

## BONI IN CHINESE SOURCES FROM THE TENTH TO THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Johannes L. Kurz\*

Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Brunei

email: jolukurz@gmail.com

### ABSTRACT

*The present national history of the Sultanate of Brunei includes a fabricated history of official Brunei-China relations that extends as far back as the sixth century AD. The present paper treats the subject of Boni, a place well documented by pre-modern Chinese sources starting from the tenth century. It attempts to address some major issues in the use of these sources to establish Boni as a precursor of modern Brunei. Since the late 1970s writers within Brunei, foremost among them Robert Nicholl, have contributed to the project of a long history of pre-modern Brunei by interpreting the available Chinese sources very narrowly. Based on a close reading of the original texts, this essay argues that the majority of the texts until the Ming dynasty quote from the first extant source in the tenth century. Hence, official Chinese perception of Boni did not increase over time, but in fact did stagnate. Consequently, identification with a specific location in Borneo, as Nicholl and C. Brown suggested, is impossible. What the essay suggests is that with the extant official pre-modern Chinese texts Boni cannot be established as Brunei, but that more likely, Boni under different dynasties referred to various places on the north coast of Borneo.*

**Keywords:** Chinese cultural studies, Boni, Borneo-China relations, Robert Nicholl, pre-modern Chinese sources on Borneo

### INTRODUCTION

For many states in Southeast Asia, Chinese sources allegedly present the earliest historical evidence of their existence.<sup>1</sup> The case of Boni is quite special, in that it not only serves to illustrate the interpretative problems of sources, but also the ongoing process of appropriating the writing on Boni for the national history of Brunei.

Robert Nicholl's studies have influenced the historical account that has been largely accepted by official history institutions in Brunei which include among others, the Brunei History Centre and the Academy of Brunei Studies.

Nicholl placed ancient Brunei along the northwestern coast of Borneo which nowadays comprises two states of the Malaysian Federation, namely Sarawak and Sabah, and the Sultanate of Brunei. His reading of the sources which came to him through translations only, led him to conclude that the country of Poli (婆利) mentioned in Chinese sources of the Tang dynasty (618–907) was the precursor of the country of Boni described in the *Taiping huanyuji* (太平環宇記) of the tenth century. He was thus able to reconstruct a history of constant settlement of Brunei from the early first millennium onwards.

Nicholl, however, was ignorant of the fact that Poli is described in the *Taiping huanyuji* as well,<sup>2</sup> and is not at all connected to Boni.<sup>3</sup> Throughout his writings (1975–1990), Nicholl transcribed the characters 渤泥, 渤尼 and 勃泥 with 'P'o-ni' following an older Western transcription system. However, his transcription of the characters is incorrect because the characters should be represented correctly by Po-ni in the Wade-Giles transcription, or Boni, according to the Chinese Hanyu pinyin transcription system. Prior to Nicholl, Paul Pelliot had referred to Boni first as Borneo, but later on specified Boni as a designation for Brunei; this was simply followed suit by O. W. Wolters.<sup>4</sup> It is important to note that Pelliot, who incidentally and incorrectly referred to Boni as P'o-ni, as well as Wolters did not access the *Taiping huanyuji* account, but either relied on W. P. Groeneveldt's translation of the account of Boni in the *Songshi* or 宋史 (Official History of the Song) (Pelliot),<sup>5</sup> or on the original *Songshi* account (Wolters).<sup>6</sup> The problem with Groeneveldt is that he did not translate the *Songshi*, but the *Wenxian tongkao* (文獻通考) entry on Boni because the latter does not name the Boni envoys to China in 977, whereas the former does. Both the *Wenxian tongkao* and the the *Songshi* were Yuan dynasty works that copied copiously from the *Taiping huanyuji* account (see below).<sup>7</sup>

The sources are never very exact in their location of Boni, so that in the following paper, the working hypothesis is that at any given time, the sources may have dealt with whatever states existed in Borneo, and not just exclusively on its northwestern coast. The aim of the present paper is to show how the relevant texts handle the description of Boni; it does not intend to fix its geographical position.

Roderich Ptak has pointed out the difficulty of locating Boni, in the absence of archaeological evidence in the form of porcelain and ceramics.

Furthermore, he raised important questions concerning the identity of Boni under the successive dynasties of the Song, Yuan and Ming.<sup>8</sup>

The relative ignorance of the Chinese about its existence from the tenth until the fifteenth century hints at its insignificance, otherwise there certainly should be a significant amount of new material available on the place during the same period. This is especially true in light of the fact that after official relations had been established, existing sources still are vague in locating a specific Boni. However, it is this confusion which leads me to think that several states existed on Borneo and a number of them were subsumed under the title Boni. On account of the very scarce sources and the available texts on Boni, I believe that Boni at any given time during the Northern Song, Southern Song, Yuan, Ming and even the early Qing, referred to a rather less specified region than a very specific country, kingdom, or urban mercantile center with an unbroken continuous history. In other words, Boni meant different localities with probably shifting centres in most likely Borneo, during different Chinese dynasties; one or several of these may have been precursors of modern day Brunei.

In the case of Brunei, solid evidence for its existence comes only with the arrival of the Europeans in the region in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. I shall present several translations from Chinese sources which provide information on Boni in the order of their chronological appearance. Through these, that are found in the attached "Translations" section, I hope to clarify some of the questions that Ptak has raised.

## **BONI IN TEXTS FROM THE SONG DYNASTY (960–1279)**

### **Boni in the *Taiping huanyuji*, ca. 980**

The earliest certain account of Boni (渤泥) is found in the *Taiping huanyuji* (Universal Geography of the Taiping [xingguo] Era) by Yue Shi (樂史) (930–1007),<sup>9</sup> a comprehensive geographical record of the Taiping era (976–983) contained in 200 *juan* (卷) ("chapters"). The main body of the work deals with the geography of Chinese territory, while the last chapters, 172–200, describe the countries surrounding the Chinese empire. This part of the *Taiping huanyuji* is entitled *siyi* (四裔) referring to people living beyond the borders of Chinese civilisation. The descriptions of the countries start in the east, then turn to the south, then the west, and at last deal with the people in the north. The entry on Boni is part of the accounts on the southern barbarians (*nan man* [南蠻]);<sup>10</sup> in all subsequent works,

this categorisation of Boni has been followed. *Man* were the inhabitants of the southern fringes of the Chinese empire in the modern day provinces of Guangdong and Guangxi, so *nan man* referred to people that lived even beyond those places.<sup>11</sup>

The text by Yue Shi is the source for all other books dealing with Boni in Song times, including the *Zhufan zhi* (諸蕃志) (1225), the *Wenxian tongkao* (文獻通考) (1308) and the *Songshi* (宋史) (1343–1345). Hence, it probably is the "ancient source" Robert Nicholl identified as the source of information for the two latter works; he, however, thought this source was lost.<sup>12</sup> The entries on both Zhancheng (占城) (Champa)<sup>13</sup> and Boni are interestingly marked as "newly entered" (*xinru* [新入]), which means that they had come into contact with the Chinese court only shortly before the completion of the *Taiping huanyuji*. Zhancheng, according to this text, contacted China only during the Later Zhou (Hou Zhou [後周]) dynasty (951–960) in 958,<sup>14</sup> whereas Boni only became known at the court in 977.

There are several pieces of information provided by the entry in *Taiping huanyuji* that are worthy of closer inspection. The first one is the fact that the Chinese had no knowledge of the place prior to 977. For Nicholl, the introductory remark of Yue about foreign places frequently changing their designations, opened the possibility that Boni was just another name for the country he had placed in northwestern Borneo. He found evidence for the veracity of his assumption in the work of Pelliot, who ascertained that the "Boni" (勃泥) mentioned in the *Manshu* (蠻書) by Fan Chuo (樊綽) (fl. late ninth cent.) was the first occurrence of the term describing Borneo.<sup>15</sup>

The *Manshu* provides no directions nor any other information which would define the place more precisely. The sentence in question reads:

又南有婆羅門，波斯，闍婆，勃泥，昆侖數種外道。

And then there are several peoples living in the foreign regions to the south, such as the Poluomen, Bosi, Shepo, Boni, and Kunlun.<sup>16</sup>

The designations provided in the *Manshu* referred to ethnic groups of people rather than to places because the qualifier *guo* (國) (country, state) after the names is missing. If we accept that *kunlun* until the Song was used to denote Malays<sup>17</sup> then what would be the ethnic identification of the Boni?

The description of the country in the *Taiping huanyuji* derives from the mouths of the Boni envoys Shinu (施努), Puyali (蒲亞利) and Gexin (哥心). If the place had traded with China prior to 977, wouldn't the envoys have had recollections of that? In the end, a mere hundred years—or three generations—had passed from the alleged Boni/Borneo in the *Manshu*.

Moreover, it was the foreign trader Puluxie (蒲盧歇) who convinced the ruler of Boni that something could be gained by sending a diplomatic mission to the Chinese court. Once the contact was established, Puluxie could certainly reap a handsome reward from both Boni and the Chinese court. The absence of information on Boni in the records before the early Northern Song does not constitute sufficient evidence for the existence of a country with a different name in the same unidentified location under the Tang.

The Boni envoys were able to explain how to reach neighbouring countries such as Shepo (蛇婆), Sanfoqi (三佛齊) or Srivijaya, Moyi (摩逸) and Zhancheng. If they really knew how to get to those places, it is hard to believe, that they were ignorant of the route to China. Again, there is a possibility that they learnt about the distances and routes from Puluxie. Interestingly, the envoys at no point in their description refer to an insular location of Boni.

The local products that the envoys submitted (camphor, turtle shell, sandalwood, tortoise shell, tusks) are typical of the Southeast Asian region. Nicholl, again, takes the presence of camphor as evidence for the origin of the people from northwestern Borneo. Though camphor may be found in Borneo, the fact that it constituted part of the tribute presentation is not sufficient to anchor Boni firmly in or around Brunei Bay. The people of Boni may have acquired camphor through trade.

The identification of the people involved as Muslims is a legitimate speculation that started with the identification of Puyali as Abu Ali by Hirth and Rockhill.<sup>18</sup> Shinu has been rendered by Jamil al-Sufri as Sheikh Noh and Gexin as Qadhi Kassim, based on his reading of Groeneveldt's translation of the entry on Boni in the *Songshi*.<sup>19</sup> Chen Dasheng suggests Sina for Shinu, Abu Ali for what he refers to as Buyali (Puyali), and Kasim for Gexin.<sup>20</sup> With the same justification we may, however, also retain the original Chinese transcriptions to refer to indigenous non-Muslim names.

