

[1]

LE ROYAUME DE ÇRĪVIJAYA

Par G. CÆDÈS,

Conservateur de la Bibliothèque Nationale (Bangkok).

H. Kern published in the *Bijdragen* of 1913 (Vol. 67, p. 393) an inscription discovered at Kota Kapur, in the western district of the island of Bangka.¹ This inscription, which probably dates to 608 Śaka,² is written in a form of Malay whose obscurities the learned editor was not able fully to clarify. The general meaning of the document, however, can be understood fairly well: according to H. Kern, it is *an edict of His Majesty Vijaya* pronouncing curses against various categories of wrongdoers and against those who would damage the stele, and blessings for those who faithfully obey their sovereign.

The name that H. Kern translated as “His Majesty Vijaya” appears three times in the course of the inscription, each time in the form *Śrīvijaya*, without any royal title. The relevant passages are as follows:

— l. 2: *mahraksa yah kadatuan śrīvijaya*, “(O powerful divinities) who protect the realm of Śrīvijaya.”

— l. 4: *tīda ya bhakti tīda ya tattvārjava diy āku... nisuruh tāpik ya mulah parvvāndan data śrīvijaya*, “those who are not devoted, those who are not loyal to me... let them be punished with... (?)... by the nobles (*dātu*) of Śrīvijaya.”

— l. 10: *nipāhat di velāhā yah vala śrīvijaya kalivat manāpi k yah bhūmi jāva tida bhakti ka śrīvijaya*, “(this inscription) was engraved at the moment when the army of Śrīvijaya chastised (?) the land of Java which did not submit to Śrīvijaya.”

If, with H. Kern, one takes *Śrīvijaya* as the name of a king, one must suppose that in the same sentence (l. 4) this king refers to himself successively in the...

¹ See also: Blagden, “The Kota Kapur inscription,” *J. Straits Br. RAS.*, 1913 (64), p. 69, and (65) p. 37.

² The numeral 6 is uncertain (cf. p. 400), but the script is very archaic.

[2]

first and third person: “Those who do not obey me ... shall be punished by the dātus of *His Majesty Vijaya*.” Such a shift of person, though barely admissible in a somewhat lengthy text,³ seems to me implausible in the course of a single sentence. The difficulty disappears if one takes Śrīvijaya, no longer as a personal name, but as the name of a country. If one returns to the three sentences cited above, one sees that nothing in the context compels us to interpret Śrīvijaya as the name of a king rather than that of a kingdom. The absence, already noted, of any royal title would be surprising if there were really a prince named Vijaya or Śrīvijaya involved. Combined with the syntactic difficulty I have just pointed out, it seems to me to lead to the conclusion that the Bangka inscription was issued not by “His Majesty Vijaya,” but by an anonymous figure who was the head of an Indianized Malay state named Śrīvijaya.

We encounter this name again in an inscription of the eighth century, discovered on the Malay Peninsula at Vieng Sa (south of the Bay of Bandon).⁴

M. Finot, who studied this inscription from an estampage brought back to France by Lt. L. de Lajonquière, gives the following analysis of it (*BCAL*, 1910, p. 153): “The document dates from 697 Śaka (775 A.D.). It begins with the praise of *a king Javendra and a king Śrī-Vijayeśvara*, who founded a sanctuary of the Buddha (*Māranisūdanavajrīnivāsam*). He then charged his chaplain (*rājasthavira*) Jayanta with erecting three stupas; after Jayanta’s death, his disciple Adhimukti built two brick *caityas* near the first three.”

Direct examination of the stone makes it possible to obtain a much fuller reading than the decipherment based on the estampage. (See Appendix I for the text and translation of this document.) The inscription does not speak of two kings named Jayendra and Śrī-Vijayeśvara, but of a single king whose name appears three times in three different forms:

³ For example, the Thai inscription of Rāma Khamhēng begins with a passage in direct style in the first person, but from line 18 onward shifts without transition to the third person. This change of person is, moreover, disturbing even to the Siamese themselves, and some wish to see in it proof that the inscription of Rāma Khamhēng is not a composition produced in a single draft, but rather an assemblage of pieces of diverse origins.

⁴ And not Viengsakadi, as it is written in *BCAI*, 1910, p. 149 (no. 15) and 152.

Śrīvijayendrarāja (l. 14)

Śrīvijayeśvarabhūpati (l. 16)

Śrīvijayanṛpati (l. 28)

Is this a king named Śrīvijaya? The third form, *Śrīvijayanṛpati*, can be interpreted in that way, but the first two seem to me incompatible with such a translation. In the epigraphy of Indochina,

[3]

indra or *īśvara* are never used as the second element of a *karmadhāraya* compound with the meaning “king”: for example, one would never encounter a form such as *Jayavarmendra(rāja)* or *Jayavarmeśvara(bhūpati)*⁵ to designate “King Jayavarman.” By contrast, *indra* and *īśvara* are constantly used as the second member of a *tatpuruṣa* compound, and the well-known expressions *Kambujendra* and *Kambujeśvara*, “king of the Kambujas (or of the land of the Kambujas),” are in a sense the official titles of Khmer kings.⁶

Thus, by analogy with these well-known expressions, I do not hesitate to translate *Śrīvijayendrarāja*, *Śrīvijayeśvarabhūpati*, and *Śrīvijayanṛpati* as “king (of the country) of Śrīvijaya.”

So here we have two inscriptions from the seventh–eighth centuries, both issued by a kingdom named *Śrīvijaya*. In both cases, is it one and the same country that is involved? In other words, could there at that time have existed a kingdom extending its suzerainty from Bangka to Vieng Sa? Paleographic examination of the inscriptions in no way contradicts this. The script of the Vieng Sa stele, especially that of the unfinished inscription on the second face, shows the

⁵ The form *Jayavarmeśvara* does indeed exist, but here *īśvara* does not have the meaning of “king.” *Jayavarmeśvara* designates an image of Śiva in the likeness of King Jayavarman, or simply one consecrated by him. Cf. *ISCC*, p. 71, where *Śrī-Vijayeśvara* designates a statue of Śiva.

⁶ M. Petithuguenin points out to me that the expression *Sayāmindra* is one of the most frequent titles of the king of Siam, notably the one appearing on coins.

closest resemblance to that of Javanese inscriptions of the same period.⁷ Moreover, this same unfinished inscription begins with praise of a king titled *Śrī-Mahārāja*; now, we know from the Arabs on the one hand that this title of *Mahārāja* (unused in Indochinese epigraphy) was specific to the kings of Zābaj,⁸ and from the Chinese on the other hand that the same title was borne by several rulers of the kingdom of Palembang.⁹

But the existence of a kingdom that left tangible traces in two places as far apart from each other as Bangka and Vieng Sa, and that bore a name unknown until now, is a sufficiently important new fact that it is proper to investigate whether, beyond these somewhat vague parallels, there are other, more solid arguments to support it.

In fact, the name *Śrīvijaya* is not completely unknown as the name of a country. It appears first in an illuminated Nepalese manuscript dating from...

[4]

no later than the beginning of the eleventh century, on which M. A. Foucher based his first *Study of Buddhist Iconography in India*. Miniature 23 of Cambridge MS Add. 1643, which depicts the four-armed Avalokiteśvara between Tārā and Mārīcī, bears the title: *Suvarṇapure Śrīvijayapure Lokanātha*, “Avalokiteśvara at Śrīvijayapura in Suvarṇapura.”¹⁰ But this citation does not take us very far, since *Suvarṇapura* may designate Burma (*Suvarṇabhūmi*) just as well as Sumatra (*Suvarṇadvīpa*).

The name *Śrīvijaya* also appears several times in the inscriptions of the Indian Cola dynasty. Under the reign of Rājarāja I (985–1012 A.D.), a Sanskrit and Tamil inscription from the 21st year

⁷ See, for example, an inscription dated 775 Śaka in *Oud-javaansche Oorkonden* (VI), *Verhand. Bat. Gen.*, LX, pl. 2.

⁸ G. Ferrand, *Textes arabes*, p. 29 ff.

⁹ Groeneveldt, *Notes on the Malay Archipelago*, *Verhand. Bat. Gen.*, XXXIX, p. 67 and following. This expression “kingdom of Palembang,” which will recur frequently in the course of the present study, is a convenient designation, but in using it I do not mean to assert that the capital of this state was always at Palembang.

¹⁰ A. Foucher, *Etude sur l’iconographie bouddhique de l’Inde*, pp. 193, 205.

[1006 AD] of that king¹¹ commemorates the donation of a village to a Buddhist temple at Negapatam, begun by Cūlāmaṇivarman and completed by Māravijayottuṅgavarman. The latter, son of the former, is called (l. 80) “king of Kaṭāha” (*Kaṭāhādhipati*) and of *Śrīviṣaya* (*Śrīviṣayādhipati*).¹² The inscription adds that he belongs to the “family of the King of the Mountain(s)” (*śailendravaṃśa*). Now the unfinished inscription engraved on the second face of the Vieng Sa stele states precisely that King Śrī Mahārāja came from the *śailendravaṃśa*. This proves at least that, in identifying the *Śrīvijaya* of the Vieng Sa stele with the *Śrīviṣaya* of the charter of Rājārāja I, I am not going astray in my investigation.

The country of Kaṭāha, over which the king of *Śrīviṣaya* ruled, and which the Tamil text of the charter calls *Kiḍāram*, plays an important role in the epigraphy of Rājendracola I (1012–1042 A.D.). This bold prince, after conquering India as far as the Ganges, is said to have carried his arms beyond the seas and conquered Kaḍāram, with which the friendly relations attested during his father’s lifetime had apparently been broken off.¹³ At the same time he is said to have seized a whole series of countries, which are enumerated in two inscriptions from the thirteenth and nineteenth years of his reign, at the head of which appears *Śrīvijayam*. This list has already been published on various occasions,¹⁴ but since...

[5]

I shall have to discuss it in detail, I am obliged to reproduce it once again, from the Tanjore inscription of 1030 published by M. Hultzsch:

“Having sent many ships into the midst of the moving sea, and having captured Saṅgrānavijayottuṅgavarman, king of Kadāram, together with the rutting elephants that served

¹¹ This is the charter known as the “Great Leyden Charter.” Cf. *Archaeological Survey of Southern India*, IV, p. 206; Venkayya, *Report*, 1898–99, p. 17; *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report 1911–12*, p. 175; Kielhorn, *List*, no. 712.

¹² *PW.*, s.v. *vijaya* ... gloss: *visaya*, “province, district.” In Cham epigraphy, *vijaya* designates certain administrative subdivisions (*BEFEO*, IV, p. 915). *Śrīvisaya* and *Śrīvijaya* are therefore synonymous and mean “the district of fortune,” “the fortunate country.”

