A Note on the Tombstone of Master Pu and the *Xishan Zazhi*

*Johannes L. Kurz**

Historical Studies, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences,
Universiti Brunei Darussalam
jolukurz@gmail.com

Abstract

The present article is a preliminary report on the debate surrounding the tombstone of Master Pu discovered in Brunei in 1972. Dated to 1264 by Franke and Ch'en (1973), the tombstone of Master Pu has been regarded as evidence of early contacts between China and Brunei, but also as proof of the existence of Muslim connections between the two countries. Pu allegedly died in Brunei while on a diplomatic mission and was consequently buried there. Of specific importance within this narrative has been a text 'discovered' in 1982 in Fujian entitled *Xishan zazhi* (Miscellaneous record(s) from the western mountain). It reports that Pu arrived in Brunei in 1247, and that the tombstone was commissioned by his sons who also served as envoys to Brunei. I shall describe the as yet unpublished text and discuss its veracity in light of the evidence available.

Keywords

Pu gong zhi mu – *Xishan zazhi* – Brunei – Quanzhou

* I would like to thank Stephen G. Haw, Barend ter Haar, Angela Schottenhammer, and Geoff Wade for generously sharing their research publications with me as well as giving their valuable comments. My thanks also go to the anonymous reviewers who pointed out a number of inaccuracies in the original article.

Introduction

In recent years there has been a re-evaluation of theories concerning artefacts of Chinese origin believed to have been manufactured in Southeast Asia, as well as a critical approach towards the study of ancient tombstones. Examples of these are Kalus and Guillot (2004), who maintain that four Islamic tombstones found in Leran, Java, are actually imports that arrived as ballast and were not local products; Salmon (2008), who traced the origins of a bronze gong heretofore believed to be the product of a local workshop in Muara Jambi to a Chinese workshop in the Song dynasty; and Lambourn (2008), who showed that a tombstone previously regarded as evidence of the rule of the first Muslim sultan of Samudra was instead a much later copy and indeed did not date to 1297.

The present article both reviews existing studies, which date the tombstone of Master Pu discovered in Brunei in 1972 to 1264, and proposes that the *Xishan zazhi* 西山雜誌, the main source to shed light on Master Pu's background, is a fabricated text. As a consequence of scholarly engagement with the tombstone since 1972, and with the text since the late 1980s, it has been established that a long-standing relationship between Brunei and China has existed since the Song dynasty. This article will examine a number of problematic issues with this historical record in both Chinese and Western studies. These issues relate to the identity of Master Pu (Pu gong 蒲公), as well as the provenance of the *Xishan zazhi*.

Master Pu's Tombstone

In 1972 P.M. Shariffudin and Abdul Latif happened across two Chinese tombstones and showed them to Wolfgang Franke and Ch'en T'ieh-fan. Franke and Ch'en dated one of them to the late nineteenth century right away, but could only date the second one from photographs and further examination in Kuala Lumpur. Franke and Ch'en published the results of their examination of the tombstone, which they dated to 1264, and also briefly described the second tombstone from 1876 (Franke and Ch'en 1973).

They believed that Li Jiazi 李家滋 from Yongchun 永春 in Fujian, whom this latter tombstone was dedicated to, was a Muslim. This suggestion is understandable in so far as Li's tombstone was found in a Muslim cemetery; therefore, it was a reasonable assumption that the owner had been a Muslim.¹

1 In an exhibition held in the newly opened Muzium Maritim Brunei (Brunei Maritime

Ch'en and Franke provided a translation of the inscription of the older of the two tombstones which reads as follows:

Tomb of Master Pu, supervisor of Quanzhou of the Song.
Erected in the jiazi [year] of the Jingding [era] by his? son Ying?jia.²

In sum, what Franke and Ch'en (1973) present us with is a translation that is unsure of the name(s) of the son(s) of Master Pu (one character at the time was already illegible); an identification of Master Pu as a Muslim from Quanzhou; as well as a strong affirmation that Master Pu was indeed buried beneath the tombstone as the inscription suggested ('tomb of Master Pu'). Franke and Ch'en believed the Rangas cemetery to be the original burial ground and proposed excavating the tomb. This suggestion was not followed up. They presented their findings in the same year, July 1973, at the 29th Congress of Orientalists, held in Paris (Ch'en and Franke 1976).

The stone only raised moderate interest during the 1970s and early 1980s, except in 1986, when Wen Guangyi 温广益 published a translation of the Franke and Ch'en article in a journal devoted to the study of the culture and history of Quanzhou.³

Chen Dasheng in 1991 referred to Master Pu's tombstone and its significance for Quanzhou–Brunei relations in his study of an early tombstone in Arabic dedicated to a ruler of Brunei.⁴

Articles published in China from the late 1980s to the 1990s emphasized early contacts between Brunei and China, and found evidence for these, either in the visits of Boni envoys to the Chinese imperial court—based on the idea of Poli 婆利 being an early designation for Boni—from the sixth to the seventh centuries, or in the tomb of a Boni chieftain buried in Nanjing in 1408 (Ji Shijia 季士家 1987; Huang Guoan 黄国安 1991). The positive identifications of the envoys in

Museum) (23 March–20 April 2015), entitled *Menyusuri Lautan: Quanzhou dan Brunei Darussalam dalam 'Laluan Sutura Maritim'/Sailing Deep into the Sea/Bihai silu: dongfang zhi zhou* 碧海丝路东方之舟, the 1876 tombstone is displayed in a photograph with a caption that informs the reader that it was first discovered in 2004.

2 有宋泉州判院蒲公之墓 You Song Quanzhou panyuan Pu gong zhi mu 景定甲子男應甲立 Jingding jiazi nan Ying?jia li.

3 I have had no access to this article.

4 He dated this tombstone of 'Maharaja Brunei' to 1301, based on a comparison with similar tombstones found in Quanzhou. The original date is illegible. See Chen Dasheng 1991, 1992, and 2000. For an earlier description of the tombstone, see Metassim and Suhaili 1987.

the sixth century and the Nanjing tomb resident as being 'Bruneians' to a large extent were provided by Western expatriate researchers working in Brunei.⁵

Master Pu and the *Xishan Zazhi*

In 1991 a number of articles were published written by scholars who were drawn to the tombstone again through the recent discovery of a text that established a connection between Master Pu and the well-known Pu clan of Quanzhou.⁶ The text was the *Xishan zazhi*, purportedly compiled by the Quanzhou scholar Cai Yongjian 蔡永兼 (1776–1835).⁷ Li Yukun 李玉昆 (1988) studied parts of the copy of the text then held by the Jinjiang district library (Jinjiang xian tushuguan 晋江县图书馆) and, by studying ten selected entries, concluded that the information found therein was erroneous.

In the same year, Fu Jialin 傅家麟 (also Fu Yiling 傅衣凌) (1988), professor of history at Xiamen University, published a preface (*xu* 序) to the text. Fu doubted that the text was written by a single person and instead suggested that the text had been compiled over a number of years by members of the Cai family of Dongshi. He also asserted the great historical value of the work for the understanding of Minnan history. Chen Guoqiang 陈国强 (1990) referred to a copy of the text dated to 1810 and to Fu Jialin's preface, while ignoring Li Yukun's study. Chen had probably worked with a manuscript copy, because he did not identify the publication date and place, or the publisher of the work.⁸ He confirmed the credibility of the *Xishan zazhi* as a historical source.

In 1991, a major conference took place in Quanzhou under the patronage of UNESCO entitled *China and the Maritime Silk Route: UNESCO Quanzhou International Seminar on China and the Maritime Routes of the Silk Roads* (Lianheguo jiaokewen zuzhi haishang sichou zhi lu zonghe kaocha Quanzhou guoji xueshu taolunhui zuzhiwei 聯合國教科文組織海上絲綢之路綜合考察泉州國際學術討論會).⁹ Among the papers published in the resulting conference volume in

5 Carrie Brown and Robert Nicholl made accessible material heretofore unknown to local scholars. Their work is critically examined in Kurz 2013, 2014a, and 2014b.

6 Liu Yingsheng 刘迎胜 1991; Sun Yifu 孙毅夫 1991; Chen Tiefan 陈铁凡 and Wolfgang Franke (Fu Wukang 傅吾康) 1991; Lin Shaochuan 林少川 1991; Gong Yanming 1991.

7 The *Menyusuri Lautan* exhibition displayed this text as 'a relatively popular folk navigation journal' (yibu jiaowei liuxing de minjian hanghai zazhi 一部较为流行的民间航海杂志).

8 Fu Jialin's preface is entitled '*Xishan zazhi xu*', and was published in *Fujian xiangtu* 2 (1988). I have had no access to this publication.

9 For a summary of the conference, see Guy 1992.

1994 was one by Franke (1991). Franke, although he remained sceptical of the *Xishan zazhi*, suggested a relationship between Master Pu and Pu Shougeng 蒲寿庚; he also claimed that Master Pu had indeed travelled to Brunei, where he died.

