura was a part of Burma, locating Śrī-Vijayapura in Suvarṇapura in Palembang.⁽⁵⁷⁾ He is supported by R.C. Majumdar. An Arab writer, Al Bîrûnî (Alberuni) (A.D. 973-1048), wrote: "The Zâbag islands are called by the Hindus '*suvarṇa dîb*' (Suvarṇadvîpa or the gold islands)."⁽⁵⁸⁾ Masao Shizutani 靜谷正雄 introduced a Tibetan text of Atîśa's biography, who lived in Suvarṇadvîpa for twelve years, saying: It was written in the tenth year of the reign of Cûḍamaṇivarmadeva in Śrīvijayapura in Suvarṇadvîpa."⁽⁵⁹⁾ Cûḍamaṇivarmadeva was the king of Śrīvijaya, which sent an embassy to the Sung court in 1003.⁽⁶⁰⁾ These passages and text show that Suvarṇadvîpa was Sumatra, so that the Zâbag of Al Bîrûnî was Śrīvijaya, and not Java as afterwards explained.

Historically, it is important that a prince of the Śailendra family of Java become the king of Śrīvijaya as depicted in the Nālandâ plate. After 879 we find that Central Java is being ruled by a king not of the Śailendra dynasty, showing that the latter had declined and lost their authority there. Thus the royal family of Śrīvijaya became part of the Śailendra family and used their title i.e. 'Mahârāja'. We may thus regard the mid-ninth century as the approximate limit of Śailendra supremacy in Java,⁽⁶¹⁾ though unfortunately we know almost nothing of the circumstances in which they lost their power. It is also difficult to assign even an approximate date.⁽⁶²⁾ The family declined on Java and recovered in Śrīvijaya, or rather, Śrīvijaya was revived with the Śailendra as its kings. The name of Zâbag came to denote Śrīvijaya, and the latter name to be used by the Mohammedans. Abû Zayd al-Ḥasan, who in 916 completed with his additional remarks the merchant Sulaymân's account of a voyage to India

(55) *Ibid.*, p. 6, 40.

(56) *Ibid.*, p. 41; G. Ferrand, Çrīvijaya, p. 122.

(57) A. Foucher, Etude sur l'iconographie bouddhique de l'Inde, *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes*, XIII, 1900; G. Ferrand, Çrīvijaya, p. 42-43; R.C. Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 45.

(58) G. Ferrand, *Relations*, p. 163, 167; Çrīvijaya, p. 64; R.C. Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 40-41.

(59) *Tôzai Gakujutsu Kenkyûjo Ronsô* 東西學術研究所論叢 (pub. Kansai Daigaku 関西大學), Vol. VIII, 1952.

(60) San-fo-ch'i-ch'uan 三佛齊傳 in the *Sung-shih* 宋史, v. 489.

(61) R.C. Majumdar, The Śailendra Empire, *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 21; *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 159-160.

(62) *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 159.

and China (originally written in 851), says that among the islands over which the Mahārāja of Zâbag rules are those called Serboza (or Sarbaza) (s-r-b-z-h), Râmî (=Achin, or Atjeh in northern Sumatra), and Kalah (Kedah, on Malay Peninsula). (G. Ferrand reads the Arabic as Sribuza, but we cannot agree with this reading). The usual Arabic reading must have been Serboza or Sarbaza, and this pronunciation was brought to the Sung court by Mohammedan embassies. According to the *Sung-shih*, there were many Mohammedans among the ambassadors. The name of the country 'Serboza' was transcribed by the Chinese as San-fo-ch'i 三佛齊. Some scholars have assumed this to be Zâbedj, but this idea cannot be accepted, because, as G. Ferrand points out, the ancient pronunciation was Zâbag (Skt. Jāvaka) and not Zâbedj, and there is no way of transcribing Zâbag to San-fo-ch'i in Chinese.

The first embassy of San-fo-ch'i, then, came to the Sung court in 960, almost fifty years after Abû Zayd al-Ḥasan's compilation of his *Account of India and China*. Abû Zayd of Syraf did not make the journey himself, but compiled the account from stories told by voyagers and seamen. In the tenth century both 'Zâbag' and 'Serboza' were known to the Mohammedans, and the centre of Zâbag moved from Java to Serboza. The Mahārāja of Zâbag was already the sovereign of Serboza. Thus the country of San-fo-ch'i was not Zâbag but Serboza.

As to the Śailendra family of Serboza, we have other evidence than the Nâlandâ plate already mentioned. The B Face of the Ligor stele bears the inscription of Śrīmahārāja of the Śailendra family, translated by G. Coedès.⁽⁶³⁾ It is undated, but said to be later than the A Face (dated 775), which refers Śrīvijaya but not to Śailendra. Various opinions have been proposed about the B Face, but the present writer suggests that it might have been written by the Śailendra kings of Śrīvijaya (San-fo-ch'i). The king of San-fo-ch'i, Çrī Cûlâmaṇivarman, who sent tribute in 1003 and his son Çrī Maraviyayottungavarman in 1008, built a Buddhist temple at Negapatam, on the west coast of the Bay of Bengal; the king of Cola (Chola) Râjarāja, presented a village to the temple. The inscription of Râjarāja further informs us that Mâraviyayottungavarman was born into the Śailendra family and was the lord of Śrīviṣaya and Kaṭâha.⁽⁶⁴⁾ From this we can see that by the beginning of the eleventh century the royal family of Śrīvijaya was the Śailendra. 'Serire' is a mistake, as many scholars say.⁽⁶⁵⁾

We may now turn to the details of the tributary relationship between

(63) *B.E.F.E.O.*, XVIII; *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. I, No. 2; R.C. Majumdar, *The Śailendra Empire*, *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. I, No. 1; *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 150.

(64) G. Ferrand, *Çrīvijaya*, p. 46; R.C. Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 168.

(65) Mas'ûdî, *Les Prairies d'or* (943) and *Bozorg fils de Chahriyar, Livre des merveilles de l'Inde* (a collection of stories in the tenth century).

San-fo-ch'i and the Sung court:⁽⁶⁶⁾

- (a) September of 960: the name of the king is Hsi-li-hu-ta-hsia-li-t'an 悉利胡大霞里檀. 'Hu' 胡 was omitted in the *Ch'ang-pien* 長編, in the *K'ao-so* 考索, and in the *Ling-wai-tai-ta* 嶺外代答, although it is mentioned in the *T'ung-k'ao* 通考, so we cannot be certain whether or not it is an integral part of the king's name. It has been restored by J. Takakusu as Śrī-gupta-harīta⁽⁶⁷⁾ and by G. Ferrand as Çrī (Malay: sēri) Kuda Haridana.⁽⁶⁸⁾
- (b) May of 961.
- (c) November of 961: the king's name was Shih-li-wu-yeh 室利烏耶, which has been restored by G. Ferrand as 'Çrī Wuja?' and by J.L. Moens as 'Çrī U(da)ya (ditya).⁽⁶⁹⁾ The king was also known as Shêng-liu 生留, which G. Ferrand has corrected to Mo-liu 末留, i.e. Malāyu. However, shêng-liu may be restored as Śrī or Ser. It is mentioned in the *Sung-shih* and in the *T'ung-k'ao*, but not in other books.
- (d) March of 962: the king's name is the same as that given in the *Sung-shih*.
- (e) November of 962: his name is given as Shih-li-wu-yeh 釋利烏耶 in the *Sung-hui-yao*, as Shih-li-yeh 釋利耶 in the *Ch'ang-pien* and the *K'ao-so*. The date of December 23 in the *Sung-hui-yao* should be corrected.
- (f) April of 971: 970 in the *K'ao-so* must be corrected. Presents brought were shui-ch'ang 水昌 (crystal), huo-yu 火油 (petroleum oil), according to the *Sung-shih*. (In the *Yü-hai* 玉海, huo-yu was incorrectly written huo-ch'ou 火紬.) We see from the *Sung-hui-yao* that petroleum oil was presented by Wu-hsün 勿巡 (Mezoen, or Sohar in Oman) in April 1072, and by Ts'êng-t'an 屬檀 (Sultan of the Seljuk Turks) in July 1071. We owe the identification of these names to T. Fujita's study.⁽⁷⁰⁾
- (g) April of 972: the king's name is given in all books as Shih-li-wu-yeh 釋利烏耶.
- (h) March of 974: the same name again is found in the *Sung-hui-yao*. Articles of tribute are listed as ivory, frankincense, rosewater, dates, flat peach, sugar, crystal rings, glass bottles and corals.

(66) Chinese books used for reference in this chapter are: *Sung-shih* 宋史; *Hsü Tzū-chih-t'ung-chien-ch'ang-pien* 續資治通鑑長編 (abb. 長編); *Shan-t'an-k'ao-so* 山堂考索 (abb. 考索); *Yü-hai* 玉海; *Sung-hui-yao* 宋會要; *Wên-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* 文獻通考. G. Ferrand used only *Sung-shih* and *Wên-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* in his 'L'empire sumatranais de Çrī-vijaya', *J.A.*, 1922, p. 17-22.

(67) *I-tsing*, p. xlii.

(68) Çrīvijaya, p. 17.

(69) Çrīvijaya, Yāva en Kaṭāha, *T.B.G.*, LXXVII, 1937.

(70) *Nankai-hen* 南海篇, p. 257-280.