¹³ One of Rājendracola I’s successors, his son (?) Vīrarājendra I, also claimed in 1068 to have conquered Kadāram and then restored it to its king (Hultzsch, *SII*, III, pp. 192, 195, 202).

¹⁴ Hultzsch, *SII*, II, p. 106, with corrections in *EI*, IX, p. 230; Kielhorn, *List*, no. 734; Kanakasabhai, *Madras Review*, August 1902, and *Tamilian Antiquary*, 1911, no. 8; Ferrand, *Textes arabes*, p. 645 (instead of 1050, read 1030).

him as mounts and that in battle were as impetuous as the sea, (he took also) the mass of treasures that this king of Kadāram had rightfully amassed, the *Vidyādharatoraṇa*, the ‘War Gate’ of the great enemy city, the splendidly adorned ‘Gate of Jewels,’ the ‘Gate of Great Jewels,’¹⁵ prosperous Śrīvijayam,¹⁶ Pannai watered by the river, ancient Malaiyūr with a fort situated on a high hill, Māyirudiṅgam surrounded by the deep sea as if by a moat, Ilaṅgāśogam unconquered in terrible battles, Māppappālam defended by abundant deep waters, Mevilimbaṅgam defended by fine walls, Valaippandūru possessing both cultivated land and uncultivated land, Talaittakkolam praised by great men versed in the sciences, Mādamāliṅgam fearless in great and terrible combats, Ilāmurideśam whose terrible strength was broken by a violent attack, Mānakkavāram whose flower gardens were like the girdle of the nymph of the southern region, and Kadāram of dreadful strength, which was protected by the neighboring sea.”

Does study of this list make it possible to identify the country of Śrīvijaya? The first task is to determine what, exactly, the conquests of Rājendracola I “beyond the moving sea” consisted of, whether more or less real.

But before that, it is important to emphasize a fact that seems to have escaped most authors who have approached this problem. The list of countries conquered by Rājendracola I forms a whole, whose various elements cannot be separated from one another. The text states, in fact, that after defeating the king of Kadāram, Rājendracola I seized his treasures, then a certain number of countries, and finally Kadāram. It is therefore a single campaign, and it is, a priori, infinitely probable that the various countries enumerated were either vassal states of the king of Kadāram, or even simply the different cities or provinces of his kingdom. This is even certain for the first name in the list, since we have seen that the king of Katāha (= Kadāram)...

¹⁵ Such is M. Hultzsch’s interpretation, which I respect, not being a Tamil specialist myself. But one may ask whether this enumeration is not rather a series of epithets referring to Śrīvijayam.

¹⁶ Or *Śrīvisayam*, since the Tamil alphabet possesses only a single sign to represent the palatal stops and the sibilants. But we have just seen that these two forms are interchangeable. M. Hultzsch had at first translated (*SII*, II, p. 109): “Vijayam of great fame,” but he later abandoned that first interpretation in favor of the one reproduced above (*EI*, IX, p. 230; cf. note in Kielhorn, *List*, p. 120, n. 6). It is obviously the same country as in the charter of Rājarāja I.

[6]

was at the same time king of *Śrīviṣaya*. This had been well understood by the epigraphists, M. Hultsch¹⁷ and M. Venkayya,¹⁸ and if everyone had kept this fact in mind, many errors would have been avoided.¹⁹ The identifications of the various countries conquered by Rājendracola I are, I repeat, interdependent, and if one succeeds in locating Kadāram, the field of inquiry concerning the others will immediately be restricted to the regions lying in the vicinity of, or under the political dependence of, the country thus identified.

M. Hultsch had first, in 1891, identified Kadāram with a locality that still bears this name today and is situated in the district of Madura.²⁰ But after M. Venkayya, seven years later, recognized in *Mā-Nakkavāram* the Nicobar Islands, and in *Mā-Pappālam* a port of Pegu mentioned in the *Mahāvamsa* (LXXVI:83),²¹ M. Hultsch was obliged, in 1903, to abandon his first identification, which, as he himself acknowledged, was hardly compatible with the naval expedition mentioned in the epigraphic texts, and he proposed instead to look for Kadāram “in Indochina,” without, however, specifying further.²² Meanwhile, M. Kanakasabhai had identified *Talaitakkolam* with Ptolemy’s Takola, and expressed the opinion that Kadāram might be (*Śrī*) *Kṣetra*, that is, the ancient site of Prome in Burma.²³ This opinion was adopted by M. V. A.

¹⁷ *SII*, II, p. 106: “The remaining names of localities must probably be looked for in the same neighbourhood (as Kadāram), as the inscription seems to imply that they were all taken from the king of Kadāram, together with Kadāram itself, which is the last item in the list.”

¹⁸ “The exact locality (of Kadāram) would depend on the identification of the other places in Kadāram conquered by the Chola king” (*Report of the Archaeological Survey of Burma*, 1909–10, p. 14).

¹⁹ By M. G. Ferrand, for example, who, after declaring that the identification of Kadāram with (*Śrī*) *Kṣetra* (Prome) is “entirely felicitous,” places Malaiyūr at Gudimallur near Arcot, and Pappālam on the north-eastern coast of India (*Textes arabes*, II, p. 646 n. 8 and p. 647 n. 2).

²⁰ “Kidāram is now the head-quarter of a tālluqa of the Rāmṇād Zamīndārī in the Madura district” (*SII*, II, p. 106).

²¹ *Annual Report*, 1898–99, p. 17. The identification of Nakkavāram with the Nicobars already appeared in *Hobson-Jobson*.

²² *SII*, III, pp. 194–95.

²³ *The Conquest of Bengal and Burma by the Tamils*, *Madras Review*, 1902, p. 251.

Smith, who added the identification of *Mādamāliṅgam* with Martaban,²⁴ and by Kielhorn.²⁵ Had not M. Taw Sein Ko even claimed to have found at Pegu two granite pillars erected by the Cola king to commemorate his conquests?²⁶ But M. Venkayya has since shown that this story is without foundation,²⁷ and has made justified reservations concerning the identification...

[7]

the phonetic resemblance between *Kidāram* and *Khettarā*.²⁸ Finally, quite recently, M. Blagden has raised the most serious objections against identifying Kadāram with Pegu.²⁹

One can see that the problem is not a new one and that it has already caused a fair amount of ink to be spilled. And yet, since 1880, when Groeneveldt published his *Notes on the Malay Archipelago*, the scholarly world has had available, in English translation, a passage from the *Annals of the Song* which was subsequently reproduced by Schlegel, Gerini, and M. G. Ferrand,³⁰ and which makes it possible to settle the question.

I said above that the great charter of Rājarāja I (1005 A.D.) names two kings of Kidāram, or, as the Sanskrit text says, two kings of Katāha and Śrīviṣaya: Śrī Cūḷāmaṇivarman and his son Śrī Māravijayottuṅgavarman, who was reigning at the time when the inscription was composed. Now the *Annals of the Song* mention, in 1003 and 1008, two embassies from the country of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi], the first sent by the king 思離味囉無尼佛麻調華 Sseu-li-tchou-lo-wou-ni-

²⁴ *Early History of India*, p. 466.

²⁵ *List*, p. 117 n. 4.

²⁶ *Report of the Archaeological Survey of Burma, 1906–7*, p. 19.

²⁷ *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report, 1907–8*, p. 233 n. 3.

²⁸ *Report of the Archaeological Survey of Burma, 1900–10*, p. 14.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 1916–17, p. 25: "M. Blagden thinks that... if Kadaram is Pegu, it could not have been conquered by the Cholas in 1069 A.D. (this date is no doubt the result of a printing error), when Burmese power was so strong, and asks whether any of the Burmese and Mon kings known to history have had names ending in *-varman*..."

³⁰ Schlegel, "Geographical Notes," *T'oung Pao*, 1901, p. 168; Gerini, *Researches on Ptolemy's Geography*, p. 623; G. Ferrand, "Ye-tiao, Sseu-tiao et Java," *Journal Asiatique*, 1916 (2), p. 528.

fo-ma-tiao-houa [Sili Zhuluowunifomadiaohua], and the second by the king 思離麻囉 Sseu-li-ma-lo-p'i [Sili Maluopi]. One need not even be a sinologist to recognize in the first name a splendid transcription of *Śrī Cūḷāmaṇivarmadeva*,³¹ and in the second the transcription of the first syllables of *Śrī Māravijayottuṅgavarman*.³²

[8]

This text seems decisive: the kings of Kātāha (Kadāram) and of Śrīvijaya are none other than the kings of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi], that is, of the kingdom of Palembang. At most one might be surprised not to find any trace in the Chinese annals either of the name Saṅgrā mavijayottuṅgavarman or of Rājendracola's conquest. The answer to this objection is easy. First, nothing prevents us from supposing that Saṅgrā mavijayottuṅgavarman is identical with that king of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] whom the *Annals of the Song*³³ mention in 1017 under the name 霞遲蘇勿吒蒲迷 Hia-tch'e-sou-wou-tch'a-p'ou-mi [Xiachi Suwuzhapumi], which is not a personal name at all, but rather a title, in which M. G. Ferrand has recently identified the expression *Haji Sumutrabhūmi*, "king of the land of Sumatra."³⁴

³¹ Schlegel, *loc. cit.*, had restored the name, approximately correctly, as *Sri Chūda Munivarmadēva*. Gerini, for reasons I do not know, did not adopt the reading *varma*, and transcribed it as *Çrī Cūḍamanibhūmyadeva* or *°bhūpadeva*, which makes no sense (*loc. cit.*). Recently, M. G. Ferrand discussed the Chinese form, and found difficulties in its Sanskrit restoration that I do not understand: "The first two characters of the royal name Sseu-li-tchou-lo-wou-ni-fo-ma-tiao-houa = *çrī*; the next two do not admit of restoration (*tchou-lo* = *jura* or a similar phoneme)... *Wou-ni* is certainly Kawi *wuni*, which appears in the royal name of Wiṣṇuwardhana, also called Raṅga Wuni... The last four characters present no difficulty; *fo-ma* = Kawi *warman*, Sanskrit *varman*; *tiao-houa* = Kawi *dewa*, Sanskrit *deva*" (*JA.*, 1916 [2], p. 529 note). I do not see what prevents one from restoring *tchou-lo* as *cūḷā*. As for the character *wou*, it is known that the ancient pronunciation of this character was *mwu* (in the sixth–seventh centuries; cf. Pelliot, "Les noms propres du Milindapanha," *JA.*, 1914 [2], p. 394). The initial nasal, which has been preserved in Cantonese, explains why this character is often used to transcribe *mo* or *ma*: *nan-wou* = Sanskrit *namo* (*T'oung Pao*, 1900, p. 251); *wou-li-pa* = Malabar (Chao Ju-kua, trans. Hirth-Rockhill, p. 223); *wou-che* = Persian *mâçû* (*ibid.*, p. 215). The restoration *cūḷāmaṇi* therefore presents no difficulty.

