

# Introduction

KARASHIMA Noboru and HIROSUE Masashi

## **Purpose of the Symposium**

This volume presents a record of the symposium ‘State Formation and Social Integration in Pre-modern South and Southeast Asia: A Comparative Study of Asian Society’ organized by and held at Toyo Bunko (Oriental Library) in Tokyo on 8 and 9 March 2014. The purpose of the symposium was to examine through comparisons state formation and social integration during the pre-modern period in two regions of Asia. The regions compared were South Asia and Southeast Asia, and the two topics on focus were: (a) a re-examination of the concept of ‘Indianization’ of Southeast Asia during the ancient and medieval periods, and (b) an examination of the concept of ‘Islamicization’ and its application to medieval society in South and Southeast Asia.

The editors of this volume coordinated the symposium in which 13 papers and two comments were presented over three sessions:

- Session 1: The State and Society in the Islamicate World (thirteenth-sixteenth centuries) (four papers followed by a comment)
- Session 2: Early Polity and Society as Revealed from Archaeological and Literary Evidence (two papers), and
- Session 3: Formation of State and Society in the fifth-fourteenth centuries (seven papers and a comment on the nine papers that comprised Sessions 2 and 3).

In this volume we have re-arranged the papers and comments from the order in which they were presented in the symposium to that seen in the contents. While the papers included in this volume, except those of some speakers, have been revised after the symposium to respond to the discussion at the symposium and the comments published in the web-journal of Toyo Bunko (August 2014, <http://www.toyo-bunko.or.jp/research/e-journal/MASR05/>), the commentators’ reports included here are written based on the papers read at the symposium and do not reflect the changes

made by the paper readers after the symposium, though the commentator reports themselves were revised after their publication in the Toyo Bunko's web-journal.<sup>1</sup> In this Introduction, therefore, if the changes made by the authors of the papers are substantial,<sup>2</sup> we will provide special mention of them as the comments included in this volume are on the papers as presented at the symposium and the commentators themselves have not seen the papers after they have been revised.

For an explanation of the purpose of this symposium, we would like to begin with a brief historiography of past studies on the topics discussed, though it is also given in detail in Kulke's comment.

First, a re-examination of the concept of 'Indianization' of Southeast Asia during the ancient and medieval periods. European scholars began researching Southeast Asian history during the Western colonization of this area in the beginning of the last century. The interpretation of the early scholars who pioneered these studies was that a highly-developed Indian culture had been 'transplanted' in Southeast Asia during an ancient period, as the scholars were well aware of the existence of a great Indian civilization in ancient South Asia. Their usage of the terms like 'Further India' or 'East Indies' for Southeast Asia harks back to the term 'Trans Gangetic India' used by Ptolemy for the Southeast Asian region. Afterwards, in the 1920s and 1930s some Indian nationalist scholars reinforced this interpretation through the concepts of 'Greater India' or 'Hindu Colonies' in their historical studies of Southeast Asia. R.C. Majumdar, who established the Greater India Society in Kolkata in 1926, was the champion of this new wave.

In the 1940s, however, George Coedes, a French doyen introduced a new concept 'Indianization of Southeast Asia'. Since then many scholars have discussed various aspects of 'Indianization', taking up, for example, comparative studies of temple architecture, writing systems, religious rituals, etc. Though the notion of 'transplantation' continued to be the leading view for some decades even after the end of the Pacific War in 1945, a new trend did emerge in the 1970s emphasizing 'indigenous' development of Southeast Asian states and society.<sup>3</sup> The scholars who adopt this view are called 'indigenists', and their view later became the mainstream of the study. Despite differences in individual understanding and explanation of the process of indigenous development, we can count I.W. Mabbett, J.G. de Casparis, P. Wheatley, and O.W. Wolters among the early indigenists.

<sup>1</sup> Though the transcript of Tanabe's comment on the papers read in Session 1 is available on the web-journal, Kulke's comment on the papers in Sessions 2 and 3 is available only as an oral recording of what was read at the symposium.

<sup>2</sup> The changes made in the papers will be referred to in this Introduction.

<sup>3</sup> The works of J.C. van Leur and F.D.K. Bosch in the 1940s show their anticipation of this trend.