- (i) December of 975.
- (j) 980: the king's name was Hsia-ch'ih 夏池 (vieu malais Haji 'roi' by G. Ferrand). The initial 'h' has been dropped in modern Malay. 'Haji' was mentioned in inscriptions of the ninth and tenth centuries, being a royal title.⁽⁷¹⁾
- (k) November of 983: the king's name was Hsia-chih 遐至, the same person as Hsia-ch'ih above. The king is mentioned in the article on India of the *Sung-shih*, v. 490. In the article on Shê-p'ò 闍婆 (i.e. Java) of the same, a Hsia-chih Ma-lo-yeh 馬囉夜 (Mahârāja) was given as another name of the king of Java. Presents are listed as a crystal statue of the Buddha, brocades, rhinoceros horns, ivory, perfume, and drugs in the *Sung-shih*. However, in the *Yü-hai* we find T'ung-t'ien-hsi 通天犀 (rhinoceros horn), Ta-shih-chin 大食錦 (brocades made in Western Asia), Yüeh-no-pu 越諾布⁽⁷²⁾ and glass bottles. This yüeh-no-pu was first mentioned in the article on Persia of the *Sui-shu*. The *Chu-fan-chih* says that it was produced in Baghdad, Ghazni and Rum (Damascus), while the *Ling-wai-tai-ta* states that it was made in Baghdad and Merbat, on the Hadramaut coast of Arabia. It is probably a kind of fine muslin.⁽⁷³⁾ In February of 985 a ship-master named Chin-hua-ch'a 金花茶 presented products of his country, but he may not have been an embassy. Yung-ning 雍寧 in the *Sung-hui-yao* is a misprint for Yung-hsi 雍熙.
- (l) December of 988: (the *pên-chi* 本紀 of the *Sung-shih* and the *Yü-hai* give December of the following year as the date, and it is not clear which is correct.) An embassy named P'u-ya-t'o-li 蒲押陀黎 arrived and "According to the *Sung-shih*, San-fo-ch'i presented Buddhist canons in blue wood boxes" says the *Sung-hui-yao*. This passage, however, refers to Jih-pên (Japan), and not to San-fo-ch'i.
- (m) December of 992: the same embassy came again to say that his country had been invaded by the Javanese army, and that he could not return. He begged the Sung court to declare by imperial decree that his country was to become a protectorate of China, and his request was granted, but the decree must be given to Java, and blaming its invasion of San-fo-ch'i. It is possible that there may be some mistake in this part of the *Sung-shih*. In the same month embassies of King Mu-lo-ch'a 穆羅茶 (Mahârāja) of Shê-p'ò came to China. The translator related that Shê-p'ò and San-fo-ch'i were enemies and were always fighting with each other. Thus the same report was

(71) *T.B.G.*, LXVII, p. 178.

(72) B. Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, 1919, p. 495.

(73) *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 266.

brought by both sides. The king of Java at this time must have been Dharmavaṃśa (Dharmawangsa) of East Java, since it was he who reopened intercourse with China after its neglect following the decline of the Śailendra family. In 1006, however, Java was overwhelmed by a great catastrophe, possibly the invasion by Śrīvijaya, which left the capital reduced to ashes and resulted in the death of the great king in 1007.⁽⁷⁴⁾

- (n) September of 1003: the name of the king was Ssü-li-chu-(or chou)-lo-wu-ni-fo-ma-t'iao-hua 思離味 (or 朱) 囉無尼佛麻調華 (Śrī Cūlāmanivarmandeva). This king had built a Buddhist temple in his domain and begged the Sung court to give it a name and a bell to celebrate the long life of the emperor; this request was approved and the name Ch'eng-t'ien-wan-shou 承天萬壽 was given, to be written on the tablet of the temple. The two embassies were named Kuei-têh-chiang-chün 歸德將軍 and Huai-hua-chiang-chün 懷化將軍 ('Huai' is 'Kuei' in the *Ch'ang-pien*), and stayed in the capital until January 15 of the following year when, together with the embassies of Ta-shih and P'u-tuan 蒲端 (Panduranga, in South Vietnam), they attended the festival of Shang-yüan-kuan-têng 上元觀燈.
- (o) July of 1008: the king is named as Ssü-li-ma-lo-p'i 思離麻囉皮 (Śrī Māvijayottuṅavarman), and the embassies attended the ceremony of fêng-ch'an 封禪 (the worship of Heaven and Earth) on the mountain T'ai-shan 泰山.

The identification of the two kings' Chinese names with their Indian counterparts was made from the inscriptions by G. Coedès in his *Le Royaume de Śrīvijaya*,⁽⁷⁵⁾ and was accepted and adopted by G. Ferrand.⁽⁷⁶⁾ We should now look at R.C. Majumdar's translation of the inscriptions.⁽⁷⁷⁾ The Colas of South India were a great naval power and this naturally brought them into contact with South-east Asia. Relations at first were friendly between the Cola kings and the Śailendra rulers, as proved by an inscription which is to be found on twenty-one plates now preserved in the Leiden Museum along with three other plates. These two records are known respectively as the Larger Leiden Grant (la grande charte de Leyden) and the Smaller Leiden Grant, as their place of finding is not known. The former is written partly in Sanskrit and partly in Tamil, and the Tamil portion tells us that the Cola king Râjarâja the Great granted, in the twenty-first year of his reign (1005), the revenues of a village for the

(74) *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 266; S. Matsuoka 松岡靜雄, *Jaba-shi* 爪哇史, p. 59, 66.

(75) *B.E.F.E.O.*, XVIII, 1918, p. 7.

(76) *Śrīvijaya*, p. 19.

(77) *Suvarṇadvîpa*, Bk. II, Chap. II: The Struggle between the Śailendras and the Colas, p. 167-190.

upkeep of the Buddhist temple of Cûlâmaṇivarmanvihâra, built by Cûlâmaṇivarman, king of Kaḍâram (or Kiḍâram) at Nâgapaṭṭan (Negapatam). The Sanskrit portion tells us that Râjarâja Râjakeśarivarman (i.e. Râjarâja the Great) gave, in the twenty-first year of his reign, a village to the Buddhist temple Cûlâmaṇivarmanvihâra, which was built at Nâgîpaṭṭana by Śrī Mâravijayottuṅgavarman in the name of his father Cûlâmaṇivarman. It then tells us that Mâra-vijayottuṅgavarman was born in the Śailendra family, was the lord of Śrī-viṣaya, had extended his suzerainty over Kaṭâha (Śrī-viṣay-âdhipatinâ Kaṭâha-âdhipatyam-âtanvatâ), and had 'Makara as the emblem on his banner'. We further learn that, after the death of Râjarâja, his son and successor Madhurântaka, that is, Râjendra Cola, issued an edict for the grant made by his father.⁽⁷⁸⁾ The important points in the inscriptions are as follows:

- (1) Ssü-li-chou-lo-wu-ni-fo-ma-t'iao-hua 思離味囉無尼佛麻調華, or Śrī Cûlâmaṇivarman Deva. Ssü-li-ma-lo-p'i 思離麻囉皮, or Śrī Mâravijayottuṅgavarman.
- (2) These were the king of Śrīvijaya and Kaṭâha (Kaḍâram), corresponding to the Mahârâja of Zâbag, and were born in the Śailendra family (of Śrīvijaya, not of Java).

We have the Chinese names of the kings of Śrīvijaya (San-fo-ch'i), but only in the above two cases do we have other sources which give the correct pronunciation.

- (p) April of 1017: the king is named as Hsia-ch'ih-su-wu-ch'a-p'u-mi 霞遲蘇勿吒蒲迷 (Haji Suvarṇabhûmi).⁽⁷⁹⁾ G. Ferrand has restored this name as Haji Sumatrabhûmi, and this was followed by R.C. Majumdar,⁽⁸⁰⁾ but Hsü-wên-ta-la 須文答刺 in the *Tao-i-chih-lüeh* 島夷志略, Su-mu-tou (or ta) -la 速木都 (or 答) 刺 in the *Yüan-shih* 元史, and Hsü-mên-ta-la 須門答刺 in the *Ming-shih* 明史 are all names of the village of Samudra, along the River Pasei in northern Sumatra, as W.P. Groeneveldt suggested.⁽⁸¹⁾ Afterwards, Europeans applied the name to the whole island, just as they applied the name of 'Brunei' to the whole island of Borneo. Thus Su-wu-ch'a-p'u-mi cannot be restored as Sumatra Bhûmi. The island of Sumatra was referred to by Marco Polo as Java Minor.

- (q) August of 1028: the king is named as Shih-li-tieh-hua 室離疊華 (Śrī Deva). G. Ferrand restored this as Çrīdeva.⁽⁸²⁾

For over fifty years after this date, no embassy came from San-fo-ch'i to the Sung court. As we have mentioned above, the Javanese king Dhar-

(78) *Ibid.*, p. 167-168.

(79) Çrīvijaya, p. 19, note 3.

(80) *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 183, 185.

(81) *Notes*, 1877, p. 215.