³² The Chinese habit of abbreviating foreign names, especially when they are very long, is too well known to require emphasis.

³³ Groeneveldt, *loc. cit.*, p. 65.

³⁴ "The earliest mention of the name of the island of Sumatra," *Journal Asiatique*, 1917 (1), p. 331.

But this conjecture is not even necessary. In fact, the conquest of Kadāram, which appears for the first time in an inscription of the thirteenth year of Rājendracola I (1024 A.D.), is not yet mentioned in the inscriptions of the twelfth year (1023), which enumerate all his other victories.³⁵ It must therefore date to 1023–1024. Now, since the *Annals of the Song* mention no embassy from San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] between 1017 and 1028, it is not surprising that they do not preserve the name of a king who was ruling around 1024 in a kingship that may have been short-lived.

As for their silence concerning the alleged conquest of the country by the Colas, this should be no more surprising: for even if one admits that King Saṅgrā mavijayottuṅgavarman was really taken prisoner by Rājendracola I, the latter, once he had returned to his own dominions, was obviously too far away for his victory to have had any political consequences other than a vague recognition of his suzerainty. We saw above that one of his successors, Vīrarājendra I, who also boasted in 1068 of having conquered Kadāram, hastened to restore it to its king. That was the wisest thing he could do, for he would have been quite unable to make practical use of his victory and to administer a country situated so far away “beyond the moving sea.”

Moreover, a few years later it was San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] that, in its turn, claimed to exercise suzerainty over the Colas: that, at least, is what its envoys went to tell the Chinese court. For one reads in Ma Duanlin, concerning an embassy from P'ou-kan [Pugan] (Pagan) in 1106: “The emperor at first gave orders that they be received and treated as had been done for the envoys of Tchou-lien [Zhulian] [Zhulian] (Cola); but the president of the Council of Rites submitted the following observations: Tchou-lien [Zhulian] is a vassal of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi]; therefore, in the Hi-ning [Xining] years (1068–1077), it was considered sufficient merely to write to the king of that country on stout paper with an envelope of plain cloth. The king of P'ou-kan [Pugan], on the other hand, is the sovereign of a great kingdom of the Fan...”³⁶

³⁵ Hultzsch, *SII*, I, pp. 98, 100.

³⁶ d'Hervey de Saint-Denys, *Méridionaux*, p. 586.

[9]

This passage is of interest because, by showing us that political relations existed in the eleventh century between the Colas and San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi], it provides a new argument in favor of identifying the "king of Kadāram" with the king of Palembang.

That being established, it is appropriate to examine the list of countries conquered by Rājendracola I from the king of Kadāram (leaving aside for the moment the names of Kadāram [Kidāram, Katāha] and Śrīvijaya). We shall see that most of them can be recognized as states neighboring the kingdom of Palembang, or as states that at some point were under its dependence.

— Pannai. This country is probably identical with the Pane that the *Nāgarakṛtāgama* names among the Sumatran states dependent, in the fourteenth century, on Majapahit, alongside Jambi, Palembang, etc., and which Gerini places at modern Pani or Panei on the east coast of the island.³⁷ But the identification naturally remains somewhat hypothetical.

— Malaiyūr. This is obviously the country of *Malāyu*, from which Europeans derived the name of the Malays. The exact location of this country has for many years been the subject of a whole series of hypotheses, which will be found collected and discussed in M. Pelliot's *Deux itinéraires* (*BEFEO*, IV, p. 326 ff.) and in Gerini's *Researches* (p. 528 ff.). Whether one places *Malāyu* on the western coast of Sumatra, or on the eastern coast, or even in the south of the Malay Peninsula,³⁸ in every case it was a country which, according to the testimony of the pilgrim Yi-tsing [Yijing], lay in the immediate vicinity of Che-li-fo-che [Shilifoshi] (the name by which the Chinese designated the kingdom of Palembang before using the form San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi]). The annexation of *Malāyu* by Che-li-fo-che [Shilifoshi] can even, thanks to a passage in Yi-tsing

³⁷ *Researches*, p. 513.

³⁸ The information provided by the Tamil inscription — "ancient Malaiyūr with a fort situated on a high hill" — does not greatly clarify the discussion. These short descriptions accompanying each name in the list are based, almost all of them, on puns or fanciful etymologies. That is the case here, where the "hill" (Tamil *malai*) no doubt appears only in order to explain *Malaiyūr*. The epithet "ancient" is more suggestive: it could be taken as an argument in favor of the theory according to which there were two countries that successively bore the name *Malāyu*, and that what is meant here is the old one as opposed to the new.

[Yijing], be dated between 672 and 705 A.D.³⁹: this datum is sufficient for the inquiry I am pursuing at the moment.

It is known that the name *Malāyu* appears in the texts under two distinct forms, one with final *r*, the other, much more frequent, without *r*. The Tamil inscription of Rājendracola I provides a new example of the first form, which until now had been attested only by a few Arabic authors...

[10]

(*Malayur*),⁴⁰ a passage in the *Annals of the Yuan* (*Ma-li-yu-eul* [Maliyu'er]),⁴¹ and by Marco Polo (*Malaiur*).⁴²

— *Māyirudiṅgam*. In Tamil, *mā°* is a usual syncopated form of Sanskrit *mahā°* in compounds: Tamil *māmuni* = Sanskrit *mahāmuni*, Tamil *māppirayattanam* = Sanskrit *mahāvīrya*, etc. It is moreover in this way that M. Hultzsch explained the names *Māppappālam* and *Mānakkavāram*, which he ultimately proposed to translate as “the great Pappālam” and “the great Nakkavaram.”⁴³ We shall see shortly that the same explanation is valid for *Mādamāliṅgam*. This at least authorizes us to ask whether, instead of *Māyirudiṅgam*, which recalls nothing known, it might not be better to read *Mā-Yirudiṅgam*, “the great Yirudiṅgam.” Now, among the fifteen states dependent on San-fo-ts’i [Sanfoqi] in the thirteenth century, Zhao Rugua cites a country of *Je-lo-t’ing* 日羅亭 [Riluoting],⁴⁴ whose name seems indeed to correspond to *Yirudiṅgam*. No doubt the Chinese *je* [*ri*] is not a very exact equivalent of the Tamil *yi*. But it is quite obvious that the Chinese form is not a transcription of the Tamil form: both the one and the other are independent attempts to render an indigenous name. And I believe that, taken as a whole, the identification proposed is sufficiently satisfactory to have some chance of being accepted.

³⁹ Pelliot, *loc. cit.*, pp. 338, 348.

⁴⁰ G. Ferrand, *Textes arabes*, pp. 343, 383, 396.

⁴¹ Pelliot, *loc. cit.*, pp. 242, 328.

⁴² Ed. Yule-Cordier, II, p. 280 (cf. p. 283 for a hypothesis by Logan concerning this *r*).

⁴³ *SII*, III, p. 195 n. 1.

⁴⁴ Trans. Hirth-Rockhill, p. 62.

Various localities have been proposed for Zhao Rugua's *Je-lo-t'ing* [Riluoting]: Schlegel thought of Jeluton on the island of Bangka;⁴⁵ Gerini proposed both Jelatang southwest of Jambi.⁴⁶ Jelutong in Johore, and Jelutong in Selangor.⁴⁷ These comparisons are worth what all geographical comparisons based on a simple phonetic resemblance between two names attested seven or eight centuries apart are worth, that is to say, very little. But there is in Zhao Rugua's book a passage which, without allowing one to locate *Je-lo-t'ing* [Riluoting] exactly, nevertheless indicates rather clearly in what region one should look for it.

For one reads in the *Tchou fan tche* [*Zhu fan zhi*],⁴⁸ concerning the dependencies of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi]: "Je-lo-t'ing [Riluoting], Ts'ien-mai [Qianmai], Pa-t'a [Bata], and Kia-lo-hi [Jialuoxi] are of the same kind (as Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling])."⁴⁹ The translators, Messrs. Hirth and Rockhill,

[11]

suppose that one must understand by this that the peoples, customs, and products of these various countries are the same.⁵⁰ It must even be understood, no doubt, that they are neighboring, for the same expression recurs a little further on, with regard to Fo-lo-an [Foluo'an]: "Its neighbors P'eng-fong [Pengfeng], Teng-ya-nong [Dengyanong], and Ki-lan-tan [Jilandan] are like it."⁵¹ P'eng-fong [Pengfeng] (= Pahang), Teng-ya-nong [Dengyanong] (= Trengganu), and Ki-lan-tan [Jilandan] (= Kelantan)⁵² are in fact contiguous to one another, and

⁴⁵ *T'oung Pao*, 1901, p. 134.

⁴⁶ *Researches*, p. 627.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 826.

⁴⁸ Here is the list of the 15 countries dependent on San-fo-ts'i (trans. Hirth-Rockhill, p. 62): P'eng-fong [Pengfeng], Teng-ya-nong [Dengyanong], Ling-ya-sseu-kia [Lingyasijia], Ki-lan-tan [Jilandan], Fo-lo-an [Foluo'an], Je-lo-t'ing [Riluoting], Ts'ien-mai [Qianmai], Pa-t'a [Bata], Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling], Kia-lo-hi [Jialuoxi], Pa-lin-fong [Balinfeng], Sin-t'o [Xinguo], Kien-pi [Jianbi], Lan-wou-li [Lanwuli], Si-lan [Xilan].

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁵² Cf. Pelliot, *Deux itinéraires*, BEFEO, IV, pp. 334–335.

all are likewise situated, from the point of view of natural products, in the zone of the “Malay flora.”⁵³

Thus one is led to suppose, by analogy, that Je-lo-t’ing [Riluoting], Ts’ien-mai [Qianmai], Pa-t’a [Bata], Kia-lo-hi [Jialuoxi], and Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling] are countries neighboring one another and situated within the same zone. Now, it will be seen below that Kia-lo-hi — Grahi was located at Chaiya,⁵⁴ and that Tan-ma-ling was in the same region.⁵⁵ Je-lo-t’ing [Riluoting] must therefore have been located somewhere toward the center of the Malay Peninsula. And, by contrast with the southern group P’eng-fong [Pengfeng], Teng-ya-nong [Dengyanong], Ki-lan-tan [Jilandan], Fo-lo-an [Foluo’an], the group Je-lo-t’ing [Riluoting], Ts’ien-mai [Qianmai], Pa-t’a [bata], Kia-lo-hi [Jialuoxi], Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling] apparently represents the more northern dependencies of San-fo-ts’i [Sanfoqi], in a region characterized, from the natural point of view, by what is called “Siamese” flora,⁵⁶ and from the point of view of customs by the predominance of Khmer civilization.⁵⁷

— Ilangāsogam. M. G. Ferrand has correctly identified this country with the Ling-ya-sseu-kia [Lingyasijia] that Zhao Rukuo lists among the dependencies of San-fo-ts’i [Sanfoqi], and with the Lenkasuka that the *Nāgarakṛtāgama* mentions, a century and a half later, as a tributary of Majapahit.⁵⁸ The initial *i* presents no difficulty, since Tamil often adds an initial vowel to foreign words beginning with a lingual or a liquid.⁵⁹ As for the consonant which, following M. Hultsch, I transcribe as *g*, it is the single guttural stop of Tamil, which serves to represent equally *k*, *kh*, *g*, or *gh*.

