

DHARMAKĪRTI'S DURBODHĀLOKA AND THE LITERATURE OF ŚRĪVIJAYA

Peter Skilling*

Abstract

Although Śrīvijaya was esteemed as a centre of Buddhist scholarship, only one example of its presumably extensive literature has survived. This is an abstruse philosophical commentary entitled *Durbodhāloka* composed at the beginning of the 11th century by Dharmakīrti. Written originally in Sanskrit, it survives only in a Tibetan translation done by Atiśa, a monk from Bengal who later travelled to Tibet. Information about the author and place and date of composition of the *Durbodhāloka* is given in the colophon, which is studied in this paper.

I

The Southeast Asian polity known as Śrīvijaya was not only a political and economic power, but also a centre of Buddhist culture. Writing at Śrīvijaya itself towards the end of the seventh century, the redoubtable Chinese pilgrim-scholar I-ching described it as a centre of Sanskrit and Buddhist studies (Takakusu 1982: xxxiv).

In the fortified city of Fo-shih [Takakusu transcribes this as Bhoja] Buddhist priests number more than 1000, whose minds are bent on learning and good practices. They investigate and study all the subjects that exist just as in the Middle Kingdom (Madhyadeśa, India); the rules and ceremonies are not at all different. If a Chinese priest wishes to go to the West [India] in order to hear (lectures) and read (the original), he had better stay here one or two years and practise the proper rules and then proceed to Central India.

It seems that Śrīvijaya maintained its standards of scholarship until at least the first half of the eleventh century, when the Indian monk Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (circa 982–1054) travelled there to study, and stayed

for twelve years, from about 1012 to 1024.¹ Through his translations into Tibetan, Dīpaṃkara—also known as Atiśa—is responsible for the preservation of the only certain example of the literature of Śrīvijaya that has survived.² Some scholars have questioned or even rejected the historicity of Dīpaṃkara's journey to Śrīvijaya, but I feel that the evidence is inconclusive.³ Dīpaṃkara was from eastern Bengal, and studied at Vikramaśīla and Nālandā. East Bengal is itself on the fringes of South East Asia, and cultural and religious (especially Mahāyāna Buddhist) relations between Nālandā and South East Asia are well-attested throughout the Pāla and Sena periods. Even if we reject the tradition, the fact remains that the reputation of Śrīvijaya and its scholars was such that the Tibetans saw fit to invent the journey: that is, whether legend or fact, the tradition is significant in the context of South East Asian history.

One of the important documents bequeathed to us by Atiśa is his translation of the *Durbodhāloka* by Dharmakīrti.⁴ Dharmakīrti is a common name, and the author of the *Durbodhāloka* should not be confused with other Dharmakīrtis, such as the famous logician, or the Dhammakittis of Theravādin tradition. Nothing is known of our Dharmakīrti except that he was a resident of Śrīvijaya: in Tibetan tradition he became known as Dharmakīrti of

* c/o The Siam Society, Bangkok, Thailand.

Suvarṇabhūmi.⁵ The *Durbodhāloka* or *Illumination of [Points] Difficult to Understand* is a commentary on an Indian text, the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*. The *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, or *Ornament of Realization*, is a terse and systematic verse explication of the *Prajñāpāramitā* or *Perfection of Wisdom*. Composed in the 4th century CE, it was one of the most influential texts of scholastic Mahāyāna Buddhism, and the subject of numerous commentaries.⁶ It remains on the curriculum of Tibetan monasteries to this day.

Like the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, Dharmakīrti's commentary is divided into eight chapters. It takes up 128 folios in the Peking xylograph edition of the Tibetan *Tanjur* (collection of commentaries and treatises). In this short paper, I am concerned with the historical information embedded in the colophon.⁷ The colophon, which will be translated and edited below in Parts II and III, consists of two parts:

- (1) three verses and a prose sentence that were part of the original Sanskrit manuscript, and composed by Dharmakīrti;
- (2) a brief prose 'translators' colophon' giving the name of the translators into Tibetan, which would have been added at the time of translation.