Puluxie certainly was not a Chinese<sup>21</sup> as Jamil Al-Sufri and Chen suggest because his designation as *fanren* (番人) hints at his being either an Arab, Persian or Indian trader. The identity of Menggu (蒙骨) who served as an interpreter between the Boni envoys and the officials in Kaifeng, remains similarly mysterious, and we do not know in which language he conversed with the envoys. It is tempting to relate Menggu to the tribes of southern China, namely the Man, and to hypothetically establish a linguistic link between the Man and the visitors from overseas. However, with the very little information we have, we can easily forego such assumptions.

## Boni in the *Zhufan zhi*, 1225

The *Zhufan zhi* (諸蕃志) (Record of All Barbarian Countries), a geographical work describing overseas countries and trade goods, was written around 1225 by Zhao Rugua (趙汝適) (?–after 1225).<sup>22</sup> Zhao, a *jinshi* of 1196 who had been Supervisor of Maritime Trade (*shibosi tiju* [市舶司提舉])<sup>23</sup> in Quanzhou, Fujian, based his work partly on personal observations, and also on earlier works such as the *Lingwai daida* (嶺外代答) (1178) by Zhou Qufei (周去非) (?–after 1178).<sup>24</sup> The entry on Boni adds to the information given in the original first description of the country in *Taiping huanyuji*.

In addition, Zhao Rugua obtained information on foreign countries from merchants, while being stationed in Quanzhou, Fujian.<sup>25</sup> He added important information to the *Taiping huanyuji* record, namely on the trade and religion of Boni (渤泥). He could probably draw on the expertise of traders who had traveled there themselves or had obtained their knowledge from people who had gone there.<sup>26</sup> His text, in part, reads like a commercial for merchants interested to trade with the place, as there was a good profit to be made. It also gives detailed instructions of how to deal with the indigenous people.<sup>27</sup> The reason why Zhao retained Yue Shi's text at least in fragments is that it was the oldest source on Boni and could thus be used to identify the place he had heard about.

Nicholl emphasises the fact that the country is addressed as Foni (佛泥). Since the character *fo* (佛) is used to transcribe Buddha in Chinese, for Nicholl this was evidence pointing to the Boni people to be Buddhists.<sup>28</sup> Another explanation for Foni is that it basically was a copyist's error because it does not occur anywhere else in Chinese historical records. Furthermore the text is quite explicit in saying that the people were Buddhists, anyway.

In light of this, it is rather difficult to understand why Nicholl refers to the people in Boni as "Taoists" and even makes them the "only indigenous Taoist community in South East Asia."<sup>29</sup> He arrives at this assumption by identifying the worship of the pearls with Daoist practices; in the relevant literature on Daoism, I was not able to verify this practice.

The flaming pearl in Daoism marks the transition from Daoist adept to Daoist master, as it is an emblem that is given to him upon his ordination.<sup>30</sup> The flaming pearl therefore is more an idea than an actual material object worthy of worship. In Daoist temples, the flaming pearl which is contested over by two dragons on the roof represents the energy that emanates from the incense burner inside the main hall of the temple.<sup>31</sup> Zhao does not say anything about the temple roof and its construction.

It may thus not be completely wrong to accept that Boni had her own local religion with many elements of Buddhism. This coincides with the explanation Schafer gives for the admiration of pearls in Tang China, where the pearl was a symbol of the Buddha and the Buddhist law. For Daoists, pearls were an important ingredient in life-prolonging drugs, but for that purpose, they were ground into powder. Apart from that, pearls served as decorations of dresses and furniture.<sup>32</sup> In light of this, Nicholl's conclusion is not very convincing after all.

Nicholl also makes much of the "more than hundred boats" that were the guard of the king, and made "Brunei... a maritime power."<sup>33</sup> The Chinese term for the vessels is too vague to warrant a translation as a sailing ship, and the "more than hundred" maybe just an exaggeration to refer to many such boats.

### **Boni in the *Song huiyao***

The works quoted above on Boni deliver such detail as social and administrative conditions and diplomatic missions to China, and can be regarded as one group of texts. A second group of texts can be distinguished; these are treating the missions exclusively as a part of the foreign policy of the Song. Characteristically they are merely recording the composition and arrival dates of missions and therefore deliver not so much information on Boni itself.

The *Song huiyao* (宋会要) (Institutions of the Song) is the first of these works. Work on the *Song huiyao* started with the reign of emperor Renzong (仁宗) (1023–1063) and it is based on sources no longer available today, such as the Imperial Court Diaries (*rili* [日曆]) and the Veritable Records (*shilu* [實錄]) of the Song emperors. The book follows the style of earlier works like the *Tang huiyao* (唐會要), covering the Tang period (618–907) and the *Wudai huiyao* (五代會要), covering the period of the so-called Five Dynasties (907–959) which was directly preceding the Song. The *Song huiyao* deals with institutions and events arranged in a chronological way. It records the missions from Boni (勃泥) on the twentieth day of the ninth month of the second year of the Taiping xingguo era (4 November 977), and from Boni (渤泥) on twenty-fourth day of the second month of the fifth year of the Yuanfeng era (26 March 1082).<sup>34</sup> The later precise date suggests that the relevant records were still complete at that time, while those dating back to the beginning of the dynasty already were less complete. The *Taizong shilu* (Veritable Records for Emperor Taizong, 998) do survive in fragmented form; however, the part dealing

with the year 977 is unfortunately lost.<sup>35</sup> Interestingly, the *Song huiyao* has two separate entries on Foni which shows again that Foni was not the same as Boni.<sup>36</sup>

Apart from the information on the two Boni missions, the work provides valuable insights into the composition and size of diplomatic missions from Southeast Asia. According to the *Song huiyao*, embassies always consisted of a head of mission (*shi* [使]), a deputy head of mission (*fushi* [副使]), and an assistant head of mission (*panguan* [判官]). In the case of Zhancheng, Boni (渤泥) and other countries, the number of embassy members never totaled more than ten, whereas those from Shepo (闍婆) and Sanfoqi (三佛齊) never comprised more than twenty persons.<sup>37</sup>

### **Boni in the *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian*, 1183**

The *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian* (Long Draft of the Continued Mirror in Government) by Li Tao, is an annalistic history of the Northern Song dynasty covering the period from 960 to 1100. The mission from Boni (渤泥) is recorded for 4 November 977 as in the *Song huiyao*.<sup>38</sup> The names of the envoys are not provided and the commentary explains that the information actually derived from the *shilu* (實錄) (Veritable Records) of emperor Shenzong (r. 1068–1085) which are no longer extant.<sup>39</sup> At the time of compilation Li Tao thus had had no access to official information such as the original *shilu* of emperor Taizong (r. 976–997).<sup>40</sup>

The date for the mission in 1082 is 26 March.<sup>41</sup> It is obvious that the dates in the *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian* coincide with those recorded in the *Songhui yao*. No more information is given there on the number of envoys, their names or the products they submitted, nor is the name of the ruler of Boni mentioned at that time. Geoff Wade treats the missions from Boni as missions from Brunei, but does not provide any explanation why he does so.<sup>42</sup>

### **Boni (勃泥) in the *Yuhai* (玉海) (Sea of Jades)**

The next work to relate information on Boni is an encyclopedia titled *Yuhai* (玉海). The *Yuhai* was compiled in the thirteenth century by Wang Yinglin (王應麟) (1223–1296), and refers to Boni (勃泥), remarking on two official missions from the state, received on 30 October 30 978 (*dingwei* [丁未] day of the ninth month in the third year of the *Taiping xingguo* era), and 26 March 1082 (twenty-fourth day of the second month of the fifth year of the

Yuanfeng era), respectively.<sup>43</sup> The latter mission is not mentioned in the basic annals of the then ruling emperor Shenzong (神宗) (r. 1068–1085) in the *Songshi* (宋史) (Official History of the Song). Note also, that the first mission is dated 978, which puts it a year later than the other sources. This may result from a copying error, a frequent occurrence in the case of Chinese block-printed books, as *er nian* (二年) (second year) can rather easily turn into *san nian* (三年) (third year).

The entry on Boni in the *Yuhai* strips the *Taiping huanyuji* account to the bare essentials. It provides new information only in the form of the presents that were given to the envoys, among them horses and saddles. The name of the ruler, Xiangda (向打), is consistent with the earlier reports, but again the exact location of Boni remains a mystery.

## BONI IN TEXTS FROM THE YUAN DYNASTY (1279–1368)

### Boni in the *Wenxian tongkao*, 1308

The relative ignorance with which Chinese official authorities treated the place may also be inferred from the entry on Boni (勃泥) in the *Wenxian tongkao* (文獻通考) (General History of Institutions and Critical Examination of Documents and Studies) by Ma Duanlin (馬端臨) (1254–1323).<sup>44</sup> The *Wenxian tongkao*, an encyclopedia, copied from the earliest account of Boni in the *Taiping huanyuji* extensively.<sup>45</sup>

It supplements the *Taiping huanyuji* account with more material about the contents of the letter of the king to the emperor of China. According to the letter which is cited here for the first time, the king in 977 had heard of China, but did not know how to get there. If we can trust the text, the people in Boni had a very vague knowledge of China. This contradicts Nicholl's assumption that Boni was a successor to Poli, and that the Chinese had lost sight of this alleged connection between the two countries. However, the king knew that Champa was likely to retain any tribute carrying ship that was sent to China. For him that would not only have meant the loss of the tribute items from his country, but it might have jeopardised relations with the Chinese court at the same time. Interestingly, not one bit of the more colorful description of Boni from the *Zhufan zhi* has entered the *Wenxian tongkao*. However, it gives a name to the king of Boni in 1082, namely that of Xilimanuo (錫理麻喏).

Jamil Al-Sufri claims the Boni envoy of 1082 on his return voyage was accompanied by "several Chinese officials"; no evidence for any

Chinese officials escorting the envoy home is provided by the sources. Jamil Al-Sufri alleges furthermore that there was a third mission from what he calls Brunei to the Chinese court in 1247, found in unspecified "Chinese sources." The chef de mission was Pu Zongmin (蒲宗閩) who according to Jamil Al-Sufri was the grandson of Puyali, one of the original Boni envoys of 977.<sup>46</sup> There is, however, no evidence to link the two nor to suggest that Pu Zongmin was an official envoy from the Chinese court. Neither the basic annals of the *Songshi* nor the *Xu Zizhi tongjian* and the *Song huiyao* contain information on such a mission in 1247, and they do not refer to Pu Zongmin.