While the indigenist view has been widely accepted among historians, a recent, important development has been the advance in pre-historic archaeological studies in Southeast Asia and also in South Asia. These studies reveal an indigenous development of Southeast Asian society even before the beginning of the Common Era. And this development took place despite the fact that Southeast Asia had relations with South Asia and other areas through the activities of merchants and artisans.<sup>4</sup>

Consequently, most scholars are now satisfied with the discovery of the process of autonomous development before the fifth century when the Indian influence became very clear. Therefore, without hesitation, they tend to regard the period in and after the fifth century as the period of ‘Indianization’ when advanced states were formed on the basis of an Indian model under the influence of Buddhism or Hinduism.

Another development was the ‘Convergence theory’, put forward by H. Kulke towards the end of the last century. According to him, the early state formation process appears to have been similar on both sides of the Bay of Bengal, namely the eastern coast of Indian Peninsula (east and south India) and Southeast Asia during the first half of the first millennium. This was the influence of the advanced state formation achieved in north India during the Gupta period or earlier. Kulke suggests that there was ‘social nearness’ between the two areas, which had been in close contact from an early period, and this ‘social nearness’ was possibly the cause for the ‘convergence’, namely, the concurrence of a similar process of state formation under the influence of advanced north Indian culture in both these areas.<sup>5</sup>

Recent archaeological discoveries in various sites in Southeast and South Asia, as well as the theory of convergence as put forward by Kulke, have greatly advanced the study of ancient and early medieval history of Southeast Asia. In Sessions 2 and 3 of this symposium, we discussed various topics in relation to these new trends to re-examine the concept of ‘Indianization’.

As stated earlier, most scholars on the indigenist side distinguish this early process of state formation as different from that achieved later in and after the fifth century. They regard the latter process as ‘Indianized’ state formation. We, on the other hand, wonder whether the states established in Southeast Asia under the influence of the culture of India can be regarded as ‘Indianized’ states. Of course, Indian influences are clearly perceived, but did these states have the same socio-political features as the states that were formed in east and south India during the

<sup>4</sup> I.C. Glover and B. Bellina, ‘Ban Don Ta Phet and Khao Sam Kaeo: The Earliest Indian Contacts Re-assessed’, in *Early Interactions between South and Southeast Asia*, ed. P.Y. Manguin, A. Mani, and G. Wade, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2011.

<sup>5</sup> Kulke, ‘The Concept of Cultural Convergence Revisited: Reflections on India’s Early Influence in Southeast Asia’ paper read at International Conference on Asian Encounters: Networks of Cultural Interaction, 31 Oct.-4 Nov. 2011, and revised in *Asian Encounters: Exploring Connected Histories*, ed. Upinder Singh and Parul Pandya Dhar, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2014.

same period? As far as Kulke limits his discussion to the ‘process’ of state formation, his ‘convergence theory’ is fully acceptable, but it does not necessarily follow that the states that formed on either side of the Bay of Bengal had the same socio-political features to allow us to call the Southeast Asian states ‘Indianized states’.

This is the reason why we, the present editors, coordinated the symposium in March 2014 to comparatively study the two regions and re-examine the concept of ‘Indianization’ of Southeast Asia. So far, scholars have paid attention only to the similarity of the state and society between Southeast Asia and South Asia, but surely there must have also been differences between them to which past studies failed to pay due attention. For example, though we find the participation of Brahmins in state governance in both regions, there appear to have been differences in the role they played in each. In Southeast Asia only those Brahmins who were associated with the royal court played their role individually and their magical power seems to have been the key point of their role. In South Asia, in contrast, Brahmins played their role as a Brahmana *varna* (priestly class) as opposed to the Kshatriya *varna* (warrior class) including kings in the *varna* (caste) system established in north India under Brahmanism.<sup>6</sup>

For the purpose of comparative examination of the Southeast Asian situation with that in South Asia we invited R. Gurukkal and R. Champakalakshmi from India and P.Y. Manguin and H. Kulke from Europe. Together with Japanese specialists the development of state in South and Southeast Asia from chiefdom to regional, and finally to centralized state was discussed. In the symposium, we shared the idea that in South Asian ideology such as *bhakti* or the *varna* system had utmost importance in integrating its society based basically on sedentary agriculture in the formation of regional and centralized states. However, the absence or the non-establishment of ideologies such as *bhakti* and a system such as caste in Southeast Asia, as well as the ecological differences between the two regions, seems to have caused a difference in pre-modern state formation in the two regions. It was also pointed out during the discussion that in Southeast Asia there were ecological differences among its various parts (mainly between the mainland and the insular parts) and there existed various ethnic groups in these parts, which resulted in differences in the state formation in Southeast Asia itself.