Pu Shougeng is said to have been a Muslim of Arab or Persian descent and a resident of Quanzhou. He was a successful merchant and for his achievements was given the superintendency of maritime trade in Quanzhou. Since he actively collaborated with the Mongols against the Song, his family was massacred and he allegedly left for the Philippines.¹⁰

At the same conference, Zhuang Weiji 莊為璣 (庄为玘), a professor from Xiamen University, Fujian, presented his findings on the famous ship that had been discovered in Quanzhou (Quanzhou wan gu chuan 泉州湾古船) in 1973. He held that a certain Pu Zongmin 蒲宗閔, a relative of Pu Shougeng, was the actual Master Pu, taking his cue from an entry in the *Xishan zazhi* (Zhuang 1991a:347–8). Access to this work had been made possible through Lin Shaochuan 林少川, who provided Zhuang with a photocopy of the entry on the Pu family that is usually referred to as ‘Pucuo’ 蒲厝. Consequently, Zhuang used this material in two articles on Master Pu in Brunei (Zhuang 1991b:2, 1991c:36).

Pg Karim bin Pengiran Haji Osman (1993) synthesized Franke and Ch'en (1973) with Zhuang Weiji (1991a) and Chen Dasheng's work.¹¹ Of specific interest here was the excerpt of the *Xishan zazhi* on Pu Zongmin from Zhuang Weiji's text, as it recognized Pu Zongmin as Master Pu. An otherwise unknown individual by the name of ‘M. Wong’ had translated the excerpt quite inaccurately,¹² probably because he or she did not have a background in classical Chinese or Chinese history. The analysis in Pg Karim's article reads like his own, when in fact it is a paraphrase of the conclusions Zhuang had published in his paper.¹³

10 The source cited most often on Pu Shougeng is Kuwabara Jitsuzo 桑原隲藏 1928 and 1935. This work was translated into Chinese and subsequently published as a monograph. See Kuwabara Jitsuzo 1954.

I would like to thank Stephen G. Haw for sharing his copy of this text as well as his writings with me. Haw disputes Pu as a Muslim. See Haw 2015:323. The discussion about Pu Shougeng's religion is ongoing. Li Yukun 李玉昆 2001 provides a useful summary of research done on Pu Shougeng in the twentieth century.

11 Karim 1993:4. He says that the *Xishan zazhi* excerpt is from the first chapter. See Karim 1993:4. However, in the available scholarship, the *Xishan zazhi* is quoted in entries on specific topics, and not in chapters.

12 See my translation of the text and my comments below.

13 The translated part not only includes the *Xishan zazhi* text, but also a summary of Zhuang's paper.

The 'Pucuo' reads as follows:

Pucuo is located to the east of Cangling, and faces Puzhong on the other side of the river. During the Shaoding era (1228–1233) of the Song dynasty there was a *jinsshi* by the name of Pu Zongmin who held the post of prefectural supervisor of the Wenling circuit. Later he was promoted to the Investigation Bureau in the Capital (that is, the post of *panyuan*). During the *bingshen* year of the Duanping era (1236) he served as envoy to Annan. In the second year of the Jiaxi era (1238) he served as envoy to Zhancheng, and in the seventh year of the Chunyou era (1247) he again served as envoy to Boni. He later died in office there. (1st paragraph)

He had three sons: the oldest was Ying 应, the next one was Jia 甲, and the third one was Lie 烈. Pu Ying went to Boni 渤泥. Pu Jia held the position of fiscal commissioner for the Western Ocean of Zhancheng. The barbarians in the neighbouring countries of Dashi, Bosi,¹⁴ and Shizi were pleased with him. (2nd paragraph)

The historical records report: The Pu family had made a name for themselves since Liu Congxiao 留从效 in the Five Dynasties period sent Pu Hua's 蒲华 son Pu Youliang 蒲有良¹⁵ to Zhancheng, where he served as fiscal commissioner in the Western Ocean and the Bosi people were pleased with him. Therefore the Pu family in Quan [-zhou] commandery were well well known since the Song and Yuan dynasties. The 'Pucuo' says: After a rebellion at the end of the Song dynasty, Pu Shougeng set sail and settled in the Philippines; some people say in the country of Moyi, some people say in the country of Pudian. (3rd paragraph)

The Renhe poetry society says: There was a Master Pu, *duyuan* of Wenling, who three times served as envoy to the barbarians in Boni shan 渤泥山. He died abroad and a burial inscription [was erected] in the alien land. For a thousand years his soul shall remain in [the shade of] the auspicious parasol tree. (4th paragraph) (Zhuang 1991a:346).

Liu Yingsheng 刘迎胜 adopted the evidence provided in the text that linked Master Pu to Quanzhou, his mission to Boni, and his sons.¹⁶ Liu had attended

14 A study of what 'Bosi' may have referred to is provided by Haw forthcoming.

15 Or 'Pu Huazi and Pu Youliang'.

16 Liu Yingsheng 1995:151–2. Interestingly, Nie Dening 聂德宁, author of yet another outline of the ancient trade relations between China and Brunei, refers to a copy of the *Xishan*

the 1991 Quanzhou conference where he had met Wolfgang Franke. It is likely that he received the text of the relevant *Xishan zazhi* entry through Zhuang Weiji's earlier article, although he does not mention this. Liu positively identifies Master Pu as Pu Zongmin ('mu zhu 'Quanzhou panyuan Pu Gong' ji Pu Zongmin' 墓主泉州判院蒲公即蒲宗閔) and concludes that he possibly died overseas. Liu suggests that the stele was perhaps erected several years after Pu's death, which may have occurred prior to 1264.

Xie Fang 谢方 (1998) was among the first to point out factual inaccuracies of the 'Pucuo'. Xie has vast experience with texts from the Ming and Qing dynasties.¹⁷ He begins his examination with the tombstone and explains that it was either commissioned by Master Pu's son Yingjia, or his sons Pu Ying and Pu Jia.¹⁸

He then asks several questions: What is the full name of Master Pu? What kind of official position is *panyuan*? Why is Pu buried in Brunei? Who are Pu Ying and Pu Jia, and what is their relationship to Pu Shougeng in Quanzhou? He remarks that Chen Tiefan, Wolfgang Franke, and Gong Yanming 龚延明 in their articles published in *Haijiaoshi yanjiu* 海交史研究 2 (1991) had expressed doubts about the veracity of the 'Pucuo', and that not only was the 'Pucuo' not compiled by Cai Yongjian, but that it had been created by an anonymous author after the fall of the Qing dynasty in 1911. Until further documentation and archaeological evidence emerges, Xie warns, it is difficult to ascertain the identity of Master Pu. He accepts that Cai Yongjian on his travels as a merchant through Southeast Asia may have heard about, or may have even seen, the tombstone in Brunei. He thus confirms Brunei as the original location of the tombstone.

Xie cites Gong Yanming, who had already affirmed that a Pu Zongmin was not recorded in Song sources, except by one official who served in Sichuan

zazhi that was given to him by an official from the Quanzhou Maritime History Museum (Quanzhou haiwai jiaotong shiguan 泉州海外交通史馆). For the Pu Zongmin story, in note 7, Nie refers to p. 347 of Zhuang 1991a. Obviously that entry did not form part of the copy held at the Quanzhou Maritime Museum. Therefore, I wonder if the reference that Nie gives in his article ('Pucuo' in the *Xishan zazhi*) may have been copied from Zhuang 1991a as well. See Nie 2008.

17 Xie has annotated the *Xiyang chaogong dianlu* 西洋朝貢典錄 (Record of the customs of the tributaries in the Western Ocean, 1520) by Huang Shengzeng 黃省曾; the *Dong Xi yang kao* 東西洋考 (On the Eastern and Western oceans, 1618) by Zhang Xie 張燮; and the *Zhifang waiji* 職方外紀 (Record of places outside the known world) by Giulio Aleni (Chinese name: Ai Rulüe 艾儒略, 1582–1649). See Xie (2000a and b).

18 Xie incorrectly dates the Franke and Ch'en 1973 article to 1993. See Xie 1998:108n1.

(see below). In the *Minshu* 閩書 by He Qiaoyuan 何喬遠 (*jinsi* 1586) of the late Ming period, a Pu Kaizong 蒲開宗 is listed as the father of Pu Shougeng, and Xie says that through copy errors Pu Kaizong may have morphed into Pu Zongmin.¹⁹ He furthermore points out that whereas Pu Zongmin is said to have been a *jinsi*, Pu Kaizong was a merchant in Guangzhou.²⁰

Further citing Gong, Xie maintains that *du chayuan* was not a bureaucratic agency of the Song, but of the Ming and Qing dynasties. In addition, he suggests that Cai Yongjian made a mistake by understanding *panyuan* as a general reference to *tongpan* and *du chayuan*. He reaffirms that Cai, after having seen the actual inscription in Brunei, may have made the wrong connection. He explains further that during Tang times Zhancheng was an independent country; hence the two Pus could not have served as fiscal commissioners (*zhuanyunshi*) of the Western Ocean. The latter term did not occur in historical records until the Yuan dynasty, the earliest reference to the Western Ocean being the *Zhenla fengtuji* 真臘風土記 by Zhou Daguan 周達觀 (fl. 1295–1297).²¹

The last point that Xie raises is the unlikelihood of Pu Shougeng travelling to the Philippines and the appellation Feidao 菲島, which only came into use in the late Qing and early Republican era to denote the Philippines. Xie concludes that the *Xishan zazhi* most likely was collated towards the end of the Qing era. For the dating of the text, he refers to the Renhe shishe mentioned in the fourth paragraph of the 'Pucuo'. The Renhe shishe was a poetry society established as the Renhe gongsuo in Taiping, Perak, Malaysia, in 1885 by a local Hokkien association.²²

There were thus scholars who, by 1998, were not completely convinced of the credibility of the text, as well as others that regarded the text as a valuable and genuine historical work. It may not have been widely circulating anyway, for some texts on China–Brunei history followed the established historical tra-

19 Xie merely refers to *juan* 153 of the *Minshu*. The relevant entry is found in He Qiaoyuan 1995, vol. 5, 152.4494.

20 For a discussion of some of the names and terms in the 'Pucuo', see the Appendix.

21 The term appears in Zhou Daguan 周達觀 2000:76. Wan Ming 万明 (2004:12–3) views the use of the term in the *Xishan zazhi* with similar caution.