Apparently, Jamil Al-Sufri's reference was Pg Karim's article on the Chinese tombstone. Pengiran Karim in turn was referring to a text titled *Xishan zazhi* (西山雜誌) by a certain Cai Yongjian (蔡永攀) (1776–1835),<sup>47</sup> a local scholar from Pujiang in Fujian, which mentions the mission headed by Pu Zongmin.<sup>48</sup> I have not been able to obtain a hard copy of this text which was discovered only in the late twentieth century.<sup>49</sup> It has "survived" in hand-written copies only, one of which is dated 8 September 1982. Given the provenance of the text, it is difficult to prove its authenticity.<sup>50</sup> What makes it more suspicious is the fact that in the online description of the work, the solving of the "mystery" of the provenance of Pu Zongmin is a central point. If there is proof that Pu actually came from Quanzhou in China as early as the late thirteenth century, and his tombstone could be verified to be that old as well, then this would make it the oldest Chinese tombstone in Southeast Asia.<sup>51</sup> However, as things stand, this claim cannot be supported by solid facts. The tombstone in question has been moved to a cemetery on Jalan Tutong opposite the Supreme Court in Bandar Seri Begawan where it now withers away. To my knowledge, no critically revised and annotated edition of the *Xishan zazhi* has been published and until this happens, any statement concerning the Pu family can be speculative at best.<sup>52</sup> Statements on the Brunei origin of the tombstone such as by Wade and also by Chen who claims that "Mr. Pu [...] had gone to Brunei"<sup>53</sup> must similarly be treated with caution until it can be proven with 100 percent certainty.

### **Boni in the *Songshi* (宋史) (Official Dynastic History of the Song), 1345**

The *Wenxian tongkao* account was almost taken over in its entirety into the *Songshi* (宋史) description of Boni.<sup>54</sup> The ruler's name has been rendered as Sri Ma-dja or Sri Maharadja by Groeneveldt.<sup>55</sup> No further mention of him is made in the *Songshi* and the mission does not appear in the basic annals of emperor Shenzong (神宗) (r. 1068–1085) ruling at that time. The

work was hastily compiled near the end of the Mongol Yuan (元) dynasty (1279–1368), in order to show the legitimacy of Mongol rule over China. Since it was not clear to the scholar-officials working on the project whom the Yuan actually succeeded as masters of China, they also compiled dynastic histories of the other two dynasties they had destroyed while conquering China, namely the Liao (遼) (907–1125) and the Jin (金) (1115–1234).<sup>56</sup>

This text adds the names of the envoys in 977 and gives the exact figures for the tribute products that were submitted in 1082. On account of its copying the *Wenxian tongkao*, I assume that from 1082, the date of the last tribute bearing mission from Boni, and 1308, the date of the publication of the *Wenxian tongkao*, no new official documents had entered the archives of the Song which otherwise would have been incorporated into the official history. No trace of the *Zhufan zhi* is visible in this account, a fact which hints at the selective use of sources by the official compilers, and simultaneously at the scarce availability of this work. The edition of the text used today has been reconstructed from the early fifteenth century encyclopedia *Yongle dadian* (永樂大典). No earlier versions of the text exist.

Nicholl used what he thought was Groeneveldt's translation of the *Songshi* entry extensively.<sup>57</sup> He furthermore assumed that the name of the king Xiangda could be rendered Seri Anakda, and the name of the foreign trader Puluxie Firoz Shah. He then alleged that "Firoz Shah" had brought news of a war between Sumatra and Java to Boni.<sup>58</sup> Neither the *Wenxian tongkao* nor the *Songshi* include such information, and therefore Nicholl's statement must be regarded as mere speculation. He first raised this issue in an essay, in which he addressed the king of Boni as Maharaja,<sup>59</sup> hinting at the possibility that Boni was an Indianised state. Similar to his other assumptions he never followed up with evidence. The Chinese texts are not helpful either, as they all refer to the ruler as a king which is the most neutral of terms for anyone in a ruling position.

As we have seen above, Nicholl in later writings believed "Brunei" to have been a Daoist state; in his writings of this time, he never referred to a Hindu or Buddhist state again in the tenth century, which means that he never critically examined his own findings.

### Boni in the *Daoyi zhilüe* (島夷誌略), 1350

In 1350 Wang Dayuan (汪大淵) finished his descriptions of foreign countries, which he laid down in a work entitled *Daoyi zhilüe* (島夷誌略) (Brief Record of the Island Barbarians). This was at first attached to a local gazetteer dealing with Quanzhou, entitled *Qingyuan xuzhi* (清源續志), compiled by Wu Jian (吳鑿). Wang Dayuan's description of Boni (淳泥) is very short.<sup>60</sup>

The people in this Boni were Buddhists and practiced agriculture. For Nicholl, the Longshan or Dragon Mountain mentioned in the text is Mount Kinabalu.<sup>61</sup> His main reason to identify the Longshan with Mount Kinabalu are legends about the mountain and dragons.<sup>62</sup> Other than that he has no evidence to prove the correctness of his presumption, but nevertheless keeps working with it anyway. As we have seen, the text is far from fixing the place anywhere else than close to a mountain, which in fact must not be Mount Kinabalu at all. The problem is how to interpret the first sentence in the entry. Is the right side of the mountain seen from the observer arriving on a ship from the west? Then Boni would, in fact, have been situated north of the mountain. The other option is the visitor arriving from the east, which in my opinion is unlikely. The text was written for Chinese readers describing places to the east of them and thus Wang's view is probably from China towards the east as well. At the same time, it is very doubtful if Wang Dayuan actually visited the place in autumn of 1330 as Nicholl would have him on account of a poem that Wang composed when he passed by Ceylon.<sup>63</sup> Ptak lists a number of options for the location of Boni such as Pontianak, Sabah, Brunei, Banjarmasin and Patani. He however decided to identify Boni with Borneo, a sound assumption based on what the sources record or rather not record. In addition, he questions the identification of Longshan with any real topographical feature such as Mount Kinabalu, and suggests Longshan may refer to the "geographical nadir."<sup>64</sup>

For Nicholl the *Taiping huanyuji*, the *Zhufan zhi*, and the *Wenxian tongkao* point to a location of Boni "on the north west coast of Borneo." In fact they are far from identifying any place with certainty. Nevertheless, Nicholl goes on to cite the *Daoyi zhilüe* as major evidence for the location of Boni.<sup>65</sup>

## BONI IN TEXTS FROM THE MING DYNASTY<sup>66</sup>

### *Boniguo rugong ji* (勃尼國入貢記)

One of the earliest accounts of Boni during the Ming dynasty was compiled by Song Lian (宋濂) (1310–1381). Song was an eminent scholar who served as the chief compiler of the *Yuanshi* (元史) (Official History of the Yuan) in 1369. Song recorded what the envoy Shen Zhi (沈秩) told him about his experiences at the place in a text entitled "Boniguo rugong ji" (勃尼國入貢記) (Report about Boni Submitting Tribute).<sup>67</sup> Song Lian's report bears no date, but it is quite probable that it was produced not long after the envoys had returned from Boni.

Song Lian's is an eye witness first-hand account describing not so much the country, but the negotiations between the Chinese envoys and the king of Boni. The reluctance of the king to comply with the demands of the Chinese is quite understandable given the fact that he was faced with two powerful neighbours, namely Sulu and Java. At the same time, we learn that Boni did not know much of China at that time, even though the name of the minister mentioned, Wang Zongshu (王宗恕), hints at the possibility that he was Chinese. The king may have treated the envoys differently, if he had possessed up-to-date information on the newly established Ming dynasty and the envoys would not have had to resort to serious threats in order to establish diplomatic tribute relations. Carrie Brown suggests that Song Lian, in writing up this report, used earlier texts such as the *Taiping huanyuji* and the *Zhufan zhi* as "models."<sup>68</sup> Song Lian indeed copied them directly as is obvious in his description of the country. That is why there are inconsistencies in the text such as the distances covered. Even though Shen Zhi himself declared that it took a little more than a month to reach Boni from Shepo, Song nevertheless quotes the distance found in the *Taiping huanyuji*, that is, fourty-five days or one and a half months. Carrie Brown's assumption that the text "provides undisputable evidence of Javanese dominance of northwest Borneo,"<sup>69</sup> is implausible because the text does not situate Boni in northwest Borneo or in Borneo as such. Song Lian, as a scholar, included the oldest information on Boni available. The people in the Boni of the early Ming had no recollections of contacts with the Song—at least they did not mention any.

**"Boniguo gongshun wang mubei" (淳泥國恭順王墓碑), 1408**

For Carrie Brown, the "Boniguo gongshun wang mubei" (淳 [also 脖] 泥國恭順王墓碑) (Stele Inscription at the Tomb of the Gongshun King of Boni) by Hu Guang (胡廣) (1368–1432)<sup>70</sup> and the tomb inscription found in the entry on Boni in the *Mingshi* (明史) (Official History of the Ming, 1739) are near identical. However, on closer inspection, it becomes quite evident that the "sentences and phrases" that Brown calls repetitive, are rather different in fact.<sup>71</sup>

The text by Hu Guang has been used in the 1990s to reconstruct the stele inscription that has only survived in a few fragments.<sup>72</sup> It is the only text that provides information on the family of Manarejiananai (麻那惹加那乃), the king of Boni, giving the names not only of his parents but also of his wife and his brothers. The name of the father, Manareshanawang (麻那惹沙那旺), suggests no link to Mahemosha (馬合謨沙), the king of Boni in 1371. The first part of the king's and his father's name, Manare, may be identified as either a royal title or a family name of the ruling family.<sup>73</sup>

I would see this as proof that the Boni of Mahemosha and that of Manarejiananai does not refer to one specific country, but rather to one region. This region may well have been separated into several small states with different rulers. The text does not refer to Mahemosha and the diplomatic relations with Boni just less than forty years earlier.