(82) Çrīvijaya, p. 20.

mavamśa invaded San-fo-ch'i in 992 and occupied Śrīvijaya for some years, but was killed in the battle field in 1007, defending his country against an enemy (Śrīvijaya?). His heir Airlangga (Erlangga) being then only fifteen years old, more than twenty years passed before he recovered sovereignty over the whole of Java. In 1031, he invaded the country of Vuravari (Woerawali) "clear water", which has been variously located in Johor (by G.P. Rouffaer),⁽⁸³⁾ as Śrīvijaya (by V.S. Callenfels),⁽⁸⁴⁾ and in Java (by N.J. Krom).⁽⁸⁵⁾ R.C. Majumdar declares that Rouffaer's arguments are far from convincing, and that there is nothing to indicate that the places were not in Java.⁽⁸⁶⁾ We find, in the article Chiu-chiang 舊港 of the *Tao-i-chih-lüeh* and in the *Ying-ai-shêng-lan* 瀛涯勝覽, the harbour of Tan-chiang 淡港. This is a synonym for Vuravari. T. Fujita locates this harbour in the mouth of the River Musi, which runs through Palembang (Śrīvijaya). Thus we might be able to adopt Callenfels' suggestion, which means that the invasion of Java in 1006–1007 could be the revenge of Māravijayottuṅavarman of Śrīvijaya.⁽⁸⁷⁾

As has already been said, at the beginning of the eleventh century a Buddhist temple Cūlāmanivarma-Vihāra was built by the kings of Śrīvijaya, to which a village was granted by Rājarāja, king of Chola (Chu-lien 注犛). This friendly relationship did not last long. Within a few years, hostilities broke out and Rājendra Cola sent a naval expedition against his powerful adversary beyond the sea. The details preserved in the Cola inscriptions leave us in no doubt that the expedition was crowned with brilliant success, and that various parts of the empire of the Śailendras were reduced by the mighty Cola emperor. In the Tiruvālaṅgādh plates (1017–18), an inscription at the temple of Malur in the Bangalore district (1024–25), the Tanjore inscription of Rājendra Cola (1030–31), and in many others of this king, details of the expedition are repeatedly recorded. They have been studied by G. Coedès, G.P. Rouffaer, G. Ferrand, and R.C. Majumdar.⁽⁸⁸⁾

The Tamil inscription of Tanjore (1030–31) gives the names of many countries subdued by Rājendra Cola. His expedition captured the king Saṅgrāma-vijayottuṅavarman of Kaḍāram with a great store of treasures, going on to subdue Śrīvijaya, Paṅṅai, Malaiyūr, Mâyiruḍiṅgam, Ilaṅgâśogam, Mâppappālam, Meviḷimbaṅgam, Valaippandūru, Talaitakkolam, Mâdamāliṅgam, Ilāmuriḍeśam, Mâṅakkavâram and Kaḍāram.⁽⁸⁹⁾ R.C.

(83) *B.K.I.*, LXXVII, 1921, p. 43, 73, 90–92, 112–125, 133.

(84) S. Matsuoka, *Jaba-shi*, p. 66, note 1.

(85) *Geschiedenis*, p. 241–242; *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 267.

(86) *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 266, note 3.

(87) *Ibid.*, Bk. III, Chap. II: Rise of Eastern Java, p. 255–275.

(88) *B.E.F.E.O.*, XVIII, 1918, p. 5–23; *B.K.I.*, LXXVII, 1921, p. 77–86; *J.A.*, 1922, p. 45; *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. I, No. 2, 1934, p. 78–80. (*Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 167–190).

(89) *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 173–174.

Majumdar says that these countries were not really independent kingdoms, but were merely vassal states of Saṅgrāma-Vijayottuṅgavarman, ruler of Kaḍāram and Śrīvijaya, and this view, originally put forward by Hultsch, is accepted by Venkayya and G. Coedès.⁽⁹⁰⁾ Some of the countries have been identified with place-names on current maps. Kaḍāram is Sanskrit Kaṭāha or Kalah (of the Mohammedans), or Kedah, on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula; Śrīvijaya is Palembang; Malaiyūr is Jambi; Ilaṅgāśogam is Lankasuka, which is near Kedah; Mā-Damāliṅgam is Tāmbralīṅgam, which is between the Bay of Bandon and Ligor, on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula; Ilāmurideśam is Rami, the Lāmurī of the Mohammedans, and the Lambri of Marco Polo, which are all Achin, or Atjeh, on the north tip of Sumatra; Mā-Ṇakkavāram refers to the Nicobar Islands. However, the various suggestions as to the identity of Paṅṅai, Māyiruḍiṅgam, Māppappālam, Mevilimbaṅgam, Valaippandūru and Talaitakkolam are not convincing.

After the death of Rājendra Cola, the Perumber inscription (1069–70) of Vīrarājendradeva states that the king having conquered Kaḍāram, was pleased to give it back to its king, who worshipped at his feet, which bore anklerings.⁽⁹¹⁾ But in the long reign of Kulottuṅga Cola (1070–1119), at the request of the king of Kiḍāra, the great king exempted from taxes the village granted to the Buddhist temple, Śailendra-Cūdāmaṇivarman-vihāra (i.e. the one established by King Cūḷāmaṇivarman as referred to in the Larger Leiden Grant). This is known as the Smaller Leiden Grant, and is dated in the twentieth year of the reign of Kulottuṅga Cola (1089–90).⁽⁹²⁾

- (r) According to the *Sung-shih*, in 1077 the great chief Ti-hua-ch'ieh-lo came as the embassy of San-fo-ch'i, and was given the title of great general. The Chinese text reads as follows: "Shih-ta-shou-ling-ti-hua-ch'ieh-lo-lai-i-wei-pao-shun-mu-hua-ta-chiang-chūn 使大首領地華伽囉來以爲保順慕化大將軍. He was also favoured with an imperial edict. The date was miswritten as 1067 by G. Ferrand and R.C. Majumdar, and we want to correct the Chinese text here. "Shih-ta-shou-ling-ti-hua-ch'ieh-lo-lai" must be "Ta-shou-ling-ti-hua-ch'ieh-lo-ch'ien-shih-lai" 大首領地華伽囉遣使來. "Ta-shou-ling" was the king, and not "l'un des plus haut dignitaires" as G. Ferrand translated it, nor "one of their high chiefs", as R.C. Majumdar rendered it. To illustrate this assertion, we find that the Shou-ling of San-fo-ch'i, Hsi-li-ma-hsia-lo-cha 悉利麻霞囉囉 (Śrī Mahārāja) was nominated to be a great general with the name Pao-shun-mu-hua 保順慕化, and also the king of San-fo-ch'i 三佛齊國王.⁽⁹³⁾ Shou-ling was a king,

(90) *Ibid.*, p. 174.

(91) *Ibid.*, p. 181.

(92) *Ibid.*, p. 182.

(93) *Chi-nien-yao-lu* 繫年要錄, v. 175.

and the name of the great general was the same as that awarded in 1077. This title was given only to sovereigns, never to ambassadors. Moreover, we suggest that Ti-hua-ch'ieh-lo, 地華伽囉 of San-fo-ch'i, who sent an embassy to the Sung court, was king of the Cola country. In June of 1077 the embassies of the king of Chulien 注鞏 (Cola, or Chola) Ti-hua-chia-lo 地華加羅 came to the Sung court and scattered pearls and pieces of camphor on the floor before the emperor. This was called "san-tien 撒殿". This name, Ti-hua-chia-lo of Cola, is identical with that of the ambassador of San-fo-ch'i, and we therefore conclude that Ta-shou-ling-ti-hua-ch'ieh-lo and Ti-hua-ch'ieh-lo were one and the same person, that is, the king of Cola, and that the compilers of the *Sung-shih* made a mistake. The passage which refers to San-fo-ch'i should be placed together with that referring to Cola, in order to make a complete sentence of the entry referring to 1077. The 1077 embassy is mentioned only in the *Sung-shih* and in the *T'ung-kao*. There is no mention of it in the *Sung-hui-yao*, the *Ch'ang-pien*, or the others. S.K. Aiyangar identified Ti-hua-ch'ieh-lo with Râjendra Dewa Kulottuṅga.⁽⁹⁴⁾ The kings of Cola named Râjarâja, Râjendra Cola, and Râjendra Dewa Kulottuṅga were written respectively as Lo-ch'a-lo-cha 羅茶羅乍, whose embassies arrived in 1015 and 1020; Shih-li-lo-ch'ayin-t'o-lo-chu-lo 尸離羅茶印俺囉注囉 (Śrî-Râjendra Cola), whose embassies came in 1034; and as Ti-hua-ch'ieh-lo, whose embassies came in 1077. These are all taken from *Sung-shih*. G. Ferrand and R.C. Majumdar overlooked the mistake, mentioned above, made in the *Sung-shih*, and also those which we shall point out in the following two sections.^(s-t)

- (s) July of 1079: the *Sung-shih* and the *Yü-hai*, vol. 154, state that embassies arrived from San-fo-ch'i, but the *Sung-hui-yao* and the *Ch'ang-pien* note that an embassy of San-fo-ch'i-tan-pei 三佛齊詹卑國 arrived on July 3 of the second year of Yüan-fêng 元豐 (1079); a note to the latter considers the Tan-pei country questionable. We know that on July 27 and August 22 the Sung court gave presents to the embassies of San-fo-ch'i, with no reference to Tan-pei, and the passage of the fifth year of the Yüan-fêng reign (1082) should be noted. The *Ch'ang-pien*, as we have seen, questioned whether the embassy was of a country Tan-pei-kuo, since the presents and titles were given to it in the name of San-fo-ch'i. The *Ling-wai-tai-ta* 嶺外代答, vol. 2, states that San-fo-ch'i sent embassies from the country Tan-pei, who presented tribute.
- (t) October of 1082: the *Sung-shih* mentions the date as the third year

(94) *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. II, p. 353; *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 186.

of Yüan-fêng, a mistake; it should be the fifth year. The *Sung-hui-yao* and the *Ch'ang-pien*, vol. 330, cite the report of the vice-head of the transportation office of Canton and chief of the overseas shipping trade office, Sun Chiung 孫迺. Here it was noted that a certain master of trade-ships brought letters from the king of San-fo-ch'i-tan-pei-kuo, and a princess who took the charge of the government. On this country of San-fo-ch'i-tan-pei, the *Ling-wai-tai-ta* states that San-fo-ch'i sent the embassy of Tan-pei-kuo and presented tribute. While this may be a commentary on San-fo-ch'i-tan-pei, we would conjecture that the tribute-bearers of 1079 and 1082 were in fact from Tan-pei (Jambi), and not connected with San-fo-ch'i, which had been weakened by the invasion by Cola. It is recorded mistakenly in the *Sung-shih* that the king of San-fo-ch'i calls himself Tan-pei, since at the time the Chinese were not familiar with the latter name, with the result that various misunderstandings grew up about Tan-pei.