Sections 1.3 (in verse) and 1.4 (in prose) establish that the *Durbodhāloka* was composed at the request of, or during the reign of, King Cūḍāmaṇivarman of Śrīvijaya. Section 1.4 establishes that the work was composed in the city of Śrīvijaya itself. The importance of this information cannot be gainsaid: the composition of the *Durbodhāloka* presupposes the existence and study in Śrīvijaya of the abstruse *Prajñāpāramitā* and *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* literature; of a high level of scholarship; and of royal sponsorship. The evidence of the colophon is unambiguous: whether or not Atiśa travelled to Śrīvijaya, the fame of the work composed by a Śrīvijayan author was such that he introduced it to the 'Land of Snows'.

The colophon states that the commentary was composed at the behest of King Śrī Cūḍāmaṇivarman, in the 10th year of his reign. We do not know when the king took the throne, but we do know that he died between 1005 and 1008.⁸ It seems then that the *Durbodhāloka* should have been written before 1005. This makes it one of the earliest extant works of South East Asian literature, predated only by a few works in Old Javanese. The translation of the *Durbodhāloka* into Tibetan was done in Western Tibet (mNga' ris, perhaps at Tho ling) by Atiśa and Rin chen bzang po.⁹ Since Atiśa arrived in Western Tibet in 1042, and stayed there for three years, the two scholars must have made their translation between 1042 and 1045.¹⁰

Cūḍāmaṇivarman is one of the few South East Asian kings of the period about whom we have any significant information. He is known from the present colophon, from Chinese records, and from Coḷa inscriptions from South India (Coëdès 1968: 141-2). Where did he reign? The colophon supplies two toponyms: Śrīvijaya-pura (dPal rnam par gyal ba'i grong) 'of' Suvarṇadvīpa (gSer gling).¹¹ In an earlier contribution to the pages of this journal, I have argued that Suvarṇabhūmi/Suvarṇadvīpa was a general name for the region of South East Asia, rather than a specific kingdom or state (Skilling 1992: 131). Paul Wheatley (1983: 267) arrived at a similar conclusion:

Whatever the name signified to those who braved the perils of the ocean, it is more than doubtful if the Indians of the Classical period in general entertained any conception of Suvarṇadvīpa more precise than that of a beckoning eldorado beyond the ocean.¹²

That is to say, the mention of Suvarṇadvīpa does not help us here.

Much has been written about the location of the political centre of the entity known from various sources as Śrīvijaya, but the issue has not been resolved. While Coëdès



Figure 1. Part of the 'domain of Śrīvijaya' with modern names of places mentioned in the text.

placed it in Palembang in south-eastern Sumatra, other scholars have proposed other sites, either elsewhere in Sumatra or on the Malay peninsula. It has also been suggested that Śrīvijaya (perhaps a title) may have been attached to the name of more than one political entity over the centuries; or that the

capital (and ruling family) may have migrated from one place to another, taking the name with them; or that there may have been two capitals of a single Śrīvijaya at one and the same time. This is not the place to review the evidence, arguments, and counter-arguments. For the period in ques-