***Ming shilu* (明實錄)**

The information that Song Lian's text provides can be supplemented by excerpts from the *Ming shilu* (明實錄) (Veritable Records of the Ming). These records have been made accessible online by Geoff Wade, and I follow his translations here.<sup>74</sup>

The order to send out envoys to Southeast Asia was issued on 12 September 1370,<sup>75</sup> or just two years after the establishment of the Ming dynasty by Zhu Yuanzhang (朱元璋) (r. 1368–1398) posthumously known as Hongwu (洪武) emperor. Zhang Jingzhi (張敬) and others were sent to Boni, others traveled to Sanfoqi and Zhenla.<sup>76</sup>

The following year (22 September 1371) Yisimayi (亦思 麻逸), an envoy from the Boni court of king Mahemosha (馬合謨沙), arrived in Nanjing submitting tribute in the form of hornbill beaks (*heding* [鶴頂]),<sup>77</sup> live turtles, peacocks, plum-blossom camphor, "rice" camphor, "sugar" camphor, Western Ocean white cloth, laka-wood and beeswax.<sup>78</sup> Pelliot suggested Ismail for the name of the envoy and Mahmud Shah for the

ruler.<sup>79</sup> Because of the phonetic similarity between the Chinese transcription of the names and the rendering of the Chinese characters into a romanisation system, Pelliot's suggestion has been accepted as plausible ever since.<sup>80</sup>

The tribute products submitted hint at the possibility that the Boni of the early Ming was in the same region as the Boni of Song times. However, the local products are not conclusive evidence that the Boni visited by the Chinese envoys in the Ming was the successor to the state of Boni in Song times. The only information provided in the same entry in the *Ming Taizu shilu*, is at once familiar and very vague as well. It reads as follows:

Boni is in the great ocean of the Southwest and it controls fourteen administrative divisions (*zhou* [州]). It is subject to Shepo, from whence it is a 45-day journey. It produces famous aromatics and exotic goods.

This places Boni somewhere in the southwestern seas, but does not give a definite clue to its location. There is no further mention of the place in the *Ming shilu* until the year 1375, when Boni was included in the sacrifices to the spirits of all the mountains, lakes and seas (*yuezhen haidu shanchuan zhi si* [嶽鎮海瀆山川之祀]).<sup>81</sup> These were being held twice yearly in the capital until 1375 for the provinces that were responsible for the five cardinal directions, and conducted by the emperor in person. After 1375, the sacrifices were transferred to the relevant provinces. Thus, Fujian was responsible for Japan, Liuqiu (琉毬) and Boni (渤泥).<sup>82</sup> This seems strange given that Boni in the historical records until the Ming usually was listed among the "southern barbarians" (*nan man* [南蠻]). One would have expected Boni to be listed under Guangxi (responsible for Annan [安南], Zhancheng [占城], Zhenla [真臘], Xianluo [暹羅 or Thailand], and Suoli [鎖里]) or Guangdong (Sanfoqi [三佛齊] and Java [爪哇]).

A little less than twenty years later, the *Ming Taizu shilu* subsumed Boni and Liuqiu under the countries from the south who had brought tribute to the court so far.<sup>83</sup> At that time, the ceremonies for the reception of rulers from those countries were revised. On arrival they were received by an official in the Interpreter's Institute (Huitong guan [會同館]).<sup>84</sup> The day after they were given an audience with the emperor in the Fengtian Hall for which they had to wear either their local dress or Chinese court clothes, if they had been provided with them. The number of kowtows to the emperor was set at eight, and after they had performed this, they were escorted to meet the crown prince and other imperial princes in the Wenhua-Hall. The

new rules regulated the status of the foreign rulers as being close to those of marquis and earls at banquets.<sup>85</sup>

The next mission from Boni was received on 5 December 1405, and it was headed by Sheng Alie Bocheng (生阿烈伯成) who had been sent by his king Manarejiananai (麻那惹加那乃) to submit a memorial and tribute of local products. The Ministry of Rites responded by giving the envoy and his retinue a banquet and conferring Chinese silk garments upon them.<sup>86</sup> On 22 December 1405, an envoy was sent to Boni to confirm Manarejiananai king and as a sign of his authority, was given a seal, a title certificate, an imperial tally and tally-slips. Moreover, he was presented with various silks.<sup>87</sup> On 6 February 1406, Sheng Alie Bocheng, the interpreter Sha Ban (沙扮) and the other members of the diplomatic mission left the court to return to Boni. They had been given paper money and Chinese dresses already, but by flattering the relevant officials, obtained headwear and belts. The emperor personally gave a silver belt plated in gold to Sheng Alie Bocheng and a silver belt to Sha Ban.<sup>88</sup> Apparently this mission was soon—probably in the same year—followed by another one from Boni. Again, the king of Boni as well as his envoys were given lavish presents on 3 February 1407.<sup>89</sup> It may have been this mission that prepared for the personal appearance of the king of Boni in the year 1408.

Manarejiananai arrived on 9 September 1408, in Nanjing. He brought with him his wife, his siblings, his children and officials. The Yongle emperor had ordered a eunuch named Du Xing (杜興) to receive them in Fujian, which suggests that they either arrived in Quanzhou or Xiamen.

While still in Fujian, Manarejiananai sent a memorial to the throne together with tribute and gave a speech assuring the emperor of his loyalty.<sup>90</sup> A little more than a week later, on 17 September 1408, Manarejiananai was again invited to a banquet.<sup>91</sup> On 20 September 1408, the king of Boni received "ceremonial insignia, a throne, a water pot and a water bowl all made of silver, a parasol and a fan, both made of white silk gauze, and two 'saddled horses' plated in gold."<sup>92</sup> He was also given ten suits made from various silks. His family and officials were given Chinese clothing too, except for the women who were provided with clothing in their customary style.<sup>93</sup> On the same day, the Ministry of Rites remarked that the ceremonies and rituals for the king, when meeting with the crown prince, had not been defined. The emperor decided that the king of Boni had the status of a feudatory minister and as such was entitled to rituals applicable for dukes, marquis and senior ministers.<sup>94</sup>

On 19 October 1408, Manarejiananai died in the Interpreters Institute. The emperor ceased all court business for three days and had an official

offer sacrifices to him. The empress and the princes also sent items for the sacrifices. An order was given to the Ministry of Works to supply an inner and an outer coffin, and the king was buried outside the Ande gate at the southern city wall. A tablet and a tomb avenue were erected, as was customary in China, and southwestern tribes people were selected to guard the tomb. In order to provide a venue for sacrifices that consisted of a sheep twice a year, a temple was built next to the tomb.<sup>95</sup> The text of the tablet was composed by Hu Guang (see above).

On 21 November 1408, the posthumous title Gongshun (恭順) (Respectful and Obedient) was conferred upon Manarejiananai. Xiawang (遐王), his son, was ordered to take over his father's position. His uncle Shili Nannananuo (施里難那那喏), younger brother of his late father, spoke for him, asking to pay yearly tribute to China, under the condition that the court would order Java to exempt Boni from paying them annual tribute. He required further that Chinese officials escort them back to Boni and stay there for one year. Furthermore, he wanted to know about how often Boni was to send tribute and the number of envoys accompanying it. The emperor approved these requests, and fixed the tributes to be sent every three years, while the number of envoys was left open for Boni to decide. Dumaban (都馬板), the king of Java, was ordered to cease requiring Boni to submit camphor.<sup>96</sup>

Following the request of the king and his uncle, on 20 December 1408, the eunuch Zhang Qian (張謙) and the messenger Zhou Hang (周航) were ordered to accompany Xiawang and his retinue back to their country. On departure, lavish presents were given to Xiawang, his family and his officials. Earlier Manarejiananai had asked the emperor to bestow on the mountain that looked over Boni the title of "protector of the country," in order to signify Boni's vassalage to the Ming.<sup>97</sup>

Xiawang repeated this request upon departure and accordingly the mountain was given the title "Mountain Which Will Ever Peacefully Protect the Country" (*changning zhenguo zhi shan* [長寧鎮國之山]). Qian and the others were to set up a commemorative tablet on top of it for which the emperor personally composed the text.<sup>98</sup>

Zhang Qian and Zhou Hang, after nearly two years abroad, accompanied another uncle of Xiawang, called Mandilihalu (蔓的里哈盧), and a retinue of altogether 180 persons, to the court on 13 October 1410.<sup>99</sup> For the tribute this mission submitted, they were given clothing, paper money and silk, each according to their status.<sup>100</sup> On 11 December 1410, Mandilihalu was given a banquet together with envoys from other countries in Southeast Asia namely from Pangasinan and Luzon.<sup>101</sup>

The next Chinese mission to Boni left the capital on 24 February 1411, and was again headed by Zhang Qian, who was familiar with the route and the conditions in Boni. They brought the new king Xiawang who by now was eight or nine years old, and his officials and chieftains various kinds of silks.<sup>102</sup> This mission probably prepared the personal appearance of Xiawang in China in autumn of 1412, when he arrived with his wife, mother and officials on 14 October 1412 in Fujian. Upon their arrival, the two officials Gao Qian (高謙) and Liu Chang (柳昌) were given orders to banquet and look after them on their voyage to the capital.<sup>103</sup>

We do not know how the king was transported, but it took him two weeks to reach Beijing where he arrived on 30 October 1412. After an exchange of customary gifts, Xiawang and his retinue were invited to a banquet in the Interpreter's Institute and the Court of Imperial Entertainments. Furthermore, they were provided with enough food and alcohol to last them from morning to evening.<sup>104</sup> The next day, a banquet was given for Xiawang at the Fengtian Gate, while his mother was entertained with a banquet at the former Three Dukes Office (*qian sangong* [*fu*前三公府]).<sup>105</sup> The celebrations continued on 2 November 1412, with a banquet for the king and another banquet for his mother.<sup>106</sup> Xiawang and his mother received more presents (12 December 1412)<sup>107</sup> and were given a banquet again (23 December 1412),<sup>108</sup> After the bestowal of generous gift, they left the court on 15 March 1413.<sup>109</sup>

Two years later the next mission from Boni led by Sheng Alie Weinuoyeshaban (生阿烈微喏耶沙扮),<sup>110</sup> arrived on 15 March 1415. It consisted of altogether twenty nine people who submitted tribute from Xiawang. In return, they were given paper money and silks.<sup>111</sup> Not much else is known about this mission. The next envoy to arrive on 6 December 1417, was a grand-uncle of Xiawang by the name of Mamu (麻木).<sup>112</sup> It took some while for a banquet to be organised and this was attended by Ali Shili (阿力迭里), the envoy of the Loyal and Righteous King (*zhongyi wang* [中義王]) of Hami,<sup>113</sup> and Bao Maweng (保馬翁), the envoy of king Zhanba Dilai (占巴的賴) of Champa.<sup>114</sup>

Mamu and Bao Maweng left the court together on 14 April 1418. A rather large Boni delegation, consisting of altogether ninety two members, arrived on 10 June 1421. It was led by Xumayi (須麻億), the grand uncle (*shuzu* [叔祖]) of the king of Boni.<sup>115</sup> Between this and the next arrival of Boni envoys at the court in Beijing (11 January 1426) more than four years passed. No reason for this rather long break in the otherwise regular visits is given in the *Ming shilu*. Shanawannuoye (沙那萬喏耶), another uncle of Xiawang, was the chef de mission. The emperor felt that because he had come from a very far place and had taken great risks to travel, he should be treated especially well and generous.<sup>116</sup>