⁵³ Cf. the map appended to M. Ridley’s article, “An account of a botanical expedition to lower Siam,” *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, no. 59.

⁵⁴ See Appendix III: The country of Grahi.

⁵⁵ To these two identifications, based on epigraphic documents and therefore offering serious guarantees of accuracy, one may add Gerini’s hypotheses, who proposed identifying Pa-t’a with the Bâta of Tavernier and the Pâte of Teixeira, which would correspond either to Patanor = Bandon, or to Bardia in the Bay of Jumbor (*Recherches*, p. 543 n. 1, and p. 822).

⁵⁶ Ridley, *loc. cit.*

⁵⁷ The inscription of Grahi is in fact in Cambodian.

⁵⁸ *Textes arabes*, p. 647 n. 1.

⁵⁹ Mousset and Dupuy, *Dictionnaire tamoul-français*, I, p. 149.

This country can be localized fairly precisely. Gerini has rightly recalled that Lenkasuka is cited under the form Lankasuka in the *Hikayat Maron*...

[12]

the *Mahawansa*.⁶⁰ According to this text, rather improperly called the “Annals of Kedah,” which was translated long ago by J. Low,⁶¹ and has recently been published in Latin transcription.⁶² Lankasuka was the first residence founded by Maron Mahawansa (an ambassador from the country of Rum sent to China), after he had been forced to land on the coast of the Malay Peninsula, opposite Pulau Sëri (or Srai). “Having left his boat,” says J. Low’s translation, “Maron Mahawansa built a fort surrounded by a moat, as well as a palace and a vast audience hall, to which he gave the name of Lankasuka, because it had been built amid every kind of rejoicing and festivity.”⁶³ Before returning to the country of Rum, he consecrated his son as king under the name Raja Mahapodisat and gave the country the name of Kedah. At that time Pulau Sëri was already joined to the mainland: this former island has become the hill now called Gunong Jërai (Kedah Peak).⁶⁴ Later, the son of Mahapodisat, Raja Sëri Mahawansa, “grew tired of living at Lankasuka, which was now far from the sea.” He had a residence built for himself “lower down, because the river there was broad and deep,” and had a small provisional palace made for himself at a place called Srokam.⁶⁵

All these facts are given without any date, and are intermingled with marvelous and confused tales. But what allows one to suppose that this Lankasuka is not an invention of the author of

⁶⁰ “The Nâgarakṛtâgama list of countries...,” *JRAS*, 1905, p. 495 and following.

⁶¹ “A Translation of the Keddah Annals,” *Journal of the Indian Archipelago*, III, p. 9 (reprinted by the Vajirāñāṇa National Library, Bangkok, 1908).

⁶² *Hikayat Marong Maha Wangsa or Kedah Annals*, edited by A. J. Sturrock, *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, no. 72 (1916), p. 37.

⁶³ Text, pp. 45–46. — Translation, p. 9.

⁶⁴ Text, p. 59. — Translation, pp. 168–169.

⁶⁵ Text, p. 64. — Translation, p. 253.

the Annals of Kedah is an interesting piece of information due to M. Blagden, according to which the name Lankasuka is still alive in the memory of the Malays of the region.⁶⁶

M. Pelliot, who dealt incidentally with this question in his review of M. Aymonier's *Cambodge*, proposed identifying the Ling-ya-sseu-kia [Lingyasijia] of Zhao Rukuo with the Lang-ya-sieou [Langyasijia] of the *Suishu* [History of the Sui], the Lang-kia-chou [Langjia zhou] of Yijing (= Kâmalanka of Xuanzang), and placing this country in Tenasserim, whose Peguan name is Nankasï.⁶⁷

[13]

The passage from the Annals of Këdah cited above, which does not appear to have attracted M. Pelliot's attention, seems to make it necessary to dissociate completely Ling-ya-sseu-kia [Lingyasijia] — Lahkasuka (Gunong Jërai) from the Lang-ya-sieou, Lang-ya-siu [Langyaxiu], or Lang-kia-chou [Langjia zhou] known in the sixth–seventh centuries, which perhaps does indeed correspond to Tenasserim.

The mention of Lahkasuka in the Tamil inscription of 1030 is important, for it ruins a rash theory of Gerini, and once again shows the fragility of chronologies based on historical romances that belong more to folklore than to history properly speaking. Gerini had first begun by deriving the following chronology from the Annals of Këdah (I have said above that this text does not contain a single date!):

— ca. 1300 A.D.: foundation of Lankasuka by Maron Mahawansa;

— immediately after 1380: accession of Mahapodisat and change of the country's name to Këdah;

⁶⁶ "Langkasuka still lives in the memory of the local Malays. It has developed into a myth, being evidently the 'spirit-land' referred to as Lakon Suka by the peasantry of the Patani States, and the realm of Alang-ka-suka interpreted by a curious folk-etymology as the 'country of what you will', a sort of fairy land where the Kedah Malays locate the fairy princess Sadong..." (*Siam and the Malay Peninsula*, JRAS, 1906, p. 119).

⁶⁷ BEFEO, IV, pp. 406–408.

— around 1400: abandonment of Lankasuka.⁶⁸

But since Lankasuka is cited by Zhao Rukuo, who was writing at the beginning of the thirteenth century, Gerini was obliged to push the foundation of this country back to the end of the twelfth century and “to insert half a dozen little unknown kings between that date and the accession of Mahapodisat, under whose reign the country changed its name to Këdah.”⁶⁹

If Gerini had noticed that Lankasuka is mentioned in an inscription of 1030, it would no longer have been “half a dozen little kings” that he would have been obliged to insert, but rather a full dozen. In fact, this ancient and authentic mention of Lankasuka is enough to overthrow that fragile chronological structure. And moreover, the Buddhist inscription found at Bukit Murriam,⁷⁰ a little to the south of Gunong Jërai, which Kern dated to the beginning of the fifth century,⁷¹ proves that the site is very ancient. If one does not know to what period the foundation and naming of Lankasuka go back, we shall see below that the name of Këdah may perhaps appear as early as the seventh century. This, together with the fact that Gunong Jërai was still an island at the time of Maron Mahawansa’s arrival, compels one to push the existence of this figure back into a past bordering on legend.

From all this discussion, for the purpose of the present study, it will be enough to retain the identification of Iahgāçogam with Lahkasuka, its location in the south of the state of Këdah, and its dependence upon the kingdom of Palembang.

⁶⁸ *JRAS*, 1905, pp. 495–496.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 499.

⁷⁰ D.-Col. Low, “On an inscription from Keddah,” *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, XVIII (1849), II, p. 247.

⁷¹ “Over eenige oude sanskritopschriften...,” *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde*, 3rd series, vol. I, 1883.

[14]

— Mâ-ppappâlam. We saw above that M. Venkayya had identified this name in the *Mahāvamsa*.⁷² In connection with Parakkamabâhu's expedition against Pegu (*Rāmaññadesa*) around 1180, the poem relates how the Sinhalese ships were partly scattered by a storm before reaching their destination: "But five of them, carrying a numerous troop of vigorous men, landed at the port of Kusumi in the country of Rāmañña... and the ship commanded by the Tamil general Âdicca cast anchor at the port of Papphâla, in that country" (*Mhv.*, LXXVI, 59, 63–64). The identification proposed by M. Venkayya was adopted by M. Hultzsch;⁷³ moreover, it is unassailable from the phonetic point of view. The mention, among the countries conquered from the king of Kadâram, of the port of Papphâla situated, according to the *Mahāvamsa*, in Peguan territory, seems to contradict the thesis that I am defending. But the contradiction is perhaps only apparent.

On the one hand, it is known that around the eleventh century⁷⁴ the suzerainty of Pagan, on which Pegu depended,⁷⁵ extended southward at least as far as Mergui, since M. de Lajonquière discovered there a Pali stele in the name of a king of *Arimaddana*, that is, Pagan.⁷⁶ On the other hand, one of the grievances invoked by Parakkamabâhu against the king of Pagan was the abduction of a Sinhalese princess who had been sent to Cambodia (*Mhv.*, LXXVI, 35). Since it is infinitely probable that messengers traveling from Ceylon to Cambodia passed by way of the Isthmus of Kra, it must have been in those parts that the abduction was committed, and consequently the authority of the king of Pagan must have extended that far.⁷⁷ If Papphâla was located on the western coast of the Isthmus of Kra, nothing prevents us from supposing that this locality, which at the end of the twelfth century belonged to Pegu, may at the beginning of

⁷² *Annual Report, 1898–99*, p. 17; *Report of the Archaeological Survey of Burma, 1909–10*, p. 14.

⁷³ *SII*, III, p. 195, n° 1: Above, vol. II, p. 109 (*the great Papphâlam must be read instead of Mâppappâlam*).

⁷⁴ Approximate date assigned by M. Finot to the Mergui stele (*BCAI*, 1910, p. 153).

⁷⁵ Phayre, *History of Burma*, p. 50. — *Mhv.*, LXXVI, 38, calls the king of Rāmañña "king of Arimaddana."

⁷⁶ *BCAI*, 1909, p. 237; 1910, p. 153.

⁷⁷ It would even have extended further south, according to Gerini, who proposes placing in the Malay Peninsula the Malayadeśa where, according to the *Mahāvamsa* (*ibid.*), the king of Rāmañña had the envoys sent from Ceylon to Cambodia imprisoned (*Researches*, p. 535).

the eleventh have been under the dependence of Palembang, whose suzerainty, as will be seen later, then extended as far as the Bay of Bandon.

I do not conceal from myself how hypothetical these propositions are, and I do not in the least mean to assert that Papphâla was in fact located on the Isthmus of Kra. I have simply wished to show that the thing was possible and that, consequently, the presence, among the conquests of Râjendracoḷa I, of a...