- (u) September of 1084: this date is noted in the *Pên-chi* of the *Sung-shih*, the *Ch'ang-pien*, vol. 248, and in the *Sung-hui-yao*, but not in the *San-fo-ch'i-ch'uan* of the *Sung-shih*. The passage saying that during Yüan-fêng embassies came twice is incorrect. Embassies of San-fo-ch'i-tan-pei came twice, in 1079 and 1082, while the embassy of San-fo-ch'i came in 1084.
- (v) Intercalar December of 1088: the fifth year of Yüan-fêng written in the *San-fo-ch'i-ch'uan* of the *Sung-shih* is a mistake for the third year of Yüan-yu 元祐. The *Sung-hui-yao*, the *Ch'ang-pien*, vol. 419, the *Ling-wai-tai-ta*, vol. 2, the *Yü-hai*, vol. 154, and the *Shan-t'ang-k'ao-so* 山堂考索, Part B, vol. 64, all report a tribute made in the latter year, and report the San-tien 撒殿 of the same embassies mentioned in the *Sung-shih*. Thus we know that the *Sung-shih* was mistaken about the date.
- (w) December of 1090: the *Pên-chi* of the *Sung-shih* mentions the arrival of tributary embassies in the third (1088), fifth (1090), and sixth (1091) years of Yüan-yu, but the last date was actually the date of their nomination, and they arrived in the previous year. They came twice, not three times. The *San-fo-ch'i-ch'uan* omitted that of the fifth year, mentioning only the nominations.
- (x) October of 1094: this date is found in the *Pên-chi* of the *Sung-shih* and in the *Sung-hui-yao*.
- (y) March of 1095 or 1097: the first date is mentioned in the *Shan-t'ang-k'ao-so*, Part B, vol. 64, while the *Pên-chi* mentions only the year. On the other hand, the *Sung-hui-yao* writes: “四月三月二十三日”. The ‘四月’ may be a mistake for the fourth year (of Shao-

shêng 紹聖) or may refer to the second year. We have been unable to decide which is correct. In the *Ch'ang-pien*, the text from July of 1093 to March of 1097 is missing. According to G. Coedès, d'Hervey's translation of the *Wên-hsien-t'ung-k'ao*, vol. 332, p. 586, mentions that in 1106 P'u-kan 蒲甘 (Pugan) in Burma sent tribute, and that the Sung emperor at first decreed that the embassies should be given the same reception as was given to those of Cola. Officials of the Shang-shu 尚書 office, however, claimed that Cola was a vassal state of San-fo-ch'i, whereas Pugan was a great kingdom, and the two could not be treated in the same manner; the decree, for example, was to be written on better paper and sealed in a better box.⁽⁹⁵⁾ We feel, however, that the officials were mistaken. Chu-lien 注輦, or Cola, was not a small kingdom, but a great one which invaded San-fo-ch'i twice as we have seen.

- (z) Before 1128: According to the *Hsi-nien-yao-lu*, vol. 17, under August of 1128, the prefect of Canton Ch'ên Pang-kuang 陳邦光 did not give permission for an embassy from San-fo-ch'i to sell precious stones and incense, since these goods were now monopolized by the court. No exact date is given.
- (a') September of 1146: we read in the *Sung-hui-yao* (quoted by the *Yüeh-hai-kuan-chih* 粵海關志, vol. 3) and in the *Hsi-nien-yao-lu*, vol. 155, that the king of San-fo-ch'i sent a letter to the Sung emperor via the customs house in Canton, and that it was delivered to the emperor by the prime minister.
- (b') December of 1156: details are given in the *Hsi-nien-yao-lu*, vol. 175. The chief, or shou-ling, named Hsi-li-ma-hsia-lo-cha 悉利麻霞囉唵 (宋史作陀) (Śrī Mahârāja) was given the honorific titles of Pao-shun-mu-hua-ta-chiang-chün 保順慕化大將軍 and San-fo-ch'i-kuo-wang 三佛齊國王. The *Li-chih* 禮志 of the *Sung-shih* gives the date as the seventh year of Shao-hsing 紹興 (1137), but this is mistaken, and most likely refers to the twenty-seventh year, the year in which the embassy left the court. Details of the tribute brought by this embassy are given in the *Sung-hui-yao* as follows:
- Lung-hsien 龍涎 (ambergris), one block, 36 *chin* 斤.
 - Chên-chu 眞珠 (pearls), 113 *liang* 兩.
 - Shan-hu 珊瑚 (coral), one branch, 240 *liang*.
 - Hsi-chiao 犀角 (rhinoceros horns), 8 pieces.
 - Mei-hua-nao-pan 梅花腦板 (crystal plates of camphor), 3 pieces.
 - Mei-hua-nao 梅花腦 (crystal of camphor), 200 *liang*.
 - Liu-li 琉璃 (lapis lazulis), 39 pieces.

(95) *B.E.F.E.O.*, XVIII, p. 8. This passage was already quoted by G.E. Gerini in his *Researches*, 1909, p. 624-625. Cf. *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 182.

- Chin-kang-chui 金剛錐 (diamond points), 39 pieces.
 Mao-êrh-yen-ch'ing-chih-huan 貓兒眼睛指環 (cat's eye rings).
 Ch'ing-ma-nao-chih-huan 青瑪瑙指環 (blue agate rings).
 Ta-chên-chu-chih-huan 大眞珠指環 (large pearl rings).
 Wu-no-ch'i 膾納臍 (castoreum), 28 *liang*.
 Fan-pu 番布 (foreign cloths), 26 pieces.
 Ta-shih-t'ang 大食糖 (Persian sugar), 4 glass bottles.
 Ta-shih-tsao 大食棗 (Persian dates), 16 glass bottles.
 Ch'iang-wei-shui 薔薇水 (rosewater), 168 *chin*.
 Pin-t'ieh-ch'ang-chien 寶鐵長劍 (large swords of Hindu steel),
 9 pieces.
 Pin-t'ieh-tuan-chien 寶鐵短劍 (short swords of Hindu steel),
 6 pieces.
 Ju-hsiang 乳香 (frankincense), 81680 *chin*.
 Hsiang-ya 象牙 (ivory), 87 pieces, 4065 *chin*.
 Su-ho-yu 蘇合油 (liquid storax), 278 *chin*.
 Mu-hsiang 木香 (putchuck), 117 *chin*.
 Ting-hsiang 丁香 (cloves), 30 *chin*.
 Hsüeh-chieh 血竭 (dragon's blood), 158 *chin*.
 A-wei 阿魏 (asa-foetida), 127 *chin*.
 Jou-tou-k'ou 肉豆寇 (nutmegs), 2674 *chin*.
 Hu-chiao 胡椒 (pepper), 10750 *chin*.
 T'an-hsiang 檀香 (sandalwood), 19935 *chin*.
 Chien-hsiang 箋香 (gharu-wood), 364 *chin*.⁽⁹⁶⁾

The same details are given in the *Shan-t'ang-k'ao-so* quoted in the note of the passage for 1018 of the *Sung-hui-yao*, but volume 64 of the former does not mention this tribute in its section titled *Ssü-i-fang-kung* 四夷方貢, and so we conjecture that the details actually apply to the embassy of 1156. In July of 1167 San-fo-ch'i begged for thirty thousand copper roofing tiles, and an imperial decree was issued ordering them to be made in the two provinces of Ch'üan-chou 泉州 and Kuang-chou 廣州. A prefect named Wang Ta-yu 汪大猷, however, disobeyed the order, saying that the smelting and export of copper were forbidden by the law.⁽⁹⁷⁾

(c') January of 1178: details of the tribute are given in the *Sung-hui-yao* as follows:

- Chên-chu 眞珠 (pearls), 81 *liang*, 7 *ch'ien* 錢.
 Mei-hua-nao-pan 梅花腦板 (crystal plates of camphor), 4 pieces,
 14 *chin*.
 Lung-hsien 龍涎 (ambergris), 23 *liang*.

(96) Cf. *Chau Ju-kua*, Pt. II. 1 斤=16 兩. 1 兩=37.3 grammes.

(97) The biography of Wang Ta-yu 王大猷, *Sung-shih* 宋史, v. 400; *Ch'üan-chou-fu-chih* 泉州府志, v. 10; *Kung-k'uei-chi* 玫瑰集, v. 88.