On 28 February 1426, warm clothes, among them socks and boots were given to Shanawannuoye, the chieftain Sheng Alie (生阿烈) and the other eighty six members of the delegation. Special presents consisting of copper cash, headwear and belts were received by Shanawannuoye, Sheng Alie and fifteen more members of the Boni mission. They stayed until 13 April 1426. The emperor recalling the good relations with Manarejiananai and Xiawang, as well as the regular appearance of Boni envoys to submit tribute, ordered the Ministry of Rites to give them twice the amount of presents on their departure.<sup>117</sup>

This is the last recorded visit of a Boni envoy at the imperial court in Beijing. One later entry is rather informative because it gives information about the maintenance of the sacrifices of the tomb of Manarejiananai. Ouyang Duo (歐陽鐸), the Chief Minister of the Nanjing Court of Imperial Entertainments, had the following to say:

At the Fengxian Hall (奉先殿) in Nanjing, every year one lamb is used in sacrifice while for the suburban altar sacrifices four sheep are used. Sheep thus indeed have to be raised in advance. As to the sheep to be sacrificed at the tomb of the king of the country of Boni, there should be a proportional allotment for that purpose. However, there are now over 100 ewes and rams and the fodder grain expenses are incalculable. It is requested that the surplus sheep all be sold, with funds obtained returning to the government. Agreements with those who shear and take the wool should be terminated.<sup>118</sup>

This shows that the sacrifices had been going on regularly, but that since the maintenance of a large herd of sheep was costly, a pragmatic solution was sought and found.

The *Ming shilu* presents a detailed record of regular relations between Boni and China during the reign of the Yongle emperor, who had had a profound interest in Southeast Asia. After his death, the interest in this region waned because the focus the Yongle emperor's successors turned from overseas to inland.

Interestingly, all diplomatic relations in 1412, 1413, 1415, 1417, 1421 and 1426 were handled by members of the royal family of Boni, and in most cases these were uncles or grand-uncles of king Xiawang, with the possible exception of Sheng Alie Weinuoyeshaban whose familial relation with the king is uncertain. Note also that while the tribute products in the later entries are never more specifically addressed as "local products," the Chinese took great care to specify the valuable presents they gave in return.

Thus the Boni tribute seems not to have played such a big role, but it was the Chinese court that wanted to impress the envoys and convince them of the wealth and power the Chinese empire possessed.

The location of Boni cannot be verified by the entries in the *Ming shilu*. The *Ming shilu* do not indicate whether Boni belonged to mainland or maritime Southeast Asia. Carrie Brown has previously discussed the possibility of the two Boni kings being Muslims based on evidence culled from the *Ming huidian* (明會典) which is rather circumstantial.<sup>119</sup> The texts dealing with the king of Boni and his visit to Nanjing do not say anything about his religious affiliation. Yet, Manarejiananai and his son have been "identified" by Jamil Al-Sufri as Muslim rulers of Brunei and addressed as Sultan Abdul Majid Hassan and Sultan Ahmad.<sup>120</sup> Chinese scholars have similarly worked under the impression that the two kings were Muslim.<sup>121</sup> However, I would consider this a retrospective affiliation of the kings in order to present the modern sultanate of Brunei as the oldest surviving Muslim country in the region. Until further evidence is found, the question of the religion of the Boni rulers must remain unanswered.

### ***Xiyang chaogongdian lu, 1520***

In 1520, Huang Shengzeng (黃省曾) (*jinshi* of 1531) who hailed from Wuxian (modern day Suzhou in Jiangsu) finished his work on the countries submitting tribute to the court. Entitled *Xiyang chaogongdian lu* (西洋朝貢典錄) (Record of the Customs of the Tributaries in the Western Ocean),<sup>122</sup> it drew on earlier works such as the *Xingcha shenglan* (星槎勝覽) (1436) by Fei Xin (費信) and the *Yingyai shenglan* (鷹涯勝覽) (1451) by Ma Huan (馬歡). The *Xiyang chaogongdian lu*, especially in the sections on local products sent to the court, supplemented the earlier works in more detail.<sup>123</sup>

The opening paragraph of the text is based on the *Daoyi zhilüe* description of the country. The text then describes the diplomatic relations between Boni and China from 1370 to 1425. Huang mentions only two missions from Boni, namely in 1414 and 1425. The tribute products he lists, clearly are of Southeast Asian provenance, but it is rather impossible to identify the provenance of the black page boys who are recorded as tribute "items." Huang does not miss the irony of Mamosha treating the first envoys arrogantly, while Manarejiananai who himself arrived as a guest, received an official state burial in China. He does not mention any contacts between Boni and China prior to the Ming dynasty, and is not referring to information found in works of Song times. Therefore it is difficult to

identify the Boni in Huang Shengzeng's text with the country of the same name in the early Song.

Similarly, Huang does not explain whether the country was located in mainland or insular Southeast Asia. Huang refers to "island barbarians," but that is about all the geographical information the text provides. Buddhism as the local religion is a detail that Huang most likely copied from the *Daoyi zhilüe*, and therefore the statement does not necessarily reflect the actual religion practiced in Boni in the early fifteenth century.

### *Zhifang waiji* (職方外紀)

The *Zhifang waiji* by Giulio Aleni (1582–1649), a Jesuit who worked in China in the first half of the seventeenth century, clearly specifies Boni (渤泥) as the island of Borneo and not as a specific country.

The island of Boni is south of the equator (*chidao* [赤道]). It produces camphor which is very excellent. When it is ignited and thrown into the water, the fire is not extinguished, until it is completely burnt. There is a beast that resembles a goat and a deer which is called Bazaer (把雜爾), in whose stomach grows a stone that can cure a hundred illnesses. Western guests (*xike* [西客]) value it very highly, and they pay up to a hundred times (of its basic prize). The king of the country relies on it to make profits.<sup>124</sup>

Based probably more on Western than Chinese knowledge, Aleni correctly addresses Boni as an island. For him, this island lies south of the equator which, if Boni is Borneo, is not completely correct. The phantastic animal he describes may reflect either Western or Chinese lore about the place. The interesting detail about the stone is that it was prized more highly than the camphor, even though that is credited to have been of superior quality. The legendary stone called Bezoar was known in Europe as an antidote to poisoning. Equally amazing is the total absence of any information on earlier relations between Boni and China. However, it may be asking too much of a work that was definitely written to provide geographical information only.

## BONIIN TEXTS FROM THE QING DYNASTY

### *Bahong yishi* (八紘譯史), 1683

The *Bahong yishi* (八紘譯史) (Explanatory History of the Remote Regions) is a work by Lu Ciyun (陸次雲) and its preface is dated 1683. The *Bahong yishi* sums up knowledge taken from the *Taiping huanyuji* and other works.<sup>125</sup> This is apparent in the description of local products. The *bazalun* certainly is the *bazaer* (bezoar) of the *Zhifang waiji*; the houses covered with palm leaves is an information derived from the *Taiping huanyuji*; and the medicinal tree comes from the *Zhufan zhi*. The work stands in a tradition of arranging knowledge by the cut and paste method, and is thus not strictly original; however, the statement by Nicholl, that the Chinese since the early Ming referred to Boni as Wenlai (文萊/汶來) has to be qualified. The *Bahong yishi* from the early Qing dynasty did not relate Boni to Wenlai. There is one case of a tomb inscription for the non-Chinese wife of a Chinese man found in Malacca and dated 1674 that refers to her as 'née Wenlai' (Wenlai shi [汶來氏]).<sup>126</sup> This is so far the only instance in which Wenlai was used as a colloquial appellation to refer to Brunei.

### *Mingshi* (明史), 1739

The *Mingshi* was submitted to the throne in 1739 during the reign of the Qianlong Emperor of the Qing Dynasty (1736–1795). The entry on Boni is based on various sources, not least the *Ming shilu* entries, as well as Song Lian's text, and Hu Guang's stele inscription. The entry on Boni is by far the longest of all texts dealing with the country; however, it does not include all details found in the *Ming shilu*, nor does it follow Song Lian's and Hu Guang's texts verbatim.<sup>127</sup>

Groeneveldt had already noted that the end of the text—the part that deals with Dani—relates information about Patani and not about Boni. I would also include the preceding paragraphs on the civil war, the queen and Zhang (張), the Chinese *nadu* (那督) from Zhangzhou (漳州) (Fujian) because these persons and events cannot be verified in the *Ming shilu*; they are not listed in any other source dealing with Boni either. I assume therefore that the memorial of Wang Xiwen (王希文) of 1530 concerning the interruption of tribute payments caused by Portuguese activities and

recorded in the *Ming shilu*, is the last information directly referring to Boni. The paragraphs following it, may or may not deal with Boni, or they might actually deal with Dani as well. This latter assumption is supported by the fact that in the *Dongxiyang kao* (東西洋考) (1618) by Zhang Xie (張燮) (1574–1640), Boni is identified as the ancient name for Dani. It then goes on to quote older references to Boni, such as the *Taiping huanyuji*, and mentions the diplomatic missions in 1082 and during the Hongwu period.

The remainder of the text describes the Nadu, named Zhang (Hokkien pronunciation Teo), his suicide as well as the queen.<sup>128</sup> It is worthwhile to note, that the text does not deviate much from the earlier texts. It highlights the visit of the king of Boni in 1408, but does not deal too much with Mahemosha in 1371, or the diplomatic relations with the place after the death of Manarejiananai. The only time that Boni is mentioned again, is in Wang Xiwen's memorial on trade practices. However, this memorial certainly dealt with private trade and less with official trade relations, hence no more specific information is provided in the text.

## CONCLUSION

This essay attempted to critically examine Robert Nicholl's claims for a continuous history of Brunei, based on his reading of translations from Chinese texts. I cannot evaluate Nicholl's use of Arabic sources, but I would like to conclude with some remarks on the Chinese texts.