(6) This note is interesting because it shows how far some scholars (like Gerini) were willing to extend Pagan's sphere—well into the Malay Peninsula—based largely on narrative sources like the *Mahāvam̃sa*, which Coedès elsewhere treats quite cautiously.

[15]

locality that had formed part of Pegu in the twelfth century is not enough to invalidate the identification of these conquests with the vassal states of Palembang.⁷⁸

— Mevilimbangam and Valaippandûru do not for the present lend themselves to any identification.

— Talaitakkolam. It is almost certain that this country is identical with the Takkola of the *Milindapañha* and the Takola of Ptolemy, the first part of the name being nothing other than the Tamil word *talai*, meaning “head.” This straightforward identification has moreover been accepted by all authors, beginning with M. Kanakasabhai, who was the first to propose it.⁷⁹ The question of the origin of the name, and that of the location of this emporium, have often been

⁷⁸ M. G. Ferrand (*Textes arabes*, p. 647 n. 2) identifies Papphala with the Fawfal of Ibn Sa'īd (*ibid.*, pp. 348–349), on the north-eastern coast of India. I have shown above that the presence, among the conquests of Râjendracola, of an Indian port is impossible a priori. But was Ibn Sa'īd's Fawfal really on the north-eastern coast of India?

⁷⁹ Kanakasabhai, *Madras Review*, 1902, p. 251. — V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 466. — Taw Sein Ko, *Report of the Archaeological Survey of Burma*, 1909–10, p. 14; 1916–17, p. 25. — Blagden, *ibid.*, 1916–17, p. 25. — Ferrand, *Textes arabes*, p. 647 n. 5.

discussed.⁸⁰ It is most readily located on the Isthmus of Kra. Gerini placed it farther south, toward present-day Takua Pa.⁸¹ Perhaps it will even have to be sought still farther south, if its identity with the Chinese Ko-kou-la should come to be proven.⁸² Its presence among the vassal states of Palembang therefore has nothing surprising about it.

— Mâ-damâlingam. M. Kanakasabhai⁸³ identified this country with Martaban, whose Talaing name is *Muh-tmam* (Haswell), or *Mat-tma* (Schmidt),⁸⁴ which became in Siamese *Mo:ta:ma:*. From the phonetic point of view, the equation is obviously possible. However, it applies only to part of the word and...

[16]

and leaves aside the group °*liṅgam*. It is therefore legitimate to seek a more satisfactory comparison.

If one once again takes the first syllable *mâ* as an equivalent of *mahâ*, the name to be identified is *Damâliṅgam* or *Tamâliṅgam*. Now, among the fifteen states tributary to San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi], Zhao Rukuo cites Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling]. This country, according to the same author, is neighboring Ling-ya-sseu-kia [Langyasijia] (Lankasuka), which can be reached by sea in six days

⁸⁰ See references under Takola in the geographical index to my *Greek and Latin Texts Relating to the Far East*.

⁸¹ *Researches*, p. 85 and following.

⁸² M. Pelliot (*T'oung Pao*, 1912, p. 455) pointed out, as a hypothesis, a connection between Takola and *to-kou* (*ta-kut = takur?*), the name of cardamom in the country of K'ie-kou-lo cited in the *History of the T'ang*. Now this country is probably identical with the Ko-kou-lo that Jia Dan places to the west of Ko-lo (= Kêdah? see below), in direct communication with it, and with the Qaqula or Qaqola (Ibn Baṭṭūṭah), whose name means precisely "cardamom." Note moreover that the traditional translation of Pāli *takkolam* in Cambodian and Siamese is *kravah* = "cardamom," and that Childers, *Dictionary of the Pāli Language*, s.v. *takkolam*, says: "the Sinhalese is *takul*," which seems indeed to be very closely related to the *to-kou = takur* of the *History of the T'ang*.

⁸³ *Madras Review*, 1902. This identification was then adopted by V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 466, and by G. Ferrand, *Textes arabes*, p. 647 n. 6.

⁸⁴ *Buch des Râgâwan*, pp. 112–113 (*Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, phil.-hist.* CLI, 3).

and also by land; and it resembles the countries of Je-lo-t'ing [Riluoting] (Yirudingam, see above), Ts'ien-mai [Qianmai], Pa-t'a [Bata], and Kia-lo-hi [Jialuoxi] (Grahi = Jaiya, see App. III).⁸⁵

M. Takakusu thought he recognized in Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling] the name of *Tanah Malayu*.⁸⁶ But M. Pelliot pointed out that this comparison is not very satisfactory from the phonetic point of view.⁸⁷ Schlegel proposed reading Timbûlan, located at the mouth of one of the rivers on the east coast of Sumatra⁸⁸: a hypothesis untenable in view of the testimony of Zhao Rukuo, according to whom one could travel by land from Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling] to Lankasuka. M. Pelliot, for his part, suggested Tëmbëling, a tributary of the Pahang River.⁸⁹ Since then, Gerini has put forward another Tëmbëling or Temiling, near the mouth of the Kwantan River⁹⁰; but M. Blagden rightly observed that this location accords poorly with the passage of Zhao Rukuo according to which Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling] is only six days' sail from Lankasuka.⁹¹

An unpublished inscription from the Malay Peninsula is going to provide the exact name of this country and make it possible to localize it with sufficient precision. This inscription⁹² is engraved on a doorjamb originating from Wat Huâ Vieng at Jaiya, and currently preserved in the National Library in Bangkok (see Appendix II for the text and translation of this document). It is in faulty Sanskrit. The wear on the last lines unfortunately makes it impossible to determine its purpose, but the date *Kaliyuga* 4332 = 1230 A.D. is sufficiently clear. Finally, the fact...

⁸⁵ Trans. Hirth-Rockhill, pp. 62, 67, 68.

⁸⁶ *A Record...*, pp. xliii–xliv.

⁸⁷ *BEFEO.*, IV, p. 328 n. 6.

⁸⁸ *T'oung Pao*, 1901, pp. 130–131.

⁸⁹ *Loc. cit.*

⁹⁰ *JRAS.*, 1905, p. 498.

⁹¹ Review of the translation of Zhao Rukuo by Hirth and Rockhill, *JRAS.*, 1913, p. 166: "If the sailing time between Ling-ya-sseu-kia [Lingyasijia] and Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling] is correctly given in the text, it seems doubtful whether the latter can be Kuantan, as six days would be rather a short time, considering the weak monsoon of the Straits of Malacca."

⁹² This inscription, as well as another from the same provenance, very badly damaged, formed part for some time of the private collections of Prince Damrong. It was in his possession that M. de Lajonquière noted them (*BCAI.*, 1912, p. 41).

[17]

which is of special interest for the present study, is that the document was issued by a person bearing the title of Śrī Dharmarâja and described as “Lord of Tâmbralinga” (*Tâmbralingeçvarah*).

Tâmbra is a Prakritizing form of *tâmbra*, “copper,” still used in Sinhalese. The meaning of the expression *Tâmbralinga* is not very clear. If one takes *linga* in the sense of “mark, characteristic,” *Tâmbralinga* would mean “the land characterized by copper,”⁹³ but I do not think copper has ever been reported in the northern part of the Malay Peninsula. One may also suppose that the country derived its name from a “copper linga” that possessed a certain renown. Be that as it may, it is almost certain that *Tâmbralinga* is the name from which the Chinese form Tan-ma-ling and the Tamil form Tamâlingam derive. The transcription Tan-ma-ling for *Tâmbralinga* is analogous to the transcriptions 多摩梨帝 To-mo-li-ti [Duomolidi]⁹⁴ and 耽摩立底 Tan-mo-li-ti [Danmolidi]⁹⁵ for *Tâmbralipti*. As for the Tamil form Tamâlingam, whose *â* might raise some objections, it is possible that the correct reading is *Tamra*^o or *Tamaralingam*. For it is known that in Tamil script, especially in inscriptions, the sign used to mark long *â* is practically indistinguishable from the sign representing the semivowel *r*.⁹⁶

To localize *Tâmbralinga*, one must take account of the following facts: 1° the inscription mentioning it comes from Jaiya; 2° this inscription was issued by a person bearing the title Çrī Dharmarâja, which seems to have been the traditional title of the kings of Nagor Sri Dharmarâj, and indeed the source of the name of that locality itself; 3° Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling] is, according to a text cited by Schlegel, ten days’ sail south of Cambodia⁹⁷; 4° Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling] is, according to Zhao Rukuo, six days’ sail from Lankasuka.⁹⁸

⁹³ Pischel, *Grammatik der Prâkrit-Sprachen*, § 295.

⁹⁴ Faxian, ch. 37.

⁹⁵ Yijing, passim.

⁹⁶ *SII*, I, p. VI.

⁹⁷ *T’oung Pao*, 1901, p. 126.

⁹⁸ Trans. Hirth-Rockhill, p. 68.

The first three pieces of evidence agree well and combine to place *Tâmralinga* on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula, between the Bay of Bandon and Nagor Sri Dharmarâj; but the last seems to contradict them. For we have just seen that M. Blagden rejected the localization of Tan-ma-ling at the mouth of the Kwantan River because six days were insufficient to make the crossing between that place and Kedah Peak. The objection has twice the force if the point of departure is Jaiya or Nagor Sri Dharmarâj.

If Zhao Rukuo's text is not corrupt, and if it really refers to a voyage by sea and not by land, the only way to resolve the difficulty is to suppose either that the country of *Tâmralinga* occupied the peninsula...

[18]

across its entire width, and looked out both upon the Gulf of Siam and upon the Straits at the level of Panga or Trang; or else that it was Lankasuka that looked out upon both seas. The two hypotheses are equally plausible, and perhaps both are true at the same time. One need only study in broad outline the geography of this whole part of the Peninsula, and remember how easily one passes there from one sea to the other, to understand that the existence of states extending from one coast to the other is entirely natural, and is explained politically by the advantage of controlling, along their whole length, the various transit routes.⁹⁹

Whatever the extent of *Tâmralinga* may in fact have been, it certainly included Jaiya and very probably Nagor Sri Dharmarâj. But, it may be objected, do you not also place at Jaiya that other vassal state of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] which Zhao Rukuo calls Kia-lo-hi [Jialuoxi], and which you identify (see App. III) with the country of Grahi, mentioned in an inscription engraved on the pedestal of a Buddha originating from Jaiya? — No doubt; but it should be observed that, in the very terms of this Khmer inscription, Grahi was only a *sruk*, that is to say, a small district

⁹⁹ Cf. de Lajonquière, "Le domaine archéologique du Siam," *BCAI*, 1909, p. 256: "It seems to me that they (= the archaeological remains of Jaiya, Vieng Sa, and Takua Pa) mark out a transit route across the peninsula and consequently one of the small Hindu kingdoms that shared it among themselves." — P. 259: "...Trang on a river descending from the north and whose valley corresponds to a pass toward Nakhon Sri Thammarat. This port, moreover of quite recent foundation, also communicates with Pathalung... by an easy road; one can thus go easily by bicycle from one sea to the other in a few hours; with present conveniences removed, these were certainly two transit routes, one to Pathalung requiring 2 or 3 stages by land and as many by water as far as the Bay of Lakhon; the other, that of Lakhon, 5 or 6 stages across an easy and densely inhabited country."

administered by a *mahâsenapati*. Consequently, even if one admits that this name was indeed applied to the ancient site of Jaiya, nothing prevents one from supposing that the district thus designated formed part of Tàmralinga. But it may also be that the Buddha statue found at Jaiya was brought there from the surrounding region, and that Grahi = Kia-lo-hi, which according to the *History of the Song* bordered on Tchen-la, was situated a little to the north of the Bay of Bandon. The inscription mentioning Tàmralinga, by contrast, seems to have been found *in situ*.