- Shan-hu 珊瑚 (coral), one box, 10 *liang*.
 Liu-li 琉璃 (lapis lazuli), 189 pieces.
 Kuan-yin-p'ing 觀音瓶 (long-spouted bottles), 10 pieces.
 Ch'ing-liu-li-p'ing 青琉璃瓶 (blue glass bottles), 4 pieces.
 Ch'ing-k'ou-p'ing 青口瓶 (blue-spouted bottles), 6 pieces.
 K'uo-k'ou-p'ing 闊口瓶 (broad-spouted bottles), large and small,
 5 pieces.
 Huan-p'ing 環瓶 (round bottles), 2 pieces.
 Chin-k'ou-p'ing 隻(雙)口瓶 (double-spouted bottles), 2 pieces.
 Ching-p'ing 淨瓶 (washing bottles), 4 pieces.
 P'ing 瓶 (bottles), 42 pieces.
 Ch'ien-p'an 淺盤 (shallow dishes), 8 pieces.
 Yüan-p'an 圓盤 (round dishes), 38 pieces.
 Ch'ang-p'an 長盤 (long dishes), 1 piece.
 P'an 盤 (dishes), 2 pieces.
 Shên-chin-ching-p'ing 滲金淨瓶 (gilt bottles for washing hands),
 2 pieces.
 Shên-chin-ch'üan-pei-lien-kai 滲金勸盃連蓋 (gilt wineglass with
 cover), pair.
 Shên-chin-ch'êng-shui-p'ing 滲金盛水瓶 (gilt water bottles),
 1 piece.
 Ch'ü-chih 屈卮 (wineglasses), 3 pieces.
 Hsiao-ch'ü-chih 小屈卮 (small wineglasses), 2 pieces.
 Hsiang-lu 香爐 (incense burner), 1 piece.
 Ta-hsiao-kuan 大小罐 (large and small jars), 22 pieces.
 Ta-hsiao-yü 大小盂 (large and small bowls), 33 pieces.
 Ta-hsiao-tieh 大小碟 (large and small saucers), 4 pieces.
 Ta-hsiao-shu-k'uei-tieh 大小蜀葵碟 (large and small hollyhock-
 shaped saucers), 2 pieces.
 Hsiao-yüan-tieh 小圓碟 (small round saucers), 1 piece.
 Fan-t'ang 番糖 (foreign sugar), 4 glass bottles, 15 *chin*, 8 *liang*.
 Fan-tsao 番棗 (foreign dates), 3 glass bottles, 8 *chin*.
 Chih-tzū-hua 梔子花 (gardenia flowers), 4 glass bottles, 180 *liang*.
 Hsiang-ya 象牙 (ivory), 60 pieces, 2109 *chin*, 9 *liang*, 6 *ch'ien* 錢.
 Hu-chiao 胡椒 (pepper), 1550 *chin*.
 Chia-chien-huang-shou-hsiang 夾箋黃熟香 (gharu wood), 85 *chin*.
 Ch'iang-wei-shui 薔薇水 (rosewater), 3009 *chin*.
 Jou-tou-k'ou 肉荳蔻 (nutmegs), 80 *chin*.
 A-wei 阿魏 (asa-foetida), 230 *chin*.
 Mei-yao 沒藥 (myrrh), 280 *chin*.
 An-hsi-hsiang 安息香 (benzoin), 210 *chin*.
 Tai-mei 玳瑁 (tortoise shells), 105 *chin*.

Mu-hsiang 木香 (putchuck), 85 *chin*.

T'an-hsiang 檀香 (sandalwood), 1570 *chin*.

Mao-êrh-ch'ing 貓兒睛 (cat's eyes), 11 pieces.

Fan-chien 番劍 (foreign swords), 15 *ping* 柄.

According to the *Li-chih* 禮志 of the *Sung-shih*, vol. 119, tribute for the year 1178 was valued at 25,000 *min* 緡 (one *min* equals 1,000 *wên* 文); the gift sent in return was ling-chin-lo-chüan 綾錦羅絹 (various kinds of silk) plus 2,500 *liang* of silver. Among the tributes of 1156 and 1175, are contained all the products of southern Asia, from the Moluccas to Arabia and Persia, illustrating the enormous energy of the Mohammedan sea traders. Many Mohammedans came as the embassies of San-fo-ch'i, exploiting the tributary relationship between the southern Asian countries and the Sung dynasty.

During the 150 years of the Southern Sung 南宋 period, few embassies came to China from San-fo-ch'i, for various reasons. One was the relative poverty of the Southern Sung dynasty, which had lost the northern half of China occupied by the Chin 金, and was still engaged in endless conflicts with them. Another was the activity of the Chinese traders themselves, who sailed south carrying their own products for trade, without waiting for the foreign ships to arrive. They would sail with the monsoon, leaving in the autumn and returning after May. Yet we should not conclude from the lack of embassies that the San-fo-ch'i nation had declined. On the contrary, Chao Ju-k'uo 趙汝适 mentions its greatness in his *Chu-fan-chih*, composed in 1225. It was a great trading centre, and fifteen states were dependent upon it. These were as follows:

- (1) P'êng-fêng 蓬豐 (Pahang on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula).
- (2) Têng-ya-nung 登牙儂 (Trengganu, same).
- (3) Ling-ya-ssü-chia 凌牙斯加 (Lankasuka, near Kedah, same)
- (4) Chi-lan-tan 吉蘭丹 (Kelantan, same).
- (5) Fo-lo-an 佛羅安 (Beranang, on the Langat river, west coast of the same). (South Selangor?)
- (6) Jih-lo-t'ing 日羅亭 (Jellotting, on the east coast(?) of the same, or the Salâhit of Mohammedan writers?).
- (7) Ch'ien-mai 潛邁 (Possibly the Semang tribe of the Malay Peninsula).
- (8) Pa-t'a 拔沓 (Possibly the Batak tribe of Sumatra).
- (9) Tan-ma-ling 單馬令 (Tâmbraliŋga (Ligor) on the Malay Peninsula).
- (10) Chia-lo-hsi 加羅希 (Grahi, or Caiya (Jaiya) on the same).
- (11) Pa-lin-fêng 巴林馮 (Palembang, in Sumatra).
- (12) Hsin-t'ò 新拖 (Sunda, in Java).
- (13) Chien-pi 監篋 (Kampeï, in North Sumatra).
- (14) Lan-wu-li 藍無里 (Lamuri, or Atjeh in North Sumatra).

(15) Hsi-lan 細蘭 (Ceylon).⁽⁹⁸⁾

The Arab writers Edrîsî (1154), Kazwîni (1203–1283), Ibn Saïd (1208 or 1214–1274 or 1286), and Dimaskî (c. 1325) all refer to the glory and power of Zâbag, but it is difficult to tell whether they write from personal knowledge or merely quote old writers, which was frequently the case. But in any case the Chinese accounts definitely prove the existence of the kingdom.⁽⁹⁹⁾

As we can see, some of the 15 dependencies have yet to be satisfactorily identified, and other problems also arise from the *Chu-fan-chih*, from the citing of Palembang as a dependency rather than the capital of San-fo-ch'i. The important states of Kaṭâh (Kaḍâram, or Kalah, i.e. Kedah) and Malayu (i.e. Jambi, in Sumatra) are not included. T. Fujita concludes, in his identification of Shih-li-fo-shih, San-fo-ch'i and Chiu-chiang, that San-fo-ch'i was in fact Jambi and not Palembang at all.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ We will discuss this problem later. Here we will simply point out the mistakes of Chao Ju-k'uo. San-fo-ch'i is clearly Palembang.

We find a king Candrabhânu of Tâmbraḷiṅga mentioned in the Jaiya inscription of 1230. G. Ferrand has identified this king with a king of Jâvaka of the same name, who twice invaded Ceylon as mentioned in the *Mahāvamsa Chronicle of Ceylon*, in 1236 and 1256. There is a passage "who was pleased to take the Chôḷa country, Ceylon, and the crown, and the crowned head of the Çâvaka" in the inscription (1264) of Jaṭavarman Vîra-Pâṇḍya, king of Pâṇḍya of South India. The same king's inscription of the following year lists Kaḍâram among his vassals,⁽¹⁰¹⁾ which prompts G. Ferrand to remark: "Il faut donc poser que Kaḍâram est Jâvaka et identifier également celui-la à Çrîvijaya."⁽¹⁰²⁾ N.J. Krom concludes too that the failures of the invasions of Ceylon formed the main cause of the decline of San-fo-ch'i. While G. Coedès has said that Candrabhânu was a king of Tâmbraḷiṅga and not of Zâbag,⁽¹⁰³⁾ we would suggest that the two kings of this name were one and the same,⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ i.e., a king of Tâmbraḷiṅga which the Ceylonese called Jâvaka, but that this Jâvaka was not, as G. Coedès says: "l'équivalent géographique" with Zâbag. The rise of Tâmbraḷiṅga signified the decline of Śrîvijaya. The *Chu-fan-chih* also tells us that Chien-pi 監篋, although a dependent of San-fo-ch'i, defeated the latter's army and set up the king of its own.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Since Tâmbraḷiṅga was also in-

(98) *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 65–66; *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 193–194.

(99) *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 192.

(100) *Nankai-hen*, p. 47–68.

(101) G. Ferrand, Çrîvijaya, p. 48–49.

(102) *Ibid.*, p. 50.

(103) A propos de la chute du royaume de Çrîvijaya, *B.K.I.*, LXXXIII, 1927.

(104) K.A. Nilakanta Sastri opposed to G. Coedès in his 'Śrîvijaya, Candrabhânu and Vîra Pâṇḍya', *T.B.G.*, LXXVII, 1937, p. 251–268.

(105) Kampar in the *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 71. Kampei in T. Fujita's *Nankai-hen*, p. 67.

cluded among the vassal states of San-fo-ch'i, we can probably conclude that at the beginning of the thirteenth, San-fo-ch'i began to decline and local princes began to gain in power.

The most important of these new powers was Malayu in Sumatra. In 1275 Kṛtanagara of Singhasāri in eastern Java sent an army to attack Malayu. We will give details later. Ten years later, this king gave a stone statue of Amoghapāśalokeśvara to Malayu. An inscription on the pedestal of the image, found at Padang Roco, near Sungai Lansat in the Batanghari district of Jambi, tells us that in 1286 the image was brought from Java to Suvarṇabhūmi and set up at Dharmāśraya. It was worshipped by all the subjects of Malayu—Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra—but particularly by the king Śrīmat Tribhuvanarāja Maulivarmadeva.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ R.C. Majumdar says that in 1286 the kingdom of Malayu, which judging by the spot where the inscription was found extended far into the Sumatran interior, was a vassal state of Java. This was a great achievement and may be regarded as the crowning glory of the reign of Kṛtanagara. We must, however, acknowledge the power of Malayu, as Kṛtanagara's expedition did not even refer to Śrīvijaya (Palembang), and it seems that Zābag or the Mahārāja must have become simply nominal.