All the texts under scrutiny here, dating from the late tenth to the early eighteenth century—ranging from privately written works to officially compiled dynastic histories—share a common characteristic in their description of Boni. This characteristic consists of the general ignorance of all the authors as to where to locate Boni exactly. None of the Ming authors establish any direct relationship between Mahemosha and Manarejiananai, but merely claim that they were ruling in the same place which is located somewhere in the southern seas. Chinese knowledge of the place since the first description of Boni in the tenth century obviously had not increased, but had rather stagnated. Taking this as proof for the relative unimportance of the place within the network of official Chinese overseas relations is just one option; another option is to understand Boni as a place or region that completely fell outside the interest of the relevant circles in China. Even though Boni provided some luxury items, they were not rare and exotic enough to create long term interest in the Chinese. After all, they could obtain these items also through other trade routes. Hence, the reference to the information of Song times in Lu Ciyun's description, and

the supplementing of the text on Boni in the *Mingshi* with information that referred to Patani.

---

\* Johannes L. Kurz (PhD in Classical Chinese Studies, University of Heidelberg, 1993), after graduating worked as an assistant professor in the Institute of Oriental Studies at the University of Kiel, Germany. In 1998 he joined the history department at Universiti Brunei Darussalam. He specialises in the history of China from the tenth to the eleventh centuries. He has published two books, the latest being *China's Southern Tang Dynasty 937–976* (Routledge, 2011) and a number of articles on this topic. In addition, he is interested in the relations between China and Southeast Asia and their descriptions in Chinese sources. A recent article on one of many aspects of this field has been published as "Pre-modern Chinese Sources in the National History of Brunei: The Case of Poli," in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 169 (2013): 213–243. Another area of interest is the depiction of the South China in pre-modern Chinese sources and their interpretation by historians in China as well as in the West.

<sup>1</sup> For a general discussion of the problematic use of Chinese sources for the identification of places in Southeast Asia see Tjan Tjoe Som, "Chinese Historical Sources and Historiography," in *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography*, ed. Soedjatmoko et al., 194–205 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965).

<sup>2</sup> Yue Shi (樂史), *Taiping huanyuji* (太平環宇記) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007), 176.3364.

<sup>3</sup> A very insightful treatment of Poli and its presumed locations is found in Ptak, R., "Possible Chinese References to the Barus Area (Tang to Ming)," in *Histoire de Barus, Sumatra: Le site de Lobu Tua, vol. I: Études et documents*, ed. Guillot, C. (Paris: Association Archipel, 1998), 12–125. On the basis of Ptak's research I would place Poli in Sumatra rather than in Borneo. On the matter of Poli and history-writing in Brunei, see Kurz, J. L., "Pre-modern Chinese Sources in the National History of Brunei: The Case of Poli," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (forthcoming).

<sup>4</sup> Pelliot, P., "Deux itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du huitième siècle," *Bulletin de l'École française d'extrême-orient* 4 (1904): 287, note 2; Pelliot, P., "Le Hoja et le Sayyid Husain de l'histoire de Ming," *T'oung Pao* 38 (1948): 267; Wolters, O. W., *Early Indonesian Commerce: A Study of the Origins of Srivijaya* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967), 175–176.

<sup>5</sup> Groeneveldt, W. P., *Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca Compiled from Chinese Sources* (Jakarta: C.V. Bhratara, 1960), 108–110. This piece was originally published as a paper in *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 39 (1880).

<sup>6</sup> I suspect that Wolters just followed Groeneveldt as well, since he had been established as the authority on the matter by Pelliot.

<sup>7</sup> Bielenstein, H., *Diplomacy and Trade in the Chinese World, 589–1276* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 13–14 and 66–67. Bielenstein agreed with Hirth and Rockhill placing Boni in Borneo based on the *Wenxian tongkao* and *Songshi* accounts, but cautions that G. E. Gerini thought Boni referred to Sumatra. I have not had access to Gerini's

- 
- Researches into Ptolemy's Geography of Eastern Asia* (Further India and Indo-Malay Archipelago [1909]).
- <sup>8</sup> Ptak, R., "From Quanzhou to the Sulu Zone and Beyond: Questions Related to the Early Fourteenth Century," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 29, no. 2 (1998): 269–294.
- <sup>9</sup> On Yue Shi, his *Taiping huanyuji*, and other writings see Hervouet, Y. (ed.), *A Sung Bibliography (Bibliographie des Song)* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1978), 128, and Kurz, J. L., *Das Kompilationsprojekt Song Taizongs (reg. 976–997)* (Bern: Lang, 2003), 152–154.
- <sup>10</sup> *Taiping huanyuji*, 179.3436–3437. See "Translations," 1–4.
- <sup>11</sup> For an impression of the horrors the uncivilised south of China, where people were frequently exiled, held for educated people, see Hargett, J. M., "Clearing the Apertures and Getting in Tune: The Hainan Exile of Su Shi (1037–1101)," *Journal of Sung-Yuan Studies* 30 (2000): 141–167.
- <sup>12</sup> Nicholl, R., "Sources for the Early History of Brunei," unpublished MS, 54, 8.
- <sup>13</sup> For a recent treatment of the history of Champa, see Vickery, M., "Champa Revised," ARI Working Paper, No. 37, March 2005, [www.ari.nus.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm](http://www.ari.nus.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm). Zhancheng is the only Southeast Asian country that is dealt with in the *Wudai huiyao* (五代會要) (961) by Wang Pu (王溥) (922–982). See *Wudai huiyao* (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 1978), 30.479–480.
- <sup>14</sup> *Taiping huanyuji*, 179.3435.
- <sup>15</sup> Pelliot, P., "Deux itinéraires," 287, note 2.
- <sup>16</sup> Fan Chuo, *Manshu jiaozhu* (蠻書校注), rev. annot. by Xiang Da (向達) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), 6.164.
- <sup>17</sup> On *kunlun* as an ethnic category see Wilensky, J., "The Magical *Kunlun* and 'Devil Slaves': Chinese Perceptions of Dark-skinned People and Africa before 1500," *Sino-Platonic Papers* 122 (2002); On *kunlun* as a term for Malays see Wyatt, D. J., *The Blacks of Pre-modern China* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 110–111.
- <sup>18</sup> *Chau Ju-kua: On the Chinese and Arab Trade in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, Entitled Chu-fan-chi* (Amsterdam: Oriental Press, 1966), ed. trans. annot. Hirth, F. and Rockhill, W. W., 157. This work was first published in St. Petersburg in 1911.
- <sup>19</sup> Al-Sufri, J., *Tarsilah Brunei: The Early History of Brunei Up to 1432 AD* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei History Centre, 2000), 9.
- <sup>20</sup> Dasheng, C., "A Brunei Sultan in the Early 14th Century: Study of an Arabic Tombstone," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 23, no. 1 (1992): 11.
- <sup>21</sup> Jamil Al-Sufri addresses him as a "Chinese trader." See *Tarsilah Brunei*, 9. Note that Chen refers to Puluxie as a "Chinese merchant" as well, and renders his name as Abu Ali. See Chen, "Brunei Sultan," 11.
- <sup>22</sup> For more information on the work and its transmission see *A Sung Bibliography*, 161. A translation of this text is found in *Chau Ju-kua*, 155–159. See also "Translations," 4–9.
- <sup>23</sup> All Chinese titles are translated according to Hucker, C. O., *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985).

- <sup>24</sup> A complete translation of this text is provided by Netolitzky, A., *Das Ling-wai tai-ta von Chou Ch'ü-fei: Eine Landeskunde Südchinas aus dem 12. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1977).
- <sup>25</sup> See *A Sung Bibliography*, 161, and Wilkinson, E., *Chinese History: A Manual* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2000), 746. Nicholl says the work comes "from the pen" of Zhao Rugua which is illustrative of his understanding of Chinese culture where the brush was the common writing utensil for scholars. See Nicholl, R., "Brunei Rediscovered: A Survey of Early Times," *Brunei Museum Journal* 4, no. 4 (1980): 226.
- <sup>26</sup> For a study of the China-Southeast Asia trade in the Song and Yuan periods see Heng, D., *Sino-Malay Trade and Diplomacy from the Tenth through the Fourteenth Century* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2009).
- <sup>27</sup> Zhao Rugua, *Zhufanzhi jiaoshi* (諸蕃志校釋), revised and annotated by Yang Bowen (楊博文) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2000), 135–137.
- <sup>28</sup> Nicholl, R., "Brunei and Camphor," *Brunei Museum Journal* 4, no. 3 (1979): 53; "Brunei Rediscovered," *Brunei Museum Journal* 4, no. 4 (1980): 225–226. In his "Notes on Some Controversial Issues in Brunei History," *Archipel* 19 (1980): 25, Nicholl claims that the *Taiping huanyuji* as well as the *Daoyi zhilüe* (島夷誌略) also refer to Foni. In the old edition of the *Taiping huanyuji* and the modern edition of the *Zhufanzhi* that I had access to, Foni is not found.
- <sup>29</sup> Nicholl, "Brunei Rediscovered," 226. He repeats this assumption addressing the religion practiced as "a form of Taoism" in his "An Age of Vicissitude Brunei 1225–1425," *Brunei Museum Journal* 7, no. 1 (1989): 7.
- <sup>30</sup> Schipper, K., *The Taoist Body* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 204.
- <sup>31</sup> Schipper, *Taoist Body*, 21.
- <sup>32</sup> For the status of pearls in Tang China see Schafer, E. H., *The Golden Peaches of Samarkand: A Study of T'ang Exotics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 242–245.
- <sup>33</sup> Nicholl, "An Age of Vicissitude," 8.
- <sup>34</sup> See *Song huiyao jigao* (宋會要輯稿), comp. Xu Song (徐松) (1781–1848) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997), 199, "fanyi" (蕃夷) 6, 7.8a (7843), and "fanyi" 6, 7.37a (7858).
- <sup>35</sup> *Taizong huangdi shilu* (太宗皇帝實錄), comp. Qian Ruoshui (錢若水) (960–1003) et al. (Sibu congkan guangbian). For more information on this work, see *Sung Bibliography*, 84–85, and Kurz, J. L., "The Consolidation of Official Historiography during the Early Northern Song Dynasty," *Journal of Asian History* 46, no. 1 (2012): 24–25.
- <sup>36</sup> The first entry records a mission of the country that "for more than nine hundred years had not had contact with China" for the twenty-eighth day of the eighth month of the fourth year of the Yuanfeng era (3 October 1081). See *Song huiyao* 197, "fanyi" (蕃夷), 4.102a (7764). The second entry merely repeats the date of the Foni mission. See *Song huiyao* 197, "fanyi" (蕃夷), 7.37a (7858). The *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian* also records the Foni mission at the appropriate date, and the commentary adds that the Foni envoys returned to their home country the following year. See Li Tao (李濤) (1115–1184), *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian* (續資治通鑑長編) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004), 305.7635.
- <sup>37</sup> See *Song huiyao jigao* 199, "fanyi" (蕃夷) 7.20b (7849).
- <sup>38</sup> *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian*, 18.412.