22 According to Cai Hui ren 蔡惠仁 (2015), the Renhe gongsuo was founded in 1883, and its members predominantly came from Dongshi in Jinjiang. They named their society after the old name for Dongshi, Renhe hamlet (Renhe li 仁和里). To commemorate the centennial of the Jin Hoe Association—as they refer to themselves—in 1983, a booklet was published in 1985 entitled 'Renhe gongsuo chengli yibai zhounian jinian tekan' 仁和公所成立一百周年纪念特刊. Marie-Sybille de Vienne holds that the *Xishan zazhi* had been compiled in 1880, misquoting Xie Fang; see De Vienne 2015:36.

jectory of pinpointing the start of mutual relations either in the Liang dynasty of the sixth century ('Poli'/Brunei) or the early Song dynasty in the tenth century ('Boni'/Brunei), without referring to the tombstone and the 'Pucuo's' Pu Zongmin at all.²³

The Discovery of the *Xishan Zazhi*

In 2006 the *Dongnan zaobao* 东南早报 published an article about the *Xishan zazhi* in which Lin Shaochuan figures prominently.²⁴ In the article Zhu Caiyun 朱彩云, the reporter, talks with a local villager from Bogu village, Dongshi township of Jinjiang city 晋江东石壁谷,²⁵ referred to only as young Huang (*xiao* Huang 小黄). Huang says that his family possessed two handwritten copies. Since the two texts are approximately similar in contents and style, written in small characters, 'it must have taken a long time to copy'. The paper used was *faxie zhi* 复写纸, carbon copy paper, which likely refers to xylographic paper. The writing tool was a modern ball pen (*yuanzhubi* 圆珠笔) which was also used to write the date 9.8.82 at the top of the first page.

Together, the reporter and his informant read the preface by Cai Yongjian. Huang points out that Cai used local names for landmarks and consequently leads the reporter to these to see for himself and examine the veracity of Cai's information.

The reporter then asks Lin Shaochuan, head of the Quanzhou studies department (Quanzhou xue yanjiusuo 泉州学研究所) about it. Lin explains: 'The author of this handwritten notebook (*biji* 笔记) is Cai Yongjian of the Qing dynasty who hailed from Dongshi in Jinjiang.' According to Lin, the book was not published because it contains characters tabooed under the Qing dynasty as well as references to books that were outlawed by the Qing government.

23 See for instance Wang Qing 王青 1998. The then ambassador of the People's Republic of China, Liu Xinsheng 刘新生, understood the early Ming dynasty as the time of the inception of diplomatic links; see Liu Xinsheng 2000.

24 The article that originally appeared on 20 February 2006 is entitled Qingdai qishu zaixian 'haisi wenming: shouchaoben jin xian minjian' 清代奇书再现海丝文明手抄本今现民间 (Rare book from Qing dynasty reveals maritime silk road culture: Hand-written copy found among the common people). See http://www.qzwb.com/gb/content/2006-02/20/content_1981955.htm (accessed 1-3-2006 and 2-2-2015). The article is also available at <http://news.sohu.com/20060220/n241915387.shtml> (4-2-2015).

25 Jinjiang is administered by Quanzhou and is the location of Quanzhou airport. Dongshi is located on the coast.

The complete text comprised twelve volumes with altogether 1630 pages, half of which were lost during tumultuous times. A descendant of Cai named Cai Chuncao 蔡春草 preserved the surviving text until the 1950s. Lin confirms the authenticity of the text, pointing out that it cites from long-lost works. These works are then listed to show that the author had had access to them before they vanished.

In an article published four months later, Cai Yongjian is introduced as a relative of the famous Zheng Chenggong 鄭成功 (1624–1662) in the seventh generation.²⁶ According to this version, Lin Shaochuan in the late 1980s—a specific date is not given—carried out research in Dongshi and happened upon the four remaining volumes that had been in the hands of Cai Chuncao in a general store in Dongshi. Only after extensive bargaining was the shopkeeper willing to lend the volumes for copying, because two additional volumes had disappeared previously after having been borrowed by people who had not cared to return them. On further inquiry and by deducing that if people had copied the two missing volumes, then they were likely to still exist, Lin finally found them. He recovered volumes of the original copy by Cai Yongjian and an unspecified number of copies of the two previously missing volumes. Because of differences in the texts that Lin received—he mentions copies in the possession of Zhuang Weiji 庄为玘, Chen Sidong 陈泗东, Chen Yundun 陈允敦, and Chen Cunguang 陈存广—he struggled to compile, revise, and edit the text, but nevertheless he earmarked it for publication in the *Quanzhoushixue yanjiu xilie congshu* 泉州学研究系列丛书 (Compendium of the research series on Quanzhou studies).

When Barend ter Haar undertook research in Quanzhou in 1993, he met Lin Shaochuan, who believed in the ‘credibility of the manuscript’ because the present owner—could that have been young Huang or the anonymous shopkeeper?—did not ‘possess sufficient cultural knowledge to fake (parts of) the text’. To prove that the manuscript was correct and genuine, Lin handed Ter Haar a copy of his article on Master Pu published in *Haijiaoshi yanjiu* 海交史研究 in 1991 in addition to an article on the *Xishan zazhi* with no date and place

26 ‘Yincang lishi mima de Qingdai qishu’ 隐藏历史密码的清代奇书, *Xiamen wanbao* 厦门晚报, 6 June 2006, <http://www.chinaqw.com/news/2006/0629/68/34380.shtml> (accessed 25-2-2015). The article was published again online in July 2013; see <http://www.qzwhcy.com/html/news/201305/27/2956.shtml> (accessed 25-2-2015). Its most recent publication is as part of a longer text entitled ‘Qingdai Cai Yongjian jinshu Xishan zazhi zuozheng Quanzhou Shaolin si xingfa’ 清代蔡永蒹禁书《西山杂志》佐证泉州少林寺兴废, which appeared on 16 January 2015 on the Quanzhou xinwengang 泉州新闻网. See <http://www.qzcns.com/2015/0116/51655.html> (accessed 25-6-2016).

of publication.²⁷ He declared that the text had one single author and that the paper on which it was written was old. The article that Lin showed to Ter Haar was probably Chen Guoqiang's. Ter Haar suggested that the old paper does 'not preclude a falsification' undertaken in the late Qing dynasty or the Republican period.

How should we understand Lin's ideas about the text? If what he said in 2006 is true, then only the four surviving volumes were written by Cai Yongjian, but the other two were copies in the hands of local people like *xiao* Huang. Do all copies have the same credibility? Lin rediscovered the *Xishan zazhi* in the late 1980s, but how is it possible that the Anhai local gazetteer's (*Anhai zhi* 安海志) editorial office already had a copy of the *Xishan zazhi* in 1983?²⁸ Obviously at least parts of the text had been quoted in the gazetteer of Anhai town (Anhai zhen 安海镇) that was circulated internally (*neibu* 内部), that is, amongst cadres. Zheng Xifu 鄭喜夫 and Wei Yongchun 魏永春 (2013:7) refer to a biography of Cai Yongjian in the *Anhai zhi*. This text explains that the original *Xishan zazhi* comprised of no more than ten volumes, which were preserved in the Jinjiang district library (Jinjiang xian tushuguan 晋江县图书馆), just like Li (1988) had said.

All copies circulating in 1988 were presumably copied from this master text. Furthermore, in 1988 the Jinjiang district museum (Jinjiang xian bowuguan 晋江县博物馆) was planning to send the text to the press.²⁹

Lin referred not once to the Anhua district text nor to the one held by the Jinjiang district library, both of which possibly antedate the text he had retrieved.

Western Scholarship on Master Pu and the 'Pucuo'

Western scholarship was slow to pick up on the subject of Master Pu's tombstone and its connection to the *Xishan zazhi*. The study of early Brunei history was for a long time the preserve of local scholars and expatriates working in the country itself; in addition, so far no publication by local scholars has hit the book shelves or download sites. The works that have had the largest impact

27 Ter Haar 1998:405–6n74. I would like to thank Barend ter Haar for sending me copies of the relevant pages.

28 James K. Chin (2010:159) explains he consulted an entry from the *Xishan zazhi* in the Anhai gazetteer relevant for his study. Anhai zhen is located in Jinjiang district.