To examine the concept of ‘Islamicization’ and its application to medieval society in South and Southeast Asia, we invited S. Kumar from India and P.B. Wagoner from the USA. The reason for taking up this topic as speakers was as follows:

In South Asia during the period from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century,

<sup>6</sup> For example, a large number of Brahmins were invited from the north and given villages (*brahmadeyas*) for social integration under *varna* system and the state control of localities in the Pallava and Chola states in south India. See, N. Karashima ed., *A Concise History of South India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 90, 91.

the Vijayanagar Empire flourished in south India ruling a large part south of the Tungabhadra River. The kings of this state followed Hinduism though they were not intolerant towards other religions. Despite this, past historiography reveals that some scholars who were ardent Hindus praised the state for having defended south India from the attack and spread of Islam, fighting against the sultanates established in northern Deccan.

However, Wagoner in recent studies has expressed strong opposition to this religiously biased understanding. According to him, the kings of the Vijayanagar state were, though followers of Hinduism, fully aware of the spread of Islam and Islamicate culture and their importance in the outside wider area. They differentiated Islamicate culture from Islamic religion, as can be seen in their using the title *hindurajasuratrana* (sultan among the Hindu kings) for themselves. Wagoner argues that the Vijayanagar kings sought legitimation of their rule from the Delhi Sultan who defeated many south Indian kings.<sup>7</sup> In recent studies on medieval Deccan history, Wagoner proposed the concept of a 'Persian cosmopolis', borrowing the idea from Sheldon Pollock's 'Sanskrit cosmopolis' to understand their interactions in the Deccan, though he avoided the use of this term in his revised paper in this volume.

S. Kumar has been studying the Delhi sultans and the society under their rule in the northern part of the subcontinent from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. It is well known that Sufism played an important role in the spread of Islam and establishment of Muslim rule in north India in the thirteenth century. According to him however, past historical studies of the Delhi Sultanate period was flawed as it treated Sufism synchronically and monolithically. Instead, he suggests that we study the role of Sufism diachronically paying attention to the change in the relation Sufi *shaykhs* had with political elites, including the sultan. According to Kumar, the study of this change or transition enables us to understand better, the reason for, and process of, the people's acceptance of Muslim rule during the period from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century.

These two aspects studied by Wagoner and Kumar are somewhat different from and independent of each other, but if we look at them together, we understand better the spread of Islam and establishment of Muslim rule in South Asia in general. This in turn should urge us to examine the situation in Southeast Asia, where Islamic states emerged in the thirteenth century. Since then Islamic religion and culture have been playing a very important role in Southeast Asia too.

That is why it was decided to take up the topic of 'Islamicization' also in this symposium. In discussing this topic due attention was also paid to the historical and

<sup>7</sup> P.B. Wagoner, 'Harihara, Bukka, and the Sultan: The Delhi Sultanate in the Political Imagination of Vijayanagara', in *Beyond Turk and Hindu: Rethinking Religious Identities in Islamicate South Asia*, ed. D. Gilmartin and B.B. Lawrence, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000.

ecological differences between South Asia and Southeast Asia, which resulted in the differences in state formation before the thirteenth century. In Islamicization also, the difference between the two regions has been clarified in this symposium.

### **Papers, Comments and Discussions**

The issue of ‘Indianization’ was taken up in Sessions 2 and 3. In Session 2, R. Gurukkal and M. Yamagata presented their papers on the early state (polity) formation in South and Southeast Asia. In Session 3, R. Furui, E. Nitta, and P.Y. Manguin presented papers on early or regional state formation with respect to states in Bengal, and Dvaravati and Sriwijaya in Southeast Asia respectively. Following these papers, R. Champakalakshmi, F. Matsuura, T. Aoyama and M. Mita took up the regional or more developed, centralized states and society in South and Southeast Asia for the period from the sixth to the fourteenth century. On these nine papers read at Sessions 2 and 3, H. Kulke, as commentator, expressed his understanding of ‘Indianization’ of Southeast Asia by investigating the historiography of the past studies. Afterwards there was an open discussion amongst all the participants including the scholars on the floor.