— Ilâmurideçam. The initial *i* is the same as in *llangâçogam*. This is obviously that country situated in the northern part of Sumatra, cited by the Arab geographers under the same name *Lâmuri*,¹⁰⁰ and by Marco Polo under the name *Lambri*.¹⁰¹ The identification is self-evident, and has moreover already been made by M. G. Ferrand.¹⁰² What is particularly important for the present...

[19]

study is that this country appears, under the form Lan-wou-li [Lanwuli], among the tributary states of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] named in the *Tchoufan tche* [*Zhu fan zhi*].¹⁰³

— Mânakkavâram. As we saw above, this country has already been identified with the Nicobars, the first syllable *ma* once again being only an equivalent of *mahâ*. The form *Necuveran* used by Marco Polo¹⁰⁴ is still quite close to *Nakkivâram*.

In sum, of the eleven countries that have just been examined, nine have been identified with greater or lesser certainty. Of these,

¹⁰⁰ G. Ferrand, *Textes arabes*, Index, s.v. *Lâmuri*.

¹⁰¹ Ed. Yule-Cordier, II, p. 299.

¹⁰² *Loc. cit.*, p. 647 n. 7.

¹⁰³ Trans. Hirth-Rockhill, pp. 62, 72. — Cf. Groeneveldt, *Notes*, p. 98; Hirth, *T'oung Pao*, 1895, p. 152; Schlegel, *ibid.*, 1901, p. 138.

¹⁰⁴ *Loc. cit.*, II, p. 306.

— one, Malaiyûr, was incorporated as early as the time of Yi-tsing [Yijing] into the kingdom of Palembang,

— four appear among the tributary states of San-fo-ts’i [Sanfoqi] listed by Zhao Rukuo, namely: Mâ-Yirudingam (= Je-lo-t’ing [Riluoting]), I-Langâçogam (= Ling-ya-sseu-kia [Lingyasijjia]), Mâ-Damâlingam (= Tan-ma-ling [Danmaling]), and I-Lâmurideçam (= Lan-wou-li [Lanwuli]),

— four are situated in regions such that their vassalage with respect to the kingdom of Palembang is plausible, or at least possible, namely: Patinai (in Sumatra?), Mâ-Ppappâlam and Talait-Takkolam (toward the Isthmus of Kra?), Mâ-Nakkavâram (Nicobar Islands).

This tally fully illuminates and corroborates the passage from the *History of the Song* on which I believed I could base the opinion that it is the king of Palembang who is designated in Cola epigraphy by the expression “king of Kadâram” or “king of Katâha and Śrîvijaya.”

It now remains to investigate the meaning and value of these two terms.

— Katâha, Kadâram, Kidâram. Alongside these three forms attested in the epigraphy, there would also exist a literary form, Kâlagam, found in an ancient Tamil poem, the *Paddinappâlai* (I, 191). According to this text, ships from Kâlagam brought merchandise to Kâvirippûmpaddinam, the great port situated at the mouth of the Kâveri.¹⁰⁵ The commentator on the poem states that Kâlagam here designates the country known by the name Kadâram, and the *nighantus* or Tamil lexicons give, among the meanings of the word Kâlagam, that of “the country called Kadâram.”¹⁰⁶ But it is possible that this...

[20]

identification may rest on a misunderstanding. In fact, Sanskrit kaṭāha and Tamil kaḍāram both mean “boiler, copper cauldron,” but kaḍāram also has the meaning “dark brown tending toward

¹⁰⁵ Cited by Kanakasabhai, *Madras Review*, 1902. Cf. Ferrand, *Textes arabes*, II, p. 648.

¹⁰⁶ Venkayya, *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report, 1907–8*, p. 233; *Report of the Archaeological Survey of Burma, 1909–10*, pp. 14–15.

black”; now *kāḷagam* means precisely “blackness,”¹⁰⁷ and it may perhaps be only this synonymy that led the commentator on the *Paṭṭinappālai* and the lexicographers to gloss *Kāḷagam* by *Kaḍāram*. It therefore does not seem that one should attach great importance to this identification, which besides does not take us very far.

Outside of epigraphy, *Kaḍāram* is named once in the Tamil poem *Kaliṅgattupparaṇi*.¹⁰⁸ As for *Kaṭāha*, it appears several times in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, as the name of an *dvīpa* neighboring *Suvarṇadvīpa*, which in this poem quite probably designates Sumatra: the king of *Kaṭāha* was the brother-in-law of the king of *Suvarṇadvīpa*, which seems to indicate that in the eyes of the author of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, who was writing around the 11th–12th centuries, the two countries had very close political relations.¹⁰⁹ The name *Kaṭāha* is also found in the Nepalese illuminated manuscript Cambridge Add. 1643: miniatures 26 and 28, which depict *Avalokiteśvara* standing surrounded by two forms of *Tārā*, of *Hayagrīva* (or *Māricī*) and of a *preta*, bear as title: *Kaṭāhadvīpe Valavatīparvate Lokanātha*, “*Avalokiteśvara* on Mount *Valavatī* in the land of *Kaṭāha*.”¹¹⁰

These citations are of interest in that they prove that the name *Kaṭāha* was known and used in India, and that consequently the *Kaṭāha* cited in the Sanskrit part of the great charter of *Rājarāja I* is not simply a translation of the *Kiḍāram* named in the Tamil text.

Now there is a country known to the Chinese whose name seems phonetically to correspond rather well to *Kaṭāha*: it is 羯茶 *Kie-tch’a* [*Jiecha*], where *Yijing* stopped twice. During his outward journey, coming from *Che-li-fo-che* and *Mo-lo-yeou* on his way to India, he stopped first at *Kie-tch’a* [*Jiecha*]; from there, after ten days’ sailing to the north, he reached the “Island of Naked Men”; then after another fifteen days’ sailing to the northwest, he arrived at *Tāmralipti* near the mouths of the *Ganges*. On his return, coming from *Tāmralipti*, he seems to have reached *Kie-tch’a* [*Jiecha*] directly, without stopovers; from there, he then needed a

¹⁰⁷ *Venkayya*, *ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ In an allusion to the conquests of the *Cōḷas*: “The war elephants of the *Cōḷas* drank the water of the *Ganges* at *Maṇi*; and *Kaḍāram*, where the roaring crystal waves lashed the golden-red sand, was annexed.” *Kanakasabhai*, *ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ *Kathāsaritsāgara*, trans. *Tawney*, I, pp. 87, 92, 552; II, pp. 44, 598.

¹¹⁰ *A. Foucher*, *Iconographie bouddhique*, pp. 102 and 194.

month's sailing to arrive at Mo-lo-yeou [Moluoyu].¹¹¹ Another pilgrim, the monk Wou-hing [Wuxing], whose itinerary from China to Ceylon is...

[21]

reported by Yi-tsing [Yijing],¹¹² had also touched at Kie-tch'a [Jiecha]: from Mo-lo-yeou [Moluoyu] he had reached that point in fifteen days, and from there, setting a course westward, he had reached the port of Negapatam in thirty days.

According to M. Pelliot, "the theoretical form one should think of restoring for Kie-tch'a [Jiecha] is *Kàda*."¹¹³ Now this form is precisely the one to which Sanskrit *katâha* should normally develop in the Indochinese languages. The loss of the final aspirate or sibilant, or at least its degeneration into a simple *visarga*, is common and moreover natural in dialects tending toward monosyllabism.¹¹⁴ As for the change from the voiceless lingual to the voiced one, it is regular in intervocalic position in the Prakrits.¹¹⁵ And in fact, Sanskrit *katâha*, "frying pan," became in Khmer *khdâh* (pron. *khteah*) and in Siamese *kadah* (pron. *kathah*). Kie-tch'a [Jiecha] is therefore a very acceptable equivalent of *Katâha*.

To anyone who might object that Kie-tch'a [Jiecha] is attested as early as the seventh century, whereas *Katâha* does not appear before the eleventh, one may reply that alongside Kie-tch'a [Jiecha] one finds in Chinese, after the time of Yi-tsing [Yijing], other geographical names which seem indeed to be only somewhat different transcriptions of the same original. First there is 偈陀 Kie-t'o [Jietuo], which, according to the *Xin Tangshu* [New History of the Tang], the envoys of the P'iao (Burma) represented to the Chinese as lying under the suzerainty of their own country.¹¹⁶ Later, Zhao Rukuo names 吉陀 Ki-t'o [Jituo], whose ships came every year together

¹¹¹ Chavannes, *Religieux éminents*, pp. 105–119. — Takakusu, *A record*, pp. xxx, xxxiii.

¹¹² Chavannes, *loc. cit.*, p. 144. — Takakusu, *loc. cit.*, p. xlvi.

¹¹³ *BEFEO*, IV, p. 351.

¹¹⁴ For example: Khmer *Râjagrih* = Sanskrit *Râjagrha*; *groh* = *graha*, etc.

¹¹⁵ Pischel, *Grammatik der Prâkrit-Sprachen*, § 198.

¹¹⁶ Pelliot, *Deux itinéraires*, *BEFEO*, IV, p. 352.

with those of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] and Kien-pi [Jianbi]¹¹⁷ to trade at Nan-p'i [Nanpi] = Malabar.¹¹⁸ In Kie-t'ó [Jietuo] and Ki-t'ó [Jituo], the character 𪚩 *to* is in fact a dental,¹¹⁹ but there are examples of its use to transcribe a lingual.¹²⁰ Therefore Kie-t'ó [Jietuo] = Kada, Ki-t'ó [Jituo] = Kida, the latter perhaps proceeding from a form related to the *Kidâram* of the stele of Râjarâja I. Since the change from a lingual to a liquid is a common phenomenon, one would be tempted to identify Kie-tch'a [Jiecha], Kie-t'ó [Jietuo], and Ki-t'ó [Jituo] with the *Kalah* or *Kilah*¹²¹ of the Arab geographers, and with the 箇羅 Ko-lo [Guluo] that Jia Dan places on the northern coast of the Strait of Malacca, and which the *Xin*...