tion here, there is reason to conclude that King Cūḍāmaṇivarman and his son and successor Māravijayottuṅavarman reigned in the central Malay peninsula, perhaps in the region of Kedah. The evidence for this lies in the inscriptions of the Coḷa kings Rājarāja I and Kulot tuṅga I, the so-called 'Leiden Plates'.¹³ The 'Larger Plates', in Sanskrit and Tamil, were issued in 1044/46, but refer to a grant made in 1005. The Sanskrit section describes Māravijayottuṅavarman as 'belonging to the Śailendra lineage,' (*Śailendra-vamśa*), 'lord of Śrīvijaya' (*Śrīviṣaya-adhipati*, taking Śrīviṣaya to equal Śrīvijaya), and 'lord of Kaḍāha' (*Kaṭāha-adhipati*) (Majumdar 1938: 242, ll. 80–82, 90; 243, l. 100). The Tamil section describes King Cūḍāmaṇi-varman as 'lord of Kaḍāra/Kiḍāra' (Majumdar 1938: 243, l. 6; 244, l. 13; 250, l. 200). The 'Smaller Plates', composed in Tamil and issued in about 1089–1090, refer to the 'lord of Kaḍāra' and describe Cūḍāmaṇivarman as a Śailendra (Majumdar 1938: 276, l. 10; 277, ll. 13–14; 278, ll. 39–40).¹⁴ Again, the Tanjore inscription of Rājendra I which details a Coḷa invasion of (pen)insular South East Asia in about 1025 describes Sangrānavijayottuṅavarman as the King of Kaḍāram (Wheatley 1961: 199–201).

Here as well, much has been written. Many scholars, including Cœdès, have concluded that Kaḍāha/Kaṭāra/Kiḍāra refers to Kedah. Kaṭāha is frequently referred to in Indian literature, and Kedah, in the central Malay peninsula at the head of the Straits of Malacca, occupied a central and strategic position on the maritime trade routes as one of the first landfalls (after the Nicobar islands) on the journey across the Bay of Bengal from India.¹⁵ Kaṭāha is sometimes identified with the Kalāḥ of Arab sources, which some have equated with Kedah, others with the isthmus of Kra further north (Bradell 1980: 381-6; Wheatley 1961: 216-24; 1983: 234-7 and n.28, 254). This gives us several possibilities to contemplate:

Kaṭāha = Kalāḥ = Kedah

Kaṭāha = Kalāḥ = Kra (area of



Figure 2. Dharmakīrti of Śrīvijaya

Takuapa: see Hall 1985: 199, following Lamb as referred to in Hall's n. 28, p. 326)

Kaṭāha = Kedah ≠ Kalāḥ; Kalāḥ = Kra ≠ Kaṭāha

Kaṭāha = Kalāḥ = the peninsula from Kedah to Kra.

What can we conclude? The colophon states that Dharmakīrti composed the *Durbodhā-loka* in the city of Śrīvijaya in South East Asia (Suvarṇadvīpa), sometime before 1005. This is a contemporary and reliable document. Coḷa inscriptions inform us that the line of kings to which Dharmakīrti's patron Cūḍāmaṇivarman belonged reigned in Kaṭāha. One of the inscriptions mentions Śrīvijaya, and Chinese annals relate the same kings to the realm of 'San-fo-ch'i', which is interpreted as Śrīvijaya. These too are contemporary and reliable documents.

It seems within the evidence to conclude



Figure 3. Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna (Atiśa)

that Cūḍāmaṅivarman and his successors ruled from Kaṭāha, and that Kaṭāha was on the west coast of the central Malay peninsula. But what was its extent, its sphere of influence, in the 11th century? Where were its 'borders'? We do not know, except that it had a number of tributary states. It is not impossible that Kaṭāha stretched from the isthmus of Kra down to Kedah and beyond: what better way to control the trade, both transpeninsular and through the straits? What was the relationship between Kaṭāha and Śrīvijaya? Were they the same? (That is, did the kings of Kaṭāha adopt Śrīvijaya as title or prestigious name for their realm?). Was Śrīvijaya a city within the state of Kaṭāha, or was it a tributary state, elsewhere in the central peninsula? Our sources cannot answer these questions.¹⁶