‘Islamicization’ was the theme of Session 1. S. Kumar, M. Hirosue, K. Nishio, and P.B. Wagoner presented their respective papers on states and the society in South and Southeast Asia during the period from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. They focused on the Delhi Sultanate in north India, Pasai in Sumatra, Melaka in Malay Peninsula, and Vijayanagar and the Deccan Sultanates in south India respectively and examined the reason for and the way in which they were Islamicized. A. Tanabe’s commentary on these four papers was followed by another open discussion.

Thus, a variety of topics was discussed over the three sessions to comparatively study the pre-modern state formation and social integration in South Asia and Southeast Asia through a re-examination of these topics in terms of ‘Indianization’ and ‘Islamicization’. The topics may roughly be grouped under the following four heads: (1) early state formation from chiefdom to state, (2) *Mandala* theory, segmentary state theory and *samanta* system, (3) the role played by ideology and caste (*varna*) system in the later state formation, and (4) Sufis, sultans, and commercial network in the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries. The examination and discussion under these heads are summarized as follows.

#### *1. Early State Formation from Chiefdom to State*

In Session 2, R. Gurukkal traced the antecedents of the state (polity) formation in the Deccan and the Tamil macro region in south India and M. Yamagata on the

development of Linyi (Champa) polity in Vietnam. Gurukkal insists that we have to differentiate the early polities in the Deccan and Tamil macro region such as Satavahanas and *muvendars* (Cheras, Cholas, and Pandyas) respectively from the state by regarding them as chiefdoms. These he says were chiefdoms on the basis that there was not a general development of class relations and sedentary agriculture in these regions, though he recognizes in the Deccan the development of agro-pastoral clan settlements to a certain extent under the influence of north India. In the case of the Tamil macro region, he emphasizes its pre-mature condition by examining the so-called Sangam literature closely. He assigns the beginning of early state formation in Tamil Nadu to the post-Sangam period.<sup>8</sup> In Linyi, which developed from the Sa Huynh culture in the second century in central Vietnam, there occurred a change of agent from China to India, which influenced the culture of the local society probably around the fourth century. Though Yamagata tries to verify this from the archaeological evidences discovered through the excavations in Tra Kiew and other citadels of Linyi, she regrets that there is still a wide gap between the archaeological findings and the information obtainable in documents including inscriptions as regards the Indianization of the Linyi polity. Archaeological evidence is insufficient as yet to show Indianization of Linyi in the fourth century and she awaits the publication of the Oc-ao excavation reports for a better understanding of the process of Indianization of central Vietnam.

The examination of the early state formation was also carried out by three more scholars. R. Furui studied the situation in Bengal from the fifth to the seventh century by examining land-grant inscriptions and emphasized the difference as seen in various parts of Bengal in the position and activities of local bodies such as *adhikaranas* in the process of the formation of regional states such as the Palas and the Chandras under the influence of the Guptas. Only later in the twelfth century did the Senas unify Bengal under their rule. This paper contributes to reinforcing the study of the processual model of state formation as proposed by B.D. Chattopadhyaya and H. Kulke. E. Nitta talked about the formation of Dvaravati, a state located facing the Gulf of Thailand that flourished from the sixth to ninth centuries. Nitta clarified its early urbanization relating it to the development of inter-regional trade in both coastal and inland areas independently and its further development, which was made possible by the establishment of a network between coastal port-cities and inland agrarian settlements. For social integration Buddhism played an important role, though Hinduism was also practised. The network-connection between coastal settlements and inland agrarian area was discussed in relation to the state formation in Sumatra.

P.Y. Manguin discussed various problems concerning the city-state formation based on the river system in Srivijaya, but his revised text presents an integrated

<sup>8</sup> Discussion on this transformation is found in his *Social Formations in Early South India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010, particularly in Chapter 10.

picture of Srivijaya's early state formation. He focuses on the early urbanization of the Batang Hari and Musi River basins, which later led to the establishment of Palembang, up the Musi River, as the state capital. Palembang had access both to the coastal cities placed in the trade network and to areas further upstream that produced gold and forest products for export. As in Dvaravati, Buddhism played an important role in the integration of these sub-regions, though Hinduism was also accepted.