[22]

Tangshu [New History of the Tang] places to the southeast of P'an-p'an [Panpan]. These various names would represent, phonetically and geographically, modern Kêdah.¹²²

It is therefore to Kêdah that Katâha, Kadâram, and Kidâram would correspond. But we saw above that it was at the old site of Kêdah that Lankasuka was located. How could Katâha be there as well? — Let us note first that the *Nâgarakrtâgama*, which cites Kêdah among the dependencies of Majapahit on the Malay Peninsula, also cites Lenkasuka. As M. Blagden¹²³ rightly observed, Gunong Jêrai, or "old Kêdah," is situated quite far to the south of Kêdah, "and that is no doubt," he adds, "the reason why the two localities are mentioned separately."

¹¹⁷ Kien-pi = Kampe (*Nâgarak.*) = Kampei in Sumatra (Pelliot, *ibid.*, n. 5).

¹¹⁸ Trans. Hirth-Rockhill, p. 89.

¹¹⁹ Pelliot, "Les noms propres du Milindapañha," *JA.*, 1914 (2), p. 388.

¹²⁰ S. Lévi, *Catalogue des Yakṣas de la Mahāmāyūrī*, index, s.v. *Co*, *JA.*, 1915 (1), p. 132. Besides, it is enough that the name should have reached Chinese ears through the intermediary of a dialect lacking a lingual for the Chinese to have recorded a dental.

¹²¹ The vocalization *Kilah* seems suspect to M. Pelliot (*loc. cit.*, p. 351 n. 6). But the existence of the forms *Ki-t'ó* and *Kidâram* renders it at least possible.

¹²² Pelliot, *ibid.*, pp. 351–352.

¹²³ "Notes on Malay History," *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909 (53), p. 148.

We do not know on what date the abandonment of Lankasuka alluded to in the Annals of Kēdah took place. This change of residence does not imply either that Lankasuka ceased at the same time to be applied to the region of Gunong Jērai, or that the name Kēdah had not already been used previously to designate the place that was to become the new capital. One can therefore quite well understand that the inscription of Rājendracola I should name Kēdah and Lankasuka side by side, since these names in fact corresponded to two different localities.

Even if later research were to prove that Katāha is not Kēdah, it would still remain true that the Kie-tch'a [Jiecha] of Yi-tsing's [Yijing] itineraries was the last stop in Malaysia before crossing the Bay of Bengal, and conversely the first point reached when returning from India.¹²⁴ If this emporium depended on the kingdom of Palembang — and that is extremely likely, since the suzerainty of this kingdom extended over both shores of the Strait of Malacca — one can easily explain why its name was used by the Colas to designate the king of Palembang. Men have indeed always tended to designate a foreign country by the name of the tribe, province, river, or mountain they first encountered upon entering it: the names of Germany, Persia, and India have no other origin. It is no doubt by an effect of this tendency that the Tamils may have designated the king of Palembang by the name of the first port at which they touched when traveling to his kingdom. Not to mention that if Kadāram was really located where I believed I could...

[23]

locate it, that port was, from the commercial point of view, a stopover of an importance comparable to that which, in the same region, the port of Pinang is in the process of acquiring.

— Śrīvijaya. The question of which country was formerly designated by the name Śrīvijaya is precisely the one that was posed at the beginning of this investigation. The notions acquired along the way will, I believe, make it possible to resolve it.

¹²⁴ This fact constitutes, incidentally, one of the best arguments in favor of identifying Kie-tch'a with Kēdah. In response to Gerini, who ironically reproached sinologists for having made Kēdah "the hub of the Universe" (*JRAS*, 1905, p. 500), M. Blagden quite rightly says: "Kēdah happens to be the first point on the Peninsula which a navigator would reach if he came from Ceylon and took the route from Point de Galle to Achin Head. And that is the natural and obvious line to take, as soon as mere coasting voyages have been abandoned" (*JRAS*, 1913, p. 168).

It is known that, on the basis of the Chinese forms (*Fo-che* [Foshi], *Che-li-fo-che* [Shilifoshi], *Fo-ts'i* [Foqi], *San-fo-ts'i* [Sanfoqi]) and the Arabic form (*Sribuza*), the name of the kingdom of Palembang has been restored as Śrībhoja.¹²⁵ Now, one cannot have failed to notice that this name Śrībhoja has not appeared in the course of this study in any of the documents relating to the kingdom of Palembang where one would in fact have expected to encounter it. Concerning King Śrī Cûlâmanivarman, whom I have believed I could identify with certainty with the king of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] whom the *History of the Song* names *Sseu-li-tchou-lo-wou-ni-fo-ma-tiao-houa* [Sili Zhuluowunifomadiaohua], the charter of Râjarâja I says only that he was king of Katâha and of Śrīvijaya. The name Śrībhoja appears no more in the list of conquests that the epigraphy of Râjendracola I attributes to that prince, and in which I have believed I could recognize the vassal countries of Palembang; but the first name in the list is Śrīvijaya. Under these circumstances, one is entitled to ask whether, instead of Śrībhoja, the true name of the kingdom of Palembang might not in fact be Śrīvijaya.

The restored form Çrîbhoja, proposed for the first time by Stanislas Julien, has never completely satisfied either Indianists, because this word is more or less devoid of meaning, or sinologists, because the phonetic equivalence *fo-che* [foshi], *fo-ts'i* [foqi] = *bhoja* is less than satisfactory.¹²⁶ Schlegel had raised serious objections to the use of the character 佛 *fo* to represent a syllable beginning with *bh*.¹²⁷ M. Pelliot seems inclined to pass over these objections, but he adds that “the only difficulty with the restoration Çrîbhoja is that the final syllable, whether transcribed 逝 *che* [shi] or 誓 *che* [shi], should have the vowel *i* or *e* rather than *a*.”¹²⁸

Is the equivalence *fo-che* [foshi], *fo-ts'i* [foqi] = *vijaya* more plausible? As regards the second syllable, certainly yes. M. Pelliot had already pointed out that Yi-tsing [Yijing] (in whom the name *Fo-che* [Foshi] appears for the first time) uses 逝 *che* [shi] to transcribe the first syllable of

¹²⁵ *Méthode*, no. 297.

¹²⁶ The Arabic forms are of little help, given the uncertainty of their vocalization.

¹²⁷ *T'oung Pao*, 1901, p. 175.

¹²⁸ *BEFEO.*, IV, pp. 336, 337 n. 1.

Jeta.¹²⁹ Since the publication of the catalogue of the Yakṣas of the *Mahâmâyûrî* by M. S. Lévi,¹³⁰ it is known that the same character is used by Yi-tsing [Yijing] to transcribe *ji* (*Ojjihanâ* = ...

[24]

Ou-che-ho-na [Wa-shi-he-na] (v. 54), *jai* (*jaya* = *che-ye* [*shi-ye*], v. 56, 62), and *jaya* (*Ujjayanî* = *Ou-che-ni* [Wa-shi-ni], v. 16). As for the character 齊 *ts'i* [*qi*], whose ancient pronunciation I do not know, I note that Groeneveldt restored it as *tsai*.¹³¹ In any case, one is thus brought back to a pronunciation *jai* or *jay*, which corresponds infinitely better to *jaya* than to *ja*. The equivalence *fo* = *vi* is, at first sight, much less satisfactory. I believe, however, that it is possible. It is known that the character 佛 *fo*, regularly used to transcribe the name of the Buddha, had the pronunciation **pwiδ*.¹³² Now the passage from *vi*, or more exactly from *bi*,¹³³ to *bu* by labialization is a possible phonetic phenomenon, which moreover is not without examples,¹³⁴ and which is sufficient to justify the use of *fo*. In the end, *fo-che* [*foshi*] and *fo-ts'i* [*foqi*] can represent a form *bujai*, a spoken corruption of *vijaya*.

One therefore cannot invoke the linguistic argument against the identification of Çrīvijaya with *Che-li-fo-che* [Shilifoshi] and *San-fo-ts'i* [Sanfoqi].¹³⁵ But one would like to have in its favor

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ *JA.*, 1915 (1).

¹³¹ *Notes*, p. 62.

¹³² Pelliot, "Les noms propres du Milindapañha," *JA.*, 1914 (2), p. 393.

¹³³ The confusion between *v* and *b*, common to so many Indian or Indian-derived alphabets, was probably caused by a phonetic phenomenon. A Sanskrit syllabary, no doubt due to Yi-tsing [Yijing], uses the same character 婆 *p'o* [*po*] to represent Sanskrit *ba* and *va* (cf. Takakusu, *Record*, p. lxi). In the Indochinese languages and in Malay, most words of Indian origin beginning with *v* are written and pronounced with a *b*. Concerning the Bangka inscription, M. Blagden remarks: "It will be noticed that many of the above words have *v* which modern Malay has replaced by *b*" (*J. Straits Br. RAS.*, 1913, no. 64, p. 70). — *Vijaya* became *bijai* in Khmer and Thai.

¹³⁴ It is this phenomenon that explains forms such as: Khmer *baj* (*pue*) = Sanskrit *bīja*; *bum* (*pum*) = *bimba*; *bumsen* (*pūmsèn*) = *bhīmasena*. In Cham, a good number of words begin indifferently with *ba*, *bi*, or *bm*; Sanskrit *vikala* gave *bikal* and *bukal*.

¹³⁵ The form *Śrīvijaya* obviously does not explain the *San* of *San-fo-ts'i* [Sanfoqi], but *Śrībhoja* does not explain it any better.

something more, and better, than a negative proof. This positive proof Cham epigraphy will provide.

At the end of the tenth century and in the course of the eleventh, the Chinese and Annamese texts mention, as the capital of Champa, the city of *Fo-che* [Foshi].¹³⁶ As M. Pelliot had already observed, this name, written 佛誓 *Fo-che* [Foshi] by the Annamites and 佛逝 by the *Songshi* [History of the Song], is identical with that of the country of *Fo-che* [Foshi] or *Che-li-fo-che* [Shilifoshi] in Sumatra.¹³⁷ Now it is known with certainty from the epigraphy that at this time the Cham capital was in Bình Định and was called *Vijaya*.¹³⁸

This new example of *Fo-che* [Foshi] corresponding to *Vijaya* seems conclusive. Finally, one may note that the name *Śrīvijaya* applied to the kingdom of Palembang accounts perfectly for the form *Kin-li-p'i-che* [Jinlipishi], in which M. Pelliot proposed to recognize a corruption of *Che-li-fo-che* [Shilifoshi].¹³⁹ If this...