29 See the first paragraph of Li Yukun 1988 for this.

have mostly been written by foreigners, and the first book that enjoyed moderate success in terms of sales and citations was Graham Saunders's *A history of Brunei*, first published in 1994. Saunders (2002:36) merely reiterated Franke's idea of Pu's burial ('there is no doubt about the tomb of a Chinese Muslim, P'u-kung dated 1264') in Brunei. Outside of Brunei studies and prior to Saunders, Ricklefs (2008:4) in passing made a casual, but factually incorrect remark: 'Another gravestone records the death in Brunei in 1264 of a Chinese who was apparently a Muslim.' Master Pu's tombstone does not record his death in Brunei, and his religious affiliation is still open to discussion.

Kenneth R. Hall in 2007 presented a paper at a conference in Muncie, Indiana, which was consequently published as Hall (2008). Hall placed the location of the tombstone in an 'estuary', which may be the geologically correct designation, but failed to acknowledge that the cemetery is situated in the present-day capital of Brunei Darussalam, Bandar Seri Begawan. For Hall, Pu was a member of the Pu clan and he thus reconfirmed Franke and Ch'en (1973) and Karim (1993).³⁰

After acknowledging Franke and Ch'en (1973) and Franke (1991), Chaffee (2009:120) explained: 'Evidence for Sino-Muslim traders in this period is rare, but there is an intriguing Chinese stone inscription from a Muslim cemetery in Borneo for a Mr. Pu ('Abu'), supervisor from Quanzhou 泉州判院蒲公 dated 1273.'³¹ Kenneth Hall argues quite plausibly that Pu was a member of the Muslim Pu clan of Pu Shougeng.'

Chaffee continued to follow Hall (2008) by accepting Chen Dasheng's dating of the Maharaja Brunei tombstone to 1301 as correct. As I have mentioned above, 1301 was but an educated guess by Chen. On account of the as yet unconfirmed religious affiliation of Master Pu and the original provenance of the tombstone, I find Chaffee's confirmation of Hall's statements obscure. In 2008 Hall had not yet referred to the *Xishan zazhi* directly, but he did so in 2011. His translation was largely based on the one found in Karim (1993). He refers to the *Xishan zazhi* as a 'Ming era source', while misrepresenting Zhuang Wei'ji as Zhuang Qi Ji (Hall 2011:62, 72n32). He replaces the Hanyu pinyin transcription of the Pu surname in the Wong translation with Bu. He does not explain why he shifted the pronunciation of the character 蒲 from Pu to Bu, but perhaps he did so because he had introduced Master Pu as Master Bu two paragraphs prior to the presentation of the *Xishan zazhi* excerpt.³² The pronunciation

30 Hall 2008:186. Hall gives Kota Baru as the location of the cemetery, which is incorrect. The correct designation is Kota Batu.

31 The tombstone clearly refers to the date 1264, and not to 1273.

32 Hall (2011:62) notes: 'A Chinese tombstone inscription dated 1264 recovered in the Brunei

Bu was more likely to represent Abu perhaps, and is thus an indication of the Muslim background of Master Pu.

Hall did not discuss the veracity of the *Xishan zazhi* or examine its credibility, and was indifferent towards the etymological origins of the character *pu*. Ferrand (1922), albeit in an easily overlooked footnote, disputed the Arabic connotation of the character Pu.³³ Instead, he suggested that Pu was part of an honorific title in pre-modern 'Indonesia', similar to Mpu. In addition, the character may also have been used to transcribe the same or a similar title, Po, from the Cham language. That of course would fit with the names of the two gentlemen mentioned in the 977 *Taiping huanyuji* 太平寰宇記 record of Boni 渤泥, namely Puyali 蒲亞利 and Puluxie 蒲盧歇 (Yue Shi 樂史 2007:179.3436–3437).

The examples of Guy (2010) and De Vienne (2015) illustrate continuing scholarly inaccuracies in relation to Master Pu. Guy identifies Pu Zongmin as a southern Song ambassador from Quanzhou to Brunei and explains that 'his grave site bears the oldest Chinese tombstone in Island Southeast Asia'. He credits Franke and Ch'en (1973) as the source of this information (Guy 2010:163). This is not quite accurate because Franke and Ch'en (1973) never referred to Master Pu as Pu Zongmin. Clearly, Guy had not consulted Karim (1993), otherwise he would not have assumed the tombstone to be marking a 'gravesite'.³⁴

For De Vienne (2015), relations between Brunei and China began when 'the first Brunei embassy sailed on a Sino-Muslim ship from Quanzhou looking for camphor, tortoise-shells and sandalwood [...]'. She is probably referring to the entry in the *Taiping huanyuji* that appeared earlier in her essay. The text does not refer to the ship as a Sino-Muslim ship—it only says it was commanded by a foreigner (*fanren* 番人)—nor does it identify its port of origin as Quanzhou.³⁵

estuary commemorating "Master Bu", provides a vital local window on Boni's thirteenth century trade networking. [...] This inscription and China sources establish that the Bu family had come from Arabia to China by way of the "South Seas", probably from Southeast Asia.' He only made minor changes to his 2008 text.

33 Stephen G. Haw drew my attention to this important footnote.

34 Guy (2010:164) also refers to the studies by Chen Dasheng (1992 and 1995) and the study by Nicholl (1984). Employing the assertive conditional that is symptomatic of studies of early Brunei history, Guy says: 'Despite the Indic title given to him by the Chinese chronicler, the Brunei ruler *must have* (my emphasis) been a Muslim.' The 'Indic title' of the Boni chieftain originates with Groeneveldt (1877:111), who transcribed the Chinese original Manarejiana as Maradja Ka-la. See on this also Brown 1974. The transcription 'Maharaja Karna' appears to have come from Nicholl (1984). He used it first in an unpublished and typewritten manuscript, which antedates his 1984 article.

35 De Vienne (2015:32n59) identifies this foreigner as an Arab merchant.

De Vienne similarly regards Master Pu as a Muslim ('born in Quanzhou') and refers to the stele as 'the first Muslim epigraph [sic]'. Hence like Hall, Chaffee, and Guy, De Vienne concludes that Islam arrived in Brunei from Quanzhou.³⁶

Concluding Remarks

What we can state with certainty is that Master Pu died probably in or around 1264,³⁷ and that his son(s) had a stone inscribed to mark his tomb. The stele itself is made from a stone that does not naturally occur in Borneo (Karim 1993:5). It is impossible to identify the position of Master Pu or to reconstruct his first name. In addition, we cannot confirm his religious persuasion. For Geoff Wade (2010a:380), for instance, the identification of Master Pu as a Muslim is a mere assumption.

Most likely the stone arrived from China in Brunei at a date later than 1264, perhaps in Kota Batu, from whence it was removed and put up in the Rangas cemetery in the 1930s. Karim (1993:8) provides the information that the stone was purchased as part of a shipment of stones from Kota Batu for the building of a shop house in Brunei Town (since 1968 Bandar Seri Begawan). An unidentified person then bought the stone as a marker of the tomb of a family member buried in the Rangas cemetery.

Possibly the stone had been erected upon the death of Master Pu in Quanzhou. How and when it arrived from Quanzhou in northern Borneo, however, cannot be ascertained, unless of course one accepts the as yet unfounded narrative of Master Pu having actually travelled himself to Boni and that Boni is the precursor of modern Brunei. Authors like to point to artefacts such as ceramics and coins dating to the early Song dynasty as evidence of direct trade relations between Brunei and China.³⁸ The problem with this is that we do not know how and when exactly the items arrived at their present location.

The earliest evidence of a naval vessel in Brunei waters is the so-called Brunei shipwreck that was discovered in 1997 about 40km off the coast of Brunei, and whose shipment of ceramics from Thailand, Vietnam, and China

36 De Vienne 2011:27–8. The accepted version of the spread of Islam in Brunei is linked to the third sultan, Sharif Ali, who as a descendant of the Prophet Mohammad arrived directly from Taif, Arabia. By marrying the daughter of his predecessor he assumed the throne. See Schelander 1998:15 and Saunders 2002:42.

37 The *jiazi* year extended into mid-January 1265.

38 See for instance Haji Matussin bin Omar 1994:6. For a critical remark on the scarcity of archaeological evidence, see De Vienne 2015:19.

was consequently salvaged in 1998. So far the ship, of which nothing remains, has been dated to the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century on account of the porcelain it was carrying.³⁹

Interestingly, Wang Gungwu, who was consulted for a TV programme produced in 2001 entitled *The sultan's lost treasure*, which dealt with the Brunei shipwreck, explained that the ship very likely had not come from China, but from a port in Southeast Asia—he suggested Vietnam—and that the Chinese component of the shipment had reached that port from China.⁴⁰ That contradicts the widely held belief of direct trade relations between Brunei and China since the tenth century. The discovery of porcelain and ceramics dating to the tenth century, especially in Sungai Limau Manis in 2002, certainly reinforced this conception.⁴¹

None of the details concerning the Brunei tombstone provided by the *Xishan zazhi* can be substantiated, namely that Master Pu's full name was Pu Zongmin; that he died in Boni in 1247; that he was a three-time envoy from the Song dynasty; and that his son Ying buried him when he served as an envoy to Boni, then had the stone made and shipped to Boni in 1264. Cleverly, however, the text never refers straightforwardly to Pu as a Muslim. Instead, persons and places that have a more or less well-defined Muslim connection appear in the text. Wade (2010b) provides a family history of the Pu, based on sources and literature published so far. He identifies the Pu as Arabs or Persians and as residents of Champa, who later moved to Quanzhou.⁴² The first paragraph of

39 The following website provides some insights into the Brunei shipwreck from a Brunei point of view: 'What happened to the Brunei shipwreck', 10 August 2006, http://bruneiresources.blogspot.com/2006/08/what-happened-to-brunei-shipwreck_10.html (accessed 18-9-2015). On the goods carried by the as yet unidentified ship, see Karim 2015. I have had no access to Perrin 2000. For exhibitions held in France (2002) and Australia (2003) catalogues exist that were edited by Michel L'Hour and D. Richards, respectively. I have had no access to these either.