During the Yüan 元 dynasty in China, mention is rarely found of San-fo-ch'i, while Malayu is mentioned often in the *Yüan-shih*. Marco Polo records only Malaiur, not San-fo-ch'i (Palembang). According to the *Pên-chi* of the *Yüan-shih*, in August of 1280 So-tu 唆都 wanted to visit San-fo-ch'i and seven other countries, but was refused permission by Khubilai Khan. In December of that year, however, Su-la-man 速刺蠻 (Sulaymân), envoy to Mu-la-yu 木刺由 (Malayu) was nominated Chao-t'ao-shih 招討使. The following June Chan-ssü-ting 苫思丁 (Shamsuddin) was sent to Mu-la-yu, but his ship was wrecked. In the biography of I-hei-mi-shih 亦黑迷失 in the *Yüan-shih* we find that he sent Chêng Kuei 鄭珪 to Mu-yu-lai 木由來 (i.e. Malayu) in 1293, and according to the *Pên-chi* for October of 1294 the embassies of Nan-wu-li 南巫里 (Lambri), Su-mu-ta-la 速木答刺 (Sumatra), Mo-la-mao 沒刺矛 (correctly yü 予) (Malayu), T'an-yang 毯陽 (the River Tamiang) returned to their countries, all of which were on Sumatra Island. Lambri (or Atjeh, Achin), Sumatra (near Pasei), the River Tamiang (near Aroe and Tanoeang) were in North Sumatra. In January of 1299 tributes arrived at the Yüan court from Hsien 暹 (Sukhothai in Siam), Mo-la-yu 沒刺由 (Malayu), and Lo-hu 羅斛 (Lopburi in Siam). The small countries of northern Sumatra were once considered tributaries of San-fo-ch'i, but now became vassal states of the Yüan.

Malayu had two rivals, Siam and the Majapahit kingdom of Java. According to the *Yüan-shih*, the *Tao-i-chih-lüeh* and the *Nāgara-kṛtāgama*, about the middle of the fourteenth century the struggle between these three

(106) *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 298-299; G. Ferrand, *Çrīvijaya*, p. 123-24.

became intense. Siam attacked Tumasik (Singapore Island), which at the time may have been a vassal of Malayu. T. Fujita suggests that Marco Polo's Malaiur was Tumasik,⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ but we cannot accept his identification. The inscription of Dharmâśraya mentions 'Bhûmi Malâyû' in 1286, and at that time Dharmâśraya was the capital of Malayu, as we have seen. It is possible that Malayu moved its capital from Jambi to the upper reaches of the Jambi (R. Hari) to protect it from foreign invasions, particularly from the Javanese. G. Ferrand has enumerated the kings of Malayu as follows: Çrîmat Tribuvana râjamaulivarmadeva (1286); Advayavarman, father of Çrîmat Çrî Adayâdityavarman Râjendramaulimanivarmadeva (1347, died 1378); Anaᅅgavarman, son of Adayâdityavarman.⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ The inscription engraved on the pedestal of a great statue of the Buddha in Vat Huâ Vieñ, Jaiya (Siamese: Xaya) on the Malay Peninsula is incorrectly dated, but is certainly after the mid-thirteenth century. In it the name of the king Kamraten Añ Mahârâja Çrîmat Trailokyarâjamaulibhûᅣaᅇavarmadeva is mentioned. G. Ferrand suggests that this king was a ruler of Malayu,⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ in which case the province of Grahi (Chia-lo-hsi 加羅希 in the *Chu-fan-chih*) must have been under the authority of Malayu.

Kᅣtanagara of Java, after his invasion of Malayu mentioned above, sent the Mongol embassy home after tattooing him on his face. Khubilai in anger sent an army to Java, but Kᅣtanagara was dead before it arrived, having been killed in 1292 by the governor of Kaᅇiri (also called Daha) Jayakatvang (Djakatong). Vijaya, a son-in-law of Kᅣtanagara, gained the support of the Mongol army to destroy Jayakatvang, but later turned upon it, forcing it to leave Java after a great damage. He then founded a new capital, calling it Majapahit, became the first king of the Majapahit kingdom, and named himself Kᅣtarâjasa. His fifth queen was a princess of Malayu, which had already been conquered by Kᅣtanagara. The marriage came about in the following way. When the Javanese army of occupation heard of the death of their king, they seem to have made preparations to return, bringing rich tribute paid by the vanquished princes of Malayu. They reached Java ten days after Vijaya triumphed over the Mongol army. Of the two Malayu princesses whom they brought home with them, the younger was married to Kᅣtarâjasa and the elder to a 'Deva', the latter princess becoming the mother of the king of Malayu, Tuhan Janaka, called also Śrî Marmadeva or Haji Mantrolot. In view of the growing importance of Malayu, this marriage relation between the two states was undoubtedly a fact of great political importance.⁽¹¹⁰⁾

We must now consider Chiu-chiang 舊港, the new name by which San-

(107) H. Ikeuchi (ed.) 池内宏, *Kenpô Isô* 劍峯遺草, 1930, p. 70.

(108) Çrivijaya, p. 126.

(109) *Ibid.*, p. 125-127.

(110) *Suvarᅇadvîpa*, p. 320.

fo-ch'i came to be called. It is first mentioned in the *Tao-i-chih-lüeh* of Wang Ta-yüan 汪大淵, who in the mid-fourteenth century travelled around many south-east Asian countries. He tells us that Hsien 暹 (i.e. Sukhothai in Siam) surrendered to Lo-hu 羅斛 (i.e. Lopburi in Siam) in May of 1349. The preface of Wu Chien 吳鑿 was dated 1349, from which we conclude that the book was compiled in the second half of that year. In the *Tao-i-chih-lüeh*, Chiu-chiang and San-fo-ch'i are treated separately. On the basis of this, T. Fujita suggests that in fact Chiu-chiang was Palembang, while San-fo-ch'i was actually Jambi,⁽¹¹¹⁾ and we may accept this conclusion. Obviously Wang confused the new, unfamiliar name of Chiu-chiang with that of San-fo-ch'i, taking what was really Malayu to be San-fo-ch'i; since he does not mention Malayu, which had frequent intercourse with the Yüan court, we conclude that our theory is correct.

Later, Malayu was again invaded by Java. Gadjah Mada was appointed chief minister (Pati of Majapahit) in 1331 during the regentship of Jayaviṣṇuvardhanī, the granddaughter of Kṛtanagara, and died in 1364 during the reign of Hayam Wuruk (died 1385). In these years Gajah Mada conquered a number of islands in the archipelago, of which a detailed list is given in the *Nāgara-kṛtāgama*, composed by the poet Prapantja in 1365 and dedicated to the king Hayam Wuruk. The book divides these states into several groups. Tanah ri Malayu . . . Les principales îles, dit le poem, qui sont sous la souveraineté du pays de Malayu sont les suivantes: Djambi, Palembang, Těba et Dharmāçraya, Kaṅdis, Kahwas, Manaṅkawa, Siyak, Rě-kān, Kāmpar et Pane, Kāmpē, Harwa, Mandahilin, Tumihan, Parlāk et Barat, Lwas et Samudra et Lamuri, Batan, Lāmpuñ, et Barus. Telles sont les principales (îles) du pays de Malayu tout entier; tous ces pays dépendent (de Madjapahit).⁽¹¹²⁾ We can see from this poem that the whole island of Sumatra was under the authority of Malayu and now came under the sway of the Majapahit king.

Although the *Tao-i-chih-lüeh* was compiled fifteen years before the dedication of the *Nāgara-kṛtāgama*, there is no mention of the subjugation of Malayu, even though Bali was taken over by Gajah Mada in 1343. The new name of Chiu-chiang, however, does occur. Thus, though we are not sure when exactly the name was first applied to Palembang, we can conclude that its use denotes the decline of that place in the thirteenth century. Chinese scholars in the Wang-li 萬曆 period (1573–1619) of the Ming dynasty claimed that the name Chiu-chiang, which means 'old harbour', was given to Palembang to distinguish it from Grisee on the north-east coast of Surabaya, where the Chinese had founded a 'new village', or Hsin-ts'un 新村.⁽¹¹³⁾ Yet there is no mention of Hsin-ts'un in the *Tao-i-*

(111) *Nankai-hen*, p. 47–67.

(112) *Relations* p. 652; *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 330.

(113) *Ying-ya-shêng-lan* 瀛涯勝覽, entry Chao-wa 爪哇.

chih-lüeh, from which we can deduce that the 'new village' was not yet founded by the mid-fourteenth century. The real origin of the new term Chiu-chiang lies in the political changes taking place; that is, the decline of San-fo-ch'i and the rise of Malayu. As the Chinese transferred their attentions, they also began to refer to the old centre, Palembang, as the 'old harbour'.