We can conclude that the *Durbodhāloka* was composed in the city of Śrīvijaya, in the reign of King Cūḍāmaṅivarman of Kaṭāha, a powerful monarch who had relations with India and China. Perhaps Dharmakīrti

worked in the area of modern Kedah, perhaps elsewhere on the peninsula. This would make the *Durbodhāloka* not only one of the earliest extant works of South East Asian literature, as mentioned above, but more specifically the oldest surviving work composed on the Malay peninsula—whether in modern Malaysia or Siam cannot be said. If the illustrious Bengali paṇḍita Atiśa indeed visited Śrīvijaya, he would have visited Kaṭāha in the central Malay peninsula, and not, as is given in all modern books on the subject that I have seen, Palembang in Sumatra.¹⁷

Three other works translated or written by Atiśa are associated in their colophons not with Śrīvijaya as such but with Suvarṇadvīpa (Eimer: 1981: 73-8). The evidence of these colophons is ambiguous, and raises more questions than it answers. I hope to deal with the colophons in a future article.

II

Colophon of the *Durbodhāloka*: translation¹⁸

1. Authors' colophon

1.1. I have composed [this work] entitled 'Illumination of Difficult Points'
If in doing so I have [written] anything inappropriate
May the wise please forgive me.¹⁹

1.2. By this merit (*puṇya*) may all beings
Realize the perfection of wisdom (*prajñā-pāramitā*)
And may I act for the benefit (*artha*)
Of sentient beings (*sattva*) equal to the space-element (*ākāśadhātu*).²⁰

1.3. This *Illumination* (*āloka*) has been composed
By Dharmakīrtiśrī, at the request of the King,
The illustrious (*Śrīmān*) Cūḍāmaṅivarman,
Of the delightful (*ramya*) abode of Śrīvijaya.

1.4. Completed (*samāpta*) is the *Durbodhāloka*,
composed in the city (*pura, nagara*) of

Śrīvijaya of Suvarṇadvīpa on the eleventh day of the first month of spring (*Phālguna*) in the tenth regnal year of Deva śrī Cūḍāmaṇivarman.

2. Translators' colophon
Translated, revised, and finalized by the Indian preceptor (*upādhyāya*) Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna and the Great Translator Bhikṣu Rin chen bzang po.²¹

III

Colophon of the *Durbodhāloka*: Tibetan text

The edition of the colophon compares the text as found in four xylograph *Tanjurs*: Cone (C), *shes phyin ja*, 265a3; Derge (D) 3794, *sher phyin ja*, 254a4; Narthang (N), *mdo ja*, 275b5; Peking (Q) 5192, *sher phyin pa*, 288b7.

tshig don rtogs par²² dka' ba yi / /
de nyid snang ba zhes bya ba / /
bdag gis sbyar 'di²³ byas gyur pas / /
ma 'tshal²⁴ dam pas bzod par mdzod / /

bsod nams 'di yis 'gro ba kun / /
shes rab pha rol phyin dngos shog / /
bdag kyang nam mkha'i dbyings' dra bar / /
sems can don ni byed gyur cig /

dpal ldan rnam rgyal nyams dga'i²⁵ gnas / /
rgyal po dpal ldan gtsug²⁶ nor bu / /
go chas chos kyi²⁷ grags dpal la / /
gsol ba btab pas snang bar byas / /

gser gling gi dpal rnam par rgyal ba'i grong
du lha dpal gtsug gi nor bu'i go cha'i rgyal
po'i ring²⁸ lo tshigs bcu²⁹ pa las dpyid zla ra
ba'i tshes bcu gcig la mdzad pa /³⁰ rtogs par
dka' ba'i snang ba zhes bya ba rdzogs so / /
rgya gar gyi³¹ mkhan po dī paṃ ka ra shrī
dznyā na dang / sgra bsgyur gyi lo tsā³² ba
chen po dge slong rin chen bzang pos bsgyur
cing zhus te gtan la phab pa'o / /

NQ only add: 'dis kyang bstan pa rin po che
rgyas par byed nus par gyur cig / shubham /

/ . Not in CD.