[25]

hypothesis of M. Pelliot's is correct, the name *Kin-li-p'i-che* [Jinlipishi], which appears in notices probably earlier than Yi-tsing [Yijing], and in which 金 *kin* [jin] should no doubt be corrected to 逝 *che* [shi], represents very exactly *Śrībijaya* = *Śrīvijaya*.

* * *

¹³⁶ *BEFEO.*, IV, p. 202. — Maspero, "Champa," *T'oung Pao*, 1910, p. 185; 1911, p. 80.

¹³⁷ *BEFEO.*, IV, pp. 202 n. 2, 337.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, III, p. 639; IV, pp. 906, 965, 975; XV, ii, p. 50.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, IV, p. 324 n. 5.

The identification of *Śrīvijaya* makes it possible to answer the question raised at the beginning of this study. We now know to which kingdom the Malay inscription of Bangka and the Sanskrit stele of Vieng Sa should be attributed: it is to the kingdom of Palembang.

But the inquiry prompted by these two epigraphic documents has other results of broader scope and more general interest. It reveals first of all the true name of the kingdom of Palembang, which people had tried to restore on the basis of the names given to it by the Chinese and Arabic texts, the only sources, it had been thought, in which it was mentioned. It thus makes it possible to localize the countries of *Śrīvijaya* and *Katâha* cited in various Sanskrit works¹⁴⁰ and in the epigraphy of the Colas; the identification of the conquests of Râjendracola I even establishes a rather important point, until now poorly clarified, in the history of relations between India and Malaysia.

But above all, this inquiry brings fully to light the role played in the Far East by this Indianized Malay kingdom whose influence radiated, from Sumatra, over both coasts of the Peninsula. If it has left only an insignificant number of archaeological and epigraphic monuments, this is apparently because its kings were more occupied with supervising the trade of the Straits than with building temples or having their panegyrics engraved on stone.¹⁴¹ From this point of view, the proximity of Java, covered everywhere with archaeological remains, has certainly done it a disservice in the eyes of History. But the inscription of Grahi, issued by a person who may well have been one of the kings of Palembang, and presenting, like that of Tâmralinga, the closest paleographic analogies with the inscriptions of Sumatra and Java, already tended to prove that Zhao Rukuo was not exaggerating in showing San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] as suzerain of fifteen states, the greater part of them located on the Malay Peninsula. The epigraphy of Râjendracola I, whose lists coincide in part with that of...

¹⁴⁰ It should be noted that the *Çrīvijayapura* of the Nepalese manuscript corresponds exactly (except for the omission of *Çri*) to the *Fo-che-pou-lo* found in Yi-tsing as a synonym of *Fo-che* [Foshi].

¹⁴¹ Cf. this passage from the *Ling wai tai ta* cited by Hirth and Rockhill (*Translation of Tchao Jou-koua*, p. 63): "San-fo-ts'i is in the Southern Sea. It is the most important port of call on the sea-routes of the foreigners, from the countries of Chô-p'o on the East and from the countries of the Ta-che and Kou-lin on the West. They all pass through it on their way to China."

[26]

Zhao Rukuo, comes to confirm this impression. Finally, the Vieng Sa stele shows that, already by the end of the eighth century, the king of *Śrīvijaya* enjoyed sufficient authority in the northern part of the Peninsula to be able to make pious foundations there and have an inscription engraved in his name.¹⁴²

These tangible proofs of the considerable extent of the kingdom of Palembang greatly strengthen the hypothesis advanced by M. Chavannes and by Gerini,¹⁴³ according to which this kingdom was none other than the famous Zâbaj (Jâwaga) of the Arab geographers.¹⁴⁴ In any case, they are of great importance for the history of Malay settlements in the Peninsula. For a long time it was believed that this history began only with the foundation of Singapore, placed by Marsden, Crawfurd, and others in 1160.¹⁴⁵ In 1901, Schlegel refused to admit that San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] could have had dependencies outside Sumatra,¹⁴⁶ a thesis contested by M. Pelliot.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴² To anyone who might still retain some doubt concerning the identity of the *Śrī vijaya* of the Vieng Sa stele and of *Śrī vijaya* = *Che-li-fo-che* [Shilifoshi], *San-fo-ts'i* [Sanfoqi], I would recall that the inscription on the second face of this stele is in the name of a Maharaja descended from the çailendravamṣa, and that this *vamṣa* is precisely the one claimed by Śrī Cûlâmanivarman and Çrî Mâravijayottungavarman, kings of *Śrīvijaya* = *Sseu-li-tchou-lo-wou-ni-fo-ma-tiao-houa* [Sili Zhuluowunifomadiaohua] and *Sseu-li-ma-lo-p'i* [Sili Maluopi], kings of *San-fo-ts'i* [Sanfoqi].

¹⁴³ Chavannes, *Religieux éminents*, p. 36 n. 3. — Gerini, *Researches*, p. 557 ff.

¹⁴⁴ If this hypothesis were ever to be definitively confirmed, one might perhaps at the same time have the solution to a rather important problem in the history of Cambodia. It is known that, according to the Khmer inscription of Sdôk Kak Thom, King Jayavarman II, who was to restore the unity of Cambodia at the beginning of the ninth century, "came from Java" and invited a learned Brahman "to compose a ritual so that Cambodia might no longer be dependent on Java" (Finot, "L'inscription de Sdok kak thorn," *BEFEO.*, XV, ii, pp. 87–88). This text attesting Cambodia's dependence in the eighth century has generally been compared with the story of the invasion of the Khmer kingdom and its defeat by the armies of the Maharaja of Zâbaj, recounted by Abū Zayd (G. Ferrand, *Textes arabes*, p. 85). If Zâbaj is indeed the Malay kingdom of Sumatra, then Java, which was certainly at times applied to Sumatra, would here be another designation for the kingdom of Palembang. A state which in the second half of the eighth century extended its suzerainty as far as the region of the Bay of Bandon was close enough to Cambodia to have been able, taking advantage of disturbances in that country, to arrogate to itself certain rights over it. M. Finot would therefore have been following the right trail in seeking the Java of the Sdôk Kak Thom inscription on the Malay Peninsula (*loc. cit.*, p. 57): it would be the kingdom of *Śrīvijaya*, which then occupied part of the Peninsula.

¹⁴⁵ Crawfurd, *History of the Indian Archipelago*, II, pp. 373, 481.

¹⁴⁶ "No place called Kelantan is, however, known in Sumatra in the neighborhood of Palembang, and Kelantan on the Malay Peninsula is here out of the question" (*T'oung Pao*, 1901, p. 133).

¹⁴⁷ *BEFEO.*, IV, p. 345 n. 1.

Gerini did indeed admit Malay incursions into the Peninsula from as early as the eighth century, and, by placing Yi-tsing's [Yijing] Malâyu there, he was obliged to conclude that the domination of Palembang had, by the end of the seventh century, already gained a foothold on the mainland, but it...

[27]

was to Cambodia that he accorded political predominance in that region.¹⁴⁸ In 1908, M. Wilkinson expressed the opinion that Malay colonization of the Peninsula did not go back beyond 1400 A.D.¹⁴⁹ M. Blagden, who had no difficulty in showing the impossibility of so late a date, seems to have had the intuition that the history of the Malays in the Peninsula may have begun earlier than is generally believed.¹⁵⁰

If the documents are still too few and too little explicit to allow one to speak of an effective colonization of the Peninsula by the kings of Palembang, it nevertheless seems to follow from this investigation that they established coastal settlements there at an early date, and that in any case their political influence there was very ancient. If I have had to leave many doubtful questions unresolved, this at least is a fact that I believe I may regard as established.

* * *

¹⁴⁸ "Historical retrospect of Junkceylon Island," *Journal of the Siam Society*, II (1905), pp. 124, 130–131.

¹⁴⁹ *Papers on Malay Subjects, History*, part I, p. 8.

¹⁵⁰ Concerning the passage in the *Annals of the Yuan* according to which, in 1295, the people of Sien (= kingdom of Sukhodaya) had long been killing one another with the *Ma-li-yu-eul* (= Malays of the Peninsula), M. Blagden says: "This would throw back the beginnings of regular Malay settlement in the Peninsula well into the middle of the 13th century, if not earlier, and I see no reason why that should not be so" (*J. Straits Br. RAS.*, 1909 [53], p. 162). — Concerning the *Fo-lo-an* of Tchao Jou-koua, which M. Blagden tentatively identifies with Pathalung: "The names agree sufficiently. The difficulty is its alleged tributary relation to Palambang... We know so little about the history of the Peninsula that we cannot say for certain whether it had been colonized by the Malays at this period or even in Chau Jou-koua's time some fifty years later. It is quite possible that it had" (*JRAS.*, 1913, p. 167).

Additional note.

In the latest issue of the *Bijdragen* (Vol. LXXIV, nos. 1 and 2, 1918), which I received only after the printing of the present memoir, M. J. Ph. Vogel, in the course of a very interesting article entitled “The Yûpa Inscriptions of King Mûlavarman,” makes the following remark concerning relations between southern India and the Far East (p. 192):

“It is certainly astonishing that in the inscriptions of the Pallavas and other Southern dynasties no reference whatever is made to the relations which in those days must have existed between Coromandel and the Far East. The explanation probably is that those relations, of which the accounts of the Chinese pilgrims have left us such a valuable record, were of a perfectly peaceful nature. Suppose the powerful Pallava princes of Kâncîpura had equipped armadas and carried their arms to the remote shores of Campa and Java, may we not assume that their conquests on the far side of the ocean would ...”

[28]

“...have been celebrated in their inscriptions with no less effusion than we find lavished on their victories over the Cālukyas?”

M. J. Ph. Vogel’s astonishment was certainly justified, and I hope that the preceding pages will put an end to it. We now have evidence drawn from Indian epigraphy which shows that relations between the Cōḷas and Insulindia were not always peaceful.

In the same issue of the *Bijdragen*, M. G. P. Rouffaer (*Oudheidkundige Opmerkingen*) incidentally cites the Bangka inscription. He gives (p. 141) a series of reasons for identifying *bhūmi Jāva* (l. 10) with the island of Java. And in a note on the work of M. G. P. Rouffaer, M. N. J. Krom (p. 147 n. 1) draws the conclusion that the author of the Bangka inscription might well be the person who is simply designated by the epithet “enemy” in the inscription of Tjanggal (Zuid-Kedoe, Java) dated 654 śaka = 732 A.D. If my conclusions are correct, this “enemy” of the Javanese would not merely be, as M. N. J. Krom supposes, a petty ruler of Bangka, but rather the sovereign of the Malay state of Palembang.