

The Long 13th Century of Tambralinga: from Javaka to Siam

FUKAMI Sumio

Introduction

Tambralinga, transcribed in Chinese texts as 'Dan-ma-ling' (單馬令), existed in the central Malay Peninsula from the 10th to the 14th centuries in the region of what would later be known as Ligor or Nakhon Si Thammarat. The present paper is an attempt to trace the rise to prosperity and the subsequent decline of Tambralinga in the 13th century. By the term "central Malay Peninsula" we mean more specifically the section spanning the area between Chumphon and Pattani on the east coast and from Kraburi to Kedah on the west coast (see map at end of article), a region where historically various port cities had been able to flourish as independent kingdoms by taking advantage of trans-peninsula overland routes. On a modern map the area corresponds to the border between Thailand and Malaysia, a region where the Thai-speaking world of Theravada Buddhists blends so imperceptibly into the world of Malay-speaking Muslims that it is not unusual to find Muslims and Buddhists inhabiting the same village, or to come across Muslims whose first language is Thai. (Kuroda 2002: 95)

The Buddhistification of the northern and central parts of the Malay Peninsula, together with the Islamification of the southern half, are generally considered to have begun in the 13th-14th and 14th-15th centuries, respectively. Tambralinga flourished in the 13th century, or just as these changes were beginning, becoming an important node in the Southeast Asia maritime network. As an outcome of these various transitions, Siam (present-day Thailand) became dominant in the central part of the peninsula in place of Javaka.

This period, when Theravada Buddhism and Islam were replacing Hinduism and Mahayana Buddhism as the dominant religions of Southeast Asia, also saw the appearance of more written records than ever before. Unfortunately, however, the value of many of these as histor-

ical materials is open to question, and the synthesis of the various types of existing materials is an extremely demanding task. In this respect, the recent major work by Jacq-Hergoualc'h (2002) is an important step forward. In its attempt to remake the history of the Malay Peninsula by bringing together both the fruits of archaeological research and a focus on the art history of the region it is an ambitious work, and warrants attention for any attempt to reconstruct the history of Tambralinga. Its shortcoming, which it shares with many other Western-language research works, is its poor command of the Chinese-language sources. The author's apparent ignorance of the Chinese texts *Dao-yi-za-zhi* (島夷雜誌) and *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi* (大德南海志) is a glaring example.¹⁾

As already discussed in more detail in previous publications, (Fukami 1987, Fukami 1999) the present author departs from the accepted wisdom of equating San-fo-qi (三佛齊) with Srivijaya. Although Chinese texts from the Song to the early Ming period uniformly treat San-fo-qi as if it were a single state, in fact its real nature was more like that of Da-shi (大食; the Chinese appellation for the Muslim states of West Asia): the name San-fo-qi, rather than being the name of one specific country, served as a collective appellation for all the Chinese tributary states in the area centered on the Strait of Malacca. It is consequently a mistake to equate San-fo-qi, as Coedès does, with the Shi-li-fo-shi (室利佛逝) that figures in Chinese sources of the Tang period (7th to 8th century CE) and that corresponded to the 'Srivijaya' mentioned in inscriptions and the 'Sribuza' of Arab texts, particularly since the later Chinese texts do not give any indication that 'Shi-li-fo-shi' and 'San-fo-qi' referred to the same place. In short, the present writer considers San-fo-qi to correspond not to Srivijaya or Sribuza but to the 'Zabaj' of Arabic texts, to the 'Javaka' of south Indian Pali texts, and also to the 'Savaka' found in Tamil inscriptions. As for the extent of the area occupied by the states comprising San-fo-qi, it is likely to have included almost the entire central and southern part of the Malay Peninsula, together with the Malacca Strait side of Sumatra, and possibly even the western side of Kalimantan as well.

The present article will attempt to trace the rise and fall of one of the states of San-fo-qi, Dan-ma-ling (Tambralinga), which enjoyed its apogee during the 13th century. The author has already addressed this topic once (in Japanese) in his "Note on Dan-ma-ling", (Fukami 1989) but newly discovered historical materials and fresh evaluations of existing materials have made possible a more comprehensive treatment of Dan-ma-

ling's fortunes.

1. The Rise and Fall of Dan-ma-ling

(i) Dan-ma-ling and Deng-liu-mei (登流眉)

In this chapter, after summing up the history of research into the identity of Dan-ma-ling, we will trace its rise and fall as recorded in historical materials.

Regarding the location of and original pronunciation of the place transcribed in Chinese texts as Dan-ma-ling, the present author is content to follow the orthodoxy established by Coedès that it corresponded to Tambralinga and that it was located in or near what is now Nakhon Si Thammarat. However, there were a number of complicated twists and turns in this research which need to be addressed.

In the early stages of research there were various hypotheses that sought to identify Dan-ma-ling with similar-sounding place names found either on the Malay Peninsula or on Sumatra. (Fukami 1989: 86-7) Since Coedès established that the identity of Dan-ma-ling must be the Tambralinga found in the so-called 'Chaiya Inscription' of 1230, and located it somewhere between the Bay of Ban Don and present-day Nakhon Si Thammarat, (Coedès 1918: 15-18) subsequent researchers have either acquiesced in his judgement or else identified Dan-ma-ling with Nakhon Si Thammarat itself. (Krom 1931: 251, 335; Wheatley 1961: 66) Coedès' article, however, does not tackle the problem of identifying the place referred to by the Chinese as Deng-liu-mei, and his subsequent research has also failed to provide a clear answer to this question. (See, for example, Coedès 1968: 325, n. 80; 342, n. 102)

The stone pillar bearing the sixteen lines of Sanskrit known as the Chaiya Inscription is said to have actually been discovered not in Chaiya but in Nakhon Si Thammarat. (Jacq-Hergoualc'h 2002: 423) From the Inscription we learn of the existence of a ruler of Tambralinga named Candrabhanu who bore the honorary title of 'Sri Dharmaraja' (Great and Auspicious Patriarch). From this title came the place-name Nagara Sri Dharmaraja (Land of the Great and Auspicious Patriarch), which would become known by its Thai name of Nakhon Si Thammarat.

Primary responsibility for muddying the waters of research on this topic lies in the identification of the Deng-liu-mei found in Chinese texts of the Song and Yuan periods with this Nakhon Si Thammarat. Deng-liu-mei, if we include the various derivatives of the name such as Dan-liu-mei

(丹流眉), actually appears more often in the Chinese texts than Dan-maling: the *Zhu-fan-zhi*'s (諸蕃志) 'History of Deng-liu-mei', the *Dao-yi-za-zhi*'s 'Story of Deng-liu-mei', the *Yi-yu-zhi*'s (異域志) 'History of Deng-liu-mei', the *Song-shi*'s (宋史) 'History of Dan-mei-liu' (丹眉流), and the *Wen-xian-tong-kao*'s (文獻通考) 'History of Zhou-mei-liu' (州眉流) all have sections specifically describing it. (Fukami 1989: 87–9; Fujiyoshi 1991: 40–44)

At the centre of the confusion is Pelliot's 1904 work, which on the one hand posited three quite different place-names – the Deng-liu-mei of *Zhu-fan-zhi*, *Ling-wai-dai-da* (嶺外代答), and the *Song-shi*'s 'History of Zhen-la' (真臘); the Dan-mei-liu of 'History of Dan-mei-liu' in the *Song-shi*; and the Zhou-mei-liu of *Wen-xian-tong-kao* – as being one and the same place, and on the other hand asserted that Deng-liu-mei and Zhou-mei-liu were no more than mistaken renderings of Dan-mei-liu. (Pelliot 1904: 233–34) He also, based on a comparison of the pronunciation of the two names, took Dan-mei-liu to correspond to (Sri) Dharmaraja, in other words, Nakhon Si Thammarat. Along with many more of Pelliot's theories this hypothesis has come to be widely accepted.

In the *Zhu-fan-zhi* and other materials, Deng-liu-mei is described as belonging to Zhen-la, the Khmer empire, and Dan-maling to San-fo-qi, so this is a vital issue bearing not only on the relations between Zhen-la and San-fo-qi but also on the historical configuration of the central Malay Peninsula and even on the history of the entire Southeast Asian region in the period before and after the 13th century. As scholars have pointed out, however, "Dan-mei-liu" is no more than a Chinese scribe's mis-rendering of Dan-liu-mei, making Pelliot's hypothesis of its being the transliteration of Dharmaraja quite meaningless.²⁾

Among subsequent English-language research on this topic the influence of Wolters and Wheatley has been considerable. The former, taking Deng-liu-mei as the transliteration of Tambralinga, locates it in Nakhon Si Thammarat. (Wolters 1958: 592–95) This hypothesis, unfortunately, lacks force for a number of reasons: namely, the author provides no solid reasoning for the identification of Deng-liu-mei with Tambralinga; he does not even refer to the possible location of Dan-maling; and finally, against the accepted view that the place mentioned in Chinese texts as Jia-luo-xi (加羅希) should be identified with Grahi, or present-day Chaiya, he wrongly argues that it was located south of Nakhon Si Thammarat, purely on the basis of the assumption that Deng-liu-mei and Nakhon Si Thammarat were one and the same.³⁾

Wheatley identifies Dan-maling with Tambralinga, and locates it in

Nakhon Si Thammarat. As for Deng-liu-mei, he suggests that, while impossible to ascertain precisely, it was probably either in the north of the Malay Peninsula or in the northernmost reaches of the Gulf of Thailand. (Wheatley 1961: 66) Wada takes the same position as Wheatley, (Wada 1954: 49) and the present author is inclined to go along with this position.

(ii) Dan-ma-ling in the *Zhu-fan-zhi*

Since the *Zhu-fan-zhi*, which presents the situation in either the late 12th or early 13th century, is the oldest historical reference we have to Dan-ma-ling, I will first clarify its location as given in that book. The 'History of San-fo-qi' related there lists fifteen countries as "dependencies of San-fo-qi", namely: Peng-feng (蓬豐), Deng-ya-nong (登牙儂), Ling-ya-si-jia (凌牙斯加), Ji-lan-dan (吉蘭丹), Fo-luo-an (佛囉安), Ri-luo-ting (日羅亭), Qian-mai (潛邁), Ba-ta (拔沓), Dan-ma-ling, Jia-luo-xi, Ba-lin-feng (巴林馮), Xin-tuo (新拖), Jian-bi (監篋), Lan-wu-li (藍無里) and Xi-lan (細蘭). Although there are varying theories about the location of some of these countries, that the first ten of them, from Peng-feng to Jia-luo-xi, were situated on the Malay Peninsula seems beyond doubt. As to the local place-names to which their Chinese transliterations refer, Peng-feng corresponds to modern Pahan, Deng-ya-nong to Terengganu, Ling-ya-si-jia to Langkasuka (Pattani), Ji-lan-dan to Kelantan, Fo-luo-an to Phatthalung, Dan-ma-ling to Tambralinga (Nakhon Si Thammarat), and Jia-luo-xi to Grahi (Chaiya). The identity of Ri-luo-ting, Qian-mai and Ba-ta are as yet unclear. (Fukami 1987: 224-25; Fujiyoshi 1991: 47-75)

Apart from the fifteen countries listed as "dependencies", the author feels that there must also have been a state that stood at the centre. While holding that 'San-fo-qi' was a collective term for a number of countries, he does not reject the possibility of there having also been at times some kind of ruler/ruled relationship among them. To give an example, the 'History of Jian-bi' (Kampe, North Sumatra) in the *Zhu-fan-zhi* relates of that country that "it was formerly a dependency of San-fo-qi, but following a war it set up a king of its own." Clearly, Jian-bi was strong enough to assert its independence of the political confederation of San-fo-qi. Whether the "central state of San-fo-qi" was Jambi, as the theory that equates San-fo-qi with Srivijaya suggests, or Kedah, as the present author has suggested elsewhere, (Fukami 1987: 227) or another place altogether remains uncertain.