- <sup>39</sup> This commentary has been skipped in the Zhonghua shuju-edition of the text. It is found in the Shijie shuju-edition. See *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian* (Taipei: Shijie shuju, 1983), 18.18a (221).
- <sup>40</sup> The fragments of the *Song Taizong shilu* (宋太宗實錄) extant today, do not include the second year of the Taiping xingguo era.
- <sup>41</sup> *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian*, 323.7791.
- <sup>42</sup> Wade, G., "An Early Age of Commerce in Southeast Asia, 900–1300 CE," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 40, no. 2 (2009): 227 and 234.
- <sup>43</sup> Wang, Y., *Yuhai* (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 1992), vol. 5, 154.34b–35a (62). See "Translations," 9–10.
- <sup>44</sup> For more detailed information see *A Sung Bibliography*, 174–175; *Zhongguo lishi dacidian: shixueshi juan* (中國歷史大辭典:史學史卷), ed. Zhongguo lishi dacidian: shixueshi juan bianzuan weiyuanhui (中國歷史大辭典:史學史卷編纂委員會) (Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe, 1983), 81. Note that the date 1224 given for the work in Wilkinson, *Chinese History*, 526, is incorrect.
- <sup>45</sup> Ma, D., *Wenxian tongkao* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986), 332.2610–2611. See "Translations," 10–13.
- <sup>46</sup> Al-Sufri, J., *Tarsilah*, 14. He gives a truncated Chinese reference for this information, namely "Zhuang Wei Ji, *Lian Tian Shi Yan jiu*, no. 2, 1990," *Tarsilah*, 14, footnote 1, and in its bibliography, 121. Throughout his *Tarsilah* bibliographical references are rather poor and are not up to accepted academic standards. The same holds for the transcriptions he uses, e.g., he repeatedly and incorrectly refers to Pu Zongmin as Pu Zhong Min.
- <sup>47</sup> Barend ter Haar previously remarked on the dubious origin of the book and suggested that though it may not be a modern fake, it could have been fabricated in the late Qing or the early Republican period. See ter Haar, B., *Ritual and Mythology of the Chinese Triads: Creating an Identity* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 406–407, note 74.
- <sup>48</sup> Pengiran Karim bin Pg Haji Osman, "Further Notes on a Chinese Tombstone Inscription of A.D. 1264," *Brunei Museum Journal* 8 (1993): 4–5. The first scholars to deal with the tombstone, that nowadays is found in a cemetery in the capital, were Franke, W. and T'ieh-fan, C., who published their findings in "A Chinese Tomb Inscription of A.D. 1264, Discovered Recently in Brunei: A Preliminary Report," *Brunei Museum Journal* 3, no. 1 (1973): 91–99.
- <sup>49</sup> The following information is based on an online document [http://www.qzwb.com/gb/content/2006-02/20/content\\_1981955.htm](http://www.qzwb.com/gb/content/2006-02/20/content_1981955.htm) (accessed 1 March 2006). James Chin has used the text that he refers to as "extracted in *Anhai zhi* (History of Anhui). Anhui: The Anhui Local History Editorial Office, internal edition, 1983." With the *Xishan zazhi* he was able to 'prove' early Hokkien settlement in Borneo. See Chin, J., "Junk Trade, Business Networks, and Sojourning Communities: Hokkien Merchants in Early Maritime Asia," *Journal of Chinese Overseas* 6 (2010): 159.
- <sup>50</sup> Two articles deal with the *Xishan zazhi* and the identification of the provenance of the name on the Chinese tombstone. I have not had access to these works which were both published in the same issue of the *Haijiaoshi yanjiu*. See Lin Shaochuan (林少川), "Boni 'you song Quanzhou panyuan Pu gong zhi mu' xinkao (勃泥 有宋泉州判院蒲公之墓新考)," *Haijiaoshi yanjiu* (海交史研究) 20 (1991): 57–64; Gong

Yanming (龔延明), "Wenlai guo Song mu 'panyuan Pu gong' suojie – jianping *Xishan zazhi* (shouchaoben) de shiliao jiazhi (文萊國宋幕判院蒲公所解–監評西山雜誌(手抄本)的史料價值)," *Haijiaoshi yanjiu* 20 (1991): 65–69.

- <sup>51</sup> Another online document not only discusses the use of the *Xishan zazhi* as a historical source, but also raises issues concerning its historical value, which according to the text was questioned by some scholars. Lin Shaochuan in that part of the text concedes that there are some ambiguities; but these do not affect Pu Zongmin and his alleged official journey to Boni. See Hou Donghua (候冬華) (ed.), "Yinzang lishi mima de Qingdai qishu (zutu) 隱藏歷史密碼的清代奇書 (組圖)," <http://www.chinaqw.com.cn/news/2006/0629/68/34380> (accessed 2 September 2006). The entry quoted from the *Xishan zazhi* under the heading of "Pu's Gravestone" (Pu cuo [蒲厝]) on Pu Zongmin reads: During the Shaoxing era (1228–1233) of the Song there was the *jinshi* Pu Zongmin, whose post was Controller-general of Wenling; later on, he rose to the Censorate. In the *bingshen* year of the Duanping era (1236) he was sent as an envoy to Annan (modern day Vietnam), in the second year of the Jiayi era (1238) he was sent to Zhancheng (a place name in modern day Vietnam), and in the seventh year of the Chunyou era (1247) he was again sent as an envoy to Boni (this is modern day Brunei). Afterwards he died in office."
- <sup>52</sup> John Chaffee has dealt with Chinese Muslims with the surname Pu in a paper he delivered at the AAS Annual Meeting in 2005. I would like to thank Prof. Chaffee for granting me access to the paper entitled "Diasporic Identities in the Maritime Muslim Communities of Song-Yuan China." The paper has consequently been published in *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 49, no. 4 (2006): 395–420.
- <sup>53</sup> Wade, "Early Age of Commerce," 234, and Chen, "Brunei Sultan," 1.
- <sup>54</sup> Tutuo (脫脫) et al. (comps), *Songshi* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1977), 489.14094–14095. See "Translations," 13–17.
- <sup>55</sup> Groeneveldt, W. P., *Notes*, 110. For reasons unknown, Jamil Al-Sufri addresses this ruler as Sa-li Mah-lui. See Jamil Al-Sufri, *Tarsilah*, 13.
- <sup>56</sup> On the compilations see Chan Hok-lam, C., "Chinese Official Historiography at the Yüan Court: The Composition of the Liao, Chin, and Sung Histories," in *China under Mongol Rule*, ed. Langlois Jr., J. D. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 56–106.
- <sup>57</sup> See Groeneveldt, *Notes*, 108–110.
- <sup>58</sup> Nicholl, "Brunei Rediscovered," 225.
- <sup>59</sup> Nicholl, "Brunei and Camphor," 68.
- <sup>60</sup> Wang Dayuan (汪大淵), *Daoyi zhilüe jiaoshi* (島夷誌略校釋), revised and annotated by Su Jiqing (蘇繼贖) (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1981), 148. See "Translations," 17–18. Cf. the translation of the text by Rockhill, W. W., "Notes on the Relations and Trade of China with the Eastern Archipelago and the Coast of the Indian Ocean During the Fourteenth Century, part II," *T'oung Pao* 16 (1915): 264–265. Jamil Al-Sufri claims in *Tarsilah*, 13, and Appendix A (no page number), that this text described an island called Ei, referring to the *Mingshi*. That is definitely incorrect, and moreover the translation of the text in the Appendix is rather poor.
- <sup>61</sup> Nicholl, "Brunei and Camphor," 53.
- <sup>62</sup> Nicholl, "Notes on Some Controversial Issues," 28.
- <sup>63</sup> Nicholl, R., "A Note on Boni and Its Location," *Brunei Museum Journal* 5, no. 4 (1984): 4–5.

- <sup>64</sup> See *Hsing-ch'a-sheng-lan: The Overall Survey of the Star Raft*, trans. Mills, J. V. G., rev. annot. ed. Ptak, R., (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996), 94–95.
- <sup>65</sup> Nicholl, "Notes on Some Controversial Issues," 27–28.
- <sup>66</sup> There are two texts that I have not included in the following treatment of Ming sources since they are largely repeating information on Boni. The first text is the *Huang Ming siyi kao* (皇明四夷考) by Zheng Xiao (鄭曉) (1499–1566). The entry on Boni is found in *Huang Ming siyi kao* (Taipei: Huawen shuju, 1968), 2.51–52 (511–512). The second is the *Huang Ming xiangxu lu* (皇明象胥錄) by Mao Ruizheng (茅瑞徵) (*jinsi* of 1601); see *Huang Ming xiangxu lu* (Taipei: Huawen shuju, 1968), 4.27a–29a (249–253).
- <sup>67</sup> Song, L., "Song Lian quanji" (宋濂全集), in *Song xue shi wenji* (宋學十文集), *Zhiyuan houji* (芝園後集), ed. Luo, Y. (羅月霞), 5.1399–401 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang Guji Chubanshe, 1999). See "Translations," 18–25. Cf. the previous translation by Brown, C. C., "An Early Account of Brunei by Sung Lien," *Brunei Museum Journal* 2, no. 4 (1972): 219–231. Note that throughout her writings she renders Boni (Wade-Giles: Po-ni) incorrectly as P'o-ni (Hanyu pinyin: Poni).
- <sup>68</sup> Brown, "Early Account," 222.
- <sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 223.
- <sup>70</sup> Guang, H., "Boni guo gongshun wang mubei," in *Huang Ming wenheng* (皇明文衡) (Sibu Congkan), comp. Cheng, M. (程敏政), 81.629–630. See "Translations," 25–32.
- <sup>71</sup> Brown, C. C., "Two Ming Texts concerning King Ma-na-je-chia-na of P'o-ni [*sic*]," *Brunei Museum Journal* 3, no. 2 (1974): 222. The stele inscription is discussed by Ji Shijia (季士家), "Guanyu Boni guo wang mu he mubei beiwen wenti: yu Shi Yuan tongzhi shangque" (關於淳泥國王墓和墓碑碑文問題：與史原同志商榷), *Fujian luntan* 5 (1984): 73–76, 43.
- <sup>72</sup> The tomb of the king of Boni was discovered in 1958 and in the same year an excavation report entitled "Nanjing faxian gudai Boni guo wang de muzang" (南京發現古代淳泥國王的墓葬) was published in *Wenwu cankao ziliao* 8. I have not had access to this text. This article was followed by a short description of the tomb by Shen Juecheng (沈厥成). See Shen, J., "Nanjing Shizi gang Boni guo wang mu" (南京石子岡淳泥國王), *Lishi jiaoxue* 10 (1965): 62. Nicholl introduced the tomb to a Bruneian audience in 1984. See Nicholl, R. "The Tomb of Maharaja Karna of Brunei at Nanking," *Brunei Museum Journal* 5, no. 4 (1984): 35–38. A more recent article attempts to provide a comparative study of early Ming tombs of foreign dignitaries. See Tang Yunjun (唐雲俊) and Han Pingzheng (韓品崢), "Boni guo wang di kao xi" (淳泥國王地考析), *Dongnan wenhua* 2 (2009): 63–67. The tomb is at the centre of an article dealing with contemporary tourism in the inaugural issue of *Lüyouxue yanjiu* (旅遊學研究). See Xing Dingkan (邢定康), Lu Naigao (陸乃高) and Li Zhilei (李致磊), "Wenhua yichan lüyou kaifa moshi yanjiu: yi Boni guo wang mu weilie" (文化遺產旅遊開發模式研究：以淳泥國王墓為列), *Lüyouxue yanjiu* 1 (2007): 198–202.
- <sup>73</sup> According to Geoff Wade, it is quite likely that Manarejjananai is a transcription of the title Maharajadhiraj which, at that time, was used by Thai rulers. Personal communication.
- <sup>74</sup> See "Translations," 32–37.