In 1368 the Mongol rulers of China were driven out and the Ming dynasty was established. During the Hung-wu 洪武 era embassies came three times to China from San-fo-ch'i, and in 1370 the first Ming emperor sent an envoy to San-fo-ch'i. In September of the following year the first tribute-bearing mission arrived representing the king Ma-ha-la-cha-pa-la-pu 馬哈刺札八刺卜, which G. Ferrand has restored as Mahârâja Prabhu and R.C. Majumdar as Mahârâja Prabu. Tribute was also presented in 1374 and in January of 1375 by the king Ma-na-ha-pao-lin-pang 麻那哈寶林邦 (restored by G. Ferrand as Mahârâja de Palembang); in September of 1375 by the king Sêng-ch'ieh-lieh-yü-lan 僧伽烈字蘭 (not restored); and in 1377 by the king Ma-na-che-wu-li 麻那者巫里 (restored as Mahârâja Wuli or Wuni?), whose father Ta-ma-sha-na-a-chê 恒麻沙那阿者 (not restored) had died in the preceding year.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ The last even asked permission from the emperor to ascend his throne, upon which envoys were sent carrying a seal and an imperial edict commissioning him king of San-fo-ch'i. This interference in the affairs of a vassal state naturally irritated the Javanese, who had already conquered San-fo-ch'i and who waylaid and killed the Ming envoys. After this event San-fo-ch'i declined and no more embassies were sent. In 1380, taking advantage of Hu Wei-yung's 胡惟庸 rebellion, San-fo-ch'i induced an imperial envoy, to the anger of the Javanese who reproached San-fo-ch'i and sent the envoy back courteously. After this date foreign traders ceased to come to China. In 1397, the Ming emperor decided to send an envoy to Java, but fearing obstructions by San-fo-ch'i he attempted to deliver the message to Java via Siam, which was loyal to him. San-fo-ch'i being a vassal of Java, his intention was to demonstrate his benevolence through Java. Thus by this time San-fo-ch'i had slipped from a glorious kingdom to a local state under the authority of Java, and thus the Chinese came to call it the 'old harbour'.⁽¹¹⁵⁾

Now, many Chinese refugees had fled from the provinces of Fu-chien 福建 and Kuang-tung 廣東, making their homes in Java and Sumatra. Following the decline of San-fo-ch'i the authority of the Javanese was not yet perfected and the Chinese, left to their own devices, elected as their chief a man from Nan-hai 南海 in Canton, Liang Tao-ming 梁道明, who had lived there for many years, had roamed over the sea and who had the sup-

(114) Çrivijaya, p. 24-25; *Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 202.

(115) Çrivijaya, p. 26-27.

port of several thousand soldiers and common people from Fu-chien and Kuang-tung. By chance, Sun Hsüan 孫鉉 left China on an errand, met the son of Liang Tao-ming, and took him back to China with him. In 1405 an envoy from Liang's native village was sent to Palembang, following which Liang Tao-ming and Chêng Po-k'o 鄭伯可 went to Peking with tribute. In the next year one of the Chiu-chiang chiefs, Ch'ên Tsu-i 陳祖義 sent his son Shih-liang 士良 and a nephew of Liang Tao-ming to Peking. Ch'ên Tsu-i also from Canton, however, was a pirate and source of embarrassment to the abassadors, so that in 1407 he was caught by the famous admiral Chêng Ho 鄭和 and sent to Peking where he was executed. In September of the same year the Chiu-chiang-hsüan-wei-ssü 舊港宣慰司 was created and Shih Chin-ch'ing 施進鄉 was nominated to be its chief, or Hsüan-wei-shih 宣慰使. It was he who had informed Chêng Ho of the treachery of Ch'ên Tsu-i. When he died his son Chi-sun 濟孫 succeeded him, in January of 1424, as mentioned in the *Ming-shih* and in the *Ming-shih-lu* 明實錄. In the *Ying-ai-shêng-lan*, it is written that his second daughter Shih Êrh-chieh 施二姐 succeeded him. According to the *Rekidai Hô-an* 歷代寶案 (archives of Okinawa) Bk. 1, vols. 42-43, there were several diplomatic contacts between Okinawa and Palembang between September of 1428 and October of 1440, in which the names Pên Mu-niang 本目娘, Pên T'ou-niang 本頭娘, and Shih-shih Ta-niang-tzŭ 施氏大娘仔, of San-fo-ch'i-kuo Chiu-chiang 三佛齊國舊港 or San-fo-ch'i-kuo Pao-lin-pang... 寶林邦 were mentioned.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ In these references San-fo-ch'i designated only Chiu-chiang or Palembang then, not the great empire of the past.

In 1577 a Chinese merchant went to Palembang and saw the Cantonese pirate Chang Lien 張璉, who also owned a line of shops and to whom attached many men from Chang-chou 漳州 and Ch'üan-chou 泉州.⁽¹¹⁷⁾

I-ching, after leaving Malaya, voyaged to Chieh-t'ü 羯荼, which is now Kedah on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula. This place was Kaṭāha in the Sanskrit inscriptions, Kaḍāra, Kaḍāram or Kiḍāra, Kiḍāram in the Tamil inscriptions, the Kalah (Kalāh), or Kalāh-bār of the Mohammedan writers, Kēḍa in the Javanese *Nāgarakṛetāgama*, Ko-lo 哥羅, Ko-lo 箇羅, Ko-lo-fu-sha-lo 哥羅富沙羅 (fu-sha-lo from the Malay 'bēsar' meaning large) in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, vol. 222, B. I-ching, in his note in the *Kên-pên-shuo-i-ch'ieh-yu-po-i-chieh-mo* 根本說一切有百一羯磨, vol. 5,⁽¹¹⁷⁾ informs us that Chieh-t'ü was a vassal state of Fo-shih 佛逝. Sulaymān wrote (in about 851) that Kalāh-bār was a part of Zābag and governed by the same king (Mahārāja). Abū Zayd also wrote (about 916) that the authority of the Mahārāja extended to Serboza, Rāmī and Kalah. Mas'ūdī said (about 943)

(116) Ch. Itō 伊東忠太 and Y. Kamakura 鎌倉芳太郎, *Nankai Kotōji* 南海古陶瓷, 1937, p. 3-14.

(117) *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, Vol. 24, p. 477 c.

that Kalah and Serboza were within the realm of the Mahârâja. The inscriptions of the Cola kingdom tell us that Mâra-vijayottuṅgavarman was born in the Śailendra family and was the king of Śrîvijaya and Katâha (see the inscription of the twenty-first year of Râjarâja the Great (1005), Sanskrit portion), while the Tamil portion mentions Cûlâmanivarman only as ruling over Kiḍâra or Kaḍâra.⁽¹¹⁸⁾ The *Sung-shih* mentions Mâravijayottuṅgavarman (in 1008) as Ma-lo-p'i 麻囉皮 of San-fo-ch'i. Later, from an inscription of about 1084 we learn that the Cola king Kulôttuṅgacoladeva exempted from taxes the village granted to the temple of Śailendracûḍamanivarmavihâra at the request of the king of Kiḍâra.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ G. Ferrand identifies the Kaḍâram of the 1265 inscription at Vîra-panḍya as Çrîvijaya,⁽¹²⁰⁾ and R.C. Majumdar suggests that the king Saṅgrânavijayottuṅgavarman of Kaḍâram, who was captured by the Cola king Râjendracoladeva in 1030–31, was the ruler of Kaḍâra and Śrîvijaya.⁽¹²¹⁾ We conclude therefore that the kings of Katâha or Kaḍâram in the Cola inscriptions were in fact the kings of Śrîvijaya.

Bibliography

- K. Adachi 足立喜六, *Hokken-den* 法顯傳 (Biography of Fa-hsien 法顯), 1936.
 C. Barbier de Meynard et Pavet de Courteille, *Les Prairies d'or*, 1861.
 C.O. Blagden, 'The Empire of the Mahârâja', *J. Strait Br. R.A.S.*, 1920.
 B. Ch. Chabra, 'Identification of Śrîvishnuvarman of the Perak Seal', *J.G.I.S.*, II, 1, 1936.
 G. Coedès, 'Le royaume de Çrîvijaya', *B.E.F.E.O.*, XVIII, 1918.
 — Critique de G. Ferrand, 'L'empire sumatranais de Çrîvijaya', *B.E.F.E.O.*, XXIII, 1923.
 — 'A propos de la chute du royaume de Çrîvijaya', *B.K.I.*, LXXXIII, 1927.
 — 'Les inscriptions Malaises de Çrîvijaya', *B.E.F.E.O.*, XXX, 1930.
 — 'On the Origin of the Śailendras of Indonesia', *J.G.I.S.*, I, 2, 1934.
 — 'A propos d'une nouvelle théorie sur le site de Śrîvijaya', *J. Mal. Br. R.A.S.*, XIV, pt. 3, 1936.
 J. Crawford, *A Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries*, 1856.
 N.B. Dennys, *A Descriptive Dictionary of British Malaya*, 1864.
 L.M. Devic, *Livre des merveilles de l'Inde*, 1883–1886.
 J.J.L. Duyvendak, 'Ma Huan re-examined', *V.K.A.W.A.*, Nieuwe Reeks, XXXII, No. 3, 1933.
 G. Ferrand, *Relations de voyages et textes géographiques arabes, persans et turks relatifs à l'Extrême-Orient du VIII^e au XVII^e siècles*, 1913–1914.
 — 'Malaka, le Malâyu et Malâyur', *J.A.*, 11^e série, T. XI, XII, 1918.
 — 'Le K'ouen-louen et les anciennes navigations interocéaniques dans les mers du sud', *J.A.*, 11^e série, T. XIII, XIV, 1919.
 — *Voyage du marchand arabe Sulaymân en Inde et en Chine rédigé en 851 suivi de remarques par Abû Zayd Ḥasan* (vers. 916), 1922.

(118) G. Ferrand, Çrîvijaya, p. 46–47; *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 168–169.

(119) Çrîvijaya, p. 47.

(120) Çrîvijaya, p. 49.

(121) *Suvarṇadvîpa*, p. 174.