Of the countries on the Malay Peninsula listed as San-fo-qi depen-

dencies, we have historical accounts for Dan-ma-ling, Ling-ya-si-jia and Fo-uo-an. In the 'History of Dan-ma-ling' we find: "[The peoples of] Ri-luo-ting, Qian-mai, Ba-ta and Jia-luo-xi resemble [the people of] Dan-ma-ling. With the gold and silver receptacles it had obtained through barter, Dan-ma-ling was able to bring Ri-luo-ting and those other countries into its fold and make a common tribute to San-fo-qi." (Fujiyoshi 1991: 64) It is clear from this account that Dan-ma-ling enjoyed a central position among these countries. In the 'History of Fo-uo-an' too we read that, "The people of Fo-uo-an's neighbours Peng-feng, Deng-ya-nong, [Ling-ya-si-] jia and Ji-lan-dan resemble those of Fo-uo-an", (Fujiyoshi 1991: 73-4) indicating that Fo-uo-an was central among these countries. Moreover, the 'History of Ling-ya-si-jia' and the 'History of Fo-uo-an' each states that the country "sends yearly tribute to San-fo-qi".

In this way the countries of San-fo-qi on the Malay Peninsula can be seen to have fallen into two groups, a northern group and a southern group, with overall control in each exercised by Dan-ma-ling and Fo-uo-an, respectively. In addition, it becomes clear that Ling-ya-si-jia was not a dependency of Fo-uo-an but sent its own annual tribute directly to "the central state of San-fo-qi".

(iii) Dan-ma-ling in the *Dao-yi-za-zhi*

The *Dao-yi-za-zhi*, thanks to the painstaking textual research and restructuring of the original text carried out by Wada, is now thought to have been compiled in the 1270s, spanning the last years of the Song dynasty in China and the opening years of the Yuan dynasty that followed it. Chronologically this would place it somewhere in between the *Zhu-fan-zhi* and the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*, allowing it to bridge the gap between those two texts. Although its accounts are derived from the records of the Song-period Office of Maritime Affairs at Guangzhou and are not merely taken from the *Zhu-fan-zhi*, in point of fact many of the *Dao-yi-za-zhi*'s descriptions are identical to those of the *Zhu-fan-zhi*. (Wada 1954: 32-36)

The countries of Southeast Asia for which accounts are given in the *Dao-yi-za-zhi* are Zhan-cheng-guo (占城國; Campa), Bin-tong-long (賓童龍; Panduranga), Deng-liu-mei, Zhen-la-guo (真臘 (真臘) 國), San-fo-qi-guo, Dan-ma-ling, Fo-uo-an, and Da-she-po-guo (大闍婆國; Java). Whether or not the word "guo" (country) is added at the end of the name would appear to indicate that country's status as either ruler or ruled. The following notations are indicative: "Bin-tong-long is vassal to Zhan-cheng, which selects rulers for it." "Deng-liu-mei is subject to Zhen-la, which se-

lects rulers for it.” And for Fo-luo-an we have: “Fo-luo-an...has a ruler who was dispatched there by San-fo-qi.” Clearly, each of the three countries was a tributary of one of the three dominant states, Zhan-cheng-guo, Zhen-la-guo, or San-fo-qi-guo.

For Dan-ma-ling, however, we have “Dan-ma-ling...has a ruler but no king”, and there is no suggestion of a subservient relationship to San-fo-qi-guo. While the ‘History of San-fo-qi’ states that “San-fo-qi...rules over the other countries”, this passage, beginning with the note that it was “accustomed to fighting both on water and on land”, is the same (there are some differences in wording) as that contained in the ‘History of San-fo-qi’ of both the *Ling-wai-dai-da* and the *Zhu-fan-zhi*; there is no specific reference to the existence of a ruler/ruled relationship. This being the case, while it is clear from the *Dao-yi-za-zhi* that Dan-ma-ling had asserted its independence from the central authority of San-fo-qi, it had not yet achieved the position of having the “controlling” authority over Fo-luo-an and other countries ascribed to it by the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi* that we will turn to in the following section. What we have, in other words, would seem to be a transitional stage between the state of affairs described in the *Zhu-fan-zhi* and that of the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*.

Even more worthy of attention in the *Dao-yi-za-zhi*’s account is the note of Dan-ma-ling’s having sent tribute to China in the year 1196. As for San-fo-qi, the last record from the Song period of tribute being paid is for the year 1178; after that there is nothing for the Yuan period, and we have to wait some 200 years for the next recorded tribute at the beginning of the Ming period.⁴⁾ In the light of the above argument that the *Dao-yi-za-zhi* records a transitional historical stage, I would argue that the 1196 tribute indicates Dan-ma-ling’s assertion of independence from San-fo-qi.

(iv) Dan-ma-ling in the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*

The *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*, dating from 1304 or some eighty years after the *Zhu-fan-zhi*, also includes a section illustrating inter-relationships between the countries of Southeast Asia. The period described is the latter half of the 13th century, some years after the description given in the *Dao-yi-za-zhi*. Dan-ma-ling-guo, alongside Jiao-zhi-guo (交趾國; Vietnam), Zhan-cheng-guo, Zhen-la-guo, Luo-hu-guo (羅斛國; see Chapter 3), Xian-guo (暹國; see Chapter 3), San-fo-qi-guo, Dong-yang-fo-ni-guo (東洋佛坭國; Brunei), Dan-zhong-bu-luo-guo (單重布囉國; Tanjungpura/Banjarmasin?) and She-po-guo, is listed as a “central country” with controlling authority

over other countries. Of the countries listed in the *Zhu-fan-zhi* as belonging to San-fo-qi, only those located in Sumatra were still controlled by San-fo-qi, while Dan-ma-ling had gained control over those of the Malay Peninsula. (Fukami 1989: 91–3) In other words, Dan-ma-ling had pushed aside the “central state of San-fo-qi” described in the *Zhu-fan-zhi*, and developed to the point where it could assume control over Ri-luo-ting, Da-la-xi (達刺希; the Jia-luo-xi of the *Zhu-fan-zhi*, Chaiya), Ling-ya-su-jia (凌牙蘇家; Langkasuka/Pattani), Fo-luo-guan (佛囉官 [a scribe’s mistake for Fo-luo-an?]; Phatthalung), Ji-lan-dan, Ding-qie-lu (丁伽蘆; Terengganu), Peng-heng (朋亨; Pahan), and other countries of the Malay Peninsula.

(v) Dan-ma-ling (丹馬令) in the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue* (島夷誌略)

The expansion of Dan-ma-ling appears to have been short-lived. In the 1351 *Dao-yi-zhi-lue*’s ‘Account of Dan-ma-ling’⁵⁾ there is no indication that it played a controlling role over other countries. The description is vague, and as far as its political situation is concerned it is listed, along with other countries, merely as “having a chief”. Were it not for the name and the statement at the beginning of the account that it “shares a border with Sha-li (沙里) and Fo-lai-an (佛來安)”, which tally with the entry in the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi* listing Sha-li and Fo-luo-guan as countries controlled by Dan-ma-ling (Fo-lai-an can be identified as the Fo-luo-an mentioned in the *Zhu-fan-zhi*), it would be exceedingly hard to identify this country at all from merely the description of local customs and products contained in the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue*. On the contrary, the country described as being the most energetic of the Malay Peninsula states is Xian (暹), which we will turn to in Chapter 3 of this paper.

(vi) Preliminary Conclusions

The ebb and flow of Dan-ma-ling may be summed up as follows. In the latter half of the 12th century, while remaining subservient to San-fo-qi, Dan-ma-ling had managed to assume a controlling role in the central part of the Malay Peninsula (*Zhu-fan-zhi*). By 1196 it had managed to break free of its subservience to San-fo-qi, as evidenced by its presenting tribute to China (*Dao-yi-za-zhi*). By the second half of the 13th century it had acquired authority over a large area of the Malay Peninsula, and attained a position alongside San-fo-qi as one of the principal powers of Southeast Asia (*Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*). By the mid-14th century, however, Dan-ma-ling had already lost that commanding position (*Dao-yi-zhi-lue*).

2. The Expansion of Tambralinga

(i) Introduction

We will next trace the 13th century expansion of Tambralinga, the original form of the name transcribed in Chinese texts as 'Dan-ma-ling', using the known facts about the reign of King Candrabhanu.

The first reference to Tambralinga is in the so-called Tanjore Inscription of 1030, from the period of the Cola dynasty in south India. The Inscription records Cola's military expedition of c. 1025 against the Strait of Malacca region, and includes among the countries subdued by Cola one named Madamalinggam. Taking away the prefix 'ma' at the beginning and the suffix 'gam' at the end of the name, we are left with 'Damaling' as the actual name of the country. The accepted view is that this name corresponds to Tambralinga, or, in its Chinese transliteration, Dan-ma-ling.⁶⁾ (Krom 1931: 250)

In addition to the already-mentioned Chaiya Inscription, there is one other mention of Tambralinga, in an inscription found at the main temple of Nakhon Si Thammarat, Wat Mahathat. From the script it is clear that this inscription also dates from the 13th century. It comprises a Tamil section written in Tamil script, and another section written in Sanskrit using Khmer script. The Tamil section mentions the name of someone named Dharmasenapati, followed by an injunction against the taking of life, while the Sanskrit section, though still to be completely deciphered, is said to contain a reference to Tambralinga. (Veeraprajak 1986: 16)

In his discussion of Tamil inscriptions in Southeast Asia, Karashima (presumably referring to this inscription) notes, "The date is either 1183 or 1283. No king seems to have been mentioned. It records that one Danma Senapati made a grant to Brahmanas in three shares. The stone is damaged and imprecatory sentences occupy nearly a half of the remaining part of the inscription. The donor, Danma Senapati, may have been a merchant, but it is not verifiable." (Karashima 1995:9).⁷⁾ Since much research is still needed on both the Tamil and the Sanskrit sections of the inscription (Karashima inexplicably fails to make any reference to the Sanskrit section), it is difficult to reach any definitive conclusions, but from the mere existence of a section written in Tamil we can safely assume that relations between Nakhon Si Thammarat and the southern India region were close around the time of the 13th century.