- <sup>75</sup> Brown in referring to the *Ming Taizu shilu* (明太祖實錄), renders the date as 12 December 1370. See "Early Account," 228, note 8.
- <sup>76</sup> *Ming Taizu shilu* (明太祖實錄), in *Ming shilu* (Taibei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo, 1963–1968), ed. rev. Huang, Z. (黃彰健), 55.4a (1079). For a translation of this entry see Wade, G., (trans.), *Southeast Asia in the Ming Shi-lu: An Open Access Resource* (Singapore: Asia Research Institute and the Singapore E-Press, National University of Singapore), <http://epress.nus.edu.sg/msl/entry/502> (accessed 16 April 2005). I have changed all hyphenated terms given in the Hanyu pinyin-transcription by Wade to conform to the non-hyphenated standard.
- <sup>77</sup> For the identification of *heding* with the rhinoceros hornbill see Ma, H., *Ying-yai sheng-lan: The Overall Survey of the Ocean's Shores (1433)*, tran. Mills, J. V. G. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 100, footnote 2. Groeneveldt translates the term literally as "crane-crests." See Groeneveldt, *Notes*, 111. The beak of the hornbill can be used for carvings.
- <sup>78</sup> *Ming Taizu shilu*, 67.6b (1264). See Wade (trans.), *Southeast Asia in the Ming Shi-lu*, <http://epress.nus.edu.sg/msl/entry/836> (accessed 16 April 2005). For a study of the Boni tribute items see Chen, P. (陳平平), "Mingchu Boni guo wang de chaogong lipin jiqi shengwu fenleixue yanjiu"(明初撥淳泥國王的朝貢禮品及其生物分類學研究), *Nanjing xiaozhuang xueyuan xuebao* 4 (2008): 44–50.
- <sup>79</sup> Pelliot, P., "Le Hoja," 268, note 347.
- <sup>80</sup> For Jamil Al-Sufri, Mahemosha is the legendary Awang Alak Betatar whom he addresses also as Sultan Muhammad Shah. See *Tarsilah*, 14.
- <sup>81</sup> These sacrifices are described in detail in *Mingshi*, 49.1283–1285.
- <sup>82</sup> On the inclusion of Boni in the sacrifices of Fujian see also Wade, *Southeast Asia in the Ming shi-lu*, <http://epress.nus.edu.sg/msl/entry/1422> (accessed 16 April 2005). Note that in this section the characters for Boni are slightly different from those in the description of the country.
- <sup>83</sup> The other countries were Xianluo (暹羅), Zhancheng (占城), Zhenla (真臘), Annan (安南), Java (爪哇), Xiyang (西洋), Suoli (瑣里), Sanfoqi (三佛齊), Baihua (百花), Lanbang (覽邦), Penghang (彭亨), Danba (淡巴) and Xuwendana (須文達那).
- <sup>84</sup> This was the principal guesthouse for foreign visitors in the capital of the Ming. See Hucker, *Official Titles*, 264, and *Zhongguo lishi dacidian: Mingshi* (中國歷史大辭典：明史), ed. Zhongguo lishi dacidian: Mingshi bianzuan weiyuanhui (中國歷史大辭典：明史編纂委員會) (Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe, 1995), 158.
- <sup>85</sup> *Ming Taizu shilu*, 232.5b-6a (3394–3395).
- <sup>86</sup> *Ibid*, 48.3a (733).
- <sup>87</sup> *Ibid*, 49.1a (737).
- <sup>88</sup> *Ibid*, 50.6a (755).
- <sup>89</sup> *Ibid*, 62.5a (897).
- <sup>90</sup> *Ibid*, 82.7b–8a (1106–1107).
- <sup>91</sup> *Ibid*, 82.8b (1108).
- <sup>92</sup> Wade, *Southeast Asia in the Ming Shi-lu*, <http://epress.nus.edu.sg/msl/entry/1282> (accessed 16 April 2005).
- <sup>93</sup> *Ming Taizong shilu*, 83.1a (1109).
- <sup>94</sup> *Ibid*, 83.1a (1109).
- <sup>95</sup> *Ibid*, 84.1a (1117).
- <sup>96</sup> *Ibid*, 85.1a-b (1127–1128).

- <sup>97</sup> Wade, *Southeast Asia in the Ming Shi-lu*, <http://epress.nus.edu.sg/msl/entry/1230> (accessed 16 April 2005).
- <sup>98</sup> *Ming Taizong shilu*, 86.1a–2b (1133–1336). The translation is from Wade, *Southeast Asia in the Ming Shi-lu*, <http://epress.nus.edu.sg/msl/entry/1230> (accessed 16 April 2005).
- <sup>99</sup> According to Geoff Wade, Mandilihalu in the Hokkien pronunciation represents the Malay title Bendahara. Personal communication.
- <sup>100</sup> *Ming Taizong shilu*, 108.2b (1398).
- <sup>101</sup> *Ibid*, 110.2a (1411).
- <sup>102</sup> *Ibid*, 113.1b (1438).
- <sup>103</sup> *Ibid*, 131.2a (1617).
- <sup>104</sup> *Ibid*, 132.3a (1627).
- <sup>105</sup> *Ibid*, 132.3a (1627).
- <sup>106</sup> *Ibid*, 132.3a (1627).
- <sup>107</sup> *Ibid*, 134.2b–3a (1638–1639).
- <sup>108</sup> *Ibid*, 134.3b (1640).
- <sup>109</sup> Wade, *Southeast Asia in the Ming Shi-lu*, <http://epress.nus.edu.sg/msl/entry/2031> (accessed 16 April 2005).
- <sup>110</sup> Wade suggests that "Sheng Alie" is a transcription of the Javanese title Sang Arya. Personal communication.
- <sup>111</sup> *Ming Taizong shilu*, 161.5a (1831).
- <sup>112</sup> *Ibid*, 193.2b (2038).
- <sup>113</sup> Wade has left this part out of his translation of the entry.
- <sup>114</sup> *Ibid*, 195.1b (2048).
- <sup>115</sup> *Ibid*, 237.1b–2a (2274–2275).
- <sup>116</sup> *Ibid*, 12.1a–b (319–320).
- <sup>117</sup> *Ibid*, 15.4b (398).
- <sup>118</sup> *Ming Shizong shilu*, 116.4b (2752). The translation is from Wade, *Southeast Asia in the Ming Shi-lu*, <http://epress.nus.edu.sg/msl/entry/1875> (accessed 16 April 2005).
- <sup>119</sup> Brown, C. C., "Some Ming Regulations on the Provisions for Tributary Delegations," *Brunei Museum Journal* 3, no. 2 (1974): 230–231.
- <sup>120</sup> Al-Sufri, J., *Tarsilah*, 42–45.
- <sup>121</sup> See for instance *Zhongguo yu Wenlai guanxi shiliao huibian* (中国与文莱关系史料汇编): *The Collection of Historical Documents Related to Bilateral Relations between China and Brunei Darussalam*, ed. Liu, X. (刘新生) (Beijing: Shijie zhishi chubanshe, 2006), and *Boni* (渤泥): *Brunei Dalam Sejarah China* (Boni: Brunei in Chinese history), comp. trans. Wu, Z. Y. (吴宗玉), (Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei History Centre, 2010). Both of these official compilations provide translations of texts allegedly describing an early Brunei, and do not discuss the possibility of the two kings of Boni not being Muslim.
- <sup>122</sup> See Franke, F., *An Introduction to the Sources of Ming History* (Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1968), 221; Huang Shengzeng (黄省曾), *Xiyang chaogongdian lu jiaozhu* (西洋朝貢典錄校注), rev. annot. Xie Fang (謝方) (Beijing: Zhonghua shudian, 2000), preface 5–6.
- <sup>123</sup> *Xiyang chaogongdian lu jiaozhu*, 1.44–46. See "Translations," 37–40.

- 
- <sup>124</sup> Ai Rulüe (艾儒略) (Giulio Aleni), *Zhifang waiji jiaoshi* (職方外紀校釋) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2000), rev. annot. Xie, F. (謝方), 62.
- <sup>125</sup> Lu, C., *Bahong yishi* (Congshu jicheng), 2.23–24. See "Translations," 40–41.
- <sup>126</sup> Salmon, S., "Women's Social Status as Reflected in Chinese Epigraphs from Insulinde (16th to 20th Centuries)," *Archipel* 72 (2006): 166–167.
- <sup>127</sup> *Mingshi*, comp. by Zhang Tingyu (張廷玉) et al. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), 325.8411–8415. See "Translations," 41–54.
- <sup>128</sup> I would like to thank Geoff Wade for providing me with the translation from the *Dongxiyang kao* which is included in his paper "From Chaiya to Kelantan: The Eastern Seaboard of the Peninsula as Recorded in Classical Chinese Texts," in *Études sur l'histoire du sultanat de Patani*, ed. Perret, P., Srisuchat, A. and Sombun Thanasuk, S. (Paris: École française d'extrême-orient, 2004), 45–46. The Chinese text is found in Zhang Xie, *Dongxiyang kao* (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2000), 55–59.