40 The transcript is found here: <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/transcripts/280isultan.html> (accessed 30-9-2015).

41 On the findings at Limau Manis and their interpretation and adaptation into the narrative of early Brunei–China relations, see Karim 2004. A short summary of the work in English, entitled 'A thousand year old Brunei town at Limau Manis', 14 December, is found here: <http://bruneiresources.blogspot.com/2006/12/thousand-year-old-brunei-town-at-limau.html> (accessed 12-10-2015).

42 I would like to thank Geoff Wade for providing me with a copy of his essay. For a Chinese contribution to the discussion, see Zhang Xiumin 张秀民 1979. Zeng Zhaoxuan 曾昭璇 1991 suggests that Pu was a resident of Guangzhou and hailed from Central Asia. Hu Xiaowei 胡晓伟 2015 explains that there were two men of the name Pu Kaizong: one

the 'Pucuo' has Pu Zongmin move from Fujian to Champa, while one of the early Pu, Pu Youliang, in the third paragraph serves in Champa. That same paragraph also establishes the relationship between the Pu in the tenth century and the famous Pu Shougeng in the thirteenth century. The affiliation of the Pu as residents of Quanzhou serves to underline their Muslim identity, as that city has a long history of Muslim communities living in or near it.⁴³

Incidentally, the year 1991, when the *Xishan zazhi* was introduced as the key to the identity of Master Pu, was the year that Brunei and the People's Republic of China began official diplomatic relations (on 30 September). Master Pu as an early envoy has been instrumental in attesting to the existence of ancient links between the two countries. Yet, in a publication dedicated to the fifteenth anniversary of official relations, Master Pu paradoxically is not mentioned because this volume was focusing on the even more interesting persona of the Boni chieftain who allegedly was a king of ancient Brunei and died and was buried in Nanjing in 1408.⁴⁴ However, Master Pu was at the center of the 2015 exhibition in Brunei that displayed prominent examples of historical cooperation. In preparation for the exhibition, the deputy director of the Quanzhou Maritime Museum went to look for the tomb (*mu* 墓); he noted that 'though it was hard to find, it is still well preserved'. 'Tomb' in this case can only refer to the tombstone, the location of which was not disclosed.⁴⁵ Huang Hao-

the father of Pu Shougeng, of Arab descent, and resident of Champa, and the other a *jinshi* from Houguan in Fujian. These two became mixed up in the sources and hence Pu Shougeng was given a Fujian background.

- 43 Apart from Chaffee 2009, on Quanzhou, Fujian, and their Muslim connection, see also Chaffee 2006 and Fan 2001 and 2003. There are of course many authors who have dealt with the topic. For a good introduction to Quanzhou as an important centre of maritime commerce, see Schottenhammer 2001. The famous Quanzhou mosque is treated in Steinhardt 2008. This building is regarded as the earliest proof of the existence of a Muslim community in Quanzhou, having been built probably between 1009 and 1010. The remains, visible today, date from 1310.
- 44 The editor of the book in his preface emphasizes 'friendly exchanges between the two countries' and that 'the earliest records date back more than 2,000 years' (Liu Xincheng 2006). The alleged long-standing relations between China and Borneo in general implicitly also serve to underline Chinese claims to the South China Sea, as in Wan Kong (2013): 'Historical relations between China and Borneo can be traced back two thousand years or more. Borneo has in fact been a significant part of China's orbit ever since the Chinese conquered [*sic*] the South China Sea.'
- 45 See Quanzhou xiayue fu Wenlai ban haisi tezhan—kan liangdi jinghuo wenhua yuanyuan 泉州下月赴文莱办海丝特展看两地经贸文化渊源 (Quanzhou to prepare special exhibition on maritime silk road in Brunei—to display origins of trade and culture of

jiang from the Quanzhou Maritime Museum declared ‘that an envoy named Pu Zongmin was sent to Brunei for diplomatic and economic missions’.⁴⁶

The exhibition that was to feature in the new Brunei Maritime Museum—built in 2006 and opened officially on 23 March 2015—was to begin on 10 February and end on 20 April. The ambassador of the People’s Republic of China remarked on Master Pu’s identity: ‘It was discovered by some Chinese scholars that during the Song Dynasty (960–1279), the local government of Quanzhou dispatched Zongmin Pu [*sic*] to Brunei for diplomatic and economic missions. Pu stayed in Brunei for 11 years and died here (he was believed to be in Brunei in 1264).’⁴⁷ How the ambassador arrived at a Brunei sojourn of eleven years for Master Pu is impossible to explain. The ‘Pucuo’ put him in Boni in 1247, and not 1253.

The ambassadorial statement shows the strong support the research in favour of Master Pu’s identity as Pu Zongmin based on the ‘Pucuo’ received, not only from representatives of the political establishment of Brunei, but of the People’s Republic of China as well.

both places), *Haixia dushi bao* 海峡都市报 (27 January 2015), http://www.fj.xinhuanet.com/why/2015-01/27/c_1114142845.htm (accessed 23-2-2015). The present ambassador of the People’s Republic of China to Brunei, Yang Jian, explained on 25 February 2015 that the exhibition would be held in the first six months of 2015. See ‘China Brunei hold joint maritime exhibition’, 25 January 2015, <http://m.bt.com.bn/news-national/2015/02/25/china-brunei-hold-joint-maritime-exhibition> (accessed 29-3-2015).

46 See ‘Maritime Museum displays 2000 years of Brunei–China history’, 24 March 2015, <http://www.bt.com.bn/news-national/2015/03/24/maritime-museum-displays-2000-years-brunei-china-history> (accessed 29-3-2015). The history of relations between the two countries obviously is extended in order to further economic relations between them. For insights into the treatment that the local ethnic Chinese population—‘second-grade citizens’, in the words of De Vienne—receives from Bruneian authorities, see De Vienne 2011, especially pp. 38–45.

47 This was simultaneously published on the same day, 24 March 2015, on a Brunei website as well as an English-language Chinese website. See Kon 2015 and ‘China’s Quanzhou “Martime [*sic*] Silk Road” Exhibition opens in Brunei’, http://www.china.org.cn/world/Off_the_Wire/2015-03/24/content_35133736.htm (accessed 14-10-2015). One month later, Sun reported that ‘“The Tomb of the King of Boni (now modern-day Brunei) can be found in China,” Wang says. The king’s cemetery from the 15th century resides in the port city of Nanjing in eastern China’s Jiangsu province. In Brunei, a counterpart discovery has been found, the tombstone of Pu Zongmin, a Song Dynasty diplomat. Having stayed for 11 years, he passed away on his third visit to the country.’ See Sun Ye, ‘Celebrating voyages of discovery’, *China Daily Asia*, 24-04-2015, http://www.chinadailyasia.com/asiaweekly/2015-04/24/content_15257386.html (accessed 26-06-2016).

As for the *Xishan zazhi*, it cannot be considered a genuine historical text. This is because of its provenance as a handwritten manuscript that only resurfaced in the early 1980s; the fact that it was only seen, studied, and published piecemeal by an exclusive group of people from southern Fujian; and because it only provides explanations for solid material that so far cannot be otherwise explained (for instance, a tombstone in Brunei, rock carvings in Hui'an and the ancient Quanzhou boat). To back up this suspicion or to discard it, we will need to await the publication of the text, which will most likely not be happening soon.

The defenders of the *Xishan zazhi* will say that it provides intimate information that would not have been picked up by official records, or even private records. The text is said to have never been printed or published because of political reasons during the Qing dynasty, and secondly, because Lin Shaochuan apparently is unable to reconcile the various copies that are circulating.

What is obvious is that the excerpts that appeared over the years are linked to material remains and issues that are related to Fujian. The *Xishan zazhi* provides answers to these, albeit in the case of Master Pu in a haphazard way. Additionally, the acceptance of the *Xishan zazhi* as a historical source for either political or academic reasons by scholars rather hampers an objective approach to the study of early Borneo–China relations.

If we could with absolute certainty place the tombstone of Master Pu in Brunei in 1264, then indeed the inscription would be the oldest Chinese epigraph in Southeast Asia. If we could further prove that Master Pu indeed was an envoy from the Song dynasty, we would have to rethink pre-modern contacts between China and Borneo. However, with the material at hand, this is impossible.

References

Primary Chinese Sources

- He Qiaoyuan 何喬遠 (1995). *Minshu* 閩書. Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe.
- Li Tao 李燾 (2004). *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian* 續資治通鑑長編. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Tuotuo 脫脫 (1977). *Songshi* 宋史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Yue Shi 樂史 (2007). *Taiping huanyuji* 太平寰宇記. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Zhou Dagan 周達觀 (2000). *Zhenla fengtuji jiaozhu* 真臘風土記校注, annotated by Xia Nai 夏鼐. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Zhu Mu 祝穆 (2003). *Fangyu shenglan* 方輿勝覽. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.