(ii) King Candrabhanu's Invasion of Sri Lanka

As already noted, we know from the Chaiya Inscription that in 1230 Tambralinga was ruled by a king named Candrabhanu. The king's name also appears in chapters 83 and 88 of the Sri Lankan text *Culavamsa*, (Geiger 1973: vol. II, 151-52, 187-88) where the name of the 'Javakaraja' (king of the Javaka) who twice invaded Sri Lanka is given as Candrabhanu. In the early days of research on this topic there was no persuasive theory concerning either the dating of these two attacks or the relations of Candrabhanu with the Pandyan kings of south India,⁸⁾ but the present paper will follow the persuasive argument of Sirisena which is based on extensive historical evidence. (Sirisena 1978: 36-57. Cf. Jacq-Hergoualc'h 2002: 425-27)

Candrabhanu's first assault on Sri Lanka, in 1247, began in the southern part of the island. After his defeat at the hands of the Sinhalese king Parakramabahu, Candrabhanu, by a route which has yet to be made clear, managed to take refuge in and finally take control of another kingdom in the north of the island. This northern kingdom, following an attack by the Pandyan king in 1258, was thenceforth forced to pay tribute to Pandya. At the end of 1262 Candrabhanu launched a second offensive against Parakramabahu's realm in the south of the island, this time with his army strengthened by the addition of troops from Cola and Pandya that he had acquired since arriving in Sri Lanka. He was defeated yet again, however, and this time died in the battle. Although both Candrabhanu and Parakramabahu had been vassals of Pandya, the Pandyan King Vira-Pandya (r. 1253-75) sided with Parakramabahu in this conflict. According to subsequent Pandyan inscriptions, the prince of Javaka became ruler of the northern half of the island in place of the dead Candrabhanu, presumably as a result of Pandya's divide and rule policy, but the reign of this king (and his successors, if there were any) was short-lived: by the beginning of the 14th century they had already been supplanted.

Whether Candrabhanu himself remained on Sri Lanka for the time that elapsed between the establishment of his kingdom in the north of the island and his second campaign against the south or whether he returned temporarily to the Malay Peninsula is unclear. Although the likelihood is strong that he would have returned to his home base of Tambralinga, there is as yet no evidence to prove the case one way or the other.

Regarding Candrabhanu's motives for his invasion, the *Culavamsa*

notes merely that it was “under the treacherous pretext that they [i.e., the Javaka] were also followers of the Buddha”, (Geiger 1973: vol. II, 151) but does not give any clear explanation. Sirisena postulates that the attack on Sri Lanka, home of Theravada Buddhism, was an attempt to acquire religious relics that would not only strengthen Candrabhanu’s own kingly powers but also bring magical powers that would enhance the stability and prosperity of his native Tambralinga. (Sirisena 1978: 40) His explanation is at one with the “invitation of the Buddha Statue” mentioned in the *Jinakalamali* and the “coming of the Buddha statue” related in the *Tamnan Nakhon Si Thammarat*, both of which will be discussed later in this chapter.

However, all this raises the question of whether or not Candrabhanu was himself a Theravada Buddhist, together with the related question of when and how Tambralinga, or the central section of the Malay Peninsula, was converted to that religion. Regarding the latter, it is generally agreed that the conversion took place some time after Candrabhanu’s invasion—either at the end of the 13th century or in the 14th century, when the region came under the control of Siam (either Sukhothai or Ayutthaya).⁹⁾ In addition, if Candrabhanu had indeed been a Theravada Buddhist, we would then require an explanation as to why the Chaiya Inscription was written not in Pali, as might be expected, but in Sanskrit.

(iii) The Pandya Inscription of 1265: Did Candrabhanu Mobilize Kedahnese and Local Chinese Forces?

In the Tamil-language Pandya Inscriptions, the first mention of King Vira-Pandya’s having defeated the king of “Savaka” (Javaka) comes in the inscription marking the 10th year of the king’s reign (1264 CE), which states that he “...was pleased to take the Chola [Cola] country, Ceylon, and the crown of the Savaka king together with his crowned head”. In the inscription for the following year, 1265, a list of nineteen countries conquered by the king, beginning with “Gangam” (Ganga), is enumerated. (Ferrand 1922: 48–9. Cf. also Nilakanta Sastri 1937: 255–56)¹⁰⁾ Savaka is not mentioned in the list, possibly because it is the name of a people, not a kingdom.

Although some of the nineteen countries listed in this inscription are obscure, many of them are situated on the Indian Subcontinent. Among the others, those that may be readily identified are, apart from Sri Lanka, Arumanam (Burma), Cinam (China), and Kadaram (Kedah). Nilakanta

Sastri's dismissal of the historical value of the inscription is emphatic: "this is court-poetry, not history; the names of countries have been chosen with a view to euphony and metrical effects, and there is no attempt here to state facts." In his view, China and Kedah are included simply because they were names known to the author; there is no implication that they were actually conquered. (Nilakanta Sastri 1937: 256)

Nilakanta Sastri's case is persuasive, but the historical facts also allow for an alternative explanation of the inscription. As regards Burma, there are historical records indicating that Sri Lanka launched an attack on that country in 1165 which enjoyed moderate success. (Sirisena 1978: 16-35; Aung-Thwin 1998: 7-32) As for "Cinam" or China, it has long since been pointed out that, by the time of the Southern Song dynasty (1127-1276), large numbers of ethnic Chinese were already settled in the Southeast Asian region, and the Chinese settlement at Fo-luo-an on the Malay Peninsula was already well-established. (Wada 1959) Needless to say, the reference in the 1265 inscription must be to one of these Chinese communities, not to China itself. In the section on 'Tu-ta' (土塔) of the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue*, we read that there was a pagoda several meters tall made from brick, with the Chinese inscription, "Completed in the 8th month of the 3rd year of Xian-chun". Tu-ta was Nagapattinam on the Coromandel Coast of southern India, (Karashima 1988: 89) and the 3rd year of Xian-chun corresponded to 1267 CE on the Western calendar. It is clear from this entry that, by the time of Candrabhanu's death in 1262, the area settled by Chinese migrants had already expanded from the Malay Peninsula across the Bay of Bengal as far as the Coromandel Coast. As for "Kadaram", or Kedah, finally, this important port-city on the western side of the Strait of Malacca that frequently appears in historical materials has now disappeared, but in all likelihood was located in the vicinity of the present-day ruins of Lembah Bujang. Extrapolating from the contents of the two Pandya inscriptions, then, inscribed after his defeat and death at the hands of an alliance between Pandya and Parakramabahu, the possibility that in his 1262 campaign Candrabhanu mobilized not only local forces from Kedah but also Chinese forces from Fo-luo-an or another community on the Malay Peninsula becomes strong.

(iv) The Javaka King, Candrabhanu

That Candrabhanu's attack on the island was accorded considerable importance in the history of Sri Lanka is clear. According to Sirisena, a number of sources (some in Pali, some in Sinhalese) apart from the

Culavamsa make reference to it, some of them noting that the king leading the attacking forces was from Tambralinga (written variously as Tambalinga, Tambalingam, or Tamalingamu). (Sirisena 1978: 37) That Candrabhanu was recognized to be a Javaka king from Tambralinga is clear from these accounts.

As indicated at the beginning of this article, the present author holds that both the Pali-language 'Javaka' and the Tamil 'Savaka' can, along with the 'Zabaj' found in Arabic materials, be identified with the San-fo-qi of Chinese records. While a similar position is held by both Ferrand (1922: 172) and Majumdar, (1937: 204-27) the present author's position differs firstly in being based on an analysis of the nature of the place known as 'San-fo-qi' in Chinese materials, and secondly in his contention that San-fo-qi should not be taken as referring to one particular country such as Srivijaya. If these names (San-fo-qi/Zabaj/Javaka) refer not to a particular country but to the entire Strait of Malacca region, it is in no way remarkable that Indian materials should refer to a king of Tambralinga as 'Javaka'.

It seems likely that, when Song-period Chinese materials referred to She-po and San-fo-qi, they were making a distinction between, respectively, Java Proper (the central and eastern parts of the island) and Outer Java (the Strait of Malacca region). Arabic materials made the same distinction, using the names Jawa (or Mul-Jawa) and Zabaj, respectively. (Tibbetts 1979: 100-118, 151-52) Indian materials too in all likelihood were referring to the Outer Java region when they used the term 'Javaka'. The distinction between the two is also reflected in Marco Polo's use (maintained by subsequent European writers) of the term Java Mayor, "Greater Java", to denote the original Java (Java Proper), and Java Minor, "Lesser Java", to denote the countries of the northern Sumatra region (Outer Java).

(v) The *Jinakalamali* and the 'First Inscription': Nakhon Si Thammarat's Relations with Sukhothai

In the stories compiled in the Pali-language history *Jinakalamali*, said to have been written in Chiangmai in the first half of the 16th century, there is no reference to either Candrabhanu or Tambralinga; in addition, being written in an allegorical style, they contain a number of obscure points. However, they do offer some suggestions as to the relationship between Nakhon Si Thammarat, Sukhothai and Sri Lanka in the 13th century. (Jayawickrama 1968: 120-22; Sirisena 1978: 87)

In 1256, we learn, Rocaraja was king of Sukhodaya (Sukhothai). One day, wanting to see the sea, the king and his army followed the course of the Nan River as far as Siridhammanagara (Nakhon Si Thammarat). Its king, Siridhamma, welcomed Rocaraja warmly and told him about a miraculous Buddha statue in Sri Lanka. Rocaraja and Siridhamma sent envoys to the king of Sri Lanka asking for the Buddha statue. The Sri Lankan king gave the Buddha statue to the envoys. On their way home the envoys' ship was wrecked, but miraculously the Buddha statue found its own way to Nakhon Si Thammarat. On hearing the news Rocaraja returned to Nakhon Si Thammarat and took the Buddha statue back to his own country. (Jayawickrama 1968: 121-22).¹¹⁾

That the Siridhamma of this story was most likely the Candrabhanu of historical records can be assumed from the fact that Candrabhanu was the king in Tambralinga (i.e. Nakhon Si Thammarat) when the episode is said to have taken place. However, there is no mention of this Buddha statue in any Sri Lankan materials, nor do the two kings Rocaraja and Siridhamma appear in any other source. Even assuming that the visit of the kings' envoys to Sri Lanka really happened, we know only that it must have been some time after 1256, and there is no clear indication of the connection with Candrabhanu's second Sri Lanka campaign. It is possible that Siridhamma was not Candrabhanu himself but his successor, and that the dispatch of envoys to Sri Lanka came after 1262, the year of Candrabhanu's death in battle.