- 'L'empire sumatranais de Çrīvijaya', *J.A. T.* XX, 1922.
- 'Quatre textes épigraphiques Malayo-Sanskrits du Sumatra et de Bangka', *J.A.*, 1932.
- T. Fujita 藤田豊八, *Tōzai Kōshō-shi no Kenkyū*, Part I: *Nankai-hen* 東西交渉史の研究, 上: 南海篇 (the collection of T. Fujita's essays on the history of South-East Asia with special reference to the Chinese trade on the sea), 1932.
- A.G. Findley, *A Directory for the Navigation of the Indian Archipelago and the Coast of China*, 1889.
- D. Ghosh, 'The Early Art of Śrīvijaya', *J.G.I.S.*, I, 1, 1934.
- W.P. Groeneveldt, 'Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca, compiled from Chinese Sources', *V.B.G.*, XXXIX, 1887, and 'Supplementary Jottings', *T.P.*, VII, 1896.
- G.E. Gerini, *Researches on Ptolemy's Geography of Eastern Asia*, 1909.
- F. Hirth and W.W. Rockhill, *Chau Ju-kua*, 1911.
- Ch. Itō 伊東忠太 and Y. Kamakura 鎌倉芳太郎, *Nankai Ko-tōji* 南海古陶瓷, pp. 1-46: 'Ryūkyū Nankai Shokoku Kōshō Shiryō' 琉球南海諸國交渉史料 (extracted from the *Rekidai Hō-an* 歷代寶案), 1933.
- N.J. Krom, *Inleiding tot de Hindoe-Javaansche Kunst*, 1923.
- *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, 1926.
- 'De ondergang van Çrīvijaya', *M.K.N.A.W.*, Afdeling Letterkunde, LXII, 1926.
- 'Antiquities of Palembang', *A.B.I.A.*, 1931.
- J. Kuwabara 桑原隲藏, *Hojukō no Jiseki* 蒲壽庚の事蹟, 1923; new ed. 1935.
- *Tōzai Kōtsū-shi Ronsō* 東西交通史論叢 (the collection of J. Kuwabara's essays on the intercourse between the East and the West, 1940.
- R. Kuwata 桑田六郎, 'Sanbutsusei-kō' 三佛齊考, *Taihoku Teidai Shigakuka Kenkyū Nenpō* 臺北帝大史學科研究年報, Vol. III, 1936.
- 'Supplementary Notes on Sanbutsusei-kō' 三佛齊補考, *ibid.*, Vol. V, 1938.
- The two above-mentioned essays were compiled in one volume and published in 1945 as Volume I of the *Nanpō Jinbun Kenkyūjo Ronsō* 南方人文研究所論叢.
- 'Gensho no Nankai Keiryaku ni tsuite' 元初の南海經略に就いて, in the *Ikeuchi Hakase Kanreki Kinen Tōyōshi Ronsō* 池内博士還暦記念東洋史論叢, 1940.
- R.C. Majumdar, 'Les rois Śailendra de Suvarṇadvīpa', *B.E.F.E.O.*, XXXIII, 1933.
- 'The Śailendra Empire (up to the end of the tenth century A.D.)', *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. I, No. 1, 1934.
- 'Struggle between the Śailendras and Cholas', *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. I, No. 2, 1934.
- 'Decline and Fall of the Śailendras', *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1935.
- *Suvarṇadvīpa*, 1937.
- W. Fruin-Mees, *Geschiedenis van Java*, 1922; it was translated into Japanese by S. Matsuoka 松岡静雄 and published under the title *Jaba-shi* 爪哇史 in 1924.
- J.L. Moens, 'Çrīvijaya, Yāva en Kaṭāha' *T.B.G.*, LXXVII, 1937.
- P. Pelliot, 'Deux itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du VIII^e siècle', *B.E.F.E.O.*, IV, 1904.
- 'Les grands voyages maritimes chinois au début du XV^e siècle', *T.P.*, XXX, 1933.
- J. Przyluski, 'Indian Colonisation in Sumatra before the Seventh Century', *J.G.I.S.* Vol. I, No. 2, 1934.
- 'The Śailendravamśa', *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1935.
- J.T. Reinaud, *Relations des voyages faits par les Arabes et les Persans dans l'Inde et à la Chine dans le IX^e siècle de l'ère chrétienne*, 2 vols., 1845.
- E. Renaudot, *Ancient Accounts of India and China by Two Mohammedan Travellers*, 1733.
- G.P. Rouffaer, 'Was Malaka emporium vóór 1400 A.D., genaamd Malajoer? En waar lag Woerawari, Má-hasin, Langka, Batoesawar? (Met terreinschetsen van Djambi, oud-Singhapoer, en de Djohor-rivier)', *B.K.I.*, LXXVII, 1921.
- K.A.N. Sastri, 'Śrīvijaya, Candrabhānu and Vira Pāṇḍya', *T.B.G.*, LXXVII, 1937.
- 'Origin of the Çailendra', *T.B.G.*, LXXV, 1935.
- F.M. Schmitzer, *Archaeology of Hindoo Sumatra*, 1937.

- W.J. Stutterheim, *A Javanese period in Sumatran history*, 1929.
 N. Sugimoto 杉本直治郎, 'Ra-etsu-koku Mondai 羅越國問題', in the *Yamashita Sensei Kanreki Kinen Tōyōshi Ronbunshū* 山下先生還曆記念東洋史論文集, 1936.
 — 'Shinshutsu Shiryō to Ra-etsu-koku Mondai 新出資料と羅越國問題', *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 東洋史研究, Vol. III, No. 3, 1938.
 J. Takakusu 高楠順次郎, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695) by I-tsing 義淨*, 1896.
 J.P. Vogel, 'Het koninkrijk Śrīvijaya', *B.K.I.*, Deel LXXXV, 1919.
 P. Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese*, 1961.
 O.W. Wolters, *Indonesian Commerce, A Study of the Origin of Śrīvijaya*, 1967.
 — *The Fall of Śrīvijaya in Malay History*, 1970.

Abbreviations of the Journals

- A.B.I.A.— Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology (published by Kern Institute, Leyden).
 B.E.F.E.O.— Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extrême-Orient (Hanoi).
 B.K.I.— Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Instituut voor de Taal-, land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië.
 J.A.— Journal Asiatique.
 J.G.I.S.— Journal of the Greater India Society.
 J.Mal.Br.R.A.S.— Journal of the Malay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
 J.Str.Br.R.A.S.— Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
 M.K.N.A.W.— Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen (Amsterdam).
 T.B.G.— Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.
 V.B.G.— Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Konsten en Wetenschappen.

Chinese Sources

- Chiu T'ang-shu 舊唐書.
 Hsin T'ang-shu 新唐書.
 Sung-shih 宋史.
 Yüan-shih 元史.
 Ming-shih 明史.
 Ming-shih-lu 明實錄.
 T'ang-hui-yao 唐會要.
 Sung-hui-yao 宋會要.
 Hsü Tzū-chih-t'ung-chien-ch'ang-pien 續資治通鑑長編 by Li T'ao 李燾 of Sung.
 Hsü-sung-pien-nien-tzū-chih-t'ung-chien 續宋編年資治通鑑 by Liu Shih-chü 劉時舉 of Sung.
 Chien-yen-i-lai-chi-nien-yao-lu 建炎以來繫年要錄 by Li Hsin-ch'uan 李心傳 of Sung.
 T'ai-p'ing-huan-yü-chi 太平寰宇記 by Yüeh-shih 樂史 of Sung.
 T'ai-p'ing-yü-lan 太平御覽.
 Ts'ê-fu-yüan-kuei 冊府元龜.
 Yü-hai 玉海 by Wang Ying-lin 王應麟 of Sung.
 Shan-t'ang-k'ao-so 山堂考索 (or Ch'ün-shu-k'ao-so 群書考索) by Chang Ju-yü 章如愚 of Sung.
 Ling-wai-tai-ta 嶺外代答 by Chou Ch'ü-fei 周去非 of Sung.
 Chu-fan-chih 諸蕃志 by Chao Ju-k'uo 趙如适 of Sung.
 Wên-hsian-t'ung-k'ao 文獻通考 by Ma Tuan-lin 馬端臨 of Yüan.

- Tao-i-chih-lüeh 島夷志略 by Wang Ta-yüan 汪大淵 of Yüan.
- Tao-i-chih-lüeh-chiao-chu 島夷志略校注 by T. Fujita 藤田豊八.
- Ying-ya-shêng-lan 瀛涯勝覽 compiled by Ma Huan 馬歡 of Ming; a Japanese annotated translation of the Ying-ya-shêng-lan by H. Ogawa 小川博 was published in 1969 under the title *Eigai Shōran* 瀛涯勝覽. For the English translations, see J. J. L. Duyvendak's *Ma Huan Re-examined*, Amsterdam, 1933, and Ma Huan: *Ying-yai sheng-lan* 'The Overall Survey of the Ocean's Shores' (1433). Translated from the Chinese text edited by Feng Ch'eng-chün with introduction, notes and appendices by J. V. G. Mills, formerly Puisne Judge, Straits Settlements. Cambridge, published for the Hakluyt Society at the University Press, 1970. pp. XIX, 393, with illustrations and maps.
- Ying-ya-shêng-lan-chiao-chu 瀛涯勝覽校注 by Fêng Ch'êng-chün 馮承鈞.
- Hsing-ch'a-shêng-lan 星槎勝覽 by Fei Hsin 費信 of Ming.
- Hsi-yang-ch'ao-kung-tien-lu 西洋朝貢典錄 by Huang Shêng-ts'êng 黃省曾 of Ming.
- Chêng Ho han-hai-t'u 鄭和航海圖 in the Wu-pei-chih 武備志, v. 240, compiled by Mao Yüan-i 茅元儀 of Ming.
- Chêng Ho han-hai-t'u 鄭和航海圖 edited by Hsiang-ta 向達, 1961.
- Tung-hsi-yang-k'ao 東西洋考 by Chang Hsieh 張燮 of Ming.
- Yüeh-hai-kuan-chih 粵海關志.
- Rekidai Hô-an 歷代實案 (1st series, Bk. 42-43, Diplomatic Archives of Okinawa Government).