References

Abbreviations:

EI = *Epigraphia Indica*

JGIS = *Journal of the Greater India Society* (Calcutta 1934 to 1959, reprinted New Delhi 1987)

MBRAS = *Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*

Agrawala, V.S. 1944. Some References to Kaṭāhā Dvīpa in Ancient Indian Literature, *JGIS* XI 96–7 (repr. New Delhi, 1987).

Aiyer, Subrahmanya, K. V. 1984. The Larger Leiden Plates (of Rājarāja I); The Smaller Leiden Plates (of Kulottuṅga I), *EI* XXII (1933–34, publ. Delhi 1938) Archaeological Survey of India, 213–81.

Bowrey, T. 1905. *A Geographical Account of Countries Round the Bay of Bengal, 1669 to 1679*, (ed. R.C. Temple), Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society.

Braddell, Dato Sir Roland 1980. *A Study of Ancient Times in the Malay Peninsula and the Straits of Malacca*, Kuala Lumpur: MBRAS Reprint No. 7.

Chattopadhyaya, Alaka. 1967 *Atiśa and Tibet*, Calcutta: Indian Studies Past & Present.

Cœdès, G. 1934. On the Origins of the Sailendras of Indonesia, *JGIS* I 61–70.

Cœdès, G. 1968. *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

Conze, E. 1978. *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, 2nd Edition, Tokyo: The Reiyukai.

Cordier, P. 1915. *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, troisième partie, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

Cortesaõ, A. (tr. & ed.) 1944. *The Suma Oriental of Tomé Pires: an Account of the East, from the Red Sea to Japan, written in Malacca and India in 1512–1515*, London: The Hakluyt Society, Vol. I.

Eimer, H. 1981. Suvarṇadvīpa's 'Commentaries' on the Bodhicaryāvatāra, in K. Bruhn & A. Wezler (eds), *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus: Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf*, Wiesbaden (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 23).

Eimer, H. 1982. The Development of the Biographical Tradition Concerning Atiśa (Dīpaṃkara śrījñāna), *The Journal of the Tibet Society* 2 : 41–51.

Eimer, H. 1985. Life and Activities of Atiśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna: A Survey of Investigations Undertaken, *Journal of the Asiatic Society* XXVII.(4) Calcutta.

- Hall, K.R. 1985. *Maritime Trade and State Development in Early Southeast Asia*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Jacq-Hergoualc'h, M. 1992. *La civilisation de ports-entrepôts du sud Kedah (Malaysia), Ve–XIVe siècle*, Paris: Harmattan.
- Longworth Dames, M. (tr. & ed.) 1989. *The Book of Duarte Barbosa, an account of the countries bordering on the Indian Ocean and their inhabitants, written by Duarte Barbosa and completed about the year 1518 A.D.*, Vol. II (repr. New Delhi & Madras: Asian Educational Services.
- Majumdar, R.C. 1938. Note on the Śailendra Kings mentioned in the Leiden Plates, *Epigraphia Indica* XXII :282–3, (1933–34, repr. New Delhi, 1984).
- Majumdar, R.C. 1979. *India and South East Asia* (ed. K.S. Ramachandran and S.P. Gupta), Delhi: B. R. Publishing Corp.
- Nakamura, Hajime 1980. *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*, Hirakata: Kansai University of Foreign Studies.
- Naudou, J. 1968. *Les bouddhistes kaśmīriens au moyen âge*, Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'études LXVIII, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Nilakanta Sastri, K. A. 1938. Kaṭāha, *JGIS* V: 128–146.
- Nishioka, Soshū 1981. Index to the Catalogue Section of Bu ston's History of Buddhism (II), *Annual Report of the Institute for the Study of Cultural Exchange*, University of Tokyo, No. 5.
- Obermiller, E. 1932. The Doctrine of Prajñāpāramitā as exposed in the Abhisamayālamkāra of Maitreya, *Acta Orientalia* XI (1984 repr. Talent, Oregon: Canon Publications).
- Sircar, D. C. 1938. Kaṭāhanagara in the Kaumudīmahotsava, *JGIS* V: 59–60.
- Skilling, P. 1992. Two Ports of Suvarṇabhūmi: a brief note, *Journal of the Siam Society* 80 (1): 131.
- Suzuki, Daisetz T. (ed.) 1957. *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition*, Vol. 91, Tokyo-Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.
- Takakusu, Junjiro (tr.). 1982 *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (AD 671–695) by I-tsing*, [London, 1896] New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Tucci, G. 1988. *Rin-chen-bzan-po and the Renaissance of Buddhism in Tibet around the Millennium*, (Indo-Tibetica II; first published in Italian in 1932), New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- Wheatley, P. 1961. *The Golden Khersonese: Studies in the Historical Geography of the Malay Peninsula before A.D. 1500*, (1980 repr.) Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Universiti Malaya.
- Wheatley, P. 1983. *Nāgara and Commandery: Ori-*