The suggestion in this story that Sukhothai imported Theravada Buddhism (symbolized by the Buddha statue) from Sri Lanka via Nakhon Si Thammarat coincides with the contents of the Thai-language 'First Inscription' (the epitaph of King Rama Khamhaeng), where we read that the king, after building the temple of Arannika to the west of the city of Sukhothai, donated it to a senior priest whom he had invited from Nakhon Si Thammarat. The learning of this priest outstripped all others, it is said. (Griswold 1971: 219; Waithayakon 1965: 10-1; Ishii 1999a: 56-8) If this is a true historical account, these events must have taken place before 1292, the date of the engraving of the main part of the inscription. In the latter part of the inscription, added after 1292, there is an account of the extent of Sukhothai's sphere of influence, which is said to have stretched south as far as Ratburi, Phetburi, and (Nakhon) Si Thammarat. This would mean that Nakhon Si Thammarat was subjugated by Sukhothai after 1292.¹²⁾

It is noteworthy that King Rocaraja of Sukhothai went to the trouble

of actually visiting Nakhon Si Thammarat in the *Jinakalamali* account. If he followed the course of the Nan River, he must have approached Nakhon Si Thammarat from the Gulf of Thailand side of the peninsula. From Sukhothai there was also an outlet to the sea west through Martaban. One possible reason for the decision to use Nakhon Si Thammarat rather than Martaban could be that in the mid-13th century it was Nakhon Si Thammarat that was the pivot of the network linking Southeast Asia with India, by virtue of its overland routes linking the Bay of Bengal with the Gulf of Thailand. Sukhothai's relations with Sri Lanka must surely therefore have been by way of Nakhon Si Thammarat.¹³⁾

(vi) *Tamnan Nakhon Si Thammarat*: Relations with Ayutthaya

There are two further historical materials which mention the name of Candrabhanu, both of them among the oldest Thai-language *Tamnan* (histories) of Nakhon Si Thammarat: the *Tamnan Nakhon Si Thammarat* (History of Nakhon Si Thammarat) and the *Tamnan Phrathaat Muang Nakhon Si Thammarat* (History of Phrathaat Temple of the City of Nakhon Si Thammarat). Though they are estimated to have been written down in the second half of the 17th century, the precise date of these materials is not clear. Because of the considerable overlap between the two, Wyatt (1975) refers to them as "Version A" and "Version B" respectively, re-arranging the contents into 27 separate stories, with both explanatory notes and an English translation alongside the original Thai script. The name of Candrabhanu appears in the 6th and 7th stories, but that of Tambralinga is conspicuous by its absence.

Following the traditional legend of the Buddha's tooth (story#1), we learn of how Narapati of Hansavati (Pegu) founded the city and how the Buddha statue Sihinga crossed the ocean to get there (story#2); of how the Indian king Asoka requested 84,000 precious relics and how they were found on the advice of a local wise man (story#3); of how its twelve tributary kingdoms were acquired (story#4); and of how the king from the west, Sri Sainaran, became the ruler of Nakhon Si Thammarat and sent the Buddha statue Sihinga to Chiangmai in Saka 1196 (1274 CE) (story#5).

Story#6 tells the story of how the Indapatapuriya (Angkor?) king Sri Dharmasokaraja, fleeing with his clan from the plague, came ashore at Nakhon Si Thammarat and reestablished the city, after which he rebuilt a giant stupa, dedicated a Buddha's tooth to the shrine, and invited priests from Hansavati and Sri Lanka to perform the ceremonies of con-

secration. The following story, #7, relates how Nakhon Si Thammarat was attacked and subdued by U Don of Ayutthaya, after which it began to send tribute to Ayutthaya. After the death of King Sri Dharmasokaraja in Saka 1200 (1278 CE), his younger brother Candrabhanu became king and built a new city at Phra Wiang just south of the giant stupa. Story#8 is quite independent of the others, telling how Nakhon Si Thammarat was subjugated by Java and how Javanese control was subsequently overthrown.

If the year of Sri Dharmasokaraja's death, 1278, is accurate, it becomes hard to link the name of his younger brother Candrabhanu recorded in this *Tamnan* with that of the Candrabhanu who invaded Sri Lanka. Putting it another way, if these two Candrabhanu's were indeed one and the same person, the elder brother's reestablishment of the city of Nakhon Si Thammarat must have taken place some time between the late 12th and early 13th centuries. In any case, as Jacq-Hergoualc'h points out, the name Candrabhanu found in the *Tamnan* is in reality not the name of an individual person but a title given to the first in line of inheritance to the throne. (Jacq-Hergoualc'h 2002: 424-25; cf. Wyatt 1975: 87, 95) It thus seems advisable to leave to one side the question of whether or not this Candrabhanu is related to the Candrabhanu found in the *Culavamsa* and the Chaiya Inscription.

Although it is difficult to determine how many of the events related in the *Tamnan* constitute factual history, a number of them do coincide with events described in historical materials. The implication that 13th-century Nakhon Si Thammarat had close links to Sri Lanka, the centre of Theravada Buddhism, for instance, corresponds to the entry in the *Jinakalamali*, while the description of Nakhon Si Thammarat as having suzerainty over twelve neighbouring kingdoms tallies with the position of Dan-ma-ling given in the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*. According to Wyatt, all but two of those twelve kingdoms can be positively identified: on the east coast of the peninsula, in north-south order, were Chumphon, Phatthalung, Pattani, Saya (between Pattani and Kota Bharu), Kelantan, and Pahan; the remaining four, Kraburi, Takuapa, Trang, and Kedah, were on the west coast. (Wyatt 1975: 84-5; cf. Teeuw 1970: 3) The six kingdoms on the eastern side stretched from the central to the southern section of the peninsula, while those on the western side were concentrated in the central region.

The "Java" that appears in story#8 could refer to the island of Java itself, or alternatively could mean Sumatran forces backed by Java.

Whichever, if the elder of the two brothers, Sri Dharmasokaraja, truly died in 1278 it would coincide with the period of the Pamalayu Expedition of 1275–93 launched by the last Singasari King Krtanagara.

The fact that Sukhothai gets no mention in the *Tamnan* is significant. The final destination of the Buddha statue from Sri Lanka is given as Chiangmai. In addition, the kingdom that subjugated Nakhon Si Thammarat is not Sukhothai but Ayutthaya. The significance of these facts will become clearer in the following section when we take a fresh look at the Xian found in Chinese records.

3. The Rise of Xian (Maritime Siam)

(i) The Rise of Xian in the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*

As noted already, the researcher experiences considerable difficulty in determining how much historical fact can be extracted from the accounts in the *Jinakalamali*, the 'First Inscription', and the *Tamnan* of Nakhon Si Thammarat. Accordingly, we will next turn our attention to Chinese texts dealing with Siam. Although these have already been examined by various scholars, recent scholarship has begun to pay more and more attention to the hypothesis developed by the Japanese scholars Yamamoto and Ishii that Xian corresponds not to Sukhothai, as previously thought, but to Ayutthaya (maritime Siam). (Yamamoto 1989; Ishii 1999a: 48–66; Ishii 2002; Ishii 2003) We will first take up the relationship between Luo-hu and Xian.

The first reference that we have to Luo-hu is in an entry in the *Song-shi*'s 'Account of Dan-mei-liu' dealing with the tribute offered by Dan-liu-mei in 1001 ("Dan-mei-liu" is a mistaken transcription of Dan-liu-mei). The next is a reference, in the 'Account of Zhan-cheng (占城) and Pudian (蒲端)' in the *Song-hui-yao* (宋會要), to Luo-hu offering its own tribute in 1115. After that there is no mention of Luo-hu until the *Zhu-fan-zhi*, where it is noted as a dependency of Zhen-la. The *Dao-yi-za-zhi* has no references, but after 1289, by which time China was ruled by the Yuan dynasty, there are several mentions in the *Yuan-shi* of tribute being made.

Xian first appears in the *Yuan-shi*'s 'Basic Annals' (本紀) entry for 1282, and thereafter it receives more than a dozen mentions. In addition, the *Yuan-shi*'s 'Accounts of the Outer Barbarians' (外夷傳) contains an 'Account of Xian'. This is worth noting because the only other kingdoms able to boast a separate Account in the *Yuan-shi* are An-nan (安南; Vietnam), Zhan-cheng (Campa), Mian (緬; Burma), Zhao-wa (爪哇; Java),

and San-yu (三嶼; part of the modern Philippines) in Southeast Asia, along with Ma-pa-er (馬八兒; Ma'bar on the Coromandel Coast of India) in the Southern Ocean region. (*Yuan-shi*, Books 209 and 210)

In the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*, as will be discussed later, both Luo-hu-guo and Xian-guo are referred to as major powers in the Southeast Asian order. The *Dao-yi-zhi-lue* has accounts for both Luo-hu and Xian, both of which describe Xian as soliciting grain from Luo-hu. Furthermore, in the 'Account of Xian' we find that "in the 5th month [of 1349], it submitted to Luo-hu". There are no further references in Yuan-period materials, and by the time of the Ming, though we find a country known as either "Xian-luo-hu" (暹羅斛) or "Xian-luo" (暹羅), there are no longer any separate entries for either country.

Where were these two countries, Xian and Luo-hu? Luo-hu is generally identified with Lopburi. Although, in the present author's view, Lopburi was situated too far inland to tally with the entry in the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue* that "seawater was boiled down to make salt", for the time being we will go along with this hypothesis. Xian is a harder nut to crack. Although most researchers have identified it with Sukhothai, it is clear from the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue* that Xian was a maritime country. Even more decisive is the entry in the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*, which notes: "Xian-guo administers Shang-shui (上水) and Su-gu-di (速孤底)". Since Su-gu-di corresponded to Sukhothai, it is clear from this entry that the two were quite separate places. It thus seems more appropriate to seek the location of Xian somewhere in the northern section of the Gulf of Thailand. Yamamoto, the first scholar to discuss the identity of the Xian that appears in the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*, suggests the possibility of Ayutthaya. (Yamamoto 1989: 51-3) Chanthaburi and Phetburi, located even nearer to the sea, are also possibilities.