## 2. *Mandala Theory, Segmentary State Theory, and Samanta System*

*Mandala* has been one of the key concepts in understanding ancient and medieval Southeast Asia since 1976 when it was adopted by Tambiah in his 'Galactic Polity' theory to explain the Theravada Buddhist state formation in mainland Southeast Asia. Some scholars after Tambiah, particularly Mabbett and Wolters, have modified this concept to a considerable extent. In earlier Southeast Asia, according to Wolters, there was 'a patchwork of *mandalas*' and in each of them 'one king, identified with the divine and "universal" authority, claimed personal hegemony over the rulers in his *mandala* who in theory were his obedient vassals' (see Kulke's report in this volume). While Manguin suggests the applicability of this modified concept by Wolters to Sriwijaya, Aoyama objects to its application by Wolters to Majapahit in Java regarding the Majapahita centralized empire.

Kulke states in his report that the *mandala* concept contains a point that is similar to the concept of 'segmentary state' propagated and applied to the pre-modern south Indian states by B. Stein. Therefore, if the *mandala* theory, particularly that of Tambiah which is closer to Stein's idea, is applicable to Southeast Asian states, scholars will be tempted to explain some of the Southeast Asian states also as 'segmentary'. Actually, according to Kulke, Ayudhya, a Theravada Buddhist state in mainland Southeast Asia, was interpreted as a segmentary state by Chutintaranond. Although we did not have time to discuss the segmentary state theory itself in the symposium, we have to clarify in future the difference between these two concepts, *mandala* and segmentary, and the applicability of them, particularly of the latter, to Southeast Asian pre-modern states.

M. Mita examined in his report the *samanta* system in India, which had been discussed extensively by Kulke, Chattopadhyaya, and others. Mita took up Chahamana state, which emerged in Rajasthan as a *samanta* of the Pratiharas, as an example of a *samanta* state, kings of which claimed the *chakravartin* title (Sanskritic imperial title) for themselves, though they actually remained as the rulers of a limited area. Though he named this phenomenon 'Sanskritized imperialism', he actually studied the Chahamana case to explain the process of regional state formation in peripheral areas. A question that arose during the discussion was whether or not the functioning of the *samanta* system could be recognized in the state formation in Southeast Asia.



### 3. *The Role Played by Ideology and Caste (Varna) System in the Later State Formation*

Session 3 had four papers concerning this topic. R. Champakalakshmi explained the part played by ideology in advanced state formation in Tamil Nadu, south India, by taking up the Pallava, Pandya, and Chola states during the fifth to the thirteenth century. She emphasized the merging of the north Indian Brahmanical tradition based on the *varna* system with the local religious tradition in the Tamil country through the spread of Puranic religion and the Bhakti movement in Tamilagam in relation to the religious policy of these states. She stressed the difference between the Pallavas/Pandyas and the Cholas with regard to the degree of importance given to the local Tamil tradition (vernacularization). Her study also covers the socio-economic development in these states.

F. Matsuura, in his revised paper, casts doubt upon the centralized and stable state rule in the Angkor kingdom (from the ninth to the fourteenth century) by examining old Khmer inscriptions and Chinese documents and also referring to the studies by I.W. Mabbett, H. Kulke, and M. Vickery. State integration seems to have shown both a centripetal and centrifugal tendency under the reigns of different kings. The way of deifying the king also differs during the reigns of different kings. The concept of *devaraja*, typically seen in the Angkor state, invited discussion regarding the divinity of kings as examined in this paper. Kulke denied the king's divinity not only in Southeast Asia but also in South Asia, in his concluding remarks. T. Aoyama studied state and social integration of Majapahit in Java. Through the analysis of *desawarnana*, an old Javanese court narrative, he emphasized that the Majapahit kings depended firmly on the Indic (Hindu) ideology for the integration of their state and society based on sedentary agriculture. Although many participants accepted his interpretation of centralization of the state for the first time in Indonesia, questions arose regarding how such integration was possible despite the non-functioning of the caste system (*varnasramadharma*) in Java. His answers, the importance given to dynastic genealogy, divinization of the king, and maintenance of king's good and amicable relations with common people, await further studies.