gins of the Southeast Asian Urban Traditions, Chicago: University of Chicago (Department of Geography Research Papers 207–208).

Notes

¹ This statement assumes, provisionally, that the Śrīvijaya of the 7th century and that of the 11th were the same, which is not certain: see below, n. 16. For Atiśa's dates see Chattopadhyaya 1967: 66, 330–1. For the date of his journey to Śrīvijaya, see *ibid*, p. 85. (I follow Eimer (pers. com.) in spelling Atiśa with short i, against the Atiśa with long ī of some sources.)

² I exclude here inscriptions, as well as the works that I-ching composed during his stay in Śrīvijaya. These (although the latter were composed in Chinese for a Chinese readership) both belong to the intellectual legacy of Śrīvijaya (or at least of the 'early Śrīvijaya': see, again, n. 16).

³ See Eimer 1985: 3–12 and especially 8. For sources on Atiśa's life see Eimer 1982.

⁴ For the question of Dīpaṅkara's birthplace, see Chattopadhyaya 1967 Chap. 6.

⁵ The Sanskrit is sometimes given as *Duravabodhāloka*. The full title is *Abhisamayālamkāra-nāma-prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstravṛttidurbodhāloka-nāma-ṭīkā* (Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan ces bya ba'i 'grel pa rtogs par dka' ba'i snang ba zhes bya ba'i 'grel bshad): see Cordier 1915, mdo 'grel VII (3) and Suzuki 1957, cat. no. 5152 *sher phyin ja*, 161.8.

⁶ gSer gling pa Chos kyi grags pa: at e.g. the beginning of the Tibetan translation of the *Durbodhāloka* in the Peking edition (*sher phyin ja*, 161a7), or in Bu ston's catalogue of books translated into Tibetan (Nishioka 1981: § 539).

⁷ For the *Abhisamayālamkāra*, the question of authorship, and the commentaries, see Obermiller 1932; Conze 1978: 101–20; Nakamura 1980: 260–1.

⁸ As far as I know, the prose colophon was first translated into a European language by Cordier (loc. cit.). Its significance was noted in Cœdès 1968: 141 (the colophon was apparently known to Cœdès only from a personal communication from Naudou: see Cœdès' n. 61, p. 323). A translation into English of the prose is given in Chattopadhyaya 1967: 88 and 475. Cordier, Cœdès, and Chattopadhyaya all include the phrase 'in Malayagiri' (according to Cordier, the Tibetan is *ri malaya*), which is not given in any of the four standard xylographic editions of the *Durbodhāloka* studied below. I suspect that the extra detail comes from a catalogue (*dkar chag*) of

the Tanjur. (The chapter colophons simply give a version of the title and the name of the author, Chos kyi grags pa for all but Chap. 3, which gives instead 'Dharmakīrti' in transcription.)

⁹ See Cœdès 1968: 141–2 and Majumdar 1938: 282–3.