It also seems possible to conclude that Zhen-li-fu (真里富) and Deng-liu-mei, both referred to in the *Zhu-fan-zhi* as tributaries of Zhen-la, were located in the northern section of the Gulf of Thailand. (Fujiyoshi 1991: 29-47) In the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue* we do not find a reference to Zhen-li-fu, but both Deng-liu-mei and Zhen-la have their own Account. The *Dao-yi-zhi-lue*, on the other hand, has an 'Account of Zhen-la' but no mention of either Zhen-li-fu or Deng-liu-mei. The problems start with the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*, where we read that "Zhen-la administers Zhen-li-fu, Deng-liu-mei, Pu-gan (蒲甘), and Rong-li (茸里)", repeating the assertion in the *Zhu-fan-zhi* that the countries north of the Gulf of Thailand and as far west as Pu-gan (Pagan) were all within the sphere of influence of Zhen-la. This

would leave no room at all for Xian. The most likely explanation is that this section of the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*, rather than depicting contemporary reality, was merely passing on memories or records of the past. At the same time as recognizing the emergence of Luo-hu and Xian, that is, the memory of Zhen-la's sphere of influence stretching as far as Pu-gan was allowed to exist side by side. (A similar confusion existed in the Chinese texts with regard to the Strait of Malacca region, where the acknowledgment of the rise of Dan-ma-ling co-existed with the memory of San-fo-qi's previous dominance.)

The rise of Xian or maritime Siam in the northern regions of the Gulf of Thailand occurred at the latest in the year 1280 (*Yuan-shi*, 'Basic Annals', Book 11), after which it expanded its influence southward through a series of piratical assaults (*Dao-yi-zhi-lue*, 'Account of Xian'), resulting in a conflict (discussed below) with the kingdom of Malayu (in the southern half of Sumatra) as related in the *Yuan-shi*'s 'Account of Xian'. This stand-off continued until 1295, when an imperial edict from China ordered Xian to "discontinue its assaults on Malayu". Malayu's contacts with Yuan China, as will be shown in the next section, are recorded in 1280, 1293 and 1299. Among the records of tribute Xian's are the most numerous, while we also have records of Luo-hu sending tribute to Yuan China. In 1294, moreover, "Gan-mu-ding (敢木丁; Kamraten)" of Bi-cha-bu-li (必察不里; Phetburi) is recorded as sending tribute (*Yuan-shi*, 'Basic Annals', Book 18, Zhi-yuan 31, 6th month). These accounts give us a clear sense of how lively the maritime area of Siam, including Luo-hu and Phetburi as well as Xian, was at this time. In the year 1299, not only Malayu, but also Xian, Luo-hu and Su-gu-tai (速古臺; Sukhothai) were all recorded as paying tribute to Yuan China. (*Yuan-shi*, 'Basic Annals', Book 20, Da-de 3, 1st and 5th months)

As far as the *Yuan-shi* is concerned, this 1299 entry is the only record we have of tribute from Sukhothai. If the account in the First Inscription of King Rama Khamhaeng's subjugation of Nakhon Si Thammarat is historically accurate, it can only have taken place, as we have already pointed out, after 1292. Where, then, did this event figure in the bustling world of Xian, or maritime Siam during these years? Did Sukhothai really succeed in pushing Xian out of the picture and extending its control to the central part of the Malay Peninsula? We have records of tribute from Xian to Yuan China in 1300, 1314, 1315, 1319, and 1323 (*Yuan-shi*, 'Basic Annals', Books 20, 25, 26 and 28, Da-de 4, 6th month; Yan-yu 1, 3rd month; Yan-yu 2, 3rd month; Yan-yu 6, 1st month; Zhi-zhi 3, 1st month). If

the “Xian” recorded in all of these entries is really maritime Siam, which is to say if it does not include Sukhothai too, the notion of Nakhon Si Thammarat’s conquest by Sukhothai becomes historically difficult to sustain.

(ii) The Rise of Malayu

Behind the Chinese imperial edict of 1295 referred to above can only have been the impending collision between Xian as it expanded its power southward, and Malayu, which was also seeking to expand its own influence northward. Dan-ma-ling, or Tambralinga, can hardly have been able to stand aloof from this conflict.

Historical materials on Malayu are few. Some time around the year 1280 it seems that the Yuan court sought to demand tribute from Malayu, but that the emissaries were shipwrecked en route and the mission was never accomplished. (*Yuan-shi*, ‘Basic Annals’, Book 11, Zhi-yuan 17, 12th month; Zhi-yuan 18, 6th month) Twelve years later the Yuan Expeditionary Fleet sent to “punish” Java, stopping off in Zhan-cheng (Campa) en route, first sent out envoys to “the small countries of Nan-wu-li (南巫里; Lamuri), Su-mu-du-la (速木都刺; Samudra), Bu-lu-bu-du (不魯不都; unidentified) and Pa-la-la (八刺刺; Peureulak)” in northern Sumatra to gain their submission. Then, after hostilities with Java had ended, they next demanded tribute from the small countries of “Mu-you-lai [a scribe’s mistake for Mu-lai-you, i.e., Malayu], all of which sent royal princes with tribute to demonstrate their allegiance.” (*Yuan-shi*, Book 131, ‘Biography of Yi-hei-mi-shi 亦黑迷失’) It seems likely that the kingdoms of Malayu in southern Sumatra were under the influence of Java. The tributary missions sent in this year returned home in the following year, 1294. (*Yuan-shi*, ‘Basic Annals’, Book 18, Zhi-yuan 31, 10th month) Their return was followed by the aforementioned edict against Xian of 1295, and in 1299, as noted above, tribute was sent by Malayu.

The Malayu of the *Yuan-shi* was undoubtedly located in southern Sumatra. The author feels that it was most likely centred on Palembang, but even if the more popular theory of Jambi were accepted the argument of the present paper would not be affected.

Malayu also appears in the Javanese materials *Pararaton* (Brandes 1920; Phalgunadi 1996) and *Desawarnana* (also known as *Nagarakrtagama*). (Pigeaud 1960–63; Robson 1995) The Malayu targeted by the Pamalayu or Expedition against Malayu, as related in the *Pararaton*, could be interpreted as meaning either the entire island of Sumatra or a part of it (or

even, possibly, a much larger area encompassing the island of Sumatra). In the list of Java's subject countries given in the *Desawarnana*, discussed below, "Malayu" clearly refers to the entire island of Sumatra, so I propose to interpret the Pamalayu as a Javan expedition against Sumatra itself. Although Malayu occupied only the southern section of the island of Sumatra, we can take it that Java used the term "Malayu" to refer to the entire island since it was its closest and most important neighbour, just as it used the name "Pahan" to denote all the dependencies of the Malay Peninsula. Dispatched in 1275, the Pamalayu Expeditionary Force did not return home until 1293. (Krom 1931: 335, 363)

In the following section concerning the Grahi Buddha, the name of two Malayu kings whose names appear on a pair of inscriptions found in the interior of central Sumatra will become an issue, so I will refer briefly to them here. The first Rambahan inscription, written in Malay and Sanskrit and dated 1286, was discovered in the upper reaches of the Batanghari River. In it, a king named Srimat Tribhuvanaraja Maulivarmadeva of "the country Malayu" is mentioned. The second Rambahan inscription, written in Sanskrit and dating from 1347, was discovered still further inland among the inscriptions of King Adityavarman. (Dating from 1347-1375, some of these were written in Sanskrit, others in both Sanskrit and Malay.) In this inscription, the name of a king Srimat Sri Udayadityavarmma Pratapaparakramrajendra Maulimalivarmmadeva is given. (Krom 1931: 336, 394)

From the 1286 inscription, inscribed in the plinth of a stone statue known as the Amoghapasa, we learn that the statue was given to Malayu by the Javanese King Krtanagara of the Singasari Dynasty in recognition of Malayu's having agreed to submit to Krtanagara's rule in the wake of the Pamalayu. (Krom 1931: 335-36) In both Javanese and modern Indonesian history, the Pamalayu is considered from the point of view of Java's suzerainty over Sumatra, but it will become clear in the next section on the Grahi Buddha that the rise of Malayu was inseparable from the support it received from Java. In this context, the so-called Pamalayu or "Campaign Against Malayu" begins to appear more like an alliance between the two countries.

(iii) The Grahi Buddha

One historical source that provides an indication of the relations between Malayu and Tambralinga is the 'Grahi Buddha', a bronze statue so-called because of the place-name Grahi found in the inscription en-

graved on it. Discovered in the Wat Wiang temple at Chaiya, it is now on display in the National Museum in Bangkok. As de Casparis has pointed out, the statue is in the Sukhothai style, the language of the inscription is ancient Khmer, and the script is a Sumatran form of ancient Javanese.¹⁴⁾ (De Casparis 1967: 31-2) According to the inscription, “the statue was made on the orders of Kamraten An Maharaja srimat Trailokyarajamaulibhusanavarmadeva...Mahasenapati Galanai [Talanai], who governs the land of Grahi, invited Mraten sri Nano to create this statue.” (Coedès 1918: 33-6)

Coedès, identifying Grahi with the San-fo-qi tributary Jia-luo-xi mentioned in the *Zhu-fan-zhi*, concluded that Jia-luo-xi was therefore Chaiya, where the statue was found. There have been no challengers to this hypothesis. However, the date of the inscription, “Saka 11006, Year of the Hare”, is clearly mistaken since it gives a five-figure date from the inception of the Saka Era. Coedès’ hypothesis, that the correct date must have been the Hare Year of Saka 1105 (1183 CE), has become the orthodox reading, but de Casparis, through a detailed analysis of both the year and the statue itself, has suggested a date of 1291 CE, more than a century later. This hypothesis also has been widely accepted by scholars alongside that of Coedès. Incidentally, de Casparis has also pointed out that the date of 11006 given in the inscription should in fact be read as 11004. (De Casparis 1967: 32)

De Casparis’ reasoning was based partly on the opinion of the art historian Dupont that the artistic style of the statue dates it from no earlier than the late 13th century. (Dupont 1942) He thus gives more weight to the statue itself than to the dating of the inscription. Moreover, if the late 12th-century CE date were true, it would represent the earliest known use in Southeast Asia of one of the twelve horary signs of the Chinese zodiac. Since the next instances are not found until 1292 (in the First Inscription) and 1297 (in Zhou Dagan’s *Zhen-la-feng-tu-ji*; 真臘風土記), this gap of more than a hundred years is hard to explain.