### 4. *Sufis, Sultans and Commercial Network in the Thirteenth to Sixteenth Centuries*

In Session 1, S. Kumar described a change in relationship between the sultan (political power) and Sufi saints (Chishtis) by taking up *mal'ufuzats*, which record the teachings of Sufi *shaykhs* like Nizam al-Din Auliya (late thirteenth century) and Sayyid Gisudaraz (early fifteenth century). Early Sufi saints kept a distance from the political powers, but later in the fifteenth century relations between the two became much closer as Sufism gained power among the common people. Kumar's

revised paper in this volume emphasizes the Nizam al-Din's innovation in creating an organized Sufi fraternity in Delhi and Gisudaraz's efforts in creating trans-regional links in the expanded sultanate in the fifteenth century. The Delhi Sultanate period is unique in this regard because we learn about historical changes by combining information from the state chronicles and Sufi literature. The above point relates to the topic studied by P.B. Wagoner who discussed the Sanskritization of Persianate political culture through the spread of Vijayanagar (Hindu) coins in the sultanates of northern Deccan. The interaction of the two civilizations represented by Sanskrit and Persian cultures respectively has so far been studied in relation to the elite culture of the state, but Wagoner's study extended it to the activities of diverse social groups and the market inviting further discussion on the vernacularization of the state rule. In response to Tanabe's shorter comment in the *Toyo Bunko* web-journal, Wagoner has revised his discussion in the present text by dropping the terms 'Sanskrit Cosmopolis' and 'Persian Cosmopolis' used in the text read at the symposium and also by emphasizing the vernacular forces that contributed to the convergence of the two different cosmopolitan traditions of political culture.

As for the Islamicization of Southeast Asia, M. Hirosue studied the case of Pasai and other states established in northern Sumatra in and after the thirteenth century. Islam was accepted by the ruler of the state living in the port-city, which was connected to its hinterland through rivers. The hinterland provided agricultural products for the maintenance of city dwellers and forest goods for export through the East-West maritime trade. Although Islamicization of the port-cities can be explained by the development of the trade network built by Muslim merchants and the close relation the sultans had with Sufis, the question whether the hinterland people accepted Islam or not invited discussion. In this relation, Tanabe wonders in this volume how the hinterland people would have dealt with the socio-economic development brought by the inter-ethnic transactions and penetration of market economy, had they not accepted Islam. K. Nishio examined *Sejarah Melayu*, a court history of Melaka state, and emphasized the remnants of Malay traditional elements (either indigenous or Hindu) in the relationship between the ruler and people as a substratum under the Islamic surface for some centuries after the Islamicization of Melaka in the fourteenth century. Only in the seventeenth century, when *Sujarah Melayu* was written, did a change occur in the Malay Islamic states and then Islamic norm became more substantial in the state rule defining a just ruler and guiding his governance. The discussion included questions such as the effect of the post-Tamerlane change in the world economy system and the start of the age of commerce in Southeast Asia on the Islamicization of the people.

As expected, these four papers showed that there was a lot of differences between South Asia and Southeast Asia (insular part) in the Islamicization, though both regions were equally engulfed by a huge wave of Islamicization from the thirteenth century onwards. As pointed out by Tanabe in his report, while Hinduism

and its caste system based on the vast agrarian society set a certain limit on the Islamicization of vernacular society in South Asia, trade network connecting port-cities in the coastal Southeast Asia facilitated the Islamicization of insular Southeast Asia. Though the role played by Sufism in the Islamicization was conspicuous both in South and Southeast Asia, the difference between the two regions was also seen in the relationship Sufis had with the sultans and with common people. This seems to have affected the process and degree of transforming vernacular society in the two regions. However, these points await further intensive studies.

\* \* \*

In this symposium we examined the issues concerning Indianization of Southeast Asia and Islamicization of the state and society in South Asia and Southeast Asia in relation to the formation of pre-modern states and societies in both the regions and also the cultural and economic interactions between these two important Asian regions. In the past, studies were focused on the similarity in states and societies between these two regions, which is thought to have been caused by the introduction of Indian culture into Southeast Asia in an ancient period. However, in this symposium, for the first time we had intensive discussions on their differences and we were able to clarify them to a certain extent.

Though we notice the 'convergence' in the early stage of state formation on both sides of the Bay of Bengal, the non-acceptance in Southeast Asia of certain aspects of Brahmanical ideology and caste system, through which Indian society was basically integrated, provided different features to the Southeast Asian state structure and social integration in and after the fifth century. In Southeast Asia, however, there were regional differences deriving from the existence of diverse ecologies and ethnic groups, which created differences in Southeast Asia itself in state formation and social integration and also in the acceptance of Indian traditional culture as well as Islam.

For clarifications on these differences, and of course on the similarities also, between South Asia and Southeast Asia and within Southeast Asia itself, further studies are required. We sincerely hope that this report of the symposium will act as a spur to such studies.