Secondary Sources

- Brown, Carrie C. (1974). 'Two Ming texts concerning King Ma-na-je-chia-na of P'oni', *Brunei Museum Journal* 3–2:222–9.
- Cai Huiren 蔡惠仁 (2015). 'Quanzhou wenshi ziliao quanwen shujuku' 泉州文史资料全文数据库. <http://mnwhstq.cn/was40/detail?record=3666&&channelid=29719> (accessed 16 February 2015).
- Chaffee, John (2006). 'Diasporic identities in the historical development of the maritime Muslim communities of Song-Yuan China', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 49–4:395–420.
- Chaffee, John (2009). 'Muslim merchants and Quanzhou in the late Yuan-early Ming: Conjectures on the ending of the medieval Muslim trade diaspora', in: Angela Schottenhammer (ed.), *The East Asian Mediterranean: Maritime crossroads of culture, commerce and human migration*, pp. 115–32. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Chen Dasheng/Chen Da-sheng (1991). 'Une pierre tombale du début du xive siècle retrouvée à Brunei', *Archipel* 42:47–54.
- Chen Dasheng/Chen Da-sheng (1992). 'A Brunei sultan in the early 14th century: Study of an Arabic gravestone', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 23–1:1–13.
- Chen Dasheng/Chen Da-sheng (1995). 'Chinese Islamic Influence on Archaeological Finds in Southeast Asia', in: Rosemary Scott and John Guy (eds), *South East Asia and China: Art, interaction and commerce. Colloquies on Art and Archaeology in Asia No. 17*. Held 6–8 June 1994, pp. 55–63. London: Percival David Foundation.
- Chen Dasheng/Chen Da-sheng (2000). 'A Brunei sultan of the early fourteenth century: A study of an Arabic gravestone', in: Vadime Eliseeff and Doudou Diene (eds), *The silk roads: Highways of culture and commerce*, pp. 144–57. New York/Oxford: Berghahn.
- Chen Guoqiang 陈国强 (1990). 'Xishan zazhi ji Taixi Moyai shike de jige wenti' 西山杂志及汰溪摩崖石刻的几个问题, in: Fujian sheng kaogu buwuguan xuehui 福建省考古博物馆学会 (ed.), *Fujian Hua'an Xianzitan Moyai shike yanjiu* 福建华安仙字潭摩崖石刻研究, pp. 91–102. Beijing: Zhongyang minzu xueyuan chubanshe.
- Ch'en T'ieh-fan and Wolfgang Franke (1976). '710 years old Chinese tombstone discovered in Brunei', in: Denis Lombard (ed.), *Chinois d'outre-mer: Actes du XXIXe Congrès international des Orientalistes, Paris, Juillet 1973*, pp. 1–2. Paris: L'Asiathèque.
- Chen Tiefan 陈铁凡 and Wolfgang Franke (Fu Wukang 傅吾康) (1991). 'Xishan zazhi jiewen zhiyi ju Wenlai guo Songmu kaoshi zhengyin zhi yijie' 西山杂志节文质疑: 据文莱国宋墓考释征引之一节, *Haijiaoshi yanjiu* 海交史研究 2:54–6.
- Chin, James K. (2010). 'Junk trade, business networks, and sojourning communities: Hokkien merchants in early maritime Asia', *Journal of Chinese Overseas* 6:157–215.
- De Vienne, Marie-Sybille (2011). 'The Chinese in Brunei: From ceramics to oil rent', *Archipel* 82:25–48.
- De Vienne, Marie-Sybille (2015). *Brunei: From the age of commerce to the 21st century*. Singapore: NUS Press.

- Fan Ke (2001). 'Maritime Muslims and Hui identity: A South Fujian case', *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 21–2:309–32.
- Fan Ke (2003). 'Ups and downs: Local Muslim history in South China', *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 23–1:63–87.
- Ferrand, Gabriel (1922). 'L'empire sumatranais de Çrivijya', *Journal asiatique*, vol. XIII (Juillet–Septembre):1–104.
- Franke, Wolfgang and Ch'en T'ieh-fan (1973). 'A Chinese tomb inscription of A.D. 1264, discovered recently in Brunei: A preliminary report', *Brunei Museum Journal* 3–1:91–9.
- Franke, Wolfgang (1991). 'China's overseas communications with Southeast Asia as reflected in Chinese epigraphic materials, 1264–1800', in: Lianheguo jiaokewen zuzhi haishang sichou zhi lu zonghe kaocha Quanzhou guoji xueshu taolunhui zuzhiwei 聯合國教科文組織海上絲綢之路綜合考察泉州國際學術討論會組織委 (eds), *Zhongguo yu haishang sichou zhi lu* 中國與海上絲綢之路, pp. 308–22. Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe.
- Fu Jialin 傅家麟/Fu Yiling 傅衣凌 (1988). 'Xishan zazhi xu' 西山杂志序, *Fujian xiangtu* 福建乡土 2.
- Gong Yanming 龚延明 (1991). 'Wenlai Songmu "panyuan Pu gong" suojie: jianping Xishan zazhi (shouzaoben) de shiliao jiezhì' 文萊國宋墓'判院蒲公'索解—兼《西山杂志》(手抄本)的史料价值, *Haijiaoshi yanjiu* 海交史研究 2:65–9.
- Gong Yanming 龚延明 (1997). *Songdai guanzhi cidian* 宋代官制辞典. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Groeneveldt, W.P. (1877). 'Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca compiled from Chinese sources', *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 39–1:i–x, 1–144.
- Guy, John (1992). 'China and the Maritime Silk Route Conference: Quanzhou, South China', *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 21–1 70–3.
- Guy, John (2010). 'Quanzhou: Cosmopolitan city of faiths', in: James C.Y. Watt (ed.), *The world of Khubilai Khan: Chinese art in the Yuan dynasty*, pp. 159–80. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Haar, Barend ter (1998). *Ritual and mythology of the Chinese triads: Creating an identity*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hall, Kenneth R. (2007). 'Coastal cities in an age of transition: Upstream-downstream networking in societal development in 15th- and 16th-century maritime Southeast Asia'. <http://www.sabrizain.org/malaya/library/coastalcities.pdf> (accessed 24 January 2015).
- Hall, Kenneth R. (2008). 'Coastal cities in an age of transition: Upstream-downstream networking and societal development in 15th- and 16th-century maritime Southeast Asia', in: Kenneth R. Hall (ed.), *Secondary cities and urban networking in the Indian Ocean realm, c. 1400–1800*, pp. 176–205. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

- Hall, Kenneth R. (2011). 'Sojourning communities, ports-of-trade, and commercial networking in Southeast Asia's eastern regions, c. 1000–1400', in: Michael Arthur Aung-Thwin and Kenneth R. Hall (eds), *New perspectives on the history and historiography of Southeast Asia: Confirming explorations*, pp. 56–74. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Haw, Stephen G. (forthcoming). 'The Chinese term Bosi 波斯'.
- Haw, Stephen G. (2015). 'The history of a loyal heart (*Xin shi*): A late Ming forgery', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 25–2:317–25.
- Hu Xiaowei 胡晓伟 (2015). 'Guanyu Quanzhou fanshang Pu Shougeng de sange wenti' 关于泉州蕃商蒲寿庚的三个问题, *Haijiaoshi yanjiu* 海交史研究 1:38–43.
- Huang Guoan 黄国安 (1991). 'Zhongguo he Wenlai de lishi guanxi' 中国和文莱的历史关系, *Dongnanya zongheng* 东南亚纵横 4:43–5.
- Hucker, Charles O. (1985). *A dictionary of official titles in imperial China*. Taipei: Southern Materials Center.
- Ji Shijia 季士家 (1987). 'Zhongguo Wenlai jiaowangshi kaolue' 中国文莱交往史考略, *Shixue yuekan* 史学月刊 2:87–9.
- Kalus, Ludvik and Claude Guillot (2004). 'Réinterprétation des plus anciennes stèles funéraires islamiques nousantariennes; 11: La stèle de Leran (Java) datée de 475/1082 et les stèles associées', *Archipel* 67:17–36.
- Karim bin Pengiran Haji Osman, Pg (1993). 'Further notes on a Chinese tombstone inscription of A.D. 1264', *Brunei Museum Journal* 8:1–10.
- Karim bin Pengiran Haji Osman, Pg (ed.) (2004). *Sungai Limau Manis: Tapak arkeologi abad ke 10–13 masihi*. Brunei: Jabatan Muzium-Muzium.
- Karim bin Pengiran Haji Osman, Pg (2015). *The Brunei shipwreck: A catalogue of some selected artefacts and Brunei's ancient trade products*. Brunei: Brunei Museum.
- Kon, James (2015). 'Maritime museum opens with historic exhibition', 24 March. <http://borneobulletin.com.bn/maritime-museum-opens-with-historic-exhibition/> (accessed 14 October 2015).
- Kurz, Johannes L. (2013). 'Pre-modern Chinese sources in the national history of Brunei: The case of Poli', *Bijsdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 169-2/3:213–43.
- Kurz, Johannes L. (2014a). 'Boni in Chinese sources from the tenth to the eighteenth century', *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* 10–1:1–32.
- Kurz, Johannes L. (2014b). 'Two early Ming texts on Borneo', *Ming Studies* 70:55–69.
- Kuwabara Jitsuzo 桑原隲藏 (1928). 'On P'u Shou-keng: A man of the western regions who was the superintendent of the trading ships' office in Ch'üan-chou toward the end of the Sung dynasty, together with a general sketch of trade with the Arabs in China during the T'ang and Sung eras', in *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo bunko* 2:1–79.
- Kuwabara Jitsuzo (1935). 'On P'u Shou-keng: A man of the western regions who was the superintendent of the trading ships' office in Ch'üan-chou toward the end of the Sung dynasty, together with a general sketch of trade with the Arabs in China during