De Casparis has also carried out a more detailed examination of the similarity (already pointed out by Coedès) between the name Kamraten An Maharaja Srimat Trailokyarajamaulibhusanavarmadeva mentioned above and that of the kings Srimat Tribhuvanaraja Maulivarmadeva and Srimat Sri Udayadityavarmma Pratapaparakramrajendra Maulimalivarmmadeva whose names appear in the two Rambahan inscriptions mentioned in the previous section. His conclusion is that the king who ordered the Grahi Buddha statue to be made was none other than the

Malayu king mentioned in the first Rambahan inscription of 1286. When the power of King Candrabhanu was eliminated as a result of his defeat in Sri Lanka in 1270 (de Casparis, like Coedès, gives 1270 as the date of Candrabhanu's second invasion of Sri Lanka), Malayu stepped into the power gap thus created, meaning that the statue must have been made some time between then and 1292, when Nakhon Si Thammarat was absorbed into the sphere of influence of Siam. The Year of the Hare would have fallen on 1279 and 1291. (De Casparis 1967: 38)

Unfortunately, de Casparis' dating of the statue as no later than 1292 is based on his misreading of the First Inscription. As has been pointed out already (see section (i) above), the last part of the Inscription must have been made after 1292, which means that de Casparis' hypothesis must be revised to a Year of the Hare subsequent to 1292, namely 1303, 1315, or 1327. (While 1339 is also a remote possibility, it seems doubtful that the Malayu king of the 1286 inscription would still be alive more than fifty years later.)

Regarding the correct pronunciation of the name of the ruler of Grahi mentioned in the Grahi inscription, Mahasenapati Talanai, Coedès originally read the second half of the name as Galanai but later revised it to Talanai. De Casparis goes along with his revision. Their reasoning is based not only on the fact that the letters for 't' and 'g' are similar in Javanese script but also on the existence of a king named Sutan Talanei in Jambi legends, together with the fact that two people named 'Talanai' appear in the *Sejarah Melayu* ('Malay History'), one the king of Bentam who is also a descendant of Demang Lebar Daun, the other an envoy sent to Siam by the king of Melaka (Malacca). (Coèdes 1941) These names clearly indicate that the ruler of Grahi was of Malay descent.

The script of the Grahi inscription is in Sumatran style, the ruler of Grahi possessed a Malay name, and the name of the king who ordered him to have the statue made was so similar to that of the Malayu king that we are justified in concluding that the order came from none other than that king himself. Grahi, or Jia-luo-xi, was within the sphere of influence of San-fo-qi. However, the language of the inscription is Khmer, and the title 'Kamraten An' was also a Khmer title. The similarity of the name given as that of the maker of the statue, Mraten Sri Nano, also seems too similar to the Khmer title Kamraten to be ignored. We can thus identify many influences of Khmer culture (or of that of Khmer-influenced Siam). If the hypothesis that the king of Malayu issued a direct order to the ruler

of Grahi is accepted, then the presence of these Khmer factors is difficult to explain. Moreover, since the Grahi Buddha is in Sukhothai style, meaning that of the Theravada school of Buddhism, it becomes even more difficult to conceive of a direct order to cast it being issued by the king of Malayu, who belonged to the Mahayana school. This leaves ample room for the supposition that the Kamraten An who ordered the casting of the statue was in fact the king of Tambralinga, which was then under the sway of Malayu. We can further hypothesize that the king of Malayu held the title Kamraten An in his capacity as the king of Tambralinga.

Accordingly, if the casting of the Grahi Buddha was the result of the rise of Malayu's influence, it must have been after the period of Tambralinga's supremacy (between the time of Candrabhanu and that of the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*), in other words some time between the late 13th century and the first half of the 14th century. As Malayu, backed by Java, advanced northward up the Malay Peninsula at the time of the Pamalayu, it came up against the southward expanding forces of Xian or maritime Siam. It was in this context that Malayu achieved the extraordinary diplomatic victory of successfully soliciting the 1295 edict from the Chinese emperor ordering Xian to desist from its conflict with Malayu. If the inscription on the Grahi Buddha dated from a Year of the Hare subsequent to that event, it must have been 1303, 1315, or possibly 1327.

(iv) The *Desawarnana*: "The Siamese of Dharmanagari"

In the wake of the expansion of maritime Siam, references to Tambralinga suddenly become few and far between. From the 'Account of Dan-ma-ling' in the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue*, as noted already, we do not get a sense of a country with sway over others. On the other hand, there is one highly significant entry in its 'Account of Xian', namely that Xian sought to attack Dan-ma-xi (單馬錫). In this account we read that Xian, after besieging the city to no avail for a month, withdrew its forces after hearing that an emissary from Zhao-wa (爪哇; Java) was on his way. On their way home its armies ransacked Xi-li (昔里). The entry has the sense of a comparatively recent event. Since the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue* was compiled in 1351, the event must have taken place in the 1340s, or at the earliest in the 1330s.

Following the accepted wisdom, I identify Dan-ma-xi with modern-day Singapore. We know that this was within the sphere of influence of the Javanese kingdom of Majapahit, founded in 1293. The identification of the place ransacked by Xian's army, Xi-li, is more difficult. Since Xian

was strong enough to lay siege to Dan-ma-xi for a month, we can assume that the campaign was an organized one on a state-level scale, not merely a piratical assault. On the other hand, the fact that Xian elected to withdraw its troops on the mere hearsay that a Javanese emissary was on his way speaks volumes of the eminence of Majapahit Java at this time.

Nevertheless, we know from Javanese historical materials that by 1365 Nakhon Si Thammarat was no longer in Java's sphere of influence but had come under that of Siam. The elegy *Desawarnana* presented to the current king Rajasanagara at the court of Majapahit in 1365 lists the country's dependencies arranged according to the four directions, followed by a list of the countries with which it enjoyed friendly relations. Concerning how the names of those friendly countries should be read, Robson has offered a new interpretation (Robson 1997) differing somewhat from that given in his own English translation of the *Desawarnana*, published in 1995.

“The above are the various regions protected by His Majesty;
On the other hand, the Siamese of Ayodhya and also of
Dharmanagari,
Marutma, Rajapura as well as Singhanagari,
Champa [Campa], Cambodia and Annam are always friends.”
(Robson 1997: 431)

According to Robson, Marutma corresponds to Martaban in modern-day Burma, Rajapura to Ratburi in the northwest of the Gulf of Thailand, and Singhanagari to Singburi in Central Thailand.

The problem here is the relationship that existed between Siam, Ayodhya (Ayutthaya), and Dharmanagari (Nakhon Si Thammarat). Robson's new hypothesis reads this passage *tuhun tang syankayodyapura kimutang dharmanagari* as “the Siamese of Ayodhya and also of Dharmanagari”, cutting new ground in his addition of the words “the Siamese of” to Dharmanagari as well as to Ayodhya. Ishii supports this hypothesis, which would read the Sanskrit-based word *kimuta* (“and also”) as meaning “and also of Dharmanagari”, adding that *syanka* should be read as meaning not “the Siamese” but with the same meaning as the *shanka* that appears in the 83rd stanza of the *Desawarnana*, namely “the country of Siam”. This would enable us to see this passage as indicating two separate Siams, “Siam with its centre at Ayodhya” and “Siam with its centre at Dharmanagari”. (Ishii 2002: 77–8)

If we accept the thesis put forward by Robson and Ishii, it follows that Majapahit Java recognized Nakhon Si Thammarat as Siam. Even if

we do not accept it, it is clear that Java's control did not extend to Nakhon Si Thammarat, which was counted among Majapahit's friendly allies, not as a dependency.

Conclusion

For just under a hundred years, beginning toward the end of the 12th century, Tambralinga enjoyed a remarkable expansion, its rise reflected in the contrasting descriptions of "Dan-ma-ling" from the *Zhu-fan-zhi* to the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*. Its sending of tribute to China in the year 1196, recorded in the *Dao-yi-za-zhi*, is the earliest record we have. At the time of King Candrabhanu it advanced as far as Sri Lanka (1247-1262) and brought a portion of that island under its control, only to have to fight against both Sri Lanka and the king of Pandya. This was a rare example of a Southeast Asian power making military inroads into other areas. By the end of the 13th century, however, following Candrabhanu's death in battle, Malayu, backed by Java, was pressing from the south while Xian, or maritime Siam, was doing likewise from the north. That Tambralinga was eventually submerged by this struggle is evident from the humdrum description of Dan-ma-ling in the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue*.

A major factor in these unfolding events was the growing influence of Java. Toward the end of the 13th century, Java began to reassert its control over Malayu. The inscription in the pedestal of the Grahi Buddha suggests that by the beginning of the 14th century the Nakhon Si Thammarat area was under the sway of Malayu.¹⁵⁾ At the same time, Xian, maritime Siam, had broken free of the sphere of influence of Zhenla in the north of the Gulf of Thailand and was pressing south. Malayu responded to this threat by the diplomatic strategy of appealing to China. In the stand-off between Java and Xian, Java retained its dominance until the 1330s and 1340s, but by 1365 it was recognizing Nakhon Si Thammarat as Siam.

In this way, by the second half of the 14th century, the central part of the Malay Peninsula that had formerly belonged to 'Outer Java' (known variously as 'San-fo-qi', 'Javaka', or 'Zabaj') had become the sphere of influence of Siam. Ayutthaya is said to have resettled the prisoners it took during its 1390 expedition against Chiangmai in Phatthalung, Songkhla, Nakhon Si Thammarat and other areas to the south. (Ishii 1999b: 164-65) Most likely it was an attempt to 'Siamify' the people of the Malay Peninsula. That this transition was less than thorough, however, is

clear from the fact that, as noted at the beginning of this article, this area continues even now to be a culturally transitional one.

Reference must also be made here to the role played by Sukhothai in the events described in this paper, and also to the related problem of the reliability of the 'First Inscription'. In the light of Chinese texts demonstrating that Xian should be identified not with landlocked Sukhothai but with a 'maritime Siam', possibly Ayutthaya, it seems clear that Sukhothai cannot have played a role in the fortunes of Tambralinga. With this in mind, the widely accepted authenticity of the 'First Inscription' itself becomes questionable, lending even more weight to the doubts cast by researchers since the 1980s that it was in fact a latter-day forgery.

The consensus among scholars since Coedès has been that the Strait of Malacca region was a relatively unified political entity, embodied by Srivijaya. The conclusions of the present paper, however, drawn from an intensive reading of Chinese texts, are that, on the contrary, the region was extremely dispersed and lacking in political unity. The examples of late-7th to early-8th-century Srivijaya, and 15th-century Melaka (Malacca), both of which established far-reaching spheres of influence in the Strait of Malacca region, are already well known. Neither of them, however, managed to sustain their influence for more than a century or so. The present author is of the opinion that the south Indian kingdom of Cola was dominant during the 11th century, (Fukami 1987: 226-29) but this too did not survive for more than a century. As this paper has shown, Tambralinga too had its period of expansion, but once again its supremacy lasted for a century at best, possibly only for a few score years. None of the kingdoms in the Strait of Malacca region ever became strong enough to maintain its influence over the whole area through a period measurable in centuries: all in all, the region appears to have seen a series of short-lived regimes succeeding one another in rapid succession, their dominance lasting no more than a short span of years.