¹⁰ Rin chen bzang po was one of the central figures in the revival or 'Later Diffusion' (*phyis dar*) of Buddhism in Tibet. For his life and work, see Tucci 1988 and Naudou 1968, Chap. V.

¹¹ For the dates of Atiśa's journey to Tibet and stay in mNga' ris, see Chattopadhyaya 1967: 307–11 and 330–3.

¹² The relation between the two is given in the genitive in Tibetan (but the original Sanskrit could well have been a compound, *Suvarṇadvīpa-Śrīvijayapura). Tibetan *grong* can stand for *nagara* as well as *pura*: the name could be either Śrīvijaya-pura or Śrīvijaya-nagara.

¹³ See Wheatley 1983: 263–9 for an overview of representations of the 'Realms of Gold' in Indian literature.

¹⁴ See Majumdar 1938; Aiyer 1938.

¹⁵ For discussion of the plates and related sources see Majumdar 1979: 29–31, 50, 63–81, 82–93, 94–101. I take the dates of issue from Majumdar, pp. 63 (Larger Plates) and 75 (Smaller Plates).

¹⁶ For Kaṭāha see Sircar 1938: 59–60; Nilakanta Sastri 1938: 128–46; Agrawala 1944: 96–7; Braddell 1980: 343–52; Wheatley 1983: 336, n. 53. For a recent study of archæological remains in the area, see Jacq-Hergoulac'h 1992. I would suggest that the kingdom of San-fo-ch'i—which, starting from 904–5, sent numerous embassies to China through the 10th and 11th centuries and beyond—was also located in the region of Kedah, although the Chinese annals that record the embassies do not give any hints as to its location. For the embassies see Cœdès 1968: 131–2, 141; Majumdar 1938: 281–2, and 1979: 60–62. I leave aside here the question of the location of the 'earlier Śrīvijaya', and refer here only to the San-fo-ch'i of the 10th and 11th centuries: except to note that, as accepted by Cœdès (1934: 63; 1968: 320, n. 176) there is no proven link between the earlier name Shih-li-fo-shih and San-fo-ch'i.

¹⁷ Another interesting question is the relationship between Kaṭāha and central Siam during the 11th century, especially in view of the fact that from the time of the early European records Kedah and other northern 'Malay states' were tributary to Ayutthaya (or, later, Bangkok). But the 11th century is a dark age in the history of Siam, and even the name(s) of the principal

polity(ies) are not known. For European accounts of Kedah in the early 16th century, see Cortesaō (1944: 106–7; Longworth Dames 1989: 164–5. For a later account, see Bowrey 1905: 259–85.

¹⁸ Palembang does not enter into the question, since we are concerned with Kaṭāha (the importance of which is attested by a wealth of references, compared with a paucity of references to Palembang). This is not to deny that Palembang might have been associated with the 'earlier Śrīvijaya', or might also have styled itself Śrīvijaya during the period studied here: points which merit further sober research.

¹⁹ I am grateful to Michael Aris (Oxford) and Gene Smith (Jakarta) for illuminating several of the difficult points in the colophon.

²⁰ Here the construction seems unusual, as is the use of the term 'tshal.

²¹ Like the element of space, sentient beings are without limit; like the element of space, sentient beings have no inherent existence.

²² Here the Narthang and Peking Tanjurs only add: 'By this may the jewel of the dispensation (*śāsana-ratna*) be enabled to flourish. Blessings!' This statement would have been added by the Tanjur editors.

²³ par DNQ : pa C.

²⁴ 'di CD : ni NQ.

²⁵ 'tshal CD : mtshal NQ.

²⁶ dga'i CD : dga' NQ.

²⁷ gtsug DNQ : btsug C.

²⁸ kyi CD : kyis NQ.

²⁹ ring CDQ : rang N (broken ki ku?).

³⁰ bcu NQ : bcos CD.

³¹ / NQ : not in CD.

³² gyi CDN : not in Q.

³³ tsā CD : tstsha NQ.