- the T'ang and Sung eras', in *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo bunko* 7:1-104.
- Kuwabara Jitsuzo (1954). *Pu Shougeng kao* 蒲寿庚考, translated by Chen Yujing 陈裕菁. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Lambourn, Elizabeth (2008). 'Tombstones, texts, and typologies: Seeing sources for the history of Islam in Southeast Asia', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 51:252-86.
- Li Yukun 李玉昆 (1988). 'Tan Xishan zazhi cunzai de wenti' 谈西山杂志存在的问题, *Fujian shizhi* 福建史志 4. <http://www.fjsq.gov.cn/ShowText.asp?ToBook=1055&index=136&> (accessed 8 February 2015).
- Li Yukun 李玉昆 (2001). 'Ershi shiji Pu Shougeng yanjiu shuping' 20 世纪蒲寿庚研究述评, *Zhongguoshi yanjiu dongtai* 中国史研究动态 8:16-23.
- Lin Shaochuan 林少川 (1991). 'Boni "you Song Quanzhou panyuan Pu gong zhi mu" Xinkao' 渤泥 "有宋泉州判院蒲公之墓" 新考, *Haijiaoshi yanjiu* 海交史研究 2:57-64.
- Liu Junyi 刘隽一 (2013). 'Bei Song Songjing fufu muzhiming kaoshi' 北宋宋京夫妇墓志铭考释, *Zhongguo dianji yu wenhua* 中国典籍与文化 4:28-34, 161.
- Liu Xinsheng 刘新生 (2000). 'Zhongguo yu Wenlai youhao guanxi huimou' 中国与文莱友好关系回眸, *Dangdai yatai* 当代亚太 10:50-4.
- Liu Xinsheng 刘新生 (2006). *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*. Beijing: Shijie zhishi chubanshe.
- Liu Yingsheng 刘迎胜 (1991). 'Haishang sichou zhi lu kaocha jingguo' 海上丝绸之路考察经过, *Zhongguo shishi yanjiu dongtai* 6:16-23.
- Liu Yingsheng 刘迎胜 (1995). *Silu wenhua: Haishang juan* 丝路文化：海上卷. Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe.
- Matussin bin Omar (1994). 'Archaeology and the reconstruction of Brunei's early history', *Brunei Museum Journal* 9:1-12.
- Metassim bin Haji Jibah and Suhaili bin Haji Hassan (1987). 'Tomb of Maharaja Brunei', *Brunei Museum Journal* 6-3:10-15.
- Nicholl, Robert (1984). 'The tomb of Maharaja Karna of Brunei at Nanking', *Brunei Museum Journal* 5-4:35-45.
- Nie Dening 聂德宁 (2008). 'Zhongguo yu Wenlai huoyi wanglai de lishi kaocha' 中国与文莱贸易往来的历史考察, *Zhongguo shehui jingji shi yanjiu* 中国社会经济史研究 2:78-84.
- Perrin, Sharon (2000). *The Brunei shipwreck*. Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam: Elf Petroleum Asia.
- Renhe gongsuo 仁和公所 (1985). 'Renhe gongsuo chengli yibai zhounian jinian tekan' 仁和公所成立一百周年纪念特刊. N.p.
- Ricklefs, Merle Calvin (2008). *A history of modern Indonesia since c. 1200*. London/New York: Palgrave MacMillan. [First published by Stanford University Press in 1993.]

- Salmon, Claudine (2008). 'The origin of the Muara Jambi Gong as evidenced by a new archaeological find', *Archipel* 76:7–14.
- Saunders, Graham (2002). *A history of Brunei*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Schafer, Edward H. (1954). *The empire of Min*. Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle.
- Schelander, Bjorn (1998). *Brunei: Abode of peace*. Manoa, Hawai'i: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, School of Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Studies, University of Hawai'i. <http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/handle/10125/19360/AbodeofPeace20All.pdf?sequence=1> (accessed 15 October 2015).
- Schottenhammer, Angela (ed.) (2001). *The emporium of the world: Maritime Quanzhou, 1000–1400*. Leiden: Brill.
- Stanley, Henry Edward John (1874). *The first voyage round the world, by Magellan: Translated from the account of Pigafetta and other contemporary writers, accompanied by original documents with notes and Introduction*. London: Hakluyt Society.
- Steinhardt, Nancy Shatzman (2008). 'China's earliest mosques', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 67–3:330–61.
- Sun Yifu 孙毅夫 (1991). 'Wenlai jixing' 文莱纪行, *Renmin ribao* 人民日报 1 October. <http://www.93913.com/renmingribao/1991/10/1/887729.shtml> (accessed 5 February 2015).
- Von Glahn, Richard (1988). *The country of streams and grottoes: Expansion, settlement and the civilizing of the Sichuan Frontier in Song times*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University East Asia Center.
- Wade, Geoff (2010a). 'Early Muslim expansion in South East Asia, eighth to fifteenth centuries', in: David O. Morgan and Anthony Reid (eds), *The new Cambridge history of Islam. Volume 3: The eastern Islamic world, eleventh to eighteenth centuries*, pp. 366–408. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wade, Geoff (2010b). 'The Li (李) and Pu (蒲) "surnames" in East Asia-Middle East maritime silk road interactions during the 10th–12th centuries', in: Ralph Kauz (ed.), *Aspects of the maritime silk road: From the Persian Gulf to the East China Sea*, pp. 181–93. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Wan Kong Ann (2013). 'Examining the connection between ancient China and Borneo through Santubong archaeological sites', *Sino-Platonic Papers* 236.
- Wan Ming 万明 (2004). 'Shi "Xiyang": Zheng He xia xiyang shenyuan yingxiang de tanxi' 释西洋郑和下西洋深远影响的问题, *Nanyang wenti yanjiu* 南洋问题研究 4:12–3.
- Wang Qing 王青 (1998). 'Lidai Zhongguo yu Wenlai de youhao jiaowang' 历代中国与文莱的友好交往, *Dongnanya* 东南亚 2:51–8.
- Wen Guangyi 温广益 (1986). 'Zuijin zai Wenlai faxian de yikuai gongyuan 1264 de zhongwen mubei de chubu baogao' 最近在文莱发现的一块公元 1264 的中文墓碑的初步报告, *Quanzhou wenshi* 泉州文史 9.
- Wenming feng 文明风 (2013). 'Quanzhou baijia xing zhi lin: zhongxiao you sheng tiandi lao, gujin wushu zisun xian' 泉州百家姓之林：忠孝有声天地老古今无数子孙贤,

- 18 June. http://wmf.fjzen.com/wmcl/2013-06/18/content_11678126_3.htm (accessed 9 February 2015).
- Xie Fang 谢方 (1998). 'Ye tan Wenlai Pu gong bei yu Xishan zazhi Pucuo de guanxi' 也谈文莱蒲公碑与西山杂志蒲厝的关系, *Haijiaoshi yanjiu* 海交史研究 1:104–8.
- Xie Fang 谢方 (2000a). *Xiyang chaogong dianlu jiaozhu* 西洋朝貢典錄校注; *Dong Xi yang kao* 東西洋考. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Xie Fang 谢方 (2000b). *Zhifang waiji jiaoshi* 職方外紀校釋. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Zang Lihe 臧勵鵬 (ed.) (1982). *Zhongguo gujin diming dacidian* 中國古今地名大辭典. Hong Kong: Shangwu yinshuguan.
- Zeng Zhaoxuan 曾昭璇 (1991). 'Pu Shougeng shi Xiyu huahua Guangzhou huimin kao' 蒲寿庚是西域华化广州回民考, *Lingnan wenshi* 岭南文史 1:21–2, 26.
- Zhang Xiumin 张秀民 (1979). 'Pu Shougeng wei Zhanchengren fei Alaboren shuo' 蒲寿庚为占成人非阿拉伯人说, *Lanzhou daxue xuebao* 兰州大学学报 1:68–73.
- Zheng Xifu 鄭喜夫 and Wei Yongchun 魏永春 (2013). 'Tan Xishan zazhi de Zheng Chenggong xiangguan jizai' 談西山雜誌的鄭成功相關記載, *Taiwan wenxian biece* 台湾文献別冊 45:7–18.
- Zhu Caiyun 朱彩云 (2006). 'Qingdai qishu zaixian "haisi" wenming: shouchaoben jin xian minjian' 清代奇书再现 '海丝' 文明手抄本今现民间, *Dongnan zaobao* 东南早报 20 February. http://www.qzwb.com/gb/content/2006-02/20/content_1981955.htm (accessed 1 March 2006), and <http://news.sohu.com/20060220/n241915387.shtml> (accessed 4 February 2015).
- Zhuang Weiji 庄为玑 (1991a). 'Quanzhou Songzhuan wei Pujia sizhuan kao' 泉州宋船为蒲家私船考, in: Lianheguo jiaokewen zuzhi haishang sichou zhi lu zonghe kaocha Quanzhou guoji xueshu taolunhui zuzhiwei 聯合國教科文組織海上絲綢之路綜合考察泉州國際學術討論會組織委 (eds), *Zhongguo yu haishang sichou zhi lu* 中國與海上絲綢之路, pp. 344–53. Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe.
- Zhuang Weiji 庄为玑 (1991b). 'Wenlaiguo faxian Quanzhou Songmu kao' 文莱国发现泉州宋墓考, *Nanyang wenti yanjiu* 南洋问题研究 1:1–7.
- Zhuang Weiji 庄为玑 (1991c). 'Wenlaiguo Quanzhou Songmu kaoshi' 文莱国泉州宋墓考释, *Huaqiao huaren lishi yanjiu* 华侨华人历史研究 1:35–7.