With these facts in mind, the subject of future research must surely be to examine why, nonetheless, dominant regimes were at times able to emerge. As far as the present article is concerned, the most directly relevant question must be: what factors operating from the 12th century onward made possible not only the rise of Tambralinga, but also the southward advance of Xian and the northward advance of Malayu? Given the relative paucity of written materials, archaeological evidence and materials relating to local art history will inevitably come to play a central part

in that debate.

Notes

- 1) With regard to the controversy over the location of Deng-liu-mei and Dan-liu-mei, addressed in pages 3-4 of this article, Jacq-Hergoualc'h correctly identifies Dan-ma-ling with Tambralinga (page 422). His acquiescence with Wheatley in locating only Deng-liu-mei north of the Kra Isthmus (page 354), can also be upheld. However, his identification of Dan-liu-mei, Dan-mei-liu and Zhou-mei-liu with Tambralinga, based purely on the euphonic similarity between 'Tambralinga' and 'Dan-mei-liu', is wrong: As Wheatley himself has pointed out, both 'Dan-mei-liu' and 'Zhou-mei-liu' were no more than mis-renderings by careless Chinese scribes of the place-name 'Dan-liu-mei'. Regarding the relative locations of Dan-liu-mei and Deng-liu-mei, see also the discussion in Wheatley (1961:65-66).
- 2) A Chinese researcher, arguing that 'Deng-liu-mei' was the Chinese transliteration of 'Dharma (raja)', and 'Dan-ma-ling' that of 'Tambralinga', has located both in Nakhon Si Thammarat. (Su 1981: 79-82) Kuwata too, (1993: 249) while questioning the relationship between Dan-ma-ling and Deng-liu-mei, identifies 'Deng-liu-mei' as 'Dharma (raja)' and locates it in Nakhon Si Thammarat. Unfortunately, there is no basis for concluding that 'Deng-liu-mei' was used to represent the sound 'Dharma'. In addition, it is clear from the Chinese sources that Deng-liu-mei was located to the north not only of Nakhon Si Thammarat but also of Jia-luo-xi (Chaiya), and that it was subservient to Zhen-la, not to San-fo-qi (see subsequent discussion, pages 7-8). Finally, the relationship between Deng-liu-mei and Dan-ma-ling described in the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi* (of which Kuwata was unaware) shows conclusively that the two cannot have been the same place.
- 3) Similar attempts to identify Deng-liu-mei with Tambralinga continue, exemplified by that of Hall. (1992: 221-22) These attempts share with Wolters the characteristic that they do not suggest a location for Dan-ma-ling.
- 4) As far as I have been able to ascertain, the *Yuan-shi* has only one reference to San-fo-qi. For details, see Fukami 2004.
- 5) While the other three major Chinese texts, the *Zhu-fan-zhi*, the *Dao-yi-za-zhi*, and the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi* all use the character 單 for the 'Dan' of Dan-ma-ling, the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue* alone uses the character 丹.
- 6) There is also a 15th-century Pali manuscript (the *Camadevivamsa*) which mentions the place name Nagara Sri Dharmaraja when referring to the story of the 10th-century King Sujita of Siridhammanagara, (Wolters 1958: 591-92) but this manuscript has no direct relevance to the 13th-century development of Dan-ma-ling/Tambralinga.
- 7) In a subsequent discussion of Southeast Asia's Tamil inscriptions, Karashima (2001) makes no reference to this inscription, while Guy (2001) also neglects to mention it.

- 8) Concerning the dates of these incursions, Coedès' original thesis suggested 1236 and 1256, dates that were accepted by Krom. (1931: 334) However, Coedès later revised the dates to approximately 1247 and 1270, respectively. (Coedès 1968: 185)
- 9) The present author agrees with that interpretation, but other scholars have dissented: Luce, the historian of Burma, has suggested that Theravada Buddhism spread when Pagan, under the rule of the king Narapatisithu (r. 1174-1211), extended the kingdom's domination south as far as the Kra Isthmus. Wyatt and Bastin, on the other hand, hypothesize that the conversion took place between 1130 and 1176 when Tambralinga was controlled by Sri Lanka. (See Luce, G. H., 'The Early Syam in Burma's History, A Supplement' (*Journal of the Siam Society* 47-1 (1959): 59-101; Luce, G. H., *Old Burma-Early Pagan*, 3 vols., New York, 1969-70; Wyatt, D.K. & J. S. Bastin, 'Mainland Powers on the Malay Peninsula, A.D. 1000-1511', Paper Presented to the International Conference on Asian History, Kuala Lumpur, 1968, all cited in Jacq-Hergoualc'h 2002: 399-401; Hall 1985: 202) These hypotheses, if true, would suggest that Nakhon Si Thammarat was converted to Theravada Buddhism as early as the 12th century. However, there is no evidence that Pagan's hegemony stretched as far as Nakhon Si Thammarat, which is considerably south of the Isthmus. Furthermore, given the short duration of Pagan's suzerainty (less than forty years), it seems unlikely that the conversion could have taken place in such a short span of time. As for Wyatt and Bastin's hypothesis, it has been presented to an academic conference but has yet to appear in print.
- 10) Sirisena makes no mention of the Pandya Inscription of 1265.
- 11) The contention by early researchers (Coedès, Krom) that Candrabhanu's second incursion against Sri Lanka took place in 1256 was based on this episode in the *Jinakalamali*.
- 12) In the mid-1980s certain researchers began to contend that the First Inscription (the epitaph to King Rama Khamhaeng) was actually ordered to be made by the 19th-century Prince Mongkut (later King Rama IV). Despite heated debates concerning the veracity of this contention, no emphatic conclusion has yet been reached. (See Chamberlain 1991)
- 13) The Martaban route is mentioned in the 'Eleventh Inscription', dating from the 1350s, where it is related that a pilgrimage by a senior priest to India and Sri Lanka exited into the Bay of Bengal through Martaban. On his return journey too this priest took a route through Tenasserim and the Mawdaung Pass in the north of the peninsula without calling in at Nakhon Si Thammarat. (Ishii 1999a: 50-58)

It could simply be that, as far as Sukhothai was concerned, the route via Martaban was not open in the mid-13th century. Wheatley, basing his argument on a Mon chronicle, judges that the Sukhothai advance south into the Malay Peninsula began from about 1280. (Wheatley 1961: 301) Although he does not give specific materials to back up his claim, among the best-known of the Mon chronicles is the *Rajadirit Ayedawbon*, translated from

Mon into Burmese on the instructions of Binnya Dala, Prime Minister (though himself of Mon descent) to the 16th century Burmese King Bayinnaung. In 1785 this work was also translated into Thai at the Thai court in Bangkok, with the title *Rachatirat*. The text tells the story of the Mon dynasty established at Martaban (after 1369 relocated in Pegu) from its declaration of independence from Burma and submission to Sukhothai under King Wareru (r. 1287-1296) up to the reign of King Rajadirit (r. 1385-1423). (Tomita 1981: 35-57, 253; Pe Maung Tin 1992: 140; Thaw Kaung 2000: 28)

- 14) The Grahi Buddha consists of three sections: the pedestal, the statue itself, and the *naga* behind it. There is a possibility that the date of the inscription on the base of the pedestal does not coincide with that of the casting of the actual statue, but aesthetically speaking the confluence between the two is strong. (Chand Chirayu Rajani 1987: 130) The form of the statue is extremely unusual in that it depicts the Buddha, protected by a seven-headed *naga* or dragon behind him, sitting not in meditative contemplation but with the right hand extended towards the earth.
- 15) Logically speaking, given that both Tambralinga and Malayu were a part of San-fo-qi (Javaka/Zabaj), there is no need to assume only that Tambralinga was under Malayu control; the possibility of the opposite, or even of both being under the control of a third country, should probably be accorded equal credibility.

REFERENCES

Comment on the principal Chinese sources used in this article: For the *Zhu-fan-zhi*, I used principally the annotated Japanese translation by Fujiyoshi (1991), in conjunction with the original text contained in Feng (1970). As noted in chapter one, Wada (1954) was my reference for the *Dao-yi-zazhi*. As for the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*, I used Chen (1987) as my principal reference while also consulting the original text in the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi canben* (大德南海志殘本) (Institute for Local History of Guangzhou City, 1986) and the *Nan-hai-zhi*, cited in Vol. 11907 of the *Yong-le Da-dian* (永樂大典), (Shijie shuju, Taipei, 1962). For the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue*, I relied on Fujita (1915) and Su (1981). Finally, for the *Song-shi* and the *Yuan-shi*, I used volumes 7 and 8 of the nine-volume *25 Histories* (二十五史) (Xianggang wenxue yanjiu she, Hongkong, 1959?).

Japanese/Chinese Language Sources

- Chen Lianqing 1987 陳連慶「《大德南海志》所見西域南海諸國考實」『文史』
 ‘*Da-de-nan-hai-zhi suo jian Xiyu Nanhai zhuguo kaoshi* (An examination of the various countries of the western regions and southern seas, as seen in the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi*)’, (*Wen-shi* 27: 145-64)
- Feng Chengjun Ed. 1970 馮承鈞『諸蕃志校註』臺北 臺灣商務印書館 *Zhu-fan-zhi jiaozhu* (Annotated edition of the *Zhu-fan-zhi*), Taipei (Taiwan Shangwu Yinshu Guan)

- Fujita Toyohachi 1915 藤田豊八『島夷志略校註』北京 文殿閣書莊 *Dao-yi-zhi-lue jiaozhu* (Annotated edition of the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue*), Beijing (Wendiange shuzhuang)
- Fujiyoshi Masumi Trans./Ed. 1991 藤善眞澄譯註『諸蕃志』關西大學出版部 *Zhu-fan-zhi*, Osaka (Kansai Daigaku Press)
- Fukami Sumio 1987 深見純生「三佛齊の再検討—マラッカ海峽古代史研究の視座転換」『東南アジア研究』 'Sanbussei no saikentō: Marakka kaikyō kodaishi kenkyū no shiza tenkan' (Reexamination of San-fo-ch'i: Change of Perspective of the Study on Early History of the Western Part of Insular Southeast Asia), (*Tōnan Ajia kenkyū* 25-2: 205-32)
- 1989 「單馬令に關するノート—13世紀マレー半島中部の發展」『東南アジア 歴史と文化』 'Tanmarei ni kansuru nōto: 13 seiki Marē hantō chūbu no hatten' (A note on Dan-ma-ling: developments in the central Malay Peninsula in the 13th century), (*Tōnan Ajia rekishi to bunka* 18: 86-98)
- 2001 「海峽の覇者」『岩波講座東南アジア史2』 'Kaikyō no hashā' (Ruler of the Straits), (*Iwanami kōza Tōnan Ajia shi* 2: 115-39)
- 2004 「元代のマラッカ海峽—通路か據点か」『東南アジア 歴史と文化』 'Gen-dai no Marakka kaikyō: tsūro ka kyoten ka' (Passage or Emporium? The Malacca Straits during the Yuan Period), (*Tōnan Ajia rekishi to bunka* 33: 100-118)
- Ishii Yoneo 1999a 石井米雄『タイ近世史研究序説』岩波書店 *Tai kinseishi kenkyū josetsu* (Introduction to research on early modern Thai history), Tokyo (Iwanami shoten)
- 1999b 「シャム諸王國」石井米雄・桜井由躬雄編『東南アジア史 I 大陸部』山川出版社 'Shamu sho-ōkoku' (The kingdoms of Siam), in Ishii Yoneo & Sakurai Yumio Eds., *Tōnan Ajia shi* (History of Southeast Asia) I, *Tairikubu* (Continental areas), Tokyo (Yamakawa shuppansha)
- 2002 「古代ジャワ語文獻に見える『シャム』—タイ史の新しい見方についての試論」『東南アジア 歴史と文化』 'Kodai Jawago bunken ni mieru "Shamu": Tai shi no atarashii mikata ni tsuite no shiron' (Siam in old Javanese literature: In search of a new interpretation of Siamese history), (*Tōnan Ajia rekishi to bunka* 31: 113-18)
- Karashima Noboru 1988 辛島昇「中世南インドの海港ペリヤパッティナム—島夷誌略の大八丹とイブン・バトゥータのファッタン」『東方學』 'Chūsei minami-Indo no kaikō Periapattinamu: Tōishiryaku no Daipattan to Ibun Battuta no Fattan' (The seaport of Periapattinam in south India in the Middle Ages: the Da-ba-dan of the *Dao-yi-zhi-lue* and the Fattan of Ibn Battuta), (*Tōhōgaku* 75: 81-98)
- 2001 「古代・中世東南アジアにおける文化發展とインド洋ネットワーク」『岩波講座東南アジア史1』 'Kodai-Chūsei Tōnan Ajia ni okeru bunka hatten to Indoyō nettowāku' (Cultural developments in Southeast Asia during ancient times and the Middle Ages and the Indian Ocean network), (*Iwanami kōza Tōnan Ajia shi* 1: 309-36)
- Kuroda Keiko 2002 黒田景子「南タイ、ソンクラのサムロン橋碑文について」『上智アジア學』 'Minami Tai, Sonkurā no Samuronkyō hibun ni tsuite'

- (Inscriptions of the Samrong Bridge of Sonkhla in South Thailand), (*Jōchi Ajiagaku* 20: 93-110)
- Kuwata Rokurō 1993 桑田六郎『南海東西交通史論考』汲古書院 *Nankai tōzai kōtsūshi ronkō* (Treatise on the history of East-West transportation in the South Seas), Tokyo (Kyūko shoin)
- Pe Maung Tin, U 1992 ベーマウンティン, ウー著 大野徹監譯『ビルマ文學史』井村文化事業社 *Biruma bungaku shi* (History of Burmese literature), Trans./Ed. Ōno Tōru, Tokyo (Imura bunka jigyōsha)
- Su Jiqing 1981 蘇繼頤『島夷誌略校釋』北京 中華書局 *Dao-yi-zhi-lue jiaoshi* (Annotated edition of *Dao-yi-zhi-lue*), Beijing (Zhonghua shuju)
- Tomita Takejirō Trans./Ed. 1981 富田竹二郎編譯『タイ古典文學名作選』井村文化事業社 *Tai koten bungaku meisakusen* (Masterpieces of traditional Thai literature), Tokyo (Imura bunka jigyōsha)
- Wada Hisanori 1954 和田久徳「宋代南海史料としての島夷雜誌」『お茶の水女子大學人文科學紀要』‘Sō-dai Nankai shiryō toshite no *Dao-yi-zh-zhi*’ (The *Dao-yi-zh-zhi* as a historical source on the South Seas during the Song period), (*Ochanomizu Joshi Daigaku jinbun kagaku kiyō* 5: 27-63)
- 1959「東南アジアにおける初期華僑社會 (960-1279)」『東洋學報』‘Tōnan Ajia ni okeru shoki kakyō shakai (960-1279)’ (Early overseas Chinese society in Southeast Asia (960-1279), (*Tōyō gaku* 42-1: 76-106)

Western-Language Sources

- Aung-Thwin, Michael A. 1998 *Myth and History in the Historiography of Early Burma: Paradigms, Primary Sources and Prejudices*, Athens, Ohio (Ohio University Centre for International Studies) and Singapore (Institute of Southeast Asian Studies)
- Brandes, J.L.A. 1920 *Pararaton (Ken Arok) of het Boek der Koningen van Tumapel en van Majapahit*, 's-Gravenhage and Batavia (VBG 62)
- Chamberlain, James R. Ed. 1991 *The Ramkhamhaeng Controversy: Collected Papers*, Bangkok (The Siam Society)
- Chand Chirayu Rajani, M.C. 1987 *Thai Imageries of Suwanbhumi*, Bangkok
- Coedès, G. 1918 ‘Le Royaume de Çrivijaya’ (*Bulletin de l'École Française de l'Extrême-Orient* 18: 1-36)
- 1927 ‘A Propos de la Chute du Royaume de Çrivijaya’ (*Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land- en Volkenkunde* 83: 459-72)
- 1941 ‘Talanai’ (*The Journal of the Greater India Society* 8-1: 61-2)
- 1968 *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, Honolulu (East-West Center Press)
- De Casparis, J.G. 1967 ‘The Date of the Grahi Buddha’ (*Journal of the Siam Society* 60: 31-40)
- Dupont, P. 1942 ‘Variétés Archéologiques II: Le Buddha de Grahi et l'école de Chaiya’ (*Bulletin de l'École Française de l'Extrême-Orient* 42, 105-13 & pl. VI-VII)
- Ferrand, Gabriel 1922 *L'empire Sumatranais de Çrivijaya*, Paris
- Fukami Sumio 1999 ‘San-fo-qi, Srivijaya, and the Historiography of Insular

- Southeast Asia', in Nguyen The Anh & Ishizawa Yoshiaki Eds., *Trade and Navigation in Southeast Asia (14th-19th Centuries)*, Paris and Montreal (L'Harmattan): pp. 31-45.
- Geiger, Wilhelm Trans. 1973 *Culavamsa, Being the More Recent Part of the Mahavamsa*, 2 parts, Trans. into English by Mrs. C. Mabel Rickmers, London (The Pali Text Society)
- Griswold, A. B. and Prasert na Nagara 1971 'The Inscription of King Rama Gamhen of Sukhodaya (1292A.D.); Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 9' (*Journal of the Siam Society* 59-2: 179-228)
- Guy, John 2001 'Tamil Merchant Guilds and the Quanzhou Trade', in A. Schottenhammer Ed., *The Emporium of the World: Maritime Quanzhou, 1000-1400*, Leiden/Boston/Koln (Brill): pp. 283-308
- Hall, Kenneth R. 1985 *Maritime Trade and State Development in Early Southeast Asia*, Honolulu (University of Hawaii Press)
- 1992 'Economic History of Early Southeast Asia', in N. Tarling Ed., *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia, Vol. 1, From Early Times to c.1800* (Cambridge University Press): pp. 183-275
- Ishii, Yoneo 2003: 'A Note on the Identification of a Group of Siamese Port-polities Along the Bay of Thailand' (*The Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko* 61: 75-82)
- Jacq-Hergoualc'h, Michel 2002 *The Malay Peninsula, Crossroads of the Maritime Silk Road*, Trans. Victoria Hobson, Leiden/Boston/Koln (Brill)
- Jayawickrama, N. A. 1968 *The Sheaf of Garlands of the Epochs of the Conqueror, Being a Translation of Jinakalamali Pakaranam of Ratanapanna Thera of Thailand*, London (Luzac, published for the Pali Text Society)
- Karashima, Noboru 1995 'Indian Commercial Activity in Ancient and Medieval Southeast Asia', Paper Presented to the Eighth International Conference on Tamil Studies.
- Krom, N. J. 1931 *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, 2nd ed., 's-Gravenhage
- Majumdar, R.C. 1937 *Suvarnadvipa, Part I: Political History*, Dacca
- Nilakanta Sastri, K. A. 1937 'Srivijaya, Candrabhanu and Vira-Pandya' (*Tijdschrift van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 77: 251-68)
- 1940 'Sri Vijaya' (*Bulletin de l'École Française de l'Extrême-Orient* 40-2: 239-313)
- Pelliot, Paul 1904 'Deux Itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du VIII^e Siècle' (*Bulletin de l'École Française de l'Extrême-Orient* 4: 131-413)
- Phalgunadi, I Gusti Putu 1996 *The Pararaton A Study of the Southeast Asian Chronicle, Translated from the Original Kawi Text*, New Delhi (Sundeepr Prakashan)
- Pigeaud, Th. G. Th 1960-1963 *Java in the Fourteenth Century*, 5 vols. The Hague (Martinus Nijhoff)
- Robson, Stuart. Trans. 1995 *Desawarnana (Nagarakrtagama) by Mpu Prapanca*, Leiden (KITLV Press)
- 1997 'Thailand in an Old Javanese Source' (*Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land- en Volkenkunde* 153-3: 431-5)

- Sirisena, W.M. 1978 *Sri Lanka and South-East Asia: Political, Religious and Cultural Relations from A.D. c. 1000 to c. 1500*, Leiden (Brill)
- Teeuw, A. & David K. Wyatt 1970 *Hikayat Patani, The Story of Patani*, The Hague (Martinus Nijhoff)
- Thaw Kaung, U 2000 'Ayedawbon Kyan, an Important Myanmar Literary Genre Recording Historical Events' (*Journal of the Siam Society* 88-1/2: 21-33)
- Tibbetts, G. R. 1979 *A Study of the Arabic Texts Containing Material on South-East Asia*, Leiden/London (Brill)
- Veeraprajak, Kongkaew 1986 'Inscriptions from South Thailand' (*SPAFA Digest* 7-1: 7-21)
- Waithayakon, Wan Trans. 1965 *Stone Inscriptions of Sukhothai*, Bangkok (The Siam Society)
- Wheatley, Paul 1961 *The Golden Khersonese*, Kuala Lumpur (University of Malaya Press)
- Wolters, O.W. 1958 'Tambralinga' (*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 21: 587-607)
- Wyatt, David K. 1975 *The Crystal Sands, The Chronicles of Nagara Sri Dharmmaraja*, Cornell University (Data Paper No. 98, Southeast Asia Program)
- Yamamoto, Tatsuro 1989 'Thailand as It is Referred to in the *Da-de-nan-hai-zhi* at the Beginning of the Fourteenth Century' (*Journal of East-West Maritime Relations* 1: 47-58)