Appendix: Some Comments on the Entry in the ‘Pucuo’

In the following, I shall examine some terms in the ‘Pucuo’. Inaccuracies of the *Xishan zazhi* have already been pointed out by Xie Fang (1998), I list them here again with more detailed explanations.

Pu Zongmin 蒲宗閔: The first paragraph of the ‘Pucuo’ gives Pu Zongmin as the name of an envoy to Boni. This thirteenth-century Pu Zongmin is untraceable in the sources, nor are any missions recorded. The *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian* 續資治通鑑長編 by Li Tao 李燾 (1115–1184), a chronology of the Song dynasty until 1126, records one Pu Zongmin making a memorial; see Li Tao (2004).⁴⁸ We encounter Pu Zongmin in the official history of the Song dynasty in the same context again, but as an assistant editorial director (*zhuzuo zuolang* 著作佐郎), an indication that he was a junior official (Tuotuo 脫脫 1977:184.4498–4501). In 1082, Pu suggested building defences that made use of the rugged terrain of Sichuan (Tuotuo 1977:193.4803). In or around 1086, he was executed following a conviction for allegedly taking unlawful advantage of his position of fiscal commissioner (*zhuanyunshi* 轉運使) (Tuotuo 1977:346.10978–79).⁴⁹ The existence of this Pu Zongmin is corroborated by a tomb inscription for his daughter found in 1998 (Liu Junyi 刘隽一 2013).

Karim (1993) says that Pu died in 1247 and that it took his son(s) until 1264 to have the stone inscribed and set up. To have the tomb stone set up in Boni fits well with the story in the second paragraph that has the sons travelling all over the region.

Wenling dao 温岭道: At the start of the Song era (960–1279) there were 24 circuits (*dao* 道). In 997 the *dao* were re-designated as *lu* 路. Wenling in Song times referred to present-day Wenling in Zhejiang, not Fujian. Wenling was not a *dao/lu*, but a small town in Taizhou 台州 prefecture in Liang Zhe donglu 两浙东路 (eastern provincial circuit of Liang Zhe). After the fall of the original capital Kaifeng 开封 (Henan) to the Jurchen invaders in 1126, a new provisional capital, denoted by the term Xingzai 行在, was established in Hangzhou 杭州 (Zhejiang)—and not Peking/Beijing as Wong and Hall say in their translations. The remaining territory was administered through 17 circuits, none of which bore the designation Wenling. The earliest geographical work on the Song

48 Li Tao 2004:282.6914. This Pu Zongmin was a jointly [appointed] supervisor for the tea markets in Chengdu City and all districts (*tong jiju Chengdu fu deng lu chachang gongshi* 同提舉成都府等路茶場公事).

49 Pu Zongmin is also mentioned briefly in Von Glahn 1988:240, 245.

empire, *Taiping huanyuji* (987), does not record Wenling at all, nor does the *Yuanfeng jiuyuzhi* 元豐九域志 of 1085. According to the *Fangyu shenglan* 方輿勝覽 by Zhu Mu 祝穆 (?–after 1246), Wenling was the designation for a small mountain range in Zhejiang (Zhu Mu 2003:9.151).

People in Quanzhou refer to Quanzhou as Wenling colloquially, but I have not been able to trace a scholarly work on this.⁵⁰ If Wenling in fact does refer to Quanzhou, then the statement about it being a *dao* is incorrect as well. Quanzhou, first established in the Tang period, was referred to as Quanzhou Qingyuan prefecture (Quanzhou Qingyuan jun 泉州清源郡) within the Fujian provincial circuit (Fujian lu 福建路) in the Song era, became Quanzhou route command (*lu* 路) in Yuan times, before it finally achieved the status of Quanzhou prefecture (*fu* 府) in the Ming dynasty (Zang Lihe 臧勵齋 1982:636).

Duchayuan 都察院: The Censorate (*duchayuan*) was established as one of the major agencies of the central government only in 1382 (Hucker 1985:7183 [536]). If we take *du* to refer to the capital, then the translation of *chayuan* should be Investigation Bureau, a designation pointing to an institution that had existed in the capital since the Tang dynasty. This agency was staffed with investigating censors (*jiancha yushi* 監察御史) (Hucker 1985:56 [105]). Hall's translation of *duchayuan* as chief censor is incorrect.

Tongpan 通判: A *tongpan* in Song times was a controller-general, who usually was sent on temporary assignments in the prefectures to check on prefects. In Ming times *tongpan* referred to an assistant prefect in a prefecture (Hucker 1985:555). The original text does not include the explanation that a *tongpan* is a *panyuan* (*ji panyuan* 即判院). This very likely has been inserted to make clear that Pu Zongmin, the *tongpan* of the *Xishan zazhi*, was Master Pu, who is addressed as a *panyuan* in the tombstone inscription. A *tongpan* is not the same as a *panyuan*. *Panyuan* (also *pan yuanshi* 判院事) means being in charge of an agency.⁵¹ Gong Yanming suggests that *panyuan* is short for *pan dengwen yuan shi* 判登聞院事 (supervisor of the affairs of the Public Petitioners Office), established in 995 which was renamed *dengwen jianyuan* 登聞檢院 (Public Petition-

50 The Wenming feng 文明风 website presents an article with the title 'Quanzhou baijia xing zhi Lin: zhongxiao you sheng tiandi lao, gujin wushu zisun xian' 泉州百家姓之林：忠孝有声天地老古今无数子孙贤, 18-6-2013, http://wmf.fjsen.com/wmcl/2013-06/18/content_11678126_3.htm (accessed 9-2-2015). This is the only reference for Quanzhou/Wenling I could find so far.

51 Hucker 1985:364 provides a list of offices in the Song dynasty that a *panyuan* could supervise.

ers Review Office) in or around 1007 (Gong 1997:169; Hucker 1985:491). It was headed by officials of court rank (*chaoguan* 朝官) on temporary duty assignment. The rank of *chaoguan* was coveted by aspiring scholar-officials, because the vicinity to the throne potentially made promotions easier. This information contradicts Franke's, who said that a *panyuan* was a metropolitan post; that term is misleading since in the capital metropolitan, officials were generally referred to as *jingchao guan* 京朝官, with the difference that *chaoguan* had access to the imperial audiences and *jingguan* 京官 had not.

Posthumously officials would be referred to by the highest position they had held, so presumably this temporary assignment to an unnamed agency had been the highest Master Pu had ever landed.

Zhancheng Xiyang (zhi) zhuanyun zhi shi 占城西洋(之)转运使:⁵² The *Xishan zazhi* is the only reference that I have so far found for a fiscal commissioner of the Western Ocean of Zhancheng. *Zhuanyunshi* was a position for officials working as fiscal commissioners in the provincial circuits of the Song empire.

Pu shi gai Wudai Liu Congxiao shi Pu Huazi Pu Youliang zhi Zhancheng 蒲氏盖从五代留从效使蒲华子蒲有良之占城: Wudai 五代 clearly denotes the historical period of the Five Dynasties and Ten States (907–960) and does not refer to 'five generations', as in Wong and Hall. They furthermore have omitted the names of the Pu clan's ancestors, Pu Huazi and Pu Youliang. Liu Congxiao (906–962), after the overthrow of the empire of Min (Fujian) in 945, installed himself as a warlord in Quanzhou and Zhangzhou 漳州 (as Qingyuan jiedushi 清源節度使) and served both the Southern Tang 南唐 (937–976) and the Song.⁵³ Pu Huazi and Pu Youliang do not appear anywhere in relevant Five Dynasties sources.

The last and fourth paragraph does not figure in the Wong and Hall translations, but is the one that links a Pu to a place outside of Fujian.

Wenling duyuan 温陵都院: If we accept that Wenling means Quanzhou, then we are still at a loss when it comes to understanding *duyuan*, which is not documented as an abbreviation of an official post.

52 Note that the Chinese text reproduced in Karim 1993 reads *Zhancheng Xiyang zhuanyun zhi shi*, whereas the text quoted by Zhuang 1991a omits the *zhi*.

53 On the history of Min, see Schafer 1954.

Boni shan 渤泥山: This term describes Boni as a mountain, but may also refer to it being an island most certainly inhabited by southern barbarians (*man* 蠻).